



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability  
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

---

## MEMO

**DATE:** January 10, 2013  
**TO:** West Quadrant Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members  
**FROM:** West Quadrant Plan Project Team  
**SUBJECT:** Meeting 10 (January 21<sup>st</sup>) Packet

---

Thank you for participating in the West Quadrant Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee. The next meeting is:

Tuesday, January 21, 2013  
5:30 - 8:30 p.m. (dinner will be served starting at 5:00 p.m.)  
1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 2500A (second floor)

This meeting will include short items on two of the “big ideas” from the Concept Development phase of the process: the Willamette River Central Reach and the Green Loop Concept. The bulk of the agenda will focus on the initial discussion drafts for three West Quadrant Districts. These initial discussion drafts are intentionally incomplete and should be considered a starting place for discussions with the SAC, other stakeholders and the broader community. We need your input to improve them over the coming months.

Enclosed is the meeting packet, which includes:

1. Agenda
2. Updated Project Schedule
3. Meeting 9 Draft Summary
4. Discussion Draft District Goals, Policies and Actions (will be discussed at smaller tables).
  - Old Town Chinatown
  - Goose Hollow
  - South Downtown/University
5. Feedback worksheets for each district
6. Updated West Quadrant Plan Equity Lens
7. Additional materials for SAC review:
  - The Summary Report from the December 4-5, 2013 Willamette River Central Reach Workshop is available online at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/42544>.
  - Wendy Rahm submitted a letter related to historic properties in the West End. This is attached.
  - A map of Central City Historic Landmarks, Districts and Historic Resources Inventory Properties is now available online at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/61673>.



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | [www.portlandoregon.gov/bps](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps)  
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

*Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.*

In preparation for this meeting we ask that you:

1. Review all the materials enclosed with your packet, including the draft district policy documents.
2. Note if there are any changes for the Meeting 9 Summary

On-street metered parking or garage pay parking is available nearby. The City does not reimburse for parking but instead encourages use of alternative modes, including nearby transit, biking or walking.

If you have any questions before December 16<sup>th</sup>, please feel free to contact Karl Lisle at (503)823-4286 or via email at [karl.lisle@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:karl.lisle@portlandoregon.gov).



**Central City 2035: West Quadrant Plan  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee  
Meeting 10 Agenda**



**Meeting Details**

Tuesday, January 21, 2013  
1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., Room 2500A  
5:30 – 8:30 pm (dinner served at 5:00 pm)

**Meeting Preparation**

**Please Read:** Meeting #10 Packet. Prepare comments on First Draft District Goals, Policies and Actions for Old Town/Chinatown, Goose Hollow and South Downtown.

**Please Bring:** Meeting #10 Packet

**Meeting Purpose**

- Updates on Willamette River Workshop Results and Green Loop Concept Presentation
- Introduce Discussion Draft District Policies for Old Town/Chinatown, Goose Hollow and South Downtown. Discuss and respond.

**Desired Outcomes**

- SAC familiarity with materials. SAC feedback to staff.

**Meeting Outline**

Time	Item	Purpose	Presenter/ Participants
5:00 pm	<i>Pre-meeting dinner will be served starting ½ hour before the formal meeting starts</i>		
5:30 pm	<b>Welcome and announcements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of Agenda</li> <li>• ACTION: Approval of Meeting Summary</li> <li>• Calendar and Event Updates</li> </ul>	Information and  <u>ACTION:</u> Summary Approval	Co-Chairs Kirstin Greene Karl Lisle
5:40 pm	<b>Willamette River Central Reach Workshop Results</b>	Information	Debbie Bischoff
6:00 pm	<b>Green Loop Concept Presentation</b>	Information	Mark Raggett
6:20 pm	<b>Public Comment</b>		
6:30 pm	<b>Discussion Draft District Goals, Policies and Actions Introduction and Discussion</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Old Town/Chinatown</li> <li>• Goose Hollow</li> <li>• South Downtown</li> </ul>	Information & Clarifying Questions	Kirstin Greene Mark Raggett Karl Lisle SAC Members
6:50 pm	<b>Break</b>		All

7:00 pm	<b>Small Group Discussions on Discussion Drafts</b> 4 tables: A. Old Town/Chinatown B. Goose Hollow C. South Downtown D. Public Table	Discussion and Feedback	Staff and SAC members, Public
---------	--	-------------------------------	----------------------------------

*For this agenda item, SAC Members will be asked to select the table for the district they are most interested in discussing. Members of the public in attendance are welcome to roam and listen in on SAC discussion tables, or join a public discussion table with a staff facilitator to review and discuss the drafts.*

8:00 pm	<b>Large Group Report Back</b>	Information sharing	Kirstin Greene
---------	--------------------------------	------------------------	----------------

8:20 pm	<b>Closing Business</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Final Remarks</li> <li>• Meeting Evaluations</li> </ul>		SAC members
---------	--	--	-------------

8:30 pm	<b>Meeting Adjourned</b>		Co-Chairs
---------	--------------------------	--	-----------

**Reminders**

- Next SAC meeting is Tuesday, February 18 (same place and time). This meeting will continue the Plan Development phase of work with consideration of First Draft District Goals, Policies and Actions for the Pearl District, West End, Downtown and South Waterfront.
- Expect Meeting 11 packets via mail approximately 7-10 days before the meeting.
- Please review your packets for relevant information and homework assignments.

**West Quadrant Plan: Project and Public Involvement Schedule**

Updated: 1/8/13

Outreach work continuing through all phases of the project include: Website updates and news items, email updates, stakeholder and organization meetings as well as broad news and media publications for events.

Project Phase	Outreach Tool	Purpose	SAC Mtg and Date	Meeting Topics	
Phase 1 KICK-OFF	West Quadrant Reader Online Survey	Introduction Orientation	Mtg. 1: Mar 11	1. Introductions and Charter 2. Process Overview / Work scope 3. CC2035 Concept Plan Overview	
Phase 2 ISSUES AND IDEAS	Charrette Week with Open House	Identify Issues and Opportunities	Mtg. 2: Apr 1	1. Central City Planning and Reader Overview 2. Systems Issues and Opportunities	
			Mtg. 3: Apr 22	1. Issues and Opportunities 2. Discussion and Directions	
		Generate Ideas and Directions	Mtg. 4: May 20	1. Issues and Opportunities 2. Discussion and Directions	
			Charrette Week Jun 10	SW and NW Quadrant Charrette 1. Subareas and Policy Areas 2. Technical Work and SAC Review 3. Working Drafts and Open House	
Phase 3 DEBRIEF	Web package of Charrette results Commission Briefings	Feedback	Mtg. 5: Jul 15	1. Charrette Report and Discussion 2. West Quadrant Plan Concept Direction	
Phase 4 CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT	Open House #1 (Concept Layers)  Online response tool	Feedback and Revisions	Mtg. 6: Sep 16	1. Draft West Quadrant Plan Outline 2. Draft Quadrant-Wide Concept Layers (1, 1a, 1b)	
			Mtg. 7: Oct 21	1. Draft Quadrant-Wide Concept Layers (2, 3, 4) 2. Transportation Discussion 3. West Quadrant Districts: Boundaries and Goals	
			Open House #1 Oct 24	Draft Concept Presentation and Feedback	
			Mtg. 8: Nov 18	1. Open House Results 2. Approval of Draft West Quadrant Concept Layers (1a, 1b)	
			Mtg. 9: Dec 16	Approval of Draft West Quadrant Concept Layers (1, 2, 3, 4, 5a-d)	
Phase 5 DRAFT PLAN	Open House #2 (Draft Plan)  Online response tool  Commission Briefings	Feedback, Revisions and Endorsement	Mtg. 10: Jan 21*	1. Willamette River Workshop Highlights 2. Green Loop Concept Introduction 3. Draft West Quadrant Plan District Goals, Policies and Actions for Old Town/Chinatown, Goose Hollow and South Downtown	District Area Meetings
			Mtg. 11: Feb 18*	Draft West Quadrant Plan District Goals, Policies and Actions for Pearl District, West End, Downtown and South Waterfront	
			Open House #2: March 10	Draft Plan Presentation and Feedback	
			Mtg. 12: April 21	Revised West Quadrant Plan District Goals, Policies and Actions for Old Town/Chinatown, Goose Hollow and South Downtown	
			Mtg. 13: May 19	Revised West Quadrant Plan District Goals, Policies and Actions for Pearl District, West End, Downtown and South Waterfront	
			Mtg. 14: June 16	West Quadrant Plan Final Review and Approval	
FINAL PLAN	PSC & CC	Adopt Plan	July - Aug	-----	

\* Note: meeting date on 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday due to holiday on regular meeting time of 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday



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

**Members**

<b>Representative</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Present</b>
Blake Beanblossom	The Standard	Y
Doreen Binder	Transitions Projects	N
Catherine Ciarlo	CH2M Hill	N
Hermann Colas, Jr.	Colas Construction	Y
Ben Duncan	Multnomah County Health Equity Initiative	N
Brian Emerick	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	N
Jessica Engelmann	Oregon Walks	Y
Jason Franklin	Portland State University	Y
Jeanne Galick	Willamette greenway advocate, South Portland resident	Y
Jim Gardner	South Portland Neighborhood Association	Y
Patricia Gardner	Pearl District Neighborhood Association	Y
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	Y
Cori Jacobs	Downtown Retail Advocate	Y
Michael Karnosh	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	N
Nolan Leinhart	ZGF Architects	N
Keith Liden	Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee	N
Jeff Martens	CPUsage	Y
Marvin Mitchell	Julia West House; Downtown Neighborhood Association	Y
Anne Naito-Campbell	Civic activist and property owner	N
John Peterson	Melvin Mark Capital Group	Y
Dan Petrusich	Portland Business Alliance	Y
Steve Pinger	Northwest District Association	Y
Valeria Ramirez	Portland Opera	Y
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	Y
Mary Valeant	Goose Hollow Foothills League	N
Karen Williams	Carroll Investments	Y
Jane Yang	NW Natural	Y

## 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	Y
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	Y
Sallie Edmunds	Central City Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Karl Lisle	West Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Nicholas Starin	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Kathryn Hartinger	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Mark Raggett	Urban Design Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Debbie Bischoff	River Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Mauricio Leclerc	Transportation Planner	PBOT, City of Portland	Y
Troy Doss	SE Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	N
Desiree Williams-Rajee	Equity Specialist	BPS, City of Portland	N
Lew Bowers		PDC	Y
Kirstin Greene	Facilitator	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y
Lisa Abuaf		PDC	N
Alisha Morton	Facilitator Assistant	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y

## 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 <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/473064>. 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 stormwater 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

### **Presentation and Discussion of Revisions to Quadrant-Wide Transportation, Street & Development Character Concept Layers**

**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: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/474832>.

#### ***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 Engemann:** 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.

## **Comments on Revised Draft Concept Layer Maps for SAC Meeting 9**

*Keith Liden, AICP*

Due to a work-related commitment, I will not be able to attend next Monday's SAC meeting. I have reviewed the materials and have several comments related to the maps:

### **Overall**

Nice job. I particularly appreciate the efforts of the city staff to keep this project moving and for consistently having agenda materials provided well in advance. The concepts shown on the maps look solid to me, and I only have a few comments/concerns.

### **Map 1 - Land Use Emphasis**

Although I agree with the idea of encouraging more residential use near the river in downtown, I feel that the residential emphasis area shown from the Morrison Br. to Market is not completely realistic due to the presence of the Yamhill Hist. Dist. along with new and substantial office buildings, which are obviously not going anywhere. I suggest this residential emphasis area should be revisited to be shown only on the blocks where it is potentially viable.

### **Map 2 - Street & Development Character**

You've provided a good start to defining what the street types are, but I think you should continue to clarify how they will look and function. This will be especially important for conversations with the public. In addition, I suppose the different street types will need to be reflected in the city zoning, design, and street design standards. There's still a considerable distance between the concepts (which I like) and the translation to implement them. I don't understand why the Burnside, Morrison and Hawthorne bridgeheads would not have streets designated as civic, district, or flexible. Aren't we contemplating making these areas special and taking deliberate actions to make them so? This map at least implies the city doesn't contemplate much change for these bridgehead street sections, which are generally not very good now. The map also implies that the city doesn't plan any special treatment to improve the abysmal pedestrian and bicycling environment crossing I-405 on 4th, 5th, 6<sup>th</sup>, etc.

### **Map 3 – Parks & Open Spaces**

You note on the legend that "small parks/plazas possible everywhere", but shouldn't a small open space component be shown as part of the "Times Square" concept for Burnside near Broadway and 6<sup>th</sup>? Also, I thought we had some ideas for some modest open space element on 3<sup>rd</sup> south of Burnside where the street section is extraordinarily wide – perhaps tying in with the Ankeny pedestrian street. I think in key locations like these, the concept should show park/open space opportunities.

### **Map 4 – Green Systems**

While it refers to green systems, the overall focus of this map is about storm water. One secondary topic covered is "adapt to future river levels" whatever that means. This map should either be re-labeled to refer to storm water and flooding or be broadened to include other green concepts, such as tree planting, river bank restoration, etc. The terms on this map need further definition/explanation, especially "high performance area" and "adapt to future river levels."

### **Map 5a – Transit**

I think this map should make some reference to future transit connections related to SW Corridor. Obviously, a preferred mode and alignment are a ways off, but it's pretty clear that BRT/LRT will be coming into downtown from the south between Moody and 6<sup>th</sup>. It appears that water transit stops are intended to coincide with the key loop connections shown on 5b. If that's the case (and I think it should be) it should be called out.

### **Map 5b – Pedestrians**

Because of the general lack of good routes connecting Goose Hollow with downtown, I think Jefferson (and possibly Columbia) should also be key loop connections, at least as far east as the Park Blocks. Barbur should also be shown in addition to Terwilliger. Because of the importance of the connections with Terwilliger and Barbur to the downtown, I recommend moving the legend box on all maps to afford a clearer view of these streets and their connection to downtown.

### **Map 5c – Motor Vehicles**

I'm not sure what is meant by "freeway connection/access improvement area." Frankly, it sounds ominous. If you liked what I-405 did to the community, you'll love this next round of "access improvements."

### **Map 5d – Bicycles**

I'm please that you saved the best item for last J The Oak Street bikeway should have a continuing route going north into the Pearl. This could be 10<sup>th</sup>, but the Burnside intersection and streetcar tracks are problems. If the intent is to have Oak connect with the green loop to go northbound, I believe that's a good solution. The map shows the green loop on the southbound street in the North Park Blocks, so you may want to clarify. If you haven't already, I think you need to have a focused conversation with PSU about how the green loop would work through campus. I like the idea, but it's a very busy pedestrian area now, and introducing a major bicycle through route could be problematic.

I apologize again for missing Monday's meeting and the free pizza. Feel free to contact me if you have any questions about the above.

## Comments on Revised Draft Layer Maps for SAC Meeting 9

*Nolan Leinhart*

All,

Regretfully, I am unable to attend the meeting this week. I wanted to pass on a few comments on the maps...

### **Map 2 – Street & Development Character**

- a. I am in favor of limiting the retail focused streets in the Pearl, but 10th and 11th are really very balanced today, each having a mixture of retail and residential at the ground level. As a couplet, they behave as a pair of strong pedestrian arteries, and I would suggest that they appear similarly on the map.
- b. The list of changes indicates that a key intersection node has been added at 1st and Morrison, but the map shows a node at Morrison and Naito.
- c. The designation of Salmon as a boulevard is confusing to me. It's a key connector, as one of the only streets running from the hills to the River, but its scale and development are not consistent with what I think of as a boulevard.

### **Map 3 – Parks & Open Space**

I would suggest treating the open space connectors in the Pearl (on Irving from 10th-12th and Kearney from 9th-12th) as you have with the Halperin sequence.

### **Map 5a: Transit**

The streetcar line in the South Waterfront shows existing condition, with two-way operation north of Gibbs. Isn't the plan still to run the streetcar north through Zidell, OHSU and under the Marquam Bridge? I strongly support the original alignment, which will carry riders through the center of these new subdistricts, rather than past their western edge. The benefit of streetcar will be strongest if it is mixed into the neighborhood.

### **Map 5b. Pedestrians**

You're showing a connection and an Access/Connection Issue on Naito north of the Broadway bridge that implies a new railroad crossing that does not exist today. Is that intentional, or should it be at the current 9th street crossing?

## **Comments on Revised Draft Layer Maps for SAC Meeting 9**

*Catherine Ciarlo*

I'm so sorry, but I have had a conflict arise with tonight's meeting and will not be able to attend.

You have my comments on the transportation concept maps from our meeting a couple of weeks ago, especially:

- 1) strong support for the green loop;
- 2) citywide parking approach and policy is critical to how the quadrant evolves, and
- 3) at a policy/classification level, freight should be looked at separately from the general motor vehicle category. I don't have comments on the other maps at this point and am supportive of moving them forward.

My apologies again – I really appreciate your great work on the plan and staffing the committee.



# MAKING CITIES LIVABLE LLC CONFERENCES

*Making Cities Livable Publications*

## 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 Mahdjoubi (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  
(Kaiserslautern)  
Mayor Hermann Vogler  
(Ravensburg)

## PROGRAM COMMITTEE CHAIRS

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](mailto:Suzanne.Lennard@LivableCities.org)

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

[www.livablecities.org](http://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 bicycle-friendly 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.”<sup>2</sup> 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 8<sup>th</sup>/9<sup>th</sup> 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>1</sup> <http://www.peopleforbikes.org/blog/entry/the-10-best-protected-bike-lanes-of-2013>

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

<sup>5</sup> Separated bike lanes on 6<sup>th</sup> 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)



# MAKING CITIES LIVABLE LLC CONFERENCES

*Making Cities Livable Publications*

## **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 prioritizing 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](mailto:Suzanne.Lennard@LivableCities.org)

---

<sup>6</sup> [www.governing.com/topics/urban/gov-most-walkable-cities.html](http://www.governing.com/topics/urban/gov-most-walkable-cities.html) (Accessed December 15)

<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.

## Introduction to West Quadrant Discussion Drafts Goals, Policies and Actions

The following district discussion drafts are organized in the same format used by the N/NE Quadrant Plan. The structure is explained below.

A **District Goal** conveys the overarching vision for each district in a short statement and is intended to touch on key elements that differentiate the district from other parts of the Central City. This goal will be accompanied by a concept map and description in later drafts.

**Policies** provide more specific direction on issues associated with the larger goal. Generally following the Central City 2035 Concept Plan framework, these policies are organized into six topic areas:

- Regional Center: Economy and Innovation
- Housing and Neighborhoods
- Transportation
- Willamette River
- Urban Design
- Environment

The district policies focus on issues that are *specific* to the district in question. Policies that are relevant to the entire Central City will be addressed in future revisions to the Concept Plan. There are some notes in the discussion drafts where a policy might be best addressed at the Central City-wide level.

**Performance Targets** may be established for key measures as a means of tracking progress toward meeting goals and policies. The discussion drafts include possible measures, but no actual targets.

**Action Items** are proposed for each district to help support the goals and policies. Actions include: changes to regulations, future work items, projects, programs or studies. Implementers are identified, with the lead implementing entity noted in bold.

**Reference Policies and recent directions** are included at the end of each discussion draft to provide context for the current work.

*These initial discussion drafts are intentionally incomplete and should be considered a starting place for discussions with the SAC, other stakeholders and the broader community. We need your input to improve them over the coming months.*

# Old Town/Chinatown

## *Discussion Draft* District Goal, Policies and Actions

### District Goal

Old Town/Chinatown is a vibrant, resilient, 24-hour neighborhood rooted in a rich historical past. The district's two thriving historic districts, numerous multi-cultural attractions and higher education institutions foster a thriving mix of office employers, creative industry start-ups, retail shops and a range of entertainment venues, restaurants and special events.

The district has a balanced mix of market rate, student and affordable housing. The social service agencies in the district continue to play a critical public health role within the Portland region. The district has a mix of human-scaled, restored historic buildings and contextually sensitive infill development. It is well connected to the rest of the Central City and the region through excellent multi-modal transportation facilities and safe and attractive street connections to adjacent neighborhoods and an active waterfront.

Old Town/Chinatown's safe and respectful environment and its success as a socially and economically diverse urban neighborhood is supported by the active engagement of its businesses, institutions, property owners and residents in the management and improvement of the district.

### Policies

#### Regional Center: Economy and Innovation

**Institutions, Creative Economy and Target Sector Industries.** Support and build on the success of higher education institutions as lasting anchors for creative industries and businesses. Support entrepreneurial incubation and encourage business start-ups and PDC target sector industries to locate in the district.

**Cultural Assets.** Protect and promote the rich cultural and multi-ethnic history and diversity of Old Town/Chinatown. This includes its unique physical characteristics, cultural institutions, community organizations and mix of businesses.

**Tourism, Retail and Entertainment.** Increase the number of visitors while managing activities in a way that controls negative impacts and supports the success of this urban mixed use district. Support the unique attractions in the district, including: cultural institutions such as the Lan Su Chinese Garden and the Oregon Nikkei Legacy Center; Tom McCall Waterfront Park; retail, dining, and performance venues; and nightlife entertainment attractions. Increase the festival and event programming of public spaces in the district.

**Redevelopment.** Encourage renovation and seismic upgrades to underutilized buildings to increase useable space and economic activity in the district. Encourage new mixed-use infill development on vacant lots and surface parking lots.

**2035 Performance Targets:** Job growth, new development

**Implementation Actions:** Old Town/Chinatown – Regional Center: Economy and Innovation

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
RC1*	Implement the Old Town/Chinatown Five Year Action Plan. [Include the action plan or list of key actions in appendix]		X			<b>PDC</b> , City
RC2*	Develop and implement a parking strategy for the OT/CT that encourages the redevelopment of surface parking lots, sharing of parking stalls and maintains sufficient parking to meet the districts' present and future needs.		X			<b>BPS</b> , PDC, PBOT
RC3	Support continued project and development opportunities and help fund development gaps that can bring transformative development on large opportunity sites.					<b>PDC</b>
RC4	Increase maximum height limits in the area south of NW Everett and west of NW 4th from 100' to 175'. Require the use of preservation incentives to access height allowance above 100'.	X				<b>BPS</b>
RC5	Reduce maximum height limits in the area north of Everett from 425' to 325'.	X				<b>BPS</b>
RC6	Implement the OT/CT Retail Strategy.				X	<b>PDC</b> , PBA, OTCTCA
RC7	Actively pursue developers for City and PDC-owned properties, including Block 8, Block 25, Block A&N and Block R.		X			<b>PDC</b> , City
RC8	Explore the potential redevelopment of the Greyhound Terminal site by continuing to pursue moving bus operations onto Block Y.		X			<b>PDC</b> , Private
RC9	Renovate and seismically upgrade Union Station.		X			<b>PDC</b>
RC10	Explore the creation of a multicultural museum complex in Chinatown.			X		<b>OTHP</b> , OTCTCA
RC11	Establish a district management entity to coordinate public space and event programming and fundraising efforts.		X			<b>OTCTCA</b> , PDC
RC12	Establish a clearly delineated Entertainment District similar to those found in Austin, New Orleans and Kansas City so these activities can co-exist with other uses including housing, higher education and community-based organizations.	X				<b>BPS</b> , PDC

**Implementation Actions:** Old Town/Chinatown – Regional Center: Economy and Innovation

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
RC13	Pursue investment partnerships for seismic upgrading and other real estate development.		X			<b>PDC</b>
RC14	Provide predevelopment funds and technical assistance to enable property owners to complete full due diligence on underutilized properties.				X	<b>PDC</b>
RC15	Consider requiring development projects that include public investment, pre-development and development assistance to include seismic upgrading.		X			<b>City, PDC</b>
RC16	Determine viability of proposed Materials Lab in OT/CT.		X			<b>PDC</b>
RC17	Pursue development of one or more new shared parking facilities to serve various users in the district and replace lost parking as surface lots redevelop.		X			<b>PDC, PBOT</b>
RC18	Explore the development of new financial tools to help fund seismic upgrades to the district's historic buildings.		X			<b>City, PDC</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

## Housing and Neighborhoods

**Preservation of Affordable Housing.** Preserve and improve affordable housing in the district.

**Housing Balance.** Encourage the development of new housing in the district, especially along the waterfront, North Park Blocks and NW Glisan corridor. Emphasize middle-income and market-rate housing to balance the high proportion of low-income and shelter units in the district. Support home ownership, workforce housing and student housing projects.

**Social Services.** Preserve and support existing social service and shelter functions in the district. Limit the significant expansion of these services and do not locate additional major social services in the district until a critical mass of market-rate housing is established.

**Neighborhood Amenities and Services.** Provide and support more amenities and services that serve Old Town/Chinatown residents and workers. These include commercial, educational, medical, recreational, transportation, entertainment, emergency and social services.

**Public Safety.** Ensure the district is clean and safe for residents, employees, and visitors.

**2035 Performance Targets:** Market-rate housing units

**Implementation Actions:** Old Town/Chinatown – Housing and Neighborhoods

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
HN1	Provide a housing tax abatement program for OT/CT.				X	<b>BPS, PHB, MC</b>
HN2	Create new tools to provide workforce rental housing for households at 60%-150% of MFI.		X			<b>PDC, PHB</b>
HN3*	Develop zoning incentives to encourage market-rate housing.	X				<b>BPS</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Transportation**

**Multimodal Access.** Improve access by all modes to the district from adjacent areas and from the region. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Circulation and connectivity.** Provide for a highly accessible, safe and well connected district, with enhanced connections to the River and Waterfront Park.

**Active Transportation.** Encourage walking, bicycling and transit as a way to increase access and transportation choices, enhance livability and reduce the carbon imprint in the district. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Streetscape.** Improve the pedestrian experience by providing urban greenery and community uses of the right-of-way and by integrating high-density mixed uses. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Union Station Multi-Modal Hub.** Maintain and increase the viability of Union Station as Portland’s multi-modal passenger transportation hub.

**Parking.** Meet existing and future parking needs in a way that reduces parking ratios overtime, encourages the sharing and efficient use of parking stalls within the district’s existing and future uses, and leads to the redevelopment of existing surface parking lots.

**2035 Performance Targets: Mode Split**

**Implementation Actions:** Old Town/Chinatown – Transportation

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
TR1	Pursue streetscape projects that enhance walking, urban greenery, community uses of the right-of-way and place-making.		X			<b>PBOT</b>
TR2	Study possible reconfiguration of the Steel Bridge ramps to improve access to/along the greenway trail and create new development opportunities.		X			<b>PBOT</b>
TR3	Prepare a local circulation study for the area north of Burnside. Consider street configurations including travel directions, travel lanes, bicycle access and parking. Address barriers created by NW Broadway, W Burnside, NW Naito Parkway, the Steel Bridge ramps, Waterfront Park and the railroad tracks.		X			<b>PBOT</b>
TR5	Improve interurban bus and train connections, and connections between MAX, Streetcar and Union Station. Consider relocation of interurban bus services closer to Union Station.	X		X		<b>PDC, Greyhound</b>
TR6	Improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and safety throughout the district.				X	<b>PBOT</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Willamette River**

**Vibrant Riverfront Districts.** Encourage new development near the waterfront, including housing along Naito Parkway and targeted clusters of commercial uses in order to bring more people, events and activities to the waterfront.

**River Access.** Improve access to Waterfront Park and the Willamette River including re-activating Ankeny Dock for commercial and recreational boaters and improving access to the river at McCormick Pier.

**River Health.** Improve river conditions to support fish and wildlife by maintaining shallow water habitat at McCormick Pier and replacing invasive and non-native plants with native plants on the river banks.

**Greenway Trail.** Improve the greenway trail to facilitate bicycle and pedestrian access, reduce user conflicts and provide access to the river. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**2035 Performance Targets:** Amount of development near river, Waterfront Park and Greenway Trail usage, linear feet of riverbank enhancement

**Implementation Actions:** Old Town/Chinatown – Willamette River

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
WR1	Improve pedestrian and bicycle connections to the river in the area of the Steel Bridge and NW Flanders.		X			<b>PBOT</b>
WR2	Activate the Saturday Market shelter in Waterfront Park and Ankeny Square with new small businesses, events and regular programming throughout the year.				X	<b>PPR,</b> OTCTCA
WR3	Rehabilitate and re-open the Ankeny Dock for public access and for recreational and commercial boaters.		X			<b>PPR</b>
WR4	Improve human access and river health by re-designing and implementing a floating boardwalk with enhanced vegetation on the bank in the McCormick Pier area.			X		<b>BES,</b> Private
WR6	Improve river bank conditions by encouraging replacement of invasive and non-native plants with native plants on the river bank between the Steel and Broadway Bridges		X			<b>BES,</b> Private

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Urban Design**

**Street Character and Hierarchy.** Establish a more intentional street hierarchy that distinguishes the development and land use character found on retail/commercial streets, boulevards and flexible streets. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Open Space.** Increase publically accessible open space in the district and encourage the provision of plazas and pocket parks with new development.

**East-West Connectivity.** Increase east-west connections to the Pearl District and the waterfront and strengthen the Festival Streets along NW Davis and Flanders through supportive adjacent new development and active programming.

**Historic and Cultural Resources.** Protect and enhance the rich historic and cultural character of Old Town/Chinatown. Preserve and rehabilitate historic resources throughout the district.

- **Skidmore/Old Town.** Protect the historic character and architecturally significant resources of the Skidmore/Old Town National Historic Landmark District. Encourage contextually sensitive infill development on vacant and surface parking lots.

- **New Chinatown/Japantown.** Protect and enhance the historic multi-cultural significance of the New Chinatown/Japantown Historic District. Encourage new development that responds to the district's historic character and multi-ethnic history and today's Pan-Asian culture.

**Active Uses.** Increase the number of ground floor activating uses and eliminate gaps in the built environment.

**2035 Performance Targets:** Active street frontages, rehabilitated buildings, redeveloped parking lots

<b>Implementation Actions:</b> Old Town/Chinatown – Urban Design						
#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
UD1*	Connect OT/CT to the Green Loop with pedestrian and design improvements to NW Davis and Flanders.			X		<b>PBOT, PDC</b>
UD2	Update the National Register nomination for the New Chinatown/Japantown historic district. Review and revise as appropriate district boundaries, period and areas of significance, and list of contributing properties.		X			<b>BPS, OTCTCA</b>
UD3	Develop and adopt historic design guidelines for the New Chinatown/Japantown historic district to encourage development that recognizes Portland's relationship to the Pacific Rim, reflects today's Pan-Asian culture, and acknowledges the district's multi-ethnic history.		X			<b>BPS</b>
UD4	Review, revise and adopt the draft updated historic design guidelines developed for the Skidmore/Old Town historic district in 2008.		X			<b>BPS</b>
UD5*	Explore options for changes to the historic review process for new development in New Chinatown/Japantown historic district.		X			<b>BPS</b>
UD6*	Develop regulatory tools that support the preservation and rehabilitation of historic resources.	X				<b>BPS</b>
UD7	Install art and educational displays that highlight Native American and maritime history in the district and Waterfront Park. [Potential Central City-wide action]		X			<b>RACC, PPR</b>
UD8	Incorporate Crime Prevention through Environmental Design principles in the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines. [Potential Central City-wide action]		X			<b>BPS</b>

**Implementation Actions:** Old Town/Chinatown – Urban Design

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
UD9	Review and revise as appropriate the 4 <sup>th</sup> Ave. “Bright Lights District” provisions of the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines.		X			<b>BPS</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Environment**

**Upland Habitat.** Create an upland wildlife habitat corridor from the North Park Blocks to the Willamette River using street trees, native vegetation in public open spaces and eco-roofs.

**Green Infrastructure.** Encourage bird-friendly building design and the use of eco-roofs to manage stormwater and create habitat for birds and pollinators on new buildings. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**High Performance Rehabilitation.** Support the inclusion of carbon reducing and environmentally friendly features and technologies in the rehabilitation of historic structures while preserving their historic character.

**2035 Performance Target:** Acres of eco-roofs, tree canopy

**Implementation Actions:** Old Town/Chinatown – Environment

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
EN1	Complete a “green finger” between the North Park Blocks and the Willamette River, potentially to include street trees, stormwater planters, eco-roofs, and native plants in public open spaces.		X			Parks, PBOT, BES
EN2	Incorporate guidance for bird-friendly building design in the Central City Fundamental Design Guidelines. [Potential Central City-wide action]		X			BPS
EN3*	Develop new regulatory and incentive tools to increase the use of green building technologies such as eco roofs, green walls and innovative stormwater management techniques. [Potential Central City-wide action]	X	X			BPS, BES

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

---

**For Reference: Previous West Quadrant Direction and Existing Policies**

Chinatown Planning Events Ideas and Themes, 2013

*Forum Ideas*

1. Preserve culture and history, rehabilitate key historic buildings, promote heritage tourism.
2. Foster economic development and investment, “Pan-Asian/Creative Corridor,” entrepreneurship.
3. Diversify activities—true 24/7, balanced housing mix, activate storefronts.
4. Encourage redevelopment, identify what to preserve, create incentives and address parking demand.

*Charrette Summary Key Planning Themes*

1. **Harness Creative Energy**, especially east-west along NW Couch and north-south along NW Broadway, using the higher education institutions as lasting anchors to attract creative companies.
2. **Support and encourage the nightlife district**, but manage and buffer it well to increase positive impact and reduce negatives.
3. **Continue pursuing housing goals to balance the district housing mix**, especially student and market-rate. Consider high-density housing north of NW Everett along the NW Glisan corridor.
4. **Recognize the Skidmore District as a national architectural gem** and continue to prioritize restoration and complementary infill at a comparable scale.
5. **Reexamine the preservation framework in New Chinatown/Japantown** to recognize the district's unique cultural significance. Identify key cultural and architectural resources, and develop a more flexible and attractive development framework for other sites. Focus the cultural hub of the district between NW Everett to W Burnside and NW 4th and NW 3rd.
6. **Develop and implement an improved parking management strategy for the district** to meet growing demand that encourages surface-lot redevelopment and rehabilitation of historic buildings.
7. **Improve connections** into and out of the district from the west and south. Improve access to Waterfront Park and the Willamette River.

Existing CCP Policy 17 River District, adopted through River District Plan, 1995

Extend downtown development throughout the River District that is highly urban in character and which creates a unique community because of its diversity; its existing and emerging neighborhoods housing a substantial resident population, providing jobs, services and recreation; and most important, its embrace of the Willamette River.

FURTHER, to become the kind of place where people would like to live, work, and play:

- A. Pursue **implementation of the River District urban design and development plans** through public/private projects (proposals for action) as described in each of the four action areas of the River District Development Plan: (1) Union Station/Old Town, (2) Terminal One, (3) Pearl District, and (4) Tanner Basin/Waterfront.
- B. Preserve and enhance the **River District's history**, architectural heritage, and international character.
- C. **Integrate social service facilities** in a manner that is visually and functionally compatible with the River District and consistent with the City of Portland and Multnomah County's coordinated social service plan.
- D. Accommodate **housing needs for diverse family structures**.
- E. Provide **neighborhood amenities** that support River District residents who work and use the services provided by the Central City. Amenities include commercial, educational, medical, recreational, transportation, entertainment, emergency and social services.
- F. Accommodate **industrial growth** in the industrial zoned areas.
- G. Pursue implementation and completion of the **Chinatown Development Plan**.
- H. Foster the development of **artist residential/work space** and gallery facilities.
- I. Incorporate **strategic public investments in infrastructure** that will stimulate private sector redevelopment. The River District needs increased transit services, improved streets, and open spaces.
- J. In coordination with the Combined Sewer Overflow (CSO) Tanner Creek Basin Project, **daylight Tanner Creek** through the center of the District and construct a large focal point basin connecting Tanner Creek with the Willamette River to provide a tangible amenity that distinguishes the River District.
- K. Contribute to the efficiency of urban living with **development density, diversity** of land use, and **quality of design** that will result in significant savings in the infrastructure costs of transportation, water, sewer, electricity, communications and natural gas.

Existing Goal of the Old/Town Chinatown Development Plan, adopted by City Council 1999

To develop Old Town/Chinatown into a vibrant, 24 hour, mixed use urban neighborhood, rooted in a rich historical past.

Recommendations

- Reduce Barriers to Old Town/Chinatown
- Preserve and Enhance the historic and cultural character of the area
- Support the development of retail and arts and entertainment businesses in the district
- Enhance the area around the Classical Chinese Garden
- Support preservation and development of housing for different incomes
- Proceed with the development of the Trailways Blocks

# Goose Hollow

## Discussion Draft District Goal, Policies and Actions

### District Goal

Goose Hollow is a family-friendly urban community with thriving neighborhood businesses and excellent access to downtown, PSU and the Northwest District. The district’s major attractions, including JELD-WEN Field, exist in harmony with surrounding mixed-use development, and attract visitors from all over the region to dine, shop, and play in Goose Hollow.

Bordering Washington Park and the West Hills, the district is known for its natural beauty and unique views.

### Policies

#### Regional Center: Economy and Innovation

**Employment.** Encourage the development of a vibrant, mixed-use area with new commercial, retail, and office opportunities in the “the Flats” part of the district.

**Stadium District.** Capitalize on activity generated by JELD-WEN Field, encouraging complementary redevelopment in the area bound by Burnside to the north, Salmon Street to the south, I-405 to the east and NW 20<sup>th</sup> to the west. Encourage a broader range of uses/events at JELD-WEN Field.

**Redevelopment.** Increase redevelopment in line with district goals, especially office, residential and active floor uses in “the Flats.”

**Lincoln High School (LHS).** Encourage redevelopment of the LHS site that includes improved educational facilities, new compatible uses, better connections through the site, a more robust street presence, and new open space amenities.

#### 2035 Performance Targets: Job Growth

<b>Implementation Actions:</b> Goose Hollow – Regional Center: Economy and Innovation						
#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
RC1*	Increase zoning flexibility in “the Flats.”  Rezone the area from RXd to CXd to encourage future redevelopment complementary to nearby attractions.  Remove the Required Residential Development provisions on CX lots in this area (33.510.230).	X				<b>BPS</b>

**Implementation Actions:** Goose Hollow – Regional Center: Economy and Innovation

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
RC2	Work with developers and existing property owners (e.g., <i>The Oregonian</i> , TriMet) in “the Flats” to encourage redevelopment.				X	<b>BPS</b> , PDC, Private
RC3	Prepare a strategy to strengthen Retail Core connections on SW Yamhill between the West End and Goose Hollow.		X			<b>BPS</b> , PBOT, PDC
RC4*	Rezone the LHS site from RHd (IRd) to CXd to better accommodate future redevelopment. Require a master plan process as part of redevelopment to address street and pedestrian connectivity, open space, views, and the transition to adjacent uses.	X				<b>BPS</b>
RC5*	To increase flexibility for redevelopment, rezone the area immediately west of JELD-WEN Field from RHd to CXd.	X				<b>BPS</b>
RC6	Work with stadium managers and neighborhoods to encourage a broader range of uses/events at JELD-WEN Field.				X	<b>OMF</b> , GHFL, NWDA, Private

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Housing and Neighborhoods**

**Housing Character.** Support development that complements the distinctive residential feel of the district which embodies Central City policies, especially within the predominantly residential areas south of SW Columbia and west of SW 18<sup>th</sup>.

**Urban Family Housing.** Encourage the development of multi-family housing with unit types and amenities supportive of families.

**Jefferson Main Street.** Encourage redevelopment and rehabilitation along SW Jefferson between I-405 and SW 20th to create a vibrant neighborhood Main Street environment with pedestrian-friendly street design and contiguous neighborhood retail.

**2035 Performance Target:** New housing units

**Implementation Actions:** Goose Hollow – Housing and Neighborhoods

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
HN1	Improve safety through programming and CPTED (Crime Prevention Through Environmental Design) improvements, including better street lighting.				X	<b>PPR, PBOT, PPB, GHFL, Private</b>
HN2	Identify sites for community building activities and pursue projects and activities such as weekend markets, cultural programming and public art.				X	<b>City, GHFL</b>
HN3	Implement regulatory requirements for active ground-floor uses along SW Jefferson Street.	X				<b>BPS</b>
HN4	Develop and implement a strategy to encourage Main Street-friendly streetscape improvements on SW Jefferson Street.		X			<b>BPS, PBOT</b>
HN5	Explore options to mitigate noise from surrounding large transportation infrastructure.		X			<b>PBOT, ODOT, BPS</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

## Transportation

**Multimodal Access.** Improve access by all modes to and from the region and adjacent areas, including the West End, Portland State University, the Pearl District, Northwest Portland, and major parks.

**Circulation and connectivity.** Provide a highly accessible, safe and well connected district, with additional connections through large sites and blocks.

**Active Transportation.** Encourage walking, bicycling and transit as a way to increase access and transportation choices, enhance livability and reduce the carbon imprint in the district. [Potential Central City policy]

**Streetscape.** Improve the pedestrian experience by providing urban greenery and community uses of the right-of-way and by integrating high-density uses. [Potential Central City policy]

**Regional Attractions.** Provide multimodal access and circulation to and from Goose Hollow’s major attractions (JELD-WEN Field, Lincoln High School, and Multnomah Athletic Club) to support their viability and increase entertainment activity, shopping and tourism while maintaining local access.

**Parking.** Meet existing and future parking demand in a way that reduces parking ratios but supports new development. Encourage ways to provide, share and manage parking to meet multiple objectives and support the diverse mix of land uses. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

Accommodate the unique parking needs of major facilities while continuing to promote transit and active transportation.

**2035 Performance Target:** Mode split

<b>Implementation Actions:</b> Goose Hollow – Transportation						
#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
TR1	Improve bicycle and pedestrian infrastructure and safety on I-405 overpasses. [Potential Central City-wide action]		X			<b>PBOT</b>
TR2	Improve West Burnside to improve streetscape quality; multimodal access; and bicycle and pedestrian problem areas, particularly JELD-WEN access areas and by I-405.		X			<b>PBOT</b>
TR3*	Complete a local circulation study for Goose Hollow east of SW 18 <sup>th</sup> Jefferson that explores possible changes to street operations and configurations including one-way vs. two-way streets, bicycle facilities and on-street parking to help meet district goals.		X			<b>PBOT, BPS</b>
TR4	Improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity throughout, including new connections on SW 16 <sup>th</sup> through the LHS site.		X			<b>PBOT, PPS</b>
TR5	Determine the feasibility of adding new light rail station(s) on the Blue/Red line near SW 14 <sup>th</sup> or 15 <sup>th</sup> Avenue in “the Flats.”			X		<b>PBOT, TriMet</b>
TR6	Establish a west-side commuter bike hub at the Goose Hollow/SW Jefferson MAX station, accommodating the needs of transit riders transferring to or from bicycles at this location.		X			<b>TriMet, PBOT, Private</b>
TR7	Develop and implement a district parking strategy that promotes multiple-use and shared parking resources in the district. [Potential Central City-wide action]		X			<b>PBOT, Private</b>
T9	Pursue streetscape projects that enhance walking, urban greenery, community uses of the right-of-way and placemaking.		X			<b>PBOT</b>
*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.						

## Urban Design

**Distinctive Building Character.** Encourage the diversity and unique character of Goose Hollow and its wide range of uses, building types, ages and scales. Seek ways to bring new uses and energy into the district while maintaining positive characteristics of existing buildings.

**Natural Features.** Support and enhance existing natural features resulting from the district's proximity to the West Hills, such as the varied topography, trees, and vegetation.

**Views.** Elevate the presence, character and role of significant view corridors (e.g., Vista Bridge, West Hills) which define the district and help bridge neighborhoods across physical and psychological barriers. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Open Space.** Develop new open spaces in the district to function as a neighborhood park and support community interaction. Make existing open spaces more usable, engaging spaces (e.g., Collins Circle, Firefighters Park, stadium plazas).

**Street Character and Hierarchy.** Establish a more intentional street hierarchy with a greater diversity of street characters, distinguishing three main types: retail/commercial, boulevard and flexible. Specifically, support the retail/commercial character of W Burnside, SW Yamhill, and SW Jefferson.

Activate ground floor facades throughout the district.

### 2035 Performance Targets: Active Street Frontages on retail/commercial streets

<b>Implementation Actions:</b> Goose Hollow – Urban Design						
#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
UD1	Develop unique signage, public art and/or design treatments to mark key district gateways. [Potential Central City-wide action]		X			<b>BPS, PBOT</b>
UD2*	Connect Goose Hollow with the West End and Downtown by capping I-405 between SW Columbia and SW Salmon, and SW Morrison and SW Yamhill. The caps could support retail or open space.			X		<b>PBOT, BPS, PDC, ODOT</b>
UD3	Develop a Neighborhood Park Strategy for the district that will accommodate projected residential and job density increases.		X			<b>BPS, PPR, Private</b>
UD4*	Improve Collins Circle and Firefighters Park to make these public spaces more accessible and engaging for the community.		X			<b>PPR, PBOT, Private</b>

**Implementation Actions:** Goose Hollow – Urban Design

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
UD5	Study the feasibility of moving or updating the PGE substation at SW 17 <sup>th</sup> and Columbia to decrease its footprint, creating opportunities for development or park space.		X			<b>BPS</b> , Private
UD6	Develop incentives to encourage publicly accessible plazas and pocket parks as new development occurs. [Potential Central City-wide action]	X				<b>BPS</b>
UD7	Prepare a strategy to mitigate the impact of blank walls on the pedestrian environment.		X			<b>BPS</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Environment**

**High Performance Areas.** Encourage green building “high performance areas,” particularly in areas with large amounts of planned new development or redevelopment, especially the LHS site.

**Urban Habitat Corridors.** Improve upland wildlife habitat connections between the West Hills, South Park Blocks and Willamette River to promote the conservation and restoration of avian and pollinator habitat. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Urban Forest and Green Infrastructure.** Increase tree canopy and the use of vegetated stormwater facilities, including ecoroofs, vertical gardens, landscaped setbacks and courtyards, and living walls. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**2035 Performance Targets:** Acres of eco-roofs, tree canopy

**Implementation Actions:** Goose Hollow – Environment

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
EN1	Identify opportunities for rainwater harvesting and reuse within the district		X			<b>BES</b> , PBOT, BDS
EN2	Encourage and promote an environmental “high performance area” on the redeveloped LHS site through incentives, public-private partnerships and/or master planning.				X	<b>BPS</b> , PPS, PDC

**Implementation Actions:** Goose Hollow – Environment

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
EN3	Improve Salmon Street with stormwater management, landscaping, and active transportation facilities to better connect Washington Park to the South Park Blocks and the Willamette River.			X		<b>PBOT, BES, BPS</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**For Reference: Previous West Quadrant Direction and Existing Policies**

West Quadrant Planning Direction, from SAC Meeting Handouts, April/May 2013

Goose Hollow Planning Workshop and Charrette Themes and Ideas, Dec. 2012:

1. Goose Hollow has many assets that make it a desirable place to live and work, including its central location, historic buildings, neighborhood feel, views, and trees/greenery.
2. There is a desire for the district to become a more vibrant place. Participants noted that there is currently no clear center or retail Main Street within the Goose Hollow area. SW Jefferson was identified as a possible neighborhood main street.
3. There is an identified need for better connections and an improved pedestrian environment that help link Goose Hollow with surrounding areas and make walking and biking in Goose Hollow more enjoyable.
4. Participants had a desire for more usable open space that serves a neighborhood park function. Adding new open space, as well as repurposing existing open space such as Collin's Circle, were suggested.
5. There is support for redevelopment of Lincoln High School as an "urban school" with community amenities and potentially a mix of uses. Other potential redevelopment opportunities include the Oregonian printing plant and surface parking lots.
6. Lastly, there is also a need to consider more flexibility for a broader range of uses in parts of the district (currently residential development is required in much of the area).

Also see: *Goose Hollow District Planning Events, December 5 and 12, 2012: Summary of Results*

Existing CCP Policy 15, revised through Goose Hollow Station Community Plan, 1996

Protect and enhance the character of Goose Hollow by encouraging new housing and commercial and mixed-use development which retains or enhances a sense of community while improving the urban infrastructure to support a more pleasant and livable community.

**FURTHER:**

- A. Create opportunities for **1,000 new households** within the District over the next 20 years. Housing created should provide for those who enjoy a central city location with a neighborhood feel, as well as encourage diversity by attracting families.

- B. Encourage **retail and commercial development** in mixed-use projects centering on the Civic Stadium and Jefferson Street light rail stations, which supports the needs of the residential community.
- C. Improve **pedestrian and bicycle connections to light rail** and throughout the neighborhood.
- D. Emphasize **linear corridor boulevards** on SW 18<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Burnside and Jefferson Streets to provide active retail, plazas and other urban amenities.
- E. Provide neighborhood amenities by including **small pockets of open space** in conjunction with new, high density development.
- F. Create a **local streetscape** that places importance on the continuity of pedestrian pathways, building lines, street corners, and other important physical design qualities.

# South Downtown/University District

## *Discussion Draft* District Goal, Policies and Actions

### District Goal

South Downtown/University is the livable, accessible home to: Portland State University, Oregon's largest university; the South Auditorium District, a unique physical landscape carved by Portland's first experiment with urban renewal; and RiverPlace, a dynamic, dense residential and commercial district with an intimate relationship to the Willamette River.

While each of these three microcosms maintains its distinct character, in combination they provide the setting for a growing international, multi-cultural center of learning, fostering information exchange and innovation. The district plays a key role in accommodating and incubating the Portland region's growing cluster of knowledge-based research-oriented enterprises.

### Policies

#### Regional Center: Economy and Innovation

**University Growth and Development.** Support the continued success and growth of Portland State University within the district. Specifically encourage new university development and partnerships with public and private development in the district to promote a vibrant and diverse neighborhood.

**Innovation Quadrant.** Strengthen relationships and connections with other major institutions in or adjacent to the Central City including the Oregon Health Sciences University (OHSU) and Oregon Museum of Science and Industry (OMSI) to support innovation and related business development.

**Tourism, Retail and Entertainment.** Increase the number of visitors to the district by encouraging new and enhancing existing riverfront shops, restaurants and recreational opportunities at RiverPlace. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Redevelopment.** Encourage public and private redevelopment in the district, particularly in the areas around Naito Parkway/Harbor Drive, SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, and along the SW 5<sup>th</sup> and SW 6<sup>th</sup> Avenue Transit Mall. Where possible, encourage new development that supports public-private partnerships and activities or helps meet University space needs.

Leverage redevelopment to provide additional access to and from the riverfront.

**2035 Performance Targets:** Jobs growth

**Implementation Actions:** South Downtown/University District – Regional Center: Economy and Innovation

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
RC1*	Increase zoning flexibility. Rezone areas of RXd to CXd.	X				<b>BPS</b>
RC2*	Increase maximum building height potential on the southern end of the Transit Mall between SW Broadway and SW 4 <sup>th</sup> Avenue to 460’.	X				<b>BPS</b>
RC3	Develop incentives to foster partnerships between PSU and private development.		X			<b>BPS, PSU, Private</b>
RC4*	Encourage redevelopment at University Place that activates the Lincoln Street MAX station and the southern end of the transit mall; increase FAR potential to maximize potential of this key site.	X				<b>BPS</b>
RC5	Encourage RiverPlace Marina and Marquam beach improvements to bring more boaters and visitors to the area to support existing and promote new businesses.		X			<b>BPS, PPR, BES, Private</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Housing and Neighborhoods**

**Student Housing.** Encourage the construction of new student housing and preservation of existing student housing to meet the long-term needs of the university and bring needed evening and weekend vitality to the district.

**Family Housing.** Encourage the development of multi-family housing with unit types and amenities supportive of families.

**Neighborhood Centers.** Create and support successful neighborhood-oriented retail/commercial districts near Portland State University and in RiverPlace. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Public Safety.** Provide a safe and secure 24-hour environment, particularly in car-free pedestrian areas including the PSU campus, South Auditorium and RiverPlace Esplanade.

**2035 Performance Targets:** Housing units

**Implementation Actions:** South Downtown/University District – Housing and Neighborhoods

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
HN1*	Develop incentives for the development of student, family and/or affordable housing.		X			<b>BPS</b>
HN2	Develop a district retail strategy.		X			<b>BPS, PSU,</b> Private
HN3	Identify opportunities for locating a new public school within the district, particularly an elementary school and/or middle school. [Potential Central City-wide action]			X		<b>BPS, PPS,</b> PSU
HN4	Encourage the development of a full-service grocery store within the district.		X			<b>BPS, PDC,</b> PSU, Private
HN5	Develop a strategy for accommodating food cart pods as infill development displaces them. [Potential Central City-wide action]		X			<b>BPS, PPR,</b> PSU, Private

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Transportation**

**Multi-Modal Access.** Improve access by all modes to the region and adjacent areas, including South Portland, South Waterfront, Goose Hollow and Downtown.

**Circulation and Connectivity.** Provide a highly accessible, safe and well connected district, with enhanced east-west pedestrian and bicycle connectivity between Portland State University and the Willamette River.

**Active Transportation.** Encourage walking, bicycling and transit as a way to increase access and transportation choices, enhance livability and reduce the carbon imprint in the district. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Streetscape.** Improve the pedestrian experience by providing urban greenery and community uses of the right-of-way and by integrating high-density uses. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Portland State University.** Enhance multimodal access to Portland State University from South Waterfront, Goose Hollow and Downtown. Address circulation issues around campus and address barriers for cyclists and pedestrians.

**Green Loop.** Implement the Green Loop through the district, connecting the TriMet Transit Bridge to the South Park Blocks and locations further north with high quality pedestrian and bicycle accommodations as well as improved opportunities for habitat movement. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Parking.** Meet existing and future parking needs in a way that reduces parking ratios but supports new development. Develop creative ways to provide, share and manage parking to meet multiple objectives and support a diverse mix of land uses, including Portland State University’s special needs.

**2035 Performance Targets:** Mode split

**Implementation Actions:** South Downtown/University District – Transportation

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
TR1*	Complete a PSU area access and circulation study that includes multimodal improvements including pedestrian safety; campus loading; drop offs; parking; and bicycle access to and from the campus to adjacent areas, South Waterfront and Goose Hollow.		X			<b>PBOT, PSU</b>
TR2	Monitor progress on Southwest Corridor High Capacity Transit planning and advocate for district goals.				X	<b>PBOT, BPS</b>
TR3	Implement near-term I-405 Crossing Improvements, especially at SW 1 <sup>st</sup> Avenue/Naito Parkway, SW 4 <sup>th</sup> Avenue and Terwilliger/Park.		X			<b>PBOT, TriMet, ODOT</b>
TR4*	Complete a study that explores long-term reconfigurations of local and regional connections on and around I-405 between the Ross Island Bridge and Sunset Highway interchanges.		X			<b>PBOT, ODOT</b>
TR5	Develop a long-term parking strategy for PSU.		X			<b>PSU, PBOT</b>
TR6	Improve local and regional bus connections by consolidating routes and stops on fewer corridors by placing bus lines onto the southern end of the Transit Mall and on SW Lincoln and Naito Parkway.		X			<b>PBOT, TriMet</b>
TR7	Improve bicycle and pedestrian connectivity and safety throughout the district. [Potential Central City-wide action]				X	<b>PBOT, TriMet</b>
TR8	Enhance pedestrian and bicycle connections to RiverPlace Marina and the Willamette River at key locations, especially Lincoln, Harrison, and Montgomery Streets.				X	<b>PBOT</b>
TR9	Pursue streetscape projects that enhance walking, urban greenery, community uses of the right-of-way and placemaking.		X			PBOT

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Willamette River**

**Vibrant Riverfront Districts.** Support existing activities and encourage new activities, including clustered small commercial uses near the Willamette River, in order to bring more people, events and activities to the waterfront. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**Greenway Trail.** Improve the greenway trail to better facilitate bicycle and pedestrian access, reduce user conflicts and provide better access to the river. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**River Health.** Improve river conditions to support fish and wildlife by maintaining shallow water habitat at RiverPlace Marina and Marquam beach; replacing invasive and non-native plants with native plants on the river banks; and replacing the existing dock with a low impact dock.

Reduce stormwater impacts on water quality by encouraging use of green streets, eco-roofs and street trees. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**River Access.** Encourage improvements along the Willamette riverfront and at RiverPlace Marina and Marquam beach to enhance human access to and enjoyment of the beach and water [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**2035 Performance Targets:** Amount of development near river, Waterfront Park and Greenway Trail usage, linear feet of riverbank enhancement

<b>Implementation Actions:</b> South Downtown/University District – Willamette River						
#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
WR1	Update the Willamette Greenway Plan (1988) as part of CC2035; develop new implementation actions and strategies	X				<b>BPS, PPR</b>
WR2	Enhance river bank and beaches around RiverPlace to maintain and improve fish and wildlife habitat.		X			<b>PPR, BES</b>
WR3*	Enhance beach access and amenities near the Marquam Bridge; promote new water-related recreation activities.		X			<b>PPR, BPS, Private</b>
WR4*	Develop a strategy for managing runoff from the separated storm sewer system.		X			<b>BES, BPS, PBOT</b>
WR5	Replace the dock at RiverPlace Marina to provide for increased boating use by motorized and non-motorized crafts, while also reducing impacts to salmon.			X		<b>Private, BPS, BES</b>
WR6	Update the riverbank design notebook in collaboration with state and federal natural resources agencies.		X			<b>BPS, BES</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

## Urban Design

**University Character.** Encourage the continued development of a pedestrian-oriented, predominantly university campus environment centered on the South Park Blocks.

Encourage the development of an integrated urban environment with more intense development including public and private institutional, commercial and housing West of Broadway to SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue.

**South Auditorium Character.** Retain the modernist feel and pedestrian-focused character of the South Auditorium Plan District, respecting in particular the National Register of Historic Places Halprin Open Space Sequence. Add new uses to increase pedestrian activity in the district. Connect the pedestrian pathways to adjacent districts.

**RiverPlace Character.** Encourage the continued development of RiverPlace with a broad mix of residential and commercial uses. Maintain and enhance the cohesive design aesthetic, generous landscaping, and close relationship of the public realm to the river.

**Improved Open Spaces.** Encourage existing open spaces, including the Willamette River, to be more accessible, usable and engaging spaces for the community while also supporting the development of new open spaces where opportunities arise. Broaden the range of available recreation experiences.

**Montgomery Green Street.** Support development of the SW Montgomery Green Street as a key east-west green connection from the West Hills/Goose Hollow to the Willamette River.

**Street Hierarchy.** Establish a more intentional street hierarchy with a greater diversity of street characters, distinguishing three main types: retail/commercial, boulevard and flexible. Specifically, support the retail/commercial character of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Broadway and College Streets; as well as the flexible character of Park Avenue and Montgomery Street.

**2035 Performance Targets:** Active street frontages on retail/commercial streets

<b>Implementation Actions:</b> South Downtown/University District – Urban Design						
#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
UD1	Develop a district open space strategy that emphasizes ways to better use and access existing space while exploring opportunities for new spaces (e.g., potential freeway caps, Green Loop)		X			<b>BPS</b> , PPR
UD2	Develop a strategy/plan to renovate the South Park Blocks.		X			<b>PPR</b> , <b>PSU</b>
UD3*	Continue implementation of the SW Montgomery Green Street.				X	<b>BPS</b> , PPR, PBOT

**Implementation Actions:** South Downtown/University District – Urban Design

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
UD4*	Review and update South Auditorium Plan District development standards and guidelines, specifically those related to landscaping and setback requirements.	X	X			<b>BPS, BDS</b>
UD5	Connect South Downtown with South Portland by capping I-405 between SW 1 <sup>st</sup> and SW 3 <sup>rd</sup> , and improving the connections to Terwilliger from the South Park Blocks.			X		<b>PBOT, BPS, ODOT</b>
UD6	Activate SW Broadway with ground floor retail and other active uses.				X	<b>PSU, Private</b>
UD7	Complete a Development Opportunity Strategy for the remnant properties on SW Naito/Harbor Drive.		X			<b>BPS, PDC</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**Environment**

**High Performance University Campus.** Support PSU as an urban laboratory for carbon reducing and environmentally friendly features and technologies.

**Urban Habitat Corridors.** Improve upland wildlife habitat connections between the West Hills, South Park Blocks and Willamette River to promote the conservation and restoration of avian and pollinator habitat.

**Urban Forest and Green Infrastructure.** Increase tree canopy and the use of vegetated stormwater facilities, including ecoroofs, vertical gardens, landscaped setbacks and courtyards, and living walls. [Potential Central City-wide policy]

**2035 Performance Target:** Acres of eco-roofs, tree canopy

**Implementation Actions:** South Downtown/University District – Environment

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
EN1	Encourage the continued improvement and expansion of PSU's district energy system.				X	<b>PSU, BPS</b>

**Implementation Actions:** South Downtown/University District – Environment

#	Action	Timeline				Implementers (lead in <b>bold</b> )
		CC2035 (2015)	2 - 5 Years	6 – 20 Years	Ongoing	
EN2	Support the relocation of Electric Avenue to a more permanent location with excellent access and visibility.		X			<b>PBOT, PSU</b>
EN3	Support urban habitat corridor considerations in the district, particularly with development of the Green Loop, Terwilliger/Park improvements and Montgomery Green Street connections. [Potential Central City-wide action]		X			<b>PBOT, BPS, BES, PPR</b>
EN4	Complete a study exploring ways to increase district tree canopy.		X			<b>BPS, PBOT, PPR, Private</b>

\*Additional details for selected action items will be included in an appendix to be developed.

**For Reference: Previous West Quadrant Direction and Existing Policies**

West Quadrant Planning Direction, from SAC Meeting Handouts, April/May 2013

*Recent West Quadrant Plan Work, Key Themes and Ideas:*

1. Supporting growth and long-term success of PSU and linkages to OHSU, OMSI, and other science and technology activities.
2. Improving connections to the University District from areas to the west, south and east. Access to the river is seen as particularly important.
3. Increasing community access to PSU amenities and facilities.

*Current Ideas and Directions*

1. Encourage growth and development of PSU through changes to incentives and regulations.
2. Evaluate the parks system in the district to increase the range of recreation opportunities and provide for the needs of a growing residential and student population. Specific examples mentioned include a Willamette swimming beach, habitat enhancement areas, a master plan for the South Park Blocks, and possible new park spaces near new student housing developments.
3. Work with ODOT and others to address connectivity issues along I-405 and Naito Parkway. Specific examples include establishing a pedestrian and bicycle-friendly connection between the S. Park Blocks and the Terwilliger Parkway system at Duniway Park.
4. Improve the local transportation network within the S. Downtown area to improve multimodal access and circulation, and maintain or improve portal capacity.
5. Increase development around new Lincoln Station and in the vicinity of Naito Parkway/Harrison/Harbor Drive to better connect with RiverPlace.

Existing CCP Policy 16, adopted through University District Plan, 1995

Foster the development of a distinct sub-district which has its character defined by its focus on Portland State University (PSU). Shape the University District into a vital multi-cultural and international

crossroads with an environment which stimulates lifelong learning, collaboration between business and government and a rich cultural experience.

FURTHER:

- A. Create a **distinct identity** which encompasses both campus and non-campus areas of the District.
- B. Build a **linked system of north to south and east to west open spaces** which help to focus and organize the District. Locate the north to south open space system along the South Park Blocks and the east to west system along Montgomery Street.
- C. Create **light rail transit (LRT) access** to the District from throughout the region and the Downtown, recognizing the District as one of the region's most significant destinations.
- D. Create at least **1,000 new units of housing** within the District. Housing created should provide for those who enjoy living in the District environment as well as those with formal ties to PSU.
- E. **Eliminate** the regulation requiring PSU academic facilities to undergo **Conditional Use Master Plan** procedures for new development proposals.
- F. Create a **University District shopping environment**, centering on Montgomery Street with extensions north and south along Broadway, 5th and 6th Avenues, and at the proposed University Plaza. Additionally, foster the location of new commercial, retail, and service businesses at locations which front on open spaces, pedestrian paths and along 10th and 11th Avenues, west of Broadway.
- G. Encourage the **development of businesses**, which serve the District and benefit from proximity to PSU.
- H. Improve **pedestrian connections** between the District and Goose Hollow and Lair Hill Neighborhoods.
- I. Reflect the establishment of the District by creating a University District Policy Element in the **Central City Transportation Management Plan (CCTMP)**. Until the new element is created, recognize that the CCTMP Downtown Element is applicable to the University District.

PSU University District Framework Plan Goals, 2010 (not City adopted)

- 1. Optimize land use in the University District and neighborhood to accommodate anticipated growth in a quality and livable learning environment
- 2. Accommodate growth and emphasize institutional distinctiveness while integrating with the city
- 3. Maximize connectivity
- 4. Capitalize and enhance the distinct quality of the Portland urban experience
- 5. Leverage partnerships to facilitate growth

## OLD TOWN/CHINATOWN

### Discussion Draft West Quadrant District Goals, Policies and Actions

Stakeholder Advisory Committee members may use this worksheet to record their comments and questions about the draft district goals, policies and actions. The worksheet may be used as an aid to SAC discussion and/or turned into staff at the end of the meeting.

How well do the policies reflect issues unique to the district? If not, why not?

How well do the policies and action items reflect SAC discussion to date? If not, why not?

What do you like or not like?

What is missing?

Are there equity considerations of which we should be aware?

Other comments/suggestions:

**PLEASE LEAVE WITH STAFF OR RETURN BY 1/24/14. Thanks!**

## GOOSE HOLLOW

### Discussion Draft West Quadrant District Goals, Policies and Actions

Stakeholder Advisory Committee members may use this worksheet to record their comments and questions about the draft district goals, policies and actions. The worksheet may be used as an aid to SAC discussion and/or turned into staff at the end of the meeting.

How well do the policies reflect issues unique to the district? If not, why not?

How well do the policies and action items reflect SAC discussion to date? If not, why not?

What do you like or not like?

What is missing?

Are there equity considerations of which we should be aware?

Other comments/suggestions:

**PLEASE LEAVE WITH STAFF OR RETURN BY 1/24/14. Thanks!**

## **SOUTH DOWNTOWN/UNIVERSITY**

### **Discussion Draft West Quadrant District Goals, Policies and Actions**

Stakeholder Advisory Committee members may use this worksheet to record their comments and questions about the draft district goals, policies and actions. The worksheet may be used as an aid to SAC discussion and/or turned into staff at the end of the meeting.

How well do the policies reflect issues unique to the district? If not, why not?

How well do the policies and action items reflect SAC discussion to date? If not, why not?

What do you like or not like?

What is missing?

Are there equity considerations of which we should be aware?

Other comments/suggestions:

**PLEASE LEAVE WITH STAFF OR RETURN BY 1/24/14. Thanks!**

## West Quadrant Plan: Equity Considerations

When reviewing the draft goals, policies and implementation actions for the districts, consider the following:

Are there opportunities to:	Why is this important?	What does this look like in action?
<p><b>Address the unique needs of communities of color and other vulnerable populations in relationship to this space?</b></p>	<p>Different communities (i.e. geographic, racial, socio-economic class) experience different outcomes, what works for one group will not work for everyone. This is due to cultural factors, but also existing disparity.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ECONOMY AND INNOVATION Promote a mix of goods and services that serve the diverse needs of the neighborhood</li> <li>• HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS Support a range of social services that serve the diverse economic and cultural communities</li> <li>• URBAN DESIGN Honor the character, history and cultural resources of the area</li> </ul>
<p><b>Create opportunities for wealth and asset development?</b></p>	<p>Public projects are critical opportunities for ensuring economic development opportunities are shared across the entire community. Without intentional strategies to address barriers to equitable participation, people of color and low income individuals are likely to continue to be excluded.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• ECONOMY AND INNOVATION Minimize displacement and maximize inclusion of immigrant/refugee/minority-owned small businesses</li> <li>• ECONOMY AND INNOVATION Promote living wage jobs available to local residents and support training for residents to access higher wage jobs</li> <li>• HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS Promote affordable housing over the long term for a range of incomes and for the range of household types, especially in locations central to transit and other services</li> <li>• HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS Foster a safe environment for the diverse community</li> </ul>
<p><b>Build capacity of and empower communities?</b></p>	<p>Solutions that are community driven and based on the experience of individuals can be more effective and durable. Policies and programs that are equitable must also be legitimate, which requires meaningful participation, including decision making by impacted communities and measurable accountability for public agencies.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOODS Promote a strong, local neighborhood/business organizations that serves the diversity of the residents and businesses</li> <li>• COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT Achieve broad and inclusive community understanding of the plan</li> <li>• COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT Ensure the benefits and burdens of community change are equitably shared</li> </ul>

<p><b>Prevent regressive impacts?</b></p>	<p>Many communities continue to face the negative impacts of current and past inequitable policies and investments. Programs and policies must recognize these disparities in order to avoid exacerbating them. Recognizing that the burdens of program impacts will impact individuals and communities differently. Though programs may attempt to distribute benefits/burdens across individuals and communities equally, the value or harm will be felt differently.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• TRANSPORTATION Ensure that the planning strategies respond to the greater reliance on transit by people of color and people from low-income households</li> <li>• HEALTH AND ENVIRONMENT Mitigate regressive impacts (costs or health risks) on people of color and low-income communities</li> </ul>
<p><b>Reduce barriers to participation?</b></p>	<p>Well intended programs may alienate or inhibit participation by different communities if they are not designed in a culturally competent and community needs based approach.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT Achieve meaningful involvement that is reflective of the community including racial, cultural, economic, and other historically under-represented communities</li> <li>• COMMUNITY OUTREACH AND ENGAGEMENT Achieve long-term engagement of historically underrepresented populations in civic processes</li> </ul>

**From:** Wendy Rahm  
**Sent:** Monday, January 06, 2014 11:08 AM  
**To:** Karl Lisle, Mark Raggett, Kathryn Hartinger, Nicholas Starin  
**Cc:** Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder  
**Subject:** WQ SAC - Historic Properties in West End

Please share this email with the members of the West Quadrant SAC.

I appreciate your having produced a map of buildings on the National Historic Register (NR). However, for the West End at least, it is not a complete picture of the historic nature of the area. The "West End" is usually defined as that area south of Burnside, east of 405, north of Market, and west of the Park Blocks. The name "West End" should be added to your map within its boundaries clearly marked on your map, since it is a neighborhood quite distinct from Downtown. To that end, I request that the title "Downtown" be moved to the east on your map inside the correct downtown boundaries on your map. "Downtown" was placed within the "West End" boundaries on your map. Losing the West End neighborhood name is something that is not desired by residents of this neighborhood.

More important of course is a complete mapping of the historic buildings in the West End. You are all aware that in 1984, a **historic resource inventory (HRI)** was conducted for many areas of Portland. It recorded buildings that had historic value at that time and thus merited attention for their preservation. One of 3 "ranks" was assigned to many buildings selected throughout Portland. Note that buildings in these three categories were identified as having historic merit nearly 30 years ago, so I would suggest that they are even more valuable today.

- **Rank 1** buildings: highest priority and eligible for National Register (all buildings in this category are now on the National Register)
- **Rank 2** buildings: also eligible for Landmark/National Register status (some of these buildings are now on the National Register, but not all)
- **Rank 3**: may be eligible for National Register as part of a district and merit preservation as contributing buildings to the neighborhood.

It is also interesting to note that the districts *with historic status* have far fewer National Register buildings than does the West End. They are made up largely of Rank 3 buildings. That is why it is important to note the Rank 3 buildings on the map. They are also what make a case for taking a closer look at the West End as worthy of preserving. I suggest that one way to consider preserving what is special about the area is by establishing or at least discussing the pro's and con's of a form-based code for the area.

In addition to that HRI inventory, in 2004 and 2008 two **Multiple Property Listings (MPL)** for the West End and Downtown area were prepared and submitted to the National Historic Register (NR) and were approved by that organization. Properties built between 1906 and 1931 were included. Excluded were many pre 1906 buildings, including many of the pre 1900 single family homes. Many buildings on the MPL list, part of this approved NR application, are not on your map:

**Built 1906-1914 in MPL but not on your map**

Tilford Building, Carlyle Building, Nortonia Hotel/Mark Spencer, Winters Apartments/Fountain Place, Elton Court Hotel, Treves Hotel/Joyce Hotel, Arthur Hotel, Masonic Temple.

**Built 1915-1931 in MPL but not on your map**

Guild Theater/Studio Arts Building, German Aid Society, Portland Women's Club, Reed Institute, Blanchard Building, Fleidner Building, First Church of the Nazarene, Prince of Wales/Eglington Arms, Mayer, Bates Motorramp Garage, Medical Dental Building, parking garage at 1106 SW Yamhill, Fitzpatrick/North Pacific Building, Parking garage/commercial at 315 SW 11<sup>th</sup>.

The story of Portland's development is told in the architecture of the West End buildings. There are 11 rare single family houses built between 1880 and 1890 that reflect the original first suburb of Portland. Only 2 have HRI status (mapped), but 2 others are Rank 2, 5 others are Rank 3, and 1 other is designated "architecturally significant." This residential area prompted the building of the many churches that still stand in the area. All are on the National Register (mapped), except for 2 with Rank 2 and 1 with Rank 3. After the Northern Pacific Transcontinental Railroad came to Portland in 1883, hotels and apartments appeared in the area to accommodate temporary workers, new residents and other travelers. This was the era when streetcars also became popular. Many of these buildings were designed by well known Portland architects. In 1917, the first parking garage downtown was built to accommodate the automobile and several auto-related structures from that era have survived. Cultural buildings followed, such as a public library, theaters, Masonic temple, and the first women's club. This complex of social/cultural structures, apartments and hotels became part of what made Portland's West End what it is today. A visible and valuable portion of Portland's history is at stake. If we are going to destroy it, let's do it consciously and know what we are doing.

Over a year ago, I gave my inventory of historic properties in the West End to Nicholas Starin, who generously said he would try to "map" them. In addition to information about ownership, address, date built, architects, etc., my inventory included whether a building had Rank 2 or Rank 3 or was "architecturally significant." Although the May 2013 map just distributed is a good start, it is far from complete and so it is not a useful tool for our discussion.

I request that before the West End is discussed, a map with all "ranked" categories and any building listed in the MPL be mapped for the committee as well as for the general public. I also request that form-based code be on the table for discussion for the West End and that specific guidelines for preserving these buildings be included in the West Quadrant Plan.

Wendy Rahm

Below is a list of pre-1935 buildings ranked in the HRI, but not on your map:

### **HRI Rank 2**

#### **Hotels**

Arthur Hotel

#### **Apartments/Single Family Homes (SFH)**

1402 SW 12<sup>th</sup>, 1326 SW 12<sup>th</sup> Ave (SFH/duplex), 1015 SW Yamhill (SFH)

#### **Cultural**

Portland Korean Church, First German Evangelical Church, Masonic Temple/Knights of Pythias, Studio Arts Building, Guild Theater

#### **Street Feature**

“Eastern” at 1001 SW Washington

### **HRI Rank 3**

#### **Hotels/Office**

The Lincoln Hotel, Nortonia Hotel (Marks Spencer), Carlyle Building, Washington Hotel (Washington Plaza Apts), Elton Court Hotel, Clayton Hotel, Eglinton Arms Hotel, Tilford Building, Fitzpatrick Building (N. Pacific Building), Fliedner Building, German Aid Society Office, Mayer Building, Medical-Dental Building, Treves Hotel/Joyce Hotel, 315 SW 11<sup>th</sup> (originally parking garage/now commercial), 733 SW 10<sup>th</sup> (Reed Institute), Behnke-Walker Business School, Franklin Hotel, Blackstone/Fairfield Hotel

#### **Apartments/Single Family Homes (SFH)**

Pine Cone Apartments, Hanthorn Apartments, Carmelita Apartments, Cambrian Apartments, Fountain Place, Newton Apartments (Empire), 1415 SW 11<sup>th</sup> Ave, 1110 SW Clay, 1421 SW 12<sup>th</sup> (SFH), 1142 SW 12<sup>th</sup> Ave (SFH-Queen Anne Duplex), 1123 SW Yamhill (SFH-Italianate), 1030 SW 13<sup>th</sup> (SFH-Rural Vernacular), 1415 SW 11<sup>th</sup> Ave, 1110 SW Clay St, 1421 SW 12<sup>th</sup> Ave (SFH-American Basic/rectory), 921 SW Clay (SFH – rectory)

#### **Cultural**

First Church of the Nazarene

#### **Auto-related**

Bates Motoramp Garage, 1106 SW Yamhill garage

### **HRI “Architecturally Significant”**

St. Nicholas Hotel/Hotel Navarre, Belleville Hotel/Kent Hotel  
1023 SW Yamhill (SFH), 1104 SW Columbia St/1405 SW 11<sup>th</sup> Ave