

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

January 22, 2019

5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach (arrived 5:37 p.m.), André Baugh, Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin (1 open position)

Commissioner Absent: Daisy Quiñonez

City Staff Presenting: Eric Engstrom, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Sarah Figliozi (PBOT), Liz Hormann (PBOT)

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 5:04 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Larsell made a complaint about the process of the new BPS director selection. She would have liked a more transparent process. She had asked questions earlier in the month and was told she could not know who was on the interview panels. She has been involved in selecting superintendents, and there is typically a mix of time to talk privately and time to be more public. She suggested the process here is too heavy on speaking internally and too light on enough speaking externally with the community.

- Eric will pass those thoughts on.
- *Chair Schultz* was on one of the panels. She is unclear about what she can share publicly, but in general she found it interesting and extremely well organized; there was thorough conversation, for what it's worth. She will find out what more she can say and relay it.
- *Commissioner Larsell* would have liked to have heard about the process before it started and if they had thought about how much people could share with the public. She wanted to know who or what organizations were involved.

Director's Report

Eric Engstrom

- Eric is filling in for Joe, who is preparing for the upcoming Budget Advisory Committee Meeting.

Consent Agenda

1. Consideration of Minutes from the January 9, 2019 PSC meeting.

Commissioner Baugh moved to approve the consent agenda. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y8 – Baugh, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Smith, Schultz, Spevak, St Martin)

Historic Code Update Project

Briefing: Brandon Spencer-Hartle

Presentation

Brandon is providing a briefing on the Discussion Draft of the Historic Resources Code Update Project.

Three PSC members, *Commissioners Bachrach, Schultz, and St Martin*, worked with the Historic Landmarks Commission to understand the key issues around preservation.

This project launched a year ago to refine the City's system for inventorying and protecting historic resources. The inventory has not been updated since 1984. It will also incorporate new State regulations and best practices for designating resources as well as refine demolition and design protections.

Two years ago, the Land Conservation and Development Commission adopted new State administrative rules for local preservation programs. Brandon served on the rulemaking advisory committee to amend rules that better meet our Comprehensive Plan goals. Many components of the current code are in nonconformance with the State rules, and this project represents new opportunities.

We looked at 13 comparable programs from other cities and scoped the project. We started concept development with public roundtables, an online survey, and 1:1 meetings with stakeholders. We're taking a holistic look at what's working and what's not working.

This summer we had an in-house draft of the code project. We received lengthy comments from the Bureau of Development Services and other partner bureaus, then we released a discussion Draft of the code on January 14. Brandon will meet with individuals and organizations over the next few months and come back to the PSC with a Proposed Draft in the summer. Public comments are due on April 1, 2018 on the Discussion Draft.

Brandon gave some background. State law requires majority owner consent for local resource designation. State Land Use Planning Goal 5 requires cities apply demolition review to federally-listed National Register resources (including districts). All resources listed in the National Register before January 2017 were automatically mapped as Historic Landmarks or Districts. All recognized resources can be viewed online (slide 4).

Brandon gave an overview of current historic resources classifications by the City. The Historic Resources Inventory is a list of resources that have not been formally designated but have potential historic significance, including both ranked and unranked non-designated resources as well as designated resources (slide 5).

Proposed changes to the Historic Resource Inventory: Today, it is a static list of resources that are not designated. A name change will make the different categories clearer, which will allow BPS to work with communities to document and determine which resources are significant and eligible for future designation. This is in line with Comprehensive Plan policies to designate resources, as a first step—the name change will bring clarity (slide 6).

Today, ranked resources are considered to be "significant" and would maintain their 120-day demolition delay. However, today owners with significant resources can remove their self from the list by-right, but we are proposing to remove that option (slide 7).

Proposed changes to local designation system include retaining and refining the two-tier local designation/protection system (Historic Landmarks/Districts and Conservation Landmarks/Districts); establishing new criteria for designation (including social, ethnic, gender, and cultural history); and creating a new classification for National Register resources listed after January 2017 (they no longer become automatic Historic Landmarks/Districts). This will create a small menu to choose from when protection is desired (slide 8). Other changes include a quasi-judicial path for local designation for 16 or fewer properties and a legislative path for individual landmarks (with recommendation from the Historic Landmarks Commission, not PSC, unless there are 16+ properties or the required owner consent is not met, which would mean a PSC recommendation as well) (slide 9).

Brandon showed the new proposed hierarchy of historic resource classifications in the Historic Resource Inventory (slide 10).

Questions

Commissioner Spevak: For the demo delay, what happens if someone is modifying the exterior of a building and that's treated like a demo?

- Brandon: Today, we have demo review and demo delay, and we don't have a definition of demolition specific to historic resources. A new state administrative rule gives cities a discretionary definition of demolition for historic resources. When it concerns protection programs, demolition is any act that removes in whole or in part the features that make a resource significant. We need to figure out how to apply that locally. A consistent list of what would be included in a demolition definition is in the Discussion Draft: complete demolition, removing two walls and a roof, or removing an entire street-facing façade.

Commissioner Spevak: If the PSC has a role in a legislative project, are the criteria to create new districts part of this update?

- Brandon: In a legislative process, you would be weighing the other goals and policies of the Comp Plan. While the criteria might be honed to architectural history, the PSC would weigh that against other adopted goals and policies of the Comprehensive Plan. For individual landmarks, because they come up on a frequent basis and are isolated to one property, we did not include the PSC as a stop along the way.

Chair Schultz: What's the logic behind the number 16 properties?

- Brandon: We didn't want a quasi-judicial action to include a large number of property owners. A typical inner-Portland block is 16 lots, so this would be roughly one block or two block faces across the street from each other.

Chair Schultz: What about a bunch of small lots going out individually creating a larger district?

- Brandon: Good question; the likelihood is small and we shouldn't be establishing partial historic districts. Peacock Lane, for example, is 35 properties, and part of the criteria for designation requires a discussion of the boundary. The boundary should capture everything that is intended to be preserved.
- *Chair Schultz* is more concerned about that happening as a workaround to the PSC process.
- Brandon: The same concern exists for landmarks. This relates to our criteria for review and our desire to have a high bar when something is designated.
- *Commissioner Spevak* is less concerned about it because of the unanimity required to be created, but is there a contiguity requirement?
- Brandon: We say that districts are generally contiguous; the Halprin Sequence is an example of one that's not contiguous.

- *Commissioner Spevak*: Currently, the main differentiator I see between conservation and historic districts is that the former includes a by-right path where the latter doesn't.

Brandon discussed the proposed protections for National Register Resources listed after 2017 (slide 11).

Brandon discussed the proposed protection changes for Historic Landmarks/Districts (slides 12-15), which include expanding the Council-level demolition review to locally-designated Historic Landmarks and establishing a lower staff-level demolition review for historic "contributing" accessory structures. Irvington and Ladd's Additions have hundreds or thousands of historic garages that go through the Council process. We heard from Council to not bring garages for demo review. This would affect only 80 properties today but would also affect future designations. The list of exemptions from review would be expanded and thresholds for the types of review would be refined.

The Conservation Districts have the most significant proposed regulatory change. We've seen that the current 120-day demolition review doesn't do much to prevent demolition. We're proposing a staff-level demo review for Conservation Districts that would generally require mitigation specific to the district for approval (e.g., assisting building being moved, rehabilitation in the district). It would limit likelihood of demolition in Conservation Districts but still retain an easier ability to get approval than in Historic Districts/Landmarks (slide 15).

Small alteration, addition, and potentially new construction projects would be able to retain the two-track option of clear and objective design standards and discretionary design guidelines. Several paths exist for what to do for larger new infill in Conservation Districts; the proposal is not firm yet. The proposal would give more flexibility for large additions to Conservation Districts. We've been thinking about Seattle's character buildings approach.

We wanted to look at use flexibility and offer a progressive approach around use. We're moving towards a form-based housing flexibility program—proposed Zoning Code incentives include expanding housing flexibility for all Historic and Conservation Landmarks and Districts. It would offer more options for owners to preserve their buildings; no limit on number of units. To make those work better, the proposal would eliminate redundant requirements to access incentives, including the FAR transfer; eliminate parking requirements for all Historic and Conservation Landmarks and Districts (as there's often not enough site area and adding parking breaks neighborhood patterns); and allow nonresidential uses in residential zones in certain situations provided there is no loss of dwelling units on the site (slide 16).

Finally, proposed miscellaneous administrative changes include changing the Historic Landmarks Commission makeup, annual report schedules, and powers and duties as well as allowing adjustments to historic resource boundaries and contributing resource status through quasi-judicial review (slide 17).

Slide 18 contains a summary of proposed changes.

Next steps (slide 20): outreach and public events in February-March, public comments due April 1, staff watching for possible changes at the State level, and Proposed Draft to be published this summer for PSC review.

Questions

Commissioner Baugh: How would allowing a church to be used for a commercial purpose, for example, work? Many institutions were built in neighborhoods for the neighborhood to use and now they could become a brewpub.

- Brandon: Two options for a hypothetical church in SE designated as Historic Landmark, for example. 1) Use the building for a retail sales and service use provided it is open to all ages at normal operating hours, off-site impacts are mitigated, and there is no loss of housing on the site. 2) An ambitious path is if they're looking at a major adaptive reuse, e.g., major events center or 21+ brewpub, it would have a Type III process in front of a hearings officer to mitigate off-site impacts. If these buildings are going to be regulated and preserved, they need economic opportunity.
- *Commissioner Baugh*: Some places of worship may be from an ethnic background. Some are on large lots with large parking lots and developers ask them to buy property. This should not be a gentrification tool and some kind of displacement analysis should be done.
- Brandon: The Vancouver Avenue Baptist Church took advantage of the existing FAR transfer to sell their unused FAR to assist with building upgrades. Some of our thinking has been how to give those institutions some economic benefit, such as opening a small coffee shop. We have more work to do on that.

Chair Schultz: Does any structure that will be affected by potential demo review or delay have the potential to get tax breaks or credits?

- Brandon: Today at the state and federal level, the only financial incentive programs are for National Register resources. There is active conversation in Salem about rethinking how those incentives apply including to local designations.

Commissioner St Martin: It's important to hear what the community has to say and how they feel about our historic resources.

Bike Parking Code

Hearing: Sarah Figliozzi, Liz Hormann (PBOT)

Presentation

Sarah re-introduced the project after the PSC briefing 2 weeks ago. The PSC received a memo answering their questions and staff is preparing a response to their next round of questions in advance of the work session.

The Bicycle Parking Code Update includes (slide 2):

- Location requirements
- Amount of required parking
- Rack design requirements
- Security requirements

These requirements apply across all zones.

Major topics addressed include (slide 3):

- Adequate amounts of parking
- Location options
- Usability
- Secure and safe to use
- Feasible and flexible regulations.

Key proposals include (slides 4-8):

- Amounts
 1. Adopt 2 geographic tiers for minimum parking amounts to be applied to all Use Categories. These amounts have not been updated in 20 years.
 2. Calculate amounts of long- and short-term parking based on data points including trip generation rates, employees/sf, and visitation rates.
- Location
 3. Specify options for where long-term parking can be provided.
 4. Require a percentage of long-term bicycle parking to be in bike rooms.
 5. Affordable Housing in-unit bicycle parking exemptions.
 6. In mixed-use developments, ensure all building tenants have access to long-term bicycle parking.
- Usability
 7. Require applicants to provide sufficient bicycle rack detail in submitted plans.
 8. Require a minimum percentage of long-term bicycle racks to be provided in horizontal racks.
 9. Provide a few bicycle parking spaces for larger bikes.
 10. Ensure double-decker racks include a lift mechanism.
- Security
 11. Streamline and narrow security requirements for long-term parking to help prevent bicycle theft.
 12. Enhance personal safety by requiring lighting for long-term parking.
 13. Require 100% of long-term bicycle parking to be covered to provide weather protection.
- Streamlining and flexibility
 14. Increase options for space-saving racks.
 15. Streamline spacing requirements for horizontal and diagonal racks to better match the right-of-way standards.
 16. Exempt bike room space from Floor Area Ratios (FAR).
 17. Remove the all or nothing aspect of the Short-term Bicycle Parking Fund.
 18. Add the major remodel threshold to nonconforming development to require both short- and long-term bicycle parking to be brought up to code.
 19. Allow the conversion of existing required parking spaces to required bicycle parking.

Liz outlined what they've heard so far (slide 9):

- Proposals are necessary and important to meet climate and transportation goals
- In-unit compromise
- Impact on affordable housing
- Flexibility in implementation and letting the market drive bicycle parking
- Balancing detail with reducing code complexity

Questions

Commissioner Bachrach thanked staff for the history on mode splits. The bike split has flatlined. Is the expectation that more and better parking will move the dial on mode split or that other things the City is doing will increase mode split for bikes and therefore we will need extra parking? Why has it flatlined even though we are investing in bike infrastructure?

- Sarah: We want to give a more detailed answer and provide an answer from our bicycle coordinator and other staff. Bike parking and infrastructure go hand-in-hand. These trips need to end with a place to store bikes safely and securely.

Written testimony

Testimony

1. Miché Lozano, Program Coordinator for Andando Bicicletas en Cully: We are a Latinx-led cycling organization that has been around for 10 years. The Community Cycling Center (CCC) has partnered with us to provide us with bike parking solutions and after 3 years of advocacy we obtained solutions for people living in Hacienda CDC buildings. Still there is not storage for all and many are denied access to long-term safe bike storage. There are issues of bikes being stolen. In the CCC report *Understanding Barriers to Cycling*, nearly 60% of Latinx or Hispanic people did not have access to safe long-term storage. Not having access close to home and work creates barriers that affect those most vulnerable. Please consider the effects these policies have on future generations and the environment.
2. Manuela Interian: I have 4 kids and for me it's important have bikes to have access to local stores, school, and go out for a ride, and for my kids to be more active given that technology is has been a distraction for the kids. In the past, my apartment manager did not permit bicycles in the apartments. She asked me to throw out the bikes. I told her I would not throw my bikes out. I had a debate with the general manager because she did not want to let me have my bikes in the apartment, and I told her I would get to wherever I needed to go and have my children be active. She told me it was fine that I had the bikes. As a mother, for us it's important to have secure, safe parking. I would like that you make it so all apartments have a dignified place to park.
3. Zoemy Tuz: I am a mother of 3 and it's important that we have a space for our bikes. Last year, they stole my kids' and my bikes. We have been in the neighborhood for 5 years and constantly they rob bikes from us and everyone in the community. Please keep in mind that you make a space for the bikes. My kids were really sad when the bikes got stolen and I still don't have a bike for my kids. The bikes are really important for our children.
4. Isabel Eusebio: I am in the same situation. Years ago, they robbed my son's bike as well, and he still doesn't have one.
5. Jonathan Ling, Community Cycling Center: Thanks for Liz and Sarah's effort. I work on CCC's charitable programs and related businesses. I echo what we heard from ABC. Space to store bicycles remains a barrier for folks living in multifamily housing. The only safety-related theme all groups identified with in our report was space to store and concern around theft. 35% of culturally-specific groups polled noted storage was a significant barrier. As a business we have an interest in people having access to bicycling; more and more transportation alternatives are necessary as density grows. Bicycling is an important part to Portland's economy and adds to property values. We want to see developers doing their share to retain the unique character to Portland.
 - o *Commissioner Bachrach*: The proposed regulations will not do anything to help the bike security problem in existing buildings. Is your group working on problems in existing buildings?
 - o Jonathan: We work with property managers and owners and development staff to improve security. A few projects with Hacienda CDC are pending including Living Cully Plaza and a large swath of apartments that will be demolished and redeveloped, which will directly affect a large percentage of folks we work with.
6. Seth Alford: The City wants to get to 25% mode share; to do that, parking must be available at destinations. Occasionally buildings will have a remodel of bike parking, and what needs to happen is additional enforcement capability. I observed in my building that there was a demolition of existing facility and bike parking was rebuilt on a very relaxed schedule. The new bike parking should be built and *then* the existing parking should get demolished. In reading others' testimony, there were comments about electric plugs in facilities; I would urge that that requirement be put in for e-bikes and recharging of lights.
7. Sam Rodriguez, Oregon Smart Growth and Mill Creek Residential: We are supportive of the quantities of parking that are proposed. The biggest issue is enough flexibility for the development community to locate them where the market wants to have them. We support putting a fair amount

inside the unit; we think the 20% allowance should be higher, at least 50%. We have different ways of distributing parking in buildings; in one we put in one big room and we have 1-3 thefts/week. No matter how many videos or the quality of videos, the police do not have the resources to act. We believe the ability to put some of these spaces in the units is a safer place. We disagree that having space in unit deters use. E-bike parking is absolutely necessary.

- *Commissioner Smith*: The police bureau has a bike theft task force.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: Bike room FAR will be free, whereas the space in the unit it would take would not. How does that change the economics?
 - Sam: We believe in a mix. 1.5 bikes/unit is a fairly healthy quantity of bikes and if we have to put it all in a ground floor (which is a design review issue), there's no net operating income being generated by that space. By segregating it, the unit gets a little bigger and we have to put it in a place that is usable.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: There aren't rules. Would you be open to defining in-unit space in the code?
 - Sam: We have to locate the parking on our plans so someone can see that it's usable.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: You have no issues with bikes in hallways and mud and dirt?
 - Sam: No; the reason we did put the big bike room was because it would avoid people bring muddy bikes into hallways and corridors, and they do that less, but more damage is caused to tenants by putting their bikes in the room. The bike room is partially empty, and people are putting them into their units and requesting that we do it.
 - *Commissioner Baugh*: Can you design spaces well in a unit so that they're actually usable?
 - *Chair Schultz*: How do we write into the code that the area that's allotted for bike clearance does not end up being a compromise between a twin and double bed? One idea is to allow you to have bike parking anywhere but living room, bedroom, kitchen, or bathroom and requiring designated clearance. Would a developer want to build such a space?
 - Sam: We are trying to build the best product to have the best economic results. I would not have any regulations on where to put it.
 - *Chair Schultz* would like thoughts on how to regulate for location so tenants don't have to choose between a bed and a bike.
 - Sam: People will choose your building based on how they can park their bike.
 - *Commissioner Bachrach*: In your recent buildings, what is the utilization of bike rooms?
 - Sam: One on Belmont has a combination of in-unit and in bike room. We have less bikes in the room than in the units. We have a washing space, or they can come in from the street. All the bike parking is in one large room in another project, which is half-empty because we've had 1-3 thefts/week. The police bureau does have a program, but no one searches for the bikes.
8. Ted Buehler: I am Co-Chair of Bike Loud PDX but speaking as small business owner on the in-unit exemption for affordable housing. I was on the Boise Neighborhood Association Land Use and Transportation Committee and asked about bicycle parking during the development boom. We put together neighborhood guidelines for what bicycle parking should look like, and now I see bike rooms and bike riders. In Eliot, buildings have balconies with bikes on the balconies, and I suspect the market-driven solution for that building is not providing residents what they need. I own a house and rent out bedrooms as by business. In 2012 *The New York Times* reported on a couple building a bike room in their house, so I cleared out a section of the basement and put in bike hooks with 24" spacing and 16" spacing for different bikes with ground-level entry and locked door. I cater to low-income people new to Portland, mostly single, and encourage them to ride a bike. Good walk-in parking is key to choosing bicycling as transportation. Indoor secure bike parking.

9. Edward LeClair: Excited about new code. I have kids and bike with them regularly and work with their schools, and it is a ridiculous fight to get enough parking. At one kid's elementary school, there's not enough parking so they're locked to wires, utility poles, and chunks of fence. If we want to have 25% mode share, we need to start with the next generation now, not when they build new schools under this code. At middle school, I'm trying to get the principal to get free bike racks available to him from the city, and there's not enough parking there. Code is great step in right direction, but what can we do to not only make it apply to new development but hold existing buildings to these standards in 5 or 10 years?
10. Jillian Detweiler, Executive Director of Street Trust: I urge you to adopt these changes to the code. Understands frustration around the strategy to get to 25% mode split, which is a means to an end—a thriving city contributing to addressing climate change and giving people choices. Even maintaining 7% means many more people riding bikes in a growing city. We have great investments in safe and convenient infrastructure; The Street Trust encourages riders with programs like Bike More Challenge, Women Bike, and an Access to Cycling Program with ROSE CDC funding the installation of new parking and bike kits and incentives for residents. We also have exciting pricing mechanisms on the horizon with congestion pricing and clean energy jobs program at state level. I hear concerns about detailed standards, which come from the fact that as many ways there are to make good parking, there are 1,000 ways to make bad bike parking. I hope we can come to a better place on affordable housing. Transportation is most households' second-largest expense. People on low incomes have much fewer choices for places to live. There are so many people for whom the market isn't functioning and getting to choose good bike parking is not an option.
- *Commissioner Bachrach* is wrestling with housing production versus more regulation that could impede it. Many letters recognize this will increase the cost of housing and cut back the quantity. How does the PSC balance that?
 - Jillian: I think you have some evidence that the impact on pricing is fairly negligible and the savings households can experience by having an option other than driving are tremendous. We don't have any other strategy to make this City's transportation system work other than to get people out of single-occupancy vehicles, and we don't have any other strategy than to reduce carbon emissions. Those benefits are very large related to a small impact on cost.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: It's a false choice and false framing as zero-sum game. If building adequate bike parking lets you reduce your auto parking by a few spaces, that may make up for the spaces for bike parking.
 - *Commissioner Bachrach*: For small developments, the analysis is more than negligible.
 - *Commissioner Houck*: Expand on comment about it relating to equity.
 - Jillian: The market doesn't serve poor people in many ways and one of those ways is bike parking. The market won't provide that choice. But there are such tremendous benefits to household finances.
11. Alexandra Zimmerman: I work for a nonprofit providing transportation options and I have secure access to parking in my work building—600 spaces, lockers, showers. Many other employees don't have this access. In my previous building, parking was in the lower level of the garage accessed by a freight elevator, and we stopped biking to work for security reasons. I can't always rely on transit, but I moved to the Central City for the ability to bike. I moved into building without car parking and could not afford my apartment with a car. I'm still choosing housing based on access to bike parking and could not ever manage living with a car. We can't meet mode split or carbon emissions goals without being bold.
12. Lindsay Huber: My apartment building is almost 100 years old so would not be impacted by this new code, but it has lessons on why it's important to be thinking about bike parking now. It has more than 20 units and 7 indoor bike parking spots. Has a couple spots outside but we have watched

people's bikes and pieces of bikes disappear. My neighbors say that if we had more secure bike parking, they would choose to bike more often, unanimously. Even this indoor parking we have is mediocre and difficult to get in and out of and there is no space for trailers (neighbor stored trailer outside and it got moldy and gross and had to throw away). We don't currently have anything like the in-unit spots discussed, but we have a similar type of hook and those walls get dirty and gross; cannot imagine what closet would look like.

13. Doug Klotz: Agrees with proposed ratios and most details. Concerned about path to the parking, especially in larger buildings—need to make automatic sensors or buttons so you don't have to navigate opening doors. All racks should accommodate fenders. There are awesome buildings going in on Division CM2-zoned 50x100 lots with 32 units—the density is good on such a small lot, but that would mean 48 bike racks, which would take 800 sf and remove 3 units; for smaller sites, allow bikes in units. Can we use the right of way to put bike parking in locked boxes where car parking spots were? We should take auto parking out of the right of way since we're also taking them out of buildings.
14. Michelle Schultz, BOMA Board of Directors: Building Owners and Managers Association Board of Oregon serves over 50 million sf of space. BOMA has participated on the stakeholder advisory committee, summarized the proposed changes, met directly with staff, and submitted written testimony. Thankful for inclusion of our comments, but 3 items need to be adjusted: 1) Minimum required spaces in retail sales and service, restaurant and bars, and office—increasing the code by 500% is too high. BOMA building surveys demonstrate current usage at 20%. Suggest increasing these categories by 200% with policy to increase in the future if demand is demonstrated. 2) Locations, standards, and units—location needs to be more flexible; up to 50% in units. 3) Minimum number of horizontal spaces—reduce proposed 30% to 10%.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: In our best practice research, we don't see any other city that allows required bike parking to be provided in-unit. Why don't other cities allow it?
 - Michelle: Portland has embraced bike parking in a different way. There are avid bike riders who have extensive, costly equipment and want more security. Leaving it as an option puts the onus on the developer to keep up their asset.
 - Tom Kilvain: Portland market is unique with big tenants like Big Pink that have their bike parking front and center right in the entryway as part of their brand.
 - *Commissioner Spevak*: Often people put bikes in units because of fear of theft. This is partly a management problem. Is that more of an obstacle to utilization of bike rooms?
 - Michelle has not heard that level of security issues of bike rooms in their projects. Similar to office market, users will drive that as well. People will move into buildings based on ability to provide parking or will force management to address parking.
15. Tom Kilvain: Member of stakeholder advisory committee, daily bike commuter, manages Urban Renaissance Group Portland office. Fully supports goals identified by committee and the majority of the committee recommendations. The proposal has gone too far in the increase in required bike parking in office buildings—over 500%. In one example it would cost almost a million dollars to meet the new requirements. Not fair to burden today's development projects with mode split projections for 2030. Recommend increasing requirement to double today's. Limit on in-unit allowance is too strict. Need to consider flexibility and additional costs and impact on housing affordability.
 - *Commissioner Bachrach*: Do most office buildings have secure bike parking, is it utilized at a high percentage, and are we seeing increased demand?
 - Tom: Office buildings downtown are seeing an amenities arms race; market pressure is forcing most downtown buildings to add bike parking. Usually secured in fairly big rooms. From anecdotal evidence, there is a lot of unused bike parking downtown in office buildings.
 - *Commissioner Baugh*: Can you design in-unit parking for bikes well?

- Tom: There have been examples of how not to do it. I'm not a residential developer, but there is definitely a way to design an in-unit hanger that works.
 - Michelle: It can be done; limiting it to one location within the unit causes some challenges. Flexibility to make sure the space is allotted and maintained perhaps by designating and maintaining it within the lease are some ways. Sometimes there is additional space in units that are not 100% clear what to do with that could be used.
 - *Commissioner Baugh*: If we lowered the standard, regulatory-wise, for retail space, do you lose out in that arms race somewhere else—do we as a government put the developer at a disadvantage without requirements or is that a market-driven decision?
 - Tom: It is a market-driven provision; buildings currently exceed code requirements by a significant amount.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: Phasing in increases as mode share increases—goal is 25% by 2030 and we have a large stock of buildings that will be here in 2030 that have much less than this. If we don't have new construction meeting the target, aren't we doomed for failure?
 - Tom recommends changing the code in four years.
16. Serenity Eager: In addition to my walker, I ride a semi-recumbent trike as my mobility device. Tracking in mud is an unfortunate reality. Since I use my trike as my mobility device, I rarely park it and get off unless absolutely necessary. Unfortunately, there's not much parking convenient to where I need to get off, so I just don't. Luckily my trike is narrow enough to fit through a standard 32" door; many are not. Standard staples can usually not accommodate trikes. I usually keep my trike parked inside my apartment. My building has a secure bike room with horizontal and vertical parking; unfortunately, it would be far more difficult for me to get my trike out of the bike room and lock my walker there instead. I encourage you today to add more bike parking in buildings and outside of buildings.
- *Chair Schultz*: Do you feel that your unit adequately provides an area for the storage of your bike?
 - Serenity: I trip over it a lot but it's fairly adequate.
 - *Chair Schultz*: Is it within your living area?
 - Serenity: It's within my living room.
17. Emily Guise, Co-Chair of Bike Loud PDX: Speaking on behalf of 400 members. We are a grassroots advocacy group and pleased to see this update. We continue to strongly support project. These are the minimum amounts needed to get us to our mode split goal by 2030. Concerns include in-unit bike parking not being as effective as separate, secure rooms in multifamily buildings. Residents prefer them; see p. 14 of the Proposed Draft for survey results. Affordable housing residents should have at least as much quality bike parking available as market-rate residents. Would like to see the e-bike charging requirement return. E-bikes continue to be important for those with families or cargo.
18. Doug Richardson: I sold my Land Rover 18 months ago and do 80% of my trips by bike. I am a professional photographer and barista; many customers are minimum-wage employees. You want your bike in a place where you see it or feel more secure about it. I live in a new building and I use my bike room half the year when my bike is wet and when it's dry I put it at the end of my bed. I don't go some places in town at night because I don't have safe parking.
19. Michael Harrison, OHSU: Asking staff to do 2 things: 1) In 2013, OHSU created a bike valet under the tram because we wanted to make our employees' bike commute safer and more convenient. It's the largest in North America; we haven't lost one bike. Many users park in South Waterfront and take the tram. South Waterfront is much more convenient for the average biker. The code would not allow the valet count towards our long-term requirements because it isn't covered and it's physically impossible to cover it because of the tram; we would have to move the parking farther away or build unused parking. 2) South Waterfront buildings must provide 110% bike parking plus lockers and showers. Happy to provide lockers and showers but we don't think it makes sense to require an additional 10%.

20. Wade Lang, Vice President and Regional Manager for American Assets Trust. We manage the largest bike parking facility in North America in the Lloyd district. AAT has been very forward-thinking in its development of bicycle parking and used it as a branding for Hassalo on 8th. I am Chair of Go Lloyd; at the same time as a developer, I worked with BOMA and Oregon Smart Growth on code responses; I have ridden my bike in Portland my whole life. We are working on our next phase of development near Hassalo that is 4 blocks. In every design we tried, bike parking was a big component. Allow flexibility for property owners to develop the central bike parking necessary in a way that works for the development; do not restrict where or how it can go.
- *Commissioner Spevak*: Can bike rooms be used effectively with time-of-use fluctuations in a large project with multiple uses?
 - Wade: There is indeed overlap. We have 650 bike parking racks that are used by both residents and office workers at different times of day; at peak we probably have 200 bicycles. We also have bike parking in residential buildings but many residents still use that central space. At our capacity, that hasn't been a concern for us.

Chair Schultz closed oral testimony and noted that the PSC will continue to take written testimony until Friday, January 25, 2019 at 5 p.m.

Commissioner Houck appreciated the thoughtful testimony from everyone.

Questions for Liz and Sarah to follow up on:

Commissioner St Martin: Are there plans to do anything about schools, including existing, not having enough bike parking?

Commissioner Smith: The 110% South Waterfront requirement struck me as interesting because I had asked about target mode splits for different parts of the city and South Waterfront does not have the highest non-auto split goal, so why is it burdened with that requirement?

Commissioner Larsell asked for clarification on standards for low-income housing.

- Liz: The in-unit requirement for affordable housing allows for up to 50% of the required parking to be in-unit for projects with at least 50% of units at 60% median family income (MFI) or below. For projects with 10 units or less with at least 50% of units affordable at 100% MFI or below, 100% of required parking can be in-unit.
- *Commissioner Larsell*: Why?
- Liz: Conversations with the Portland Housing Bureau, Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives, and others included the impact of this code on the cost of projects. These proposals caused the most spatial impacts and potentially a loss of a bedroom in these projects.
- *Commissioner Larsell*: Were you hearing from others advocating for more parking in low-income communities like those from ABC?
- Liz: The testimony reflects a variety in opinions. From a user perspective, we are hearing a need for more parking. We want to balance that with concerns from developers around the impact on costs.

Commissioner Larsell: The Residential Infill Project is going through at the same time; how are you working with that?

- Liz: We are working with our colleagues on that; right now, bike parking requirements apply at 3+ units, and the Residential Infill Project may change the definition of multifamily development to change that number.

Commissioner Larsell: In East Portland, there is a lot of theft, and what I heard is that theft is as much of a deterrent as anything.

Commissioner Baugh: Affordable housing looks at not only housing costs but transportation costs. We could be providing people an alternative that's cheaper than a car. We're thinking about the developer but not the individual being able to afford an apartment if they can reduce their transportation costs. If you look at Seattle right now, people moved from a car to a bike in one day and they're seeing not enough parking spaces around bus stops. It's short-sighted to say that we shouldn't put these requirements in East County, especially if tolling comes. Would like to talk about how PBOT balances tolling.

Commissioner Spevak is interested in incentives for existing buildings to add bike parking. One option is to convert car to bike parking. If any options have been discussed in the past, I'd like to see it. There was a comment about bike parking being provided per bedroom rather than per unit. I encourage family-sized units, but that means more people using bikes. I am also interested in transit areas where people are transitioning between modes. Should be covered with lots of racks available. Is there a type of parking that could be helpful there that we don't have in the code yet?

- *Commissioner Smith:* TriMet has a model that meets our code requirements.

Commissioner Bortolazzo found Michael Harrison's comment about the OHSU valet compelling. May want to look at more ways to create more flexibility around being covered or not.

Commissioner Smith: I got interested in this issue in 2010; we're 9 years into the 20-year plan and we're just now getting around to addressing this issue; there is urgency.

- *Commissioner Bachrach:* The problem I'm hearing is a problem today; zoning code regulations will not address theft, etc. in the short term but only at least 5 years from now. If this is what we're doing, we're not really showing much urgency; I wish we were putting more energy into encouraging retrofits. New development is not going to be affordable to middle-, lower-, or working-class people (unless subsidized), so they will not see the benefit even in 5 years.

Commissioner Smith heard concern about what happens in small-scale developments (10 units or less). Should we have a subcommittee to explore that prior to work session? Proposed *Commissioners Smith, Spevak, and Bachrach.*

- *Commissioner Spevak:* Good idea; willing to be part.
- *Commissioner Bachrach:* Willing to join. Tyler Bump could help staff that.

Friday, February 1, 2019 is the final date for commissioners to submit questions to Sarah and Liz via Julie Ocken. February 12, 2019 is the next work session.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 7:43 p.m.