

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

September 27, 2016

5 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Gary Oxman (arrived p.m.), Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

City Staff Presenting: Joe Zehnder, Phil Nameny, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Sallie Edmunds, Mark Raggett, Rachael Hoy, Mindy Brooks

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

[Documents and Presentations for today's meeting](#)

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck:* I recently sent a description of the upcoming ecoroof conference that's in Portland next week. I encourage anyone who can make it to do so.
- *Commissioner Smith:* *Commissioner Tallmadge* and I with a delegation from Tunisia yesterday about encouraging community input in planning.
- *Commissioner Spevak:* Dan Parolek will be returning to Portland October 6 and 7 to discuss middle housing. Events are listed on the 1000 Friends website.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- The draft transmittal letter from the PSC to Council re: Task 5 package is in front of you for approval. We'd like to send this on to Council this week.
 - *Commissioner Houck:* The change on page 3 troubles me regarding the cumulative impacts on cost of housing from regulations or code requirements. This is the same type of argument that people make about the environment, meaning that typically the only economic analysis concerns alleged negative impacts of environmental protection on jobs and the economy. There are two sides to the equation, positive and negative impacts that need to be documented. This isn't exactly identical to that situation, and I'm not going to harp on it or insist on changing the letter. But we need to look just as equally at the positive impact of code and potentially expediting the process. Analysis of ecosystem services or the positive economic of the environment are almost always overlooked.
 - *Chair Schultz* appreciates this comment. My aim was to make sure we have looked at both sides. Generally there is support for all the items, but we aren't sure what it looks like all together.
 - *Commissioner Spevak* had a last-minute thought. When reviewing mixed-use areas to identify what the zoning would be, properties at the intersection of Cesar Chavez and Powell were recommended to be held for now based on the prospect of upcoming re-zoning projects. But if these projects don't happen, they are still prime spots that could be candidates for CM3 or other up-zones. I would invite Council to look at this and do the up-zoning now.
 - A majority of Commissioners gave a nod to *Commissioner Spevak's* proposed addition.

- *Commissioner Baugh* noted that we may be rushing with up-zoning and may be another burden for the Powell-Division project.
- *Commissioner Spevak*: I'm hopeful it's neutral on the Powell-Division project. I'm thinking of locations that already have good transit service that could support more density today.
- Staff will add this to the letter, send to PSC members and then forward to Council prior to the October 6 hearing.

Consent Agenda

Consideration of Minutes from the September 13, 2016 PSC meeting

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

Commissioner Houck noted that the minutes stated he thought the staff amendments were good, but had actually complimented staff's work as excellent and said he'd wished he'd simply moved to adopt the document as is after the last hearing, given the direction the conversation had gone during the work session following testimony.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Mass Shelters and Housing Zoning Code Update

Work Session / Recommendation: Joe Zehnder, Phil Nameny

Disclosures from PSC members

- none

Chair Schultz noted there are 9 items. I'd like to take a consent vote if we can unless commissioners have items to discuss.

Staff has an amendment to discuss about Item #4.

Commissioner Spevak proposed to pull items 8 and 9 based on discussions with staff regarding the definition of household size. I am willing to withdraw these items from the list.

Commissioner Smith noted since staff doesn't support items 6 and 7 we should discuss those.

Commissioner Rudd: Regarding the 180-day average length of stay, is average the metric we want to use? What about consideration of Good Neighbor Agreements? In terms of increase in beds for operating efficiently, what does "efficiently" mean in this context? Is any consideration given to the size of the facility as it relates to successfully transitioning people to more permanent housing?

Average length of stay: The intent is to keep this as a temporary occupancy. Today's code update amendment (in Chapter 33.920) helps define this. *Commissioner Rudd* confirmed this response took care of her question.

Good Neighbor Agreements were not part of this proposal since there is difficulty addressing them through the Zoning Code. The conditional use requirements for mass shelters are very much like GNAs. We had discussed them with A Home for Everyone and housing providers. Generally, AHFE will

encourage GNAs, but they were concerned about making this a requirement. The sense we got from providers was to let them be the judge about these types of agreements.

Commissioner Rudd: My memory is that we recently looked at using this somewhere when the user should look to do a GNA, but if it's not possible to negotiate an agreement, Council can approve it and have it move forward? I'm not against increasing beds, I just want to be sure we're doing this in a way that is most successful.

- This example was for parking at Providence Park. It would be incumbent on BDS to enforce it, which is difficult in terms of staffing and time.

Increase in number of beds for efficiency: Thresholds of staffing for facilities was the main question.

As we increase the right number of beds, is that consistent with other limitations we're putting on other properties to keep their size down? In the mixed-use code, that size and type of building is not typically what you'll find for a mass shelter provider to use. It's finding a property that's there that they can convert to this use with relatively low cost. Finding the locations without other requirements is part of the solution. Mass shelters fit into existing shelters for the most part.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve items 1, 2, 3 and 5 as consent. *Commissioner Houck* seconded. The motion was approved with an aye vote.

Item #4: Amendments to 33.920 – Use Categories

The code language provided today would replace the last part of the memo dated September 20 regarding Chapter 33.920. Colleges, schools and religious institutions will be included. We removed the piece that said it had to be in a building. We clarified that the occupancy duration must be less than 180 days in a calendar year. It still expands from the original staff proposal of just having religious institutions. Institutions can have 3 cars camp overnight, which is what's allowed at the state level code. Community services use types are not included because one type of community service use is a mass shelters. Adding an additional accessory use potentially makes the use category ripe for interpretation and loopholes.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked what the state statute prohibits.

- There are lots of state regulations about camping facilities in general. We didn't want to open up other camping situations that may not be allowed under ORS.
- *Commissioner Spevak:* Does Portland still have an option to allow up to 4 cars as originally suggested?
- This is unclear. We can revisit it later but for now we don't want to go above 3 cars based on state statute.

Commissioner Baugh: Would this allow a college to push the envelope and allow for temporary shelters for over 180 days?

- This is likely a building code allowance unless the conditional use review has a very specific limit to the number of people who can live there.

Commissioner Baugh moved to adopt the revised language for 33.920. *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded. The motion was approved with an aye vote.

Item #6: Transitional Housing (accessory use). Extend amount of time for a transitional housing unit from 180 to 365 days.

Staff does not support this proposal. With the revised language in 33.920, we are defining this better, and it seems like we have a resolution based on that language.

Item #7: Allow institutions to provide transitional housing for up to 10 households where each household is up to 3 individuals.

Staff does not support this proposal. Originally we set the number at 4 to be in line with the City's resolution about car camping in religious facilities.

- At some point an increase in the number of units has the impact of a secondary primary use instead of an accessory use to the institution.
- Because of the definition of household, the current proposal for four units is more flexible and may allow more individuals than the proposed amendment for up to 10 3-person units.
- With the definition of household, you can have a family and 5 unrelated people. So this is a minimum of 6 people.

Commissioner Smith asked about the logic of households and *Commissioner Spevak's* intent of 10 households of 3 being allowed. If you had 6 households of 6, this is already more than the 30 *Commissioner Spevak* proposed. I could see the fear from neighborhood associations and the number of people.

Our code is wrapped around the household definition. But this can also be interpreted by the institution, so it's not always about homeless individuals. At this point, working with the term households could be better.

If you think about the purpose for mass shelters and temporary housing -- humanitarian need, accessory use, temporary use -- we want to have the most reasonable way to give providers flexibility to take in a big family if needed or have more unrelated individuals in the unit, depending on the situation.

Commissioner Spevak does think that 3 individuals per transitional household make little sense. But this is an example of it's being unfortunate how things are bundled together. I'd like to see our code unbundle and we count people, but we're not there yet. I'm ok with 4 households but would like to see 6.

Commissioner Tallmadge: My rationale about going to 6 or more is that I want to allow the flexibility for an institution to host according to their size.

As a reminder, we're trying to get at the City declaring a housing or weather emergency (allowing for emergency shelters) and the institution allowed.

Commissioner Spevak moved to increase the number of transitional units to 6 (from 4). *Commissioner Houck* seconded. The motion was approved with an aye vote.

Commissioner Smith noted that taking on items 8 and 9 should include direction to staff to work on the definition of household.

Commissioner Smith moved to adopt amendments 1-3, 4 as modified today, and 5. Give direction to staff to review the definitions of households (items 8 and 9) in a near-term project. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y11 — Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Design Guidelines for Chinatown/Japantown Historic District

Briefing

Brandon introduced the project. It is a 10-block national historic district listed in 1989. Today it's subject to two sets of guidelines. These new guidelines will be approved by Council in early winter.

This is a collaborative project between BPS and PDC that worked with a 10-member stakeholder advisory committee. There were 2 hearings at the Historic Landmarks Commission, and next we're going into a work session phase. We hope to have the guidelines finalized at the October HLC meeting.

- *Chair Schultz* noted she served on the committee representing a client, not representing the PSC.

PDC provided some of the financial backing. Their building in the district allowed for opportunities for stakeholders. BPS worked closely with them and the consultant and to guide the legislative process. When we did the West Quadrant Plan, there was a consensus reached to consider additional height on parts of the district if we could come up with historic guidelines to strengthen the review process to allow greater height but to make it fit in the district.

Brandon provided background about what historic district design guidelines are and how they function.

Block 33 is an example. The guidelines are intending to let the applicant make the case for a building that's a bit taller than what the height limits are today.

There are three main sections to the design guideline document:

- Introduction
- History, character and context
- Design guidelines used for historic resource review including 4 different categories of guidelines

Commissioner Spevak asked about the order of the two commissions' decisions.

- These guidelines intend to be agnostic on height. We will discuss height as part of the CC2035 Plan tonight. These are separate when they go to Council. The design guidelines will get through Council first, and they work with or without the height guidelines. By City law, the HLC has the discretion to look at the allowed maximum height and reduce it if it's contextually appropriate. These guidelines address characteristics. There is a line above which the HLC would have difficulty approving, but we don't think this is anything we're proposing in the CC2035 Plan.

Commissioner Spevak: Who gets to make the call? Can the HLC effectively downzone parts of the city? It seems like the PSC has a limited authority in this regard.

- This is addressed when we go through the process of establishing a historic district. Property owners collectively decided to create the district. We are attempting to make this more transparent in tonight's discussion and proposal.
- HLCs look at historic districts as unique places within the city. They view their job as maintaining the overall district integrity.

Design guidelines do typically come before the PSC for briefings. We just haven't written updates in a while. But the PSC will see these coming through in the next few years. We want the district-specific guidelines to make the process more transparent, not more difficult.

What percent of the Central City is within a historic district?

- Historic districts are about 4 percent of the entire city. I'm not sure of this exact number for the Central City, but we can review.

Central City 2035 Plan

Work Session: Sallie Edmunds, Mark Raggett, Rachael Hoy, Mindy Brooks, Derek Dauphin, Mauricio Le Clerk

[Memo and work session packet](#)

Disclosures from PSC members

- *Chair Schultz* does business throughout the Central City and has potential conflicts. She will recuse herself from items A1 and C3. *Vice Chair Baugh* will preside over these sections.

Sallie provided an overview of tonight's session as well as the upcoming CC2035 Plan work sessions at the PSC. Tonight's discussion will focus on Height, Green Building (aside from ecoroofs) and Parking Code.

Additional items requested from commissioners to pull for discussion:

- B4, B5, B9, B10... specific viewpoints (pulled by Commissioner Baugh)

Height Overview

Mark provided a general overview of heights in the Central City. We received lots of testimony both for and against increasing height in different areas of the district. This is the largest center in our Centers and Corridors growth scenario. We have expectations for lots of growth here even though we have the smallest block size compared to other large cities. Also, about 40 percent of the land area as streets, so we can't build there, plus with parks and open space, the actual buildable land area is just about 50 percent. There are a number of Central City height principles we use to allow for flexibility and design to add variety and attractiveness.

Height works together with Floor Area Ratio (FAR). Allowing more height increases flexibility for different uses over time. All buildings in the Central City have ground floor regulations regardless of height. The Zoning Code, Design Review and Guidelines, as well as the PBOT Pedestrian Design Guide are the tools we use to review and assess developments.

Commissioner Smith: An argument by the folks who want to limit height say that height degrades the user experience on the block. Is a big mass of a building or shadow uninviting to the street-level experience?

- These regulations aim to alleviate these concerns.

Graphics show different height grouping allowed under the same FAR. The map today (slide 10) and the proposal (slide 11) show that we are proposing increases in the Lloyd District, bridgehead heights and reductions for scenic resources inventory considerations.

Commissioner Tallmadge noticed the height reduction in the Central Eastside.

- This doesn't represent a proposed change. This is a historic height step-down.

Proposed areas for increases to bonus height include:

1. Bridgehead Portals - to provide flexibility to better activate the riverfront
2. Portions of the Pearl District - waterfront areas; linking increased heights to older buildings

3. Transit Mall - for growth and development and supporting the light rail investment
4. Station Areas
5. Central Lloyd District - to catalyze development near the Convention Center

Reduction in height is proposed in a few places:

1. Historic Districts
2. Scenic View Corridors
3. Shade study requirements adjacent to parks

Based on public testimony, staff will return at the next work session with an urban form recommendation for the Park Blocks.

Commissioner Bachrach asked if, regardless of FAR, will height get us to the development outcomes we want? Or does it work in tandem with FAR? Are we really creating the more intense development we want based on height?

- We're trying to make it easier to develop and remove constraints, particularly around the bridgeheads for example.
- Depending on the building use, it will dictate the size of the tower (e.g. apartment versus office building plates).

Historic District Heights

Brandon walked through the proposal and noted the 7 historic districts in the Central City. Many were first listed in the 1970s-90s. There are contributing (historic) buildings that make up the historic integrity of the place.

Some Central City historic district heights were set in 1980 but haven't yet had review of heights; that's part of what we're getting at tonight.

General policy approach:

- Based on HLC input, eliminate bonus height options in all Central City historic districts:
 - NW 13th Ave
 - New Chinatown/Japantown
 - East Portland / Grand Ave
- Refine heights in three historic districts that have been listed in the National Register since the 1988 Central City Plan.
- Retain existing FAR allowances for use on site or transfer within a sub-district.

Item A1: New Chinatown/Japantown

Portland Historic Landmarks Commission requested further reduction in heights to align historic resource review with property owners' expectations. PHLC requested 75' for most Central City historic districts. In some areas, 75' may be close to appropriate, but in other areas we thought more than a 75' allowance would be appropriate. 30-50 percent taller is about what BPS would suggest.

In this plan we have a base height map, and we came back and mapped heights with bonus height to see the overall potential impact on the Central City. In historic districts, design review will want to push heights down. So we're setting maximum heights and not adding unreachable bonus options to be clear what the height expectations are.

In Chinatown/Japantown, we are proposing to add height to the surface parking lot while reducing height at the other end of the site. *Commissioner Rudd* asked about the ODOT building. It is outside of this area and is about 60-70'. The PDC building is about 80'. The average height of buildings in this district is about 35-40'.

Commissioner Smith asked a global question about policy trade-offs. We chose a growth scenario that says 30 percent of growth over the next 20 years will be in the Central City. With these considerations and changes, will we meet that target?

- We updated our analysis of impacts, and with all height increases and decreases, we still meet the overall growth targets for both residential and employment forecasts in the Central City.

Commissioners gave nods to approve Item A1 as staff recommended.

Item A2: On NW 13th Ave, we have a small compact district with a large number of contributing historic buildings. PHLC requested to change the maximum height to 75'. We looked at the buildings and initially felt supportive of this. But at the PSC hearings, we heard from a number of property owners in the south end of the district that they would potentially have more opportunities for higher. Staff proposes to increase the height in the NW 13th Ave Historic District to 100' south of NW Hoyt St, but otherwise affirm the district heights as presented.

Commissioners gave nods to approve Item A2 as proposed in staff's amendment.

Item A3: East Portland / Grand Ave Historic District. The heights presented in the Proposed Draft provide a consistent approach that takes existing buildings and historic resource review into account. The Proposed Draft heights allow for taller development at the bridgeheads consistent with the 160' contributing 1928 Weatherly Building.

Commissioner Smith noted he helped to get the streetcar funded and built in this area. FAR utilization around the streetcar is very deliberate to put people in this corridor. FAR opportunity still exists here and helps make the transit investment payoff.

Commissioner Rudd: If we are wrong and you can't maintain development capacity, can you sell that additional FAR? Is this an active, trading market?

- If you're a contributing historic building, there is opportunity to transfer the FAR within the full Central City. For non-contributing buildings, you can transfer FAR within the sub-district. You will lose value with the transfer. You'll get more value for the FAR for remaining/building in place.

Commissioner Baugh asked about the LID based on the existing zoning. This was created in 2007. If we now make a change to their capacity, is the value the same as when it was assessed years ago? If the value is different, do you change the equation about how much you can extract from the property owners?

- Reaching 275' may not have been possible in 2007 or 2014, so some of the question about how the County conducted the assessment.
- *Commissioner Smith:* There was no discussion of historic review when we were selling the LID in 2007. Value is not a guarantee over time, as we saw coming out of the recession.

Chair Schultz: When the historic district was formed, was there discussion about the height and scale of buildings? If not, do we have an argument about the height not degrading the historic district?

- Every contributing building has a description and notes what the contributing resource looks like.
- When we created this district, heights were as shown on the left. When we looked at increasing heights, we had concerns that we had to review about losing the district's register.
- We have not done a block-by-block survey of this district.

Commissioner Rudd: Would we be concerned about losing green space if we're keeping the height and FAR?

- We would have to go back to the guidelines. But we don't think this is so much a consideration here.

Chair Schultz would like to know if we have an issue or not. I'd like to propose some more staff work on this issue. There is the one section proposed with 9:1 FAR that I don't think will be used. But in an adjacent section, I see us running out of FAR.

Commissioner Bachrach: Why does this 160' limit make such an impact? Isn't this adjacent to a 200' allowance?

- The 200' is outside the historic district.

Commissioners suggested staff work more on **Item A3** and bring this back for further discussion. Maybe there is a more nuanced approach in this district.

Commissioner Smith noted this is a truth in zoning question. Does PHLC agree that the Weatherly Building is the right one to use in this district?

- They maintain that 75' is what they're comfortable with. They do acknowledge that this district does have more nuances than other districts.

Item A4: Irvington Historic District. The Proposed Draft allows for building heights that are more compatible with the historic district than the existing heights, while still allowing larger buildings consistent with the Central City.

Commissioner Oxman asked if this area is all CM3.

- The proposed zoning is a Central City zone (CX). CMs are outside the Central City. FAR is 4:1 as the base here.

Commissioners gave nods to approve **Item A4** as proposed by staff.

Item A5: Historic district height maps. In addition to refining heights in historic districts, PHLC asked to look at a new height map in Chapter 510. Staff is considering this and will bring options back to the PSC at the January work session:

1. Action item to develop a handout describing historic resource review in the Central City
2. Creation of new 510 map(s)
3. Addition of 510 code language describing height as an allowance
4. Adding an overlay zone letter to historic districts

Scenic Resources Protection Plan

Mindy gave background about the scenic work. We'll be talking about views, but scenic resources include more than just views. But views are what we heard most about in testimony. Mindy also touched on Statewide Planning Goal 5. It requires we do and explain the process and policy choices but does not prescribe outcomes.

Item B1: View of Mt Hood from Japanese Garden. Staff recommends maintaining the view of Mt Hood and limiting an area of tree removal because of the important functions provided by trees, particularly trees on steep slopes. This vegetation is contributing to this particular view.

Commissioner Baugh asked about view protection here. This is at a very specific spot. As you move across the horizon, that changes the angle.

- This is based on a single point at the very center of the pavilion.

Commissioner Rudd: The trees are on public property.

- Yes, the trees are in the Rose Garden and around the reservoir. This doesn't preclude removal of trees outside this area. The Japanese Garden could ask PP&R to do pruning within any of the area through the Title 11 Programmatic Permit. The recommendation for this view would prioritize this area for tree removal.

Commissioner Oxman asked if there are important cultural meanings for this view.

- In testimony, people talked about "borrowed landscape" as a theory. This theory applies to the natural landscape, which includes the mountain and the vegetation. We could ask them to talk to the cultural importance of this view.

There is no proposal to limit building height here. We don't need to in this case because the height limits already in place protect the view.

Commissioners gave nods to approve Item B1 as proposed by staff.

Item B2: Views of Vista Bridge from Jefferson St

The proposed draft heights are increased to 40-60' along Jefferson St, up from 30-45'.

Staff Recommendations:

1. Amend the heights along Jefferson St to 75'. This will support Jefferson St as a commercial corridor and promote redevelopment around the light rail stop.
2. Add a new viewpoint at Collins Circle, which provides a safe location for people to stop and take in the view.
3. Add actions to develop the viewpoint at Collins Circle and improve pedestrian connectivity.

Commissioner Baugh asked why in this view corridor we're proposing to add a viewpoint versus in Item B1 and its being point-specific for the view corridor.

- We have a general recommendation that all viewpoints should be developed in some way such as a sign or bench to denote viewpoint if not clearly marked.

Commissioner Smith: Going back to the original I-405 viewpoint, if we wanted to protect that piece of arch, what would we have to do to building heights?

- We could still go up slightly (40-60') to preserve most of the arch. But this doesn't really increase flexibility for development. There is a surface parking lot next to the light rail stop that, with 75', could develop with ground floor retail and upper floor of residential.

Commissioner Spevak has a hard time approving money to be spent on creating a viewpoint. On a larger issue, I want to bring up the issue of allocation of staff time and resources. We have tons of inches of paper documentation about scenic viewpoints, but only a fraction of pages about housing, for example.

- *Commissioner Houck* commented on how this is important work and the value should be balanced.
- *Chair Schultz:* This is certainly a good discussion... for another day.

Commissioners generally gave nods to approve **Item B2** as proposed in today's 3 staff amendments above.

Item B3: View of Mt Hood from Salmon Springs

There are 5 locations today along the westside Greenway Trail where you can see Mt Hood. Salmon Springs is a large developed viewpoint with seating and telescopes. It is located at the Salmon Springs fountain at the heart of Waterfront Park. Views of Mt Hood are iconic to Portland, and this location is a regional asset contributing to tourism and Portland's image. But in the Discussion Draft staff recommended not protecting this view or any of the views of Mt Hood from the westside Greenway Trail because the economic impacts in the Central Eastside are significant.

We decided to elevate the discussion to the PSC in the Proposed Draft based on public input stating that the plan undervalue the importance of this view.

Staff recommend making amendments to the geography of the view corridor:

- First, narrow the view corridor slightly. Existing development partially blocks the northern edge of the view. Narrowing the view corridor removes 15 properties.
- Second, raise the bottom elevation of the view corridor. The general policy is to protect views of Mt Hood to 1,000' below timberline. In this case, existing vegetation blocks a view of the mountain below timberline. Therefore, the elevation can be raised to the timberline.

