

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

February 28, 2017

4:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

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

Commissioners Absent: Maggie Tallmadge

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Sallie Edmunds, Troy Doss, Rachael Hoy; Mauricio Leclerc, PBOT

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 4:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck* just finished a call about the April 26 Nature of Cities symposium that I've mentioned before. It's an incredible lineup of 25 international folks talking about climate change, equity and inclusion, etc. We'll be sending out details by early next week. The Bullitt Foundation, which focuses on urban ecology and climate change. They have changed their geographic focus to Cascadia or The Emerald Corridor, and their funding focus is on Vancouver, BC, Seattle, WA and Portland, hence their supporting the summit. It will be two days of planning for the 2018 symposium with all the experts in town, so we're putting the full-day summit on April 26 while they're here.
- *Commissioner Bachrach* asked about a memo outlining changes the City Council made to the Comp Plan Implementation Package.
 - Staff will get this to PSC members.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- We are hosting the C40 Network here in July. It will focus on transit-oriented development; we'll get more information to PSC members as we know more.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from February 14, 2017 PSC meeting

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, St Martin)

Central City 2035 Plan

Work Session: Sallie Edmunds, Joe Zehnder, Rachael Hoy, Troy Doss, Mauricio Leclerc

Sallie introduced today's work session. This is our sixth work session on the CC2035. We have three items on the agenda today.

Actions

Decision Table R

Troy walked through two actions. The first was the Urban Forestry's request for visibility of the White Stag sign. They asked to modify the language to talk about evaluating options to preserve the sign view from the Burnside Bridge and the Eastbank Esplanade. The other is about PPS and supporting them in the development of new grade school (K-12) facilities to serve the growth of families with children to the Central City.

Chair Schultz: Is it just PPS, or is it other organizations as well?

- There is nothing to preclude us from looking and opening it up to other organizations like non-profits and charter schools. But we are more interested in the public schools in terms of inclusiveness and working with them.

I see what you're saying, but if another organization could come in and serve the need, I wouldn't want to exclude them. The hang-up for me is that we're specifying PPS in this edit, but not others.

- *Commissioner Houck* noted he doesn't see this language as excluding anyone else, as Troy noted.
- *Commissioner Bachrach:* Perhaps "coordinate" or another more active verb than "support" should be used to be more proactive.
- *Troy:* We do have Comp Plan language that uses stronger verbs, such as "coordinate". We can wordsmith now or later.
- *Commissioner Larsell:* I agree with supporting public schools. I don't want to water-down the language.
- *Commissioner Spevak:* We could say something like "support K-8 schools downtown, 'particularly PPS'...."

Commissioners confirmed the language as proposed in Decision Table R.

Transportation System Plan

Decision Table J

Mauricio and Joe introduced Item J3. Mauricio shared some of the process, history, big ideas, recommendations and early actions for this item. He also talked through the implications of the amendment proposed by *Commissioner Smith*.

Commissioner Smith's amendment:

- Remove the ODOT Broadway/Weidler Interchange Project from the TSP Major Projects List
- TSP Projects # 20119, #20120 and #20121

This interchange is a significant and long-standing problem area from ODOT's perspective. It has the highest freeway crash rate in the state with short, weaving sections. We did an inventory of the land, looked at history of the area and tried to propose something to lessen the gap while creating something better than the modified Greeley-Banfield Concept. We tried to find ways around "the box" area (Broadway-Weidler / Vancouver-Williams). Vision Zero identifies the Broadway Corridor as part of the high-crash network, so we hope this project addresses these safety issues.

Mauricio shared the Recommended Concept plan (slides 12-13). We looked at over 70 options before arriving at this concept. There are benefits to both the freeway mainline and the local street network.

Joe walked through the N/NE Quadrant Plan vision.

We took care of the near-term improvements including safety provisions. The CC2035 Plan includes ODOT's concurrence on the MMA designation. This provides flexibility to the City in the way our plans envision.

The implications of *Commissioner Smith's* amendment (taking this project off the TSP) include:

1. The project is an innovative design that advances both safety along the freeway with significant improvements to local streets and adjacent blocks.
2. The project includes a complete rebuild and seismic upgrade of critical bridges that carry all modes including streetcar.
3. It adds critical links to the pedestrian/bicycle system through a new pedestrian/bicycle bridge over I5 at Clackamas Street and a new multi-modal bridge connecting Dixon St. to Vancouver St. north of Broadway.
4. It includes a lid over the freeway, which proved to be the best engineering solution for ODOT AND an approach that can best support the redevelopment potential of the Rose Quarter/Blanchard Building area.
5. It enhances accessibility and livability for the adjacent neighborhoods that were adversely impacted with the construction of the freeway in the 1960s.
6. The project eliminated the longstanding oversized proposal to build flyover ramps connecting I-5 to the Banfield.
7. The safety improvements on the freeway and access ramps allowed ODOT to approve Multimodal Mixed Use Area (MMA) status for the Central City. Removing these projects from the list jeopardizes the MMA designation.
8. Removing the projects would make the City's TSP out of compliance with the Regional Transportation Plan.

So staff recommends against *Commissioner Smith's* removal of this from the TSP and to retain the Proposed Draft version.

Commissioner Spevak asked about induced demand. This is a route I would drive, but I often avoid it. I assume this is part of your analysis and if you open up more capacity on the freeway.

- In the studies, the congestion benefit of adding a lane was minimal. The system is congested all sides and around this area. But there are significant safety benefits to this proposal to improve the multi-modal system.
- *Commissioner Smith* noted when he asked this in 2012 he asked if there was a TDM alternative. There is so much latent demand that another TDM program would fill quickly too.
- Susan: In 2012 we had numbers about crashes and number of crashes that could be avoided with these improvements.
 - *Mauricio*: We do have numbers about this. We don't have many fatalities here, but many crashes and accidents.
- *Commissioner Rudd*: This is regionally significant with I5 being the major route between Mexico and Canada and the increased truck freight demand given shipping container issues at the port of Portland. Is there an Environmental Impact Report? What are the costs?
 - ODOT is working on an environmental assessment, which will begin this year along with the other requisite environmental reports. The project would be about \$450M today on the three projects in the TSP. These are likely old numbers. They are outside of our TSP and would be funded from outside sources.

Commissioner Houck talked about decisions that were made when they were made. Would priorities that would have been different today (e.g. Vision Zero)?

- We don't think so in the sense that this is a once-in-a-generation time to work with ODOT. Now we can have a project that is significant regionally. This has a strong multi-modal component and includes key portals into the Central City. It was just adopted in the Comp Plan just recently.

Commissioner Smith moved to remove items 20119, 20120, and 20121 from the TSP. *Commissioner Spevak* seconded.

Commissioner Smith explained his amendment to pull these items. Things are quite different from 2012. We have another iteration of our CAP to reduce driving in the city; reduce VMT in the Comp Plan; stopped infrastructure for fossil fuels. This will be the largest single investment of the CC2035 Plan, and it makes driving easier... which I think is backward. There are other solutions and benefits that

don't make driving easier. The scale of investment is huge. Look at the gas tax versus what ODOT will spend here. Perhaps the most discordant thing is how this fits into Vision Zero. We killed 45 people on our streets last year; none on this stretch of this highway, but on places that ODOT has orphaned or abandoned such as on NE 82nd.

Commissioner Rudd noted I'd rather keep the planning process to go forward. We're improving multi-modal and freight routes as well. Public-private partnership here could leverage the money / cost of the project with increased develop-ability of these parcels. There is lots of potential here, and I'd like to stay in conformance with existing plans at this stage and allow the studies to occur.

Commissioner Baugh noted in 2012 I was in the same position as *Commissioner Smith* in saying that the plan was balanced and there was money allotted for East Portland. The downtown budget should not eat into other areas' budgets. The thing to keep in mind when we look at this project is that this is the crown jewel of the transportation budget; it's a regional project that has interest from all parts of the state from a transportation perspective and getting trucks through Portland. Projects like this suck every dollar. I want to ensure that projects that need funding to facilitate better transportation are not lost in these large projects. The investment of \$450M doesn't come back in terms of that figure back to the City if we don't do this project. In our previous meeting, we asked to look at the African American community around this project, and ODOT has already started this process. I'd rather look at an amendment that has support that asks the question when this project comes up to have a discussion about funding sources and tradeoffs.

Commissioner Spevak appreciates being part of the planning process. There is a history of infrastructure projects we decided not to do, which have contributed to the vitality of our city. What would be the next step if we support this amendment? It's a compelling argument.

- *Commissioner Smith*: If my amendment fails, I will support *Commissioner Baugh's* language. I'll make a process argument... by taking the projects out of the TSP, we create a great debate at City Council, which makes the final decision. If we leave it in, it likely won't get the Council scrutiny that it would if we do take it out, wherein Council would have to talk about adding it, debate in a public forum, and a focus that will bring out community members to share their thoughts about it. To *Commissioner Spevak's* point about reallocating the funds, the City of Portland's influence is not strong.

Commissioner Bachrach noted from a process standpoint, this would be a dramatic change. But we have no testimony and have not had a hearing on this action to undo what's in the adopted plan. It would send lots of ripples out just based on our own informal decision, and I don't think Council would appreciate our throwing this to them.

- When the N/NE Quadrant Plan came through the PSC, we did have hearings and deliberations.
- On the stakeholder committee for that project, there were some who didn't agree with including this on the TSP.

I support *Commissioner Baugh's* language, but if I think about others outside of Portland and not funding anything outside of multi-modal, I don't think that's right from a policy perspective.

- *Joe*: Multi-modal does include freight. We're saying don't just pick one "winner" transport mode.

Commissioner Smith: I am definitely concerned about moving freight. A congestion pricing scheme would be much better, and just adding lanes to the freeway doesn't help move freight.

Commissioner Rudd: Congestion pricing has equity issues too, so it is not without issues and I don't want to demonize the need for some people to use single-occupancy vehicles.

Mauricio: Adding a lane does have some benefit, but it's not significant. Lots of congestion on freeways come from crashes and accidents. So adding a shoulder or extra lane could help this. Freight tends to travel outside of peak times.

Joe: During the process discussions from ODOT the argument to reduce the number of accidents reduces the unpredictable incidences of extreme delay was highlighted. The cost is \$450M, but about half is for and from the local system.

Commissioner Spevak: If we support this amendment, can City Council put it back in our court to take testimony?

- It's possible but quite unlikely that they would. It's unlikely they'd pick just one item out of the full CC2035 Plan to send back. They'd likely just have testimony there at Council (which they will do anyway). There is a timing component vis-à-vis the state discussion.
- In terms of process, if we don't offer a proposal of something else we want instead, it will be seen that we're not moving things forward. You should think of another proposal if you accept *Commissioner Smith's* amendment.

Commissioner Baugh: I would remind us that this particular item was brought up in 2012 was not about focused testimony; it did not have funding at that time. Now it's on the wish-list in the TSP. There are projects on the list that have been on the TSP list for ages that don't move forward. This one now has funding and interest, which has brought it into the spotlight.

Commissioner Smith spoke to congestion pricing. There would have to be rebates to low-income system users. We have Comp Plan policy that allows us to explore this. Even ODOT and PBOT are thinking about congestion pricing. I think we do need to offer to City Council that we revising the Broadway-Weidler Corridor to figure out how to make improvements happen in a different way.

Commissioner St Martin: I'm wondering if we're going to be making a bunch of noise by taking this out. Are there alternative methods to daylight the issues to Council instead of just saying no and forcing a discussion? Are there not check-points before funding?

- There are many Council moments for decisions in a project like this. So much value is in the lids and the local project portion. *Commissioner Baugh's* language supports this. We have a balanced project that is in compliance with the laws of the state and Metro.

Chair Schultz: As part of the EIR, would we look at the option of congestion pricing as an alternative?

- ODOT seems interested in the topic, so it's something we could suggest.

Commissioner Baugh: If we took this out, does it jeopardize the MMA?

- Yes, it would.

Commissioner Spevak: At some point, where does it make sense to invest for safety. How does this compare to other areas?

- This is the number one priority in the state. Within the city, we have the Vision Zero Plan. There are many lines this side of Portland that need safety improvement.

Chair Schultz: Thank you for this discussion and to *Commissioner Smith*. I'm still wrestling with this particular piece. I'm inclined to let the process play itself out, continue to support the discussion and push on congestion pricing.

Vote on *Commissioner Smith's* amendment.

(Y4 – Houck, Larsell, Smith, Spevak; N6 – Bachrach, Baugh, Oxman, Rudd, St Martin, Schultz)

The amendment failed.

Commissioner Baugh moved to amend the TSP as in the Proposed Draft but to include:

1. Contingent on the project containing all elements identified in the Facility Plan, in particular the local surface transportation elements such as the lids over the freeway, a future east-west

- pedestrian and bicycle bridge in the vicinity of Clackamas Street, and new bridge connections that include high quality pedestrian and bicycle facilities and improved signalized crossings.
2. Conditioned on the development of a City Council supported equity strategy addressing issues related to the Broadway Weidler I-5 Interchange project specifically - including, historically African American community impacts, low-income housing solutions and MWESB community benefits.
 3. Transparency and public discussion about the City of Portland's funding sources and tradeoffs is essential. City funding will be limited to multimodal aspects of the project and to funding sources that do not reduce planned investments to fund transportation improvements in support of Vision Zero and safety and livability investments in East Portland.

Commissioner Houck seconded.

Commissioner Houck: I don't see the climate change and other concerns included in this amendment.

Commissioner Smith: I'd amend this list and add that we encourage ODOT and PBOT to look at congestion pricing and TDM options to mitigate climate impact.

Commissioner Baugh: We could add a statement to encourage the City of Portland to encourage the Transportation Commission to fund orphaned highways in addition to this project.

Commissioner Rudd: What form does this take? Is it a recommendation in our letter? And on part 3, we're saying public discussion, but we've already decided what we're doing before we have the discussion in the language of the second sentence of number 3.

Sallie: We'd add this as an action and suggest the PSC include this in your letter to Council.

Susan: It's not unreasonable to add this. We're saying if we support this project, it's contingent on investments in East Portland (and/or other options such as studying congestion pricing and TDM measures).

Commissioner Baugh: We could put orphaned highways in our letter to Council.

- *Chair Schultz*: I feel more comfortable with this option.

Commissioner Smith: I'm happy to add TDM to the fourth bullet point that I proposed adding to the amendment. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Bachrach: I'm concerned about all the language and without having clarity in these words.

- Susan: Contingent and Condition are stronger than Study or Consider. We spent lots of time discussing the verbs in the Comp Plan. If you feel strongly that we should just be Studying at this point, you should be clear.

Vote on *Commissioner Smith's* amendment to encourage ODOT and PBOT to evaluate congestion pricing and TDM options to mitigate for climate impacts.

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

Vote on the motion to support three items as action items as well as the added amendment.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin; N1 – Rudd)

Bonus and Transfer Code and Maps
Decision Table Q

Rachael introduced the topic, which is about prohibiting the transfer of FAR from surface parking lots. On February 14, the PSC asked staff to come back with language that would prohibit transfers from the parking areas but allow developed areas of the site to transfer. We also heard concerns about how this could impact historic landmarks that may need to sell their FAR to help support the cost of seismic upgrades.

Rachael walked through a few scenarios and what the transfer options would mean (slides 2-5).

Chair Schultz: Is there language that notes if you can transfer the potential bonus FAR?

- If it had qualified for residential and they didn't use it all, they could transfer that.

Another question was how this impacts a historic property since we don't want to lose our historic properties. One thing we've done in the code is to have the same amount of FAR to transfer off, but we're proposing they can transfer an additional 3:1 FAR off the property... so it's based on the full site size. The hope is that this will provide additional funding for seismic upgrades.

Commissioner Spevak: Wouldn't we just say it's three times as much from a historic property?

- The price of FAR is set on the open market, and it changes. So this way we are at least giving a historic site more FAR to work with.

Staff recommends editing the text of 33.410.205.D Flore Area Transfer Options as noted in Decision Table Q.

The intent is to encourage redevelopment of surface parking lots. This proposed amendment requires floor area to be maintained on a site over the surface parking areas, but allows the developed portions of a site to transfer floor area. Historic and conservation landmarks and contributing resources in historic districts receive an additional 3:1 of FAR that can be transferred off site as part of staff's proposed updates to the historic resource transfer (33.510.205.D.1). Revenue from the sale should help defray some additional cost of seismic upgrades for these historic properties.

Commissioner Spevak: This doesn't address my concern, but it's a creative way to address this. I'm sold.

Commissioner Rudd: Are scenic corridor sites treated like historic?

- The historic resource transfer is different. If you're in a scenic corridor and your height is being restricted, this doesn't apply unless you're talking about a historic resource. Part of the past discussion is if you're in a corridor you may not have an opportunity to use all your FAR, but you can transfer it within your subdistrict.

Commissioner Oxman moved to support the staff proposal. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

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

Next Steps

Our next discussion will be on March 14. bring forward amendments to the bonus and transfer code that are necessary to implement Council's recently adopted Inclusionary Housing program and some changes that could be made to improve that program in the Central City. Staff will meet with PSC officers on Thursday to prep for this session. The final planned PSC work session will be on April 11 when staff will the PSC and ask for a final vote on the entire CC2035 Plan package and forward it on to City Council as the Recommended Draft.

Adjourn

Chair Shultz adjourned the meeting at 6:10 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken