

CIZUP Meeting #6 Notes
Thursday, September 11, 2014

In attendance: John Cole, Tom Armstrong, Rodney Jennings, Mark Walhood, Elizabeth Decker, Chris Brehmer, Marty Stiven, Jill Punches, David Ellis, Dave Johnston, Beverly Bookin, Bob Haley (PBOT), Jim Edelson , (Laurelhurst Association), Jean Harrison (NWDA Transportation Committee), Kurt Kruger, Tom Karwaki, Rebecca Ocken

INTRODUCTION

Meeting Notes from the August 14th advisory group meeting were approved without comment. Jill Punches subsequently requested that Karen Karlson's comments regarding Legacy Good Samaritan's allowable FAR be added to the record.

TRANSPORTATION ISSUES

Staff asked for the group's perspective on institution related parking and transportation issues. How are existing regulations working and where can they be improved?

In east Portland reality is different from perception regarding traffic speed and volume. Neighbors of Western States University complain about these issues but the roadways are actually operating below acceptable levels of service. Bus access on the other hand is lacking. Buses used to run to the campus every twenty minutes while now it is every 70 minutes and it is not coordinated with campus schedules. Bus service in east Portland is designed to get people out of the neighborhood (to downtown) and not back or around east Portland. It is not a viable transportation alternative for their faculty or students.

Parking issues around Lewis and Clark special events create heartburn for residents of that neighborhood. At the same time much of the traffic in the neighborhood is caused by commuters to and from Lake Oswego. It is unfair to expect universities or hospitals to solve traffic issues alone when they may be only a small part of a larger problem.

TriMet bus service is inadequate for the needs of Lewids and Clark as well and the school spends approximately \$400K a year for a private shuttle bus for their students and faculty

Clear and Objective standards make for fairer Traffic Impact Analyses and mitigation programs. The more can be defined up front the better and the most successful examples involved early neighborhood/institution communications. Cut through traffic and speed came up during the course of the Providence Medical Center CUMP creating the need for additional work. This additional documentation raised the cost substantially while not resulting in any substantial change in operational or infrastructure requirements.

It was noted that policies from the Comprehensive plan that support the need for traffic demand management programs are also supportive of the City's Climate Action Plan and other City Goals. In that sense using percent mode share split as a metric is a flawed approach. An increasing mode split for a growing institution will still result in more traffic in a neighborhood.

Administration of approved transportation demand management programs can be erratic. For example, parking limitations at Legacy Good Samaritan Hospital were not being enforced until more recently allowing commuters to use up available spaces in parking structures intended for short term parking and eating up otherwise available on-street spaces. Comparable examples are available for other institutions where administrators turn over and priorities change over time.

Kurt Krueger, from the Bureau of Transportation provided some information regarding where the Bureau is headed in regards to transportation related development regulation. Using auto-focused level of service standards that draw from nationwide aggregated data is an increasingly antiquated model at odds with Portland's goals of a more dense urban area. It is also contrary to the city's emphasis on active transportation and public transit options. He envisioned a system where an institution would be required to pay into a local transportation improvement fund similar to a systems development charge that would be earmarked to finance transportation improvement projects in and around the institution such as bike paths and crosswalks. We should spend more money on infrastructure improvements and less on studies.

There is also a flaw in the current approach in that some large projects that are allowed by right within their zoning districts are not subject to a transportation analysis while much smaller projects subject to certain land use reviews are required to provide such documentation. It leads to situations where a 50 unit development may not be required to provide transportation information while a two lot subdivision across the street must go through such a review. A more logical approach would be to require additional transportation analysis based on project size or anticipated trip generation.

Staff was asked what review procedure option they were leaning towards. In response John Cole indicate they were proposing three base zones: CI1-medical center, CI2-urban higher education and a CI3- residential higher education, each with their own set of allowed uses and development standards. Institutions would apply for one of these zones at the expiration of their current conditional use master plan or impact mitigation plan. The intent is for institutions to retain development entitlements allowed by their current approvals. At the time of this quasi-judicial rezoning application a Transportation Impact Analysis and Transportation Demand Management Plan would be a required component of a complete application. Subsequent to the rezoning there would be a set of permitted and conditional uses like in other zones and a set of development standards that would guide development. Off-site impact mitigation would continue to be required.

The ensuing discussion around this proposed review process included a comparison to the Planned District chapter, overlay zones and a review of what a zone change in conformance with the Comprehensive plan entails. No decision has been made whether or not an individual institution could opt out of the proposal. Advisory group members expressed concern that the proposed rezoning action could be more difficult than the current CUMP process and that existing entitlements could be in jeopardy.

The October PAG meeting will return to the proposed process and present it in more detail.

Rodney Jennings from the Bureau of Transportation then distributed a memo outlining a proposal to update the city's Transportation Demand Management requirements. All campus institutions are currently subject to such a requirement. As outlined in the memo PBOT is interested in

An update TDM program that includes

- Baseline and projected mode share and trip generation projections.
- Short-term and longer-term non-SOV mode share targets.
- A menu of strategies to achieve the targets.
- Performance monitoring, reporting and adaptive management.
- Enforcement provisions.

The advisory groups response to this proposal was truncated due to time constraints but issues and comments raised included the following:

Trimet should be included in the process. They have marketing expertise in this regard and can be a significant partner.

TDM should recognize differences among institutions based on their type and their location. Hospitals have less control over their patients than schools have over their students. More options are available to institutions along frequent bus service routes or max lines than for those less connected to the public transportation network.

There were questions raised regarding how TDM targets would be enforced. Institutions will not be fined or shut down but additional development permits could be impacted.

There needs to be a better way to administer these. Currently PBOT does not have the staff to review them.

There could be a relationship between TDMs and the Employee Commute Option Survey currently required by ??? every year.

Shared administrative approaches used by the Washington Park institutions and the Lloyd District businesses were offered as examples. These are partially funded by parking meter revenues.
