

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, August 14, 2012

12:30-3:00pm

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

Commissioners Absent: Lai-Lani Ovalles, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, [one open position]

BPS Staff Present: Susan Anderson, Director; Michael Armstrong, Sr Sustainability Manager; Alisa Kane, Green Building Program Manager; Morgan Tracy, City Planner; Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner; Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 12:35pm and provided an overview of the agenda.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- There are a number of upcoming Council dates for projects the PSC has recently heard:
 - Cully Main Street and Local Street plans: 08/29 @ 6pm @ Rigler School Auditorium - *Chair Baugh and Commissioner Gray* will attend and testify. *Commissioner Valdez* will also attend.
 - 122nd Ave / Powell Blvd: 09/19 @ 3pm
 - CC2035: 10/24 @ 2pm and the Eastside Freeway Reference Plan @ 3:15pm
 - N/NE Quadrant Resolution: 10/25 @ 2pm
- There is no August 28 PSC meeting.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of [Minutes from 07/24/12 PSC meeting](#)

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.
(Y7 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

Commercial Building Energy Efficiency Partnership

Briefing: Michael Armstrong, Alisa Kane

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5084936/view/>

Document: [Carbon4Square handout](#)

The Commercial Building Energy Efficiency partnership is a new program BPS has developed in partnership to improve energy performance of buildings, mostly for larger commercial buildings.

The work builds out of the Portland Plan direction to “build the commercial, industrial, and residential markets for cost-saving energy efficiency improvements through incentives, technical assistance, policy and education” and the Climate Action Plan 2030 Objective to reduce total energy use of all existing buildings by 25 percent.

Buildings in Multnomah County are responsible for 44 percent of all county emissions; commercial buildings themselves are about 24 percent of the total.

Benchmarking energy use is the first step. There is a tool that was created by the EPA and DOE, the Energy Star portfolio manager - a free program. The tool provides a benchmark to compare one building to other buildings with similar characteristics on a scale of 1 to 100. A score of 75 or higher means the building can be Energy Star certified; 57 buildings in Portland are certified so far. The program is an important opportunity for commercial buildings in Portland to benchmark then begin to look at investments in energy efficiency projects.

The tool is widely used already, as it is built into a LEED requirement; BOMA; major firms; and also a number of jurisdictions including Austin, New York City, San Francisco, Seattle and Washington DC require buildings above a certain size to disclose energy use. Portland is looking at these cities' actions, but we are looking more at working together with the builders as opposed to creating policy or requirements. Recognition and competition can drive people to comply with suggested standards. We are also looking at Portland's results compared to cities that already do require building energy disclosure. The policies are relatively new (the first year of data being sorted currently), so in none of the jurisdictions can comparisons be done yet.

Commissioner Gray noted work on building efficiency is also happening in school buildings in Portland. The new Parkrose middle school going for LEED Gold certification based on a carbon emission plan. The motivation is that it saves money annually, and the differential in costs was so slight that it didn't make sense not to do it.

The Carbon4Square building efficiency challenge is funded by Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance (NEEA) and deployed by BOMA to help track energy. The competition works with the building owner for a year, and a professional engineer certifies the work. There were 74 participating buildings in last year; overall these buildings saved \$1.2M in energy costs and 15.3M KWh.

Portland buildings that were in the 2011 competition included the Liberty Center, Commonwealth Building, Albers Mill, 200 Market, City Hall. Also, the Portland Building earned LEED-EB this year, building off the initial work with Carbon4Square.

The Portland building energy efficiency partnership includes:

- BOMA
- City of Portland BPS
- Energy Trust of Oregon
- Northwest Energy Efficiency Alliance
- Portland Development Commission

We are also working with architects and builders as experts and messengers too. BPS is the "glue" in the partnership.

The goal is to double participation in the next version of Carbon4Square to:

- 150+ commercial buildings benchmark in greater Portland
- Save \$2 million in energy costs in 2013
- Increase recognition

The program provides an energy coach, who can bring the building owner to the door of the incentives (e.g. with Energy Trust) as an incentive to participating.

The partnership hopes to launch in October 2012. Benchmarking starts in January 2013, with winners announced in spring 2014. More information will be available on the BPS Green Building website: www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/greenbuilding.

Staff will return to the PSC in late 2013 with some further details and initial results.

Barbur Concept Plan Briefing: Morgan Tracy

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5083279/view/>

Commissioner Smith is the PSC liaison to the Barbur Concept Plan, and this is a mid-project check-in. The community working group is coming to a consensus about appropriate focus areas along the corridor based on their access from adjoining neighborhoods and the preferred scale of development along the corridor.

Work to date: staff completed an existing conditions report; a needs, opportunities and constraints; vision and goals; and ongoing coordination with the overall SW Corridor Plan.

Barbur connects many of the SW neighborhoods to Portland. There are four unique sections of the corridor: Lair Hill; The Woods; Historic Highway; Far Southwest. Each presents unique needs and opportunities:

- In the lair hill section, there are opportunities to better connect Barbur to OHSU and NCNM.
- In the scenic Woods section, vehicle travel speeds are high and pedestrian and bike facilities need improving (few sidewalks exist and there are key gaps in bike lanes).
- The Historic Highway contains most of the commercially zoned parcels. Two major grocery anchors have undergone multiple renovations and redevelopment, about once every 30 years. With the average lifespan of about 30 years for large commercial buildings, there is lots of opportunity for re-investment to occur.
- In the far southwest, PCC Sylvania's campus and its 20,000+ students is close to the corridor but not yet linked.

The May 3 community forum included polling questions about Barbur's future. People noted their interest in more places to visit (especially during the day), for more housing, more businesses, safe crossings and wider sidewalks.

Staff and the community working group crafted a range of development scenarios. These are theoretical approaches that will still need to be tested, which include:

1. Commercial Investments (similar to Macadam)
2. Main Street (similar to Lake Oswego State St, Orenco)
3. Moderate mixed-use (similar to Belmont in terms of what the buildings would look like)
4. Higher intensity mixed-use (similar to the Pearl in terms of intensity level)

Staff then analyzed the outputs of each of the scenarios corridor-wide.

To help participants visualize the development scenarios, staff developed photo simulations and asked for feedback.

- The option of Barbur as a Main Street: realized that Barbur and I-5 together are noisy and not walkable. About a block off the main street is more comfortable for pedestrians, which means 13th Ave could be used as a perpendicular Main Street.
 - 71 percent favored the moderate mixed-use scenario
- Barbur as a buffered Main Street (separated from through traffic by a "slip" road)
 - Also favored the moderate mixed-use scenario, but not as much

Traffic conditions are being analyzed as part of the larger SW Corridor plan which will reflect the preferred scenario for Barbur. There is existing traffic/road capacity on Barbur except when there is a crash on I-5. During normal rush hour and at other times of the day, there is surplus capacity. There is also the potential effects of adding High Capacity Transit which will be considered.

As part of the larger SW Corridor plan, ODOT is looking at new standards for mobility (beyond levels of service and capacity) - more holistically how to move people through the corridor. Even within the working group, there is a tug between facilitating through-traffic and making the corridor livable (not just specific to Barbur).

Demographics of the corridor are not as diverse as the city as a whole. The May 3 forum was primarily attended by 45-65 year olds. When staff has been able to talk with younger folks at community events for example, there is excitement about transit and the transformation of Barbur.

Regarding TriMet as a partner, we need to be clear on the reliance on transit for development to occur without adding parking. This is crucial to executing a plan with transit and goals of the Portland Plan and Climate Action Plan.

The scope of the Barbur project is a half-mile envelop around Barbur - so Hillsdale is outside the scope of this particular working group but is part of the overall SW Corridor Plan. Improving connections between Hillsdale (as well as Multnomah Village) and Barbur are being evaluated through the Barbur Concept Plan however.

Regarding the “hierarchy of the numerous City plans”, in an ideal world, we would do the Portland Plan first, then Central City, then quadrant plans and other area-specific plans. However, we now have a new beginning with the Portland Plan, which will help us decide about what plan we’ll work on next. There will also continue to be partner priorities that will need to be integrated and that Portland will want to be a part of. We are also continually weighing resource strategically. This particular project follows from the previous SW Community Plan, where Barbur wasn’t addressed.

John Gibbon and Roger Averbeck, members of the Community Working Group spoke briefly to highlight and reiterate the work of the project.

For the car-oriented business owners, this will be a transition for them. We need to be aware of how the changes affect business owners and how they may be able to take advantage of the expected changes on the corridor.

- Retail/service demand capacity is less than what is zoned along Barbur. When you look at how we’re approaching the focus areas, there are stretches that will remain in-between, so these businesses and demand for them will remain.
- Staff is anticipating targeted outreach with business owners that front Barbur to see what their long term vision is.

Next steps:

- Continue to evaluate scenarios and market/catalyst analysis this summer.
- In fall 2012 (late October), a preferred scenario will be discussed at a community forum, and staff will prepare the concept plan report.
- In winter 2012-13, staff will brief the PSC and elected officials on the preferred scenario.

West Hayden Island
Briefing: Eric Engstrom

Staff Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5083715/view/>
Community Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5083719/view/>

Documents:

- [Advisory Committee Memo](#)
- [Health Assessment Scope of Work Memo](#)
- [Hayden Island Natural Resource Inventory](#)
- [Hayden Island Natural Resource Inventory - Appendix K](#)
- [WHI Economic, Social, Environmental and Energy Analysis](#)
- [Letter from Bob Sallinger, Audubon Society of Portland](#)
- [Comments from Chris Hathaway, Lower Columbia Estuary Partnership](#)
- [Port of Portland WHI project summary](#)
- [Port of Portland WHI Traffic Scenario information](#)

Chair Baugh noted that commissioners received a lot of information today, but this is just a briefing. After today's meeting, PSC members will have opportunity to ask staff questions, as will the public to the PSC. This is just the beginning of the decision process.

Advisory Committee members spoke:

- *Commissioner Hanson* - The make-up of the AC has broad representation of stakeholders (residents, environmental, development, labor interests; and staff from PP&R, BES and PBOT). They have learned lots about existing conditions, history, rail engineering, ship loading, traffic to/from the site and fish. All meetings had opportunity for discussion and time for public comment. There have been concerns voiced about the schedule, which the PSC should talk about.
- Chris Hathaway, Lower Columbia River Estuary Partnership - The ecological value of WHI is extremely high and cannot be over-estimated. The interior includes habitats for birds, turtles and other wildlife. WHI's highest and best purpose needs to remain in tact to conserve all benefits for wildlife and residents. The mitigation proposals currently don't meet the needs of ecology of the island, so further work needs to be done to create one mitigation process confirmed by all stakeholders. The timeline is not adequate since there are still significant issues to address. Members have worked well together, but the City has the right and responsibility that the project benefits the public good.
- Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland - shared the Port's traffic scenario and proposal documents about WHI. Ports are vital to great cities. Portland ranks 15th for global trade, and is 2nd in recent growth. We can see that past investments are now resulting in opportunities. Leveraging public investment for the good of the public is fitting for WHI - we need access to other markets to thrive and grow. WHI is a gateway; it enforces the Portland Plan and Climate Action Plan, and provides high-wage jobs. The Port embraces the compromise; development will create jobs and funding.
- Victor Viets, Community Resident - Addressed WHI community concerns in his [presentation](#) including:
 - The project's Health Impact Assessment (HIA) is inadequate.
 - Traffic issues need to be solved - we need a dedicated bridge to WHI.
 - Cumulative impacts, not just the Port proposal, will destroy island quality of life; impacts include the mall expansion, CRC uncertainty, PDX and ANG flights - noise and toxics - and Lottery Row.
 - Island benefits are disproportionate to island impacts.
 - If the Port can't afford to do it right, then WHI is not the right site for them.

Commissioner Smith asked the members about the pace of the process - has the AC been given enough time to process the issues and provide input on those issues? Comments included:

- The increased pace feels false - what is the big hurry, and why can't the HIA occur in an extended, more accurate time frame?
- The pace through most of the process was good; the EcoNorthwest cost/benefit analysis recommended the HIA, and since then, the AC has had a difficult time keeping up. 8 weeks for the health report is not sufficient.

- Port - there have been times when it has been challenges to get responses, but in general the AC has had time to comment, even if comments are not all incorporated into the proposed draft.

Regarding the traffic impact, the dominant source of traffic currently is for the mall. With the new mall facilities, the island will be inundated with more traffic.

WHI is regionally significant for habitat. Ecologically for the region, WHI is also the most significant piece of land left in the lower Columbia system.

Commissioner Shapiro noted the combined ports of New York and Newark. Could this be something between Port of Portland and Port of Vancouver?

Yes, about 10 years ago this was reviewed - but there was recognition that how the ports are created is quite different, and the direct interests and roles of each port are different. A number of initiatives are coordinated efforts (e.g. channel deepening).

Eric Engstrom provided the staff briefing. In addition to highlighting some of the AC ideas, the purpose of today is to give a project update; introduce the emerging proposal; and provide an update on the health impact research.

This briefing kicks off another phase of public involvement, aimed at collecting feedback on this new draft. Staff will return to the PSC in October, after spending the month of September collecting input and working with our AC.

Project process to date -

- **2008:** City initiated project due to CRC and Hayden Island Plan, project scoping
- **2009:** IGA with Port, Community Working Group
- **2010:** Entrix Foundation Studies, Resolution 36805, Revised IGA, WHI AC formed, public involvement summit meeting
- **2011:** WHI AC meetings, additional study scopes and consultant hiring, Concept Plan, open houses, Council briefing
- **2012:** Additional studies completed (Cost/benefit, harbor lands inventory, HINRI, etc.), WHI AC meetings, open houses, PSC briefings, health research initiated, draft annexation proposal per Resolution 36805, which (1) directed BPS to develop a proposal for annexation of WHI and (2) directed BPS to develop a concept plan to protect at least 500 acres of open space, and identify no more than 300 acres for future deep water marine terminal.

The resolution also directed staff to conduct additional studies (access plans and traffic impacts; land management options for open space; benefit-cost analysis; harbor land inventory; among others).

There have been numerous community outreach events and time for public involvement and input throughout the process.

In the fall of 2011 the AC arrived at this concept plan with the help of Worley Parsons international engineering firm. A variety of site plan alternatives and rail configurations were also studied.

The benefit-cost analysis tried to break down and quantify the trade-offs on ecosystems services; mitigation costs; recreation benefits. The recommendation was to further the analysis with a HIA.

EcoNorthwest took a fairly skeptical view of the Port benefits, pointing out that many port benefits flow to the larger region, while many impacts are local. Despite that general

statement, they did conclude that the local benefits would still exceed the costs. Depending on individual views of Port benefits, the project could be expected to generate between \$3.75 and \$90 million annually in local benefit. As noted in the report's conclusion, the break-even point is about \$5.5 million annually.

The Harbor Lands report helped staff understand what other alternate sites might exist. It also incorporated recent commodity forecasts and included an analysis of the remaining capacity of existing terminals in the Portland/Vancouver region. Key findings included:

- Alternate sites are not big enough to provide efficient rail access
- Forecast shows growth in auto, grain, dry bulk
- Additional terminals needed for these commodities at the mid-range or high-range forecast
- Vancouver has new 200-acre Terminal 5 rail loop, intended for dry bulk growth, plus 350 more acres of vacant land available

The proposed plan, which will be the topic of the hearings at the PSC in October, includes:

- Zoning (Plan District) - limits uses in a way that is consistent with resolution 36805
- Comprehensive Plan designations
- Transportation Systems Plan amendments
- Ordinance for Annexation (including boundaries and legal description)
- Intergovernmental Agreement to include next steps around planning for infrastructure; next steps on environmental and community mitigation actions
- Technical Reports

Some of the major changes from the last WHI draft include:

- Focus first stage of HIA work to feed into the ESEE analysis
- Added a truck cap in code
- Changes to North Hayden Island Drive cost-share approach
- Revised Best Management Practices (BMPs) to be consistent with AC feedback
- More specific terms for Community Grant Fund
- Add local hiring preference element with the Port's agreement, which still needs some details added
- More permanent legal instrument to preclude future industrial use of the 500 acres of open space
- Additional forest mitigation
- More specific language to outline City role in determining mitigation for wetlands and shallow water impacts
- Removed possibility of rail encroachment in the open space
- Financial pledges stated more specifically
- Extension and dispute resolution clauses to be overhauled

Draft health report scope:

- Two stage analysis
- First stage informs annexation and ESEE
- Second stage informs the Federal EIS process
- Partners include Multnomah County Health, Oregon Public Health Institute and Upstream Public Health
- Draft scope sent to AC

Staff provided the PSC with a copy of the County Health Department's recommendations. In addition to helping us identify gaps in our research to date, the County recommended staff incorporates the results of this work into the ESEE analysis, to the extent applicable.

In consultation with the County, there the health analysis scope includes:

- Additional demographics
- Noise baseline
- Port emissions data
- Regional air quality data and toxics model
- Additional literature review
- Consideration of cumulative impacts
- Technical work session - at the end of September, to assess where we are in the process that will go into the briefing staff provides the PSC on October 9.

Discussion

Questions from Commissioners; responses from Eric:

Commissioner Houck: The initial City Council resolution indicated there should be a net increase in ecological function. Is that still a condition of outcomes for WHI? We also need detailed information and outline from staff about regarding mitigation.

Regarding the long-term prospects for the 500 acres, eventual ownership should be by a public entity which would have responsibility for long term restoration, beyond what the Port would be required to do, and for long term management. There must also be an endowment that goes with transfer of the land to a public entity (Metro and/or Portland Parks and Recreation). Is there an endowment required?

Commissioner Shapiro: Who ultimately owns the 500 acres?

In the current proposal, the Port maintains ownership during development and mitigation stages; there could be a possible transfer after that, including the land going to PP&R.

Staff can provide commissioners with a track-changes version of the latest proposed draft.

Commissioner Hanson: supported talking about mitigation as a commission, which is important prior to the hearing. Grasslands and tree-removal areas should also be reviewed. He is still torn about building the direct bridge - could we take part of that budget to redesign Hayden Island drive where it crosses the residential zones?

Commissioner Smith: (1) Regarding the health study, what about baseline for air quality data?

It is difficult because the measuring equipment is not mobile, and it is much more expensive than noise monitoring. There are permanent stations in the area, but the closest one to WHI is on the road that connects the Port of Vancouver to I-5.

(2) Demographics - what about disability? Rates of cardiac and pulmonary health?

This information is not easy to obtain, and we don't have it for any neighborhood in the city. We are trying to understand age, ethnicity and income demographics as a statistical approach.

(3) Why do we have such an aggressive schedule?

The health study is an iterative process, so from the time we generated the commitment to the time it's done, it will have been a number of months. We are also trying to create a template to see how health information can be built into a regular planning project timeline for future projects. Expertise is provided by County, but BPS is the fiduciary and document-keeper. Part of the request to the PSC is to suspend time considerations about an HIA, but rather to review and judge the work based on information in the first draft to see how sound a product we have created based on the final schedule.

About the question of costs, if we measure the externalities and mitigate for them, the price tag may not pencil out. *Commissioner Houck* noted this is the same for environmental externalities.

Commissioner Houck: What makes this habitat regionally significant is the interior forest habitat and the mosaic of habitats on WHI. He asked Mr. Hathaway what WHI's significance is when the entire lower Columbia River is considered and expressed that he would like ecological experts to address the mitigation efforts for the project, including on and off island.

Commissioner Hanson: The AC had a number of sub-committees, one that focused on environmental and mitigation issues. Could WHI be developed in Multnomah County without being annexed by City?

It could, but it would not be allowed as urban development.

Commissioner Smith: Where are employees for the new port likely to come from? I appreciate the local hiring efforts. Regarding the bridge issue - with the CRC, WHI and mall - it seems that the community comes last. How do we get to some certainty about this? Numerically, the increase in traffic isn't too big, but the impact is within the margin.

The guidepost is the Hayden Island Plan, but the CRC is not consistent with this plan. In general the pattern shows a community street (Tomahawk Island Dr) with the trucks coming through on the outer streets. The issue is where the onramps would be.

Timeline - there is an activity per week in September through early October. Are we pushing the AC too hard during the end?

Susan noted there are several opportunities for PSC members to sit in on over the next month; other meetings can be scheduled within the next month to ensure PSC members get answers to questions. We could also squeeze an hour in one of the September PSC meetings to focus on Q&A prior to the late October hearing.

Commissioner Houck: The October 9 briefing is good. Having an opportunity to have other conversation in September is also helpful. I intend to write out questions then send to PSC and staff.

Commissioner Shapiro noted Bob Sallinger's letter and request for a response about it.

The AC review of the documents and comments to the PSC will occur at their next meeting on October 2, with the purpose to digest and discuss proposed draft. They will likely be offering written comments for the Commission to consider.

Chair Baugh recapped with some of the key issues raised today that need to be addressed:

- Ownership of the 500 acres
- Mitigation/environmental area long-term
- What are the benefits specifically to Portlanders?
- HIA
- Traffic mitigation - and/or keep bridge option open for now?
- Community impacts - document how we will mitigate specific impacts
- Timeline - the October 9 date is a critical date - health information from the County - is it enough to get into the decision-making process in late October?

Susan cautioned about the benefits for Portland. For example in the CC2035 project, we note Portland's Central City is a regional center. We might not want to pull for all the benefits of WHI project being specific to Portlanders.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 3:58pm.