

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
Tuesday, November 13, 2012
12:30-3:30pm
Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Lai-Lani Ovalles (arrived), Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd (arrived 1:45pm), Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

Commissioners Absent:

BPS Staff Present: Susan Anderson; Joe Zehnder; Eric Engstrom; Julie Ocken

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 12:30pm and provided an overview of the agenda.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Thanks to *Commissioner Smith* for being a member of the Citywide Budget Committee.
- The BPS Budget Advisory Committee is being formed; Irma (thank you) will be the PSC representative.
- River Plan - North Reach: Oregon Supreme Court unanimously held that the City's North Reach River Plan lawfully regulates development of land used for industrial purposes. In so holding, the Court rejected the argument that state law limits local governmental authority to regulate greenway lands to situations involving "intensification" or "change of use" only and does not allow regulation of "development" of those uses.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of [Minutes from 10/23/12 PSC meeting](#)

Chair Baugh asked for any comments to the consent agenda. Commissioner Shapiro moved to approve the minutes. *Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

West Hayden Island - Health Analysis

Briefing: Eric Engstrom; Betsy Clapp, Multnomah County Health Dept.

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5267391/view/>

Document: [Final Health Analysis](#)

Multnomah County Health Dept lead the process in the development of the Health Analysis. OPHI and Upstream Public Health contributed to the analysis as well. PBOT also provided much of the information regarding traffic on the island.

Eric provided background information about the West Hayden Island project - the timeline and request for health analysis as described in the presentation slides.

Health report defines a Development Scenario:

- 500 acres of open space
- 2.3 miles of trails, with beach access and non-motorized boat launch
- 300 acres of marine terminal with rail loop

- Two bulk export facilities, one auto import/export facility
- North Hayden Island Drive reconstruction, including improved pedestrian and bike facilities

The project Advisory Committee wanted to ground the analysis in terms of everything affecting WHI over the next few decades including the possible CRC Bridge, additional residential development (HI Neighborhood Plan) and redevelopment of the Janzen Beach Supercenter.

The Health Analysis is a 2-stage process:

- First stage informs annexation and ESEE
- Second stage informs EIS

In the spring of 2012, staff had a baseline report, collecting information about noise and air quality. Staff is now figuring out how to integrate the health-related findings into annexation and zoning decisions.

There are 2 communities within a 1 mile radius of the proposed Port facility. “Local” in this sense refers to these two communities (floating homes and manufactured home community). It is particularly the manufactured home community that may be impacted. This community is 440 households, with approximately 65% on fixed income, and an average home value less than the rest of Hayden Island.

The report includes draft mitigation strategies. The Advisory Committee has begun to review these as well as the Mayor’s proposal in relation to the mitigation strategies. The AC did agree to meet one more time to continue their discussion to propose a recommendation to the PSC before the 11/27 WHI worksession. A few PSC commissioners raised concern about not having a public review of the recommendations prior to this worksession.

Mitigation Strategy concepts include:

- 20: in proposed IGA or Code
- 15: in existing City Code/Policy or Law
- 9: have Additional agreement from Port
- 9: with small changes to language Port OK
- 25: Port is either not in agreement or purview of a different bureau/agency
- 9: recreational and housing related strategies (could be covered in part under Mayor’s Proposal)

Betsy Clapp shared the details of the report recommendations (slides 22-25 in the presentation).

Highlights of the findings include:

- Positive health impacts: employment and physical activity opportunities (recreation and improved bike/pedestrian infrastructure).
- Negative factors: related to changes in air quality, noise and vibration, housing issues.

Vulnerable populations include children, elderly, residents within 1 mile of location. Many of the residents of the island fall into one or more of these categories.

The local population would experience most of the negative impacts, whereas positive would be seen more on the regional scale.

The cumulative and synergistic factors table (slide 26) shows that many of the health incomes could be impacted by more than one of the 7 factors reviewed in the study.

It is possible that residents in the manufactured home community may have cumulative impacts for multiple development projects (e.g. CRC Bridge, Port activity).

Discussion

Commissioner Gray asked about Table 7: When you talk about local air quality being causal to illnesses, is this relative to the exact air quality issues that could happen at WHI?

- This is over a lifetime of being exposed to poor air quality, not specific to WHI.
- WHI will experience comparable air quality degradation, but air quality degradation will be 3x worse than it is in the current situation should the Port develop. DEQ's standards are based on cancer risk, looking at no more additional 1 case per 1M pop exposed for 70 years. The baseline is already 20x that standard, predicted to go to up to 55x.

Commissioner Shapiro: Health risk deals with real people in real time. There is lots of projection, so how can we feel comfortable with this?

- There will always be a section of information that we don't know. Part of what staff asks from the PSC is some idea of what health reports look like and what we do with the information going forward.
- We may do one type of analysis for a project then a full HIA for an EIS.

Commissioners and staff noted the worst air quality in the region is in NW Portland. But health outcomes are likely better in NW because of other factors. There are many inputs to health, so we can't look at just one factor in determining potential health outcomes. *Commissioner Houck* noted the differences in populations between NW Portland and WHI. We don't know more than anecdotal points about the populations however.

There are a number of phases in this development process. The full EIS would be triggered if Federal funding is used at any point of the project. The fill, beyond existing dredge area, would also trigger an EIS, as would the rail loop construction, as would any dock construction.

There was due diligence of the housing proposal the Mayor suggested, including conversations with Home Forward and PHB.

Commissioner Houck noted one of the positive potential outcomes of the project are recreational trails, but there are concerns with location and impacts on mitigation efforts.

- Staff noted that the proposal shows trails in the NE corridor, mitigation focused on south and west shores of the island, so there would not be interference between the two.

The ESEE report will be updated (first draft is already available). Before making a recommendation, the PSC can ask to see an updated draft or just request specific changes to be made. The health section of the ESEE was from previous impact studies completed in earlier years of the WHI project. *Commissioner Smith* noted that whatever mitigation we land on should be updated in that report.

Commissioner Gray noted that lots of times we compare studies or projects because sometime the similarities between them can be predictive. A big question for WHI development is if there other locations in the US that have done a project like this.

- Staff directly used results of Terminal 4 and Terminal 5. The container terminal will be different, but the Rivergate and St Johns facilities are relative to possible WHI development. A similar approach was used in trying to figure out the potential traffic situation. The study is also based on a literature review, which includes information about other places.

Commissioner Smith noted that one of the risks is that the truck traffic increase could lead to more bike/ped crashes. There is a side under-run bar that can be applied to the fleet of trucks that will be servicing the terminal which should be included as a potential mitigation effort.

Commissioner Hanson commented on the process and the AC. The timing of this project is a challenge. As with many projects, it all comes down to the last part of the process, and we want to be sure the community has adequate time to review materials and to testify before the commission makes a recommendation.

Commissioner Oxman: This is our first implementation of health as supported by the Portland Plan. We wanted to be sure this was included, but now we need to figure out the best way to include the information we have. The question is about balancing local versus regional outcomes. And there is a time dimension: how do we recommend future process features for the project to continue to have transparency and community input, which likely will look different 20 years from now?

Commissioner Houck added that the PSC may go beyond Thursday if we're serious about taking testimony from all who want to provide input.

Chair Baugh's commitment to the WHI hearing is to have everyone who wants to testify have an opportunity to do so. There are limits to everyone's time that we have to be aware of. This is the beginning of the implementation of the Portland Plan in terms of incorporating health into the plan. Keeping the community engaged is also critical long-term for when implementation of the process occurs. Impacts will be local, so mitigation needs to be local as well. In a process like this that has continued technical information coming in, we may not have the complete basket of information at this point that will impact the future.

Commissioner Hanson noted that part of the recommendation from the PSC could include the need for an ongoing committee that represents WHI perspectives.

Commissioner Houck noted that in the past, general decisions have been made about projects without having enough detail to make a decision (specifically about annexation for WHI). This is a caution we need to ensure doesn't happen in this project.

Eric outlined a few choices that will be in front of the PSC:

- There are items on the table that could be added to the IGA (housing, parks purchases)
- An attachment to the IGA re: on-site management practices that Port is committing to, which could be added to with health items
- What does future EIS commitment look like
- Ongoing WHI committee

The AC has a table of mitigation menu items, which has been sorted by what's in the current agreement, what's new and what the Port comments are. Staff will share this with the PSC.

Parking Study

Forum: Joe Zehnder

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5267390/view/>

Documents:

- [Parking Impacts Study](#)
- [Memo to PSC regarding Minimum Parking Requirements for Multi-family Development](#)
- [Map Multi-dwelling Permits In Last 18 months and Changes to TriMet Service Level Since 2007](#)
- [Map Areas Where Parking Is Allowed But Not Required](#)

- [Cost of Onsite Parking + Impacts on Affordability](#)
- [Parking and Land Use Sites of Note](#)
- [Spreadsheet overview of letters received by City Council and BPS about parking and other related land use cases](#)

The study focuses on new multifamily construction and parking (or non) construction requirements. Issues came from the community. The study was prepared by David Evans & Associates with BPS staff Matt Wickstrom working with PBOT and BDS.

The current policy exempts certain properties from having to providing minimum amount of parking - this has been in place since the last Comp Plan update in 1980 as a way to promote compact development, affordable development. In 1980s there was a threat of suburbanization of Portland and properties on main streets being converted to “automobile-like communities”.

For a number of C (commercial) zones, code allows mixed-use development. Many of these zones in neighborhoods do not require parking to be built. X zones in the Central City shared this. In 1990s the City added a parking requirement exemption for complexes built within 500’ of frequent transit lines.

The 2009 Climate Action Plan is another guiding policy document that shows Portland’s interest in reducing greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles traveled, showing we keep adding consistent policy direction.

There are 75000 tax lots today in the city that do not have minimum parking requirements. Most are within 500’ of frequent transit. 38% of the city subject to this provision (citywide, not just in the eastern neighborhoods reviewed in the study).

Community concerns included:

- Parking impacts
- Neighborhood notice and influence over design and development
- Height and design impacts
- Other neighborhood change impacts
- Accessibility impacts

Part of analysis included looking at permit data (since 2006) as shown in slide 6. 55% of buildings have on-site parking. On average, providing parking is .5 per unit. In the 80s and 90s, the market required more buildings to include parking than without.

Buildings without parking tend to be smaller (in terms of number of units); a small percentage of large buildings do not have any parking spaces included.

With the superheated mortgage market, there was preference for sale units over rental units; Portland had and still does have one of the lowest apartment vacancy rates in the nation.

The parking and travel study included:

- Vehicle counts
- Resident surveys
- Interviews
- Compilation of other research
- Cost of Onsite Parking and Impacts on Affordability
- TriMet Service Review

Results of the study are compiled in slide 9 of the presentation. Tenants own cars, but mostly that are stored on the street for use on weekends. This is an interesting market for TMD and car-sharing services.

On-street parking was congested in some locations in the study, but there were still many places where you could find parking within a 2 minute walk of home. The level of congestion changes a bit between weekdays and weekends, but it is minimal.

There are a variety of things we can do to influence what people do, but affordable on-street parking is something to overcome.

The most congested area reviewed in the study was NE Broadway at NE 15th and Hancock, a 50-unit building. Even in this area, there is ample parking available 2 blocks away.

Cost implications - development pro forma by different types of parking provided:

- Surface = \$3,000
- Structured = \$20,000
- Tuck Under = \$20,000
- Mechanical = \$45,000
- Underground = \$55,000

This shows a 50% or more premium on rents in the apartments depending on type of parking structure built.

Commissioner Hanson noted that with tuck-under parking, we still would need to think about circulation and back-up space as well.

Policies are being reviewed in a number of sections of the Comp Plan. Livability, compact development, neighborhood commercial districts, options for housing, reducing VMT and encouraging use of transit are all opportunities for policy.

The City's parking policies and private market decisions have provided options. Most multifamily buildings have at least 1 parking space per unit. Tenants are largely multi-modal. Typically there is adequate on-street parking.

Transit, car sharing options, daycare (walkable), and more secure indoor parking were moves that could compliment a parking policy to better serve the community. Charge parking separately from rent would help with affordability.

Commissioner Oxman asked about how typical the 8 selected buildings are in terms of what we want to see for multifamily housing over time.

We can look at the modeling we've done, but in the Portland Plan we encourage 2- and 3-bedroom options in neighborhoods.

Commissioner Schultz noted that rents are fixed by market demand. Adding costs generally raise market price, so the quality of construction may go down.

Commissioner Smith: We should look at a cause and effect: the 8 buildings in the study are not in areas at parking saturation yet. Is that the cause? Smart developers located here so they don't have to pay to build parking. What about a new building where this is already parking saturation?

Testimony

1. Gary Davenport, ONRG: The current parking survey is a good first step, but I suggest that it needs to be expanded to include surveys that measure the impact on neighborhoods, adjacent homeowners and businesses. I suggest that we ask Neighborhood Associations to conduct these surveys. This will promote transparency, help neighborhoods to abate their concerns of being cut out of the process and likely provide a far richer dataset. We should put a review process in place by conducting

impact studies over time, when specific milestones are reached; Take studies when construction is completed, after buildings have filled with tenants, conduct annual reviews to better understand long term effects. Any project requesting a Parking Exception require a full design review to ensure that the interests of all affected parties will be considered.

2. Steph Routh, ED, Oregon Walks: It is an important policy for building truly walkable communities to allow Portland to build networks and allow people to age in place. Younger people are driving less, so parking management beyond building off-street parking is important. This prioritizes transit as a viable primary transportation choice. Context is important, and neighborhoods must be visitable - ensuring pedestrian access to transit is important. We are generally happy with this as a tool in the toolbox.
3. Jeff Mandel: Kerns has lots of on-street parking overall, and it's mostly available. As a Neighborhood Association member, there has been a concern about lack of parking that might be caused by new building. There are some self-serving requests for permit zones - there is a disconnect in attitudes; and people value their own parking resource more than they value others'. To look at an overall policy to require developers also would require a review of individual residents to do the same. The current policy does provide for choice.
4. Gerri Sue Lent: There have been 2 developments that have been approved recently on the stretch of SE Tacoma. These lots are not fulfilling the essential requirements of density - frequent transit service isn't accommodated. Frequent service needs to be a bus on the route at least every 20 minutes.
5. Pamela Gurnari: In close-in SE, a building is proposed with 20 parking spaces for a 50 unit structure. Many homeowners in the area are elderly and want to age in place. More cars on the street affect the ability to be self-sufficient when a homeowner can't park near his/her house.
6. Susan Levine: Division St will have 7 new projects in a 10 block stretch. It makes it impossible for the neighborhood to develop positivity and adapt to change. 3 ideas for zoning change: (a) neighborhood input and notice; (b) design review should be given more teeth, expanded; (c) density requirements.
7. Sally Joughin: It is great idea to have fewer cars on the road. Using public transportation but still having a car with a place to put it is reality for many. Too many buildings are going up at once without consideration with overall neighborhood impacts. Can construction be staggered to allow the neighborhoods to adjust?
8. Ben Schonberger, Board Member Housing Land Advocates: Supports the current policy because it makes housing more affordable. It reduces the costs of housing and the price to the end user. There are valid concerns about the availability of free street parking, design of building and disability access. This should be addressed as a holistic approach, and HLA would volunteer to be part of that process. The neighborhoods belong to all of us and should be accessible.
9. Tom Neclsen: The potential controversy doesn't just apply to the east side. For example, cultural venues on the west side need streetcar and parking accommodation. Solutions should apply citywide, not just to some designated pockets. The differentiation in terms of size/scale of a project should be taken into account. Perhaps 80+ units should require parking to some extent.

10. Anjala Ehelebe, Woodlawn Neighborhood Land Use Chair: There is a proposed development in neighborhood right next to frequent service. The community met the with developer, expressed concerns. The developer said including parking will depend on what the bank will finance, but this area does not have sufficient parking - additional cars would intrude onto neighbors' homes. If not for the developer, the neighborhood association would not have opportunity to voice concern. We need to make sure NAs have a say that is actually listened to.
11. Terry Parker: It's wrong for a developer to make a profit on a complex by not including parking. A family car equates to freedom and mobility. Children are also a component to travel and car needs. The street should not be a primary parking place when a car is not in use.
12. Richard Lishner: 37th between Division and Clinton. A registered architect and urban designer who believes in density and the UGB. We want responsible, sustainable development over time. These new complexes are trying to take advantage of the neighborhood, not develop it. We need to time... we can develop over the next generation, not the next 3 years. A solution must be implemented immediately - all current developments will be completed before the Comp Plan update is finished. A 25% parking ratio will mitigate with little costs (per the study), but this is applicable for new residents and not those living there now.
13. Tamara deRidder, Linda Nettekoven, Ellen Burr, Mary Ann Schwab, Parking Study Taskforce:
 - a. The group evolved from Citywide Landuse Group. The developed a survey and distributed it via ONI's neighborhood directory to land use chairs, treasurers. 1188 responses in a 12 day survey. The hope is that results will initiate a broader conversation, policy options, greater neighborhood involvement early in the process. Most respondents own a car and a bike; auto used daily by over 50%. Transit used 33%. 18% by bike daily. By far, walking (63%) is most taken on a daily.
 - b. The survey asked 3 zoning questions - about structures over 4 stories abutting single-story; medium height for a transition zone; residential uses with little regulation in commercial zones - prefer to limit the number of residential units allowed and apply design standards. 83% agree step-down architectural features would help in transition. 79% new apartments with 5+ units should have compatible features required. Reduce impact of massing, maintain privacy. NAs should provide neighborhood features that new development must address, for example sightlines, solar access and public spaces.
 - c. 65% of those surveyed shared concern about voice that the community has. Many felt the should be notified earlier in process, especially tenants within 2-block radius. Other possibilities could include at least 2 meetings with developers; required 3-D models from developers; and for the City to help facilitate meaningful conversations. Use of SDCs in areas being impacted: still a mystery to residents and developers, so want to define a percentage to be allocated within same area, tracking how funds can be used for mitigation.
 - d. Mass transit - TriMet has not been open to listening to their riders over time. Not all seniors have access to check trip schedules online, so this is not equitable for seniors.
14. Al Ellis, Beaumont-Wilshire NA president: There has been little communication with developer in proposed buildings. Their NA asked for a developer to come to community meeting, they met with developer afterward, and the developer ultimately added a few commercial stalls and no on-site parking. There is no frequent bus service in this

area. We need to change code with a moratorium until changed.

15. Richard Benner: He and friends are planning to do 6-unit development in Buckman - specifically chosen as it is walkable, near transit, bike-friendly and the property is zoned CM. They designed units to meet passive house standards and for aging in place, but they cannot achieve these goals with parking on-site. If the City changes policy now, will be forced to abandon project. The City is right to emphasize equity - and if you provide parking, cost of development goes up.
16. Ted Labbe, Depave: The City can/should do more to harmonize new units with the existing housing stock. A waiver is consistent to add density, preserve habitat and the UGB. We need to sustain Portland's coziness, which on-street parking neglects. Providing parking drives up the cost of housing. Housing displacement is a huge issue, and a moratorium on units without parking would only increase this. Housing choice is currently limited by the overabundance of single-family housing stock.
17. Tony Jordan: A parent, home-owner and car-free. The nearest bus stop is 2 blocks from his home. He looks forward to accessible 24-hour public transportation. We need to manage public parking, which should be permitted and priced accordingly - prioritize to people without on-site parking. Permit district dollars should be returned to the immediate community.
18. Judah Gold-Markel: The City's rapid growth is especially noticeable on the eastside. We don't want to depend on cars, but how we go about it is key. We should only be changing zoning codes in a strategic, deliberate way, but we can't wait until the Comp Plan update is complete.
19. Patience Bingham: Has owned a house on SE Division since 1981. Public transportation is still not good enough, and car sharing options are not yet there either to allow the City to permit buildings without worrying about parking. Wanting to get places outside of rush hour is still problematic.
20. John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute: New development will still be auto-reliant. TriMet is still reducing transit even though revenue has gone up.
21. Michael Hayes: The limited resource of on-street parking has impact on livability of neighborhoods and economic viability. May encourage alternative means of access, but people still need some auto access. Locating housing near transit is good but need thought process about developments, including a threshold for larger buildings with more units. We should be applying the same principles as onsite stormwater management to parking and design.
22. Daniel Andersen: Encouraged the commission to think about sites west of the Willamette. Study likely understates development of projects. Transit service cuts have undermined mitigation assumptions and current policy. He encourages a mandate of TMA or TDM to tie to cumulative impact targets. Looking at interventions that encourage small accessory lots is an option too.
23. Debra Hochhalter: Voiced safety concerns, especially for pedestrians as an important component of this discussion and policy.
24. Allen Field, Richmond Neighborhood Association: The neighborhood is one of the hardest hit areas in apartment-building boom: 9 new buildings in 7-block stretch, about 291 cars, plus new destination businesses. The parking exemption should be revised and a size threshold should be considered. Responsible developers are doing .5 parking

spaces per unit. Longer-term we should have code to incentivize developers to attract car-free tenants.

25. Jeff Deiss: Inner SE neighborhoods are old streetcar neighborhoods that are already very dense with more units being built. There is going to be a parking impact, which will impact safety for walking and biking too. The cost of parking is being pushed into neighborhoods where current residents are bearing the costs. The commission should relook at FAQs - the moratorium especially. There is a compelling need for action while planning continues.
26. Ken Hills, Car2Go: Portland has been very receptive to car-sharing. Car2Go had 6500 new users in first 100 days in Portland. This should be promoted as a good option for people who use a car just occasionally.
27. Bob Stacey: This work is important to understand impacts and concerns about rates and the amount of change in Portland. He has seen much change since living on SE Division since 1976. He likes the changes to this main street, and it's making progress at providing neighborhood amenities and destinations.
28. Rick Michaelson: In 1980 the City pushed the no-need-for-parking in the Central City and furthered it throughout city in 1990. We didn't think about large structures that impact large swaths of neighborhood areas. A number of preservation projects could not have happened if parking was required, so we don't need to require parking for all projects - but we don't want to throw everything together.
29. Steve Gutmann: Has been involved in promoting car-sharing services since 1998; in all but the last year, growth has been tepid in this market. There has been a 400% growth by private companies in the last year. Car-sharing typically serves people who don't have a car or families that have down-sized from multiple to one car. With support and a push, car-sharing can become mainstream in Portland.
30. Steven Jenkins: New homeowner, but until recently was a renter. People who are young and people of color didn't have much of a voice today, but they will be heavily impacted. Rent continues to rise in Portland while wages are remaining relatively low. Everyone is here because they love their neighborhoods, and we all may need to compromise to help others have opportunity to live in these areas too.
31. John Urbanowski: The Mt Hood Freeway was a significant turning point saying that Portland is not centered on the automobile; and we're not going to destroy our neighborhoods for a concept of people needing to live in the suburbs. This is very similar to today's parking situation. We don't want to force a solution onto the community, and this is going to deteriorate the neighborhoods.
32. Aaron Brown: Regulation are expensive, but they are also necessary. But why should people be forced to pay for parking if they don't own a car?
33. Doug Klotz: Exceptions on parking requirements should be used to increase livability. Policies help meet state requirements and support the Climate Action Plan. They also allow for less expensive housing. Parking requirements should not be added to transit-oriented zones. Many people are still owning cars, so the question is if the number of units should be reduced and prices to be raised. The parking permit system could assist with this too.
34. Heather Flint Chatto: Understands the need for future growth. The Richmond neighborhood is walkable. Neighborhood changes are affecting comfort in walking and

safety, especially with limited sidewalk access during construction. No parking requirements are not the biggest issue. The disproportionate scale and unchecked development are larger concerns. Parking, height, size and density are all issues to be studied - wholesale neighborhood issues should be addressed collectively.

35. Rebecca Hamilton, Pedestrian Advisory Committee: CS and CM zones with no parking requirements will create dense, walkable neighborhoods. If implemented correctly, the City can create more affordable housing and car-free households via not requiring parking. She encourages programmatic changes if a developer takes advantage of the no parking option, but we should require a developer to create a 15- or 30-minute limited parking to accommodate lift vehicles. They should also build to encourage car-share options and create specified parking spaces for car-share vehicles to make car-free attractive and feasible.

Written Testimony Received

- Jere Grimm
- Markland Fountain
- Heather Flint Chatto and Debra Hochhalter
- Joan McGuire
- Jean DeVenney
- Chris Wilson
- Fred and Joan Coates
- Allan Rudwick
- Richmond Neighbors for Responsible Growth
- Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee
- Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
- Portland Commission on Disability
- Getaround, Car2go, Zipcar [presentation document]
- Jean Baker
- Susan Lindsay
- Jonathan Winslow
- Robert Fedoroff
- Paul Gronke
- Alexis Grant
- Margaret Davis
- Chris Rall
- Bob Stacey
- Cristina Pera
- Terry Parker
- Sally Joughin & Bernie Koser
- Mary Ann Schwab
- Bob Kellett
- Linda Nettekoven
- Tony Jordan
- John Charles, Cascade Policy Institute
- Susan Levine
- Rick Michaelson
- Doug Klotz
- Christine Yun
- Housing Land Advocates
- Susan St Michael
- Citywide Landuse Group - survey and memo

Final Considerations

Commissioner Hanson: is against a moratorium because there are specific legal criteria that would have to be met. Today we heard good ideas about minor adjustments to the code and process, which should be our focus. Economically, projects pay full SDCs, and infrastructure is in place - this is good for the City's economy.

Commissioner Valdez: The TriMet/transportation issue does need to be addressed to ensure frequent service. It's healthy for people to walk; this is healthy for the economy.

Commissioner Houck: Some tweaks may be applicable (e.g. a threshold for large units). There is a concern over design issues, which we do need to look at more fully.

Commissioner Shapiro: We are looking at WHI and parking issues through the equity lens of the Portland Plan. Portland is urbanizing - we have to create an equitable space for people who are already living here, but we need to review and accommodate car use.

Commissioner Schultz: Today we've heard about how we deal with the larger issue of change in neighborhoods, not just about parking. There is more of a policy issue to help with the densification issues for neighborhoods set for large growth.

Commissioner Smith: In terms of growth pattern, much will happen on transit corridors, but if we don't make this growth happen in a way that neighborhoods can live with, we will get backlash. We need to make this change positive with better design standards (perhaps for the 5 different neighborhood types); understand how height and building mass relate to the individual neighborhoods (including parking); and have an "impact management" point of view. There are some smart developers who have figured out they can externalize the parking costs, but there should be a value-capture mechanism to put this back into the community directly. We would like to see some options before the Comp Plan is implemented.

Commissioner Rudd: To provide some certainty to the community and developers, it would be good to establish guidelines that everyone understands going in. What triggers where we use parking permits? Are there opportunities for LIDs to deal with parking?

Chair Baugh: Tools and options are important. We would like some short-term options for the PSC to review as well as longer-term options that could be integrated into PEG discussions in the Comp Plan process. There needs to be a process, and neighborhood residents should have an opportunity for better input (but need to balance the burdens with development). Also, the business community in the neighborhoods have not been heard - what are their concerns and/or issues? The development community should also be heard as we come back and evaluate the comments at a future PSC meeting.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 4:28pm.