

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
November 16, 2016
4:00 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach (arrived 4:09 p.m.), Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin (arrived 4:18 p.m.), Maggie Tallmadge

Commissioners Absent: Eli Spevak

City Staff Presenting: Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Sallie Edmunds, Mindy Brooks, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Rachael Hoy, Mark Raggett, Marc Asnis, Debbie Bischoff, Troy Doss; Mauricio Leclerc, Grant Morehead, Teresa Boyle (PBOT); Bob Stacy, Metro Councilor

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Chair Schultz* noted the Council work session on IH will be November 29 at 9 a.m. The PSC has been requested to join the conversation.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- The IH letter from the PSC is being finalized. Thanks for your input. The final draft will be sent out tomorrow since we need to get it to the Mayor on Friday.
- At your seat is a hard copy of the RICAP 8 proposal, and the PSC will have a hearing and recommendation on this proposal at the December 13 meeting. December 13 is our next and final PSC meeting of the calendar year.

Southwest Corridor DEIS

Briefing: Eric Engstrom; Teresa Boyle (PBOT); Bob Stacy, Metro Councilor

Councilor Stacy introduced the project and gave the context about the transit network. Regionally, we're currently missing options in the SW quadrant, which is why this project is going forward now. There is also a community development consideration, which has been provided by the SW Corridor strategy and plan that advances thinking about what kinds of connections and development we want in the development of this new high-capacity transit (HCT) corridor line.

The Barbur Concept Plan was the first of the HCT efforts. Metro was awarded an \$895k grant to work on an equitable housing and connecting people throughout the corridor and region. Metro is also acting for the first round of equitable housing grants; Portland is poised to receive \$100k for equitable housing in the SW Corridor.

Commissioner Tallmadge: Why did we choose light-rail over BRT?

- Distance is a factor. But the system's capacity will be reached by 2035 with 35,000 daily riders. That means at peak, a long bus would be going up or down Barbur every 2 minutes, and we'd soon run out of capacity in the lane. At the bus mall, we'd be adding too many long busses, and the system would break down and become ineffective.

Commissioner Houck: But we'd be remiss to not include that along with housing and transportation, green spaces will provide and manage some access. I want to acknowledge this vote and levy we just passed. All counties were at least 70 percent voting in favor of funding.

- Thank you to *Commissioner Houck* for his work on this levy. We will be adequately funding maintenance and improving our parks and nature with it.

Commissioner Baugh: I appreciate the planning but the real issue for me is housing accompanied with light-rail. Affordable housing being funded alongside the development of transportation infrastructure is necessary.

- The equitable housing grant will help us focus on this here in the SW Corridor with specific sites noted to build affordable housing. This allows us to target sites here and in other amenity-rich areas before the value increases.

Commissioner Smith: I had the opportunity to be on a Metro think-tank, and we talked about not putting light-rail lines on freeway ditches.

- I completely agree with you. We do face a choice to keep Barbur clear and put light-rail between and behind buildings. In my opinion, fortunately that is about \$85M more expensive than building on Barbur, so ODOT is coming around to the idea of building light-rail as a civic amenity.

Eric mentioned that there was a decision about the long-term future about HTC that the SW Corridor and Powell-Division were the next in line for development. The Comp Plan provides some guidance about how we think about this, too, in the three main objectives. We also did the Barbur Concept Plan in 2013 to establish some of the land use goals for the SW Corridor.

As a note, TriMet would usually be here with us today, but they are meeting with the FTA right now. We can take any TriMet-related questions to get responses if necessary. There are still lots of options outside of the Portland boundary, and we are tracking these closely since they influence the full corridor and land use needs in the region.

Teresa reviewed some of the decisions that have been made about the Corridor recently. In June of this year, LRT was confirmed as the mode choice. It has a higher initial capital cost but lower operating costs "per rider".

Portland's concern remains about how to get people to transit, particularly with the lack of connectivity in the SW. We have turned our focus to make sure the project includes a way to bring people to the stations safely.

The Steering Committee meets next month to discuss alignment; connecting to Marquam Hill; PCC bike/pedestrian/bus connections; and limiting adjacency to I-5 versus connecting to places along Barbur. We will want to retain designs that stay on Barbur with a single transition point near the Barbur Transit Center. There are lots of questions about the adjacency question, and we expect these to continue as we get into the DEIS stage. A full schedule/timeline is included on Slide 9.

Further considerations in the next two years include narrowing the approaches and projects in the Central City, Central Barbur and West Portland Town Center.

- Central City: Naito / Ross Island Bridgehead versus Barbur alignment.
- Central Barbur: on the freeway or on Barbur directly.
- West Portland Town Center: yet-to-be accomplished town center. This is huge opportunity to activate this town center. The design choice is a surface alignment on Barbur versus a flyover.

City Council directed staff to include a housing strategy with this project as a condition of Portland's participation. We have applied for the Metro Equitable Housing Grant in partnership with Tigard to develop the foundations of the strategy. The Metro FTA TOD Grant will also be leveraged to advance the common goals of equitable housing in the corridor.

The FTA is requiring a local match of about 50 percent. For Portland's share, we don't yet know how we'll be paying for this. Potential match sources include SDC funds; LID; urban renewal; or a regional bond. We need to signal our intention for meeting our share of the project by the summer of 2018. One of the issues is that we inevitably acquire land as the project proceeds. We'd like to transition some of this land to housing, but there are some rules that limit some of these options.

ODOT is the road authority for Hwy 99 / Barbur until it meets Naito. Naito is also ODOT road authority, and its standards are different from what the City's are. We are looking at the option of transferring so the LRT project could build new infrastructure to the City's standards. This would be a huge opportunity in terms of updating stormwater management (instead of how it is now mostly unmanaged). The DEIS work needs to know ownership. Tigard is currently restrained from participating in the project to support LRT. "Yes" votes are leading as of today, but we won't know the final outcomes until November 28. Without a yes vote, it's unclear what we can do to move forward without the support of Tigard.

As we talk about local funding and a potential regional match, in November 2018 we might be looking at a bond measure.

We are going into the DEIS process, a new phase of formality with Metro as the project lead. Over the next 6-9 months, we'll be exchanging concepts and drawings, which is why we wanted to share with the PSC today.

Commissioner Rudd: On the Orange Line, what was the match?

- 50 percent. We formulated based on local being 40 percent, but it became clear that the most we could get from federal funding would be 50.

When talking to FTA, if they can be more flexible about local jurisdictions keeping money for projects that come in under budget and/or ahead of schedule, that would be good. If you can acquire more at the outset and identify land as a TOD site, then that might avoid some of the back-and-forth.

Commissioner Smith: I find it ironic that Bridgeport Village is the terminus since it wasn't on the original 2040 map. I would strongly prefer that Barbur Blvd be in City ownership to ensure greater bike/pedestrian standards. In terms of the bond measure, we need a funding source for a number of projects, but what do we put in to make it politically feasible? In the past we've bundled transit with freeway projects, I'd prefer we be bundling transit projects with active transportation projects.

Commissioner Baugh: Affordable housing is a great part of the strategy. I'd note that this is a station strategy, but what about the rest of the corridor and funding strategy? Regarding transit connections, TriMet didn't commit to all for the community on Powell-Division, so I'd like to see what TriMet will do here. SDCs: We have a TSP that has some SDC funding in it. This would potentially disrupt that, and if that's the case, we'd need a policy and discussion about extraordinary transportation projects... so funds don't all go to these huge projects while the rest of the City loses out. Is this the right investment for these funds? This is a policy discussion for the whole city, not just southwest neighborhoods.

- Some percentage of projects in the TSP are active transportation that feed into this, as is the Naito / Ross Island Bridgehead.

Chair Schultz: Are you looking at it as PBOT SDC funding? Or a specific overlay here?

- We're not sure yet; it could be either or both.

Central City 2035 Plan

Work Session: Sallie Edmunds, Mindy Brooks, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Rachael Hoy, Mark Raggett, Marc Asnis, Debbie Bischoff, Troy Doss; Mauricio Leclerc, Grant Morehead (PBOT)

Introduction

Sallie provided an introduction about today's work session and discussion items on the agenda. As a reminder, this is your second work session after the first we held on September 27. We will continue to work through items staff and Commissioners have noted as items to discuss on the spreadsheets for each topic. Our assumption will be that items not discussed or otherwise asked to be pulled for a later work session discussion will be incorporated as-is into the final Proposed Draft that the PSC will make a formal vote about on February 28, 2016.

1. Height in Historic Districts (A3)
2. Other Height requests (C3, C8, C15, C32)
3. Height and Zoning: SE 11th and 12th (D1, D2, D3)
4. Parking Code (F1)
5. Willamette River (G1, H1, H2)
6. Miscellaneous Code Amendments (no discussion items identified)

Commissioner Baugh asked for discussion on items C6 and C23.

Commissioner Tallmadge clarified that she's interested in D3, D4 and D5 (not D1-3 as noted).

Historic Height follow-up

Group A Decision Table

Brandon introduced the topic of East Portland / Grand Ave height. He gave an overview of the testimony we received on both sides of height limits here.

We are proposing to eliminate the current allowance of additional bonus height. Around the historic Waverly Building in the center of the district, reduce from 200 to 160 to allow for proposals for taller buildings but not so much larger than the historic building and average height in the district. The edges will be up to 200 feet close to the Burnside Bridgehead.

The PSC had previously asked staff to study the impact of proposed height limits on the usability of existing base floor area ratio (FAR) in the historic district. We have a 9:1 FAR in the northern at 200 feet and 160 in the center; and 6:1 in the "vertical arms" with a 100-foot height limit.

Staff's FAR study found the proposed height limits would not preclude the use of full base FAR on non-contributing sites. Large sites bifurcated by the historic district boundary provide unique opportunities to arrange height and massing outside of the historic district. We do feel an applicant could make the case for the full use of their FAR. As a reminder, Historic Resource Review required to ensure site-specific compatibility for proposed new buildings.

Chair Schultz: Thank you for this. This explanation satisfies my original concerns.

Commissioner Bachrach: At the bridgehead, the height of 275 includes the bonus. This is outside of the historic district. Is this a change from what's currently there?

- This is what's allowed today. The difference is it's shown as a bonus on existing, but the heights on the map here include the bonus.
- The map that shows existing shows existing zoning, but this project proposes IG1 to become EX, which is already approved in the SE Quadrant Plan.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on A3.

Other Height

Group C Decision Table and Memo C

Rachael walked through the Other Height requests. We've added a few items (C20-32) from the original table. We had checked 4 items for discussion:

- C3: RiverPlace
- C8: West End
- C15: Lloyd Edge
- C32: Park Blocks
and as requested this evening:
- C6: Bridgeheads
- C23: Post Office Site

C3: RiverPlace

Chair Schultz recused herself from this topic.

Staff is proposing to reconfigure the height pattern in this area to align with parcel boundaries and rights of way. We also maintain a base height of 125 but allow for bonus height to be earned in two areas and no bonus height as we step down to the river.

Staff believes that adding the potential for bonus height will encourage denser, urban scale development at this redevelopment site with more active uses along the riverfront, consistent with the goals of the CC2035 Plan. Maintaining base heights and adding bonus height is a similar approach we've taken across the Central City.

Commissioner Smith had wanted to discuss this to maximize construction along the streetcar line. This is responsive to this request.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on C3.

C8: West End

Testimony we received requested a decreased base height across the subdistrict to 100 feet and to create a step down from taller buildings in the downtown core.

Staff's proposal is to maintain the proposed maximum heights in the district. Staff believes that height flexibility is important to encourage different design options and allow for a variety of building forms on our smaller block. It offers flexibility for such as provision of on-site open areas, and ability to use transferred FAR/height from historic resources. In addition, there has been a great deal of investment in infrastructure in this district. Maintaining heights can help support and leverage maximum benefit from light rail and street car development. Considered the western edge of downtown which has the highest heights and FARs in Portland as well as some of the densest, residential development in the Central City. Lastly, at least 12 existing structures would be made non-conforming by reducing heights to 100 feet, and there are many more in the pipeline.

Commissioner Oxman asked if this was where we had testimony from seniors who were concerned about heights in terms of access to sky and greenery.

- Yes. But we will also be discussing the Park Blocks in this regard in just a moment.

I'll hold until that portion.

Commissioner Houck: I'm glad we're having a conversation about this since there was such a difference of opinion between West End people and staff's proposal. Density targets could be met without taller buildings, but there would be trade-offs in terms of open space and design.

- The discussions have been ongoing with the neighbors. Allowing flexibility for height would keep historic. More height would also allow more open spaces and plazas when we build up.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on C8.

C15: Lloyd District Edge

The existing and proposed heights for this area are 150 for the base height with the ability to earn bonus height up to 225 feet.

Testimony from Sullivan's Gulch NA included a request to decrease height to 75 feet and create a step-down to adjacent neighborhoods, similar to what we've proposed near Irvington. This is also adjacent to a historic district, which is not what we have in Lloyd, particularly with adjacent taller buildings.

Staff proposed to maintain the proposal of 150-foot base with the ability to earn a bonus up to 225 feet. A bit outside the area, the Kaiser building is about 200 feet, where they are in an area for more potential bonus.

Commissioner Smith has been approached by Sullivan's Gulch neighbors and noted they have had some inter-association questions about their positions being shared. The adopted neighborhood plan has objectives including a transition from Lloyd and other considerations. How does this height regime reflect these objectives?

- Part of our reasoning is based on what's going on adjacent to the Central City. Our new multi-dwelling zoning project is looking at these areas, but we don't know what we'll find yet. The potential to go to 100 feet, with a base of 150 feet in the Central City, there is a step-down as you leave the Central City and head into the neighborhood. Also, the Irvington edge is within the historic district, but that's not the case here.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on C15.

C32: Park Blocks

Testimony was to lower heights to 100 feet along Park Blocks and require shadow study on east side of Park Blocks.

Staff's recommendations:

1. Apply shadow analysis requirement to east side of the Park Blocks.
 - This could allow flexibility in development and lowering heights. We'd apply the study on March 21 at 10 a.m. You couldn't shade more than 50 percent of the park block.
2. Require a ground floor setback on new development on both sides of Park Blocks.
 - 12-foot minimum setback with 50 percent landscaped.
 - This will be based on the Green Loop project.
3. Update Central City Design Fundamental Design Guidelines to move larger building forms away from Park Blocks.

Marc walked through some of the shadow modeling as well as the redevelopment potential along the Park Blocks. They only take into account cast by buildings, not by the trees along the Park Blocks.

Mark showed a sampling of setbacks currently along the Park Blocks.

Commissioner Houck likes the direction. One of the most pleasant aspects of the Park Blocks is that the tree canopy is not uniform.

Commissioner Oxman thanked staff for the shadow study. In testimony we heard a stream of people saying that the nature they've had access to is in the Park Blocks and going elsewhere is not really practical for their "nature fix". As an age-friendly city, this is important. It looks like the step-back is an effective strategy to maintain light. How much authority will there be in the design scheme to force this issue?

- Buildings will have to address the shadowing since it will be in the Zoning Code. The Design Commission will also use the Fundamental Design Guidelines to preserve light and air.

The shadow study is for the bonus height.

Commissioner Houck: The Park Blocks, during spring migration, are home to many migratory birds. This serves a great function in the heart of the city.

Chair Schultz: I don't see in the proposal that the shadow study is required for bonus height only.

- On the west and south side, the shadow study is applicable today. By applying this along all of the Park Blocks, we'll remove it from the bonus height section. It will be disconnected from the bonus height section.

I find it awkward to create buildings that have a clean wall then have buildings that are set back. All those images were extremely quiet conditions, so often set-backs promote less activity along the edge. Or do we want to activate and encourage activity here? And with the Green Loop, what about encouraging people to stop and sit in cafes, etc?

- Right now we're at a 50 percent proposal, and we're hedging our bets here. When the Green Loop project is more defined, we will look at a more block-by-block level to tailor this proposal. We want to cover our bases now then adjust later as needed.
- Joe noted that some form of set-back is not that unusual; it exists now. There are lots of historic structures that line the Park Blocks, so it will be episodic because of those buildings as well.

Commissioner Bachrach: You commented on the food pod block. It's across the street from the Park Blocks, and that stretch of the Park Block is fully built out. If it were to redevelop, would it be subject to this?

- It is already subject because it's kitty-corner to O'Bryant Square.

Commissioner Rudd: At base height level now, do we know the shadow would be more than 50 percent on March 21?

- We didn't do this analysis, but we can look into what the percentage of shaded area would be at just the base level.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on C32.

C6: Bridgeheads

Proposal: The bridgeheads and adjacent buildings act as gateways into and out of the downtown and plans since the 1970s have called for major attractions and new development at these important riverfront locations.

Commissioner Baugh noted the heights at the bridgeheads. What's the rationale for having this up to 300 feet versus the lower heights along the river? You're adjacent to two historic districts, so I'm concerned about lots of height right on the river then substantially lower height. I don't want to isolate a historic district. You're putting shadows on the park that has no shadows today.

- Bridgeheads are difficult sites to redevelop. We had lots of discussion about the Morrison Bridgehead. And we are trying to activate the waterfront and eyes on the park, so we wanted to further this objective, particularly near downtown.
- This demarcation of a historic site is generally preferred by historic district advocates.
- The height allowance is for the potential, not a requirement.

Commissioner Tallmadge: Concerts and festivals on the waterfront could benefit from shadows.

Commissioner Oxman: How likely is it that the configuration of the bridgehead remains?

- Mauricio: PBOT looked at this, and the removal of one or both ramps was study. It was challenging to take out the north ramp, so that likely will remain. The south ramp had one opportunity, but traffic analysis showed this would impact traffic congestion leaving downtown at rush hour.

- Joe: The ramp to the north can't go away (though it could be reconfigured). The south ramp has less function, but we're not sure. As long as the two ramps are there, there could be more than 75 feet height (helping to bring more activity to the park), but it would be hard to get the additional height with the ramps still in place.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on C6.

C23: Post Office Site

Commissioner Baugh notes this is a "blank slate" of a site right now.

There is a Framework Plan for the site that lays out rights-of-way. The project will go through a Master Plan process and meetings with PBOT. Part of a Master Plan requirements include meeting street scape and open space requirements.

When we did the Framework Plan, it was done to put a high level of essential public interest and urban design of the site: what do we do with the Park Blocks and expectations for connectivity through the site. When the master plan process goes through, if there are compelling reasons to change the street plan, it would happen at that time.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on C23.

Commissioner Bachrach had previously asked staff about testimony re: Jefferson Holdings. *Rachael* noted that this was part of the conversation about the Vista Bridge views. In the proposal we had recommended increased heights on the north side to 75 feet and a new Collins View viewpoint. This works with the testimony from Jefferson Holdings.

SE 11th/12th Ave Height and Zoning

Group D Decision Table

Troy introduced the topic. It's the corridor in the Central Eastside of what we've been looking at as industrial sanctuary.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked for discussion about topic D3, Rezoning from IG1 to EX on 11th Ave between SE Madison St and SE Main St.

- This becomes a further erosion of IG zoning. If we were to say yes to this request, you start to erode industrial capacity at this point. Industrial office here is preferred by those in the area.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on D3, D4 and D5.

Parking and Loading

Group F Decision Table and Memo F

Mauricio shared the process and Stakeholder Advisory Committee's work around parking regulations in the Central City. He shared staff's proposal about code changes regarding parking in the Central City.

The SAC recommendations and plan include:

- No requirement to build parking if you don't need it.
- If you need some, see if you can find existing parking nearby first (sharing parking resources).
- If you still need to build, build the minimum amount you can to support your development.
- If you need more parking later, you can use your remaining parking entitlement to add parking to your building, on or off site.

Staff compared the proposed regulations to other cities as summarized on Slide 16. There are a wide variety of parking policies in North American cities. Our context is on the progressive side of having no minimums and tight maximums.

Commissioner Smith: Thank you for this. The frame I come at this from is that we're in a long-term project to shift transportation modes. The Central City is on the leading edge of this effort. We're using a combination of carrots (building infrastructure to support transit, bikes, etc) and sticks including enforcing parking maximums. If we lower the maximums more, that could induce the modal shift even more. What's the countervailing force from reducing the rations even more?

We don't have minimums so we support affordable development. We have maximums, but commercial maximums are for both the workers and customers/clients. In residential zones, maximums are for those who live there and for their visitors. Maximums do not mean "district average".

Chair Schultz noted that existing buildings are getting denser internally with adding more people in them (less space per employee in the building) without creating more parking.

Commissioner Smith: If we were to further reduce maximums, we might not meet housing and jobs goals or we would require lots more investments in other transportation modes.

- Yes, this is the trade-off.

Commissioner St Martin: If parking looks like an entitlement, can it be transferred?

- Yes. There is a limit between districts, but this is an option within a district, so there is lots of transferability that could happen.

Commissioner Baugh: Workers coming to the Central City are generally not using cars to get here. And if we're spending lots of funding on the new transit line, the idea that we have to put in parking for workers coming to downtown doesn't make sense. The workforce today is working differently, remotely, compared to in the 1990s. It seems like a conflicting viewpoint.

- We have to support transit, particularly things in the TSP. But knowing we have lots of new people coming to Portland, and with the Central City being a regional attraction, we need to provide accessibility to everyone who wants to come here. With this, we are letting the market decide about parking development needs. We encourage not building parking, but we know if we don't have some, we won't grow as fast or as much at this time.

Will you review the code requirements 10 years from now?

- Yes, certainly. We can adjust things in the future, though this is not proposed in this packet.
- This can be recommended by the PSC as a staff work item.

Commissioner Smith: You're essentially saying that parking in the Central City is a market good. We want to make sure there aren't subsidies that distort the market. We don't want to let people provide parking in a bundled way so an individual chooses to pay for parking as a separate item. This is an important policy.

Commissioner Smith: I proposed we formally add an action item to review and assess parking ratios every 5 years. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Bachrach: I think 10 years is a better and more realistic timeframe.

Commissioner Oxman is supportive of the reevaluation. I think 10 years would be good.

Mauricio: Our consultant told us there was a directive originally to review every 7 years.

With a friendly amendment, 7 years is the proposed reevaluation timeframe for parking ratios.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

F1: Parking Ratios

Parking ratios vary from 0.5 to 2.0 depending on land use and location. Staff recommends retaining this proposal.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on F1.

Willamette River

Commissioner Rudd is recused herself from this discussion.

Group G Decision Table and Memo G + Item G11

and

Group H Decision Table and Memo H

Mindy provided an overview of the proposal.

In the Proposed Draft we are updating the zoning code for the Central Reach:

- We propose replacing the 1988 Greenway Overlay Zone chapter with a new River Overlay Zones chapter
- And replacing the Greenway Review with River Review
- Both of these address uses, development and impacts on the land and in the river

These new river overlays and river review won't apply to South Waterfront. South Waterfront has its own unique regulations. The regulations also won't apply to sites in the Central City that are zoned for industrial uses. These sites will be addressed when planning for the North Reach.

The proposal includes two River Overlay Zones:

- River General Overlay Zone
- A new River Environmental Overlay Zone

H1: Swimming in the River

Debbie introduced the topic. The Willamette River is healthy for people to swim in it. A major reason is the Big Pipe project, which greatly reduced sewer overflows into the river. The desire for and use of public swimming beaches in Portland is gaining popularity. Overall, the CC2035 Plan emphasizes bringing people to, along and in the river for a variety of activities including swimming.

The Central City Swimming Beach Sites Study recently was done, along with the Eastbank Crescent Riverfront Plan. Both plans are going to Council in early spring 2017.

Commissioner Houck: With the vegetation exemption, how would the Eastbank Crescent plan change?

- It would be a much smaller geography.

That's very helpful.

There's reference to PCBs being abundant here. Is that an issue?

- In the next year, PGE will be doing a capping of the area, covering the soil surface. Last year was another capping closer to the Marquam Bridge.
- We just don't know what happens when you cut into a bank.

CC2035 Plan contains:

- Thorough policy framework for increasing river's edge access.
- District-specific actions for publicly accessible river access.

CC2035 Plan lacks:

- An action to establish safe places to swim.
- Public information on safe swimming. PP&R is updating their website to provide this information.

The Human Access project and a few supporters submitted testimony about PP&R providing public information about safe swimming and no net loss of access at the river's edge.

Staff proposes a new Central City-wide action: Expand opportunities for safe swimming in the Willamette River in the Central City in places where conflicts with natural resource protection and enhancement can be avoided or minimized.

Commissioner Houck suggested a friendly amendment to be consistent with the hierarchy.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on H1.

G1: Landscaping Standard

Mindy provided background about the topic. We talked about the setback. The existing setback is 25 feet from top of bank and when development occurs on a site then the setback needs to be landscaped. The Proposed Draft expands the setback to 50 feet from top of bank and updates the landscaping standard and includes landscaping standards under 3 subareas. Most testimony was supportive of these standards.

Request 1: Do not require landscaping on public beaches.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on G1, Request 1.

Request 2: The request is to allow flexibility for subarea 1 when it is steep and armored with rip rap. The proposed draft said you could retrofit the wells with planters, but that could undermine the stability of the bank.

The updated proposal from staff is to amend the Proposed draft so that:

- If the river bank is very steep and armored with rip rap, OR
- If the rip rap is so thick that plants can't survive
- Then the required landscaping can be planted anywhere on the site or the applicant pay a fee-in-lieu. The money would go to BES into an existing program and be used within the Central Reach on a revegetation project.

Commissioner Houck: One option is to plant anywhere on the site, but we talked about a site where it could be denser.

- Yes, this would apply there.

I'll support this, but if you can't plant in subarea 1, it might be more beneficial to say the fee-in-lieu is required instead of planting upland.

Commissioner Oxman: How much of the river is armored with rip rap like this?

- A large portion, but some is in public versus private ownership. The trigger is development in the river overlay zone.

If there is a large extent of rip rap, what's the benefit to planting upriver from it?

- Creating favorable habitat for birds and fish. We lose sight in the Central City that the riparian area extends 100-200 feet back, even though it's developed.

Chair Schultz: Banks like this that are heavily contaminated still have the requirements of subarea 1 to do plantings. So are we setting up a bank erosion issue?

- If doing a state-approved formal clean-up, these standards don't apply. Clean-up sites don't need to follow these regulations.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal on G1, Request 2.

Any planting done in the setback for any reason can count towards the landscaping standard; we will clarify this in the Recommended Draft. And we will clarify that the timing of the landscaping needs to be concurrent.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal.

Miscellaneous Code Amendments

Group I Decision Table and Memo I

Rachael noted the table with further information that addresses comments about code edits, particularly from BDS staff.

Commissioner Baugh asked about I6: Are trains handled separately?

- If you have a complaint about the neighbor in an industrial area, you can have a conversation. But if you can have a complaint about the railroad noises, you don't have much of an option to do anything about it. This is a completely separate process from working within the City.

Chair Schultz: Can you please explain C3: Dwelling units are prohibited on the ground floor. Where is this applicable?

- This is mostly downtown commercial retail core. You could still have lobbies, just not the actual individual residential units.

For projects that today have something like bike parking with windows on the ground floor, if we are no longer counting the windows, that puts them into non-conformance. We've celebrated bike parking on the ground floor (with windows).

- It's a ground floor active use. This is an adjustable provision, so they could modify it. We'd have to come back and think about this more after talking with BDS staff.

Chair Schultz pulled ground floor windows and ground floor active uses.

PSC is supportive of staff's proposal excluding further conversation about ground floor windows and ground floor active uses.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Next Steps

The PSC has three additional work sessions on the calendar: January 10 and 24, and February 28, 2017.

Anticipated topics:

- January 10: transportation classifications and projects, green building items (ecoroofs, bird safe), specific zoning and FAR requests, tree canopy targets, environmental code amendments.
- January 24: bonuses and transfers, cost analysis, actions, miscellaneous code amendments, new historic resource tools.
- February 28: final amendments, vote on the draft recommended draft of the CC2035 Plan.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 7:38 p.m.