



**Meeting Attendees:**

Garlynn Woodsong - Concordia  
Micah Meskel - Humboldt  
Luke Norman – Sullivan’s Gulch  
Dave Johansen - Alameda  
Kate Lyman - TriMet  
Dan Marchand – TriMet  
Jim Howell – Eliot  
Anjala Ehelebe – Woodlawn  
Rachel Lee - Sabin

Jim Brown - Alameda  
Charlie Tso - Boise  
Matt Ferris-Smith - King  
Sara Long – Eliot  
Andrew Sheie – At Large, Humboldt  
Paul van Orden - Eliot  
Nan Stark - BPS  
Lokyee Au – NECN staff

**Meeting comes to order 7:07pm. Quorum counted.**

Anjala moves to approve June minutes with amendment to state May minutes were approved by committee. Dave seconds. Andy abstains. Approved.

**Kate Lyman, TriMet**

Looking at the way bus service will grow to better serve existing riders, where they might put new bus routes, how routes may be changed, hours of service. What is being presented is a first draft – TriMet is actively seeking comments and feedback. They will come back in the Fall with a refined draft. The hope is to finish the planning process by the end of the year.

Changes to lines affecting NE area:

Line 24:

Heard the desire for connection between NE and NW Portland via service on Fremont Bridge. Ridership would be monitored and frequency will be added if need is observed.

Line 70:

Connect to Rose Quarter transit center and serves Swan Island instead. Goal is to substantially increase service for Swan Island. Will take over line 85.

Line 17:

Will serve NE 33<sup>rd</sup> and continue across Broadway Bridge into downtown. Heard from residents near NE 33<sup>rd</sup> – they’d like to take the bus to downtown.

Line Y:

Just a proposal at the moment. This would become a continuous line connecting NE and SE Portland, continuing to Sellwood. Intended to provide logical continuous bus service connecting NE and SE Portland. Northern portion of line: service on Columbia Blvd. and turn around Oregon Humane Society.

Line Z:

Start at Parkrose Transit, serve Prescott to 33<sup>rd</sup>, to Alberta, to MLK, to downtown – will allow Line 72 to stay on Killingsworth. This means bus service will be available on both Alberta and Killingsworth.

Bus riders on MLK will have options with Line 6 and Line Z.



Line 6:

Diverted to serve area called Delta Park. Go north to Jansen Beach.

Extended hours of service for certain bus lines:

Some individuals need options with more flexible hours – earlier start times, later end times.

Line 4, 15, 20, 72 (Killingsworth), and 75 (42<sup>nd</sup> and Lombard)

Sara notes that bus lines should optimally run 24/7.

**Discussion**

Garlynn notes many are supportive of several proposed changes – 72 and Z.

Charlie asks the reason for Line 4 changes to switch from Lombard to Ivanhoe, as service is lower on Ivanhoe than Lombard.

Kate responds that the change is in response to businesses in St. Johns. They have noted concerns over volume of service affecting community and quality of life. Switch is a means of ensuring people are still provided service while also addressing concerns heard from the business community.

Garlynn notes that Line 72 going down Killingsworth stops at 38<sup>th</sup> and 36<sup>th</sup>, but at 37<sup>th</sup> there's a bike boulevard and curb bulbouts. Is there a way to combine the two stops to 37<sup>th</sup> to make it a way to place bus stops at curb bulb outs to give bicyclists a chance to cross the greenway? Or are there opportunities to do so at other locations?

Dave notes that there are other locations where this already occurs.

Jim notes the importance of frequent & grid services: Line 24 is good, with many neighborhood support. Line Z: great. There is room for improvement though because it essentially duplicates Line 6. He would prefer to see it cross on Skidmore, and go over to interstate. It would pick up the 44, 4, and yellow line.

Garlynn notes that this is what Line 72 would do.

Jim responds the Skidmore corridor would provide huge opportunity for ridership. The distance from Line 72 to Skidmore is over half a mile, so it is further and less accessible.

Discussion of whether or not direct downtown service is necessary.

Jim notes that rather than changing the 70 again, TriMet should keep it as is. Extend the Line Y, and hook to the Line 17 Broadway line.

Garlynn asks, in East Portland they have to drive to get to Columbia Blvd because there is no transit there. There is no proposal for Columbia service – did TriMet look at that?

Kate responds that TriMet heard that as well. However, the challenge is the low-density of jobs in the area. They're spread out and the actual number of jobs within walking distance of a bus stop is less than 10,000. This means fewer than 8 people per hour would be riding the bus based on those numbers. Unless density of jobs will increase, there is no sign that there will be enough people to ride the bus. There's also an abundance of parking along job sites on Columbia Blvd. So even if there were frequent service, it would take a lot longer to ride the bus and for the rider to get to the front door of their work. The result is that a lot of challenges exist to having effective, efficient bus service at that site.



Garlynn asks for clarification- if this is a long-range plan, then that means there will be minimal service to Columbia?

Anjala notes the Comprehensive plan vision for industrial businesses in area and that extending lines northward would in fact align with a 'future' vision. There are plans to take bike routes north toward Columbia and it would be important think about how to align this with bus service in the area.

Jim: Line 8- extend (past Line 6) across Rosa Parks to Denver, north on Denver to Kenton, up to Delta Park station, into Hayden Meadows.

Nan asks if there is a timeline TriMet is functioning under.

Kate responds that these drafts are used to guide our annual budget allocations. They're looking to community feedback to help TriMet prioritize. These documents will be used to make incremental improvements – they don't know which ones will happen first.

TriMet survey is online and available until July 31<sup>st</sup>. Visit: [Trimet.org/northcentral](http://Trimet.org/northcentral)

### **Commercial Trash Collection and Noise**

Sara: Commercial collectors are set to come by in the middle of the night because of increased dangers of having them come by during the day. With more mixed use residential and commercial this becomes more of an issue. Seems like this issue is the broader issue with noise.

Paul provides information – The city spent 5 years following garbage trucks at night. Noise review board made recommendations to city council but city council did not accept the bulk of the recommendations, except: No glass collection after 10pm and no backup beepers during the middle of the night.

One option is to treat trucks to mute noise. Another option is to treat garbage trucks.

Paul notes the biggest issue is the lack of franchising. Home collection is franchised. More big cities use that methodology for commercial collectors. Need to explore franchised commercial collection.

City had it on their agenda to look into noise with trash collection but the Board made the decision to table garbage truck challenges to address more the more immediate problems related to pile driving. LUTC may want to send a letter to the noise review board to encourage them to take their recommendation back to council. Also explore the avenue of enforcement.

Sara also notes that even when fines are levied, they're too low to dissuade noise polluters.

Paul responds that the enforcement element needs to be addressed.

Garlynn notes that this issue goes back to the Comp Plan discussion – with the growth in our communities, mixed use, etc, this will be an increasing problem.

Paul adds it would be great to have an embedded planner within the noise office (need to staff appropriately to address the concerns)

Garlynn moves to write a letter for NECN Board to approve. Letter would be sent to Mayor Charlie Hales and Commissioner Amanda Fritz, and CC'd to all other council members. The letter would recommend commercial franchising, noise treatments (dumpster with acoustic



pads, treat forks with material) when complaints are presented, and stronger enforcement, including staff to do legwork. Dave seconds. No discussion. Paul abstains. Motion passes. Sara's friend would be willing to write the letter.

#### **Leadership Approval:**

Garlynn Woodsong and Dave Johansen nominated to be co-chairs of LUTC. Both accept. All in favor.

#### **Going Street Greenways**

Concordia LUTC recommended letter regarding Going Street Greenway be passed along to the NECN LUTC to consider endorsing on a fast-track schedule, so that PBOT is given an opportunity to possibly take action prior to the beginning of the school year.

Micah notes a mistake in the second page of the letter regarding Kind Neighborhood – the intersection written in letter is 10<sup>th</sup> and Williams, which should be corrected to be 10<sup>th</sup> and Rodney.

Garlynn moves to send letter to NECN Board to send to PBOT. Anjala seconds. Motion passes unanimously.

#### **Demolitions, DRAC (Development Review Advisory Committee) Accountability**

Jim notes issues with the organization of DRAC don't have a way to be addressed.

Garlynn this agenda item is in part regarding the larger fact that LUTC has a 2-3 month old approval to write a letter regarding demolitions. It is a bit unclear as to what the letter will entail. Also, since the letter has been approved, demolition regulations have changed.

Jim notes that the demolitions/major alterations regulation changes have in some ways made it more difficult for those not even engaging in demolitions. Residents desiring to alter their homes are experiencing burdens in delays.

Rachel adds that part of the reason for notices is to give people a heads up and let people prepare for alterations or demolitions near their home.

Jim notes one of the problems with BDS is inconsistency in agency's message to residents. Garlynn asks is there a role for a public defender or government paid lawyer when neighborhood associations need one to deal with hearings and can't afford one due to their nonprofit status?

Jim: General direction of UNR is to keep neighborhoods intact. Need to have code that considers neighborhood context to identify suitability of different developments. Also need to provide residents the opportunity to provide input regarding context and suitability.

Regarding the LUTC letter, Rachel notes as one of the original volunteers to write the letter, it was difficult to engage because of the unclear direction it had.

Garlynn asks the group, if NECN were to be asked to send a letter regarding demolitions, what would we like to see in the letter?

Andy: 1. Try to find a way to talk about scale and setbacks in a way that's flexible and neighborhood-appropriate; 2. Physical demolitions: hazardous materials need to be abated and verified. Needs to happen on a commercial level at the very least.

Micah: Better protection of natural resources – increase fees for taking out significant trees; give incentives for keeping those resources.



Dave: Scale, style, and setback. Design review for neighborhood input. If it's total new construction or what you'd define as a major remodel (significant changes) – should go through design review process.

Anjala: There is no way on current demolition notice to notify the builder they're okay with the demo as long as they spare the tree. There need to be more options on the response form for those don't want to appeal the demolition per se – they just want to know if the tree can be saved.

Rachel: 1. Scale, appropriateness; 2 hazardous materials; 3. Corner lot partitions – currently there is no effective way for residents to provide input to deny corner lot partitions.

Rachel states her concern that there is incoherency within the letter LUTC wants to write.

Andy suggests to separate the items into different letters to different groups.

Dave adds that what seems to be the biggest thing is the lack of neighborhood input.

Nan notes if you want to talk about scale – lot size determines scales currently. Setbacks are determined by zone – implies the less dense the zone, the bigger the lot, the bigger the setback. Provide some suggestions on what type of neighborhood is being discussed in the letter.

Dave notes that Rachel made a good point about the issues that comes with making a laundry list.

Garlynn states a letter is important because its intended purpose is to effect change. If we are writing a letter to council, a laundry list is not the most effective, but a list is helpful so a point isn't forgotten. Question is, can we turn it into a narrative that hits on all the points?

Also, he notes that he doesn't want to engage in NIMBYism. The letter should point out there are artful and effective ways to have certain developments that are context-sensitive.

Jim notes that the infill project will include topics of narrow-lot development, scale, setbacks.

What's not included: Rules for demolition/deconstruction, asbestos regulation enforcement, and lead abatement/enforcement.

Garlynn suggests to narrow down the letter by crossing off items that already have traction or are already in the works.

Jim responds it wouldn't be a bad idea to include phrases to support items already in motion.

Nan suggests LUTC could try to get a BDS staffer involved in demolition regulations to come to a meeting and provide more information and give NECN the opportunity to offer some input.

Rachel notes she is unsure if there's anyone NECN can talk to from BDS to enact changes that are political in nature.

Anjala responds that lower level bureaucrats can be just as powerful as the council member. If we can get to the person that writes the form, we could get to a lot of stuff rather than going to council.

Garlynn adds, yes, LUTC should invite someone from BDS to come to speak to us sooner rather than later, recognizing that this won't solve all the problems.

Lokyee will connect with Nan to identify a BDS employee that would be good to have speak with LUTC at the August meeting.

### **Residential Infill Project Committee Position**

Residential Infill Project seeking to fill positions for its Stakeholder Advisory Committee. Each district coalition has been asked to provide a nominee for the committee. NECN is looking for those interested to fill out a statement of interest form to apply for the position. At-large positions are also available for those that do not want to be a district coalition representative.



Requirements are 2 monthly meetings during the 18-month project, additional events, workshops, and to attend monthly NECN LUTC meetings to provide updates to committee. Strawpoll: Micah motions to take a straw poll that Garlynn would be a good representative for LUTC as the infill committee member. Garlynn abstains. All others in favor.

### **Nan Stark updates**

Comp Plan: Last week (July 13) Planning and Sustainability Commission took vote on parts of plan; July 28 meeting will be the vote on remaining document. Last week they voted on maps, transportation systems plan, infrastructure plan (city-wide systems plan). After the 28<sup>th</sup> it'll be out of the hands of the Planning and Sustainability Commission.

Sometime in August there will be a draft document that goes public – goes into hands of city council. Hearings start in the Fall. Work sessions with city council are open; hearings will start in November.

Employment Zoning discussion draft came out July 13. A series of discussion drafts will come out and will be open for a few weeks. Proposed drafts follow.

Discussion for campus institutions comes out August 3, and mixed use projects discussion draft comes out August 17 – those hearings will start in November.

Transportation Systems Plan discussion draft: September 14 and Zoning Map as well.

### **Neighborhood Updates**

Anjala – Fuel Storage

Meeting set up with relevant parties to ask whether or not city agencies are prepared to deal with the potential fuel storage issues?

Agency's answer: These fuel depots are inspected regularly by city and state – they're state of the art. The city is as prepared as it can be, but it knows there a threat there. They're going to classes on coal train derailments.

Neighborhoods need to work to form neighborhood emergency teams. This will be something to be brought to SALT (Safety and Livability Team). However there is still the issue of hazards trains pose.

Nan notes that the PBEM representative was encouraging about having Woodlawn use their agency resources.

Anjala adds PBEM has resources for people to set up Neighborhood Emergency Teams. Can help with the drafting of neighborhood evacuation plan, can provide scholarships/resources for emergency classes.

Garlynn – Concordia LUTC meeting discussion 20s Bikeway

City is willing to consider one diverter in Alameda rather than Concordia. If Alameda doesn't go for that, it would go to Prescott. From Prescott to Ainsworth – alternating one way blocks always pointed at the arterial seemed to be a good idea. City will run outreach notifying residents to make sure it's not a big surprise, and they're looking to finalize the design within the next couple of months.

Andy – question about role at Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) Bureau Advisory Committee.

As NECN representative, is he allowed to offer input?

Garlynn responds he should be giving input based on NECN stances and positions.



Micah - Meeting schedules

NECN Board is discussing option to roll back general meeting frequency – every other month. Executive committee would meet the months the general meetings don't meet. The option exists to set emergency meetings for urgent matters. This would affect LUTC if there is something pressing so he would like to get feedback from LUTC.

Garlynn notes NECN is strong because of its ability to have quick turnaround.

Dave adds that it's workable to still have a quick turnaround

Garlynn asks if members would be okay with an emergency meeting

Dave responds yes, if there's enough notice.

Micah notes rolling back on meetings means LUTC would need to keep better timelines/deadlines.

Garlynn adds each time LUTC takes a vote on a letter, the committee will need to know what the deadlines exist.

Dave suggests exploring the option of having LUTC send out letters.

Rachel responds there may have been some important reason as to why the Board can't delegate authority to LUTC to send letters.

Garlynn adds that to do so LUTC would have to go through process of modifying by-laws.

Jim adds from his experience on the NECN board they didn't seem to run out of business to take care of on a monthly basis.

Rachel responds that part of the reason is not that there was not enough to talk about. The Board is trying to cut down on meetings to make it more feasible/accessible for more people to serve on the Board.

Garlynn notes that the concern as committee is the need to act on a timely manner. However, if we can preserve that ability, he's okay with it. Important thing is to be able to act on a timely fashion.

Micah responds saying he'll take this information back to the board.

*Adjourn at 9:25pm.*