

March 25, 2016

Michael C. Robinson
MRobinson@perkinscoie.com
D. +1.503.727.2264
F. +1.503.346.2264

VIA EMAIL

Ms. Katherine Schultz, Chair
City of Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
1900 SW Fourth Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

Re: Proposed Transportation System Plan; Submittal Prior to Close of Written Record on March 25, 2016

Dear Chair Shultz and members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission:

This office represents Providence Health & Services—Oregon (“Providence”). This letter is Providence’s written submittal prior to the close of the open record on March 25, 2016.

This letter addresses two (2) issues that appear to be of interest to the Planning and Sustainability Commission: Whether Providence’s request that it be able to use its existing Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) Plan subject to clear and objective standards is a repudiation of Providence’s support of the Climate Action Plan and whether the proposed Title 17 and 33 TDM regulations is really a “simplification” of the current Conditional Use Master Plan (“CUMP”) process for institutions.

1. Providence continues to support the Climate Action Plan goals but as Providence said at the last public hearing, how those goals are achieved is very important to Providence.

Providence reiterated its support for the City’s Climate Action Plan in its testimony to the Planning and Sustainability Commission on March 22, 2016. Providence remains a partner with the City on implementing the Climate Action Plan. Nevertheless, Providence continues to urge the Planning and Sustainability Commission to recommend to the City Council that the TDM approval process allow use of existing TDMs where they are proven to be effective and that they be adopted in a clear and objective process.

Providence has provided the Planning and Sustainability Commission with a copy of its Comprehensive Transportation Plan. Additionally, Providence provided four (4) other documents in its March 22, 2016 testimony to demonstrate the commitment Providence has to non-single occupancy vehicle trips and the effectiveness of Providence’s current TDM Plan:

- Two (2) memoranda by Julia Kuhn of Kittelson & Associates showing that Providence compares favorably to other institutions in mode share split and demonstrating how Providence has consistently reduced single occupancy vehicle trips.
- A memorandum from David Bodine explaining Providence's commitment to TDM solutions.
- A memorandum from Matt Meskill demonstrating Providence's commitment to bicycling commuters.

The Climate Action Plan will not be easily achieved; there can be no debate about that. Nevertheless, requiring an institution with a proven TDM such as Providence's to throw out its current TDM and adopt a new TDM through the discretionary Transportation Impact Review ("TIR") in PCC Chapter 33.852 is inefficient and unnecessary. Providence should be given the chance to prove that its existing TDM can satisfy the mode share split requirements contained in the proposed Transportation System Plan ("TSP"). If at some point Providence's existing TDM fails to meet those requirements, then Providence understands it will have to revise its TDM. However, to assume Providence's existing TDM, which has been prepared at great expense and has proven successful, should not be given the benefit of the doubt is unnecessarily costly and introduces Providence to a discretionary land use process that should not be required.

The issue of the discretionary land use process is the second issue that Providence urges the Planning and Sustainability Commission to carefully consider. PCC 33.852.100 requires a discretionary approval process for the TIR, including the TDM. The memorandum provided by staff to the Planning and Sustainability Commission at the March 22, 2016 hearing explains that the TIR and TDM will be approved through a Type II process leading to a Type III appeal period. This means that anyone that disagrees with the Director's decision approving the TIR can appeal the decision resulting in a Type III appeal hearing before the City of Portland land use hearings officer. PCC 33.720.020.B.

Providence sees little difference between this process and the current Type III CUMP process. While the proposed process will result in a Type III appeal hearing only in the event of an appeal, it seems likely that the opportunity for an appeal will be taken by any person that believes an institution has not fully committed through its TDM Plan to mode split objectives, or that the TIR requires additional transportation improvements. This is another important distinction between the current CUMP process and the proposed process: The current CUMP process does not wholly focus on transportation whereas the proposed process will place the burden on Providence and other institutions to fix pre-existing inefficiencies simply because the institutions are often on streets that have existing capacity problems that are not exacerbated by the institutions.

I have enclosed as **Exhibit 1** a portion of the 2012 Hearings Officer's decision approving Providence's CUMP in which the Hearings Officer concluded after reviewing substantial evidence provided by Providence that the issues of cut-through traffic and congestion were not primarily caused by Providence even with the building expansion approved in the CUMP.

These two (2) issues are very important to Providence and the other institutions. Providence believes that the Title 17 and 33 regulations must allow use of a current TDM and that a regulatory scheme requiring discretionary land use decision does not treat Providence like a permitted use but rather continues the same regulatory scheme now found in the CUMP process.

2. Approval of the TDM should be through a clear and objective process.

The City proposes an "off the shelf" non-discretionary process for TDMs in mixed-use zones. See "Mixed Use Project, Proposed Draft March, 2016", commentary at page 280. It is clear that a non-discretionary (Type I) approval process can be created for the institutions' TDM approvals. In fact, Providence is discussing this very concept with PBOT. Unfortunately, the PSC's record will close before Providence and the other institutions have concluded this discussion with PBOT.

Having a clear and objective process for the TDM and TIR approvals accomplishes two (2) important goals. First, it assures the City that Providence and other institutions will have a TDM that is capable of meeting the TSP mode share split objectives. Secondly, it will do so without the discretionary land use process. Nothing has gained by the institutions, the public or the City by using a discretionary land use process where it is unnecessary; it is clearly not necessary to approve a TDM or the TIR. The City can develop a "checklist" that would establish a Type I approval process for TDMs and TIRs and, in the event an institution fails to meet the checklist requirements in the future, then a new TDM would be required. This kind of regulatory process is not unheard of and places more emphasis on the substance of the TDM.

3. Conclusion.

Providence is committed to working with its neighbors and the City in achieving the Climate Action Plan goals. It wants to do so in the most efficient way possible. Providence's testimony provides a realistic way of achieving the City's goals without maintaining the current discretionary land use process found in CUMPs. For these reasons, Providence respectfully requests that the Planning and Sustainability Commission recommend to the Portland City Council that it adopt the TSP but do so with a recommendation that current and effective TDMs be allowed to be used, and that there be a clear and objective process for making the TDM and TIR decisions that does not result in a discretionary land use appeal.

Ms. Katherine Schultz, Chair
March 25, 2016
Page 4

Very truly yours,



Michael C. Robinson

MCR:rsr
Enclosure

cc: Ms. Michelle Bernard (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Jeff West (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Karen Weylandt (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Dana White (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Julia Kuhn (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Marty Stiven (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Peter Hurley (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. John Cole (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Tom Armstrong (via email) (w/ encl.)

Officer finds that the application proposal is in conformance with the Arterial Streets Classification Plan.

The Hearings Officer finds that this criterion is met.

2. The transportation system is capable of safely supporting the proposed use in addition to the existing uses in the area. Evaluation factors include street capacity and level of service, access to arterials, transit availability, on-street parking impacts, access requirements, neighborhood impacts, and pedestrian safety;

Findings: This approval criterion was the focus of much of the opposition testimony in this case. (See, for example, Exhibits H.3, H.5, H.7, H.10, H.14, H.15, H.18, H.20, H.24, H.25, H.27, H.29, H.32, H.33, H.37, H.38, H.39, H.43, H.47, H.48, H.50, H.53, H.57 and H.59.) This approval criterion also was a major focus of the Applicant's comments. The submissions by the Applicant's traffic consultant addressed this approval criterion, in this case, in a manner that should be the benchmark of all future traffic submissions in a conditional use master plan application. (Exhibit A.1, appendix H and Exhibits H.55b and H.55c) The Hearings Officer also takes note of the Applicant's Exhibit H.55 comments.

Opponents raised important issues related to this approval criterion. (See Exhibit references above.) Opponents challenged the Applicant's data as set forth in Exhibit A.1, Appendix H. (The Applicant's TIA.) Opponents questioned: (1) the timeliness and credibility of traffic counts, (2) the accuracy of vehicle wait times at intersections, (3) the accuracy of the amount of neighborhood cut-through traffic, (4) the accuracy of on-street parking estimates, and (5) the adequacy of the Applicant's proposed transportation demand management strategies. The Hearings Officer found that two opponents (Parker and Edelson) presented testimony at the hearing and open-record written submissions that were particularly well researched and conveyed. (Exhibits H.27, H.32, and H.59) Neighborhood representatives also directed critical comments to the Applicant's submitted materials related to this approval criterion. (Exhibits H.15, H.20, H.37 and H.57)

The Hearings Officer found helpful comments submitted by PBOT. (Exhibits E.2 and H.44) The Hearings Officer notes that PBOT addressed issues relating to cut-through traffic, traffic volume estimates, level of service and the pedestrian bridge. The Hearings Officer finds that PBOT's comments are supportive of the data and conclusions presented by the Applicant's traffic consultant.

The Hearings Officer considered the above referenced comments from the Applicant, PBOT staff, and opponents, as well as all relevant testimony offered at the public hearing. In the final analysis, the Hearings Officer found the evidence submitted by the Applicant's traffic consultant to be the most credible. The Hearings Officer incorporates the following, from Exhibit H.55, as additional findings for each of the evaluation factors of this approval criterion:

"A. Street Capacity, Level of Service and Other Performance Measures.

The application included a traffic impact analysis ('TIA') prepared by Kittelson & Associates dated June 2011 (the 'June 2011 TIA'). The June 2011 TIA, Figures 11 and 12 (Figure 11 shows weekday a.m. peak hour trips and Figure 12 shows weekday p.m. peak hour trips), shows that 12 studied intersections will all operate at Level of Service ('LOS') 'D' or better in the year 2021, including background traffic and traffic from Providence from the proposed CUMP. The same Figures show that all intersections will operate a volume to capacity ('V/C') ratio of no greater than V/C 0.85 in the a.m. peak hour, and no greater than V/C 0.87 in the p.m. peak hour. The intersection of NE Glisan Street and NE 47th Avenue operates with a V/C 0.85 in the morning and a V/C 0.81 in the afternoon, well within acceptable levels.

The June 2011 TIA shows that the City of Portland standard for a signalized intersection is LOS 'D' or better, and unsignalized intersections should operate at LOS 'E' or better (June 2011 TIA at page 20). Using this standard, the Hearings Officer can find that all of the studied signalized and unsignalized intersections operate at or better than the required level of service.

Street capacity means whether the street is capable of handling the volume of traffic. The volume to capacity ratio is an appropriate measure for street capacity. The Hearings Officer can rely on two sources of evidence to show that street capacity is adequate. First, the June 2011 TIA, Figures 11 and 12, show that street capacity at the studied intersections is adequate based upon the volume to capacity ratios.

Second, **Exhibit 1** shows that all of the local streets operate well below the threshold of 1500 vehicles per day. **Exhibit 1** at page 2 states that all of the local streets have less than 600 vehicles per day with the exception of NE Oregon Street, which has 1,138 vehicles per day.

Finally, there are no other relevant performance measures for determination of street capacity and level of service. Based upon the above evidence, the Hearings Officer can find that studied signalized and unsignalized intersections and the local streets operate at appropriate levels of service and have sufficient capacity to accommodate both the proposed use and the existing uses in the area.

B. Access to Arterials.

The Hearings Officer can find that the transportation system has appropriate access to arterials. The June 2011 TIA notes that NE Glisan Street and NE 47th Avenue are both 'Neighborhood Collectors,' while the other streets are

'Local Service Streets.' Only Interstate 84 is an arterial level of street. The June 2011 TIA at Figure 3 shows that access to Interstate 84 is reached via an interchange at NE 47th Avenue and there is easy access and connectivity to Neighborhood Collectors from the adjacent Local Service Streets.

The Hearings officer can find that access to arterials is appropriate.

C. Connectivity.

Connectivity is not defined in PCC Chapter 33.815, but the Hearings Officer can find that it means connecting streets. Connectivity is appropriate in this area because of the street's grid pattern. To the extent connectivity might be negative, the evidence in **Exhibit 1** demonstrates that connectivity does not adversely affect the surrounding area and results in a transportation system capable of supporting the proposal in addition to the existing uses in the area.

D. Transit Availability.

Exhibit 2 shows transit routes in the area. The area is well served by public fixed-route transit. Bus routes 75 and 66 service Cesar E. Chavez Avenue. Bus route 19 serves NE Glisan Street. A light rail transit stop is located in the Hollywood District at NE 42nd Avenue. Bus route 66 is a rush-hour service. Bus route 75 is a frequent service, and bus route 19 is standard service. Additionally, while not adjacent to the conditional use master plan campus, bus route 71 serves NE 60th Street. Bus route 71 is standard service. All of the bus stops on NE Cesar E. Chavez Street and NE Glisan Street are easily reached by public sidewalks.

E. On-Street Parking Impacts.

The June 2011 TIA examined on-street parking impacts. Figure 15 showed that Hoyt Street between NE 47th Avenue and NE 44th Avenue, NE 55th Avenue between Hoyt Street and Glisan Street, the east side of NE 47th Avenue between NE Glisan Street and NE Flanders Street, NE 52nd Avenue, NE 53rd Avenue and NE 55th Avenue between NE Glisan Street and NE Flanders Street, NE Glisan Street and the east side of NE 47th Avenue have between 75% and 100% of their on-street parking spaces utilized during the middle of the day. However, with the exception of the south half of the block on NE 52nd Avenue, NE 53rd Avenue and NE 55th Avenue, all of the areas with the highest utilization of parking are within the existing and proposed conditional use master plan campus.

Exhibit 1 also examined the neighborhood in May 2012. **Exhibit 1** at page 3 concludes, 'Comparing Figure 15 of the June 2011 TIA and Figure 5 summarizing 2012 data shows nearly identical results. No additional on-street parking impacts are identified.' Further, **Exhibit 3** is a memorandum from Marty Stiven to Douglas Hardy dated April 10, 2012 in which she describes Providence Portland Medical Center's ('PPMC') policy of prohibiting employees from parking on neighborhood streets.

Additionally, the existing Good Neighbor Agreement ('GNA') provides a 'hotline' for neighbors to call and report violators. **Exhibit 4** is a log of hotline parking complaints over an 11-month period.

Exhibit 4 shows that between May 18, 2011 and April 18, 2012, the hotline received 107 telephone calls. Upon receiving a telephone call, Providence reviewed its license plate data to determine whether the offending vehicle was registered as an employee. Of the 107 calls, only 19 of the calls involved registered Providence cars. Thus, over almost a one-year period, only 19 employees were reported on the hotline as having parked in the neighborhood.

The Hearings Officer can find that the June 2011 TIA, the May 2012 update and the evidence regarding hotline complaints all show that there is adequate on-street parking, that very few Providence employees utilize such parking and that Providence parking policy prohibits parking in the neighborhood.

F. Access Restrictions.

The Hearings Officer can find that there are no relevant access restrictions.

G. Neighborhood Impacts.

Neighborhood impacts as an evaluation factor of transportation system capability can be both positive and negative. On the positive side, the Hearings Officer can find that ease of access to the hospital and its services are a benefit to neighboring residents. Not only can they drive there but the presence of public sidewalks on all streets makes it easy to walk or bike. The low amount of traffic on all the neighborhood streets also facilitates bicycling or driving to the campus.

Further, the Hearings Officer can find that the evidence demonstrates that there are no adverse neighborhood impacts caused by the existing PPMC campus or that can be expected because of the proposed CUMP. First, all streets operate within expected street capacity. None of the

local streets exceed their capacity. Second, all the studied intersections operate within acceptable performance levels. Third, speeding is not a problem. Fourth, cut-through traffic is not a problem. Moreover, the majority of the cut-through traffic is unrelated to Providence. Providence's evidence is most credible because Providence was able to identify license plate numbers of the cut-through traffic.

The Hearings Officer can find that much of the cut-through traffic may be related to the Laurelhurst School. **Exhibit 5** shows the location of Laurelhurst School. **Exhibit 6** shows the Laurelhurst attendance area map. **Exhibit 7** shows that the current student enrollment of Laurelhurst School is 710 students.

Laurelhurst School offers childcare from 6 a.m. to 6 p.m., Monday through Friday. In addition to 710 students, the school employs 26 classroom teachers and additional staff. The school, offering grades K-8, begins operation at 8:25 a.m. for grades 6-8 and 8:35 a.m. for grades K-5. Morning kindergarten ends at 11:50 a.m., while all-day kindergarten and grades 1-8 are dismissed at 3 p.m. (**Exhibit 8**). The attendance area map shows that the Laurelhurst School, which is widely praised by its parents, draws students from an area to the west of Cesar E. Chavez Avenue, south of NE Glisan Street and east of NE 47th Street. It is not unreasonable to believe that many of the cut-through trips are, in fact, school related. However, this is the purpose for which these local streets are intended. Not only do they provide access to uses within the neighborhood, they provide appropriate access to and from the higher level streets.

The Hearings Officer can find that none of the effects of traffic on the neighborhood streets, to the extent it is even caused by Providence, creates adverse neighborhood impacts, and there is no reason to believe that cut-through traffic is either caused or not caused by Providence (the opponents' evidence is unreliable and not credible because they cannot determine, as Providence did, with any degree of specificity, how many of the cars are related to Providence). Moreover, the Hearings Officer can find that cut-through traffic in and of itself is neither prohibited nor undesirable. As long as neighborhood streets continue to operate safely, within accepted speed limits and within accepted capacity levels, cut-through traffic is both positive and warranted.

H. Impacts on Pedestrian, Bicycle and Transit Circulation.

The Hearings Officer can find on substantial evidence in the whole record that existing traffic and expected

traffic if the CUMP application is approved will not create adverse impacts on pedestrian, bicycle and transit circulation. First, all of the surrounding streets have public sidewalks, which enable safe pedestrian circulation. Second, the evidence does not show any pedestrian or bicycle accidents. Third, because the streets operate within acceptable capacity and performance levels, the Hearings Officer can conclude that there are no negative impacts on pedestrian, bicycle and transit circulation.

I. Safety for All Modes.

Substantial evidence in the whole record shows a lack of accidents in the area. Moreover, the evidence also shows that because the streets operate within their expected capacity and most vehicles move at or below posted speed limits, pedestrians and bicyclists are safe.

J. Adequate Transportation Demand Management Strategies.

The Hearings Officer can find that Providence achieves a high degree of success in transportation demand management. The opponents' suggestion that Providence charge for parking is both unworkable and unwarranted. It is unworkable because, as the Hearings Officer can surmise, charging for parking would undoubtedly force employees to park further away in the neighborhood and then walk to Providence. Moreover, charging for parking when no other institution does so would place Providence at a disadvantage in hiring employees. All parties will acknowledge that Providence Portland Medical Center is an important institution to the neighborhood, to the City and to the region. Requiring Providence to do something at this hospital that no other similarly situated hospital does is both unwise and unwarranted."

The Hearings Officer also considered the PBOT comments, relating to traffic volume, observed speed of vehicles, and level of service (Exhibit H.44). The Hearings Officer found the PBOT comments to be credible.

The Hearings Officer reviewed the June 2011 TIA (Exhibit A.1, Appendix H, Section 5, pages 47-49, Parking and Transportation Demand Management) and the traffic consultant's update (Exhibit H.55b, pages 3-4). The Hearings Officer finds the analytical model used by the traffic consultant, in the June 2011 TIA and the update, to reflect generally accepted traffic engineering protocol. The Hearings Officer finds that, with the condition that the Applicant continues the use of the "24-hour hotline," on-street parking impacts should not be expected to negatively impact the surrounding neighborhood. The Hearings Officer finds that the transportation system is capable of supporting the proposal, in this case, as well as existing uses in the area, based upon the on-street parking evaluation factor.

In the above-quoted material, the Applicant states that "the evidence does not show any pedestrian or bicycle accidents." (Exhibit H.55, page 6) The Hearings Officer notes that the Applicant's traffic consultant, in Exhibit H.55b, page 2, states that "there was one bicycle crash at NE 41st Avenue/NE Hoyt Street intersection" during the last five years. The Hearings Officer finds that the NE 41st Avenue/NE Hoyt Street intersection is generally outside the area considered, by the Hearings Officer, as directly and immediately impacted by this application. However, for the purposes of analysis of the pedestrian/bicycle circulation and safety evaluation factors, the Hearings Officer modifies the Exhibit H.55 statement that there were no pedestrian/bicycle accidents to accurately reflect that one bicycle accident did occur within the last five years. The Hearings Officer finds that even with this correction, the evidence in the record is that the application in this case will not negatively impact pedestrian, bicycle or transit circulation and will not create a significant safety risk to pedestrians or bicyclists.

One opponent (Parker) testified at the public hearing that the Applicant's proposed Transportation Demand Management strategies did not include sufficiently aggressive tools to lower employee and visitor reliance upon use of private vehicles (cars). (See also Exhibits H.27 and H.48.) This opponent suggested that the Applicant should consider charging employees to park in the Applicant owned/operated parking facilities. In support of this suggestion, the opponent noted that a large medical/hospital in Portland (Oregon Health Sciences University – "OHSU") charges for parking to create an incentive for employees to walk, bicycle or use public transportation to travel to/from OHSU. The Hearings Officer finds that this suggestion may have some merit. However, as pointed out by the Applicant in Exhibit H.55 (page 6), imposing a fee for employee parking may have negative unintended consequences such as creating an incentive for employees to park their cars in the surrounding neighborhood and/or place the Applicant, as an employer, at an economic disadvantage when attempting to hire quality employees (who don't have to pay for parking at any other hospital other than OHSU). The Hearings Officer finds that including a provision calling for paid employee parking is, at this time, premature. The Hearings Officer finds the record to be woefully lacking in data and analysis necessary to arrive at the conclusion that paid employee parking is appropriate to be included in a Transportation Demand Management Plan.

Opponents (for example testimony at the public hearing by Parker, Edelsen, Sexton, Gustavson and open-record written submissions Exhibits H.15, H.27, H.38, H.48, H.49, H.56, H.57 and H.59) assert that the Applicant generated vehicle traffic uses the neighborhood streets to avoid travel on NE Glisan and NE 47th. Opponents refer to this activity as "cut-through" traffic. At the core of the cut-through assertion is that the intersection at NE 47th Avenue/NE Glisan Street is often congested and that utilizing neighborhood streets is an efficient and time saving way to avoid that intersection.

The Applicant's traffic consultant, in Exhibit H.55b (pages 4-9) and Exhibit H.55c, addressed the cut-through issue. The Hearings Officer finds that the analysis and data set forth in Exhibit H.55b to be credible evidence that cut-through traffic created/initiated by the Applicant is not a significant problem. The potential of a conditional use master plan use to create neighborhood negative cut-through impacts is a frequent concern stated by opponents. The Hearings Officer, in at least one past case, found that anecdotal testimony by neighbors to be credible and trump

evidence provided by an applicant (LU 08-180498 CU MS (HO 4090017)). The Hearings Officer finds the evidence provided by the Applicant, in this case, negates the anecdotal evidence proffered by opponents. The Hearings Officer finds, in particular, that Exhibit H.55b directly addresses and negates opponent Parker's assertions (Exhibit H.48, pages 6-8).

Opponents suggested that traffic data generated for the 2011 TIA was outdated; therefore, no longer reflecting the traffic conditions in and around the Growth Boundary. (For example, testimony at the public hearing by Parker, Edelson, Sexton and open-record written submissions Exhibits H.15 and H.27.) The Hearings Officer finds that the Applicant's traffic consultant, in Exhibit H.55, updated data or included new data related to the following:

- street volumes and speed data; and
- crash data; and
- traffic counts; and
- on-street parking utilization; and
- travel times (re cut-through traffic); and
- origin/destination on neighborhood streets (re cut-through traffic).

The Hearings Officer finds that the updated evidence in Exhibit H.55 adequately addresses the concern that the Applicant, PBOT and BDS staff were relying upon outdated data.

A number of opponents indicated that the intersection at NE 47th Avenue/NE Glisan Street was currently operating at a poor and/or inadequate level. (For example, testimony of Naylor, Edelson, Cartmel and open-record written submissions Exhibits H.7, H.15 and H.49.) The Applicant's traffic consultant, using data from the 2011 TIA (Exhibit A.1, Appendix H) and from updated traffic counts/observations in May 2012 (Exhibit H.55b) determined that the NE 47th Avenue/NE Glisan Street intersection was operating at an acceptable level. The traffic consultant, in Exhibit 55b (see also Exhibit H.61f, page 3) states:

"Mr. Parker suggests that the June 2011 Traffic Impact Analysis for PPMC is based on outdated data. As discussed in our May 23rd letter, weekday am and pm peak hour traffic counts were conducted at the NE 47th Avenue/NE Glisan Street intersection in May 2012 when school was in-session to address the potential for fluctuations in the count data. A comparison of the 2010 and 2012 traffic data counts at this intersection indicated that:

- The total entering volume at the intersection has decreased by 2 percent during the am peak hour and 3 percent during the pm peak hour between 2010 and 2012.
- All intersection approaches during both peak hours have experienced a decrease in traffic volumes with the exception of the westbound approach in the am peak hour and the eastbound approach during the pm peak hour."

The Hearings Officer finds, based upon the data and conclusions provided by the Applicant's traffic consultant, that the NE 47th Avenue/NE Glisan Street intersection operates at an acceptable level. The Hearings Officer finds that the transportation system, including the

intersection of NE 47th Avenue/NE Glisan Street intersection, is capable of supporting the proposal in this case in addition to the existing uses in the area.

Opponents testified that the Applicant generates (employees, patients and visitors) excessive on-street parking demand in the area. (For example, testimony of Gustavson and Gore and open-record written submissions H.7, H.39 and H.42.) The Applicant's traffic consultant provided data/analysis of on-street parking demands created by the Applicant. (Exhibit A.1, Appendix H, pages 3, 47, 57, 62, 63, and Figure 15 and Exhibit H.55b, pages 3-4) The traffic consultant, in Exhibit H.55b, pages 3-4 states:

"In response to concerns raised regarding potential employee parking on neighborhood streets, additional parking data was collected in May 2012 to update Figure 15 of the June 2011 TIA.

Consistent with our previous analysis, the number of vehicles parked on each block face were recorded every hour between 6 am and 6 pm by the traffic data collection firm *Quality Counts*. The 6 am time period was used to identify parking that is likely associated with the neighborhood residents. Like 2010, the 2012 on-street parking demand was fairly consistent between 9 am and 2 pm.

The 2012 on-street parking utilization at 6:00 am and at 1:00 pm is show in Figure 5. Comparing Figure 15 of the June 2011 TIA and Figure 5 summarizing 2012 data shows nearly identical results. No additional on-street parking impacts are identified. As summarized in our June 2011, on-street parking demand increases within the PPMC growth boundary between 6:00 am and 1:00 pm occur within the growth boundary and are primarily centered near the NE 53rd Medical Office Building. As discussed previously, there is ample off-street parking available on-campus and at the surface parking lot associate with the medical office building so the on-street parking is likely a result of convenience, rather than need. Providence should continue to maintain the 24-hour hotline available to neighbors to address any parking in the neighborhoods and enforce any infractions."

The Hearings Officer finds that transportation system (on-street parking) is capable of supporting the proposal in addition to the existing uses in the area. The Hearings Officer finds the Applicant does not utilize on-street parking spaces, in the nearby neighborhood, to such a level that on-street parking is not available for other users (i.e. residents and their guests). That being said the Hearings Officer does find that Applicant's utilization of on-street parking spaces in the vicinity of the NE 53rd Medical Office building needs to be reduced. The Hearings Officer finds that the Applicant, through its TDM, needs to provide additional actions in reducing on-street parking impacts in the vicinity of the NE 53rd Medical Office Building.

The Hearings Officer addresses, with additional findings, opponent Parker's comments related to the Applicant's proposed TDM. Parker suggested that the Applicant consider additional measures to reduce its single occupancy vehicle rate ("SOV"). The Hearings Officer

acknowledges that the SOV rate at OHSU may be lower than that experienced by the Applicant (per Parker, the OHSU SOV rate is 41 percent and the SOV rate for Providence is 68 percent). The Hearings Officer finds that the City does not set a specific SOV goal; in particular the City does not establish the OHSU SOV rate as a City-mandated standard. The Hearings Officer finds that the Applicant's TDM strategies have reduced the SOV rate from 85 percent in 1996 to 67 percent in 2009. (Exhibit A.1, page 4) The Hearings Officer also takes note that the Applicant, over the past 15 years, has exceeded the goals set by DEQ for reducing single occupancy vehicle travel to the Growth Boundary uses. The Hearings Officer finds that the key consideration for any conditional use master plan applicant is to create a TDM strategy that results in consistent reduction in its SOV rate and in this case, the Hearings Officer finds the Applicant's strategy to do just that.

2010/2011 Mode Split Data from DEQ	Drove Alone Percentage
OHSU Marquam Hill	41
OHSU Center for Health and Healing	51
Portland Providence Medical Center	68
St. Vincent	72
Good Samaritan	73
Emanuel	78
Tuality Community Center	83
Providence Milwaukie	85
Adventist Medical Center	87
Providence Willamette Falls	88
Meridian Park	90

Examples of some of the TDM resources available to Providence staff, patients and visitors include:

- Provision of free bus passes to all Providence staff;
- Access to more than seven transit stops along NE Glisan Street within one block of the campus (TriMet Route 19 serves NE Glisan Street between 5:00 a.m. and 12:00 a.m. on 15–20 minutes headways);
- Access to a Zip Car on NE 60th Avenue near NE Everett Street;
- 24-hour guaranteed ride home in event of an emergency;
- Shuttle service between the campus and the Hollywood MAX station on 15–20 minute headways;
- PPMC campus bike and pedestrian coordinator who serves as a resource to staff;
- Provision of 165 bike storage racks on campus, including four secure employee-only bike cages, two of which have clothing storage lockers;
- Distribution of Portland neighborhood Bike/Walk maps, promoting active transportation, recreation options, safety tips, transit stops, and shopping;
- Campus and community events that showcase Providence's commitment to sustainability;

- Valet parking for patients;
- Preferential parking to carpools and vanpools; and
- Telecommuting options for administration staff.

The Hearings Officer finds that the Applicant's proposed TDM, while not perfect (no TDM reviewed by the Hearings Officer has ever been considered perfect), forms an adequate platform for transportation demand management strategies.

The issues of street vacations and the pedestrian bridge were discussed in the "Preliminary Comments" above. The Hearings Officer found that street vacations are specifically addressed in PCC 33.820.070 H. The Hearings Officer found that PCC 33.820.070 H indicates that street vacations are subject to City Council approval. However, the Hearings Officer also found that street vacations were subject to the PCC 33.815.105 D.2 approval criterion; demonstration that even with a street vacation proposal the transportation system would remain capable of supporting the existing uses in addition to the existing uses in the area. In this case, the Hearings Officer notes that the 2003 Master Plan approved street vacations, as part of that proposal, so long as the street vacations were approved by the City Engineer. (Exhibit A.1, Appendix D, pages 60-61). The Hearings Officer, in this case, need not review the street vacations against this approval criterion. The Hearings Officer treats the street vacation as a "carry-forward" proposal from the 2003 Master Plan.

The pedestrian bridge, however, was not approved as part of any prior master plan approval. The PCC 33.815.105 D.2 approval criterion must be applied to the pedestrian bridge. The Hearings Officer finds that the following PCC 33.815.105 D.2 evaluation facts are not impacted by the proposed pedestrian bridge: street capacity, level of service, other performance measures, access to arterials or on-street parking impacts. The Hearings Officer finds that a pedestrian bridge would create another "connectivity" alternative for pedestrians (in addition to sidewalks). The Hearings Officer finds that a pedestrian bridge, over NE 47th Avenue, would enhance pedestrian safety for persons who actually use the bridge.

One opponent (Cartmel) suggests that if the pedestrian bridge is constructed over NE 47th Avenue, vehicle "sight-lines" will be negatively impacted. This opponent did not explain, with any particularity, how the pedestrian bridge would interfere with safe sight-lines. Another opponent (Gavine) states, "Providence is planning to build a Skybridge to connect hospital buildings so that their employees no longer have to endure the outdated and vulnerable crosswalk on 47th and Glisan. While their need for efficiency is understood, where does that leave the rest of us who live and work in this community?" (Exhibit H.39, page 2) The Hearings Officer finds that this opponent concedes that those who use the pedestrian bridge will enjoy a safe route between the West Medical Office and the Main Campus. To that extent, the Hearings Officer finds a pedestrian bridge over NE 47th would enhance pedestrian safety. The Hearings Officer has already found that the general pedestrian system, in the area, is not compromised by the projects proposed in this application. The Hearings Officer finds, for the purposes of this approval criterion, that the proposed pedestrian bridge will not negatively impact the transportation system when considering the PCC 33.815.105 D.2 evaluation factors.