

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, June 14, 2016

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd (arrived 2:18 p.m.), Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Maggie Tallmadge (left 2:20 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: Jeff Bachrach, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin

City Staff Presenting: Deborah Stein, Sara Wright, Eric Engstrom, Judith Gray, Denver Igarta, Courtney Duke, Troy Doss

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

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Director's Report

Deborah Stein

- The Comp Plan is at Council for a final vote tomorrow at 2 p.m. in Council Chambers. Prior to the vote is a celebration sponsored by Commissioner Novick and the Anti-Displacement Coalition in the City Hall Atrium.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the May 17 and 24, 2016 PSC meetings
- RW #8051 Vacation of Unnamed Alley between N Midway Ave and N Columbia Blvd

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.
(Y7 – Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, Tallmadge)

Task 5: Community Involvement Program

Hearing / Recommendation: Sara Wright

Sara gave an overview of the Community Involvement Program. Today is a hearing about the program, and we're seeking a recommendation from the PSC to forward the plan to Council.

Testimony

1. Dixie Johnston: BPS has done a remarkable job on the program/plan document, but it needs more specificity. Look at the definitions and context put together that are in the existing codes. *see written testimony*
2. David Johnston: The role of neighborhood associations and recognized associations is necessary, but the proposed draft deletes the phrase "neighborhood association". I've suggested some wording that could be inserted in the plan to emphasize the NA role. *see written testimony*
3. Laura Campos: My concern with the current document is that it seems to water down the central role neighborhood associations have. By creating the Diversity and Civic Leadership (DCL) group and spreading out responsibilities of representing our citizens and compromise our

goals, NAs lose focus. NAs need to represent more people, including people of color.

4. Greg Greenway, PIAC: I strongly urge the PSC to move the CIP forward to Council. It puts Portland in line with State Goal 1 and the stated Portland Plan goals. Chapter 2 of the Comp Plan, along with the CIP that implements it, represents a model for cities. We really support the relationship that is forming. Our letter highlights a few items we'd like to see incorporated to clarify components, but we are very supportive overall. *see written testimony*
5. Courtney Duke, PBOT: We appreciate the collaboration with BPS. Our input was received and incorporated in both Chapter 2 and the CIP. PBOT has some minor amendments that clarify legislative versus non-legislative projects and what would be part of the CIP and what wouldn't. We are concerned about the resources required, so we would encourage the PSC to ask Council to ensure funding is specified for the CIP. *see written testimony*

Commissioner Tallmadge: Some testimony we received said that the plan leaves little room for the community to establish their own goals and objectives. Is this something PIAC agrees with?

Greg: PIAC sees that the framework is there and it allows the public much more input in the process and the ability to monitor the work. We do see some areas for clarification as noted in our letter. Metrics could be clearer. In the supporting text, it should be clear that the role of the CIC works with and oversees staff, but it should also be a liaison group to the community.

Commissioner Tallmadge: How exactly is this plan watering down the role of neighborhood associations?

Courtney: It doesn't change any resources or what is funded. But there could be additional resources provided to non-NA groups.

Laura: My concern is that what I've noticed is that we have a division. People in the DCLs have been reluctant to talk to NAs. I'm concerned not about a loss of resources but a division. We should work with NAs versus creating new groups.

6. Doug Klotz: Emphasis in NAs is about home owners. It is wise that the document doesn't emphasize NAs because they generally don't represent neighborhoods as a whole. We need to look at groups that are not necessarily recognized by ONI to be sure to include them. The CIP is definitely headed in the right direction.

Chair Schultz closed testimony at 12:59 p.m.

Written testimony received

Discussion

Commissioner Tallmadge noted that one piece of testimony said there wasn't clear indication of how feedback would be received and incorporated about the CIC. Is this something that should be added?

- This is asking for a prescriptive level instead of what we're aiming to get here for the programmatic level. This is something for the CIC to work on after it's established. We want the program to be iterative to let us keep improving as we learn more about best practices.

Commissioner Baugh: Are PBOT's recommendations going to be included?

- Yes, we have worked with PBOT and will incorporate them in the language before it goes to Council.

Chair Schultz: I do feel that we need to hear from a broader representation of our community. We have well-organized NAs, but the people who come before us are mostly property owners. Could we broaden the definitions even more?

- The definitions change is a proposed change to the Zoning Code. It's actually a housekeeping item because the Title 33 definition has to match the Comp Plan glossary; the language here is directly from the new Comp Plan glossary. The CIP is not limiting outreach to just recognized organizations.

Commissioner Larsell: How soon with this program be implemented?

- The CIC will have a relationship and reporting with the PSC. 2018 is when the Comp Plan becomes effective, but we are putting in place the work of establishing the CIC, working with OEHR and ONI now, and we're already reorienting ourselves to be following the program guidelines so we're fully up and running by the time the Comp Plan is implemented. It means starting work on what the budget looks like, ensuring we have the commitment for funding as we move forward.

Commissioner Smith: I bemoan the verbiage change from community involvement to citizen involvement. Citizenship is still a value I hold highly, but I also recognize this is how we get more people to share their voices with us. In the same vein, NAs are incredibly valuable for a lens for place in making our decisions; but by that nature, they won't attract some people. We have to have other mechanisms for other groups, and I'm strongly supportive of the direction of this plan in supporting this.

Commissioner Houck: I echo *Commissioner Smith's* comments.

Commissioner Tallmadge: I would love to incorporate PIAC's recommendations in terms of ensuring resources and having a liaison from the CIC to PIAC. And a community involved process about working on metrics. Additionally, I would say keep hammering in equitable resourcing to groups outside of NAs and have a more robust involvement process.

- These are items that could be included in the letter to Council.

Commissioner Baugh is fully supporting of the plan and broadening the opportunities for non-geographic communities to participate. The important part is about resources. We need to emphasize this must be funded by Council for the program to be successful.

Motion

Commissioner Baugh moved to recommend the Community Involvement Program to City Council, including the proposed changes to Title 33. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

[withdrawn]

Commissioner Baugh moved to recommend the Community Involvement Program to City Council, including the proposed changes to Title 33 and include the proposed PBOT recommendations. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Tallmadge: I propose adding in the liaison from the CIC to PIAC. *Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

Commissioner Baugh moved to recommend the Community Involvement Program to City Council, including the proposed changes to Title 33, include the proposed PBOT recommendations and to include a liaison from the CIC to PIAC. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Houck: This is impressive work.

(Y7 – Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

Title 17 Components: Street Vacations and Transportation Demand Management (TDM)

Work Session / Recommendation: Judith Gray, Eric Engstrom, Troy Doss, Courtney Duke

Judith introduced the two portions of the TDM proposal: one part for the Mixed Use Zones plan and the other for Campus Institutional Zones.

TDM closes the gap between expensive infrastructure and the choice the individual makes to get the most out of the system. We need to preserve roadway capacity for essential roadway trips. And TDM can help achieve our growth and climate goals. TDM programs can help in reducing vehicle trips as well.

TDM in Mixed Use Zones

In Portland, we have custom TDM plans required for CUMPs and Central City Parking Review, and also some voluntary TDM programs. The Lloyd TMA (now Go Lloyd) is a great example of TDM.

We had a stakeholder meeting last week, but there is additional work to do.

New in this proposal is to require a TDM plan for residential development.

Commissioner Smith: We have reduced or removed the requirement for parking, but in lots of cases it is the market that drives the need for parking. So the economics for how we fund TDM may be difficult. Developers will need to build less parking but not because we're ahead with regulations. We also need to be careful as we move into the age of shared mobility (e.g. Uber), we are still using space on the road. Removing parking is a huge benefit but so is not getting into a congested state.

Staff has been working with stakeholders and other interested parties. There have been common themes in the feedback: There is support and appreciation that TDM strategies are helpful, but there are more questions about implementation, responsibilities and program details. We want to continue our engagement and working with the public.

Step 1 of a pre-approved plan includes "basic" pre-approved elements (slide 9).

Chair Schultz asked about the \$1100 per unit based on 2 individuals in the unit. Is there a way to charge based on how many people are living in the unit?

- To keep it simple and make it possible for this to be one-time and upfront, we don't know the number of residents. But how these are bundled, a developer could be flexible about how they are taking care of the obligation. As soon as there is an on-going component, we are getting into more of a Step 2 component.
- *Commissioner Bachrach* suggested in his letter that there should be an off-set for this, something like an SDC waiver.
- PBOT is currently revising our SDCs. It is common practice that if a developer can use TDMs up front, they can get a credit or have SDCs reduced. We'll have to think about it going forward because SDCs do provide funding for building infrastructure.

Chair Schultz: Why not have a TDM program from retailers? You could do a program to encourage employees to use mass transit, etc.

- BPS has discouraged this in the initial phase. Lots of the retail that's in mixed use outside of the Central City is pretty small scale, and the cost-benefit ratio is very different. We aren't opposed to this, but in the first step in how we roll out TDM in a mixed-use environment.

Commissioner Smith: In terms of the off-set, I believe economically there will be an off-set for parking, but it will be hard to measure. In the cities we've looked at that have successful TDM programs, who is funding this?

- It depends on market conditions. In a tight market, there may be enough return, but in others it may be passed through as additional rent. It's a bit situational.

The timing for Step 1 and Step 2: The work doesn't take effect until 2018, so we might have Step 2 developed and able to implement by 2018.

- We certainly want to have things in place by 2018. Step 1 gives a level of certainty but it doesn't preclude Step 2 from happening to build on it.

Commissioner Oxman was confused by the chart on page 2 about the effectiveness of a TDM program. It looks good if you include parking in the bundle, but what should our expectations be?

- Modeling for the long-term would go as high 25 percent reduction in auto trips in the long-term.
- We have a paid parking environment in much of the city. In the Central City, we would have more effectiveness in trip reduction. We are putting more than half of our mixed use growth in areas where we expect to have paid parking. And many buildings already are charging for parking.

Commissioner Oxman: About the \$1100 bundle, do we know what impact on turnover this has?

- We would like an on-going program for all new residents moving in. But this would be part of Step 2. We need more time to figure out the impact of the on-going option to judge the wider effects of the expansion on this approach.
- The December proposed draft included multi-modal financial incentives.

Commissioner Oxman: You're eliminating the targets for reduction in auto-ownership and mode share. How will we know we're effective?

- To tie an individual development to meeting a specific mode-split target instead of a community-wide standard is difficult. But this is good feedback if we want to include it in Step 2.

Commissioner Baugh: This plan is just for new development. But how do we work with the existing buildings?

- We know that more than half of future residents won't be included in this first Step. But for Step 2 it could be something to incorporate.

Judith walked through the key scope items for Step 2 (slide 10).

Commissioner Baugh: This is about our Climate Action Plan and transportation. If we can't reduce the trips on the streets, we won't achieve a lot of our other goals. We are going to have to price people out of their cars in some way if we want to have less congestion. We have to bite the bullet and look at some of the conditions and impacts when we get to Step 2. We have to step forward first then come back with what we can do. I'd also remind us that PBOT does not need to come back to the PSC to do the work. We are not in control any more, but we want to be in control because of how the policies relate to our other work. We need PBOT to work with us and come back with a solid plan for Step 2.

This is triggered by Title 33 code, which does require the PSC's approval. Title 17 is where the specific direction lives, which is outside the PSC's purview. But we would much rather have the PSC's support before going to Council.

PBOT is hoping for a letter of support to go to Council, and the PSC could mention this in your letter to Council about the mixed use zones project.

Commissioner Larsell: Developers would pay \$1100 per unit to go for transportation incentives. What if the person in the unit doesn't want the incentive?

- This is what we're tracking in the survey to see what's being used or not.
- The simplest way is a calculated fee, which then becomes and account for the building to use in a way that works best. The building would still have the value of the incentive, but they might want a different way to use it.

Commissioner Larsell: Lots of times, people really like the incentives, but if it's wasted, then others will look at it and question it.

- This is a good point. We wanted something so flexible that could be used by anyone. We will add this to make sure it's flexible enough that it's transferable and valuable.

Commissioner Smith remembers the genesis of Smart Trips. One of the features was that they were highly personalized and could be tailored. So incentives could take a lot of forms. I would think that in this spirit, if we want to get the most bang for the buck, I hope Step 2 is very data-driven to make sure incentives are being used well. This is a Smart Cities investment. TDM is a carrot to entice people out of their cars. It's important how we fund the carrots to make them effective.

- It is our intention to make this flexible enough for third-party implementation. We'd also like to have app developers and others, so it definitely ties into the Smart Cities approach. Even with Step 1 in Title 33 there is an option to do an alternate tailored plan; this would be suited for a larger development.

Commissioner Smith: On page 5 of the memo, #1 removes TDM requirements for Central City zones. But I thought the CC2035 Plan has a TDM linkage.

- We heard from stakeholders that we need to look at the Central City differently. So at this point, we are taking it out of this process and adding it to Step 2.
- Initial Title 33 proposal for CC2035 will not include TDM. *Commissioner Smith:* This is disappointing.

Commissioner Houck: This is like déjà vu going back 20-30 years to an analogous situation with floodplain and stormwater management when engineers wanted to build "hard" infrastructure. It's taken that long to convince utilities to combine green infrastructure approaches with more traditional engineered solutions to solve environmental problems. I like this approach which combines investment in roads but also relies on non-engineered options. But, I share Katie's and Katherine's concerns about incentives not being wasted. I like the approach of being non-structural and multi-objective.

Commissioner Baugh: What do you mean by third-party development? Is this private or public?

- It could be either or both. A TMA is an example. There may be other models or examples. The scale of where this makes the most sense is beyond a single building (e.g. a district) as *Commissioner Smith* noted.

Commissioner Tallmadge: I think we also see a geographic burden; if we're looking at East Portland and people's jobs are still mostly in the Central City, there is an increased burden of the cost of a car versus time to take public transportation. A bus pass may not be as worthwhile an incentive because of the time to get to work.

Commissioner Smith: Vanpool is an option that the Swan Island TMA uses effectively.

Chair Schultz has a concern about not including TDM in the Central City. If we're ready to do it in mixed use zones, why can't we do something similar for the Central City? There has to be a tie-in and understanding of how they work together.

- In the Central City, there is a more complex ecosystem of property owners and stakeholders. We want to take enough time to get buy-in. It's a time factor of how we propose it.
- There is a different parking environment in the Central City, and folks that choose to locate here have invested in a non-single-occupancy lifestyle in large part. If we can find a way for the CC2035 Plan to include a similar TDM plan, but I don't want to do it badly.

The hope is that we get support for the 2-step process. If there are concerns or items we want to have considered, let's get this on the table.

Troy: The PSC has raised good questions. We on the Central City team are concerned about putting something in at the last minute, without getting adequate support from stakeholders. The Proposed

CC2035 Plan comes out next week. I think we have adequate time to deal with this issue and not throw it into the CC2035 at the very last minute without stakeholder engagement. The CC2035 briefing with the PSC is in two weeks. From a code perspective, I don't know what we'd put in Title 33 now without figuring out the details first. I would add this as a high priority item to figure out, but it would be irresponsible for us to put something in the code draft in the next week. We want to make sure we get it right and are happy to work on in the next few months.

Chair Schultz: If the Central City lags, should mixed use zones be on the same timeline?

Commissioner Baugh: We want to look at how the entire city works and addresses TDM. It would be a question for mixed use zones and others outside the Central City why we're asking them to make changes before the Central City.

Commissioner Smith: We need to grow total trips inside and to the Central City by 50 percent, without growing auto trips, and I don't believe that's possible without a TDM component. I agree we should take the time to do it right and sort out residential versus employment TDM, which is complicated. But we have to go into our consideration of CC2035 with the expectation there will be TDM.

- Staff agrees with this. We need to look at the overall package.

Chair Schultz is supportive of a two-stage approach. I am concerned with the \$1100 per unit on top of other fees. It's big money, and we're fooling ourselves if we think it won't get passed on to renters unless we can provide incentive to the developers to not do so. I want to put something in the letter that while we're in support, I would like to see an off-set considered. If TDM is really going to work, that reduction in SDCs seems to be the most logical tie to me.

Commissioner Smith moved for the PSC to support the simplified Step 1 as a starting point, knowing it will be modified in Step 2. Step 2 should include on-going programs for new residents, a component to bring in all buildings, and looks at targeting to make sure the incentives will maximize effectiveness. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Baugh wants to add that staff should evaluate off-sets in Step 2 as part of what comes back to the PSC.

Chair Schultz wants off-sets to be part of Step 1 with the continued review and updates as necessary for Step 2.

Commissioner Smith included *Chair Schultz'* comment to include the off-sets review in Step 1.

The PSC had consensus on this item to include in a letter to Council about TDM for mixed-use zones.

TDM for Campus Institutions

Judith gave an overview of Campus and Institution requirements and the proposed requirements in the Campus Institutional Zones project. PBOT has updated and modified the Campus TDM proposal based on community input over the past few months. Judith highlighted the key changes (slide 18).

Commissioner Oxman: Do you have behavioral science people working with you on this? It's a human who drives a car, so changing behavior becomes very important and something to think about.

We have penciled in an August 2 date to continue discussion on the Campuses portion.

Commissioner Smith: A concern I had was that we got to our public hearing about campus institutional zoning, and both sides told us they didn't like it. We amended the work in line with the institutions' requests. And here again we have ideas from the institutional stakeholders, but we need to have neighborhood input for a balanced review too.

- If we can iron this out by the August 2 date, we certainly will. We will continue to work with the stakeholders.

We will have a statement in Title 33 that says you have to have a currently-certified TDM plan. There is still a required transportation impact assessment. Land use isn't how you get TDM approved, but contents can be brought to bear. This piece needs more thinking, which is what we'll be working on to include in the TDM reviews.

The Campus Institutions TDM discussion will continue at the August 2 PSC meeting.

Street Vacations

Courtney presented components of the memo. Title 17 language that PBOT staff had proposed last December. We modified the street vacation policies in the Comp Plan Chapter 8. Council voted to incorporate these policies to include community uses. *Commissioner Rudd* had expressed concern about the community uses policy changes.

PBOT staff did make minor changes based on conversations with BPS and right-of-way staff to make approval criteria more flexible.

The current proposal is to ask the PSC to recommend that we consider temporary uses in the approval criteria.

Commissioner Rudd: I understand my policy concerns aren't shared. ROW is for transportation for a variety of means. Accessory uses are ok, but I'd rather see a property vacated if it isn't going to be used for a transportation purpose at all. Looking at the language itself, I think we need to define "temporary", "community uses" and "public services". Criteria #8 says "any other matter of like or different nature...", which to me means you can deny for any reason.

- The intent of #8 is about putting on conditions of approval.
- We can certainly add the definitions to the Zoning Code.

Chair Schultz: What about, for example, a street fair that happens every other year in the right-of-way?

- This could be considered a valid use for keeping the right-of-way and not vacate it.
- I think everything in the right-of-way requires a permit to use, but we can check on that.

This has to be in Title 17 and go through Council. The first hearing is in late September. This is distinct from TDM.

Commissioner Smith moved to give conceptual approval to the Street Vacation memo with the expectation that final definitions will be brought to the PSC on August 2. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

(Y6 – Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Schultz, Smith; N1 – Rudd)

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 3:09 p.m.