

Summary Meeting Notes

Institutional Policy Working Group (IPWG) Meeting #1

Meeting Date: July 12, 2012

Time: 3:00 pm – 5:00 pm

Attendees: Jane Barker, Beverly Bookin, John Bradley, John Cole, David Ellis, Douglas Hardy, Tom Karwacki, Steve Kountz, Kurt Krueger, Keith North, Rebecca Ocken, Marty Stiven, LeeAnne Wrenn

Overview and Central Group Assignment

John Cole used a powerpoint presentation to explain the City's current Comprehensive Plan Update process, the use of policy expert groups to focus on specific components of the update, and the use of the Institution Policy Work Group (IPWG) to develop policies related to health care and higher education institutions.

Colleges and hospitals have been significant economic drivers over the last two business cycles continuing to add jobs even through the latest recession. Among other findings, the City's Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) is projecting that 36% (5,300) of the total new jobs created in the city through 2035 will be within the healthcare or higher education fields. An inventory of the conditional use master plans for campus institutions within the city suggest that a maximum of 73% of the projected growth within institutional employment can be accommodated on existing campuses under approved master plans. The IPWG is being asked to help the city develop Comprehensive Plan policies to increase the capacity of the existing campuses to absorb the expected increase in institutional jobs or otherwise identify ways to meet projected need.

Determinants of Institution Growth

Beverly Bookin presented a powerpoint to illustrate factors influencing the design of healthcare facilities. These include an increase in the number of out-patient procedures with a corresponding increase in the level of care needed for the remaining in-patient facilities. The need for proximity and the lack of mobility of hospital patients lead to most hospitals nationwide moving towards a multi-story nursing tower over a pedestal housing ancillary facilities with structured parking. Future investment will likely be made on existing campuses due to cost differentials while those uses less dependent on adjacencies are relocated to satellite facilities.

Jane Barker presented a similar powerpoint to outline influences on the design of college campuses. Face-to-face interaction remains important even while technology is changing the delivery of educational services. Competition for students is leading to pressure to provide improved facilities and amenities. Open space is an important organizing element of many campuses. Travel time between classes remains an important consideration with buildings of 2-4 stories best meeting this need. The context within which the campus is situated will have a great influence on its design but most college expansion will be through additional land acquisition and not building taller buildings.

Colleges and hospitals are similar in that programming and adjacencies drive design. These requirements transcend regional differences and both types of institutions are the source of above average wage jobs. There are differences in the intensity of land

uses, scale and transparency between colleges and hospitals. Finally Technology is the primary driver in changes to hospital design while market trends and competition for students influences college design

Steve Kountz explained the methodology used in developing both the demand forecasts and the development capacity figures contained in the Economic Opportunity Analysis and the Developable Lands Inventory. Job forecasts are based on trends which are then translated into a building square foot/job figures and land area/building square foot figures based on industry standards and city zoning requirements. Capacity is an aggregation of approved hospital and college conditional use /master plans on file with the city.

IPWG participants had a number of questions regarding the methodology used in determining the available capacity.

- Hospitals use "bed utilization" as an important metric in their planning efforts
- Many of the existing square footage numbers presented in the table seem high.
- The maximum square foot allowed by CUMPs is often a "pie-in the sky" figure. None of this square footage is allowed by-right. Practical constraints ranging from environmental overlays to traffic impacts to residential zone development standards prevent institutions from reaching such theoretical build-out figures.

Steve K and John C will review the capacity figure with these comments in mind.

IPWG members also discussed "growth area boundaries" included with CU/MPs. These are drawn around properties that the institutions have some expectation will eventually be incorporated into their operations but are not necessarily owned by them. Most institutions are expanding their master plan boundaries over time. Staff will review the mapped geographic boundaries of campus master plans to make sure they are accurate.

The group then discussed two policy questions proposed to them:

1. How should the city meet its growth capacity shortfall for campus institutions?
 - Policy should be towards helping existing institutions to expand.
 - It is difficult and expensive to go through the master plan process. Institutions propose as much expansion as they can possibly contemplate due to the expense involved in the review and in turn this results in unnecessary anxiety for the surrounding neighborhood.
 - Impact mitigation plans allow greater flexibility but there is less predictability.
 - South Waterfront OHSU expansion is an example where, from a zoning perspective, the process is working quite well. The underlying land use regulations have been flexible allowing for intense development but in contrast to many institutions across the city, there are no closely surrounding neighborhoods to be impacted.
 - The perimeter interface is important to review. Development internal to the campus should be easier to pursue.
 - Provide performance standards for parking and traffic.

- Good Sam has a growth boundary, tapered height plus a traffic demand management agreement. These have been institutionalized along with a Good neighbor agreement and it works well.
- Satellite healthcare facilities will not want to be too far away from the main hospital due to interrelationships.
- Satellites for colleges are not as useful unless they can be self contained such as community law or health clinics where students serve the public.
- Many of these satellite uses can be permitted under standard commercial zoning.
- PCC campuses all serve as satellites hence bus service between campuses. As satellites grow they become small campuses.
- The residential development standards which form the base zones for many institutions influence what institutions ask for and limit development capacity.
- We are no longer talking about small campuses as were envisioned 50 years ago. It is no longer practical to keep these campuses residentially zoned. A different tool is needed to provide certainty + performance standards to ensure compatibility.
- Blended boundaries between campuses and the adjoining neighborhoods are important to provide activity in the evenings and avoid deserted areas during parts of the day.
- Campus edges have been an issue and need stronger guidance from the city. There are circumstances where some commercial activity is warranted to serve the neighborhood and provide a transition

The group discussed the implication of master plan growth boundaries. What do they really mean? They are a disservice in that new residents are not aware that they exist because they do not show up on a map anywhere.

College growth can also impact the surrounding residential neighborhoods when higher density, student accommodating housing is developed outside of the Master Plan boundary. Sometimes this occurs in existing houses and sometimes it takes the form of townhouse development.

2. What are the important components of neighborhood compatibility?

- Traffic and parking
- Building and site design
- Public safety
- Gateways and wayfinding
- Types of uses
- Lighting
- Noise
- Deliver trucks
- Public Safety (off-campus)

Discussion returned to the importance of campus edges and the potential benefits of allowing some commercial activity in conjunction with the institutional uses.

There was also a discussion related to traffic impacts and a general perception that there is often an (unfair) expectation that the institutions are responsible for correcting transportation issues that they did not create,

Finally, there was a general agreement that staff should look for opportunities to bring greater clarity and conclusion to the decision making process “de-judicialize.”

Next Steps/Adjourn

- Tentative meeting date August 9
- Focus on Regulatory Options

For more information, please contact John Cole, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability at 503-823-3475 or John.Cole@portlandoregon.gov