

Summary Meeting Notes

Industrial Land Capacity Working Group

Meeting Date: July 5, 2012

Time: 11:30 am – 1:30 pm

Location: 1900 SW 4th Av., Ste. 7100

Attendees: Corky Collier, Larry Harvey, Peter Finley Fry, Dean Marriot, Mike Houck, Jane Van Dyke, Tom Dechenne, Tom Bouillion, Bob Hillier, Pia Welch, Bernie Bottomly, Jeff Swanson, Tom Armstrong, Tyler Bump.

View the original [agenda](#) for this meeting.

Overview on working group role and industrial land planning tasks of Comprehensive Plan Update

Steve Kountz utilized a PowerPoint handout to give members an overview of the role of this working group and the Economic Development Policy Expert Group in the Comprehensive Plan Update and related background materials. A question-and-answer discussion followed.

- How will the relation of Goal 9 to other statewide planning goals be addressed?
- Questions and clarifications were discussed about the development constraints analysis in the Buildable Land Inventory used for Comprehensive Plan Update. Members asked about redevelopment/refill rates and discount rates for brownfields and low-level constraints.

Discuss preliminary policy concepts on industrial land use

The group reviewed and discussed a handout on preliminary industrial land use policy concepts.

- Consider replacing the term Central City Incubator areas. Clarification of land use direction is important in this unique, significant part of the Central City.
- Clarify what protecting prime industrial land means in Comprehensive Plan Update policy language.
- What are the implications for industrial land policies on residential land, golf courses and non-conforming uses? Will these issues be addressed in the Comprehensive Plan Update?
- One way to approach the land supply shortfalls is through the tightening up of zoning. Is it possible to also loosen regulations but keep the balance?
- Industrial areas have very different real estate markets. Differentiate policies for horizontal industry versus vertical industry and showroom-oriented industrial uses.
- How to address the conflicts between residential and industrial uses in an area like Brooklyn Yard. There is no easy fix for close-in industrial areas.
- The role of the TSP designation needs to account for freight routes and the implications for bike infrastructure. Classification of networks in TSP needs to inform industrial discussions.
- There needs to be a policy language about capital projects to facilitate expansion. The capacity alternatives should reflect a fiscally constrained approach.
- Why not set a policy for “no net loss” of industrial lands? Is it redundant because it is assumed?

Discuss options to meet capacity shortfalls

The group reviewed and discussed a matrix handout comparing alternative approaches to address industrial land capacity shortfalls.

- Add a land supply expansion alternative for commercial and residential areas to be rezoned to industrial. Opportunities exist at Gateway for use changes to industrial.
- EPAP has made recommendations to rezone properties to dispersed industrial in East Portland.
- Get rid of the alternatives laundry list for tradeoffs analysis in the handout. Is Portland Plan a wish list or set of priorities? Make clear that not all policy tradeoffs are equal.
- The financial piece of brownfields needs to be addressed to get from 40% redevelopment to 90% redevelopment.
- How much of the 300 acres on West Hayden Island would really be available for development? Account for the loss of developable land due to permitting costs, constraints, and land lost to mitigation.
- There are other constraint considerations that are outside of the City of Portland's controls, such as floodplain/floodway and environmental litigation. How can the land supply implications of this litigation be included in constraints analysis?
- Need language clarification on Columbia Corridor and Columbia Basin. Explain geographies and define the terms.
- How can the Economic Development Policy Expert Group (PEG) account for Metro's economic development and industrial lands policies? How can the PEG develop complimentary policies with Metro?

Steve asked for any additional comments on these handouts to be sent to him by July 10, so that they can be included in the materials distributed to the Economic Development PEG for their July 18 meeting.

For more information, please contact either Steve Kountz (503-823-4551 or Steve.Kountz@portlandoregon.gov).