

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, March 8, 2016

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach (arrived 12:42 p.m.), Andre' Baugh, Katie Larsell, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin

Commissioners Absent: Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Maggie Tallmadge

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Joan Frederickson; Denver Igarta, Courtney Duke, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Additional meetings

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Testimony for today's meeting

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the February 23, 2016 PSC meeting.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.
(Y6 – Baugh, Larsell, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

Disclosures

Commissioner Smith is a resident of the NW neighborhood; his residence just outside the boundaries of the district. He also has a long history of being involved with parking issues in NW. And his employer, Xerox, does business for the City, including red light cameras.

Commissioner Baugh: My company, Group AGB, is currently working on a project for Multnomah County on the Burnside Bridge, which is owned by the County.

Chair Schulz: My company is working on a project in the NW district that may or may not be affected by today's hearing.

Northwest Parking Update Project

Hearing / Recommendation: Joan Frederickson

Presentation

Joan gave an overview of the project, noted a few minor amendments and shared information about the plan district.

The area has capacity for a significant amount of development. And this plan district continues to steadily experience growth. This growth coupled with a historic streetcar era development pattern where many of the earlier developments did not include parking and a continually popular shopping district and employment areas, continue to create a very constrained parking environment.

After over a decade of effort on this front, an on-street Parking Management Plan was adopted for the NW District area in 2013. Under this plan the existing Area Permit Parking program has been expanded and new parking meter areas are on their way.

The Management Plan also established a Stakeholder Advisory Committee, to be appointed by the commissioner in charge of PBOT, to bring on-the ground perspective to the management of on-street parking.

The NW Parking Management Plan will evolve as new management strategies are adopted, notably through tools being developed through PBOT's Centers and Corridors work.

I've shared this for context. In addition it a useful moment to call out that at the most basic level there's parking that happens "on-street" – at the curb, and parking that happens "off-street" – on the property side.

The regulations here are related to off-street parking, basically parking lots or buildings.

The purpose of this project is to more closely align NWDP with the minimum parking requirements adopted Citywide in 2013 and to assure some continued modest increases to off-street parking supply in the district over time. And making more efficient use of existing parking resources.

Part 1 of the proposal is the minimum parking component, which is to add a graduated household minimum parking requirement for multi-dwelling structures with more than 30 units. These are the same proposed standards as they are the same as what was adopted in 2013 for the majority of the city. Given its special character/history and its proximity to the Central City, we've proposed a slight deviation from the citywide application. In the amendments, we are proposing to rearrange some of how things are laid out in the code, but there are no substantive amendments for Part 1.

Part 2 of the proposal is to provide more flexibility for accessory parking to be used as commercial parking. "Accessory" means parking related to a specific use, either on a site or off-site. "Commercial" is not associated with a use, for example a stand-alone parking structure or lot.

Today we are proposing to update the language in existing provisions to provide additional flexibility. The current NW Plan District Code contains provisions that allow for what we call "Shared Parking". Technically as reflected in the code this is the use of accessory parking lots for commercial purposes.

Clean up outdated language, including replacing references to a Transportation Management Association with the NWPMP SAC.

Changes liberalize use of these provisions by allowing all types of users rather than the current limited users, as well allowing short-term parking, previously not allowed.

The code is intended to provide the framework and underlying permission for shared parking in district with additional administrative details in a PBOT administrative rule.

In the amendments memo I provided you with today I've called out some clarification on language and verbiage to clarify how the provisions apply.

With this provision, we're allowing required and non-required parking that is accessory parking to be used as commercial parking, whether existing or created in the future, with some limitations.

Before concluding, I'll offer a review stakeholder involvement in this process. They met and discussed issues and the proposal with the NWPMP SAC over the last 9 months. The SAC is comprised of Neighborhood and Business association representatives, community members at large and is open to the public. Notices were sent to all property owners in the district and an open house was also held. Moving forward staff will continue to work with PBOT and the SAC to refine the administrative rules.

That was a quick summary of the proposal to help with parking issues in NW Plan District area. After you hear public testimony today we're asking you to consider the following possible actions/recommendations.

Commissioner Smith asked to discuss the parking produced in development since the formation of the district. It points out if the minimums were all that were created, there would have been 388 parking spaces added; but 584 have been created, showing the impact and pull of market forces. Policy-wise, I am a big fan of the shared parking. But the idea that parking in the neighborhood should be focused on users as opposed to a commuter going into the Central City, for example, I'm wondering if the language has any hooks to reinforce that policy? Also, regarding the idea of parking displacement: if I'm renting to tenants and my spots are not filled to capacity, I can rent them to others. But what if the price of the parking is bid up so my tenants can afford them?

- The "hook" for concerns related to commuter parking is in neither code nor Admin Rules. There has been discussion to add this to the Admin Rules, and we can continue to consider this.
- In terms of the displacement piece, we do have something in code that addresses this. We can carry the language forward into Admin Rules as well.

Commissioner Larsell: Can you tell me the exceptions to minimums?

- There are a number of required spaces, then there are provisions that allow you to reduce the requirement by up to 50 percent. Exceptions include tree preservation, motorcycle parking, public plaza, bike share spaces, car share spaces. You can use a combination of these exceptions to be to the 50 maximum reduction.

Commissioner Baugh: Are those administrative rules for the reductions so they can be changed in the future or are they code that's locked in?

- Currently they are in code that is locked in. They are in the zoning code base zones and apply citywide unless superseded by a plan district or overlay zone.
- *Commissioner Spevak*: I appreciate making shared parking easier. Did you think of making it easier than what's shown here? Seems you still have to go in front of the SAC and get a one year permit and then renew and get a three year permit. That might be enough process to get people to do it underground and not do anything at all. Wondering if in the process to come up with this document there was objection to making it easier. There was robust discussion on this issue. It will likely be a continuing discussion about whether the provisions are too much of an obstacle to shared parking. Underscoring some of the concerns raised about displacing users from a site, these are some minimum parameters we think need to be in place. There were voices that asked for more streamlining.

Commissioner Spevak: Just to clarify, the parking minimums are zero right now, so someone could just turn a parking lot into a garden. The issue is commercial - it's renting the space not so much losing the space. A commercial use on what would otherwise be a residential property.

Testimony

1. Rick Michaelson, NWPMP SAC: Thanks to staff. We were too late to find out parking minimums from 2013 don't apply to plan districts and are pleased to have the project to alleviate some of this. There are currently about 13,000 residents, 14,000 employees and just 5,000 parking

spaces in the district with 7500 parking permits competing for the spaces. Over 20 years, we're looking at adding 10,000 housing units in the district, and we don't think this plan addresses these issues fully. Don't include the exceptions in the district, because they don't apply here like they do in other parts of the city. The only appropriate exceptions would be for affordable housing. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith: There is the issue of operation of shared parking. If the NWPMP SAC ceases to exist, what would they do with their parking after that? It's incumbent on the City to maintain this even if the SAC goes away.

Commissioner Bachrach: The chart that shows the historical development pattern. And the market has been producing more on-site parking than the code requires, yes?

Rick: There are proposals for large buildings with zero parking. The stats on the chart are a bit misleading. For example, Conway has a 1:1 requirement, but that's not district-wide.

2. Philip Selinger: I struggle with some of the specific exceptions, but I agree we should promote alternative modes to get around as the exceptions do.

Karen Karlsson: Shared some statistics. The location a property is built on and the developer have impacts on how much parking is built too. 70 percent of the units have a car. You find a great need for on-street parking. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith: The PSC recommended minimum a few years ago, particularly about SE Division. This is in contrast to the Pearl because parking in the Pearl is metered. Developers know they need to provide parking. The NW District is lots more like the Pearl than Division, and there are on-street regulatory tools. Could the NWPUP SAC say which buildings need parking or not?

Karen: Not as of now; we can't restrict the parking of residents, and we need to be able to do so in the future. Under City code, we can limit employee parking. But every resident with a car is entitled to have a parking permit for every car they own. The easiest way to provide parking is when the buildings are built.

3. Jonathan Avery, Legacy Good Samaritan: Legacy is in strong support of the proposed code changes with the following two changes: Section C3E should be struck. And Section C1 should state that if the SAC is disbanded, the City should be responsible for maintaining.
4. Gustav Cruz, NWDA board: Our board voted to support the proposed code changes subject to some edits as are including in our memo. We support elimination of exceptions to the minimums. And we also appreciate this effort and staff's work. *See written testimony.*
5. Ben Schonberger, HLA: Parking requirements raise housing costs, and that's the wrong direction for us to be going. When you impose mandatory parking minimums, costs go up. The Zoning Code should not be where we address parking; the toolkit is the right place to deal with this. We oppose mandatory parking requirements and are against higher housing prices. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Baugh: Concerning, affordable housing, if you look at the exceptions - Would you agree that with passage of Inclusionary Zoning it is an opportunity to trade parking for affordable housing? Not probably the right place now but setting stage for down the road.

Ben Schonberger: The distinction globally, this rule does not create income restricted subsidized affordable housing. For market rate housing this makes it less affordable than it would have been otherwise because bundles with expensive parking space.

Commissioner Baugh: But you could trade parking out for more units in a future code for inclusionary zoning?

Ben Schonberger: Right.

6. Tony Jordan, Portland Shoupistas: Oppose the proposed amendments. A main reason is the affordable housing component. Lack of study of effect of 2013 rules on housing supply. Served on CC parking update committee and Centers and Corridors study SAC. Also, scarcity of on-street parking can influence how many cars people own. If we can price closer to a market-rate, that would go a long way to balancing where we have more parking and not. Codifying the requirements ties the hands of future developers. *See written testimony.*
7. Doug Klotz: From pedestrian perspective, more parking will create more traffic. I hear a disconnect, between what the NW folks are saying about being built now and the policies that will be implemented later this year. Can we not have something temporary to fill a gap so that we don't create a permanent code that was really only needed for 6 months. I oppose the proposal for parking minimums. Have seen effects of the new minimums in Richmond neighborhood. Whereas before on a 100 by 100 foot site we'd be getting 40 to 50 units now we're seeing 30 unit proposals. We're not getting that extra 20 units.
8. Iain Mackenzie: NW resident and oppose the code changes. I don't live in NW despite parking situation, its part of the reason I live there as it is the greatest example of a 20-minute neighborhood. My concern is affordability. Once we start adding parking requirements, it pushes up costs and decreases affordability. We need to look at data from the original 2013 parking minimum code changes before looking to add or change minimums.
9. Alan Kessler: We have climate change and mode share goals. A minimum parking requirement goes against these goals. We haven't heard information about how unit count and affordability have been affected by the 2013 changes. Seeing fewer larger buildings being built because of the rules. You should not vote on this on until you have information on effect on affordability. The upcoming toolkit provides options. The Centers and Corridors project is taking the right approach, and this discussion seems divorced from human and affordability implications.

Chair Schultz closed the hearing.

Discussion

Commissioner Smith asked about staff's suggested amendments. Joan walked through the memo. In Part 1, it is purely rearrangement of the language to conform to how other code sections are written. In Part 2, we are proposing to add "existing" to clarify. Because the proposal includes new minimum parking standards, we want to be sure it's clear that the provisions could also apply to the CS zones.

Commissioner Bachrach: If minimums are passed, could a developer rent the extra spaces from someone else?

- Currently required parking can be off-site for commercial uses. Not for residential though.

Chair Schultz: For minimum parking on a development site, can those be leased out in a residential project?

- If there are required parking spaces, they would be able to use those as commercial spaces if they can meet the provisions and go through the NWPUP SAC for approval.

Commissioner Baugh: I'm not in favor of most of the exceptions; maybe we could just get down to a tree exception. We want things that are truly valuable to trade. I'm struggling with motorcycle parking, and we have bike parking in code. As for shared parking and accessory parking, under section C3, it doesn't say you have to identify the users. We should know who the users are.

Chair Schultz: Are these the same exceptions that we require in other areas of the city?

- Yes.

Commissioner Spevak: Why would we want to require minimum parking to trade for affordable housing? I don't think we'd get anything with this trade. What about density and/or number of units for trade instead?

- *Commissioner Baugh:* More tools mean more options down the road. There isn't a silver bullet for affordable housing, so this may not be a perfect solution, but it is something to trade. I'm looking for flexibility for whenever the question comes up.

Commissioner Baugh: The real question is that parking drives up housing costs. Do we have a sense of the right number? Under 30 looks like a breaking point. But is there a sense that we will drive more under-30-unit buildings where developers don't build to capacity to avoid?

- *Susan:* We don't have a complete evaluation of parking minimums. At this point, we're trying to bring NW District up to parity with the rest of the city. We can still look at this again in the future when we do review the parking minimums in the next year or two, and suggest changes to things like the exceptions or the numbers. Also, when you're voting on these, voting because of something that "might" be in the future is something we've waived on in the past, so that's something to keep in mind.

Motion

Commissioner Smith is swayed by the arguments that we'll reduce units and make affordability worse. I move to recommend the shared parking portion of the proposed plan only with applicable staff amendments to that section included. I'd also add an amendment that, if the SAC ceases to exist, the City will continue to administer the shared parking program. *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded.

Commissioner Bachrach: That is a high authority the City has given to the NWPUP SAC. How did this get delegated? Has the City Attorney blessed it?

- The TMA was the body that was supposed to administer the 2013 provisions. The SAC is advisory to PBOT, and PBOT makes the final decision. In terms of what can be delegated out of the code, we are looking at those provisions.

Commissioner Bachrach: We know mandatory minimums will be negative for affordable housing, but we don't know to what extent. In terms of another potential amendment, I'm bothered by the authority given to the SAC. I know the neighborhood has a history of contentious issues without clear consensus. I don't want to delegate to a neighborhood association the amount of authority they have. Can we scale this back at least a little?

- *Commissioner Smith* was part of the initial shared parking concept. Both residential and commercial sides of the neighborhood agreed on this. Control was given primarily to manage nuisance. I don't mind making it clear that the SAC is a "recommendatory" power, not authoritative.
- *Susan:* You can have the amendment that Chris put forward, and in the letter to Council you can comment on reviewing the authority of TMAs or this SAC. You could also include a mention to have PBOT and BPS to have data about the 2013 parking minimums on housing, size of buildings and affordability.
- Also, the Admin Rules are still being developed, so these comments could be included.

Commissioner Spevak generally agrees with the amendment. It would be nice to have non-discretionary process for parking sharing.

- This is the intent. It's a simple online application. The Admin Rules are for PBOT to review internally and with the SAC to confirm back to the applicant.

Commissioner Bachrach is concerned about shared parking. We're delegating this downstream, and there is disagreement about how shared parking should work. If we're making a recommendation now, can we take a pause and use staff to come back with how this will all work?

Commissioner Smith: The Admin Rules are approved through the PBOT Director. We can make recommendations, or we can lock provisions in code if we really want to own it.

Commissioner St Martin: We currently have no parking rules here. We don't know if the parking minimums in the rest of the city are working. So why create minimums without a review of what they've accomplished in other areas?

- *Commissioner Smith*: When this district was created, there were no minimums along corridors. NW currently has better tools to deal with on-street parking than almost any other neighborhood in the city. But the demonstrated history in the neighborhood is dealing with this well. NW is not in the dire situation that, for example, Division was in 2013.

Susan: When we went forward with parking recommendations in 2013, it was because it was new in an area not used to having so much. In the study areas for the 2013 changes we found that in a 2-block radius you could still find a parking spot, even at peak times. The availability of on-street parking in this area is very different. We have a different issue in terms of demand for parking and that's why the recommendation is the way it is. We want to put this in place and have parity and then come back and look at the whole system and change it if necessary. That was the reasoning for going forward with new parking regulations in this area.

Commissioner Smith argued that because parking wasn't saturated in Richmond, developers didn't have to be building parking. In NW that's not the situation.

Commissioner Smith restated his motion: I recommend forwarding the shared parking portion of the proposed plan only with applicable staff amendments to that section included. And if the SAC ceases to exist, the City will continue to administer the shared parking program.

Commissioner Bachrach noted we want a streamlined application process and a program that encourages as much shared parking as possible. Applications should not be denied at the neighborhood level. This will be included in the letter to Council.

(Y5 – Bachrach, Larsell, Schultz, Smith, Spevak; N2 – Baugh, St Martin)

The motion passed.

Task 5: Transportation System Plan

Hearing: Denver Igarra, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Presentation

Denver and Peter reviewed a few items about the TSP. Today is our first hearing, and we also will continue the hearing to March 22. April 12 is scheduled for the PSC's work session and potential vote.

PBOT has produced the "Reader's Guide" to the TSP, which is also available on the [PBOT website](#). This is a quick reference to the larger proposed document.

So far, we've received about 45 comments. Some are general about safety and bike access. A handful of comments came through the Map App, which were mostly about bike and street classifications.

The majority of comments have been about an originally proposed bike path on Hayden Island. Denver highlighted the background about the adopted Hayden Island Plan. There was an oversight, and staff missed the final amendment that was made at Council at the final hearing. So staff recommends the

PSC amends the Proposed Draft to be consistent with the adopted Hayden Island Plan. We have shared this with everyone who drew our attention to this error. The pedestrian portion stays the same.

Commissioner Smith asked if the transcription error affected the 2010 Bicycle Master Plan in the same way. I will be supportive of the staff-recommended amendment to make the TSP match the adopted plan.

- The Bicycle Master Plan is consistent with what was adopted.

Peter provided a brief response to questions PSC members had at the February 9 briefing about how all the TDM pieces fit together.

Testimony

1. Philip Selinger: Thanks to staff for your work. I was a member of, and support, the TEG comments, but testifying for myself. The TSP needs to think about advancing technologies and the changing needs in the future. TDM can meet the needs of a wide range of residents. Portland hasn't been a leader in TDM, and we need to have better standards, and these should be expanded over time. The City and TriMet have a history of collaboration, but the TSP largely omits strategies for collaboration. The TSP needs to reference the Regional Transportation Plan and other analysis. *See written testimony.*
2. Michael Robinson, Providence: We appreciate the City's collaborative approach. Providence has 4 comments about how we can make the TDM process better. We share the City's sustainability goals. We have a successful TDM, and we think we need to continue this customized TDM. Concerned about use of Admin Rules because they can be too flexible, and we have little opportunity to influence how the rules are written. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Bachrach: Providence has a CUMP with a TDM component. We previously agreed that if you have an existing TDM, it won't expire (if Council agrees). How does this affect what you have today?

Michael: We're not sure what all the regulations will require because the Admin Rules haven't been drafted yet. That's why I'm not sure how you can vote without seeing the Admin Rules.

Commissioner Baugh: You represent a large agency. The person next to you represents citizen that have similar concerns. How do you suggest PBOT gets rules through in a timely manner that work for both parties?

Michael: I can try to get a better answer and will share it before testimony closes. Admin Rules apply to all, but I'd like to see a process that's closer to a Title 33 process that comes through the PSC.

3. Jeanne Harrison, NWDA Transportation Committee: Thanks to staff. We have a few recommendations for changes, which are fairly minor. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith: On the Pettygrove bikeway designation, how would you make this connect to Naito as Overton does right now?

Jeanne: I saw both Overton and Pettygrove going to Naito.

4. Brendon Haggerty, Multnomah County Health Department: We support the TDM proposal and the linkage to health. What's exciting is that transportation decisions can influence things such as chronic diseases that can be tracked back to harmful pollutants and inactivity. The TDM proposal can help us achieve health goals as well. TDM makes travel options more accessible to low-income workers and reduces climate change impacts. The health department wants to be a

partner with PBOT, and we're committed to working closely with the City.

5. Martin Owens: Thank you for removing the bike path along the east side of Hayden Island. I would like to extend this to all bike path proposals on the island. We don't have the infrastructure to accommodate paths. *See written testimony.*
6. James Parker: Supports the TDM plan and facilitating the growth of institutions. We also must agree that infrastructure changes will be able to accommodate all the expected growth at our intersections. So the performance targets should facilitate the growth of institutions and keep traffic levels as close to today's levels as possible. Performance targets make goals attainable. The Plan should provide a plan for modifying via a Type II hearing to assist PBOT and institutions to work together.
7. Tim Helzer, HiNoon: Opposes reclassification of walking paths to bike paths on Hayden Island. The Hayden Island Plan doesn't reflect Hayden Island residents' interests; it was created to accommodate the CRC, so the plan has been out of date since the CRC has ceased to exist. The bike path will eliminate 112 units in the manufactured home community. *See written testimony (map).*
8. Roger Averbeck, Portland Pedestrian Advisory Committee: Support the TDM plan that's been proposed by PBOT. And we should expand TDM requirements from campuses to Mixed Use and employment sites in the Central City. TDM is a relatively quick, inexpensive strategy to increase alternative forms of transportation. And it's good to disincentivize single-occupancy driving. *See written testimony.*
9. Ian Stude, Bicycle Advisory Committee: We support the recommended language around TDM planning and requirements. It's important to extend to Mixed Use and Central City employment zones. TDM is effective and inexpensive to transition from SOV to other modes of travel. Excited to see this continue. Supports potential Admin Rules that would include requirements for development to provide incentives to encourage non-SOV travel. PBOT has been successful in its efforts to date, and this plan is a way to step this up.

Commissioner Smith: Is the committee ok with the bicycle network as proposed? The plan is now 6 years old, and we know we have a better idea of land use patterns and how the transportation system will respond. Civic and neighborhood corridors are two new classifications. Almost all are City Bikeways. But very few are Major City Bikeways. Should more of the civic and neighborhood corridors potentially be major bikeways?

Ian: We have focused primarily on street classifications and modal hierarchy to be in the TSP. We can come back with further comment about the corridors.

Personally, as a neighbor of Providence, the hospital has taken some effective measures. But we need to fully embrace TDM due to the expected growth, and I'd like to see the planning require TDM.

10. Eric Hesse, TriMet: TriMet supports the written TEG comments. We also support the TDM amendments that are included as a measured and powerful step forward to reduce SOVs and associated emissions. We need to meet these goals as we prepare for much anticipated growth. We are already working at over 1900 sites and campuses on TDM with TriMet passes and programs. It has been focused as an employer program, but we also work on residential services.
11. Doug Klotz: I support *Commissioner Smith's* comments about civic and neighborhood corridors being places to bike. Almost all civic corridors have a bike designation, but Cesar Chavez does not, so we should add the City Bikeways classification on this road. The reason people are

riding there now is because it is direct and goes through. It's about readability of the system; when people are new to the area, they want to have a direct way to get where they're going. We should have biking included on all major streets. I have one concern about TDM: if cost gets too expensive, I don't want it to add to the costs of housing units.

Chair Schultz continued the hearing to March 22.

Discussion

Commissioner Bachrach commented on TDM and potential modifications. There is a provision that says PBOT has to approve and applicant's proposal prior to a development application. Do you have other authority like this? I'd like to modify the language so it's not a gateway authority for PBOT.

- The application can continue to move forward, but development approval, where a TDM plan is required, needs an approved TDM. This is currently the case for many permits. A hearing's officer would make a decision for Type III permits. We are attempting to have a base zone (campuses, for example) to make the process cleaner and simpler. Ensure that we maintain the TDM requirements and reduce traffic and parking in the neighborhood.

I also have a concern about using an Administrative Rule to implement TDM. I understand these are good tools, but they happen under the radar sometimes. I want to be sure anyone going through a regulatory process has clarity about where the rules come from and that they are balanced.

Commissioner Spevak shared some concerns about administrative rules versus code changes and approvals for land use. We need clear delineation about what can be done through admin rules versus land use decisions.

Commissioner Baugh: Can the City Attorney delineate what is land use and what can be done administratively? That is an important distinction for us that we need to understand. Hayden Island: when you think about bikes and pedestrians here, we know we'll have many more residents there in the future. We recommended a local bridge for bike/pedestrian uses onto Hayden Island; let's look into the future about uses. If you look at when the Hayden Island plan was adopted, part of the issue about getting people near the river was just that. We have very few places where people can get to ride and walk on the river in the city. If we remove the bike classifications and don't allow them to ride, that might not make sense for the future. As we think about HI, think about development potential, which is significant. If we make it less attractive, do we limit development potential? We should have a mechanism for PBOT to increase standards to push boundaries to help meet CAP and modal split goals. We need to be moving in synch.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 3:18 p.m.