

Portland Planning Commission

August 8, 2023

Commissioners Present

Wade Lange, Mary-Rain O'Meara, Michael Pouncil, Steph Routh, Erica Thompson

Commissioners Absent

Michael Alexander, Nikesh Patel, Eli Spevak

City Staff

Patricia Diefenderfer, Barry Manning, Ludwig Salzmann; Mauricio Leclerc, Shawn Canny (PBOT)

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

Chair O'Meara called the meeting to order at 12:35 p.m.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Thompson provided an update on the Inclusionary Housing Work Group. This included 10 members from private and non-profit developers and housing experts to look at potential modifications to the IH program... to ensure the program is not deterring or discouraging development of housing and maximizing opportunities. The group concluded with a letter to Council this summer with some suggestions. There was a presentation shared on July 25, which we had shared a link to last meeting. Three geographic zones/areas are highlighted in the [Opportunity Map](#).

[Work group recommendations](#) were around encouraging the expanding the 10-year tax exemption that's applicable to the Central City to development outside the Central City to projects providing housing at the 60% MFI level. Of course there are other things that play into development costs, but the IH program is not a deterrent here. Program administration and design standards are also in the recommendations from the work group. There is a whole [IH Calibration Study website](#) for more details.

Director's Report

Patricia Diefenderfer

- none.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the July 25, 2023 Planning Commission meeting.

Commissioner Routh moved to adopt the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Lange* seconded.

Y5 (Lange, O'Meara, Pouncil, Routh, Thompson). The Consent Agenda was adopted.

Montgomery Park to Hollywood Project

Briefing: Barry Manning, Mauricio Leclerc, Shawn Canny (PBOT)

Presentation

Patricia introduced the item – today’s presentation is purely a briefing to share some of the details of the project, which is part of fulfilling part of a grant. The actual action on the project will come for a hearing later on. We expect this may be a joint Planning Commission and Design Commission meeting.

Barry: The Montgomery Park to Hollywood Transit and Land Use Development Strategy assessed opportunities, costs, feasibility, and interest in high-quality transit investments and transit-supportive land use changes around NW and inner NE Portland.

The two areas of the study are shown on slide 4 – with future transit expansion options highlighted.

This plan is about looking at opportunity for housing and jobs with a big emphasis on equitable development and deriving public benefits from public policy changes and public investments. There are lots of policy considerations, ranging from investments in centers and coordinated land use and transportation investments to the need for industrial land to support industry and provide for middle wage jobs that don’t require a 4-year degree. A major emphasis is on equitable development and how this proposal can help realize public benefits through the value created by public actions.

Quite a bit of community engagement happened through the pandemic, so lots of engagement was done in the early stages of our virtual time. The emphasis was to reach out to under-served communities through CBOs. Some examples are shown on slide 9.

Barry shared alternate development scenarios considered, potential alternative alignments considered, as well as objectives and information about the eastside study area (slides 10-11) and the northwest study area (slides 12-18).

The NW Plan Discussion Draft was released in December 2021. It didn’t propose zoning changes at the time, but it included a new plan district that would apply to development as zoning occurs over time. slide 20.

There were a number of public benefits identified in the Discussion Draft. Lots of the benefits were identified early in the community outreach. Staff is continuing to develop a package of public benefits. Some of these would be achieved through regulatory means (housing/IH; environmental features; affordable commercial), while others would be through a benefits (legal) agreement with key property owners.

The plan’s anticipated refinements and the next steps are shared on slides 26-27.

Shawn shared the Draft Montgomery Park Area Transportation Plan, which has been developed as in tandem with, and a complement of, the MP2H-NW Plan Draft.

The draft Montgomery Park Area Transportation Plan includes recommendations for multimodal transportation design, based on the proposed preferred alignment for the streetcar, as well as based on existing policy, traffic analysis, and public engagement. It considers local streets to regional connectors, and also overviews new street and street standards. It recommends updates to the Transportation system Plan or TSP, with new street classifications for several modes on new and existing streets within the study area. It also overviews potential implementation strategies.

This spring and summer, we've been conducting a new round of community engagement for the project. Since the discussion drafts of MP2H-NW and the Montgomery Park Area Transportation Plan came out in December 2021, we wanted to reintroduce the streetcar element and to get feedback on the project through various means as the project team conducts preliminary engineering, cost estimation, and other analysis and strategy toward the creation of the Locally Preferred Alternative, or LPA. We hope to have an LPA for the streetcar to Montgomery Park to share with the Commission and City Council by the end of this year.

In addition to the Comprehensive Plan, the Transportation System Plan, other citywide modal plans, and the Northwest District Plan, other plans informed the Montgomery Park Area transportation plan. Those include the 2009 Portland streetcar system concept plan, Guild's Lake industrial sanctuary plan, and Northwest in Motion, which is a short-term implementation plan for active transportation improvements in the area. The plan is also coordinated to support development proposed in the privately developed Montgomery Park Master Plan, particularly with concentration on supporting increased multimodal trip demand as that site develops.

The Montgomery Park Area Transportation Plan is organized around connections. It considers multimodal connections within the district, key connections to neighboring areas, and regional connections for broader movement as well. Of course, land use and transit complement each other, and the best transit option to serve Montgomery Park depends on the final proposed land use for the area. The MP2H Northwest District Plan Concept considers land use changes to dense mixed-use and employment on and around the now mostly vacant ESCO site. Through transit alternatives evaluations, the project team decided that streetcar is the best mass transit option to serve Montgomery Park.

Streetcar is the highest capacity transit mode, is a climate-friendly transportation option, and can help reduce drive-alone trips as the area develops. It also has a proven track record of spurring dense, walkable development and affordable housing development. Streetcar riders are more diverse than Portlanders as a whole. And, the streetcar can leverage various potential funding sources toward its development. The proposed streetcar extension alignment is an approximately 1.5 mile extension of the existing NS Line to the Montgomery Park office building along NW 23rd Ave, to a one-way couplet along NW Roosevelt and NW Wilson Streets. The streetcar would operate both north and southbound on NW 23rd Ave, and the couplet construction would be paired with the construction of new multimodal local street connections on Roosevelt and Wilson. The project would also include a complete rebuild of NW 23rd Ave from NW Lovejoy to NW Vaughn, including stormwater and accessibility upgrades. The streetcar would operate off-wire, as well, limiting impacts within the tight right-of-way of NW 23rd Ave and providing additional benefits of lower capital construction costs as well as other benefits.

The streetcar is proposed to run two-ways on NW 23rd Ave in shared general purpose travel lanes, with parking maintained on both sides of the street. Along NW Roosevelt and NW Wilson streets where the streetcar would move on a one-way couplet, parking would be maintained and added along one side of each street. The streetcar would share one general purpose travel lane, and autos would have another general-purpose travel lane in the same direction to help facilitate internal movement as the area develops. These streets would also include protected bike lanes connecting to the broader bicycle network, and new street classifications would require the development of 15-foot-wide sidewalk dedication on both sides of the street.

The draft transportation plan also recommends updates to TSP street classifications for all modes and for street designs in and near the area of greatest expected growth, in order to support the expected trips generated through development in the area. Recommendations for the pedestrian classifications are overviewed on slide 37, with the addition of a large pedestrian district, and the upgrading of key streets to higher priorities for pedestrian movement. These maps and recommended updates have been developed for bike, transit, street design, traffic, and emergency response classifications.

The draft transportation plan also lays out various potential implementation strategies for further exploration. They include the creation of a plan district in the area which can be used for parking ratios and off-street parking restrictions, parking management strategies, the development of a Transportation Demand Management (TDM) program for the area, the exploration of various pilot projects, and the pursuance of federal funding as well as other potential funding sources to help pay for the streetcar extension.

This summer and fall, we'll be working to research and organize for the NEPA (environmental review) process, and make edits to the transportation plan to get it ready for the formal adoption process. We'll also be working on getting to a Locally Preferred Alternative. After that, we plan to work on finalizing local funding commitments, apply for federal funding, and enter formal project development. So construction could begin by 2026, with potential completion in 2028.

Chair O'Meara: Is the NW 23rd limited to street infrastructure?

- Shaw: There is no anticipated need for eminent domain, and limited impacts expected to any private property – predominantly in the ROW.

What do we know about ESCO site in terms of environmental clean-up?

- Barry: Some of the work has occurred via DEQ. We are still looking at what might be remaining to be cleaned up.

Commissioner Thompson: How is the project intended to be funded? Federal and local grant funding and private money? And I'm trying to understand a bit more about the origins of this project and why this sort of improvement is needed in these areas.

- Shawn: Still working on the local funding strategy. FDA Small Starts would ideally fund at least 50%. An LPA could be another component.
- Barry: Both lines were 2 of 4 identified in the Comp Plan as extensions for future study. NW is partially due to the change in the ESCO site, which is a large opportunity area to study.

Hollywood currently has rather good transit, but it is on the map to be served; it's more about how the investment might work on streets already served by transit.

- Patricia: These routes and extensions are in the Comp Plan, so that was the main impetus. It was a partnership with Metro to go after the grant funds, and staff made the case that these two possible extensions were worthy of exploration with opportunity for development in the 20-year time frame.

Commissioner Pouncil: Can you explain what wealth-building communities means? Can we be sure wealthy are not purchasing some of the affordable to give younger Portlanders an opportunity? I'm also interested in the designation of York and how that might be made prominent and give people a way to understand the history a bit more.

- Barry: The type of transit investment plus zoning changes can result in property value increases. We are looking at establishing a fund to help provide downpayments for low-income communities. The work around commemoration of York is still underway; work with the community as we think about the design of buildings and public infrastructure.

Commissioner Lange: I have been on the Streetcar Board for a number of years and continue to serve on that. Will the Montgomery Park Master Plan come to us?

- Barry: That is a proprietary plan, but their zoning in EX, so it allows a full range of uses. So they have zoning that facilitates housing on a majority of their area.

Commissioner Routh: I want to underscore *Commissioner Thompson's* comments and support her questions about prioritization.

Training: Chapter 8: Public Facilities & Services

Briefing: Barry Manning, Ludwig Salzmann

Presentation

Today we are providing an overview of Comp Plan Chapter 8: Public Facilities and Services. This Chapter emphasizes/speaks to the relationship of the plan to infrastructure essential to operation of the city. But it also provides policy guidance on the relationship of planning and other key urban services that may not traditionally be thought of as "infrastructure."

Ludwig: The City of Portland owns and maintains numerous facilities, including water pipes and reservoirs; stormwater swales and sewers; parks, streets and trails. These are basic systems needed to protect the health, safety and well-being of Portland households and businesses. In addition, services such as access to broadband technology, electricity and natural gas, and comprehensive waste, recycling, and composting services are essential for households and businesses.

It takes the collective and coordinated effort of multiple agencies and regulated utilities to maintain and operate the complex systems used to manage and provide these necessities to Portlanders.) (The chapter guides the City's intent on levels of service, equitable service, management to improve

reliability and resilience and describe on how to coordinate and properly consider infrastructure and public facilities in planning and land use deliberations and decisions.

The city expected to grow by 260,000 people and 123,000 new households by 2035. Despite the Comp Plan states to ‘maintaining existing infrastructure’ truly: the City will need to maintain, upgrade and expand existing transportation, parks, water, sewer, stormwater and public safety systems to make sure they meet the needs of current and new residents and businesses.

Next to Chapter 8 (and Chapter 9 what you heard about already from PBOT), the List of Significant Projects and the Citywide Systems Plan are two elements that directly relate to infrastructure:

- The List of Significant Projects includes the City’s planned infrastructure projects for the life of the Comprehensive Plan. These investments are necessary to meet the transportation, sewer, stormwater and water needs of Portland’s current and future residents and businesses.
- The Citywide Systems Plan guides infrastructure investments to address deficiencies, maintenance needs and safety risks. It includes the state mandated public facilities plan to provide public facilities to serve a growing population.

We must consider the three layers (maintenance, deficiencies, and growth) in our infrastructure planning:

- System maintenance – Take care of existing infrastructure so it can continue to meet community needs and work efficiently.
- System deficiencies – Determine where systems do not meet basic levels or needs, and analyzing who is and is not being served. It is also about meeting state and federal requirements.
- Future needs – Assess which facilities need to be upgraded or replaced to avoid major problems or to meet growing demand.

Centers and corridors vary in terms of their current and expected future size, character, and demographic makeup. They also vary on how prepared they are, in terms of physical infrastructure and facilities, to be able to succeed as anchors to healthy connected neighborhoods. The Comprehensive Plan supports four investment strategies that tailor the type of investment to the expected population of the area, infrastructure needs, and presence of people who might be vulnerable to displacement. The figure on slide 8 shows how designated centers vary according to these factors. The combination of these factors plays out in four different investment strategies.

1. This strategy is appropriate for places that are not expected to grow significantly, but that have existing infrastructure deficiencies. Investments could fill gaps in streets, bicycle and pedestrian routes, and create local parks. Economic development programs could support existing and new businesses and improve neighborhood prosperity and vitality.
2. This strategy is aimed at places that lack basic infrastructure or services and that have many residents now, or will in the future. Investments could include improving streets, creating new parks, and addressing other deficiencies. Economic development programs could preserve and increase jobs, businesses and community services in the area.
3. In these areas, investments focus on maintaining livability and existing infrastructure as well as responding to opportunities.

4. Some places have already benefited from public and private investments in things like light rail, complete streets and neighborhood business districts. Future investments should focus on making sure that infrastructure can serve new residents by filling remaining service gaps and providing affordable housing.

Barry highlighted the intent of Chapter 8 (slide 10). This Chapter addresses traditional “infrastructure” but covers a much broader range of services and facilities that are not hard infrastructure.

These are the policy topic areas of Chapter 8. There are also area 13 Goals related to Chapter 8 that set direction for these policies. We will walk through the policies at a high level to inform you about them. The City provides many services, but some key services are provided by non-city partners and agencies.

Service Provision and Urbanization policies support the maintenance of an urban services boundary to coordinate planning and provision of public facilities, including to areas that are not currently in the City. Policies also identify which urban facilities and services are and will be provided by the City of Portland within this boundary (policies 8.1-8.5).

Service Coordination – Portland is the primary provider of many urban facilities and services within city limits, but other public and private agencies also provide public facilities and services. Policies identify other public facility providers and encourage planning and service coordination — both within the city boundaries and between the City and partner agencies — to meet the needs of people and businesses (policies 8.6-8.10).

Service Extension – Policies in this section outline the City’s approach towards annexation and service extension to newly-incorporated areas (policies 8.11-8.19).

While the City of Portland is the primary provider of many urban facilities and services within city limits, other public and private agencies also provide public facilities and services. The City has a responsibility for, and an interest in, the planning, coordination, provision, and, in some cases, regulation of these facilities and services. The policies identify other public facility providers and encourage planning and service coordination — both within the city boundaries and between the City and partner agencies — to meet the needs of people and businesses.

Ludwig: Public Investment (policies 8.20-8.26) guide the City to provide levels-of-service to meet the needs of residents and businesses now and also in the future. Policy 8.21 System Capacity, e.g., is considered to provide services at levels appropriate to land use patterns, density and anticipated growth. Policy 8.22 directly refers to the investment framework and the four investments strategies for the City (reference to diagram ‘Investment Strategies for Complete Centers’).

Funding – policies 8.27-8.30. The City’s investments are funded through a variety of mechanisms, including taxes, user rates and fees, system development charges, and partnerships. The policies in this section acknowledge and support cost-effective service provision, maintenance of diverse funding streams to support the public’s investments, and equitable sharing of the costs of investing in and maintaining the City’s public facilities. Policy 8.29 System development, require private or public entities whose development contributes to the need for facility improvement, or extension to bear a proportional share of cost.

Policies 8.31-8.38 (public benefits) support investments to improve equity, economic prosperity, human and watershed health, and resiliency while minimizing negative impacts. They also recognize that the public facility and service needs, and the appropriate approaches to meeting those needs, vary throughout the city.

Public right-of-way policies 8.39-8.44 support the role of public rights-of-way in providing multiple public services, including multimodal transportation access and movement, stormwater management, water distribution, private utilities, tree canopy, and community use, among others. Current practices and the Portland Plan regard public rights-of-way as a coordinated and interconnected network that provides a place for these multiple public facilities and functions.

Trails – the City of Portland’s trail system is a key part of both the City’s multi-modal transportation system and its recreation system. Trails within this system take many different forms and are located within the right-of-way and on public and private property. Trails provide Portlanders with local and regional pedestrian and bicycle connections and access to many key destinations within the city. They also provide a place to recreate and allow Portlanders to experience the city’s parks and natural areas. Trails play a particularly important role in meeting pedestrian and bicyclist mobility and connectivity needs in western neighborhoods. The policies in this section (8.53-8.60) support continued improvement, management, and coordination of the trail system.

The City manages sanitary sewage through an extensive piped collection and treatment system, including two wastewater treatment plants that discharge to the Columbia and Willamette rivers. Stormwater is managed and conveyed through a variety of facilities, including pipes, sumps, surface facilities, and natural drainageways. Private property investments and public-private partnerships also play key roles in the management of stormwater (policies 8.61-8.75).

Water systems – Reliable service and high-quality water is essential for all for us. The 11 policies in this section are intended to protect the quality of the water supply while delivering clean drinking water and meeting user needs (policies 8.81-8.91).

Parks – The City of Portland manages more than 11,000 acres of developed parks and natural areas, as well as local and regional trails, the urban tree canopy, and the City of Portland’s community gardens. It offers thousands of programs for people of all ages at its community centers, swimming pools, and other recreational facilities (policies 8.92-8.103).

Public safety and emergency response policies reflect the variety of public safety and emergency response services provided by the City that must be maintained and enhanced as the city grows, including police, fire and rescue, emergency communications, and emergency management (policies 8.104-8.111).

Solid Waste Management (policy 8.112). Solid waste, composting, and recycling facilities and services are regulated and provided through a partnership between the City of Portland, Metro, franchised haulers and private companies. The policy supports sustainable waste reduction, recovery, and management, and the use and reuse of materials prior to disposal.

School Facilities (policies 8.113-8.122). Public education is provided by six public school districts, as well as by colleges and universities. The City partners with school districts on school facility planning and siting. By encouraging school facilities to be multi-functional neighborhood anchors, designed and programmed to serve community members of all generations and abilities, these policies also help implement the concept of Portland as an age-friendly city.

Private utilities and companies are the primary providers of technology and communication facilities and services to the general public. The City also provides services to support City and partner agency service delivery. The policies encourage innovation in emerging technologies and systems that have the potential to make Portland a cleaner, safer, and more efficient, resilient, and affordable city (policies 8.123-8.123).

Energy infrastructure (policies 8.125-8.126). Energy facilities and services are primarily provided by private utilities and companies. The City of Portland promotes efficient, sustainable, and resilient energy resources, production, distribution, and consumption. The policies relate to energy infrastructure and support Oregon's Statewide Planning Goal 13 – Energy Conservation, which includes planning guidelines for renewable energy sources. They ensure that as the City makes land use decisions, it removes barriers to promoting efficient and sustainable energy practices.

The Citywide Systems Plan is a 20-year, coordinated municipal infrastructure plan which guides infrastructure investments to address deficiencies, maintenance needs and safety risks. Part of the CSP also functions as the state mandated public facilities plan to provide public facilities to serve a growing population. The State of Oregon requires cities to develop and implement a public facilities plans (Planning Goal 11: Public Facilities and Oregon Revised Statute 197). Ludwig highlighted the CSP and where it fits both within the Comp Plan and the Citywide System Plan.

- The State requires a Public Facilities Plan – we call it CSP because it is larger and more comprehensive than what the state requires. In other words, part of the CSP serves as the mandated Public Facilities Plan.
- The Comp Plan's guiding principles as well as Chapter 8 and 9 are also part of the CSP.
- The CSP's Appendix A 'Investment Strategy' is a list of identified projects to meet the cities maintenance, system deficiency and future needs. A subset of those identified projects becomes the 'List of Significant Projects' which is an element of the Comprehensive Plan

Key Chapter 8 take-aways:

- Infrastructure and other services
- City and other providers
- Coordination with multiple agencies
- Maintenance, deficiencies, and growth
- Consider as part of planning process

Commissioner Routh: How in something like Powell Blvd does one decided in planning which priority wins?

- Barry: You will soon have a conversation about balancing policies, but I don't have a full response today.

- Patricia: Therein lies the work we do. We will bring a couple of plans as examples of trade-offs in our decision making and how we evaluate this into a recommendation we bring to Planning Commission.

Commissioner Thompson: On prioritization re: MP2H, it was interesting in the chart about relative need and population that of all the neighborhoods, NW has the lowest need, but many east neighborhoods have high need and high population. So does the Comp Plan address how to prioritize different projects? The request is if it isn't too much work, if we can have a brief presentation about the work plans at BPS and PBOT for the next couple of years that related to the significant projects that are/will move forward, that would be good context.

- Patricia: We will try to come back with more information. Prioritization is dealt with in a few different ways. There is some guidance throughout the Comp Plan including the equity lens. Opportunities may be created by external sources as well. A combination of things informs land use and transportation projects, including funding considerations. We are also thinking a lot about the notion that advancing equity policies doesn't only mean we do plans and improvements in areas where there are deficiencies or lower-income folks. It's about creating opportunity for all people to live in all areas of the city as well.

Adjourn

Chair O'Meara adjourned the meeting at 2:57 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken