

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Maggie Tallmadge

Commissioners Absent: Michelle Rudd, Teresa St Martin

BPS Staff Present: Susan Anderson, Karl Lisle, Sallie Edmunds, Eric Engstrom

Other Staff Present: Javier Mena, PHB; Lisa Abuaf, PDC; Kimberly Branam, PDC; Art Pearce, PBOT; Courtney Duke, PBOT; Peter Hurley, PBOT

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 12:34 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 08/12/14 and 08/26/14 PSC meetings

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y8 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Tallmadge)

CC2035 West Quadrant Plan

Hearing: Karl Lisle

Documents:

- [Packet](#)
- [West Quadrant Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #12 Summary](#)

Presentation:

http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6963195/view/westquad_presentation.PDF

Commissioner Schultz thanked the staff's efforts for the work. There are a lot of great big ideas, including activating the waterfront.

Karl provided an overview and reminder about the project's plan area. The West Quadrant is a piece of the update of the Central City Plan, which is being updated from the 1988 Central City Plan. By the end of 2015, staff will come back with the final package together to a new proposed Central City 2035 Plan.

Testimony:

1. Karen Williams, West Quadrant SAC Co-Chair: Privileged to co-chair of the SAC. The 33-member group met 16 times, with public comment at every meeting. People offered many responses to proposals but also their heart-felt contributions to making Portland a better city. There were some disagreements, but everyone had a desire to contribute to Portland as a community. The majority of the group strongly endorses the proposed draft, and there are 3 minority reports included in the packet before the PSC. It is important that Portland move forward. The Green Loop, freeway capping and wholesale reimagining of the waterfront are major components that are transformative to advance the Central City. A healthy urban core makes for a healthy region overall.
2. Cameron Whitten: A member of various boards and civic committees who lives in NW Portland. Thanks to staff for the great work with the plan. I had a specific focus of looking at the housing and neighborhood portion. With the new development agreement to waive SDCs in Chinatown, affordability is set to expire in 10-15 years, but part of the benchmark of this plan is to ensure affordable housing in 2035. Looking at different geographic regions of the West Quad, there are different types of housing mentioned (senior, workforce, etc), but 0-60 percent of MFI (low-income) housing is missing. We need to talk about and guarantee access to all to live in the inner city.
3. Ethan Seltzer: PSU professor and past Planning Commission member; sharing ideas from other past PC members including Bing Sheldon. The group has a concern for the Old Town / Chinatown (OT/CT) district, which is a unique resource. Every plan has identified that area as a key component of the city. But the promise of the area is unfulfilled, and we should turn that around. We endorse the plan's work in OT/CT and Skidmore, particularly RC2 - development of parking strategy as a means to redevelop surface parking in the area. This is applauded. Redevelopment is now make parking a land use issue, not just a transportation issue. It will be challenging but vital to the district to implement the plan.
4. Michael Harrison, OHSU: talked about the treatment of South Waterfront. OHSU appreciates the partnership with the City. The university will build 3 new buildings in SoWa soon as part of the quest to diagnose/treat cancer early. OHSU is committed to active ground-floor uses, but they are not sure the plan has the optimal places for retail designated. He asked for staff to work with OHSU before the CC2035 Plan is adopted to learn more about future OHSU plans. Regarding the parking policy, many patients will be driving to and home from surgeries, so he requested the phrase "while maintaining and enhancing patient and visitor planning..." be included in the plan as it is in the N/NE Quad plan parking.
5. Wendy Rahm: Concerns about the building height component. We should amend the height map and lower the West End to 100 feet to preserve over 100 unprotected historic buildings. What's not needed is more tall towers from downtown. We can increase density while preserving the current form. Urban needs are often different from single-family neighborhoods. An alternative example, from Patrick Congdon's model, is dense, compact mid-rise buildings that preserve the human-scale and connectivity of the area. We should focus on citizens' needs, not opportunities for profit.
6. Jill Sherman, Gerding Edlen: a former PC member. She is generally supportive of the plan. Regarding OT/CT and surface parking, it's not yet redeveloped because projects are not feasibly financially. Incentives like SDC waivers will more likely get additional development in the near-term. She also encouraged more thinking around district parking and how the public sector/PDC could formulate a plan to provide parking. Allowing parking for residential projects could also do double-duty (e.g. if they are

able to be used by shoppers, etc during the day). A diversity of building heights makes a district interesting.

7. Michael James: Supports the minority report from NWDA. Density can be accomplished with medium-rise buildings. Portland is so unique with a charm and Parisian quality. He is not convinced the economic forecasts are accurate, so the high-rise proposal would not be sustainable. Portland's economic future may not be as rosy as the plan suggests, which would lead to empty buildings, which is bad for the economy and for the people who live here. He supports Steve Pinger's minority report.
8. Raihana Ansary, PBA: Appreciates the plan's focus on the Central City as a regional and economic center. PBA submitted the OT/Skidmore report with recommendations that support business vitality and district livability. The height increases are in strategic areas as noted in the plan. Central City is the economic hub of the region and should continue to absorb both housing and job growth. PBA opposes imposing taxes or closing surface lots. We need to be able to support growth and different modes to the Central City including freight.
9. Pat Scruggs: Thanks to those who have worked on the plan. I applaud the plan's work to address a vibrant waterfront and Central City. It has strong technical merits to leave the legacy we want, except for the height limits at bridgeheads. 325 feet is too high; it's not sound environmentally or economically. Some of the environmental aspects of the plan have been divided or put into other plans. The relationship with the place matters to the economic viability of the region.
10. Jeanne Galick: The plan has good ideas but fails to address environmental and habitat issues fully. There need to be specific benchmarks for air and water quality, green infrastructure requirements, and we should reinstate river policies and goals that help maintain and improve the water habitat. The plan needs to address the potential for conflicts between public activity and habitat. Strongly opposed to the bridgehead height allowance increases. There is no compelling reason to triple current heights, and it constitutes spot zoning. We could change Naito Parkway into a pedestrian-friendly boulevard that could be a far more effective tool to activate the riverfront.
11. Suzanne Crowhurst Lennard, Institute for Making Cities Livable: Provided data on effects of high-rise housing in writing prior to this hearing. The argument to promote high-rise buildings is primarily economically-driven. But rapid growth is not sustainable, and high-rise buildings may accelerate inequities. Research shows that generally people living in high-rise buildings have more mental health issues, especially for those living at higher levels.
12. Jeff Nudelman, Harsch Investment Properties: Thanks to staff and those who participated in developing the plan. Harsch has been a Portland-based company for over 60 years, adding value to real estate and improving communities where the company works. We support the City's work and partnership and own properties throughout the West Quad. I'm concerned that a reduction in existing height limits will not be consistent with goals of the City, and they are not what we've been planning for on properties we currently own and plan to redevelop.
13. Taz Loomans, The Old Historic Church: A architect and professional urban planning blogger. The 250 foot height allowance should be reduced to 100 feet, which is more appropriate for the character of the area. High-rises diminish livability. The Old Historic Church will be dwarfed and overshadowed with a higher limit and not fit within the historic context. It is possible to embrace progress without raising the height limits.

14. Jacqueline Peterson, Old Town History Project: Has been working in OT since the mid-1990s. She attended most of the West Quad SAC meetings. On page 28 of the plan, the map has 5 white spaces, all of which have height limitations. The OT/CT height increases to 175 feet in the heart of Chinatown.
15. Terry Chung, PCHMF: OT/CT has presented the idea that history and place are important. OT/CT is the only historic place left in Portland where people live. Others have been pushed aside by redevelopment. Consider the height limitations: 175 feet destroys the historic nature of the area. How will that help the livability of Portland, where people want to come? My vision is to turn the area into a historic-designated area. Create a “museum complex”, which would be a destination. Are the height limits as proposed equitable to the minorities in the area?
16. Kal Toth: Past professor of engineering at PSU and UBC. Moved to Portland because it was a livable city compared to Vancouver where high-rises have created “vertical sprawl.” We should reevaluate the height limits in the plan.
17. Grant Higginson: Retired public health physician. Lives in the Harrison Towers. Commends the bureau and PSC on the work in this plan. He agrees with the big issues that frame the document and implementation actions and is a proponent of new development. He is also concerned about the height allowances, particularly for the South Auditorium area. High-rise living may damage the healthy demographic mix of the community. He’s concerned that height comments are a NIMBY issue, so I’m only asking that you not increase existing limits unless there is a real reason to do so. RC-6 is a great policy, and I’m also excited about RC-5 that will benefit the community greatly.
18. Helen Ying: Vice-chair of OT/CT Community Association and a concerned citizen. As we continue to make Portland the best city in the nation, need to stay true to the goals of the Portland Plan. OT/CT is a vital hub for the city, but today it is lacking that vitality. We need to move away from an “all or nothing” approach and be innovative and strategic to balance the history while making progress. Diverse viewpoints need to come together to collaborate and design guidelines. Parking is limited in OT/CT, so closing surface lots will not help since that will make it more difficult to lease open space. We should work with PDC to redevelop surface lots, not close them.
19. Patricia Gardner, Pearl District NA: This plan builds on decades of past plans. The Pearl District is a great location for growth in the Central City and is a key location for density throughout the entire city so other areas of the city can remain as is. Portland is quite low-density at this time; it has room to grow in rich and livable ways that welcome people of all incomes and abilities. As a reminder, there is no change to FAR with the height suggestions in the plan.
20. Roger Leachman: Opposed to the height increases and emphatically seconds the comments of those before me who have spoken about height issues. A trailer park is more connected than a high-rise. My 6-story building creates a neighborhood feel, where I meet my neighbors. Community erodes in impersonal too-tall towers.
21. Joan Kvitka, South Auditorium Greenway Environs (SAGE): Supports the South Auditorium proposal. Open space should be integrated with high-density and a balanced approach. Protection of the Halprin Open Space is vital to Portland’s commitment to leading by design. The Green Loop must blend with the development. We need to stabilize connectivity and create linkages for bikes/pedestrians to the new bridge and South Waterfront.

22. Daniel Kaven, Kaven & Co: Developer and designer. Regarding the height increases in OT/CT, 100 feet versus 175 feet, it's cheaper to develop a 6-story (70 feet), but it's a less substantial, inferior structural system. The extra 3 floors don't provide the economy of scale we'd need. 175 feet allows for high-quality and long-lasting buildings to help build the vibrancy of the neighborhood.
23. Deanna Mueller-Crispin: West End resident. The cultural history in Portland is being lost. The older buildings offer public benefits such as affordability. 100+ historic buildings need to continue to exist in human-scale surroundings. The 460 foot limits in the West End was an unfortunate misstep that needs to be rectified, but the draft plan perpetuates the problem. What are the true public benefits of tall buildings? Public benefits in existing buildings would support low-carbon development goals instead of demolishing and replacing.
24. Lynn Longfellow, Oregon Nikkei Endowment: Voiced concerns with the OT/CT district regarding heights. Chinese and Japanese American community members have been discussing the need to preserve OT/CT. The recommendations in the plan to raise heights show that the concerns of the community have not been taken yet. This is the only historic district where height increases are being proposed. The value of diversity and retention of the district should be prioritized. Portland has historically done a poor job of acknowledging the work and role of its diverse communities. We need to keep the current scale of the district and maintain 100 foot max building height.
25. Wilfred Mueller-Crispin: Shared examples from German cities show that high-rise is non-livable; they are for business means only. They create an environment that is not very conducive to people going to visit the area, and they crowd out the historic aspects. He's not against high-rises, but we don't need huge companies to create economic viability.
26. Debbie Kitchin, Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC): Board and members are concerned about the portion of the plan that would impact ability to move freight out of the area. The Central Eastside saw growth even in the recession. We need to be able to move products to market easily and efficiently. We are concerned about the proposed bridge ramp changes; the CEIC wants freight movement to continue with access to I-5, Naito and Highway 30.
27. Justin Fallon Dollard, Portland Public Schools: Served on West Quad SAC as technical advisor. He focused on Lincoln High School's proposed zoning change to central commercial. He recognizes the unique location of the high school and opportunities to develop partnerships. There has been important work done by staff on the proposed zoning update, which has the community excited. Timeline for rezoning for Lincoln is proposed in the next 1.5 years.
28. Bob Sallinger, Audubon of Portland: Submitted a minority report on the SAC process. Environmental representatives both wrote minority report. It is less a matter of conflict than the fact that we didn't really get to the environmental issues, which is a big disappointment. There is a lack of actions, vague notes and lots of placeholders for what should be very baseline components. We have discussed with staff since the end of the process, but it needs to be part of the process. The plan doesn't connect back to other plans (e.g. the Climate Action Plan and Watershed Plan). There are not really bold or innovative aspects in the West Quad plan; we're resting on our "green laurels" instead of being a leading city. We need river recovery and salmon recovery components to be included. We have an opportunity to reconnect people to the river for ecological reasons as well. There should be ecoroof requirements included for buildings as well.

29. Mary Vogel: Lives on SW 12th with “too much air and noise pollution”. She endorses the freeway caps as part of the plan to reduce pollution and make neighborhood more livable. A minority report shows that there are not enough specific actions for green and environmental needs. We need to increase tree canopy in the West End with specific street tree goals. Building commercial buildings without street trees leaves a blank streetscape.
30. David Gold, Goldsmith Blocks: OT/CT focus. The increased height limits fosters development, but closing surface parking lots will create more challenges for the district. Uwajamaya would have been a great project for OT/CT, but it failed because it wasn't financially viable with lease rates and parking issues. The 100 foot limit will probably create 75 foot buildings; 175 will likely get same FAR but higher quality buildings. If we just figure out how to build “something” on a parking lots, we don't get anywhere.
31. Ann Forsthoefel, James Beard Public Market: The public market does want to take empty parking lots and create building lots there with a plaza connecting them. It will connect river to downtown. The new market plan estimates show it would create 350 jobs and attract about 850,000 visitors annually. The market site is a foot of Morrison Bridge, and the proposal works with current height allowances.
32. Reza Farhoodi: Lives in Central City. The plan works for vision of the city. We don't want arbitrary caps. Demographics are changing, and cities are naturally dense places. We should concentrate density in the Central City to create vibrant neighborhoods outside this area. Portland has many traditional single-family neighborhoods, and it makes the most sense to build tall and dense in the inner city. I approve the plan as drafted.
33. Jason Franklin, PSU: Member of the West Quad SAC. Thanks to staff for the work on the plan and increased FAR at the University Place site of PSU. PSU sells education, and it Portland. We need a dense downtown core and area around the university. I encourage the PSC to adopt this plan. The Mayor asked the SAC to think big and to think of a new vision for downtown. That has gotten lost in the discussion about height. We need to look at what things will make downtown a great place for the future of Portland, e.g. the Green Loop and reclaiming the riverfront.
34. William Galen: Objects to the proposed height limits. The blocks are too narrow to accommodate huge buildings, and the area will be threatened with large buildings.
35. Chris Kopea, Downtown Development Group: You can't pick a more inopportune height than 100 feet. Buildings of this size offer lesser amenities and safety; it's not a good type of structure for the long-term. Over 75 feet is substantially more expensive, but it is much more durable and flexible in terms of design. Skidmore/OT district hasn't redeveloped because of the rent structure there, not because of the surface parking lots. We need to focus on how to make buildings work.
36. Dan Petrusich: Flexible zoning is not controversial; we should change areas to have several types of zoning. The Pearl District is a great success from this. Supports the Lincoln HS rezoning. Regarding height limit increases, he recommends adoption of increases at bridgeheads. We might need a bit more work at OT/CT. Also, increased heights don't necessarily mean increased density. Portland is the “shortest” city on the West Coast with only 4 buildings over 400 feet. Even in Paris, there are tall (600 foot) buildings. He recommends the West Quadrant Plan as drafted.

37. Tom Neilsen: Read the testimony from Michael Mehaffy. Portland needs to maintain its leadership in planning and sustainability. The supply-side model is not the answer to our problems, as has been shown in LA, London and elsewhere because it creates expensive urban cores, which is not equitable. The proposed move to deregulate heights is unwise. Livability is Portland's greatest asset.
38. John Czarnecki: Architect. He appreciates the efforts on the West Quad Plan but noted intended density and locations of taller buildings must be analyzed. He supports the minority report provided by Steve Pinger, which has the formal support of the NWDA.
39. John Russell: Skidmore still has not developed... why? It's not due to a lack of investment or time. It is unique in the preponderance of surface lots, which creates a dead neighborhood. How can you revitalize an area without buildings in the area? He is happy with the wording in the draft plan but doesn't want to give up on the surface parking issue.
40. Steve Pinger: Member of the West Quad SAC and NWDA planning committee that drafted the minority report. This is not intending to be "anti-tall building". It is to encourage a meaningful distribution of tall buildings in specific areas, not all throughout the West Quad. What are the impacts of big buildings to people on the street? That is the question to assess the public benefits.

Written Testimony Received:

- Joseph and Lynn Angel; JC Milne
- Cliff Breedlove
- Nancy Catlin
- Mary M. Cramer
- Jo Durand
- Peter Finley Fry
- Janet Flaherty
- William Galen
- Jere Grimm (x2)
- Robert D. Hermanson
- Martin and Sandra Jaecksch
- Suzanne Lennard
- Michael W Mehaffy, Sustasis Foundation
- Jeff Merrick
- Bob Sallinger and Jeanne Galick
- NWDA (and revised report)
- Stephanie Oliver
- Anne O'Neill
- Shirley Rackner
- Wendy Rahm
- Barbara Ryberg
- Martha Van Dyke
- Amy Veranth
- Mary Vogel (and revised memo)
- Rudolph Westerband
- Andrew Steinman
- Norma Dody
- Brooks Hickerson
- Paula Lifschey
- Deanna Mueller-Crispin
- SAGE (South Auditorium Greenway Environs)

- Andrew Steinman
- Sharon Whitney
- AIA/APA/ASLA Urban Design Panel
- Ramona Kearns
- Koren Backstrand
- Unico
- City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services
- Sheila Brandlon
- Jack Rocheld
- Lucille Chomowicz
- Portland Historic Landmarks Commission
- Don Drake
- Michael Harrison, OHSU
- Ted Grund
- Jeff Nudelman, Harsch Investment Properties
- Debbie Kitchin, CEIC
- Wendy Rahm
- Taz Loomans
- Raihana Ansary, PBA
- Pearl District NA
-

Chair Baugh closed public testimony. The written record will remain open until October 1.

Discussion about themes heard today

Commissioner Houck asked staff to come back to address issues about the lack of environmental specificity, in particular the inherent conflict of river development and climate change issues. He has concerns about building heights but needs more information from a design perspective to make an informed recommendation.

Commissioner Oxman: We heard a lot about building height. We need to know more about the proposed increases. What do we embrace, and what do we risk losing when we add height?

Commissioner Gray is drawn to subject of OT/CT. She is saddened by Portland's Chinatown, which is so unlike the vibrant Chinatown in San Francisco.

Commissioner Shapiro: No one today discussed mixed-age housing. We need a provision for seniors to comfortably and affordably live in the area. Height concerns are a classic example of the two sides of development. What are best practices in other cities around the world?

Commissioner Schultz: It's a testament to previous planning projects how many people testified today; it is great to have all the voices and perspectives. We could have included more housing-specific targets in the plan.

Commissioner Smith: On the height issue, we have a process challenge because this is not a West Quadrant question; it's a Central City or all Portland question of "Paris versus Vancouver". We will be a hybrid, but which direction will we lean toward? The 1980 Comp Plan pushes us towards Vancouver, but now we're hearing questions about it. Can we make space between the quadrant plans and have a conversation about what height means at that time? The West Quadrant Plan moves toward Vancouver... and how we can do it well. I'm concerned about bridgeheads and stepping down to river as well as OT/CT equity issues. I'm intrigued about public versus private benefits of building height. Regarding parking in Skidmore, I'm open to a variety of tools, but I also don't want this same discussion in 30 years... we need an action plan, not just aspirations.

Commissioner Tallmadge: Talking about affordable housing, there is an increased attention to workforce and middle-income housing, but not affordable housing. We need to increase housing for all income levels, but where will we compensate for people who may be pushed out of OT/CT? Historical preservation, economic development and affordability need to be balanced. We need to reevaluate the financial feasibility and resiliency factors of buildings and height limits.

Commissioner Hanson: I'm not alarmed by the height increases but would advocate a more "surgical" approach. Too much height in too many places isn't good, but we can do height in the right places. Save the buildings that already have the right scale, and make them blend in more. Taller, more slender buildings could be a good choice. I'm also keenly interested in the first 30 feet of tall buildings. Environmental issues - are they in the right place? They probably need to be in this plan, but where are the best placed? We need more clarity about flooding on the Willamette shoreline and how we can deal with those issues. Ross Island is also a concern as noted by *Commissioner Houck*.

Chair Baugh: Thanked all the testifiers today who shared their perspectives. We can't look at height or parking in isolation; they are linked to all other aspects. The health and height questions, and height to demographic concern is intriguing. Environment is a critical component too. Low-income housing is a missing component.

Proposed Amendments to Six Portland Urban Renewal Areas

Briefing: Javier Mena, PHB; Lisa Abuaf, PDC; Kimberly Branam, PDC

Document:

- [URA Documents Packet](#)

Presentation:

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6963194/view/URAAmndpresentation.PDF>

Objectives:

- Reduce impact of urban renewal on taxing jurisdictions
- Provide resources to meet City's community development , economic development, and affordable housing goals
- Support Portland State University (PSU)

Proposal:

- Close or reduce: Willamette Industrial, River District, Airport Way, Education District Urban Renewal Areas (URAs)
- Extend and expand: North Macadam, Central Eastside URAs
- Solidify partnership with PSU via Development Agreement

North Macadam and Central Eastside URAs have a hearing at the October 21 PSC meeting.

The package:

- Will return over \$1B of property tax value to the tax rolls in FY15-16
- Will provide an additional \$5M to taxing jurisdictions next fiscal year
 - approximately \$1.5M to the City of Portland
- And, provide an additional over \$150M (\$67M NPV) to taxing jurisdictions over 30 years
 - Over \$45M (\$20.7 NPV) over 30 years for City of Portland
- The package of changes to the 6 URAs - and a close out approach for the South Park Block URA that add \$5M to affordable housing - leaves Portland Housing Bureau

- effectively held harmless (NPV of \$1.5M)
- Align TIF dollars where we believe we have the key opportunities
 - And areas where it's important for the city to have resources to invest in

The PSC is not being asked to approve the Plan, but rather make a recommendation to the City Council on the conformance of the changes to the existing Comprehensive Plan.

When we next come to the PSC on October 21, staff will have draft amended URA plans and reports (including findings and conformance) for the two substantial amendments.

Proposal for North Macadam URA:

- Expand N Macadam to include about 35 acres of the Education URA
- Release remaining Education URA acreage and property tax revenue in FY15-16
- Extend last date to issue debt by 5 years
- No change to maximum indebtedness

PDC is analyzing particular sites like ZRZ's 30 acres, OHSU's Schnitzer campus, the Harbor/Naito area and Lincoln Station and identifying infrastructure and development investment that follows on the City's West Quad findings and URA plan goals.

They are in the midst of negotiating development agreements with PSU and ZRZ that identify the partnerships needed to implement development at the south end of the Central City and commits to public investment in projects like SW Bond, the Greenway concurrent with adjacent development.

Expansion and extension of the CES URA:

Investments at the north end of the district are concluding with the completion of the Burnside/Couch couplet and active projects on all properties at the Burnside Bridgehead.

Over the past year, PDC has worked closely with BPS and the SE Quad committee in looking at the strategic sites. The analysis has supported BPS and the to better understand land use and transportation opportunities and impacts while identifying development related next steps that can run concurrent to BPS's zoning recommendations. Specific areas of opportunity that we have analyzed are at sites like the 3 parcel ODOT blocks at the center of the district and the Clinton Triangle.

The URA amendment findings focus on these key opportunity sites for future redevelopment while assuming current zoning so as to remain in conformance with existing code, plans and strategies.

Discussion: What will be helpful for PSC members to deliberate on these issues?

Commissioner Hanson: Does the boundary for the North Macadam URA preclude greenways at the river's edge?

- No, that was already completed.

Commissioner Smith: I looked at the URA amendments during the budget process last year. They are well thought-out and constructed. Has there been an equity analysis done on the dollars moving around?

Commissioner Shapiro: What about greatly adding to affordable housing? Please include this.

Commissioner Gray: Concurred with *Commissioner Smith's* question about equity and where the reductions are. Regarding public outreach, how has it been done in East Portland happened?

- We will ensure the conversation with EPAP has happened. The Airport Way URA

changes were more administrative; we are not collecting additional taxes aside from paying off there, so this was an opportunity to right-size the acreage and free up funds in case we want to add another URA or area in the future.

Chair Baugh: On the list for your outreach, there are lots that are downtown focused, but I didn't see a specific conversation with them. We will have to evaluate the proposal against the existing Comp Plan, but we talked about the lack of affordable housing in the new plans. What is the connection to the future downtown plans specifically for affordable housing? What is the displacement policy within URAs?

- Staff showed the impacts to affordable housing by URA (slide).
- We have an eye towards the new plans, and the changes are intended to seize the new plans, particularly in the Central Eastside (e.g. Clinton Station opportunities).

As we look at the changes to the URAs, looking at additional resources for affordable housing to achieve goals we have outlined. In North Macadam, there is an additional \$23M proposed. Staff will show the balance of what opportunities are.

Commissioner Shapiro: In the calendar, we see meetings with us and with the PDC Commission. I'd like to advocate for another joint meeting with that Commission in this kind of planning before the fact going forward.

Comprehensive Plan Update: Citywide Systems Plan and Transportation System Plan

Briefing: Eric Engstrom; Art Pearce, PBOT; Courtney Duke, PBOT; Peter Hurley, PBOT

Document:

- [CSP Changes Memo](#)

Presentations:

- Citywide Systems Plan
- Transportation System Plan:
<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6963196/view/TSPPresentation.PDF>

Eric provided an overview of the Citywide Systems Plan.

Today, Portland's City-owned infrastructure is worth \$31B. That's about \$50,000 per person in Portland. The Citywide Systems Plan (CSP) is a supporting document to the Comprehensive Plan. It relates to the Significant Project List, which is adopted as an element of the updated Comp Plan.

The Citywide Systems Team is a multi-bureau partnership (PBOT, PWB, PP&R, BES, OMF, BPS) that meets regularly to prepare background information for the Portland Plan, this work and the project lists.

Draft CSP draws on a number of previous plans. Much came out of the PEGs for the Working Draft and now the Proposed Draft of the Comp Plan.

The State of Oregon's Growth Management Act requires cities and counties to develop and implement public facilities plans. At a minimum, the public facilities plan (PFP) must describe transportation, water, and sewer facilities needed to support the land uses designated in the acknowledged Comprehensive Plan. Portions of the CSP will serve as the City's state-mandated public facilities plan.

The CSP goes beyond the state planning requirements and includes chapters related to parks and recreation and other essential facilities, such as technology and civic assets. This was done in the interest of more coordinated and comprehensive planning and to recognize the critical roles these systems play in meeting the needs of Portlanders and supporting the overall mission of the City of Portland.

The CSP is organized into:

5 citywide chapters

1. Overview of the planning context and process;
2. Description of the City's asset management approach;
3. Discussion of how CSP supports the CPU Guiding Principles (equity, prosperity, human health, watershed health, resiliency);
4. Summary of infrastructure systems and investment strategies;
5. Relevant goals and policies from the Public Facilities and Transportation chapters of the CP Goals & Policies document.

Bureau-specific chapters include:

- inventories of existing systems
- discussions of infrastructure needs
- investment strategies

Projects on the Map App are the same as those included in the CSP. Members of the public can make official testimony through the MapApp.

Eric walked through the various infrastructure components in the proposed CSP for each specific component (BES, PWB, PBOT, PP&R, and other essential facilities and systems).

Commissioner Oxman: There are a number of ways to cost things out. How is this calculated?

- There are procedures, and the City has been working to standardize the procedures among different bureaus. Maintenance is not traditionally part of the land use / growth management framework. Portland has a growth-management strategy to grow up, not out. The CSP purposefully brings in maintenance more so than previously, but it's still not completely consistent.

Commissioner Houck was surprised not to see dollar amounts listed. How do we set priorities without knowing what the costs are?

- The Comp Plan doesn't choose what gets built; the CIP and Council budget decisions do. This provides a menu of what priorities are.

Chair Baugh: If we're trying to make decisions about the Comp Plan, we do need to have a ballpark about what we're putting into one neighborhood versus another.

Commissioner Smith asked about broadband. We rely primarily on the private sector to provide it, but Portland is about 200th in terms of connection speeds, and it's not equitably available around the city. The City potentially has influence over broadband and access since we have fair amount of fiber resources. This should be included in the plan.

- We talked lots about this as well as electric utilities. One thought was to take the step to include parks, and in the next few years we could review what the City's role is for broadband and utilities.

Staff is hosting three Open Houses about the Comp Plan Update: Sept 10, 16 and 18. The hearings at the PSC are September 23, October 14 and 28, November 4.

Art, Courtney and Peter introduced the Transportation System Plan (TSP), which is a focus on the transportation of the Comp Plan.

The TSP is the 20-year plan to guide transportation investments in Portland. The TSP meets state and regional planning requirements and addresses local transportation needs. It includes:

- Policies that guide the maintenance, development and implementation of
- Portland's transportation system.
- A list of projects and a financial plan that will accommodate 20 years of
- Population and employment growth.
- Master Street Plans and modal plans.
- Strategies and regulations for implementation, including street classification maps.

We know growth is coming

- 120,000 new households by 2035
 - 150,000 new commute trips per day
- And... the current roadway system can't support growth with current mode split

We need a Balanced System

- More safe choices for short trips
- Saving space for longer trips and trips that must use vehicles
- A system that works for everyone, including:
 - Commuters
 - Parents
 - Shippers
 - Disabled residents
 - Diverse populations

We are trying to distill all the directions that transportation can go. There are seven outcomes that are informing how we're orienting the TSP.

Chapters 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 of the Comp Plan all include policy changes to transportation-related policies.

Peter walked through the four different revenue scenarios. Regardless of how optimistic we are, in comparing to the candidate project list costs, it is 2-3 times the cost of the projected revenue. So we have to prioritize to determine where we'll spend the limited funds we do have.

There are a number of projects as well as maintenance and operations that need to be prioritized. We are not doing a full call for new projects, but some projects will be studied to see if they'll land on the priority list in the future.

7 evaluation criteria to prioritize projects:

- Safety
- Access
- Cost
- Equity
- Environment
- Health
- Economics

Staff will take the smaller list of projects and evaluate them based on these 7 criteria. The eighth item is community support or opposition, which will play a role via the TSP hearing.

Different areas of the city have gaps and deficiencies, so part of the evaluation criteria (access / network) captures this. We want to create a full network of access instead of just individual projects.

After the evaluation, we will have a prioritized list.

Chair Baugh asked about the weighting of the criteria.

- They are currently not weighted. If there are adjustments we have to make, that will help to make modifications in the process, but we can't make those adjustments until we complete the exercise.
- *Commissioner Hanson*: You should take a project or two to test them through this process to try out the methodology.

Commissioner Gray: Where are projects that have disappeared off lists going? How is staff communicating to groups when projects look like they're disappearing?

- On October 13, there will be an updated candidate list.

Commissioner Oxman asked about the expenditures being 2-3 times available revenue. Is this typical?

- The Metro regional TSP has a large unconstrained component. It is typical to have the constrained list with this gap. This is why we doing an Our Streets program – to help chip away at the larger need. There is a significant gap that is a major issue to achieve the 20-year targets.

The first TSP hearing is part of the Comp Plan hearing on November 4. We will also have a TSP-specific hearing on February 24 with the revised and sorted/prioritized list and additional policy changes that come out of work sessions with the PSC this winter.

Commissioner Houck asked about West Quad and the 40 percent of the public realm being taken up by the transportation system. Is that explicitly integrated into your thinking? We have many opportunities to improve that public realm. BES makes an explicit statement that exposes how we value green infrastructure, which is an accounting problem. I'm hopeful we can have an action item that says that Portland will work with partners to attack that problem at a national level to change the accounting system to capitalize green infrastructure.

- Yes, see policies in Chapters 3 and 4. We are recommending the street for use for movement and for people.
- We don't yet have the tools to account for green infrastructure, but we are trying to do this. It was a hot topic in conversations. It relates to maintenance, too, because we have to maintain it.

Chair Baugh: PBOT should coordinate with BPS that is working with groups (e.g. IRCO) who may think about transportation much differently than we do. This should be included in how we evaluate and look at projects.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting 5:00 p.m.