

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
Tuesday, July 9, 2013
12:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Lai-Lani Ovalles (arrived 1 p.m.), Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez
Commissioners Absent: Michelle Rudd (recused)
BPS Staff Present: Susan Anderson, Eric Engstrom, Julie Ocken
Other City Staff Present: Mike Rosen, BES; Bob Hillier, PBOT

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and provided an overview of the agenda.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Thanks to the PSC members and staff for your diligence, expertise and hours you've spent on the West Hayden Island project. Council and the community appreciate the time and service of PSC members.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the June 25, 2013 PSC meeting.

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda. *Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve. *Commissioner Valdez* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.
(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

Southwest Corridor

Briefing: Jay Sugnet; Malu Wilkinson, Metro

Documents:

- [SW Corridor Summary Fact Sheet, July 2013](#)

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/5877019/>

The Barbur Concept Plan was the land use planning precursor to discussion about high-capacity transit in this area. It helped identify important places with transit to connect those places. The Mayor, as a member of the Steering Committee, votes on July 22 for this draft recommendation being shared today.

More information is available at [SW Corridor Plan site](#); there is a public involvement report online as well. In June, the project hosted a community planning forum. Input was also taken via an online survey, which had over 2500 responses.

The Plan began by looking at area from Portland to Sherwood for next investment in high-capacity transit and uses land use to guide investments in transportation.

The corridor is a destination for retail and entertainment and education surrounded by stable residential communities. Much future growth is expected on this corridor in next 25 years.

The transition of 99W to a mixed use corridor has the greatest potential to unify the corridor to its main streets and downtowns and provide a critical linkage to the employment and regional destinations in the corridor.

Infill and redevelopment are going to be the primary generators for new development in the corridor.

The SWC is a regional employment district has the potential to grow and aspire to higher land use efficiency and to become more complete places.

July 22 the Steering Committee will vote on:

- Transit
 - Local service enhancement planning
 - Narrow HCT alternatives
- Strategic set of roadway and active transportation projects
- Prioritized parks and natural resource projects
- Policies and incentives for further exploration

This will provide direction on SW transit service; policy direction on the level of BRT for further study; which modes to carry forward for further study; and destination.

A Draft EIS for the transit element, if the timeline continues forward, is expected in early 2017.

The SW Service Enhancement Plan (local service) directs TriMet to provide:

1. Connection of key SW Corridor locations quickly and reliably to one another and to a potential HCT line.
 - Within corridor
 - Throughout Washington County
2. Improved local transit connections to WES.
3. Capital improvements necessary to achieve higher transit system functioning to better connect key corridor areas and HCT.
4. Identification of improvements cities and counties can make for better transit access.

Both light rail and BRT should advance for further study based on

1. High ridership potential of both modes.
2. The need for additional design to produce more developed capital cost estimates necessary to clarify tradeoffs among:
 - capital costs
 - operating efficiency (operating costs and ridership)
 - support for SW Corridor Land Use Vision

The percent of BRT in dedicated the transit-way is proposed to be between 50 and 100 percent of the alignment in exclusive right-of-way.

The main destination is Tualatin, via Tigard, based on ridership potential; operational efficiency; and plans for increased housing and employment in Tigard and Tualatin. The proposal does not include high-capacity between Tualatin and Sherwood.

The Roadway and Active Transportation includes a list of about 80 projects, which is likely more than what funding is available in the next 15 years.

Recommendations:

- High-Capacity Transit: During refinement some projects will be determined to fit with HCT project as refined
- Land Use Vision: Project sponsors will take responsibility to implement their projects with some collaborative efforts to seek funding, particularly for projects identified as early opportunities; project sponsors actions may include project design and engineering, public outreach and working with regional partners to include the project in the Regional Transportation Plan

The SW Corridor Plan recommendations will inform updates to TSPs and the RTP, but projects will not automatically be added or removed based on SW Corridor. It will still be up to the individual jurisdictions to decide on each.

Green Projects for parks and habitat projects will be included as well. This includes developing and prioritizing by each jurisdiction in the corridor for parks, trails and natural areas.

Next steps

- Steering Committee consideration 7/22
- Project partners adopt SWCP by resolution in fall 2013
- Move into a refinement phase
 - Focus on HCT
 - Determine which roadway, AT, green projects move forward with HCT
 - Refine policies/tools for further implementation
- Steering Committee decision to move into NEPA early 2014

Discussion

Commissioner Smith served on the Barbur Concept Plan Steering Committee. People were anxious about how we get to PCC, using local streets (or not) around the HCT area.

- We haven't addressed this in the current recommendation. Staff received ideas from neighbors about how to serve PCC directly or indirectly. The best way is not the original line that was in the plan, but it will be refined.

Local service could originate in Sherwood that feeds into BRT instead of the line going all the way to Sherwood.

- Based on the work and studies, this could be best served by a feeder line. Regarding a transit-only versus a "mobility corridor", transit service timing should include a continuous bike/ped service connection on the same route. Are we set to have all the components open at the same time? The FTA is changing rules so bike/ped projects in a generous radius of HCT projects can be eligible for a match.
- The hope is that as we move forward we continue to integrate the pieces together.

Commissioner Houck noted the regional trail plan. Are those trails potentially part of this concept?

- Yes. The map online shows this regional system well.

Commissioner Gray: \$500M for one project is gigantic. What percentage will be within City of Portland?

- It depends on which projects on the list City of Portland chooses to implement and pay for. There is no funding commitment for having the projects on the list; it can be a fund-raising tool to show priority projects that support land use.

Staff is meeting with organizations that serve underserved communities and low-income populations, trying to figure out best ways of engagement going forward. There were 2 focus groups in June aimed at working with leadership of the organizations that serve these populations.

Chair Baugh: before the vote, does the PSC have input?

- This is all there will be for the PSC. The Mayor is the Portland delegate who will vote.

There is an outstanding question of equity in terms of the dollars and where populations are going to be impacted/benefit or not (e.g. East Portland). PSC members could meet with Josh Alpert to share the ideas prior to the vote on July 22. Staff will work to set up this meeting.

In the context of the region, SW is the #1 priority in terms of transit; Powell-Division is the 2nd. We are waiting to hear about a grant that would allow similar work to be done on Powell-Division. We are not choosing do one over the other, it's just a question of timing and funding.

Commissioner Schultz: Why is SW a higher regional priority over SE Portland?

- Analysis shows higher ridership potential in SW. It's also a political pull by west-side Mayors who have previously been able to fund projects more readily.
- Funding from the Federal government is not being given as it was previously. Equity needs to consider jobs (e.g. in Tualatin) where employers have difficulty getting their employees who come from other parts of the region to work. Better connections will be good for both where people live and the jobs center.

Commissioner Smith: A North-South frequent service line in East Portland is a high priority for people there, but this may be more of a TriMet Board discussion instead of a Metro-driven priority.

West Hayden Island

Work Session / Recommendation: Eric Engstrom

Documents:

- [June 2013 Cover Memo](#)
- [June 2013 Amended Proposed Draft](#)
- [July 3, 2013 Proposed Amendments](#)
- [July 8 CRC Memo / Amendments](#)

Chair Baugh shared an overview of this portion of the session.

- Amendment 1 (July 2 MEMO) and vote
- Amendment 2 (CRC MEMO) and vote
- Any additional amendments provided by commissioners
- Individual commissioners' comments
- Vote 1: June 2013 WHI proposed draft as amended today
- Vote 2: Annexation of WHI

Eric thanked the PSC members for their time and efforts on this project and provided an overview of the documents.

- The amended draft and memo were distributed to PSC members on June 19.
- The July 3 memo outlines ways to reduce impact, and therefore the extent of mitigation necessary. It includes additional amendments about a truck cap and stronger language about emissions related to truck impacts; floodplain and forest actions; tribal governments being named; and partnerships name explicitly in the agreement. It also includes a chart that summarizes potential cost implications - opportunities for partnerships and what savings might come with some of those reductions if impact was reduced.
- The July 8 memo responds to PSC questions about the implications of the CRC no-go decision in Washington State.

Technical staff are available today to respond to questions about amendments if necessary.

July 2 Memo Discussion

Commissioner Houck expressed concern about the proposal to look at potential for retention of the floodplain within the 300 acre site footprint and 50 acres of contiguous forest. Giving credit to this for loss of ecosystem floodplain doesn't work for me. I will propose some language that gets at the spirit of what the Commission wants to do in terms of functionally important systems.

- *Mike Rosen*: Avoidance of impact to habitat is the best way to minimize impacts. The attempt here is to protect another 50 acres, within the rail loop, that is continuous. That's about an additional one-third of the forest that would have been removed and now would be retained. There would also be less filling needed. BES' reference to support this was a methodology about what the habitat value is if the 50 acres are within the rail loop and close or adjacent to the other 500 acres. Our conclusion is that the concept of avoidance is one to follow. Specifics in this case suggest that it is not likely to produce a major reduction in habitat impact, but we are speculating about how it would work. As an alternative, if 50 acres of forest are protected outside the loop, there would be contiguous forest that wouldn't be impacted. The question is if minimizing fill by 50 acres restores some ecological function. Staff still urges avoidance. But if this is the preferred alternative, on the surface it doesn't look like it will achieve this.

Commissioner Schultz: It seems that this is just an option that can be further studied but still needs to be reviewed. By putting it in this proposal, we are only saying this is an option to be studied down the line.

- *Mike*: I think that flexibility exists. This amendment tries to create other efficiencies to provide additional habitat life that could reduce costs.
- *Commissioner Houck* asked that, given all the uncertainties, why would we want to leave this in? There are organizations that do work on the Lower Columbia that make much more sense than some floodplain retention and 50 acres of forest.

Commissioner Smith: This language presents an option to retain ecological function within the rail loop. Do we need the new language, or does existing language say this?

- *Eric*: 50 acres are noted only as being contiguous, not necessarily inside the loop. The framework in the proposed IGA already gives some flexibility before this amendment. The intent is to make it extra clear the flexibility exists.

If we were to pursue this in the future, who decides how much ecological function you get in this option?

- Decision-makers that administer the IGA will be responsible, and an agreement will have to be reached.

If this takes some of the land for industrial zoning, would it reduce the credit we can take for industrial land supply by 50 acres?

- Yes, so we lose industrial land and potentially don't have a good ecosystem upgrade.

The amendment doesn't discuss footprint of the rail loop or its alignment (if it would be elevated or not).

Commissioner Hanson: 50 acres is a large swath of land. I'm in favor of leaving the idea in to give the final design team options to explore. The value needs to be characterized when more details are in place. The rail defines what's needed functionally for industrial aspects; a tree preserve area, if they can demonstrate it works, should be an option. An elevated rail is expensive compared to putting it on fill, which may not be feasible, but it could work.

Commissioner Houck would not argue against avoidance; that is the first thing you want to do. I still have a concern about floodplains. Even without this language, there is flexibility without specifying the 50 acres.

Susan: There are several places in the IGA that provide more clarity and instruction to future implementers. This amendment is to provide the possibility of more clarity and direction.

Commissioner Houck: In 5.5.4.1, the IGA specifies flood events. Through future analysis, that objective has to be achieved. My concern is that we're moving what can be achieved.

Chair Baugh: Analysis still must be done in the future to determine how much the mitigation credit is worth. This is just presented as an option to give credit under the current methodology.

Motion

Commissioner Valdez moved to accept the July 3 memo amendments. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

Chair Baugh restated the motion, and the motion passed.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Ovalles, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

July 8 Memo Amendment (CRC) Discussion

Eric provided details about the newly-suggested amendments. The key finding is that there is a failure of intersections near the interchange without the CRC being built. There are options included in the memo that address this:

Option 1 (Decouple Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Designations): Take traffic away as you put new traffic on via commercial or industrial land, taking it out of circulation.

Option 2 (Remove Other Traffic from the Interchange): The City has a Comp Plan map (long-term intent) and a Zone map, which can be different in the short-term as a control. You could withhold the zoning on the industrial area until a traffic plan for the interchanges is confirmed. The Governor has already asked ODOT to begin looking at options.

Eric clarified the language that discussed an interim zone (placeholder zone) before a transportation solution is defined. The intent is that we're talking about the industrial footprint area. The Open Space designation could be implemented sooner. We are also talking about a City zone (not a County zone as it is currently) that would be used as a placeholder.

Commissioner Houck: What is precluded under City zoning?

- An IGA clause remains the same and says the Port can't cut outside the dredge management area until after the permitting process is complete.

Commissioner Hanson: Will the 500/300 acre delineation be achieved with the Comp Plan designations?

- Yes.

Commissioner Smith: The CRC is in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). When can we begin to model without the CRC in it?

- Bob Hillier: We are unsure at this point. The City's plan has to be consistent with the RTP, but we don't know when/if this will be changed.

Do we know if current zoning under the Hayden Island Plan works without the CRC?

- Assumptions included the CRC in the adopted Hayden Island Plan, so all analysis is based on CRC inclusion at this point.

The concern is that we need a new access vision for the island. Hopefully the City will take a lead on this. We wouldn't want to see the Port get ahead while the rest of the island waits to see what they get. I prefer Option 1 because of this.

Commissioner Hanson concurred there is a new access plan needed for the island. Are there realistic measures given current land use and zoning, and addition of WHI, to address this? If we decouple the zoning designations, part of that is about what's feasible to improve circulation and access to elevate level of service.

- Nothing has been analyzed yet.

Commissioner Shapiro: The amendment says that if we do this, we keep control of Hayden Island in the City.

Commissioner Schultz: Why not change the zoning all to Open Space at this point?

- Farm/forest is a category of Comp Plan designation in the same category as industrial, so when's it is time to change that designation, it will fall in line.

5.6.6 in the IGA notes that fill doesn't happen outside the dredge management area until the later permitting process.

Commissioner Valdez noted that the CRC wasn't something that was necessarily going to happen. Whether WHI is annexed or not, there is development on the island, so there will be improvements.

- Yes, but the major failures are with the I-5 interchange, not local streets.

Commissioner Gray noted that *Commissioner Smith* prefers Option 1 over 2. Are they exclusive?

- You could opt to do one or both.

Chair Baugh noted he prefers Option 1 too. This is a choice between whether WHI is kept in the City's arena, or if it allows the Port to chase some other alternative without solving the traffic problem on WHI. We need the Port in the room to work on a potential solution with us. By annexing and keeping it as farmland for now, that solves this question.

Motion

Commissioner Smith moved to accept the July 8 memo amendments with Option 1 only.

Commissioner Shapiro seconded.

Chair Baugh restated the motion, and the motion passed.

(10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Ovalles, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

Commissioner Oxman had questions on the annexation cost chart. In May the PSC voted for an amount up to \$13M for the HIA and work on health mitigation efforts. Now there is a range, so what is the loss?

- Before the May amendment, \$13M was in a separated bin (designated for parks). This amount was taken out of parks and put into health, which was outlined as about \$1M for HIA impact plus \$3.6M for housing fund plus funds for doing the HIA, which totaled about \$5M. We now combined all this funding into one description, and that's what the \$17M represents. The range is the minimum without additional parks and a maximum if the whole \$13M from parks is transferred.

Commissioner Schultz: Why is it decoupled the community benefit fund?

- We kept these two items separate because the process for the grant is through the WHI Advisory Committee, whereas the rest is tied to the HIA. Staff felt it was appropriate to leave discretionary funds that are community-driven that are not specific to health.

Commissioners' Comments about the WHI Plan and Process

Commissioner Valdez: I value each commissioner's expertise and input. This process has been a good research tool. In touring Seattle and San Francisco, I saw that ports are prosperous and beneficial. Annexing the island is the right thing to do for the City, and it creates economic prosperity while keeping open space. It helps the working poor. We want to be able to have both development and environmental sanctuaries, and this plan achieves both. This can be a positive development for residents, tourists and others to model Portland. Keeping partners involved will be important.

Commissioner Smith shared thanks to staff, community and fellow commissioners. I'm happier with the process now than I was in November when we originally thought we'd vote. It was the right choice to not move forward at that time. The heading for this project is "making decisions under uncertainty". A fundamental question is if we need new terminals; to me the global factors suggest growth and need will continue, especially for grain. My concern is about the impacts. The Portland Plan says we need to balance the health of community, environment and economy. I hope we have a consensus around Vote #1 (about the plan), and it behooves us to have a strong plan for Vote #2 (whether or not to annex). It is important the Port takes the message that we need partnerships to do this well. I still have significant concerns: the ability to gauge health impacts and know how to mitigate them. I worry we're planning for this in too small a context or Portland versus the region of the Lower Columbia. Even with environmental mitigation, we may not get back to the whole, and for climate resilience this is an important consideration.

Commissioner Ovalles echoes the thanks for everyone's time to create the best package we can come up with. My values are driving my decision today. I heard strongly that WHI is an irreplaceable natural resource; opposition from residents and tribal nations; need for jobs and economic development and prosperity including the health of the community. The health analysis impacts my decision, no matter how many jobs we create. Even if we have divided opinions, what's paramount is a healthy community and health of our resources. These need to come first in our considerations. Community engagement needs to be ongoing with enriched tribal involvement.

Commissioner Hanson noted he has worked on this project for about 3 years. He thanked staff and the community who represented themselves so well through their constructive involvement. I hope that we are taking a balanced approach; I believe we are headed in that direction. I want this development in Portland and not in the Lower Columbia. There is uncertainty, but I hope we have put this in place and that more details will help inform future decisions. We have set the foundation for that. I'm glad the Port of Portland owns this property; they have persevered and have an excellent track record of improvements they've made in our community. They will be here in the long-term, which bodes well for us.

Commissioner Gray is honored to work with the PSC members and hopes her work on the Commission speaks on behalf of East Portlanders. There is an urgent need for economic development for stability and the impact it has on success for children. Development is positive in general. I asked three questions in making my decision: (1) Why would we do this? The land was already designated for this purpose with Council's designation for a 300/500 acre split. (2) Are there treaties with tribes today that preclude it? This development doesn't violate any treaties. The consultation with tribes and Advisory Committee requirements are positive to ensure voices are included going forward. (3) What are the mitigation processes to keep an environment healthy, and who would pay for them? The proposed range of costs and requirements for partnerships are positive.

Commissioner Oxman shared thanks for all involved in the project and to those who provided input. The PSC provides advice to the City Council. The potential for many additional family-wage jobs in the community is positive. We are trying to balance this with environmental and

health harms. Net increase in ecological function is the policy the PSC is forwarding. I would argue we've done this similarly, but more implicitly, in relation to health. There is a wide range of things that can happen with the Port development: increased air pollution; additional noise and vibration; economic instability for residents. Benefits include fewer traffic accidents; more employment opportunities; and physical activity opportunities. Preventing and mitigating health impacts will be in the future HIA. There is \$17M potential for mitigation. I do still have trouble with the economic analysis; the project will cost what it will cost, and the Port should be motivated to find the best cost and least impact. The health analysis was based on a scenario that included the CRC, but now we don't know where that fits. There is lots more work to be done, but we need to commit to understanding what it takes to create family-wage jobs in a way that is not harmful to health of the community or the environment.

Commissioner Houck: When I agreed to serve on the PSC, I did so because I was assured that we would not solely be involved with zoning and code decisions, but we would look at broader sustainability issues. This is clearly an example of our broader scope. I agree with *Commissioner Smith* that we are moving in the direction of bringing social and environmental issues toward parity with economic issues, which is key to truly addressing sustainability. I am opposed to annexing WHI more so now than when I shared my thoughts in 1983 against incorporating WHI into the UGB. Thirty years ago, climate change was not seriously considered. Protection for large sites for resilience on rivers is extremely important. Citing the Port facility here versus on another area on the Lower Columbia does not make good sense. I don't buy that this will be a huge job creator. Yet I am proud and thankful that even with different opinions among Commissioners, net increase in ecological function and addressing forest mitigation at 110 percent was agreed on by all. That is incredibly important. We need to think more broadly about what the regional economy truly is and I would argue that the entire Lower Columbia needs to be considered our economic region when it comes to marine facilities. By rejecting annexation of WHI we would force that analysis and the need for further partnerships.

Commissioner Schultz noted she came quite late into this process. Thanks to bring me up to speed and for allowing me time to catch up to have time to make an informed decision. This issue involves all challenges and roles as laid out in the Portland Plan. The commitment to getting through all of this has been key to understanding our goals. This package does balance these goals. Leaving WHI with Multnomah County doesn't guarantee natural resources will be improved; and annexation does not mean the Port will build. It allows options for development. This proposal is a solid base for the environment and health implications while being critical for job creation. It is important that funds are tied to mitigation measures. Community funds should be used for specific and real, not potential, issues. I do have a bit of frustration in looking at just Portland while this is a much larger regional issue.

Commissioner Shapiro confirmed much of what other commissioners have stated. We have been professionals, and we are proud of everyone who has worked on this project. The community is connected and determined. This project shows that Portland is outstanding in community-building. The Comp Plan process will allow for the larger perspective of planning.

Chair Baugh shared thanks for the community, the Port and City staff. This project has all the components about how we work based on the Portland Plan. Because of uncertainty, this is speculation at its best. We have crafted a process, not a solution, which says whatever comes from WHI, we can evaluate it based on economic and ecological benefits with community health. The HIA is the first the City has done on a large project, and it will be a learning process. It sets a path by which other communities and the PSC can look and figure out how to develop best. The Climate Action Plan (CAP) is another way we need to look at this project. In terms of reducing emissions, all of Hayden Island is part of this that we will have to evaluate. We can't isolate WHI from the CAP, so part of this is about the transportation solution and making it most efficient. We need to have a solution that works for the entire island and its future. The Port needs partnerships to get their work done. The more partnerships that can

help, the better the solution will be. In favor of the package vote; this is how we need to do development if it's going to happen. In favor of annexation to keep the ball in our court to find a solution that meets the Portland Plan and CAP goals.

Motion

Vote #1, West Hayden Island Package: *Commissioner Valdez* to recommend the June 2013 Amended Proposed Draft, *as further amended today*, in response to City Council Resolution 36805. This draft, as amended, recommends Comprehensive Plan Designations, Transportation System Plan amendments, as well as Plan District and zoning designations for WHI annexation – all to become effective on annexation with the exception of the industrial zoning. The package also includes, for City Council consideration, a draft intergovernmental agreement between the City and Port, which outlines next steps and the responsibilities of each party related to future development on WHI. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

Chair Baugh restated the motion, and the motion passed.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Ovalles, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

Vote #2, Annexation: *Commissioner Valdez* moved to recommend City Council annex West Hayden Island into the City of Portland. *Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

Chair Baugh restated the motion, and the motion passed.

(Y7 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Valdez; N3 – Houck, Ovalles, Smith)

Staff will draft a letter and will send around to PSC members for comment. We will also work to schedule meetings over the next couple of months with individual Council members and PSC members to share their thoughts.

Susan shared thanks for coming together with consensus for the plan. It sends a strong message to Council and is a positive statement for the PSC's work.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 3:15 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator