

**Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition
Board Meeting
Monday, November 3rd, 2014 – 7 to 9pm
SE Uplift Fireside Conference Room
3534 SE Main St.
Portland OR 97214**

<i>Time</i>	<i>Item</i>	<i>Presenter(s)</i>	<i>Info</i>	<i>Disc</i>	<i>Action</i>
7:00 (10 min)	Welcome Approve Agenda and Minutes, seat new member	McCullough	X	X	X
7:10 (40 min)	Proposed City Street Fee, presentation, Q&A	PBOT staff	X	X	
7:50 (10 min)	Update Neighborhood Small Grants, call for board member to serve on the selection committee	Fedderson	X	X	
8:00 (10 min)	Break	All			
8:10 (15 min)	Board Training 101: Review of Advocacy Request process, rational	Kellett	X	X	
8:25 (15 min)	Proposed Street Fee letter from board.	McCullough	X	X	
8:40 (10 min)	Executive Director report, building upgrades, new hire progress, BAC process, NA visits, strategic planning process		X	X	
8:50	Neighborhood Reports	Dufay			
9:00	Adjourn	McCullough			

Next Board Meeting:
1/5/2015
SE Uplift Fireside Room
3534 SE Main St

MEMORANDUM

Date: 14 October 2014

To: Mayor Hales
Commissioner Fritz
Commissioner Fish
Commissioner Novick
Commissioner Saltzman

From: Southeast Uplift Board of Directors

Subject: Portland Street Fees

When the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) proposed a new “Street Fee” earlier this year, a sense of urgency framed declarations about its absolute need. Portland’s roads were falling apart, and if we failed to fix them, addressing the problem would only cost us much more in the long run.

In May, the Portland Bureau of Transportation, citing examples from a number of smaller cities in Oregon, proposed shifting tax burdens to home owners and local business and away from fuel users. The discussion has been disjointed with little in the way of analysis and even less public involvement.

Southeast Uplift’s board, representing hundreds of thousands of Portland’s residents would like to make the following points:

1. A fee, requiring no vote of the people, requires more public involvement, not less. The discussion has lacked transparency, involved a very limited number of participants, and is not well understood.
2. The purpose of the street fee has apparently changed from street repair to safety. As this policy U-turn has taken place, application of the funds now appears oriented to special interests rather than the good of the city as a whole
3. The design of the fee and its implementations has serious mistakes

Oregon, like other states, depends on a combination of fuel taxes and weight-miles taxes to fund transportation. Fuel taxes are assessed on a federal, state, and local basis. In Oregon, the gasoline tax is lower than that in our two neighboring states of Washington and California. For diesel, Oregon primarily depends on weight-miles. Some Oregon cities such as Eugene, Tigard, Milwaukie to name a few, also assess a per gallon tax on diesel.

Public Involvement and Transparency

Portland's neighborhood associations are the primary focus of public involvement in the city. In this case, there has been very limited communication with the neighborhood associations or the coalitions, like Southeast Uplift.

Concerned citizens have had access to a bewilderingly disorganized web site, but this provided few comprehensible answers.

Over the summer, several committees were formed, but the representation on the committees was hardly representative.

A street fee does not face the vote of the people. As such, public involvement should be more intense, not less, and it should be possible for the average Portland resident to understand the proposal.

Failing this, the new tax should be put forward for a public vote.

Maintenance vs Street Maintenance vs. Safety Projects

No in depth study is needed to declare many of Portland's road surfaces are pitiful - yet a review of the proposed street fee spending (Our Streets Project List Breakout by Years/ October 2014 Draft) reveals a range of projects that piggyback on the core concern regarding Portland's crumbling roadways.¹

In general, only about two-fifths of every new Street Fee dollar received would be spent on the urgent matter of preserving and repairing Portland's road surfaces. It is unclear whether the additional spending will be in addition to current budgets or not.

Another (11%) of Our Streets funds would go to Bridges, Signals, Signs, & Street Lights, while 47% would be devoted to Safety Projects. While some of the safety projects will be useful, moneys spent on greenways and bicycle lanes appear sharply divorced from street repair.

We question why all of the new revenues are not being directed into Street Preservation, given the demonstrated long term savings in preventive measures, and given the current allocation will fall short of meeting the deliverables needed to rectify the backlog in road maintenance. We would also like assurance that existing funding for Street Preservation will not be reduced or reallocated.

One of the major arguments made for imposing a Portland Street Fee is that many other local governments that have imposed them. Yet the comparison fails in a key regard: how new street fee revenues are spent.

For example, Tigard's street fee program puts its entire emphasis on street maintenance. The city has gone to great lengths to produce materials which explain in appropriate detail different methods of street preservation and their associated costs.²

¹ <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation/article/506249>

² http://www.tigard-or.gov/city_hall/departments/public_works/engineering/street_maintenance/docs/pavement_treatment_examples.pdf

Uplifting community advocacy since 1968.

Ardenwald-Johnson Creek • Brentwood-Darlington • Brooklyn • Buckman • Creston-Kenilworth • Eastmoreland • Foster-Powell
Hosford-Abernethy • Kerns • Laurelhurst • Montavilla • Mt. Scott-Arleta • Mt. Tabor • North Tabor • Reed • Richmond
Sellwood-Moreland • South Tabor • Sunnyside • Woodstock

Any new Street Fee needs to use best long term practices if they are to justify the additional financial burden on Portland citizenry.

Correcting the Errors

The current street fee methodology has a serious error. In many cases major users of roads may pay less than a single Portland resident. The proposed street fee insulates large fuel users who typically operate fleets of heavy vehicles that cause major roadway wear and tear from paying their fair share.³ Consider for instance:

Home owner: Three cars/25,000 miles a year/4 tons/3,650 trips a year: Estimated Street Fee \$0 to \$600/year.⁴

UPRR Brooklyn Yard: 1,000 heavy trucks/33,000,000 miles a year/40,000 tons/400,000 trips a year: Street Fee: \$480/year.^{5,6}

This does not appear equitable. In fact, this appears so inequitable that it is most likely a computational error.

Major institutions which are heavily dependent upon trips to their location are paying minimal amounts in relation to residential properties. Major medical institutions such as OHSU, Providence Hospital or Legacy Good Samaritan would apparently pay only \$60.00 per month after the non-profit discount. These are multi-million dollar Institutions and they are being given major reductions despite having a tremendous impact on the transportation system.

The new street fee would impose new burdens on the small businesses that make Portland a special place to live and visit. Large corporations can more easily absorb the costs of complying with complicated reporting requirements than small operators who drive Portland's thriving entrepreneurial scene.

In Conclusion

In terms of approaching a street fee and improving Street Preservation in Portland we would like to see:

- a fee structure that is fair and simple and assesses heavy road users their appropriate share
- funds dedicated entirely to street preservation without reducing existing allocations in the PBOT budget
- use of the most cost efficient techniques for pavement preservation and rehabilitation.
- in conjunction with other cities, lobby our state government to raise the gas tax raise or move forward with plans to replace the gas tax with an alternative funding mechanism that adequately addresses transportation needs.

³ Rough ride: One-third of Seattle's arterial streets are in poor shape. Crosscut.com. September 2, 2014:

"There are certain vehicles that put tremendously heavy loads on your roadways," said Larry Galehouse, director of the National Center for Pavement Preservation at Michigan State University. He noted tractor-trailers and garbage trucks, as well as buses, which are a primary mode of mass transit in Seattle. "It really accelerates the wear."

Galehouse said that a rough rule of thumb is that one loaded tractor-trailer can cause the same amount of road wear as approximately 9,600 automobiles. Rough ride: One-third of Seattle's arterial streets are in poor shape,

⁴ The actual residential street fee varies by adjusted gross income with a \$50/month ceiling.

⁵ Brooklyn Intermodal Yard Modernization Project Description, undated, page 6 cites between 145,851 and 410,434 "lifts". A lift is roughly equivalent to one heavy truck delivery.

⁶ U.S. Department of Transportation, Federal Highway Administration, Highway Statistics 2011, Table VM-1, March 2013.

<http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics/2011/vm1.cfm>. The mileage assumed per truck has been reduced by 50% to allow for other uses as well.

Uplifting community advocacy since 1968.

Ardenwald-Johnson Creek • Brentwood-Darlington • Brooklyn • Buckman • Creston-Kenilworth • Eastmoreland • Foster-Powell
Hosford-Abernethy • Kerns • Laurelhurst • Montavilla • Mt. Scott-Arleta • Mt. Tabor • North Tabor • Reed • Richmond
Sellwood-Moreland • South Tabor • Sunnyside • Woodstock

- put the proposed fee to a vote of the people

On behalf of the Southeast Uplift Board of Directors,



Robert McCullough
President

DRAFT

Uplifting community advocacy since 1968.

Ardenwald-Johnson Creek • Brentwood-Darlington • Brooklyn • Buckman • Creston-Kenilworth • Eastmoreland • Foster-Powell
Hosford-Abernethy • Kerns • Laurelhurst • Montavilla • Mt. Scott-Arleta • Mt. Tabor • North Tabor • Reed • Richmond
Sellwood-Moreland • South Tabor • Sunnyside • Woodstock

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE BOARD
SOUTHEAST UPLIFT (SEUL) NEIGHBORHOOD COALITION

MONDAY Oct. 06, 2014, 7:00PM @ 3534 SE Main Street, Portland Oregon 97214 (Fireside Room)

Note: The previously scheduled SEUL board meeting (Sept. 2, 2014) did not have a quorum, and so no official meeting took place.

There was sufficient attendance Oct. 6, 2014 to constitute a quorum, listed as follows:

SEUL Board Members Present (P) / Not Present (N)
P - Ardenwald-Johnson Creek - Marianne Colgrove P
- Brentwood-Darlington - Jacob Sherman
N - Brooklyn - Wendy Miller
P - Buckman - Greg Moulliet
P - Creston-Kenilworth - Seth Gardner
P - Eastmoreland - Robert McCullough (Chair)
N - Foster-Powell - *vacant*
P - Hosford-Abernathy - Bill Crawford
N- Kerns - G.T. Meili
P - Laurelhurst - Don Gardner
P - Montavilla - Peter Maris (Treasurer)
P - Mt. Scott Arleta - Scott Vala
N- Mt. Tabor - Paul Leistner
P - North Tabor - Cathy Riddell
N - Reed - James Hager
N - Richmond - Cliff Hutchinson
N - Sellwood-Moreland - Vacant
P - South Tabor - Eric Lozano
P - Sunnyside - Jeff Cole (Secretary)
P - Woodstock - Moshe Lenske

Draft

At large:

P - Mandy Heaton
P - Mary Ann Schwab
P - Michael Sonnleitner

Guests:

Justin Douglas - Portland Development Commission
Karen Tosi - Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association
Karen Hery - SouthEast Examiner

Staff:

N - Anne Dufay - Executive Director
P - Bob Kellett - Land Use, Sustainability, and Transportation Manager
N - Ashe Urban - Community Outreach Coordinator
N - Kelly Fedderson - Community Outreach Coordinator
N - Jay Derderian - Administrative Assistant

There was a request for a Treasurer's report. Peter Maris reported this is not yet available due to technical impediments.

Agenda Items:

1) Introduce new Board candidate Greg Moulliet (Buckman). Motion to approve Greg on Board: passed unanimously.

2) Introduce At Large Member candidate : Mandy Heaton
Director of Public Affairs at Reed. Lives at 34th/Clinton. Motion to approve Mandy on Board: passed unanimously.

3) Introduce At Large Member candidate : Mary Ann Schaub
In Sunnyside for 45 years. Concerned about water issues, comp plan, AirBnB. Motion to approve Mary Ann on Board: passed unanimously.

4) Introduce At Large Member candidate: Michael Sonnleitner
Montevilla. Has visited 23 neighborhood associations. Motion to approve Mary Ann on Board: passed unanimously.

5) Proposed PDC Changes to Central Eastside Industrial Sanctuary Urban Renewal District - discussion pro and con (Jeff Cole, Justin Douglas (PDC))

PDC - Justin Douglas - explains Tax Increment Financing and proposed changes to Urban Renewal Areas.

Motion to support of the Central Eastside Industrial Council in appealing the Portland Design Commission Decision on the LOCA/Goat Blocks development. Approved with one abstained, one opposed.

6) Request for support from Brentwood Darlington Neighborhood Association (BDNA) regarding Green thumb/Learning Gardens Zoning letter. Presented by ? Sherman. Motion: support BNDa's letter, passed with three abstained.

7) Proposed letter regarding city's management of AirBnB & smilier operations. Draft letter written and present by Don Gardener. Motion: support Gardner's letter with modification from the excomm.

8) Update Division/Powell Project. Update by Bill Crawford

9) Board Retreat Planning. Discussion led by Robert McCullough. Basic question: Service vs. Advocacy.

10) Portland Community Summit Vision Roundtable (ONI) Report by Mary Ann Swchab.

Draft

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned on time with approval of all.

_____ Secretary

MINUTES OF MEETING OF THE EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE (SEULXCOMM)
SOUTHEAST UPLIFT NEIGHBORHOOD COALITION

Wednesday October 15, 4:30 PM @ 3534 SE Main Street, Portland Oregon 97214 (Anne Dufay's office)

SEULxcomm Members Attending: Jeff Cole, Scott Vala, Peter Maris, Robert McCullough, Don Gardner

SEULxcomm Members Not Attending:

Also attending: Anne Dufay, Kelly Fedderson, Bob Kellett, Moshe Lenske, Mary Ann Schwab

A sufficient number of SEULxcomm members were present to constitute a quorum. Robert McCullough chaired the meeting.

Agenda Items:

1) Communications Robert's Idea: NAs to sign up to receive the board packet. Anne to email board chairs to see if they want receive the board packet.

2) Proposals for visiting NA meetings. Mon 27th Robert/Anne/Kelly to Ardenwald, 6:30pm.

3) Comprehensive Plan comments period delayed until March 13, 2015. Update by Bob Kellett. There will be several comments plans in the future.

4) Final on Don's B&B letter Letter is ready to be sent; add specific reference to low number of permits applied for.

5) Possible Street Fee Letter Discussion only.

6) Door Security Camera update.

7) Computer Projector for Board Room Robert's idea for a projector; will pursue a bid.

8) Strategic Planning - Peter located a facilitator. Talks to begin.

9) Board Training and good operating practices - a little at every meeting.

10) Agenda items: Ann Schwab wants to add Bull Run supply info. Need to submit Advocacy Request.

There being no further business, the meeting was adjourned with approval of four.

_____ Secretary

Draft