

March 22, 2016

Michael C. Robinson
MRobinson@perkinscoie.com
D. +1.503.727.2264
F. +1.503.346.2264

Ms. Katherine Schultz, Chair
City of Portland
Planning and Sustainability Commission
1900 SW Fourth Avenue, Suite 7100
Portland, OR 97201

Re: Proposed Transportation System Plan

Dear Chair Shultz and members of the Planning and Sustainability Commission:

This office represents Providence Health & Services—Oregon (“Providence”). I am writing on behalf of Providence to comment on the review draft of the Transportation System Plan (“TSP”) dated December, 2015. This letter supplements my testimony on behalf of Providence at the March 8, 2016 PSC public hearing.

1. Response to PSC Questions at the March 8, 2016 Public Hearing.

A. Commissioner Bachrach asked about proposed Section 17.106.030, “Approval Required”, which provides that “The TDM Plan approved in writing by the Portland Bureau of Transportation is required prior to development approval.”

Commissioner Bachrach asked whether the Portland Bureau of Transportation’s (“PBOT”) approval could supersede the Hearings Officer’s approval. Providence requests that the PSC recommend the deletion of Section 17.106.030 because the Hearings Officer is the final decision maker in a Type III appeal of a Type II decision. PCC 33.720.020.B; 33.730.020.I.8 (See Section 3 below regarding PBOT modifications to Title 17).

B. Commissioner Baugh asked how institutions would advise PBOT on a process for adoption of a Transportation Demand Management (“TDM”) plan while also considering the ability of citizens to comment.

If administrative rules are used, the process for adoption of administrative rules by PBOT should require notice to all interested persons, an opportunity to comment and a clear and objective approval and appeal process. The administrative rules must be available for review before the Title 17 and Title 33 amendments related to TDMs are adopted.

The Portland City Code gives PBOT the authority to issue administrative rules and regulations in order for PBOT to carry out its responsibilities. The Director of PBOT is required to establish

procedures in a "Rules and Procedures Manual". PCC 16.10.300. As of today, Providence has not been able to obtain a copy of the Rules and Procedures Manual.

Because the Portland City Code authorizes the Director of PBOT to adopt administrative rules and adopt procedures for adopting and implementing the rules, the PSC's recommendation to the Portland City Council should be that if administrative rules are used to identify the TDM requirements, the rules need to be provided prior to adoption of Title 17 and 33 requirements for TDMs and adoption and amendment of the rules needs to be pursuant to a process that provides adequate notice and opportunity to comment in the event of a future amendment.

2. Response to Other Public Testimony.

A. Testimony by Jim Parker

The Transportation Chair of the Laurelhurst Neighborhood Association, Mr. Jim Parker, testified that performance standards for non-single occupancy vehicle trips should be set and are achievable. Providence concurs with the City's goal of reducing single occupancy vehicle trips. Additionally, Providence has a history of reducing single occupancy vehicle trips (**Exhibit 1**; March 18, 2016 memo and table from Julia Kuhn of Kittelson and Associates). If a percentage of single occupancy vehicle trips is imposed on institutions and they fail to meet that target, Section 17.106.050 provides for enforcement and penalties against the institution. While PBOT has proposed an amendment to this section so that failure to meet performance targets alone is not an enforcement violation, the PSC should recommend to the City Council that targets not be a basis for enforcement against the institutions.

Medical institutions are critical to the health and safety of the City's residents. If failure to meet a target results in enforcement against a hospital, enforcement could jeopardize the health and safety of the public.

B. Testimony by Ian Stude.

Mr. Ian Stude, Chair of the Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee, testified that Providence has taken some measures that are effective in reducing single occupancy vehicle trips but that Providence needs to embrace TDM measures to be more effective. Mr. Stude said that PPMC's efforts would "impact the health of our neighborhood".

Providence's mission is to provide health care to all. In implementing its Comprehensive Transportation Plan, Providence has committed to TDM methods which will further reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips.

Mr. Dave Bodine and Mr. Matt Meskill of PPMC will testify to the PSC on Providence's TDM efforts and their relationship to healthy communities and PPMC efforts to encourage employees to use bicycles as part of their regular commuting habits.

Additionally, Providence's performance compared to other medical institutions shows that Providence has been very effective over the last four (4) years in reducing single occupancy vehicle trips (**Exhibit 2**; March 18, 2016 memo and table from Julia Kuhn of Kittelson and Associates).

3. Modified Title 17 Provisions.

Since the March 8, 2016 PSC meeting, the institutions have met with PBOT and have reviewed modified Title 17 language (**Exhibit 3**).

The modified Title 17 language, among other changes, proposes to remove Section 17.106.030. However, new Section 17.106.030, entitled "Modify and Performance Targets", is problematic. The performance targets include new Transportation System Plan ("TSP") Objectives 11.13.G-I which Providence has not had a chance to fully review. While Objectives G and H may be applicable to Providence, it is unclear how these objectives were set and whether Providence will be able to meet them in the required timeframe. Further, Objective I should be excluded from the institutions' obligation since it has to do with mixed-use zone households automobile ownership.

Additionally, Providence requests that the PSC recommend the deletion of Section 17.106.040, "Ongoing Participation". This Section provides: "The development should be required to commit to ongoing participation in the TDM plan in its deeds, Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions."

This Section imposes a requirement on the title to land and it is unclear how this recorded requirement will assist the City or institutions in meeting the TDM requirements. In fact, cluttering a title with TDM plans would not be helpful and, because properties can be sold but the TDM plans are specific to businesses, could confuse property owners and the public. Further, recording TDM plans in public records only provides notice; it does not add to the ability of an institution to meet a TDM requirement.

4. Conclusion.

Providence appreciates the attention of the PSC to these issues and PBOT's efforts to work with it and other institutions to develop appropriate Title 17 and 33 regulations.

Providence believes it would be productive to leave the record open for an additional period of time to allow further discussions between the institutions and PBOT.

Ms. Katherine Schultz, Chair
March 22, 2016
Page 4

Providence's primary concerns with the proposed Title 17 and 33 regulations remain as follows:

- The mechanism used to establish the TDM requirements;
- The elimination of the possibility of contested land use proceedings to approve a TDM plan; and
- The ability to use an existing proven and effective TDM plan instead of creating a new TDM plan.

Very truly yours,



Michael C. Robinson

MCR:rsr
Enclosure

cc: Ms. Michelle Bernard (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Jeff West (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Krista Farnham (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Dave Bodine (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Matt Maskill (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Julia Kuhn (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. John Cole (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Tom Armstrong (via email) (w/ encl.)
Ms. Judith Gray (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Peter Hurley (via email) (w/ encl.)
Mr. Kurt Krueger (via email) (w/ encl.)



KITTELSON & ASSOCIATES, INC.

TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING / PLANNING

610 SW Alder Street, Suite 700, Portland, OR 97205 P 503.228.6230 F 503.273.8169

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 18, 2016

Project #: 9906

To: Chair Katherine Schultz, Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
Krista Farnham, PPMC
Michelle Bernard, Dana White, Jeff West & Karen Weylandt, Providence Health & Services
Dave Bodine, PPMC
Mike Robinson, Perkins Cole

From: Julia Kuhn, PE

Project: Portland Providence Medical Center

Subject: Comparison of Mode Split Rates

The City of Portland is embarking on exciting changes to its Comprehensive Plan and its Transportation System Plan (TSP). These changes reflect a strong commitment and vision for how the transportation system can support future land use, economic development, public health, and the City's goals for sustainability. As part of these changes, the City is proposing significant modifications to its Transportation Demand Management (TDM) strategies to provide transportation choices for users of all ages, abilities, incomes, and phases of life. The City is also seeking commitments from institutions and private developers to partner in our efforts to achieve these strategies.

Portland Providence Medical Center (PPMC) is excited to continue to collaborate with the City and TriMet to achieve our collective TDM goals. Providence Health & Services has a long history of its commitment to TDM and has recently completed a comprehensive Transportation Management Plan (TMP) for its PPMC and Providence Office Park (POP) Campuses. This TMP exemplifies a vision to create healthier communities by identifying ways to continue to reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips to both campuses and provide transportation choices for caregivers, patients, and visitors.

Since 1996, both PPMC and POP have made significant progress toward reducing the percentage of people that drive alone to campus. These trends are shown in Table 1.

Table 1. Mode Split Comparisons

Year	Drive Alone	Carpool	Transit	Bike	Walk	Telecommute	Compressed Work Week
1996	85	6	3	2	2	0	2
1998	81	8	6	1	1	3	0
1999	82	5	9	1	1	0	2
2001	79	8	7	2	3	0	1
2003	76	5	11	1	3	3	1
2005	68	8	16	1	4	1	2
2007	68	6	14	3	4	2	2
2009	67	9	11	4	4	3	2
2011	68	9	10	5	4	2	2
2013	65	5	19	3	3	2	2
2014	66	4	19	3	3	3	2

As shown in Table 1, the drive alone rate to the campuses has decreased from 85 to 66 percent and the transit rate has increased from 3 to 19 percent. Despite this progress, Providence has committed through its TMP to enhance and expand its current TDM strategies.

Providence Health & Services looks forward to its partnership with the City, TriMet and the neighborhoods in years to come in helping our community to achieve our land use and transportation vision.

Please let me know if you need any additional information that can assist the City in shaping a vision and framework for our future.



KITTELSON & ASSOCIATES, INC.
TRANSPORTATION ENGINEERING / PLANNING
610 SW Alder Street, Suite 700, Portland, OR 97205 P 503.228.6230 F 503.273.8169

MEMORANDUM

Date: March 18, 2016 Project #: 9906

To: Krista Farnham, PPMC
Michelle Bernard, Dana White, Jeff West & Karen Weylandt, Providence Health & Services
Dave Bodine, PPMC
Mike Robinson, Perkins Coie

From: Julia Kuhn

Project: Portland Providence Medical Center

Subject: Comparison of Mode Split Rates

As a follow-up to our meeting on March 16, 2016, we prepared the following table comparing the mode splits at the two Legacy hospitals in Portland, the two OHSU campuses and Portland Providence Medical Center. The table identifies the mode splits for 2014/2015 as well as those from 2012/2013 and the percent change by mode. As shown, each hospital has very different characteristics and has seen fluctuations in year-to-year results. In addition, PPMC showed the lowest increase in drive-alone trips between the two survey years as compared to the other hospitals shown.

Please let me know if you would like to discuss further.

Table 1. Comparison of Mode Split Rates (as provided by DEQ)¹

2014/2015 ECO Results								
Location	Drove Alone	Carpool	Bus/MAX	Bike	Walk	Telework	Compressed Week	Total
OHSU Marquam Hill	49%	6%	25%	13%	4%	2%	2%	101%
Center for Health and Healing (OHSU SWF)	51%	8%	25%	8%	7%	1%	0%	100%
Portland Providence Medical Center	66%	4%	19%	3%	4%	3%	2%	101%
Good Samaritan	81%	5%	6%	2%	3%	0%	4%	101%
Emanuel	82%	4%	4%	4%	1%	0%	6%	101%
2012/2013 ECO Results								
Location	Drove Alone	Carpool	Bus/MAX	Bike	Walk	Telework	Compressed Week	Total
Marquam Hill	39%	10%	31%	11%	5%	2%	1%	99%
Center for Health and Healing (OHSU SWF)	48%	10%	21%	11%	8%	1%	1%	100%
Portland Providence Medical Center	65%	5%	19%	3%	3%	2%	2%	99%
Good Samaritan	73%	5%	10%	5%	4%	1%	3%	101%
Emanuel	80%	5%	6%	3%	1%	1%	4%	100%
Change from 2012/2013 - 2014/2015								
Location	Drove Alone	Carpool	Bus/MAX	Bike	Walk	Telework	Compressed Week	Total
Marquam Hill	10%	-4%	-6%	2%	-1%	0%	1%	2%
Center for Health and Healing (OHSU SWF)	3%	-2%	4%	-3%	-1%	0%	-1%	0%
Portland Providence Medical Center	1%	-1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	2%
Good Samaritan	8%	0%	-4%	-3%	-1%	-1%	1%	0%
Emanuel	2%	-1%	-2%	1%	0%	-1%	2%	1%

¹ In reviewing this table, it is important to note that not all rows add up to 100% due to rounding in the DEQ reports between modes.

PBOT

PORTLAND BUREAU OF TRANSPORTATION

1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 800 Portland, OR 97204 503.823.5185
Fax 503.823.7576 TTY 503.823.6868 www.portlandoregon.gov/transportation

Steve Novick Commissioner Leah Treat Director

Proposed Approach for TDM Policy For Campuses & Institutions 3/18 stakeholders meeting

March 16, 2016

This proposal is intended to address concerns and questions raised regarding a need for more clarity and certainty about standardizing Transportation Demand Management (TDM) requirements for the Campus Institutions Zones (CIZ). While these proposals have been developed with the CIZ uses in mind, in several instances they overlap to a considerable degree with TDM applications in the mixed use zones and Central City proposals.

The overall approach is two pronged:

- 1) Provide greater TDM plan certainty by incorporating specific changes into Title 17 and Title 33. These code changes provide the greatest certainty to stakeholders, but the lowest flexibility for ongoing implementation and administration;
- 2) More fully integrate TDM into development application review and mitigation. Provide more certainty in application requirements, approval criteria, and mitigation measures, including expanding multimodal LOS mitigation options in Title 33.

Proposed changes to Title 17.106 Transportation and Parking Demand Management (Attachments A and B)

In response to campus institution zone stakeholder requests, PBOT staff is recommending four additions to the proposed Title 17.106 language under consideration by the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission.

- **Performance Targets:** specify that the performance targets in a TDM plan are those adopted by the City Council in the Transportation System Plan (Attachments A and B);
- **Interim Performance Targets:** specify that interim performance targets will be calculated using a straight-line method from the base year to the horizon year (Attachment A);
- **Modified Performance Targets:** specify that there is a provision for an applicant to propose, and the City to review, a modified performance target (Attachment A);
- **Enforcement.** Clarify that failure to achieve a mode split target is not subject to enforcement (Attachment A).



The Portland Bureau of Transportation fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, the ADA Title II, and related statutes and regulations in all programs and activities. For accommodations, complaints and information, call (503) 823-5185, City TTY (503) 823-6868, or use Oregon Relay Service: 711.

Proposed changes to Title 33.852 (Attachment C)

We've heard concerns and questions about how Transportation Demand Management plan requirements relate to traffic impact analysis, approval, and mitigation in Title 33. We propose to more closely integrate TDM plan requirements with the development review process, instead of a separate TDM plan review:

- **Application Requirements.** Provide greater certainty by stating that the elements required to be in a TDM plan are found in Title 17.106.020;
- **Approval Criteria Evaluation Factors.** Add language that evaluation factors should be balanced, and that a finding of failure in one or more factors may be acceptable if the additional impacts from the proposed development are mitigated, including by TDM and/or other system improvements;
- **Approval Criteria TDM Plan TSP Reference.** Clarifies that the TDM plan should meet performance targets in the Transportation System Plan, which is approved by City Council not a PBOT Director administrative rule decision;
- **Approval Criteria Mitigation Measures.** Provides more options for mitigation. Elevates TDM and multimodal system improvements to the same level as intersection improvements, providing a clearer path to mitigate system deficiencies with multimodal improvements;
- **Transportation Impact Review Duration.** Adds flexibility by providing for Transportation Impact Review shorter than ten years. Note that the ten year duration will not trigger a new TDM plan.

DRAFT

17.106 Transportation and Parking Demand Management

17.106.010 Purpose.

Providing residents, employees, and visitors information and incentives to walk, bicycle, ride transit, carpool, and otherwise reduce the need to own and use automobiles can be a relatively quick, inexpensive, and effective strategy to achieve city goals and prevent traffic and parking impacts. Requiring transportation and parking demand management (TDM) is intended to prevent, reduce, and mitigate the impacts of development on the transportation system, neighborhood livability, safety, and the environment while reducing transportation system costs.

17.106.020 Required Elements of a Transportation and Parking Demand Management Plan. A TDM Plan shall include, at a minimum, the following elements:

- A. Site and proposed development descriptions, baseline information and analysis, including proposed auto and bicycle parking;
- B. Performance Targets:
 - 1. Performance targets from the Transportation System Plan, including pattern area targets;
 - 2. Interim performance targets may be determined as a straight line projection from the base year to 2035;
- C. TDM Strategies likely to achieve the performance targets:
 - 1. If a site meets 2035 performance targets prior to application for approval of a TDM plan, the strategies in the site's previously approved plan may form the basis of the updated plan.
- D. Automobile parking demand reduction strategies;
- E. Performance Monitoring plan;
- F. Ongoing participation and Adaptive Management plan;

17.106.030 Approval Required.

The TDM Plan, approved in writing by the Portland Bureau of Transportation, is required prior to development approval.

Modifying Performance Targets.

Applicants may propose modified targets. Approval factors for target modification include:

- a. The relative availability of bicycle, transit, bike share, and car share infrastructure and services;
- b. Whether the site has implemented documented high-effectiveness TDM strategies;
- c. Travel characteristics including schedules of employees, residents, and visitors;
- d. Best practices and performance of comparable sites in Portland and comparable cities.

17.106.040 Ongoing Participation.

The development shall be required to commit to ongoing participation in the TDM Plan in its deeds, Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions.

17.106.050 Enforcement and Penalties.

It shall be a violation of this Chapter for any entity or person to fail to comply with the requirements of this Chapter section or to misrepresent any material fact in a document required to be prepared or disclosed by this Chapter. Any building owner, employer, tenant,

property manager, or person who fails, omits, neglects, or refuses to comply with the provisions of this Chapter shall be subject to a civil penalty of up to \$1,000 for every 7 day period during which the violation continues. If an entity or person is fully implementing all other elements of this Chapter, failing to meet performance targets alone shall not be an enforcement violation.

17.106.060 Administrative Rule Authority.

City Council authorizes the Director of the Bureau of Transportation to adopt administrative rules for Transportation and Parking Demand Management consistent with City codes Title 33 and Title 17.

17.106.070 Fees.

The City may charge fees for Transportation and Parking Demand Management goods and services provided, including but not limited to application review, incentives and education, performance monitoring, adaptive management, and compliance and enforcement.

DRAFT

OBJECTIVES 11.13.G-I (*new*)

G. By 2035, reduce the number of miles Portlanders travel by car to 11 miles per day on average and 70 percent of commuters walk, bike, take transit, carpool, or work from home at approximately the following rates:

- Transit 25%
- Bicycle 25%
- Walk 7.5%
- Carpool 10%

H. By 2035, increase the mode share of daily non-drive alone trips to 70% citywide and to the following in the five pattern areas:

Central City	87%
Inner Neighborhoods	71%
Western Neighborhoods	65%
Eastern Neighborhoods	65%
Industrial and River	58%

I. By 2025, increase the percentage of new mixed-use zone building households not owning an automobile from approximately 13% (2014) to 25% and reduce the percentage of households owning two automobiles from approximately 24% to 10%.

J. By 2035, reduce Portland's transportation-related carbon emissions to 50% below 1990 levels, at approximately 984,000 metric tons.

33.852.105 Supplemental Application Requirements

In addition to the application requirements of Section 33.730.060, a transportation impact analysis is required to determine compliance with the approval criteria. The transportation impact analysis must include:

- A. Description of proposed development;
- B. Delineation of the study area, and rationale for the delineation;
- C. Description of existing uses and conditions in the study area. If the application is for development in the Cascade Station/Portland International Center Plan District, the following are also required :
 - 1. The TIA must include build-out of the Maximum Use Allocations in Table 508-1 in the count of background traffic, regardless of whether construction of those uses has occurred;
 - 2. Any approved TIA must be reflected in the BDS tracking report;
- D. Traffic forecasts and distribution;
- E. Primary traffic access routes to and from the study area;
- G. Analysis of the proportional responsibility of the proposed development to mitigate forecasted impacts;
- H. Recommended mitigation measures including transportation system management and needed transportation improvements; and
- I. Transportation and parking demand management plan that has all the elements required by 17.066.020;
- J. Evaluation of:
 - 1. Impacts on street function, capacity and level of service;
 - 2. Impacts on on-street parking;
 - 3. Access requirements;
 - 4. Impacts on transit operations and movements;
 - 5. Impacts on pedestrian and bicycle routes and safety; and
 - 6. Impacts on the immediate area and adjacent neighborhoods.

33.852.110 Approval Criteria for Cascade Station/Portland International Center Transportation Impact Analysis Reviews

The request for development or development capacity will be approved if the review body finds that the applicant has shown that all of the following criteria are met. If the applicant has chosen Transportation Impact review over meeting the objective standards of 17.XXX as allowed by 33.266.410 and 33.510.260, only approval criterion B applies:

- A. The transportation system is capable of supporting the recommended development in addition to the existing uses in the area, as shown by the TIA. Evaluation factors include street capacity, level of service, connectivity, transit availability, availability of pedestrian and bicycle networks, on-street parking impacts, access restrictions, neighborhood impacts, impacts on pedestrian, bicycle, and transit circulation, and safety. Evaluation factors should be balanced; a finding of failure in one or more factors may be acceptable if the failure is not a result of the proposed development, and any additional impacts on the system from the proposed development are mitigated as required by criterion C;
- B. A proposed transportation and parking demand management actions are sufficient to achieve the relevant mode share and auto ownership targets established by the Transportation System Plan for the uses and development on the site. It is recommended that the plan includes measures to reduce the number of trips made by single-occupant vehicles during the peak pm. commuting hours;
- C. Adequate measures to mitigate on- and off-site transportation impacts are proposed/recommended. Measures may include, but are not limited to, the following: transportation improvements to on-site circulation, public street dedication and improvement or private street improvements, intersection improvements, transportation and parking demand management actions, street crossing improvements, improvements to fill in gaps in the local pedestrian and bicycle networks, and transit stop improvements; and
- D. Transportation improvements adjacent to the development and in the vicinity needed to support the development are available or will be made available when the development is complete or, if the development is phased, will be available as each phase of the development is completed.

33.852.115 Duration of a Transportation Impact Review

The Transportation Impact review must include proposed development and possible future development that might be proposed for at least 3 years and up to 10 years. An approved Transportation Impact Review remains in effect until development allowed by the review has been completed or the review is amended or superseded.