

CIZUP Meeting #7 Notes
Thursday, October 9th, 2014

In attendance: John Cole, Tom Armstrong, Rodney Jennings, Mark Walhood, Chris Brehmer, Jill PUNCHES, Dave Johnston, Beverly Bookin, Jim Edelson, James Parker (Laurelhurst Association), Karen Karlsson, D.J. Heffernan, Kurt Kruger, Tom Karwaki, Justin Fallon Dollard Rebecca Ocken

INTRODUCTION

Meeting Notes from the September 11th advisory group meeting were approved with addition of an emailed comment from Marty Stiven that she was concerned that staff's initial proposal for transitioning from CUMP/IMPS to a base zone would not represent the type of regulatory improvement she had hoped for by reading the Comprehensive Plan Policy document .

There was a request reminder for a revised campus institution FAR table. Staff will distribute this at the November meeting.

Transportation Follow up

Staff indicated that the city's transportation development review methodology is moving away from an emphasis on comparing street volume/capacity to a more comprehensive multi-modal impact review.

One approach under initial consideration by the Bureau of Transportation is a geographically targeted development fee that would be assessed against developments that would be devoted to multi-modal and or active transportation options. PBOT has acquired funding through a TGM Grant Project to measure transportation system completeness as a variable for calculating such a fee. This project will be completed by this spring.

Discussion followed regarding how such an approach might work for "failing" street segments and intersections such as Boones Ferry/ Terwilliger. Under the current regulations you don't get to build unless you can prove you won't make the traffic congestion worse.

Many streets around the city that are falling below their required level of service as currently measured. The presumed solution is to add lanes but the expense, property condemnation and other impacts on adjoining neighborhoods makes it unlikely that many such projects will actually be undertaken. We are looking at a future where we acknowledge there will be vehicular congestion.

Regional direction recognizes we can't build our way out of the traffic associated with 120,000 new households in Portland but the more we mitigate and provide alternative facilities the more mobility we will have. Were not building anymore big arterials but we still want to grow and that is good for the region and the environment. Something is broken when we are trying to reserve capacity for Lake Oswego.

Additional discussion followed including comments that creative approaches are needed such as reversible lanes and congestion pricing. It was clarified that the development fee outlined by PBOT representatives would likely be used for new construction rather than maintenance but that the concept is still in its initial phase and could change.

There are different population groups involved hospital vs. college and different levels of alternative transportation options. Eastern Portland and the southwest have more challenges due to their geography and past infrastructure investment decisions. There is an equity issue that must be considered.

The city emphasizes active transportation in its IGA with the Portland Public School District. Perhaps the city could codify the process and the standards title 33. Such performance standard around mode splits could be included in a table and subsequently enforced through the zoning code.

TDM programs combined with limited parking and effective neighborhood parking enforcement does a fair job at addressing the existing transportation conflicts around Lewis and Clark but can't address more development. The current Hearings process does a good job at objectively assessing a developments impact without having such a review devolve into a political issue such as what occurred with the SW Community Plan. An important consideration in evaluating a new PBOT transportation impact mitigation program is that it should actually result is a physical solution as opposed to just collecting fees. You need to go beyond just collecting money to making things happen.

Transportation Demand Management follow-up

Refer to the September 11, 2014 Peter Hurley memo. Peter Hurley is the PBOT staff member leading an effort to energize that agency's Transportation Demand Management Program. Peter gave an overview of that project stating the Intent of TDM (less traffic) was desirable but that substantive issues with implementation were frustrating for both institutions and those impacted by traffic. State funding has been provided for improving predictability and effectiveness of the City's ongoing administration of TDM programs. The intent is to provide clear options for institutions to choose amongst and to shift towards a performance system. While the context is important the shared goal is to reduce single occupancy vehicle trips. The revised program is now in place for master plans and conditional use processes. The Conway master plan in the northwest quadrant is the first development project subject to the revised TDM requirements followed by a church.

There was a discussion about what the appropriate metric to use in measuring transportation impacts should be. Just using mode split percentages means increased neighborhood impacts when an institution grows. The current targets come from the Climate action Plan and are considered to be aggressive but achievable.

Site specific mode share is not going to meet policy targets and the city should also look at TDM from a neighborhood point of view. It is also about a specific site. This is particularly true when a campus hosts special events such as graduation ceremonies, performances or sporting events.

There are many factors outside of an institutions control. To be realistic Tri Met must be involved, an element in the toolkit. It has been cheaper for PCC to finance their own system shuttle system than coordinate with Trimet. At the University of Western States even a free bus pass is of limited utility due to the lack of service in east Portland.

As far as establishing and administering a Transportation Demand Management Program, there is an advantage to considering an entire campus and its satellite facilities at once rather than on a building-by building approach.

Enforcement remains a big unknown. Once a project is built there is not a viable mechanism for cracking down on institutions that are not following through with their commitments. PBOT acknowledges that they have abrogated their responsibility in this regard in large part due to a lack of staffing to monitor TDM agreements, but there is a renewed commitment to having staff to monitor and administer such agreements going forward. We won't want to shut down an institution but we will work more closely with institutions and neighbors to make a continued good faith work towards targets.

The most effective tool at reducing sov trips to an institution is requiring paid parking on campus combined with an on-street permit parking permit system in the surrounding neighborhood.

It's a balancing act. At some point institutions will make a decision that it is too much of a hassle or too expensive to develop within a given jurisdiction and move their operations regionally or out of state if the exactions and development requirements are too onerous.

Process Review

Staff outlined its current draft proposal for procedurally reviewing development proposals on institutional campuses and transitioning from existing approved conditional use master plans and impact mitigation plans. Refer to the September 11 Concept Report. This concept includes the drafting of three institutional base zones and requiring institutions to apply for such designations at the time their current CUMP/IMPs expire. Alternatively such a rezoning might be an option. Documentation of compliance with transportation and other public service requirements would be required as a component of this review new development would then be subject to Base Zone land use allowances and development standards as well as overlay zones and additional development standards described in the 200's chapter of the development code.

Subsequent discussion included the following topics

College campus zoning should distinguish between commuter colleges and those where the students reside on campus. They have different profiles and impacts on their adjoining neighborhoods.

High schools would need a subsequent zone tailored to their unique needs.

Some members advocated for legislatively rezoning all campuses as part of the Task 5 implementation effort. Then if individual institutions choose to run out their CUMP/IMP so be it. When a campus gets too big in terms of traffic or other impacts then the city might have to reassess. Look for a mechanism for requiring TDM and TIA on an ongoing basis rather than tying these to a one time quasi-judicial application.

Alternatively, what is the benefit to the surrounding neighborhood? The current CUMP/IMP provides an ongoing forum for neighbors to address neighborhood safety and environmental issues and to hold the institutions responsible for their mitigation proposals. This would be lost under the base zone proposal.

There was a brief discussion on the boundaries of the existing CUMP/IMPs and their relationship to the proposed base zones. Property within existing CUMP/IMPs would require a rezoning application in compliance with the comprehensive plan. For those properties that the institutions own but are not included in their existing master plans, a more involved rezoning and comp plan amendment would be required. This would make it easier to build up rather than out.

In some instances neighbors want institutions to acquire additional properties in the neighborhood. It can be a nice transitional use but is problematic due to regulatory procedures.

Type III applications are expensive and involved undertakings for the applicants but they are a big deal for the neighborhoods too. A bigger concern is the details of the particular zone(s) and can they adapt to the unique campuses. Maybe institutions will recognize this and prefer to just extend the current 10 maximum time frame assigned to CUMPs and revise some of the review thresholds.

In closing the importance of the “d” design overlay to the neighborhoods was raised, specifically to the Good Samaritan hospital. Perhaps this is not as important where the “d” was assigned strictly as an addendum to the IR zone.

Public Comment

It's not as simple as the proposed rezone makes it sound. Good Samaritan Hospital has a huge impact on the character of the surrounding NW neighborhood. Although it is a hospital it is more like Portland State University than Adventist Hospital for example.