

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

April 11, 2017

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Jeff Bachrach, Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katie Larsell, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Maggie Tallmadge (left at 2:30 p.m.), Teresa St Martin

**City Staff Presenting:** Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Nick Kobel, Sallie Edmunds, Tyler Bump, Rachael Hoy, Troy Doss, Nicholas Starin

**Other Presenters:** Congressman Earl Blumenauer

*Chair Schultz* called the meeting to order at 12:31 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

#### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Smith* commented on the “slippery slope” of degraded pedestrian easements. There is actually one through Big Pink. And there is still one on what used to be NW Marshall St at Good Sam Hospital. Now the Art Museum is proposing to build a pavilion, and there is an easement that goes back to a street vacation from the 1960s. On April 20, they are seeking to modify this again at Council. But oddly, it's not coming before the PSC. I learned that we have authority for street vacation but modifying the conditions afterward does not come through the PSC. I'm concerned enough to ask that the PSC share a letter of recommendation and ask that Council and PAM slow down the process so we do see this modification at the PSC. Today it's a path and accessible for most of the time and all modes. The ordinance would prohibit bicycles and dogs. I don't want to see connections go away, and that's what I want to see if it's happening here.
  - *Commissioner Baugh:* Is there some reason they are rushing this through? If it doesn't slow down the project, I don't see why they shouldn't come to the PSC.
  - *Commissioner Smith:* I don't know why slowing it down would cause issues for the project. We could have an opinion, but I don't know about jurisdiction.
  - *Chair Schultz:* Schedule is always of the essence for design, but I don't know anything about this process. If we were to invite staff to talk to us, when could they be on the agenda?
  - Susan: I'd recommend we get a note out from the PSC and then for me to have a conversation with Leah Treat. I also can have a conversation with Commissioner Saltzman's office to see if we can get you a briefing before it goes to Council (i.e. push the Council date out). We could schedule this briefly at the April 25 meeting.
  - *Chair Schultz:* I want to see that we as a PSC have a consensus before we decide to take this route.
  - *Commissioner Smith:* I move that we send a letter to City Council and Director Treat expressing concern about loss of access and asking Council to let us hear about the project before Council's date. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.
  - *Commissioner Houck* noted that even for things out of our purview, we as the PSC can take initiative. That was part of the goal of creating the Planning and Sustainability Commission.
  - (Y8, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin, Tallmadge; N3 – Bachrach, Rudd, Schultz)

*Commissioner Spevak:* There is a lot going on in the small housing realm. On November 3-4 the Build Small, Live Large Summit will be at PSU. Lots of cities are looking to see what Portland is doing, and I expect a number of PSC members would be interested in this event.

*Chair Schultz:* The final report and recommendations from the DOZA consultant is now available. It goes to Council on April 26, and I do plan on representing our DOZA subcommittee on that. If there are additional items that you want included in our letter, we're looking to get that revised and completed.

- *Commissioner Houck* did set up a meeting with some neighborhood folks to sit down with staff to go through some of their outstanding issues.

## **Director's Report**

Susan Anderson

- I want us to recognize Kat [*Chair Schultz*], who will be recognized as a 2017 Portland Business Journal Women of Influence award. This year's 25 honorees were selected from over 250 applicants, so it's a great honor.
- Yesterday, Mayor Wheeler and Chair Kaufory outlined their climate agenda. We know we can continue to take action here locally regardless of what's going on at the national level. This is a 2-year plan. We're excited for the local leadership we have.
- Yesterday, Joe sent an email to you all about a new PDC advisory group that's forming. PDC is working with BPS to explore viability and program administration of the bonus. PDC has contracted with Johnson Economics to help explore more of the market/economic issues associated with developing a viable program. PDC is also recruiting members for an advisory group that can help shape program details and administration. PDC expects that this group would meet a few times over the next few months. Kat will appoint 2 PSC member to participate.
- The May through August PSC meetings will be held in the CH2M building, just two doors south of here, at the regular meeting times while this commission room is getting remodeled.

## **Consent Agenda**

- Consideration of Minutes from March 14, 2017 PSC meeting.

*Commissioner Smith* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y11 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin, Tallmadge)

## **Congressman Earl Blumenauer**

Briefing

*Commissioner Baugh* introduced the Congressman. I've known Earl since the mid-90s when I was working at the City he was a City Commissioner. It's been a pleasure working with him on various transportation projects. His knowledge and perseverance for transit has been fun to work with and be part of. Thank you for being here today.

*Congressman Blumenauer:* It was great fun at the time dealing with the art of transportation. And I think that has evolved as the Planning Commission evolved into the PSC. I was able to work with a great Planning Commission when I was a Commissioner. I'm pleased with what happened in the course of those 10 years, but because we weren't looking as comprehensively, we weren't prepared for how rapidly plan would take hold (e.g. Albina Community Plan). Your making neighborhoods accessible and solving problems is to be commended.

Don't give up on the federal government yet. We've talked about reframing and adjusting the coordinate and work. In last Sunday's NYT, there was an article about main streets being dead and not coming back; I've sketched a response to that. Main streets are not dead. You're helping to update arterials here, which are basically the equivalent of main streets. We are working hard to maintain and strengthen elements in the federal partnership, particularly with historic properties. We are working to raise the gas tax for the first time in 24 years to help meet the infrastructure gap, with the federal gov't playing their part in that. There is agreement about needing lots of spending on infrastructure. We are working to maintain community development block grants and other resources that deal with environmental protection.

We are trying to make affordable housing part of the equation across the board. We are all working with affordable housing. Hopefully transportation initiatives will include housing as a part of them. I will leave this with you for advice to repurpose fed financed transportation and assets. The money will be paid back, either the amount that was given, or the current value, whichever is greater. My notion is that there ought to be more interest in terms of giving some local control and latitude. Then the assets would be treated as the functional equivalent of a grant. I continue to be keenly interested in orphan highways... Sandy, 82<sup>nd</sup>, Lombard, Powell... where the state doesn't have the resources to deal with them, and they aren't as concerned with the residents who live there. We should be able to repurpose them to city streets to help Portland reach its goals for housing and access.

I'm particularly interested in the work you'd doing in East Portland, which has been challenging and under-served by the governments that have had jurisdiction. We still have unmet needs there, which we can't solve overnight. But I'm pleased there has been greater attention given. But this is a challenge we all face. There is great opportunity but we need to do so in a way that speaks to the inequities we have created. I'm open to your ideas and input to help people.

*Commissioner Smith:* Thank you. infrastructure is always a concern, and I'm interested in your thoughts about engaging. TIGER grants have been a key funder here. How do we get in line with what's available at the federal level?

- It's important to all out some proposals. TIGER are most popular program. Our key is to be able to do everything we can at the local level to do it right. We are looking to step up here and creating opportunities for the community to invest. It's very important for us to do well and connect with people around the country who are doing similar things. Being alert to ways that recast the federal partnership is important.

*Commissioner Larsell:* I live in East Portland, so I'm particularly interested in those efforts. But we don't really want orphan highways to come into the City before they are fixed up. Also, about the TIGER grants: my worry is that it sounds like they will continue, however right now, there is so much feeling that "everything is in play", so people might stop applying.

- The concept of the orphan highway program would be to provide the resources to do exactly what we need to upgrade the roads.
- The question with the TIGER grants is the battle we have now. They are continuing and have been in the budget. The proposal of the administration is just a recommendation to Congress to zero this out. Given how many applications are received and still are, with 100s of examples of successful projects that magnify the federal dollars, is what we're working on this summer.

*Commissioner Houck:* With no disrespect to Commissioner Baugh, transit isn't everything; we all know that green infrastructure is everything. The Congressman really started this off with multi-objective management when he was commissioner in charge of the Bureau of Environmental Services. In deference to my colleagues and your time I'll follow up in writing with priorities many of which fly in the face of everything coming out of Washington DC.

*Commissioner Rudd:* I'm interested in your thoughts on accessing federal funds and the sanctuary city tension.

- It's on everyone's mind. Many of my colleagues are resolute to provide protection for vulnerable populations. The whole series is tragic, inhumane and immoral. There will be a spirited effort that are continuing against this. I am heartened by the response we've seen in our community. We will continue to fight to defend under-served populations legislatively. We've also seen courts willing to stand up.

*Chair Schultz:* Thank you for your time and for coming today. We certainly appreciate your efforts and are in alignment with all the work you're doing.

## **Portland Plan Progress Report**

Briefing: Susan Anderson, Nick Kobel

Susan shared the background about the Portland Plan, which was adopted almost 5 years ago. It was the City's first strategic plan, created with multiple people and partners. Great cities don't just happen by accident. The Plan was designed around three integrated strategies with equity as the framework and surrounding theme. Council adopted 12 specific Measures of Success, which is what the progress report focuses on.

The Plan is about people first and foremost... how we make this a great community for the people and businesses that are here and who will be here in the future. The Plan was built on partnerships. In creating the progress report, we reconnected with them and asked how they've been doing on the actions they committed to leading.

Each new mayor has embraced the Portland Plan as a guiding document, so that has been a success. About 80+ percent of the 140+ actions have either been started and are on track or even completed.

Susan presented the metrics for each of the 12 Measures of Success.

We've seen major improvements in job growth and education. Some in the number of people living in health connected neighborhoods. But there is still a serious issue for housing, affordability and childcare costs.

*Commissioner Tallmadge:* Is it possible to look at immigrants and refugees as a separate category?

- Nick: From the census, there are only a few things we can disaggregate. Immigrants and refugees aren't split out from census data. If you have other sources we can use, I can certainly look into it.

*Commissioner Larsell:* I like the measures of success. I also looked at the actions, particularly #48 about the East Portland Education Center. What would be the next steps in terms of moving this forward?

- Susan: Council members were looking at this progress report and looking for the red circles as places and where they can work with their bureaus to improved. For this one, the school districts wanted it to be in the plan. If there is still a community interested in pushing this forward to Council members, we can help with that.

*Commissioner Spevak:* The charts are pretty distracting for me. Logically there should be one trend-line of where we wanted to go and then where we actually went. I would like to see them in a consistent format in future updates and years so we can see it. On page 11, it talked about MWESB. In practice it's an "or", not "and". On page 19, there is a supply and demand question for housing and households. I'm sure there is a great data point out there, but this is units versus people.

*Commissioner Baugh:* I like this. It's great we're reporting on how we're doing. My concern was a bit around some of the bureaus that I thought would be father along with some of their actions. I'm particularly concerned about brownfields, which is a big part of our plan. What do we as the PSC need

to do to build some fire with this? The SUN System also, a big part of the schools coming into this, was lagging. I don't know if we can disaggregate and see how different neighborhoods are doing against the objectives.

- Susan: Discussions around brownfields with BES and PDC are happening. But we still don't have a leader. We are meeting again next week to try again to sort it out.

*Commissioner Rudd:* In terms of the brownfield issue, I noticed the lack of identifying a 25-acre site to develop. This could be the end of a real estate cycle, so it could be a good time to focus on this in terms of real estate pricing.

*Commissioner St Martin:* Will we revise goals and targets for things we're already exceeding at?

- We're looking at having the conversation with Council around the plan and when/if we update the 142 actions. This could be 2-3 years out, but definitely not immediately. We won't be doing another big vision document, but we might update the actions in the next few years.

*Commissioner Houck:* I was wondering about the tree canopy goal, for example, which I think was set at what I consider a pretty low bar. Looking at the distribution of canopy in the city is still a concern, and I don't think we're really exceeded the goal when we look at it citywide given the research coming out of PSU that documents urban heat island and lack of urban forest canopy. We just know the overall number doesn't tell the full story. I think we need to look at increasing some indicators like urban forest canopy.

*Commissioner Spevak:* How much value do you think this update provides versus homework on the staff end to create the report?

- Susan: Our Mayor is very data-driven, so I think this is very important. The more we have the conversation, the easier it gets for us to collect the data. There is value to connect knowledge and data with decisions around policies, smart cities.

*Commissioner Baugh:* We know averages don't tell the full story. So we know parts of the city may still be deficient. The city overall is probably not complete within each action. I would see us refining the plan to be more location-specific.

- Susan: What if we did a plan with this as the base to ensure we get the benefits to those who aren't yet seeing the positive results and impacts? The Mayor was supportive of this direction.

## **Central City 2035 Plan**

Work Session: Sallie Edmunds, Joe Zehnder, Tyler Bump, Rachael Hoy, Troy Doss, Nicholas Starin

Sallie introduced today's session. This is our seventh and final work session on the CC2035 Plan. We will return on May 23 for your final recommendation on the Recommended Draft, which we'll talk about at the end of this session.

### **Bonuses and Transfers Part 3**

*Memo 1-3 and Table 1*

Rachael noted the two items here, Item I32 and a revision to I30.

#### *Item I32*

I32 has to do with calculating the bonus FAR. Staff has come back with three approaches to connect the bonus compared to what's been approved with the Inclusionary Housing program.

Rachael walked through the three options:

- Option A: 3:1 FAR for the site (existing provision)
- Option B: 1 sq. ft. earned for each sq. ft. of residential up to 3:1 maximum
- Option C: 1 sq. ft. earned for each net building sq. ft. (excludes parking), up to 3:1 maximum

*Commissioner Rudd:* How does this relate to the modeling in terms of the off-set of inclusionary zoning costs we saw modeled by developers and the city, perhaps PHB?

- Getting the bonus FAR was part of the incentive package. It's still part of the package, but we are looking at different calculations because of our concern about how we can come up with an option that applies this in a way that proportionately awards bonus FAR by project on a larger site.
- Tyler: There are two things here. When we did financial modeling, far and away the biggest offset was the tax exemption. When we did modeling, we looking at specific building types. What we're talking about here is more of a mixed-use building, so it's a bit of an apples-and-oranges comparison.

Staff recommends Option C with this rationale:

- Allocates bonus proportionally to project, not all at once and in relation to only one building.
- Intended to encourage residential development on larger sites.
- Could reduce complexity for accessing FAR for a mixed use development.
- Easier to track earning and use of bonus FAR when distributed by project rather than by site.

This is different from our original suggestion we presented at the last meeting, but it is closest to what's provided with the IH code. It could be easier to track since it's distributed by project rather than by site.

*Commissioner Spevak:* I like staff's recommendation, and I'm thinking this would come up more outside the Central City as well.

- It's also being looked at outside the Central City, but we'll have to check with the mixed-use staff.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Option B would force people to go to other transfers or bonuses. How much would that force them and will it hurt historic districts?

- We're talking about the affordable housing bonus and how we calculate it. For projects that don't trigger this bonus, they can go to the historic resource transfer. But here we're mostly talking about projects that are being designed to have a mix of uses. We're trying to figure out the best approach to meet the intent of the IH incentive package and distribute the bonus incrementally on a building-by-building basis. Either B or C is calculated at the time you go in for approval.

*Commissioner Oxman:* Can you please further the response from staff about choosing C over B? And how will we know if this is working or not working? Can we revise?

- C is more closely-connected to what was approved with IH. Our main goal was to figure out a way for larger sites to allocate the bonus FAR by building. The big difference is that we felt C was a better fit and less of a change to what has already been approved.
- BPS will be working with PHB to evaluate the full package. We have the ability to track the usages of the bonuses and how it is allocated by project. We could take a look at it in a couple years, as the affordable housing bonus fund will be, so we could coordinate the bonus FAR look then too.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* The concern about large sites is more about a Master Plan as we discussed before. Is the proposal still to define site as the entire Master Plan site?

- This will come back to you on May 23. Defining the Master Plan boundary as the site area won't be in the Central City section of the code (33.510), but it will be in 33.245 (Inclusionary Housing). This will be done as part of the Task 5 clean-up project, so it will be at the PSC later. The definition of "site" is in the Zoning Code.
- Troy: There are only 5 Master Plans in the Central City, but there are still many more large sites here. It is applicable to the large sites that are opportunities aside from just Master Plans.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to accept staff's proposal for Option C. *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

*Item 130*

Staff is requesting to add back in to the draft an exemption to the prioritization of the bonus and transfer usage for South Waterfront that was included in the Proposed Draft.

In the process of updating the draft to integrate inclusionary housing code, staff intended to maintain South Waterfront's ability to use the transfer within the subdistrict and existing bonuses for projects that do not trigger inclusionary housing. The use of the transfer within a subdistrict is an important tool for development in South Waterfront.

*Commissioner Baugh*: Why would you take away priorities?

- We were trying to make as few changes to South Waterfront as possible, particularly because the complexity of how that area has been changed and developed. We hadn't intended to change this in the recent draft. This was just a step we missed.

*Commissioner Spevak*: It seems like priorities don't apply, but that there is a specific priority for South Waterfront.

- Yes, and that's how it's always been. The greenway is the first priority.

Staff is proposing to return to the Draft the exemption language for the South Waterfront Subdistrict that was included in the Proposed Draft. Staff had not intended to change the existing priorities for South Waterfront except for those projects that trigger the inclusionary housing program (IHP) as noted in B.2.a. However, if IHP is not triggered, properties along the greenway must use the South Waterfront Willamette River Greenway bonus option first. Other properties can transfer FAR from other sites in the subdistrict.

*Commissioner Houck*: Having participated for years in the agreements for South Waterfront, the entire concept was developed based on the greenway priority.

*Commissioner Spevak* moved to support staff's proposal to put this language about South Waterfront back into the plan draft. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

*Item 140*

Troy introduced this item as mostly specific to Lincoln High School if they don't redevelop at that site. The tweak would say, if it's anything other than a K-12 school, it would require a Master Plan.

*Commissioner Baugh*: When schools were talking about changing uses within the school, citizens wanted to be involved in the changing of the use. How do citizens voice their concerns for the use of the school as a different school other than in a Master Plan process?

- The process doesn't look at parsing what's appropriate for the site or not, particularly because it's a CX zone. It will go through a very large process. In terms of how the public influences PPS, that is a very public process, which they're going through right now. Whether we have or don't have this exemption, Design Commission doesn't have purview over what's on the site.

*Commissioner St Martin* moved to accept staff's proposal. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin; N – Baugh)

## **Policy Amendments**

### *Decision Table P*

Nicholas noted this is a proposed new policy crafted based on input to support measures to increase connectivity over I-405. The language has been written to cover the different project ideas already incorporated into Volume 5 as actions and to support innovative solutions developed at a later time that may address other infrastructure barriers.

### *Item P2*

*Commissioner Smith* move to approve the new policy 2.7, Reconnecting neighborhoods across infrastructure. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

## **Willamette River**

### *Decision Table M*

### *Item M31*

Sallie noted this is about creating a standard for temporary floating structures on the Willamette River.

We shared details about the swimming study with you in 2016.

We also developed a conceptual plan for the Eastbank Crescent Riverfront between the Hawthorne and Marquam bridges with a goal to find a way to address fish and wildlife habitat, boating, swimming, educational opportunities and an enhanced greenway trail in this area.

- Concept 1 focuses on habitat (top) and Concept 2 on public access (bottom).
- The recommendation is to use elements of both concepts depending on feasibility and site constraints to improve the area.

Both the Swimming Sites Study and the Eastbank Crescent Riverfront Plan will be reviewed by City Council on May 31.

In the Mayor's recent State of the City Address, he made a number of comments about swimming and access to the river:

- Take (river) renaissance to a whole new level.
- Begin our work this summer, with Portland's first pilot beach program at Poet's Beach on the westside
- The eastside of the Willamette River has great potential to radically enhance our relationship with the Willamette River. A broad stakeholder plan is done, in place and we're ready to move on it.
- These projects have the potential to revitalize our relationship with what is essentially our city's largest unofficial park, the Willamette River.

Staff considered a number of ways to make it easier to permit temporary floating structures in a way that is sensitive to the environment. Sallie highlighted the eight conditions for a temporary floating structure.

There are also a number of state and federal permits and a lease from the Department of State land who is the owner of the river bottom that someone would have to obtain. Today, all development in the river goes through Greenway Review. When there are no or little impacts to natural resources, there is very little or no beneficial gain from spending staff time and resources on review. By creating a standards track for limited development that avoids and minimize impacts on natural resources, we can reduce the staff time and resources spent on reviews.



*Commissioner Houck* thinks the standard route is a much better way to go and should not be handled as an exception. I feel staff addressed the many concerns I had with the original proposal. I do think the state and federal process will be longer than the City's. Staff raised the same issues I had. I think these will be taken over by transient folks on the river, so enforcement will be an issue. I think this is a great idea. Shallow water habitat is prime salmonid habitat, so the timing factor is important. I'm glad to see the proposed standard addresses the in-water period for salmon protection. I'm happy to support this.

*Commissioner Smith*: What are assumptions about who the applicants will be? What would stop someone for setting up the platform and charging people to use it?

- Likely public entities. PP&R is supportive of this. It's mostly public land adjacent to the river in this area. OMSI could also apply.
- Since it's PP&R land, it would have to be PP&R to be the applicant.

*Commissioner Rudd*: The market will drive this in terms of charging a fee or not. If you try to charge people, they would use the free one. The dock by the boathouse is being used now.

*Commissioner Baugh*: Could you put a retail use on this temporarily?

- Without a roof or walls. We'll look into this since you did approve retail in Open Space.

*Commissioner Oxman*: I am very supportive of having swimming options in the city on the river. At what point in the process do human safety issues come in? This creates a uniquely attractive and possibly dangerous situation for kids.

- Yesterday, PP&R met with the lifeguard company as part of the "pop-up beach" idea. They are very concerned about this and are taking steps to make it as safe as possible.

*Commissioner Houck*: I'm not sure I heard definitively this will solely be a public resource and not privatized. I just want to be sure we address this potential issue.

- All the adjacent land is OS and publicly owned.
- OMSI is what we believe is the only private entity.
- We could restrict it to just public entities.

If OMSI wants to have a platform and take on the responsibility for it, I don't have an issue with it.

*Commissioner Spevak* moved to accept staff's proposal for the dock to be publicly owned.

*Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Oxman*: Is it the dock facility to be publicly owned or accessibility to it is public?

- *Commissioner Spevak*: A public entity needs to own the dock.

*Commissioner Bachrach*: This is a new idea. The owner of the code is suggesting how we see floating docks can work. We've got basic criteria, but I don't think we should over-think how it should happen.

*Commissioner Rudd*: This is how I believe the process works: As an individual person, if you went to the state, they would then contact the adjacent property owner (City), who would have priority to lease as the adjacent land owner. The City could say no, it doesn't want it leased to a private user because the City has a first shot at it as the adjacent owner and the City wants to put the area to beneficial use. I am not sure how attractive this would be to a private entity anyway. You can only have the dock in for a couple months anyway. I'm hoping you can arrange something with the state and feds where you don't have to a completely new set of applications every year. Redoing the permitting every year would be a logistical nightmare.

*Commissioner Baugh*: We've already ok'd commercial activities in Open Space, and PP&R was ok with this. So I don't think it's a large extension.

- We could add a purpose statement. This could be a direction from the PSC to staff.

*Commissioner Smith:* I offer an amendment to remove the “public entity” amendment from *Commissioner Spevak’s* motion and back to the staff proposal. *Commissioner Rudd* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

*Commissioner Spevak* withdrew his amendment.

*Commissioner Smith* proposed to directed staff to add a purpose statement to reflect supporting swimming and water recreation and to approve staff’s recommendation. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

### **Next Steps**

On May 23, we will be asking the PSC to vote and forward a Recommended Plan to Council. Staff has been working with PSC members about the particular votes we’ll have based on people needing to recuse themselves from specific parts. We will have three final votes.

Staff is creating a guide for the initial recommendations the PSC has made, and we will provide you with full, staff-revised proposed drafts: 2A1 and 2A2.

We’re looking at the end of July for Council hearings and work sessions in the fall.

*Chair Schultz:* Thank you to staff. You’ve done a great job walking us through this work.

### **Adjourn**

*Chair Shultz* adjourned the meeting at 3:34 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken