

# Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #9 ApprovedSummary December 16, 2013; 5:30 – 8:30 pm 1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., Room 2500A

#### **Members**

Representative	Organization	Present
Blake Beanblossom	The Standard	Υ
Doreen Binder	Transitions Projects	N
Catherine Ciarlo	CH2M Hill	N
Hermann Colas, Jr.	Colas Construction	Υ
Ben Duncan	Multnomah County Health Equity Initiative	N
Brian Emerick	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	N
Jessica Engelmann	Oregon Walks	Υ
Jason Franklin	Portland State University	Υ
Jeanne Galick	Willamette greenway advocate, South Portland resident	Υ
Jim Gardner	South Portland Neighborhood Association	Υ
Patricia Gardner	Pearl District Neighborhood Association	Υ
Greg Goodman	Downtown Development Group	N
Patrick Gortmaker	Old Town / Chinatown Community Association	N
Jodi Guetzloe-Parker	Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council	N
Sean Hubert	Central City Concern	Υ
Cori Jacobs	Downtown Retail Advocate	Υ
Michael Karnosh	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	N
Nolan Leinhart	ZGF Architects	N
Keith Liden	Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee	N
Jeff Martens	CPUsage	Υ
Marvin Mitchell	Julia West House; Downtown Neighborhood Association	Υ
Anne Naito-Campbell	Civic activist and property owner	N
John Peterson	Melvin Mark Capital Group	Υ
Dan Petrusich	Portland Business Alliance	
Steve Pinger	Northwest District Association	Υ
Valeria Ramirez	Portland Opera	Υ
Tamara Kennedy-Hill	Travel Portland	N
John Russell	Property owner and developer	N
Bob Sallinger	Portland Audubon Society	N
Katherine Schultz	GBD Architects, Planning and Sustainability Commission	Υ
Mary Valeant	Goose Hollow Foothills League	N
Karen Williams	Carroll Investments	Υ
Jane Yang	NW Natural	Υ

#### **Alternates**

Representative	Organization	Present
John Bradley	Northwest District Association	N
Dave Harrelson	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	N
Rick Michaelson	Alternate for John Russell	Y
Lisa Frisch	Downtown Retail Advocate	N
Martin Soloway	Central City Concern	N
Kevin Myles	Alternate for Jeanne Galick	N
Bing Sheldon	Alternate for John Russell	N
Carrie Richter	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	N
Len Michon	South Portland Neighborhood Association	N
Raihana Ansary	Portland Business Alliance	Υ
Peter Bilotta	Portland Opera	N
Chet Orloff	Alternate for John Russell	N
Tony Bernal	Transition Projects	N
Paddy Tillett	ZGF Architects	N

### Project Team/Staff

Representative	Role	Organization	Present
Susan Anderson	Director	BPS, City of Portland	N
Joe Zehnder	Chief Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Υ
Sallie Edmunds	Central City Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Υ
Karl Lisle	West Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Υ
Nicholas Starin	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Υ
Kathryn Hartinger	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Υ
Mark Raggett	Urban Design Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Υ
Debbie Bischoff	River Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Υ
Mauricio Leclerc	Transportation Planner	nsportation Planner PBOT, City of	
		Portland	
Troy Doss	SE Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	N
Desiree Williams-Rajee	Equity Specialist	BPS, City of Portland	N
Lew Bowers		PDC	Υ
Kirstin Greene	Facilitator	Cogan Owens Cogan	Υ
Lisa Abuaf		PDC	N
Alisha Morton	Facilitator Assistant	Cogan Owens Cogan	Υ

#### Public

Wendy Rahm		
Suzanne Lennard		
Cathy Galbraith		
Rebecca Liu		

#### **Welcome and Announcements**

Co-Chair **Karen Williams** welcomed SAC members and the public. Karen shared the news that PDC liaison Lew Bowers is retiring and that this will be his last meeting as an official PDC representative. His thoughtfulness and serious personal commitment has benefited many of us both in Portland and Eugene. **Lew** thanked Karen and said that PDC will continue to be at the table. PDC liaison Lisa Abuaf will take up his responsibilities.

#### Overview of Agenda & Calendar Review

**Kirstin Greene**, Facilitator, reviewed the agenda and methods of indicating level of comfort with yellow, red and green cards. Since all the issues in front of SAC members have been discussed before, we will move quickly to the questions on the agenda for a quick feel of SAC members' concurrence on whether staff has captured direction to date correctly. Three SAC members were not able to be here this evening; they provided comments and refinements which staff will address. Copies were presented for all SAC members.

Recognizing the very tight agenda before SAC members, she asked that during the public comment period that comments address the materials that the SAC is considering tonight. Written comments are welcome at any time.

#### ACTION: Approval of Meeting Summary

**Kirstin** asked SAC members if they had any corrections or comments on the meeting summary. There were none. Kirstin asked SAC members to provide any changes via email and that the SAC Meeting #8 summary will be considered final on Friday and posted to the website.

#### Overview of Calendar and Event Updates

**Karl Lisle** reviewed the updated project and public involvement schedule which can be found in the meeting packet online <a href="http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/473064">http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/473064</a>. He emphasized moving to a new phase of the project in January where we will consider the first three of seven district policy proposals. In February we will introduce the other four. After the a series of community meetings, and a public open house, we will come back to the SAC with revisions in April and May.

Karl added that throughout the course of this project, various stakeholders have expressed interest in the Central City 2035 "Green Loop" concept. Referencing a sheet in the meeting packet with a link to a larger document online, he asked that SAC members come to the January meeting ready to discuss the concept.

#### Willamette River Central Reach Workshop

**Debbie Bischoff**, River Planner, gave a quick update on Central Reach planning. She said there were two workshops on December 4<sup>th</sup> and 5<sup>th</sup> and that about 70 people attended. Debbie thanked SAC members who came - Bob Salinger, Jeanne Galick and John Russell, who sent an associate.

She reported that it was enlightening to see all of the interested stakeholders; that participants have a lot of great ideas; and that there is much untapped potential in our riverfront area. She

continued to say that for the Central Reach to be more vibrant and attractive on land and in water, more work needs to be done to create a sense of place. This can be done through enhancement of natural resources, history (people, fish, maritime commerce etc), and other human interactions. Workshop participants felt there were many opportunity sites for habitat restoration and other work, with Tom McCall Waterfront Park being the key place.

She said the team is summarizing the ideas received and a report will be included in the January Meeting #10 packet.

#### **Public Comment**

**Suzanne Lennard:** Suzanne Lennard commented on Portland's recent loss of status as a pedestrian- and bike-friendly city by not making it into *PeopleforBikes'* list of America's 10 best Protected bike lanes or *Governing's* Most Walkable Cities list, and suggested ways we can regain our #1 reputation. See attached statement.

**Wendy Rahm:** Wendy expressed concern that the voice of West End residents does not appear to be of real concern. The impact of having no West End resident specifically on the SAC became apparent to her at the last meeting. At a previous meeting of the West End residents, staff was given a "wish" list developed by approximately 40 West End residents. She is happy to see that residential use has returned to the maps. Residents have advocated for lowered building heights, preservation of the residential-mixed use code and the historic buildings, and the desire for a park in the West End. She said that consideration should be given to a form-based code for residential / mixed-use West End. See attached statement for complete comments.

Cathy Galbraith: At the last meeting and at previous meetings, the historic buildings topic has come up. I'm not optimistic about a detailed inventory being conducted. An on-the-ground inventory for the large potential west side URA area was completed during 2010 – 2011 and was sent to BPS. I strongly suggest that we use it for this process. The demolition of historic buildings only applies to those on the historic register. If there is no designation then there is no review, including for demolition denial. There has only been one building designated in the last eight years. In the historic preservation community we look forward to the next 30 years not the next 10. In the SE Division area we learned the hard way what happens when you try to build buildings with no off-street parking. We need to insist on the details.

#### Presentation and Discussion of revisions to Quadrant-Wide Concept Layers

#### Land Use Map

**Mark Raggett** reviewed the changes since the group had last seen the Land Use Map. His full presentation can be viewed on the project website here: http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/474832.

**Kirstin** commended the great summary of changes and direction to date. She asked SAC members to please indicate their level of comfort using the voting cards with a one, two or three (one being generally comfortable, two being comfortable with some hesitation and three not comfortable.) Most were comfortable. Kirstin then asked for comments from those with twos or threes.

**Patricia Gardner:** We suffered from linking bonuses to residential in the Pearl District. If these aren't linked to bonuses then the map is fine. I'm not sure that people understand what we are seeing in the downtown core – residential is taking off and we are having more trouble on the office side.

**Staff:** Pearl has seen lots of residential. We have seen very little down on the waterfronts, so we might want a more general bonus in some areas. Around the post office site we might want more employment sites so we could have bonuses to target that.

**Staff:** Try to look at the pattern of emphasis uses. We would like to hear from you tonight if the pattern is ok.

Patricia Gardner: Just be aware of the bonus. I accept that explanation.

**Lew Bowers:** As a lover of maps – this map offends my aesthetic sense. I suggest you show the mixed-use as a hatching. Right now it's muddy and confusing and I don't like the choice of color and shading. While it is what we told you to do, it doesn't convey the visual information very well.

**Jeanne Galick:** If these are the land use emphasis maps that we want, shouldn't maps 1 and 3 agree with where the potential parks will be?

**Staff:** We can look at that. That's good.

**Steve Pinger:** Is there any way to make the brown blob transparent to get a sense of the streets? Land use emphasis areas for office and housing are included but somewhere along the line we lost the emphases of retail, institutional and government / cultural center.

**Staff:** Yes, we can make the brown transparent. Those emphasis areas are on the special places maps. Institutional is showing.

**Steve Pinger:** Residential use is directly adjacent to the I-405 viaduct and freeway. I think it's something to look at. The land use map needs to wrestle with how the impacts of I-405 are addressed.

**Staff:** We can look at that to avoid freeway impacts; we could possibly move the residential so it's not so close.

**Jim Gardner:** The early map for the very south end of South Waterfront showed residential emphasis in blue; the hatched residential emphasis doesn't go as far south.

**Staff:** That's probably an oversight and we can move that down.

**Kirstin** indicated that those who gave comments had indicated a two – level of comfort and that the majority of SAC members had indicated a one – level of comfort. She asked staff to move to the next subject area.

#### Open Spaces and Parks

**Mark Raggett** gave a brief overview and reviewed the changes since the group last saw the Open Spaces and Parks Map. The full presentation can be viewed on the project website here: http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/474832.

**Kirstin** again asked SAC members to indicate their level of comfort using the voting cards with a one, two or three (one being generally comfortable, two being comfortable with some hesitation and three not comfortable.) Again, the majority were comfortable. Kirstin then asked for comments from those with twos or threes.

**Jeanne Galick:** My understanding is that South Waterfront has potential natural resource enhancement. That area should go all the way to the south.

**Staff:** The primary targets are from the Ross Island Bridge going north. There will be a lot of enhancement all along the waterfront, but the best, most efficient enhancement will be on that north area. We will check on this though.

**Jeanne Galick:** We had a discussion asking us to think long term and talked about the possibility of vertical parks. Is there a way to encourage these and think about planning for vertical parks?

**Staff:** The note on the map about pocket parks could be inclusive on this.

**Patricia Gardner**: Parks and plazas are a specific image. If you can't put it in here then you should have an illustration in the document so that the concept won't get lost. It could be a narrative or a sketch. The use of space under the freeway north of Johnson is not showing on here. Could you at least put a dotted line for park space under the freeway?

**Staff**: It is on the transportation maps. We can add it here too.

**Jessica Engelmann:** I want to see more detail and hope that it will be there during the district area meetings. There are different uses for different types of parks – where is the inventory of playgrounds or community centers? It seems appropriate to include on this map. Field and open active recreation play is important to identify as well. At least take an inventory and understanding what is there. This will be important for land use and housing topics as well. I'm ok with these maps. I just don't want these ideas to get lost.

Staff: We can discuss in more detail at the district level conversations.

**Katherine Schultz:** I'm curious about why you are specifically calling out public/private opportunity. Why not just opportunities?

**Staff:** This came out of specific conversations with the Parks Bureau. That's their key focus. It also came out of the charrette process.

**Staff:** That's a fair observation. Perhaps it should say "public or private" or "public/private." We are trying to capture the valid input that there is some kind of deficiency in those areas. Parks isn't necessarily comfortable committing to a "standard" public park. We will take a look at it.

**Steve Pinger:** In the NW District Plan, Johnson Street is identified as a potential greenway or green street. Would we want to make Johnson Street in the Pearl a green /park connection?

Patricia Gardner: Like a planned street with green stuff? I'm ok with that.

From SAC members' indications, **Kirstin** indicated that there was general comfort with moving forward on this map.

#### Green Systems

**Mark Raggett** gave a brief overview and reviewed the changes since SAC members had last seen the Green Systems Map. The full presentation can be viewed on the project website here: http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/474832.

**Joe Zehnder** said we are looking at how to take green building forward in the City. Performance standards are needed. Storm water / energy or other measurable outcomes may

not really lend themselves to the map layers. We are developing the non-map version to bring these performance standards to you as well. This doesn't tell the whole story and we acknowledge that. We will continue to work this. It will be interesting once we develop it to tease out how it plays out in each district area.

**Kirstin** asked SAC members to please indicate their level of comfort using the voting cards with a one, two or three (one being generally comfortable, two being comfortable with some hesitation and three not comfortable.) With a majority comfortable, Kirstin asked for comments from those with a two or three.

**Rick Michaelson:** Do you want to add light rail as another opportunity on Lincoln Street? **Staff:** We can do that.

**Raihana Ansary:** There is a potential missed opportunity for the civic core, government buildings and city buildings. Government should practice what it preaches. We need an interconnected system.

**Patricia Gardner:** In the text you talk about new buildings but the amount of orange opportunity areas are quite small. We need to address retrofitting existing buildings including civic buildings etc. We should have a challenge for the existing buildings because there are so many in downtown that need it.

**Jason Franklin:** District energy for PSU is out on the edge on the map and should be located more centrally in the campus. There is general confusion about the separated storm water/sewer issue. If this is just a green street designation then you could do a better job showing where they are. What are you trying to convey? High performance areas – what are they? That is difficult to convey on the map. You will have a pretty long legend item to say what they are.

**Staff:** We are just learning about the separated storm water issue as well. This connects to the conversation about the Willamette River and swimming in the bowl. One of the stormwarter mains dumps out right at the bowl where people want to swim and brings a fair amount of pollution with it. There has been a shift of energy to take a new look at capturing and filtering /treating stormwater runoff before it goes down into the river.

**Blake Beanblossom:** It is more efficient to retrofit buildings in downtown core. Is the discharge in stormwater unique to university district or does it occur elsewhere? **Staff:** The sewer system is a very complicated thing. Much of the city has a combined storm / sewer system, but this area is different and presents different challenges. BES came to us with this idea and suggested it might be a focus area for future work.

**Jeanne Galick:** I'm not sure if this belongs on this map but we need to consider bird friendly design. It is kind of a green street thing but also a design issue.

**Staff:** With design guidelines we want to apply that to any new building in the city to make it appear more visible to migratory birds. But we can look how to apply that to this map.

**Lew Bowers:** In the Climate Action Plan, district energy is one alternative. Making existing buildings more efficient is another alternative. The two are kind of competing with each other as district energy only seems to be efficient with new buildings and it is hard to build that in with a retrofit.

**Karen Williams:** Building a district energy system only works if you have a take or pay covenant on the property which is hard to do. A quadrant wide comment is that these goals have to tie into SDC calculations and building codes. The City needs a plan for how to link those up.

**Katherine Schultz:** I don't like the map, I'm still at three. I completely agree with what Joe said. It's more of a narrative. Unless there is a unique challenge that we want to correct, then I get it. These things overlay the whole area. Greenstreets make sense if you're targeting specific ones. It's a big narrative that we want to push performance everywhere.

Jason Franklin: I am still at a two. I just don't like the big green blob in the middle.

**Dan Petrusich:** What are the actual locations where the circles are showing district energy? — There is only one in the brewery blocks right now. High performance buildings are the right direction. There is no proof that district energy is working or is a better alternative. I don't think the circles should be on there. I don't think they are going to happen. I'm not sure brewery blocks are more efficient just because there is district energy. It seems like a buzz word to me. Ultimately, energy efficient buildings should be the goal. Consolidated ownership is where it works.

**Staff:** Yes, we do indicate on the slides that we are hearing some uncertainty about district energy districts.

**Jim Gardner**: Given the doubts about district energy, and PSU questions about the green blob – if you took those two things off you wouldn't have a reason for the map. Most of the green systems ideas that we've been talking about are not mapable. There are things that should apply everywhere. They are policy issues. Do we even need a green system map? All these details will be covered in the narrative.

**Staff:** Your point is well taken. A lot of these things do apply city-wide. We consider this a place holder for further discussion and narrative.

**Katherine Schultz:** Does a map of existing achievements help in comprehensive planning? If so, that is great. If not, then why?

**Staff:** Geographically we have a couple [district energy systems] like PSU and the brewery blocks. We are thinking about systems and where they are. Where are opportunities for more and where would they serve? An example could be new buildings for South Waterfront. In the long run – it's getting an idea of the current situation and ways to share systems more efficiently and effectively. It is not a bad way to look ahead at Central City development.

**Karen Williams:** You have to put in the infrastructure first for these systems before you build them (put them in the ground). This is an economic question not a regulatory question. Things like bird friendly buildings and development to high performance standards within a particular building can be a regulatory issue. But trying to solve an economic issue with zoning is not very productive.

**Herman Colas, Jr.:** We've built one of the most energy efficient buildings – June Key Delta building. We added all the possible requirements while preparing that building. To encourage that is more a question of planning and not really designing one specific area. Try to encourage buildings as they are being designed. If you want to have solar power systems then you have to put the arrangement for the trays inside the buildings. You are spending it on buildings rather than the area.

**Patricia Gardner:** The map is important in the final document. We will need to see it so it rises to the same level as the other maps. District energy is a vision of what it is. High performance areas are very critical to be identified. The civic center should be identified. There is an opportunity to identify City owned structures. The district energy topic has taken away opportunities on the map.

**Lew Bowers:** It is important to keep maps and systems. There has been debate about building-level or larger-level systems. We are experimenting but we don't know. There may be areas of opportunity that are not just district energy. Retrofit encouragement should be blanket for the whole system.

**Kirstin** indicated a majority of you have agreement. **Joe** said if it's ok with group, we need to come back to this topic because the map tells an incomplete story on this topic. We need to look at how to apply green systems in the Central City. If you can define the outcomes and relate them to how much you can get from retrofit, from transportation, etc. then you start to get a budget. We just need to think that through. We are evolving our thinking and will come back with something that will help us keep our eyes on the big picture with what green systems can accomplish. We want to talk about results.

#### **BREAK**

## <u>Presentation and Discussion of Revisions to Quadrant-Wide Transportation, Street & Development Character Concept Layers</u>

**Mauricio Leclerc** gave a brief overview of the following maps: Transit, Pedestrians, Motor Vehicles and Bicycles. The full presentation can be viewed on the project website here: <a href="http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/474832">http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/474832</a>.

#### Transit Layer Map

Following the agenda, **Kirstin** asked SAC members to please indicate their level of comfort using the voting cards with a one, two or three (one being generally comfortable, two being comfortable with some hesitation and three not comfortable.) Comments from those with a two or three follow.

Jessica Engelmann: I know it is still in the planning stage, but there needs to be acknowledgement of the Southwest Corridor. All of the access issue symbols are really vague. Each one is a different type of access issue. On the transit map are they all bus / transit issue? Pedestrian access issues should be on the pedestrian map; transit issue on the transit map etc. But we will find that a lot of the issues will be multiple types. I also have an issue with the word improvements. It could be an improvement to some user groups but not to all.

**Jeff Martens:** My concern is with the access issue marks. Tell us more about what they are and convince me that we have an issue. Burnside and Old Town Chinatown – I don't know what the issue is there and I spend 10 hours a day there.

**Staff:** One issue at the bridgehead came from TriMet saying buses are getting stuck in the system right there. It's hard for buses coming down Burnside to get to the Transit Mall. Think like a bus on the transit map.

**Jeff Martens:** What does the symbol mean?

**Staff:** They will become an action item for something to study and address.

**Jane Yang:** How does a potential transit water stop affect the natural resource enhancement areas?

**Staff:** It would have to be evaluated at that time. There are many regulations to address that. We dug into some of these issues at the river workshop last week. Your point is well taken.

**Patricia Gardner:** It feels like we are missing something. What about a water taxi stop close to Union Station in Old Town from a tourist perspective?

**Jim Gardner:** Nolan mentioned this in his written comments. The long term plan for the streetcar loop in South Waterfront shows it continuing north on Bond. This needs to be included in the map.

**Staff:** We will fix that to be consistent with the adopted street plan.

**Jeff Martens:** I disagree with the water taxi idea. Do we have any evidence that they work, that people want them etc?

**Staff:** There is a long planning history around water transit in Portland. It has come up many times over the years and was included in the current Central City Plan. We put a memo together that reviewed each time it was discussed and it shows that the idea has never penciled out very well. That doesn't necessarily mean it couldn't work some time in the future.

**Patricia Gardner:** There is significant interest. It has been around for a long time. People want it. It could start off as a kayak fleet. People want to be on the river and we are not.

**Jeff Martens:** Having some people ask for it is one thing but we shouldn't be spending money for these things.

**Jeanne Galick:** We used to have ferries. We don't have them anymore because we have bridges. People want them back. Other cities in the nation and Canada have water taxis. **Staff:** It would be good to review the staff materials to some of the history on this issue. It has come up from river providers. It is a public idea not a staff idea. There is a definite business and community interest in this.

**Steve Pinger:** I agree with Jeff. We are struggling with what the water taxi system would be. There aren't many destinations for stops. Potential streetcar alignments – what is the relationship of the map with the streetcar system?

**Staff:** We have added a couple of new lines to look at including Hawthorne and Burnside to Con-way. Transitways on this map could potentially become streetcars in the future. The core of the Central City streetcar system is complete. We have finished up a loop. Which areas outside of the Central City will be ready to take the streetcar next? We are consistent with the plan that we put together a few years ago.

**Kirstin** indicated there were a couple of twos, but that there was general comfort with moving forward with revisions discussed.

#### Pedestrian Layer Map

**Kirstin** asked SAC members to please indicate their level of comfort using the voting cards with a one, two or three (one being generally comfortable, two being comfortable with some hesitation and three not comfortable.) Kirstin then asked for comments from those with a two or three.

**Jessica Engelmann:** The access issues are very vague and need to convey where pedestrians are not safe etc. Please consider Keith's written comment about connecting Goose Hollow to the Green Loop.

**Staff:** We will change that on the map.

**Jason Franklin:** My main concern is the need for another issue mark on 4<sup>th</sup> particularly between Harrison and Market. There is a lot of afternoon traffic – vehicular and pedestrian. This needs to be addressed. What are we trying to accomplish there? Clearly, it is a safety issue. One of the more dangerous street stretches in downtown.

**Jim Gardner:** I walk through the southernmost area of the South Waterfront. It's a difficult area to walk through. There are not pedestrians walking down there due to the current impacts.

**Jeanne Galick:** People want to walk down there and cannot.

Valeria Ramirez: When you look at the pedestrian and the bicycle maps, it looks like they are pretty much the same except for the Salmon areas. On the Eastside Esplanade, commuter bicyclists and pedestrians do not mix well. We should not think of them traveling together. We need to consider pedestrian walkways that are not ground level such as sky bridges or tunnels underneath. In my perspective walking is faster than almost everything else we can do in the Central City. It is also the cheapest. I see this tendency to widen things and widen roadways where you can. Bike lanes cost as much as the middle of the road. Separating street traffic [cars] and freight from pedestrians and bikes would be cheaper in the long run.

**Staff:** Sky bridges were a hot idea in the 70s. They were found to be expensive and people don't often use them. Sky bridges are limited by city code now. It also sends a message that they need to be on a separate plane. We want to send the message that the City is pedestrian focused. You should be able to safely cross every 200 feet downtown.

**Patricia Gardner:** The point about this having a lot in common with the bicycle map is true. It feels very much the same. If it's truly about pedestrians then let's make it about them. There are some overlaps. There are two areas where the issue marks need to be bigger – Everett and Glisan close the freeway. It is dangerous. There are pedestrian log-jams at 9<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Burnside.

**Staff:** We can make that bigger. We will also review this more at the district level.

**John Peterson:** The bicycle / ped shared space is an issue. I walk a lot downtown. We will get buzzed walking along the sea wall by bicyclists going as fast as they can. Somebody is going to have an accident. We need to separate or have rules.

**Jessica Engelmann:** It really is an issue of having pedestrians at the street level. There is a lot of economic development generated this way. I would argue against sky bridges or tunnels.

Valeria Ramirez: My concern is about the bicyclists. Pedestrians need a place to go.

**Jessica Engelmann:** Greenways are a good way to have the pedestrians and bicyclists separated. There are some really good examples. Trying to make separation on the path and move the traffic onto the specific paths. Street character design sort of gets at that. Something needs to depict the existing ones and new ones.

**Staff:** We have heard a lot about separating bikes and pedestrians on busier sections of the greenway trail. The Green Loop document online has some information about this. We will discuss this in January.

**Hermann Colas, Jr.:** I do not hear anybody talking about a set of rules for the bicyclists. Sometimes you're walking on the sidewalk and a bicyclist comes at you. Signs or rules of the road would be good.

**Patricia Gardner:** In the downtown core they can get a ticket for being on the sidewalks. **Staff:** This is correct and an enforcement issue, though the area where sidewalk riding is prohibited is fairly limited.

**Kirstin** indicated that by the voting cards there appears to be general comfort with moving forward on this map.

#### Motor Vehicle Layer Map

**Kirstin** asked SAC members to please indicate their level of comfort using the voting cards with a one, two or three (one being generally comfortable, two being comfortable with some hesitation and three not comfortable.) Kirstin then asked for comments from those with a two or three.

**Raihana Ansary:** There is a discrepancy as the slide says Motor Vehicle and Freight and the map only says Motor Vehicle. I don't see freight highlighted on the map and it should be depicted.

**Staff:** We can correct the labels.

**Jeanne Galick:** ODOT is not at the table currently but because they will hopefully be here in the next 30 years, we should add the South Portland circulation study area on the map. City council has passed it; we just need to get the people at the table to get it done. **Staff:** Agree.

**Jessica Engelmann:** The purple legend is the only place where you put improvement area. Improvement is a loaded term because it can improve for one and decrease for another. Area for heavy vehicle / congestion would be a better way to say it.

**Staff:** It seems like we were having some confusion earlier about this. We need to be clear to specify that it is an access issue for transit vs. motor vehicle vs. pedestrian, etc. depending on what map you are looking at.

**Steve Pinger:** The ramps at NW 23<sup>rd</sup> and Vaughn are not in the West Quadrant boundary but it is an access issue that affects the quadrant. Everett and Glisan are indicated as traffic ways west of I-405; and east of I-405 indicated as potential coupling.

**Rick Michaelson:** In the Pearl District there are many more east / west trafficways than there are north / south. This hasn't been fully vetted. This shows how it functions today but not how we can make it function better.

**Patricia Gardner:** I'm reading traffic-way as freight. In the Pearl, 9<sup>th</sup> is missing as a truck street. The entire system works as a net and we try to get the trucks to use those streets. Since everything west of I-405 has declined to be part of the Central City, then we can look a block or two in that area, but beyond that, they're outside of the boundary.

**Rick Michaelson:** Just because it's outside the boundary doesn't mean the Northwest District doesn't affect this.

**Staff:** We will take this up at the district level.

**Raihana Ansary:** Do we expect the freeway access and portal capacity at I-405 and Everett to meet future demand?

**Staff:** Everett and Glisan are not the worst in the system. This is something ODOT monitors and we are working with them. We don't see any major changes to the ramps / geometry there.

**Karen Williams:** I think having specified freight corridors and auto corridors is really important. Several of us have been bringing this up throughout these meetings. There are some areas where you basically can't get through because there are so many trucks blocking the streets and loading docks are not sufficient for getting them off the street. Having real freight corridors with sufficient loading docks would lead to a more accessible city. We have to be able to move commerce through the city, not just pedestrians and bicycles.

**Staff:** On the retail street we want to say this is a key retail street so let's put the loading elsewhere. It's not quite popping up because we are still talking to the freight coordinator – it will come up later.

**Dan Petrusich:** On-street parking in the Central City is missing from the map. The City has added a lot in the last 10 years and taken lanes of traffic out of service. There are hundreds or thousands of spaces that the city has added. It's integrated into the systems and has impacts on traffic flow and everything else. I would like to see comparison maps between the last planning process and what is there today.

**Staff:** Parking will be in the narrative.

**Kirstin** thanked SAC members and indicated that by the voting cards there appears to be general comfort with moving forward on this map.

#### Bicycle Layer Map

**Kirstin** asked SAC members to indicate their level of comfort using the voting cards with a one, two or three (one being generally comfortable, two being comfortable with some hesitation and three not comfortable.) Kirstin then asked for comments from those with a two or three.

**Cori Jacobs:** How would you do bicycles on Morrison with light rail, one lane of traffic, and its designation as a key retail street? I don't see how that is physically possible.

**Staff:** Putting them in mixed traffic would probably be the case. The point is getting bikes across the city. It's a direct connection through the Central City. Some of these lines will be determined by a lot of factors. Don't need to imagine that all of them are cycle track. These are conceptual and we will do a lot of future study.

**Jason Franklin:** Montgomery is showing as a bike way. Don't see this happening given Halprin Blocks etc. Making connections would be very difficult.

**Staff:** We changed the bicycle to Harrison from Montgomery.

**Jason Franklin:** PSU is the largest generator of bike trips and there is only one dedicated bikeway that serves PSU. There are no designated bikeways to get away from PSU, only to get there. We need to look carefully at that. Most people are riding on the sidewalk on 4<sup>th</sup> because they aren't comfortable in the road. What we do on Naito and how we expand on the west side

of the park is important. Get cyclists away from the seawall. I am a little unsure what we are trying to solve on the map.

**Staff:** The map is trying to illustrate a conceptual system that would appeal to the broadest range of potential bicyclists.

**Sean Hubert:** Old Town is pretty underserved by bike lanes. Burnside is the only major bridge route but dead ends. I would like to see investment in the Burnside / Old Town area. Is there a way to carry a bike route on Burnside to get to the Broadway park area? If not, needs to be part of Couch Plan.

**Jim Gardner:** There is conflict between bikes and pedestrians. Bicyclists are prohibited to be on sidewalks. But Central City definition of this prohibition is too narrow.

Following the discussion, **Kirstin** indicated that by the voting cards there appears to be general comfort with moving forward on this map.

#### Street and Development Character Layer Map

**Mark Raggett** gave a brief overview of the Street and Development Character Map. The full presentation can be viewed on the project website here: http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/474832.

Again, **Kirstin** asked SAC members to indicate their level of comfort using the voting cards with a one, two or three (one being generally comfortable, two being comfortable with some hesitation and three not comfortable.) Kirstin then asked for comments from those with a two or three.

**Jeanne Galick:** I'm not sure if we can put this on the map, but during the charrette we had an "arts district" on the map. I'd like to see that on the map as it looked like an exciting idea. I think it's more like an overlay.

Staff: We can do that. It is related to this map.

**Jason Franklin:** How are these maps going to manifest themselves? **Staff:** Primarily through development standards and design guidelines, potentially also streetscape and classifications in some cases.

**Jason Franklin:** Broadway through the PSU campus will become more retail. They all will have retail / mixed use. This strip will continue to the south.

**Rick Michaelson:** I am surprised not to see Lovejoy remain as a retail street. That's where I do all my retail shopping. Grocery store, liquor store, bank. It is a major retail street. **Staff:** We can add this back.

**Jeff Martens:** Green line along the waterfront – what are we saying about the waterfront here? **Staff:** Green streets can be trails and that is a trail. We are not adding a street.

**Jim Gardner:** A friend contacted me recently about land use and street character. He did a survey along the streets in the West End in the 1960s. The idea was to narrow the sidewalks with the ultimate goal of easing access out of town to the west through the tunnels. They went ahead and did that. It just made the lanes wider. He thought then and thinks now that it was

destructive to the street character. Particularly since the West End is primarily resident-focused, can we reexamine and possibly reverse that?

**Kirstin** indicated that by the voting cards there appears to be general comfort with moving forward on this map. She acknowledged staff's great preparation work and the SAC members on their deliberation and response.

Co-chair **Katherine** thanked everyone for all their hard work in 2013. We look forward to focusing on the district work in 2014.

Meeting Adjourned at 8:25 pm.



#### DIRECTOR

Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard (Portland)

**ADVISORY BOARD** Krzysztof Bieda (Krakow) Mayor James Brainard (Carmel IN) David Cloutier (Santa Fe) Derek Drummond (Montreal) Andreas Feldtkeller (Tübingen) Mayor Dietmar Hahlweg (Erlangen) Charlie Hales (Portland) Richard J. Jackson (Los Angeles) Ferd Johns, (Bozeman) Jaques Kaswan (Berkeley) Gianni Longo (New York) Michael Lykoudis (Notre Dame) Donald MacDonald (San Francisco) Lamine Mahdioubi (Bristol) Tom Martineau (Tallahassee) Ettore Maria Mazzola (Rome) Rolf Monheim (Bayreuth) Judge Robert Morrow (Hamilton) Peter Novak (Ulm) Tatia Prieto (Huntersville) Borzou Rahimi (Los Angeles) Jürgen Rauch (München) Mayor Joseph P Riley Jr. (Charleston) Edoardo Salzano (Venice) Philip Stafford (Bloomington) Sven von Ungern-Sternberg (Freiburg) Mayor Sylvia Sutherland (Peterborough) Hartmut Topp

#### PROGRAM COMMITTEE **CHAIRS**

(Kaiserslautern) Mayor Hermann Vogler

(Ravensburg)

Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard Ph.D.(Arch.) Director **IMCL Conferences** 1030 NW Johnson St #501 Portland, OR 97209 USA Tel: 503-208-2817 Suzanne.Lennard@ LivableCities.org

Dr. Sven von Ungern-Sternberg Regierungspräsident State of South-Baden Freiburg i.B. GERMANY

www.livablecities.org

December 16, 2013

#### Statement for West Quadrant SAC

#### Improving Portland's bike network

Portland was an early leader in creating bike lanes and became #1 most bicyclefriendly city in the US. However, Minneapolis now holds the title and other US cities are making tremendous improvements that could push Portland out of the top 10 entirely. People for Bikes<sup>1</sup> has just announced their list of America's 10 best Protected bike lanes - and Portland is not on the list.

Sharrows and unprotected bike lanes on busy roads are simply not safe. "The most important reason for the higher levels of cycling in the Netherlands, Denmark and Germany—especially among women, children and the elderly" according to Pucher and Buehler, is that "cycling is over five times as safe in the Netherlands as in the USA.2" If we want to increase bike ridership, especially among women and elders<sup>3</sup>, safety must be improved<sup>4</sup>.

Separated bike lanes are especially important in increasing ridership<sup>5</sup>. Portland needs a network of separated bike lanes protected from moving vehicles by bioswales and planters (as in Indianapolis), or raised curbs (as in Denmark), or parked cars and buffers (as on 8th/9th Aves, New York), or at the very least, bollards and buffer zones (as in Atlanta and numerous other US cities). Different methods can be used in different contexts.

There are additional safety improvements that we can make at intersections beyond bike boxes: advanced green lights for cyclists, colored bike lanes across intersections, synchronized "green wave" traffic signals for bicyclists, bike lanes moving to the right and crossing with pedestrians at busy intersections, bike short cuts to make right hand turns, etc, according to the context.

We need these improvements not simply on the "Green Loop" but on the complete bicycle network of "Key Loop Connections", on all the bridges, and also on the "Ped/Bikeways".

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> http://www.peopleforbikes.org/blog/entry/the-10-best-protected-bike-lanes-of-2013

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Pucher, J., & Buehler, R. (2008). Making Cycling Irresistible: Lessons from The Netherlands, Denmark and Germany, Transport Reviews, 28:4, 495-528, Retrieved December 12, 2013, from http://policy.rutgers.edu/faculty/pucher/Irresistible.pdf <sup>3</sup> Garrard, J., Rose, G. and Lo, S. (2008) Promoting transportation cycling for women: the role of bicycle infrastructure, *Preventive Medicine*, 46(1), pp. 55–59.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> Rietveld, P. and Daniel, V. (2004) Determinants of bicycle use: do municipal policies matter?, Transportation Research A, 38, pp. 531–550.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Separated bike lanes on 6th Avenue, NY increased bicycle volume up to 177%. http://www.nyc.gov/html/dot/downloads/pdf/2012-10-measuring-the-street.pdf (Accessed December 15, 2013)



#### Improving Portland's pedestrian network

We also need to protect pedestrians from bicyclists, using similar barriers and buffers. Greenways such as those along the river, shared by bikers and pedestrians, are simply not safe for younger pedestrians. As the number of users increases, and speeding bicyclists predominate, we need to separate these users wherever possible.

As reported in Governing<sup>6</sup>, Portland is not in the top ten most walkable cities in the US, nor is it in the top ten cities where residents walk to work. Cambridge is top with 24.5%; Portland trails with 6.9%. We can do better. We need to improve the pedestrian environment, especially on streets such as Burnside, to attract walkers (as well as increase workforce housing in the West Quadrant). Protected bike lanes and pedestrian zones are good for business, too<sup>7</sup>.

We need more area-wide traffic calming (rather than individual traffic-calmed streets), car free zones (for certain hours of the day, on regular days of the week), and Living Streets/Home Zones/Woonerven.

There are some blocks where pedestrian traffic is very heavy, that could become car-free. This should be on an experimental basis for the hours/days when pedestrian traffic is highest, on a regular schedule (like First Thursdays) to attract people to go shopping/eat out there.

"Living Streets" where pedestrians have equal right to the width of the street and cars are limited to walking speed should be introduced adjacent to a residential population, especially on streets with outdoor cafes/restaurants. This encourages residents to socialize in the public realm while children play on the street.

We can regain our reputation as a walkable city by <u>prioritizing</u> walking. This means, not only wide sidewalks, but also redesigning main crosswalks to prioritize the pedestrian, and uphold the highest possible safety standards.

Suzanne H. Crowhurst Lennard, Ph.D.(Arch.)

Co-founder and Director, International Making Cities Livable Council Author & editor of 8 books, including: Livable Cities Observed; The Wisdom of Cities; Genius of the European Square; The Forgotten Child: Cities for the Well-Being of Children; Making Cities Livable; etc Suzanne.Lennard@LivableCities.org

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>6</sup> <u>www.governing.com/topics/urban/gov-most-walkable-cities.html</u> (Accessed December 15)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>7</sup> Locally-based businesses on New York's 9th Ave increased retail sales up to 49%. http://www.nyc.gov/html/dot/downloads/pdf/2012-10-measuring-the-street.pdf

Wendy Rahm WQ SAC COMMENTS December 16, 2013

I would like to begin by correcting a box checked off at the last meeting that I believe was misleading. Karl said staff had come to the DNA, but staff came to a poorly advertised DNA Land Use Committee meeting, of which I am a member. *Including* me, there were 4 residents of the area present. That is not adequate outreach. It implies again that the voices of West End residents do not appear to be of real concern.

However, several months ago I advertised and around 40 West End residents came to a meeting with Karl. Staff was later given their "wish" list, which included a desire for the preservation of the West End's RXd residential-mixed use code and the historic buildings. At the last meeting, residential use was returned to the maps, which was good to see. Thanks to staff. Residents have also advocated for lowered building heights, allowing for livable development that would be sensitive to the over 80 historic buildings that date between 1880 and 1935 and that tell beautifully the story of Portland's development at the turn of the century. Consideration should be given to a form-based code for a residential/mixed use West End.

This same group of 40 residents expressed a desire for a park as an incentive for middle class families to live in the West End with the idea that this population would be good for downtown's economy. Although this is mapped, it is "iffy." Preferable would be to have a parks department priority for a park there instead of a public private partnership that would no doubt be a developer bonus for additional height. This is not what is wanted.

At the last SAC meeting, the impact of having no resident on the SAC became painfully apparent. No one on this committee raised a voice to put the West End on the list of areas for review when heights are revisited. Yet several public speakers/West End residents were here last time to advocate that heights need to be lowered in the West End. A little history might be useful: Current heights were raised in 2002 with a possibility of a business improvement district. At that time, livability was not a concern or topic for discussion as it is today, and there was no inventory of the historic properties in the West End. In addition, to my knowledge, like this group, that committee which recommended and got passed raising those heights did not have a resident from the West End either. That district did not materialize but the allowable heights did. Today, there is an inventory of those historic buildings. It would be good if SAC would inform itself of the history and architecture by many famous architects that are threatened with demolition unless these existing building heights are lowered. Preferable would be to limit maximum heights to not more than 10 stories, which would allow for development that is sensitive to the surrounding context and a livable street life. I realize this might be considered a "takings" issue, but my question is, did those landowners pay for the "giving"?

I ask you to consider a form-based code for the West End and to put the West End on the list of areas where heights will be revisited.