

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, December 9, 2014

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson (arrived 12:45 p.m.), Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

Commissioners Absent: Karen Gray, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro

BPS Staff Presenters: Joe Zehnder, Karl Lisle, Derek Dauphin, Nicholas Starin, Mindy Brooks, Sallie Edmunds

Other Presenters: Jillian Detweiler, Mayor's office; Kimberly Branam, PDC; Javier Mena, PHB; Tim Kurtz, BES; Robin Schneider, Columbia Green Technologies

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 12:31 p.m.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- January 21 is the PSC thank you celebration. Please be sure to RSVP.
- Confirming times for the PSC meetings in 2015 / Comp Plan work sessions. We would like to start at 3 or 4 p.m. Commissioners confirmed a 3 p.m. start time for these meetings. Staff will send this confirmation to all PSC members and will note it on the PSC calendar.
- Responsibility for oversight of solid waste rates will (may) be passed on to the PSC in 2016. This is on the recommendation of the Blue Ribbon Commission that is looking at water, sewer and solid waste rate-setting options.
- This Friday we're publishing a zone change package related to the Pembina facility at Terminal 6. We will be sending this an analysis to PSC members as soon as it's published. The Port is also offering briefings and tours for PSC members.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 11/18/14 PSC meeting

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.
(Y6 – Baugh, Gray, Houck, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendments to Two Urban Renewal Areas

Hearing / Recommendation: Jillian Detweiler, Mayor's office; Kimberly Branam, PDC; Derek Dauphin, BPS; Javier Mena, PHB

Documents:

- [Central Eastside URA Memo](#)
- [Central Eastside URA Amendments](#)
- [Central Eastside Findings](#)
- [CES Report](#)
- [North Macadam URA Memo](#)
- [North Macadam URA Amendments](#)
- [North Macadam Findings](#)
- [North Macadam Report](#)
- [PDC Chair letter to PSC](#)
- [Final Amendments Memo to PSC](#)

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7089323/File/Document>

Derek introduced the project. This is specifically about two URA changes (North Macadam and the Central Eastside) because they are substantial as defined by the state. The PSC's role is to check for the amendments' conformance with current Comp Plan.

Jillian provided background about Council's work in responding to URAs. We are trying to right-size all the city's URAs. Council's direction included:

- Reduce impact of urban renewal on taxing jurisdictions
- Preserve affordable housing investments and help the city better meet its redevelopment and economic development objectives
- Support Portland State University (PSU)

Today's amendments respond to Council's direction. On the whole, they bring in additional \$5.5M in the next year and \$354M over 30 years to the taxing jurisdictions.

The amendments maintain investment in affordable housing and increase resources for South Waterfront (SoWa), Central Eastside (CES) and Old Town / Chinatown (OT/CT). Development agreement with PSU is in the works, and the PDC Board will review this next week.

Central Eastside amendments include:

- Expand to include the Clinton station area for the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail
- Increase maximum indebtedness by 20%
- Extend last date to issue debt from FY17-18 to FY22-23

North Macadam amendments include:

- Expand the district by approximately 45 acres (approximately 35 acres from the Education District)
- No change to maximum indebtedness
- Extend last date to issue debt from FY19-20 to FY24-25

Kimberly and Javier highlighted the proposed amendments' alignment with the equity goals of the Portland Plan.

There are limited resources to be added in the Central Eastside, so we are developing strategies to address affordable housing including:

- Funding development
- Incentive Zoning through density bonus
- Market development leverage
- Clinton Triangle

In North Macadam, PDC is working with ZRZ and PSU to ensure they are proposing affordable

housing in their work, specifically the Harbor Naito parcel and Parcel 3 (which is currently owned by PDC). Affordable housing will target the 0-30% median family income (MFI) range.

PDC staff is meeting with the Multnomah County Board and PDC Board this Thursday, with a Council hearing scheduled for next Thursday, December 17.

Commissioner Smith asked about returning resources to education as a way to increase equity.

- This is a balancing act. They are potentially conflicting issues, but what we're saying is that there are districts that have been successful, so they will now go back onto the tax roll.

Commissioner Smith: In conversation with the League of Women Voters (LoWV), they make a point that development as a part of the strategy excuses developers from agreements to include affordable housing.

- We are working to ensure this agreement includes some teeth (working w/legal counsel).

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about Clinton Triangle and if there is proposed affordable housing there in addition to its being a transportation hub.

- The station area includes 4 acres of public land, which the Mayor thinks is currently under-utilized. It gives us the opportunity to dictate how this land is developed, which includes affordable housing.

Chair Baugh is confused by the term "industrial office".

- This is what we call employment uses in the CES that are typically creative industries and technology industries (e.g. the Eastbank Commerce Center). We can look at the existing employment overlay in the CES to see that when we liberalize the range of employers in the area, we can also intensify the job density in the area. The Southeast Quadrant Plan proposed to expand the CES to get more of this use.

Commissioner Houck commented that this was the subject of our joint meeting with the PDC regarding Central Eastside as about how we think differently about industrial jobs and how we can intensify that area. This is relevant to Joe's remarks regarding our work on Goal 9, industrial jobs.

Chair Baugh asked about job growth and who gets those jobs. We need to look at this job classification and see if it's a diverse group who can get these jobs. How do we get the jobs to be diverse and the employees to be diverse as well?

Testimony:

1. Barbara Ross: Many of the recommendations are positive. But I'm troubled by the possibility of affordable housing goals that will be reduced and/or too weak. The Comp Plan notes that the housing being developed needs to mirror the composition of the city as a whole, and we don't see enough affordable housing included in these URA amendments. The City must comply with the housing requirements. *See written testimony.*
2. Tasha Harmon: CLF founding director. Initially negotiated the NMac district. She is concerned about affordable housing, particularly in NMac. The PSC shouldn't recommend acceptance until we know how the affordable housing goals will be met. URAs are missing affordable housing goals. We need inclusionary zoning requirements in exchange for subsidies. Affordable housing needs to be thought of as infrastructure. *See written testimony.*
3. Ruth Adkins, Oregon Opportunity Network: Housing affordability in NMac needs to stay true to the City's goals for affordable housing in this area. We need to be consistent with the Comp Plan requirement of mixed-income neighborhoods that reflect the

diversity of housing types and income levels of the region. *See written testimony.*

4. Nick Sauvie, Rose CDC: Portland has an affordable housing and access crisis. Vacancy rates are at historic lows. Maintain the existing goals and prioritize making additional resources to meet the goals. We can meet the existing modest goals to include all income levels including home ownership.
5. Daniel Valliere, REACH: Echoes much of the testimony heard already. REACH is a developer of Gray's Landing. It is 209 apartments in SoWa, which needs to be ramped up. The NMac Framework Plan was adopted in 2009 and included a vision statement for 2020 that includes a statement that the area includes a mix of incomes and diversity of people that reflect diversity with local employment opportunities. We need public-private collaboration to make this happen.

Commission Houck was there in 1999, and it's similar to the natural resources and greenway.

The City does has it on its plan to go to the state to ask for inclusionary zoning allowances.

6. Peggy Bengry, LoWV: The CES URA adds 16 acres to fund streets and sidewalks around the station area. It diverts funds from the County and schools, which is inappropriate for urban renewal. We already have unmet needs, so difficult to justify the extension of the URA. This URA should end in 2018, which was the original extension date. The City should use its own resources outlined in the letter to fund the transportation infrastructure. *See written testimony.*
7. Debbie Alona, LoWV: Has concerns about affordable housing in NMac. The 0-30% goals are especially critical. We need more than URA funds to accomplish the affordable housing goals. The PSC and Council should delay signing off on adoption of the amendments until we know how the City will meet the housing goals. Inclusionary zoning should be considered. The Comp Plan housing goals are good and should be maintained. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith asked about resources from the City to be used for financing transportation infrastructure. What resources are you referring to?

The City owns many of the properties they want to see developed. We need to leverage ownership and work with private developers. PDC has done well in the Central Eastside.

8. Michael Harrison, OHSU: OHSU's goal is to improve the health and well-being of Oregonians. Future job growth depends on health. OHSU offers good jobs, and about a quarter of the jobs have a low barrier to entry, so job growth at OHSU can help all Portlanders. Extend the NMac URA.
9. Debbie Kitchin, Central Eastside Industrial Council: The CEIC supports expansion of the URA but has a number of concerns. We need to ensure efficient freight movement and that increased density in development doesn't hinder this. Increase safety and access for all users. Affordable housing in the CES would be fine for using the funds, but not market-rate housing. Focus on infrastructure improvements. The ODOT blocks are another priority project for PDC, and the CEIC supports this redevelopment to be held in private sector job expansion. We should also evaluate structured parking. The CEIC supports HAND's ask for safety improvements between 11th and 12th at Hawthorne and Division. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith asked about supporting the extension of additional resources except in Clinton Triangle (affordable housing aside). Do we need to expand the district or just extend the timeline?

Transportation and infrastructure changes we support would be in the Clinton Triangle.

10. Mary Ann Schwab: Her concern with affordable housing is that it shouldn't be built just because the land is there. This housing shouldn't be built so close to a railroad. I would like to see this vote tabled because this is creating a split between HAND and Brooklyn neighborhoods. Let's see how we're distributing the wealth of the expansion. Property taxes will be affected even though the report says it won't.

Written Testimony Received:

- League of Women Voters
- Julie Chapman
- Oregon Opportunity Network
- Ann Dudley
- Larry Burt
- Barbara Ross
- Tasha Harmon
- Central Eastside Industrial Council

Chair Baugh closed testimony.

Discussion

Jillian commented on affordable housing. We welcome this challenge. The changes are not causing that challenge. They add \$7M that will go to PHB for affordable housing. I don't think doing nothing (holding up the project) is what we need now.

We anticipate \$30-40M would be available as a result of the amendments. Public-private partnership with the Zidells can help generate resources that we can invest in affordable housing. These are not available today, but if we reach private investment goals, we will have additional resources toward the end of the life of the district.

Agreements we draft will need to have enough teeth to make them successful. We need to be able to leverage the private sector. The proposed plan gets to an increased number of units.

Commissioner Houck asked about delaying the process. Does that do anything? The agreements need to produce what we ask them to do. Are people working with you on affordable housing agreements?

- PHB has provided language to ensure affordable housing is kept whole in the PDC agreements. PHB and housing partners have been in consistent communication.
- We're at the "sounding the alarm" stage. The advisory committee on this project had an affordable housing subcommittee. PHB took the opportunity to say we're struggling in NMac. We are now seeing great advocacy and are getting to see what the next steps we can take are.

Commissioner Smith noted we're not getting enough affordable housing in NMac, but I'm not sure how to address this. In terms of CES, what would happen if we didn't expand this URA? What's at risk if Clinton develops on its own in the private?

- Pedestrian improvements and traffic conflicts are a concern. Working with the Fire Bureau, PDC assistance will be needed to make this transaction happen. It might not be so much funding, but to make the land available it will be important.
- We've looked at the strategic sites and have a short list including Clinton Station, OMSI

development and the ODOT blocks that takes \$12M that the amendments would support. It is a trade-off.

- *Commissioner Hanson* noted that the Southeast Quadrant Stakeholder Advisory Committee has discussed mostly transit access around Clinton. The sites will become more valuable after light rail comes in. We discussed housing near this area, but not about affordable or market-rate housing. Funding would definitely help with traffic improvements.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked that we look to be sure to consider more resources into affordable housing near the developing stations. Instead of shifting from a numerical goal to a percentage in NMac, would that affect the 30% set-aside that goes to PHB? Would that be a big concern?

- The 30% is based on total resources; this is a City policy. It would probably have an impact if we shift from a percentage goal to a numerical goal, but we don't yet know how much residential or commercial will be developed.

Commissioner Smith asked about the policy of redevelopment mirroring citywide composition, which is not included in the Comp Plan update.

- Correct. This change was done in collaboration with PHB in the development of the Portland Plan. Matching income level in every neighborhood wasn't producing anything. With the new PHB Housing Strategy, we talked about opportunity areas as an approach. We have moved away from mirroring the citywide profile but focusing on diversity of housing types in all neighborhoods, which we think is a more robust way to look at housing.

Chair Baugh noted the ZRZ development won't produce housing. We probably won't get much housing out of it due to the expense of buying into it. Housing is very important in both districts. After infrastructure, housing is one of the most important things for the area.

- Yes, but there is a tension in terms of generating money to pay off bonds, etc.

Chair Baugh: If you built all the infrastructure and funded it, what is the priority for the dollar after that is funded – is it for housing, or is it up for grabs?

- It's guaranteed to be at least 30% for housing. In NMac, there could be additional resources after the ZRZ and PSU agreements, and housing could get this.
- The first priority is to complete the street system.

Chair Baugh proposed that if you're going to have communities develop in a URA, you will bring in jobs. We need to have jobs with affordable housing. The floor is 30% of the resources going to housing. If we suggest 30% of total *units built*, this causes Council to ask how we get there. 30% of production makes you rethink how we get to that goal. I propose that housing is the highest priority and that is funded at a higher rate than they have at 30%. We won't get the housing units without changing the funding mechanism and what Council does. This gets to how we have diverse communities in these neighborhoods.

The current PDC model is that you get the same percentages even after meeting the goals.

Commissioner Oxman: I like the idea of having concrete goals to work with. But how much housing should we be doing in this district (housing area versus jobs area)? Does housing need to be directly adjacent to the jobs? This is a heavy traffic and transportation area. Also, if you use a percentage criterion, if you're not making it, you can just decrease the number of housing units developed. It feels like there are higher-order questions that need to be addressed.

Commissioner St Martin noted we need a way to meet our housing targets, but is this the right place and time? This is a citywide problem.

Chair Baugh noted the West Quadrant Plan gets to more specifics to give us direction about how we will answer some of these larger questions.

Joe clarified: Today, affordable housing is about 35% in the Central City. 30% in SoWa would be a big lift. We are trying not to lose ground in the Central City, but it suffers from the same issues of not having the plan to develop this in the next 25 years. The other big point is that 30% is a floor, not a ceiling, so as resources become clearer, we could look to prioritize more funds for housing. TIF funds themselves don't produce housing.

Chair Baugh: We should also ask the TIF districts to follow the Central City Plan housing goals.

Commissioner Smith reiterated: We could approve with recommendations and amendments. Alternatively, we could not adopt them and ask PDC and PHB to come back with a stronger housing plan.

Commissioner Hanson acknowledged both options but is happy to go with what's proposed with the amendments because they are part of the solution. Our recommendation to Council could include what *Chair Baugh* is asking to be included.

Commissioner St Martin asked about timing.

- PDC can make the positive impact to taxing jurisdictions. But if the PSC doesn't want to act now, the only issue would be the Council notice for December 17.
- We'd like to have the PSC recommendation by then, but if we don't have that and just have other comments, we can share that with Council too.

Joe noted that the findings against the Comp Plan are in conformance. That is what the PSC is responsible for reviewing, but we can push this. Technically we have a solid case about being in conformance. The sooner we vote, the sooner funds go back to the taxing jurisdictions. I'm not sure what we can get from staff in terms of additional information that would be sound and meaningful enough would be in the best interest of delaying a vote.

We want to point to Council that they need to look at housing, and if they don't, it's a failing for the City, not for the PSC. *Chair Baugh* has committed to going to the PDC Commission and Council hearings.

Commissioner Oxman asked about delaying the vote today until the discussion of housing in the West Quadrant Plan would help (and vote at the end of the meeting).

Commissioner Tallmadge asked to approve the conformation to the Comp Plan and include a set of recommendations to strengthen the plan.

Chair Baugh noted that a new requirement of the total of 30% of total production would change this (as opposed to 30% of the total resources).

Commissioner St Martin would vote in favor of conformance, but we also need a Commission discussion about when we take a stand, especially about housing.

Recommendation

Commissioner Smith moved to delay the vote and that the PSC would ask PDC and PHB to strengthen affordable housing requirements in URA districts. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y5 – Houck, Oxman, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge; N2 – Baugh, Hanson)

Elaine Howard, URA consultant: The statute says that the substantial amendments have to go to the PSC for review. The Plan has to conform to the Comp Plan. But if the PSC doesn't vote,

the amendments can go to City Council, and they can make the decision/finding of conformance itself.

Commissioner Houck commented that sending the amendments back for more work did not preclude communicating our concerns to Council, and they can find the URA Amendments in conformance.

The PSC letter will document that the hearing at the Commission happened, the PSC's concerns, and note that the PSC did not vote on conformance with the Comp Plan. The Council can still vote the amendments are in conformance with the Comp Plan and move the URA amendments forward.

Commissioners will share their concerns with staff by tomorrow so that the request to PDC and PHB will be articulated prior to the PDC Commission hearing on Thursday.

Commissioners Smith moved that the PSC should send a letter to Council reflecting the goal for NMac and CEIC be 30% of all housing produced be affordable, and that once district has produced sufficient funds for core infrastructure, Council should assess additional funds going to housing. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

Commissioner Houck commented that our recommendations did not mean that we do not need to ensure basic green infrastructure. Willamette Greenway, parks and habitat improvements, for example, need to be met as well.

Joe: 30% is a noble goal. We have not tested the financial feasibility of hitting this over the next 30% in the Central City as a whole. We are holding up an amendment to the URA, but it's going to be aspirational but potentially unrealistic.

(Y6 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge; N1 – Hanson)

CC2035 West Quadrant Plan

Work Session / Recommendation: Joe Zehnder, Karl Lisle, Nicholas Starin, Mindy Brooks; Sallie Edmunds; Javier Mena, PHB

Documents:

- [West Quadrant Packet](#)
- [Handouts for December 9](#)

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7089325/File/Document>

Today we have 4 parts to the work session:

- 3 main items for discussion – affordable housing; bridgehead heights; West End heights
- Changes made in the plan and time for discussion
- Vote on the amended plan
- Transmittal letter

Central City (CC) housing and neighborhoods

The amended plan includes new goals and policies that *Chair Baugh*, Joe and PHB have discussed since the West Quad hearing. Joe walked through these amendments. The new Goal H includes an affordable housing and diversity in housing statement.

The 2035 Performance Target for housing is that 30% of all housing in the CC will be affordable to households in the 0-80% MFI bracket.

We are looking at opportunities to do things differently with housing in the CC. We won't be able to build ourselves out of the need for affordable housing, so we also need to leverage the current market and provide affordable housing in that market.

Commissioner Oxman thanked staff and stated his support for these updates. Housing is a multi-generational problem, and supporting home ownership helps to begin to build a stronger middle-class.

If these amendments are ok with the PSC members, staff will edit the plan and apply these standards across the Central City except for OT/CT.

Bridgehead Heights

Staff provided a summary of the proposals from previous PSC work session.

Morrison Bridgehead: The proposed increase is to 250' on the waterfront with a podium to match the height along Naito. There is some shadow cast, but the principle is to open up development opportunities on difficult and challenging sites (e.g. the bridge ramps).

Hawthorne Bridgehead: Heights today are 200'. Sites that are left are constrained, so we're proposing a 325' max at this bridgehead.

Commissioner Smith noted the Mayor is talking about removing a ramp on the Morrison Bridge. Can we condition the height so that if a ramp is removed, the height increase option goes back down to the current limit?

- Development potential is one of the factors of removing the ramp. We're not sure what scale of building could go in there. We are looking at FAR and allowing flexibility in the height, so there might not be a mathematical formula of the ramps/heights correlation.
- Also, while there is not a proposal right now, PBOT may be undertaking an analysis. Our discussions have made the case that the Morrison ramps are critical for freight and other movement.

Commissioner Houck asked about wind impacts at the pedestrian scale. I have talked with Kat Schultz and understand there are ways to mitigate these effects, but when do we address those mitigation measures? During codes or when?

- We could do this by resolution that we would explore provisions to mitigate for pedestrian and other impacts.

West End Maximum Building Heights

Since the 1980s, the FAR has been set with height to allow more head-room than the FAR might allow. This is currently 250' for areas south of Salmon, and up to 350' north of Salmon in certain areas.

You can see the development potential sites – particularly surface lots and smaller buildings. If we take the forecasted amount of growth, the additional development scale is shown in slide 21. The West End is planned to be higher-density residential. The historic designations and pace of development keep the district fairly stable. Design of the public realm and of the streets is really important.

Commissioner Hanson noted he and *Commissioner Smith* took a walk in this area. Director's Park is a great laboratory to understand heights in the Central City. It has all the variety of conditions right there.

Commissioner St Martin asked about historic buildings: those wouldn't go up in height, but owners of these buildings could trade their heights?

- National and local historic buildings have preservation programs and incentives including the height transfer option. That could go to another development site, but in the West End, there are many buildings that are interesting and add character, yet they don't have the historic designation. One of the things in the Plan is that we want to update our Historic Resources Inventory and figure out more incentives and which sites could be able to be part of the transfer system.
- There are a fair number of buildings that have recently be designated as historic in the West End.

Environmental Issues Memo and Proposed Revisions

Commissioner Houck noted he made many comments to staff and is exceedingly happy with how responsive staff has been. Updates include things such as verb choices that strengthen the plan in regards to conservation issues. The important thing is that we have acknowledgment about the environmental issues. Restoration versus enhancement: all the research shows that there are salmon in the Portland Harbor at all times and all stages of their life cycle, and need about a quarter-mile habitat to survive, especially for young migrating salmon. The question is how many restoration sites (habitat creating sites) do we need? There are 6 potential sites, and can support the suggestion that there be 2-3 sites at a minimum, but the other sites remain in play as well. Regarding item #23 he can support the revised language so long as the language calling for developing a strategy to address impact to fish and wildlife remains.

Commissioner St Martin asked about housing goals and looking at new ways to do housing. This doesn't need to be in this plan, but part of later discussion.

Commissioner Houck restated his concern about mitigating for wind and shadows, which we can follow up with staff about. I'm comfortable with the environmental revisions. *Commissioner Hanson* appreciated the clarifying questions on environmental issues.

Waterfront Park is currently not in the floodplain, but we want to keep new significant development to the west of Naito in case of changes FEMA makes in updating the floodplain map.

Commissioner Smith commented on Attachment D, items 3 and 17. Language is added about access for emergency fire and medical response. He reflected that in the past we have had conflicts with protected bike lanes downtown because of requirements for fire vehicles. Staff facilitated discussion with a Fire Marshal today, and we could be more aggressive about alternatives for access, especially since this is a project-by-project issue.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about High Performance Design in the Pearl.

- The overall Central Citywide Plan includes high performance and should be included in each district (not just the Pearl).

Item 60: I want to reiterate that height and density is good wherever possible and that we don't reduce building heights if it still fits in with design character.

Item 69: "some housing" is vague.

- This is OHSU land, so the primary function will be for medical/university. We are trying to avoid saying something that contradicts the development we know will be happening there in the near future but leave the option for housing as space permits.

Chair Baugh asked about the alignment of this policy with the housing policy. Make sure this matches.

Page 156, UD2: Heights were reduced within the NW Historic District. The height bonuses are available there, but the desire was to get rid of the height bonus option in this area. Our bonus study will help illuminate things here too.

Chair Baugh: For Item 50, I want to ensure we're talking about culturally-diverse families. Item 60 – design guidelines to be culturally-sensitive. Item 69 – alignment with the housing policy. Item 74 – this goes away because it's superseded by the new housing policy. RC2 – strike bullets 3 and 4.

- This is intended to be for structured parking, so staff will update this language to clarify.

Hawthorne Bridgehead Heights

Commissioner Houck noted he has mixed feelings about it.

Commissioner Oxman continues to have concern about what it feels like about having taller buildings closer to the river. We have a dichotomy of “let's embrace the river” versus “visually closing it off.”

- The crux of the idea is to activate the waterfront. Bridgehead height is one possibility that goes back to the 1970s. Most of our vibrant areas are currently a few blocks west of Naito.
- People also wanted to see variation along the waterfront, so this could lead to a more exciting node.

Commissioner St Martin noted that something that could invite interest down to different parts of the waterfront would be helpful.

Commissioner Hanson likes the spatial concept of increasing bridgehead height as a welcoming into the city core where there is a gap right now. *Commissioner Tallmadge* also confirmed this is a good area for development.

Chair Baugh is supportive of the height, but he wants to have housing there. Waterfront property is very valuable, so is it possible to condition the height on getting something out of it for both the bridgeheads?

- We are designing a bonus system, mostly about FAR, but also looking at height. There could be a premium for FAR in a location like this.
- We can explore the feasibility of residential use at the Hawthorne Bridgehead

Commissioner Smith noted the proposed public market could be a primary use for the Morrison Bridgehead. The group leading that effort has previously noted they don't need the additional height, but as the height option has become available, they have stated they want it.

Commissioner Oxman asked about options to open the riverfront: more people have access to the river and we are fiercely protecting it.

- Zoning does allow commercial and housing uses.

Recommendation

Commissioner Hanson moved to forward the Proposed Draft West Quadrant Plan as amended to the City Council for consideration including amendments in Attachment D (as modified) and amendments as noted in today's discussion:

- exploring pedestrian-level wind impact
- exploring bonus system for bridgehead height for commercial and housing options

Commissioner St Martin seconded.

(Y7 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Green Infrastructure Panel

Briefing: Tim Kurtz, BES; Robin Schneider, Columbia Green Technologies

Presentations:

- [BES – Green Infrastructure](#)
- [Economics of Green Roofs](#)

Video: <http://vimeo.com/75605921>

Commissioner Houck introduced the topic. This is a continuation of conversation at the PSC in March 13 about green infrastructure and why it's so important. He noted the work Portland has done, much of it led by Tom Liptan, who was in the audience and recently retired from BES. He introduced Tim Kurtz, BES Innovative Stormwater Program, and Robin Schneider, Marketing Director for the local firm Columbia Green Technologies.

Tim shared the first presentation including information about:

- What is green infrastructure in Portland
- Why it's a valuable tool in the stormwater management toolbox
- How it's integrated into public and private development
- What we know about performance and cost
- Where do we go from here

Green infrastructure is both built and the natural systems. Green infrastructure can manage the issues of “too much, too fast and too dirty” all at once.

Flexibility of the systems – preserves capacity in the public conveyance system, allows exchange of cleaner residential runoff.

We look at the total cost – both construction and long-term operations and maintenance to make decisions; green is not always the best choice

Health – this is especially important as we face the potential of climate change impacts and also our biophilic nature championed by Dr. Beatley of UVA. Green is part of our physical and emotional well-being.

Habitat – ecoroofs provide islands for pollinators / birds as they move through the urban landscape.

Partnerships – we can do more with the limited resources. We have an opportunity to engage and work with multiple agencies to accomplish things together.

How we use green infrastructure:

- Green streets
- Parking lots
- Green roofs
- Urban canopy
- Natural systems
- Habitat restoration
- Safety
- Space constraints

Impacts include:

- Green roofs
- Innovation (stormwater green wall as a “vertical ecoroof”)
- Placemaking
- Integrated stormwater management

BES is monitoring 24/7/365 to see the effectiveness of the systems year-round. They can also do simulations of different storm patterns to estimate their effects.

Glencoe Elementary Rain Garden was one of the first places to put in a rain garden. We monitored rainfall and the amount run-off expected prior to implementation. After construction, 86% of what was going into the system was kept within the garden instead of running off.

Green roofs help to reduce peak flow; the rate at which water goes into the sewer drops off substantially (e.g. 458 l/min expected versus 10 l/min actual at Hamilton Apartments roof).

Looking ahead, opportunities include:

- Continued monitoring / innovation
- Stormwater System Planning
- Central City 2035 / Mixed Use Zoning Project
- Climate Action Plan / Preparation Strategy
- Green infrastructure work crosses discipline and Bureau boundaries (e.g. with PBOT's Street-by-Street program)
- Integrated planning results in better, smarter development and infrastructure

Commissioner Hanson was impressed with the vigorous monitoring that shows the data and effects of using a variety of green infrastructure systems.

Commissioner Houck asked about up-front costs (a question previously asked by *Commissioner Schultz*) and maintenance costs.

- There are a number of factors that go into up-front costs as well as the payback period. Incentives are one of these, but the ability to demand increases in rent, and other things such as reduced energy consumption costs and replacing the roof fewer times also are factors. Overall ROI can come out all over the map, but most ROI is within 6 years.
- Cost studies are somewhat convoluted because they take into account existing incentives with other possible returns. So it's difficult to piece out individual contributors.
- We often see green roofs implemented on health care or education facilities where there is a long-term sense of ownership so they understand the overall costs in the long-term versus residential buildings where it may be harder to make the case.

Commissioner Oxman asked about financial benefit options for people who have green infrastructure on their buildings/property.

- The Clean River Rewards program is available in Portland for people to get a discount of up to 35% on stormwater fees.

Commissioner St Martin asked if there is anything the PSC can do to keep the motivation and need to continue to move green infrastructure forward here.

- Acknowledging we have more to do is important. We could be doing more as other communities have already demonstrated.

Columbia Green Technologies is a green roof company headquartered in Portland. Robin's presentation highlighted the economic case for green roofs and highlighted some of Portland's work and innovation with green roofs.

For every dollar spent on green roofs, \$0.75-0.85 goes towards local job creation in:

- Design
- Consulting
- Manufacturing

- Construction
- Maintenance

Covering even 1% of large buildings in America's medium- to large-sized cities with vegetated roofs could create over 190,000 jobs.

Portland was the first city to have an established green roof incentive program. As of October 2014, Portland has 579 green roofs covering more than 1.5M square feet.

But in the last few years, we have seen a number of new buildings without green roofs. The City's Green Building Policy does have ecoroofs included as something to review as a possibility for buildings that receive funding, but it is not currently a requirement.

Up-front costs of ecoroofs are falling as the market for them grows.

Green roofs:

- Extend life of roof membrane by 2x-3x
- Reduce stormwater management costs
- Attractive amenity spaces attract higher rents and less turnover
- More efficient buildings

Other North American cities are incentivizing green roofs including Washington DC (the leader), Chicago, New York, Philadelphia and Boston. Portland ranked #14 on the 2012 list, just behind Quebec City, which is a similarly-sized city as compared to some of the larger ones at the top of the list.

We don't have a per capita ranking, but that would be something to look into that could be shared with the PSC.

Indirect incentives, stormwater incentives, direct financial incentives and regulations are all ways cities encourage green roof development.

The Green Area Ratio is a ranking when the zoning code requires a certain score depending on green infrastructure and ratio point values. Green roofs are heavily weighted in this ratio.

Other ideas for what Portland can do to continue to encourage green roofs are:

- Implement a combination of Incentives, Zoning Code and Stormwater Policies for rapid implementation. (e.g. Washington D.C.)
- Portland has a trial version of a "Green Area Ratio" zoning program which, if adopted, would strongly incentivize the use of green roofs.
- Green Roofs could be written into the zoning code for certain overlay zones or ecodistricts.
- Leverage partnerships with government, education (e.g. Portland State's lab).

Commissioner Baugh asked about hearing more about code examples and places that have requirements. The response from the development community is that it costs too much and the ROI takes too long. How does the development community look at that requirement versus an incentive-based program? What are solutions that work to get immediate ROI versus saving on roof maintenance in the long-term?

- It's difficult to decouple pre-existing incentives versus the inherent payback. We could look at cities of comparable size to see what they have done and/or with a particular building owner scenario.
- *Commissioners St Martin*: Ask the people who will buy the building to understand more about ecoroofs so they want it and the developer will then have to respond.

Green Area Ratio pilot in Portland: staff looked at four recent developments in Portland based on the Seattle model to get an idea of what it could look like here. There are numerous benefits that are weighted.

Joe: The Comp Plan Update currently says “evaluate” green infrastructure options, and there is still work to do on this. It’s mostly wanting to get it right (e.g. with the Portland Stormwater Manual) without overstating it in the Comp Plan.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting 5:25 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken