

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, April 12, 2016

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach (arrived 12:42 p.m.), Andre' Baugh, Katie Larsell, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Maggie Tallmadge (left at 2:30 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: Mike Houck, Teresa St Martin

City Staff Presenting: Joe Zehnder, Susan Anderson, Deborah Stein; Lance Lindahl, Denver Igarta, Courtney Duke, Peter Hurley, Judith Gray, Zef Wagner (PBOT)

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

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Smith:* I have been in a couple meetings discussing the Smart Cities concept. The City has a formal proposal into USDOT for a \$40M grant, and there was a meeting with equity partners today. Also, as I think you know, Council is doing final consideration of Comp Plan Amendments (Thursday @ 6 p.m. and April 20 at 2 p.m.). I'm considering writing a letter about digital equity and open data if other PSC members are interested in signing on.
- *Chair Schultz* will be at the Comp Plan hearing on Thursday to do a short introduction on behalf of the PSC. If there are other items that PSC members want to write letters about like *Commissioner Smith* is doing, we can share via Julie who will see if others want to co-sign. Open data, industrial lands and golf courses, and downzoning of Eastmoreland are topics we've discussed at the officers' meeting.
 - Joe clarified that the letters would be from individuals, not from the PSC as a whole. One of the golf courses is out, and Broadmoore is in and being rezoned. The concern was that there isn't the same amount of acreage.
- *Commissioner Spevak* noted there are a few middle-housing amendments that have been proposed by Council members that he'll be writing about.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- There is a proposed ordinance going to Council tomorrow about tightening rules around lobbyists and current/past City officials. In the draft there is a provision that applies to the PSC that we've asked to get clarified since it's not totally clear how it would affect PSC members. Those concerns have been shared with the Auditor's office to try to clarify things. The decision is to pull that particular provision in the ordinance tomorrow. We could get the Auditor's office to come to a PSC leadership meeting for direct dialog, and BPS is prepared to offer comments to what comes out as well. The ordinance includes PDC and the Design Commission as well.
 - *Commissioner Smith* was part of the original advisory group that helped create the lobbying code. He explained that the prohibition would be to prohibit a Commission member to lobby City Council for money/compensation.

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

[Testimony for today's meeting](#)

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the March 22, 2016 PSC meeting.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y8 – Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

RW #8070, SW Florida St west of SW 45th

Hearing / Recommendation: Lance Lindahl

Lance introduced the proposed vacation and gave the background of this being the last piece of a vacation that was approved in 2012.

Testimony

1. Jim Winkler, Winkler Development Co: This is the “street to nowhere”. Adjoining property owners didn’t want to pursue the LID, which is why they were against it. This portion of the street has no connectivity. We are fully supportive of the LID and improvements that will bring.
2. Doug Klotz: I did oppose the larger vacation several years ago. Looking at it at this point, I see it’s not worth keeping this little piece. But we need to look closer at vacations more generally.

Chair Schultz closed the hearing at 12:47 p.m.

Discussion

Commissioner Baugh noted there is no need to have any kind of sidewalk or easement to connect, right?

- There is a stream just to the west of this vacation, and there are other connections being made with the LID.

Motion

Commissioner Baugh moved to recommended the street vacation #8070. *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

Task 5: Transportation System Plan

Work Session / Recommendation: Denver Igarta, Courtney Duke, Zef Wagner, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Presentation

Denver introduced the project and recapped the meetings the PSC has held. There have been over 400 comments about the plan.

There are 3 lists before the PSC today:

- Consent list. Items here could be voted on as a package.
 - *Commissioner Tallmadge* asked to pull #3 for discussion.
 - *Commissioner Baugh* asked to pull #4 and #7.
- Discussion list. There are seven items on this list for discussion.
- No change list. These are items proposed not to change and delay to a future public process.
 - *Commissioner Smith* asked to pull #4 for discussion.

Denver gave an overview of the discussion list items, in which staff has offered options and their proposal/recommendation.

Autonomous Vehicles (Attachment K)

Courtney described the changes to objectives made for Stage 2 of the TSP. We got recommendations for additional objectives in Chapter 8, and our response to that and most other additions was to put them in the Stage 3 work for the TSP. We're starting this stage shortly and expect to finish it about this time next year. Public facilities work, Vision Zero and additional analysis of the Comp Plan after Council adopts it are major components of Stage 3. The objectives will be part of the TSP, not the Comp Plan. That why the change to objectives is fairly narrow for this stage.

Commissioner Smith has a growing degree of concern that autonomous vehicles will have a big impact on the city in the next 20 years, and I want to get ahead of this. They are shared mobility tools, but we could have a situation of cars without passengers actually creating more VMT, for example. I assembled an informal group of "thought leaders" on this topic. The objectives language I submitted favors shared mobility, considers equity and looks at other things we want to get out of autonomous vehicles to benefit the city. I'm in agreement with staff that we shouldn't adopt this for Stage 2, but I would like to make a more specific motion than the one in the staff report:

I move to direct staff to include language substantially similar to the amendment in the Stage 3 discussion draft. *Commissioner Spevak* seconded.

Commissioner Bachrach asked if this is the appropriate time to do this. Is this premature?

- Stage 3 is where staff will be putting forward new objectives, so the timing is good.

Commissioner Baugh is concerned autonomous vehicles would take away from other basic transportation needs and not look at equity as a component of implementation. They are the "shiny new penny". Who and/or where will we need to take money from to make this happen?

- *Chair Schultz* suggested it could be an effective and efficient way to get to our goals. If we don't put it in and have a discussion.
- *Commissioner Smith*: I don't want the technology to happen to us, so I see this as a precautionary measure to get ahead. The goal of the objectives is to make us pay attention.

Courtney noted that including direction to staff in the PSC's letter and the next discussion draft would be to make sure we're looking at people and equity.

Commissioner Tallmadge: My concern is the study and what studying for this may displace resources in terms of other projects or objectives.

- Autonomous vehicles has been on the objectives for Stage 3 list since the beginning. There are also PBOT staff already working on this that we can tap to help us.

Commissioner Bachrach asked if we are at the level of evolution that private developers

- ODOT region 1 has been working with various companies and researchers around the region. It's not an "if" but more of a "when" question, so we want to have policies in place.
- *Commissioner Smith*: One of my deliverables is to get Portland ahead of ODOT and map our destiny. I think we have a better idea of urban needs.

Commissioner Spevak thanked *Commissioner Smith* for bringing this up.

Commissioner Baugh asked to amend *Commissioner Smith's* amendment to include the discussion of location, target audience and inclusion of how this meets the Comp Plan for complete neighborhoods. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

The amendment passed.

Commissioner Rudd noted it's a good idea to think about getting out of the way of testimony, but I tend to think industry should pay for it at this point.

Commissioner Smith's to direct staff to include language substantially similar to the proposed amendment, with *Commissioner Baugh's* additions, in the TSP stage 3 discussion draft. *Commissioner Spevak* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

Traffic Diversion: Neighborhood Greenways

There is just a two word change to add traffic diversion a tool for use on neighborhood greenways. Denver provided the glossary definition of neighborhood greenways including that they are low-traffic streets with priority for bicycles.

The proposal is to make more explicit “traffic diversion” as a specific tool on neighborhood greenways. This is consistent with new Comp Plan policies about traffic diversion on city greenways.

Commissioner Smith noted his Comp Plan amendment to strengthen the language around diversion. Staff used this for other parts of the TSP already. I am supportive of this staff recommendation.

Commissioner Oxman: Is there a need to include this versus “other available tools”?

- We wanted to be very specific about what tool to use; traffic diversion is what we want to use on greenways.

Commissioner Smith moved to accept the staff recommended Option A. *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

NE 7th/9th Bikeways (Attachment M)

The bulk of testimony on this topic was about extending the bikeway on NE 7th farther north and to move the Major City Bikeway to NE 7th from NE 9th. Other testimony from people was about the concern of diversions, but they weren't necessarily saying not to make this a Major City Bikeway.

Staff recommends to extend the bikeway on 7th north and extend the Major City Bikeway on 9th farther north. We felt it was appropriate to stay with the recommendation of the Bicycle Master Plan for Stage 2. We could have a larger public process in the future.

Commissioner Smith noted that currently 7th has a high volume of cut-through traffic for people to avoid MLK. Some testimony was to tame this traffic. Other testimony said that 7th would be the better bikeway if there were no cars. The problem is about cut-through traffic and the diversion tools we use. Will we have the will to try to tame the cut-through traffic to put it back on MLK, or will we live with the level of cut-through traffic? Going back to Policy 9.6, if we want biking to be the preferred mode, then we need to make sure we are protecting the full neighborhood, not just one street (e.g. residents on 8th). Between the options we have before us today, I like option C, but I don't have strong feelings right now.

Commissioner Spevak uses this bikeway and has been experimenting with it lately. 9th runs into Irving Park, which is a serious diversion.

Commissioner Spevak: I move to support 7th as the Major City Bikeway (Option A) but to switch the MCB over at about Sumner to put it on 9th. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y7 – Bachrach, Baugh, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge; N2 – Larsell, Rudd)

The motion passed.

Commissioner Rudd asked about the concern about not having enough public outreach at this point.

- Option C would negate any MCB in this area for now, which is not supported. Both A and B would at least provide guidance to have a MCB in this area.
- The project list has a 7th/9th bikeway project included.

All the options for City Bikeway are the same as for Major City Bikeway. We tried to have a similar spacing between routes.

“Major” Bicycle Map Amendments

Staff recommendation is to keep the classifications until there is further public process about moving or changing MCBs. There are inconsistencies with the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) we’d need to analyze and share with the public.

Commissioner Smith was using a frame of Civic Corridors as we identified as the most intense land use in the Comp Plan. Are there other corridors in the RTP that may get upgraded to MCB status?

- These were the ones we got the most public testimony about, but there are other corridors in the RTP as well.
- The 2018 RTP is a back-and-forth process, so we can offer ideas about the mapping, and it likely will be a mix of the two.

I’d be inclined to include “in Stage 3” in our recommendation.

Commissioner Spevak noted some advocacy for the Mason route is at a specific intersection. I own property at this intersection, but I want to check if a CB or MCB would de-prioritize this.

- Mason-Skidmore is a high priority and is on the constrained list, as is Going-Alberta.

I didn’t catch it until yesterday, but I know there is a proposal to make Sandy a MCB just from 42nd out. I think we should extend this to where it comes in and links to Burnside.

Commissioner Larsell asked why Burnside (used lots by cyclists in East Portland) isn’t included as a MCB in East Portland.

- It is actually included east of 71st, and it stays a MCB out through the city.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about SE Foster Rd, which is going to be getting a road diet. If that doesn’t happen, would a major bikeway be safe there?

- Foster’s road diet is because we have designated it a City Bikeway.
- MCB is a new classification in this stage of the TSP, so we aren’t sure what the implications will be. SW Capitol Highway is our first test.

Commissioner Oxman asked about if we are envisioning separated bike lanes on Sandy and Foster in the future.

- MCB can be a greenway, separated bikeway or otherwise. It’s only laying the groundwork for capacity of bike traffic.

The staff recommendation is to defer this to a future public process because people haven’t seen these thick lines on a map yet.

Commissioner Smith moved to direct staff to take this discussion and evaluate proposed MCB amendments and other MCB testimony for inclusion of recommendations in the discussion draft of Stage 3. *Chair Schultz* seconded.

Commissioner Baugh is not in favor of this proposal but is rather in support of staff’s recommendation as described in Option B. I’m ok looking at it, but I want to take our time to do so.

- Staff doesn’t feel they would have adequate time for a full study in Stage 3. Looking at bike classifications were what we thought would be part of Stage 2, so this isn’t currently included as a priority for staff in Stage 3.
- *Commissioner Smith* was under the impression that conforming to the RTP is a main goal of Stage 3.

- Judith Gray: We are very interested in responding to concerns, but it's difficult to take it as direction right now since we've been adding items to our scope of work for Stage 3.

Commissioner Smith rescinded his amendment and restated it:

I move to direct staff to take this discussion and evaluate proposed MCB amendments and other MCB testimony to harmonize with the 2018 RTP. *Chair Schultz* seconded.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge; N1 – Baugh)

The motion passed.

Consent Item 3 (pulled for discussion)

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about pages 7 and 9 in Section 4. She wants to add more explicit language around targeting low-income neighborhoods for increased bicycle safety infrastructure and education.

Courtney noted that, process-wise, we would need the exact language to approve or continue the work session to another date. Staff is supportive of the ideas and having additional conversation about under-served areas, but we would want to be sure we are covering the right issues. So generally we are supportive, but we would need to write it as we speak without public input or review.

Joe also noted that we'd have to come back to the PSC with the specific language. We could vote to include the "gist" of the recommendation in the PSC's letter. Between now and Council, we could draft language, and a Council member would have to be the one to bring the amendment, which we could do.

Commissioner Larsell appreciates this conversation and supports *Commissioner Tallmadge's* recommendation. East Portland is one of the areas where it's generally harder to put in bike facilities, but they are needed.

Commissioner Smith is supportive of the concept. *Commissioner Spevak* is as well.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked to apply the same principles on page 9 as well.

PSC members are in support of including this in the letter. *Commissioner Tallmadge* also wants to target areas and neighborhoods that have been under-served in this. *Commissioner Rudd* wants to be sure we are checking for consistency in other language that talks about investing in areas that traditionally have received less.

"Minor" Bicycle Map Amendments (Attachment O)

This is a continuation of the bicycle classification map amendments. This was testimony we received of a smaller scale, smaller segments of streets. It seemed like they were good suggestions to fill in gaps that the Bike Plan may have missed. Some of the list is technical corrections. Staff recommends making these corrections based on public testimony received and other technical edits.

Commissioner Smith moved the staff recommendation A with an extension of NW 22nd to Everett from Flanders. *Commissioner Tallmadge* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

Hayden Island Pathway and Item #4 from the Consent List

What we heard through testimony and hearings were two issues: the Hayden Island pathway is already designated on the north shore of the island as a bikeway. We were trying to be consistent with Council

adopted bike classification map. Staff made an initial error, so in the consent package we want to remove this from the proposed draft so we match Council's vote. We also heard testimony about the west end and removing the classification along the river. In 2009 Council removed the bicycle classification from the eastern segment but adopted a pedestrian classification as part of the Hayden Island Plan.

Staff recommends staying consistent with what's in the TSP and staying consistent with Council's 2009 decision. The question about construction of a trail on the west side: we don't have any recommended projects to improve this path in the TSP or the Bicycle Master Plan, so it likely won't occur unless it is required as a condition of redevelopment.

Commissioner Baugh had asked to remove Consent #4 because in 2009 this was a blank piece of property; today it's built up. We had a lot of discussion about Hayden Island, and there was a sense we wanted to put lines on the map to provide the opportunity to make this bike- and pedestrian-accessible along the river. In 2009 there was the consideration of the CRC, which is now gone. The opportunity to have a line on the map around a bike path is something we should hold onto, whether or not it's built. If you take it off, we will never have the opportunity to ride here, and we have very few places along our rivers where we have a connected river path.

On Consent item #4, I want to leave the line on the map and retain what's there and keep the bicycle classification in the Proposed Draft. On discussion item 6, I'm looking at Option B.

Also see Attachment D, exhibit C in the packet.

Commissioner Baugh moved to recommend Option B for item 6. *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded. *Commissioner Bachrach* is comfortable with the proposal to put this back in front of Council since it's been over 6 years since their initial vote.

Commissioner Rudd: Where is the map causing the concern about mobile homes being lost? I don't see how the path would be cutting through a neighborhood. It's on the edge.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The motion passed.

Commissioner Baugh: For consent item #4, I move that we reject staff's recommendation and keep the bicycle classification in the Proposed Draft. *Commissioner Rudd* seconded.

Commissioner Smith noted he would introduce the errata to support this initially.

Joe clarified the reference in the motion: no change in the recommendation that is in the Proposed Draft, which *does* change what's in the TSP.

(Y7 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Spevak; N – Smith)

The motion passed.

The PSC discussed mode share targets for all trips (Attachment G: Order of Objectives) 11.13. *Commissioner Baugh* moved that the order should be walk, bike, transit, carpool. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The motion passed.

Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Judith reminded the Commissioners of what TDM is and gave an overview of the TDM proposed process (slide 11).

The scope of work in the packet is intended to be draft; working with the SAC, we'll likely change this and update priorities.

We want to ensure the process for the decision is correct. Any new fees to developers must go to Council for approval. Additionally, we would take a presentation to Council for all of the TDM program and administrative rule, if recommended by the SAC or Transportation Commissioner. If requested by the PSC, we would present to the PSC of course; but in thinking about the timeline of completing the work, we are leaving this as an optional item instead of required.

Title 17 lays out PBOT's requirements. Title 33 is where we'd relay the trigger mechanisms that refer to the specifics of what would be required in a TDM plan, the specifics of which live in Title 17.

Commissioner Spevak asked about modifying performance targets. Who makes the decision? Can this be clarified?

- PBOT staff makes a recommendation, but the approval is either by BDS or, in certain cases, the Hearings Officer. This is where we're suggesting language to clarify this.

Staff intends to provide notice if there are changes. Changes to the Administrative Rules would be minor modifications. Who we'd notice would be specified in the Admin Rules. We don't currently have a formal process for notification, but it's a fair question and one we want to hear from the Advisory Committee or PSC about.

Peter walked through some of the specific Title 17 amendments (slide 13). These only apply if and when Council acts on the Title 33 code, not until then. This is to make TDMs consistent and everyone would know what the 6 components are. These are in response to comments from the public.

Commissioner Bachrach asked about what we're trying to achieve with these plans and objectives. Ultimately there is a lot of discretion even with code and objective standards. I'm concerned from a policy standpoint that a large campus or industrial user can bring in lawyers, etc, and they have more ability to navigate the uncertainties of the process. As this starts to apply to mixed-use, we're now dealing with smaller developers as well. It's a tricky proposition for smaller projects for sure, but I'm not sure how we check that we are achieving the goals. It seems very premature to approve Title 17.106 at this point.

- The Mixed Use Zones Project will include a pre-approved plan option because we don't want people to have to spend a lot of time and money on this for smaller projects. An applicant can take advantage of the pre-approved plan, unless they choose to do a custom TDM plan.
- Title 17.106 won't apply to Mixed Use Zones unless the PSC recommends, and Council approves, requiring TDM plans for mixed use buildings.

It's really hard for a developer to go to so many code chapters in Title 33 and then be referred to Title 17. Who am I talking to at that point to get approval?

Commissioner Spevak commented on the off-the-shelf plan and how it doesn't seem feasible for small (e.g. 10-20 unit) plans. How do you even talk about small projects?

Commissioner Oxman asked about what the institutional scope for TMD is. Is there an intended scope in terms of size?

- The 15 institutions in the Campus Institutional zones would be included.

Is there an intent to expand to other new or existing entities?

- In the Mixed Use Zones proposed draft, there is a proposal for pre-approved TDM mixed-use developments greater than 10 new units. Similarly in CC2035 there is a proposal for pre-approved TDM plans unless you want to do a custom plan.

On element C, removal of a TDM plan, was that just a question of timing?

- It's to be consistent to be sure it's the Hearing Officer or BDS to make the recommendation for approval of a plan.

Joe suggested we should bring the TDM item back to the PSC with an attempt to clarify some of the questions. TDM is integral to how we've built the Comp Plan in terms of vehicle capacity, so if it's not TDM, we'd need to adjust something else to get the forecasted performance to work (e.g. changing parking ratios).

Commissioner Baugh commented on the idea in (F): Is this the idea that if they're not meeting one but they are doing ok on all other performance targets ok? Not all items are equal in terms of impact to the goal.

- When a TDM plan is submitted it says they will implement certain actions. We want this commitment to be enforceable. Because there are other variables affecting performance, we thought it was fair to make sure they are doing what they said they would do rather than if they are getting the exact performance results.

Chair Schultz noted that if the process is foggy to PSC members, it must be to the public. Can we have you come back after public outreach so we can see how it all comes together, etc?

Clarity and consistency has been the intent. We know it's a confusing process. We hope we can address the questions and get them approved at the same time the Comp Plan is being implemented.

Joe recommended not to vote on the TDM today. Staff will come back with clarifications *or* say we can't clarify in this time frame. I want to be sure consider, so we can advise on the implications, too.

Chair Shultz asked if whether the concern from some PSC members was about TDM or about the process.

Commissioner Bachrach stated that he didn't realize that having some TDM was essential to capacity analysis and completing the comprehensive plan.

Joe responded that he wanted to quantify the implications of TDM and explore options.

Commissioner Baugh asked to remove Discussion Item 7 from the current document today for consideration but ensure it comes back before the Comp Plan TSP hearings and finalization because we need a TSP that includes TDM to close the deal.

Joe stated that we would have to bring this part (TDM) back before the whole thing could be supported.

Chair Shultz proposed that the other parts of the TSP be voted on today, and TDM brought back at the next work session.

Commissioner Smith moved adopt the remainder of today's consent list and direct staff to develop "trips avoided" targets. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The motion passed.

Commissioner Smith moved to recommend that City Council:

- Amend the City of Portland Transportation System Plan (TSP) as shown in the Proposed Draft of the TSP Update, Stage 2, Sections 1-13 (as amended today);
- Amend Title 17: Public Improvements, as shown in the Proposed Draft, Section 16 (as amended today)

Commissioner Larsell seconded.

Commissioner Rudd would like to remove Section 16 (about street vacations).

Commissioner Smith withdrew his recommendation and restated: I move to amend the City of Portland Transportation System Plan (TSP) as shown in the Proposed Draft of the TSP Update, Stage 2, and Sections 1-13 (as amended today). *Commissioner Rudd* seconded.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Baugh, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The motion passed.

Task 5: Residential & Open Space Zoning Map

Hearing: Deborah Stein

Disclosures

- *Commissioner Bachrach* owns a 4-plex at SE 17th that is on a list at Council. I won't vote on any section in this area. I'll clarify this before the April 26 work session.
- *Commissioner Spevak* owns property at 47th and NE Going that is potentially in the plan for a zone change.

Presentation

Deborah introduced the public hearing and provided a reminder/overview of the timing Task 5 early implementation projects. We will be bringing a Composite Map back to the PSC for a unified zoning map that will incorporate PSC feedback about each project. The timing also will allow for reconciliation of any amendments and changes from Council about the Comp Plan.

Staff set out to do a focused update of the zoning map, not a complete citywide overhaul. We focused on these 4 categories of changes (described at briefing in February). I'll talk briefly about categories #1, 3 and 4 (#2 is essentially "clean up" and is very straightforward). We expect most testimony you'll hear will be about the 3rd and 4th categories.

As a reminder: Portland has a 2-map system:

- The Comp Plan map paints a picture of land use in 2035.
- Zoning tells us what can be developed today.

In most places and situations, these two match. In categories #1, 2 and 3, the Zoning is proposed to match Comp Plan designations (including newly applied through the 2035 Comp Plan Update, and designations that have been in place since 1980).

However, in category #3, staff is proposing Zoning that does not match the Comp Plan designations.

Category #1

The PSC made recommendations to City Council about the 2035 Comprehensive Plan Map last year, and this map is now in front of City Council for decisions. The Comp Plan Map includes recommended changes to reflect a number of situations, with some changes increasing residential densities and some decreasing densities (for example, in areas with natural hazard risks, stormwater management and drainage challenges).

Your recommendations also included adding the Open Space designation to properties currently in – or proposed for – open space uses. These properties are all owned by public agencies. Where staff has proposed Open Space on the Comp Plan Map, we are also proposing Open Space zoning. City Council is now considering a number of Comp Plan Map amendments, and some of these amendments would likely affect the proposed zoning map before you today. If these amendments pass, we have an opportunity to reconcile these differences in early summer when we publish the Composite Zoning Map.

Category #3

Staff proposes limited down zoning within the David Douglas School District (Mill Park and Hazelwood neighborhoods) to temporarily ease the district's overcrowding situation.

Here we have areas that are well-served by services and transit *except* for school capacity. Once new schools are constructed and capacity exists for additional enrollment, staff asserts that the higher Comp Plan designations would be appropriate.

This situation differs from elsewhere in Powellhurst-Gilbert (also within the DDSD), where staff proposed Comp Plan down-designations to reflect a lack of connectivity, services and infrastructure. These proposals were strongly supported by EPAP and the PGNA as well as the school district.

DDSD is finalizing its Facilities Plan now, and is also actively pursuing opportunities to acquire new school sites and construct new elementary schools to meet demands.

This proposal is strongly supported by the David Douglas School District Superintendent and board members, and EPAP members. We anticipate you'll hear testimony from affected property owners who have expectations to develop at the current Comprehensive Plan designation.

Category #4

About 3.5 percent of properties across the city have zoning that doesn't match the Comprehensive Plan residential designations applied in 1980. The City of Portland Official Zoning Map depicts such areas with a dotted line. Properties are labeled with the zoning designation, followed by the Comprehensive Plan designation in parentheses.

Following publication of the Discussion Draft Residential and Open Space Zoning Map Update in November 2015, we evaluated 42 of these areas (known as "Zoning Review Areas") for their suitability and readiness for zone changes, considering current conditions and changes since the Comp Plan was drawn in 1980.

Where criteria were met, these areas have the potential to provide a blend of single family houses and duplexes near opportunity areas that are walkable, rich in amenities and services, and close to transit.

In the evaluation of Zoning Review Areas, staff considered a number of physical and social factors. Staff reviewed 42 areas in all. Based on this evaluation, 24 were proposed for a Zoning Map change. Each of the 24 is described in the Proposed Draft with a 1-2 page write-up, summarizing evaluation findings. In addition, the notes from neighborhood discussions are included in the appendix of the Proposed Draft.

Generally, residential zones in areas with relatively strong infrastructure investments, proximity to transit, amenities and services, and lack of development constraints are proposed to change to match the long-standing Comprehensive Plan designation.

The majority of proposed changes are modest in scale — most typically a change from R5, which mostly allows single-family home development, to R2.5, which allows single-family home development as well as duplexes and row houses.

What can this map change mean for a property? A change from R5 to R2.5 would allow a property owner to:

- Do nothing (retain an existing single family house)
- Convert an existing structure into a duplex
- Demolish a sf house and replace it with one sf house
- Demolish a sf house and replace it with a duplex

Note that if an interior lot is 4749 square feet or smaller, a change from R5 to R2.5 would not result in any change.

Testimony

1. Arlene Williams: Against R2.5 zoning on SE Henry St. This is a dead-end street that ends abruptly. Don't upzone this area. *See written testimony.*
2. Laura Miller, MD: Opposed to R5 to R2.5 on my street. *See written testimony.*
3. Laurie Kovack: Opposed changes from single-family to multi-family east of Lone Fir Cemetery, between Stark and Belmont (930 and 931). *See written testimony.*
4. Susan Whitney: We have a fully-developed, sustainable neighborhood with houses mostly built over 100 years. Don't upzone my property as well as the other houses along SE Division and SE Hawthorne just behind the main commercial streets. *See written testimony.*
5. Dominic Anaya, Boise Eliot NA: Opposes the proposed change #1471, amendment M to the Comp Plan, North Fremont corridor from R1 to CM. The traffic with the current development is a mess already and it becomes unsafe when school gets out.

Commissioner Baugh asked about how the zoning change would affect the affordable housing units.

It seems like where there is room to develop, it's already being taken. I'm concerned about potential replacement of existing units.

6. Lara Mendicino: The proposal includes a change from R5 to R2.5 in Piedmont (N Kerby and N Borthwick). These streets are full with old, beautiful homes. We shouldn't rezone in this area. The only redevelopment in our neighborhood that has been successful is one towards the north part of the Piedmont neighborhood, but we shouldn't be shoved into a zone that was once open space.
7. Terry Parker: I'm speaking for myself, but I support the RCNPA testimony provided to the PSC about the 60th Ave MAX station area. Inconsistency of proposed zoning changes. *See written testimony.*

8. Max Oxman: This zone is proposed to go from R5 to R2.5. It will destroy the community. I'm concerned about the timing of this hearing, and we who are here are speaking on behalf of a number of our neighbors. SE Lambert. *See written testimony – images.*
9. Bob Kowry: Own 10861 E Burnside and 9 NE 109th, which are adjacent properties. Currently zoned R2, and proposal changes to R5. This would devalue the property; we are right on the MAX line, so we'd be unable to develop larger even though we're near the light rail.
10. Doug Klotz: I support all the proposed upzoning in the review areas in the Proposed Plan. We need to take advantage of what's coming up in the Residential Infill Project, so R2.5 may mean lots of other things with options and flexibility. I am opposed to downzoning in the Eliot Conservation District. *See written testimony.*
11. Allen Brown: RCPNA, just north of the NE 60th Ave MAX station. Don't upzone this area. The PSC heard from the public 5 years ago and unanimously decided to not upzone this area. Not much has changed in the past 5 years. We would be ok to upzone some higher-density properties that are currently non-conforming.
12. Terry Griffiths, Woodstock NA: Unimproved streets in my neighborhood are a very big issue (around the Woodstock Neighborhood Center). This is currently designate neighborhood commercial on one block either side of Woodstock. In the proposed draft, it changes from designated R2.5 to zoned R2.5. We don't object in principle, but we need the infrastructure (streets) to upzone. *See written testimony and map.*
13. John Neidig: Duplex at SE Insley and 18th. Proposed from R1 to R5. I try to provide affordable housing to people, and I've owned this building over 20 years. I'd like to expand to a 4-plex. Across the street is a 16-unit building going in. This isn't a good mix with the R1 zoning across the street. I object to the proposed changes.
14. James Gorter: S Burlingame neighborhood. I'm concerned that the rationale for changes is to conform zoning to the Comp Plan map. Many changes result in higher density. Complete neighborhoods will incentivize demolition of viable homes with less affordable housing.

Chair Schultz continued the hearing to July 12 with the composite map.

Next Steps

- April 26, 2016: discuss testimony received to date and make an *initial recommendation*
- June 2016: staff publishes proposed Composite Zoning Map
- July 12, 2016: public hearing on Composite Zoning Map

The plan for the Composite Zoning map is to notice people where there is a change to what's being proposed (e.g. from City Council's decisions). For people where the proposal is the same, we won't be sending an official new notice, but we will be letting people know of the July 12 hearing.

Commissioner Baugh noted the PSC's decision 5 years about the 60th Ave Transit Station. *Commissioner Smith* noted we looked at a number of station areas, but the economic modeling didn't look to work out; the market wasn't right for the redevelopment.

Five years ago, 60th Ave wasn't ready because some of the transportation improvements were not yet in place. Many are now on the TSP on the constrained list, which is part of why we're proposing to upzone.

Measure 56 Notices are legally-required to property owners if/when there is a proposed zoning change to their property. Includes information about the hearing and how they can otherwise provide

testimony. We have been using these notices much more extensively, as a communication vehicle, instead of only what's legally required.

In some locations, addition of new development could trigger new transportation improvements that otherwise wouldn't happen in the area. This could work out to be beneficial for the neighborhood.

Commissioner Spevak noted on the Residential Infill Project, the timing is a bit off; as we heard, that project will provide some changes that may address some of the concerns we've been hearing about upzoning.

Are there particular things staff should provide additional information about for the work session on April 26?

- *Commissioner Smith*: Comments about downzoning as "takings".
- *Commissioner Rudd*: What Council is considering with downzoning in Eastmoreland and what the criteria is... so we can apply that filter to other neighborhoods.
- *Commissioner Baugh* noted Eastmoreland seems similar to 60th Ave station area. Are the criteria the same?
 - No, 60th is very specifically a station / amenity-rich transit station area. Eastmoreland is more residential.
- *Chair Schultz*: How will staff be synthesizing all the testimony we've received, particularly those comments we received via the Map App and other written testimony?
 - We'll be reviewing all testimony and "batching" types of areas to review. We may find that we have a different recommendation at the work session.

Chair Schultz restated that the Zoning Map hearing is continued to July 12. There will be preliminary recommendations after the work session on April 26.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 4:44 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator