

**Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods
Land Use and Transportation Committee
Wednesday, January 23rd, 2013, 7:00pm
Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods Office, 4815 NE 7th Ave., Portland, OR**

MINUTES

Present

George Bruender, Concordia, Co-chair
David Sweet, Sabin, Co-chair
Paul Anthony, Humboldt
Carol Gossett, Sullivan's Gulch
John Cole, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, City of Portland
Ed Abrahamson, Irvington/At-large member
Debbie Bischoff, Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, City of Portland
Clifford Walker, Humboldt
Steve Cole, Irvington
Anjala Ehelebe, Woodlawn
Garlynn Woodsong, Concordia
Jim Brown, Alameda
Benjamin Adrian, NECN staff
Shoshana Cohen, NECN staff

Additions to agenda

Clifford of Humboldt has an addition to agenda.

Carol has an update from Sullivan's Gulch.

Agenda approved.

Minutes from October and November have been emailed and available in print. Motion to approve both minutes as distributed. Approved.

Committee Elections

David and George were elected one year ago to be co-chairs of this committee. In accordance with the NECN bylaws, Community Committee membership terms end in June, so LUTC will conduct the next elections in June for the upcoming year. Steve moves to continue with David and George as co-chairs until June to align with NECN's fiscal year. Seconded by Paul Anthony and approved unanimously.

Campus Institutions Comprehensive Plan, John Cole, BPS

John introduces himself and the project he is working on currently focused on how Campus Institutions are dealt with in the Comprehensive Plan update. In NECN's area, there are three (Concordia University, PCC Cascade, Legacy Emanuel hospital) out of roughly 15 major campus institutions located in Portland, but outside the Central City and Gateway area.

John explains the economic significance of these large campus institutions. Yet there are often various impacts with campuses, which can lead to points of contention to neighborhood associations.

The policies relating to campus institutions are found in the economic development sections of the Comp Plan update. The City has found a shortage of space for projected expansion and needed land for campuses in the next 25 years. The zoning code is the primary tool used for large campus regulation. In the next two years, the City aims to update this code. John is conducting outreach now to let groups such as LUTC to know of upcoming opportunities to make recommendations and be involved with advisory groups on the issue.

City is interested in new implementation measures to be adopted shortly after the Comprehensive Plan adoption. John seeks our input or from our neighborhood associations in the upcoming weeks and months.

Q: Have you considered a growth boundary to apply to individual campus institutions? John says he knows of a few individual neighborhood associations that have developed agreements with an institution regarding growth areas. However, within existing code, most institutions would typically be required to go through a lengthy process to change the surrounding zoning away from residential.

Q: Will there be a new zone specifically for institutions or for campus edges? John says it is too early to say, but points to Policy 3.45 which seeks to recognize major campus institutions as a type of Employment Land. Also, Policy 3.47 relates to campus edges with allowances for development.

George mentions the imbalance that often exists between institutional players and neighborhood associations, which usually places the onus of taking the first step on the neighborhood groups. The institutions could do more to create reasonable opportunities for input from neighbors.

In regards to noise, a rezoning could present related associated issues. For instance, the E zone is industrial, for noise-level purposes, so a change for an institutional zone could also have corresponding increases in noise allowances to adjacent residential zones.

As to the campus edges, there could be allowances for some commercial development, but this could present unwanted developments as well. There is a need to be on the guard for unwanted intrusions into the surrounding neighborhoods.

John welcomes additional comments from us via email, and mentions that Carol Gossett on LUTC sits on the Economic Development PEG.

Comprehensive Plan Update, Debbie Bischoff, BPS

Debbie refreshes us to the background of the Comprehensive Plan, which is the plan helps guide our development over time and is mandated by State law that we update the plan roughly every 20 years. Also, it addresses how to serve the needs required by projections, such as infrastructure and parks. Just last week, the Working Draft Part 1 has been released.

In this version, there are integrated goals which combine elements. This is the first time these new goals have been released. Prior to this, policy goals have been from the old Comprehensive Plan.

Debbie passes around a copy of the Plan, and left NECN two printed copies for our office, which you can come by to review. The full version is also [available online](#). Comments are due May 1st, so you have time to discuss and comment.

Debbie talks more about the plan and says there are “pattern areas,” which are ways of describing similar geographies. Much of NECN is in one such pattern area, so keep this in mind as the policies in the plan are citywide. Debbie distributes a schedule of upcoming public workshops for the Comp Plan, and encourages us to attend. The workshop in NE is on Saturday, March 9th, at Beaumont Middle School, 4043 NE Fremont St., but all the workshops are open to the public, so you can attend any.

Debbie will work with us as a Coalition after the workshops. For NECN’s area, much of the work will pertain to business district areas and commercial zones.

The workshops will include breakout sessions to focus in on different areas of the plan. Reports such as alternative growth scenarios are conducted as part of the background report of the Comp Plan, which means they are presented to City Council but not in the Comp Plan itself. One aspect of the reports is capital improvements which help to prioritize upcoming investments.

A business-focused workshop takes place Thursday, March 14th, which is also open to the public.

Q: Will you be presenting to individual neighborhood associations? Debbie says they are exploring how to create a short presentation on the overall process, but if your neighborhood is interested, you can contact her to see about possible presentations. Debbie encourages the LUTC to consider the Comp plan and official comments would be appreciated.

Who is interested in working more closely on this draft for a NECN response?

Co-chairs George and David, along with Garlynn, Paul Anthony, Carol Gossett, Steve Cole and staff are interested in diving more deeply into the Comp Plan. Will extend invitation via email for those are not here.

What format should we approach this review by? First, reviewers should read the Plan and identify items relevant to their neighborhood or interests as well as what is lacking. We can bring these together and consider as a group. Debbie says comments will take a multitude of formats so we can be flexible in how we present NECN comments, a letter format is fine.

Historic Resources Code Improvement Project, David

As we heard at the last LUTC meeting, BPS is working on making improvements to the Historic Design Review process. Just last night, the Historic Commission heard the proposal and approved the recommendations. David gives a summary of the proposed changes, which include a revised Type I process. Generally speaking, this would create a threshold for more projects to proceed without Historic

Design Review. With a few types of items such as ADUs, there is a tightening of what is permissible. David has been attending on behalf of the Sabin Community Association and has commented for the solar panels to be exempt for review. So far, it has not been accepted into the recommendations.

Steve reports from Irvington Community Association that there is some concern over the language and how vague it is. ICA is also concerned about the lack of local appeal in this revised Type I proposal, which is by design to help reduce the fee amount. ICA is also concerned that the 150 square foot exemption area could allow projects with too much impact.

This is coming before City Council soon, so there is another opportunity for public comment.

Portland Bureau of Transportation Budget Advisory Committee, David

David has been attending the PBOT BAC meeting as an NECN representative and reports there are proposed budget cuts for the upcoming year. The reason is that there is declining revenue from the sources of funding PBOT has, namely the gas tax. This year, the proposed cuts are largely to active transportation programs. Since active transportation is not a large program, the cuts are significant to the program. The BAC is preparing two letters for City Council. The first suggests the funding cuts are bad, but necessary. A second letter is more forceful and states that the funding cuts are devastating and should not occur.

PBOT has developed proposals to increase revenue; one idea that has been floated is a street maintenance fee. This would apply based on street use/impact, so businesses with many vehicle trips such as grocery stores have been opposed in the past.

David has drafted a letter and distributes it to the LUTC for consideration. It states PBOT is unable to implement their mission with the funding constraints, and that active transportation is very important and should be restored by City Council. Additionally, the letter suggests finding new revenue sources to fix the budget problem.

Some discussion of what is in the PBOT report on revenue options. Performance parking prices during Timbers matches is one example. Also a tax which applies to parking spaces on private lots to raise funds and encourage less land be used for parking.

It is not clear what the new City Council is thinking towards budget questions at this point. Also, the PBOT director Tom Miller is resigning.

Steve mentions a question with the Vehicle Miles Travelled (VMT) fee as well as an interest in a fee on studded tires. Ed talks of questioning the need for new revenue sources as the general motoring public may not be ready for something like a VMT.

Carol asks about Transportation Districts which could be established to generate revenue for specific areas, such as Light Rail.

David agrees with the stated suggestions to the letter as distributed and will integrate them into it.

Jim moves to approve the letter with edits for David to present to the NECN Board for approval.
Seconded by Paul.

Is the Youth Pass included in the PBOT budget? No one thinks so.

Approved unanimously, with no abstentions.

Columbia River Crossing update

Steve reports the lawsuit is moving forward slowly. Also, NECN staff and volunteers have been meeting with Coalition for a Livable Future and other parties to develop an organized strategy. At this point, the working group has agreed to hire a lobbyist to work on the Oregon Legislature. NECN is interested in lobbying our own representatives, while CLF is looking at the entire legislature.

NECN is seeking interested parties to help speak on behalf of NECN's position opposing the CRC.

Question: Is the only strategy available to stop the current proposal? Or is there room to discuss alternative projects?

We could have that conversation, but the Governor has asked for 450 million dollars now for the current proposal. Until this question is answered, the alternatives discussion is less relevant.

NECN needs assistance fundraising, David says he has already made a donation. NECN will use this in our efforts. Have a house party to invite your friends and ask for money and support on this issue. Having an NECN lobbying day in Salem is another possibility if we have enough people.

Shoshana encourages the committee to get involved and reiterates that NECN has been active on this issue for at least three years. Shoshana also reports CLF is taking steps to hire a lobbyist.

Woodlawn bus layover, Anjala

Trimet No. 8 bus layover site, since September 2012, is at NE Dekum and Durham. A layover zone should be prepared for buses to be parked and include facilities for the bus operator, primarily bathroom facilities. Anjala reports on communications from Trimet and what the Woodlawn Neighborhood Association has done thus far, she also distributes two copies of the report WNA has completed.

Anjala asks for LUTC support by having us write a letter approving of Woodlawn's research on the issue and request that the layover zone be moved away from the current location. Trimet itself has identified two possible places that could work for the layover zone, but it is not clear when the change would take place.

David asks if Anjala could draft a brief letter saying this is causing negative impact and request a change right now, which LUTC would recommend the NECN Board approve.

There is an angle from PBOT and traffic safety that could influence Trimet routes.

Paul motions to approve a letter drafter by Anjala as described here. Seconded by Jim and approved unanimously.

Clifford of the Humboldt Neighborhood

Seeking NECN support for the following statement:

This Board (Humboldt Neighborhood Association) is opposed, as a matter of policy, to retaining names of schools and other public institutions named for former slave owners and others who did not respect equal opportunity for all.

The Humboldt Board has discussed this extensively and passed it in November 2012. Clifford mentions the historical aspects of the issue and how names for schools and public institutions came to be.

One school board member has signed on to already.

Q: Do you have a list of all the impacted schools? Not ready made, and the list would include parks and public buildings.

David clarifies the process NECN uses in making endorsements: Community Committees such as LUTC send all recommendations to the NECN Board for official organizational approval.

David moves to approve the statement and support the Humboldt Neighborhood Association's endorsement of the statement. Seconded by Paul.

Discussion: Ed appreciates the provocative discussion this brings up and supports it.

What is the outcome you are seeking for this effort? Clifford recognizes it is a long-term cause, but reflects on the changes he has experienced in this part of Portland in his own life.

Steve mentions hesitancy on this resolution as NECN is currently expending political capital and advocating the school board on the Jefferson School cluster.

Shoshana suggests other options for engagement on the issue, such as trying to have a dialogue facilitated by NECN, as the issue seems pertinent to the larger community.

Clifford responds he would be willing to speak in something of this nature.

Has the Race Talks forum at Kennedy School been approached as a venue to discuss this? Paul did bring it to their attention but knows of no plans to address this issue.

There is general discussion on the topic and what this would entail.

Vote: Two for, three opposed, and two abstentions. David's motion fails.

George suggests we take this topic up at a future meeting time. Moved by Paul and approved unanimously.

Carol announces the Grant Park Village development at Albina Fuel site is going to the Design Commission tomorrow.

Meeting Adjourned at 9:05pm.

Next LUTC meeting is Wednesday, February 27th at 7:00pm.