

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, December 8, 2015

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, André Baugh, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman (arrived 12:49 p.m.), Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge (arrived 12:55 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: Howard Shapiro, [1 open position]

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Kevin Martin, Tom Armstrong, Steve Kountz

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck:* I checked in with the City about conditions on Johnson Creek. We've had significant flooding events there event after BES' work with FEMA funds, and yesterday was a super event. We have an additional 248 acre feet of storage which wasn't there about 10 years ago, which is huge. Yesterday's event is exactly what has been projected as a result of climate change in the City's Climate Action Plan and Climate Preparation Strategies. I bring this up for obvious reasons as we talk about protecting industrial lands and not concurrently updating environmental zones and implementing environmental protections in Airport Futures. As we establish policy, we need to think seriously about where we are with these types of severe events.
- *Commissioner Smith* followed up with a comment about urban infrastructure. I saw a Tweet that said "Pearl District, meet Couch Lake", which is what was there before. It makes me think about the Big Pipe and if other infrastructure is sized correctly.
- *Chair Baugh* reminded the PSC members that we need a new PSC member to sit on the CIC, which will meet 2-3 times in the upcoming months prior to the Comp Plan adoption.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Next Tuesday's meeting will be Howard Shapiro's last on the PSC. With that, we will need a PSC member to participate in the last two meetings of the Community Involvement Committee, which Howard has co-chaired. The CIC will be ending in June.
- We have provided recommendations to the Mayor about two new PSC members who will be joining the PSC in January.
- The Mayor and Michael Armstrong were at the Paris climate talks. The Mayor was one of the main speakers at the Local Leaders featured event and was part of a growing group of Mayors that are showing cities are in a leadership position in terms of climate action. On Thursday and Friday of this week, there is a West Coast Mayors Summit in Portland (Seattle, Eugene, LA, SF and Portland). Homelessness and affordable housing then climate change and climate adaptation will be the focus of their discussions. I will find out if it's appropriate if PSC members may attend any of the work sessions. They will be at the City Club lunch this Friday.
- Susan introduced Kevin Martin, who will do a brief demo on the new Map App and Database.

Kevin Martin

This is version 3 of the Map App. It is one of our Comp Plan outreach tools to reach a new and different demographic. It's available 24/7 from any device. We've seen 20-30,000 unique visitors already, which is huge for a planning project. We developed it entirely in-house and have gotten lots of interest from other cities as well.

<https://www.portlandmaps.com/bps/mapapp/> is the landing page where all the project proposals have a "card". We'll be adding the CC2035 and other pieces of the TSP to the app, so we're working to make this a bit cleaner and user-friendly.

The About page distills what the Comp Plan is, designations, zoning differentiations. Kevin highlighted the Discussion Draft map site for the Mixed Use Zones project.

Commissioner Bachrach: I'd like to see the difference between what you're allowed to do with current zoning versus what's proposed.

- We'd ultimately like to get there, but right now people have to read the proposal and refer to Portland Maps for what their proposed is.
- *Commissioner Houck* confirmed having information available on the site about what changes with the proposal is key to people's understanding.

We've gotten about 3000 comments in this app to date. People can see comments that others post; this is not moderated by staff. We aren't used to dealing with this volume of testimony, so we're now building a testimony database. PSC members will have access to this in the future, but initially this is for staff to track all the comments that are coming in, flag for follow up, have internal staff dialogue that's recorded in the database, filter by a project or location, etc. City Council will also have access to use this. We'll ultimately make a similar version for the public so people can track what changes they've commented on, proposed change and what staff did with the person's comment or proposal via a staff comment.

This is coming out in the next few months, and we'll let PSC members know when this is ready for a training at the PSC.

Commissioner Smith noted that comments he heard about the previous version was that people could only comment on a property that had a proposal on it.

- This is something we're working on going forward.

Is it possible to depict all the comments through the app on a map to see the distribution?

- We are doing this for City staff currently, and we can do that. For the public-facing version, a heat map would be a part of the app.

We are building a workflow so that other comments (e.g. via written, email, in person testimony) can be included in this database. We might have the capability to let people upload a letter and submit testimony that way into the comments too.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the November 10 and 17, 2015 PSC meetings.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Task 5 – Employment Zoning Project

Work Session / Recommendation: Tom Armstrong, Steve Kountz

Presentation

This is a continuation of the proposal. At this point, we are giving staff direction for when the compiled map comes back to the PSC in late spring.

Tom highlighted today's agenda:

- Code proposal that responded to *Commissioner Schultz*' question about including a jobs capacity criteria into larger parks.
- Map discussion to review/respond to Zoning Map changes. Request for PSC to give direction to staff on these discussion/proposal points.
- Map discussion to discuss testimony that was more directed to Council because of the Comp Plan map if we have time today, but we don't need a recommendation about this part.

Eventually all the Zoning Map pieces will come to the PSC together for a hearing in the spring.

Tom walked through the December 1 memo, which deals with the piece of the code regarding Parks and Open Space in the Prime Industrial Zones and Metro Title 4.

Code change options for "local" Parks and Open Areas larger than 2 acres in the Prime Industrial Overlay:

1. No conditional use for larger (2+ acres) local parks
2. Conditional use criteria as proposed
3. Conditional use criteria as proposed with 10-acre size limit
4. Conditional use criteria as proposed with 10-acre size limit and adequate industrial capacity criterion

The question of jobs or a park is not an appropriate framing of the issue for conditional use; this is how the question is framed in a balancing of Comp Plan policies. On page 3 of the memo, we've suggested adding a criteria that, as part of conditional use, PP&R and BDS need to make a finding that after you account for the larger park, we will still have enough industrial land capacity in that EOA geography. There would have to be a finding that, for that size, we counted "x" acres of capacity and we have at least "x" acres surplus in industrial land. If not, they would have to go to the Comp Plan policy.

Definition of Effected Industrial Geography: EOA has three main industrial geographies, so for whichever location the proposed park site is, the calculation would be based on the industrial land capacity in that area.

- *Commissioner Smith* noted this isn't clear in the current language.
- We can make this clearer in the proposed language to Council.

Commissioner Houck noted the reference to natural area park. Metro indicated in their letter to us, in addition to Title 4 issues, they want to be able to acquire natural areas, not for active park use. We aren't referring to those in this policy, are we?

- No, this is for active recreation-type parks. The Metro prohibition is to not site things such as ballfields in industrial areas. But they do make an allowance for siting smaller recreation parks. We've started with a 2-acre limit on this.

Commissioner Oxman asked about option 2. Is this conditional use criteria with no limit on size?

- Correct.

Commissioner Schultz commented on the proposed language — thank you. I'm still struggling with item E. How does one go about showing something is a primary market in a park?

- It is discretionary since we're talking about conditional use. It's up to BDS staff and the hearings officer to show the need for the park, but it is open to some interpretation. Once we've sited and sized it, there aren't continued restrictions about who uses the park.

Commissioner Tallmadge is concerned about lack of parks in East Portland in particular. What is the radius beyond Prime Industrial area to show what's parks-serving?

- We've left this open to PP&R. The Prime Industrial Areas are mostly in areas north of N Columbia Blvd, so it is farther away from the residential concentrations in East Portland.

Commissioner Houck: Mike Abbate, the PP&R director testified. Did he reference 10 acres as being adequate?

- Yes.

Commissioner Smith: If the typical neighborhood park is 5-7 acres, why wouldn't we set the minimum at that size?

- We took in to account Goal 9. I'm not sure how Metro would react to saying up to 5 acres is local-serving without having to go through a discretionary review.

Commissioner Rudd: With the language in F, how does that capture cumulative impact?

- As part of making the finding, we'd have the EOA. Then substantive to that, there would be a number of City legislative actions to show an accounting of how much acreage we have. Our intent is to update the EOA every 5 years, so we'd reset the capacity account in that time frame, and we'd look at the current available land.

Commissioner Rudd: I'm not sure that comes through in the language.

- We can work to clarify that.

Commissioner Tallmadge: In terms of conditional use criteria for number 4, is it possible to add on to that list? If it's a park in East Portland proposed larger than 10 acres, can we add on that it will either provide job or serve other equity goal?

- I'm not sure how you'd do that through a conditional use process. 10 acres is a large park, so larger than that is more of a Comp Plan process.

Chair Baugh noted the need to balance criteria. I am in the thought process of if we're going to have significant discussion, that seems like a Comp Plan / PSC discussion. We can discuss those tradeoffs if it's a significant benefit for the community.

Commissioner Rudd agrees with this distinction. We aren't talking about limiting parks throughout the city; we're talking specifically about parks in Prime Industrial Lands. I don't think it's unreasonable to ask PP&R to bring their proposal to the PSC for a Comp Plan level discussion.

Commissioner St Martin noted by bringing it up to the Comp Plan level that it creates a hurdle for creating park lands. If we're talking about vacant lands, seems like the Comp Plan hurdle is not in the best interest of people. Parks do create jobs (people are maintaining them for example), so they aren't "just dirt".

Commissioner Bachrach: The difference is if the PSC wants to make the decision or if we want a hearings officer to make the decision. The Comp Plan process isn't necessarily much longer process.

- It would be more expensive and a longer process to come through the PSC for a Comp Plan review.

These are real (dollar) costs and permit costs to process a conditional use review. For a Comp Plan amendment, it is BPS staff time as the resource.

Commissioner Rudd noted the public has to pay to do conditional use reviews all the time, so I don't think it's out of the question to ask a public agency to do the same.

Commissioner Schultz noted the somewhat split discussion, which means it's complicated. This makes me think it even more so a Comp Plan discussion versus a conditional use review.

Motion

Commissioner Rudd moved to proceed with Option 1. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

Discussion

Commissioner Oxman asked about what an adequate industrial capacity look like?

- The language is on page 3 of the December 1 memo. BPS would issue a memo with the actions, surplus, proposed park size and state/show if there is adequate capacity (or not).

If this is elevated to a Comp Plan discussion, we would be looking at Comp Plan policies, particularly in Chapter 6 and 9.

Commissioner Smith noted Option 1 is the most restrictive; then in sequence the most restrictive are option 4 then 3 then 2.

Chair Baugh noted we made specific reference to have parks in park-deficient areas in the Recommended Comp Plan. There is language to support larger parks, and at the same time, we have the jobs discussion.

Commissioner Houck stated before his vote that he had initially been opposed to allowing active parks in industrial areas but as we have proceeded to rezone Open Space for industrial uses it seems unreasonable to make it even harder to locate parks where there are park deficiencies.

(Y5 – Bachrach, Baugh, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz; N4 – Houck, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Steve walked through the Zoning Map issues identified in testimony (slide 5).

Montgomery Park on NW Vaughn St

Map change options:

1. Keep the proposed map change from EX to EG2.
2. Retain EX zoning.

If City Council changes plan designation from EX to Mixed Use, then Commercial Mixed Use zoning will apply.

Commissioner Tallmadge noted the conversation about housing and when we're making changes what are we getting for it. I'm curious if EG2 would be more profitable than EX?

- Not necessarily. People sometimes think they're losing value because they can't develop housing on the site. But we don't necessarily want housing creeping closer to heavy industrial lands, so that is the tradeoff. In the EG zone, in exchange for not allowing housing, we've proposed more office space than is currently allowed.
- We are not expecting additional value to come from EX to EG.
- We are only charging what it costs to process the application.

The area is not intensely developed. Is the Montgomery Park building historic?

- Yes.

Commissioner Smith noted EX is mixed-use. But we've designated EG above Vaughn, not mixed-use.

- A change in the proposed Comp Plan is to pull back on EX outside Central City. We've looked at other areas outside the Central City to designate different areas, but this is one of the edge sites.

Commissioner Oxman asked about current zoning between Thurman and Savier.

- It is mixed-use.

Commissioner Houck noted we had a conversation about capturing increased wealth for affordable housing specifically. In the bigger picture, will this be a conversation?

- Yes, as part of the mixed-use zones proposal.

PSC members confirmed the proposed map change from EX to EG at Montgomery Park.

Freeway Land site at SE Foster and I-205

Map change options:

1. Keep the proposed map change from EX to EG2.
2. If City Council changes plan designation from EX to one of the Mixed Use Dispersed on part of the site, apply CE Commercial Employment zoning.

PSC members confirmed the proposed map change from EX to EG2.

PECO Site on SE 17th Ave

Map change options:

1. Keep the proposed Prime Industrial Overlay on the current IG1 base zone.
2. Do not apply Prime Industrial overlay on SE 17th Ave frontage sites. Leave IG1 General Industrial base zone.
3. Create a different overlay zone to allow Industrial Office along SE 17th Ave.

PSC members confirmed the proposed Prime Industrial Overlay on the current IG1 base zone.

Broadmoor Golf Course

Recommended change to Proposed Draft map:

- Change OS to IG2 on the 15-acre part of the site proposed IS Industrial Sanctuary.

PSC members confirmed the proposed map change.

Metro Greenspaces requests on Port of Portland land

Recommended change to Proposed Draft map:

- Retain Prime Industrial l-overlay on Port-owned properties and railroad right-of-way and remove from other sites on maps below per Metro request.

Options:

- Remove Prime Industrial l-overlay from other sites recommended by Metro.

Tom noted that Metro “overreached” and proposed map changes for Port and railroad land in their request. Staff proposes to leave those belonging to the Portland railroads in the Prime Industrial but pull the Metro land out.

Commissioner Houck: What is the overlap between the Natural Resources and Metro-owned property? I am familiar with the properties, in particular one of the Port owned properties that is a highly significant wetland. Has that area already been e-zoned?

- It’s a wetland that is also Bonneville Power ROW and railroad yard.
- It’s a subtle difference. The Prime Industrial overlay doesn’t change the e-zone.

Commissioner Rudd asked if all the Metro land is submerged.

- Not all, but most is. The total acreage is over 100, but we didn’t separate out what is Port-versus Metro-owned.

PSC members confirmed the proposed map change.

Linnton Prime Industrial Overlay

Generally the Prime Industrial was put on industrial sanctuary land in Linnton. Excluded were edge EG zones, existing parks and two commercial shopping areas. Steve walked through the proposed three map changes he had previously shared with the Linnton Neighborhood Association.

PSC members confirmed keeping the proposed map change.

N Hayden Island Dr Boat Ramp

Map change options:

1. Keep the proposed Prime Industrial Overlay on the IG2 base zones.
2. Do not apply Prime Industrial overlay on vacant IG2 sites (6.6 acres shaded brown), to allow regional boat ramp.

PSC members confirmed keeping the proposed Prime Industrial Overlay on the IG2 base zones.

Proposed Draft Addendum

Recommended addendum changes to implement additional Comp Plan Map changes:

- Split zoning corrections – Apply IG2 or EG zones to align zoning with property boundaries.
- Marina sites – Apply IG2 zoning on 2 sites to enable infill moorages.
- Unincorporated county pocket – Apply IG1 or IG2 zoning at 3 sites being brought into Urban Services Area.
- Map correction at Reed College site – remove Prime Industrial overlay zone at a warehouse site with IC Campus Institution Plan Map designation.

Additional Comp Plan Map Issues.

- Cornfoot/Slough residential areas
- Levee Road area
- Airport Way EG2 limitations
- NE 148th split zone
- SE Quad – MLK IG to EX loading dock issue
- MU zone a SE 92nd and Powell

These are items staff is working on with Council members that are explained in the December 8 staff memo.

Commissioner Houck asked if the PSC made a decision regarding the timing of the e-zone update and the airport regarding applying the industrial overlay simultaneously.

- We didn't have a determination. We are trying to figure out where it fits into the 3-year workplan as part of the budget discussion.

Commissioner Houck reminded the commission that our letter of conveyance will have a strong statement regarding making the e-zone update and application of Airport Futures a high priority

Commissioner Oxman is on the BPS BAC and can keep an eye on this issue.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 2:23 p.m.