

Stakeholder Involvement

UPDATING PORTLAND'S MULTI-MODAL TSDC

Sumner Sharpe, FAICP
Senior Consultant
Parametrix

GOALS

- Early and continuing engagement of representative stakeholders in the decision process
- Build on Portland's existing networks – neighborhood, business and advocacy organizations
- Open-ended two-way communications: face-to-face, written and electronic

APPROACHES

- Stakeholder interviews; inform/issue i.d.
- Presentations: outreach/inform
- Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC):
consensus/recommendations
- Open houses: inform/feedback
- Communications: inform/feedback

INTERVIEWS

- Relationship building; SAC membership
- 20 interviews: LWV; institutional alliance; developers/Realtor/attorney; neighborhood associations; bike/ped/freight advocates; major business; business associations (chambers, restaurants, TMA); elected officials and agency staff (Port, Housing Authority)

Interview Findings

- Unclear how the TSDC program works
- Lack of a central place to access information
- Significant support to continue the program
- Support for same or more TSDC funds, incl. inflation adjustments
- Affordable housing and small business exemptions/discounts acceptable
- TOD discounts as incentives questioned
- Interest in geographic equity; project distribution

PRESENTATIONS

- 25 presentation to business, neighborhood, advocacy groups
- Short and long versions and leave behinds
- Inform, identify issues, feedback on questions, establish communications channels

CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE

- 19 members – most active throughout process
- Roles/responsibilities
 - Sounding board
 - Represent interests and positions
 - Communication links
 - Recommend to City Commissioner of Transportation
 - TOD discount phase-out (consensus)
 - Geographic/modal equity (majority/minority)
 - Project list (consensus) (several added projects)
 - TSDC rates (majority/minority)

COMMUNICATIONS

- Two-way; one-on-one; responsive
- Fact sheet/contact information
- Commonly asked questions
- Website – meeting summaries, research reports, recommendations
- E-mail and personal exchanges
- Exploration of issues/methodologies at SAC meetings

The Role of the Citizen's Advisory Committee

Portland TSDC Update

Rick Williams

**Lloyd Transportation
Management Association
(LTMA)**

Chair TSDC CAC

October 10, 2007

Committee Composition

Bruce Allen	Portland Development Commission
Don Baack	Hillsdale Neighborhood Association
Kay Durtschi	Southwest Neighborhoods Inc (SWNI)
Arlene Kimura	East Portland Neighborhood Office (EPNO)
J. Susie Lahsene	Port of Portland
Jeff Hampton	Oregon Restaurant Association
Rob Mawson	Alliance of Portland Neighborhood Business Assns.
Jim McCauley	Homebuilders Association of Metropolitan Portland
Steven L. Pfeiffer	Original Policy Advisory Committee Member
Scott Bricker	Bicycle Transportation Alliance
Bruce Halperin	Portland Freight Advisory Committee
Jan Semenza	Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
Marilee Tillstrom	Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Program
Mel Vietzke	Cully Association of Neighborhoods
Mark D. Whitlow	Retail Task Force
Ben Williams	WRG Design
Rick Williams	Lloyd Transportation Management Association
Brian Wilson	Portland Business Alliance
Ty K. Wyman	Institutional Coalition

Committee Charge

- **Project List**: Reduce list of 215 potential projects to approximately 40 priority projects eligible for future TSDC funding.
- **Geographic and modal equity**: Assuring equity of priority projects while also supporting projects that have identified leverage and/or are regional in nature.
- **TOD Discount**: Evaluate effectiveness of TOD discount and feasibility for continuance.
- **TSDC Rates**: Raise or lower.

Committee Ground Rules

Support for TSDC as mechanism for supporting/funding capacity increases. Each member was asked to agree that their role was to support a process that leads to a more equitable and strategic distribution of TSDC funds. This was not a process to seek reparations for past problems with the program.

Participation. Make every reasonable and good faith effort to attend each scheduled meeting. This would assure understanding of the project and its findings and create a representative group of stakeholders who have a high level of knowledge about TSDC's and the ultimate recommendations for change.

Open-mindedness. Each member brought an open mind to the committee, recognizing that all other members represented unique geographic areas of the City and/or specific vested interests.

Courtesy to others. Each member brought a unique perspective to the table and the group was very good at respecting and validating that.

Liaison and feedback. Committee members should serve as a conduit of information on the TSDC study to and from their respective organizations or businesses.

Factors for Success

- **Clear recognition that there were inequities that resulted from the TSDC program of the past 10 years. This recognition included areas that had benefited by the inequity.**
 - + **TOD Discount favored Central City (+\$13 million)**
 - + **A marginal system for tracking projects and project status**
 - + **No report back mechanism within the program.**
- **Extremely high level of professionalism on the part of the City and the consultant team.**
 - + **Very fact based reports and background work.**
 - + **Willingness of project team to (a) do extra research and (b) reformat information to address committee concerns.**
- **Early agreement by CAC that “\$ in \$ out” goal, would drive discussions and decision making.**
 - + **Agreement that no area would “subsidize” another area.**
 - + **Changed the dynamic of discussions.**

Outcomes

Project List

Committee came to near unanimous consensus on final list of 41 projects.

Geographic and Modal Equity

Projects were geographically/modally balanced and reflected the priorities of the diverse areas of the city represented on the committee. More importantly, \$ in \$ out was maintained. Everyone could leave the room feeling they had effectively represented their constituent group.

TOD Discount

Consensus recommendation to phase out over 4 years.

TSDC Rates

Recommendation to maintain comparable rate versus doubling or tripling.

What not to do

- **Avoid discounts**
 - + They reduce total funds available and create disparities (and animosity) between geographic areas.
- **Don't let one area vote on another areas priorities**
 - + Do not give a group red dots and a sense of power
 - **Do not focus on “total project cost” versus “total SDC funds allocated to a project”**
 - + Big projects with big costs confuse people with little projects and lower costs. Priorities and leverage are everything.