

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, July 24, 2012

6:00-9:15pm

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman (arrived 6:15pm), Michelle Rudd, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

Commissioners Absent: Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Lai-Lani Ovalles, [one open position]

BPS Staff Present: Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner; Roberta Jortner, Sr Environmental Planner; Jay Sugnet, City Planner II; Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator

Other City Staff Present: Christine Leon, PBOT; Jane Bacchieri, BES; Rachel Whiteside, BDS; Denver Igarta, PBOT

Metro representatives: Councilor Rex Burkholder; Tim O'Brien; Kim Ellis

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 6:03pm and provided an overview of the agenda.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- The West Hayden Island project schedule for the PSC has been updated: 08/14 is a briefing on the updated draft of zoning and IGA; 10/09 is the initial hearing; 10/23 is a continued hearing if necessary and recommendation.
- PSC members received the new Portland Plan handout - a 4-page summary: this is the PP in its "highlight form" with brief talking points about what's included in the full plan.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of [Minutes from 07/10/12 PSC meeting](#)

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda. *Commissioner Smith* moved to approve the minutes. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.
(Y7 – Baugh, Gray, Houck, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

Metro Title 13 Compliance

Hearing / Recommendation: Roberta Jortner

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5057338/view/>

Documents:

- [Memo](#)
- [Title 13 Report](#)
- [Appendix A](#)
- [Appendix B](#)
- [Title 13 FAQ](#)

Roberta provided an overview of Title 13 of Metro's Urban Growth Management Functional Plan, which establishes minimum region-wide requirements to protect, conserve and restore designated Habitat Conservation areas (HCAs).

The HCAs are regionally significant resources within riparian corridors, including rivers, streams, flood areas, and wetlands, and the land and vegetation adjacent to these water bodies.

HCAs also contain wildlife habitat areas, including areas that support rare or declining habitat types, plant and wildlife species. HCAs provide a number of benefits and services.

Metro adopted Title 13 in 2005. The adopted package includes a regional natural resource inventory and Economic, Social, Environment and Energy (ESEE) Analysis, the Habitat Conservation Area map, and the provisions of Title 13.

Title 13 requires cities and counties to establish regulations or other tools to prevent adverse impacts on the HCAs, and that require mitigation where impacts can't be avoided. Most HCAs in Portland are High or Moderate. Title 13 is flexible, allowing cities and counties to comply using combinations of regulatory, non-regulatory, jurisdiction-wide and area-specific programs.

The original date for compliance was 2009. Portland received an extension twice. During this period the City completed the Natural Resource Inventory update, the Airport Futures Project, Citywide Tree Project and the Invasive Plant Project. These efforts will improve our information base, extend resource protection and mitigation to hundreds of acres, enhance the urban forest, and prevent the spread of invasive plants.

The Portland Plan will provide strategic direction to improve watershed health and sets the stage for updating the Comprehensive Plan.

The City's compliance package includes the updated Natural Resource Inventory, Zoning Regulations, Non-Zoning Regulations, and Non-regulatory Programs.

The PSC has endorsed the Natural Resources Inventory update which is based on the Title 13 NRI. It has been updated using higher resolution data and reflects additional studies, field work, technical review, and vetting through the River Plan/North Reach, Airport Futures, and the Portland Plan.

Zoning regulations include overlay zones, plan districts, natural resource management plans and the land division code. The Environmental, Greenway, Scenic Resource, and Pleasant Valley Natural Resource overlay zones, combined, form the foundation for the Title 13 compliance package. These overlay zones apply to most of the Title 13 Habitat Conservation Areas, preventing or reducing adverse impacts on natural resources and requiring mitigation for unavoidable impacts. Plan Districts apply additional protection for natural resources in environmentally sensitive areas.

Non-zoning regulations include the Stormwater Management Manual, Drainage Reserve Rule, Erosion Control Manual, Tree Codes, the Invasive Plant Required Eradication List, and the Illicit Discharge and Spill Response Programs. These rules help protect natural resources, improve the urban forest, prevent the spread of invasive plants, and prevent pollution of soil and waterways.

In addition to requiring protection, Title 13 also requires cities and counties to remove code barriers "habitat friendly development" including approaches to reduce impervious area and provide safe fish and wildlife passage. City codes and technical manuals allow, encourage or require most of the practices outlined in Title 13. The City is also pursuing habitat friendly development through projects such as this culvert replacement to allow fish passage on Crystal Springs, and our new voluntary resource guide for bird-friendly building design.

Non-regulatory programs are implemented primarily by the Bureau of Environmental Services and Portland Parks and Recreation. These programs focus on protection, such as willing seller land acquisition, resource management and restoration, such as Protect the Best and the Watershed Revegetation Program, green infrastructure, such as Green Streets and the Portland Ecoroof Program, watershed projects, such as confluence restoration and Tabor to the River, and education and stewardship, such as Neighborhood Tree Stewards and the Tree Inventory Project.

The City is also committed to tracking watershed conditions and the effectiveness of our efforts. The new PAWMAP program establishes coordinated monitoring across Portland's watersheds, allowing the City to track trends and prioritize future investments.

To make it clear that Portland's efforts to sustain healthy watersheds will continue post-compliance with Title 13, the City proposes to document its intent to continue key projects and programs through a 10-year intergovernmental agreement (IGA) with Metro. The IGA would state the City's intent to:

- Continue multi-objective planning efforts that address watershed health; and
- Seek funding to continue ongoing watershed programs.

The IGA would also state the City's and Metro's intent to collaborate on key issues of regional concern, such as how to meet local and regional goals for a healthy economy, jobs, and healthy watersheds.

The IGA addresses some key issues raised in testimony so far, especially references to future planning work in the Columbia Corridor.

The [draft IGA](#) was provided to commissioners.

Jane Bacchieri, Watershed Services Manager, spoke about BES' role and support for Title 13 compliance. BES is focused on protecting and improving environmental health; the watershed health efforts align with Title 13. Green infrastructure can be more efficient than updating or replacing old infrastructure. Many efforts were accelerated by the Grey to Green initiative. BES is planning for further stream enhancement efforts that will advance the intent of Title 13 and help the City meet other goals and compliance obligations. An ongoing challenge is that work depends on utility rates, which creates an uncertainty on funding. However BES is committed to continue this work and also to assist with the Comp Plan update in a variety of realms. BES supports the proposed IGA between Metro and the City.

Tim O'Brien, Metro Planning, provided support for the City's compliance efforts and the proposed IGA. Tim acknowledged that Portland was able to complete a number of projects that support Title 13 during the two extension periods. He emphasized that Metro takes a comprehensive approach to determining substantial compliance based on overall program implementation, not a numbers game. The City's protection programs cover a wide array of areas, aligning with many of the actions Metro is doing too. Portland is the most comprehensive of any of the cities in the Metro jurisdiction. Metro hopes to continue to work closely with City staff, including the IGA to continue the work together.

Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder noted he's been working on this issue for a number of years. This determination of compliance takes place at the staff level, but Metro Council is intensely interested in Portland's compliance completion with the recognition that regional items still need to be addressed and continued. This is a regional issue, and Metro hopes to help coordinate the work of Portland and the other jurisdictions around Title 13 to make sure efforts complement Portland's work. Portland goes above and beyond what was originally envisioned with Title 13. He urged the PSC to support the work and IGA.

Commissioner Houck noted the number of years there have been in the process of creating Title 13. There has been some agitation due to the long timeline; some wanted it to be more regulatory, but ultimately it is more voluntary. It is important to recognize that much is voluntary and we're looking forward to the IGA to make sure the other programs are included.

Testimony:

- Linda Bauer highlighted notes and images in the written testimony provided including a BDS e-mail exchange about the building, showing the impervious surface. Code states that "no more than 50% can be built as impervious surface", but this site plan doesn't comply, though it was reviewed and approved by BDS. The property next to it is in the compliance case for the same reasons. The rules are great, but they are not being enforced.
- Bonny McKnight lives in east Portland. Her written comments discussed the Columbia River including the slough watershed. She asked to expand the scope of notice to neighborhood associations and coalitions because issues around development in habitat areas have changed. Industry and environment do not need to be adversaries. Transition planning with a definition of how we'll maintain our progress, we risk funding and continuation issues. Economic development includes educating people to where the jobs are.

Commissioner Houck thanked Ms McKnight for bringing up the important issue of the economic contribution of natural resources to the city's economy and potential for job creation. He noted the huge potential for the city and Metro to work with PSU regarding ecosystem services - the economic value of natural resources. In the IGA, there could be more attention to ecosystem services and green infrastructure. There is lots of data out there that has not yet been "packaged". We hope to talk beyond industrial land and incorporate the economic value of natural resources, parks, and natural areas into the city's Comprehensive Plan process, including the Economic Development PEG.

- Corky Collier, Columbia Corridor Association helped draft Nature in Neighborhoods (Title 13). He's pleased with the improvements to slough in past years. CCA supports Portland's compliance but questions the need for an IGA - the projects outlined are ones the City is committed to, but money and resources are missing. We should focus the financial resources on more implementation of work rather than on the IGA.
- Bob Sallinger, Audubon: The PSC needs to look at the request for the original extension, including the 7 items the City noted they need to do to be in compliance. Those 7 items are correct; if we don't do these well, the peripheral things won't matter. We have not been successful on many of these things, even though staff has worked diligently on them (1. Natural Resource Update and Adoption; 2. Baseline standards to protect Title 13 Habitat Conservation Areas; 3. River Plan; 4. Airport Futures; 5. Hayden Island; Citywide Tree Project; 7. Portland Plan). If the PSC declares success, we won't go back to these items to complete them. Most impediments are a conflict between Goal 5 and Goal 9 - so it will be more difficult to talk about how to protect the environment and the economy. We are not in compliance due to these issues, but if PSC approves and forwards a recommendation to Council, we also need a specific IGA with timelines and outcomes.
- Mary Ann Schwab noted a missing piece. We are losing fresh water in exchange for plumbed water from the Columbia River. The salmon jobs we have are numbered; if we lower the fish count, we lower the number of jobs available. We need the IGA to be strong and enforceable. We have not been good keepers to the land under the river, and we need to work together to restore and protect the river.

Written Testimony:

- Bonny McKnight, Chair and Land Use Chair - Russell Neighborhood Association and Coordinator, Citywide Land Use Group
- Maryhelen Kincaid, Land Use chair, East Columbia Neighborhood
- Martha Perez and Russell Anderson
- Linda Bauer
- Bob Sallinger, Audubon

Chair Baugh closed public testimony.

Discussion:

Roberta noted the challenge with the IGA is to balance the level of specificity with flexibility, and to not pre-suppose outcomes of the public process. The IGA should specify the work that needs to be completed and programs to continue, not how we'll meet the policy goals. The purpose is to be transparent regarding the things will continue to move forward in the future. From the testimony there are additional opportunities for Portland, Metro and other jurisdictions to continue working together, potentially adding to the list of items to be addressed in the Comp Plan update such as ecosystem services and coordinating research on ecological design options. Discussions are starting in some of the Comp Plan Policy Expert Groups (PEGs).

Joe Zehnder noted that today's meeting is to confirm that Portland is in substantial compliance with Title 13. We have gone beyond what is required; and when you look at the actions as part of the Comp Plan background work forwarded by the PSC to Council, things are moving forward and are in motion about Hayden Island, the Tree Project, etc. The funding issues can't be addressed in a legislative fashion, but we are continuing to push for continuing this work. In terms of revisiting aspects of work done in Airport Futures this could happen through a future Columbia Corridor Plan that will development and ecosystem services/functions in the corridor. In the IGA, we are making a commitment to do the best we can to get the work going in the timeline of the IGA (10 years). With the Comp Plan, we are adopting the NRI.

Commissioner Houck agreed that the City is in substantial compliance, and stated that Portland is going above and beyond Title 13 requirements. An IGA is essential to demonstrate the will to go forward. We are now putting natural resources and industrial lands on equal footing, and the IGA is necessary to continue this work. Ten years is a reasonable time period for the IGA.

Commissioner Smith noted the PSC is not an enforcement body, but in the past the City didn't do a good job with enforcement. Regarding development items, who gets noticed today?

- Rachel Whiteside, BDS, confirmed that there are notices for standards tract and a 500' notice for discretionary reviews under the current environmental zone issues. Notices go to Neighborhood Association chairs and the Neighborhood Coalition. Surrounding property owners within 100-150' of the site also receive notice. Non-discretionary development gets posted on the site, on the BDS website and e-mailed to neighborhood reps.

What is the process for fleshing out the IGA? Will PSC see it before it goes to Council?

- The formal IGS still needs to be drafted, reviewed by City lawyers and reviewed by Metro and their attorneys. It can come back to the PSC for review. Staff will include a tentative schedule, knowing full timeline commitments will depend on funding.

The IGA will be reviewed by the PSC, specifically with input about which projects to include before it goes to Council. Projects listed in the [memo from Susan Anderson](#) will be the focus of the IGA. These preliminary listed projects are ones Metro would collaborate with the City.

Of note, there will be a long list of priorities coming out of the Comp Plan, so we don't want to make promises about projects.

Commissioner Shapiro moved to:

1. Recommend that City Council approve the request for determination of substantial compliance with Metro Title 13.
2. Direct staff to work with Metro to draft an Intergovernmental Agreement (IGA) the stating intent to continue efforts post-Title 13 compliance. The IGA will be reviewed by the PSC before going to Council.

Commissioner Houck seconded.

Chair Baugh restated the motion, and the motion passed.
(Y7 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

Street by Street Project

Briefing: Christine Leon, PBOT; Denver Igarta, PBOT

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5057336/view/>

No two streets are alike - they vary in texture, size and speed. However, there are City standards that say when the streets develop, there should be a standard to which they're designed. Due to differences in the timing of annexation of different parts of the city, there are many areas (neighborhood streets) that do not currently meet City standards as written.

There are about 45 miles of unimproved streets. We need to review the standards, especially because current standards are too expensive for most. When we have infill, why should we just improve one segment of the street when it will take years for the rest of the street to improve?

The goals of the Street by Street initiative include:

1. affordable options
2. improving more than just one section of a roadway
3. maintaining safe and slow streets through neighborhoods

Why Street by Street?

- Policies say we can allow something new "in the interim".
- There is little data on local streets.
- One-size-fits-all (today's standard) is not working.
- Standards have not developed, and streets are not getting improved.

Street by Street focuses on the classification of Neighborhood Streets - those focused on access in single-family zones. The City needs to better explain standards, maintenance requirements and share information with the public to help them understand the requirements.

Performance-based streets (flexible streets) look at functionality of streets and context. Looking to keep costs low, so doing process via maps and making decisions to not build as they come in. Standardize some of the processes to make it easier for the public to understand.

Today's standard, high-performance street costs about \$1500 per linear foot. For a 50' home frontage, this is about \$70k, which is unaffordable for most people.

The stormwater management manual relies on an integrated street approach, which works best on a full street development. It doesn't necessarily work most effectively or efficiently for infill, when parcels of land and road are developed but not full streets, nor where stormwater cannot infiltrate into the soils.

Portland has 1000 miles of local streets in single-family residential zones. 5% are unpaved and 17% are without a curb or sidewalk. Of the total city streets, 73% of the unpaved ones are classified as local streets.

Linnton, Cully, SW, Woodstock, and outer NE/SE have the most unpaved streets. There are 3 areas for stormwater management, so this is another reason why the one-size-fits-all doesn't work very well.

Objectives of Street by Street include:

- Performance-based neighborhood streets
- Inform program through stakeholder input
- Fundamental Building Blocks Concepts and Design
- Clear Construction Options
- Clear Maintenance Options
- Pilot Program & Projects
- Optional developer fee in lieu of performance and associated Street Improvement Fund.
- On line tool to guide the community
- City Program and Implement/Deliver; Change and Train

Pilot programs and projects, including in Cully, have been proposed to test an alternative street design.

Staff started looking for solutions with an analysis. There are 3 realms of the street; staff looked at what we need for mobility, durability, and safety and comfort and what are the bare minimum cross sections and materials relative to:

- Moving vehicle realm - (16' queuing)
- Parking realm - (7')
- Walkway realm - 16' current standard

A minimum width travel way section (16 ft wide) with a separated walkway on one side and stormwater draining into the soil was the most basic.

This works in areas where the sub-grade allows stormwater to drain. There is an addition to this most basic cross section of an integrated stormwater system for areas such as SW where the soil don't drain as readily. Responding to a question on the cost, curbs are similar in cost of sidewalks due to the detailed design and engineering needed.

Commissioner Smith noted these Local Streets are for people. They are not through-streets, so could we envision a 10' permeable paver area (where you'd be allowed to drive, but at very low speeds) that could work for people who are walking, rolling, etc... so we put cars at the bottom of the hierarchy?

- A shared street, where there is low volume and low speed, can be one where we can prioritize the rolling, strolling, playing, biking, etc realm. The costs have come down for an LID with the shared street to \$300 per linear foot (with no buy ups; no public stormwater; still lots of assumptions). 20 MPH is what the legislature approved to sign streets, so they can be designed and operated at that speed. Staff can review if there are options to lower speeds below the 20 MPH mark.

There are also options to do with the excess right-of-way and the vehicle realm that are creative and useful.

When a street has a transit classification, the variable street is not an option... this initiative is just for the Local Streets that meet its criteria. If there is a local gravel street that meets

criteria and is on a route between, for example, a school and a park, that is a compelling reason to put sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Traffic calming techniques and new stormwater management options are being considered for the streets. The streets we are considering to be property-owner maintained, not City maintained.

Want to mainstream the alternatives consideration; update website with more information about options. Staff is looking at developer optional fees as well, so that if the developer is not required to build a high performance street with new development:

- Fee is seed money
- Credit transfers with the property
- For future street construction
- Fee based either on (still developing):
 - (A) High Performance Street (HPS)
 - (B) Base Street Configuration
 - 1. Lean Shared Street + ISW
 - 2. Lean Street + Separated Walkway + ISW
- Administrative Fee (preliminary)
- Credit for improved length off site

The proposal is that the City will determine what the alternative street looks like. There is consideration for developer's basis to appeal the standard street improvements today that could be transferred to the performance-based street as well.

Some of these tools could ultimately be transferrable to higher levels of street classifications.

There are still many details to review and resolve with the concept, but it's headed in the right direction, and the project is working in concert with Comp Plan and TSP Updates.

In the Portland Plan, sidewalks are a priority. Also, when we look at buildable lands for housing, they are mostly in East County. If the City isn't going to maintain the streets, there is an equity issue - are we building in a sub-standard device that has no potential to upgrade in the future? PBOT needs to monitor where these streets are being built so there is not an over-concentration in certain areas of the city. The streets need to be attractive and engage the community to participate on the street. These need to be seen as an enhancement of value, not just a lower-cost option that's easier to implement.

Staff noted there is a City Council worksession scheduled on August 28 at 9:30am. PSC members are invited to attend this session.

Metro's Climate Smart Communities Scenarios Project

Briefing: Metro - Councilor Rex Burkholder; Kim Ellis

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5057333/view/>

Documents:

- [Fact Sheet](#)
- [Scenarios](#)
- [Findings and Toolbox](#)

Metro Councilor Rex Burkholder, noting Commissioner Houck's longstanding interest in Metro addressing Climate Adaptation, noted that what is before the PSC addresses Climate Change mitigation, not adaptation. There is ongoing work on Climate Adaptation and Metro will be

working to determine how mitigation and adaptation strategies can be integrated. This project is addressing the State requirement to reduce emissions from cars and small trucks in Metro area by 20% by 2035. Metro will be developing and evaluating three scenario options in the coming year, building on the lessons learned from the first phase of the project. The region is expected to implement the preferred scenario through local and regional plans.

Metro has identified transportation and land use strategies, which are some of the same strategies that can reduce GHG emissions. The focus is on efforts to support community goals to create a thriving region. There are numerous opportunities for partnerships, and where Metro can provide technical assistance, are keys.

This project focuses specifically on climate change mitigation; Metro will continue to work on adaptation as well through other efforts.

In January 2012, Metro council accepted the findings of from Phase 1 of the process. We are now in phase 2 of the process, which is reviewing the choices to shape three scenarios that will be tested next year. The process is scheduled to conclude in December 2014 with the selection of the preferred scenario; implementation will begin in early 2015.

The project is building toward 6 desired outcomes:

- Vibrant communities
- Equity
- Economic prosperity
- Transportation choices
- Clean air and water
- Climate leadership

The 2040 growth concept map is a regional strategy to address and manage growth, implemented with local approaches throughout the region. Since 1995, a lot of planning work at the community level has been done to help achieve a regional growth strategy in a way that supports local community goals and visions.

More than 20 different strategies were tested in Phase 1 in 144 different scenarios that included different combinations of:

- Cleaner fuels and vehicles;
- Community design and roads; and
- Education, marketing and pricing.

The current plans plus cleaner fuels and vehicles get us close to meeting target. The analysis showed that this would get to 1.3 metric tons per capita under this strategy combination - just short of the 1.2 MT CO₂e target. The Metro target applies to all roadway emissions from light vehicles, including emissions generated inside the UGB, emissions generated by vehicles driving through our region and emissions that come from trips generated from outside the region to a destination within the region.

The most effective strategies from Phase 1 included: cleaner fuels and more efficient vehicles; shifts to more fuel efficient and zero emission modes; increased transit; use of market signals (pricing) to promote and support desired changes.

The purpose of Phase 2 is now to define 2-3 scenario options to evaluate in detail and create a scorecard to evaluate the options.

This scenario planning:

- Show potential futures;
- Combine a variety of strategies and actions;

- Compare choices and consequences;
- Inform strategies to optimize outcomes; and
- Allow discovery of new strategies.

Metro will work with local staff to confirm that the individual community assumptions reflect what's already adopted. Metro also will develop case studies to better illustrate how applying strategies may change places (e.g. in the Rockwood area, Gresham is updating there Rockwood Plan, where these strategies can be tested and ground-truthed).

A number of planning projects in the region are other sources for the scenarios that will be developed.

The scorecard will evaluate the 6 desired outcomes with specific measures to evaluate in the process. The goal is to give policy makers a tool to evaluate what priority outcomes/results are happening and how to communicate to the public.

Commissioner Houck asked if there would be a comparable scorecard associated with upcoming work on Climate Adaptation. Metro Councilor Burkholder responded that he did not know whether there would be a separate score card for Climate Adaptation strategies and noted that Metro did not want to duplicate other efforts such as Greater Portland Pulse indicators.

Next step discussions include:

- What is the right mix of local and regional policies, combined with state and federal actions, to meet state targets?
- What outcomes are most important to measure how well the scenarios meet our shared desired outcomes?

In September, Metro will report the results of the scorecard community engagement; more formal discussions about what should be included in scenario options will be asked via an OptIn survey in late fall. Metro will then convene a summit in winter 2013 to share and discuss results.

Commissioner Valdez noted her concern about being equitable in looking at transportation. Those in transit-heavy and in walkable neighborhoods need to be tested as well as those far from transit opportunities. It is also important to ensure that the result of this effort not further burden the region's most vulnerable populations.

- The vision of the region - which is already adopted - is to make every community a complete community. The scenarios will show us if it is enough to show if these options reduce people's reliance on cars and reducing GHG. This also relates to forwarding a low-carbon economy.

Commissioner Valdez expressed interest in receiving a presentation on the Oregon Strategy Transportation Strategy.

Commissioner Smith noted the importance of making sure implementation tools are aligned (e.g. low parking ratios and increase mixed-use density being implemented on frequent transit routes, but transit service is being scaled back and neighborhoods are experiencing parking spillover). Metro can be a repository for best practices to share throughout the region.

A key part of this effort is figuring out how we address the lack of funding at TriMet. The service level is about 10 years behind what Metro had projected regarding the amount of service available in the system (but ridership is still up). Portland can take a lead role to say we need the region to have the development patterns like those in the city that are efficient for providing transit options that aren't cost-burdensome. We need to grow together as a region and Portland's leadership can encourage this.

Barbur Concept Plan

****This briefing will be held over until the August 14 PSC meeting.**

Historic Resources Code Improvement Project

Briefing: Jay Sugnet

Document: [Project Scope](#)

This is a quick 8-month legislative process with an impetus from those living in Historic and Conservation districts. Because of the current review process, people in these areas often end up paying more in fees than for the project itself, so some property owners make repairs and modifications without going through historic design review while others make no improvements at all.

The project will reassess when historic design review is appropriate and necessary.

The project will explore amendments to the zoning code including:

- Historic Resources Definitions - Clarify terminology related to historic resources;
- Regulations, including the terms “repair,” “maintenance” and “replacement”;
- Redefine Historic Review Triggers/Exemptions - Determine the appropriate level of review in historic and conservation districts for:
 - minor alterations to structures;
 - improvements that are not visible from the public right-of-way; and
- Procedure Type - Create a land use review procedure with a shorter timeline and no local appeal. This could be a new land use review or a revision of the Type I procedure.

Project tasks include:

- Collect data needed to assess impact of options
- Public Involvement with communities in historic districts, conservation districts, historic preservationists, and the general community
- Policy decisions
- Code drafting (writing, editing, ensuring internal consistency, etc.)
- Coordination with Bureau of Development Services, Historic Landmarks Commission, and Development Review Advisory Committee
- Legislative process, including public notice and hearings at the Historic Landmarks Commission, Planning and Sustainability Commission, and City Council.

Staff noted that trees are currently not part of historic review, and a review of this is not an issue for the scope of this project. Other issues not being addressed in this project include:

- Revising BDS’ Historic Design Review fee structure;
- Updating the City’s Historic Resources Inventory;
- Creating or updating design guidelines for historic or conservation districts, including adopting the Secretary of the Interior’s Standards for Rehabilitation; or
- Reorganizing BDS’ historic design review website.

There will be public hearings at the Landmarks Commission in November/December 2012, followed by public hearing at the PSC in January 2013, going to City Council 2013.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 9:24pm.