

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

September 26, 2017

5 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, Andre' Baugh, Ben Bortolazzo, Katie Larsell, Andrés Oswill, Michelle Rudd, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin

Commissioners Absent: Mike Houck, Katherine Schultz

City Staff Presenting: Joe Zehnder, Marty Stockton; Courtney Duke, Zef Wagner, Steve Szigethy, Francesca Patricolo, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Vice Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Spevak* provided an update about the second reading for the Transportation SDC package, which will be at Council tomorrow. Council is not supportive of the PSC's recommendation on the tiered SDC charges. Also, I'm helping to organize a summit on November 3 at PSU... Build Small, Live Large.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- Residential Infill Project: We're releasing the Discussion Draft code proposal this coming Monday. We'll have 7 weeks of outreach and events. After that, we'll take the input into a Proposed Draft that will come to the PSC early next calendar year.
- OHSU annual luncheon: You should have received an email invitation for the event on November 8. Remember that if you do attend, as *Commissioner Smith* reminded us, you will need to file a lobby report at the end of the quarter.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from August 22 and September 12 PSC meetings.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 — Bachrach, Baugh, Bortolazzo, Larsell, Oswill, Rudd, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

2035 Comprehensive Plan Map Refinement Project

Briefing: Marty Stockton

Marty introduced the project and the District Liaison team.

This is a house-keeping project coming out of the Comp Plan Update. It has four limited categories of potential map changes. It's a fairly narrow scope so we don't open the full Comprehensive Plan and/or Zoning Map discussions entirely. The categories include:

- Exhibit O: Council directed to evaluate or re-evaluate 13 sites based on testimony Council received September 2016 – November 2016.
- *BDS land use reviews
- *Nonconforming development
- Technical and policy priority

*Between the dates of Jan. 2013 and Jan. 2018. Proposed Draft includes BDS activity up to Aug. 2017.

The Proposed Draft contains potential map changes on 641 affected tax lots (either whole or portion), amounting to 166 acres citywide.

Number of map changes

- Exhibit O — 13
- Reconciliation of BDS Land Use Reviews — 3
- Nonconforming — 7
- Technical and Policy Priority — 143

In the 2035 Comp Plan, we separated the Comp Plan Map discussion (Task 4) and the Zoning Map (Task 5). In this project, we're talking about both maps together in one phase.

As a reminder, the differences between the maps are:

Comprehensive Plan Map

- Land use designations
- Centers boundaries

Zoning Map

- Base zones
- Overlay zones
- Plan districts
- Trails

Overlay zone and plan district modifications – There are several overlay zone and plan district modifications in this Proposed Draft, including, but not limited to:

- Alternative Design Density “a” overlay zone – Addition or removal of alternative design density overlay.
- Design “d” overlay zone – Removal of the design overlay zone on sites going to an open space designation and expansion of the design overlay on sites going from residential to commercial.
- Buffer “b” overlay zone – Removal of the remaining buffer overlay sites, which appear to be mapped on 15 additional employment and industrial areas.
- Centers Main Street “m” overlay zone – Expansion of the centers main street overlay along North Interstate Avenue within Arbor Lodge, Kenton and Overlook areas and removal of the centers main street overlay on other sites going to residential zoning.
- Prime Industrial “I” overlay – Expansion of the prime industrial overlay on Hayden Island.
- Gateway Plan District – Expansion of the Gateway Plan District south of NE Halsey Street.
- Laurelhurst Plan District – Removal of the Laurelhurst Plan District on properties abutting NE Sandy Boulevard that are also mapped with the Sandy Plan District.
- Sandy Plan District – Removal of the Sandy Plan District on a property fronting NE Multnomah Street.

Within the 2035 Comprehensive Plan, the buffer overlay zone was removed from all commercially-zoned areas, where updated setbacks, landscaping, and exterior use standards were intended to remove the need for the b-overlay. Continuing this approach, the remaining b-overlay zones are now proposed to be removed, combined with updated base zone standards. Revisions to setback and exterior use standards in employment and industrial zones are being proposed concurrently in the Code Reconciliation Project. Most of the buffering standards in employment and industrial zones already match or exceed those in commercial zones.

We published the Proposed Draft on September 12. So far, we have received limited testimony in four general categories:

- Removal of the Buffer “b” Overlay zone
- RX to RH/R1 downzone in Hollywood
- Retain RH zoning on adjacent properties in Sellwood
- Sites included in the Discussion Draft that generated public comment

Next Steps

- October 24: PSC public hearing
- November 14: PSC work session / recommendation
- November 28: PSC work session / recommendation

Commissioner Bachrach: There are a couple instances where you’re recommending a more intensive use on the Comp Plan Map but not updating the Zoning to a higher use. This is something I’m curious about if you can walk us through it. What are the circumstances that make a determination like this?

- Marty: The quick explanation is when you go through a legislative process, staff cannot include specific conditions of approval based on the service bureaus review and requirements. This is allowed within a quasi-judicial review process.

There is a site at 2525 NW Lovejoy that it’s been “deactivated”. What does this mean?

- Marty: That was within the Exhibit O category. This is an area where it is zoned RH, but there are some non-conforming medical offices there. In the Discussion Draft, we had a Mixed-Use Neighborhood designation with the CM1 corresponding zone to acknowledge this. When we received public comments from the applicant representative, adjacent residents and the neighborhood association, no one was satisfied with this change in the Discussion Draft. So after further conversations and looking into the transportation at that intersection and along NW Lovejoy and Cornell where there is no project identified in the Transportation System Plan, we made a staff recommendation of no change.

Commissioner Spevak: For situations where we’re creating open space from residential land, are there opportunities to get those housing units back?

- Marty: No. Typically sites that are being proposed to OS are because there has been considerable Parks master planning or there is a site BES owns that has a stormwater function (e.g. SW 45th and Harney).

Commissioner Bachrach: If the City owns residential land and they don’t have intention to develop, would it make sense to sell?

- *Commissioner Spevak:* That’s allowed in multi-dwelling zoning but not single-family. I think this idea makes a lot of sense though.
- Marty: For single-dwelling zones within the Johnson Creek Basin Plan District, transfer of development rights is allowed by code.
- Joe: I had a conversation today with a bureau that’s interested in that kind of idea.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: In the SE Harold St station that wasn't developed by TriMet, have there been conversations about the long-term potential?

- Marty: This was about 3 years or so ago, but TriMet confirmed there was no future proposal of a Harold St station. *This hasn't been revisited, but we can ask them about it.*

Commissioner Bachrach: At the time, I owned property there that was being down-zoned. I've since sold that property, but there was lots of down-zoning on major transit routes, and I think that was a response to neighborhood comments.

Vice Chair Baugh: Can we check with TriMet to see if there's any update?

- Marty: Certainly.

Transportation System Plan – Stage 3

Hearing: Courtney Duke, Zef Wagner, Steve Szigethy, Francesca Patricolo, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Courtney provided an overview of the project and reminded the PSC about the relationship of the TSP to other policies and plans. There are 10 major components to the TSP.

Courtney walked through the changes in the objectives... which were deleted, which were elevated to sub-policies and which were removed to implementation strategies (slide 8).

Francesca gave an overview and highlighted the changes in the Geographic Policies (slides 9-11). Zef walked through the updates and changes to Street Classifications (slides 12-16).

Commissioner Smith: Are speed cushion and speed table the same?

- Zef: Essentially, but the table has the cut outs.

Commissioner Smith: There was testimony that speed tables or cushions are less effective than speed bumps on neighborhood greenways. I want to flag this for discussion.

Peter talked about Performance Measures (slides 17-19) and the updates/changes.

Commissioner Spevak: I can see the data about car share (Uber, Lyft), but does it make sense to count them as car share? For the most part, they are single passenger vehicles still.

- Peter: No, if you have a single passenger, we are not making the system any more efficient. What we're attempting to do is to prioritize shared fleet trips. We know there are data issues, but we will work with this challenge.

Commissioner Rudd: I know in San Francisco, you can share your Lyft ride.

- Peter: Yes, and we want to promote more of this and shared trips.

Commissioner Smith noted Policies 9.49i and 9.49j. Level of Service (LOS) measures are mostly about the SOV when our transportation policies are about de-emphasizing SOV. I rather see LOS gone completely. I yield to the safety point but not for mobility purposes.

Vice Chair Baugh: Does this dilute transit?

- Peter: We are looking at a range of metrics and mitigation measures. For example, vehicle miles traveled (VMT). All modes can influence this metric.
- *Commissioner Smith:* System completeness could be another metric to use.

For Automated Vehicles (AVs) (slides 20-21), we know there are challenges and opportunities. There are minimal changes from the Discussion Draft to the Proposed Draft about AVs. And we are proposing to change Policy 9.6, the people-moving strategy. The old versus new policy is shown on slide 21.

Commissioner Smith noted that written testimony talked about zero-occupancy vehicles as a bad thing. What about automated freight such as drones? I want to clarify what we're talking about here is the people-moving strategy, which is not the goods-moving strategy. That will come later.

Vice Chair Baugh: We're defining the vehicles as being electric. Should we be saying this, or "non-fossil fuel"? That could be something to think about for what we may be using in the future.

- Peter: We're trying to focus on outcomes rather than technologies. So we might want to use zero-direct emission vehicles as the terminology.
- Courtney: The Council-adopted Electric Vehicle (EV) Strategy was what we were responding to. This same conversation came up, but currently the language is about EVs.

Courtney noted updates to the supporting documents including the Introduction, Glossary and a new Implementation Strategies section.

Steve Szigethy highlighted the South Waterfront Street Plan and the updates including the removal of the trail along Bond Ave. The other major change is that the northbound streetcar has moved from Block 5 to potential different locations as development of the Zidell property continues.

Zef highlighted the River District Master Street Plan.

Francesca share information about the public comment period.

Zef shared context about the SE 20th and SE 21st avenues proposal and testimony received about the classifications here.

Courtney commented on the Decision Matrix that staff provided to the PSC. This is a "consent list" for items staff would like the PSC to approve without discussion. We have already pulled the SE 20th Ave item for discussion and can certainly do the same with other items on the list if Commissioners would like to discuss them instead of voting on them in the consent package.

Staff requests the PSC to take the following actions:

- Recommend the TSP3 Proposed Draft
- Recommend the TSP3 Consent Decision Matrix
- Remove and modify objectives (other than classifications) from the TSP2
- Provide amendments as necessary for staff to make prior to City Council hearings
- Letter of support to City Council

Courtney thanked staff for all their contributions.

Oral Testimony

1. Jeanne Harrison, NWDA Transportation Committee: Elimination of district objectives is our main objection. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith asked about pattern areas. I thought NWDA is entirely an Inner Ring pattern.

Jeanne: We have Inner, Rivers and Central City pattern areas included in our district.

2. Douglas Allen: Eastside street classifications. In the Proposed Draft, the major transit priority street distances changed. Experts recommend a quarter mile spacing. But up to a half mile is too far. The TSP should recognize we need a comprehensive grid of transit lines. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith: To maintain headways, you don't want to get too close together. Is there an optimum point?

Douglas: I'd recommend a quarter mile spacing. Once you get farther apart, you can have up to a quarter mile walk to the route plus between the stops. I fear we'll have a severe loss of transit ridership with stops that are farther apart.

Commissioner Smith: With respect to the transit grid, I distinguish between high-ridership service and coverage service. I would like to upgrade corridors to frequent-level (e.g. in East Portland), but is there still a place for transit access street for areas where there won't be large ridership?

Douglas: Ridership is often a function of LOS, for example on NE Fremont St.

3. James Barrett: SE 20th Ave resident. The street is very unsafe and now has speedbumps, only thanks to the neighborhood with help from Gerding Edlen. The proposed change is not grounded in the TSP's own policies. You should be concerned for a long-term TSP plan letting go of a North-South collector. Also, looking holistically, if we're going to benefit a neighborhood and harm another part, how can that be mitigated? I'm concerned about the classification.

Commissioner Smith: I understand your point about shifting and the winners and losers conversation between 26th and 20th. What do you think about a future bus route on 20th Ave?

James: I was part of the petition, and I appreciate the difficulty of this work, but if a bus line is the need, I want to see some effort to mitigate this, for example, with safe crosswalks and/or speed signs.

4. Doug Klotz: I support the testimony from the Portland Bike Loud Project. I agree with adding the transit access street on 20th and removing it from 26th. I also applaud the removal of Clinton between 23rd and 26th. And I support the upgrade of Hawthorne from neighborhood to district collector. *See written testimony.*

Written Testimony Received

Vice Chair Baugh closed oral testimony at 6:54 p.m. Written testimony will be open through this Friday, September 29, at 5 p.m.

Commissioner Spevak asked about the decision matrix and voting. I hear now that we won't vote today based on our leaving the written record open for the rest of the work week.

- *Vice Chair Baugh:* Correct.
- Courtney: Staff put the matrix together thinking it would be the consent list that could be voted on today. We can certainly hold off on any voting until October 24.

Vice Chair Baugh: On October 24, we will have a full matrix in front of us. In the interest of time tonight, let's have Commissioners ask staff questions that we'll want them to address either now or before the October 24 meeting.

Commissioner Rudd: When you talk about 20th Ave performance now, do we have a sense of the delta in traffic levels with the change?

- Zef: The change will give us options such as adding a diverter. But until we make a decision, we don't know. We would then want to give staff who are working on the greenway improvement process do an analysis like what was done with the Clinton greenway to see where the traffic might go. Traffic volumes are in line with a neighborhood collector. And we could ask about mitigation as part of that project. I want to look into the speed limit question.

Commissioner Bachrach: It's not the designation that will affect 20th; it's the changes to Harrison and the greenway that might affect it.

- Zef: Classification may add traffic and speed, but that is based on what else is going on in terms of mitigation.

Commissioner Bachrach: Let's be explicit, as far as you can be, to include what PBOT will do as mitigation efforts here.

Also, I was interested in the comments from Douglas Allen. How do you manage transit resources? Is this PBOT or TriMet? Who drives it? And what is the PSC role?

- Zef: It is collaborative. TriMet is taking a more regional perspective, but our interests usually align.

Commissioner St Martin: I have questions about the change from objectives and sub-policies. This can be confusing for people. I haven't read through everything in detail, but Jeanne's testimony brought up some issues related to this. I hope to see some cross-walk information to help us here.

- Courtney: We will share a link to the cross-walk that we have done. Staff made some of these decisions, and we're happy to look at them again. We will specifically look at things that people have brought up in testimony to share with the PSC.

Commissioner Oswill: I'm looking at Section 5 on the Modal and Management plans with the streetcar in contrast with the SW Corridor Plan and how streetcars can relate to gentrification. Transportation investments can also be linked to displacement. Is there thought about how the streetcar can impact different areas and diverse populations? How can the streetcar be a more equitable transportation mode?

- Courtney: The Comp Plan has more displacement and gentrification policies overall, and we will address these in our projects. I'll review the connection and what we might put in the streetcar modal plan. There is an equitable transit policy that we'll review as well.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: My question is about connected and automated vehicles. Driverless car technology is here, and we're at a crossroads. Changing the priority in Policy 9.6 with adding this is also good. But Portland doesn't currently have an AV policy. So do the objectives we have defined provide enough guidance to implementing bureaus and the private sector?

- Peter: The policy is one component of a broader initiative that the Mayor launched. Council directed PBOT, BPS and other bureaus to develop an AV policy as well as issue an RFI, which we're reviewing (to test and pilot these vehicles) and an agreement system and a level of engagement for the public. We know this is a first step with the policy; we also know we need a shared mobility policy than is more explicit than what we have right now.

Commissioner Spevak: Some of the testimony was about performance measures before 2035. That got me thinking about how we know or figure out how we're doing. If you look at page 75, I don't know what our current mode split is, so I'd like to see that. And maybe a 10-year target that we should be aiming for. The Portland Bus Lane Project also commented on this.

Commissioners Smith: I've shared with staff that when we get a final vote, I will have additions to the recommendations:

- Direct PBOT to prepare an action plan for achieving 70 percent (or greater) non-SOV mode share.
- Recommend that the City take a leadership role on work-at-home trip avoidance by making work-at-home opportunities (full week or partial week) available in all bureaus for all positions where appropriate.

In terms of what we have in testimony, I'd like to see items related to the half-mile bus stop spacing; the question of the grid of frequent transit; a general question about where we overlay greenway/bikeways with other classifications and the implications for this; with regard to 20th, we need to make sure we do what makes sense for the system and do mitigation for the best overall outcomes; neighborhoods along Forest Park said the TDM strategy is great, but why did you put it under trails? I had flagged taking out the western bypass opposition policy, and I'd like to see that stay. I'll read transit things in more detail and will provide more comments via email.

Commissioner Larsell: Looking at the maps in Outer Northeast Portland, Fremont is shown as a route out to 148th, but it doesn't actually go through there.

- Zef: That's been part of the Master Street Plan for a long time. If the street is ever built, TriMet will want this street connection, so we're not proposing a change to that.

I also went through the Modal and Management plans, and I wanted to ask about the Public Transportation section. I found this wasn't hanging together like some of the other sections did. I never got a sense of an overall plan. Also, on the Division Transit Project, they already have said the bus service isn't faster, so I would like that to be taken out. The quarter-mile issue hasn't been resolved there, so that should be pointed out. Also in the bicycle section, can we include a mention of the East Portland in Motion Plan there?

- Courtney: It doesn't hang together because it is a summary of many other documents. We can make it more cohesive, but we don't have a separate Modal Plan (yet).

Vice Chair Baugh: I agree with what others have said. I think we need a very good cross-walk of all the items as we come back with an explanation so we know what we're making decisions on. In terms of 20th Ave, it seems like we're asking PBOT to come back with more of a plan, but we want to know what is possible there is you're going to change routes. What can you commit to if you make the change? It seems that there need to be interim targets about mode splits, as *Commissioner Spevak* noted. I'm interested in the mode split around transit and the lack of consistency around the 25 percent mode split and what can get us there. What are the tools that get us to get us to the mode splits we are aiming for? Streetcar doesn't have a mention of housing, and that is a huge miss. Also, we talk about public-private partnerships to leverage money; is this about tolling? In a broad sense, equity is mentioned up front, but I want to see it throughout so it isn't just glossed over... particularly in some of the sections around transit.

Commissioner St Martin: AVs seem to be a good place to get good data collection.

- Peter: A minor amendment we have proposed is to not limit the data components that are in the policy. It is incredibly important to have the data to manage the system.

Vice Chair Baugh: As *Commissioner Smith* commented, I'd like to see the City leading the effort about working at home (telecommuting). It would be good to see what we have and what leadership would look like.

Joe: Written testimony is open until this Friday at 5 p.m. I'm asking PSC members to provide your additional comments or questions to Julie by the following Friday, October 6. On October 12, we have a PSC officer briefing, so we can see the full list for getting through the discussion and your recommendation on October 24.

Courtney: I appreciate everyone's attention to the TSP3. We'll be back with updates.

Adjourn

Vice Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 7:43 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken