

51. Transportation demand management and on-street parking management

Requested by: Hales

Related testimony (for or against): Portlanders for Parking Reform, Legacy Good Samaritan; Providence, Reed College, Rose City Park Neighborhood Association, other individuals

Amendment: Direct PBOT to take the following further actions regarding Transportation & Parking Demand Management policy in Title 17 prior to effective date of the 2035 Comp Plan and associated early implementation actions:

- A. Clarify administrative process for TDM requirements in the CI Zone and Mixed Use Zone sufficient to facilitate the approval process in development review and to ensure adequate administration of new program requirements, including:
 - a. Evaluation guidance for Campus Institutional zone mode split trends
 - b. Evaluation guidance for evaluating “current practices” in existing local Campus Institutional zone TDM plans to assist in adaptation
 - c. Administrative procedures for implementation of the Commercial/Mixed Use zone TDM requirement
 - d. Guidelines or standards for the required education/information materials in Commercial/Mixed Use zones
 - e. Procedures for administration of surveys in mixed use zones, including distribution and monitoring

- B. Develop an expanded (Phase 2) TDM policy for private development and bring to Council for further consideration. This expanded policy should be developed with input from stakeholders representing development, transportation service providers and advocates, business groups, neighborhood associations, as well as other Portland bureaus, including BPS and BDS. The expanded policy should address the following
 - a. Appropriate strategies in the Central City
 - b. Approaches to maintaining on-going obligations for TDM incentives (beyond the one-year requirement being adopted for mixed use development)
 - c. Relationship to on-site parking supply and management
 - d. Relationship to on-street parking management, including proposed permit programs for high growth mixed use centers and corridors
 - e. Opportunities to expand TDM program to engage existing development



Staff recommendation: Support. On-street parking management, off-street parking regulations, and TDM should be integrated. This is consistent with actions taken by other major West Coast cities.

52. Future of the “f” overlay

Requested by: Saltzman

Related testimony (for or against): property owner

Amendment: Direct BPS to study the “f” overlay area along Skyline to determine if the overlay is still necessary, and if it should be retained, modified, or removed. Bring recommendations back to Council in 2018.

Staff recommendation: Support. The “f” overlay is necessary to fulfill requirements in Goal 14 and OAR 660-04-0040. It establishes a 20-acre minimum lot size for this area, which is outside the UGB. This ensures that this land retains a rural character. It also ensures that large parcels are retained, to make future urbanization more feasible, if the area were ever brought into the UGB. Pending a final decision on Metro’s urban reserves, there may be reasons to modify this overlay, and consider smaller lot sizes (down to two acres). Staff would want to evaluate the environmental and water quality impacts of allowing smaller lot sizes here, because any development would be served by septic systems. The City previously determined that a sewer extension would be infeasible here – and not legal under Goal 14.

53. Comprehensive Plan Map refinement.

Requested by: See below

Related testimony (for or against): Multiple

Amendment: Direct BPS to study the comp plan designation and zoning on the following sites, and others if appropriate, and return with recommendations for any appropriate post-acknowledgment amendments in 2018:

- a. 7008 SW Capital Hill Rd (Hales, Saltzman)
- b. 9808 N Edison St (Fish)
- c. Strong property - 4931 – 4947 N Williams Ave (Hales)
- d. Marquam Hill mixed use node (Novick)