The amended proposal provides slightly more development potential but still reduces the allowed stories by half. The ESEE economic analysis is based on the Comprehensive Plan's Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI). For BLI sites, the economic impact of the amended proposal is between \$720,000 and \$2.9M. The reduction in jobs is between 100-405.

There are 29 properties in the view corridor that were assessed as part of the Streetcar LID. The assessments range from \$1,608 to \$37,004, with an average of \$7,007. Unlike in the Historic Districts, the height reductions in the view corridor would make it difficult for some sites to use their entitled FAR. We would like to come back to you in January with a proposal to prioritize FAR transfer from the Salmon Springs view corridor.

Staff recommendation: Amend the view corridor by narrowing it and by raising the bottom elevation.

Commissioner Houck: When I think of views of Mt Hood, I think of the Rose Garden and other views. When we talk about activating the river, on this view issue, I'd rather see more trees, a healthier riparian zone on the greenway. As the staff presentation went on I moved from supporting to opposing this view, which I had to admit comes as a surprise to me.

Commissioner Smith noted that transferring FAR away from the streetcar corridor is somewhat nonsensical. This is a concern. But to me, this is the toughest issue we have to look at tonight. I want to send this on to Council with the right framing considerations. If we're giving this view corridor away, that should be a Council decision. We should include a clear statement of tradeoffs in our letter.

Commissioner Spevak is inclined to agree with *Commissioner Houck*.

Commissioner Oxman spent the week at the Land Institute in Kansas with Wendell Berry, so I'm finding myself thinking about the intimate relationship with nature. When I look at these views, Mt Hood sandwiched between buildings doesn't get to this. It doesn't have the context that the 1971 view from the Japanese Garden has. Is it more important to connect to the river here and downtown?

Commissioner Baugh noted the economic and jobs costs. But if you have been to this viewpoint, it's visitors, not Portlanders who are here. I would argue that sandwiching this iconic "product", as Mt Hood is, to create jobs and create value in Portland, isn't balanced. I do agree this is a Council decision for this viewpoint.

Commissioner Rudd: When you come back to talk about FAR transfer and the LID, I feel different when someone has paid into the LID as opposed to when zoning simply changes over time. Has the City ever paid for easements? This could help deal with the issue of lost value.

Commissioner Houck's comments were specifically about focusing attention on the river not Mt Hood from that viewpoint, not about jobs or the economy.

Commissioner St Martin: Is there another place where the view would be easier to maintain with less impact/cost?

- We looked at 5 locations along the river. This one has the least negative economic impact. The others have significantly more economic impact. We looked 5 views of Mt Hood from bridges. Tilikum Bridge is the least impactful of all 10 views, then Salmon Springs, then it goes up from there.

Commissioner Baugh: The viewpoint crosses 2 ODOT properties. Does having this as a designated viewpoint limit the new ODOT ramp height?

- Narrowing the corridor allows for more opportunity. The southern block is not in the view corridor. My understanding is that the ramp project is for seismic upgrades. I don't know the proposed height of the ramp.

Chair Schultz asked Commissioners about *Commissioner Smith's* suggestion to maintain the Salmon Springs view corridor for now but note that it needs more time at Council for discussion.

Commissioner Houck: Our letter can express the conflicted nature of this particular discussion and vote.

Commissioner Spevak suggested giving up this view corridor but to support the Tilikum Bridge view.

Joe: The Tilikum view is a separate issue. A go or no-go decision specifically about this view corridor is the cleanest vote on this issue.

With a 7-4 vote, Commissioners oppose preserving the Salmon Springs view corridor.

Items B4-10 will be left as-is and approved as proposed by staff.

Commissioner Baugh is concerned about the I-84 / Sullivan's Gulch view (Item B5).

- ODOT has not specifically expressed concerns about proposed heights here in terms of ramps. Staff will follow-up with ODOT on this issue.

**Items not discussed today will be addressed at future work sessions.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 9:06 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken