

# Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, July 28, 2015

5 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh (by phone), Karen Gray (by phone; joined at 7 p.m.), Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin (arrived 5:12 p.m.), Maggie Tallmadge (arrived 5:12 p.m.)

**City Staff Presenting:** Lance Lindahl (PBOT), Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Alex Howard, Radcliffe Dacanay, Director Leah Treat (PBOT), April Bertelsen (PBOT)

**Other Presenters:** Councilor Bob Stacey (Metro), Dana Lucero (Metro), Kelly Betteridge (TriMet), Stan Penkin (CIC), Kenneth Doswell (CIC), Christina Blaser (CIC), Jessi Conner (CIC)

*Commissioner Schultz* is chairing today's meeting. She called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

## [Documents and presentation for today's meeting](#)

### Director's Report

Deborah Stein

- Tomorrow is the continuation of the Council hearing on the SE Quadrant Plan at 2 p.m.
- August 11 is the only August PSC meeting (12:30 p.m.), then we have a summer break until the September 8 meeting.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the June 23 and July 14, 2015 PSC meetings.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.  
(Y8 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith)

### R/W #7792 Street Vacation – University of Portland

Lance Lindahl (PBOT)

Lance introduced the proposal to vacate a number of streets on the University of Portland campus. The staff report outlines the request and how it is consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.

### Testimony

1. Jim Kuffner, University of Portland: Supports the vacation request. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Shapiro:* What will be built on the vacated land?

We are interested in this so the university can consolidate some street areas in the long-term. In the immediate future, the street grid that is currently there will remain. The traditional main entry to the campus will likely shift to Portsmouth as part of the Master Plan.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the reference to PP&R. One of the conditions is access to be retained to the North Portland Greenway, correct? There is reference to the scenic views, but nothing about natural resources such as of the large, old oak trees and native vegetation along these rights of way. We won't want to lose those in the future.

As of now, we are specifically preserving the view corridor in our Master Plan.

*Commissioner Hanson*: Are you in agreement with the conditions and notes in the staff report?

Yes, there was some give-and-take, but we believe we can successfully accomplish this vision.

2. Thomas Karwaki, UPNA: Has worked closely with the university about this and the UP Master Plan. The UPNA board supports the street vacation proposal and staff report. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith*: Looking at the map and the non-university-owned parcels at N McCosh and N Portsmouth, it looks like this is subdividable. Is there a potential loss of access there?

- That is block 34 in the Portsmouth neighborhood. There won't be an issue of access because it's owned by the church, with which the university is tied.

### Written Testimony Received

*Commissioner Schultz* closed testimony.

### **Motion**

*Commissioner Hanson* moved to recommend the street vacation. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

The motion passed.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### **Powell-Division Transit and Development Project**

Alex Howard, Radcliffe Dacanay, Director Leah Treat (PBOT), April Bertelsen (PBOT), Councilor Bob Stacey (Metro), Dana Lucero (Metro)

Director Treat introduced the project and provided an overview of the project's timeline. [See the presentation](#). This has been a collaborative project between a number of jurisdictions. The project is supportive of Vision Zero. These streets already have a high demand and are high-crash corridors, and transit is likely to increase with this project.

Dana noted this is a 15-mile corridor goes through the most diverse part of Oregon. We have interested community members, so we've taken a place-based approach for developing the project plan. The project team has worked closely with a number of organizations and has ensured the community has been part of the process through over 250 events and meetings. We've made opportunities for people to find information and weigh in online and have focused on equity and engagement throughout the process and will continue to do so.

This is a robust transit corridor and a priority for high-capacity transit. There are a number of plans that make the connections more and more important. There is lots of planning work in the corridor as well: large employers, small businesses, PDC Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative areas and destinations. This is also considered an "education corridor" with a number of college and high school campuses along it. We have engaged students in the planning process including working with a group of GIS students and high school students canvassing businesses in Portland and Gresham.

The project isn't just about transit; we are trying to understand how we can best link transit and land use planning. The work that's happening in the Jade District, PCC Southeast and APANO is a big piece of the development.

The steering committee formed in winter 2014. It has defined goals and outcomes for the project. Light rail was moved off the table and we've confirmed Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) as the transit option for the corridor.

The Transit Action Plan has codified the decisions made to date. It also identifies complimentary actions. There are still some the decisions yet to be made including where in downtown Portland the line runs. The group is next working on a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) that includes route, mode and station locations decisions, which is expected to be done in spring 2016. We are also coordinating with local plans and other TOD projects and place-making work in the corridor. Leveraging dollars from other grants and funding options is a priority of the work as well.

The planning phase has culminated in this Transit Action Plan. Now we're working on the design phase, and we could have service beginning as early as late 2020.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about the LPA. Are you looking at the whole corridor?

- Kelly Betteridge: We did initially look at a Minimum Operable Segment (MOS). But based on the levels of design we're looking at, we will likely be looking at an environmental assessment, and we'd need to have one end-to-end identification before doing the assessment.

April gave an overview of the projects and plans that are underway in the corridor:

- East Portland in Motion. An implementation strategy for active transportation in East Portland.
- Division-Midway Neighborhood Street Plan. Identifies local street and pathway connections to improve connectivity and prioritizes connections that most help achieve City goals on equity, healthy and connected complete neighborhoods, and access to transit. We expect that City Council will adopt this plan later this summer.
- 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave TriMet Partnership to get to frequent service along with corridor. This is going to design and production in 2016. This will help increase access to employment opportunities along the corridor.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that the bike network improvements are perpendicular to the corridor. What about safety improvements parallel to or on the corridor?

- Metro has developed a bike component to the project that could be part of the project or may be complimentary. These connections may be along the corridor or on parallel streets. We aren't yet sure what those improvements will be.

My understanding is that the FTA will allow bike improvement funding for up to 3 miles off the corridor. Are we working to maximizing the federal funding opportunities?

- We will look to do so.

Metro Councilor Stacey is co-chair of the project Steering Committee, and he congratulated staff on the project. The transit strategy is timely based on federal funding. Of the several steering committees that Metro has assembled, this is the most community-based committee we've ever had, and we're proud of this. This includes grassroots leadership and numerous organizations. We have a well-integrated group that represents community values in the planning process as we look at both transit and impact that the project will have. Some community concerns and ideas about how to address them reside in the City's planning process, and City staff has made themselves available to work to address displacement and build community.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted the representation on the Steering Committee. I am looking at the list, and it's representative of the diversity of stakeholders, but does it represent the neighborhoods all the way along the corridor?

- The SE Uplift and East Portland neighborhoods each selected their participants. Gresham did as well. So we have these representatives along with the “usual suspects” from the agencies. It is a good group and collaboration. We’ve reached out to people in multiple languages, of diverse backgrounds, Jade District, etc. I’m very happy with the process.

The public engagement reports include lists of the numerous groups and meetings we’ve participated in. We’ve been making the rounds consistently for the past 1.5 years.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about the regional supportive actions. What is the overlap with Metro’s equitable housing initiative?

- The housing initiative is just beginning, and it will work to collaborate with jurisdictions. The development of a toolkit is one of the objectives.

*Chair Baugh* commented on Title VI, which is to make sure minority and low-income groups’ concerns are heard and are dealt with in a productive way. When I look at the list of groups that have participated, I’m concerned we don’t see low-income or minority group represented. TriMet will be responsible for Title VI issues, so I want to be sure that is something we’re aware of from this viewpoint.

- The people composing the steering committee are more reflective of the community than the Metro Council or other boards and commissions in the jurisdictions. Some diversity is directly reflected in the Steering Committee make-up, and outreach has been to a huge variety of groups. We’d welcome ideas about what other groups we can reach out to.

*Commissioner Houck* noted gentrification and how it is almost always used as a pejorative term. But it creates wealth, and we want to try to capture that value-added from the project and use it or create tools to avoid displacement that typically occurs.

- This topic will largely be part of the Local Action Plan. We want to stabilize communities that are there already so they can benefit from the project. We want to implement in the short-term and build the case for benefits in the long-term.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the experts on engagement are here to present next at today’s meeting (the CIC).

Alex introduced the Local Action Plan ([see presentation](#)). The complete plan for Portland will come before the PSC this fall.

Portland needs its own plan for this project because funds allocated for the overall project will only go to transit. Additionally, Portland needs to:

- Support residential and community stability, so that current residents and business benefit from the transit project.
- Illustrate design and development concepts for opportunity areas (e.g. major station areas).
- Provide a roadmap for City work in the Powell-Division corridor.

We’ve hosted a number of focus groups included translated sessions. We worked with consultants to see what is likely to be developed along the corridor and what rents we’ll likely see. The corridor is very different in different places along the corridor, so we are looking at ways we can work in the various areas to address issues specific to the variances along the corridor. The group’s Working Principles outline these areas of focus.

Major themes include:

- Community Development
- Affordable Housing
- Placemaking, Station Area Design and Access
- Project Coordination
- Multi-modal Streets and Connections

Radcliffe gave an overview of the urban design and development planning. There are three focus areas for the project, and there are five opportunity areas with them. He walked through a number of slides that are initial sketches and ideas for future planning for each focus area.

The actions are still in development, and we are working with our partners to finalize and develop them. Some of these project development components include:

- Just Cause Eviction Policy Study
- Business Technical Assistance
- Development Grants
- PSU Collaboration
- Station Area Placemaking

The proposed draft for the Local Action Plan will be published this fall, followed by a hearing at the PSC. We expect the recommended draft in late fall / early winter, culminating in a City Council hearing in winter 2016.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about the rapid transit on 82<sup>nd</sup>.

- Kelly: We are modeling a number of scenarios, so the frequency is still to be determined. It really means the overall travel time will take less time with fewer stops and improvements at intersections for busses. Headway time could be as little as 5-7 minutes. We are doing demand modeling to help us determine the spacing and frequency.

*Commissioner Hanson* is a #4 bus rider. I've been hearing good things about this project, and I like the broad look you're taking at transportation and land use planning. This is a diverse corridor, and you're doing a good job at looking at and providing for this diversity. I'm all in favor of BRT systems. As I look at good examples in other areas, they are successful. The transition from Division to Powell at 82<sup>nd</sup> will do great things, particularly with the updated PCC campus there.

*Commissioner Smith* noted this project will create lots of value in the community including better access to jobs and education. In terms of an economic gain, have we considered any value-capture ideas?

- We're looking at community benefit agreement opportunities and other possibilities.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* noted the connection between TOD and the propensity to create displacement. What about equitable transit development? What about NAYA and CAT for outreach groups?

- We are looking at the reports we've shared with you as well as community development goals, but we still have lots of work to do in this area. We haven't worked directly with CAT yet. Our focus group discussion with NAYA fell through, but we'll be working to reschedule this.

### **Community Involvement Committee**

Stan Penkin, Kenneth Doswell, Christina Blaser, Jessi Conner

Deborah introduced the CIC group and work they've done through the Portland Plan and Comprehensive Plan processes. We've had about 50 meetings, and I've learned so much working with them. Thank you for all your work.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted the 6 years of service of the CIC. The report today speaks to our work and if we have reached out to enough constituencies to feel satisfied we've done enough outreach about these long-range plans. The CIC's recommendations are about how we can continue to do our outreach and continue to better our citizen involvement work.

The CIC members walked through their report and discussion points about this Comp Plan community involvement process. ([See the written testimony/report](#)). The CIC members concluded their presentation by asking the PSC where they thought outreach went well and where improvements could be made for future outreach.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted the CIC is great. “Don’t mess with perfection.” Keeping the energy and involvement going is key.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the issue that the CIC raised with the March 13 Comp Plan testimony cut-off and that the PSC already starting to process input at that time. We struggled with this too. We were trying to have a policy phase and an implementation phase as per the state framework, but the public seemed to want both simultaneously (particularly around the mixed-use zoning). Do you have advice on how to deal with that type of problem?

- This is a lot about a communication issue and letting the public know how the process works. There will be glitches, but it’s all about good and proper communication.
- If there had been someone at the bureau who was designated as a point-person, that would have been helpful so we could have had one version of the information the public was receiving.

Something I found as a challenge was the massive amount of testimony. Keeping track of all the good ideas was difficult. How did testimony management go from the community’s and staff’s perspective?

- This was certainly a challenge as was the whole process. We had problems as the CIC distilling all the information too. I know BPS staff really did listen to the testimony, but we don’t know if the community really knows that. People will hear what they want to hear. The staff does an incredible job with diligence and heart and compassion.
- Considering the volume of testimony, I don’t know if there are any other cities that would not have cut it off sooner. We are a benchmark city, and we are doing a really good job that other jurisdictions take note of.
- From an organizational perspective, there were a few people working on testimony. I think BPS has some lessons learned, and we will have a dedicated person working with testimony as the Plan goes to City Council.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* noted that the Powell-Division project emphasized funding for CBOs and organizations to work in focus groups. Would this be something we should look to do for future planning projects, particularly for organizations and people who are hard to reach?

- This could be a really good program to foster relationships and engage people.

*Commissioner Oxman* thanked the CIC for their work as well as their critiques of the process. There were great efforts made, and there are always areas to improve. I’m particularly struck by the ideas of scope and complexity that you brought up today as well as the importance (and challenge) of working with diverse communities. We often forget communities are overwhelmed with their own and individual concerns, so we probably need should look to pay for continuous involvement to foster it.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted the CIC’s recommendations in their report. I want to make sure we include the recommendations that are included, and I want to urge staff to implement the recommendations as soon as possible.

- The Community Engagement Workbook is a Task 5 product that will come before the PSC. It operationalizes these outcomes and will provide the guidance for our work going forward.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted the Comp Plan transmittal letter outline includes a section about community engagement where *Commissioner Shapiro’s* comments could be included.

#### **Motion**

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to forward the CIC report to Council with the recommendations included in the report. *Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

The motion passed.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

## **Comprehensive Plan**

Eric Engstrom

We have two final amendments to the Plan for today's discussion:

1) Policy 9.6. (presented by *Commissioner Smith*)

Amend the final sentence to read:

"A policy-based rationale is provided if modes lower in the ordered list are prioritized."

[This reflects some added TEG discussion last week.]

2) Policy 4.79 (presented by Staff)

Change the title to "Grocery stores and markets in centers."

Change the policy language to "... grocery stores, neighborhood-based markets, and farmers markets..."

[This reflects food policy staff feedback.]

### **Motion**

*Commissioner Smith* moved to accept the final two amendments as discussed. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

The motion passed.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

*Commissioner Houck* asked about when City Council will hear the Comp Plan.

- Our approach to City Council is that we will have 5 work sessions in September and October, then the hearings will begin in November.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted the mention of a possible third amendment today.

- *Commissioner Shapiro* commented that this will be a topic to include in the transmittal letter to Council.

### **Recap of CIC Work**

Based on the input from the CIC and *Commissioner Smith*, we are looking at the technical aspects of tracking testimony. With the Task 5 zoning map and projects, we will be using another iteration of the testimony database system and hope to make it easier for Commissioners to see where map-related testimony really is relevant and located.

We are required by the state to say who the overseeing body for public involvement is. This could be the PSC, or it could be another group like the CIC; a separate group like the CIC is our recommendation for going forward.

### **Vote on Goals and Policies**

#### **Motion**

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to recommend Comprehensive Plan Policies as amended at the June 9, June 23, July 14 and July 28 PSC meetings. This includes Chapters 1-10, the diagrams and maps included in the policy document, the glossary, introduction, vision statement, guiding principles and "How to use the Plan". This is part of Task 4 of Periodic Review. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

#### **Discussion**



*Commissioner Tallmadge:* Thank you to Commissioners, staff, communities and advisory committees. We really brought together diverse perspectives, insights and values to this plan. I'm honored to be a part of this and to have been able to learn from everyone in the community.

*Commissioner Oxman* also thanked Commissioners and staff for all the work we've done. From a content perspective, I think it does support a healthier community where everyone can thrive.

*Commissioner Smith* thanked the Commission, staff and the community.

*Commissioner St Martin* thanked the Commission, testifiers, stakeholder groups and staff.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted this is a great plan. It has so much depth, and it's not just a land use plan. It became so much more and evolved over the process. Staff has done a great job as has the Commission. I'm glad I could tough it out. My last meeting will be the August 11 meeting, but I'm proud to have been a part of this full process through to the end.

*Commissioner Rudd* continued the thanks to everyone who has been involved in the process of creating this plan. I appreciate all the substance that reflects our multiple objectives to craft a plan to build our common goal. I know I have pained people with the Glossary, but we have now made very clear what we mean and that we want balancing to happen. There isn't one policy that determines an outcome; we encourage people to look around and not just be mono-focused in decision-making so we create a city that works for everybody.

*Commissioner Houck* first got involved in land use planning doing Goal 5 fish and wildlife inventory work about 35 years ago in Washington County, Beaverton, and eventually Portland as well. When I started that work, I was told there is "no place for nature in the city", which was based on the fact that the UGB was viewed as an "end" and not simply a planning tool. The argument was made by planners that we can't afford to protect nature in the city because then we might have to move the UGB. We have come a long ways in the years to recognize that it's essential to integrate nature in the city, for human, economic and ecological health of the city. This plan is finally acknowledging the need to integrate the natural and built environments. I'm please the CAP, Climate Preparation Strategy and resiliency planning has been incorporated into the Comp Plan. Thank you to staff and the PSC. We all had amendments, and we were all treated fairly with staff and among Commissioners in understanding our different perspectives to come out with this good product.

*Commissioner Shapiro* thanked the PSC members and their contributions in creating this great plan. There is a piece that I feel didn't quite get into the plan. I'm not sure if we did a good epilogue about why we're doing the plan and what makes Portland such a special place. "Building bridges for the common good" is what it is all about, and I want this included in our letter to Council. This plan can only work if the "special sauce" of Portland is here.

*Chair Baugh:* Thank you to the citizens of Portland who have endured years of meetings and time devoted to telling us what you want Portland to be and what the special sauce should be made of. This plan is about our listening to and hearing what the community wants, and we hopefully have captured that. Also a great thanks to the PSC members who had listened to the community and to each other, which allows the community to see that we're taking their interests to heart. This really is our plan that we've facilitated. Lastly, thanks to staff, particularly the BPS management and leadership. We have done a great job, and this is a plan that will live through the next 20 years because it's about how we should think about Portland.

*Commissioner Gray:* Thank you to citizens, staff and the Commission for a job well-done. We have taken a very balanced approach and have looked at integrating many ideas to benefit all Portlanders.

*Commissioner Schultz:* I am honored to have been a part of this process and am proud to move this plan forward.



The motion passed.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Eric also shared thanks to staff who have worked on the plan. An additional thanks to the Commission and your packed schedule for the last few months to make it to tonight's vote.

### **PSC Letter to Council**

Staff has shared a draft outline with PSC members. PSC members should share their thoughts and input with staff within the next week or so to be integrated into the letter.

Staff is also working to incorporate all the amendments and changes into the document to create the Recommended Comprehensive Plan by mid- to late-August. We then have the work sessions in the fall with Council, which we'll provide more information about as we get close to those sessions.

The transmittal letter is structured based on the scheduled Council work sessions as well as around topics that the PSC had strong input about.

*Commissioner Houck* is pleased to see environmental protection listed under economic elements.

Though I am not sure what we mean by environmental protection here, so I want to be sure we are talking about weaving nature into the city, the relationship to human and economic health. Also, what is the WHI regional request?

- This is so that we ask Council to elevate the question to Metro to get further clarification and directly for the future.

*Commissioner St Martin:* Connections to climate action policy needs to be included in the letter.

*Commissioner Rudd:* Freight transportation is something that should be called out as well as the balancing discussion (balancing should be at the front of the letter). And we should hit on the key components of the Portland Plan including thriving, educated youth.

*Commissioner Tallmadge:* We need to acknowledge public involvement and reasons for environmental justice. Disastrous effects of gentrification and on-going displacement with "the why".

*Commissioner Hanson:* We should include something about quality education facilities. Maybe this is mentioned with health.

### **Adjourn**

*Commissioner Schultz* adjourned the meeting 8:04 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

# Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, July 14, 2015

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**City Staff Presenting:** Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Michelle Kunec-North, Troy Doss, Deborah Stein, Courtney Duke (PBOT), Peter Hurley (PBOT)

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:36 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

## Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck* reminded the Commission of the August 14 Policy Makers bicycle ride focused on the Comprehensive Plan and Green Loop. The ride will also do a side loop to Westmoreland.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* commented on his experience riding the new Orange Line MAX train. He noted three “no man’s land” stops that don’t appear to have much development surrounding them. Director Anderson commented that those areas are expected to change and offered to do a transit stop orientation in the future.

## Director’s Report

- None

## [Documents and presentations for today’s meeting](#)

### Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session / Recommendation: Eric Engstrom (BPS)

This work session continues our working through PSC members’ comments and amendments.

The group will be working off of the July 14 Discussion Guide (handout) and the annotated agenda. Eric Engstrom walked Commissioners through the table and explained how it works. He also walked through the agenda for today.

All items the Commissioners pulled for discussion should be included in the July 14 Discussion Guide.

### Continued Amendment Discussion

#### Amendment 10

*Commissioner Houck* asked to withdraw. The existing language is sufficient.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked if it hurt to leave the language in. It’s the only guiding principle that doesn’t have a descriptor in the vision statement.

*Commissioner Oxman* moved to adopt Amendment 10. *Commissioner St. Martin* seconded.

(Y2 – Oxman, St. Martin; N8 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Tallmadge)

Amendment 10 failed.

#### Amendment 13

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt Amendment 13. *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

*Commissioner Houck* commented that even though we've talked about green infrastructure, the language is referencing constructed things and not natural systems.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* suggested it could go into the glossary.

(Y5 – Hanson, Houck, Oxman, St. Martin, Tallmadge; N5 – Baugh, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith)

Amendment 13 failed.

*Commissioner Schultz* made a motion to add “natural” to the glossary. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

After discussion, both withdrew the motion.

#### Amendment 15

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 15 with staff recommendation. *Commissioner St. Martin* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St. Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 15 with staff recommendation passes.

#### Amendment 19

*Commissioner Tallmadge* moved to adopt Amendment 19 with staff recommendation. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked for clarification for the record. Eric indicated the indented language on the handout was the substitution language - about five paragraphs. (GP 2.8)

*Commissioner Houck* asked how we refer to tribes and tribal communities. Eric said the group would come back to this.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St. Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 19 with staff recommendation passed.

Amendment 22

*Commissioner Tallmadge* moved to keep “restore,” strike “and reconstruct.” *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

*Commissioner Oxman* wanted to discuss this amendment so a decision could be reached on which term is more appropriate - reconstruct vs. restore. Reconstruct is not in the glossary.

Director Anderson clarified that both are in the wording now. Do we take one out? If we leave both in, do we need to define it?

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

Amendment 23

*Commissioner Oxman* withdrew.

Amendment 24

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt Amendment 24 with change “while protecting.” *Commissioner Rudd* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

Amendment 25

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to adopt Amendment 25. *Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

*Commissioner Smith* asked for clarity in terms of aesthetics - he would like to keep the aesthetics component. *Commissioner Houck* agreed.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted this item’s section and also that “high performance” may be more appropriate and less subjective.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked if both terms could be included. *Commissioner Shapiro* agreed.

*Commissioner Schultz* gave the example of vinyl windows - they were not allowed by the Design Commission, but they are extremely high performance. The Design Commission now allows certain manufacturers of vinyl windows. You can have a great, high quality product and sometimes not be able to use it because someone doesn’t like it.

(Y9 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, St Martin, Tallmadge; N1 – Smith)

Amendment 25 passed.

Amendment 26

*Commissioner Tallmadge* moved to adopt Amendment 26 as proposed. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* clarified that “as proposed” means to adopt language from June 23<sup>rd</sup> document, page 25.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about removal of “physical characteristics of neighborhoods.”

(Y6 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge; N4 – Hanson, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro)

Amendment 26, as proposed, passed.

#### Amendment 27

*Commissioner Oxman* moved to withdraw his amendment and motioned to approve *Commissioner Houck’s* Amendment 27. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 27 passed.

#### Amendment 30

*Commissioner Oxman* moved to withdraw original language and substitute staff recommendation. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked for clarification.

Courtney Duke (PBOT) explained PBOT’s interest in making sure greenways also have a transportation function. PBOT’s definition of pedestrians includes those using wheelchairs and mobility devices - was redundant to specify that. PBOT’s language is in the Discussion Guide.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about consistency between TSP and Comp Plan glossaries. Eric indicated that the TSP glossary could be updated based on Comp Plan glossary. There will be opportunities to make them more consistent.

*Commissioner Smith* asked if this meant that streets without sidewalks couldn’t become neighborhood greenways. Courtney indicated this was not the case - it could be a greenway. That’s why it says “enhance.”

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 30, staff recommended language, passed.

#### Amendment 32

*Commissioner Houck* withdrew amendment.

Eric clarified that this is about public views, not private views from private property.

#### Amendment 40

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to adopt Amendment 40. *Commissioner St. Martin* seconded.

*Commissioner Smith* expressed concern that we’re setting the bar too high.

*Commissioner Schultz* indicated that she's open to other adjectives. Maybe it should match what's in the Zoning Code? The City does have a standard.

*Commissioner Smith* asked if we'd be better voting this down and relying on the Code.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about referring to Code in language.

Michelle Kunec-North (BPS) clarified language in code: "negative effects" rather than "harmful."

*Commissioner Oxman* commented that whatever we use should be measurable and subjective rather than objective. Maybe "excessive."

*Commissioners Schultz and St. Martin* withdrew the original motion.

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to change "harmful" in original amendment to "excessive."  
*Commissioner St. Martin* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

#### Amendments 41, 41A

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 41. *Commissioner St. Martin* seconded.

*Commissioner Houck* asked if stability implied housing stability. Eric commented that it's in the Housing chapter, so yes.

Eric also noted that 41 and 41A need to be taken together so they are consistent. Staff suggests keeping "support" in 41A.

*Commissioners Rudd and St. Martin* withdrew Amendment 41.

Amendment 41A is in the Consent List, but was pulled for discussion.

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 41A with staff's recommendation that "support of" remain. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

#### Amendment 46

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 46. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Houck* suggested additional language. *Commissioner Rudd* noted that it's in the regulatory section. *Commissioner Houck* noted that environmental and economic competitiveness are connected.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 46 passed.

Amendment 48

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 48. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

*Commissioner Smith* was concerned that Central City is supposed to maintain its share, not take business away from other centers.

*Commissioner Rudd* indicated it was not her intent to offend other jurisdictions but she was not clear the City's goal was to just maintain its current state.

(Y8 – Baugh, Hanson, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, St. Martin, Tallmadge; N2 – Houck, Smith)

Amendment 48 passed.

Amendment 50

*Commissioner Rudd* withdrew Amendment 50 – this was already voted on.

Amendment 51

*Commissioner Rudd* withdrew – this was already voted on.

*Commissioner Oxman* wanted clarification on “protect.” *Commissioner Rudd* had suggested the use of the broader term protect to provide greater flexibility when regulations drafted.

*Commissioner Baugh* suggested the group readopt the item for verification.

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 51. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 51 passed.

Amendment 52

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt Amendment 52 (language in Chapter 6). *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

Eric noted that staff is concerned about introducing economic caveats to environmental policies and vice versa. 7.51 probably already deals with this. This would work better in Chapter 7.

*Commissioner Houck* was amenable to that placement if push came to shove, but would prefer this in Chapter 6 with the other Superfund Site language.

*Commissioner Hanson* felt the language was stronger in Chapter 6.

*Commissioner Shapiro* felt it was redundant in Chapter 6.

(Y8 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge; N2 – Hanson, Shapiro)

Amendment 52 (Chapter 6 placement) passed.



Amendment 59

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 59. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

*Commissioner Rudd* requested the amendment to better ensure coordination.

Eric noted that overall coordination is already covered in the plan - and his feeling that this item is specific to unimproved rights-of-way and the coordination piece dilutes that.

*Commissioners Rudd and Schultz* withdrew the amendment.

Amendment 60

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 60. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Rudd* indicated this amendment was about increasing flexibility.

Courtney and Eric expressed concern that this could dilute protection of existing public right-of-ways.

(Y8 – Baugh, Hanson, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, St Martin, Tallmadge; N2 – Houck, Smith)

Amendment 60 passed.

Amendment 61

*Commissioner Oxman* asked for clarification of “station communities.”

Eric indicated it’s defined in Figure 3.4 in Chapter 3. There it’s “transit station areas.” Motion amended, as above.

*Commissioner Smith* moved to adopt Amendment 61, replacing “station communities” with “transit station areas.” *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

Amendment 63

*Commissioner Tallmadge* moved to adopt Amendment 63 with staff recommendation.

*Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 63 passed.

Amendment 64

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 64. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked for clarification of “or” versus “and.”

*Commissioners Rudd and Houck* withdrew the original motion.

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to adopt Amendment 64 with *Commissioner Oxman's* revision. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

**Amendments 69, 70C and 70D are depending on one another and were discussed as a group.**

Amendment 69

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to adopt Amendment 69. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

*Commissioner Smith* stated that the Macadam line doesn't stand alone. A complete solution would be better on the project list than a partial solution.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if removal of the Macadam streetcar line from the constrained list would mean we can't study it at all.

Peter Hurley (PBOT) indicated that staff does not support removal of this item because there has been so much analysis around it already. East Portland and the inner ring projects are both important and separate. The Bureau recommends keeping the Macadam project on the constrained list.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if the project was moved to the unconstrained list and somehow gained traction again, would you have to start all over.

Peter indicated no. They will prioritize various studies.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if the EIS would expire and is there a way to extend it?

Eric indicated that either way, you'd likely have to start a new EIS process because so much has changed.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 69 passed.

Amendment 70C (dependent on passage of 69)

*Commissioner Smith* moved to adopt Amendment 70. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Smith* explained the methodology for selecting new projects to go on the list - looking primarily at outer East and Southwest Portland. These items are the ones that were next on the bubble.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 70C passed.

Amendment 70D

*Commissioner Smith* moved to adopt Amendment 70 with an amendment to second bullet,

removing the words "Very Small Starts". *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Baugh* indicated that this study would look at what is the best advanced transit system that would work in East Portland.

Peter explained the difference between the constrained and unconstrained TSP lists.

*Commissioner Smith* stated that we need to learn how to do catalytic projects outside of the Central City. It's about learning to do the things we do well in different places for the sake of equity.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 70D passed.

#### Amendment 71

*Commissioner Baugh* indicated this amendment is about putting something on the table for West Hayden Island, to look at multimodal access opportunities now that the Columbia River Crossing effort is over. What can we build to the island to support it?

*Commissioner Smith* moved to adopt Amendment 71. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked how this relates to future industrial development on WHI.

*Commissioner Baugh* indicated it was more targeted at residential, local freight and commercial development. How do we support that development? It's about studying access to the island. It does not specifically address industrial development on WHI.

Eric clarified that this is about health and safety access for the neighborhoods.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Tallmadge; N1 – St. Martin)

Amendment 71 passed.

**Eric distributed maps related to Amendments 72 and 73 for reference.**

#### Amendment 72

Eric reviewed the proposal to add a neighborhood center at NE 60<sup>th</sup> and Glisan Street, centered on the 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue MAX station.

*Commissioner Smith* relayed the story of a bicycle ride he took with members of the North Tabor community asking for higher density in their area.

*Commissioner Smith* moved to adopt Amendment 72. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if opponents to this have had an opportunity to comment.

Eric and Deborah Stein commented that there was extensive outreach in this area and they don't have concerns. They heard from others that they also wanted more density here. Additionally, potential zone changes related to this change would not happen automatically.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 72 passed.

Amendment 73

*Commissioner Hanson* moved to adopt Amendment 73. *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

Troy Doss explained the SE Quadrant/OMSI map, and clarified what the amendment would do.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 73 passed.

Amendment 76

*Commissioner Tallmadge* moved to adopt Amendment 76. *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 76 passed.

Amendment 79

*Commissioner Oxman* withdrew amendment.

Amendment 81

*Commissioner Oxman* moved to adopt Amendment 81. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Oxman* supports an ordered transportation list, but also wants this to be a piece of the Comp Plan that a member of the public could understand. This amendment tries to return to the original conception of modes, and enhance the notion of vulnerability, how that works and how it will be addressed. It is detailed, but we somehow need to define vulnerability. Amendment also would add “low emission” vehicles - City would classify.

*Commissioner Smith* relayed concerns that the Transportation Expert Group (TEG) might object to some of the editorial changes because they were highly invested in the language. On the low emissions point, we’re splitting out a category that doesn’t have much of a significant difference. Otherwise, there aren’t really strong policy differences.

Courtney stated that the TEG and all the chairs of the modal committees worked together to craft the language, including the ADA components. We could be a little more definitive about what special accommodations are. No opinion on the low emission vehicle part. Also, we may want to define “low” occupancy vehicles. “Users” is more inclusive. Lastly, some of the text on vulnerability could go into the glossary. Some of these things could be handled as part of Task 5, but the policy piece needs to be addressed now.

*Commissioner Oxman* commented that special accommodation should be above and outside of the hierarchy rather than in the hierarchy.

*Commissioner Baugh and Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about moving the special accommodation piece to the top of the hierarchy.

*Commissioner Baugh* asked if we could do this as part of Task 5.

Eric indicated that everything could be done in Task 5 except for the hierarchy list.

*Commissioner Oxman* commented that we should lead with the ability/special accommodations piece and then go into the modes.

Director Anderson asked where motorcycles and motor scooters fall into the list. She would like to include them somewhere in the list.

*Commissioners Smith and Oxman* commented that they'd like to look at this issue in more detail as part of Task 5.

*Commissioner Oxman* restated that looking at vulnerability with the modes does not work out epidemiologically. A transit user is less vulnerable than a passenger in a car. Modes and vulnerability are separate.

Eric and Courtney worked through draft language to replace changes in original amendment (see below).

*Commissioners Oxman and Houck* withdrew original motion.

*Commissioner Oxman* moved to adopt new language. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y11 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed (approved language below).

Policy 9.6 Transportation strategy for people movement. Design the system to accommodate the most vulnerable users, including those that need special accommodation under the ADA. Implement a prioritization of modes for people movement by making transportation system decisions according to the following ordered list:

1. Walking
2. Bicycling
3. Transit
4. Taxi/commercial transit/shared vehicles
5. Zero emission vehicles
6. Other single occupancy vehicles

When implementing this prioritization, ensure that:

- The needs and safety of each group of users are considered, and changes do not make existing conditions worse for the most vulnerable users.
- All users' needs are balanced with the intent of optimizing the right of way for multiple modes on the same street.
- When necessary to ensure safety, accommodate some users on parallel streets as part of multi-street corridors.
- Land use and system plans, network functionality for all modes, other street functions, and complete street policies, are maintained
- Rationale is provided if modes lower in the ordered list are prioritized.

Amendment 80 (pulled from consent list, out of order)

Courtney expressed that PBOT would prefer this language just say “users” instead of road users.

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to adopt Amendment 80 with deletion of “road” and “right-of-way.” *Commissioner Rudd* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

Amendment 82

*Commissioner Oxman* withdrew original amendment, moved to adopt Amendment 82 with staff recommendation. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 82, staff recommended language, passed.

Amendment 86

*Commissioner Hanson* moved to adopt Amendment 86. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 86 passed.

Amendment 87

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt Amendment 87. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked if this would impact Central City, South Waterfront or West Hayden Island.

Eric indicated it would not.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 87 passed.

**Consent Amendments**

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to approve the Consent Amendments. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The Consent Amendments passed.

### **Economic Opportunity Analysis**

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to recommend the Economic Opportunity Analysis. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

(Y8 – Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St. Martin, Tallmadge; N2 – Baugh, Rudd)

The motion passed.

### **Citywide Systems Plan**

*Commissioner Smith* moved to recommend the Citywide Systems Plan. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

### **List of Significant Projects and TSP Project List**

*Commissioner Smith* moved to recommend the List of Significant Projects, TSP Finance chapter, and TSP Project and Program List. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

### **Land Use Map**

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to recommend the Land Use Map. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

The motion passed.

### **Policies**

*Commissioner Shapiro* expressed concerns that the PSC had not yet heard from the Community Involvement Committee (CIC). Their report is due on July 28 and he would like to hear from that group before voting on the entire Comprehensive Plan package. This is a requirement of the state – that we hear from, and react to them. To pass this without hearing from them is an insult to them, and not a responsible way to finish the plan.

*Commissioner Houck* asked whether the state required they hear from the CIC or if it only requires public involvement.

Eric indicated that it does require a CIC and they will bring forward a report. PSC will be asked to accept the CIC report and forward it to Council.

Susan said that legally, PSC could vote, but from a perception standpoint, it might be better to



wait until after they've heard from the CIC.

Eric commented further that regardless of whether or not you vote today, it will all get to Council at the same time.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked *Commissioner Shapiro* if they've done anything the CIC would be against.

*Commissioner Shapiro* indicated that he thought they would support the plan but that they would likely have recommendations on procedural things that could be done better. The group feels that the process is pretty good and that BPS is trying really hard - but it doesn't always work. Fundamentally, they would be supportive.

Deborah commented that it really is about perception, not legality. What they would bring is a retrospective analysis and will be informative for staff and PSC. It could also give the PSC some suggestions on things to include in their transmittal letter, but the report won't touch on the content of what PSC is recommending.

Director Anderson asked who would be available on the 28<sup>th</sup>. Karen Gray can call in. Andre' Baugh will be out of town, as will Susan. But they can try to call in. There will be quorum.

*Commissioner Baugh* decided that the Commission will vote on July 28<sup>th</sup>. Andre will call in. Further, he asked if staff could outline the big pieces of the transmittal letter. It would be good to understand the format so commissioners can figure out where to insert their pieces.

Lastly - things that weren't in the Comp Plan but people indicated they wanted to put in - we should include these in the transmittal to City Council as well.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked what the outreach process looks like moving forward.

Eric indicated they will update the various pieces and then begin the required notification process along with a wider outreach effort that this is going to Council. The content will be more informational in nature, rather than aimed at soliciting ideas.

Susan highlighted that staff has set up five informal work sessions with Council to allow them to really dig into the issues-anyone can come to these. We may ask some PSC members to come, depending on the topic.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 5:00 p.m.

Submitted by Kathryn Hartinger, Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

5:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**City Staff Presenting:** Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Tom Armstrong, Tyler Bump

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Smith* participated in the Missing Middle Housing Ride as part of Pedalpalooza. It was focused on the policy aspects of why duplexes and other “interesting housing types” are not being built in Portland any more.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted The Monocle, a UK magazine focused on design and lifestyle. They have recently published a list global cities with the best quality of life, and the last city on the global list is Portland, the only US city on the list.
- *Commissioner Hanson* noted that he met with David Douglas School District and staff today to talk about the district’s growth and where they might expand. BPS, PP&R, PDC staff were at the table, which is an on-going conversation.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted that there was a meeting with the Mayor this afternoon about his upcoming trip to the Vatican to discuss climate change. The Pope’s Encyclical has similar topics included such as conversation about biodiversity and environmental impact analysis on ecosystem health, and what we need to do to create livable cities.

### Director’s Report

- Susan added the Mayor will be going to Rome on July 21 with 16 mayors from other cities with similar carbon reduction goals as Portland. What’s notable about the list is that most of the other cities are large, mega-cities.
- Tomorrow we have the Climate Action Plan at City Council. We have about 20 people coming as invited testimony, and we expect a very good conversation. There will be some controversy about if we’ve gone too far or not far enough with the Plan.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the June 9, 2015 PSC meeting.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

## [Documents and presentations for today's meeting](#)

### **Revised Growth Scenarios Report**

Hearing: Tom Armstrong, Tyler Bump

Tom and Tyler shared the [presentation](#) and background. This is part of Task 3 as part of looking at possible growth scenarios. The updated report reflects what and where we grow and how our investments impacts many of the Portland Plan measures, which is the evaluation portion of this work.

The presentation includes information about growth patterns in the proposed plan and highlights of a few performance measures.

Most choices are on the residential side on the multi-family side, where we expect 80 percent of our growth and development. Most of this is in the Central City and mixed-use corridors.

We look at where we have capacity to grow and where we're likely to grow based on recent development trends. Over the last five years, shifting development trends show that the market is favoring the Central City and Inner neighborhoods. One growth and investment strategy could be to support this trend, which may create some breathing room to improve conditions in East Portland.

Two-thirds of the households that will be here in 2035 are already on the ground today. This legacy development plays a huge role in future development patterns. By district, we expect lots of growth in East Portland, but not as much as we originally thought. Initially that was about 40,000 units, but now we're looking at about 27,000 in this huge geographic area of the city.

The two investment strategies we've learned are (1) support growth in the right places and (2) create more "right places" by investing to reduce disparities.

We also have learned that increasing transportation options and choices have multiple benefits. In 2035 we're looking at 61 percent of households with access to frequent transit, a large increase from the 47 percent today. A low-stress bike network access increases our performance from 56 to 72 percent of households with easy access to them. This is just the fiscally-constrained list, not the full Bike Master Plan being implemented.

In terms of complete neighborhoods, we need to create more centers and complete neighborhoods, especially in East and Southwest Portland. In the updated report, complete neighborhoods go from 63 to 73 percent of households that live in them.

The Proposed Comp Plan has a 3 percent decrease in total vehicle miles traveled (VMT), but this is a 27 percent per capita reduction. We also get close to the 2035 carbon reduction goals.

### **Discussion**

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the legacy landscape.

- Most of our residential neighborhoods that are off the centers and corridors we expect to remain mostly the same; most of those houses will be here in 25 years. So that leaves the majority of growth focused on the remaining one-third (mostly corridors and centers).

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about equity and how it didn't come into the principles. Shouldn't this be explicitly be included?

- It is implied as an overarching principle, and it shows up in the focus on affordable housing in the report; and in complete neighborhoods and additional infrastructure investments in East and Southwest Portland we need to close the gaps to move the needle.
- We looked at increases in performance in the communities of color. Our commitment to equity shows up greatly in our infrastructure investments. Now we have to get ahead of this on the displacement side. But for the most part, communities of color performance was twice that of non.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about closing the gap to our Portland Plan goals. Are there policy levers we didn't push that we could to get us there?

- 80-85 percent of growth is happening where and how we want it. The other 15-20 percent is going to be based on the market, so we don't have much control over that.

*Commissioner Houck* noted this approach is consistent with where Metro was about 20 years ago in the Metro 2040 planning. Last time I talked about the term "density". The complete neighborhoods phrase is better to communicate to folks in terms of building a better community.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about the gentrification measurement chart.

- Some measures we want to minimize development in gentrification-pressured areas. We asked if any of the scenarios would push more development into areas of high risk. We don't have a specific goal to shoot for, but we want to minimize the impact.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* noted a number of stages that can lead up to risk of displacement. If we back off of investments, what happens?

- We are monitoring and evaluating where we expect development to occur. Twenty-three percent of households are in high gentrification risk areas. Growth areas are largely complete, but we need to invest in affordable housing and fill in service gaps to support the growth. But we still have the heavier lift in East Portland and other under-served areas. This is the balance with preventative and mitigating activities.

*Commissioner Gray* asked about the baseline data for the communities of color slide (slide 48). What is the actual comparison?

- The chart shows we're closing the gap, but it doesn't define how big the gap is. We will work on getting you that specific information.

### Testimony

1. Nolan Leinhart, 1000 Friends of Oregon: I urge the PSC to adopt the package of amendments from the anti-displacement coalition to make our communities more resilient. There are challenges ahead, and one of the greatest is to respond to inequalities in the city and region. The Portland Plan established equity at its core, and we want to see this goal come to policy in the Comp Plan.
2. Edward Hill, Groundwork Portland: You should fully adopt the amendments from the anti-displacement coalition that *Chair Baugh* and *Commissioner Tallmadge* have put before you in today's amendments. Our work is rooted in converting spaces into active, vibrant places. We need to reflect in detail and monitor our growth as a city. Continued inequities from the past 20 years are still in our headlines today. We must plan for inequity and work towards mitigation.
3. Cat Goughnour, Anti-Displacement Coalition: Thank you to BPS staff for working with our coalition to respond to the needs of our most vulnerable communities. We have an opportunity to approach new development to reduce segregation with this plan. Higher income areas in the city tend to be areas of low diversity. In planning for changing

demographics, we have to plan to uplift those who have been left behind.

4. John Gibbon, SWNI: Enhance medium-density housing by requiring if you build to a lower density, you'd still pay the SDC fees and be a non-conforming use. I'm enthusiastic about the growth scenarios in East Portland. If you look closely at the report, we see centers and corridors as the places where we'll have issues. Staff even notes that stormwater is better accommodated in corridors, not centers. SW Portland centers are questionable.
5. Pat Wagner: Linnton resident. We want to increase density but lost our land use plan in 2006 for our neighborhood. We want a zoning change from heavy industrial, and we could add tiny houses and increase density in this area. We have lots of dedicated people who are willing to work on this, and things have changed a lot in the past few years. *See written testimony.*
6. James Peterson: The expected 124,000 housing units has some flawed expectations and assumptions. *See written testimony.*
7. Sara Taylor: Linnton resident. This was the first European settlement in Portland. We have access to nature, employment/industrial zones and opportunity to develop. The piers are now empty, industrial storage. Our roads are clogged with people driving to work, not walking or biking. Please consider Linnton as a place to transform this area into a historically and environmentally model neighborhood.
8. Greg Theisen, Port of Portland: Growth Scenarios performance measures should include additional performance measures to include. Since 2010, Port has submitted over 10 letters and appreciate your consideration of them. The low forecast for harbor land development will impede City efforts to attract new business. Removal of Policy 6.41 (West Hayden Island [WHI]) restricts options for future marine terminal development in the Portland Harbor. *See written testimony.*
9. Jan Wilson: SW resident. A 1200-1300 square foot house is what people in my neighborhood treasure, and Growth Scenarios show that is encouraged. But little houses are being torn down to build huge houses. When that happens in SW, you lose tree canopy and ability to handle stormwater, particularly in the SW hills. Please find a way to keep new development out of residential neighborhoods.
10. Doug Klotz: Supports the Revised Report. Low-stress bike networks depend on building out the bikeways, so we need to make sure they actually get built to achieve these results. Middle density housing developments can only be built in multi-family zones, so I would propose single-family zones be modified to allow these duplexes and up to 6-plexes in proximity to corridors. *See written testimony.*
11. David Red Thunder: River spoils dumping needs to stop at WHI. We need to have a beneficial use and recognition that people live on WHI.
12. Nancy Davis: Supports the anti-displacement policies that have been proposed. We need policies that support diverse neighborhoods.

### [Written Testimony Received](#)

*Chair Baugh* closed testimony at 6:16 p.m.

## Discussion

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about Jim Peterson's request to have the record left open.

- If you left it open, you could vote your recommendation on July 14. But *Chair Baugh* has closed testimony.

*Commissioner Houck* noted Metro's 2040 Growth Concept. They removed 200 feet on both sides of streams and rivers, steep slopes, and floodplains from the buildable lands inventory. Regulations were predicated on this, so it's important to note this. We reference other aspects of the growth management strategy, so we should carry all components of this forward. Also, City Council just adopted the Watershed Scorecard, so I think we should reference that here too.

- We already have development within these areas. The reference is in the BLI, which informed the growth distribution model for the Growth Scenarios Report.

*Commissioner Houck* also commented on discrepancy between use of "green space" and "natural areas" that should be used consistently.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the progress toward Portland Plan goals – this is great. When we do transmit a letter to Council, we need to make sure to include the investment strategy.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the waterfront industrial / EOA issue that the Port has pushed back on again.

- This is about available capacity and how we designate WHI and matching the two. If we leave WHI as it is and not move that designation, how do you achieve a higher level of cargo forecast without that capacity? We think it's a difficult case to make.

*Commissioner Rudd* recapped prior a staff briefing that WHI was only place large enough for a rail loop, and that the mid-level forecast therefore relied upon intensification on existing land which required higher levels of investment. The low level was a PSC choice that was made but was debated, with, for example, Rudd favoring midlevel. We could go with the mid-level forecast.

- We could, but it would be harder to make the policy commitment and the bar would get raised to achieve this.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about the tension in Linnton.

- It factors more into the EOA than the Growth Scenario report. Scenarios is about growth pattern and our choices. Our employment areas are fixed on the ground; the EOA got into what sectors we want to growth. The EOA is where we explored those alternatives and capacity. Growth Scenarios took that as a fixed point, except for Neighborhood Business Districts, which follow the residential growth. Linnton questions get back to the EOA and scarcity of waterfront industrial and the Portland Superfund shadow; until that is resolved, we have that backlog. In Chapter 6 we have policies about brownfields and Superfund clean-up.
- *Commissioner Smith* noted the bubble chart. Linnton didn't get into the investment quadrants, and I know this doesn't fit our parameters for a complete community investment.

*Commissioner St Martin* clarified: goals, policies and the gap. The gap needs to come from market activity and things we need to do.

- Yes; innovation, private investment or additional public investment is needed to fully achieve our goals.

*Commissioner Gray* noted growth areas. I'm hoping we are really planning to invest commensurately in those places where we will see the most growth. I know we have to grow in

the Central City, but I'm hoping this also addresses investments and job growth in the eastern part of the city. Anti-gentrification and tools are part of this conversation. Are we planning on a formative assessment before the next 25 year plan?

- The Portland Plan's Measures of Success, and with every new jobs forecast for the EOA, and following development trends are all ways we will monitor.

*Commissioner Houck* was surprised about performance measures regarding green infrastructure and access. In the proposed scenario, we see a loss of access to natural areas. Even on the Esplanade, we do have encounters with nature. I'm surprised we end up with a net loss of 1 percent in terms of access to natural areas.

- One of the challenges of access to natural areas for new acquisition is we don't know what the access (physical/spatial) is. The map on page 76 of the report talks about what natural areas are.

We should just acknowledge this, we don't need to change anything. Riverview Natural Area will likely have additional access, but not a lot of people live nearby.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about tracking and program evaluation for gentrification risk areas. Can you remind me what the framework for equity does, and if there is a reporting requirement or actionable work? I want to be sure we don't just have analysis for the sake of analysis.

- We have the gentrification risk area analysis, which we're in the process of updating. That is separate from policy or plan decisions. We still need to figure out after the Comp Plan and a new area plan or investment opportunity comes forward how we do some of that analysis.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about ADUs and if they're included.

- We looked at recent trends and saw about 3,000 new ADUs (2.5 percent; 150 per year). So they're in there, and each housing type is a percentage.

*Chair Baugh* asked about prosperity measures and distribution of wages. Does our measurement include the jobs and distribution of jobs as we think about this?

- This reaches back to Portland Plan measures of success. This was specific to residential distribution but access to jobs is what we were measuring. The Growth Scenarios analysis doesn't measure economic growth. Many of the Portland Plan measures are better for monitoring trends, not forecast them out to the future. Growth patterns has such an indirect effect on things that we couldn't get to in this report. But in a progress report, we can look back on these measures.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the Forest Heights development and that it is what not to do in terms of watershed health.

In terms of voting and next steps, the things the PSC has left to vote on/recommend include: EOA; this report; and the actual Comp Plan with all its components.

#### **Motion**

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to accept the Growth Scenarios Report. *Commissioner Gray* seconded.

(Y11 – Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge, Baugh)



## Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom

This work session continues our working through PSC members' comments and amendments. We realize that there are a few amendments from *Commissioner Oxman* that we missed in preparing the amendment lists, so staff will send those out in the next couple of days.

Amendments on the consent list are ones staff thought don't need discussion; they are fairly clear-cut and/or typos in nature. These are "Tier 3" amendments as noted on today's annotated agenda.

"Tier 1" decisions are those that had staff disagreement and/or Commissioner conflict. These are what we hope to get through tonight. "Tier 2" amendments are everything else. If we can get through Tier 1 items tonight, we can then try to get through the map and project list comments.

*Chair Baugh* noted the Tier 2 decisions should be reviewed by Commissioners after tonight's meeting. If there are items on this list that Commissioners want to discuss, we can do that on July 14. But we should have many of those amendments from the Tier 2 list go to the consent list if there aren't conversations necessary.

*Commissioner Smith*: Based on tonight's testimony, I might have a few more amendments to propose.

- Please have any final/additional comments and amendments to staff by July 7. PSC members should also identify what you want to talk about from the Tier 2 list or new items by July 7.

*Chair Baugh* asked if any Commissioners had items they want to withdraw from the amendment list.

- *Chair Baugh* withdrew Amendment 74 regarding ESCO.

The first bundle of tonight's amendments is related to anti-displacement requests. The Anti-Displacement Coalition is here tonight. Staff has met with this group several times and focused on their review of the Plan. Commissioners have sponsored outcomes from this group's meetings with staff.

Amendments 8 and 9 are both about the Introduction to the Plan.

*Chair Baugh* moved to adopt Amendment 8. *Commissioner Tallmadge* seconded.

Staff noted 8 and 9 deal with adding to the Guiding Principles. Staff thinks we should combine this into one amendment as noted in response to Amendment 9.

*Commissioner Houck* supports this, but he feels low-income communities should be included in considerations regarding equity. I understand we are using terminology development in the Portland Plan, which focused on race, not class or low income communities. I am willing to stick with race as the focus, but did want to indicate my concern that low-income communities, regardless of race, are critical to address.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about the term "remedy" in the proposal. How is this different from "reduce disparities" that we've used elsewhere in the Plan?

- *Chair Baugh* noted "remedy" here means there is a past impact. Anti-displacement is a forward-looking discussion.
- *Commissioner Rudd* suggested "address" as the verb in this context. In terms of the staff concern about exactions, I don't see exactions as a dictated tool and don't have

those concerns in this situation.

- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted that “remedy” suggests aggressive action and likes this word.
- *Commissioner Schultz* had the same question as *Commissioner Smith*. Who is responsible for remedying? This is a deeper conversation, and I feel more comfortable with “address” to note we’re trying to do better going forward.
- *Commissioner Hanson* said “remedy” means to me that something gets completely solved.
- *Chair Baugh* noted equity is a key policy of the Comp Plan. We should be clear of our intention of what and how we’re saying this. It is a cornerstone of our work, and my concern is that it has to be doable. I want to be sure that it’s clear for someone 10 years from now making a decision based on the Comp Plan that we’re clear about what the intent and expectation is. I’m willing to look at the staff recommendation about equity and changing “remedy” to “address”.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if this should be broader than communities of color. Also, “prevent” is a tough bar.

- It is a majority of communities of color that have been displaced by land use policies, not necessarily other under-served groups.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted the rationale for focusing on communities of color is because it’s consistent with decisions that have been made in the past.
- *Chair Baugh* noted the word “prevent”. As I looked at this word, we use it lots of places throughout the Plan. If we start picking out this verb here, I think we open a Pandora’s Box to reviewing every time we use the verb. I feel like it’s appropriate in this context.
- *Commissioner Rudd* noted there is a proposed amendment to adjust the definition of “prevent” later on.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about “remedy” would look like in a decisions process.

- *Commissioner Rudd*: As an example, the City could have a policy that designates funds to help people return to a neighborhood where their community once was.

Eric reminded the Commissioners about language added to page A-3 about policies not automatically going over others based on the specific verb used. This is a reminder that while verbs are important, there is not a “trumping” verb.

Joe noted that when you think about how we might use this, we need to think about future application. Part of the goal of the Guiding Principles is to make us think multi-objectively.

Eric noted that thinking back through in terms of land use decisions and making findings against this, one could imagine making a land use amendment to add an amenity and then saying that I can’t remedy past injustices so I can’t move forward with this improvement.

*Chair Baugh* withdrew the motion. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded withdrawing Amendment 8.

*Chair Baugh* is ok with the word “prevent”, but I am wrestling with “remedy”. I proposed that we adopt 8 and 9 as staff recommends with changing “remedy” to “address”. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked if there will be new language for PSC consideration.

- What’s on the screen now is the language we are voting on:  
**Equity.** Promote equity and environmental justice by reducing disparities, minimizing burdens, extending community benefits, increasing the amount of affordable housing, [affirmatively furthering fair housing](#), [proactively fighting displacement](#), and improving socio-economic opportunities for under-served and under-represented populations.

~~Inform and involve Portlanders in~~ Intentionally engage under-served and under-represented populations in decisions that affect them. Specifically recognize, address, and prevent repetition of the injustices suffered by communities of color throughout Portland's history.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted that looking ahead to the future, we have other under-represented communities that aren't communities of color. Should we look at that?

- Under-served and under-represented are included.
- Susan noted we had this discussion in the conversation about the Portland Plan. We had significant data on the impacts of communities of color specifically. It doesn't mean that other groups are not included, but we focused on communities of color in the Portland Plan.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge).

**Amendments 8 and 9 with the combined language passed.**

*Commissioner Tallmadge* moved to adopt Amendment 16. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

**Amendment 16 passed.**

*Commissioner St Martin* moved to adopt Amendment 22. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Eric explained this amendment includes Policy 3.3 with the addition of Policy 3.3.e. Staff notes that the additional statement in 3.3.b. was duplicative from other policies, but it is fine as rewritten.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

**Amendment 22 passed.**

*Commissioner St Martin* moved to adopt Amendments 35

Eric noted that Amendment 35 adds language to Policy 5.9.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

**Amendment 35 passed.**

Amendment 36 is about Policy 5.11. There is an Amendment 36A to this same policy, so we might want to combine them. The first introduces a number of new phrases, and the second talks about what to do with the evaluation. *Commissioner Schultz* noted we can focus on Amendment 36.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to adopt Amendment 36. *St Martin* seconded.

Eric noted there is some duplicative language in using “significant new infrastructure” with the glossary-defined phrase “plans and investments”.

*Commissioner Smith* noted being concise is important and we should remove the duplicative statement.

*Commissioner Gray* asked about why this phrase was added by the amendment sponsors.

- *Commissioner Tallmadge* is ok with removing the word “significant” if that provides more clarity.
- *Chair Baugh* noted that this was intended to capture development in terms of public investment and that we take into account anti-displacement. I was actually against the word “significant”.
- *Commissioner Oxman* asked about the definition of “protected classes”. This is the Federal definition.
- *Joe*: The “plans and investments” phrase helps us throughout the Plan to clarify and define what is included.

*Commissioner Gray* would like to see a cross-walk of the amendments and the list of 11 proposed anti-displacement tools. Staff can provide this before the next PSC meeting.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* withdrew the motion. *Commissioner St Martin* confirmed.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* moved to adopt Amendment 36 as proposed. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge; N2 – Rudd, Schultz)

**Amendment 36 passed.**

*Commissioner Schultz* withdrew Amendment 36A.

Amendment 37 relates to Policy 5.14. Staff had the same note about the same phrase as in Amendment 36.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked if this policy includes SDCs.

- This is not a land use decision, it’s a legislative action by the City.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve Amendment 37 as shown. *Commissioner Tallmadge* seconded.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted that this is a broad policy but it seems like people are trying to get to specifics about particular buildings.

It’s not legal for staff to apply this to, for example, specific building permits. If we want this to apply on a case-by-case basis, that gets to rewriting the Zoning Code.

(Y7 – Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge; N4 – Baugh, Houck, Rudd, Schultz)

**Amendment 37 passed.**

Amendment 19 is essentially a substitute policy for the original Environmental Justice text.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* moved to adopt Amendment 19. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* wanted this amendment to help clarify this section.

*Commissioner Smith* noted this replaces “sovereign tribes” with “tribal communities”. The phrase tribal communities is broader, so that is concerning that we are elevating Federally-recognized tribes but potentially diminishing others.

Perhaps we separate these so this applies to the other amendment with similar language.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted we have a list of groups but it’s not all inclusive of under-represented communities and groups.

*Commissioner Schultz* commented we could make this broader with using the phrases under-represented and under-served, for example.

*Chair Baugh* said Environmental Justice is pre-defined. *Commissioner Tallmadge* noted the phrasing is pulled from Federal language.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about “tribal communities and governments” and if this is the correct phrase. Is this consistent with the City’s work?

Susan reminded the Commissioners that language is the introduction to the section, so we have the opportunity to recognize the most groups and participants as possible. I would include both sovereign tribes and tribal communities.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted the intent was to broaden the definition and recognition of tribal groups. We should include “sovereign tribes” in the phrasing. I’d also reiterate that this is introductory language to set the context for looking at environmental justice.

*Commissioner Smith* commented on the role of introductory language in the Plan.

- When staff is making findings, we look at the introduction as purpose statements.
- *Commissioner Smith*: A previous version of this section had lots of stakeholder buy-in, so I’m going to oppose the change to make sure we have the correct language.

Staff also noted we just haven’t been able to connect with all the stakeholders. We could withdraw the amendment and resubmit it for the next discussion.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* withdrew the statement. *Commissioner Oxman* withdrew the second.

Staff will bring this amendment back this amendment with revised language to the July 14 meeting.

Amendments 49, 50, 51 are all amendments to Policy 6.39, the prime industrial land retention policy. There are sub-policies (a) through (e), and we’re specifically looking at the words “prohibit” and “protect” in addition to other language.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt Amendments 49, 50 and 51 as a package. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

*Commissioner Rudd* clarified the recommendation to use the verb “protect”. I am all for preserving prime industrial land, but normally when you’re trying to get a Comp Plan Map change, you have to show your proposal furthers the Comprehensive Plan policies as a whole to a better extent than the existing designation. This would be a difficult burden but one might for example, be able to identify substitute land better suited to the designation for a swap.

- Eric noted that section 6.39.a applies to quasi-judicial Comp Plan amendments.

*Commissioner Houck* reviewed Chapter 7, and he is now comfortable with the verb “protect” here so long as protect is used in Chapter 7 as well.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

**Amendments 49, 50, 51 passed.**

Amendment 42 adds a bullet to the introductory language about “what this chapter is about” in the economics chapter.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt Amendment 42. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

**Amendment 42 passed.**

Amendment 43 is about Goal 6C regarding business district vitality. It elaborates on the quality of life elements in the Plan.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt Amendment 43. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the reference to SW Washington in the amendment.

- *Commissioner Houck*: We have access to those landscapes, and they are part of our local physical geography. This was very intentional to include, even though it’s outside the Portland jurisdiction.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

**Amendment 43 passed.**

Amendment 44 adds “creative”.

*Commissioner St Martin* moved to approve Amendment 44. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

**Amendment 44 passed.**

Amendment 52 is about Policy 6.41. Staff thinks this amendment is redundant to policies in Chapter 7 (7.15 in particular).

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt Amendment 52. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that while staff thinks this is, it is not duplicative. The Superfund policy language is about brownfields, not about improving environmental quality. There is another outcome from the Superfund process, and we need to specify this.

Staff then thinks we should amend 7.15 if we are changing 6.41. We can propose a new version of 6.41 and 7.15 to bring back in the next meeting.

***Commissioner Houck* withdrew his amendment. *Commissioner St Martin* withdrew the second.**

Amendment 63 is similar to Amendment 19. Staff will return with language as noted above and as noted in other policies.

### **Next Steps**

On Thursday, PSC members will receive an addendum of amendments that we missed in this packet from *Commissioner Oxman* and *Commissioner Houck*.

Staff will work with PSC members on language as noted above in today's discussion. Items deferred from today will be brought back on July 14.

PSC members will review the consent list and other "Tier 2" amendments within the next 2 weeks. If there are amendments listed that Commissioners want to talk about, please let staff know by July 7 which items they need further discussion and clarification about at the July 14 meeting.

Staff will let PSC members know what the full agenda for the July 14 meeting will be once all the amendments are in. The expectation is we'll vote on July 14 if the amendments are mostly moved to the consent list; this could move to a vote on July 28 if we need more time. *Commissioner Houck* noted he will not be in town on July 28.

Susan noted that we shouldn't just rush to put items on the consent list if Commissioners want to have discussions about the items. If you have a concern about an item, please feel free to contact the Commissioner or staff.

*Chair Baugh* reiterated we need to continue to be deliberative and do this right.

Staff will issue an addendum sheet including compromises, edits and staff input a few days prior to the July 14 meeting.

### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 8:47 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, June 9, 2015

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge (left at 3:10 p.m.)

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray, Don Hanson

**City Staff Presenting:** Susan Anderson, Troy Doss, Eric Engstrom, Michael Armstrong, Michele Crim, Grant Moorehead (PBOT), Geraldene Moyle (PDC), Courtney Duke (PBOT)

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:33 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck* mentioned this year is the 11<sup>th</sup> Annual Policymaker's Ride. This year we are focusing on the Green Loop and some side trips; all PSC members should have received the invite for August 14. Mayor Hales will be speaking, and City staff will also be available to describe some of the Green Loop concepts.

### Director's Report

- Video from the Portland TEDx Conference – the past and the future of Portland: <https://vimeo.com/127954097>.
- A few BPS items are heading to Council this month:
  - June 17: RICAP 7
  - June 24: Deconstruction pilot (hearing was last week at Council)
  - June 24: Climate Action Plan hearing
- There are 4 additional projects in the BPS budget for FY15-16:
  - CC2035 Plan
  - Single-family infill project
  - Mountain Bike Master Plan
  - New Beach on the Willamette (between Marquam and Hawthorne bridges on the east side of the river)

*Commissioner Houck* was surprised to see the mountain bike planning with BPS instead of PP&R. Is the focus solely on mountain biking? Also, Metro is looking at this on a regional scale; are you working with them?

- We are in conversations with Metro. The project is focused specifically on mountain bike trails, options and trade-offs.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the May 26, 2015 PSC meeting.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)



[Documents and presentations for today's meeting](#)

## **Climate Action Plan**

Briefing: Michael Armstrong; Michele Crim

Michael reviewed the past efforts in Portland's climate planning. This plan is an update to the 2009 Plan – mostly updating the actions the City and County will take over the next 5 years.

Total emissions in Multnomah County as of 2013 were 14 percent below 1990 levels, even with all our population growth. We are down 35 percent per capita in that same time frame.

We also had about 20 percent more jobs in 2013 compared to 1990, so we've seen decent economic growth even with the continued carbon emission decline, which is encouraging. At the same time, we have a very long way to go to our 80 percent reduction goal by 2050. The trend is about right starting in 2000. We need to keep an eye on this long-term goal while doing very specific shorter-term actions to get to the overall goal.

Michele discussed the process to develop the updated plan, including the Steering Committee and Equity Working Group. We also relied on City and County staff as well as ad hoc advisory groups to help sort through some of the details as well as a number plans including the Portland Plan, Comp Plan and Climate Change Preparation Strategy.

There is a strong relationship between working to address climate change as well as build a healthy, prosperous, resilient and equitable community. The 2015 Plan is much more comprehensive in this way than the 2009 Plan was. We also looked much more closely at impacts of consumption in the 2015 Plan – the carbon impact of things that are produced elsewhere that are consumed within Multnomah County.

The 2015 Plan includes a series of actions that we expect to have underway in the 8 categories.

- Buildings and energy
- Urban form and transportation
- Consumption and solid waste
- Food and agriculture
- Urban forest and natural systems
- Climate change preparation
- Government operations
- Engagement and outreach

The Plan was out for public review between March 1 and April 10 of this year and received about 450 comments via surveys, letters, email, open house events and meetings and in presentations. Based on community input, there are a number of changes from the public comment draft to this current version as highlighted on slides 27 and 28 of the presentation.

There are a few things we didn't include in the updates but heard from the public:

- Consumption-based inventory as the main inventory review (we will do this periodically).
- A more expansive inventory of things that pass through Portland.
- Comments urging the City to oppose all fossil fuel exports (the Plan seeks to establish a policy but not leap to it in this Plan).

Next steps:

- Today staff is seeking the PSC's input and a letter of support.
- The Council hearing is on June 24 at 2 p.m.

- The County Board hearing is on June 25.

## Discussion

*Commissioner Houck* noted this is fabulous work. Words matter; so in terms of density and carbon impact, what we're really talking about is urban design and compact urban form. The term "density" is very loaded. We need to communicate to the public that it's not about density, per se but about compact urban form and urban design. I'm really pleased with the responses that staff has given to the input you received, particularly the link between the climate preparation strategy and climate action. Regarding the CAP and Pembina, I met with Angus Duncan recently, who is a highly respected expert in climate related issues. I think most people in the city think of our power source is hydro and don't realize how much coal is burned. Angus has advocated for pushing the utilities to reduce their use of coal and I agree. What specifically in the CAP would suggest how the city should proceed?

- There is an action in the Plan to push the utilities, but we might want to elaborate what we mean by "push". The concept is there, but implementation is still a question.

With some things in the Plan, we are at a point where the PSC's input could shape actions more explicitly.

*Commissioner St Martin* likes the consumption-based section but has a question about the graph on page 22.

- This chart identifies the categories of products to show that for some things, production generates the lion's share of the carbon emissions and using it generates very little emissions, while for other products, the reverse is true.
- We are still testing and learning how to communicate this.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the impact scale and the device of using up to 4 C's. What are the really big targets? I see we have to do a ton of things that add up. What should really be the focus? I didn't get a good sense of that.

- We wrestle with this. We need to do almost everything that has 4 C's, but to get to a list of the things that really matter, it depends on who you talk to. To move the needle, we need packages of things and a set of strategies, which creates somewhat of a laundry list of actions.

In terms of food choice and carbon impacts, the chart on page 101 doesn't show much about what the impact of processed foods. If we could make the change to people eating non-processed foods, that would help tremendously. But is that realistic?

- Staff will circle back. We are replacing this graphic that brings in a different set of data, though it may not help differentiate between fresh and processed foods.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted the public process. How did the business community comment and get involved?

- We had a handful of business people on the Steering Committee. We didn't do a business-specific outreach strategy. We did go to brief the Working Waterfront Coalition and PBA gave us direct feedback.

Have we looked at linking SDCs and benefits of specific design, for example? And when we talk about divesting of fossil fuels is it in consumption or investment portfolios?

- What's in their investment portfolios.

What do we know about how equitably the benefits of things like Clean Energy Works are being realized?

- Middle- to high-income households are setting the home improvements but lower income people are getting the jobs.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted that people are what make the Plan work, and people have to be engaged. How will we engage Portlanders?

- This does come down to individual decisions. If we can equip people with information and making things easy, people will be more engaged. A large percentage of people are interested in the different components that all can add up even if their entry point isn't about carbon reduction. At least as much of our work focuses on these individual actions and engagement.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted that there are recent ads on TV about eating less beef and meat.

- We had a section in the 2009 Plan that tees up food choice as a primary way to reduce emissions, which we think is the only one in the country. For some people food choice is an easy option versus some of the other possible actions.

Portland is very much a voluntary, motivational place. Then we provide assistance and meet people where they are before making regulations.

*Commissioner Schultz* is pleased to see the action items around carbon pricing and fossil fuel exports. I support the language in the Plan. I'm hoping that upon adoption we quickly move into these two actions and not waste more time in creating policy. If we were to take every action, do we know where we'd get?

- We don't know for sure. Because some of the actions are not quite quantifiable or not having a very specific timeline for some work. If we did everything, we believe we can get to the 80 percent reduction by 2050.

On page 128, item 19M: I want to encourage that this knowledge is publicly-shared and easy to find so we encourage other companies to follow this lead.

*Commissioner Smith* also compliments staff. I want to echo the call that we emphasize the fossil fuel export policy in our letter to Council. Do we have a plan on how we are going to address this?

- We have two choices: we could establish committees, etc and have a big public process, develop options, then put that out. Or we could, using the best knowledge we have now, have an option in the next couple of months that we could then have the PSC and public review. We'd like to get the PSC's idea of what your choice would be after the Council adopts the Plan.

I'm really happy with the focus on equity, which is quite a change and improvement from the original Plan.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* appreciates the public input and staff's work on the process. Page 43 does a great job laying out the increasing diversity of Portland. Equity in the CAP should be better highlighted even more. In Table 6 on page 46, I like the clarity of the lack of investment in East Portland. Could we see a comparison between a component like park access in this area versus other areas of the city? On page 132 (climate equity commitments), could there be an explicit call for increased funding?

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about working with the school districts and community gardens on the food choice actions.

- We have worked with them in the past but will relook into where we are now.

*Commissioner Houck*, in response to Director Anderson's comments regarding regulatory versus non-regulatory strategies, noted that if it weren't for the Clean Water Act, Clean Air Act and Endangered Species Acts there would be little by way of environmental quality. We need regulations as a base from which incentives and volunteerism can work. There is a role of regulations and incentives.

Regarding *Commissioner Oxman's* comment on prioritization of actions, I think the strength of this plan is that it focuses on those actions that result in multiple benefits or co-benefits. Those actions that get multiple bang for the buck are ones that should be highest priority.

*Chair Baugh* also commended staff on the work of the Plan. We have lots to do, but there are many options for different people to help make the change we need to see. I applaud the inclusion of equity and the tie to public transit to reduction of carbon. The other tie is about density and carbon. In terms of the equity component, a concern I have is on 19M and the purchasing requirement. City Purchasing is putting this into contracts, and it's sometimes difficult for smaller firms and minority contractors to get funds for new equipment that fits these standards. You should work with the EPA to get in their grant cycle to help move us quickly in the contracting community and freight haulers to change out engines (for example). Lastly, is there a stronger way to link schools to build behavior in the actions?

The PSC will write a letter of support to Council recommending the 2015 Climate Action Plan. We've heard two main things today that we want to encourage Council to do in particular.

Staff will put together a draft of the letter. Please send input to Julie O if you have specific language to include.

### **Central City 2035 SE Quadrant Plan**

Work Session / Recommendation: Troy Doss, Joe Zehnder, Grant Morehead, Geraldene Moyle

Today's session is a response to the PSC members' questions and comments from the May 26 hearing.

#### *EOS Use Allowances*

Should the EOS provisions allow 5,000 square feet of retail and 5,000 of traditional office? The current provisions allow for this.

The proposal that staff is standing by is:

- **Retail Sales and Services:** 5,000 square feet of Retail Sales and Service uses per site. Repeal conditional use allowance for more allowed by existing IG1 provisions. On sites larger than 40,000 square feet, up to 12.5 percent of site may have this use.
- **Traditional Office:** 5,000 square feet of Traditional Office per site. Repeal conditional use allowance for more allowed by existing IG1 and EOS provisions. On sites larger than 40,000 square feet, up to 12.5 percent of site may have this use.
- **Industrial Office:** 3:1 FAR maximum per site, or full rehabilitation of existing building shell. Repeal conditional use allowance for more allowed by existing EOS provisions.

We heard lots of support to this in public testimony.

*Chair Baugh:* Does the change increase the number of jobs and shift income levels?

- The SEQ Employment Summary memo shows where, by sector, the jobs are. Most of the industrial jobs are middle- to upper-level income. Most of the jobs that would be created are also in this range. We aren't seeing a displacement or loss of traditional industrial uses in the EOS.

*Commissioner Houck* is supportive, but we've had such conversations about loss of industrial lands, and we're now talking about shifting jobs. I fear we may be setting ourselves up for a battle over industrial lands.

- We have data on the existing EOS, which has created 1,000 jobs since the recession. We aren't seeing displacement of jobs in our experience in this district.

In this case, we are seeing and are looking to allow for redeveloping existing buildings to rehab for small-scale manufacturing and industrial office.

*Commissioner Oxman* commented that it's a challenge to try to grow the jobs that are accessible to those without advanced education. Do we have any information about this in the EOS?

- The EOS has grown lots of jobs, but without displacement of existing jobs, so we are seeing a compatibility and an increase in the diversity of types of jobs. We aren't seeing a shift from one type of job to another.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the greater threat to existing industrial is in places that are on the edge and in EX zones. We heard there aren't new freight-dependent businesses in the area, but we are still providing accessibility for those businesses that are freight-oriented. I don't think the EOS choice will trigger anything we're afraid of.

- *Chair Baugh* is concerned about the pressure from the EOS that could cause displacement of industry, even though we don't see it today. But, I am supportive of the staff proposal.

PSC members confirmed the staff proposal about the proposed EOS Use Allowances.

#### *EOS Expansion*

The Plan proposed the middle map on slide 4, but during the hearing, we heard overwhelming support for district-wide EOS expansion. Staff would recommend considering EOS to all IG1 properties, which would take care of the "islands" that are in the current proposed plan.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about retail square footage.

- It is 5,000 square feet max per site. Today you can get a conditional use permit for up to 20,000 square feet, which we'd take away with this proposal.

*Commissioner Schultz* proposed to shift the Recommended Plan to the revised EOS expansion map. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge, N1 – Baugh)

PSC members confirmed the staff proposal with *Commissioner Schultz'* amendment about the proposed EOS Expansion.

#### *Housing at OMSI Station Area*

Staff still recommends this area be zoned EX with no housing at the OMSI station area. But if the PSC wants housing in the area, staff proposes a version of conditional use that gets folded into the OMSI master Plan.

*Commissioner Oxman* supports staff's recommendation for this. *Commissioner Houck* confirmed.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted staff's compromise, but he still thinks housing should be allowed in this area. We know priorities change, and I don't want to close the door to allow housing here.

Single-occupancy vehicles are more likely with housing than with business. This isn't a huge deal-breaker, but it would generate more trips to the area.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked if there would be increased transportation capacity in the future.

- We are doing significant multi-modal improvements in this area to try to get people out of single-occupancy cars in particular. When we look at transportation constraints, it is the regional trips that may cause problems, not necessarily the district growth.

*Commissioner St Martin* supports staff's recommendation.

*Chair Baugh* supports retaining the conditional use for housing at the OMSI station. You're going to need all the players to participate, and OMSI is a big component to this, so we shouldn't "poke them in the eye". Leaving the housing option open keeps them at the table to talk about solutions.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to adopt the staff recommendation to not allow housing at the OMSI Station Area. *Commissioner St Marin* seconded.

*Commissioner Houck* stated he was voting no because he thinks anything that negatively affects jobs and industrial land in the SE Quadrant is inappropriate.

(Y4 – Houck, Oxman, Smith, St Martin; N5 – Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Tallmadge, Baugh)

The motion failed.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to allow housing at the OMSI Station Area via a conditional use. *Commissioner Rudd* seconded.

*Commissioner Schultz* amended *Commissioner Shapiro's* motion to allow conditional use in concert with the OMSI Master Plan. *Commissioner Rudd* seconded.

(Y9 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge, Baugh)

*Commissioners Schultz' amendment passed.*

*Commissioner Smith* worries about having housing in isolation at this site.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the conditional use.

- The heart of the criteria is on page 5 of the memo.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about houseboats and moorages. I don't want to see them included as housing options here.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about the river zoning adjacent to OMSI.

- It is EG.

*Commissioner Smith* noted this proposal is just for OMSI, not for all of EG in the area. Does this fall into spot zoning?

- The OMSI site is a large one. The Plan currently proposes no housing at OMSI and at the properties between Woodward and Powell. As a reminder, the final zoning and code changes don't happen until the full CC2035 Plan goes to Council and is adopted next year.

Does the motion on the table affect both areas (OMSI and Woodward-Powell) or just OMSI?

- *Commissioner Shapiro's* motions is specifically about the EG component of the OMSI property.

*Commissioner Schultz* proposed an amendment to include all EG properties. There was no second for this proposal.

*Commissioner Oxman*: Is there an issue of similarly-situated properties being treated differently?

- Spot zoning is not the issue, but equitable treatment could be an issue if the other EG

property owners raise it. Anything that has EG today that can do a conditional use should probably be looked at.

The Master Plan criteria is being looked at in the station areas, much like we are doing at the Post Office and Blanchard sites in other areas of the Central City. We'd want to tailor a Master Plan to the conditions here in the CES instead of adopting the old language that we currently have.

You could set which parts of the Central City that are eligible for Master Planning. Flexibility on large sites can produce a better outcome with certain parameters about how much and what you can put on the sites.

We did get letters from ODOT after the hearing that requested not allowing for housing between Woodward and Powell because of its function as an exchange between state routes.

The segment of Woodward is under ODOT jurisdiction, so they would have a review role. Powell is a state facility, so they have the ability to not allow the City to go through with a zoning change if it affects the state highway. It's both Powell and portions of Woodward.

The motion is to allow housing on OMSI property with the conditions of the Master Plan for conditional use that will be developed by staff.

*Commissioner Rudd* moved to amend the motion to include "Master Plan sites within the OMSI Station Area." *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, St Martin, Tallmadge, Baugh; N1 – Smith)

*Commissioners Rudd's amendment passed.*

*Chair Baugh* stated the proposal with both amendments: Housing should be allowed as conditional use with the conditions of the Master Plan sites within the OMSI Station Area.

(Y5 – Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Tallmadge, Baugh; N4 - Houck, Oxman, Smith, St Martin)

*The Housing at OMSI Station Area proposal passed as amended.*

#### *Transportation Strategies*

Staff thinks between parking, signalization and active transportation improvement and transit, it will be able to handle the growth.

*PSC members confirmed the updated staff proposal about the proposed Transportation Strategies.*

#### *Parking*

The proposed Plan states parking capacity does not need to be increased. Parking supply, mode splits, transportation enhancements and district parking at the ODOT blocks all support this. We will be doing a pilot project to test whether we can do accessory commercial parking to legally be used among different users.

*Chair Baugh* noted the Consent item #43 as the language that would be used.

- Yes. We have been looking at 1-2 year period to do accessory commercial parking to get us a sense of where the demand is and make sure we can phase the parking out over time. We don't want to have surface parking lots that dis-incent development later.



*Commissioner Schultz* commented on vertical development and shared parking, which is not currently allowed by code, so we currently have to build more parking, not less. I'd like to see something that if someone is building vertically, it has to be grandfathered in.

- The issue we're addressing would only be applied to existing parking lots. We appreciate this input.

*Commissioner Smith* clarified that the code would not allow someone to drive in, park their car in the district, then walk or take transit into downtown.

- Correct.

PSC members confirmed the staff proposal about Parking Strategies.

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to add an action item for shared parking in vertical structures. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge, Baugh)

The motion to add an action item for shared parking in vertical structures passed.

#### *Role of the URA in CES*

Questions about the URA included:

- Can TIF be used to support businesses?
- Can TIF be used to help provide workforce and affordable housing?
- Can TIF be used to provide structured district parking?

The response to all is yes.

*Chair Baugh* asked about how we are applying these in an aggressive manner to give businesses the right tools.

Geraldene talked about the Storefront Improvement Grants (up to \$32,000) that are being heavily used in the CES; there are 76 grants in this category in the area right now. DOS is a matching grant of \$25,000. Loans for tenant improvements and others for working capital and equipment.

*Chair Baugh*: It seems like there are some businesses in the area that are struggling to find technical assistance to help them grow.

- Lots of inquiries have been from legacy industrial businesses. We've had staff walk the neighborhood during slower times to share information. PDC staff works closely with the CEIC, but our best asset is word of mouth. For businesses that are growing and lacking space, we've found it's difficult to expand over 10,000 square feet in the CES unless the footprint is already there. We want businesses that want to be in the CES to be able to be there.

PSC members confirmed the staff proposal about the role of the URA in the SE Quadrant.

#### *Affordable Housing Targets*

We don't need additional shadow language in the SE Quadrant about affordable because targets are covered in the other components of the overall CC2035 Plan.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the role of the arts and culture in the SE Quadrant Plan. There is remarkably little said about arts and culture in other plans, so I don't know if this plan is where we should include it.

- *Commissioner Shapiro* commented about Washington High School becoming a popular cultural center. Arts and culture is doing its own integrating.



- *Commissioner St Martin* noted she thought an arts and culture comment could be done through the Comp Plan so it covers the city overall, not just the CES.

There is a concept in the CC2035 Concept Plan about arts and culture. We can make sure it references the Central Eastside specifically. The Portland Plan has the most elaboration about arts and culture as a reference.

#### *Consent List*

*Commissioner St Martin* moved to approve the consent agenda. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

*Commissioner Smith* elaborated on items 42 (clarifies that the Green Loop should complement existing facilities) and 45 (emphasizes the need to support adopted bikeway facilities in the district). Also for items 43 and 44: “Provide” a pedestrian bike bridge (versus “consider”).

*Commissioner Houck* pointed out that the Green Loop is one of the big ideas in the Comp Plan. It’s about urban design, not about cycling. The word “complement” is critical in this amendment. *Commissioner Houck* also noted he is ok with staff’s responses to his other amendments.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

[The motion to approve the Consent List passed.](#)

#### **Vote**

*Commissioner Houck* moved to accept staff proposal as amended with today’s amendments as noted above. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

[The CC2035 SE Quadrant Proposed Plan as amended in today’s discussion passed.](#)

The Plan will be heard at City Council at 2 p.m. Time Certain on July 1. Staff will get a draft letter to PSC members tomorrow for review so we can include it in the Council filing packet that we file this Friday.

### **Comprehensive Plan Update**

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Courtney Duke

Eric noted today’s session is fairly brief and is easing us into the amendments process. We ask you to refer to the Draft Recommended Plan, which provides specific language we’ll be reviewing. If staff has done our job, what’s on the table reflects the direction PSC members have given over the past few months.

For the June 23 work session, please submit your amendments in the template form by June 19. Items up for amendments are map designations, policies, narratives, goals and project list items.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted that in some sections the updated language is really helpful. Some areas of the new language are complex, and I don’t know how to manage those observations.

- You can decide to live with them, you can propose an amendment, or you can make casual observations. The plan is in your hands. We can take informal recommendations that we can update before forwarding the Plan to Council.

*Amendment 1: Commissioner Smith*

**Policy 3.64 Design.** Use design options such as distinctive street design, landscaping, tree plantings, scenic views, and other appropriate design options, to create City Greenways that extend the experience of open spaces and nature into neighborhoods, while improving stormwater management and calming traffic.

Add the phrase “motor vehicle diversion” between “street design” and “landscaping” because it’s important to highlight traffic calming as a tool that should be called out explicitly.

**As amended:** Use design options such as distinctive street design, [motor vehicle diversion](#), landscaping, tree plantings, scenic views, and other appropriate design options, to create City Greenways that extend the experience of open spaces and nature into neighborhoods, while improving stormwater management and calming traffic.

*Commissioner Smith* moved Amendment #1. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

*Commissioner Smith* explained his rationale for the amendment about designing greenways so that motor vehicle diversion is clearly part of the plan. We want to have through-traffic make another choice and go on another route entirely.

*Commissioner Houck* asked when submitting amendments, I’ve found it helpful to have a consent approach. Will there be staff responses?

- It will depend on the issue.
- PBOT is having internal conversation about diversions. The concern is that in some street classifications we aren’t allowed to divert from one local street to another local street. We need to change some of our classifications for this to move forward. Having it in the Comp Plan means we’ll have to make the changes.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked what we mean by “distinctive street design” and “motor vehicle diversion”.

- Street design came through the Urban Design Framework. We do have specific tools for motor vehicle diversion.

As you’re developing the distinctive street design, could this include diversion?

- Yes, this could be part of a toolkit.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted that when something is listed, there are certain people who think it needs to happen or be included. I struggle a little with this.

*Chair Baugh:* Could the diversion language be handled in Task 5 and not included here?

- With the PSC’s recommendation, yes. But Task 5 is to implement the Comp Plan.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

[Amendment #1 passed.](#)

*Amendment 2: Commissioner Smith*

**Central City** – The Central City is the region’s high-density employment center. It is primarily an office district for professional and business services, finance, information, and government. It is also a key location for the entertainment, small industry, and education sectors.

Add the word “software” between “information” and “government”. This is an important cluster that should be called out explicitly.

**As amended:** The Central City is the region’s high-density employment center. It is primarily an office district for professional and business services, finance, information, [software](#), and

government. It is also a key location for the entertainment, small industry, and education sectors.

*Commissioner Smith* moved Amendment #2. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that software seems to be an overarching term. *Commissioner Smith* noted it is, but it's separate.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

[Amendment #2 passed.](#)

*Amendment 3: Commissioner Smith*

**Policy 4.23 Design for pedestrian and bicycle access.** Provide accessible sidewalks, high-quality bicycle access, and frequent street connections and crossings in centers and corridors.

**Add** “and parking” after “high-quality bicycle access” to provide clarity about what it included in the word “access”.

**As amended:** Provide accessible sidewalks, high-quality bicycle access [and parking](#), and frequent street connections and crossings in centers and corridors.

*Commissioner Smith* moved Amendment #3. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted we don't define “access” to include “parking” in the Glossary.

(Y4 – Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Smith, N4 – Rudd, Shapiro, St Martin, Baugh)

[Amendment #3 failed.](#)

*Commissioner Rudd:* I can include an amendment to define access to include parking in the Glossary. I will send this in to staff to add to the next meeting's amendment list.

*Amendment 4: Commissioner Smith*

**Policy 8.37 Interconnected network.** Establish a connected rights-of-way system that equitably provides infrastructure services throughout the city.

**Add** “safe and” at the beginning of the policy to be consistent with the Chapter 9 safety policy and with Vision Zero.

**As amended:** Establish a [safe and](#) connected rights-of-way system that equitably provides infrastructure services throughout the city.

*Commissioner Smith* moved Amendment #4. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

[Amendment #4 passed.](#)

*Amendment 5: Commissioner Smith*

**Policy 2.11 Open Data.**

**Add** substitute language to convey stronger commitment to open data.

**As amended:** [Ensure planning and investment decisions are a collaboration among](#)

stakeholders, including those listed in Policy 2.1. The City works with the software development community, data providers, and other professionals with relevant expertise to advise on open data practices and priorities, ensure oversight, and to maximize the utility of City data sets. Data collected and generated by the City are:

- Publicized, accessible, and shared widely,
- Open by default, in the public domain, freely redistributable, and adhere to open standards. Exceptions may be made due to compelling concerns of privacy, security, liability or cost, and should only be granted in accordance with clearly defined criteria and oversight.

*Commissioner Smith* moved Amendment #5. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about aligning this better with Oregon Public Records law in terms of a clear criteria about the City being asked to develop new data and the cost to having this all accessible.

*Commissioner Smith:* This would include an oversight body to help weigh in on these decisions. This is Comp Plan policy – broad guidance – and we’d create a more operational policy.

The City Attorney has concern about the relationship to the larger complex web of laws that govern information. And about whether governance of data is subject to land use law.

Because this is in Chapter 2, it’s about how we provide the community information, not about a rule beyond the nature of a Comp Plan policy.

*Commissioner Rudd:* Does this show up in a zoning ordinance at some point?

- BPS would have to update Administrative Rules about how we release data.

(Y7 – Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh; N1 – Rudd)

Amendment #5 passed.

*Amendment 6: Commissioner Smith*  
**Technology and communications introduction.**

**Add:** Relationship to growth and prosperity

**As amended:** Private utilities and companies provide technology and communication facilities and services to the general public. The City regulates limited aspects of these services, such as the siting of new facilities. The City also provides specific technology and communications services to support City and partner agency service delivery. The City promotes access to affordable and reliable technology and communications for all Portlanders. The policies in this section embrace innovation to ensure all Portlanders are able to access and benefit from emerging technologies and systems that have the potential to make Portland a cleaner, safer, and more efficient, resilient and affordable city. This section acknowledges that information and technology services have become essential infrastructure, related to the City’s growth and future prosperity, and supports investments and partnerships to keep Portland competitive and build on the City’s tradition of open-source collaboration and innovation.

*Commissioner Smith* moved Amendment #6. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

Amendment #6 passed.

*Amendment 7: Commissioner Smith*  
**Policy 8.117, Equity, capacity, and reliability.**

**Add:** Universal access

**As amended:** Encourage regulatory approaches and investments in technology and communication infrastructure, such as broadband, [to ensure universal access](#), reduce disparities in capacity, ~~access~~, and affordability, and provide high-performance reliable service for Portland’s residents and businesses.

*Commissioner Smith* moved Amendment #7. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

*Commissioner Smith:* My concern with broadband is that the private market is only providing access in certain neighborhoods, and broadband is a key equity issue.

*Chair Baugh* noted a concern about defining “universal”. I don’t want “universal design principles” to be used for defining in this universal.

*Commissioner Smith* withdrew the motion.

*Amendment 7A*

*Commissioner Smith* modified the amendment to read: “ensure access in all areas of the city”.  
*Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y8 – Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

[Amendment 7A](#) passed.

For the next work session, staff will sort amendments by groups/chapters. If Commissioners are proposing new terms, please send the new definition with the new term to staff. Or if you’re relying on a Glossary term, note that it is already defined.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about verbs. When I see “maintain” in a policy, it is not clear to me that we are currently where we want to be and that “maintain” is the correct term. If I flag those and send them to staff, can you help to clarify?

- Yes, for sure. Staff is available to respond to Commissioner questions to help determine if it warrants an amendment and/or discussion with the full Commission. Staff can also help with crafting amendment language.

If we get two amendments on the same policy, we can try to work them out ahead of time. But if the amendments are in conflict, we will flag those prior to the next work session so Commissioners are aware.

Commissioners should use the template to send in amendments by June 19.

**Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 4:27 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

3:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray

**City Staff Presenting:** Joe Zehnder, Susan Anderson, Troy Doss, Eric Engstrom, Michelle Kunec-North, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck* noted that 29 years ago Mayor Bud Clark designated our City bird as the great blue heron. Tomorrow morning at Council we will discuss again having herons in our city. We sometimes lose track of the spiritual and philosophical dimension of what we're doing in our planning today. *Commissioner Houck* then mentioned he asked then Oregon poet laureate William Stafford to write a poem to commemorate the city bird. The result was "Spirit of Place" which he read.
- *Commissioner Schultz* thanked the Anti-Displacement group and the thank you video they shared with PSC members.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the May 12, 2015 PSC meeting.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### [Documents and presentations for today's meeting](#)

### Central City 2035 SE Quadrant Plan

Briefing: Troy Doss

Troy provided an overview of the project as noted in the [presentation](#).

The Plan proposes rezoning at the station areas themselves: OMSI to EX, with no housing in the area; Clinton Station would be more of a mixed use with some housing. Expanding the Employment Opportunity Subarea (EOS) is another component. We don't have great tools to address compatibility issues, so we're also proposing to update design standards.

Troy also provided an overview of testimony we expect today.

In terms of overall change in the district, 70 percent of the growth and impacts will be at OMSI

station and Clinton station, Southern Triangle and expanding the EOS zone.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about shared parking.

- This would lift the ban that's currently in place so there could be agreements between businesses for employees or customers.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the industrial disclosure and contact with other jurisdictions that might have influence (e.g. around air quality/pollution).

- We have not had contact with other jurisdictions, but we have internally in the City with BDS and ONI.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about MLK and Grand being multi-use corridors and freight streets. Is there a conflict there?

- They are also regional highways. They connect major freight hubs and will need to continue to do so. But adding signalization and improvements will slow the speed of traffic to help with safety issues. Zoning has been in place for about 30 years, so we're not proposing to change that.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* commented on the couplets. What about additional housing in the area?

- The couplets would be either EX or EOS designations.
- District-wide we would have 3200 units for housing total in 2035 (there are 1100 units today with 1300 planned or in development). Lots of the additional proposed housing would happen quickly, but there is still room to have as many as 5000 units in the district.

*Commissioner Oxman*: Where will big box stores be allowed?

- We're proposing to cap retail at 40,000 square feet per site, which is like in the Pearl and SoWa. A big box store is around 100,000 square feet.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about Action Item RC9. Can you explain this?

- You'd pass through to the Ross Island Bridge. It's a mix of commercial uses right now. The idea of not doing housing there is because it's an on/off-ramp for ODOT with high traffic volumes. We also made a conscious effort to change zoning within the zone but not increase capacity. More residential would impact employment lands.

*Commissioner Smith*: I'm supportive of the shared parking. But given how bikeable the area is, wouldn't it make sense to have a TDM component as well?

- We are increasing bike infrastructure to better work with what we have. We're trying to create safer routes to help too. We are trying to maximize the existing parking supply before moving to add beyond that.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted the islands without the EOS overlay. What is staff's opinion on that?

- The area north of Couch was a big topic. There are traditional office buildings and many that could be rehabbed to that. It's not heavily dominated by industrial use, so we think it will transition to an EOS-compatible area. The MLK-Grand EX zoning stops at SE Clay. So we thought to extend EOS for higher-density employment but not additional housing capacity.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that he has issues regarding natural resources, and he'll send those questions to staff.

### **Testimony**

*Commissioner Hanson*, SAC co-chair, introduced the SAC's work. It was a great group that met 13 times. This proposal is a good balanced approach for the district.



1. Debbie Kitchin, CEIC and SAC co-chair: The CEIC has a number of issues as noted in their written testimony. We'd like to add an action item to add work on the Morrison Bridge ramps. We'd also like to add safer bikeways in the district as part of the Green Loop, but we'd like to have more flexibility to move some of the pedestrian/bike enhancements separated. A right-to-work policy like a right-to-farm policy is also something we'd like to see. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith* commented on the name of the proposed policy and suggested changing that. For the Morrison Bridge ramps: The I5 south connection is important. Why the other ramp?

We still need access from both sides, but it could be modified since it's mostly smaller distribution trucks in the district. The south ramps could be modified, but we're adamant about maintaining north side ramp for large truck use. Minimizing reduction of freight movement is what we're after.

2. Peter Stark, CEIC and SAC member: For the most part, the Plan is well done, but there are still issues. The industrial sanctuary as it stands is a benefit for the city. This is a different model and district, so modifying zoning could have incredibly disastrous repercussions. We don't necessarily agree with EOS expansion; we should limit it up to 3,000 or 5,000 square feet, but not 10,000 as proposed. Expansion of the new EOS to fill the holes is good, but we would only support it to plug holes. Expansion of EXd to Industrial south to the Southern Triangle is too far and would remove industrial lands for development. I also support a Marine Commercial Overlay, which has not yet been discussed.

*Commissioner Shapiro*: What's the concern with 3,000 versus 10,000 square feet? What do you fear with the 10,000?

We're already giving concession with the industrial office model. Traditional office may have a higher lease rate (demand), therefore removing opportunity for industrial office. It's a question of where we want to put our investment.

This was a common topic at the SAC with different opinions.

3. Doug Klotz, Pedestrian Advisory Committee and SAC member: The PAC endorses the SE Quad plan. *See written testimony.*
4. Mike Tevis, SAC member: Thanks to the BPS staff team for this effort. I endorse the plan with three major edits: (1) EOS should be extended to the entire district. (2) We need to add parking by considering 4 large district parking structures and/or a density bonus consideration. (3) Immediate station areas within a quarter-mile should allow for residential use for vibrancy and safety of the station areas. *See written testimony.*
5. Carrie Strickland, SAC member: Supports the plan. Expansion of the EOS is critical, and we should include the "islands" as part of the expansion.
6. Jonathan Malsin, Beam Development and SAC member: I'm very supportive of the final draft plan but also support the expansion of the EOS throughout the district. The CES should include a broad range of industrial users. Industrial office space is doing very well, particularly in the CES.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about the 3,000 versus 10,000 request.

I think that is a mistake. Some uses help to drive density of industrial office. It's not

the retail that's gentrifying. It would be taking a step backward to limit the square footage to 3,000.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the islands. They were put in place to stabilize business that are there now.

Acknowledging that the islands are left are just off EOS in either direction, so I think they would be exaggerating the line. Potential conflicts would be around noise and the "right-to-work" issue between an apartment/condo and the industrial users.

7. Bruce Burns, SAC member: Supports the Plan as currently crafted but agrees with amendments proposed by the CEIC. My main concern is about how many new jobs we'd create and still maintain the industrial sanctuary. Improving the livability should be accomplished with this plan. There is optimism and opportunity to grow, particularly in the Southern Triangle. Mixed use corridors will be zones EXd and should attract premier development.
8. Romeo Sosa, VOZ and SAC member: Supports the plan. VOZ works with day laborers and the MLK Works Center to connect people with jobs. The SAC group was good to work with and developed a vision for the next 20 years.
9. Sam Sauter, Sauter Rental Properties: Owns a 1907 building with apartments upstairs. We're concerned about the future, and we'd like to have housing as a future development option. The proposed use might be ok, but we're still concerned about what can happen with our family's site in the future. The new, non-traditional industrial uses are concerning.
10. Christe White, OMSI: OMSI is currently zoned EG2. Today in this zone, residential uses are permitted as a conditional use with several criteria to be sure you're compatible with the industrial area. OMSI has asked to retain that residential option as a conditional use. Limited housing is an appropriate use and is integral, but under the SE Quad plan it would be reduced. OMSI sites are not adjacent to heavy industrial uses. *See written testimony.*
11. Susan Keil, OMSI: OMSI came to the eastside in the 1980s. The location helps us achieve our mission of science, education and the jobs of the future. We have had good relationships in the area. Our campus is ready for development. We have property we can develop on and have a shared vision with our neighbors. We're right near the new transit station, and we should have the flexibility for the kind of development you'd expect near a large transit section. It's the last piece of waterfront with a public access opportunity close to the Central City. This is an ideal place for development for people who want to live and work and enjoy the space. Housing is important to this kind of flexibility to achieve development potential for the long-term future. *See written testimony.*
12. Paddy Tillett, OMSI: Station areas and other parts of the area should be planned differently. Without housing, retail isn't viable in the station areas, but that's what we're planning there. Housing compliments what OMSI is doing and is essential to successful TOD. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith* asked if this is the only housing in this part of the district, is it viable?

We believe so because it would be part of the mixed use development near the station area as modeled elsewhere.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted this was an issue the SAC wrestled with. As I do the math on the concept plan, it's 600-700 units possibly. There is no context for it, but you also can't just look at what's going on today. Compatibility with industrial uses is also an issue. The conditional use process allows the City to review and see what is or isn't compatible.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the OMSI District Plan and clarification of what properties OMSI owns.

We've looked at the full district, beyond the ownership of OMSI, to understand the potential. This allowed us to consider opportunities for new transit access and influence of the station.

13. Jim Morton, Edy, Morton & Edy, LLC: Site at 1319 SE MLK. In 2002, they looked to change zoning from IG1 to EXd. After many hearings, we decided we couldn't do that zoning change because it would require we remove the back dock on 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave, rendering the property inoperable for the tenants. We support the Plan without having to remove our dock as was verbally assured by staff.
14. Sam Beebe, Ecotrust: Ecotrust recently bought blocks in the area. We thank staff and support EOS overlay on our 2 blocks. *See written testimony.*
15. Mike Lettunich: Owns 3 blocks near Franz Bakery. Supports the Green Loop and its going through the district. Our tenants bike commute, and part of the parking issues in the district are alleviated by using bike access into the city. Green loop should be on 6th, not 7th. Cyclists, generally, don't want to ride near high density, fast moving traffic. If the goal is more bike commuting/use, then please put it on 6th Ave. It is sensible for EOS overlay for the full district.
16. Barbara Grover: Supports the Plan. I still see issues in the district that overlooks the 4<sup>th</sup> Ave alignment. We import bicycles via large freight containers and our customers are cyclists and families. There is transit-user conflict in the district, so we need to make sure our alignment is correct for and in the district. Parking is an issue for both recreational users and employees. There is a lack of availability of services for those who work in the district.
17. Tom Rocca, 7 Hills Properties: Supports the Plan; it's comprehensive and deals with lots of the issues. We think the EOS should be district-wide to reduce conflicts because the islands leave inconsistencies that we'll likely have to deal with later. *See written testimony.*
18. Scott MacLean: 1127 SE 10<sup>th</sup> property owner. In the current plan, this property stays IG1 and will be across from the new Orchard Supply and bike routes on the other side. I haven't seen a traditional industrial tenant wanting to move into the area in the last few years. Traffic and lease rates are the biggest problems for traditional industrial tenants, but the EOS is well thought out and fits of the entire district. EOS is a good compromise and border zone.
19. Cameron Herrington, Living Cully: The Anti-Displacement Collation thanks the PSC and bureau staff. Regarding the SE Quad Plan, this is exactly the type of implementation plan that needs to be incorporated. All the new development will have an impact on property values and housing costs, and we need to be careful with the displacement impact of our planning decisions.

20. Karly Rose Foster: Noted the importance of the anti-displacement proposals. Transportation and infrastructure improvements will impact my ability to stay in the neighborhood.
21. Roger Gertenrich: Leads a grassroots project in SoWa in an effort to support an outdoor maritime display. 31 organization have given us letters of support, including OMSI. The first phase is done, and we have tremendous support. There is funding for a grant for planning and design of the North Greenway. The key is that next year the design and planning will occur. *See written testimony.*
22. Barry Smith: Supports expanding the EOS throughout the area and employment zones should be allowed to keep their housing opportunities.
23. Jordan Winkler, Winkler Development Corp: Supports the Plan and amendments to extend EOS over the whole area. The Plan should be able to be flexible to accommodate new industries, and it doesn't detract from existing IG uses.
24. Ian Stude, PDX Bicycle Advisory Committee: The BAC has significant concerns about bicycle transportation in the CES. We support the Green Loop and want to see both 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> avenues as Green Loop routes. The omission of 9<sup>th</sup> Ave is a concern since it's noted as a major city bikeway in the 2030 Bike Master Plan. We're also interested in facilities principally for bicycle transportation which aren't yet included. *See written testimony.*
25. Olga Sanchez, Milagro & #CEIDCreatives Coalition: Thanks to SE Uplift and their space we use. We advocate for affordable live-work spaces; personal and property safety; health; public spaces; support for small- and mid-sized cultural organizations; addressing homelessness. I request continued work between the City and the CEIDCreatives. *See written testimony.*
26. Dale Bernards, Lindquist Development: Supports the proposed use for the Southern Triangle but want to change zoning to EX. Planned housing in the area would be good for businesses to create an active 24/7 environment.
27. Mike Redmond, Creative Woodworking: There is a bike boulevard on SE Salmon, which is very dangerous. We hear lots about freight priority in the area. Our business moved here in 1993 because it is industrial zoned. But with all the change, we are being told we can't load from the streets (Taylor, 10<sup>th</sup> and Salmon). Where do you want this business to be located? I'm looking for time to move if I need to instead of continually being ticketed. The half-hour truck loading zoning and permits are required for truck loading. Looking for changes in operational practices, not necessarily zoning changes.  
  
*Commissioner Smith* asked about the property and not being in the EOS zone. It is currently EXd. EOS could change the mix of neighbors.
28. Noel Johnson, Killian Pacific: Own about 8 blocks in the area. We are generally supportive of the Plan and the process. Our approach is to be long-term, and the Plan balances immediate concerns relative to long-term goals for the city. We would suggest the EOS zoning has some potential improvements to be made. We also appreciate OMSI's perspective.
29. Susan Pearce, HAND and SAC member: Generally supports the plan. Priorities: protection for existing homes in the HAND section of the SEQ, most or all of which pre-date the designated industrial sanctuary. We'd like to see protection for homes just outside the SEQ east of 12<sup>th</sup> Ave and north of the UP railroad. We support the EX zone

in Clinton Triangle with mixed use development. Building height should not be overwhelmed or become a brick wall. We are more concerned about mass than height and are strongly in favor of the open space. HAND did not discuss housing around OMSI, but in the past we have opposed this area for housing. *See written testimony.*

30. Renee Strand, Holst Architecture: Supports the Plan and urges the EOS be applied to all IG1 zones in the area as a holistic approach rather than the island/spot-zoned approach. *See written testimony.*
31. Ryan Hashagen, Portland Pedals: Our building at MLK and Davis is proximate to suppliers. Staff bikes to work. The main concern is lack of safe active transportation route, particularly north-south, throughout the district and conflict is from single-occupancy vehicle traffic. The Green Loop would make doing business and safety a priority.
32. Peter Fry, Bolliger-Sons: The Plan is very good and is visionary. There is one property that we'd like to see changed as noted in the letter. *See written testimony.*
33. Mary Ann Schwab: My concern is about air emissions in the area. Commissioners Fritz and Saltzman are considering moving R2D2 to the area as well. This is a very busy area, and I don't want to see any families living here. We need to protect kids, and this is not an appropriate place for families.
34. Emma Pelett, City Liquidators/Pelett Properties: Owns 13 parcels in the CES; 823 SE 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave is the main office. This is a park deficient neighborhood, and we need a place for the people who work here to be outside. Support UD9, UD3, HN4, UD7, T19 and UD6. Parks offer an opportunity to escape without leaving, which is something we need in the industrial area. Keeping the people in the neighborhood there after work through a night market or an active viaduct is also important.
35. Bob Sallinger, Audubon: Natural resources and access to nature issues are similar to the West Quad plan. They are anemic and incomplete relative to the rest of the Plan. I hope the deficiencies will be rectified as they were in the West Quad. Natural resources and the river are absent from sections of the Plan. There are lots of placeholders for green features, which should have been integrated earlier on. The Green Loop almost disappears in this quadrant. Greenway expansion needs to be defined. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Houck* noted that he has heard different response when he's asked about the number sites planned for fish and wildlife habitat enhancement and restoration in the central reach of the Willamette. He asked about the number of potential enhancement or restoration sites.

My sense is that it doesn't line up with the West Quad right now. I need to reference the whole plan, but the aspirations on the SE Quad plan don't line up.

36. Curt Davis: Owns about three-quarters of a block at 7<sup>th</sup> and Lincoln with 3 apartments, brewery, studio, engineering firm and parking lot included. I support EOS as it supports growth for the district. There is a caution about restricting growth and not listening to supply and demand and market needs.

[Written testimony received](#)

*Chair Baugh* closed testimony at 5:30 p.m.

## Discussion

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about expanding EOS and the ability of that to expand the number of jobs. Do we know about the nature of those jobs and salary level?

- We can provide that. We know what's going in there today. This is a 20 year plan, and we don't want to make the same mistakes as the last plan and provide flexibility for changes.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about the changes between IG1 and EOS. There is support on both sides but probably some confusion about what's different.

- IG1 is light industrial that allows for manufacturing, production, industrial services and sales. It restricts 3,000 square feet per site for other uses such as retail. There is a conditional use possibility. EOS is an overlay over the IG1 that allows for industrial office as well as the other IG1 uses. Creative industries are EOS. You can also do 5,000 square feet retail and/or office by right. The proposal is to take away the conditional use option. The islands are suggested to maintain what is currently there.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if there was discussion about "the islands" versus maybe changing IG1 to be surrounded by EOS to maintain the overall same balance of property with a bit of a buffer. When you come back, I would like to hear about rationale about not having housing at OMSI and about multi-modal transit and potential conflicts and resolutions.

- We didn't discuss this buffer idea.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* noted the disagreement about rent potential and lease rates between traditional industrial and traditional office.

- We can provide more information. You are going to pay more for office than traditional flex space.

*Commissioner Hanson* commented on the OMSI housing situation. Lots of the comments against this were based on (1) conflicting uses and (2) it's not a good housing site. But one thing I'm thinking about is it could be more of a student housing site than a family housing site. It has great transit access. I was on the fence before, and I like the suggestion of keeping a set of CUP criteria about doing housing there as an evaluation process. The CEIC letter poses other questions. Commercial Marine Use Overlay sounds complicated, and I'm not sure exactly where you'd do the overlay.

*Commissioner Shapiro* supports the EOS overlay. The dissenting opinion is something I'd support as well. I'm equally concerned about the OMSI site and like the idea of the conditional use possibility for housing. I'd like some more creative thinking around the two islands and opportunities there.

*Commissioner Rudd* is interested in hearing about where we have done shared parking elsewhere in the city. On the conditional use permit for housing, I'd like to see all the conditional use permit criteria. Student housing is an interesting idea, but I'm not sure if the area will be affordable given you are talking waterfront.

*Commissioner Smith* supports the BAC call for showing the bike facility on 9<sup>th</sup> Ave. Regarding OMSI, they talked about a hotel and residential. (A hotel is currently allowed.) Have we done any kind of a displacement/risk assessment for this plan?

- For bikes on 9<sup>th</sup> Ave, that is one of the bikeways on the TSP as is MLK, 11<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> and Water Ave. We only showed items that we're adding, not what's already being including in the TSP.
- 9<sup>th</sup> Ave should show as a priority street for bikes.

*Commissioner Houck* noted natural resources are missing from the mission statement and stakeholder priorities. Was this a reflection of the SAC, and do you agree with it? I was involved



with the original Willamette Greenway habitat inventory, working with Bureau of Planning staff in 1984. The resulting 25 foot setbacks don't allow for integration of recreation and habitat protection and restoration. It is simply too narrow. We can't do both restoration and allow for recreational opportunities without expanding the greenway setback.

- I don't agree with that it does that, but natural resources are well addressed throughout the Central City plan. It wasn't a big issue for the SAC. We know we need to get the waterfront right. The vision is there, but we're open to further details.

*Chair Baugh* agrees with the other commissioners' comments. The one concern is the conflict with the loading zones and changes as an issue of gentrification and displacement of businesses. I would like to understand what PDC is going to do to help businesses survive and expand, or, if they need to move, that they find an alternative site in the city that helps them be successful. PDC also has a role for housing in this plan. Parking is another issue. The parking strategy is inadequate, and we need a better one. My sense is that in 5 years, you won't be able to park here.

Staff will accept other commissioner comments by this Friday so we can respond at the June 9 work session and PSC recommendation.

## **Comprehensive Plan Update**

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Joe Zehnder, Michelle Kunec-North, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Eric provided an overview of today's Work Session. We have a number of different issues to discuss today. We are almost done with the strike-through-and-underline policies and updated map, which will be coming to the PSC in early June. Today is a last chance to clean up issues and get general direction. We're getting into the actual language, which will be available in about a week.

### *Full- and Half-Block Zoning*

This is about mixed use designation and relationship to the housing behind it. Often existing houses are built to a shorter height than what's allowed. We can avoid the relationship issue by allowing full-block mixed use zoning. An example is the Tupelo Building on Mississippi Ave. A full-block development on the front half with townhouses that are shorter on the back.

Where there is full-block zoning, we have a cross-section diagram for full-block zoning. We still care about the height relationship, so we are proposing to impose a bigger setback and vegetation, or we allow residential uses to have a step-down built into the development.

Where there isn't full-block zoning, we provide for a step-down that corresponds more closely to the adjacent zone. If you're in a denser place, the step-down will be lower. If you're adjacent to RX or RH, you won't have any step-downs since the height limits are comparable to the mixed use zones.

We are not recommending to have consistent full-block zoning in all Civic Corridors. We already have quite a bit, but this is plan-specific determination that should be made (e.g. in area plans). There isn't a one-size-fits-all recommendation. We would suggest allowing both going forward and will address these issues in the Mixed Use Zone project.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about mixed use zones. Does that cover all the corridors? The current code doesn't have enough clarity about the set-backs, and it's subjective, which causes strains.

- Civic Corridors are already mixed use zones. We are proposing clear and objective set-backs in the Mixed Use Zones project.

PSC members confirmed staff's direction.

#### *Open Data and Broadband*

The staff memo dated May 21 has a couple sections, mostly relating to Chapter 2 and Chapter 8. The memo notes where we have City policy, siting policies suggested by open data stakeholders (staff did not recommend including the full suite) and staff's recommendation that condenses the concepts. Much of the issues is about what is relevant for the Comp Plan and land use policy and where items may fit into other City policies.

*Commissioner Smith* is frustrated with the process. I provided my recommendations a number of months ago and just got this memo last Friday with no time to process it. I still feel good about the full set of recommendations. I've been following the national conversation, and other cities are putting these into their Comp Plans. I understand Oregon is a different state with different laws (e.g. LUBA). It's interesting we're ok with tenants' rights but not digital inclusion as components of the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about applicability in the Comp Plan. Information flow is almost important as how trucks get down the streets.

*Chair Baugh* agrees with *Commissioner Smith*. In Policy 8.114 we use "encourage", but in the sub-policies, we use "provide" and "support", which are a stronger sense than "encourage". Also, we need to ensure everyone has access to open data and the City provides this.

*Commissioner Smith* would like to work with staff to refine the language.

Susan noted that many items comment on providing City financing and other specifics. We need to look at this in comparison to other policies. In some cases, we want to use "provide", but we can't say that if we don't have the financial capacity and ability to go to that. We do need to prioritize. Policy 2.11 takes the very specific implication of open data and make it a bit more general. I don't want this to be a one or two person issue. Movement of information does help us get to our goals, but it's hard to understand if it's not a priority for others in the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Houck* noted he doesn't fully understand the issue and welcomes further education. I was prepared to make a motion to adopt all the language submitted by *Commissioner Smith*. If there are elements that aren't appropriate for the Comp Plan, I want to know where those policies can live.

*Commissioner Rudd* would like to talk about the trade-off of including these policies in the Comp Plan versus other City policies. We want to make information available, but there are issues if we put it into the Comp Plan versus elsewhere.

*Commissioner St Martin* will work with staff and *Commissioner Smith*.

#### *TSP Project Update*

Peter noted the revisions to the January 30 memo that PBOT sent to the PSC members. Most changes are in response to the 1300 comments staff received; they are mostly relatively modest. Many people commented that the projects on the list were too large and expensive to land on the constrained list. Staff looked at phasing options that could be on the constrained list. As a result, we could include more (smaller) projects on the constrained list. There is also a new citywide map that shows the updated projects.

As we move into the final deliberation and recommendation for the Comp Plan, the list is the first final deliverable. We didn't want PSC members to lose track of this as we enter the final stretch, which is why we brought it forward today.



*Commissioner Houck:* Are the additional projects on the constrained list? Are they mostly in a small category?

- They were mostly mid-range (\$2-20M). We reviewed them, re-scoped the projects.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that process-wise, we just got this message today. When will we have time to discuss this?

- June 9 and June 23 are focused on PSC members' review and amendments to the draft recommended draft plan. PSC members will be able to look at the full plan, project list, maps and policies. If we need more time, we can push out the recommendation timeline.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the full TSP. Will it be reissued with these recommendations?

- These are the elements of the TSP that move forward with Task 4. Other elements are part of the implementation (Task 5) portion. This establishes the big picture policies, project list and financial plan.

*Chair Baugh* asked about sending questions about the TSP.

- Commissioners will send questions to Julie by June 1 for staff response.

Alternative street design is a component we're looking at as well.

#### *Anti-displacement policies*

We had significant testimony about this topic and have met with stakeholders a few times. The May 10 memo from staff was rather general, and the May 21 memo is more explicit about policies and language staff proposes to include.

The first piece of recommendation included community involvement and adding emphasis about people who are adversely affected by decisions. Added elements to Chapter 2 goals and specific language about burdens and benefits and environmental justice.

Section 2A was about impact analysis, and staff has added specific emphasis in chapters 1, 3 and 5 including the equity principle in Chapter 1.

2B, Mitigation, included adding "mitigate" into Policy 3.3.a. Policy 3.3 in general is now more specific.

2C is more specifically about community benefits. Staff recommends that we add a policy in Chapter 6 about Urban Renewal Plans.

We don't recommend policy changes in 2D because they are more about tax policy, so it's not quite a Comp Plan topic in staff's opinion.

3A and affordable home ownership: added 5.28 and other existing policies.

3B to reference land banking: added a specific policy.

3C added language about "permanently affordable" to policies in Chapter 5.

New policy re: specific target and emphasizing the need for better funding strategies to meet the target.

More specific reference to inclusionary zoning should that become an option.

Renter well-being policy (not typically a Comp Plan policy) added to housing safety and

conditions section.

4A topics and tools are more about community development, which isn't necessarily a land use or zoning tool.

4B is being looked at in the Central City and Mixed Use Zone projects.

*Commissioner Schultz* is thrown off by the term "well-being". What is the definition? Maybe there is a better term or we define it somewhere.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted that items she pulled off the consent list are related to defining the words "well-being". What about "health, safety and welfare" as a more clearly established/understood phrase?

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about a meeting of the lawyers and the groups. Did that happen?

- Yes, we met. It was one of probably several meetings. We traded information about views on legal issues. There was general agreement that issues staff flagged in the April memo are legitimate. In the short term, we want strong policies in the Comp Plan, and we have general agreement that the recommended policies are legal to do. We may need to explore more about specific tools. The issues that need to be identified were confirmed, and the policies are being discussed.
- There was a lot of validation of issues staff raised, but we haven't yet reached conclusion. A moment of consensus was that if we were to build policies to authorize us to go down a particular path, we want to make sure we have a policy basis to pursue a family of approaches... not necessarily the very specific of an item. The math for this is similar to the housing bonus study that we're completing.

*Commissioner Houck*: I think staff has been responsive to the information we've had. I also had the same problem with "well-being". What about "renters' stability"?

*Commissioner Hanson*: We are being responsive here.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about onsite versus off-site housing mitigation (e.g. with land banking). What are the differences in community benefit in light of recent publications about improved outcomes for children who move to better neighborhoods?

- When we look at the bonus approach, this would have a ratio of bonus to housing. It can be provided onsite or, for a little less better deal, you could pay into a housing fund. It gives more opportunity for the households. This is how we're proposing this in the draft study.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about further study of certain tools.

- We have the impact analysis policy in Chapter 5. We discussed the question of impact studies and when you use it (e.g. scale of a project). In Policy 5.11 we say "legislative and land use decisions".

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about recommendation 2D: Staff noted that taxes are not appropriate in the Comp Plan, but what about a linkage fee?

- This is more of an exaction. Where there are windfall profits, there would be a tax applied to capture funds for public benefits. In a condition of a land use decision, we don't know how to do this. Council can adopt different property tax implications, but it's not a zoning code issue.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*. I also have language suggestions that I can provide to staff. For example, in Policy 3.3.d, can we add strategies other exactions?

- Exactions are relatively broad. Other things we might do, if you analyzed them in terms of land use, are likely forms of exaction.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*: Through the community involvement section, I would emphasize that

“encouraging equity” is both a process and an outcome.

For 2B, mitigation, *Commissioner Shapiro* asked if this was a compromise.

- Staff took the general idea and put it into the policy. We were adding it to a particular policy, which is why it may not be exactly the language the coalition proposed.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted this is the kind of situation where we need to be careful about how we pick our situation where we put language. Push back from the private development world will be a question about putting this all up front. Incentives and exactions both need to be reviewed.

- If the objective is to find the means to build affordable housing, what is within the public jurisdiction’s grasp? A bonus exaction isn’t producing much. But we need to look at bonds and other forms of public finance.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about land banking. Should there be mention of non-profits to land bank or create land trusts as well?

- We could just say “support land banking...”.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted that one common developer comment on housing affordability is that increasing supply helps affordability and asked that staff respond to that argument.

- If you do not increase supply, you cannot be affordable if you’re a place where people want to live. Nationally this is a phenomenon. In Portland, we have lots of apartment buildings in the pipeline. We tend to be a conservative market in terms of how much gets built.

**PSC members confirmed staff’s direction.**

#### *Verb strength*

Eric reminded the PSC that all policies are balanced, regardless of the verbs. We wanted to be sure the verbs are not circularly-defined, which we’ve fixed in this iteration.

*Commissioner Houck* is ok with the verbs as defined in the May 21 memo.

*Commissioner Rudd* confirmed the expansion of the definition of “protect”. I do think the text of the plan needs to include a statement that no verb can trump.

- The new introduction and “how do you use the plan” language being added to the body of the Comp Plan draft help define this.

**PSC members confirmed staff’s direction.**

#### *Surplus property*

This memo closes the loop on Policy 8.74.

*Commissioner Houck* commented on the disposition of property. When Commissioner Saltzman was at the County, we got them to adopt a “green screen” to look at each property’s ecological value. Is the City looking at a screening process like this? Outside the scope of the Comp Plan.

#### *Consent list review*

This is the list of items that commissioners had pulled for discussion from the staff consent list. The memo outlines the original language, commissioner requests and updated language.

#31, #32 and #40

Well-being language confirmed (with definition).

#34 confirmed.

#46. *Commissioner Baugh* was concerned about dropping “pedestrian or bike” safety (and just saying “safety”).

- Staff will rewrite to include “safety includes x, y, z” and move Policy 7.32 to Policy 8.40.

#63 parking policies confirmed.

#83. *Commissioner Oxman*: The parking hierarchy is a pretty radical change. Language that clearly states is necessary. This still doesn’t quite say what it needs to say, and I’ll work on language edits. I’m concerned to have enough clarity for public support and that there is a consistent reading by staff over the next 20 years to implement the policy.

- *Commissioner Smith* is comfortable with the text that’s in this version.

Staff also recommends moving the special accommodations concept to be first on the list. And to have people and movement of goods and services into Policy 9.7.

#### *PSC disclosures about extra Comp Plan conversations*

Commissioners confirmed the list of disclosures of contacts outside PSC meetings that commissioners have had.

#### *Next steps*

We have 3 or more meetings left:

- June 9 and June 23: you will have a link to the update map, a strike-through edited Comp Plan and the TSP list and the updated CSP. These meetings are opportunities for PSC members to raise final issues about the proposed plan. For amendments, we will ask for a motion and a second. June 23 is also the hearing on the Growth Scenarios Report.
- July 14: final vote on the as-amended final document.

PSC members’ comments on the SE Quad Plan are due this Friday, May 29.

Comments on the Comp Plan are due on Monday, June 1.

#### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 7:50 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, May 12, 2015

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson (arrived 12:38 p.m.), Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Katherine Schultz

**City Staff Presenting:** Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Tom Armstrong

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:29 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

[Documents and presentations for today's meeting](#)

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Chair Baugh* acknowledged the thank you card from the housing advocates.
- *Commissioner Tallmadge* noted that tomorrow is Mult Co Budget Forum being held at IRCO. Planning and development are topics that will be discussed.

### Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- Two reports we'll send links to the PSC members:
  - State of Black Oregon. There is a consideration of development and gentrification.
  - State of Housing in Portland. Prepared by PHB as a snap-shot of housing conditions and affordability across the city.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from April 28, 2015 PSC meeting
- R/W #7880 N. Terminal Road east of N. Lombard St.

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Tom Armstrong

Eric provided an overview of today's Work Session. We have two primary subjects today, Residential Densities and Economic follow-up. We will wrap-up with a brief discussion of where we are with the PSC members' review of the consent list and a review of next steps.

### Residential Densities

### *Proposed R5 to R7 changes*

The July 2014 proposal includes a set of down-designation proposals labeled “distance from centers and corridors, and prevalent lot patterns.” The objective of this set of proposals was to adjust residential densities to better align the Comprehensive Plan designation with the lot patterns in:

1. Areas that are relatively distant from centers and corridors, AND
2. Where the existing development pattern is predominantly at a lower density than the Comprehensive Plan designation currently allows.

The proposal to down-designate is based on prevalent lot pattern originated with a 2011 request by the Reed Neighborhood Association, followed by a similar request by Eastmoreland NA.

To ensure that we treat like situations in like ways, staff scanned the city to identify any other R5 areas outside of centers and corridors.

In the July 2014 proposal, staff identified 10 areas that met the criteria:

- R5 areas that are distant from centers and corridors, and where the prevalent lot pattern doesn't jibe with the designation.
- Some of these areas are ZONED for R7 but have an R5 Comp Plan designation; other areas are zoned and comp planned R5 but have a strong R7 pattern.

There are three take-away messages staff heard from the PSC in the March 24 discussion, when we first introduced this set of map changes for consideration. We used these as guide posts as we analyzed the data and considered options.

1. Be clear about what problem we're trying to solve
2. Be consistent across the city
3. Keep it simple

Staff reviewed lots of testimony and identified issues from neighbors to ascertain: (1) Which are most appropriately addressed through changing the map from R5 to R7? And (2) Which are instead most appropriately addressed through zoning code changes?

Staff asserts that down-designation could address a subset of the 2 concerns expressed by neighbors:

- Large and small lots can be re-established based on historic underlying lot lines, where these exist.
- As mentioned in the previous presentation, there is a difference between the minimum lot size depending on whether the base zone is R5 or R7.
- A map change will not erase or negate the underlying lot lines, but it would increase the minimum lot size of any new lot that can legally be created. Therefore, there may be a net decrease in the number of skinny lots in the neighborhood.
- Larger lots can currently be divided based on allowable lot size in R5. The largest lots may still be dividable under R7. But there may be a slight decrease in the number of new lots created through land divisions if changed to R7, because fewer lots will be large enough to allow division.

Things that are not addressed by a map change include:

- Demolition of homes in good condition (*code*)
- New development is out of scale with existing homes (*code*)
- Duplexes allowed on corner lots (*Changes could be made via code changes to address scale or development standards, while still allowing attached units or duplexes on corner lots.*)
- Loss of economic and/or generational diversity within a neighborhood when smaller

homes are replaced by larger, more expensive ones (*same as demolition; can't be controlled by the map designation*)

Deborah walked through the staff's analytical approach to their review and recommendations and provided some examples.

*Portsmouth/Kenton:* (slide 8) The proposal for R7 to be applied in this particular area in North Portland was originally delineated based on where the current zone and comp plan designation don't match; our proposal is to retain the current R7 zoning and reduce the Comp Plan designation to match.

This is straightforward because the zoning is already at this lower intensity. Here, nearly all of the area in the proposal is red, meaning that the blocks have concentrations over 75 percent of lots greater than or equal to R7 density. The dark blue area is currently zoned R7 and the comp plan designation is R5. In this situation, the blue is misleading because there are two very large lots within this particular polygon, owned by Union Pacific.

*Southern Lents:* (slide 9) The proposal for this particular area in the southern portion of Lents, well outside of the Town Center, was originally delineated based on blocks that are designated as R5 but are primarily at R7 density, surrounded by other areas that are R7. Here, nearly all of the area in the proposal is red, meaning that the blocks have concentrations over 75 percent of lots greater than or equal to R7 density, with some pink and a little blue.

*Eastmoreland:* (slide 10) the Eastmoreland NA submitted a large quantity of testimony (nearly 100 in favor) asking for a down-designation of the entire neighborhood, shown on this map (extending east to Cesar Chavez Blvd). The neighborhood's reasons for proposing R7 are:

- Historic development patterns
- Lack of access to transit and services

Here you can see more of a mix of lot sizes within the neighborhood. Keep in mind that this map shows the entire neighborhood (extending east to Cesar Chavez), beyond what had been shown in the July 2014 proposal (which extended east to 36<sup>th</sup>). The yellow circle indicates a quarter-mile radius around the new Bybee LRT station. The closest retail corridor is on Woodstock, starting east of Cesar Chavez.

*South Burlingame:* (slide 11) Staff hadn't originally selected this neighborhood as a candidate for down-designation from R5 to R7 because of the proximity to a corridor (Barbur Blvd), commercial nodes within walking distance of many homes, and the variety of lot sizes. Like Eastmoreland, this neighborhood shows some concentrations of R7 lots and some concentrations of R5 lots.

The neighborhood does have the full range of roadway conditions. While there are areas with substandard, or even unimproved roads, they are most notably in the areas with the strongest R5 lot pattern. Substandard streets are also not a unique issue to this area.

Related to public safety, while they are in a general landslide hazard as in much of the southwest, staff has verified that there have been no record of landslides in any of the residential areas of the neighborhood in the past 50 years. Topography, while varied, is not in any way extreme so as to make R5 density here unadvisable.

Similarly stormwater management is a prevalent problem for most of SW as well as many other parts of the city.

Their concerns, as expressed by other community members citywide, emanates from the frustration felt regarding the size and scale of infill development, the demolition of older or humbler homes, and the removal of mature vegetation. These are issues that the designation



change in and of itself will not address.

Staff found that 9 of the study areas we examined have fairly uniform concentrations of R7 lots, while Eastmoreland and South Burlingame have a mix.

The second important finding is that the underlying lot lines – and the kind of development that is happening as a result – would best be addressed through code changes rather than map changes. Changing from R5 to R7 may, however, reduce the overall number of smaller lots that can be re-established and developed.

In Eastmoreland, the largest concentration of underlying lots is located east of SE 36<sup>th</sup>, where lot sizes predominantly match R5 density. The pattern of underlying lots continues eastward past 36<sup>th</sup>, well beyond the edges of the Eastmoreland neighborhood. Therefore, addressing the underlying lot issue should be based on a citywide response rather than a neighborhood-specific response.

Staff recommends:

1. Affirm July 2014 proposals for R5 to R7 changes
2. Consider options for Eastmoreland
3. Retain R5 in South Burlingame because of proximity to services and amenities

And in addition:

Address underlying lot and scale issues on a citywide basis through code changes

For Eastmoreland, staff recommends two options:

- a. Retain R5
- b. Down-designate area within existing Eastmoreland Plan District boundaries from R5 to R7\*

\* In considering a down-designation to R7 in Eastmoreland, staff found the most straightforward boundary for Eastmoreland would be the existing plan district that extends to SE 36<sup>th</sup>, taking in the row of homes that front on 36<sup>th</sup>. This is a slight modification to staff's original proposal in July 2014, which stopped at the centerline of SE 36<sup>th</sup>. The neighborhood has asked to expand the plan district boundaries, but that's not on the table with the Comp Plan update.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about how many units we would potentially lose in Eastmoreland by down-designating.

- The original growth allocation showed that there isn't a significant difference. The increase is because of changed assumptions about ADUs. There were 2 acres of under-utilized. Capacity for 5 new units in both the proposed and new plans. That doesn't include the narrower blocks (only the R5 densities).

*Commissioner St Martin*: What happens to places already in R5 or another lot configuration?

- They become non-conforming density, which doesn't have much meaning here. Development standards for houses on R5 and R7 are primarily the same. The main capacity for development in Eastmoreland are ADUs and skinny lots. It's hard to quantify because you have to document the lots, which we can't do. The two zones won't have a big impact on how the City plans transit because it's already developed.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the lot line adjustment: does this solve some of these problems?

- It depends on the outcomes of the single-family project. It could address scale of new development if there are issues about compatibility. There could be different minimum lot size imposed. We have this project in the Mayor's recommended budget as a project we'd be undertaking.

What option will address more of the issues?

- The single-family project will look to adjust size of infill house you can build



(dimensions and proposals about how to treat the skinny lots). Getting at the truth in zoning issue is what people are interested in, which is what the project will address. It should be done in about a year, and then the project will come for hearings at the PSC.

*Chair Baugh:* A potential solution is that the PSC could request as an interim step that Council put somewhat of a moratorium on this then get to the broader issue under the lot-line adjustment. A pause on skinny house building then return with a zoning change about design.

- This is separate from what we're talking about here.
- The map changes we're talking about will go to Council in the fall, when we'll be partially done with the single-family project.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted *Chair Baugh* is urging the PSC to approach Eastmoreland separately to move more quickly and asked why the urgency.

- *Chair Baugh:* The urgency is giving the community some temporary relief, then we'd come back with the broader zoning package.
- *Joe:* The discussion would apply citywide. It's not a moratorium, but it's a change that would pause development of skinny lots until new rules are in place. I'm not sure of the legalities of this, but it could be a possibility. The pace of development and infill would decrease for the period of time, which is not good for housing affordability (though we're not sure of the scale of the impact).
- *Deborah* noted the concentrations are citywide.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* doesn't see the urgency to put an ordinance to stop development right now.

*Chair Baugh:* The R5 to R7 zoning change is just mitigating, not solving the problem.

*Commissioner Gray* asked why this is important for the PSC to follow staff's recommendations.

- We were looking at areas farther from centers and corridors and opportunities to reduce infill pressures there, aligning zoning with lot pattern that prevails in the different areas.
- The ambiguous areas are mostly in Eastmoreland and South Burlingame.

The Comp Plan changes go through acknowledgement at the state, so the single-family project will likely be in affect prior to the Comp Plan being approved.

*Commissioner Hanson:* If we change from R5 to R7, how does that address the inherent conflicts with infill housing in Eastmoreland? Does this help to solve that?

- Development standards are the same. The number of dividable lots is the major change.

*Commissioner Rudd:* The changes that make the most sense to me are the ones that are making things more consistent. I would pull Eastmoreland and South Burlingame out and deal with them through the code.

*Commissioner Smith:* If we go from R5 to R7 in Eastmoreland, how many opportunities for skinny lot subdivisions go away?

- It's hard to quantify because we don't know how many of the underlying lots are documented that could be reestablished.
- IN terms of R5 versus R7 for minimum lot size allowed, it's 3000 sq ft if R5 and 4200 if R7.
- The concentration of historic lot lines is much greater east of 36<sup>th</sup>.

*Commissioner Rudd:* Isn't there a risk of driving more conversions with the zone change based on people being motivated to submit applications ahead of the zoning change?

- Yes, but we can't quantify this.

There is a hesitancy among some commissioners for downzoning in Eastmoreland.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to keep the current recommendation in Eastmoreland to retain zoning east of 36<sup>th</sup> (R5). *Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

*Commissioner Hanson* moved to change the designation in Eastmoreland west of 36<sup>th</sup> to be downzoned including the eastside lots on 36<sup>th</sup>. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

This would include properties w/in a quarter-mile radius of a transit center. They tend to be the largest lots. People will walk farther than a quarter mile for higher-quality transit.

(Y5 – Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Shapiro. N5 – Baugh, Rudd, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Eastmoreland Plan District will retain its current zoning of R5.

*Commissioner Smith* moved to:

- Confirm the July 2014 proposals for R5 to R7 changes for the other study areas outside of Eastmoreland.
- Retain R5 in South Burlingame because of proximity to services and amenities.

*Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

#### *Concordia*

The request from Concordia was about the zoning of R2.5 and R5. Some residents have requested the removal of the R2.5 designation and zoning, and to down-zone the R2.5 area to R5, and the R5 area to R7, likening the situation to that of Eastmoreland. This is in response to narrow houses being built on 25-by-100 foot lots.

Concordia was mapped with the Attached Residential (R2.5) designation during the Albina Community Plan. This is a fairly typical pattern found in proximity to neighborhood commercial corridors in the inner neighborhoods. There are very few service deficiencies here.

The Proposed Comp Plan does not yet ensure a supply of affordable units to the lowest income groups, and has slightly reduced entry level homeownership options.

Down-designations from R5 to R7 in the Proposed Plan have slightly reduced the supply of more affordable small-lot single family development.

Down-designations in East Portland and Southeast Portland have also decreased the zoned capacity for duplexes, townhomes and lower density multifamily development types through a reduction of R2 zones.

Adding more R2.5 or R2 zoning near neighborhood centers could increase the supply of small-lot single family homes, duplexes, townhomes, and low density multifamily development types.

Staff is not proposing up-zoning of this type at this time, but this should be a consideration as refinement plans are developed for centers and corridors as a code solution. In the meantime, we should not be reducing the amount of R2.5 or R2 zoning in opportunity-rich locations.

*Commissioner Smith* asked if it is the actual zoning that people are having trouble with or if the R2.5 is the underlying plat zoning.

- In R2.5 it's both zoning and the underlying plats.

PSC members confirmed the staff recommendation to keep zoning of R2.5 in Concordia.

## Economic Elements

This is a follow-up to last month's EOA hearing as well as other items about the economic development policies.

### *Economic Opportunities Analysis – Cargo Forecasts*

We've taken the larger jobs forecast from Metro and allocated across the city based on employment sectors and geographies. Focused on industrial area (32,000 jobs) because we have the most challenging land supply/shortfall issues there.

The Central City has a surplus of capacity, but the Central Eastside and Lower Albina districts have a shortfall, especially for cheaper, Class B office space that account for about 50 percent of the employment growth. We expect the SE Quadrant Plan to propose the zone changes that will fill this gap.

In the Industrial areas, overall there is a slight 100 acre surplus, but there is a small 38 acre shortfall in the Harbor Access Lands that we need to be proactive to help meet.

The Commercial areas have a surplus of capacity.

Institutions have strong demand but current master plans and zoning accounts for only 80 percent of the demand. We are working on a zoning code proposal that will provide the needed development capacity.

### Components of Land Need:

1. 32,000 jobs
2. Traded Sector Facilities
  - Marine Terminal Commodity Forecast
    - Volume: Medium or Low
    - Facility (3 different types): Compact, Modern, Rail Loop

Eric noted that the numbers we're taking about today have already taken West Hayden Island "off the ledger". That policy discussion will happen later today.

Tom walked through the steps to creating the estimated land needs for terminals (slide 6).

What's telling is that examples of reinvestment in the harbor have been about reinvesting in current facilities / intensification, not building new sites.

We look at commodity totals but also across the rows to see what capacity is there, where we'll be short for which specific commodity if we go with the medium forecast. There are lots of sunk costs in existing facilities that make it difficult to change commodity types. These are also private companies, so the City doesn't have much influence on changing their facilities.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about the rail loop. In the Pembina discussion, they talked about off-loading via splitting the train onto two spurs.

- Not all new facilities will have rail loops. That is the most efficient option, but it's also the most land-intensive.

We are now looking at the different site need assumptions to fill in the gaps.

For the marine terminal demand, anything more than 48 acres pushes us to look more fully into a Goal 9 exception.

*Commissioner Houck* recalled that all the conversations regarding WHI were predicated on the rail loop and the CRC.

- There was discussion of both. The loop was considered a baseline need. The CRC was not a critical component from the Port's consideration, but the CRC came up in the traffic analysis and neighborhood impact considerations.

*Commissioner Houck* asked if it is feasible to have the loop without having the CRC.

- The loop doesn't use or require the CRC. There aren't any sites other than WHI that would fit a loop.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about the projections and numbers.

- Numbers are constantly changing. There is a new Lower Columbia Commodity Forecast being developed now. The economy is constantly changing, which is one of the reasons we continually revisit these as we go through different business cycles to make mid-course corrections. In terms of market demand versus picking a forecast, there are so many other factors that are making decisions.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the Marine Terminal Land Need for Medium Cargo Forecast (slide 9).

- With all the options, we were asked about what the heavy lift is to make it happen. For example, looking at the compact versus modern facility for automobiles, structured parking is much more expensive.

The overall tonnage going through facilities has increased over time, but individual commodities have changed and varied; grain is growing on the higher end, autos on the lower end. The PSC has a choice between the low forecast with a modern facility (how staff wrote the current version of the EOA) and the medium forecast (where we'd need to show that more compact facilities are feasible). We'd need a subsidy or some other investment to make the medium forecast with compact facilities work.

Options:

1. Low cargo volume forecast with modern facility ~ 38 acre harbor access land shortfall.
2. Medium with compact facility ~ 48 acres.
3. Medium with rail look ~ 268 acres.

*Chair Baugh*: Staff is recommending either option 1 or 2. To make the medium forecast, we'd have to make public investments to make sites more compatible and marketable to customers.

- Yes, and the investments from options 1 to 2 to 3 build on each other.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that when he uses the term "break a sweat", it's in reference to when we were talking about UGB expansion at Metro during the 2040 Growth Management Process, we needed to show that we can more efficiently utilize the land within the UGB for residential and commercial development before going to "green field" sites. The same should hold true for industrial lands and Options 1 and 2 move us in that direction.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about rate of investment between options 1 and 2.

- We'd need the \$100M for brownfields plus additional funding for the marine facilities to achieve the compact land need.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*: If we were to pick the low forecast, would it be feasible for the private market to subdivide lots, be more efficient on their own?

- Option 1 doesn't change the map or code. It reflects the constrained capacity we have.

The response to go beyond the low forecast is all about the market making reinvestments with City assistance in terms of how we may be able to do so.

- The existing map is within 50 acres of either option 1 or 2. Option 3 would be a mapping difference.

*Commissioner Rudd:* If we went with option 2, would staff return with ways we could add to the TSP or policies to make this more feasible?

- Yes.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that this reflects what we're up against in terms of how much land is available. It's not "sending a message" or saying Portland isn't open for business. The reality is we have a lack of land; it's saying this is what's available. As for the 10 acre difference between options 1 and 2, can the City justify or document the rationale of getting to the medium forecast?

*Commissioner Rudd* believes it does send a message when we don't reflect the existing growth trends and somehow accommodate it. Since we're land-constrained, we need to make investments to do the hard work to make the compact development work if the modern option won't work. The UGB is a good thing but we didn't make the needed investments and now we have an affordable housing issue.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked if we picked the medium forecast, does that put pressure on development of housing?

- It is only on land for industrial use, so no.

*Commissioner Baugh:* For the issue of the medium forecast, we can still justify this relative to Goal 9.

- Yes, for either option 1 or 2.

*Commissioner Gray* noted the industrial land capacity chart (slide 11). Is this where you're pretty well landing in the strategy?

- Yes, all these numbers are assumed, so we're still the 38 or 48 acres short for the low or medium forecast, respectively. Without those acres included, we'd then have to look at other lands.

*Commissioner St Martin* noted that a forecast is just a forecast. What's the reservation we're willing to make? We're taking about a 20 year time span. With efficiencies and new technologies, I'm guessing we'll see efficiencies in how we move freight for the industry to cut costs.

The March 2015 EOA version is based on Option 1. If the PSC wants to go to Option 2, staff will have to rewrite for the PSC to review in June/July to recommend with the Comp Plan package.

Jobs growth and numbers stay the same in either case with approximately 1900 new jobs in the harbor. The numbers just relate to the amount of cargo flowing through. There will be fewer marine terminal jobs balanced with more other industrial facility jobs if we go to Option 2.

If we were to make investments to Option 2, what's the return to the community?

- It's about the flow of money (e.g. via tax revenue), not an increase of jobs.

*Chair Baugh:* The rate of return will have to be higher if we invest in Option 2 to make it viable.

If you look at the commodity type, the low forecast is just autos. The medium forecast adds facilities for grain and dry bulk. The medium forecast includes more commodities from Eastern

Oregon, so it's likely we won't see much job growth.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted we're within the margin of error in terms of the amount of land needed. Today's discussion makes me more comfortable with the low forecast.

- A majority of other commissioners confirmed this.
- *Commissioner Rudd* prefers the medium forecast.

*Commissioner St Martin*: The message is we believe industry can innovate and take less land.

- *Chair Baugh*: But we're not putting the policy to push industry to do this, and we're not putting public equity to help private industry grow more efficiently. We're saying they're on their own.

*Commissioner Hanson* commented on innovation. Option 2 is a tougher test than Option 1. I am with Option 1, but I don't want to restrict growth. Prompting efficiency is what's important.

PSC members confirmed the low cargo forecast as is explained in the March 2015 EOA.

Given the decisions we made, we are not foreseeing a need to seek a Goal 9 exception at this point.

#### *West Hayden Island policy*

The proposal is for a map designation as Rural Farm/Forest. Policy 6.41 provides guidance for future annexation. WHI is not included in the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) because we don't think that land will be ready by 2035.

PSC members had previously asked staff to come up with different policy options; these are outlined in the memo:

1. Retain the Farm/Forest map designation, and DELETE draft Policy 6.41.
2. Retain the Farm/Forest map designation, and amend the policy to add more about community impacts.
3. Retain the Farm/Forest map designation, and amend policy to delete bullets that reference 300/500 acre split.
4. Change the map to designate WHI as open space and delete the policy.

*Commissioner Houck* recommends we take it off the table altogether and remain silent on WHI. We have demonstrated we don't need WHI for the economic forecast consideration. Take all reference out of the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about number 4. Is this the most likely to provoke a Metro reaction?

- Yes, this is in the most conflict with Metro.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about a hybrid option. I'd like full protection of WHI. If we want to move in that direction, can we use Option 1 and include that Council should take up with Metro a change in the function plan to reflect WHI as a natural resource?

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about differentiating Farm/Forest from Open Space.

- Current county designation is closest to Farm/Forest (maintain current). Open Space is a much stronger protection against development.

*Commissioner St Martin*: If we leave it as Farm/Forest then need it later for economic reasons, it would go through another vetting process?

- For any option, that process has to take place. We have the previous (current) policy; do we want to encapsulate this in an explicit way in the updated Comp Plan?

*Commissioner Hanson* looked at Option 2. This bookmarks what we did in the WHI process. I lean to this one. *Commissioner Shapiro* agrees. Whatever we do, I would be comfortable with staff's recommendation instead of a more specific proposal so we don't tangle with Metro.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that a concern about removing the policy is that it removes what we did and worked on. We can still direct Council to work with Metro; it doesn't preclude that. Option 2 goes to the balanced approach.

*Commissioner Gray* likes being able to return to this plan regularly to meet our obligations to people. I support Option 2 because of all the conversation we had regarding community and impacts to people.

*Chair Baugh* is in favor of Option 1. Let's just delete the whole thing. We need to go to Metro one way or the other. It's appropriate to use WHI as the forum to ask Council to do this in an informative way to work to some sort of solution.

*Commissioner Houck*: What are we asking of Metro specifically? That they made a mistake? I don't see that happening.

The memo notes that WHI comes out in the Metro function plan in two areas:

- Title 4: as a future industrial area.
- Title 13: also an important natural resources area.

Metro said it's important for both, and the City and Port should do a plan to figure out the balance. Metro is expecting an area plan that shows the balance. The last time we tried, that was the 300/500 split, which didn't work. Metro is not inclined to mandate anything specific; they would much rather our telling them so they can either agree or ask us to fix a specific part.

*Commissioner Smith* noted if Policy 6.41 stays in, we should add the human health bullet to it. We need to ask the meta-question to Metro: There are uses that don't intensify, so at some point we stop meeting growth in all categories, and what do you expect us to do about that?

*Commissioner Rudd* suggested that before any version of option 4 go forward, staff ask the City Attorney whether changing WHI to Open Space would be a regulatory taking.

Joe: Of the choices, the one I think most accurately reflects the PSC work and feedback from City Council is Option 1. This can't be confused with a direction to go back and do something with WHI, and it seems most consistent that we don't think a facility there will be within the timeline for this plan.

*Commissioner Hanson* moved to accept Option 1. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* confirmed the current map designation does not show any division on the 300/500 split.

Joe: The difference between the future PSC and today's is that they will be making a decision on the new Comp Plan, which we're including health, environmental justice, etc. So those objectives will be in the future consideration.

*Commissioner Houck*: I want to be certain that there is no reference to Metro's Functional Plan if we are going to remove Policy 6.41.

(Y9 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge. A1 – Gray)



### *Industrial Land Retention Policy*

Discussion of Policy 6.38: When you balance the policies and have a decision to adopt a regulation or change a map, we may see a conflict. This is a prompt to address and acknowledge the impacts and what we do to limit it. The PSC has to make a choice. The policy creates an acknowledgement to get to the outcome in front of you.

*Commissioner Houck*: This relates to industrial land retention. The concern I have is the way this reads. There will be a huge push to do away with environmental regulations in industrial lands, and that's my concern with this.

*Commissioner Rudd* still has concerns with the verbs. Protect, prohibit, and limit are different levels, so I'm interested in seeing the updated verbs in the glossary and expanded discussion of balancing.

- There is a map in Chapter 6 that shows prime industrial lands.

If you look at something like the proposed R2D2 land in the CEI industrial area, how is that zoned to protect industrial uses? CEI is not included in this area. Staff believes the R2D2 land is right of way and the use is allowed as a service use.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about Policy 6.38e: Has PP&R weighed in on this one in terms of trail connectivity?

- This policy comes from Metro Title 4. Metro carves out trails as transportation facilities, not parks.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*: In 6.38d, the language seems a bit weaker than the others. "Strive to off-set..." Why not just off-set?

- This acknowledges we won't be able to off-set everything every time.

*Chair Baugh* notes this policy prompts people to look at the balancing of policies to determine the balance relative to need.

- Yes, for future proposals and considerations.

### *PSC members confirmed staff direction for Policy 6.38.*

#### *East Columbia Neighborhood Association Map Change*

This is a follow-up to testimony we heard about properties at the interface of the East Columbia neighborhood. Under the current Comp Plan, these properties are zoned RF with a Comp Plan designation of Industrial Sanctuary. The designation pre-dates the 1980 Comp Plan. There are houses on the sites currently.

We haven't proposed changing the zoning because a zoning change to industrial would have to take into account traffic through the neighborhood. Changing industrial to residential designation brings the residences closer to the industrial area and the noise and other impacts of that. So we want to keep those conflicts up to a future zone change process to resolve this.

*Commissioner Houck*: Is there any e-zoning here?

- Yes, the dark green is the p-zone, and the light green is the c-zone along the corridor (slide 16).

### *PSC members confirmed staff's recommendation of no change for the East Columbia request.*

#### *Accuracy of Employment Forecasts*

Timing of forecasts is important. In 2000 was at the top of a business cycle, but then 2008 was during the recession. Generally Metro forecasts for population are closer than those forecasts for employment, which is why we need to review these more frequently than every 20 years.



The EOA gives us a foundation to track performance through the business cycles.

*Commissioner Shapiro* commented on the need to be nimble. In the future we need to pay attention to flexibility as best we can.

#### *Employment to Open Space Map*

We're looking at public agency acquisitions and truing-up the zoning with those. Thomas Cully Park is a good example. There is not a lot of real potential without a lot of mitigation for many of the 900 acres.

*Commissioner Houck*: Neither the City nor Metro is buying prime industrial land. Their acquisitions focus on natural resource lands like wetlands, stream corridors and habitat, not upland industrial land.

*Commissioner Rudd*: I understand some of the industrial land is within parks, making it not accessible for industry. Are there places we are proposing rezoning where we think we'd push back if the acquisition were happening today?

- There are some 1-2 acre slivers that would be available. But the question becomes if we need that for the park space or if we can partition it off to make it useable for employment. Other than Thomas Cully Park, there weren't good opportunities we saw in these lands.

#### *Institutional Zones Project update*

This is how we're capturing the extra capacity for campus and hospital facilities. The plan is now available for the public, a discussion draft will be out this summer, and the project will come before the PSC this fall.

In short, we are proposing to allow campuses to grow on their existing boundaries, but it will take a Comp Plan change if they want to grow outward. Within the zoning code, we are taking some of the multi-family zones, particularly on the edges of campuses, to implement the same notification process to incorporate into the base zones.

#### **Consent Lists**

The two lists of policy and map considerations should be the last of the staff recommendations based on reading all the testimony we received.

PSC members should flag items you'd like to talk about. We have time on the May 26 agenda to continue this discussion. And then when PSC members get the strike-through version of the plan, commissioners can note items they'd like to discuss.

So far, staff has received the following:

- *Commissioner Rudd* has flagged policies in Chapter 5 that we'll discuss on May 26.
- *Commissioner Houck's* question was about Policy 6.38, which we discussed today.
- *Commissioner Oxman* asked about Policy 9.6, and PBOT staff is working on a response for that.
- *Commissioner Baugh* asked about Policy 7.32.

Please send your questions to Julie by May 15 so we can prepare the list for discussion at the May 26 meeting.

Staff has worked with the anti-displacement coalition group and will send them back a draft of how we're addressing their specific issues. PSC members will see these changes in the updated draft. We have addressed many of their policy issues and are still continuing to work with the group. Joe noted we may be able to bring something back to the PSC on May 26.

Affordability of housing is an issue across the city. One side is looking at ways to extract value to spend on community benefits. What we've learned from other cities is that the cost of housing is going up because demand exceeds supply. There is a balance point. It's not just a one-sided issue. The pot is not bottomless, and it will effect development. There are several points of view about how to build affordable housing and prevent displacement.

*Commissioner Houck* asked if there is someone representing the other side. We need to hear that along with the anti-displacement group. We need the complete context.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about what's currently in the Comp Plan related to anti-displacement strategies and the memo that staff is working on back to the group. What is appropriate to have included in the Comp Plan and not? That was a question we've heard before.

- We are working with the City Attorney and the group later this week to specifically talk about this question. We'll be in a better position to report out about this next month.

*Chair Baugh* confirmed we do need a very complete picture about the implications of the proposed policies: costs, market realities of supply and demand, etc. This will help us make a better-informed recommendation.

#### **Next Steps**

On May 26, we will wrap up the consent discussions and, tie up loose ends staff has committed to discussing. There will be a few additional memos prior to this session. Staff will also provide a reminder about how we'll run the amendment process at this meeting. And commissioners will have a chance to orally state their disclosures of groups or individual stakeholders they've met with regarding the Comp Plan for the benefit of public transparency (who, what, when).

We expect to publish the draft recommended draft on/about June 1.

On June 9 and 23, PSC members will have seen the updated draft and current status of the map. We will discuss any further amendments from commissioners over the span of two sessions. Also on June 23 is the Scenario Report hearing, a copy of which PSC members will receive early next week.

On July 14, we expect the PSC will vote and recommend the Comp Plan draft to Council. This final will include the map, policy document, CSP, TSP project list, the EOA and Scenario Report.

#### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 4:04 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, April 28, 2015

3:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck (arrived 4:45 p.m.), Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd (arrived 3:30 p.m.), Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin (arrived p.m.)

**Commissioner Members Absent:** Maggie Tallmadge

**City Staff Presenting:** Joe Zehnder, Nicholas Starin, Morgan Tracy, Sandra Wood, Tom Armstrong

**Other Presenters:** Nancy Bennett, Multnomah County; Doug Oblatz, County Consultant; Kristin Cooper, BDS

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Directors Report

Joe Zehnder

- The Scenic Resources Inventory is out for public review until May 31. This update is to make sure that all Central City scenic resources are included in the inventory. We encourage PSC members to review the draft and provide input as well.
- Which would like to be part of discussion of next steps with the David Douglas School District about site identification? As you know, BPS staff is working with DDSD to assist them in identifying potential school sites to help address their over-enrollment situation. You'll recall that for the short term, the PSC has supported staff's proposal to down-zone residential areas within the district to relieve some of the immediate pressures on enrollment. If you are interested in participating in upcoming conversations with DDSD staff about site identification, please let Julie O know.
  - *Commissioner Hanson* mentioned he'd be interested but will check with staff about time requirements.
- T6/Pembina now slated to be at Council on June 10 at 2 p.m. time certain.
- A reminder that staff has arranged for two additional Q&A / pre-work session times for PSC members to ask questions about the Comp Plan. They are scheduled for Wednesday, May 6 and Thursday, May 21 (3:30-5 p.m. for both).

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the April 7, 2015 and April 14, 2015 PSC meetings.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.  
(Y7 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith)

### Documents and Presentations:

- [April 28 meeting documents folder](#)
- [April 28 testimony folder](#)

## **Multnomah County Health Building**

Hearing and Recommendation: Nicholas Starin; Nancy Bennett, Multnomah County; Doug Oblatz, Consultant

*Chair Baugh* recused himself from this agenda item. *Commissioner Schultz* chaired the meeting for this agenda item.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted he worked for Multnomah County Health for many years and still has some contacts with staff and does volunteer work, but he does not have a conflict of interest for this project.

Nicholas introduced the project and guests. This is a limited scope legislative project to raise heights to accommodate the development of the new County Health Department Headquarters in Old Town / Chinatown (OTCT).

Nancy Bennett noted the health department's large mission and extensive work in the community. The headquarters development is due to the urgent need to meet the increasing demands of the department and to help consolidate the many administrative functions.

Doug Oblatz noted the project is in an evolutionary phase, originally as a six-story building to now a larger one to allow for the consolidation of all functions of the department. The proposed site is adjacent to Bud Clark Commons. It will help increase the neighborhood's vitality and increase densities in the very accessible location. They have received lots of input from key stakeholders and have tried to make sure to keep faith with the original objectives of the project.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about where the department is moving from.

- Two main offices, downtown at 5<sup>th</sup> and Stark and the Lincoln Building.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked if there is expected to be interaction and back-and-forth with Bud Clark Commons.

- This is not planned as a function, but it could be an adjunct to serve Bud Clark Commons.

Nicholas provided background about the site. It's currently zoned CXd, limited 6 to 1 FAR and eligible for additional 3 to 1 FAR height bonus.

BPS is proposing to amend the height maximum to 150 feet. This includes two changes to the zoning map:

- Increase the base height to 105 feet.
- Make the site eligible for bonus height that could be earned through the use of bonus FAR or transfer of FAR. 15 feet of bonus height could be earned for each 1:1 FAR earned through bonuses or transfers, up to a maximum of 45 additional feet.

Staff is reviewing all Central City bonuses in the CC2035 Plan. But this work is not yet complete. The site is subject to design review.

The location is also close to Union Station Clock Tower, a scenic resource. Because of the proximity, staff analyzed potential impacts on the scenic resource (slide 5). The impacts were found to be minor, and no views are blocked or partially blocked by the proposed building.

In general we have heard support for this project, in some cases qualified support. Some of what we have heard include concerns about three main items:

- The precedent this kind of height adjustment to accommodate a single property is setting.

- Desire for mitigation of the impacts from construction, particularly as it affects Bud Clark Commons.
- Questions about which particular bonuses will be used and the anticipated community benefits achieved.

Staff requests that the PSC recommends that City Council:

- Adopt the Multnomah County Health Department Project *Proposed Draft*, dated April 1, 2015.
- Amend the Zoning Code, as shown in the *Proposed Draft* to:
  - Increase the maximum base height on Block U from 75 ft. to 105 ft. and
  - Make Block U eligible for up to 45 ft. of bonus height.

## Discussion

*Commissioner Gray* asked about the OTCT support letter. If the base zone is raised to 105 feet with a possibility of bonuses for 45 feet, did the neighbors realize this could be 150 feet?

- Helen Yin will speak for the neighborhood group.

In terms of precedent-setting, does this set the 150 feet for more than just this block and for the rest of the area?

- The proposal changes the height on just the one block.
- On the bonus question, the reason we did the bonus approach so we could be consistent with the PSC's direction for the West Quad Plan which recommends that any additional height will require the use of a bonus.

Were there any negative comments from The Pearl?

- Their basic concern was the precedent issue. They are supportive of the HQ in the area, but they prefer having it on a block where the zoning capacity was already there.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted the building would be quite large for the area. What about Home Forward's concerns about the building?

- We've had a series of meetings with Home Forward and Transition Projects, who have provided joint testimony. We are looking at issues that we are prepared to talk about a Good Neighbor agreement with them for the construction phase. We have a design in development, but we will have to start the process and reengage the community as we get further in the process.
- People have been enthusiastic about having the HQ there.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about the land being owned by the Portland Housing Bureau now. What about affordable housing?

- We have an opportunity to use the affordable housing bonus here.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about PDC's proposal for the post office site. How does this project relate to the potential new look of the area? This is interesting timing that could open the post office site.

- That project is in very early stages of ideas. As we look at the post office site, we will want to look at the existing entitlements. It has a similar proximity to Union Station and a view along NW Johnson of the Clock Tower will need to be considered as the development is planned for the Post Office site.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted the question of precedent. This project has been in the works at least three years, and what's on the table now seems to be a reassessment of the developer's needs, which requires the height change. Does this set precedence for the PSC to make zoning and map changes?

- Typically we like to consider height changes in an area plan so there is more context. This is a legislative process, so there's nothing wrong with proceeding with it. In our Central City, you can't get a variance on height (you can in other neighborhoods).

*Commissioner Smith* just noted this could have been teed-up as part of the West Quadrant Plan. Why wasn't the timing in synch so we could have looked at it as part of the project?

- Part of the issue was changes in leadership at the county, and changes in the idea for the building and consolidating county services.
- What motivated staff to look at this was the consistency of creating this major source of employment proximate to OTCT, which is consistent with what we've been looking for in that area.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about this being spot zoning and that being illegal.

- We've consulted with the City Attorney, and spot zoning is not considered illegal as it was before. It has gone through much process, and it will continue to do so through City Council hearing.
- This is proximate to blocks where height limits are higher, too, so it's not "so spotty" anyway.

### Testimony

1. George Devendorf, Transition Projects: We are supportive of the project, with some concerns about the construction and design phases. Overall this is a positive benefit for the neighborhood. We were engaged in a similar process a few years ago with development of Bud Clark Commons. Regarding design, we are looking forward to having the health department as a new neighbor, but we'll lose our morning sunlight. Bud Clark Commons has a day center for homeless in the city with a courtyard that abuts the portion of the lot this project would fill, so we would want to see about having the courtyard maintain its sunlight opportunity. *See written testimony.*
2. Helen Ying, OTCTCA: We are in support of the proposal with some conditions as outlined in our letter. The County has noted they will address our concerns. We understand there is a chance of having the building be 150 feet, so there are some concerns with that. The neighborhood would rather as minimal a height as possible. We'd also hope BPS, PDC and the PSC would consider parking; height and mass; and additional social services in the neighborhood. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Schultz* closed testimony.

### Discussion

*Commissioner Shapiro* hopes the design of the building will be compatible with Bud Clark Commons.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about input to the County and if they have been working with the groups on their concerns.

- They are going to work on a Good Neighbor agreement.

### Motion

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to recommend that City Council:

- Adopt the Multnomah County Health Department Project *Proposed Draft*, dated April 1, 2015.
- Amend the Zoning Code, as shown in the *Proposed Draft* to:
  - Increase the maximum base height on Block U from 75 ft. to 105 ft. and
  - Make Block U eligible for up to 45 ft. of bonus height.

*Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

The motion passed.

(Y7 – Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Schultz)

## **RICAP 7**

Hearing and Recommendation: Morgan Tracy; Kristin Cooper, BDS

Morgan highlighted the work and proposals within RICAP 7 including public outreach (slide 2). The public discussion draft, published January 5, provided 7 weeks for public review. We sent notice to over 700 people and met with a many organizations and individuals during that time.

RICAP 7 covers 47 items in three areas of amendments categories:

- 4 Minor policy items
- 38 Clarification items
- 5 items where no changes are proposed

Kristin and Morgan walked through the minor policy item proposals.

Staff answered clarifying questions about item #2, the Pre-application Conference, and #5, Measuring of Shed Roof Height.

Of the 38 clarification items in the package, Morgan highlighted items 35 and 36, about tree size thresholds in rights-of-way in the scenic corridor (slide 11).

Staff recommends that the PSC approve RICAP 7 with:

- Amend the Proposed Draft per April 28, 2015 Memo;
- Recommend that City Council adopt the Proposed Draft, as amended; and
- Amend the Zoning Code as shown in the Draft, as amended.

## **Discussion**

*Commissioner Smith* asked about household living standards.

- BPS is proposing to undertake a project to look at development standards for single-family housing, which this could include.

## **Testimony**

1. Jaimes Valdez, NW Seed: We look at soft costs for solar including reducing barriers that aren't related to the panel costs themselves. For item #30, I want to thank to staff for clarifying design standards that had previously restricted solar panel mounting on flat roofs. There are still some concerns with the language that looks to screen solar equipment from view and with setbacks. We encourage the PSC to look at what that intent means in terms of promoting solar in the built environment. For the community design standards portion of the staff recommendations, we'd like to remove the setback and screen language to consider this perspective.
2. Katie Martin, OSEIA/Neil Kelly: We are also supportive of #30 but ask staff to address the setback and screening requirements. You should consider easing these requirements to allow more solar to be installed and maximize the benefits. *See written testimony.*
3. Randy Feldhaus, Imagine Energy: Thank you for the adjustment in Item #30. This helps decrease soiling and increases solar opportunity. The state solar code addresses setbacks, which we support, so we don't feel there needs to be an additional change for the City. Would like to see that the height restriction be just the.
4. Pat Schellerup, OSEI: We represent over 40 solar installation companies in the state.



The screening and setback requirements previously mentioned are the concerns we have. The state requirements should be used within Portland instead of having a separate set of rules.

*Chair Baugh* closed testimony.

## Discussion

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about the proposal to hide solar panels behind screens.

- The issue we wanted to address is that, in the design overlay zone, the way the language is currently, the panels would have to lay flat on a flat roof. We used a similar premise to the historic and mechanical equipment exemptions are applied. The benefits of this negative aesthetic impact is that it creates more certainty for the applicants and staff in the review process. See slides 15-16.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the 3 foot setback.

- This is a safety and maintenance component, which would apply citywide. Some design standards don't align exactly with safety codes (they are more restrictive).

*Commissioner Schultz* is in support of the way that staff has written this item. I'm not against the look of a solar panel, but we try to inset all equipment. This cleans this up and keeps it out of the sightline.

*Commissioner Gray* noted that this is only for design review areas. I'm trying to understand what the context is.

- The design overlay areas are limited (e.g. Central City, Gateway). Also, this just applies to houses with flat roofs, and you always can go through design review for individual requests. It makes the code more permissive than it currently is.

## Motion

*Commissioner Smith* moved to

- Amend the Proposed Draft per April 28, 2015 Memo.
- Recommend that City Council adopt the Proposed Draft, as amended.
- Amend the Zoning Code as shown in the Draft, as amended.

*Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

The motion passed.

(Y9 – Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

## RICAP 8 Work Plan

Hearing and Recommendation: Morgan Tracy, Sandra Wood; Kristin Cooper, BDS

Sandra provided context for this project and highlighted the many code projects that we have underway right now (slide 2).

Morgan illuminated the process for how projects get onto a RICAP work plan.

RICAPs are a bit different from other legislative code projects because:

- They are not topic or area specific (but may have bundles of issues that may relate to an area or topic)
- More significantly, they are limited in scope – to address mainly technical issues, and some minor policy matters



- In your current world of the comp plan update, RICAPs offer a slight reprieve in that they are not part of the new Comp Plan implementation (but this fact also affects our workplan selection, as we don't want to be working in areas that may be significantly rewritten by the Task 5 projects.

The miscellaneous items in RICAPs are packaged into one-year cycles for efficiency and greater economies of scale.

Staff begins the workplan selection by ranking items in the database. This ranking looks at:

- Who is affected: what groups and how many people?
- How widespread an issue is (one zone? Citywide?).
- How problematic the issue is.
- The potential for improving the regulation without adding undue complexity.

This year's (RICAP 8) workplan includes 37 items. Included in this package are several zoning code items that reflect BES and PBOT issues and concerns. The reduced number of technical items reflects our progress after a three-year backlog, and we have offset the workload with a review of an increased number of minor policy issues.

Policy issues are bundled as:

- Land Divisions
- PLA/Lot Confirmation
- Radio Frequency (cell facilities)
- Miscellaneous

The 25 remaining technical items do not affect adopted policy and do not require significant additional resources. The other 15 items relate back to the zoning code.

### Testimony

No testimony was provided for this project.

*Chair Baugh* closed testimony.

### Discussion

*Commissioner Gray* asked about the testimony letter regarding AT&T's support for Item #4.

- The FCC adopted rules that specify particular thresholds local jurisdictions have when proposals come. Local governments have a short review timeframe and generally, if there aren't substantial changes proposed to the sites, the jurisdiction must approve the proposals. We worked on this in RICAP 6, but we have these final tweaks to catch back up to the FCC.

### Motion

*Commissioner Schultz* moved to approve the RICAP 8 Proposed Workplan dated April 2015.  
*Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

The motion passed.

(Y9 – Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Baugh)

### Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA)

Hearing and Recommendation: Tom Armstrong

Tom provided background about the EOA. The EOA is part of Part 2 of the Comprehensive Plan update. We went through this process in 2012, but the EOA was appealed to LCDC. With updates in the forecasts, we elected to pull the report back for revisions, which is what is before the PSC today. This is part of the whole package of the Comp Plan update.

There are 4 main reports of the EOA:

1. Recent Trends and Market Factors
2. Employment Growth Forecast (Demand)
3. Land Development Capacity (Supply)
4. Proposed Comp Plan Analysis

Based on today's hearing and input at the May 12 Comp Plan work session, staff will make final revisions and adjustments to create the recommended draft EOA. The PSC will not vote on the EOA today so we can wrap up the policy discussion about the EOA and economic policies.

What has changed since the January 2015 EOA version:

- Draft SE Quadrant Plan proposals add 123 acres of development capacity.
- Proposed TSP projects have been factored into the BLI constraint analysis.
- Boundary adjustment at Terminal 6 to shift into the Harbor Access Lands geography.

We add projections for job demand figures, traded sector facilities and employment land demand, which all combine to almost 3000 acres of demand for employment land, which we balance with the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI).

The BLI map (slide 11) shows sites but not necessarily the constraints to see the real development capacity. We have surplus capacity across the city, particularly in the Central City and Neighborhood Commercial Districts.

In the Industrial areas, overall there is a slight 100 acre surplus, but there is a small 33 acre shortfall in the Harbor Access Lands that we need to be proactive to help meet. This comes from four main strategies:

- Industrial land retention
- Brownfield redevelopment
- Industrial land intensification
- Airport golf courses

*Commissioner Houck:* During the Industrial Land / Watershed Health PEG discussions, we took a field tour. A question was that it's great that we have industrial land retention, but we know there have been massive changes from industrial to commercial land in the past. We could convert those back to industrial potentially. Was that looked at?

- We looked at some areas, particularly around Cascade Station and other areas such as PIR and didn't find anything that was ripe for that type of "going back the other way." But if someone wants to do that, we could be supportive of accommodating that type of change.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about industrial land intensification. What was the analysis?

- Freight is the most direct thing that shows up in the Comp Plan and the TSP. We also included regulatory climate policies. We also looked at development trends in 2000-2008 and how much of the development was occurring on existing built sites. East of the airport, that development was close to 26-28 percent on already-built sites. We settled on the 15 percent recommendation as a conservative estimate.

There are probably other ways we can look at this, and it's part of a continuing conversation.

*Commissioner Rudd:* If EOA is appealed by LCDC, what happens?

- In general, it gives deference to the local government about if we've made a

reasonable assumption (e.g. the question of converting Open Space golf courses to Industrial). The Goal 9 reference isn't well-defined about what a "reasonable assumption" is.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that some of the written testimony we received for this hearing asserted that there was an over-statement of constraints on vacant industrial land.

- Audubon spoke about the regulatory constraints and e-zones. The way the constraints all overlap (e-zone, brownfields, transportation infrastructure), if we just remove one constraint, it won't result in a huge swing to increase a huge amount of capacity.

*Commissioner Oxman*: Could there be geographically-focused strategies to see about getting specific areas of land "back in play"?

- We've looked at this for big opportunity sites, but it's hard to do this in the Comp Plan. We know of some sites, but we haven't gone so far at this level of detail to unfold and assume all of this.

Harbor access lands are our most difficult challenge, which are in the river-related industrial areas. We are not counting West Hayden Island in the BLI. The draft Comp Plan Policy 6.41 provides guidance for future annexation. This policy also serves to help the City maintain compliance with Metro plans, which direct the City to eventually annex WHI for a mix of open space and marine terminal development. The City needs to adopt a Comprehensive Plan that is in alignment with the Metro regional plan, and the proposed policy helps us communicate a "not now, maybe later" approach. We are not counting on WHI land to meet industrial land needs through 2035, but we acknowledge that under the Metro plan annexation may be considered at a later time. The Commission or Council may choose to remove this policy, but we believe that such removal may create conflict with Metro.

In the draft EOA, we've selected a low cargo forecast. But even with this combination, we have a small 38 acre shortfall in the harbor access lands. This is off-set in other industrial districts that have surplus capacity.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the low cargo forecast. I want to reframe the question: we have limited waterfront land, but if we assume it's constrained, do we need to think about policies that allocate this to the highest and best uses? Jobs per acre may not be the best measure. Value added is potentially another measure. Have we systematically used this to evaluate how harbor lands are used?

- This analysis can be part of our work in the future. The Port is probably more qualified to talk about this, what the trends are and what is needed to support the economy. It is a mix of commodity flows.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* supports this proactive thinking.

*Commissioner Schultz*: Regarding businesses located along the river, do we have policy that speaks to encouraging relocation of these businesses? If not, should we?

- We don't have a specific policy to focus river-related industries on the waterfront, but we can discuss this on May 12.

### Testimony

1. Don Baack, SWTrails: We need to include trails in the overlay to see where they are. We have 20 mph speed limits on greenways, but this is not being applied to streets where there aren't sidewalks. We should require the City to retain and maintain our existing trails. The City should maintain and build partnerships with non-profits. See *written testimony*.
2. Raihana Ansary, Portland Business Alliance: The PBA is concerned about a number of the assumptions including the proposal to project and only accommodate a low marine

cargo forecast. Traded sector goods are still the backbone of Portland's jobs. The EOA assumes 60 percent of brownfields will redevelop over the next 20 years, but this is dependent on state regulations and costs associated with redevelopment. Golf courses are not a great fit to be considered industrial land, and owners of courses have not confirmed an interest to sell. We urge staff to look at market realities. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the cargo assumption being low. If we modify that, where do we put the industrial land to accommodate that expanded growth?

We recognize we're land locked. The question should be what we envision for our city over the next 20 years. Don't we want good middle-income jobs, tax revenues and other benefits?

*Commissioner Rudd* asked if we're being honest with our numbers. We need to get on the same page.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about cargo growth being about 3 percent historically. How much is exported from this region versus what's transported through the state? [The Port can address this.]

*Commissioner Houck*: This is a foundational question that we've been dancing around. I was just at a Parks SDC hearing. PP&R has said they can't buy enough land to meet future needs of the city; there is only so much land out there. They are looking at how to make existing park land more usable by more people. We are in the same situation with industrial lands, and we should look at intensification and deal with this, just as parks is doing with park land.

3. Jeremy "Byron" Tennant, Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods: We'd urge greater than 70 percent of existing brownfields be redeveloped and prevention of further contamination of brownfield sites. We have a big concern that increased freight traffic will increase diesel pollution. We urge a more inclusive process to get answers about the freight projections including about the Comp Plan Map App shows strategic freight investments having effects on the Woodlawn Neighborhood; widening of MLK; 11<sup>th</sup> and 13<sup>th</sup> overcrossings; Argyle Dr. We should be asking for an exemption to Goal 9. *See written testimony.*

Staff would be glad to meet and talk about these questions and discuss what the dialog has been or should have been.

4. Ellen Wax, Working Waterfront Coalition: The low cargo growth forecast is not supported by market trends. The EOA doesn't fully recognize the importance of cargo businesses. We need to reflect the current and historic realities. *See written testimony.*
5. Bob Sallinger, Audubon: In general, this version of the EOA is a big improvement. Intensification over acreage. But it is still an exercise in putting off the inevitable of asking for a Goal 9 exemption. We are focusing on taking pieces of golf courses, not big pieces of land. The current Comp Plan protects golf courses as Open Space. I appreciate the question about if we're creating jobs and economic development on these sites. We are often a throughput, so we're not doing the follow-up work to reap the benefits locally of our industrial land. We're supposed to have innovative land use planning, but Goal 9 has become a restriction on how we think e.g. not thinking about inter-port coordination and relating to the bigger metro landscape with more industrial lands. I like the Parks approach; they are still looking for acres, but we aren't being

held to an artificial number. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about Goal 9. If you do an exception, can you do a partial exception to calibrate the land availability we have?

6. Greg Theisen, Port of Portland: The Port thanks staff for working on the EOA and trying to work through issues with the working group. The Port supports an EOA that is responsive to Goal 9, based on the harbor's economic forecast and significance. But the low cargo forecast is disconnected from the current level of investment in the harbor. We look forward to continuing to work with the City on creating an acceptable EOA. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith* asked if the Port does analysis of economic efficiency in terms of value added versus employment. Regarding historical economic growth, how much is pass-through versus goods created in the region then shipped? What is the value added back to the regional or state economy?

There is disconnect between marine shipping (big ships) that move big bulky goods, which is a fundamental nature of moving goods on the marine side. Lots of what's exported on the container side is still lower value products. We are always looking to maximize.

*Commissioner Shapiro* was compelled by this testimony. We're at a crossroads. It's an opportunity to use the land we're talking about in creative ways and get it to be most valuable as a river resource.

*Commissioner Hanson* appreciates the Port testimony with the handout about other ports. Do you talk with the other ports and have dialog, or are these serious competitors?

We're somewhere in-between; we have similar goals and challenges, and we talk. But we do also compete.

*Commissioner Rudd:* The channel deepening was an investment for both sides of the river. We value habitat but still have the jobs concern: people have to travel to jobs, and there are impacts to that as well.

*Commissioner Houck:* Regarding jobs and industrial development, we have a regional economy. I don't feel confident on making a recommendation about projected commodity growth being 1.3 or 3 percent. Before we make any decisions, I want to hear a bit more about staff's methodology. *Commissioner Gray* also asked for clarification on the 1.3 and 3 percent projected growth discrepancy.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted there are lots of shoe companies here and others that are relocating here. Pass-through businesses also highlight Portland as an export location, so if we start pulling back, how does that effect the numbers?

*Chair Baugh* asked about the Port's strategic plan, which says one of the impediments to the Port's growth is the City. There needs to be an agreement about growth, and it seems that the projection is part of the impediment. What is the real impact to the Port of saying it's a low cargo forecast?

If we accept the low number, what does that translate to? If we're striving for something that we need to put lots of effort into, it drives us to get there. A low goal means less opportunities for cooperation, how we market the Port, and possibly how

much land we have to develop. The more activity there is in the harbor, the more attention and funds, and the more likely and the sooner the harbor will get cleaned up. It's also relative to achieving the brownfield goals.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the terminology is critical. Staff has arrived at a 1.3 percent growth as a projection, not a goal. This is a really important distinction.

Bob: I interpret this as a projection. A higher projection pushes back on environmental protection and other environmental regulations; this is our concern about a high projection.

Ellen: I think of this as a projection, but I'm concerned about the impacts of future plans if we set a low cargo forecast.

7. Martha Johnston, East Columbia Neighborhood Association: Thank you to the PSC for all your volunteer work. This is a surprise for us – we'd like to allow time for review of these EOA documents since we just found out about this yesterday. On the list of EOA outreach committees, we didn't see a neighborhood association representative. Our area is affected, but we can't adequately reply since we didn't have time to review it as a committee. *See written testimony.*
8. Barbara Kerr: I'm concerned about a 20-acre parcel on NE Levy Rd. This land should not be designated as Industrial Sanctuary, nor should it be counted as industrial land. Intensive agriculture could co-exist if this were environmentally protected. *See written testimony.*
9. Justin Callaway: Concern about noise in the North neighborhoods. Trucking yards were developed without neighborhood involvement, and they are out of compliance. It's not livable. The Noise Officer doesn't help at all. *See written testimony (card).*

*Commissioner Houck* noted that City staff are professionals, and we need to respect them. I don't want to hear staff being attacked by anyone.

*Chair Baugh* closed testimony.

### Discussion

Are there specific technical assumptions that we can clarify? From what you've heard, are there larger policy or map issues we can work through on May 12?

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about the balance of industrial versus environmental land. We need to be able to accommodate both of these interests.

*Commissioner Smith* is worried that we're having the wrong debate. We are trying to avoid a Goal 9 exception versus looking at what the best forecast for the city is. We have limited land, and we need to have a discussion about the best way to use it.

*Commissioner Gray* asked about the golf courses and their interest in selling property. There was 123 acres in this combined land.

- Riverside has indicated they don't have interest to sell right now, but this is a 20 year plan. Out of the 123 acres we attribute to airport golf courses, 48 are in Colwood, 15 in Broadmoor, and the balance is at Riverside. We are looking at the opportunities in the long term and how things change over time; declining golf participation could provide this opportunity. We don't intend to rezone the land, this proposal just makes an easier path to convert when they want to.

*Commissioner Houck* indicated he agrees with *Commissioner Smith* but stated that we should go into that conversation with eyes wide open and have a very clear understanding of the implications of asking for a Goal 9 exception.

*Commissioner St Martin*: Is it not possible to go with the plan we have now then work on the Goal 9 issue over the next 10 years to have that brought into reasonable compliance?

*Commissioner Smith*: I like the idea of a “calibrated” exception as *Commissioner Hanson* suggested.

*Commissioner Hanson*: We could evaluate some of the areas to see what would be a candidate site and what wouldn’t be. We could pick and choose more carefully this way. But at the same time, we could go down two tracks as *Commissioner St Martin* noted.

*Commissioner Rudd*: If we’re going down two tracks, what does that mean for the plans we have going forward? If we want equity and increase middle-wage jobs, I’m not sure what that looks like.

*Chair Baugh*: What is the economic impact of the shift of jobs from marine to the back side?

- We aren’t shifting them to, say, a neighborhood, so the jobs don’t change.

What is the cascading effect from a low end cargo projection? If we have a higher projection, can we state that it’s not new land we’re looking at but it’s specifically intensification and redevelopment of brownfields.

- Even with the low end and 60 percent brownfield development, the demand is still more than what we can accommodate. Low to medium gets us to look at intensification or new areas; it drives that choice.
- We can look at what levels of intensification and value-added throughput we’d need to achieve in the existing harbor to get to that higher level. We can do this today; choosing a low forecast doesn’t prohibit this.

*Commissioner Houck* noted no matter the projection, it’s the same need to deal with the brownfields. The low commodity flow doesn’t impact if we go after the brownfield sites or not.

*Commissioner Schultz* commented that projections strive to be at least somewhat accurate. I want to start with the question of if the low end is realistic. Does it make sense to start at a middle-level projection? We need to find the correct projection.

*Commissioner Rudd*: What happens when we get to the implementation stage? Is there a limit to intensification if we choose the low projection?

We have a way to frame these questions. One of the things that is behind the logic of picking the low range is that it is based on a forecast of a variety of commodities. A big piece is having the facilities to be able to handle this. The mid-range forecast makes the argument for a unit-train rail loop. So we have a physical constraint for our projection as well. There is still a demand for the intense utilization of the harbor land and to clean up brownfields. We do have a regional economy, but we can’t, say, go to Wilsonville to find harbor lands. We will bring back information about the implications of what not getting to our goals are. We do need to keep investing, and more volume does help to justify that.

*Chair Baugh*: Connecting the EOA to investments – how do we tie all that together to make this work?

- The forecast does have a range in it that we can look at.

*Commissioner Hanson* is optimistic about industries using their land more efficiently. This is similar to the UGB squeeze. Wherever we end up on this, I hope our message is that Portland is



open for business, all types of business.

*Commissioner Houck* seconded *Commissioner Hanson's* comment. During Metro's Region 2040 growth management discussion, the City and Metro argued that we had to "break a sweat" to avoid green field development and UGB expansion by being more aggressive with infill and intensification of development. We have the same issue here. What are we going to do in the region to avoid green field development? West Hayden Island is a green field. What are we doing as a City to maintain the UGB but not at expense of quality of life inside and environmental quality of the city and the region? Intensification of use is hugely important in the Goal 9 discussion.

**Wrap-Up**

Staff will return on May 12 for the Comp Plan work session to follow-up on these economic elements and questions.

**Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 6:45 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken



## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, April 14, 2015

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz (arrived 12:38 p.m.), Howard Shapiro (arrived 12:38 p.m.), Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin

**Commissioners Absent:** Maggie Tallmadge

**City Staff Presenting:** Joe Zehnder, Susan Anderson, Troy Doss, Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Tom Armstrong, Mark Raggett, Marty Stockton, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner St Martin* noted the Tiny House conference in Portland this weekend.
- *Commissioner Gray* commented that Parkrose charter school built two tiny houses that will be on display. She also noted that she chairs the ACE school board on late Tuesday afternoons and will leave at about 3:45 p.m.
- *Chair Baugh* thanked the commission for the work on the PDC URA project. As a commission, we talked extensively about housing. Council really did hear our concerns and comments that enabled “the old housing advocates” to testify and have their voice heard about the need for affordable housing.
  - *Commissioner Houck* noted that the result will be less funding for parks, which is a big trade-off that we should be aware of. It shouldn't be a zero-sum game, and the parks advocates provided support, but we know there is limited funding.
  - *Chair Baugh* noted it does have to be both housing and parks.

### Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- We have a number of project heading to Council in the next week or so:
  - Building Energy Performance Reporting – tomorrow at 3:30 p.m. time certain.
  - Sustainable City Government Principles and Green Building Policy – Wednesday, April 22 at 9:30 a.m. time certain.
  - Tentatively on April 30 at 2 p.m. is the Terminal 6/ Pembina hearing.
- Kathryn Beaumont from the City Attorney's office provided PSC members a reminder about public record rules. The commission is a public body, so communications that pertain to your work as a PSC member are public records, and we are required to retain them and produce the records on request.
  - *Commissioner Smith* asked about voice mail. I don't believe my phone provider has an infinite retention. How do we take care of this?
    - Those that are retained are public records, but if they are gone, they are gone.
  - *Commissioner Oxman* asked about the hundreds of past emails.
    - You can forward them to Julie as a batch or you can hang onto them; it's your choice. It's easiest to provide them to City staff so you don't have to worry about holding them.

[Documents and presentations for today's meeting](#)

## Central City 2035 SE Quadrant Plan

Briefing: Troy Doss

### [Presentation](#)

*Commissioner Hanson* noted that there have been 14 advisory committee meetings, which he chaired. We had a very good process, and the group had a good consensus about the proposed plan. It's balanced with the diverse interests of the group.

Troy introduced the team that has worked on the plan, including staff from BPS, PBOT and PDC.

Most of the area is zoned for employment and industrial, but there is quite a bit of underutilized mixed-use land.

This district has about 18000 jobs today, which has been growing approximately 7 percent annually, even during the recession. The area has largely been left alone since the first Central City plan. The employment opportunity sub-area is really the only thing that has changed since 1988.

The inner southeast station area plan was the beginning of this work: OMSI, Clinton, Rhine, Holgate stations.

The goals of the plan include:

- Expand employment opportunities
- Protect industrial businesses from incompatible uses
- Foster safe and vibrant station areas
- Create a regional waterfront destination

There was general agreement on these four goals among stakeholders.

The big strategies include

- Expand employment opportunities
- Attractive, safe station areas
- Maximize potential of mixed-use corridors
- Regional waterfront destination
- Enhance efficiency of multi-modal transportation network

Troy provided a history of the area and its evolution (slides 9-16). Some of the industries didn't even exist when the original plan was developed. There has been growth in the new industries while not losing the old, more traditional industries. The industries typically work fine with each other in the area. The uses aren't conflicting, and in fact, there is somewhat of a synergy between some of the businesses. There are more cars, but the biggest complaint from some is the parking problem. But this issue is also seen as a market success.

Compared to the goat blocks with residential/mixed-use and freight concerns, we are not seeing this issue in this area. That is a different situation. Here it is jobs (office) that are using the older industrial buildings.

Going through the planning process, one of the big endorsements was from Pacific Coast Fruits, a huge freight user. A large portion of their workforce bikes to work, which is good for keeping the roads open for delivery and freight. We don't see much freight delivery in the peak commute hours.

In addition to the Stakeholder Priorities (slide 18), through public events and committee meetings, staff heard three things that will be addressed and likely will receive a number of comments from the public:

- Protect the district's industrial uses including protecting freight movement.
- Manage impacts of increasing employment densities including demands for parking.
- Improve conditions for cycling and pedestrians so that as more people access the district they can do so more efficiently than they can today.

*Chair Baugh* noted his office is in this district. Second Ave often has truck lined up and idling all night long to keep their refrigeration going. Are we looking at policies around this issue? Even if the truck isn't idling, the refrigeration unit is going.

- It hasn't come up in discussions. Second Ave is not an area that we're proposing any changes. People know they're moving into an industrial area, and we will continue to approve if they are operating within lawful limits.
- The disclosure statement makes the tenant or successor of property know the approved uses and requirements of operating in the area.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about a more sustainable solution to idling. Not discouraging the activity, but could they plug in for example?

- We can work with PBOT and owners, but this is a comprehensive land use and zoning code change, a land-use plan. We can look at adding a policy statement. We did touch on this issue with WHI.

*Commissioner Oxman* is supportive to maintain industrial capacity in the district. For the disclosure statement, is that effectively implemented by realtors?

- *Commissioner St Martin* noted if there is a requirement for disclosure that is included as a requirement by the state or by the local constituencies. Failure of the seller or landlord to disclose information about the property puts them at risk.
- Staff talked to BDS enforcement about complaints, and there have been none in the area as of now.

There is a parking permit situation right now by the Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC). We need to reign this in to about 80 percent capacity. We are trying to increase mode split significantly. This is a district where people work in shifts, often late-night when transit isn't running. There are about 3-4000 parking spaces that are sitting unused at peak hours, so we want to be sure we are using the available parking to its greatest extent. This is an issue with the current code, which we'd change to make the spaces allowed to be used by employees and others using/purchasing in the district.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about the current zoning along Water Ave and the increased number of food and bar uses going in along Water Avenue.

- The existing zone allows 3,000 square feet of retail per site and the area is highly parcelized so there are a lot of "sites".

We also need to look at enhancing freight mobility. We're looking to enhance east-west streets and converting a few key streets to be one-way streets. We'll combine this with better signaling to make getting through easier for both freight and bikes.

Freight counts will be an issue we will hear about as well. We need to find a way to manage this. There are concerns about conflicts between freight and bike. We are trying to address this existing condition, which likely will escalate: how do we get bike commutes through without conflict with trucks? The inner SE neighborhoods have the highest (23 percent) bike mode-split in the city, many of whom go through the central eastside.

Other priorities include supporting the innovation quadrant; activating the mixed-use corridors;

enhancing the livability of the district; and creating a regional waterfront destination.

We've proposed additional mixed-use/residential at the Clinton Station area.

At the OMSI station, we've proposed EX without housing to promote employment transit-oriented development. The area is not housing-compatible and wouldn't be able to create enough sense of place to encourage housing in the area. The additional uses we're proposing are significant compared to the industrial area that surround OMSI today. When you look at the future of the land there, the big driver seems to be proximity to South Waterfront. Opening the area to a more flexible but still employment zoning will spark development and bring activity. When you look at who owns the land, of the parcels that OMSI owns, only one could be an attractive residential building. The northern boundary is Clay St.

Water St is zoned IG1 with the employment opportunity overlay.

Out of the entire plan area of about 600 acres, only 9 acres are being up-zoned to allow housing (EX). This could be developed to be 5000+ units.

TriMet talked about the zoning change at Clinton at a previous PSC meeting. They are on-board with the housing change at Clinton.

The approach to expanding the employment opportunity subarea (EOS; slide 26) allows us to meet employment projections. In those areas, you could do industrial office above manufacturing/industrial use on the ground floor in the IG1 zone. This is what the SAC put forward; but we likely will hear a number of people testify that they'd like EOS in other areas.

The reason the existing EOS is restricted was to experiment about industrial uses in the area but a concern about a tipping point. The new zoning supports the conservative approach but has more development capacity for job capacity than the expected demand for jobs in the area.

There is not a unanimous decision within the CEIC about expanding the EOS zoning. There may be a different zoning tool they might want to recommend.

Their main concerns about expansion are the limited parking in the district; impacts on freight; affordability of space; and that the proposal includes too much retail space.

*Chair Baugh* asked about pressure on small businesses in terms of costs/rent and availability of smaller spaces.

- Ideally an office is either in EX or EOS. Part of this is that the market is tightening up because of development and tenancy is being realized in the EX area. Expanding the EOS can bring in more potentially places for businesses to go to moderate price increases.
- Only can have 60,000 square feet office use per square foot. We are proposing to change this to be 3-to-1 FAR. EOS was in part adopted to preserve the historic buildings in the district.

Others think the proposal hasn't gone far enough and say EOS is not being applied district-wide, resulting in inequitable treatment and a missed opportunity for greater job creation.

The amount of change is focused in the station areas and MLK/Grand avenues. Even with a full build-out, we are talking about adding only 1700 jobs over 20 year, a fairly low amount of growth.

OMSI developed a district plan last year. The areas OMSI controls are about 21 acres. A number

of their neighbors don't support adding housing to the area.

We are proposing the full range of uses in the OMSI plan aside from the one housing proposal. The goal is to orient development toward the river and station areas to create a sense of space.

The public review draft of the SE Quadrant Plan will be released on April 28, with a PSC hearing on May 26. Then the project is tentatively slated to be at Council on July 1.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the proposed mixed-use zoning. Is housing currently allowed here?

- It is conditional use (zoned EG currently) and does include housing today. The proposal is to do EX without housing. Office and retail use would be allowed in much greater densities.

*Commissioner Shapiro* commented on the OMSI area. I think housing and employment are compatible and should be encouraged. I do understand the rationale.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the white parcel areas on the EX maps in the presentation.

- Open space zones, mostly how you get on and off the bridges, no changes proposed.
- Multifamily zoning in other areas, also no changes proposed.
- EX is not necessarily needed on, for example, Hawthorne since it's already developed.

Is there enough industrial capacity in the "islands" to justify not expanding the EOS there? That is the question. This was a big discussion with the SAC. The OMSI issue was largely resolved by the SAC.

*Chair Baugh* noted this is a TIF district. My concern is that the area has been a place with very small businesses. Now there are new opportunities for the building owners, so long term, the small businesses are going to have to find a new place to go. We need to preserve affordability for new businesses to come in and grow.

- This is expanding the ability to do those types of operations. We have support from those types of businesses: bigger pool of smaller, affordable spaces. Also the very small businesses are expanding and growing.
- *Commissioner Houck* reminded the PSC that we've been in a protracted conversation about the lack of industrial land and asked staff why we would want any housing that might displace industrial land.

*Commissioner Hanson*: Some of the SAC members have businesses that have started and grown there. They want to stay. They are able to attract employees. I would support a suggestion about programs to endorse to stabilize rents for incubator businesses. Part of the recommendation about not having housing at OMSI was to address the compatibility issue with freight. With the new line going to Milwaukie, the ETOD prospect is a good place to emphasize this option.

*Commissioner Baugh* asked about trains.

- We know Union Pacific is not going to go anywhere, but we did talk about a quiet zone. There is a policy to look at a quiet zone going through the area in the future.

Population increase is expected to bring 3500 units total, and we're getting to about 2500 through current proposals. Most are for rentals. There is potential to get up to 5000. We'd expect kids would go to school in Buckman or Hosford neighborhoods.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about the amount of residential population growth and where kids would go to school.

- Population increase is expected to bring 3500 units total, and we're getting to about 2500 through current proposals. Most are for rentals. The expectation is this will largely be workforce housing. There is potential to get up to 5000. We'd expect kids would go to school in Buckman or Hosford neighborhoods.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted that although she understood the argument about there not being sufficient housing capacity at OMSI to make it work, if there was sufficient "there" there, proximity to OMSI and the resulting STEM opportunities could make it attractive to families.

## **Comprehensive Plan Update**

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Joe Zehnder, Deborah Stein, Tom Armstrong, Mark Raggett, Marty Stockton, Peter Hurley (PBOT), Art Pearce (PBOT), Courtney Duke (PBOT)

Eric provided an overview of today's Work Session.

## **Transportation**

### [Green Loop Presentation](#)

The Green Loop is not currently included in the TSP. It will be surfaced in the Central City 2035 planning process and then would be an amendment to be added to the TSP.

Mark provided an overview of the Green Loop concept. It's about public space, health and making the Central City a more attractive place for more people more of the time.

There are pieces of the loop already established. Need to add safe and clear east-west connections that build on infrastructure that's already there. We want to add the feeling of Sunday Parkways.

Broad objectives of the proposal include:

- Improve health
- Connect and create parks
- Support businesses
- Extend pathways
- Encourage riding
- Grow and build green

Potential alignment includes the Park blocks, Broadway Bridge, Clackamas St cap, Lloyd on 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup>, I-84 crossing, 6<sup>th</sup> or 7<sup>th</sup> on Central Eastside, Clinton to the River alignment and Tilikum Crossing Bridge.

Funding will likely be through alternative/private funding as well as public funds.

We are thinking about design and character to bring all people comfortable in the Central City. Community engagement has begun, and an aggressive timeline could see construction beginning in 2019.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the Policymakers Ride, which this year will focus on the Green Loop, will occur this summer and the PSC and BPS staff will be invited to ride along.

*Commissioner Schultz* commented on bikes and pedestrians and The Walk in Boston. We should make the loop more interesting for visitors as well as those who live here and can use it as a transportation trail.

The PSC confirms the direction that the Green Loop will continue in conjunction with the

CC2035 Plan, not to amend the current proposed TSP list.

### [Transportation presentation](#)

#### *Streetcar*

Portland Streetcar Inc (PSI) sent the PSC a letter of recommendations, which staff recommends:

- Include Johns Landing project on the constrained list. This would extend to Willamette Park.
- Study other potential extensions. There are a number of other corridors where we'll need to enhance transit capacity.

*Commissioner Smith* said that Macadam will have to link to other corridors to create a full project. We'll need new funding mechanisms since we don't have TIF funding districts or value-capture to pull this off. What about affordable housing and TIF set-aside? An effort like how we designed the eastside streetcar will likely be necessary. We should identify the corridor study. Does it make sense to include Macadam on the constrained list without linking it? It will be part of the bigger discussion and not built by itself.

- This is part of the RTP. We want to look broadly at potential corridors at first, then delve into the study of specific corridors.
- Joe: It's important to think about equitable distribution of major transit investments. How the TSP is structured makes sense, but it doesn't explicitly tie projects and studies together. Major investments will have an impact, but funding is not always there to build out, for example, affordable housing (e.g. on Interstate). We're trying to pull these together in planning and into the project costs.
- *Commissioner Houck* also commented on Interstate and the Coalition for a Livable Future's intent for an equity component and review.
  - We don't know the results of this but can look into providing that.
- *Chair Baugh* noted the link between Macadam, equity and the enhanced transit. The streetcar may not be the right tool for development changes in East County, but we can't do these and invest in a silo.

We know the importance about the investments we've identified and working with TriMet to look at their corridors their planning to match investments there. The LOI would then look at how we provide transit service to accommodate growth and improve access to make it all work better.

There is concern that we not proceed with the next streetcar line until there is confirmed funding for East County transit improvements. We need to pair the Macadam line with certainty there will be options for the Eastside transit in that same time frame.

This is the intent of the partnership between BPS, PBOT and TriMet: to look comprehensively at the corridors that need significantly enhanced capacity.

#### *SW Portland projects*

There are very high project costs in many parts of Southwest. There are many gaps and deficiencies in the networks in the area as well as issues with soil and stormwater infrastructure. There are topographic constraints that also drive up costs and fewer centers and less projected growth in the area as well. We are proposing that one of the studies be Southwest in Motion to help identify how we can fill in the gaps.

Residents in Southwest have different views on density. Hillsdale supports the center. There is a questioning of center in Multnomah.

Slide 4: What we heard about projects in Southwest.



*Commissioner Smith:* I understand what we've heard is that solutions are so expensive that they will only happen in the distant future.

- Yes, there is a higher density of these types of issues in Southwest.

Segmenting is an option. We could segment and look at which segments would serve more people, reduce injuries, etc, this could make the improvements more likely to occur.

Re-scoping is another option. We have to look at contexts.

Citywide, we are proposing a new program called Alternative Street Design, which would fund interim safety improvements like safer shoulders. This would be done in partnership with BES.

We can also look at substitutions – where there might be new projects that are more appropriate connections to destinations than the project we had in the TSP.

Staff will send revised recommendations to the PSC by the end of the month and will meet with the Southwest community. There will be extensive, ongoing work, but the initial list will identify projects and changes in these four categories.

*Commissioner Houck* noted environmental constraints. Some people's advocacy for less expensive facilities have argued there should be less or no review of the environmental impacts. I'm assuming you're not doing that and are working with BES, PP&R and other experts.

- We are working very closely with our sister bureaus, much more than in the past.

#### *Other TSP items*

*Commissioner Smith* commented on the CRC. Arterial access to the island can't easily be taken apart from the access to Marine Dr. I would like placeholder project in the TSP instead of the full CRC in the TSP. Is this viable?

- We want to take a more extensive look at a number of options. We are interested in being able to evaluate components of the CRC. But because it is a state and regional project, we have to work with those partners. And the cost to “deconstruct” those projects will need their assistance to see how we can cost and scope the component projects. We're putting together a plan to do this is something we want to bring forward to the PSC.
- *Commissioner Schultz* is not necessarily supportive of breaking out the components of the CRC.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about West Hayden Island (WHI).

- PBOT is meeting with the Port tomorrow. Hayden Island broadly is one of the topics. The PSC will have to determine which projects best support the land use that is recommended to Council.
- The WHI discussion at the PSC is on April 28 during the hearing on the EOA. On May 12, we will follow up with the work session to close up economic policy discussion. It is in the PSC's hands to make sure the transportation meets the land use needs.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the meeting with the Port. Are you also meeting with other stakeholders?

- The Port, ODOT and TriMet are the agencies we're required to coordinate the list with, so that's why we're meeting with them.

#### **Residential Densities**

### Parkrose

This is a proposed up-designations we included in the consent list, but it was a request from *Commissioners Gray* to review today. Some properties have potential for residential density above what's allowed today to stabilize abilities of families to stay.

Staff recommends up-designating R2 to R1 to allow for more family-sized housing for the proposed area at 148<sup>th</sup> and Burnside. There is a MAX station with pedestrian crossings within a half mile. In that area, parcels are currently under-utilized, so there is good potential for development.

At Stark, staff does not recommend up-zoning. In this area, there is newly proposed mixed-use to address non-conforming situations. There are also already lots of apartments in this area.

At Glisan, it is outside of the half mile radius of the MAX station, and staff didn't think R1 is the right designation.

The addition of the 3.5 acres to R1 at the Burnside and 148<sup>th</sup> site is what staff proposes.

PSC members confirmed this recommendation.

### **Housing**

#### *Affordable housing targets*

The memo addresses question of affordable housing target: what should it be? What sort of housing are we talking about? How should we set this target?

The goal is that 15 percent of the city's housing stock be affordable in 2035. We are down to 7.5 percent currently. Is this goal reasonable and attainable?

What we have experienced is approximately 480 units/year over last decade. The production needed to meet the new goal is about 1000 units annually, so that's ambitious. From the population forecast, we expect 18 percent of households to be in the 80 percent MFI range.

Staff recommends that we use the Comp Plan to put us on a path to think about housing production like we do transit projects. Projects should be included with costs associated. We don't have a good understanding of housing supply. And there is uncertainty of a funding strategy for housing. There is a steep decline expected in TIF resources, which will be felt substantially for affordable housing.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* How do we hold people to this?

- This is a little illusive because we don't have federal and state mandates like the TSP does. Setting the policy in the Comp Plan is reasonable to set the expectations that this strategy will be done. We need a financial plan and motivation to do one built in the Comp Plan to get this going.
- With limited TIF dollars, we're seeing more needs and trade-offs. There is an opportunity to provide direction about funds.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted this isn't unique to housing.

*Commissioner Hanson:* Will this help us to motivate the private sector to increase volume of affordable housing they build? I think the private-public partnerships are key.

- This is tied to a housing goal and can create pressure at a regional level. Part of the demand for housing in the city is for households who can only pay this much. There is a market opportunity because this income cohort is growing.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the performance of the private sector.

- We don't have a sense of the housing market supply at this point. We need a better understanding of this. If it's not subsidized and it is affordable, it's likely smaller, older or has other issues. We don't know how to untangle this.

*Commissioner Rudd* said that FTA funding supports TOD that increases ridership. The draft Climate Action Plan says low-income populations utilize convenient transit more than wealthier populations. Assuming the environmental documentation shows a potential transit project impact on housing for low income people, you could potentially link providing affordable housing to the transit project.

- This is the focus of lots of discussion, for example on Powell-Division, Barbur and the SW Corridor. Getting ahead of the game through land banking to have a supply of affordable housing before land values go up is the thinking, but how to finance it hasn't come up to speed yet.

*Commissioner Houck* likes this approach. Lack of resources is not unique to affordable housing. Portland Parks Vision 2020 and The Intertwine's regional parks and natural areas vision are both aspirational. For example the bi-state regional trails plan will take 190 years to implement at the current rate of investment. That's a wake-up call for additional resources. We need the same with affordable housing. We need to be aspirational and recognize the financial constraints.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about other institutions and land banking funding options.

- Within the housing community, land banking is a big idea. PHB, PDC, CDCs and Home Forward are looking at this. The big hurdle is the initial capital, but the desire to get there is definitely there.

*Commissioner Houck*: I like the reference to Metro and inclusionary zoning. Have they been tracking this data?

- Not really.

*Chair Baugh* likes the idea of the financial plan and looking at new tools as part of the plan. Metro has a critical role in the regional strategy of affordable housing. If people can't afford Portland, it becomes another city's problem. There should be a regional financial strategy for affordable housing.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction.

#### *Single-dwelling development project*

In next year's BPS budget, we have proposed looking at development standards for single-dwelling development. This would include:

1. Height requirements and set-backs and making tweaks to better ensure infill development is at an acceptable scale for the existing context.
2. Rear yard requirements.
3. Skinny lot development.

This is mostly in R7 and R5 zones.

We need to accept infill development to meet our 2035 goals in a way that's predictable but prevents unacceptable manifestations of infill.

Right now we're also rewriting institutional and mixed-use zones. These projects come to the PSC this summer.

In the coming year, through a Metro grant, we're also proposing a review of development standards for multi-unit projects and improving the design of these.

Overall to help people understand what their neighborhood may look like in the future.

*Commissioner Houck* expressed concern about infill. We are often losing tree canopy with infill.

- We are designing the new standards around the Tree Code.

*Chair Baugh*: Does this address many of the concerns we've heard around the "McMansion" redevelopments?

- We believe, especially the skinny lot part of this, can help address parts of this. It will be in the base code, not a design standard. It's won't discretionary or design review.

#### *Anti-Displacement Coalition Recommendations*

PSC members received a letter from a coalition of organizations that suggested ways of combatting displacement. Staff has met with the City Attorney and coalition representatives. Comments are in the staff memo.

Staff agrees with:

- Add more clear mention of affordability in the Guiding Principles.
- Chapter 2 and effective public involvement, particularly for those who may be adversely affected.
- Chapter 3: Adding a notion to identify and mitigate impacts as a general development principle.
- Suggestions for the Chapter 5 additions to policies.
- Adding a target for affordable housing.
- Including an affordability mandate (e.g. inclusionary zoning).

In terms of impact analysis and community benefit agreements, there is a scale of projects where this makes sense, but for some projects it creates too large a hurdle and could stifle what could otherwise be a good project. We want a threshold so that the requirement doesn't hinder projects. Staff suggests these tools are appropriate for larger-scale planning (e.g. area plans and major transit investments). We want to be careful that these policies don't apply to everything.

There are some things that are good policy ideas that are not necessarily within the scope of what the Comp Plan can regulate. Tenant rights is an example of a very good idea, but this is a policy context outside of zoning.

The PSC could develop parallel recommendations that go back to the Portland Plan. We can collect these items that may not fall in the realm of the Comp Plan and land use but that we could forward to make sure Council sees them and adopts them somewhere.

*Commissioner Gray* understands that the Comp Plan isn't always the best location for some ideas, but the ideas shouldn't be lost. Groups have spent hours developing excellent ideas. Communication to and with the community is very important. If the Comp Plan isn't the right venue, we need to be sure to community where the concepts go. Referencing the Portland Plan works too.

Our intent is an ongoing dialogue with the coalition. We agreed to take on additional legal research to work jointly on to move forward. Many of the items in the memo are implementation tools. Between now and finishing the implementation tools, we can work through some of these legal questions to see where and how we implement the different aspects and tools.

Zoning tools staff is pursuing now:

- CC2035 bonus provisions to include a much stronger affordable housing bonus. This will come with a report to Council in May and will be part of the CC2035 code.
- Mixed-use zoning bonus provisions to make affordable housing a substantial bonus

outside of the central city. A draft will come with the mixed-use concept plan.

*Commissioner Rudd:* Does our code allow tiny houses? Houses that, for example, are not on a formal foundation.

- There are tiny houses that are legally occupied. The bigger issue is that they have to be on the ground versus ones on wheels. For permanent ones, legal issues are about construction and utilities.
- As part of the single-family project, we are looking at options for larger lots with smaller buildings on it and how that could work. We want to make this easier to allow more density without changing structures.
- Micro-apartments are another area where the code could be clearer.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about the bonus structure.

- This is a report that Council requested. We can get a copy to PSC members.

*Commissioner Houck* commented that the discussion of scale and how it's described in the memo makes sense to me.

#### *Homelessness*

The proposed policies relate to the tiny houses question. Policy 5.39 talks about housing types. We received comments to make this policy more explicit about safe, legal, sanitary and innovative with more options. The question is if we want to be more explicit about creative or innovative housing types that meet life safety building codes to provide more creative license.

Staff confirms 5.39 is broad enough with the statement "including but not limited to..." to give a framework without having to detail specifics within the policy itself.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about keeping life safety included but waiving other requirements.

- Comments were not specific about what could be waived. There is a pared down, simplified code for some smaller, transitional housing. What we require under the maintenance code versus new building code. Micro-housing has limitations about how small you can go, number of fixtures, kitchens, etc.

*Commissioner Rudd* commented about "limited but not limited to..." and making sure what we include as examples is broad enough to demonstrate the flexibility desired.

*Commissioner Oxman:* Being homeless is a safety issue in itself. We shouldn't be creating barriers to viable housing options.

PSC members confirmed the current policy is appropriate.

#### *Opportunity areas*

This is policy direction around housing location areas and strategy. We want to encourage a range of housing and affordability in areas that have high levels of completeness. This is different from the current Comp Plan that is more explicit about having mixed-income neighborhoods reflect the diversity of the entire region.

The new policy talks more about where we want to direct affordable housing (complete neighborhoods). In testimony, there was concern about mixed-income and losing the "balanced" language versus using the broader proposed language.

We do talk about income diversity in centers and corridors, but do we need to be more explicit in all neighborhoods across the city?

*Commissioner Houck* asked if we would potentially be concentrating low income people in

specific areas under this new policy.

- The current code says reflection of all in all parts of the city. But we want to have people who, for example, rely more heavily on transit, to be able to live close by it. We want to be more explicit and be able to get to our goals for access.

*Commissioner Schultz* fully supports the concept but is concerned that we could create segregation “for the right reasons”, but that neighborhoods could use this for the wrong reasons.

*Chair Baugh* is concerned about the unintended consequences of leaving the specifics out and the possibility of NIMBYism.

We want to create choice for those who are seeking affordable housing. Choices in close-in, accessible locations. But we don’t want to create barriers to choice outside of the central locations.

*Commissioner St Martin*: Perhaps we just remove the word “all” neighborhoods.

*Chair Baugh* commented on the dual investment strategy. Policy 5.26 somewhat gets to this, but we should be explicit and should be included in the new policy.

#### *Demolition*

We received lots of testimony about what we’re doing about residential demolitions. Staff summarized the Council sessions and code changes that are in the works.

We heard lots about demolition being a growth-related issue, but many demos in 2013 were just a one-to-one replacement or just a complete demolition. We also noted where there are new housing units created, there were few demos that resulted in the large majority of new units. Most new development is occurring in mixed-use zones. Some is growth-related (adding second houses, lot-splitting). The R5 is the most common zone in the city, so demos occur here lots, but percentage-wise, it is probably fairly close to the distribution of zoning.

Staff noted that we could improve the policy about discouraging demolition. Perhaps we move this into Chapter 4 (it’s in the sustainability section right now) to better tie this to preservation of existing affordable housing and maintenance of neighborhood character.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about Policy 4.13. This is what the neighbors are complaining about.

- This is at the core of the single-family development project.

*Commissioner St Martin* commented that when we can integrate sustainability into the area where the practice should be followed it is a good idea.

- *Commissioner Houck* concurs.

*Chair Baugh* is concerned that the policies don’t “sufficiently” address concerns about demolitions.

- There is a limit to what the City can do to respond to demolition concerns (e.g. the new delay requirement). This could also become part of the City’s state legislative agenda, like inclusionary zoning.

*Commissioner Hanson* confirmed the City’s improved notification process about demolitions is working better. I don’t know if we can expect to have an opportunity to actually change what happens with a demo though.

- Height and set-backs are what we can influence in the zoning code. We do not see a path to get to the City having control over demolitions at the “yes/no” phase.

*Commissioner Rudd* commented on McMansions. Large is not always a bad thing, e.g. it can be used for multigenerational housing that is sensitive to the area, which is a good idea.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked if you buy a house, tear it down, remove foundation, and then want to rebuild, do you pay SDCs or do you get credit?

- You'd get credit (within a certain time period).

*Commissioner Schultz* commented about houses from many periods, different sizes and how they're used over time. We need to recognize that this is ok. Variety in neighborhoods is good.

*Commissioner Houck* suggested that the language should acknowledge that the Comp Plan policies alone are not sufficient to address all concerns about demolitions.

This topic could be added to the list of additional recommendations to Council that is not part of the Comp Plan. This makes sense and is the direction staff will use.

#### *Commercial displacement approach*

This is follow-up from the centers and corridors work session. Like the housing displacement question, this discusses policies about commercial displacement. Policy 6.65 addresses involuntary commercial displacement. The specific tools are where the action is, but we do have this larger umbrella policy. There are other tools and policies that are also available that staff has been discussing.

Some of PDC's loans, URAs and other programs do relate to support businesses that may otherwise get relocated.

We are also exploring a zoning code bonus provision for affordable business space. This may create a monitoring issue, but we could get a third party into this role. The ground floor commercial right now is being over-built, so this sort of bonus could be used to provide more affordable commercial space.

Land trusts have addressed this issue in other cities. Some other cities and CDCs get directly involved with owning commercial spaces.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked if we think we understand the reason for low-income and minority displacement and whether it can be successfully intervened.

- We hear that it is a feeling that it is hard to be part of the conversation about who ends up being tenants in new mixed-use buildings. What can zoning do to be a part of this transaction?

Also, the feeling I have in looking at previous recommendations sounded like pilot projects. This doesn't see aggressive enough for me.

- We are highlighting the direction in the proposed plan. In the draft recommended plan, we can include this assertiveness by using stronger verbs.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked if this relates to the food cart industry and the sites (e.g. parking lots) being developed.

- Policy 6.66 talks about temporary spaces and using the transitional spaces to provide these opportunities.

*Chair Baugh* confirmed this strategy as part of an economic development strategy. This helps immigrant and low-income people to become part of the community and get more people have a voice in the potential next use of places.

Susan reminded the commissioners to look at the verbs again. Some people have pushed for very strong words around different areas of the plan. Make sure we use stronger verbs where



items are more important to you.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked if there was discussion around neighborhoods and populations transition, and people who have different needs than people who were there before. Was there discussion about assistance to business owners to modify their businesses to stay in the neighborhood and be able to stay in the same location?

- We don't have specifics about what the toolbox is, but it is a good idea.

Direction to staff: we will re-look at the verb choices.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the inclusionary zoning bill passed at the house this afternoon.

- It is focused on for sale, but not rental projects.

## Residential Densities

### [Up-Zoning Presentation](#)

Marty talked through what staff looked at in considering appropriate residential density in different areas (slide 2).

This is specific to non-conforming residential density and non-conforming residential designations; what is there today.

In the 1980s, the R5 zone was applied broadly in Buckman and Sunnyside to counter the many apartment buildings that were built in the 1960s and 1970s.

Inner SE is the largest part of the city where we haven't revisited zoning or updating to reflect current conditions since the 1980 Comp Plan.

### *Buckman*

This area (slide 6) received very balanced comments about the proposed changes. Staff proposes going from R5 to R2.5, which is also a single-dwelling zone. We could easily have proposed R2 (multi-family). This proposal is a conservative approach. The initial proposal was for two half-blocks. The new proposal adds additional blocks and properties based on testimony in support. R2.5 still fosters home-ownership. Regardless of if this stays R5, demolitions can occur.

80 percent of non-conforming uses here would become conforming. Another 20 percent multi-family buildings would become closer to conformance. There are 60 lots, with 27 under the minimum size for R5. 13 blocks have duplexes, which is allowed in R2.5 but not R5.

Corner lots (about half of the proposed) are under the R5 have the density provision to become duplexes and be divided.

The blue area is proposed to go to R1, multi-dwelling. It has a 10-plex that is owned by Home Forward, which is currently non-conforming. The middle lot is a duplex, and the corner lot is a 4-plex. All the lots are R1 properties but currently zoned R5.

Buckman didn't make a formal vote or statement about this proposal.

R2.5 still fosters home-ownership. Regardless of if this stays R5, demolitions can occur.

Slide 7 shows other proposed areas to convert that were requested through testimony. These are currently non-conforming uses that would be brought into conformance with the proposed changes.

Slide 8 focuses on an area that has existing R2.5 and R5 zoning, which we had proposed to go to R2 with some tweaks. Testimony and analysis has helped us revise the proposal. The dark blue to go to R1 multi-dwelling and the lighter blue to R2.

#### *Richmond*

Slide 9 Proposal to go to R2.5 as a gentle approach. It's an area with a high concentration of duplexes.

Slide 10 is a split-zone site: R1 with an R2.5 Comp Plan and R5 zone. This is a perfect R1 proposal.

#### *Sunnyside*

Slide 11 highlights testimony asked for an up-designation to reflect the existing development. It was proposing an RH zone. But we don't want to promote speculation and encourage displacement or redevelopment.

Staff proposes to go to R1 along Belmont in this area to match the zoning across the street. The existing density exceeds the R2 but is well under R1 density that's allowed because the site is so large. Staff suggests R2 with amenity bonuses for the rest of the area highlighted in light blue.

Slide 12 shows another proposal through testimony, located on Cesar Chavez, a civic corridor. The June Manor and other garden apartments are included. Staff proposed going to R2.5.

*Commissioner Hanson:* This is a good sensitive approach to match the diverse housing stock.

*Commissioner Houck* confirmed. *Commissioner Shapiro* also supports the proposals and commended the outreach to the community.

*Commissioner Rudd* is supportive but asked about the "surprise" 66 units.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the consideration in the proposals. But when we're down- and up-zoning in different areas, I'm curious if we are making patterns of favoring or hurting various socio-economic groups.

- We have been taking this into account: where is this situation occurring elsewhere, what and who the common actors are. These are questions we have been asking in the proposed changes.

*Commissioner St Martin* complimented the work and the dedication to not using a one-size-fits-all approach.

PSC members confirmed the direction and staff's proposed changes.

#### **Next steps**

Eric noted there is the EOA hearing on April 28, which will help to inform wrapping up some of the economic discussions.

The recently-released consent list was focused on mapping questions. The next consent list is largely about policies, which we'll be getting to the PSC in the next few weeks. There will also be a smaller mapping consent list with about 25 additional proposed changes.

Staff is keeping a running list of items individual commissioners wanted additional information about. This will be included in the last work session and/or in a memo for the PSC to review.

May 12 will include discussion of many topics like today. We will also include the consent list in

that conversation. May 26 is currently scheduled for the Scenario Report hearing and metrics and measures we set forth in the Portland Plan.

Around May 13, we will publish a strike-through-and-underline version of the policy sections that respond to PSC input. Then additional amendments for the PSC to get them on the table. The final vote, provided we get through all the components, will depend on how many additional work sessions we need to get through PSC members' amendments and/or consent list items that may be pulled.

If commissioners have concerns or want to discuss items on the consent list, we will ask you to let staff know what items they'd like to pull for discussion the Friday prior to the May 12 session.

If you have questions but may just need more information, staff can set up another pre-work session for commissioners.

*Commissioner Smith* doesn't have capacity to evaluate all the items on the consent list. The public can comment on these proposals at Council.

The CIC will join the PSC with a process update around the time of the vote and recommendation.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 5:30 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, March 24, 2015

3:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray, Michelle Rudd

**Staff Presenting:** Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Michelle Kunec-North, Roberta Jortner, Leslie Lum, Brett Horner (PP&R), Sarah Huggins (PP&R), Peter Hurley (PBOT), Courtney Duke (PBOT), Dave Unsworth (TriMet)

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 3:05 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda. *Commissioner Houck* is joining the meeting via Skype today.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Hanson* noted the SE Quadrant Plan process is continuing. He is serving as co-chair for the advisory committee, and last meeting is next Thursday to discuss the draft report.

### Director's Report

Eric Engstrom

- This room will be remodeled over the summer, probably starting in July. This means that we will be scheduling Commission meetings in other locations, potentially some in the Portland Building and other locations in around the city.
- The next draft of the Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) has been published, and notices have been mailed for the April 28 PSC hearing. The EOA report was adopted by Council in 2012 but updated based on changing circumstances related to West Hayden Island (WHI). Council will consider this new draft along with the rest of the PSC's Comp Plan recommendation.
- Reminder that PSC members need to disclose external meetings. On May 12 we will ask you to briefly itemize and describe any meetings you may have had outside of the Commission meeting with stakeholders. This is important for transparency.
- Congratulations to *Commissioner Rudd*, who has been named as one of the nation's most influential black lawyers by *Savoy Magazine*.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from 3/10/15 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Smith* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

## Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein,

### Documents:

- [Residential Densities Staff Report](#)
- [Housing Staff Report](#)
- [Centers and Corridors Staff Report](#)
- [Nonconforming Residential Densities and Uses Memo](#)
- [Nonconforming Uses Staff Report](#)
- [Nonconforming Commercial Uses Follow-Up Memo and Diagram](#)
- [Open Space Designations Memo](#)
- [ONI Responses to Community Involvement questions](#)
- [Testimony Memo 1 \(testimony received February 24 - March 9\)](#)
- [Final Testimony Memo \(testimony received March 9-13\)](#)
- [Proposed language for Policy 9.6: Transportation Hierarchy](#)
- [Transit-supported TSP investments in East Portland map](#)
- [TriMet testimony letter from November 2014](#)

Eric introduced today's session and reiterated the timeline. We expect the PSC to make its final recommendation on May 26. Today's conversations continue to be directional for staff.

Testimony is now closed. We collected approximately 4100 comments from the public that came from over 1000 individuals. PSC members have received links to all the testimony we've received, and staff is compiling a complete index of testimony received.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked how the testimony will be shared.

- It will be distributed as a PDF with indexes. We have about 7 volumes/binders that include one copy of each comment, which commissioners can borrow to review.

### PP&R

Brett Horner (PP&R), Sarah Huggins (PP&R)

PP&R has had a good relationship in working with BPS throughout the Comp Plan process. In November, PP&R submitted a memo with their comments on the Comp Plan. They commend the treatment of parks, open spaces and trails in the draft.

The main requests for modifications to the draft had to do with heightening the urban forest. PP&R supports the stronger language about the environment as proposed by BES. Staff has discussed recommendations with BPS already and support these recommendations.

There have been good robust discussions about trails as being managed by either PP&R or PBOT. We strongly support that it should be both. Trails are used for both recreation and transportation, so both bureaus have an important role in maintaining them, and we work closely to do so.

We appreciate BPS staff's developing additional language about trails and support this additional wording. PP&R supports the city greenways concept and the Green Loop concept in the Central City 2035 Plan as well.

PP&R also supports a proposed transportation improvement over Columbia Blvd from Cully to the Colwood Golf Course.

Regarding park and open space system development, there are proposed incentives to build close to open space, and PP&R wouldn't object to this proposal. New residents will have easy

access to these resources. We also support reuse of public right-of-way for the public good (e.g. community gardens, added tree canopy) especially, where we struggle to provide park and open space options.

Thank you for the work that has been done in developing the current language.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about new home construction near developed parks. Is this a sliding scale for SDCs for building near those areas?

- We don't want to adjust the SDC methodology.

*Chair Baugh* also asked about the incentive for housing near existing parks versus park-deficient areas. Does this put a strain on getting parks into parks-deficient areas?

- This is about encouraging density near parks like we do with housing near transportation. We don't have anything specific as of yet.

*Commissioner Houck* is pleased to hear that Parks disagrees with the notion of taking trails and putting them entirely with PBOT. Parks has excellent ecologists on staff to evaluate if trails are being put into appropriate locations. On March 10, Dawn Uchiyama (BES) referenced the agreement that BES has with PBOT regarding green streets and green infrastructure. I'm curious if there is a plan for a similar agreement between BES and Parks regarding integration of their work.

- We do have an MOU between the bureaus with protocols. We haven't done as much collaboration on right-of-way areas, but we want to get to this with both PBOT and BES. We are also updating the MOU, so that will be changing in the near future to reflect the rate payer realities.

There is a huge concern that the lawsuit and initiative that was trounced has had a chilling effect on these bureaus collaborating. We need more integration of green infrastructure efforts, so I'm hopeful the revised MOUs don't pull back on the great work you all have been doing.

## **Transportation**

Peter Hurley, Courtney Duke

### [Presentation](#)

Courtney discussed the transportation hierarchy policy and the right-of-way street vacations information.

#### *Transportation Hierarchy*

The 2009 CAP introduced the hierarchy concept, which was emphasized in the Portland Plan as well.

In the Working Draft Comp Plan 2013, there were comments and concerns related to freight and separating the movement of goods and people.

The Proposed Comp Plan Draft was released with changes to the policy reflecting comments and concerns, separating the movement of goods and people. The new version still had internal and external concerns about the policy and implementation.

Implementation of the policy still a conversation. There will be additional work during Task 5 in 2015 and in 2016 to assist implementation of the policy including classification review, classification modifications (street design), and modification of project design guidance and process.

Courtney shared the [amended language for Policy 9.6](#).

*Commissioner Smith* is generally supportive of not trying to slot freight movement into the hierarchy, but he's also skeptical about removing it completely. We want to facilitate both kinds of movement, but I would prioritize a freight truck over single-occupancy vehicles. And we don't want to remove active transportation (e.g. bike lanes) from freight districts. Our concern about moving freight can't be an excuse to ignore the active modes. I have a hard time with the addition of zero emission vehicles in the hierarchy; they take up the same amount of space even if they are using cleaner fuels.

- There is a policy about new technologies that references things like driverless cars.

*Commissioner Schultz* also commented on zero emissions vehicles. What about an option like in Los Angeles where these get to use carpool lanes?

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the statement regarding all users' needs being balanced.

- The intent is to first look at a safe effective corridor in the same right-of-way for multiple modes. This addresses the concern that we might just move bicycles to an adjacent corridor before trying to make a street work for multiple modes. This will be corridor-specific work. The implementation phase is equally important as the overarching policy.

*Commissioner Oxman*: I support the hierarchical approach but wonder about keeping multiple modes together as a priority in and of itself. We may do better by separating some of the modes. I'm not sure about locking this in. What is the underlying purpose of combining the modes?

- We attempted to create a policy that clearly indicates that safety is a primary concern. There are many people who won't use the facility unless it feels very safe. As part of the policy, we want to find a design that does feel safe for all users. The parallel street option gets to this.
- Some of this comes from the civic corridor construct in the urban design plan to meet land use goals related to corridors. It's about destinations and access to them by all modes.

*Commissioner Smith* noted it is about the destinations. Regarding parking, we have an example at 28<sup>th</sup> Ave between Sandy and Stark. It was designated as a bike corridor but we couldn't get to removing parking on one side of the street to create a bike lane due to political and neighborhood opposition. Most curbside parking is for private vehicles, which is at the bottom of the hierarchy, but in reality, we have this as a big hurdle to change. The implementation tools need to support this. Also, the BTA testimony in response to Vision Zero was about under-carriage bars to provide more safety for bikes. We should have policy language included to explore this option.

*Commissioner Houck* supported *Commissioners Smith's* comments about connectivity and active transportation facilities in industrial areas.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the statement about "needs and safety". My concern is that transit options from an equity standpoint could impact where buses are aligned.

- Transit is third in the hierarchy. Successful corridors with sufficient access to transit is important (e.g. getting to Powell-Division and SW Barbur). PBOT is looking at how we provide appropriate improvements in corridors that is consistent with making people feel safe and having access to transit.

TriMet may make an investment that then limits other options they may have. Couldn't we add "vulnerable users at any level" should not create worse conditions?

*Commissioner Tallmadge* prefers "under-served" rather than "vulnerable". This is a different use of the word than "disadvantaged".



### *Right-of-Way Street Vacations*

PBOT has put more codified language into Policy 8.43, but for the City Attorney is too much detail. We have now provided a broader statement rather than an action. This recommendation is intended to make sure the Comp Plan provides guiding policy (rather than actions or approval criteria). Street vacations are currently evaluated directly against Comp Plan policies and do not have a clear set of approval criteria in the Zoning Code.

Proposed updated language is on slides 8 and 9 of the presentation.

*Chair Baugh* asked why we don't have the criteria here.

- The City Attorney noted the criteria used for project selection is not adopted in the Comp Plan.
- The other issue in the original proposed language is that it starts to lay out criteria-like statements, but it's not a comprehensive list.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about "appropriateness of other public uses".

- Examples of this are a park, parklet, community gardens, utilities and stormwater facilities.

Peter responded to PSC members' questions about the projects and TSP list. This will be incorporated into a revised recommendations report that will be prepared by the end of April.

*Chair Baugh* had asked that staff show the timeframe of transit-supportive investments along three potential higher-growth corridors in East Portland.

On the [map](#), the cross-hatched light blue is the East Portland Access to Jobs and Transit project, a series of smaller improvements covering much of East Portland.

The dark green lines and dots are projects we're recommending be funded in the first ten years of the plan. They start to provide a network of safe, multimodal access to potential transit service improvements.

The light green lines and dots are projects we're recommending be funded in the second ten years of the plan. These additional investments provide are more complete network of transit access and mobility.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the Safe Routes to Schools symbols. Are these safety improvements?

- Yes. There is an extensive list that would be funded but not all are shown on this map.

PSC members had also asked whether staff is recommending any projects where there is an unconstrained segment separating two constrained segments, meaning we'd build two ends without the middle. Macadam was an example. The answer is no; we're not aware of any projects with constrained segments separated by an unconstrained segment.

There are some projects, such as regional trails, with both constrained and unconstrained sections, usually with the unconstrained segment on one end.

*Commissioner Smith* had requested a map view of which segments of regional trail projects are recommended for the constrained list, and which for the unconstrained list.

There is only one segment recommended for the unconstrained list, the outermost segment of the North Portland Greenway project.

As for the spaces between the trail segments, some are already built, but some are particularly challenging and will require additional planning to determine route alignments. Staff can add the segments that are on existing facilities to the map.

*Commissioner Smith* also asked if we have a recommendation for dealing with unimproved streets, such as the project mentioned by David Sweet of the Cully neighborhood at the February 24 TSP hearing.

Bureau staff met last week to discuss both unimproved streets and improved streets without safety shoulders. We are recommending we add a 10<sup>th</sup> citywide program called Alternative Street Design. This would be consistent with the Our Streets local funding recommendation to include approximately \$11 million over the next 20 years to provide a partial match for Local Improvement Districts (LIDs).

*Commissioner Smith* clarified that we did the policy work (Street-by-Street) and we came up with alternative design standards. But no one has used this yet. The City may have to build a few of these to show they are successful to the public.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about unimproved street density. Is this residential plus those employed in the local businesses?

- The map on slide 15 shows literally the density of unimproved streets; it's locations where there are more significant concentrations of these streets.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked who would be motivated to do these streets. If someone was doing infill development, could you levy this?

- The alternative street approach hasn't been attempted much yet. We believe that property owners have incentives to do this, and we need a combination of development (improvements are made or property owners are committed to an LID) with enough property owners who see the value and participate in the LID. Flexible standards that are affordable are also very important.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about coupling this with the economic make-up of the area and if there could be displacement associated.

- We are looking at similar base criteria for both the projects and programs lists. Whether a major project or citywide program, we use the same lenses (the 7 outcomes) as a framework for evaluation.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that the bigger policy question is that today the official City policy is that improvements are the responsibility of the abutting property owner. Are we shifting to the idea that the City has responsibility too?

*Chair Baugh* is supportive of an alternative streets policy. The bureau we're leaving out of this discussion is BES, which has funding to help defray some of the costs. We should see what BES can do to help as well.

In our revised recommendations, to be consistent with the West Hayden Island comprehensive plan land use recommendation, we will propose removing project 30019, West Hayden Island Rail Access and project 30062, West Hayden Island Rail Yard Expansion.

We are proposing to re-scope 116320, N Hayden Island Dr Reconstruction, to build a multi-use path and crossing improvements, but not rebuild street to accommodate heavy trucks.

Per *Commissioner Smith's* request, staff met to discuss how we might pull out City priority investments and individual projects from the larger CRC project to advance in the TSP. An example is extending light rail to Hayden Island via a local access bridge, both of which would

support Hayden Island development. Unfortunately, PBOT feels a local bridge and the Marine Drive interchange reconfiguration from the CRC are so intertwined that it would take extensive work to develop a separate project.

As a result, PBOT is proposing to attempt to resolve the CRC question using the 2018 RTP development process. In the interim, we would simply acknowledge the CRC projects on the Other Agency lists, not endorse or oppose them, with language proposing that individual smaller projects, be developed.

*Commissioner Smith* noted Metro is the only body holding onto the CRC. Could we push them to remove this instead of having to follow their lead? I want to finalize that the CRC is dead. I also want to help out Hayden Island and do the right thing.

- Recommending individual projects: we can recommend as a part of the next RTP along with a study that could help identify which components could be pulled out from the overall CRC project.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked if you leave the bridge in, does that impede measures that could help Hayden Island?

- You're moving away from this by redefining a package of improvements but not the full CRC.

PBOT and BPS staff need to make sure the transportation investments support the land use plan. We would propose narrative, in the studies section for example, that show the intent that the projects should not be tied to a potential future bridge. We want to pursue funding for infrastructure investments that are good for the island.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted that with major impediments getting to the island, perhaps the land use is incorrect.

- We will discuss this further later today. Land use and transportation have to relate and be consistent in the plan language.

We will defer the *Street Car* and *Green Loop* conversations to a future work session.

## TriMet property

### [Site Analysis Presentation](#)

Eric shared TriMet's testimony that was submitted on November 24, 2014 regarding station area zoning on SE 17<sup>th</sup> Ave. BPS made a recommendation that is at odds with TriMet's suggestions. The question is about sites in proximity to MAX stations on the new Orange Line. The question is about zoning to allow mixed-use or residential (TriMet's recommendation) versus employment use (BPS). Staff is currently working on criteria to determine which zones you would apply on which types of sites.

Dave Unsworth (TriMet) noted SE 17<sup>th</sup> Ave is now a very different street with the inclusion of the new MAX line. At the old Advantis site, we don't need parking. Housing and daycare is important. We also have parking lots that will not change. Slides 7-9 highlight the suggested zoning and options that we'd like the City to consider to activate the stations and get them back to a good use as quickly as possible.

*Commissioner Hanson* thinks a buffer to the Brooklyn neighborhood is necessary. The flexible mixed use possibilities could help get to this objective at a 2-story building footprint.

*Commissioner Shapiro* commented that housing is important as well.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about if there have been discussions about affordable housing locating in these areas.

- Other remnant sites may be a better option for affordable housing. We aren't looking at affordable units here.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about employment zoning. If we're trying to preserve industrial sanctuaries, we need firm boundaries, and the new MAX line seems like a good boundary. Also, what about the air quality issue?

- Union Pacific and TriMet will not be moving any time soon. Holgate and 17<sup>th</sup> are both truck routes.
- BPS is hesitant to put housing abutting industrial sanctuary zones. Holgate is a main truck route. This is designated as an employment zone in the current plan, which allows housing, but in the implementation planning it will no longer allow housing in an employment zone.

*Chair Baugh* commented on the noise factor and the rail yard. We have no control after the housing has been built. We have tried not to put people in proximity to rail areas, so I'm concerned about building housing here. This is a transit area, but we also should have affordable housing near transit stations as the policy states.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked if this is different from the development on Front Ave.

- It's not different, but those apartments and housing are already built.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked for more background information about conversations that have taken place about housing in these areas. And if there are already financial models we can review.

- TriMet certainly has done and supported affordable housing, for example on N Interstate. 17<sup>th</sup> Ave is a tough site, so it's more difficult to leverage development that suits the urban design. We can return with details for the PSC about where on the alignment we could look for other affordable housing options.

*Commissioner Schultz* supports this staying zoned mixed use. We can encourage affordable housing, but it's not part of the Comp Plan.

- *Chair Baugh* wants to provide direction for providing affordable housing.
- *Commissioner Oxman* is generally supportive. But what about zoning implications relative to noise and air pollution across the board? The second issue is a requirement for low-income housing in mixed-use zones more generally.
- *Commissioner Hanson* noted you can mitigate for the noise.
- This is part of the mixed-use discussion: if affordable housing is built in and required or is a bonus.

Dave shared the Growing Places brochure that TriMet has just produced about the Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail Transit Project.

## **Nonconforming Uses**

Deborah Stein

### [Presentation](#)

Deborah shared a decision framework to help PSC members make consistent recommendations about requested map changes to address nonconforming uses. This is based on methodology presented in the January 27 staff report, and further informed by discussion at the January 27 work session.

As attractive as it would be to have a tool that spits out a clear, unambiguous recommendation

for every case, this isn't possible because there are often case-specific locational and other factors that may need to be considered. Nevertheless, we've identified a few "clear paths to 'yes'" that we propose to apply to map change requests to address nonconforming commercial uses.

Where an answer is not a clear "yes," we've identified a set of factors that we propose you consider when evaluating the less straightforward situations. Any may override other factors; the more that apply, the greater weight they have in determining whether a "no" can be shifted to a "yes."

Slide 2 shows the clear path in Inner Ring and Inner Neighborhoods.

Slide 3 shows the slightly different path that would be used for Eastern and Western neighborhoods.

Factors in the gold box on slide 5 may shift a "no" to a "yes" or vice versa; the factor in the red box may shift a "yes" to a "no." Preservation isn't something that zoning can guarantee. A "no" decision doesn't mean the use cannot continue, if there is legal nonconforming status. If we're stuck on a decision, a "no" is fine, and there will be additional opportunities to revisit if we are able to establish a regular process to consider nonconforming and split zone situations through a legislative process.

Deborah walked through examples, highlighting the framework that the PSC had reviewed at the January 27 meeting.

- SE Stark and 14<sup>th</sup> on the NE corner: staff still recommends yes based on this criteria.
- SE Stark and 14<sup>th</sup> in the middle of the lot: staff revised their recommendation to a no. We are addressing some of Buckman's concern of having monolithic development across a full block.
- SE Harold in Lents: this is in the middle of a block, on a city bikeway, not on a corridor and not on a corner. It fills a gap in services provided to the neighborhood. The neighborhood supports it. We could go either way on this one, but it might suggest a yes. The zoning here is R5, so the potential contrast could be quite different from the current profile.
- NE 53<sup>rd</sup> and Halsey: This is situated on a bus line (#77 Halsey, not frequent service) and on a recently improved bikeway (on 53<sup>rd</sup>). Neighbors oppose applying a mixed use designation here. They believe current situation (legal NCU status) is appropriate for the restaurant to continue without having it be redeveloped as mixed use.
- SE 162<sup>nd</sup> and SE Foster Rd sites: we said no to the property owner's request because site constraints (location in a flood plain) would be exacerbated by redevelopment (mixed use). It's a pretty rural portion of Foster.

New examples shared today:

- SE Belmont location: staff recommends no new mixed use because while this is on a corridor and across from another mixed use site, it is not on a corner and could completely change the block.
- SE 52<sup>nd</sup> and Bybee in Brentwood Darlington: staff recommends no based on neighborhood opposition and the fact that the market may not be ready, especially considering that it's across the street from properties that have commercial zoning but still developed with houses.

Deborah also noted that a "no" decision does not make a use go away; saying no when you're stuck is completely fine. There will be additional opportunities to revisit these nonconforming uses and split-use zoning. There is nothing we'd decide through zoning that would preserve a one-story building; there is an opportunity to redevelop at a higher scale.

*Commissioner Smith:* in a nonconforming situation is it more difficult to get financing?

- It is harder to get funding at least to maintain the existing building.

If this process seems to work for the PSC, staff will go back and reapply the criteria with the new tool to reaffirm or change their original recommendations. There are a number of cases that we reviewed that we did have to go to extra factors to consider.

*Commissioner Schultz* thinks this is helpful. I would like to add to the additional factors a scale comment, which is as important as neighborhood support. I want to be sure the neighborhood fully understands what they're supporting. If it's R5 and in a gray area, we should leave the nonconforming and not change to mixed-use.

- This makes it a more objective evaluation. "Neighborhood support" is not always a helpful criterion, simply because neighbors may not be aware of the requested change. So, it's informative but shouldn't be a deciding factor in the way that more objective locational factors can be. *Commissioner Hanson* confirms.

*Commissioner Smith* met with Buckman neighbors, and they disagree with staff judgment at most of the steps staff has provided. The staff work does clarify things, but the question for me is when we can apply this process versus when this should come through a hearing. As we get to some of the fine cases, they deserve individual attention instead of being done in bulk.

- If we had the legislative process, there would be a hearing. This bulk process helps with the costs to the applicant.

*Commissioner St Martin* likes the decision matrix. People need to know about the neighborhood support factor so they can get this support if they need/want it. People need the same level of awareness.

- We don't want to weigh this too heavily. The on-going program that staff is suggesting would help this process.

*Commissioner Houck* likes the approach since it standardizes the thought process.

*Chair Baugh* confirmed the staff approach and methodology.

Staff will put the recommendations into a chart to share with the PSC to show the applicability to each case.

*Commissioner Oxman:* Can we include short-term options on this chart so it's clear what the options are when we say no?

- Yes.

## **Residential Densities**

Deborah Stein, Roberta Jortner

### [Presentation](#)

There are three topics of down-designations in today's discussion.

#### *Natural hazards, drainage concerns and infrastructure constraints*

The intent of down-designating in these areas is to avoid exacerbating existing problems, and reduce future risks, costs, and impacts to public health and safety, infrastructure and property.

There are areas in the SW Hills, Linnton and SE near Powell Butte that could experience significant additional development under the current Comprehensive Plan and zoning, and that are also prone to landslides, wildfire, earthquake damage and/or flooding. These areas have

steep slopes, poorly draining soils, and limited stormwater systems, or are in the floodplain. These areas also have poor street connectivity and few if any sidewalks. They are generally not near existing or planned urban centers and are adjacent on one or more sides to lower density areas, and city/county boundary, and/or publicly owned open space.

BPS has consulted with a number of City bureaus to develop and refine this proposal. In addition to limited stormwater systems, most of these areas have water supply and sanitary sewer limitations, and improving infrastructure is relatively costly especially in steep terrain with open channel streams. In addition, the emergency response times to many of these areas is relatively long, and additional growth and associated congestion in steep areas with narrow windy roads makes emergency response and evaluation more difficult. Staff also visited these areas to assess the landscape first hand, and to confirm that the proposal would be sensitive to neighborhood character and compatible with surrounding uses.

The proposal supports the overarching policies in the draft Comprehensive Plan, including investment to support growth in centers and corridors, to reduce infrastructure service disparities affecting under-served and under-represented communities, and to improve community resilience. The proposal also is consistent with state law that sanctions local ordinances to protect public health and safety, including reducing risks associated with natural hazards. The proposal will help reduce future risks, but additional investments, regulatory improvements, community partnerships will be needed to fully implement these policies.

The PSC received testimony from about 30 people who live in or near the proposed down-designation areas. More than 95 percent of affected property owners who received public notice of the change did not submit testimony.

Of the 30 individuals, about half support and half oppose the proposal. Opposers are concerned about reduced development potential and property value, or impacts on City housing policies and the UGB. Some said they don't plan to develop but feel that changing the existing density is not fair. Some don't dispute the proposal, but asked to be excluded based on property-specific circumstances.

Individuals supporting the proposal are concerned about the impacts of existing **and** future development on neighborhood character, stormwater runoff, loss of trees, landslides, and stream erosion. BES, PBEM, PF&R and the Urban Forestry Commission submitted letters in support for the proposal, as have Powellhurst-Gilbert and Linnton neighborhood associations, and the Audubon Society of Portland. Several individuals and organizations said they felt the proposal did not go far enough to address development impacts and recommended expanding the down-designations or applying additional regulations.

Suggestions from BDS and PBOT have helped shape the proposal, and the revisions staff is recommending today. We're still working with PBOT and may recommend a few more tweaks to address LID issues before the PSC takes action in May.

The staff recommended changes include:

1. Boundary refinements to omit existing non-dividable lots, which are not affected by the proposal.
2. Several changes based on testimony and on additional staff analysis: For example, staff recommends omitting several lots along SE 152<sup>nd</sup> Ave that are part of a completed LID, and where the City assessed fees based on the number of lots allowed under existing zoning. Another example is a property staff propose to exclude because it is almost completely developed with a manufacturing business, and where potential residential redevelopment of the site even at the current density would improve stormwater conditions and tree canopy.
3. Staff is also recommending two additional changes in response to testimony submitted



after the staff report was published. One change would omit six properties at the southernmost tip of the down-designation area near Council Crest. These lots are within a half-mile from the Hillsdale town center and benefit from recent water system and road repaving improvement. Three of the lots are currently not dividable and the others are slightly less steep than the very steep properties just to the north of these properties. The second change would add two properties to proposed down-designation area just south of Powell Butte. These lots are similar to the rest of that area, which is in the Johnson Creek 100-year floodplain, and which flooded in 1996.

*Commissioner Hanson* confirmed that the intent of the proposal is to make targeted changes to unique clusters of dividable lots that have constraints that are more ubiquitous than the areas.

- Other tools would be needed address these issues, such as limits on impervious area.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked how many lots would be affected by the proposal and whether the proposal to down-designate from R10 to R20 would make the lots undividable.

- There are about 935 lots in the proposal. On the west side the proposal is primarily to change the land use designations from R10 to R20. On the east side the proposal addresses a mix of R5, R7 and R10 lots, and would take them to R20 for the most part. Some of the lots affected by the proposal are already not dividable but most are dividable. Under the proposal many lots would become undividable and many would remain dividable, but could not develop as much as they can currently.

*Commissioner Oxman* also asked whether long emergency response times were a primary basis for this proposal.

- The proposal for each area was based on multiple factors. Emergency response is important but is not the only factor.

*Commissioner Houck* was surprised there aren't more properties included in the proposal. He strongly supports downzoning these properties which is a reflection of the on-the-ground realities of the areas and environmental issues.

PSC members are in agreement with the staff proposal.

#### *Residential area fronting on a truck route*

This is a specific site in St Johns on the northwest edge of Lombard St. Freight use takes a shortcut from N Columbia through the St Johns neighborhood of N Fessenden/St Louis area to avoid having to drive all the way around the "horn" to Lombard. Fessenden/St Louis was never classified as a truck route. St Johns and Cathedral Park neighborhoods are surrounded by industrial uses. Neighborhood activists organized to get freight off this "illegal" cut through.

The original staff proposal was to down-designate to R5 to minimize potential health hazards and correct some commercial non-conforming use situations. Public testimony in included people who objected to down designation because of existing multifamily complexes and two bus lines that travel down this stretch of Lombard.

Staff now suggests changing the original proposal of down designating to R5 to R2.5. With this change, there will be no nonconforming cases.

*Commissioner Schultz:* If we don't want to build more housing along the corridor, shouldn't we keep the R5 as originally proposed?

- There are a number of duplexes that exist now that would be in conformance with R2.5. We would keep the existing R1 and R2 but change the rest of the corridor to R2.5.

*Chair Baugh* asked about if it makes a substantial difference to zone R5 instead of R2.5 and the

duplexes that are there currently.

- Nonconforming residential densities have some limits about how it can be rebuilt and financed. They could continue as duplexes if the zoning is changed to R5.

*Commissioner Smith* asked why we wouldn't just let the market settle this out.

- *Chair Baugh* noted that there is lots of lower income housing that has been built there, so it's lots of people without too many choices.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted we want to move freight here, but you don't want to increase curb cuts where people are backing out onto the busy road. With R2.5 or R5, there will be a similar number of curb cuts at the street, so I don't think it would intensify this.

PSC members confirmed the proposal to rezone as R2.5.

*Distance from centers and corridors, and prevalent lot pattern*

Areas in this bundle proposed for change are relatively distant from centers and corridors and may lack improved sidewalks (such as a portion of Brentwood-Darlington, which is designated R2.5 but is predominantly developed at an R5 density).

R2.5→R5: Large portions of Mt Scott-Arleta and Brentwood-Darlington are designated and zoned R2.5, even areas farther from transit. Here, lots are all dividable under the R2.5 designation because they are twice the size that the designation allow. However, to date most lots are 5,000 sq ft or larger with detached single-family homes. These areas are distant from services and amenities and lack a complete sidewalk network.

Here, development is predominantly built at R5 density. But with current Comp Plan designations, these lots could be redeveloped with 2 units each, double the existing density. This level of density isn't supported by services, amenities or a complete sidewalk network. Staff recommends R5 here to better match the prevailing development pattern.

Testimony from area residents strongly supported the down-designation proposal as it recognizes the traditionally larger lot sizes in the area and, while still allowing for some new development, it lessens the intensity of future development. Other supporting testimony emphasized the area's lack of easy access to local amenities, such as transit and commercial services. Additionally, development is often not required to provide sidewalks and other infrastructure improvements that other closer in neighborhoods must have to accommodate higher density. Individuals testified in opposition to the Mt. Scott-Arleta and Brentwood-Darlington proposal and other inner eastside down-designation proposals because it places limits on the available housing stock and choices, and ultimately may contribute to further decline in housing affordability.

R5→R7: This group includes areas that are designated R5 in the current Comprehensive Plan, but are zoned R7 and/or predominantly platted with approximately 7,000 sq ft lots. This group includes portions of Eastmoreland, Reed, Portsmouth, Kenton, Brentwood-Darlington, and pockets in East Portland (Lents, Centennial, PGNA, Hazelwood).

The proposal to down-designate based on prevalent lot pattern originated with a 2011 request by the Reed Neighborhood Association for a subdivision known as Reedwood.

This is a mid-century subdivision the covers approximately 30-40 percent of the neighborhood and is fairly uniformly platted with 7,000 sq ft lots and designated R5. The neighborhood's proposal is intended to reduce redevelopment pressures that would alter the well-preserved mid-century style and scale of this subdivision (following a 2008 land use case in which a zone change and land division resulted in 3,000 sq ft lots).

*Commissioner St Martin* is generally supportive. She also noted these larger lots can still build ADUs to help support density.

R3→R5: A large portion of Wilkes is designated R3 in the current Comprehensive Plan. Other portions of the neighborhood have a variety of lot sizes and development types, however, and some infill is possible at the currently allowed density. Staff has proposed amendments to the July proposal including:

1. Apply the R5 to the Summerplace subdivision only, because it is predominantly platted with 5,000 sq ft lots and there is little or no opportunity for redevelopment at R3 densities.
2. Retain the R3 designation elsewhere in Wilkes where it now exists.

PSC members generally support the staff proposal for down-zoning these areas.

We also have a proposal for down-designation in Eastmoreland that are included in this larger grouping of proposals under the same heading. Here concerns are about preserving the neighborhood's historic and cultural resources include streetscape, diversity of architecture and landscape quality and maturity.

Smaller homes on larger lots are most vulnerable to being redeveloped because land values are so high.

We've received the largest volume of testimony from Eastmoreland residents than about any other residential area. The vast majority expressed support for a down-designation for the entire neighborhood, not just the portion staff had originally proposed. The NA is currently conducting a poll of neighbors and it appears that participating neighbors have expressed overwhelming support for the down-designation.

After the last staff memo came out, we also received a lot of testimony from the South Burlingame neighborhood in SW Portland asking to be treated in the same way as Eastmoreland because of similar lot patterns and concerns about underlying historic lot lines that enable redevelopment on smaller lots.

Concordia neighborhood has also weighed into this conversation and has requested down-designations.

Today, we don't have a proposal for the PSC to consider. Staff will return in a coming work session with a proposal after describing some of the issues of concern we've heard.

This includes concerns about "truth in zoning". Prior to 2002, R5 meant that 1 lot was allowed per 5000 sf of site area and each lot needed to be 5000 sf. In 2002, density was decoupled from the lot size standards. So the density remained the same, but the lot size was decreased. This allowed for greater flexibility when subdividing land and encourages preservation of existing houses and trees in a tract, where they have greater chance of being successfully preserved.

The R5 "confirmable" lot example is a reason the Eastmoreland NA is concerned.

Staff are in the process of reviewing the analysis they used to propose the original down-designations. We will also review the Concordia and South Burlingame testimony that has come in recently.

*Commissioner Hanson* commented on the boundaries of Eastmoreland. Near 39<sup>th</sup> Ave, the neighborhood changes. What is the perimeter of the neighborhood, particularly the edges? There are probably not too many lots there that are under 7000 sq ft. Would these be out of conformance? Is there a downside to going to R7 from the City's perspective? I think it helps

protect character, and I'm not opposed to going to R7.

- In the original proposal we noted where the lots were more consistently smaller where we wouldn't propose going to R7. We will revisit this but don't want too many spot areas.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about allowable lot size and square footage.

- We will review this and provide the information for the PSC.

There are many voiced concerns about scale of new homes being larger and taking up so much of the lot: we are proposing to look at this through an upcoming single-family residential project about compatibility and scale.

*Chair Baugh* is concerned about when we look at the first set of neighborhoods we see a lack of services, so there is a reason to down-zone. The reason is less clear in the Eastmoreland case. Are we trying to fix the tear-down-and-build-bigger concern that the neighbors have? Is the Comp Plan the right tool to address this problem? This is a neighborhood that is well-served, so I'm looking for a rationale about why we want to downzone here.

- We want to treat like situations in like ways. The initial request came from Eastmoreland, but we then looked at similar places and tests to see where else this could apply, which we can continue to do.
- *Commissioner Schultz* wants to confirm that we are consistent in the application of the down-designations and zoning throughout the city.
- *Commissioner Smith* noted this is an equity issue/lens as well.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* is sympathetic to having distinctive neighborhoods.
- *Commissioner Hanson* noted South Burlingame has physical constraints that are very different from Eastmoreland. I'm in favor of making the Eastmoreland change because it applies zoning that is already there on the ground. I'm resistant to changes that R5 has. Similarly, Concordia is a different situation.
- *Commissioner Tallmadge* wants to make sure we look at the infrastructure limitations that should take priority over existing development patterns.

*Commissioner Houck*: Is it possible to come to any conclusions to arrive at preservation of urban canopy in these measures? Tear downs and rebuilding of larger houses is not the only issue related to infill and density issues. We are losing urban forest canopy, and I'd like an assessment of how this work might result in saving more trees during the development process.

Putting aside the lot issue, the development standards between R7 and R5 zones are virtually the same (size and setbacks).

Staff will update the work session schedule to include this topic at a future meeting.

## **Centers and Corridors**

Eric Engstrom

This is a follow-up from the January 27 PSC conversation. At that time, we talked about the large-scale urban design framework, where density would occur in the city over time, and distribution of centers and corridors.

*Hayden Island center*

### [Presentation](#)

This relates back to the CRC conversation and transportation projects planned in the area. I-5 is the largest of these projects, which is technically still on the RTP but almost definitely won't be built in the TSP timeline. So the feasibility of the land use is in question here.

The green dashed line on the map (slide 2) represents high-capacity transit to Vancouver, which would have been light rail with a station on the island via the CRC. There is bus service, but it's not to the scale that light rail would have provided.

Right now, the Comp Plan draft has a neighborhood mixed use designation in the area currently zoned CG (general commercial).

Unlike the zoning pattern in other areas, this is a broad swath of contiguous zoning that is the same. Staff is asking if we want to keep the neighborhood center designation on the map.

*Commissioner Smith* asked if this center designation is supportable without transportation improvements. Do we have to down-zone, or are we just prevented from up-zoning?

- There had been a moratorium to build on the island (more about retail than residential). That has been lifted now. Centers are supposed to be transit-served. Also there is no secondary emergency service route to the island.
- PBOT doesn't think we can separate the local bridge project from the CRC.

Possible scenarios on Hayden Island are:

- Keep the neighborhood center designation until the RTP in 2018.
- Make a decision to move on.
- Support the eventual construction of the bridge and rail but acknowledge the timing issue.

The City can't stop development that is allowed by right. So the current zoning and lack of a path forward raises questions about the mismatch.

*Commissioner Schultz*: If we have a clear transportation issue, why are we trying to make this a neighborhood center today?

- *Commissioner Hanson* noted there was a Hayden Island Plan that had alternative circulation options and articulated more of a grid on the island. Did that get erased?
- That is still the zoning code. But this effectively allows a mixed use center without a transit center.

*Commissioner Smith* noted we aspirationally want a neighborhood center, but we know we can't support it without transportation improvements.

*Chair Baugh* asked if it makes sense for us to preserve the plan (because it's still in the RTP) even though the bridge won't be built.

- The plan says there is going to be a bridge.
- *Commissioner Schultz*: But is this the place that needs to be a neighborhood center just because of the bridge?

The original motivation for the neighborhood center designation was the expected light rail extension. There is a considerably higher level of density allowed in the zoning today. The neighborhood wants the streets improved and a more walkable area, which could be more easily accomplished with the neighborhood center designation.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted it doesn't mean we need a neighborhood center to have mixed use zoning.

- If it's not a center, we might change the zoning because it's a huge swath.
- *Commissioner Schultz* is supportive of this dispersed/general commercial instead of the very intense commercial use.

*Commissioner Schultz* wants to understand today's zoning to see if it is appropriate or needs to

change.

This is neighborhood commercial and general commercial right now. We could retain the current designation but change the zoning with a note that the trigger to up-zone would be based on the availability of infrastructure improvements and service availability. We don't want interim development that would preclude what's desirable going forward. There isn't a commercial zone we could put here now without transportation improvements.

We will indicate that the neighborhood center is not ripe yet. Staff will flesh out the land use implications of this determination.

### *Inner Powell and Macadam*

#### Presentation

These are two different mixed use corridors, but both are inner neighborhood corridors. Originally the Powell area was proposed as an urban center and Macadam was proposed as civic corridor.

For Macadam, staff has suggested it as an urban center because streetcar investment is dependent on raising revenue along it. Powell-Division is the proposed bus rapid transit corridor, which is less reliant on connection to property redevelopment and is not as much as a full streetscape change.

These are both mixed use with a variety of zones allowed. Civic corridors are better for urbanizing old highways (e.g. Barbur, Powell). The urban center is more designated for the inner-most areas.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked if the Powell area would be transitioned into an urban corridor at some time. Macadam feels more urban, so I'd support the difference in the two designations.

- A civic corridor can be quite urban.
- *Commissioner Schultz* would support the opposite.

Is it incongruous to have two different designations on these similar corridors?

- *Chair Baugh* has a hard time making a distinction because they are trying to do similar things in terms of development.
- ODOT prefers the civic corridor designation for Powell.
- *Commissioner Hanson* thinks of these as two different places in terms of physical siting.
- *Commissioner Schultz* wants to understand how one designation changes the character of the area versus the other. They could be designated the same.

*Chair Baugh*: Would you look at the designations and make different investments?

- Investments likely would come down to what the actual zoning is. It depends on what policies you want to have these streets share. It is a different suite of policies.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about the words: corridor (linear) versus center (more of a location).

Throughout the plan, we refer to policies that reference the two different types of streets.

PSC members support the staff recommendation of the two different designations. Staff will provide a follow-up memo with the suite of policies that apply to each designation.

### *Sugar Shack site*

This is at Killingsworth/Cully/Columbia. Staff originally recommended an employment designation but got testimony to change it to mixed use. It's next to the commercial area, but the Living Cully partnership is proposing affordable housing development here. So it could be a redevelopment area. The tradeoff is that it directly abuts the industrial sanctuary, but you could orient the housing development to Killingsworth. There is flexibility in way the site could be developed.

PSC members support the change to mixed use for this site.

*Full versus half-block zoning* will be discussed at a later work session.

### **Wrap Up**

We have held over the following topics for future discussion:

- full block/half block zoning discussion.
- streetcar and transit
- Green Loop
- Residential lot pattern decision (proposed down-designations)

The next Comp Plan work session is on April 14. We will update that agenda based on today's hold overs. We also have a work session on May 12. There is an EOA hearing on April 28 and the revised Growth Scenarios hearing on May 12 as well. May 26 may be a work session and vote or just a continued work session.

The red line version of the plan and map (based on staff getting through and reviewing all the testimony) will be released on April 28. We will have an update at the April 14 meeting about the revised schedule.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted that if the strike-through deadline slips, we may not want to vote on the May 26 meeting.

### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 7:58 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken



## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, March 10, 2015

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro (arrived 2:06 p.m.), Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**City Staff Presenting:** Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Nan Stark, Marty Stockton, Peter Hurley (PBOT), Art Pearce (PBOT), Mark Lear (PBOT), Traci Manning (PHB), Javier Mena (PHB), Dawn Uchiyama (BES)

**TriMet Presenters:** Alan Lehto, Vanessa Vissar, Kate Lyman, Tom Mills

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:34 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Smith* attended the Pembina risk assessment work shop this morning. An interesting idea that the PSC will have to evaluate is the idea of maximum tolerable risk. The UK government has this already.
- *Chair Baugh* also attended the session. When you look at the information, it is very fact-driven. It is essentially a bunch of engineers looking at quantifying risk and what the tolerance level may be. We'll have to look at that; it's not an emotional issue from the consultants' perspectives. In terms of maximum tolerable risk, they've also compared accidents to things such as earthquakes, tsunamis, etc. At the March 17 briefing, we will hear from Pembina and community groups and will have the information from Pembina next Monday.
- *Commissioner Gray:* Yesterday met with the City, Port and Pembina to discuss the roles and duties of a community advisory committee. We also were able to do a review of Pembina's outreach in the community over the last few months. Meetings for the advisory committee will begin in June. Also, the EPAP housing group had a four-hour work shop on Saturday and came up with an 8-point strategy for anti-displacement that they would like to share with the PSC.
- *Chair Baugh* met with the EPAP housing group to hear their concerns last week and will send the notes to PSC members.

### Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- *Commissioner Tallmadge* was offered a position with the Coalition of Communities of Color as their environmental justice manager.
- The West Quad Plan made it through Council last week after many proposed amendments. The SE Quad Plan will come to the PSC this spring, and after all 3 plans have been adopted by resolution at Council, we'll begin working on the code aspects in 2016. Council appreciated the many hours the PSC and advisory groups put into the project.
- The Climate Action Plan is out for public review. This was a hugely collaborative effort between City and County staff. Public comments are being accepted through April 10,

and we're hosting 2 open house events. More information is on our website at [www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/climate](http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/climate).

- On March 12, BPS is receiving a STAR award from LCDC for our Comp Plan public involvement efforts over the past year. The committee found that with the Map App and our people-to-people engagement we adapted quickly and listened well.
- Next Tuesday at 3 p.m. we'll have the briefing with two panels of invited testimony only (Pembina and neighborhood reps). Testimony is continued through April 7 when we'll have the hearing on the project. The safety reports will be available next Monday, and we'll post them when we receive them.

### **Consent Agenda**

- Consideration of Minutes from 2/24/15 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Smith* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### **Comprehensive Plan Update**

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Joe Zehnder, Deborah Stein,

#### **Documents:**

- [Residential Densities Staff Report](#)
- [Housing Staff Report](#)
- [Testimony Memo](#)

#### **Presentations:**

- [Housing](#)
- [Residential Densities](#)
- [Transportation](#)
- [Service Enhancement Plans](#)

Eric reminded the group about the process for the Comp Plan and where we are at the PSC. A draft recommended draft will come in April, and the final PSC vote will be based on that. After the last work session, we realized we have a number of outstanding items, so we've shifted the schedule so that the final PSC recommendation will likely be on May 26.

### **Housing**

Eric provided context about housing in the city of Portland.

The proposed Comprehensive Plan Map is based on a 30-50-20 residential growth strategy:

- 30% allocated to the Central City
- 50% to other Centers and Corridors
- 20% to other residential neighborhoods outside of the Centers and Corridors

When we talk about housing, we start from 8 household type groupings, which have a range of characteristics. We use this to forecast the need for different types of housing. We cross-walk these groupings with the kind of housing that is available. ADUs are a footnote but analogous to

several of the housing types that could substitute for a few of them.

Slide 6 shows the growth allocation (number of new units) based on the proposed Comp Plan. Some of the larger numbers are in the R5 zone, and there is lots of apartment capacity in corridors and in the Central City.

Overall we have enough housing types to meet expected demand except for the lowest income groups.

In terms of the single-dwelling zones (RF - R2.5), we are forecasting about 25,000 new dwellings in those zones. The largest concentration of growth in this will be in the R5 zone. There is about 3600 acres of vacant residentially-zoned land in single-family neighborhoods. Farm forest sites are primarily on Skyline Blvd. The vacant land can accommodate about 11,000 homes. So we have a slight supply-demand squeeze for small-lot or high-density single family homes expected to exceed demand.

#### *Housing Targets*

Proposal: Add an explicit policy with a numerical target of approximately 1,000 affordable units per year.

Currently in Policy 5.22, we identify the need for affordable housing and we want to provide for the extent possible to meet this need. Since then, we've adopted the Portland Plan, West Quadrant Plan and URA amendments that call for 30% of new housing to be affordable, which we're thinking about bringing into the Comp Plan more specifically. Joe walked through the implications of this. We've produced about 480 units of this type of housing per year in the past decade; we'd have to increase this to about 1,000 units per year to meet the 30% goal.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted this is aspirational, but he supports it. Most of the housing will be accomplished by non-profits and government entities.

- 15% was the number included in the Portland Plan, so a number of partners know this and have provided input.

We know this is a stretch goal, and the need is still beyond it.

*Commissioner Smith* supports this proposal, but it is both an income inequality as well as a housing issue. We need to be aggressively looking at ways to lower the cost of housing production (e.g. Eli Spevak's work). We have policies that support exploring this type of housing production. But I have a concern that our revenue source in the past has largely been dependent on TIF. We know that is decreasing, so the revenue source is a question.

- In thinking through how much production is necessary to balance affordable with other housing, this is a major infrastructure investment.
- One of the things we do with Council is an asset management report to show what we need over the next years. We don't do this for housing because we don't (yet) think of this as infrastructure. Internally we've been talking about if we had the numbers, we need to identify the revenue we'd need to look at housing as a component of civic infrastructure.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*: If we set the goal at 15%, and we know that there will be about double that need, I'm not sure I'm comfortable supporting this.

*Commissioner Rudd*: I assume as a practical matter that a lot of those units would be SRO units to hit this number, but that doesn't really get at kids in poverty, for example.

- The target number is regulated and subsidized, so it doesn't necessarily include things that are being privately built. There is some supply that is not included in this target.

*Commissioner St Martin* is supportive of the policy, but we should also think about improved ways to provide the needed housing, in addition to adding more money to the programs.

- Some things will raise the cost of development; others will help drive this down.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted that lots of times, cost per square foot doesn't go down because it's affordable. For example, looking at reducing the SDCs, if you're a non-profit doing affordable housing, you don't need to pay for parks. This is an issue for me knowing that it's simplistic and doesn't help build the infrastructure households need, especially in East County.

*Chair Baugh* is supportive but also wants to look at regulatory issues (how we do bonuses, for example). How does this play into the discussion? What about rent control? Or a preservation strategy for the current units we have to stabilize the neighborhoods and keep the housing there?

- *Commissioner Hanson* added that much of the affordable housing demand will be for families on the perimeter, so lots of small units likely won't fit the need, particularly in that geography.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the \$290M investment figure and what's included.

- *Javier*: Studios to family-sized units, throughout the city. Many of the resources were TIF-generated and in URAs. A smaller percentage is federal resources, which we can invest throughout the city. The \$290M is for 10 years includes just a small portion for health and human services, and some operational services.

*Commissioner Oxman* is supportive of a policy that sets targets. I'm concerned about labeling any measurement as being aspirational, so I'd rather see a more realistic target that we actually can get to.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about how and why the percentages were chosen. I'm supportive, but I'm not sure where these numbers come from or why we'd need to settle on these numbers.

- We may not be there in terms of being able to do this. It's something that the City is interested in learning about, but we may not know the answer about the absolute feasible spot and a stretch goal right now. So the question is what we do about this.

*Chair Baugh*: We know where affordability is ranked with other cities today. When we look at "x%", can we estimate where our housing affordability will be in 2035 relative to other cities? We don't want Portland to be becoming less affordable compared to other similar locations.

- Staff will think about this. We don't know how the 15% goal compares to other cities, so we can do some research into this.

*Susan*: The PEGs came up with the 15% as aspirational, even though we need to do better. This isn't just out of the blue, and we still don't know how we're going to get there yet. We need to look at what we need and then go back to figure out how we get there.

*Commissioner Schultz* would like to see the logic from the Portland Plan and how we came to this 15% affordable housing target. [Staff can provide this.](#)

[Commissioners confirmed that around 15% is a place to start for the affordable housing goal.](#) We need to define what the range of this 15% includes (% MFI).

### *Gentrification and Displacement*

We defined gentrification in the Portland Plan with objectives and policies. Gentrification was defined as displacement of residents from their neighborhood because of price. We also hear the baseline concern that Portland is getting too and more expensive. So independent of how it affects various populations, prices are going up.

A piece of this is that Portland is a very popular place to live; there is a high demand to live here. At the end of 2013, we only had about a 2% vacancy rate, which drives new housing production as well as the cost of housing. Housing production rates have not kept up with supply, but it is also part of the business cycle. Part of our path to be a more affordable city as we grow is to build housing.

We are still a fairly low-cost market compared to other West Coast cities.

The Portland Plan goals were to balance neighborhood revitalization with the ability of residents to stay in place to enjoy the benefits of that revitalization... prevent or mitigate displacement that results from public actions and investments.

Slide 18 shows the anti-displacement strategies in the Comp Plan, which are also detailed in the staff report. We have policies and programs in place, but they are mostly smaller pilot programs. We also have a policy to work on land use regulations to support the policies (e.g. bonuses, inclusionary zoning – if/when restriction is removed by state, etc).

Have we captured what the PSC has requested in these components? Yes.

In addition, we have received the anti-displacement policies from a coalition of groups at the last PSC hearing. There is lots of interest in this topic. The policy suggestions we received at the last hearing (slide 19) are things we'll come back to the PSC on April 14 so we can get more background to have discussion with the PSC then.

Joe reminded the PSC that the Comp Plan gives direction and offers how we get there; it doesn't specifically create a tool. He also reminded the PSC that anything in the Comp Plan is appealable by land use law, so we want to be careful about what we include directly in the plan. All the good things we want to do also can make things more expensive, so this is a big dilemma to balance.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about “capture windfall profits”. To whom? How is this defined? The more recent environmental impact reports may have looked at this, so what do we think about the quality of these analyses?

- We need to look at this and parse it. But the principle is that there is some value that we could get part of out of a development deal to spend on public benefit.
- Neighborhood affordability is something we're looking into more so in transit projects.

*Commissioner Gray* noted there is an opportunity to be bold in this area. This is extremely important to lots of people in the city. There is equity verbiage, and then there is true equity. What about broadening home ownership, rent stabilization/control? Crosswalk your work with the reports from EPAP and Living Cully and see which ones really have legs.

- Traci: PHB is working with BPS and OEHR on impact assessments and reviewing the work from the other groups. The bold and optimistic part is that so many people are working on these issues.

*Commissioner St Martin* noted that one area we should pay attention to is keeping existing homeowners in their homes and pair that with density increase. An example, not for inclusion in the comp plan specifically, but an implementation tool that would allow homes in areas at risk for gentrification to build ADUs on their property via a grant program. Then they can rent the ADU to create more income, and deed restrictions (similar to some of the down payment grant programs) can maintain the affordable housing status for a designated period of time. This increases density while keeping single-family character of a neighborhood.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*: The plan should be striving for equity, not just mitigating affects but addressing and reversing past injustices. This does need to be supported by investment to

prove we're supporting equitable outcomes.

- The Comp Plan is a plan about growth and physical development of the city. So there are aspects of many conversations that are good ideas and policies, but where they live in the land use plan versus other City strategies or policies is something we need to work through. We can put barriers in front of ourselves if we put too much into the land use law realm.
- Part of this is we want to have clear metrics and goals. The land use plan should set clear policy direction, but everything in the Comp Plan is appealable to LUBA. We want to have lever on the policy side but not too prescriptive that we tie our hands in the future. Look at the items in the staff report, many of which are not land use actions, but there could be components of some of these that should include.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that he'd support forwarding the plan in 2 pieces to Council; one under the jurisdiction of LCDC and another piece that could be adopted by not in the Comp Plan directly.

*Chair Baugh*: OEHR ought to be involved in some manner, but I haven't heard or seen their comments. I just want to know if this is an issue of concern for them.

- We can ask OEHR Director Dante James to join the PSC at an upcoming meeting.

*Chair Baugh* also asked about no net loss and policies for how we get there.

Be bold. We can do it differently in Portland. But also remember that the tools we're talking about, while useful, are not at all sufficient as we saw in the 15% discussion. We can work these individual tools, but the bold move is bigger than that.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the definition of public action. Adopting plans set a number of things in motion.

- We have to sharpen this for ourselves and figure out the rules. Things that affect the marketplace. Looking at past decisions and repercussions.

#### *Compatibility*

What is the relative emphasis in policy in existing single-family neighborhoods, particularly outside of centers and corridors? This is addressed primarily in policies 4.12 and 4.13.

We did get lots of testimony of the relative balance between these two policies. Both are important: we want to emphasize stability of form and scale while we continue to allow adaptive reuse and creation of additional housing types to meet affordability and changing household needs.

4.12 is about adaptability. 4.13 is about maintaining scale, form and pattern. We are specifically not saying every house has to match the existing houses. How are we doing in the balance for these policies?

*Commissioner Smith* thinks these are complimentary policies. 4.12 is about more incremental things (e.g. adding an ADU) that probably don't influence form as much.

*Commissioner Shapiro* supports both policies, and they do work well together. At any given time, I hear about the City having surplus properties – could we make this available to neighborhoods?

*Commissioner Rudd* noted there is some tension in the development community and BDS about what compatibility means. This may not be the place to do it but I'd want to think in the future about whether design guidelines make sense to give people some comfort.

- A statement that is not in this pair of policies as explicitly as it could be is if we talk about scale and patterns is if we're talking about the planned scale or the existing. This is especially a tension in the R2.5 zone.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted that what is planned is what this should refer to, not necessarily what's built currently. I think these policies complement each other. And how would we do design guidelines for single-family homes?

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the suggestion around existing entitlements.

- Staff is suggesting to delete this component since it's not clear to most people (including staff).

*Commissioner St Martin* likes the policies in the context of how we do things today (e.g. historic districts). But how do we create other guidelines in area outside of historic or conservation districts?

- The Zoning Code has requirements about setbacks and heights and open area and other standards that are intended to set the patterns.

*Chair Baugh* is supportive of the policies but asked about quality in different neighborhoods. We need to preserve the quality and not have low quality units/construction in low-income neighborhoods, for example.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* noted these policies are a lot about private ownership. The quality will vary from neighborhood to neighborhood.

- Any kind of design-based regulations have to be clear enough so they do impose cost burdens.

*Commissioners Schultz* wants to define scale (at the plan level? Existing environment?). I would support plan scale. We also should define quality.

*Commissioner Houck*: We have a broader issue than just the loss of house and form. What about loss of tree canopy for example? I wouldn't change the policy, but this is a large item to think about for the city.

- In 4.13, does "natural landscape features" capture this?

Commissioners are supportive of these two policies and find they are overall complimentary.

## **Residential Densities**

Deborah, Marty, Nan

Staff is looking at what the appropriate residential density should be in each area of the city. This is what we reflect in the proposed Comp Plan Map.

We have identified 6 groupings of down-designations (slide 3). The staff report summarizes each of the groups, and today we're looking at 3 of the 6 items.

### *Lack of connectivity, school district capacity and/or other public services*

These proposals are for down-designating:

- R1 → R2.5
- R2 → R5
- R2.5 → R5

This relates to the David Douglas School District conversation we had at the last PSC meeting. They currently don't have a remedy for keeping up with the population growth they've seen. Areas of Woodstock and Reed have similar characteristics.

Densities in these areas aren't supported by connectivity, parks, basic services and amenities and/or school district capacity.



In DDSD, we have a 2-pronged approach:

1. Decrease housing potential where infrastructure, connectivity and school capacity won't support currently allowed residential densities through 2035.
2. Decrease zoning potential but retain Comprehensive Plan designations. Tie zone map amendments to "service adequacy" letters from David Douglas School District.

We are signaling that within the plan period, these issues won't be able to be addressed.

*Commissioner Gray* asked about up-zoning areas nearby these down-designated areas to help with capacity.

- Yes, absolutely. We want the density in places that are most appropriate. Today we're focusing on the down-designations, but we'll come back with this second part next meeting.

*Commissioner Oxman* and *Commissioner St Martin* asked about if down-designating in areas institutionalizes the lack of amenities there.

- We certainly don't want this to happen, so it's a careful balance. We want services to catch up with the development that is already there without stepping away fully. In the staff report we note that with some of the lower designations there is an assumption of land division versus multi-family, so improvements could be more effectively triggered through the land division process.

*Commissioner Houck* was also concerned about institutionalizing inequities. I like the approach, but at our last conversation about down-zoning, we want to be able to look at what has evolved and do some up-zoning where applicable.

- Yes, and we can do some refinement plans in the interim if necessary.

*Commissioner Schultz* is more in favor of decreasing zoning potential instead of decreasing housing potential in the DDSD example.

- We need to look at all the services. We have been incrementally scaling down the map/proposal to get more to this option so we don't provide an excuse not to provide services.

With the local improvement district (LID) question in mind, if an area is already being assessed, we should revisit our proposal. This is new information we just are getting from PBOT today that we can share at the next work session.

*Commissioner Rudd:* We talked in an earlier session and I want to be sure we maintain the policy to periodically to see how our zoning processes are working on the ground and to periodically do rezoning packet as a city. Applying to rezone property is expensive and we don't want to unnecessarily add that to the cost of housing. We've talked about the need the balance zoning and school capacity (DDSD) and not adversely impacting things by downzoning. I'd like to make sure when we are looking at down-zoning in other areas that, given the demographic profile, we expect to maintain required child populations for schools in our established neighborhoods.

#### *Historic character in a Conservation District (of Eliot Neighborhood)*

Staff has endorsed the neighborhood proposal to alleviate pressure to redevelop properties that have existing single-family homes to multi-unit structures. Eliot has some of the oldest homes in Portland, and there has been pressure to redevelop. This proposal is intended to be more of a preservation approach for these older homes.

R2 → R2.5 is the proposal, so just a slight density change. But it would allow for duplexes and triplexes on a 5,000 square foot lot where they are currently not allowed. There is an opportunity to provide density where we have amenities such as transit.

This is intended to reuse houses that are already there and get more value out of the home

that already exists. But you could also end up with houses that don't match the neighborhood character. Eliot does have a d-overlay since it is in a conservation district.

This doesn't guarantee nothing would be redeveloped, but we added a proposal to amend the a-overlay in the future to allow extra density if you keep the existing structure.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about if it would be cheaper to convert the existing structure.

- It would depend on the current structure.

*Chair Baugh* noted that MLK Blvd is in a proposed streetcar corridor.

- Intensity along the corridor is where we want the density, so we don't anticipate this would lower the density all that much. The number of fewer units is probably not enough to make that difference.

*Allowable density where anticipated LRT station likely won't be built*

This is a portion of northern Westmoreland where a light rail station had been planned but TriMet has confirmed there isn't a plan to have a station here in the plan period. There is a mix of development in the area.

The proposed changes include:

- RH → R2.5
- RH → R1
- R1 → R5

This proposal was greatly informed by neighborhood input and community conversations.

*Commissioner Rudd:* How far away is the RH site from an existing station or one being built? What do the studies say about how far people are willing to walk to a station?

- 17<sup>th</sup> and Holgate is the closest station, about a quarter- to half-mile away and outside that distance of willingness to walk.

This area has a high concentration of homes that were built in the late 1800s, early 1900s. It's not a historic or conservation district, it could be.

Commissioners are supportive of these policies. We need to look at the implications of down-designations on future investment in infrastructure in these areas, which could be looking more at the zoning and keeping the Comp Plan designation.

*Commissioner St Martin:* What's the net effect of the proposals added together?

- In rough numbers: reduction of 780 units in the first grouping; reduction of about 100 units in Eliot; and about 400 units in the Harold area. We would balance these by up-zoning in other areas.

*Commissioner Hanson* also is supportive but notes we should look at the LID details that PBOT has recently provided.

## Transportation

Art Pearce, Peter Hurley

Art provided context about the TSP. This is a 20-year plan, based on a series of financial assumptions. Much is based on the new revenue – as well as how we can increase these funds.

Peter highlighted the smaller (typically each under \$500,000) proposed projects in the Citywide programs bundle. Slide 4 highlights a number of projects within four of the programs. PBOT will be posting the full list of the small projects, by program, online in the next few days. These

are not part of the land use decision as the major projects are. This list will be updated on a more regular basis than will the major project list.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if the proposed Green Loop would be a small or a large project.

- Large. It's not in the TSP now, but it could be added after the Central City Plan goes through Council and recommended to be added to the TSP. There is not a big bucket of funding for projects that are not yet on the plan, so we have to adjust and recalibrate as we go along.

*Commissioner Smith* supports the concept of combining small programs. In the TEG process, there was a desire to bring in new projects in this cycle of the plan. Conditions and policies have changed, so we aren't totally sure the old project list is not necessarily the best way to get new ideas, but I am actually more comfortable with the list now that I've seen it. In the testimony we received, some people wanted to include all of the Bicycle Master Plan items.

- Everything in the Bicycle Master Plan is at least on the reference list. We're removing the projects that have already been completed. But all the projects that haven't been completed or funded will be on the reference list. It doesn't mean they'll be built in the next 20 years though.

North Portland Greenway and Sullivan's Gulch are two major projects. What portion of these projects get advanced on the constrained list?

- There are significant components of each that are on the constrained list. *Staff will provide details to the PSC.*

*Chair Baugh* noted that as we down-zone some areas we don't affect transportation elements or priority of getting built in those areas (e.g. in East Portland).

- The way we've scored the projects includes the Comp Plan proposals.

Small projects get on a reference list in a few different ways:

- Modal plan
- Area plan
- Program manager

#### *Citywide Transportation and Major Programs*

We are looking at breaking/phasing the very large project to be able to construct portions in the first phase.

How much are we investing in high-growth, high-need centers? \$218M (17% of total) is on the constrained list, and this includes about a quarter of the projects on the list.

The Albina Community Plan does not include a list of projects, but we have completed 4 projects in the area, 3 are funded and 3 are on the draft recommended constrained list.

#### *Analysis*

Slide 10 is the shared of projected spending on the constrained list by geography and the share of projected 2035 households and jobs by geography. Slide 11 shows, by geography, the constrained list spending per person.

Art walked through the various maps in slides 13-17 that highlight how project scores are influenced by a variety of components including equity, health, safety, freight mobility and cost effectiveness.

Then slides 18-25 are the projects based on their being on the constrained list, unconstrained list or if they are funded TSP projects overlaid on various areas.

Many projects in East Portland scored well and are on the constrained or funded list.

*Commissioner Smith* asked if the ranking components should be weighted equally (as they were) or differently (e.g. giving double priority to equity). Would this be feasible and would it be useful?

- We can do this, but because we want to see how we score on multiple criteria, it would likely be more productive to focus on specific projects.

*Chair Baugh* asked about spending by year and priorities there.

- The list currently has a 1-10 and an 11-20 year funding horizon. The majority of the East Portland projects are on the constrained list, but we don't have a map today that shows in which year grouping. *Staff can produce this map/report.*

*Commissioner Rudd* asked to see freight corridors in a similar map.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about the safety map and the little "bubbles" that appear to on the map, how does the level of safety in these areas as compare to other similar cities? I am looking for a rough gauge on how good or bad our human safety is with the current street configurations.

- These represent areas where there have been traffic fatalities in the last 10 years. We have identified safety improvements that also don't show up on the map (this map shows major projects) for example Safe Routes to School.

*Commissioners Schultz* asked about project area.

- Gateway street improvements are a good example: numerous small improvements that were bundled into a major project.

*If commissioners have further questions or want additional analysis, staff can provide answers at the March 24 work session.*

#### *Service Enhancement Plans*

TriMet staff: Alan Lehto, Vanessa Vissar, Kate Lyman, Tom Mills

Alan provided an introduction to the service enhancement plan work. TriMet has reached an agreement with its represented employees and now is financially stable for the long-term with this new agreement. We can now keep up with our current requirements and increase our work over time.

By the end of this year we will have restored service hours back to pre-recession levels, which means less waiting and less crowding on board buses and trains.

We are restoring our Frequent Service on bus and MAX lines to serve key corridors, with weekday service across our Frequent Service network restored in 2014 and weekends being restored in 2015. The Orange Line and bus service connecting neighborhoods along this corridor will be running later this year as well.

We are able to make investments in capacity and reliability now too.

The Service Enhancement Plan (SEP; "the future of transit") is a collaborative process about what the full service network looks like. Incremental improvements have already started on the Westside, with each of the other areas being completed by the end of this year. This is consistent at the broad level with the Comp Plan and TSP update.

TriMet staff walked through outreach they have completed and learnings from each of the different areas of the SEP.

The SEPs are creating a shared long-term vision for the future of transit in the city and throughout the region. As resources allow, each year's budget includes one or multiple of three objectives:

- Maintain
- Optimize and restore
- Increase

To implement the full vision for the Future of Transit over the long term, however, additional resources will be necessary to provide the increased service envisioned.

Beyond operating resources, we also need to develop an even stronger partnership with the City to ensure that those investments in service are supported by safe and convenient access to the service and that the operating environment supports efficient and reliable service.

*Strengthening the Partnership for High Quality Transit*  
Art, Eric and Alan presented.

We are building a land use proposal that is very dependent on a good and improving transit system; the land use plans don't work without this. Traditionally in the TSP it doesn't always cover service provision and operations that TriMet leads. We need to make sure we're tying ourselves to those commitments as well.

There is now a [draft letter of intent](#) with responsibilities for each agency (TriMet, PBOT, BPS). The growth strategy needs to be complimented by access and the right level of service. This is a first attempt to put together the pieces. A TGM grant, Growing Transit Communities, will be starting this summer and will help refine how we work and deliver packages together.

One way this relates to periodic review is that through the review, there is a formal way to establish agreements with service providers. They are typically uninspired, so we're trying to be more specific where we are mutually making commitments to each other.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the Streetcar Master Agreement example. This took about 10 years to form that partnership. How can this evolve to something that substantial?

- We have a collaborative relationship. We are likely to talk about co-investment in some smaller corridors; a broader declaration of intent with very specific investment strategies.

Our objective is stability and permanence through economic downturns.

*Commissioner Hanson* is happy the letter states intent in an overarching manner at this point.

*Commissioner Oxman* thanked TriMet for showing the budget variance over time. How much of a percentage of TriMet's budget does this represent?

- In the far out years, it was up to about 25%. But now we're at about a steady state with the recent agreement with staff. We have to keep a 2.5 month reserve in case we're down a bit one year we are still ok.

When they closed the Thurman Street Bridge, we got the TriMet van option. Are the other ways we can do transit, particularly for neighborhoods that are on the edge of town or in difficult places in terms of location?

- The SEPs include "community connectors" – areas that need some sort of connection but due to constraints, a traditional fixed-route bus doesn't make sense. But we can look at right-sizing the vehicle or working with partners.

*Commissioner Shapiro* is happy to see the letter of intent.

*Chair Baugh* is also pleased to see the letter of intent. But we need to have commitment on

both sides. I want to be sure we have a long-term commitment to ensure the transit service doesn't disappear. If the City makes investments, what's TriMet's commitment to these corridors or other areas of town? We need to figure out how to preserve a partnership. I'm also interested in solving the student transit problem, particularly in East Portland (school districts that are not PPS).

- We understand the thinking behind the commitment to specific corridors. The more we drill down to details, we can make real commitments, but we don't know what that looks like just yet. In terms of access to schools, we need to improve service enough it is worth students taking transit.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* noted the analysis that is being done. Are you also doing displacement analysis?

- The focus of our displacement study work is on the Powell-Division BRT project. We are largely approaching this with the City's lead to understand what that pressures physical capital investments make.

*Commissioner St Martin* commented on the TSP project list and asked if people have been providing feedback.

- The MapApp is being used readily. Now we're preparing the scoring and program reference lists, and those will be populated on the website in the next week.

Susan noted that usually we start with a letter of intent, and then we often get to an IGA, which is a legal contract. If we can show we are going to provide demand and TriMet is the supply, that could work, but we need to think about the flip side as well. The private sector, institutions, schools, etc can also benefit from an agreement like this, which we'd have to think about in the future of how to get these people involved.

*Commissioner Smith* noted an executive level management structure in the Streetcar Management Plan that keeps it at the forefront.

#### *Coordination with BES*

Mark Lear (PBOT), Dawn Uchiyama (BES)

Dawn introduced the [charter](#) that BES and PBOT signed last September about right-of-way work and coordination.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about PP&R and coordination with that bureau as well.

- At the next PSC meeting, PP&R will be here for the conversation. BES has the intention to put a similar charter together with PP&R too. The history of the past few years had made us become more strategic in our efforts.

#### **Next Steps**

Eric reiterated the topics from today:

- For housing, we will bring back some follow-up on the displacement conversation.
- PSC members like the compatibility policies and the concept of housing targets (with more details to come).
- Housing topics that we'll return to include homelessness, opportunity mapping areas, status report on demolition issue and single-family development standards.
- Residential density discussions received a general nod from the PSC with extra caution that we are not precluding additional infrastructure.
- Remaining residential topics include prevalent lot patterns; proposed down-designations in natural hazard areas; Lombard in a portion of North Portland; and proposed up-zoned areas.
- For transportation, we heard an endorsement of the approach for an agreement with TriMet. There will be more time to discuss project-specific questions.

- We also will review the Chapter 9 (Transportation) policies at a future work session.

Commissioners should send project-list-specific questions to staff.

Written testimony on the Comp Plan for the PSC is open through this Friday at 5 p.m. This includes the MapApp being able to accept comments.

Susan thanked the PSC members for their continued diligence and hard work. Our next meeting is next Tuesday at 3 p.m. to be briefed on the T6/Pembina project.

### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 5:16 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken



## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, February 24, 2015

3:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin (arrived 3:15 p.m.), Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Katherine Schultz

**City Staff Presenters:** Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Bob Glascock, Marty Stockton, Leah Treat, Art Pearce, Peter Hurley, Mark Lear

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Gray* mentioned that she and *Chair Baugh* will meet with the EPAP Housing Committee and will have conversation with Division-Midway Alliance regarding issues around housing. Additionally, *Commissioner Gray* will serve on the SB 215 OEIB Committee, a Senate committee on education, which will meet Tuesdays in March.

### Director's Report

- Last week at Council, *Chair Baugh*, *Commissioner Shapiro* and *Commissioner Gray* were reappointed to their positions on the PSC.
- For the TSP hearing tonight, we will open cards for testimony for the public at 4:30 p.m. this afternoon.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 2/10/15 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Tallmadge)

### Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Deborah Stein, Bob Glascock, Marty Stockton

**Documents:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7171504>

**Presentation:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7233311/File/Document>

Eric provided an overview of the flow for today's work session and the overall timeline for the rest of the PSC work sessions for the Comprehensive Plan update. At or before the March 10 session, we will figure out if we need additional work sessions to make sure we get through all the items before the PSC.

The written public comment period remains open through March 13 at 5 p.m. As of today, we have 3,236 public comments collected. We still have the helpline open for the public to ask questions about any of the Comp Plan proposals.

We have not done a formal survey or inquiry about the helpline inquiries or feelings about it from the public, but we have gotten some good feedback and thanks for the added staff services.

On the Map App, we have evidence that this style of outreach increases the amount and range of testimony we're getting, so that is a good sign for public involvement opportunities.

Deborah introduced the two topics for today's work sessions and then introduced Bob Glascock and Superintendent Don Grotting from David Douglas School District.

#### **David Douglas School District Capacity**

Bob provided some background including a reminder about the overcrowding in David Douglas schools. We want to talk about possible collaboration between the City and DDS D to assist in relieving the overcrowding in the school district.

DDS D is still working on their 10-year facility plan. For their elementary schools, these exceed target enrollment and it's projected by 2033 that there will be 800 students at two of the elementary schools, 200 more students that each can hold capacity-wise.

In the state of Oregon, if a school district puts together a 10-year plan, as part of the City's periodic review, we must include the facility plan in our Comp Plan and cooperate with them to identify land for school sites. Several of the metro area's school districts have already adopted plans (e.g. Beaverton) as adding schools as a required service for adding housing growth. There is lots of documentation necessary on the part of the school district to make this happen. Using this strategy for school districts that are in both Portland and other cities (e.g. Centennial) is more challenging, but this comment process could be available to them if they adopt objective criteria in a school facility plan.

Today's first discussion question is whether the PSC likes the idea of a collaborative approach for the City to work with DDS D to approve objective criteria and apply them for zoning map amendments. The PSC will consider map changes to residential densities at its March 10 meeting. Both program (school capacity) and map changes go hand in hand to address school capacity. The March 10 staff report addresses residential densities, including map changes affecting David Douglas School District.

Superintendent Grotting thanked the PSC and City staff for their working with DDS D. We are looking at numerous avenues and possible land to purchase for expansion. DDS D says they can respond in a timely manner for response on zoning amendments, which was a question from the Bureau of Development Services initially.

The second question is about how the City may work with DDS D to find and acquire new school sites if the PSC has direction and/or feedback to BPS and DDS D.

- Superintendent Grotting: The school district recently purchased the Elks property on NE Halsey, but DDS D won't be able to develop the property in the short-term.

*Commissioner Gray* asked how overcrowding has affected some work in DDS D.

- Grotting: One of the things is that we have no available elementary classrooms, making kindergarten classes in the 30-35 student range. PE classes in upper grades have upwards of 70 students. We can't get any more desks in our rooms due to the lack of space. Also, when some new housing developments come in, especially in East Portland, we're lacking other services that support safety and law enforcement and

places for the residents to be. We are putting a moratorium on open enrollment and transfers due to the overcrowding situation and have even had to bus students out of their home enrollment area at times.

*Commissioner Gray* noted that DDS has very high academic achievement. In terms of the objective criteria that could be created to allow or disallow development, what are examples?

- In Beaverton, there is a square footage assessment (per student). If there is a proposed development, the assessment looks at square footage of classroom space.
- We also are proposing to look at the type of housing (e.g. if there are developments specifically for senior housing that wouldn't affect class size / student population). The number of school-aged kids by housing type is a way to look at what capacity and housing development may be allowed or not.

We are looking at a 2-pronged strategy. One is the large issue, primarily for Powellhurst-Gilbert where we're looking to down-designate; there will be more details on this at the March 10 PSC meeting. Where we see places that are suitable for higher designation except for school enrollment, that's where we're looking at the zoning map amendment possibility. Today we're looking for a general nod for these approaches for the City to help ease capacity and pressure for the school district.

*Commissioner Houck* was initially skeptical about the down-designation, but he is impressed with the memo and the delineation of the legal background provided. He also liked that in the future, if capacity needs are met, we could go back and reconsider the capacity and zoning. At an earlier hearing it was noted that Parkrose is under-capacity. What is the reality of districts working together to address some of the capacity issues?

- It's complex. It comes down to funding, and it takes school districts to vote and agree to these ideas. PPS would likely not be interested in this as they would be losing tax base.
- Parkrose has land and capacity to build additional housing.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the process and communication between City and school districts. This sounds like a service provider situation. The district would respond to applications based on projected enrollment and react to it. I would suggest we include things other than land use actions. For example, some apartments allowed by right increase school demand. The school sites question is a difficult issue. I understand that many schools carry a residential zone and have a conditional use over it.

- Most schools will keep residential plan designations and zones. Most schools will remain conditional uses in residential zones. Staff is looking at a change to high schools—changing the Comprehensive Plan designation to Campus Institutional, and retaining current zoning designations. As part of the Campus Institutional project, we are looking at high schools. We have discussed a possible are not yet looking at a Schools Zone, but it's not an immediate step.

I think the conditional use is a good criteria and process for now. I have lots of experience in Washington County, and there are often boundaries of SDs that are different from boundaries of cities, but there is precedence to change them. It's important to understand where the student population is being generated to make sure everyone is well-informed.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about identifying additional properties for the school districts to acquire. This speaks to what the City should be doing both for schools and issues of housing citywide.

- Grotting: This is not formal in the facilities plan yet. We've met with the City and County, and we've talked about opportunities and trade/share options. But it's not a quick process.
- The City is committing to collaborate in ways that we can, even if it's not finding additional sites. We also have a number of policy statements in the Portland Plan about

schools being centers of community that offer more than just education. Location, accessibility, co-locating are encouraged.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked what this means for Comp Plan designations and zoning in East County. Are there adjustments?

- In the March 10 staff report, you'll be looking at adjustments to densities. Where we have some influence on this is where we can adjust residential densities to relieve some housing and capacity pressures.

*Commissioner Gray* noted Human Solutions is building just a block within DDSD from the Parkrose District line. This could be a time to discuss boundary change that is a benefit to both districts. The collaborative approach is good but we need to keep it open for other districts in the city as well.

*Chair Baugh* asked if the service requirement looks like an overlay.

- It functions this way where the zoning doesn't match the Comp Plan designation.

*Chair Baugh* also noted that when looking at service levels we need to include transportation, sidewalks, Safe Routes to Schools, etc. You might have capacity in the district, but the other amenities are also necessary.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction for the school capacity approach.

#### **Community Involvement Policies**

Marty gave context for today's discussion, which includes three specific items: Community Involvement Policies: Promoting Inclusive Planning; Role of Neighborhood Associations; and Community Involvement Committee.

She highlighted two City groups, the Public Involvement Advisory Council (PIAC) and the Community Involvement Committee (CIC).

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked for a distinction between PIAC and the CIC.

- The CIC started in the Portland Plan process and continues through the Comp Plan. It is charged to review public involvement process for Periodic Review specifically. PIAC is appointed by City Council and advises Council (the CIC advises staff and the PSC) on citywide public involvement best practices.

#### *Promote Inclusive Planning*

Proposal: Clarify the term "community" as inclusive with broad application, including neighborhood associations, and is a replacement for the term "citizen."

This proposal is to particularly include non-geographic and communities of color under the equity framework from the Portland Plan. We have heard some confusion about what the word "community" means. In the existing Comp Plan, we use "citizen" involvement, as does Statewide Planning Goal 1. Staff decided to change the term to make the phrasing more inclusive. When we use the word "citizen", that can exclude people from the conversation.

*Commissioner Smith* noted this makes him sad. Citizen has always implied a measure of active involvement and engagement. I know why we have to go there to change the terminology, but I also don't like it.

- This has come up a number of times with the CIC and PIAC. We do want all community members to strive for this, but some people do feel it's exclusionary.

In some ways, where we have a list of groups, "community" is a way to make sure we haven't forgotten anyone. There are places in the document where we can tighten up how we use the

word community, but we intend for it to mean everyone.

*Commissioner Oxman* supports this, but who gets to define “community”?

- This ties into the next question and the role of Neighborhood Associations and who’s entitled to participate. It also goes back to what the Comp Plan is and what a legislative process is and who gets to participate in it. For example, there are limitations on who we send notification to about legislative processes and amendments. This includes formally-recognized and self-defined groups.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted it’s a difficult topic. It would be helpful to try to reflect the idea about obtaining maximum appropriate involvement so people understand what they’re participating in. Clarity in this would be helpful.

*Commissioner Houck* had a similar position as *Commissioner Smith*. But I agree with what we’re doing and the philosophy behind it. The loss of the individual taking responsibility is difficult for me. Can we use the definition to be explicit that it’s not just the collective but also individuals?

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted the key to being a member of community is participation. If you’re willing to participate in an action, you are a member of a community.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction for the use of the word “community” in place of “citizen”.

#### *Role of Neighborhood Associations*

Proposal: Add language to the Chapter 2 introduction referencing the history of Portland’s neighborhood system.

We received lots of testimony about this topic, questioning the Neighborhood Associations’ role in the Comp Plan, specifically in Chapter 2. There was some clarification and desire for Neighborhood Associations to be more acknowledged; some wanted to be the only avenue for community involvement for the Comp Plan. This proposal is for a new introduction to acknowledge the neighborhood system with the direction of wanting to have inclusive engagement in planning. For Working Draft Part 1, from *Commissioner Houck*, we have the term Civic Infrastructure in the neighborhood system within a new policy.

*Commissioner Smith* has served as a Neighborhood Association officer and supports the acknowledgement for the Neighborhood Associations system. I understand who does and who does not use this system as a forum. I have concerns of the opportunities and burdens of this system. The relationship with ONI is formalized, funding is involved and we want to be even-handed even as we widen the net to include more people. Resources and burdens should be even. I want to be sure opportunities and burdens are well matched.

*Chair Baugh* noted the role of the Neighborhood Associations is appropriate, but it points back to community as something we want to embrace and the differences between groups. We want to embrace and provide avenues for all people to engage.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about extending funding to the other groups and if we’d include that in policy. Where does the funding live?

- This policy wouldn’t direct this specifically, but over time, ONI could change its funding allocation/procedures.

Marty paraphrased the desire for a potentially new policy to have better clarification to operationalize resources and the burden to qualify. We need to think about if Chapter 2 is the right place for this. ONI is currently having the conversation about an approach to look at a more equitable distribution of resources based on other factors as well.

*Commissioner Smith* commented that resources should be used to broaden outreach, but if Neighborhood Associations are not the sole voice, we may want to revisit the historical regulatory burden on them.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that current funding is not necessarily about providing money. It could be more staff interaction, engagement with a broader array of folks.

ONI has been funding Diversity and Civic Leadership (DCL) group, similar to funding Neighborhood Associations in the recent years. There could be more evolution like this over time.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction for adding context about the role of Neighborhood Associations and acknowledging their history in Portland.

#### *Community Involvement Committee*

Proposal: Revise Policy 2.14 to task an independent body, rather than a subcommittee of the PSC, to oversee the Community Involvement Program.

The PSC has been serving as the state-recognized committee for community involvement until Periodic Review for the Comp Plan, which is the role of the current CIC. This is somewhat of a hybrid group as *Commissioner Shapiro* sits on this group, and there is an open spot for another PSC member.

PIAC stated that they feel an independent group should serve this role. The CIC noted to the PSC that a separate, independent body be the ongoing CIC. In the staff proposal, we have suggested revising policy 2.14 to have the CIC be an independent body from the PSC.

*Commissioner Shapiro* agrees with the recommendation. It is important for a separate group to be responsible for outreach but to also share their work with the PSC more frequently. The selection of the CIC was culled from a few hundred applications. I encourage the continued equity and diversity of and within the group.

*Commissioner Houck* asked if there would be PSC representation on the committee. There should be.

- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted that yes, one or two PSC members should be included, not necessarily as a chair.

*Chair Baugh* asked if the BPS role of support would change.

- Practically, probably not. BPS would still staff this group.

The connection between the CIC and their reporting to the PSC is something we should strive to operationalize. Other cities have something of a hybrid model on their CICs and have adjacent meeting times to ensure cross-over between the groups.

*Commissioner Oxman* likes the idea of a blended model. It seems that because we're involved with the same set of issues, we should look to have at least some integration and connection would be helpful.

PSC members confirmed the connection between the PSC and the CIC but that the group membership could be separate (with the assumption that 1-2 PSC members would be part of the CIC).

*Commissioner Houck* asked about non-profits and if we intentionally didn't reference them.

- We've used the word "organizations" to be more inclusive.

### *Status of Adopted Neighborhood and Area Plans*

This discussion is a response to PSC members' questions about currently existing neighborhood and area plans. We have about 60 of these plans. Early in the Comp Plan Update process we did go through these and pull out policies that cross many of the plans to build them into the new Comp Plan.

Staff suggests that plans remain in effect (Policy 1.15) unless a situation comes up where a new Comp Plan policy conflicts with an older area or neighborhood plan. In that case, the new Comp Plan would supersede.

We look to the area plans in quasi-judicial land use cases. We also consult them to guide coordination of capital improvements. And they continue to guide advocacy for neighborhoods. All these functions continue to be valid. We will build in language about how the plans will continue to be used.

Language in those plans will be reviewed based on advice from the City Attorney and the PSC (e.g. not having mandatory verbs and that they are all balancing).

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about Policy 1.15. Are all the plans adopted by Ordinance?

- Yes. Though some pieces are adopted by Resolution.

*Chair Baugh* noted a concern about the Albina Plan and communities looking for different direction from their neighborhood plans. We need to be clear that what takes precedent and what part(s) of the plan takes precedent. I'm worried about PDC funding based on different plans, too.

- Some choices will have to be situation-specific as cases arise.
- Part of what we're trying to do is pull the principles that were developed in neighborhood plans, so there are ideas that are citywide that we want to pull up to the overall Comp Plan level. Ideally we would go through and clean up each of the plans, but we don't have the resources to do so at this time. There is an important role for neighborhood-specific strategies, but we don't want to pull all those into the overall Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that the Comp Plan does trump older plans if there is a conflict.

We are specifically referring what we do with existing plans, but we will also provide guidance about what we do with area plans in the future so we don't set up potential new conflicts. We hope that individual communities will take a look at what they currently have and do some refreshing as their own advocacy agenda to reflect the values of people who live there today versus when the plans were written.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction about adopted neighborhood and area plans.

### **Transportation System Plan**

Hearing: Leah Treat, Art Pearce, Peter Hurley, Mark Lear

**Documents:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7171504>

**Presentation:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7233312/File/Document>

**Written Testimony Received:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7171505>

*Chair Baugh* introduced PBOT Director Leah Treat. Director Treat introduced herself and gave a



short introduction about the TSP as we all PBOT's recently published two-year plan, [Portland Progress](#).

Recommendations in the TSP commit to an equitable and prosperous city and are well-aligned with the Portland Plan, Climate Action Plan, Comp Plan and serving underserved people. These are also consistent with goals for PBOT.

The Portland Progress document includes two-year action plan for PBOT. It outlines the beginning steps to TSP work. Director Treat particularly highlighted the chapter on Vision Zero and the chapter on Equity. She thanked staff and PSC members for their work.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that the street system is about 40 percent of the land area in the city. I'm happy with previous integrated work between bureaus including PBOT, BES and BPS. But I am concerned with recent issues related to water bureau and bureau of environmental services that there might be a retrenchment with regard to interbureau collaboration and meeting multiple objectives with projects. I'm hopeful we see even more cooperation between bureaus, especially relating to streets and stormwater, going forward.

*Commissioner Smith* noted his excitement about bike share. Thank you to Director Treat for your leadership on Vision Zero in Portland.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted NYC's Vision Zero agenda, which has drastically changed that city. Does Portland's plan seek to do this?

- We are setting off on a bold agenda, which is taking lots of collaboration and partnerships that we're still building. We certainly have a different form of government than in NYC, but our plan is just as daring as their plan.

Peter provided background about the policies, projects and programs. The PSC held a hearing on these components on November 4, 2014. Staff will be providing some minor updates based on those recommendations.

This the first update to the TSP since 2007. We have looked through potential projects in the plans that have been adopted since 2007, but there is also a process before the 2040 TSP that will identify projects that will be incorporated into that update as well.

There are implications for the limited funds that are available; this is the major limiting factor. We have a realistically aggressive funding plan, but the only way we can achieve all the outcomes in the plan is with funding.

Staff went through the 5-step process they used to determine which projects would be included in the TSP (slide 6). There are 7 consistent outcomes that are the foundation upon which much of the analysis occurred.

Criteria were not weighted, but staff is now looking at how the majority of projects and programs achieve multiple benefits.

Mark provided background about how staff put together the financial plan (slide 19-20). In the next few months, there will be more analysis and discussion to get more feedback. The three funding scenarios show that the biggest increase is in the local funding streams between the existing, constrained and unconstrained scenarios.

Freight revenue in the constrained model looks at historic spending for locally-led projects and maintenance, which is about \$108M for 20 years. In the constrained model, we are looking at another \$88M for 20 years. But lots of this funding could go to maintenance.

Art walked through some analysis about the initial list. This is a first taste of our “recipe”, which we may hear that we’re missing ingredients, which is part of the process.

Slide 27 shows (in blue) the number of projects in the constrained list that meet the 9 criteria. Most of the projects that made it into the constrained list meet more than one criteria. Four projects met zero criteria, and they are not recommended to be on the constrained list.

How does the investment strategy support the growth we want to see and the community attributes we want? This is an investment strategy we want to use to get us to the future we’re striving for.

*Commissioner Gray* asked about unpaved streets, high-crash corridors and the map of projects. Is there an overlay of these three components together? It looks like crashes in the unpaved areas don’t match where the projects are.

- We want to make sure we’re putting our investments into areas that have high need and expected higher population growth.

Where should City resources go? That is the question for the evening. We are primarily looking at multi-modal, pedestrian/bike and freight improvements. We have partner agencies working with us on other aspects too.

### Testimony

Jim Owens, Phil Selinger, Linda Nettekoven, TSP Transportation Expert Group (TEG): Most of the policies and goals adequately respond to the Network PEG comments. Specifically... policy direction that recognizes the TSP to support regional and economic growth; reduces carbon emissions; promotes equity; promotes the Centers and Corridors strategy. Some stronger terms are necessary as the PSC has discussed about other policies before. The proposed draft assumes coordination, but often this hasn’t been true. The TEG is most concerned about lack of process to resolve conflicts among, for example, the transportation hierarchy. The hierarchy fails to recognize the need for autos and freight; there needs to be more guidance about how the hierarchy will be used. The City should work with TriMet. Trails should be recognized as part of the transportation network. Inadequate emphasis on regional coordination. Proposed parking policies are premature. Project selection process and list includes the result of a programmatic category to target smaller projects that could otherwise be lost. We have comments that the PSC should consider. We have been trying to test and develop the criteria list simultaneously, and we want to make sure it is still refined over time. We are also concerned that people are confused by the prioritization and that smaller projects are categorized separately from the list. Supportive of outcome-based criteria. We’re supportive of PBOT’s realistic financial plan and for reporting performance results. We’re concerned about the correlation of the list of projects with those shown on the Map App, so we still need a consolidated map. Staff has worked hard to touch lots of groups, but the TEG is still concerned people don’t understand the relationship of the TSP to other projects and plans. The greatest concern is the abbreviated time for people to comment on the list between the release in late January and the deadline of March 13. *See TEG written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith* is the PSC liaison to the TSP TEG. The TEG didn’t necessarily get to conclusions on lots of the work, and it does feel hurried. Is the TEG done with the work it needs to do, or has it been truncated too early?

- We are never really done. We will review the public comments and will comment to PBOT on those comments to provide additional recommendations on goals and policies. We see the evaluation work as a test run, and we need to continue this and be fully involved. At this point, the TEG has not focused on individual projects.
- A concern is that with the sprint we’ve been doing is a bifurcated result, where people who are in the know are more able to comment, but what about community support if you don’t know about this? People with little experience with the transportation realm

aren't as able to comment and provide feedback.

*Commissioner Houck* would like to send his questions to the TEG to ask for feedback instead of asking for comments today.

Communication between now and the March 10 work session is helpful.

1. Terry Parker: Any bicycle projects in the TSP that reduce auto capacity should be removed. Streetcar expansion should be derailed. *See written testimony.*
2. Jeanne Harrison, NWDA Transportation Committee: The Committee has approved a streetcar extension for NW Northrup. A study should be added to see about an extension to Montgomery Park. Access to the Conway area is also vital and is a key recommendation from the group. What about major reconstruction projects in the list? Support program areas but would like to know what the projects are. *See written testimony.*
3. Marianne Fitzgerald, SWNI: I'm concerned about the time crunch. More detailed comments will be submitted by SWNI soon. All Centers and Corridors need projects on the TSP to make complete neighborhoods. SW Barbur is a key priority for pedestrian and bicycle improvements. I appreciate that project ranking is based on outcomes, and we'd like access to this.
4. Jennifer Vitello, Cathedral Park NA: Commented on project #30050 and the 2004 St Johns Lombard Plan. Under the Comp Plan, this area will turn into a high-density urban center, which is promising. Our concerns arise with transportation because street don't have pavement, they lack of sidewalks, traffic lights and there are few through streets. I support the project to have improved transportation in the neighborhood but am concerned about lack of bicycle access.
5. Jeremy Byron Tennant: Discussed impacts on Woodlawn. He recommends the 13<sup>th</sup>-14<sup>th</sup> Ave bikeway to be completed soon, as should the 22<sup>nd</sup> Ave bikeway. He's concerned with the freight priority program and how that won't harm Woodlawn. You should consider Portland seeks an exemption to Goal 9 so equity and environmental justice can be fulfilled.
6. Brad Perkins, NNEBA: we need more living wage jobs. Oregon's most important planning goals started with SB 100 that instituted the UGB to limit sprawl. We need to continue this big picture approach to secure needed financing for transportation projects. The PSC and PBOT need to have a stronger voice with ODOT. *See written testimony.*
7. Dan Lerch Walters: Build the Sullivan's Gulch Trail. It's on the constrained list, and I think the full trail should be done within the first 10 years of the plan. It's vital to the 40-mile loop trail to make this a world-class biking city. This trail separates contact points so we will reduce injury. The health of Sullivan's Gulch is poor, and we can restructure it with more native species and trees.
8. John Gibbon, PURB: Handling stormwater is a major cost driver and should be included in the TSP. We need to push for policies for concurrency that work for both transportation and stormwater management. The Tabor to the River stormwater system did create a good transportation project and has saved people money. The PSC needs to be strong on planning for best outcomes together.
9. David Martin, Bridlemile NA: Spoke to Hamilton St and Shattuck Rd. Neither have

pedestrian facilities, and there is not a good way for people to walk to the school. We have repeatedly asked for these projects to be included in the work. Hamilton St received the most positive comments on the Map App. Shattuck was number two on the list. The NA remains at a loss about how these projects remain unfunded. The Hamilton project had a steep price tag, but we think it could be done for considerably less.

10. David Sweet, Cully Association of Neighbors: in May 2012, the PSC approved the Cully Main Street Plan, which includes projects to test range of improvements on Cully streets. The recommendation was not included on the TSP list, and this needs to be added. 10 other projects on the list are important to Cully, constrained for \$10M. But this raises the risk for Cully's most vulnerable residents. BPS was also to use Cully as a case study for a test to displacement and gentrification. There are a number of anti-displacement strategies that we propose be included. *See written testimony.*
11. Laura Young, East Cully NPI, Cully Blvd Alliance: It's critical to have thoughtful and intentional investments in Cully. Look beyond the price and see what the investments can do for local living-wage jobs and reduce the effects of forced displacement.
12. Steve Messinetti, Habitat for Humanity: There has been a huge increase in the number of families coming to HFH for help in the past years. Housing affordability is at a crisis level in Portland. The cost of housing has seen a 60 percent increase in the past 10 years. We appreciate the equity lens, but please consider strategies to ensure the transportation improvements don't result in displacement. In Cully two-fifths of households are at risk for displacement. We want to see improvements that will increase quality of life, but we need to make sure they don't displace people they are intended to support.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about the alternative street project in Cully. The Council did not decide to fund this, so a reminder that voices need to be brought to Council as well.

13. Alan Hipolito, Verde: Partner with HFH in Living Cully to address multiple disparities. We've addressed the needs for low-income people to engage the community. This includes a street that's piloting alternative street design standards. Anti-displacement work is extremely difficult, but we need to include this in our work together. I support the previous testimony and only want to support the TSP improvements if they include the anti-displacement measures as we've submitted. We need responsive leadership for new and more powerful anti-displacement tools.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that he and Hipolito worked together in the Coalition for a Livable Future on securing a racial impact/displacement impact statement for north interstate light rail and wanted to know if there were lessons learned from that experiences that might be applied to requests for displacement impact statements.

14. Laura Campos: "Intersectionality" is a word that I'm interested in. How does the demolition delay policies and anti-displacement policies work together and interrelate? They create a system of discrimination. I worked on the original Comp Plan. The majority of people in Portland are not property owners, so they don't see the benefits afforded to owners. My work has largely been with people on the margins. I do have a valuable perspective on planning because of this. Please listen to communities of color because their perspectives are very important.
15. Barbara Quinn, Friends of Baltimore Woods: Project #103570, Cathedral Park Whistle-Free Zone, is a long-standing goal of the neighborhood. It improves N Bradford to make it more accessible for trucks and autos. This frees up N Decatur for bikes and

pedestrians and the natural area of Baltimore Woods. This is especially important as the neighborhood is projected to grow.

16. Rebecca Hamilton, Pedestrian Advisory Committee: The submitted list reflects the PAC's priorities. We support citywide programs to fill the gaps and the green transportation hierarchy. We also support the Vision Zero policy to guide transportation investments. Update the 1998 Pedestrian Master Plan for inclusion in the TSP. *See written testimony.*
17. Jocelyn Gaudi, Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee: Shared goals for a safer, more equitable and sustainable network are important. We ask the PSC to incorporate: 1. Inclusion of the transportation hierarchy; 2. Inclusion of bicycle transportation hierarchy; 3. Support the TSP selection criteria; 4. Request that PBOT define which projects fall into the programs categories to clarify and evaluate PBOT's prioritization. *See written testimony.*
18. Arlene Kimura, EPAP and Hazlewood NA: EPAP submitted a list of prioritized projects, but the EPAP process doesn't seem to be fully incorporated in the TSP list. With the studies going on, we don't have the information about mixed-use zoning. We need a list of those potential impacts. Equity is a goal, but I don't see it; not because of lack of trying, but this is not a fast process. It takes a long time to get to know people. More time and effort needs to be built in to planning.

*Chair Baugh* asked about EPAP's projects not being incorporated into the TSP list. We haven't been able to get full resolution about this.

19. Jill Statz: The committee of best practices looking at how to off-set displacement and gentrification concerns. We need to further assess and mitigate for transportation investments for existing populations as well as for long-term impacts on affordability, particularly for minorities. We need to extend efforts to make displacement policies actively, not retroactively. Providing stabilization and support for existing community members is imperative.
20. Ryan Bass: Advocating for 2 projects that should be included, SW Shattuck Rd and SW Hamilton bike improvements. These projects had a majority of comments on the Map App. We want safety and to be able to get around our neighborhood. There is huge community support for these projects. What we really need is just a sidewalk on one side, and we don't feel like we need all the funding allocated in the TSP list.
21. Eavan Moore, CAT: Protection of renters' rights is vital to strengthening Portland. Growth and change should benefit everyone, especially our most vulnerable. CAT collected 158 comment cards, and everyone supported more affordable housing. Rent control, water costs, just-cause notices for evictions, landlord certification and affordable housing in every neighborhood are key items we want addressed. BPS can impact affordability, and CAT looks forward to working with BPS and the PSC as well as tenant leaders to identify the right solutions to keep people in the communities they helped to build.
22. Raihana Ansary, PBA: PBA encourages job growth, livability and prosperity. We have the [Cost of Congestion Report](#). We appreciate the economic benefit criteria to help prioritize projects that help create quality middle-income jobs but are concerned about difference in funding levels and a shift away from multi-modal system. The freight revenue slide in the PBOT presentation was helpful. Projects that add traffic lights should be prioritized. Comparing Projects #20068 and #20077 highlights the discrepancy of prioritizing some modes versus all.

23. Leah Gray, CAT & EPAP Housing Committee: Lives on fixed income, but spend about 40 percent of her budget on housing. I've had continued trouble with the housing complex, which refuses to repair, and people then get evicted, then the owners raise rents. We need to tie immediate financial impacts to violations like this.
24. Don Baack: Laura Foster's testimony is important; please be sure to read this carefully. In SW, 42 percent of streets are substandard, which is far worse than any other part of the city. On trails, we are happy to see these included in transportation, but we still need to have public conversations to make sure this is structured for all modes. We need to make sure greenways are applicable to transportation options for pedestrians. We also need to focus on the F4 / Marquam Hill Rd. *See written testimony re: Red Electric.*
25. Jason Franklin, PSU: PSU generates many pedestrian, bike and transit trips. 40 percent of new students are from families of color. Pedestrian/bike safety downtown is actually quite lacking in the district, and the TSP doesn't address these concerns. We need more time to work with PBOT. Most of the infrastructure is in place downtown, but there are continued needs particularly in the West Quadrant Plan. 2 projects that should be included in the TSP are the Broadway Cycle Track and SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave Streetscape.
26. Cristina Palacios, CAT: Spoke to displacement and the Comp Plan. People are confused because they don't know how the Comp Plan will affect them. Please reach out to the people who need to know what's going on. Housing is a very important piece in a 20-year plan. Many tenants who live in substandard housing cannot afford to move. We need to enforce housing codes and ensure that people aren't continued to be pushed out. Title 6 should be used as a tool to be used consistently.
27. Mike Connors, Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community: Objecting to the proposal for removing the N Hayden Dr improvements from the project list. It's inconsistent with the other policies and plans for West Hayden Island. In the TSP, there are projects linked to the project that are remaining including the WHI rail yard expansion. We need consistency throughout the plans. *See written comments.*
28. Jim Howell: 2 projects not in the list including streetcar extension and the MAX 2050 Plan. Regarding funding, we can't use state funding for bicycle transportation projects. But SJR16 would refer to the voters the opportunity to change this rule in the next general election. *See written testimony.*
29. Jessica Engleman: We are on track to shift from private vehicle system to walking, biking and transit. We should focus on the "interested but concerned" populous. This means that before adding to the network, we should improve the gaps and strengthen what we have. Removing on-street parking will be a contention point. We should make parking expensive instead of cheap. Public transit should be faster and more reliable. I also support the Green Loop proposal.
30. Jacqueline Conley, Gladstone Square Tenants Association: I strongly support the anti-displacement recommendations. There is a lack of respect for many community members in substandard housing developments. We are working with CAT to help get needs met and make voices heard. Tenants have been threatened by management companies, even when asking for upgrades based on maintenance and code violations. The community lives in fear, and we need to increase and provide affordable housing and programs that have outreach included. All community members deserve to be heard.



31. Brian Posewitz, SMILE Transportation Committee: 1. Support the Reedway pedestrian/bike over way. 2. Support the Tacoma Main Street improvements, but we would like to see it on the constrained list. 3. SE 13<sup>th</sup> Streetscape improvements: would like to see the project have additional pedestrian crossings, particularly at Lambert. 4. Outer Milwaukie: would like to see this extended south of 17<sup>th</sup> with additional pedestrian crossings. 5. Concerned that a project doesn't close the gap on the Springwater Corridor, but now see that it's on the list.
32. Edward Hill: Transportation is integral to healthy communities. Improvements are often tied to big investments where historical patterns of planning have created displacement. We need solutions to mitigate these effects. An equitable process is necessary. There are over 50 pages in the Albina Plan that have been abandoned, but the plan should be included in the next iteration of the Comp Plan. Community plans should be prioritized to ensure people can access the prosperity of the region and goals in the plan.
33. Danell Norby, Housing Land Advocates: TSP policies may improve quality of life for low-income communities, but they are only experienced by people who live in healthy connected neighborhoods. Well-intentioned investments often displace people. We support the 11 anti-displacement measures put forth tonight, especially land banking and affordable units and new market-rate housing.
34. Anita Yap, APANO / Jade District: Thanks to City staff. The Jade District is one of the most diverse zip codes in the state. Anti-displacement policies and community benefits are not one-size fits all. I'm most concerned about displacement of small businesses. Right-of-way improvements don't necessarily fall under land use policies, but the TSP policies should include the community benefits for suggested improvements. In terms of the Comp Plan Map versus the Zoning Map, we should fine-tune how we look at displacement for both residents and businesses. Policies in the Comp Plan should come first, before any zone changes happen.
35. Todd Struble, APANO / Jade District: I appreciate that equity is a core value. 88 percent of students in Jade District schools receive free or reduced lunch. There is investment coming with Powell-Division and 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave improvements, but we have unique challenges. Things that work in Cully may not work in our area. Tools that would help include: 1. Working with ODOT to transfer the 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave jurisdiction to PBOT; 2. The Metro purchased vacant furniture store that will be a TOD should be maintained as affordable housing; 3. More green space in needed.
36. James Lopez-Ericksen, CAT: Thanks to the PSC and today's testifiers. Community forums on displacement need to include racism, and I hope this is part of policies and procedures in place. I have been trying to think about meeting displacement and gentrification at its core via a historical and cultural flyer about the history of each neighborhood. That could help new businesses work with the community that already lives in the neighborhood to show how everyone can benefit.
37. Rick Grogan: Has lived downtown for 7 years, and rent has increased about 5.2 percent annually but 16 percent this year. But we had a verbal agreement that there would not be increases this year, but Home Forward won't enforce the agreements.
38. Pamela Phan, 1000 Friends of Oregon: Works with the larger coalition that brought forth ideas for anti-displacement work. We have provided options that we'd like to work with the PSC and staff about to see how we can make them possible. We are encouraged by policies in the proposed draft and the TSP. The promise of smart growth



needs to be done equitably. We are fully supportive of the communities of color and low-income tenants' testimony. We do support infill and density to help create opportunities for more people.

39. Raquel Valle: Part of the tenant association at Gladstone Square, working to organize to get repairs done and to take up harassment issues among tenants. The management company allows tenants to attack people for the color of their skin and the language they speak. People should not have to worry about trying to make their lives and homes better in the place they live. We need further community outreach to support our efforts. *See written testimony.*
40. Tabitha Boschetti: PSU students looked at streetscape improvements, community benefits and zoning. Our scenarios for the future of N Fessenden looked how the changes affect displacement and people's outcomes. Proposals that minimize displacement support lots of other benefits. See <https://futurefessenden.wordpress.com/> for the project details.
41. Pia Welch, Portland Freight Committee: With the transportation hierarchy, there is still confusion on which street classifications it would be applied to. Street design is based on surrounding land uses and the transportation network. How would the hierarchy help to resolve conflicts? We propose the hierarchy not be included for freight-oriented streets. Freight needs to be treated more like it is in the Vancouver BC plan. All modal needs must be reviewed. Project selection criteria - would like to see more work done on this. *See written testimony.*

*Chair Baugh* closed oral testimony for the Transportation System Plan and for the Comprehensive Plan.

## Discussion

*Commissioner Rudd:* Please pass housing comments to PHB. We should see what can be policies included in the Comp Plan / TSP versus addressing issues via other avenues. I would be curious about if we've looked at LIDs and ability to get funding that way. Regarding partnership projects, do we have assumptions about how this would work? For example, where we would need to do a match, are these assumptions concerning a source of dollars or an expectation that we can contribute land for the match? There were comments about the level of support about what got comments on the Map App, but I'd want to understand how we are looking at community support with the consideration that there may be equity issues related to the use of the Map App.

*Commissioner Smith* will read and review the suggested language on anti-displacement policies. The hierarchy proposal is a question we need to address. When will the scoring for the project list be available? [TEG members will review initially for feedback then will provide in about April.] Sooner is better. I will want to talk about the CRC's role and breaking it up into smaller projects that make more sense. I have individual projects that I'd like staff to consider that I'll email. Also, can we allow another 30 days for people to review the project list to provide opportunities for staff to comment?

*Commissioner St Martin* echoed the comment to have people get access to the scoring criteria. The details about the bucketed program list – when will that be ready? [This is on the immediate to-do list for staff.] Look at how to include the displacement language.

*Commissioner Gray* was impressed with the testimony about anti-displacement tools and the number of comments tonight. Tenant rights, which perhaps aren't specifically about the TSP, certainly are about people living in our city that don't have opportunity. There is history with

the EPAP projects and the TSP, and there have been lists going back and forth. We've collected the lists, and the true-up on that would be very good. We could use some more information on that. I have a number of work items I'll send to staff.

*Commissioner Houck* focused on the multi-objective comments. In the 7 outcomes, climate change was included, but only when talking about reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. I hope it includes climate adaptation as well. The notion of collaboration between BES and PBOT to get to multiple objectives is imperative. We need to be integrating the missions of the bureaus. I was pleased to hear about the small project compilation that can have great impact on various parts of the city. I do want to reiterate that not all trails are transportation projects. There is a need for trails that solely provide access to nature.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* agreed with *Commissioner Smith* about the timeline and lack of time community members have had to review the project list. I appreciate the testimony and comments about public involvement, which should continue and increase to meet communities where they are. We need to show leadership with anti-displacement strategies, particularly in the context of transportation.

*Commissioner Oxman* was impressed with the TSP overall and the process. He's interested in seeing the scoring and how that plays out. Given the history of transportation funding, I do think I can be a bit nervous about project funding. I'm supportive of the transportation hierarchy, but the implementation will be a very tricky issues as it gets to intergenerational conflicts, ability/disability, highly-functioning transit system and financial versus time costs of transportation.

*Chair Baugh* commented on inclusion and the need for a more inclusionary process about the TSP. I heard a different view between people of color and others. We need to make sure people understand the plan and implementation and how that will help people. The community benefits tie seems like how does transportation provide community benefits; this is an intriguing idea to explore. Vision Zero is the right thing to do, but I'm concerned that PBOT has picked bikeways are part of this, where I think pedestrian should be the initial priority. I'd like to see the rationale for bikeways versus sidewalks. We have put lots of emphasis on economic analysis, and freight has to carry this. But what about diesel emissions? We need to look at the balance of this. I want to see if the Albina Plan for transportation and what's in the TSP are in conflict or which would be prioritized with the new TSP (and Comp Plan overall). Regarding housing, jobs and prosperity, the streetcar and transit ways on Powell-Division, etc. are long-term projects, but transit improvements are not guaranteed. It's great that East County will get transit improvements, but we need to continue the frequent bus service, which could disappear with the next economic down-turn (whereas streetcar, with laid-down tracks, wouldn't). How do we leverage the streetcar that has development opportunities to bring benefits to the rest of the city?

What are the implications for extending the deadline by 30 days?

- There is a state requirement to have a proposed plan by July 2015. Ultimately the state can remove funding if we fail to meet the deadline, and we've already used up our allowed extensions.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about how this would impact the PSC work session schedule.

- The March 10 work session is to be about housing and residential designations as well as the transportation work you heard today. Adding work sessions in May would push the PSC vote into May, and that would affect other project timing coming to the PSC.

The two April hearings for the PSC are on the EOA and the Scenarios Report. Those provide opportunities to comment on these specific topics, which can relate to the TSP.

Staff would need to think through the implications for missing the state deadline and the potential to add time to the PSC schedule for the Comp Plan. Lots of testimony came today from organizations that have reviewed the work. People can also testify in front of City Council after the PSC sends its recommended draft to them.

We need to have a constrained list in the current status to meet the state guidelines for the TSP. More transportation work comes in Task 5 for the Comp Plan later in the calendar year and into early 2016. Then the next TSP update will be prior to the 2018 RTP.

The main to-do items to meet periodic review are to look at items that are on the unconstrained (or constrained) list to make sure they either are or aren't on the correct list.

Benefits agreements are on the table and would be part of the implementation (Task 5) phase. They could be more like contracts as opposed to zoning work.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted that if we move forward and close the public hearing, we can still give staff direction to meet with these specific communities.

Also the TEG will continue their work, and the PSC can ask the TEG members for their perspectives in future hearings.

*Chair Baugh* noted that TSP comments can be made at the April hearings as they relate to the topics at these hearings. Staff will have to go back if there are significant comments at those meetings if the PSC directs them to review specific comments.

We will stick with the current plan and will close oral testimony tonight but continue written testimony through March 13 at 5 p.m.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 9:03 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, February 10, 2015

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray (arrived 12:45 p.m.), Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**BPS Staff Presenters:** Susan Anderson, Eric Engstrom, Tom Armstrong, Roberta Jortner, Steve Kountz

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:34 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck* noted the 13<sup>th</sup> Annual Urban Ecology and Conservation Symposium yesterday at PSU. Bureau of Environmental Services staff gave presentations, including one about Riverview Natural Area restoration, which was purely an ecological objective. The Bureau of Environmental Services' tree planting program, on the other hand, is focused on addressing focuses on under-served and under-canopied communities and addresses both ecological and equity. I would like to have updates at the PSC when we have more time in our schedule.
- *Commissioner Oxman* and neighbors have been putting together a Climate Forum for the neighborhood that will include neighborhood-specific interventions and adaptations in preparation for climate changes.

### Director's Report

- We took the West Quad Plan to Council last week. The hearing will continue, with comments due by this Friday, 2/13. It will be back at Council on 2/25 for more discussion, amendments from Council members. Council and staff are appreciative of the PSC's work.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 1/27/15 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Tom Armstrong, Steve Kountz, Roberta Jortner

### Documents:

- [Annotated Agenda](#)
- [Testimony Memo](#)

- [Economic Development Report](#)
- [EOA Briefing Document](#)
- [EOA Section 1](#)
- [EOA Sections 2-3](#)
- [EOA Section 4](#)
- [EOA Appendix C](#)
- [Comp Plan Chapter 7 Memo](#)
- [Updated Annotated Agenda](#)
- [Items Pulled from Consent List by PSC Members](#)
- [Supplemental Memo dated February 10: Industrial Land Capacity Proposals](#)

**Presentation:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7213683/File/Document>

*Chair Baugh* and Eric provided an overview of the flow for today’s work session.

This is the second “marathon” work session for the PSC – thank you for the Commissioners for your continued work.

February 24 is a work session (Community Involvement and David Douglas School District) and a hearing on the Transportation System Plan (TSP). Staff will send documents for this meeting to Commissioners tomorrow.

Eric introduced other BPS staff, Tom, Steve and Roberta, who are presenting today’s work session materials. He provided an overview of the [documents](#) Commissioners received and have before them for today’s session. The Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) is a draft, which will be updated prior to the EOA hearing at the PSC in April.

Staff met with *Commissioner Houck* earlier today to discuss some of his questions and clarifications. *Commissioner Smith* confirmed that the transportation policies in the chapters relating to today’s work session will instead be included in the TSP hearing.

Today’s recommendations, as at the first work session, are tentative in direction to staff. The PSC will continue to receive written testimony through March 13, so there may be edits to the current recommendations before any final recommendation to Council.

***Economic Opportunities Analysis and Buildable Lands Inventory***

Tom gave an overview of the EOA, which is a foundation document, and is part of Task 2 of Periodic Review. A previous version was adopted but challenged in 2012, so we voluntarily withdrew it for revisions. Today’s document is the next draft with changes that reflect a revised jobs forecast from Metro and some updated Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI) information. What’s new is Section 4, the reconciliation and analysis of the policies, investments and map changes in the Proposed Comp Plan and what this means for our employment land base versus forecasted demand.

This is the third version of the EOA, and we’ll probably have 3 more: a March version based on what we hear today and updates to the BLI based on the CPS and TSP. Then based on the PSC’s final recommendation, staff will update the analysis prior to Council, and then Council may have final edits before they adopt the report.

The results of the employment forecast and resulting demand for development land are reported by ten employment land geographies, which are subareas of the city that represent types of business districts. The employment geographies allow development assumptions to vary across the city and provide more detail in describing job growth trends and forecasts together with associated building and anticipated land acreage needs.

We are looking at how we accommodate 142,000 new jobs by 2035. This is a 26 percent job capture rate, which is similar to Portland's historic capture rate compared to the rest of the region. The biggest growing job sector is our campus institutions, which include universities and hospitals covering more than 10 acres each.

We also look at the traded sector facilities that are land extensive but don't have high job densities: airports, rail yards and marine terminals. One of the key changes in this EOA is that we have lowered the marine terminal demand forecast to be at the low end of the forecast range.

We need about 3000 acres of employment land.

On the supply side, the BLI process is to identify vacant land and what land is likely to redevelop. After that base capacity, we apply a number of constraints based on the difficulty to develop the specific land areas (for example, physical, infrastructure and regulatory constraints).

*Commissioner Houck* noted the difficulty of creating land with the industrial sanctuary zoning and then adding the environmental overlay zone. What about mapping environmental zones up front and then have a conversation about if we could/should add industrial land here? We may think differently about how we do our inventories in the future.

- Yes, that is similar to the process that cities on the edge of the region do when looking at adding land.
- For Portland, we have a different challenge in dealing with a built-out city with an established development pattern.

Based on the supply and demand for employment land, we find:

- The Central City has a surplus of capacity, but the Central Eastside and Lower Albina districts have a shortfall of about 25 acres, especially for cheaper, Class B office space that account for about 50 percent of the employment growth. We expect the SE Quadrant Plan to propose the zone changes that will fill this gap.
- In the Industrial areas, overall there is about a 100 acre surplus, but there is a small 33 acre shortfall in the Harbor Access Lands that we need to be proactive to help meet.
- The Commercial areas have a surplus of capacity. Neighborhood commercial districts, town centers and Gateway.
- Institutions have strong demand but current master plans and zoning accounts for only 80 percent of the demand. We are working on a zoning code proposal that will provide the needed development capacity.

If property is zoned for industrial use, we can look on the demand side and limit the retail use (which is allowed in industrial areas in Portland). For Commercial Mixed-Use where we allow a 4-story building, we can look at where it would be located, and then assume use/density based on location. We also discounted commercial space in East Portland because we have not yet seen the market at that level. Staff has also proposed to shift some capacity in the maps before the PSC today. Commercial uses are inefficient in these areas, and there could be more intensity of land use.

The major change from the 2012 EOA is a slight lower employment land demand due to: a) the 2012 Metro forecast of 5,400 fewer jobs; and b) selecting lower marine cargo forecast to roughly match the available capacity in the Portland Harbor.

We think we have reasonable assumptions about development trends, and we are staying fairly conservative with these estimates. Unlike where we've been, we don't see this as a "set it and forget it" type of process for the EOA. Metro updates their forecasts every six years, and our proposed policies suggest the City can make adjustments to the assumptions to respond to

these updates. The City is engaged with Metro so that Portland, which has different objectives and commitments than other cities, advises Metro on how to do their numbers. We do make sure their assumptions and view for Portland is what the City also expects.

The next version of the EOA will be published in early March, with a public hearing at the PSC on April 14. The recommendation from the PSC will go to Council and then to DLCDC and LCDC for their acknowledgement.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the value added versus falling jobs situation.

- We'll continue this discussion as part of today's work session.

Staff can send the PSC members background about how accurate forecasts have been in the past. Our residential numbers back to the mid-90s is pretty much spot-on with forecasts.

## **Chapter 6: Economic Development**

### **Issue A: Economic Equity**

Tom reviewed the Economic Equity chart: the 2012 wage quartile comparison of Portland's employment based on area (slide 17). This asks us what we can do to boost the middle quartiles, especially for people without college degrees.

Regarding Policy 6.27, staff added subpolicies to limit negative impacts on middle/high-wage job growth and to recognize the middle-wage and disparity-reduction roles of industrial land. And a new proposed Policy 6.1 Diverse, Growing Community is suggested as an overall policy for the document as proposed by the Office of Equity and Human Rights.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted this is how we view this from a planning perspective – how we use the land to create industrial-wage jobs. But there is a cultural and education aspect as well.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about the wage level chart and overlaying it with job density per acre in each job type.

*Commissioner Rudd*: If we perform this mapping the mapping should also show the secondary and tertiary jobs that result from that industrial job.

- *Commissioner St Martin* shared her quick math on this equation. There is a big spread between the different land areas.
- *Commissioner Oxman* did further math, and looking at the ratio of how much area it takes to create a job. Industrial jobs require about 16x as much as a Central City job.
- But what is bringing income to the region? This is what the industrial lands offer, so it's not just one job in one location; there is a huge multiplier affect with traded sector jobs.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the Neighborhood Commercial designation, where there are many low-wage jobs. With growth in the corridors, how do we change the dynamic about who gets the higher wages in the developing corridors?

- It is a mix in the corridor, and you balance it with the opportunity for small business ownership and wealth creation for small business owners.
- If we were a suburban community, we would have a mall instead of the corridor category. It would be interesting to compare small business ownership versus franchises and chains.

PSC members confirmed the recommendation for a new Policy 6.1 and proposed edits to Policy 6.27.



### ***Issue B: Industrial land and watershed health policies***

The work Watershed Health and Environment and Economic PEGs developed five main strategies on the industrial land and watershed health strategy:

- Retain and protect prime industrial land
- intensify and reinvest
- develop brownfields
- map changes
- manage capacity

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about the University of Portland's request to rezone the part of their property on the Willamette River.

- We are proposing to change this to Campus Institution with Mixed-Employment zoning instead of Industrial as it is currently.

When we look at the proposed changes and how they play out in terms of generating capacity, we get a huge lift from more aggressive brownfield redevelopment and industrial land intensification. Details are in the supplemental memo provided to PSC members today.

Policy 6.17 Regulatory Climate is a proposed policy that garnered lots of comment and discussion, especially around subsections a and e.

- *Commissioner Rudd* is supportive of subsection b, but would like to keep the "avoid" statement. She wants a check for new policies to verify that additional review by the City adds value, given the resulting delay in project development, jobs online and drain on staff resources.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted that in the past, it was argued that the City shouldn't have jurisdiction over some areas (e.g. things that the Federal and State governments regulate), but the City should retain its authority since we often have higher standards.

PSC members confirmed this policy with the change from *Commissioner Rudd* for Policy 6.17e.

*Commissioner Houck* has significant issues with 6.17a. It is like creating a race to the bottom. We shouldn't base our decisions on how little other jurisdictions are doing versus Portland's priorities. Why do we even need this in the Comp Plan? We don't need to peg our aspirations to what other cities may or may not be doing; it should be on our radar, but we make decisions more broadly.

- This is an issue that comes up regularly, for example when setting System Development Charges (SDCs). We've heard these issues, and instead of using "ensure", we could use the phrase "maintain our financial competitiveness...".
- *Commissioner Smith* proposed the word "understand".
- *Commissioner Shapiro* asked about our being cost competitive in the region and *Commissioner Houck's* comment. There is a whole range of considerations that relates to our competitiveness with other cities, including quality of life, environmental health, access to parks and natural areas. Corporations base their decision on locating here to attract high quality workers.
- *Commissioner Schultz* supports the policy how it is written today because we need to know what's going on and compare it to other cities. We need to keep the full picture.
- *Commissioner St Martin* noted this is piece is specifically to the regulatory environment, but we can't ignore the environmental goals.
- *Commissioner Hanson* agrees with *Commissioner Schultz* about keeping regulatory cost-competitiveness on the radar. We need to know what other jurisdictions are doing to stay competitive. Other cities' requirements have become more stringent, which is promising and different from in the past.
- *Commissioner Smith* noted that SDCs are a provision of infrastructure. "Understand" implies we're conscious of other cities' plans. *Commissioner Rudd* and *Commissioner*

Hanson agree with this word choice. “Maintain” implies we already know where we are. “Understand” explains we will be aware of the financial implications of the decisions.

PSC members confirmed “understand” is the verb choice for Policy 6.17a.

**Policy 6.36 Prime industrial land retention.**

*Chair Baugh* asked why BES and PP&R are against this policy.

- We have 550 acres of industrial being rezoned to Open Space due to acquisitions. This policy would be a pause for consideration for future acquisitions. It could be seen as a constraint, but BPS sees it more as a question or consideration about impact on the industrial land capacity when making these types of decisions.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about the nature of these lands. They are purchasing natural areas.

- Some of these lands could have developable upland that could be for employment. Out of the 550 acres of previous acquisitions, we estimate that there is only 53 acres of employment capacity, but it’s at least worth asking the question what the impact is.
- The 53 acres in lost capacity has been factored in the updated EOA from those. Going forward, we would ask about offsetting this loss and if it’s possible to partition the land to make available the non-resource/developable portion of the site. This is theoretically feasible.
- *Commissioner Houck*: There is a difference between asking the question versus not being able to acquire land. The combination of upland and wetland habitat may be significant, so we shouldn’t consider all upland as buildable. I support the objective of this, but when it comes to making a decision where the Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) indicates there is additional land that needs to be protected, I don’t want to get into a situation where we want to acquire land for conservation, but can’t because the policy says “limit”.
- *Chair Baugh*: This policy is a step in a process to understand the balance.
  - If we can’t figure out how to offset the reductions, as part of the decision we would factor this in and need to take an exception to Goal 9. We’ll have to do that whether we include this policy or not.
- *Commissioner Rudd* is supportive of the concept but not the specific language. Additional work needs to be done related to the words “protect”, “limit” and “strictly limit”. “Limit” is defined as maintained. She would also like to see when the map changes come back, the implications of carving off the developable parts of the Open Space conversion acreage and discuss requiring as part of these changes, contribution of the owners to some sort of offset of the loss of industrial lands, such as contribution to a fund for brownfield remediation. *Commissioner Rudd* also noted that there were errors in the Staff Report where it indicated a letter had been submitted by the Stoel Rives law firm when in fact it was submitted by the Perkins Coie law firm.

Part of this policy implication plays out in how it gets interpreted in the Zoning Code implementation. Staff will check about the use of the word “prohibit” in 6.36a; “limit” in 6.36b is to limit non-industrial uses in prime industrial areas.

*Commissioner Oxman* is supportive of the policy, but asked if there been discussion of it being more broadly used (e.g. inner SE conversation from industrial to housing). Should the principle of protecting industrial land be expanded?

- There are other policies, especially Central City industrial policies and the EOA, that get to this concept.

The PSC is supportive of the policy, but required staff to update/edit language.

**Golf Course Rezoning**

There are three privately-owned golf courses by the airport that have a mix of potentially developable land and environmentally-sensitive land. Colwood got approval for a Comp Plan amendment to convert 49 acres to industrial and 100+ to remain as Open Space. Based on this model, staff looked at Broadmoor and Riverside as potential options to do the same to add to industrial land capacity. The Colwood process was quite laborious, so the Comp Plan map update would create a more streamlined process to allow for industrial uses on these areas. Between the two properties, we'd have about 105 acres of Industrial and 220 of Open Space lands.

In the last few weeks, we have received one letter from the Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods (NECN) opposing this map change and the loss of Open Space. Riverside also has provided a letter objecting to the proposal because they plan to continue operating as a private golf course in the foreseeable future. In terms of the map edit, no changes are proposed. There is a policy that supports the conversion of golf courses. The next step is to change the map but not the zoning, which can be done in the future at the owner's discretion. We can add this statement about discretion to the policy.

- *Commissioner Houck*: That would still allow the City to count the acreage as Industrial land.
- We currently have 113 acre surplus of industrial land based on all our assumptions. If we take away the 90 acres on Riverside, we're then close to the minimum necessary to demonstrate an adequate supply.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that we're going to run out of industrial land in the future anyway. In talking with staff, this is a balancing act with Metro. How will this play out in the future? The continued discussion about how close we are to the edge takes a tremendous amount of energy, and it's an ongoing issue.

- Over time, as development occurs, our future capacity will shrink. Our job in working with Metro is to balance these numbers. As the capacity shrinks, Metro will not assign as many jobs to Portland. On the demand side, we will review the industrial sectors and likely see they are growing slower than other sectors of the economy. So we will see a declining share that reflects the declining capacity. We will forever be on the edge in terms of trying to balance the declining share and the declining capacity.
- *Commissioner Rudd* likes to include the policy as it provides opportunities for middle-wage jobs.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted that Metro has recognized the land is not there. We don't want to get into a situation where Metro says we have to rezone, for example, Smith and Bybee Lakes.

PSC members confirmed the proposed map changes for the noted golf courses.

#### ***Issue E: Employment Land Map Changes***

*Commissioner Gray* asked about concepts specific to East Portland regarding dispersed employment. The noted areas that are of interest include NE Sandy and 122<sup>nd</sup>/Shaver at Rossi Farms.

There is a high priority truck route proposed on Sandy, which is part of a Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative area (NPI), which is not attractive to have truck traffic going through. And it's important to have the opportunity for areas that have been historical farms to remain. And you not that we're adding 4000 jobs by adding 50 acres of industrial land to Gateway – how does that work out?

- In Gateway, we have 4000 jobs demanding about 50 acres; most of these jobs will be institutional, office and retail, so it is high job density employment. We are proposing to change what was formally a light industrial area, which was previously changed to high-density mixed use (EX), to go back to the mixed employment/business park zoning. We are trying to right-size the zoning to what was there and what we expect

- going forward.
- NE Sandy as a priority truck route: it is still in the TSP, so this can be a topic at the TSP hearing at the next meeting.

Rossi Farms: *Commissioner Smith* noted the PSC has been supportive of urban agriculture. What will the proposed zoning change do?

- There is no impact on this as a continuing use; this map change is strictly about what happens if the property owners want to change the use in the future, just like the golf course situation. The proposed change is to encourage more jobs in East Portland and dampen the residential and retail capacity.
- Mixed employment areas are about three-quarters development as business parks, class C office space... the lightest of light industrial zones.
- We have received testimony from the Rossi family and the Argay neighborhood opposing this change.
- *Commissioner Hanson* noted he has talked with Rossi, and it sounds like he'd like to have more of a flexible zoning on his land. And that is the direction we're going.

There are a number of other small map changes throughout the city going to Mixed Employment – Light Industrial use designation. We've gotten various comments and questions on most of these, particularly Rossi Farms and the Argay neighborhood.

Other areas include:

- Northwest Industrial District (Montgomery Park)
- North Portland (north of Kenton Park to Columbia)
- SE 82<sup>nd</sup> and Gateway
- SE 82<sup>nd</sup> and freeway lands
- North Hayden Meadows Drive

PSC members confirmed the direction for Issue E: Employment Land Map Changes.

### ***Issue C: Harbor Access Lands***

This is one of the issues that was a big debate at LCDC. We had previously approached this as a sub-area of the Columbia Harbor District. In this version of the EOA, we broke this out as a separate geography. We have the tightest land supply here and have a 33 acre deficit. Within this area there are a mix of jobs with some industrial and office space that is not dependent on river access that could move to the uplands areas in adjacent industrial areas.

The West Hayden Island proposal drives the rest of the discussion here. The proposal is to map it as Rural Farm / Forest, which is equivalent to what is there today. Policy 6.41 provides guidance for future annexation. The designation means we still have an annexation and a Comp Plan Map amendment review process. The subpolicies of 6.41 begin the framework to guide this discussion.

This policy serves to help the City maintain compliance with Metro plans, which direct the city to eventually annex WHI for a mix of open space and marine terminal development. The City is not permitted to adopt a Comprehensive Plan that is directly at odds with the Metro regional plan. We are not counting on WHI land to meet industrial land needs through 2035, but we acknowledge that under the Metro plan annexation may be considered at a later time. The PSC or Council may choose to remove this policy, but we believe that such removal may create conflict with Metro.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the historical context, which is that the land was designated industrial prior to Metro. The annexation question has been addressed a couple of times at the City, in dividing industrial and environmental. Can't we get to the point now where we say this is an environmental asset that should remain as Farm Forest / Open Space?

- *Commissioner Houck* noted that current calculations show we have a surplus of 113 acres of industrial, which doesn't include WHI, so why would designating WHI as Open Space be in conflict with Metro?
  - Metro designates WHI as prime industrial land. The regional plan doesn't say when we have to annex, and we are reaching a conclusion that we don't need to annex right now based on taking a low end of the commodity forecast, which allows us to meet the requirement without the acreage. But this doesn't exempt us from the Metro Urban Growth Management Functional Plan. We need to remain consistent with other Metro policies, not just the jobs forecast.
  - The other confusion is the County's zoning with the significant environmental overlay. We don't have a proposal to change the County zoning or overlay at this time.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about the zoning.

- WHI is inside our urban service boundary, and the Comp Plan deals with all areas within even if we haven't yet annexed the land. Sometimes through an IGA with the County we have authority to zone, and sometimes we use County zoning - WHI is one of these areas. We have never changed the zoning, and it still sits with County designations until we make a decision on annexation and new City zoning.

The question for WHI is if we want to change the policy to be in conflict with Metro. We can leave the designation Farm / Forest, which is a rural zone, but we don't think we can change it so that doesn't include any industry is potentially in conflict with the Regional Plan.

*Commissioner Gray* noted this could be in conflict with City Council as well, which has designated the 300/500 acre split. Should the PSC take this stand against City Council?

- *Commissioner Houck* noted Council never adopted the PSC recommendation, but we could take this up with them.

*Chair Baugh* noted he is interested in leaving the staff recommendation as-is. There are lots of hurdles, and I'm not sure this is where we need to take issue.

- *Commissioner Hanson* confirmed; it was never annexed, and Council would have to take multiple actions to change anything.

*Commissioner Houck* stated that if Commissioner Smith made a motion to take WHI off the table he would second it. He said his second preference would be to attach the PSC recommended package, including the IGA to the Comp Plan amendment. He then noted that at a minimum, the amendment should spell out specific habitat types included in the IGA. He also noted that the staff report failed to mention that Metro's floodplain exemption was for balanced cut and fill, not floodplain ecosystem function. At a minimum the following habitats should be listed for full mitigation: floodplain, bottomland hardwood forests, wetlands, grasslands, sandy beach and shallow water.

Listing habitat types is something that can be included in the policy.

*Commissioner Oxman* would like staff to have a conversation with Metro about process implications to ask the question about removing WHI.

There was also discussion about moving jobs from Harbor Lands to other types of land.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked if moving the jobs would continue to provide jobs for people with AA or high school degrees. Staff confirmed that the jobs created would still serve this demographic

PSC members confirmed the policy with the inclusion of listing habitat types that would be mitigated, and staff will look at including more background/description from their 2013 WHI

recommendation.

PSC members would like a policy option that includes more detail from the IGA in the policy. PSC members would like a description of the process to change the Metro designation/policy to enable an OS map designation on the Comp Plan Map.

#### **Harbor Access Lands**

PSC members confirmed the staff direction.

#### **Issue D: Freight System and Brownfields**

We are assuming 15 percent of job growth will go into existing businesses and developed sites. There are a number of projects that are in the strategic freight investments that will need to be supported in the TSP to achieve this.

We have proposed aggressive policies and a new program for brownfield redevelopment as well as a need to solve the Portland Harbor Superfund to bring brownfield redevelopment back online. We need to have a City commitment of approximately \$1M annually to get to these increased brownfield performance numbers.

*Commissioner Oxman* likes the approach on brownfields. But “there are brownfields, and there are brownfields.”

- BPS did a good job with our brownfield assessment and evaluation that shows with a good program, 60 percent is an achievable target.

*Commissioners Houck* commented on channel deepening and the implications for what’s in the sediments, especially in relation to Superfund.

- The Columbia River has been deepened (to 43 feet), and this is part of the equation about how we clean up the harbor.
- The project list associated with this Comp Plan emphasizes better using the existing harbor.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted a prioritization process to figure out which acres could come on faster if they aren’t as brown.

- The market would play into this factor, and it would depend on location, owner and clean-up costs involved.

*Commissioner Smith* appreciates staff’s work on incorporating comments from the public about brownfields. I am fully supportive of this policy. *Commissioner Houck* agreed.

*Chair Baugh* noted there was lots of testimony about brownfields. We are saying we’re going to come up with \$100M to do this work, but it needs legislative and other investment to support. Also, when we get to the TSP, we need to review freight decisions, and we need to rethink our process and financial implications to investing in brownfields and/versus other projects. We need to make brownfield redevelopment a priority at the legislature, Council and with partners.

- *Commissioner Houck* noted that leadership should come from Metro, too.
- *Commissioner Hanson* noted clean-up costs of \$900k/acre is a hard sell.

PSC members confirmed the staff proposals for Issue D.

#### **Issue F: Campus Institutions**

Staff met with OHSU to make one map designation change for Marquam Hill and retain the EX zoning.



PSC members confirmed the staff proposals for Issue F.

### **Consent List**

Staff walked through items PSC members had requested to be pulled from the consent list and described and discussed.

Policy 6.64 Non-confirming neighborhood business uses.

- This sets direction to not displace existing neighborhood business.

Policy 6.20 Corporate Headquarters

*Commissioner Smith* asked about how this fits in tightening down things that shouldn't weigh in the industrial land.

- This policy refers to locating headquarters (e.g. Adidas).

*Commissioner Tallmadge* raised the question of environmental justice and is concerned about not connecting environmental justice and the environmental policies, especially in the introduction to Chapter 7. Her noted other comments on the chapter also focus on this issue.

- *Commissioner Houck* agrees. But as we go through this process, there are actions and investments that need to be taken purely for ecological reasons that are “human aside”.
- Director Anderson suggested that staff meet with Commissioner Tallmadge and come up with suggested changes to address the issue. Staff will report in a memo to the PSC.

PSC members confirmed this approach.

### **Planning for Natural Resources Protection**

*Commissioner Houck* commented on the term “protection”. I would like to leave this in the title but go with what staff has proposed for the policies following.

- Staff will revisit the glossary definition for “protect” as well.

PSC members confirmed the staff proposal with “Protection” remaining in the section title.

Proposal to reorder Chapter 7 so the overarching policies come first then followed by guidance-related policies for environmental plans. We also want to move policies 7.1-.3 to the overarching section.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted Policy 7.1 Environmental Quality, and the need to include examples to further specify how protection of air, water, and soil quality might be achieved. Staff will also revisit “protect” in the glossary. She asked for examples and similar levels of specificity for Policy 7.4. Natural Resource Protection.

PSC members confirmed the staff proposal with this addition direction.

Policy 7.6 and 7.7: Staff propose to consolidate to one policy. *Commissioner Rudd* would like to see how the “cumulative impacts” phrase fits in.

PSC members confirmed as staff proposed.

Policy 7.8: Staff proposes to simplify and add the word “coordinated” to refer to the land acquisition program so that the City will look at how land acquisition affects other goals and programs (e.g. industrial land supply, housing).

- *Commissioner Houck* noted this needs to be just one tool. We passed two bond measures that resulted in the acquisition of 16,000 acres of natural areas, which is great. But, realistically, there will never be enough money to protect what needs protecting and restoring. We don't want to spin this as “we're going to go out and buy the land we need to protect”.



Policies 7.10 Regulatory hierarchy: Avoid, minimize, mitigate. Proposed change is to clarify language.

- *Commissioner Houck* requested addition of term “fully” mitigate - otherwise environment will continue to degrade.
- *Commissioner Rudd* expressed concern about adding “fully”, but okay to add it is clear that full mitigation does not have to be achieved on-site.
- *Commissioner Houck* suggested that adding the locational hierarchy will make it clear that off-site is an option.
- *Staff confirmed* that the proposal will prefer on-site but allow mitigation occur off site as well.

PSC members confirmed the staff proposal with addition of term “fully” mitigate, and specification that full mitigation does not necessarily have to be achieved on-site.

Policy 7.11 Mitigation effectiveness

- *Commissioner Houck* requested inserting a hierarchy specifying preferences for on-site mitigation before off-site, and for mitigating the same resource type before a different type. He had also requested in written comments that the policy require mitigation to occur only within the same sub-watershed and within city limits.
- Staff agreed that hierarchy, which is also in the current Comprehensive Plan, could be readily re-established in the policy. Staff recommended also retaining proposed new language calling for prioritization of mitigation within in the same watershed and the city urban services boundary. Staff emphasized that while the policy should call for mitigation to be proximate to the impact area, staff recommended not including an absolute prohibition on mitigation outside the city since this could have unintended consequences and would preclude mitigation on sites like Government Island, West Hayden Island, and mitigation banks. Staff will consult with BES, *Commissioner Houck* and Bob Sallinger in developing revised language.
- *Commissioner Hanson* agreed that the Comprehensive Plan should not prohibit mitigation outside the city – that there needs to be some flexibility.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* expressed appreciation for the proposal to change “encourage” to “require”.

PSC members directed modification of the policy to incorporate the addition of the locational and resource type hierarchy.

**Policy 7.14 Air Quality, 7.16 Water Quality, and 7.22 Natural Hazards.**

The proposal would remove the term “and especially for under-served and under-represented communities, and create a new policy focusing on reducing environmental disparities.

- *Commissioner Tallmadge* expressed concern about just having one policy addressing equity, separate from the issues - that it might get overlooked.
- Director Anderson noted that referring to equity in individual policies poses the risk that we’ll miss some policies, and is redundant. This is an issue in other report chapters too, and she would like to a single policy highlighting equity in each major section of the report.

PSC members confirmed as staff proposed.

Policy 7.24 Impervious surfaces. The proposed edits intended to focus more on outcomes and impacts rather than the specific action of limiting impervious surfaces, and would add “urban heat island” to the list of impacts.

- *Commissioner Houck* likes the focus on reducing impacts. But why can’t we say “limit impervious surfaces and reduce the impacts...”?
- *Commissioner Hanson* asked whether impervious surfaces is the cause of urban heat

- island.
- Staff recommended that if the current language is retained, that the policy should read “Limit and strive to reduce”, consistent with the Climate Action Preparation Strategy.

PSC members directed retention of current policy language, as modified to begin with “limit and strive to reduce” and adding “urban heat island”.

Policies 7.37-7.49: Staff will meet with *Commissioner Tallmadge* to discuss her suggestions to address cultural significance in these watershed-specific policy sections.

Add new policy for Columbia Slough watershed section to recognize protection and wildlife hazard in the PDX Plan District.

PSC members confirmed as staff proposed.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted the importance of terms defined in the glossary and that they are very important for the PSC to see the next iteration of these terms.

Staff is getting close to filling the March 24 agenda, which is the “overflow” meeting.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about the packets and maps. When the maps are not included in color, it’s difficult to review without having to go back and forth from the screen to the paper. Staff will print next maps/packets in color for PSC members.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked staff to confirm that none of the proposed map changes would allow rezones before the zoning code is updated. [Yes, correct.]

In the spring, the PSC will recommend the policy document and map to Council. Then the PSC will begin the hearing on implementation projects, but those zoning code changes won’t be implemented until after the new Comp Plan is confirmed by the State. The PSC’s recommendation will include the TSP.

The current TSP list is based on input from the fall 2014 hearings and the advisory committee discussions. This initial list can be flagged by PSC members after the February 24 hearing.

Susan reminded PSC members that will continue to get comments and testimony throughout the process, some of which content will have been discussed at a work session prior to the testimony is received. This is an iterative process, and we have time at the end to make sure we revisit issues that PSC members hear and want to raise. Written testimony is still open through March 13.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 4:47 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, January 27, 2015

3:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray (arrived 6:25 p.m.), Don Hanson, Mike Houck (by Skype), Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

### Commissioners Absent:

**BPS Staff:** Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Michelle Kunec-North, Bill Cunningham, Barry Manning, Marty Stockton, Julie Ocken

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 3:01 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Smith* noted he reached out to a number of Climate Action groups regarding the Terminal 6 rezoning project. He will let PSC members know if there are meetings set up with these groups if others would like to attend.
- *Chair Baugh* noted that *Commissioner Houck* is calling in via Skype for today's meeting.

### Director's Report

- The SW Corridor Transit project is going before Council tomorrow morning.
- The CC2035 West Quadrant Plan is at Council on February 4 at 2 p.m. Time Certain. *Chair Baugh* and *Commissioner Schultz* will attend on behalf of the PSC.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 1/13/15 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Eric Engstrom

### Documents:

- [Staff Report - Using the Plan in Decision Making](#)
- [Staff Report - Centers and Corridors](#)
- [Staff Report - Non-conforming Uses and Split-zoning](#)
- [Staff Report - Miscellaneous Consent List #1](#)
- [Errata Memo #2](#)
- [List of topics pulled from consent by PSC members](#)

## Presentations:

- [Introduction; Centers and Corridors](#)
- [Mixed-Use Zones project update](#)
- [Using the Plan and Balancing Decisions](#)
- [Non-conforming Uses and Split-zoning](#)

Eric introduced the work session topics and flow for the PSC's discussion. He provided a reminder of the project timeline. Today is one of several work sessions for the Comp Plan. The next session is on February 10 at 12:30 p.m. with sessions continuing through March.

Each staff report has consent lists within it. Today's deliberations will result in tentative direction, based on what we know today. Staff reports dated January 14 are in response to testimony received before January 6, so there are other letters and comments we've received that will be reviewed as well.

The PSC is not endorsing specific strike-through and underline verbiage today. The next draft will include this and will be available the first week of April.

We have had about 2800+ comments about the draft plan so far. Written testimony for the Comp Plan is still open and will be open through March 13, 2015 at 5 p.m.

### Using the Plan in Decision Making

Michelle walked through the six primary recommendations in the staff report about how the plan is used in decision-making. The report relates to items that track through the whole plan and pertain to the full plan. Today's recommendations are specific mostly to chapters 1 and 10 based on proposals developed by a multi-bureau staff workgroup (BPD, BDS, City Attorney). There are sections that aren't covered in today's chapter 1 and 10 discussion, including neighborhood plans. That will be discussed at a later work session.

#### (A) Scope of the Plan

Staff proposes that legislative (city-wide, broad) and quasi-judicial (individual property owners) amendments apply to elements of the Comprehensive Plan, supporting documents and certain implementation tools. The Zoning Map has a qualification to clarify that if the amendments conform to the Comp Plan Map, they "by default" conform. Regarding development agreements, those under ORS 94 are included.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about amendments.

- Legislative amendments will continue to come through the PSC; quasi-judicial will go through the Hearings Officer.
- District Plans: we are trying to do refinements to area plans, and we'll try to focus on what you amend into the Comp Plan; but parts may be amendments to the Zoning, which are legislative.

[PSC members approved the staff proposal for this work.](#)

#### (B) Compliance with the Comp Plan

This is about defining a standard for compliance in the plan. Staff proposes that amendments must be evaluated against the Comprehensive Plan's Guiding Principles and applicable goals and policies and on balance be equally or more supportive of the Comprehensive Plan as a whole than the existing language or designation.

We had used the verb "comply" in others ways in the plan, so to avoid confusion, we are proposing "consistent" for other areas of the plan versus "comply" in this definition.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about the definition of "comply" that includes the phrase "on

balance”. What does “on balance” mean? The Court of Appeals’ has said that if one policy leads you to a no answer (veto) words, that policy overrides the others regardless of the number of supportive policies.

#### (D) Verbs

The intent of the “on balance standard” is that we have multiple policies that say different things. This is meant to be guidance for when the full optimal decision that incorporates all applicable policies can’t be made. We weigh components of the proposals and make a recommendation based on balance and weight of all those factors. We also intend to use and define a consistent set of verbs throughout the plan. Some are actions the City has significant control over, so we can use stronger verbs. We didn’t intend to create a hierarchy of verbs, but sometimes it feels like there is one.

Staff proposes: Describe how verbs are intended to be used in the “About the Plan” section and define them in the Glossary. In decision-making, it’s tied back to the “on balance” factors, based on the situation at hand.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted the comment that the intent wasn’t to create a hierarchy. “Prevent” and “prohibit” versus “strive to” are different levels in the definitions. We need to be very clear within the Plan itself that none of the words are veto words. If there is a guidance document we can rely on for legislative decision in the future it needs to be part of the plan to have weight. The word “prohibit” using the LCDC definition has been held to require de minimus impact, and they aren’t allowed to do “balance” there... which isn’t what we want.

*Chair Baugh* noted “on balance” is to look at policies and balance them in decision-making. The concern is that if I’m weighing, for example, two neighborhoods, “on balance” could put the advantage to the neighborhood that is already more complete.

- This “on balance” standard is intended to mean that the decision-maker reviews the applicable policies and, in different situations, the policies may be balanced in different ways.
- If you look at the policies that you’re applying in doing the balancing, we do have a path of policy to allow us to prioritize one area of the city over another. We could bring forward these specific policies to show how in a given decision parts of the plan acknowledge the differences in areas of the city. And we do have the equity policies overlaying decisions.

*Commissioner Houck* said he has no concern about the term “on balance” as it conveys all policies in the Comp Plan are taken into account. But is concerned about the use of “encourage” in that while staff says that “encourage” may include ways of achieving a particular policy, in practice, I’ve experienced that people who don’t understand that definition will literally use it to mean merely encourage an action or policy, and not include regulatory approaches.

- We should expand the definition that’s in the Glossary to include City regulations reference.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted that “on balance” is a squishy word.

- *Commissioner Rudd* is not comfortable about the words right now. We need to include a statement that no verbs, despite the language used, are veto words. We have to also look at the policies in a timeline frame and context. If we are prohibiting at the front end but have flexibility later, we may not get to that flexibility on the ground at the time of development.

*Commissioner St Martin* first understood and liked the definition of “on balance”. But if “on balance” means equilibrium, that doesn’t work if we are trying to, for example, bring up neighborhoods that are less complete.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the implementation and if there is anything that speaks to how staff will be educated about what “on balance” means. This is important even though staff doesn’t make decisions.

*Chair Baugh* is interested in what the intent is. Balance does not mean equal, and I’m concerned about the intent.

- This is clear in the Comp Plan. Staff can bring some examples forward to the PSC. The one that is puzzling is the concern about averaging versus seeing the balance.

If we can describe balance not as “to average”, that is what’s important. The intent of “on balance” is well described in the staff report, page 4, under the definition of “comply”. The URA discussion that the PSC recently had is a good example of how the PSC can make these recommendations balanced.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that goals and policies need to be stated as strongly as possible so we know where we want to go.

*Commissioner Rudd* was not comfortable with any veto words in the plan.

Recap: There is comfort with the proposal with the inclusion of thinking about how we institutionalize into staff practices. And how the “on balance” statement is applied to the use of verbs. Be clear there is not a statement that trumps any other (unless we want to signify that very clearly).

- *Commissioner Hanson* noted this is very important since the PSC may not be the decision-maker.

*Commissioner Smith* reiterated: on balance standard creates an envelope instead of being a mandate to find a center point.

### (C) Guiding Principles

In the Plan, we added the Guiding Principles that indicate key priorities from the Portland Plan and Climate Action Plan and recognize the big-picture intentions of the plans that are carried forward over time. But we had some comments that reflected concern over how the Guiding Principles would be applied.

Staff proposes:

- Clarify that Guiding Principles are applied to legislative amendments to Plan elements, supporting documents, and implementation tools.
- Clarify that Principles are considered on balance.
- Create and maintain a separate guidance document to provide “instructions” for staff that would be shared with the public.

*Commissioner Houck*: what is the reason to not adopt this with the Comp Plan?

- Practices are rapidly improving, and we thought it would be better to have a more flexible document that we update as we gain more knowledge and practices improve.
- This will be a guidance document that matches with the principles. We are recommending that it be adopted outside the Comp Plan and memorialized in another way.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted the Guiding Principles are “encourage” words. The document could include examples of how you could promote some of these examples, not exclusive ways of how to achieve principles. Given that the guidance document would just relate to “encourage” policies, *Commissioner Rudd* was ok with that document not being incorporated into the Plan.

Joe gave an example of the City budget process and the requirement to put the add asks through an equity lens. The science of equity and health assessments is evolving. Guiding Principles are all about bringing the Portland Plan into the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Tallmadge:* In terms of environmental justice, would you take these recurring ideas out of the Comp Plan and put them into the manual?

- EJ policy right now is buried. Rather than bury it at end of chapter 10, we propose to move it into the equity guiding principle and move principles in chapter 10 into a policy of their own.

*Commissioner Oxman* likes the statement in C3, implementation guidance, in terms of what we're trying to accomplish. Why would we want quasi-judicial decisions to be exempt? Can there be a process where the PSC can review the implementation guidance for consistency? [yes]

- A quasi-judicial request for Comp Plan Map Amendment would have to make findings against the applicable goals and policies but not against the Guiding Principles. This is because the Guiding Principles are expressed throughout the goals and policies; it's also a practicality issue as an ask from a quasi-judicial applicant.
- If the legislation and goals and policies are done well, that already includes the Guiding Principles, so the applicant would by default meet the Guiding Principles.

Staff is proposing to leave the Guiding Principles in the plan to apply to legislative processes.

*Commissioner Houck* agrees that the state planning process tends to create boxes instead of being multi-objective. I'm fine with the process staff has described but I would like the guidance document elevated so it has some legs and importance. I strongly support memorializing and elevating it in some way.

The PSC asked to modify the staff recommendation with today's comments to determine how to elevate the Guiding Principles and have them reviewed by PSC. Upon adoption of the Comp Plan, we will create the book of practices to implement and will be reviewed by PSC.

#### (E) Organizing the Plan (Chapters 1 and 10)

These recommendations have come about because of the iterative process of creating the Comp Plan.

Staff recommends to reorganize Chapters 1 and 10 to improve clarity and readability.

- Chapter 1: The Plan, its implementation and administration.
- Chapter 10: Comprehensive Plan Map's land use designations and application of zoning.

In doing this, we will make a new specific policy around environmental justice.

[PSC members confirmed this direction.](#)

#### (F) Metrics and Targets

The Portland Plan 12 Measures of Success and the Growth Scenario Report include a variety of measures related to land use choices.

[Staff proposes to add more information to the Plan describing specific numerical targets or goals. This would include a metrics page in the About the Plan section.](#)

*Commissioner Houck* commented on greenhouse gas emissions and vehicle miles travels metrics. We have an adopted Climate Preparation Strategy and a soon-to-be updated Climate Action Plan. There are other issues related to climate change that also need metrics. What does the existing Comp Plan include regarding metrics that might be appropriate to bring into



the new plan?

- There are metrics embedded in policy statements in the current plan. They have mostly been changed and integrated in the update.
- Use of metrics in the current Comp Plan is spotty. We want to get more systematic about it.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that if we have a metrics document, it needs to be a living document. Like in the Portland Plan process, the best way to do this is to tie into the Portland Pulse work.

- *Commissioner Houck* noted that the Portland Pulse recently removed all the environmental indicators. We spent two years developing those metrics and they have simply been taken out of the Portland Pulse process. So I would not rely on this; we need to look at every opportunity including the Comp Plan to include more metrics around resiliency, green infrastructure, etc. Are there metrics in the current Comp Plan that can be carried forward in the updated plan? I'd like to see whether that is the case.

The metrics we're suggesting are based on the Portland Plan measures. On the issue of climate and resiliency, we can look if we need to add indicators. City Council reviews the Measures based on the budget process, but they don't fully review them annually because they don't necessarily move/change every year. A Portland Plan progress report will get more into the details.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about how adding metrics improves accountability. What leadership will embrace this and make sure measures are achieved?

- Full ownership of the metrics is with the PSC and our work on the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Houck*: The Climate Preparation Strategy came after the Portland Plan was adopted, so this is an area we should review.

*Commissioner Schultz*: I generally support metrics. But in the list of goals and policies, are you stating those in chapters 1 and 10 are the only goals in policies in the plan? This seems like a very short list.

- The intent initially was to not include metrics or targets but to include them where there is a specific application to the policy. What will be in the Plan is the next iteration of what's in the staff report.

*Chair Baugh* noted the issue of accountability versus just having a matrix available. We have the opportunity to be accountable and take a look at the measures on a regular schedule.

Joe suggested that staff will flesh out the set of metrics to see if it makes sense for the PSC to track progress of the Comp Plan. In doing this, will look at how we might keep the information in front of the PSC on a regular basis. We will include a review of the Climate Adaptation Plan to include components as applicable.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*: Metrics are numerical, but what about goals and targets that are less quantifiable?

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about how the metrics will be used. Could an applicant use them to show that their project/proposal moves the metrics forward/on balance furthers the Comp Plan? [yes]

Seeing the next iteration will be helpful for PSC members.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the environmental justice item on the consent list. Staff will

remove this item (#5) to discuss at a later work session.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction.

## Centers and Corridors

### (A) Urban Design Framework

- Is the proposal to allocate residential growth 30 percent to Central City, 50 percent to Centers and Corridors, 20 percent Residential neighborhoods the right approach?
- Are the correct Centers and Corridors identified on the diagram (figures 3-2 and 3-3)?

Eric illustrated some of the high-level changes in the proposed diagram.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the recommendation for the Central City growth scenario proposal.

- This scenario does better on things like transportation and carbon emissions than the other models do. There is a limit to how much we can affect behavior, which is just a few percentage points different for the 25 year time period. For growth to make a big difference in the performance measures, we have to grow more.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about metrics of affordability.

- We looked at affordability to different types of households. They all squeezed to the bottom end of the spectrum, and land use by itself cannot solve the affordability concerns. This will be discussed in the upcoming affordability work session more fully.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted that the Central City may be growing faster than projections.

- The growth projection is a continuation of last 20 years of Central City growth and upping it a little bit. This is a success of the last plan to grow in the Central City. We're also seeing more growth in the corridors than in the last plan.
- The goal is to get 30,000 more households in the Central City over the next 20 years.

*Commissioner Hanson* supports the percentage mixes. They support housing diversity and place the density where our infrastructure is best.

*Commissioner Smith* is generally supportive of this strategy. Is the 20 percent dispersed development too much? Do we have enough centers, or are there opportunities to create more to bring more people into the 20-minute radius.

- Regarding household types we project in the future, we've shifted lots toward multi-family, but we do still have a need for single-family development, especially at the affordable end. The 20 percent includes ADUs. We would caution to go too far against the 20 percent recommendation.
- The Portland Plan goal was to have 80 percent of Portland in a complete community. There are some geographies where it isn't cost-effective to build at a higher density. The updated scenarios report will provide more details.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about student housing. Is this part of the 30 percent?

- Staff will get back about this.

*Chair Baugh* is in favor of the proposal, but it ties into the housing strategy being critical. Downtown housing policy will be a big fight. And when I look at transit, the TSP needs to support a transit-rich environment.

- The whole inner area/Central City also has variable transit and service options.

*Commissioner Rudd*: Do K-12 existing resources support the split?

- As a district, Portland Public can handle the scenario, though some schools may have a

threshold issue. David Douglas will be at a future work session to discuss their concerns.

*Commissioner Smith* noted Linnton, as it is an interesting case: they have tried to develop a community plan, they want to be more complete, and we aren't giving them an avenue to get there.

- Staff recommend against the size and growth Linnton has requested because there are significant environmental and topographical constraints. There is infill potential, but the opportunity for significant growth is small. We need to work within the limitations of the size it is today.
- Support making Linnton a more livable center, but we don't want to designate it as a full center. Safety on Highway 30 is something we will want to work on.
- They will continue to be eligible for programs around local planning initiatives. They are not currently a PDC area, but that doesn't rule them out from receiving resources.

Eric noted the testimony about Multnomah Village. It is currently a Metro Main Street (regional) designation. The City has never directly implemented the Metro designations until now. The proposed Neighborhood Center is basically a translation of the Metro designation. We don't want to take this designation because it could imply Multnomah aspires to be smaller than it is today, but we think of the designation as a village. It doesn't imply up-zoning necessarily.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the testimony was that they wanted to be designated a Corridor versus a Center.

- At the map level, this affects the type of zoning that would be put there. Services that go in hand with centers wouldn't necessarily be developed. A corridor would get the lowest density mixed-use zone, which is smaller in scale than Multnomah is currently.
- Up-zoning around centers is not required or necessarily expected.
- This is an area of focused community development and places people go to meet their service needs.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about high capacity transit and "significant growth capacity": is this a projection?

- Connections that are region-wide that Metro has a plan for.
- Neighborhood Center and Town Center policy benchmarks are around 3500 households surrounding for Neighborhood Center, 7000 for a Town Center.

The Inner Southeast corridors have also received many comments, especially from Richmond, Sunnyside, Buckman and Kerns neighborhoods. There has been a range of ideas within each neighborhood about the size of the center they'd like to be. Opposition from Richmond, some positive testimony from Sunnyside initially and concern from Buckman about growth issues in general.

In this report, we have defined the Inner Ring more clearly and are suggesting a new Neighborhood Center in Kerns (Burnside and 28<sup>th</sup>). In looking at the 20-minute neighborhood map, Inner Southeast has good access district-wide. This is a good place for continued growth.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted Macadam. Do they not want to be a Center?

- We have left a Neighborhood Center in the John's Landing area. We did get testimony against that, but the TSP has a potential streetcar in this corridor, so we don't want to take that designation away.

*Chair Baugh* noted the dot at Hayden Island.

- This is to acknowledge that Metro still has the Columbia River Crossing on the regional plan, with a light rail station at Jantzen Beach with the train going to Vancouver. So we need to leave it as is until we discuss. It's tied to light rail and to the fact there needs

to be a second way off/on the island. There is a concern about growth and access from the community.

- Lots of people who opposed the CRC do still support the transportation updates.
- We could develop policy to attach a nuance to a particular location.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked if it makes sense to have a dot on Hayden Island if transportation doesn't go to Vancouver. We will talk about this with the TSP discussion.

#### (B) Comp Plan Map

- Does the Proposed Comprehensive Plan Map appropriately implement the intent of the growth strategy described in the UDF?

Eric provided background and orientation to the Zoning Map. The Comp Plan Map designates place type, not the nitty-gritty specifics of the zoning.

The Inner Ring concept affected designations. The inner-most locations have an Urban Center designation to acknowledge the form of the city being different in these locations.

Gateway and Central City have RX and CX designations. We did not change those designations in the proposal.

There are some places where we have a Neighborhood Center on a Civic Corridor. We were trying to reconcile the scale. Where a Center is on a Corridor, we gave it the Civic Corridor Comp Plan designation.

We also made some manual adjustments. In a few places, like Delta Park (currently commercial; would have moved to mixed-use), we made a recommendation to change it to Mixed Employment instead of Mixed Use due to its auto-oriented type.

Occasionally on a corridor, like in the Dekum Triangle in Woodlawn, we have changed the designation that notes it is a neighborhood place that is just adjacent to the corridor.

Eric walked through examples of specific recommendations/changes that are emblematic of proposed changes.

- Upper Belmont: where is the cut-off from mixed-use? Change to Neighborhood Center.
- Refinement to boundaries of Lents Town Center: Designation is on a large swath and includes part of Woodstock. Recommend adding the Urban Center to 92<sup>nd</sup> and to remove Woodstock portion to keep focus on the center aspect.
- 82<sup>nd</sup> at Bybee: specific site used by a number of small business. Propose to change to mixed-use to maintain commercial uses there.
- Inner Powell: propose to change Urban Center to Civic Corridor. Discuss with TSP.
- Macadam: propose changing from Civic Corridor Urban Center along northern portions of this corridor. Discuss with TSP.
- NE Cully and NE Killingsworth: Adjust Mixed Use - Neighborhood boundary to include Sugar Shack site and to encourage more active use on Killingsworth. This is in response to the Verde testimony. We will continue discussion on this site.
- OHSU designation: change to Campus Institutional designation but retain the current EX zoning.
- NE 21<sup>st</sup> and NE Multnomah: propose no change; keep Urban Center designation.
- SE 17<sup>th</sup> and SE Holgate: retain Mixed Employment designation to keep compatibility. Noise and disruption are large influences to this recommendation. TriMet would like to change to activate the station platform. This will be reviewed at the next work session as part of the employment discussion.

#### (C) Investment Strategy

Does the PSC support the investment approach described on page I-29 in the Plan?

Staff proposes to start with majority of investments to neighborhoods that need enhancements to accommodate growth. These neighborhoods include Rosewood, Jade District, Gateway, Lents and Midway.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about Macadam and West Portland dot/quadrant locations.

- The diagram is based on information from before. As we have developed the plan, it's possible that both of these locations would move farther into the top right quadrant.

*Chair Baugh* asked about how this chart and the policies tie to the evaluation matrix. We need to be able to evaluate what we've done.

- Yes, the metrics can be made more explicitly tied back to this chart and growth.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about investing and leveraging investments part of responding to opportunities in strategy 3. If leverage is part of this strategy, should be explicit in this statement.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about the four quadrants and if they match PDC's goals.

- PDC funding is just one component. We are also including transportation and other investment needs. Staff has been working with PDC staff on their neighborhood economic development strategy.
- *Commissioner Schultz* sat in on the PDC strategic planning session, and it is very well tied to the Comp Plan.

*Chair Baugh* noted the tie to the TSP with these proposals is important.

- This is the lens through which BPS has been reviewing the TSP. You should see the relationship between this diagram and the List of Projects.

*Commissioner Oxman*: What is the unifying process to make sure the plan gets played out as it should be?

- In the CSP and TSP is where we'll see these implemented.

*Commissioner Houck*: I realize we are discussing investment strategies in the context of centers and corridors. That said, there are many investments that have no relationship to equity in that they are intended to protect or improve the city's environmental health across the city. Some investments may need to be made from strictly an environmental standpoint, for example BES's watershed and stormwater programs.

#### (D) Relationship to Mixed Use Zoning

Barry gave an update about the Mixed Use Zoning project. The project will come before the PSC in July/August for public hearings. Looking at consolidating the current nine zones into 4-5 zones.

Bonuses for community benefits is a key component in this project work. Staff is exploring options to incorporate options for a zoning bonus provision. The question is if we start from the height limits we have now or start at a lower point.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if this is potentially down-zoning.

- We are trying to not do this and are looking at the economics and FAR value.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted that Bellevue is doing this in their downtown area, so that might be somewhere to look at for ideas.

Commissioner Gray asked about the term “community benefit”. What is your formula for determining benefits for a specific community?

- There would be a specific menu for these provisions: affordability, open space, commercial space are examples that are citywide. This isn’t a locally-defined benefit.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about the height provisions the PSC forwarded in the Central City West Quad Plan.

- We are looking at the economics of a bonus system in the Central City. This will tell us options staff will bring back to the PSC. We are optimistic that a bonus would work in the Central City at least.

Commissioner Houck likes how staff is working forward on this.

Chair Baugh noted that some communities are expressing concern about lack of control to development in their neighborhoods.

Commissioner Rudd asked if Chair Baugh was referring to design review.

There will be a hearing on all the Mixed-Use Zones project this summer.

Does the PSC have enough information about the Mixed Use Zoning Project to proceed with the policy and land use mapping recommendations contained in the Proposed Draft? [generally yes.]

- Commissioner Shapiro noted the PSC will want to take a better look at the bonus proposal.
- Commissioner Schultz is generally supportive and extremely supportive of the Mixed-Use project work.
- Commissioner Hanson is supportive. Bonuses could be off-site in addition to on-site. We can fill in gaps in sidewalks; safety around the site. These may have more benefits than on-site items.
- Commissioners Smith asked about the neighborhoods who wanted more time to see the Mixed Use Zone proposals.
  - We know there will be more requests for more time, but we need policy before the code, so we’re moving forward.
- Chair Baugh is supportive but is concerned about timing. This is key to the Comp Plan and what the neighborhoods will look like.

At the final Comp Plan deliberation, we will have a concept plan for these mixed-use items.

(E) Commercial Gentrification and Displacement: How are we addressing this concern? Are we on-track?

- These items will go on a future work plan agenda, likely March 24.

The policy items that are flagged at the end of this staff report: if there is a need to discuss any of these items, please let staff know via email.

- Items 1-14 and 1-15 are questions for Chair Baugh.

#### **Non-conforming Uses and Split-zoning**

- **Non-conforming uses\*:** situations in which a current use (say, retail or office) occurs on a site that is designated or zoned for another purpose (say, residential use).
- **Split zones:** situations in which there is one lot divided by two different Comprehensive Plan designations and zones.

Deborah walked through how we are addressing commercial situations in these two categories in the Comp Plan. There are also residential issues that will be discussed at the March 10 work

session.

There are avenues for property owners to address these issues one-off, but a quasi-judicial review is quite expensive. Alternatively, non-conforming review can allow for the use to continue. This is onerous for a property owner to do on his/her own.

Through the Comprehensive Plan update, we have an opportunity to review individual non-conforming uses and determine whether these properties should be re-designated and rezoned so that the current commercial use (retail, restaurant, office, etc.) is allowed by the zone long-term. Similarly, we have an opportunity to adjust Comprehensive Plan designations to rectify split zone situations that may be inhibiting efficient redevelopment otherwise supported by policy.

We are addressing the situations we're aware of, but we know there are other situations we are not aware of. We are thinking about creating an ongoing process as a "catch-up" for cleaning up these situations so the property owners are not as burdened to request changes.

- *Commissioner Rudd* likes the idea of a system to come back to do these catch-up type processes.

Zoning map changes will come before the PSC as part of the Comp Plan Implementation work this summer. The decision about map changes comes in this project. The default is that the Comp Plan and Zoning Map designations are the same.

Non-conforming examples:

- *Commissioner Oxman* noted he was pleased to see most requests from testimony have been accommodated.
- It can be very difficult for a property owner with a non-conforming use to get a loan. Many non-conforming uses are done through building permits, and it's not easy to query these.
- The concept of a non-conforming use is that we want eventually to change the designation to fill isolated holes. We are looking at getting rid of non-conforming uses or update the zoning.

#1-3 / [Buckman at 14<sup>th</sup> and Stark](#).

- The blue building is like a little warehouse/garage, so there is a question about why we'd change the designation for this property. We can keep the blue property R1. We didn't catch this because the documentation of the building has been through building permits.
- R1 is preferred by testimony from Buckman.
- *Commissioner Smith* asked about the non-conforming use for this property. The policy choice is about the neighborhood not wanting more intensity in the area.
- *Commissioner Rudd* noted that the existing zoning allows increased intensity at the site as of right.
- [We will continue the discussion on this property at a following work session.](#)

#1-28 / [Rose City Park: NE 53<sup>rd</sup> and Halsey](#).

- This is R5, and you could develop residential on the corner, so there is potential there even though it is operating as commercial. We should look to if this is a good location for commercial to help serve the neighborhood.
- *Commissioner St Martin* noted this site is a good use of the site and frequented by the neighbors.
- There are these types of places that are scattered, and if they stay occupied they can stay in those uses, but we are trying to simplify the use for the owners.
- This highlights the one-off type situations, and *Chair Baugh* is concerned about this. *Commissioner Shapiro* noted one-offs are not necessarily a bad idea.



- *Commissioner Smith* noted this contributes to the 20-minute strategy that we are trying to improve. *Commissioner Houck* agrees.
- The PSC is good with the staff policy recommendation, but they should keep this in mind when we return to the Centers and Corridors conversation.

#1-29 / SE Harold, just east of Lents.

- Currently retail, so any retail use can go in to the location. There can be some reconfiguration or expansion on-site if they can meet criteria (e.g. it won't create other impacts in terms of coming and going). These are compatibility standards.
- Recommendation is to leave this R5. PSC confirms.

Split-Zones examples:

#2-1 / Sellwood QFC on SE Milwaukie. The parking lot backs to single-family homes. Testifiers don't want this parking lot change to change. Applying a single Comprehensive Plan designation to cover the full site is desirable from a long-term perspective, to enable more efficient redevelopment in the future. Retaining the R5 zoning on the parking lot would not rectify the split-zone situation; however, this approach would enable current limits on hours of operation and outdoor storage to remain in place.

- *Commissioner Hanson* confirmed this is a good concept.
- PSC confirmed the staff recommendation.

#2-2 / 3500 block of SE Division to rectify split-zoning. We didn't hear testimony from neighborhoods about any concerns about the parking lot.

- PSC confirmed this recommendation.

#3-1 / Portland Nursery at SE 50<sup>th</sup> and SE Stark. Staff recommends retaining the current proposal, which applies MU-Dispersed to the northern portion of the site that fronts on Stark, where the current retail operation is located. The proposal expands the existing commercial zoning here, but doesn't encompass the full site. This change would partially but not completely address the non-conforming status of the nursery because the property owners' plans for expansion and site reconfiguration may be limited. Staff also recommends exploring options to allow nurseries in residential zones as a conditional use.

- *Commissioner St Martin* about how many nurseries there are in the city. 6-8 including some noted in the report. Some are slightly different situations (e.g. Tony's Nursery).
- *Commissioners Schultz* noted the conditional use concept makes lots of use to support a neighborhood in a low intensity way. Changing to commercial does make me a little concerned.
- *Commissioner Hanson* likes the staff recommendation for the northern portion of the property as commercial.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* commented that generally inner city agriculture is good. This recommendation is a good compromise.
- PSC confirms staff recommendation of the zoning change.

Staff can come back to discuss examples of where the staff recommendation doesn't match with the request from owners or community members.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted this ties back to the Mixed-Use Zones Project. We haven't talked about split blocks, and I'm still struggling with that. My challenge to staff is to give us pros and cons to why we should or shouldn't do this... not just "we've always done this". The transition issues are something the Mixed-Use Zones Project should address.

- Other commissioners had this question as well.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked about further discussion about non-conforming uses being allowed for more than 3 years, and if additional review should be based on ownership change.

## Errata Memo #2

- PSC members confirmed they are good with these edits.

## Consent List #1

These are miscellaneous recommendations that staff have that don't necessarily fit into the topics at each meeting. Today's list refers mostly to Chapter 8.

There is an active discussion around open source data and broadband that is being teed up for a future consent list. Staff will work on proposed text for items that commissioners don't have further discussion requests about. *Commissioner Smith* would like to review these concepts before they are shared.

This is another call for items for staff to have prepared for the March 24 "catch-up" agenda.

*Commissioner Baugh* asked about definitions of products and how we categorize them (item #3).

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about #6 and if it's about construction materials.

*Commissioner Houck*: What about retention of existing structures?

- There is a policy relating to this.

*Commissioner Houck* had pulled items #21-22. Not all trails are transportation facilities.

- The intent of creating a trails section outside of the Parks & Recreation section is to have a more complete policy section relating to trails.
- We are adding that some are transportation, but this is not exclusive.
- *Commissioner Houck* is fine with this confirmation from staff so long as it's explicitly understood that some elements of the trail system have nothing to do with transportation.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about #40, Policy 8.74, which directs PP&R to look at acquiring surplus property.

- We have been advised to keep this out of the Comp Plan but will pull out for discussion.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked to pull #20 as well for future discussion.

Joe thanked the PSC members for their work. The way we structured today's work session is how we'll provide information and discussion for the future work session. If you have feedback to help the PSC members be efficient in the process, please let us know.

Deborah reminded PSC members about the pre-work session discussions led by staff that PSC members should find useful. We are happy to answer questions off-line to help members better understand the concepts. [The pre-work session in preparation for the February 10 PSC meeting will be next Wednesday, February 4 at 3:30 p.m. Please let Julie know if you plan to attend.](#)

*Chair Baugh* thanked staff for their work.

The next batch of information, in preparation for the February 10 work session, will be emailed to PSC members tomorrow. All PSC members will also receive hard copies of the documents at the end of this week.

## Adjourn

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 8:26 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, January 13, 2015

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Don Hanson

**BPS Staff:** Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Alisa Kane, Eric Engstrom, Tom Armstrong, Julie Ocken

**Other Presenters:** Jillian Detweiler, Mayor's office; Shannon Callahan, Commissioner Saltzman's office; Branam, PDC; Traci Manning, PHB; Nate Takara, Fire Marshal

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

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 12/9/14 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Smith* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### Vote for 2014 PSC Officer Slate

Decision: PSC members

*Chair Baugh* proposed the slate of officers through the PSC's work on Task 4 of the Comprehensive Plan as *Chair Baugh*, *Vice Chair Shapiro* and *Vice Chair Schultz*.

*Commissioner Oxman* moved to keep the PSC slate of officers through the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner St Martin* seconded and the vote passed unanimously.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### Energy Performance in Portland's Commercial Buildings

Briefing: Alisa Kane

#### Documents:

- [Email](#) to potentially affected building owners and stakeholders
- [Project website](#)
- [Handout](#)

**Presentation:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7159749/File/Document>

Alisa gave an overview of the proposed policy. Scores, ratings and labels are how we often communicate as a society.

There are over 5000 commercial buildings in Portland. These buildings spend over \$330M every year on energy. About 60 percent of electricity resources come from fossil fuels, and commercial buildings are the second largest contributor to carbon emissions.

Energy STAR has an energy portfolio manager that many companies use to evaluate building performance. This is the system the City is proposing to use. Buildings that consistently track energy use save 2.4 percent in their expenditures every year. These buildings are often better managed and better maintained.

80 buildings in Portland are Energy STAR certified through the portfolio system. Others are using Energy STAR to track their use. But Portland is consistently falling in city rankings, and we're now lower than Detroit.

We want to change the conversation around energy in Portland. Today's proposal does this. We want to see commercial buildings over 20,000 square feet to use the Energy STAR tracking system; provide their score to the City on an annual basis; and report to the City, publicly. The proposed timing is for larger buildings (50,000+ square feet) to track this year and first report in April 2016, then smaller buildings (20-50,000 square feet) be required to report in 2017.

Slide 24 outlines which buildings will be covered by the policy and which will be exempt.

The City and partners will provide training and technical assistance to these buildings and operators. We will recognize high performers: some sort of award event and media campaign to recognize buildings that are doing well. We will publish all the scores in a database as well.

Portland would be the 11<sup>th</sup> city in the country to require benchmarking if we accomplish getting the policy through Council. Washington, DC, was the first city to have the requirement.

The City of Portland does track energy use in its own buildings, and it will continue to do so and make this information public.

Staff is getting the word out and getting feedback about the proposed policy in the next few months, with a Council date likely this April. See the [project website](#) for further details.

## Discussion

*Commissioner Schultz* is supportive for the proposal. What about mixed-use buildings?

- At this point, if the building is predominantly a commercial use, it will be included. But this won't be for buildings that are predominantly residential that have storefronts on the first floor. It is the building overall that reports, not individual units.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about smart building management systems.

- There are 3<sup>rd</sup> party providers that can take information from utilities or other systems and put that into Energy STAR system. We are working closely with the utilities, and they will have products available to put info into Energy STAR as well.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the Columbia Green Technologies and Bureau of Environmental Services Green Infrastructure/Green Roof presentation documented how Portland was slipping behind other cities in those green features as well. Does the management system really account for a 31 percent increase in the value of the building?

- Yes, up to 31 percent. Buildings are better managed and retain asset value.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*: Can energy use in the buildings that report be tracked geographically?

- Yes, we will be able to map it for that so people can compare. We can then also will

see concentrations of where we need to do more outreach.

*Commissioner Gray:* Are the Energy Trust of Oregon (ETO) assistances for doing this work? What about incentives for people to work hard at it?

- Information can lead to operational and capital investments. ETO will provide incentives on improvements. ETO will also help to provide training for building owners/managers.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the buildings that are in the exclusions and how much they represent.

- Some buildings are not covered in the Energy STAR program, so they don't have the same reference. We've looked at some of the largest consumers of energy and are going for the biggest opportunity to reduce energy use.

*Commissioner St Martin:* Are some buildings already tracking their energy use and efficiency?

- A good percent of buildings are tracking their energy use. There is a bigger hole in the 20-28,000 square foot buildings.

*Commissioner Rudd:* What's the City staffing expectation for this work?

- We would reassign duties of current staff. The work will be done by the equivalent of 1 FTE. We certainly will leverage resources of our partners to make this work.

*Chair Baugh* asked about 3<sup>rd</sup> party partners. Are they partners or just identified resources?

- ETO has been at the table. Energy service providers are.

Staff asked PSC members to share the word about the proposal. Staff will ask the PSC to support this at Council and a letter to Council. The PSC confirmed they provide a letter as we approach the Council deadline.

## **Comprehensive Plan Update**

Briefing: Eric Engstrom

### **Document:**

- [Memo #6](#)

**Presentation:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7159748/File/Document>

Eric provided a brief update and reminders to the PSC about the Comp Plan and the work session schedule. As of last week we have had just over 2500 comments since publishing the draft in July 2014. We are accepting testimony through March 13, 2015.

We are in the PSC work session schedule. There will be a hearing on the TSP in February, one on Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) in April as well as the Scenario Report addendum in April. We expect a recommendation from the PSC to Council in May.

The work session schedule is provided on slide 7.

Staff will documents to PSC members tomorrow in preparation for the January 27 work session. Staff will ask PSC members to identify any consent list items they wish to discuss/remove from consent by Friday, January 23.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about receiving hard copies of the documents in addition

- Commissioners Houck, Smith, Tallmadge and Oxman all asked for hard copies.
- Staff will provide Word documents so PSC members can use track changes to note their

edits/requests.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the check-box for marking consent items.

- The documents will be available both electronic and hard copy. Commissioners will be asked to pull agenda items by Friday, January 23.

There are specific topics that will be addressed, but there are other topics that are outstanding. As we go, we will have a time period for PSC members to flag items. We are still getting testimony, so there could be letters we haven't yet addressed. We will give another consent list in about a month.

Eric reminded the public that testimony is open through March 13, 2015 at 5 p.m.

### **Amendments to Two Urban Renewal Areas**

Work Session / Recommendation: Jillian Detweiler, Mayor's office; Traci Manning, PHB; Kimberly Branam, PDC; Shannon Callahan, Commissioner Saltzman's office

#### **Documents:**

- [Housing memo](#)

**Presentation:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7159751/File/Document>

Staff provided the memo as follow-up to the December 9, 2014 hearing to address PSC questions, specifically about affordable housing in the two URAs in question (North Macadam and the Central Eastside).

The action before the PSC today is to find that the recommended changes support and are in compliance with the Comprehensive Plan. Kimberly outlined the changes and how they provide additional resources and certainty through the development agreements.

*Commissioner Smith* noted a message he and some of the other commissioners received from a coalition of housing advocates and their proposed strategy framework to meet housing goals in North Macadam. These include:

- A requirement that Development Agreements entered into by the City (including the one with ZRZ Realty) include strong affordable housing requirements. (For example, in a development agreement, the City can require housing at 60%-120% of MFI be built without public subsidies, and can require that sites be sold to the city.)
- A plan/commitment to get site control over not just one or two, but three to six sites at a reasonable cost (e.g., assessed value prior to the City's environmental cleanup and infrastructure investments).

If we create an ability to buy units, will PHB be able to do that? Development agreements could get site control of property at pre-development costs and require ZRZ building units without subsidies as part of the agreement. Would that provide more affordable housing? I've heard uncertainty that this is how PHB wants to work.

- Shannon: We have not successfully achieved a model of buying into a provider market before, but we don't want to close that option. Being able to have a developer agree to that has merit to the agreement. With inclusion to buy a parcel from ZRZ, we have assurances to have the land to build more affordable units. Affordability and design: a subsidy would be similar to subsidies in other areas of the city.

*Commissioner Smith:* I certainly support mixed-income development. But I'd like to hear this from PHB directly.



- Traci Manning: PHB will buy the units if that is the best bang for the public dollar. Our strategy is to secure affordable housing in this area. If we can get more units at a cheaper cost, that's what we would do.

*Commissioner Smith:* This is my hang-up. I hear a disconnection.

*Chair Baugh:* If this were inclusionary zoning, housing would be required to be built. The City supports this. But why are we as a city through a TIF agreement, where we're investing money, we're not doing this?

- We are asking ZRZ to move forward with development to create property taxes to use to create affordable housing. ZRZ won't develop without this public-private partnership.
- We'll pay market rate for the land. For the units themselves, "typical subsidy for a similar unit" is the phrasing in the agreement.

The PDC Board will vote on the amendments at their meeting on January 21 at 1:30 p.m. The amendments then go to City Council on January 29 at 2 p.m. time certain.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked if we are out of compliance with the Comp Plan right now.

- The staff recommendation shows that the changes are in compliance with the current Comp Plan.
- Joe noted Policy 4.7 "Income distribution of the district should be similar to that of distribution citywide". Application of this topic was addressed at Council, and we think this was addressed. Today, the citywide profiles would have about 44 percent at 80 percent MFI or less, which is more than double the fiscally-constrained model Council at the time thought could happen in South Waterfront. We believe it's in conformance based on the previous City Council action.
- 209 out of approximately 2250 total units in this proposal are affordable 0-60 percent MFI. Based on the memo from PHB/PDC, we can include language around the idea of when total housing production is over 3000 units, we will relook at the 30 percent affordable housing goal.
- The goal that we just forwarded to Council for the CC2035 West Quadrant Plan is less than this.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about the 30 percent TIF set-aside. Can we increase this to meet the goal?

- There is enough money, but it's not always the right kind of money. If ZRZ takes off, there is capacity to accelerate the affordable housing funding. Also, we see room to increase affordable housing allotment in the end. TIF could rise to over 30 percent.

*Commissioner Tallmadge:* What's the possibility of 50/50 split after the obligation is met? Could this be 70/30?

- We are looking at different scenarios to see what the limit would be, and we'll have that information by the time we're at Council.

*Commissioner Houck:* If we go above the 30 percent affordable set-aside, there is a trade-off to other things that wouldn't get funded. For example, in the first 3 years, there is no allocation of TIF funds for park-related infrastructure. What about the greenway that is being built now?

- The agreement with ZRZ is that infrastructure development is concurrent.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the distance between affordable housing advocates and what's being proposed. Does staff have issues with any recommendations they make in their letter? How do we proceed with these two different realities? I do appreciate responses that staff has provided thus far.

- We are in dialogue with housing advocates. Today's proposal brings a lot more

resources to the table. I would ask the PSC that if there are things the advocates letter that you recommend that you send that message to PDC Board and Council.

*Commissioner Schultz:* You believe that if all goes as planned, there will be enough TIF for 479 units, then we may look to change the split. A concern is that you might get housing (building) with the TIF, but then there is a potential operational gap?

- The gap is in the 0-30 percent MFI range. TIF is sufficient. We've identified other opportunities to meet the obligation though they are not fully committed.

*Schultz:* If the gap is covered, are you more committed to providing more affordable housing potential in North Macadam? Yes.

*Commissioner St Martin:* How are you addressing 60-100 percent MFI range?

- That is part of the planning. We are committed to try to meet this income range, but TIF is not allowed for 61-80 percent MFI. Local subsidy has to increase because there isn't as much leverage for this income level. We are committing to figuring out a better tool to try to meet this obligation.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about the number of units in the North Macadam. The housing advocates' letter is about twice as much as the staff has noted.

- It's likely because we're using slightly different geographies.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about "affordable housing covenant".

- It's a defined term in the development agreement to attach a requirement on the owner on the land, and it travels with the land.

*Chair Baugh* noted the 30 percent Central City affordable housing goal for the CC2035 West Quad plan. Where do we pick up the slack if we're trying to get people to live downtown? Part of it is in the 0-60 percent range, which we have funding for. But the 61-80 percent range is a different set of tools. In numbers, we've created a deficit of affordable housing, so where do we build to account for this?

- Incentive zoning, which is a form of inclusionary zoning. Part of the work on the CC2035 Plan is to recalibrate the Central City bonus system. We are doing analysis to see what may be produced if we have an affordable housing bonus. This will come as part of the CC2035 code amendments next year. We need to run the numbers and will bring them back to the PSC with that project. We are hopeful it could be useful tool in the CC, possibly SoWa as well. There is already a SoWa bonus to dedicating greenway funding, so that is an example of tradeoffs we will consider.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted there is new housing being build, but what about purchasing already-built housing to get to the goals?

- That is front of mind for PHB too. The incentive zoning strategy came from this. We have been pushing for property tax exemptions and SDC exemption program is similar too.

*Commissioner Houck* would like to move forward, but we need to convey to PDC and Council some of our major concerns.

*Commissioner Shapiro* agrees with *Commissioner Houck*. We got a response, and we need to move it forward with a hope that some of the aspirations should be met with a strong letter.

*Commissioner Smith* is in general agreement. If there isn't development, there isn't funding for affordable housing. He's concerned that our strategy with development agreements doesn't implement our housing strategy; that is something Council should work on.

*Commissioner St Martin* noted the improvement from original proposal but we need to continue to push forward.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* noted the PSC's role is to approve based on compliance with the existing Comprehensive Plan, and it is.

*Commissioner Schultz* would like to include an annual reporting back to PSC from PHB/PDC on their efforts to help move affordable housing goals in the URAs forward.

*Commissioner Oxman* agrees with the ideas stated.

*Commissioner Rudd* is also in favor of moving forward. There are challenge of making aspirational goals work on the ground. We also need to be realistic.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that park advocates strongly supported 30 percent affordable housing set-aside, and this wasn't easy to do. But we recognized the importance of it.

*Commissioner Gray* relayed the Irish Moss project opening in East Portland, which is amazing and affordable. That was a great example for what affordable housing can and should be. It encompasses the philosophy of equity. I'm hoping our policies align with what we say about equity.

*Commissioner St Martin*: If we do over achieve, the TIF split should be weighted to housing.

*Chair Baugh* is concerned about not having specifics. It has been frustrating, but we should move on. Let's write a very strong letter to Council. We have a disagreement about numbers. We will be asking for 40 percent affordable as our proposed strategy. Information about the development agreements info should be in our letter. Having an annual review is a great suggestion. For the Central Eastside, we should ask for requirement for an affordable housing goal in that district too.

*Chair Baugh* will work with staff to draft a letter from the PSC to address the issues we've discussed. This will include points above as well as: delivery of the affordable housing commitment; openness to more than 30 percent set-aside; encouragement that operating funding will be needed, not just TIF funds; and moving forward with Lot 3.

#### **Recommendation**

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved approve the URA amendments as they are in conformance with the Comprehensive Plan. The PSC will write a letter to Council that outlines our concerns.

*Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Baugh, Gray, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### **Terminal 6 Environmental Overlay Zone Code and Map Amendment**

Hearing: Tom Armstrong

#### **Documents:**

- [Packet](#)
- [Issues Summary Table](#)
- [Environmental Overlay Zone Map](#)
- [Conceptual Site Plan](#)

**Presentation:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7159750/File/Document>

*Commissioner Rudd* recused herself from this agenda item.

Tom introduced the project and proposal for Terminal 6. Extending a pipeline to the dock across the environmental zone is what's at issue today. As the e-zone currently reads (applied citywide):

### **33.430.090 Prohibitions**

The following items are prohibited in all environmental zones. Prohibitions apply to both transition areas and resource areas:

- A. The use, packaging, transportation, or storage of hazardous substances, except as follows:
1. Transportation of hazardous substances through environmental zones by rail or on designated truck routes is allowed;

There is nothing that mentions why pipes were not included in 1994 when this was written. The proposed exception, only for Terminal 6, is:

2. The transportation of propane through environmental zones is allowed on a site that is:
  - a. Zoned Heavy Industrial; and
  - b. Has a primary river-dependent industrial use; and

On the Willamette River, on the Portland Harbor, the prohibitions are not in place. Today's proposed amendments would put Terminal 6 on a similar footing the Portland Harbor by treating hazardous substances in a similar way.

The project needs the code amendment to enable it. Because we are going through a legislative project, we are also taking advantage of the process to change the map. The original map was made in 1989 based on inventories then. The 2012 Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) identified additional significant natural resources that are not covered by the current e-zones.

We are proposing to extend the c-zone (the areas in green on the map on slides 7 and 8) coverage over parts of the developed portions of the site, the BPA power corridor, and the 100-year floodplain on the vacant portion of the site.

If we followed previous e-zone decisions, we would have extend the c-zone over more of the vacant site We are unable to do that at this time due to limits in Goal 9 and impacts on industrial land capacity. We can't do more right now without an adopted EOA, which is coming before the PSC in April.

Staff identified a number of the issues heard after they published the proposed amendments on December 12. These include: safety/risk, Portland's Climate Action Plan, GHG emissions, habitat impacts, boating access, jobs and tax revenue. We expect to hear testimony about these topics today.

This is a legislative project; the City is considering changing our own rules. The PSC is being asked to consider the code and map amendments and recommend these changes to City Council, who will make the final decision on these proposals.

*Commissioner Smith* asked that testifiers are about climate change, if they have ideas about the role of bridge fuels (such as propane) in decreasing GHG emissions, to share those ideas. For staff: why doesn't this trigger a NEPA process?

- No federal funds are being used as part of this process.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about the noted additional 100 train cars every day. What if more

cars arrive than ships?

- This is a scheduling question for Pembina.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the existing 100 year flood plain, but there are likely changes to those maps.

- As the 100-year flood plain map changes, we would make changes through follow-up projects and amendments. The proposal is based on our current map and Comp Plan.

I would like you to go through what we should be considering... e.g. we are working off the current Comp Plan. How narrow is our ultimate decision?

- This decision is about the current Comp Plan; we have to make findings against this. In the ESEE analysis, we have under Goal 5 a broad latitude to consider the impacts and have gotten into all of these issues. We will balance conflicts to determine the best way to protect natural resources.

Independent of the Pembina projects?

- Map proposal goes with the code amendment as a package.

Are the e-zone changes proposed independent of the Pembina Project?

- No the e- zone changes proposed on the map will be submitted with the code amendment as a package.

Nate Takara, Fire Marshal, explained the process for permitting and development review. We are early in the process for this project right now. If permit applications are submitted, Pembina would go through the standard BDS procedure, and Fire would be one of several bureaus reviewing the application. It's a complex issue, and with safety in mind, we will review the plans with an independent 3<sup>rd</sup> party reviewer.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked who the 3<sup>rd</sup> party reviewer would be.

- We are working with the building department to do a proper review via a bid process to determine an appropriate 3<sup>rd</sup> party, knowing what type of expertise we're needing.

*Commissioner Oxman* is curious about experience with propane explosions will be part of the analysis.

- Yes, this is part of the fire risk analysis.

#### **Port of Portland / Pembina Panel**

Harry Andersen, VP Legal and General Counsel; Stu Taylor, Senior VP NGL and Natural Gas Facilities; Eric Dyck, VP Marine Terminals

The panel provided background about the project and what's currently allowed versus what's being asked to be amended.

Pembina agrees with the proposed code and map amendments and the staff recommendations to approve these amendments.

Pembina is committed to buying green power for the project. It will mitigate all local environmental impacts associated. They will employ a diverse workforce and use unionized labor for construction of project. We have a letter signed by Pembina leadership outlining these commitments.

This will be a \$500M investment by Pembina into Portland. It will create 600-800 construction jobs when the facility is being built and 30-40 permanent jobs. We expect about \$12M annually in property tax revenue and will purchase about \$250M in locally-sourced equipment for

construction. Workforce diversity and training and union participation for construction are key initiatives. No subsidies on any tax abatement are associated with the project. And there will be minimal environmental impacts; this is an existing industrial site.

Propane is a safe and clean product. The project is safe, and it is no different from other Pembina facilities aside from it is larger. There is no processing at the site – no chemicals or treating at the site.

*Commissioner Smith* appreciates the mitigation of local impacts but has concerns about global impacts. I did not find reference to climate change in Pembina's annual report. Does Pembina have a position on climate change?

- Propane is a transition fuel that enables countries to move from traditional fuels to cleaner. Portland and the school districts use propane because it is a cleaner option.
- Production of plastics and heating and cooking would be the main uses of the propane once exported. Between 50 and 100 percent of that would go to production of plastics, which would displace oil-based production sources.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about the size of the project.

- This is the largest private investment in Portland's history (\$500M). It is Pembina's largest in Oregon, but not Pembina's largest investment ever.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked why with good rail a Vancouver or other BC port wouldn't be used.

- We looked at a number of different sites and chose Portland as our first choice because the proximity to Asian markets is important. There is a good skilled labor force in Portland. This is already an operating and existing site. And there is convenient access to locally-sourced goods. Pembina has not been turned down in other locations.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted safety as a priority. What about catastrophic events that may happen? Do you know what the radius of the blast zone might be?

- Safety is our number one priority. We are aware of the risks. Double-walled storage tanks. Facility design and inspection. Tanks do not implode or explode on their own if built and maintained properly as Pembina does. Other sites with similar ships and equipment have a hazard zone of ~300 yards. Not specific to this site.

*Commissioner Houck* is (perhaps surprisingly) most interested in the jobs question. We have gone through conversations about Portland's lack of industrial land, and a way to address this challenge is to intensify use on the land we have. The figures are impressive, hiring locally and unionize labor, but this is a 40-60 acre footprint with 30-40 full time jobs to operate the site. I want to see the Port utilize this site but would like to see 100 or more jobs generated. I have a problem with this.

- This is a difficult site to put anything on. It's an infill site. The jobs are \$80-100k/year. Industrial jobs in the waterfront also create other jobs, probably about at a ratio of 3:1. We can get you these details. In the current Comprehensive Plan, there are no jobs designated on this site.

*Commissioner Gray* appreciates being able to go out to the site. I want to be sure the PSC has further time with the Port and Pembina for future conversations before making a recommendation. One of three Portland school districts will get a tax benefit, but Parkrose SD won't get this benefit.

- The \$12M referenced are the "big buckets" of tax revenue. We can get these details to share with the PSC.

*Commissioner Oxman* returned to the safety issue. Pembina has not has serious incidents with propane, but there have been other companies that have had explosions. As you go through the safety analysis, you should look at the other disasters to come up with information to describe

how they would or would not happen under Pembina leadership.

- We can't speak for others, but we have been safely operating for 40 years in 60 different communities. Pembina also reviews other companies' issues. These have predominantly been human error as the root cause of the issues.

*Chair Baugh* noted the Port is the landlord. The Port will be responsible to ensure Pembina does what they say they will do. How do you monitor this? We will have more trains and ships coming in to this site; how do you address emissions from these?

- The Port will participate and approve the site design. It is allowed to audit tenants at any time, including safety audits. Safety and environmental performance are key components.
- The Oregon Clean Fuels Action Plan defines propane as a clean fuel that can help displace other heavier fuel options. The Port walks our talk and are about 50 percent below 1990 emission levels, 9 years before our goal. We use 100 percent green fuel for our own energy use and have a 90 percent waste reduction goal. We believe propane is part of the global story in the battle against emissions.

#### **Audubon / HiNoon Panel**

Bob Sallinger, Portland Audubon; Ronald Ebersole, HiNoon; Lowen Berman, Climate Action Coalition

The PSC should reject this proposal as bad for commitment to safety and protecting our communities. This may be the only opportunity the community has to provide comment. We urge you to take a broad view of the ESEE analysis, not a narrow one. The ESEE is incomplete and not adequately addressed.

Carbon emissions from this proposed site will be measurable at a local and global scale. We believe Pembina should offset all impacts, globally, not just the local ones. The ESEE fails to address public health and safety adequately. We have asked Pembina to articulate the blast zone as well as impacts of the added trucks and trains, but they haven't yet as part of this process.

The City should do a health impact analysis from the diesel fumes, boats, trains and the potential blast zone as a matter of environmental justice.

Less than one job per acre isn't sufficient to help Portland and our limited of industrial land.

Recreational impacts would effectively shut down the slough when the ships come in a few times per month.

We also don't believe propane is a transitional fuel. This is a byproduct of fracking for natural gas. We are adding to the infrastructure network to allow fossil fuels to be extracted and used.

We do think the City does need to expand e-zones, but not solely for this project. This should be a public process, not just to accommodate a company.

The PSC should be courageous and not recommend this proposal to City Council.

Pembina has not provided information about blast zones or other concerns. We researched industrial and scientific papers about transporting propane and reviewed modeling examples in case of failure. Refrigerated tanks like Pembina proposed using are the safest, but the transfer containers are not as safe. They are susceptible to fire, earthquake and terrorist attacks. We are publishing a white paper with our findings that will be on the HiNoon website.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the flood plain regulation changes.



- We don't know what this will entail for this specific project. The City is protecting the floodplain on this site, but our biggest concern is that this is being done out of sequence with the EOA, so we're not mitigating all the lands that we should.

*Commissioner Shapiro*

In terms of jobs, Pembina said they would like to double the capacity of this facility by moving more trains and boats through.

*Commissioner Smith* keeping carbon sources in the ground is essential to the planet. But I'm sure if we turn this down, another port city would want this project.

- Cities in Canada and First Nations sovereignty issues are a concern. We have to stop increasing any fossil fuel extraction and movement and start going in the opposite direction.

*Commissioner Oxman* noted carbon emissions of various fuels. Displacement of coal is a noble goal. What is evidence that propane or other cleaner fuels do or don't displace coal?

- We haven't seen any evidence produced or demonstrated that propane will displace coal. It's easy to say, but we don't see evidence. The City needs to look at all the assumptions. We don't need to add to infrastructure to ship fuel products overseas.

**Testimony**

1. Michael Haynes, AmeriGas: Supports the Pembina proposal. Propane is safe and is not damaging to water ecosystems. *See written testimony.*
2. Mike Smith, Class Harbor Inc: 24 homes are just below the potential site area and 15 homes are just farther downstream. Concern about livability, especially with the 24/7 facility. Odors and residual downstream effects are a concern.
3. Rick Brown, 350 PDX: This organization is building a grassroots movement to work on climate crisis. Commend Portland for climate work and for being a Climate Action Champion. If the City continues to meet its reduced emission goals, if the terminal were built, the combustion of propane through the terminal would produce CO2 levels that approach and possibly exceed those of all of Multnomah County. Please deny the proposed amendments. *See written testimony.*
4. Rick Bryant: Lives on the floating home community closest to the facility, about 3000 feet from the southeast end of the facility and 2 miles from the container docks at T6. Any accidental release of propane could be devastating. Capacity of 8 tanks with 125,000 barrels each. A barrel is 42 gallons, so this is millions of gallons.
5. John Talberth, Center for Sustainable Economy: The propane dehydration process that would be used in China has high carbon emissions. The NRI and ESEE are required but don't have citizen involvement. What about job losses for exporting propane to Asia? *See written testimony.*
6. Baron Glassgow, Pacific Propane Gas Assn: Spent time (unrelated to this project) observing Pembina and other propane terminals. Pembina is a first-class operation. The propane industry takes safety very seriously and in the last 15 years has spent about \$7M to train fire emergency services.
7. Joe Westby, Ferrellgas: Portland Public Schools replaced 400+ busses with propane busses for a 20 percent less NO2 and CO and fewer particulates. Propane burns cleaner than diesel. Bus drivers don't complain about fumes. Propane is a good passenger vehicle fuel. Supports the project. *See written testimony.*

8. Lana Butterfield, Blue Star Gas: Highlighted written testimony of Darren Engle and facts about propane. Supports the proposal. *See written testimony.*
9. Sandra McDonough, Portland Business Alliance: Supports the amendments and proposed project. This is the kind of project we need to meet our job goals in Portland including indirect jobs that will be created. Pembina has a proven track record. *See written testimony.*
10. Bonnie McKinlay: Protect the environment. *See written testimony.*
11. Deane Funk, PGE: Commended staff on the report. Supports the amendments. \$500M is significant. 40 ongoing jobs plus indirect job increases are good. Tax revenue is important for Portland. Pembina has an impressive track record, and that's what Portland wants to attract.
12. John Mohlis, Oregon State Building Trades Council: The Council's membership supports the code changes for the project to move forward. Spoke with Pembina and understands their number one commitment is safety. We can provide them the safety and highly-skilled workforce to build the facility. Local MWESB contracting is included in the agreement for the workforce that will construct the plant. This project provides good opportunities for young people to learn a craft. Supports the goals of the Comprehensive Plan update.
13. Willy Myers, Columbia Pacific Building Trades: Represents high-skilled and well-trained workers. Supports the project that will create more opportunities.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about the particular use of this land versus other uses on this property.

Industrial projects always create more construction jobs because of the amount of mechanics that go into the development.

14. Corky Collier, CCA: 700 union construction jobs are great. 30-40 permanent jobs provide middle-wage incomes. These are traded sector dollars. I encourage and support the proposal.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about traded sector jobs. Aren't we just a pass through versus Intel developing a chip and exporting it?

Who pays for the jobs is the question. This is from out of state, so that's the traded sector value.

15. Cpt Steven Woods, Columbia River Pilots: Responsible for safe navigation of ocean-going ships. The Pilots take no position for or against this amendment or the Pembina facility. We give the ships the same service regardless of what they do or are. *See written testimony.*
16. Bob Carroll: This project will be built safely because the building trades craftsmen are highly skilled and supported. The 30-40 permanent jobs are significant along with the 700+ construction jobs. Industry is the backbone of our nation and the local economy. Supports the proposal.
17. Michael Horner: Propane has an emissions profile similar to other extracted fuels. It's not displacing coal and oil; it's creating a market where solar and wind are less economically viable replacements. *See written testimony.*

18. Jim Townley: Talked about capacity of channel to handle additional ships. *See written testimony.*
19. Ellen Wax, Working Waterfront Coalition (WWC): The harbor is an economic engine that provides jobs for Portlanders. Harbor businesses are important and provide middle-income jobs/wages. We urge approval of amendments that is consistent with businesses in the harbor that contribute positively to the local economy and jobs. Support the project.
20. Rob Mathers, WWC and Kinder Morgan: KM owns a number of terminals and pipelines that handle fuels including renewable fuels. No direct interest in the project, but on behalf of the WWC, I support the amendment of the e-zone. This isn't really a pipeline; it's a dock line that is secure and fixed. Supports the harbor and business development.
21. Al Roxburgh, Hayden Island: Opposes the proposal and amendments based on livability and health concerns. *See written testimony.*
22. Timme Helzer, Hayden Island: Opposes amendments. *See written testimony.*
23. David RedThunder: Opposes amendments. Concerned about livability and health. *See written testimony.*
24. Jeff Geisler, Hayden Island Neighborhood Network: HiNoon has not yet taken a vote, but why does this have to be here (in this location)? We have lower regulatory hurdles than in Canada. We have many questions about the safety and potential blast zone, area of devastation that is a possibility. We don't have enough services on the island to deal with a catastrophe. Get more information about safety and regulations before we approve any amendment.
25. Jim Plunkett: Information at the right time is what's important. Let's not make the effects of global warming worse. Propane as a replacement fuel: whatever its virtues, it is a byproduct of diesel and other fuels. Please deny this amendment. *See written testimony.*
26. Kristin Meira, PNWA: Supports proposal and job opportunities. The river has the capacity to handle increased traffic.
27. Liz Wainwright, Maritime Fire & Safety Assoc and Merchants Exchange: Supports amendments. The river has the capacity to handle increased traffic. *See written testimony.*
28. Pamela Allee: The Alberta tar sands are the some of the dirtiest, and that's where the propane is coming from as a byproduct. Health is not a concern for them. Please oppose the amendments for the sake of our planet and Portland. *See written testimony.*
29. Joe Esmonde, IBEW Local 48: Supports the amendments and Pembina. It's not unusual to have an omission in a bill. Income inequality is as big a problem as environmental challenges.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about income inequality and exports to China. The longshoremen union is concerned that the trains will displace other cargoes that provide more jobs.

“No comment.”

30. Peter Teneau: If we approve this, we are providing a Canadian company ability to ship from our land from a site that’s in a liquefaction zone. The product is a byproduct of fracking, which is hazardous and accelerates global warming. We should not be facilitating this proposal.
31. Travis Argue, UA Local 290: We would be the people putting the pipe in. We have a great track record for safety and an apprentice program. We support these amendments.
32. Dr Theodora Tsongas: Concerned about safety issues. Explosions and fire are key concerns. Reject the proposal. *See written testimony.*
33. Regna Merritt, Oregon Physicians for Social Responsibility: Concerns with risk of destabilization of climate. Long-term health issues with a warming climate. Public health and safety concerns. Please deny the code amendments. *See written testimony.*
34. Art Lewellan: Concern about the capacity of the rail bridge and the cumulative effect of trains including Amtrak on this bridge. We should be using fossil fuels sparingly and not be transporting fuels overseas.
35. John Bruce Liles: Supports unionized workers. But climate change is a major concern... and the indirect jobs being created will likely be more in the health realm. We need to improve these amendments so there won’t be any transport through the e-zone.
36. Rebekah Creswell: Health worker. Environmental justice and public health. Concerns about local impacts of the terminal. *See written testimony.*
37. Taizz Medalia: Respiratory therapy specialist. Fossil fuels are coming to an end and have already caused irreparable damage. An agreement without thought to conditions could leave residents dealing with problems and potential explosions. Reject this proposal and show leadership for climate change.

The Commissioners discussed the options to get through all the testifiers today. The next PSC meeting regarding this proposal will be on March 17 at 3 p.m. Written testimony will remain open through March 17.

Susan asked all PSC members to get questions to staff by the end of this week so we can put together a response for PSC members and for the public.

*Commissioners Schultz* suggested that we give time to testimony today so we can offer more time to testifiers instead of PSC members verbally sharing their thoughts at the end of the meeting.

*Chair Baugh* confirmed that testimony will remain open through March 17.

*Chair Baugh* asked the remaining audience who supports the amendments as proposed. About 40 people. Opposes: about 80 people.

#### Written Testimony Received

- Emerald Goldman
- Julia Harris
- Rob Neyer
- Barbara Pikus
- Howard Shapiro
- Ben Mendenhall
- Helen Hays
- Sarah Aaserude
- Kelly McConnell
- Linda Swanson-Davies
- Glenn Koehrsen
- Blaine Ackley

- Janet Stein
- Mark Wheeler
- Jeff Davies
- Heather Carver
- Carol Kline
- Laurence Eckman
- Barbara Bartschi
- Eric Schnell
- Jules Elias
- Roger Kofler
- Barbara Baltz-Shields
- Jonnel Covault
- Jon Jacklet
- Marguerite Hall
- Sharon Rickman
- David Sweet
- Lauren Patton
- Anaïs Tuepker
- Emily Herbert
- Barbara Krupnik-Goldman
- Michael Haynes, AmeriGas Propane
- Susan Haywood
- ICTSI
- Pembina
- Greater Portland Inc
- Laurie Dougherty
- Theodora Tsongas
- Rebekah Creswell
- Kelly O’Hanley
- Gregory Monahan
- Cpt Steven Woods, Columbia River Pilots
- Sandra McDonough, PBA
- Anna Fritz
- Sierra Club Oregon Chapter
- Regna Merritt
- David RedThunder
- Lowen Berman
- Marilyn Sewell
- Susan Haywood
- Jennifer Darling
- Rev Katherine Jesch
- Theodora Tsongas
- Pamela Allee
- David Spitsyn
- Marna Herrington
- Douglas Steves
- Adrienne Martin
- Dell Goldsmith and Robin McLeod
- Nancy Pfeiler
- James Tyree II
- Stephanie Rege
- Lucy Schneid
- Marvin Slifman
- Jim Conroy
- Jacob Scritsmier
- Dan Jaffee
- Center for Sustainable Economy
- Lisa Frank
- Mary Vogel
- Kate Schmitt
- Alice Shapiro
- PNWA
- Ann Faricy
- Joe Westby
- Darren Engle
- Angela van Patten
- Walt Mintkeski
- Heather Brunelle
- Walt Evans, PNITA
- Schnitzer Steel
- Nancy Crumpacker
- Mike Stanton, ILWU Local 8
- Marilee Dea
- Columbia Riverkeeper
- Peter Wilcox
- Scott Schroder
- Curtis Robinhold, Port of Portland
- John Talberth, CSE
- Rob Mathers
- James Townley
- Al Roxburgh
- Lorraine Heller
- Donald McKinlay
- Bryan Brumley
- Carolyn McDalen
- Ruth North
- Jim Plunkett
- Bonnie McKinlay
- Melly Scott
- Kyle Jensen
- Holly Blakeslee
- Mary Workman
- Judith Arcana
- Kelly Reece
- Claire Darling
- Karen Stolzberg
- Richard Turnock
- Dave & Laurie King
- Diane Rios
- Mark Darienzo
- Phillip Norman
- Port of Portland
- Paula Manley
- Linore Blackstone
- Catherine Arp
- Jennifer Fijii
- Scott & Heidi Trinkle
- Marian Drake
- Carol Sherman-Rogers
- Columbia River Yachting Association
- Joanna Kirchoff
- Pacific Propane Gas Assn
- Larry McAllister
- Bonny McKinlay
- Columbia River Pilots
- Jim Plunkett
- Pamela Allee
- Susan Haywood
- Sunnyside Environmental School students
- Walt Evans, PNITA
- Elizabeth Wainwright, Maritime Fire and Safety and Merchant Exchange
- Rebekah Creswell
- NAIOP
- Kelly O’Hanley
- Timme Helzer
- Andrew Murdoch
- Judith Gerry
- Barbara Walden
- Emily Herbert
- Rick Brown

**Discussion**

Susan offered that she and Tom will be available to talk with PSC members one-on-one or in

small groups prior to March 17.

*Commissioner Tallmadge:* How long would a full EIS take? Regarding future expansion, can the site handle it? What would that look like?

*Commissioner Smith:* Safety questions still need to be worked out. We need a view from Pembina and independent experts. The key issue for me is climate. Is this inalterably in conflict with our Climate Action Plan?

*Commissioner Shapiro:* This has been an engaging hearing. How does this project comport to the goals of the Portland Plan? Equity and economic impacts. I'm still unsettled about earthquakes and floods.

*Commissioners Schultz* noted the disparity in facts that have been shared. Also, we have heard about carbon emissions, but nothing about comparing these sources' emissions to renewables.

*Commissioner Houck* is concerned about climate implications, but also about jobs. Why can't this site be used for other purposes that create more jobs?

*Commissioner St Martin* also asked about alternative site uses.

*Commissioner Oxman* is concerned about climate issues and safety issues. He is particularly concerned about setting a policy precedent inadvertently for this case.

*Chair Baugh* noted we don't know if we can control drilling for natural gas or if we can be assured about what the propane will be used for. Transport of fuels through Portland is a big policy question. What can we affect? Jobs. What about public safety? I'm confused by the disparate facts we've heard today from credible sources. I would like us to create a fact sheet. Is it a pipeline or an above-ground line? I didn't hear specifically from tribes today, so I want to be sure we have engaged them and address their concerns. We heard from a number of communities today who may be affected. I would like that we have a process for the Port and Pembina work with the communities to be sure they are engaged (not just who get outreach). For wages, I heard \$50-\$100k for the long-term jobs; that's a big range. What's the Port's responsibility with the plan in terms of safety? The trains and ships that are coming in? How do we look at health issues jointly with the Port? We have to create a policy that works today and in the future. This shouldn't be a knee-jerk policy; it needs to be something we can use in the future. On the issue of trains, not specific to propane, what about the amount of traffic? We have a port that has minimal container shipping capacity, but we don't want to constrict train traffic from other parts of our state for the trains from Canada.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted that Pembina is going to form an advisory committee. Does that help with the engagement concern?

- *Chair Baugh* noted he didn't hear this today. I would like the PSC to work with staff to ensure the communities are set up for success with Pembina and the Port around a Good Neighbor Agreement.

Tom noted that Pembina has proposed a community advisory group to help address items that would typically go into a Good Neighbor Agreement. A couple of PSC members could be included on this group.

*Chair Baugh* asked that staff and a couple of PSC members work with the Port to develop an overall policy to share with all PSC members. *Commissioner Smith* will work with this group.

*Commissioner Smith* commented on what we can control and what we can expect to control. What do we choose to participate in, even if there are things we can't control them?

- *Chair Baugh* noted you can buy offsets. We can't control what happens in China, but a policy could include things we can control and do.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the staff time that will be required on gathering responses and information. We also need others to help answer some of the more outstanding technical questions.

PSC members will share their others questions via email to Julie by this Friday, January 16.

We might want to consider asking tribes specifically to provide testimony at the March 17 meeting.

*Chair Baugh* thanked all of today's testifiers. Your input helps us make an informed decision.

### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 6:02 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken



## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, November 18, 2014

4:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Mike Houck (arrived 4:15 p.m.), Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray, Gary Oxman, Maggie Tallmadge

**BPS Staff Present:** Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom

**Other Staff Present:** Kathryn Beaumont, City Attorney Office; Traci Manning, PHB; Courtney Duke, PBOT; Jonna Papaefthimiou, PBEM; Justin Douglas, PDC; Stephanie Beckman, Douglas Hardy, BDS; Jim Hagerman, Marie Walkiewicz, BES

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

*Commissioner Smith:* I attended a [Digital Inclusion Summit](#) this morning. I hope we can reflect some of the themes about broadband policy in the Comp Plan.

### Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- PSC members received the information about the recommendation from the Blue Ribbon Committee that the City's Solid Waste rate-setting may be coming to PSC. In the next month, staff will join a PSC officer meeting to explain that piece of work. More information to come.  
*Commissioner Shapiro:* I believe that oversight was originally formed by a vote of the people. In moving the oversight around, are we going to be in conformance?  
*Joe:* I will check in and will be sure we are aware of this question. It's likely we would form a sub-group of the PSC to make recommendations to the full Commission for a vote.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 10/28/14 and 11/4/14 PSC meetings

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.  
(Y7 – Baugh, Hanson, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin)

### Comprehensive Plan

Work Session: Eric Engstrom; Kathryn Beaumont, City Attorney Office; Traci Manning, PHB; Courtney Duke, PBOT; Jonna Papaefthimiou, PBEM; Justin Douglas, PDC; Stephanie Beckman,

Douglas Hardy, BDS; Jim Hagerman, Marie Walkiewicz, BES

**Documents:**

- [Staff Memo](#)
- [Agenda for 11/18/14 Work Session](#)
- [CIC Memo](#)
- [Testimony Compilation Memo](#)
- [Work Session Proposal](#)
- [BDS memo](#)
- [BES memo](#)
- [Office of Community Technology memo](#)
- [OEHR memo](#)
- [PHB memo](#)
- [PP&R memo](#)
- [PBOT memo](#)
- [OMF memo](#)
- [Mixed Use Zones Preliminary Concept](#)
- [Portland Plan Measures At-a-Glance](#)

**Presentation:** <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7062755/File/Document>

Eric introduced today's agenda:

- Citizen Involvement Committee Report
- Bureau Observations
- Work Session Schedule
- PSC Members' Observations

Eric provided an overview of the components of the Comprehensive Plan. In addition to the plan components, there are also background reports and fact documents on which the Comp Plan builds that the PSC recommended in years past.

The 2012 Portland Plan set the strategic framework and higher-level policies. In the Portland Plan we also adopted metrics and goals, which should be referred to in making recommendations about the Comp Plan.

The legacy development pattern in Portland dictates much of what we can change through new development. Growth can influence the direction some.

We want to locate people where there is good access to things that make them successful including jobs and transit. A big question is how we improve parts of the city that are lacking amenities now, and how do we locate people where there are already these services.

The Comp Plan includes 7 key directions. There are also Urban Design terms that describe different pattern areas and types of places and an investment strategy relating to designated Centers and Corridors in 2035. We have limited resources, so we want to invest in places that have infrastructure gaps where growth is expected to happen.

We're in the state Periodic Review process, Task 4 – the Policy Choices. There will be more hearings later for Task 5 – Implementation in later 2015. We have an initial proposal for the Mixed Use Zones project, which PSC members received today.

We're heading into a few months of work sessions at the PSC, with a hearing on the TSP on February 24, 2015, hearings on the performance evaluations (scenarios report and EOA) in April and likely a recommendation from the PSC in May 2015.

We are still accepting comments through the Map App, via email and via snail mail. We've recently provided a deeper set of information from the original Map App (Map App Explorer). The Helpline is also still open for questions.

### **Community Involvement Committee Report**

*Commissioner Shapiro* introduced the CIC members. They are reporting on the work the CIC has been doing since the spring. This is a volunteer committee with members who have helped extensively in outreach for the Comp Plan. Thank you for the work and time you've dedicated.

CIC members Stan Penkin, Denise Barrett, Kenneth Doswell and Linda Nettekoven provided an overview of the CIC's and BPS' outreach work since April of this year.

The CIC has had 47 full committee meetings over the past 5 years. The CIC reviews involvement and results, and makes recommendations to the PSC and bureau staff to help meet overall goals of the Public Involvement Work Program.

Thanks to BPS staff who helped guide the process, particularly Marty Stockton, Deborah Stein, Eden Dabbs, and *Commissioner Shapiro*.

CIC members shared recent involvement efforts in the Comp Plan process. They will share an evaluation of the outreach efforts with the PSC in 2015.

BPS has used a range of methods such as community meetings and the Map App to inform the public about the Comp Plan, answer questions and ensure people who want to provide testimony are prepared to do so.

There have been a variety of communications about the Comp Plan: online tools and information; community and cultural newspaper ads; mailings to property owners affected by potential changes; community meetings, open houses and other events; and immigrant and refugee community outreach in conjunction with the Office of Equity and Human Rights is underway. The Comp Plan Helpline received more than 1300 calls in 4 months.

"Good fences make good neighbors": good communication is a benefit to everyone. The voices that we use are critical to the messages we want to deliver.

One of the biggest things we heard is to consider literacy: many areas targeted for future development have a lower literacy rate (aging, vulnerable, new comers to Portland, immigrants). We need to make sure these populations are communicated to in ways they understand.

Consider race and socio-economic background of the people in the neighborhoods (e.g. deep Southeast). People who mirror the community should be the ones delivering the message.

Culture: Development changes the culture in the community. We need to develop policies and decisions for the existing culture and ones that facilitate community buy-in and adaptability.

Design concerns: We want to make sure policy addresses the historical integrity of neighborhoods. We need to design in and with quality.

Fear of loss of access: Think about people who will be impacted if they didn't know their property is in an area targeted for development. How do we ensure we're not getting swallowed up by big-pocketed developers?

It's our responsibility to have policy in place to address issues especially for our fragile populations.

How we move forward into Phase 5 in terms of community involvement. As the Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) notes, planning doesn't end with the adoption of the Comp Plan, and neither does citizen involvement. We are asking how the PSC would like to see the CIC's participation in the next phase for implementation.

The City established the CIC rather than having the PSC serve in this role as the Planning Commission has done in the past. We need to think about a balance going forward. DLCD suggests possible ways of oversight for community involvement. For example:

- The PSC could be the CIC.
- There could be a hybrid committee – part from PSC members and part from community members.
- Ask PIAC to assume this role.
- Another free-standing CIC as we have now.

The CIC recognizes staff time is another consideration. The oversight role is a large task with a number of requirements, so the PSC needs to start thinking about how we best manage community involvement going forward.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* The make-up of the CIC is diverse. I appreciate the free-standing committee and would suggest that going forward. But are we able to reach out enough to those we need to get to?

- More time is always a question and request from the public. But there are mixed feelings about this because processes and outreach can't go on forever. There has been tremendous amounts of outreach, and there are still many challenges.
- People in the community get swamped with the amount of information that is coming at them that they're expected to respond to.
- Outreach efforts have been phenomenal, but there could be more budget for BPS to expand some of the outreach efforts and have time to reach out to underserved communities.

*Commissioner Shapiro* are we reaching new communities that are moving into the city?

- We have come light years since this process started, but we still have a ways to go.

*Commissioner Houck* seconded Ken's point about "who the messenger is". The Exporando el Slough event was his example of his not being the culturally-appropriate person to share information with the attendees.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about the role of Neighborhood Associations as vehicles of citizen involvement and input. The Comp Plan draft reflects this change from having Neighborhood Associations be the hub. They are a source of citizen input, and they want to be the "official" channel of citizen input, but we want to be able to expand the opportunity for all to provide input.

- Neighborhood Associations and Business Associations are very important because it's where lots of people receive information. The history of the city is much better because of these groups.
- However, it is important for people to find ways to come together in ways that are comfortable for them. The challenge is how to create many portals for people to provide input and get information. Ultimately if it's a place-based issue, people have to come together. Neighborhood Associations have a huge task, and it's all volunteer work.

*Commissioner Hanson* thanked the CIC members for all their hard work. The messenger and

delivery comments really resonate with me: Portlanders would rather have discussions rather than listen to speeches. I'm happy that we're looking forward and looking to implementation, which we'll be considering soon. An ongoing committee has a lot of appeal to help the PSC translate information and to weigh in on issues.

*Chair Baugh* thanked the CIC members for their dedication and time commitment. It's valuable for the CIC in some form to get diverse views and turn over a lots of opinions that may not come through Neighborhood Associations and other established groups, especially as we get into the implementation phase.

### **Bureau Observations**

Kathryn Beaumont, City Attorney Office: This is a complete Comp Plan update from the City's first Comp Plan, which was written when I first started at the City. We appreciate the staff time and thought this draft reflects. It strives to address many policies in the Portland Plan. Two key thoughts:

- The starting point is State Law. The lynchpin of the Comp Plan is a focus on land and the way land is used; it's about land use policies and regulations. There are other tools to implement other policies of the Portland Plan. You can decide how broad or narrow the plan is. The more non-land use things that are included, the greater the risk to implement these policies is based on land use rules.
- Language matters. The words determine whether the function is to guide planning efforts, mandatory requirement or aspiration. This is particularly true in Chapter 1, the Guiding Principles. They need to be clear and unambiguous.
- Also, we need to note how other documents are described and referenced will influence how they are reviewed in the future. Do we need to refer to these other documents? Because if we do so, they could be challenged as land use decisions in the future. Be clear about the intent.

*Commissioner Smith* appreciates the state legal framework is about land use. But this is our opportunity to take Portland Plan policies and adopt them by ordinance for the City. Have you talked with staff about a method of parallel adoption – one for the State and one specifically out of LUBA's jurisdiction?

- We haven't had conversation about an option like this yet.

*Commissioner Houck*: If there is a hypothetical area of the city that we want to zone in a way, I am assuming then we have the right to include additional information such as conditions for development such as mitigation, as long as we're explicit about why we chose to do that. Language matters. I share the concern that there is language in the current draft that is ambiguous, particularly in terms of some of the verb choices such as consider or encourage vs implement or require. This is a major conversation we still need to have.

- Yes. It's your judgment about what you want to include. But the farther from land use decisions we go, the greater the element of risk of them being challenged in the future is.
- There is a function of using some verbs is aspirations, and that can be deliberate.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted that language is critically important. We need to be cautious about referencing other documents. Is there a way to footnote language we use to emphasize our language?

- We can define the words in the glossary; we can do it though ordinance findings; and we can use other tools to make the point clear.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted language as well. It would be helpful to have the City Attorney's office help with the balancing of language.

Jonna Papaefthimiou, PBEM: Resilience as a key direction is important; it is part of a healthy connected city. Green infrastructure is also a great practice in building resilience, which is well addressed in the plan.

- Reducing density in hazard-prone areas: The draft plan gets this right, for example in Powell Butte and the West Hills. This is the best way to protect the city, and it highlights best practices.
- Seismic safety: We have landslides and fires; we also have earthquakes, but we have not been impacted by them in the recent past. A number of things are concerning with earthquakes: unreinforced masonry structures and unbolted buildings; and much of our industrial land is mostly in areas prone to liquefaction. The proposed draft does not yet address these risks. We should add seismic safety policies to chapter 4 and chapter 5. The plan references seismic safety in relationship to efficiency, but not with safety. Include a goal to include seismic retrofits.
- Chapter 6 could also benefit for description of hazards, particularly about areas of liquefaction concern. For example, Linnton is a key place where the majority of the region's fuel tank farms are.
- Recovery planning: We need to focus on incremental changes over time in the Comp Plan. But in terms of disasters, cities can change overnight. If we consider these possibilities, we could include recovery planning options, and that could drastically change the look and abilities of the city.

*Commissioner Smith* noted earthquake risks. Do we have any inventory of the private structures that are not seismically safe? Can we map this?

- We have an inventory from the 1990s. We know that about 25-30 percent of buildings included are not accurate. There is a proposal to create a new BDS position to update the inventory. There is also a City working group that's looking at what we can do to promote retrofits when we have this information updated.

*Commissioner Houck* noted floodplains and that there was nothing in PBEM's comments that related to floodplains and issues related to the likelihood that floodplains will increase in area as a result of climate change. He was pleased that climate change is referenced as an issue but wondered why floodplain issues were not addressed in the PBEM comments.

- There is a chance for floodplains to increase in intensity. We have FEMA's policy about building in the floodplain. Green infrastructure and natural systems are highlighted in the Plan, which is good.

*Commissioner St Martin*: Liquefaction is a factor in industrial sites. Are we counting on something (land supply) that we shouldn't be in our inventory?

- It's not realistic to rezone all our industrial lands, but it's important for us to recognize the risk. Redevelopment can be done in ways and areas that will be more resilient.

Traci Manning, PHB: PHB works more closely with BPS because it is the most relevant to help solve the unmet housing needs in the city. In thinking about housing 120,000 new households in the next 20 years, many of whom are low-income and larger families, is a daunting task. We are pleased that Chapter 5 – Housing, reflects the joint priorities and the priorities of the Portland Plan:

- Work we're doing around the risk of displacement and possibly getting ahead of it by setting policy and making funding decisions that help to mitigate displacement.
- Opportunity mapping: Your zip code is a big indicator of health... basically things that translate into complete neighborhoods are better places for people to live and for them to be healthier. Mapping and policy that is reflected in the Comp Plan that we're already using today to make policy and funding decisions.
- We are happy with the inclusion of good language around housing access.

*Chair Baugh*: What about stronger language for housing to have a better assurance that we do meet the goals for affordable housing? Is this a question of the strength of language in the Plan?

- We can provide some options and work with staff to think about a plan.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted that "affordable" needs a clear definition, particularly in the Plan. Partnership with Home Forward and other housing organizations should be a part of what we have going forward.

- Yes, “affordable” is something we can help to define.

Courtney Duke, PBOT: Worked closely with BPS, and the Plan reflects our work together. The PBOT letter lists a number of concerns and suggestions that Courtney highlighted. We’re still working on the transportation hierarchy and parking policies to refine these policies. We want a stronger Vision Zero policy. We would suggest strengthening the public involvement policies in Chapter 2 to state that they do apply to PBOT. The definition of “underserved” is not clear enough, and it should be better defined in the glossary.

*Commissioner Smith* thanked PBOT for the language proposal for a strong policy on eliminating traffic deaths (Vision Zero).

Justin Douglas, PDC: The staff partnership in working on the Comp Plan has been great, as has been the public involvement process. The PSC and PDC Commission joint meeting was a good collaboration as well. PDC appreciates the tailored approach to Portland’s unique neighborhoods. Integrated policies and reinforcement of the “one size does not fit all” approach is now included, which is great. These efforts complement PDC’s role in its economic development objectives: high-growth, traded-sector areas are priorities that we agree with. A challenge is how we make these opportunities available to all. Placemaking and redevelopment with neighborhood plans and action plans to reflect the Comp Plan – there is an importance of investments and the impact on communities, particularly in evolving communities.

*Commissioner Hanson* thanked PDC for their recent work on neighborhood catalytic projects and an emphasis on placemaking.

Douglas Hardy, Stephanie Beckman, BDS: Douglas commended BPS on the Comp Plan work so far and collaboration with all the bureaus. They focused on issues of concern as described in the bureau memo, particularly on how areas of the Plan will be implemented. We need to be clear and use consistent terms throughout the Plan, which will especially be helpful for those making findings against it in the future. They highlighted four topic areas, which are more described in the BDS memo:

- Community involvement procedures for land use applications and reviews.
- Criteria for quasi-judicial Comp Plan Map Amendments.
- Criteria for Zoning Map Amendments.
- Land use designations and corresponding zones.

*Commissioner Hanson* appreciates the “reality check” from the implementation side. When you do a zone change to make a place into compliance, does it still go to Council for final approval?

- No – this is only reviewed at the Hearings Office. When you’re amending it, that does go to Council.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the comments on Policy 10.2.C: Are you saying you don’t want us to say what neighborhood involvement should be and leave that in the Zoning Code?

- We want to clarify what neighborhood process are included in legislative versus land use processes and decisions. In terms of approval criteria, these should remain in the Zoning Code; the Comp Plan approval criteria are not the same as the Zoning Code, and we need to be clear what is required.

Jim Hagerman, Marie Walkiewicz, BES: Thanked BPS on their work on the draft Comp Plan. They highlighted information as shared in the bureau’s memo. Stormwater management, health of rivers, watershed health, green infrastructure, Centers and Corridor growth, and the balance of economic and environmental policies are important in the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the language changes BES has recommended. We have heard about many of these, and I appreciate that you have been specific on giving recommendations about language. From our role, can we assume some significant percentage, say 80-90% of requests



from other bureaus will simply be adopted by BPS and then be on our consent agenda? And that we would likely see about 10-20 percent of the language edits that there may not be bureau-to-bureau agreement on? It's very helpful to hear other bureau's perspectives and we appreciate the effort BPS has made to solicit other bureau perspectives.

- Yes, we will review all the written comments in detail. There are some issues to be resolved between bureaus, and we'll bring forward to the PSC the ones we can't get to a final statement about.

*Commissioner Houck:* Regarding language about green infrastructure and integrating this, aspirations are great, but reality makes it difficult to incorporate, for example, how do we achieve more urban canopy and vegetative cover in the Central City if buildings are built lot-line to lot-line, leaving no room for vegetation? If you have specific suggestions on how to do this, that would be helpful too.

*Chair Baugh* asked about looking at East Portland. It's resource deficient, but we've targeted it for lots of development. There is a balance of how we would look at the balance so that area achieves that level of service in terms of green infrastructure and also meets the housing needs of the community.

- One of the strengths of the Comp Plan is that it recognizes the different areas and needs in different parts of the city. Even within East Portland, we have different needs within the subarea, so working with, for example, PBOT about different types of street designs is good. There are some places where we're more challenged.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted she's struggling with balancing some of the efforts of green infrastructure – it is more expensive, e.g. to build green roofs. How do we balance this appropriately with our equity and affordability goals?

- *Commissioner Houck:* Information about long-term maintenance, not just up-front costs, would be helpful information.
- It's about fitting the right tool in the right situation.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted that on December 9, BES staff and some private developers will be providing an overview for the PSC. Staff involved in that session could provide some of the information about ROI and costs of green infrastructure.

*Chair Baugh:* Does the Comp Plan supersede the area and neighborhood plans?

- At the start of the process, we reviewed the area plans to bring concepts and ideas from them that have citywide application into the Comp Plan. Some of what's in the area plans are community development action plans. We've tried to build this in where appropriate.

*Commissioner Houck* and *Chair Baugh* thanked bureaus for their time in coming to tonight's meeting. It's been incredibly helpful.

### **Upcoming Work Session Agendas**

Eric reviewed the proposed work session agendas for the January through March PSC Comp Plan sessions. These are what we believe are some of the meatier issues we heard testimony about and we heard in the PSC members' comments. We do have limited time for the work sessions, so we don't want the PSC to discuss everything we've heard. There will be a staff report within each work session topic, which will also include consent lists within the topics.

Out of each work session, we are trying to get general direction and consent from the PSC. We also will have two "miscellaneous" consent lists for things that don't fit into a category. These consent items will be to give staff direction. We will get to a strike-through and underline version, and our current goal would be to release this version the first week of April. There will be a final opportunity to get into the detailed word-smithing at the final work session before the vote.

*Commissioner Schultz:* What about a discussion about glossary terms? *Commissioner Rudd:* And

what the State thinks it means based on their definitions of terms.

- This would increase the time demand for the first work session, but it's important.

*Commissioner Houck* noted he will be out of the country on January 27. Depending on staff availability, I would ask if we could flip work session 2 and 3.

- This is okay from a staff point of view.
- \*\*We will switch what's currently listed as Work Session 3 to January 27, and Session 2 will be February 10.
- Staff will still release the first consent list prior to the January 27 meeting.

*Chair Baugh* requested staff to come back with a Farm and Forest strategy for West Hayden Island with a policy statement that would direct a future Council and Commission about what they would have to do if they were to change it to Industrial.

- *Commissioner Smith* asked about an option for permanent protection for WHI, and for an option that attempts to memorialize the mitigation and other criteria the PSC recommended during the WHI process.
- *Commissioner Houck* asked about if it's zoned Farm and Forest: does that automatically mean it's taken out of the Industrial Lands equation? [Yes.] That would affect the Goal 9 discussion in light of this alternative option. We are due for that conversation, and it will be good to have a range of options to discuss.

We have an ambitious work schedule to get through the Comp Plan, and we've included a schedule check-in at the end of Work Session 3.

*Commissioner Rudd*: Do the consent lists relate to the topics of the work session?

- Each staff report will have consent items. There are also two "miscellaneous" consent lists.

*Commissioner Smith*: Can the Institutional Zones topic be included in the Mixed Use Zones work session? I'm also interested in the area and neighborhood plans questions. Also, at the first hearing, we had testimony about broadband and open data. I intend to propose direction about these, and I think open data goes into the Community Involvement conversation.

- Area and neighborhood plans fit well with the Community Involvement discussion.
- Institutional zones – we made a judgment call to not include this as a topic in a work session in part because in this Task 4. The decision in the Comp Plan is about designating; what you do with it is more of a Task 5 item. This could be a topic for the last work session, as could open data and broadband.

*Chair Baugh* asked about 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave and its development. Is that part of Centers and Corridors?

- It actually fits into three areas: non-conforming, centers and corridors, and employment.

*Commissioner Houck*: What about sound/noise and light and people's experience with the natural landscape? This is a health issue too. I wanted to sit down with staff to have a conversation about this if it's possible to get at least a general statement in the Plan.

- Remember the City Attorney's advice about what's in the Comp Plan. But we do have a "what's next for BPS projects after the Comp Plan" list going, and what we can do in long-range planning to address these issues, and these topics could be included.
- *Commissioner Schultz*: Food security is part of health, too.
- *Commissioner Smith*: What about air quality as part of this health work?
- *Commissioner Houck*: I became a PSC member with the understanding that aside from zoning and code work, the PSC is to be proactive and advocates. Given our collective knowledge, we could do some interesting things around these issues.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the school district conversation, which is currently focused on David

Douglas. Can we look at the whole subject of how school districts are included in the decision-making process about development and how that would work?

- With the policy in place, BDS would have to implement a system of having service provider letters from the school districts showing the capacity of the district as a whole. This could be a blanket letter from each district, but the challenge would be in David Douglas.

For the housing discussion, *Commissioner Tallmadge* offered some items via an email that she'd like to have included, specifically about affordability and gentrification.

At the end of Work Session 4, we will finalize the agenda for Work Session 6. We've noted topics from PSC members tonight, and staff will show what else we could include in that work session a few weeks ahead of that time.

Work sessions are likely to be about 4 hours long. The way we have the schedule now, we alternate afternoons and evenings. This could be reconsidered to accommodate the longer meetings too.

There is a typo on the work session list: The May 14 date is supposed to be May 12.

The hearing will be continued at this location on February 24, 2015, which will be a hearing specifically about the Transportation System Plan (TSP) project list.

The written record will be open through March 13, 2015.

### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 7:14 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, November 4, 2014

4:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Eric Engstrom

**Other Staff Present:** Peter Hurley, PBOT; Mark Lear, PBOT; Art Pearce, PBOT

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 10/21/14 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Oxman* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

*Chair Baugh* gave an overview of the agenda.

### Comprehensive Plan

Hearing: Peter Hurley, PBOT; Mark Lear, PBOT; Art Pearce, PBOT

#### Documents:

- [Staff memo](#)

#### Presentations:

- [Financial Plan](#)
- [Projects and Programs](#)

PBOT staff provided an update about the Transportation System Plan (TSP). Growth is coming, and we need to figure out how to direct that growth. We're planning for 150,000 new commute trips and 120,000 new households in Portland by 2035.

We need a balanced transportation system that includes more safe choices for short trips through walking, biking and transit. We need to reduce our vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and save space for longer trips and trips that must use vehicles.

#### TSP schedule

- Today's hearing
- Public comment now through February 18
- February 24 PSC hearing about the updated and tiered project and program list

We need to prioritize into shorter lists: a financially constrained list; an unconstrained list and a list of projects with dedicated funds; and a study list and projects that didn't make the cut.

We have a candidate list that have been drawn from already-adopted plans. People can provide comments via the Map App and/or on the PBOT website, or at [psc@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:psc@portlandoregon.gov) and [tsp@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:tsp@portlandoregon.gov).

There has always been a program list in the TSP, but many smaller projects have not been as competitive funding-wise. We have an opportunity to bundle smaller projects together into more robust programs so they are more competitive (e.g. for when applying for grants). The individual projects will still show separately in the TSP.

We identified 7 outcomes that we'll use to evaluate projects. These come from adopted state, regional and local plans, including the Freight Master Plan.

The 7 evaluation measures include: safety, access, return on investment, economic benefit, equity, health and climate. These are the key components against which projects and programs will be evaluated.

Over the next 6-8 weeks, staff will review the 311 projects plus the approximately 12 programs on the list to determine to what extent they will each help us achieve the goals/criteria. Access and mobility are other components against which projects will be reviewed.

Chapter 9 in the Goals and Policies are key components for PBOT as well.

#### The TSP financial plan:

- Ensures TSP strategies have a strong financial foundation
- Fulfills Transportation Planning Rule (TPR) Requirements - Transportation Financing Program (OAR 666-12-040)
- Must be consistent with Regional Transportation Plan (RTP)
- Includes a general estimate of timing and rough cost estimates for planned transportation facilities and major improvements
- Estimation of the fiscal requirements to support land uses in the comprehensive plan and assess the adequacy of funding mechanisms
- Considers existing and possible alternative or new funding sources
- Considers regular maintenance and capital replacement requirements
- Considers capacity expansion
- Will include projects, programs, and studies

In the financially constrained revenue scenario, we have \$1.4B. There are \$2.6B candidate program and project costs on the list right now, so clearly we need to prioritize where we'll spend the funds we expect to have.

There are 3 different revenue models:

1. Current Allocation Level
  - No increase in Gas Tax/Vehicle Registration Fee (VRF)
  - Minimal General Transportation Revenue (GTR)
2. Financially Constrained
  - Includes share of \$15 VRF increase every 8 years (same as RTP)
  - Our Streets funding for Safety

- Assumes 1 cent Gas Tax per year increase to cover Operations and Maintenance
- 3. Unconstrained
  - Includes Financially Constrained
  - Increase of Small Starts for Streetcar projects
  - State and Local VRF increases

The big task is to refine the revenue targets and understand what claims there already may be against those revenues. There is a lot of gray area (e.g. with the Our Streets program).

Considerations and next steps from staff:

- Have we missed any revenue streams that we should be included?
- In high growth areas, should we develop a new revenue source that includes local revenue sources like value capture, including parking, that could be used to fund a specific set of improvements in that area?

In the financially constrained analysis, we are including the Street Fee Proposal that is being considered by Council. The assumption would be \$40M annually.

*Commissioner Houck* was surprised by the pie chart regarding the increase in walking. It's exciting to see how much potential there is in terms of ROI on investing in options that increase walking as a mode.

*Commissioner Oxman*: Aside from parking revenue, what are other value capture mechanisms?

- System Development Charges (SDC) overlays, for example, around the light rail development. An Urban Renewal Area (URA) is also a form of value capture.

*Commissioner Smith*: The TSP has a ton of planning in it for how to prioritize projects. Our Streets has a more political set of projects. How will you marry the two different project lists?

- We've already started to do this: in the first 3 years, we've identified projects we want to start via Our Streets. We used the TSP criteria to look at projects to make some adjustments to the list before talking with our modal groups. Half the program for the later years gives us some flexibility. In addition to the 7 criteria, there is an eighth criteria, which is public comment and the PSC's recommendation. In January, we will take the public comments into the evaluation of the tiered list.

*Commissioner Smith* offered a challenge: [PBOT] Director Treat is the most articulate person in the City about Vision Zero [goal to have zero traffic-oriented fatalities]. The safety policy in the TSP draft is a long way to the Vision Zero safety policy, so how can you incorporate her articulation into the plan's safety policy?

*Chair Baugh*: Are you classifying "disadvantaged" in a federal sense? We need to redefine "equity" as to what's in the Portland Plan. In terms of the investment strategy, how will disadvantaged areas be on a "catch-up" schedule? When you start bundling projects, you lose the neighborhood locality, which is disconcerting. As for the location of the TSP and the list on the PBOT website, can you bring it up to a higher level so it's easier to find?

- East Portland Action Plan (EPAP) endorsed the Our Streets projects that they are seeing moving forward in East Portland.

If we're looking at where land use growth is going to happen, and if Centers and Corridors is how we should approach growth, that influences how we place our investments.

**Testimony:**

1. James Dreiling: The draft plan proposes to rezone my property to Open Space, but I'm against it. Retain what's currently zoned R20. 11197 N Portland Rd, on Smith and Bybee Lakes. *See written testimony.*

2. Sean Loughran, Port of Portland: Spoke to the Airport Futures project and need for consistency with the Comp Plan. This was a joint project between the City and Port as well as members of the public. The PDX CAC presented their annual report to the PSC last May, and the main components include long-range planning and Comp Plan amendments, as well as 3 IGAs. The major issues that the community addressed were also included in Comp Plan amendments. But the current draft plan includes almost none of the adopted language, so I request the PSC asks staff to work with the Port to ensure the outcomes from the Airport Futures group continue. The PDX CAC meets again in January, so it would be great to discuss this and bring it to the group then.
3. Bing Sheldon, NW Cultural Center: We are requesting a change the parking lot on my property to the same designation because we don't see the two being separate. The NW Cultural Center is a national landmark, which is currently zoned RH. We should change the designation for the full property. The Comp Plan proposes changing the designation for just the building, but we have them under the same ownership, and we never want to separate it.
4. Gustavo Cruz, NWDA: Excited and optimistic about the plan, but a few concerns. One size doesn't fit all, but the unique qualities of NW may not be fully recognized in the draft plan. Infrastructure may not be able to keep pace with rapid development. Neighborhood Associations (NA) need to be an integral part of community outreach. Goals and policies may not be specific enough to be implemented effectively; they need to be clear and direct and able to be evaluated. Please hold additional public hearings in the future. *See written testimony.*
5. John Bradley, NWDA: The current draft envisions urban nodes linked by transportation infrastructure. NWDA node currently doesn't have a geographic boundary. New mixed-use zones will reexamine set-backs, design standards, mass and bulk, etc, which is a shift to centralization and one size fits all. We want to see the actual code language before being in favor of this.
6. Sharon Genasci, NWDA: The air quality committee recognizes the need to protect Portland's air shed for the health of city residents. City and NAs should work together to clean up. (1) Construction projects should use Clean Diesel Agreement as standard for all new construction. (2) Fill the gap between DEQ and the City. (3) City regulations should limit the release of asbestos and lead in demolition sites. *See written testimony.*
7. Juliet Hyams, NWDA: In the draft plan, it seems that "sustainability" refers mostly to the economy and "resiliency" relates to global warming. These terms should be added to the glossary. We also should include "conservation" to address the intent of both terms. Conservation needs robust regulation, at the City level to protect air, water and quality of life. Increased gas tax and carbon pricing should be included as policies in the plan. The plan should help Portland maintain its national leadership in these areas. *See written testimony.*
8. Wendy Chung, NWDA: Spoke about demolitions and the historic district. Out-of-scale demos and rebuilding is detrimental to the neighborhood. This is a citywide concern about destruction of unique neighborhood character. We need to strengthen policies to maintain historic resources. The Landmarks Commission urged Council to update the Historic Resources Inventory (HRI) and recommended a 120 day waiting period for buildings that are 50 years or more old. Delay is not enough; we need incentives for preservation. We also need to reconcile current zoning so homes in the national register so they are not zoned RH.



9. Karen Karlsson, NWDA: Medical centers and higher education are seen as places for job growth, with the proposal to create “institutional zoning”. The next step will be to develop code as is started in the Institutional Zoning Project. Institutions are usually in residential zones, and they have conditional use master plans. Institutions, neighborhoods and the City need to work together to mitigate effects of growth on the neighborhood. But each is individual and tailored to different situations and need to be individualized to integrate into the neighborhoods. In NW, Good Samaritan is part of the community, and we have been working together with them. Think carefully about the new institutional zoning designation.

*Commissioner Smith* noted the growth boundary on Good Sam. How do we balance the need of an institution from overwhelming the neighborhood?

10. Jeanne Harrison, NWDA: The update of the TSP is still early, so I’m not sure what will happen. We assume Comp Plan and TSP will be updated to reflect each other. Issues include: lack of vision for next 30 years; verbs are often ambiguous (e.g. policy 9.59) in the draft plan; Comp Plan versus TSP classifications are confusing; and regional coordination is not strong enough in the plan.
11. Philip Selinger, NWDA: NWDA has additional transportation concerns around traffic demand management (TDM). The proposed institutional zones will not be able to address unique transportation needs. Transit needs are increasing beyond TriMet’s abilities. The City needs to better define future transit service and network and support development of a sustainable operating budget. Policy 8.37 for commercial uses in the right-of-way (ROW) takes up space but ignores the primary role of the ROW. Also, proposed parking Policy 9.50 conflicts with Policy 8.53.

*Commissioner Smith* asked if there is specific language NWDA can offer, please include that in your written testimony.

12. Jim Laubenthal, Riverside Golf and Country Club: Riverside is quite successful with a current membership over 500. The board discussed the industrial sanctuary designation and opposes this on our property. The perception that Riverside may be converted to industrial is bad for our business. I’m also concerned about regulatory processes in the future. There are likely other properties that have more feasibility to be converted to industrial in the future. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith* noted Portland is projected to be 600 acres short of industrial land. What is the trend in golf now, particularly for courses in urban environments?

Fewer young people are playing, but the Portland area is growing quite a bit for the golf community.

13. Carol McCarthy: Aspirational language in the plan needs more direction and grounding. The Comp Plan is too high level. In Multnomah, we have some R7 zoning, but corner lots are now being zoned at R2.5 and are exempted in the 2015 Tree Policy. We also need to have performance measures in the Comp Plan so we know if the language and intended outcomes are being met. *See video.*
14. James Peterson, Multnomah NA: We’ve requested a 90 day extension for public comment until after the Institutional and Mixed Use zones are defined. The Commission extended the record until March 13, but that doesn’t help with the timing of the other zoning projects. How can neighborhoods be prepared to testify without knowing what the categories of mixed use are? The public needs a chance to testify on the whole

plan. *See written testimony: Spreadsheet/timeline on the Comp Plan.*

*Commissioner Smith* asked about what “proposed code is defined” means. Our mandate from the State is to do the Comp Plan then the zoning.

How the zones will affect our neighborhood need to be defined. If you don’t have hearings on the zones until late May, how would we know what the language is? You need to combine Task 4 and Task 5.

The March 13 date comes after the Mixed Use Zones concept report, to give NAs time to review and testify against what’s being proposed.

15. Tim Helzer: Marine development on West Hayden Island (WHI) is not economically or environmentally feasible. *See written testimony.*
16. David RedThunder: Provided details about his personal history and connection to WHI. WHI will not succeed economically as an industrial port. WHI is a highly valued urban natural habitat. WHI should be sanctuary for us all. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Houck*: Short of taking it off the table entirely, can you give us language in writing that would accomplish the objective of carrying forward the PSC’s WHI language in the IGA?

We would be glad to supplement the PSC’s language.

17. Christopher Brown: The Westmoreland QFC lot at 6144 SE Milwaukie Ave. is currently zoned R5 non-conforming use, which restricts uses for the parking lot. This has served the neighborhood well. Since the opening of the store, the neighborhood has experience negative impacts including noise from trucks, garbage and debris blowing into the neighborhood, and vandalism. A Good Neighbor Agreement draft was never signed by QFC, and it’s not enforced, despite repeated efforts by the neighbors. The grocery store is needed in the neighborhood, but we need a better neighbor in our grocery store. Help maintain current R5 non-conforming use so the neighborhood needs are met.
18. Susan Egnor: Homestead neighborhood. In the UDF, my neighborhood is portrayed in 3-21 as an inner-ring pattern area. But this inner ring pattern area is not applicable to this area. Homestead is almost 50 percent undeveloped parkland with steep winding hills to reach public transportation. It does belong in the Western Neighborhoods pattern area. I would like to see clarification that our forested slopes will not be developed like inner city. Or, if we are a hybrid, explain what that means, and allow an opportunity for input.
19. Gene Dieringer, Woodstock Business District: There has been minimal attention to Woodstock in the plan. But new energy is in the neighborhood. Many new businesses are coming and the area is being redeveloped. Neighbors and businesses and Reed College partnered together to complete a vision plan for Woodstock. We’re still finalizing this plan, which we want to be considered. The community supports positive change and growth. We don’t want another Division St, but something quaint while accommodating higher density that fits the neighborhood. Our final charrette session with the neighborhood will be on December 3. The City should stay engaged in our planning efforts to develop into a complete neighborhood.
20. Angie Even, Woodstock Business District: There is a sense of urgency the neighborhood is going through in balancing growth and lack of infrastructure to the support growth.

Woodstock is not safe for pedestrians or bikes, and our community expressed a need for traffic calming. Woodstock is not a candidate in the TSP proposed plan, but why not? We have no east-west bikeway from 52<sup>nd</sup> to Chavez. Woodstock is a perfect example of where a little funding can go away. We are at the edge of southeast and are vulnerable to development. We have been proactive and not reactive to change. Please be proactive with us.

21. Terry Griffiths: 8 percent of Woodstock streets are unimproved, compared to 2 percent all citywide. The Roadway Not Improved report showed that this is in part because LIDs are too prohibitive, and because residents adjacent feared an undesired increase in traffic on the streets. The Comp Plan envisions high density, but substandard streets undermines this objective. *See written testimony.*
22. Blythe Olson: Concerned about zoning change for Strohecker's on SW Patton Rd. as the plan shows a change to Mixed Use Commercial. In early 1980s, the Strohecker family owned the market, and application was made for a variance to expand to a more commercial size. After a long process including neighborhood residents, Ordinance 155609 amended the current Comp Plan map. It allowed them to expand and amend the Comp Plan Map to Local Commercial – R5 to C3 for the store property. Please continue these conditions. *See written testimony.*
23. Jim Howell: Opposed proposed downzoning of Elliot to single-dwelling R2.5. This is an ideal transit and compact neighborhood. We need to increase affordable multi-family housing, not downzone. *See written testimony.*
24. Anton Vetterlein, Homestead NA: OHSU should not be changed to Mixed Use zoning. This would open the door to more vehicle trips, which would be more difficult to control. Policy 1.15 is concerning as it creates uncertainty with existing area plans. We need to be assured that all components of current plans remain. This is an issue for all Neighborhood plans. R1 and CG rezoned to Mixed Use should not be allowed for commercial uses.
25. Bob Sallinger, Audubon Society: *See written testimony.*
26. Joe Leubezet, Audubon Society: Chapter 7 language has become weaker than the January 2013 draft and entirely rewritten. Policies have been eliminated. The Industrial Development chapter policies have been expanded. Action verbs in Chapter 7 have been weakened rather than strengthened to enhance ecosystem health. *See written testimony.*
27. Jim Labbe, Audubon Society: Environmental equity, green infrastructure and access to nature need to be strengthened in the plan. We need to improve the language of Chapter 7 goals, for example, include “and design to protect, enhance, and restore nature in all neighborhoods”. Integrate green infrastructure. *See written testimony.*
28. Dan Rohlf: Policy 6.17A is a wrong-headed approach and sets up a “race to the bottom”. Goal 9 does not trump all other state goals. We should look for other ways to meet industrial land needs, such as brownfield redevelopment. Minimal protections for the environment should not be regulatory handcuffs we use in Portland. Portland should be a leader in balancing industry and protecting environment, but this plan doesn't get there.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about specific written testimony. Please submit this to us.

29. David Hampten, Transportation Chair, Hazelwood NA and East Portland Action Plan: Regarding policies 9.6 and 9.7, lots of people who live and work in East Portland are in the Columbia Corridor or south in Clackamas County, not downtown. But the transportation focus for PBOT has been getting people to downtown, even though that is not serving people who need to get to the family wage jobs. We need more north-south infrastructure. Policy 9.6 ranks transportation modes, but 9.8 talks about affordability. For many people in East Portland, they are far from biking and transportation options, so they have to drive to get to their jobs. PBOT has underinvested, especially on N-S transportation. I encourage PSC to think about the long-term goals but also think about the medium and short-term for people currently living in East Portland.
30. Corky Collier, Columbia Corridor Association: Career and technical jobs are located in the Columbia Corridor. But we need more transportation options for people to get there. More diversity needs to be encouraged. We need to improve living-wage job opportunities.
31. Katie Larsell, East Portland Action Plan: EPAP has been talking about the Columbia Corridor, which shows that lots of the workforce comes from East Portland. We do not want to displace people who are currently living here. Anything we can do to promote middle income jobs is something that we should try to do through the plan or some other way. We want to make sure people who live in East Portland can get to jobs without having to drive. If there is any other action you can take around displacement, we should include that as well. We're afraid that when displacement in East Portland starts, we won't be able to stop it.
32. Richard Johnson: Concern about the change in zoning from R1 to C2 on SE 15<sup>th</sup>. These are 1-2 blocks of single-family residences, and rezoning would make less family housing and less of a neighborhood community. Retain current zoning *See written testimony*.
33. Susan Lindsey, Buckman NA: Please keep current zoning and don't up-zone the 4.5 blocks of 15<sup>th</sup> to 19<sup>th</sup> on SE Morrison. This is currently R2.5 or R1 single-family homes.
34. Tamara DeRidder, Rose City Park NA: Lots of elements in the plan directly impact the Rose City neighborhood. The proposed draft reflects only a few of our recommendations. We look forward to reviewing other committee proposals (mixed use and industrial zoning). We have concerns about lack of planning for off-street parking that generate impacts on air quality and livability and access to stores and services is choked. A TDM should be developed. We need to transition to alternative transportation options, but we can't do this as a sudden change. The 45' height limit in Hollywood should be continued on Sandy Blvd as it continues eastward. *See written testimony*.
35. Claire Coleman-Evans, Bridlemile NA: A concern for residents is walkability. Bridlemile only has a 46 walkability score. How will the Comp Plan improve the walkability of Bridlemile neighborhood?
36. William Moss: Strip-zoning is counter-productive and doesn't "keep Portland weird". There is no thought to ramifications of parking or noise. The City should designate strip-zoning as legacy zones, freeze them and move on. We need to protect neighborhoods. Limit sound, hours of operation and other adverse effects on neighborhoods. The City should also invest in intelligent development – develop commercial centers where residences grow up around.

37. Laura Campos: Minority rights are only recognized by the dominant culture when the dominant culture perceives it's in its own best interest to help. You need to reach out to communities to show how affordable housing can be in keeping with neighborhoods. Diversity needs to be framed in a positive light. It needs to be an effort to win the hearts of all residents in SW as there have been in East Portland. Regarding displacement, if you locate people near higher-paying jobs, that will help. And look at reversing the state ban on inclusionary zoning.
38. Don Baack: SW Trails was started to improve transportation system in SW Portland via trails. Policy 8.77 implies this will be under PP&R, which will be difficult for us to work with. This should be under the Active Transportation group at PBOT. SW Trails were put together with a safety perspective. The plan should encourage a focus on completing networks and the system of trails.
39. Tinsley Honsdorfer: Disappointed that WHI is designated as industrial without mitigation requirements. Remove WHI from the Comp Plan.
40. Jay Higgins, TriMet: Requested a change of Mixed Employment to Mixed Use west of 17<sup>th</sup>, adjacent to the Milwaukie Light Rail. This is currently an EG1 zone. Properties must be leveraged to create lively and viable station areas.
41. Mary Ann Schwab: Was surprised by policy changes in Chapter 2. Most recommendations from the previous draft have been changed. We need to reinstate NAs and Business Associations as means of public involvement. We need to protect all our open space for future generations. No net loss should be included in the Washington HS property to buy at market rate.
42. Jeanne Galick: There is vague language around environmental issues that needs better and clearer language. Change "encourage" to "require" in 4.58, 59, 62, 63, 64 and 7.11. Policy 7.47 is about Willamette Greenway, and we should remove "where practicable", which in my mind implies there is a loophole. Better regulations are needed here. The Comp Plan should strengthen guidelines for the greenway planning process. Policy 7.47 should be restated "increase existing 25' set back to at least 100' and encourage larger setbacks. Increase and protect riparian habitat in the Portland harbor." Enforcement needs to be addressed somewhere as well including better tree protection and trash removal.

*Commissioner Houck* reminded her to submit her testimony in writing.

43. Scott Fernandez: Retain open reservoirs as functional drinking water facilities. For over 100 years, Portland's open reservoirs have provided healthy drinking water. Covered reservoirs do not allow sunlight or oxygenation. Open air is important for a healthy water supply. Include this as part of the Comp Plan update. See [www.bullrunwaiver.org](http://www.bullrunwaiver.org).
44. Craig Beebe, City Club of Portland Bicycle Advocacy Committee: The description of community involvement is incomplete. Transportation planning needs to be more inclusive. Public investment choices need greater clarity about how bureaus will coordinate and prioritize investment decisions. Use the plan to endorse a clear Vision Zero policy. We're also concerned that freight policies are separated from the transportation hierarchy and that we don't have clear evaluation measures to see how effective the plan is in the future. *See written testimony.*
45. Andrew Phan: Has had his practice at 6919 SE 82<sup>nd</sup> for the last 2 years. There is heavy traffic in the area, and it's a challenge to cross the street. Concerned about kids and

elders who are trying to cross the street here and the routine crimes that don't mix well if this is changed to residential zoning. Please keep our property zoned as-is.

46. Ted Labbe, Depave: Three themes: (1) I'd reiterate earlier comments by Audubon about chapter 7 and 6.41 and 6.48. (2) Green infrastructure – we can do more to integrate it across different land uses instead of isolating these policies in chapter 7. Emphasis and detail should be included in chapters 3 and 4. And we should incentivize green infrastructure and to put it close to where people live. (3) Policy 9.15 (repurposing the streetscape) can be more explicit to encourage and facilitate temporary uses for other community purposes. TDM needs to be better included in the Comp Plan.
47. Michelle Devlaeminck: Annexation and development of WHI is entirely humanitarian and is only a benefit to the economy, which is might not even do; jobs that are said to be created may not even happen. The Port has been declining in its business in the last several years. Wetlands are vitally important for this area.
48. Lily Nguyen: SE 82<sup>nd</sup> properties. Don't change zoning to residential. This is not a safe environment for families. These properties went a major zoning change in October 2006, but now the plan shows this reversing. Keep our property as commercial. *See written testimony.*
49. Judy Bluehorse Skelton: Served with Vision PDX, when historically underserved communities were included. Continued to serve on the Portland Plan CIC and the current Comp Plan CIC. Industrial land use does not reflect conversations that we had in PEG discussions or in the equity conversations had under the Vision PDX process. We need to take a longer look and not just a short-term one. The PSC should advise the staff on industrial land use sections and the equity concerns, and on integrating green infrastructure.
50. Marianne Fitzgerald, SWNI: Submitted testimony on 11/03 that includes motions that were approved by the SWNI board. The March 13 deadline is not sufficient to evaluate neighborhood livability based on potential new Mixed Use and/or Institutional zoning. In Chapter 2, we need to keep the current standing of NAs in public processes. Centers and Corridors must have adequate and safe facilities to allow people to access shops in these areas.
51. Garlynn Woodsong, Concordia NA: City greenways and bikeways are getting traversed through cut-through traffic. We should have auto diverters every 2 blocks. Also, alleys are being ignored by new development. We don't have policies for developers to provide access to new development, so Policy 3.77 should require that auto access is used where alleys exist. Regarding demolitions and affordable housing, we are losing our historic single-family homes. We need to slow down and reform the demo process and look at how can we turn this into a net benefit for neighborhoods, We would like to have R5 and R2.5 remove the prohibition on more than one unit per structure, depending on size of the lot, which could help to create more affordable housing.
52. Bob Bernstein: My property tax has gone from \$3200 to over \$5000 in past few years. I won't have enough money to continue my lifestyle if this continues to rise each year. If seniors can have options to deal with property tax increases, by volunteering or otherwise, that would help people stay in place and not be displaced. Also we need to strengthen language in the plan about WHI so it doesn't disappear.
53. Justin Buri, Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT): CAT works to hear concerns that tenants have to secure healthy and safe housing. They are worried about dwindling



opportunities for housing and the effects of displacement in N and NE Portland. We want to preserve people in our communities so they are not pushed out. The plan should look at opportunities to address involuntary displacement. Concerns about substandard housing and how to bring it up to a better standard. We support Living Cully's proposed policies. This is a 20 year plan, and we should be able to overturn the statewide ban on inclusionary zoning. Land banking is another option. Displacement also happens when other areas don't capture an equitable amount of housing growth e.g. what happens with downzoning in Eastmoreland. *See written testimony and cards.*

54. Janet Roxburgh: Protect WHI. *See written testimony and video of photos.*
55. Tom Liptan: Protect all of WHI. Don't lose this natural treasure that we don't have elsewhere in Portland. Create incentives and consistency for installation of ecoroofs on industrial and multifamily developments. They are a proven technology and affordable. We also need specific goals for green infrastructure, especially as associated with industrial land development. Reduce impervious surfaces in the public ROW and don't pave over the landscape. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Houck* noted that Tom started as the ecoroof program in the City and has been lauded around the world. Do developers wish that green roofs were required so that the playing field would be even?

Yes, some developers have confirmed this and it makes dollars and sense. It extends the life of the roof and is financially good in the long-run. Portland should remain a leader in the world in terms of what we've done with green infrastructure.

56. Jeff Geisler, HiNoon: Remove WHI from the industrial lands section of the Comp Plan. Also, we need air quality testing throughout the city. Sidewalks should be prioritized over other transportation (biking) facilities. We'd also ask for another hearing in North Portland. *See written testimony.*
57. Lisa Skube: Livability and conservation is most important, especially as it relates to our City trees. Implementation of the Tree Code is not working. If the Comp Plan is going to work, we need to ensure coordination for execution. Development needs to be consistent with neighborhood character including care of trees. We need enforcement and a way for neighborhoods to talk to and be part of the process in development plans. *See testimony.*
58. Alastair Roxburgh: There are deficiencies in the methodology used in the industrial land inventory. Simple constraints don't work. An acre on an island is different from other land and needs to be reviewed differently. *See written testimony.*
59. Raihana Ansary, Portland Business Alliance: The PBA supports multimodal transportation policies that encourage job growth. But pedestrian/bike/transit are overly used in the TSP criteria. We need to add criteria to evaluate the number of people benefited and/or impacted by projects. Criteria need to address all issues. Freight-related projects will be evaluated separately, but if we can't evaluate both sets of criteria simultaneously, it's not clear how one will affect the other. It's not sufficient to only focus on freight streets when focusing on goods movement. Also, the transportation hierarchy is a concern in terms of how it may be applied as is the use of streets beyond their use for transportation functions. *See written testimony.*
60. Micah Moskel, NECN: We need a better balanced approach to industrial land and health of the environment. The golf courses and WHI proposed changes paint over natural areas and develop them as industrial, which likely will increase pollution and will



create a loss of environmental benefits. Look for other ways to secure industrial jobs; clean up existing brownfields. We need to promote intensification of industrial jobs on current lands. Consider seeking Goal 9 exemption from the state if necessary.

61. Springwater Stables: 6729 SE 122<sup>nd</sup>, at the SW corner at SE Foster Rd. A Commercial or Employment designation would satisfy a need for economic development and employment opportunities at this location in East Portland. *See written testimony.*
62. Paul van Orden: Eliot resident. You should return the SE corner of Fremont and Williams to R1 zoning as it is an equity issue. Don't downzone the property at 52<sup>nd</sup> and NE Fremont from R2 to R2.5. We purchased the property knowing the zoning and plans for future years and want to pass development rights of R2 to children to develop later. I've estimated the land value would be decreased \$1.5M if it is downzoned.
63. Willie Levenson, Human Access Project: The HAP hosts the annual Big Float event. WHI testimony has been true tonight. I feel disenfranchised by having to go back and question what the work the PSC did last year on the plan was. "Environmental crisis" is new to our vernacular. We need to protect our open spaces.
64. Steve Morasch, US Realty 86 Associates: At 12350 NE Sandy, the plan proposes to change the site to Mixed Use Employment, but then current use (Kmart) would be non-conforming. Mixed Used Civic Corridor is preferred use designation, not Mixed Use Employment.
65. Susan Schuster: Please don't rezone Clinton between 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup> avenues. We need more affordable housing in Portland. The area you're considering rezoning into commercial here is mostly rentals. If you get rid of these houses, they could turn into commercial spaces, and there isn't another place that the current residents could move. *See written testimony.*
66. Peter Wilcox: Include another transportation option in the Comp Plan – river boating as a transportation opportunity through the corridor downtown. Boats have lower carbon emissions and could use existing docks and new docks out of the river channel. Add river transportation as an option to the Comp Plan. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Houck* noted that Mr. Wilcox has advocated for a 5 mph speed zone throughout the Portland Harbor and asked if that would be an issue with water transit. *Commissioner Houck* asked if 5 mph speed zones were unusual in large metropolitan areas.

A 5 mph speed limit in the Portland Harbor would not be an issue and that in fact he has not found any major city without a harbor speed limit.
67. Doug Klotz: Promote more density. *See written testimony.*
68. Terry Chung, Portland Chinese History Museum: To preserve, save and utilize historic landmarks and conservation districts has not been upheld in current revisions in the proposed plan. Preservation of buildings is one of the top needs identified by the Old Town / Chinatown NA, but it's not carried into the Comp Plan. Verbs should be reviewed and balanced and strengthened. *See written testimony.*
69. Justin Callaway: Owns 4 acres of residential property with environmental overlay on East Columbia Blvd. The Comp Plan doesn't include upgrades for basic services here. We walk 1.5 miles to the closest bus. I can't sleep through the night with the trucking yards that are right by my house. How do we go back and assess when plans don't

work? 8850 NE Levy Rd. The noise ordinance hasn't been enforced.

70. Elliot Callaway: Our community has developed and is working on getting better as a community. But board meetings are about bus safety, kids who have to walk 1.5 miles to bus services to get to school. Arguments are usually about buses and if they should move even farther away or if we could get them closer. The NA is run by only a few people, who usually are those who are selfish and greedy. It's a popularity contest. Our neighborhood needs to better collaborate and think of others and give everyone a voice. They need to think about everyone in the neighborhood.
71. Timothy Boyd, PCRI: A recent economic study showed the disparity between black businesses and other businesses. I've lived in N/NE for over 15 years. Most of my family and friends have been forced out to Gresham and far East Portland. Disenfranchised people should be able to get back into the neighborhoods they were raised in. Neighborhood outreach needs to get to people that changes really effect. We need a remedy as part of the plan to bring people back into their communities e.g. through an oversight committee. Loan qualification, elimination of loans and other subsidies could help. Also, when we group minorities together, we don't see the differences between the individual groups' needs and can't give appropriate economic support.
72. Jude Callaway: My road – Levy Road – has limited paved roads and sidewalks. The trucking yards make it hard to concentrate when our family is trying to be together, when I'm trying to do homework. When I get dragged to NA meetings, I hear lots of arguing about where the bus stop is and try to get sidewalks near my house in my neighborhood.
73. Lynn Longfellow, Oregon Nikke Endowment ED: Worried that the plan is weak on historic preservation and doesn't protect treasured buildings and districts. We support Terry Chung's written testimony about policies 4.36-38 and applaud 4.39 and 4.45. Heights have been controversial; we are against looking at height as development tool. We hope height is concentrated on Block 33 if it is raised to 150'. We need written guidelines at the same time that Skidmore guidelines are passed. We need to protect and preserve Chinatown and Japantown that are so unique to the history of Portland.
74. Kris Day, Urban Forestry Commission: We are still reviewing the drafts, but overall the UFC is pleased with inclusion of green infrastructure throughout the Comp Plan. We do feel there could be many more connections between chapters as well as with some of the guiding documents about green infrastructure and natural resources. They are often used in a very vague way and need to be better defined.
75. Mark Bello, Urban Forestry Commission: The vision is that nature is woven into the city and the city is woven into the city. The Urban Forestry background report has great information. There is still a large gap in the thinking: trees are perceived for an environmental view but not as part of urban design. Trees are form-giving in the urban structure. We want to propose additions to Policy 4.8 about trees being integral to development.
76. Meryl Redish, Urban Forestry Commission: We support policies about downzoning in environmentally-sensitive areas. It will reduce risk of landslides and also serve to safeguard human health. Request that WHI development be completely removed from the Comp Plan. No full mitigation exists, especially as it relates to tree canopy and equity goals.
77. John Koehler: Owns properties on NE 112<sup>th</sup> Ave. that are currently residential properties. I support the proposed change #645 to Mixed Use Neighborhood.

Wheelchair-bound residents generally aren't well-accommodated, and this is an accessible community created in this area that exceeds ADA guidelines to create accessible facilities and a real community. *See written testimony.*

78. Joseph Van Lom: Architect Van Lom was hired in 2010 to develop a facility for the disabled. This facility is 100 percent for people with disabilities at 112<sup>th</sup> / 111<sup>th</sup> and NE Halsey. We coordinated the project with an early assistance program through the City and originally had problems with property lines zoned R7, mixed with different residential zones. The project was on hold. Now with the multifamily and mixed-use option at 112<sup>th</sup>, this will straighten the back property lines to allow for a more efficient building profile. I support proposal #645, which helps to develop properties in this area.
79. Linda Sanchez: I also agree with the proposed zoning changes on 112<sup>th</sup>. Personal trainer who works with disabled individuals. If we can build a facility that's fully accessible, then I could hire additional person and encourage job growth as the Portland Comp Plan goal.
80. John Gibbon, PURB: PURB has not yet officially taken a position on list of significant projects. Thank you for leaving the record open longer so we can review this. There are real disconnects between green infrastructure issues. PBOT and BES need to work together: stormwater management is vital to greenways. In CSO areas, we started with \$4B but are now down to \$3.6B from water and sewer. We need to be able to deal with as much stormwater as we can through green infrastructure. For BES, how are centers going to work in terms of sewer capacity?
81. Michael Harrison, OHSU: Oppose Mixed Use zoning on the OHSU Marquam Hill site. This area is wooded and hilly and doesn't lend itself to being mixed-use. The Marquam Hill Plan guides development on campus. We're not sure if new designations of mixed-use or institutional will work at this location. Central Employment is the current designation, and we hope to retain this.
82. Laura Wozniak: Multnomah Village resident and business owner. Remove the second sentence in second bullet in 10.8 (alternative development on corner lots in single-family residential neighborhoods). I bought into the neighborhood because of the character of small houses on larger lots with lots of tree canopy. Defend the trees and wildlife that relies on them.

Written Testimony Received October 22-28, 2014 is available online at [ftp://ftp02.portlandoregon.gov/BPS/PSC/CPU/testimony\\_102214-102814\\_compiled.pdf](ftp://ftp02.portlandoregon.gov/BPS/PSC/CPU/testimony_102214-102814_compiled.pdf).

Written Testimony received at today's meeting:

- Edward Ozeruga
- Robert Rosholt
- Timme Helzer
- David RedThunder
- Dana White, Providence
- Sara King, PPS
- Susan Schuster
- James Dreiling
- Gustavo Cruz
- Sharon Genasci
- Chrys Martin, Riverside Board
- Juliet Hyams
- James Peterson, Multnomah NA

- Terry Griffiths
- Jim Howell
- Audubon Society
- Corky Collier
- Richard Johnson
- John Koehler
- Rose City Park NA
- City Club of Portland
- Lily Nguyen
- Janet Roxburgh
- Tom Liptan
- Alastair Roxburgh
- Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT)
- Lisa Skube (PDF)
- Jeff Geisler
- Peter Wilcox
- Doug Klotz
- Terry Chung
- Blythe Olson

The hearing will be continued at this location on February 24, 2015, which will be a hearing specifically about the Transportation System Plan (TSP) project list.

The written record will be open through March 13, 2015.

*Commissioner Hanson* is concerned about transit in the Columbia Corridor.

*Commissioner Houck* agrees with Bob Sallinger’s testimony regarding West Hayden Island being the “tip of the iceberg” with regard to environmental issues in the Comp Plan. I’m pleased to hear specific recommendations about environmental issues from various people tonight. I haven’t had a chance to see the differences between draft versions from January 2014 to July 2014, and I would like to see track the changes between drafts. This especially relates to the verbs such as “encourage” and “consider” versus stronger language and verbs such as “require”. Thanks for all the good testimony today.

*Commissioner Oxman*: I do have TSP concerns and employment and development pattern questions. Environmental issues are also top of mind tonight. Aging and specific approaches for people with disabilities still needs work.

*Commissioner Rudd*: We need to make sure we are balancing policies about industrial lands. I would like to hear from the City Attorney if we are at a point that’s balanced in our policies.

*Commission Smith*: We can’t have wishy-washy verbs in this plan. I appreciate the testimony we’ve heard. We should think about additional hearings in the neighborhoods.

*Commissioner St Martin*: Performance measures. The river transportation idea is interesting. Including trees in the urban form is a good idea.

*Commissioner Shapiro*: I support looking into specific demographic considerations. I do have a concern about giving enough time for public testimony. Neighborhoods have expressed concern about time and calendar, which is an equity issue, but we can’t have this endlessly drag on.

*Chair Baugh*: Testimony was again compelling with good specificity. We need to continue to look at areas we hadn’t looked at as critical before. The Calloway children were great. One

thing that is coming back to us is the EOA: how do the industrial lands and the jobs analysis help us tie how the plan comes together and help us make decisions (e.g. about golf course rezoning). Based on comments tonight, Woodstock is a neighborhood we should take a look at.

*Commissioner Houck* noted the comments about Goal 9: what are the legal/political ramifications of not adhering to this? It's not jobs or no jobs. It's also about the type of jobs.

Susan: Staff will bring two proposals, one that includes WHI and another that doesn't. What kind of jobs and what kind of land do we need to support those jobs is a key question. Who do the different scenarios affect? At our next meeting on November 18, we'll outline how we'll walk through all the issues at upcoming work sessions.

### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 9:37 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, October 28, 2014

5:00 p.m. / PCC Southeast Campus

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Howard Shapiro, Michelle Rudd

**BPS Staff Present:** Deborah Stein, Eric Engstrom

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

PCC Southeast Campus President Dr Jessica Howard welcomed the community to PCC.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 10/14/14 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y7 – Baugh, Grey, Houck, Oxman, Shapiro, Smith, Tallmadge)

### Director's Report

Deborah Stein

- The Mayor's Short-Term Rentals for Multi-Dwelling Structures proposal was published. The Council hearing is November 19<sup>th</sup>.
- The Age-Friendly Portland Action Plan (adopted by Council October 2013) will be in front of City Council November 12<sup>th</sup> at 9:45 time certain for a one-year update on accomplishments to date, and a look forward to 2015 activities.

*Chair Baugh* gave an overview of the agenda.

We anticipate that we will keep the written record open until March 13, 2015. Tonight is the third of four planned hearings on the Comprehensive Plan. The PSC is here to listen to the community's thoughts tonight and will limit our questions and comments unless we need clarification about a person's comment.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

*Commissioner Houck:* attended the Westmoreland Park celebration. It was amazing to see salmon spawning in the Crystal Spring Stream after the restoration efforts. I encourage others to check it out.

## Comprehensive Plan

Hearing: Eric Engstrom

### Documents:

- [Testimony recap memo](#)

### Presentation:

[http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/7036663/view/CP\\_presentation.PDF](http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/7036663/view/CP_presentation.PDF)

Eric provided an overview of the Comp Plan and where we are in the process. The Comp Plan includes proposed land use maps, policies, project lists, and a supporting document – the Citywide Systems Plan. There is also the Urban Design Direction report, which serves as an illustrated guide to some of the urban design and city form policies.

The Comprehensive Plan Map covers all of Portland, and some not-annexed areas within our urban services boundary. Our proposal is to leave much of the existing Comp Plan map as it is today. This map shows the areas that would change with the Proposed Map.

On November 18<sup>th</sup> we have scheduled the first work session to begin discussing what you heard. Three things will happen in that session.

First, we will get an update on outreach from the Community Involvement Committee (CIC). Second, we will go over City bureau comments with you. We have asked city agencies to prepare comments and bring their observations to you on the 18<sup>th</sup>. Third, staff will deliver an initial recommendations memo. The purpose of this memo will be to identify the agenda for subsequent work sessions in January, February and March. In other words, identify the major topics and issues arising from the testimony that warrant more in-depth discussion.

On Thursday you received a brief summary of the comments received to date, along with the full packet of comments we received between October 8 and 21.

The online Map App tool remains open for comments. This week we restored the features of background information into the Map App, which you can navigate to via the blue dot (Map App Explorer) in the Map App.

### Testimony:

1. Linda Degman, PCC: Thank you to BPS staff for working with institutions on the campus policies. PCC supports the proposed designation in the Comp Plan, but the zoning code is where the real challenge lies. All 4 PCC campuses are within city limits. If re-designated, PCC doesn't find sufficient incentive to rezone outside of the current development application process. We request that City continue the dialogue to refine zoning and also take a look at the design review process.
2. Jon Denney, Portland Nursery: The original owners purchased the property in the 1960s. They want to be able to stay as a nursery at 50<sup>th</sup> and Stark. Currently nurseries are a non-conforming uses in residential zones. At this time, there is no place for nurseries in the city. But we are strong part of the community.
3. Sara Ori, Portland Nursery: This is a family-owned business. We're known for commitment to community. Many of the plants we sell are locally-sourced, and we provide residents opportunity to plant diverse plants. We employ over 100 full-time employees in the busy season, offer good benefits and have a 10.35 year average staff tenure. We are creating a positive impact on the surrounding area.



4. Carol Finney, Portland Nursery: The nursery gives back to community every year to 400 schools and organizations. We have provided 30 years of OPB programming support. We have an annual community apple festival and other festivities. We want to continue to support the community. We want the zoning to change so we're not a non-conforming use.
5. Jill Denney, Portland Nursery: The Stark building needs to be improved to accommodate employees and customers and upgrade safety. We'd make more office space, add parking and create a more inviting building configuration. If we're not able to make these renovations, it's likely we won't continue as a business. We want to continue to be in and support the community but need to be rezoned.
6. Peter Fry: Consultant for Portland Nursery. We need the right plan to get the right zoning we need. The split designation doesn't work.
7. Jan Von Stavern: 2636 SE Division. This neighborhood has changed quickly. I support the changes regarding this street and the Division mixed-commercial designation but also request my property be included. It makes sense to make our property urban commercial, and it will create opportunities in the future by changing to this designation. It would activate 2 corners of the block, emphasizing street-level design, instead of just the 1 corner.
8. Reed Dow, Dry Rental Properties, SE Wine Collective: 2425 SE 35<sup>th</sup> Pl, which fronts on Division. The property was originally purchased in 1962; the parking lot has been gravel since 1925. There is a split zoning of the building and the parking lot (2 parcels). Remodeled the building to commercial spaces and have a conditional use for the zoned residential parking lot. I'm asking that the split be changed to incorporate the full lot for consistency. We're currently unable to move forward because of the residential zoning. The Richmond Neighborhood Association (NA) voted to approve this change to zone both parcels storefront commercial.
9. Thomas Monroe, SE Wine Collective: This is a community urban winery to bring learning I have from my work and travels to the community. We have 9 employees, offer good benefits and committed to being a member of the neighborhoods. The challenge is that the parking lot is still zoned residential, but the business is commercial storefront. We would like to build storage capacity in the parking lot space but currently can't because of zoning. Want also to be good stewards to our neighbors and keep a good relationship.
10. Jonathan Suarez-Mendoza: Franklin HS graduate. Participated in industrial and shop classes in high school. He then entered the internship program at Vigor Industrial and received a job there. There is a career path for me there as a drafter. The City should consider living-wage jobs for high school students and recent graduates in the Comp Plan update.
11. Fred LaCapra: Gunderson employee. Gunderson is a diverse company with lots of benefits including education benefits. It currently has 1114 employees and is growing, which is close to 2006 levels. There are 34 job categories not including white collar positions, and they offer good wages with low barrier to entry. The skill base is not here in Portland for welders as there was before. There are many opportunities that don't need a 2- or 4-year degree. We need to support policies that address job creating and retention. Policy 6.27 is especially important.
12. Aaron Bouchane: Works at Impact NW, which works to connect HS metal shop students to living wage jobs in Portland. Over the next 10 years, it's estimated we'll need

30,000 jobs due to replacement and growth. Most only require a HS diploma and certification. But most HS don't provide much guidance about these opportunities for living-wage jobs that are easy to access. There is paid training and are educational opportunities, which is important for career and technical learners in Portland. Support and strengthen policy 6.27.

13. Joe Miles-Kelley: Went through the Impact NW program welding program and currently is a welder at Gunderson. He's independent and living on his own, just 5 months out of high school based on the opportunities he's received. We need to consider the importance of programs like this and continue to provide living-wage jobs in the future.

*Commissioner Smith:* Do you think we can use the land that we have more intensely, knowing we don't have much more land to expand to?

14. Laura Webb: You need to withdraw the proposed West Hayden Island (WHI) designation and designate it as forest land. BPS has removed any guarantee of maintaining WHI as was decided last year. Please honor the public process.

15. Terry Parker: We need to preserve neighborhoods' character. We need to add a policy about replacement homes and how they fit in the neighborhood regarding mass, height and setbacks. Encourage that single-family homes are responsibly deconstructed. The Comp Plan must also equitably reflect diversity and freedom and not dictate or favor one choice over another. *See written testimony.*

16. Ryan Hyke, Pacific NW Regional Council of Carpenters: I became a union pile driver right out of high school, which is a good paying job. Local projects I've worked on include the Big Pipe and the OHSU Tram. I have an appreciation for family-wage jobs because I have seen that these jobs increase prosperity of people in the trades. My union represents over 20,000 people. We need to encourage jobs to grow and continue to locate in Portland. 6.34 Industrial Lands is a great start. Also consider other economic development policies that support prosperity of Portland and livability.

17. David Sweet, Land Use Chair, Cully: This is a very diverse neighborhood. More than one-fifth of households are living below the poverty line. The neighborhood is 68 percent single-family homes, and Cully was identified as being at risk for displacement. We hope we can avoid this. Policies should support smaller homes since they decrease resource use and can provide affordable housing. Some ideas: (1) have more flexible rules for ADUs; (2) be able to divide large older home into smaller units; (3) scale SDCs based on home size; (4) offer density bonuses in exchange for smaller home sizes or for permanently affordable housing. Would like to see a "community benefits overlay zone" in areas like Cully.

*Commissioner Houck* asked if he was familiar with the fact that the Coalition for a Livable Future asked for and successfully got a Racial Impact and Displacement Statement for the Interstate Light Rail Project which was to address the issues that David Sweet testified on. *Commissioner Houck* suggested Sweet and others take a look at the Impact Statement to see if there were portions of it that might be relevant to their concerns.

18. Cameron Harrington, Living Cully: Concerned that while the Comp Plan lays out specific goals and strategies to improve life in neighborhoods, it only pays lip service to threat of displacement. Planning is a catch-22 practice. Improvements make places more attractive, but that also makes them more expensive to live, usually displacing low-income families and people of color. To address the mismatch to improve and lack of policies to deal with displacement, Living Cully has 10 concrete recommendations.

Look forward to working with PSC to implement ideas into revised draft. An impact/assessment analysis should be included in decisions and what can be done to mitigate with built-in funding to mitigate. *See written testimony.*

19. Laura Young, Cully Blvd Alliance: I support the drafted recommendations from Living Cully. Transit and transportation infrastructure is necessary as an anti-displacement strategy. As property values increase, and risk of displacement increases. The community could better mitigate this by having better access to living-wage jobs, which can be helped by improved transit. Nearly half of residents in Cully are low income or people of color. I want to promote investment of transit funds in Cully.
20. Dawn Cartwright: Westmoreland resident, discussed an R5, non-conforming use parking lot that's on the QFC property on Milwaukie Ave between Duke and Henry St. It is only to be used as parking lot, which was based on the original owners' plan to create a buffer between the original grocery store and the neighborhood. QFC built in 1995, and it's a 24-hour store. There's noise from delivery trucks and debris from parking lot blowing into the neighborhood. QFC has not signed a Good Neighbor Agreement in the 15 years the neighborhood has been try to get to common ground. *See written testimony.*
21. Eli Spevak, Orange Splot LLC: 1200 square foot houses being built in Portland is very rare, but I'm hopeful the Comp Plan will encourage smaller single-family homes and more multi-family. Portlanders love parks, and we could increase density at the perimeter of a number of large parks. This could encourage people to live near parks where they don't need to have large yards. This needs to happen through the Comp Plan process. Grant Park, Wilshire, Alberta, Irving, Woodlawn and many other parks are all circled by single-family homes and good transit. Parks could serve more people with just slight changes in zoning near them. *See written testimony.*
22. David RedThunder: Industrial development on WHI is a continued concern. Shorelines are vital to salmon recovery. The Port's environmentalists need a plan to sustain symbol creatures that have always inhabited WHI. Homeless camps disturb the native populations as well. Please take WHI off the Comp Plan.  
  
*Commissioner Houck* noted the conversations with Tribes during the WHI conversations. The City promised to follow up with the tribes and wanted to know if the city had done so.  
Staff will follow-up.
23. Tim Helzer: During last year's hearings on WHI, the PSC got it right, and the mitigation requirements forced the Port to pull off the table. The Port's costs are not sustainable, and it won't create the number of family-wage jobs the Port has promised. *See written testimony.*
24. Alastair Roxburgh: Islands are different. WHI is not an extra piece of land, it's island land, but it's been zoned as other land has. *See written testimony.*
25. Rob Johns, Chair Benson HS Alum: There is a great importance of strong economic development policies for Portland's youth. Expand economic opportunity and equity. We need business growth to support a healthy economy and provide for living-wage jobs. These opportunities provide work, wages and self-respect in a state that is very dependent on private sector for tax base. What are we doing for the majority of people without 4-year degrees? Policy 6.27 is important and should be strengthened.
26. Harold Hutchinson: Small businesses rely on larger ones, many of which are in the

- Portland Harbor. They provide significant contributions to living-wage jobs. Give weight to economic development policies in Comp Plan.
27. Ellen Wax, Working Waterfront Coalition: Portlanders support community colleges and workforce training. We also support our local small businesses, which are often suppliers to larger firms. Marine industrial companies are linked to the health and prosperity of the local and regional economy. *See written testimony: Economic Linkages from Marine Industrial Businesses.*
  28. Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland: Harbor businesses provide for many smaller businesses in the area. Capital investment in the harbor create tax benefits for school districts and local governments. Policies in the Comp Plan need to support development, in particular Policies 6.1, 6.3, 6.15, 6.17 and 6.27. We need to be sure they are reconciled with natural/environmental policies in Chapter 7. *See written testimony.*
  29. Greg Schifsky: 6801 SE 6<sup>th</sup> is a 12-acre parcel, Green Thumb. We are in favor of this being zoned open space instead of for development. The Green Thumb program helps get people ready for the workforce. Emergency preparedness can be done on this huge, flat parcel as well. Our community is there gardening on the site. Gardening instills great things in people. Young people need to learn to get outside and be in nature. *See written testimony.*
  30. Matt Millenbach, SMILE: Open space along the Springwater Corridor in Sellwood needs to be retained and designated as such in the Comp Plan. *See written testimony.*
  31. Nancy Henry: Columbia Slough resident. Concerned about change 297, which will designate part of Broadmoor Golf Course as industrial. This is a special area that provides unique habitat and is vital for bat species. This area is a recovering treasure within the city. Many resources have already been directed to slough recovery. Given the investments, why would you allow new construction and development in this area?
  32. Gail Hoffnagle, SMILE President: The QFC parking lot (Milwaukie in Westmoreland) is creating dangerous traffic conditions with the traffic created by large delivery trucks. BDS has been enforcing rules, which has improved life. We currently don't hear deliveries between 11 p.m. and 6 a.m., and it seems like deliveries are better scheduled. If zoning change occurs, though, QFC won't live up to these standards. SMILE opposes proposed designation from R5 to mixed-use neighborhood. SMILE is also concerned about lack of acknowledgement about role of neighborhood associations (NA) in the Comp Plan. Underserved populations also deserve a voice. "Community" is a needed term in the Comp Plan. NAs have long been the forum for neighborhoods to improve neighborhoods in our city.
  33. Lisa Joerin, Rhododendron House: 2165 SW Main St. She fully supports the zoning change from R5 to CO-1. The building provides office space and is part of the community. Zoning changes will keep the character and provide for efficient use of the building, which includes family-wage jobs for the community. *See written testimony.*
  34. Melissa Ard, Simpson & Company PC: Voiced support for CP designation change to mixed-use dispersed on SW Main St. where her company is renting office space at Rhododendron House. Clients are from the neighborhood, many of whom are elderly, appreciate that they can walk to their CPAs for services. The new designation will remove our uncertainty of being able to remain in the neighborhood.
  35. Joe VanderVeer, PCOD: The Portland Commission on Disability (PCOD) was involved in drafting of the Comp Plan. Disability equity has been incorporated, but it still needs to

further be woven into the Comp Plan. Our written testimony provides details about what policies can be included or bettered. PCOD asks that we take full advantage to ensure infrastructure needs (accessibility especially) are well-positioned to guide City's development going forward. We support the use of Universal Design Principles and increased accessibility for housing options with people with disabilities.

36. Susanne Stahl, PCOD: Reminded the PSC of testimony that the disabled community provided during the Portland Plan hearings. After many comments, the draft PP remained void of language pertaining to people with range of disabilities. Today we would like to applaud the City that updated the PP language with 10 actions to make Portland more physically-accessible and age-friendly for the Comp Plan. Continue to better quality of life for Portland's disability community. Remember the Portland Plan principles and how they are applicable to the disability community.
  37. Alan De la Torre, Age-Friendly Portland Advisory Council and PCOD: We have a window of opportunity is in this Comp Plan to address aging population. Embrace the age-friendly initiative to make Portland accessible for all. Our critical recommendations are included in written testimony. Additional analysis is needed about expected household changes and age-specific analysis. The biggest growth in new homes are in vulnerable populations. Within the Comp Plan, there needs to be a mention of Portland's efforts to be an age-friendly city.
  38. Martin Slapikas, HiNoon: Chapter 3, Urban Form, notes 5 pattern areas in Portland. We need to add "Island Neighborhoods" as another pattern area. There has been ever-increasing interest in development potentials, but what about island issues that affect health, welfare and safety of islanders and visitors? *See written testimony.*
  39. Jessica Richman: Chapter 10, Administration and Implementation. It's important to consider how/if policies and goals can be implemented. For example, on page 10-6, how would you say the criteria are met or not, and what work would have to be done to document "demonstrate that reasonable consideration was given to the guiding principles..."? What is reasonable consideration? Or "reduce existing disparities... improve socio-economic opportunities..." how would we demonstrate this? Or how would someone show the opposite? What is "good planning"?
- Commissioner Houck* thanked Ms Richman for her testimony, pointing out that words, verbs in particular, matter and that we have to go beyond "consider", "explore" and "evaluate" and use more active verbs that are not so vague.
40. Vicki Skuyha: Mixed-Use Zones policy advisory committee member. We need more incentives for affordable housing. Oregon doesn't allow for inclusionary zoning, but we can encourage density bonuses and other ways to promote affordable housing. Historic preservation seems to be weakened in the updated language compared to the current plan. Historic preservation: regarding demolition, new language seems to weaken preservation of historic properties. Verbs seem to be weakened, and more qualifiers are added.
  41. David Messenheimer, Brentwood Darlington NA: The Green Thumb space should be changed to Open Space. It's managed by 4 partners and is an important learning lab. There is no other place like this site in the Portland area. The land is owned by PPS and PP&R.
  42. Brad Melaugh: Works at learning gardens lab at Green Thumb site. Asks that site be rezoned to Open Space. It offers so much: a family-based garden education program, farm stand collaboration, connection to community and an agricultural hub for the

area. It's near Lane MS, which has been a partner for years.

43. Patrick Burke: R2 zoning is inappropriate for the Green Thumb site. The Green Thumb location, even with better transit service, is still not a good location for high-density. This has been a special space that brings together a diverse neighborhood.
44. Jacob Sherman, Brentwood Darlington NA: Rezone Green Thumb from R2 to Open Space. It's an important neighborhood space for urban agriculture and sustainability education. Help preserve the site because it's also needed for bird habitat and pollinator plants.
45. Bob Bernstein: In favor of the Green Thumb request for rezoning to Open Space. On another topic, schools in N Portland will be adversely affected by more air pollution if WHI is further developed. We can't keep growing and continue to use the word "sustainable". How would you be able to mitigate the best of open space that's left in Portland?
46. Richard Johnson: 1414 SE Oak St. Shared a petition signed by neighbors regarding the zoning change at 1400-1416 and 1401-1415 SE Stark St. Changes from R1 to CS are not an option for this block. *See written testimony AND collected signatures sheet.*
47. Ronna Neuenschwander: Homeowner at 14<sup>th</sup> and Oak. She's against the proposal to change zoning from R1 on Stark St. The current zoning is compatible with our R2.5 property. We value the community that has grown in the Buckman neighborhood. We know our neighbors, have a vital community that is getting overrun and squeezed out. There are 128 apartments in a 1-mile radius of our home now. We've reached a saturation point.
48. Susan Lindsay, Buckman NA Chair. The NA supports the request to retain R1 zoning at the SE Stark properties Richard Johnson noted. There are also concerns about large property between SE 15<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup> on Morrison, which is R2.5 currently. The new Comp Plan changes this to mixed-use commercial, which we think will mean demolitions and rebuilding as duplexes and other density. SE 17<sup>th</sup>-20<sup>th</sup> on Alder is all R5, which is proposed to be up-zoned as R2.5, which we don't support either. There is no transit service on SE Stark.
49. Tim Nguyen: Opposes the zone change at his properties, 6933 and 6919 SE 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave. He immigrated to Portland at age 15 with family for the promise of education and opportunity in the US. They worked for a zone change in 2006, which was adopted by City Council. This is 2 acres with half of the property being R2 and RH and half commercial-general. Going back to R2 will hurt us. *See written testimony - LU 05-107223 CP ZC.*
50. David Nemo: Regarding Policy 4.28, light pollution, we need better standards to reverse impacts of light pollution. We need to shield outdoor lights property so lighting is directed downward. Shrink the negative impacts of light pollution for health and safety, and it would be a good neighbor policy to reduce pollution. *See written testimony.*
51. Ben Franchuk: Works at an auto business at 7036 SE 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Also working on 6850 SE 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave. between Ogden and Duke. He doesn't support the plan to change the property to residential. This has always been commercial. I'm worried about the 15 year business (with 10 employees) being shut down if zoning changes.
52. Rebecca Liu, CCBA: Worried about the protection of the historic area in the Central



- City West Quadrant, particularly NW Davis St in Chinatown. We've invested time and energy into preserving Portland's oldest Asian-American community. We need to honor the immigrant experience of Portland's immigrant communities. Members of the Japanese and Chinese society oppose increased height proposals in the historic district. We need to make this an area where Portland's immigrant groups can be proud of with better design guidelines. Please support creating design guideline for Chinese-Japanese historic guidelines.
53. Jackie Peterson, Old Town Chinatown Community Association: We have an inhospitable climate for historic resources right now. This is a "development moment", but we need to save our historic areas. 10 square blocks in Chinatown are an homage to our original immigrant populations that make Portland what it is today. We are depending on the PSC to ensure heights are not increased without tying them to design guidelines. We need to tie Chinatown-Japantown guidelines to Skidmore Design Guidelines as well.
  54. Lily Nguyen: I'm a co-own of the property at 6919 SE 82<sup>nd</sup>. We oppose the Comp Plan map change to residential. The property won't be able to be used as commercial for retail and service space if it's rezoned. But 82<sup>nd</sup> is a principle arterial, 5-lane road with lots of traffic and a main street designation. This is not a residential location.
  55. William Kielhorn: We request that the Comp Plan hearings continue and the record be kept open until after the mixed-use zones have clearly been defined. Multnomah NA also made the request. This limits the role of NA in the updated Comp Plan, particularly in Policy 2.1.C., but others noted in Policy 2.1.E are unrestricted. Please make the wording and intent clear in these policies. Staff mentioned "community" is replacing "neighborhood association" as the primary body for state-required community involvement. The definition is too general in the glossary. The NA is the correct vehicle to play this role. *See written testimony.*
  56. Carol McCarthy: Urge the PSC to extend hearings for at least 90 days after details of other zoning projects have been made public so citizens can be involved. Also request additional hearings in 2015, including one in SW Portland. *See written testimony* from Multnomah Neighborhood Association.
  57. Alex Misink: Properties at 6708 and 6704 SE 82<sup>nd</sup> are currently commercial zoned. And now 15 years later the proposal is to change it to a residential zone. But 82<sup>nd</sup> is a business street. Want to keep property commercial for my son to run the business in the future.
  58. Joan Coates: A neighbor of the QFC grocery on SE Henry. Aspects of the current non-conforming code rules are helping the neighbors that live next to the store, so that the parking lot would continue to be closed 11 p.m. - 6 a.m. and only allowed to be used as a parking lot. Changing to commercial would be detrimental to the neighborhood livability. *See written testimony / photos.*
  59. William Moss: Lives at 1500 SE Duke, close to the QFC site. Strip zoning is like city planning by default, and it often defaults to opportunists. It's erosive to the neighborhood. When you rename the zone without consideration to the neighborhood area, it does damage to the whole neighborhood ambience.
  60. Richard Dickinson, Powellhurst-Gilbert NA: The NA voted to strongly support downzoning in our area. We are in the David Douglas School District and have a huge school-aged population, with little capacity to continue to serve students with present facilities. Investment in the neighborhood has not kept up with population growth. Please continue investment in the area but please downzone these areas.



61. James Peterson, Multnomah NA: Request the designation of neighborhood center be changed to neighborhood corridor. We are in-between 2 town centers, with radii that overlap. We also request an extension for 90 days after mixed-use zones and institutional zones have been defined. Task 4 and Task 5 have to be joined together. We have 250 mixed-use zones properties in the neighborhood, and there are 4 mixed-use designations, with 3-4 different zones. It's not a one-to-one correspondence, so you can't gauge density or effects of these changes.
62. Mike Connors, Hathaway Koback Connors LLP: Spoke on behalf of two clients, Space Age Fuel and Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community. *See written testimony.*
63. Dr Andrew Phan: Opposes the zoning change at 6919 SE 82<sup>nd</sup>. All my saving and income to work at this location have been put into my practice. By rezoning, I would need to move and practically wipe all my savings and let go of my 7 employees. Rezoning to residential is inappropriate here anyway since it's not safe for families.
64. Mark White: Zoning codes have historically not worked in East Portland. *See written testimony.*
65. Doug Klotz: I've proposed three areas where new residents and development should be going, where there is good transit service and good infrastructure. (1) Belmont & Chavez; (2) Hawthorne & Chavez; (3) Division & Chavez. *See written testimony.*
66. John Washington, North-Northeast Business Association Economic Development Chair: There's been attrition of African-America businesses in our district in last 5 years. Things are moving fast, and we'd like to consider slowing things down. For example, the Soul District needs community investment and culturally-specific nodes to address community needs in the area. There are equity issues, and we're trying to maintain the demographic that has been there for years, but housing costs are increasing too quickly. There's also a potential for conflict between the NAs and business associations. I'd encourage us to integrate business associations with NAs.
67. Fred Sanchez: Owner of 111<sup>th</sup> Square. Booster of the Gateway area. Proposed changes at 1342, 1409, 1418 NE 112<sup>th</sup> are good, and I support a mixed-use neighborhood. It will help to straighten out zoning lines. Buildings and improvements in the proposed designation will promote livability and safety for residents and businesses. 112<sup>th</sup> and Oregon needs a stop sign to slow down traffic. *See written comments.*

Written Testimony Received October 8-21, 2014 is available online at [ftp://ftp02.portlandoregon.gov/BPS/PSC/CPU/testimony\\_100814-102114\\_compiled.pdf](ftp://ftp02.portlandoregon.gov/BPS/PSC/CPU/testimony_100814-102114_compiled.pdf).

Written Testimony received at today's meeting:

- Alastair Roxburgh
- Portland Nursery
- Lisa Joerin, Rhododendron House
- HiNoon
- Melissa Andal
- Argay NA
- Powellhurst-Gilbert NA
- SE Wine Collective
- Lily Nguyen
- Terry Parker
- Eli Spevak
- Tim Helzer

- Living Cully
- Dawn Cartwright
- Ellen Wax, Working Waterfront Coalition
- Susie Lahsene, Port of Portland
- SMILE
- Greg Schifsky
- Fred Sanchez
- Richard Johnson
- Collected signatures from 17 neighbors re: 1400-1416 and 1401-1415 SE Stark, proposals #87 and 88.
- Ronna Neuenschwander
- Terry Griffiths
- David Nemo
- Tim Nguyen - LU 05-107223 CP ZC
- Rose City Astronomers
- Carol McCarthy
- William Kielhurn
- Joan Coates
- James Peterson, Multnomah Land Use Chair
- Hathaway Koback Connors LLP on behalf of Space Age Fuel
- Hathaway Koback Connors LLP on behalf of Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community
- Mark White
- Doug Klotz

The hearing will continue November 4 at 4 p.m. at the 1900 Building: 1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave, Suite 2500.

**Discussion about themes heard today**

*Commissioner Oxman:* Thank you to all the testifiers tonight. We have lots to process.

*Commissioner Schultz:* Cully’s displacement mitigation ideas are helpful. I also appreciated the Green Thumb comments and would like to see staff take this further. How can we look at incorporating food resiliency throughout the city? Strategies that strengthen quality of life comments for all, particularly the disabled and elderly, struck me as well.

*Commissioner Houck:* “Ditto.”

*Commissioner Gray:* I’ll ask staff to research the charge to the PSC about Cully and displacement. Split zoning doesn’t seem like a winning strategy, so I need some more information and history about why we split-zone places. I support ideas about Universal Design. Implementation measurability criteria is important. I’m also seeing things fall into two dichotomies: (1) neighborhood development versus displacement; (2) creating living-wage, career jobs versus environmental protection. There are thoughtful ways to go about this, and look forward to future conversation.

*Commissioner Hanson:* We heard diverse testimony tonight – thank you. Differing ideas about zoning for specific properties – how do we deal with those?

*Commissioner Tallmadge:* Things that struck me in tonight’s testimony include: provisional performance measures; infrastructure needs; individual property requests. We need to have metrics within the Comp Plan so we can see how policies line up with the Portland Plan. We also need a greater analysis of community benefit agreements and follow through.

*Commissioner Smith:* How do we get more people into single-family neighborhoods and have more aggressive distributed infill without being disruptive? We heard ideas about ADUs, skinny houses and allowing single-family house to be subdivided. We need to ensure public safety through good design. I'm also supportive of the Green Thumb property request; and also, tying that to Portland Nursery, we need places in the city where we can fit these in. I do remember the PSC stating a commitment to evaluate the Cully Plan in two years. We also need to analyze household living patterns; we know we'll be building lots of multifamily and that household size is shrinking, but we don't know where people will live. For the properties on 82<sup>nd</sup> – why are we proposing designating them residential? It's ok to encourage housing through mixed-use, but I'm not sure why we're changing the zoning to specifically be residential. I do have a concern about the mixed-use zoning and consideration of merging Task 4 and Task 5. Finally, we need a tool to encourage places for small businesses to thrive.

*Commissioner St Martin:* The Cully Plan is intriguing, and I want to make sure we do go back to evaluate it. What about tribal input, especially as it relates to WHI? We also need to be aware of cultural recognition areas – WHI, Soul District, Chinatown. We also need to look at the distribution of the disabled and aging populations and the effect on households. Light pollution was an interesting concept that we could also talk about.

*Chair Baugh:* Thanks to everyone who came out to testify to night – it's very valuable to us. Tonight's comments clearly give us things to think about and things for staff to work on. Thank you to PCC Southeast campus for housing us at this great facility tonight. I echo many of the commissioners' thoughts. What are demographics of the people who will be here in the future? Regarding 82<sup>nd</sup>, what about the transportation component and how that integrates with the changes we're proposing? The TSP and the timing of that plan has to match with the zoning and how we think about it. We should think about design guidelines and how we address the concerns of design to get quality products so we get intended consequences versus poor quality development. NAs and business associations and other groups' need recognition. Is the Comp Plan underserving NAs? What about immigrant groups and others who don't fit into a NA structure but who provide good comments and are vital in the process?

Deborah Stein: At the November 18 work session, staff will take all these issues and divide them into a discussion for organizing future work sessions. And a sample of how we could walk through some of the hard decisions and specific properties.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 9:13 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, October 14, 2014

5:00 p.m. / Parkrose High School

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson (arrived 5:40 p.m.), Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Michelle Rudd, Teresa St Martin (arrived 5:40 p.m.), Maggie Tallmadge

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Eric Engstrom

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m.

*Commissioner Gray* welcomed the community to Parkrose.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 09/23/14 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Grey, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Rudd, Tallmadge)

### Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Thank you to *Commissioner Houck* for testifying at City Council about the Climate Preparation Strategy, which passed unanimously. He stressed the continued need to work with Metro since this is a regional issue.

*Chair Baugh* gave an overview of the agenda.

We anticipate that we will keep the written record open until March 13, 2015. Tonight is the second of four planned hearings on the Comprehensive Plan. The PSC is here to listen to the community's thoughts tonight and will limit our questions and comments unless we need clarification about a person's comment.

### Comprehensive Plan

Hearing: Eric Engstrom

#### Documents:

- [Testimony recap memo](#)

#### Presentation:

[http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/7015869/view/CP\\_presentation\\_101414.PDF](http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/7015869/view/CP_presentation_101414.PDF)

Eric provided an overview of the Comp Plan and where we are in the process. The Comp Plan includes proposed land use maps, policies, project lists, and a supporting document – the Citywide Systems Plan. There is also the Urban Design Direction report, which serves as an

illustrated guide to some of the urban design and city form policies.

The Comprehensive Plan Map covers all of Portland, and some not-annexed areas within our urban services boundary. Our proposal is to leave much of the existing Comp Plan map as it is today. This map shows the areas that would change with the Proposed Map.

On November 18<sup>th</sup> we have scheduled the first work session to begin discussing what you heard. Three things will happen in that session.

First, we will get an update on outreach from the Community Involvement Committee (CIC). Second, we will go over City bureau comments with you. We have asked city agencies to prepare comments and bring their observations to you on the 18<sup>th</sup>. Third, staff will deliver an initial recommendations memo. The purpose of this memo will be to identify the agenda for subsequent work sessions in January, February and March. In other words, identify the major topics and issues arising from the testimony that warrant more in-depth discussion.

On Thursday you received a brief summary of the comments received to date, along with the full packet of comments we received between September 17 and October 7.

In addition to the verbal testimony you will hear today, and what you heard in September, you have received 1186 comments as of October 7 via email, via the online Map App and letters. Of these, 862 were submitted via the Map App, 65 in writing and 193 via email.

The largest number of comments collected online are about Centers and Corridors map changes and Transportation projects in the TSP, and the residential designations.

On the policy side, the environment and economic policies have attracted the most interest.

The online Map App tool remains open and accepting comments. There is a handout at the back of the room with information about the App.

**Testimony:**

0. Representative Jeff Reardon, District 48 (Lents and Happy Valley): Rep Reardon has a long history in East Portland. Rep Barbara Smith-Warner also here this evening. He's had conversations with the community about three main topics: (1) down-zoning, (2) transportation and (3) equity. Schools in East Portland are over-crowded, and there are no new places to build, so there is a request for down-zoning in some areas. Regarding transportation, the TSP must be a part of the Comp Plan, and it has not been completely upgraded with comments that have been made over the last 3-4 years (e.g. EPAP and East Portland in Motion Plan). East Portland has been neglected in terms of funding over the years. Funding in East Portland should be at least on parity with other parts of the city. East of 82<sup>nd</sup> is about 28 percent of the city's population.
1. Moe Farhoud: Request to add his four properties as multi-family. The locations are on SE Stark and one on NE 91<sup>st</sup>. His requests won't increase density, but they will provide affordable housing to families. *See written testimony.*
2. Terry Parker: The anti-car mentality in the Plan victimizes Portlanders. Bicyclists should pay for bike infrastructure. *See written testimony.*
3. Bob Sallinger: After the last PSC hearing, Hayden Island advocates discussed language that would give assurances about West Hayden Island (WHI) in the Comp Plan. But it's not possible: you can't distill down a 100s pages plan into a few lines. In 2010 Council instructed the PSC to create a proposal about how to do the 300/500 split. It's in the details where the environment and neighborhoods are protected. Last year, PSC stood

up to City Council, which was the right answer. But now we're trying to go forward by locking in 300/500 without the details. Don't designate WHI as industrial. That is what you decided last year.

*Commissioner Houck:* We'll have the Goal 9 issue and discussion. We need to have a better understanding about what the land use law actually says, so having that information from staff will be important for our work session on industrial lands and the Goal 9 issue.

4. Steven Adam: Owns property at 2345 SE Ankeny. Request change to commercial or mixed-use. *See written testimony.*
5. Lenore Bingham: Owns property at 2348 SE Ankeny, and requesting a change from residential non-conforming to conforming mixed-use. The property was grandfathered in as non-conforming, but they can't do improvements on the third floor without ~ \$20,000 to investigate the proposed changes. Always has been a mixed-use building. Similar situation to Steven Adams. R2.5 currently. *See written testimony.*
6. Eugene Bingham: Just across the street, everything is zoned as commercial (24<sup>th</sup> Ave). The building used to be commercial but was rezoned in the 1980s. These corner lots (ours and Steve Adam's) got lost in the system. *See written testimony.*
7. David Hampsten, East Portland Action Plan (EPAP) and Hazelwood NA Land Use Chair: Discussed concerns with Chapter 9, specifically the Transportation System Plan (TSP). Neighborhoods don't yet have a full project list. What's in the current draft is pretty much the old 2006 TSP with some items from the Regional Transportation Plan included. Missing are the 2010 Bike Master Plan, Pedestrian Master Plan, 2012 East Portland in Motion (EPiM), 2012 EPAP and others, all of which have been adopted by City Council already. We want to be able to review the full list before the Comp Plan hearings, so we're asking to delay the process until those lists have been made available to the public. The TSP is vital for future funding for transportation SDC list too.  
*Commissioner Gray* thanked David Hampsten for his being on top of tracking. Mark Lear at PBOT will meet with me next week to review the entire list.  
*Commissioner Smith* noted the TSP will be released in November, and the PSC's hearing will be in February.  
David Hampsten: The concern is that hearings about the rest of the Comp Plan will be complete, and will the process to modify the list will be gone? 600+ projects are listed in the TSP... and the issue is how you get through this list.
8. Tim Helzer: Over a year ago, the PSC got it right when they made a recommendation about WHI. Now the Comp Plan is going against this. Stand for the facts and convictions, and require the Plan to include all the mitigations for Hayden Island. *See written testimony.*
9. Ronald Ebersole: The east end of Hayden Island has zoning to allow additional building, but it's a narrow island with a narrow 2-lane road to the east end of the island. Currently there are 2800 residents on the island. An apartment building is being built at the east side, and that is a 373 unit development... which could increase the population by about 750. This confined area can't get more roads, and there is no bus service to this end of the island. If you're adding development, we need more facilities to help accommodate it. With the current zoning, there is provision for about another 1000 units, which more than doubles current residency at that end of the island. Please make changes in infrastructure that were included in the Columbia River Crossing (CRC) and Hayden Island Plan made before additional building. *See written testimony.*  
*Commissioner Smith* is challenged that Metro has left the CRC in the RTP, so it's still in

the TSP even though we don't have faith that the CRC will be built.

Ron Ebersole: You have to consider that one road goes through the very narrow island, and there's not room to expand. The CRC did not have provision for improving flow around the island, so the problem will continue to exist.

10. Jeff Geisler: Sustainability and sustaining the city is my emphasis. We've gone from a farming area to the concentrated city we have today. I hope that instead of overdeveloping, we look to preserve and "redecorate" the city. We have lots of natural beauty. Polish what we have. Think more about a clean environment, improve skills of workers, reduce costs of health care, maintain green spaces, and work to reduce fossil fuel use and poor air quality.
11. Nick Sauvie, Rose CDC and EPAP: East Portland has suffered from planning decisions for years. Today East Portland is rated lowest in terms of livability in the city. The Comp Plan acknowledges the public investment deficits in east Portland. Follow the EPAP recommendations for this part of the city to get parity with the rest of the city. EPAP is concerned about displacement and gentrification and hopes the City acts now. Additionally, the Comp Plan should have more about housing affordability. Down-zoning residential increases prices, so need to include subsidized and non-subsidized affordable housing.
12. Bruce Campbell: We have a climate change versus industrial development conflict in the Comp Plan. How will they fit together? There isn't a good logic to be able to do both. As a resident of the Columbia Slough, I'm concerned about industrial development, particularly to golf courses and adjacent areas. I don't understand why these would be changed to an industrial zone. The slough is already carcinogenic, and now we want to do the same to other green spaces and repeat a regrettable history. The area should be converted to green space, which would be more in line with fighting climate change.
13. Joe Rossi: I talked about undeveloped farm land at the last meeting. Right now it's mixed-use and going to light industrial would be a disservice to the community. I know the goal is to have jobs, but to do that, we would have an island of light industrial around what's otherwise residential.  
*Commissioner Gray* thanked the Rossis for their support of Parkrose.  
Joe Rossi: My family has been farming for four generations here, with the fifth generation up-and-coming. If it does get developed, I want it to be at the highest- and best-use for the community.
14. Mary Ann Schwab: Thank you for extending the public involvement process until March 2015. There are many disconnects between the Plan, Metro, Multnomah County, OMSI, Portland Plan, Central Eastside (CES) development... for example the need to improve open spaces and nature opportunities. Zoning definitions are not understood by the community. How do we get Multnomah County to site their new courthouse there? Regarding the CES and affordable housing, consider noise and air quality and proximity to trains through this area.
15. Belinda Marier, Serendipity Center: This is a non-profit therapeutic school. It's been at the same location since 1969 with some expansion and renovation. There are five consecutive parcels that currently range from general commercial to multi-dwelling. In the proposed Plan, all would change to mixed-use civic corridor, which we fully support. The school is now identified as an anchor of this southeast neighborhood, and we also appreciate that.
16. Jeremy O'Leary: Will submit detailed comments in writing. I applaud the community



resiliency work in the Plan. Resiliency, long-term sustainability and preparedness are the same thing on a differing time scale. Schools being community centers should be included in the Plan. I specifically applaud the work back-up water supply discussion, but there is no reference about if the sewer systems is down for an extended period in the Plan. Wood chips and a 2-bucket method (PBEM website) could be included, and this is a zoning issue. This could also help with erosion management. I also echo Rep Reardon's comments about East Portland, especially about the TSP.

17. Claire Coleman-Evans, Bridlemile NA: Thanks for extending public testimony time. We need to put an entry for Neighborhood Associations back into the Comp Plan glossary. Additionally, demolitions should be noted as "50 percent or more of the current structure." And they should be deconstruction permits so we can recycle what's being taken down instead of just doing tear-downs. Neighborhood notification is necessary so developers can't get a permit and then demo the house without neighborhood notification. As for complete neighborhoods and access goods and services, this is a great idea, but in the SW topography, this is really difficult without easy ways to get around.
18. Cassie Cohen, Groundwork Portland: We look at how to clean up land and transform it to be community assets. The City's long-term vision to transform brownfields into job centers and provide land for industrial job opportunities is good, but there are also different opportunities at smaller neighborhood sites. Work with communities to determine the best uses for those sites. In East Portland, there has been conversation about a future town center in at Division and 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave, which has a brownfield site at the intersection. This is a case study and opportunity to think about how the Comp Plan can make this real and have early actions to give the community hope... not a fast food drive-through as may be added.
19. Don Baack: The TSP has lots in play, and I would suggest a hearing about the scope and what's included in it. Staff has not been clear about the sorting process so we have all the projects considered and then staff evaluate and prioritize the list. Regarding the street fee projects, many of those may not be in the TSP, and they should be. IR zones need to be taken away if they don't yet have a plan. Also, there are no comments about the fire department in the Plan, which needs to be addressed. Move Policy 8.77 from parks to transportation in its entirety.
20. Deborah and John Field; Kamala Chhetri: Own properties in the Beaumont Business District, specifically 45<sup>th</sup>-50<sup>th</sup>. There were commercial before the 1981 plan. Ideally they would like the full south side of the street changed back to mixed-use. They own the 48<sup>th</sup> and Fremont property and adjacent property across the intersection. Currently this is a non-conforming use but is considered commercial because they pay commercial water rates. Portland has great neighborhood business districts. But we don't have consistent, adequate zoning. Mixed-use with housing on top. See written testimony.  
*Commissioner Shapiro* commented on the growth in Beaumont and specific zoning concerns in neighborhoods that have expanded over time.
21. Darrell Desper: Do you believe in private property? The Plan is trying to tell people how to live. Why do you care what my house looks like? My son has spent \$18,000 on permits for building on his in-laws property. A house plan doesn't need to be checked for six weeks by a planner before getting approval or not.
22. Don Grotting, David Douglas School District (DDSD) Superintendent: We need to significantly or reduce high-density housing in our school district. We're over capacity. We don't have food or outlets to support our neighborhoods and families, specifically

for DDSD.

*Chair Baugh* asked about housing: Are you just concerned about high-density?

Don Grotting: We don't want any more of any type that would bring in more children to the district.

23. Frieda Christopher, DDSD Board Chair: Has lived in the district since 1976. Also a member of the EPAP. The Plan and the CSP should have stronger language to coordinate with school districts regarding growth. Policies directed to enhance coordination should be elevated and clearly-articulated with zoning, assumptions of zoning, locations, and current and future capacity of schools equitably distributed across the city, especially in chapter 8 and in the CSP. Regarding down-zoning, I'd recommend a change at the Gateway Regional Center to increase commercial and reduce student population growth projections. *See written testimony.*
24. Emily Seltzer: Discussed the proposed rezoning at the former Whitaker School site at NE 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave. Transitions and neighborhood context are important between the zoning on the main streets and development elsewhere. Stepdowns and setbacks are important to mitigate impacts on livability. *See written testimony.*
25. Wendy Newton: Alameda neighborhood. Talked about the quality of housing in her neighborhood and a concern about language that is too narrow and short-sighted. Policies 4.24, 4.36, 4.38 are of particular interest. She's glad there is language included, but there are many units that aren't on registered or recognized that need to be protected. Propose that language be softened like "that contribute to the history of Portland neighborhoods".
26. Laurie Kovack: Lives in inner SE and supports the density concepts to encourage open space areas elsewhere. But we should consider density throughout the city, not just in inner SE. Consider up-zoning plans in this area. Density should also have parking policy implications. People may not be concerned about more housing in their area but more so that they won't be able to park in front of their homes. She also supports ADUs throughout the city to provide well-designed affordable housing.
27. Aesha Lorenz Al-Saeed: Owns 2 acres on Patton Rd. She was working to divide it into 5 x 10000 square foot lots a few years ago, but stopped the process during the recession. The new proposed designation for this land won't help the land shortage in Portland. Believe R20 designation would increase property taxes, so we are against this. *See written testimony.*
28. Janet Linstead: Assistant DDSD teacher. We don't have space for increased zoning. Many properties that were good retail spaces before are no longer there because many low-income families and individuals have moved in. We need stores that have big bangs and benefits. We can't afford more mixed-use here.
29. Willy Myers, Columbia Pacific Building and Construction Trades Council: Thanks for work to date on the Comp Plan update. Long-term planning is critical to good jobs and a strong economy. We represent 15,000 members in 25 different skill crafts and are committed to professionalism and quality. We train thousands of workers each year, with all funding from the private sector. Members are a vital part of Portland. We are proud to be a part of diverse community of Portland. We urge PSC to adopt principles: (1) preserve and expand industrial land in the city; (2) prioritize projects that have identified funding sources; (3) enable development of WHI as an industrial site and job-creator; and (4) adopt policies and plans to create good middle-class jobs. *See written testimony.*

30. Gary Miniszewski: Ashsford neighborhood. Garden Home Road is identified in the updated Comp Plan as totally rebuilt as a 3-lane road, but it's just a neighborhood collector street. We don't understand why this change would be included. We've also heard lots of discussion about razing buildings, but not much about infill and the impact in residential neighborhood on existing single-family dwellings. The City also should encourage PPS to reconsider elementary school closures since schools are hubs for the neighborhoods. *See written testimony.*
31. Steve Hansen: Concerned about transit and overflow and use in neighborhoods. Especially looking at 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave, where my property is just adjacent.
32. Doug Cook: Concerned about neighborhoods. The goal is to create safe access to goods and services, and the old Plan served some inner NE areas really well. But it has failed to support East Portland. Because of infill, areas without infrastructure have challenged many neighborhoods, especially in East Portland. The loss of retail and grocery stores is a microcosm of decisions that have been made. We've had loss of livability in this area. We need jobs, infrastructure, strong retail centers and neighborhood clinic.
33. Cristina Palacias, Community Alliance of Tenants: Advocate for renters' rights. Suggested that renters and non-English speakers should be approached where they live so we can hear them. When we talk about plans, many low-income people think about sub-standard buildings, bringing them to code, and fixing and providing affordable housing. Rent increases displace people – we need a cap on rents. With Section 8 vouchers, some landlords are making sure costs are just high enough so people can't access buildings so these people can't live there. There are bullying issues too – neighbors call in and complain and harass other neighbors so they want to move out. We need to make sure people aren't getting pushed out. Make sure everyone's voice is heard.

**Written Testimony Received** between September 17 and October 7, 2014 is available online at <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6968061/>.

**Written Testimony** received at today's meeting:

- Ron Glanville, Russel NA
- Lenore and Eugene Bingham
- Deborah and John Field
- Terry Parker
- Steven Adam
- Timme Helzer
- Ronald Ebersole
- Nick Sauvie
- Emily Seltzer and John Wilson
- Columbia Pacific Building and Construction Trades Council
- Gary Miniszewski
- Aesha Lorenz Al-Saeed

The hearing will continue October 28 at 5 p.m. at the PCC Southeast Campus Community Hall.

**Discussion about themes heard today**

*Commissioner Hanson:* This was a good spotlight on East Portland issues. I'm concerned about school districts that are over-capacity. How do we deal with this? It could also be a decision or plan beyond land use.

*Commissioner Houck:* Had a similar reaction as Bob Sallinger about the difficulty in distilling

down what represents the work we did over more than a year that resulted in a package that addressed all of the PSC's concerns. I went through most of the documents trying to capture the most significant elements of mitigation measures we approved last year, but it was incredibly challenging. I will have a draft to share with staff and PSC members, but short of referencing all the documents in the package we developed, I don't know we can get to the point that we got to, to address social, environmental and health issues.

*Commissioner Rudd:* I am struck by the industrial development concerns. We heard about potential industrial development on golf courses and brownfields. Greater Portland Inc's Economic Summit this morning talked about income inequality and the ability of industrial jobs, whether traditional industry or some new type, to provide living wages without necessarily requiring a four year degree. There are a variety of types of industrial jobs that may improve people's standard of living and we need to keep that in mind if we are going to reach our equity objectives. We need to figure out industrial development that is consistent with Portland's values. I also heard the concerns about TSP projects. The local neighborhoods are experts on what they need. We also need to be on the same page with the region about freight mobility needs for economic development.

*Commissioner Smith:* Industrial lands question will be a pivot point; I prefer that staff brief the PSC on what happens if we don't get to 600 acres of additional industrial land. We continue to hear about the need for more affordable housing. I'm challenged by the testimony about specific problems in East Portland – DDSD's no-growth requests (which I don't think can be healthy for any neighborhood). Gateway is the only regional center in Portland, and it should be an economic generator, not seen as a problem for the schools. Transportation issues were highlighted tonight – how do we make the TSP work? And regarding the TSP timeline – I have similar concerns as testimony we received tonight. I've also dealt with the question about trails being transportation versus/and parks. Individual parcels in business districts – I'm sympathetic about having a continuous stretch, but Neighborhood Associations may have different thoughts. We need well-crafted recommendations about each of these from staff.

*Commissioner St Martin:* We have great examples with neighborhood corridors, commercial and non-commercial uses. Affordable housing is a place we need to continue to look at, and make sure that we have it in the right place. Regarding the request for alternate language testimony – how can we encourage testimony in languages other than English?

*Commissioner Shapiro:* It's sad we have to make decisions between not creating new housing and educating kids. Both should be accommodated in a growing community. We are growing in ways that disadvantage some areas, and I think we may be struggling with our own success. We need to have compromises. Thank you to all who have expressed their thoughts tonight.

*Commissioner Schultz:* Thankful we had an opportunity to be here today. The main things I heard about were industrial lands, mixed-use zones as well as the DDSD testimony regarding school capacity.

*Commissioner Gray:* We heard some very decidedly East Portland comments tonight – thank you. I agree with Nick Sauvie about following EPAP's ideas around public facilities and public spending/funding. I'm concerned about gentrification. Housing affordability is important, but the DDSD comments about being over-crowded aren't new. And I agree with comments about getting more testimony and input from people who aren't native English-speakers.

*Commissioner Oxman:* Thanks to Parkrose for hosting the Commission meeting tonight. Thinking in big themes – transition and balance. How do we get from where we are now to where we say we want to be? Achieve auto-accessible and promote alternative transportation? Environment and business? Consistency in zoning while recognizing life-long plans for individuals' property that may be non-conforming. Employment and residential land usage?

Zoning is a piece of these, but there are other strategies as well.

*Commissioner Tallmadge:* Thanks for hosting at Parkrose to get varied voices and concerns heard. Tonight's testimony is a reminder that the City and PSC should support neighborhoods' goals and needs. We need to have the TSP lists and get feedback. I too heard about DDS versus Parkrose capacity – and about reallocating growth. We also have the issue of employment versus housing and where these opportunities and developments are going. Regarding WHI, I would like more background information to evaluate the policy to see if it can be more flexible and see what the Comp Plan needs to say. We need to strike a balance between industrial land and preservation – brownfield remediation over green development options.

*Chair Baugh:* Thanks to *Commissioner Gray*. Testimony we received is great, and hopefully we can make some actions on what we heard today. We have the issue of a school district that doesn't want to grow balanced with jobs needed in the area that is consistent with the neighborhood. It has to grow, but this takes some real thought and process. We have to bring the solutions in concert with a transportation plan that fits and is adequately-timed. Is the TSP sufficient to support the growth we are expecting, especially in East Portland? If the funding isn't there, the growth won't come. Concerns about housing – we need the right mix of types and size. Industrial land – what's the consequence and legality for not meeting industrial land requirements? WHI is only one piece of this. Residential and commercial areas should have some consistent zoning policies. I also enjoyed people bringing specific property questions/concerns – and I hope staff can address these individual questions.

Susan Anderson: There were dozens of questions tonight, and staff will begin to respond to these at the work sessions. We'll have conversations with individual property owners before then too. I appreciate that the PSC members have evolved as diverse voices and ideas, and we have a care about so much more than just development... jobs, environment, health, age diversity and other ideas.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 8:02 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, September 23, 2014

5:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Michelle Rudd, Teresa St Martin

**Commissioners Absent:** Maggie Tallmadge

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Last night in New York, 9 cities were chosen as Climate Leaders in the world by the C40. Organization of the 40 largest cities in the world plus Portland. HCN, the primary strategy in the Portland Plan. Recognized the importance of land use planning as a key determinant to reduce energy use and carbon emissions.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 09/09/14 PSC meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Grey, Hanson, Houck, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Rudd, St Martin)

### Comprehensive Plan

Hearing: Joe Zehnder

#### Documents:

- [Testimony memo](#)
- [Errata memo](#)
- [Comp Plan relationship to Mixed Use Zones and Institutional Zones projects memo](#)

#### Presentation:

[http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6993476/view/cp\\_presentation.PDF](http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6993476/view/cp_presentation.PDF)

*Chair Baugh* noted that tonight and for the hearings, the PSC is just listening to what the public has to say. Deliberation and discussion will occur later.

Joe provided an overview of the Comp Plan and where we are in the process.

The Comp Plan includes proposed land use maps, policies, project lists, and a supporting document, the Citywide Systems Plan. There is also the Urban Design Direction report, which

serves as an illustrated guide to some of the urban design and city form policies.

Much of the testimony we expect will relate to the proposed land use map. The Comprehensive Plan Map covers all of Portland and some not-annexed areas within our urban services boundary. Our proposal is to leave much of the existing Comp Plan map as it is today.

This is the first of four scheduled hearings on the Proposed Comprehensive Plan. We'll have hearings on October 14 and 28 then on November 4.

On November 4, the PSC will need to decide if you are ready to close the record, or if you would like to accept comments for a longer period. You will also get an update on the TSP from PBOT on November 4. They will publish a revised project list in mid-October.

On November 18 we have scheduled the first work session to begin discussing what we've heard from the public. Three things will happen in that session:

First, we will get an update on outreach from the Community Involvement Committee (CIC).

Second, we will go over City bureau comments with you. We have asked City agencies to prepare comments and bring their observations to you on the 18.

Third, staff will deliver an initial recommendations memo. The purpose of this memo will be to identify the agenda for subsequent work sessions in 2015. We'll identify the major topics and issues arising from the testimony that warrant more in-depth discussion. We will also bring you a "consent list" of smaller amendments that we recommend based on the testimony. These consent items will be smaller changes that in our judgment can proceed without detailed discussion in a work session.

This is not really the first Comprehensive Plan Hearing.

- In 2007/08 the Commission held hearings on the proposed work plan.
- In 2009/10 the Commission held hearings on the public involvement strategy and creation of the CIC, the group that oversees our outreach efforts.
- In 2010-2012 the Commission held hearings to establish the facts (the background reports), and to set the overall direction via the Portland Plan. The adopted background information includes the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI), the Housing Needs Analysis, a new Natural Resources Inventory (NRI), among other things. You also reviewed the Growth Scenarios Report and the Employment Opportunities Analysis (EOA), both of which we will return to the PSC in early 2015.

Later next year you will have hearings on more detailed implementation including zoning codes and maps.

Last Thursday the PSC received documents from staff:

1. A memo identifying a few errors in the proposed maps and policies. We will be updating the Map App in the coming week, and notifying impacted property owners.
2. A letter from Eric Engstrom providing staff's thinking about the requests you have received for extension of these hearings.
3. You also received a brief summary of the comments received to date, along with the full packet of comments.

Within the written testimony you received this month on the Comprehensive Plan are several letters from recognized neighborhood associations requesting a 90-day extension of the comment period. The letters express a desire to know the specifics of potential new code provisions before closing testimony on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies and Comprehensive Plan Map.



However, before specific code provisions can be proposed, the Comprehensive Plan needs to first define desired outcomes through goals and policies, and the plan map. Establishing goals and policies and directional maps before developing more detailed implementing actions is essential. The specifics of any zoning changes that will be adopted to implement the new Comprehensive Plan will be subject to additional public hearings before final action by the PSC and City Council.

I also want to reiterate that the Comprehensive Plan is building from the direction we set with the Portland Plan. In 2012 City Council adopted the Portland Plan, which was a strategic plan covering all aspects of local government activity. The Comprehensive Plan is more specific to the physical development of the city – to land use, and the provision of needed housing and employment. While the Portland Plan was adopted by resolution, the Comprehensive Plan is adopted by ordinance and becomes binding policy for the things it governs.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about the EOA and if we will take another look at that.

- We submitted it to the state, it was approved, and we know it's going to change, so we took it (and the scenarios report) back for amending it. It is an iterative still.

**Testimony:**

1. Nader Rassouli and Peter Finley Fry: Owns 1.28 acres at 6141 SW Canyon Ct that's zoned R20 that I'd like to have rezoned to R2. The property is directly adjacent to Highway 26 and is close to public transportation. There are commercial properties and fire station close by. Originally the property was part of Multnomah County and designated rural, and it was annexed to Portland after the 1980 Comp Plan. Now in an urban area with urban needs and services. I would like to develop it into a multi-family campus. *See written testimony.*
2. Ken Forcier: BPS writes the code and instructs other bureaus about code interpretation. If there is conflict within the code, we should bring it into compliance. Why is there a right to a non-conforming situation when it's new? Is there a grandfather right? When we apply this argument to a development, we need to first decide if development is a grandfathered right. Non-conforming new construction isn't ok, for example R2.5 in R5 neighborhoods. Skinny houses disrupt the neighborhood character, are an oxymoron, and conflict with the zoning code. Please review Table 110-6 in the code. *See written testimony.*
3. Herman Kachold: Concerned that the 300 acres on West Hayden Island (WHI) is going to be zoned industrial after our years of fighting for it. Industrial zoning on this acreage isn't what was recommended in 2013 by the PSC.
4. Stefan Karlic: WHI industrial zoning circumvents the 2013 PSC recommendation. The Comp Plan would open the door for the Port to develop without having to meet livability expectations and needs of the community. This is one of Portland's last large natural areas. There is plenty of industrial land; clean up the brownfields, and leave WHI alone. All 12 Measures of Success of the 12 Portland Plan would be met if we start cleaning up brownfields.
5. Lucinda Karlic, Hayden Island Livability Project (HILP): This is a regional issue what happens on WHI. I've shared a resolution from HILP, of which a majority came from the PSC. Clean up brownfields to supply more jobs. *See HILP written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith:* The language about WHI is based on the last Council action which is a 300/500 split. Some of us are frustrated that we don't see the result of the PSC recommendation yet. I've asked staff to draft policy language for discussion based on what the

PSC recommended. I hope we'll get testimony that informs if it should be industrial, open space, etc.

*Commissioner Houck* clarified and asked for people to provide ideas about what the language about WHI should be so we can incorporate those ideas into the plan.

6. Timme Helzer: Thank you for the decisions you made in July 2013 about WHI after many months of analysis. We weren't delighted, but we believe you got it right. There were significant mitigations to potential destructive processes and results. But others have totally disregarded this work, rolled back the clock and are recommending something that goes in the opposite direction. There are 5 points in the document we prepared for tonight's hearing (*see the HILP letter*). There is no protection in the new zoning proposal, and there is no improved transportation infrastructure.
7. Kelly Hossaini, Portland Business Alliance, Chair of Land Use Taskforce: Participated on Comp Plan PEGs, and I commend BPS staff who developed policies to guide growth. The plan shows the importance of economic development, but needs greater priority to achieve a prosperous, equitable city. Good living-wage jobs are declining in Portland. BPS' own report ("Industrial Middle of Portland's Changing Income Distribution") finds that industrial lands sustain these mid-income jobs and they are needed for an equitable city. PBA requests are to ensure an adequate industrial land supply; edit the green hierarchy of transportation so it does not apply to freight corridors and movement of goods; and prioritize internal inconsistencies in the plan, for example Policy 6.39 versus 7.29. *See written testimony.*
8. Alastair Roxburgh: If there were a marine terminal on WHI, it would severely impact the health of the community, especially air quality. There are already air quality problems on WHI, and this would exacerbate it. To achieve air quality goals, we'd need to reduce industry by up to 90 percent to be ideal as per federal standards. We need to minimize impact on green areas and livability; and work with our neighbors to make sure there isn't duplication or wasteful spending on duplicating infrastructure. There is significant harm to WHI acres if 300 of the reserve is split off. This is one of Portland's greatest habitats. Remain engaged in the process about WHI.
9. Janet Roxburgh: Concerned about the mapping of WHI to industrial. We need to leave it alone and restore WHI. There is much pollution in the area, and lots of people are getting sick, much of which is because of what's in our air. I'm also concerned that the Port is wanting the propane terminal, and Vancouver is wanting an oil terminal, both of which are dirty. Jobs will become hospital jobs because more and more people will be getting sick. We need more natural areas, not more industry.
10. David RedThunder, HILP: *Shared a 15-page photo description to the PSC.* There is legal as well as illegal hunting on WHI. There are already too many problems with the environmental quality on the island.
11. Dixie Johnston: Tried to compare the new proposal with the existing Comp Plan, but it's difficult because things are very different in the two plans. There are two things in ORS 195, 196, 197 that refer to State Goal 1 (citizen involvement) that talks about recognized associations by the City, and I know of three: business associations, neighborhood associations, PSC. All these groups have rules and regulations that must be followed. Neighborhoods can lose their charters if they don't follow the rules. Is the PSC appropriate to advise on community involvement in land use decisions? Yes. But what does citizen involvement require? Is this to protect neighbors or businesses?
12. Ellen Wax, ED, Working Waterfront Coalition: Balanced policies matter, and the

wording matters. Concerns about conflicting policies and clarity of the language as well as the strength of the words. The verbs are not balanced between chapters 6 and 7. “Protect” is used much more in chapter 7, and it’s restrictive. The economic development chapter doesn’t reconcile with the environmental. Policy 1.3 is ensure internal consistency in the plan, and this needs to be followed. WWC is concerned with the imbalance, and with the protection of jobs and protection of industrial land supply.

13. Phil Grillo, Working Waterfront Coalition: Middle-income jobs are important especially in Portland as an equity issue. Portland has a low high school graduation rate, and if we believe in equity, we need to grow middle-class jobs. In Portland, most middle-income jobs that don’t require college are especially along the industrial corridors and harbor. The policies in Chapter 6 are a good starting point, but we are concerned they will be undercut by policies in Chapter 7. Policies 7.11 and 8.59 make it difficult for water-related businesses to expand. When harbor businesses make investments, they produce jobs and tax revenue for the City. The PSC should review BPS’ report as a basis for further discussion.
14. Ann Gardner, Working Waterfront Coalition: Harbor sites have deep water and rail access, which is essential. The opportunity to grow and create middle-income jobs needs more unique harbor land. It’s estimated that the cost to clean up brownfield sites is about four times the value of the land, so it’s highly unlikely that harbor brownfield sites that are need will work when we look at the funding gap. The EOA will not meet the shortfall of 600 industrial acres, which is exacerbated by 120 acres based on Policy 7.46. We need adequate resources to stimulate economic development in the harbor.
15. David Johnston: Agrees with Dixie’s comments about needing more time for neighborhoods to review the proposed plan. The timing currently downplays rights of citizens. On institutional zones and conditional uses: the proposed institutional zoning shows a complete lack of consideration to surrounding neighborhood, and institutions should serve the surrounding neighborhoods. The Comp Plan should inform the work to include more consideration as is the current plan for the needs of the neighbors and residences in the area. The rights of individual land owners around the campuses are very important. We need to include the surroundings as an important part of the zoning.
16. William Kielhorn: We need more time for citizens and neighborhood associations to review the draft plan. It was released in late July when neighborhood meetings were on hold or sparsely attended. There have been at most 2 neighborhood meetings since the plan’s release, which is insufficient for us to get together. Mixed use zones and institutional zones are not yet defined, and the draft should not be submitted until all zones and all parts of the plan are completely defined. There is still lots to be done. Much of the language is open to multiple interpretations (e.g. Goal 1.D). Rewrites will take lots of time, and we need to take the time to get it right. We need to address the plan’s significant omissions (e.g. noise). Please give us time to modify and enhance the plan.
17. James Peterson, Multnomah Neighborhood Association: Circulated an extension request for 90 days after the mixed use and institutional zones have been defined. We would like Multnomah to be designated a neighborhood corridor. The more you read the plan, it’s very poorly written; the more you read it, the more confused you become. All the answers we’ve asked should be in the document since this is a plan for 20 years.
18. Carol McCarthy: Allow the public more time to review the plan. State Goal 1 places primary importance on public involvement. Citizen involvement is not adequately encouraged in the plan. The role of the neighborhood associations is almost non-

- existent. Goals and policies should not have aspirational language. We need metrics for each goal to see the effectiveness of the policies, and we need to be able to amend them. Policy 1.1 should be stated “comprised of” instead of “includes”. We need the hearings to be open for at least 90 days after mixed use and institutional zones are defines.
19. Terry Parker: Policy 9.6 appears to be politically-motivated policy carryover. Hierarchy status is social engineering, and it is not constitutional. Special privileges are given to those higher on the hierarchy. This needs to be completely removed as policy. It’s discriminatory. *See written comments.*
  20. Brandon Bunke: Remove the WHI industrial zoning. The urban growth boundary wasn’t created so we can continually cut out more greenspace to add industrial areas. We’re creating more problems that we’re going to have to clean up later. The state supports restoration of the wild salmon runs, which is one of the pioneering industries of Oregon. Accessibility to WHI is already poor. If we add commercial traffic, how will that improve the bridge that connects Portland and Vancouver? A reason that Portland stands out is due to our greenspace, and if we chop those spaces away, we lose the appeal of Portland.
  21. Chris Anderson: A tech entrepreneur, who chose Portland because it was the number 1 city for bikes. What about broadband? I know it’s invisible, but we need a policy about broadband equity. In 2010 the City did a big push for open data (accessible data, made easily available). We should include a policy in the plan. I also have frustration about bike transportation: I was sold on the idea to come to Portland, but in countries that have the bike success, all bike trips in town are more direct than the car trips. Our grid system is holding us back. We need to add diverters that force cars onto serpentine routs. On local streets, there should be traffic diverters everywhere.
  22. Tinsley Hunsdorfer: WHI is critical habitat. We need to remove WHI from the zoning or designate it as Open Space. If it maintains the industrial zoning, the mitigation package recommended by the PSC last year should be locked in place beforehand.
  23. Bob Sallinger, Audubon Society of Portland: The WHI hearings went on for 5 years. We are now upset that it’s back in the plan. Keep faith with your commitments you made in 2013. WHI should have a holistic set of actions. This was the right choice, and the Port withdrew its annexation application. But the Comp Plan now locks in 300 acres of industrial land without locking in the mitigation package. We need a paradigm shift: don’t convert greenfields to industrial. We need to focus on brownfield remediation, etc. Reconsider how we find industrial lands and focus on clean-ups. *See written testimony.*
  24. Robert Bernstein: Look at this plan with open eyes... what do you want Portland to look like in 2035? The growth is unsustainable. WHI should be removed or set as Open Space. Do mitigation first before you do any development. If you’re going to talk about planning, don’t think about the Port – it’s wasteful and harmful to the environment and the people and the species. It’s an equity and social justice issue. Habitat for creatures is continually degraded by industrial use. We’ve lost times the amount of environmentally-sound land as we have.
  25. Tad Savinar and Lindley Morton, The Squish: This is an area in NW Portland bounded by Naito, NW 20<sup>th</sup> Ave, Highway 30 and the Fremont Bridge ramps. We want to support and enhance this area where people work. It’s not like the Central Eastside. BPS staff understands this as a neighborhood and has done a good job in the proposal. Ours are just tweaks based on our being in the area. *See written comments.*

*Commissioner Houck* noted the comments that are site-specific. How are we tracking those and to what level of detail can we consider those?

- Staff will compile all comments, categorize, and then PSC will get the information. The ones you have specific questions about will be discussed in the work sessions that the PSC will have. Staff will make recommendations, but the PSC will discuss.
26. Robert Barnett, Red Hills Holdings: 2802 SE Ankeny property, a block from Burnside and SE 28<sup>th</sup>. It's currently zoned R2.5 and has been legal non-conforming use for decades. We're asking to bring our property in as a mixed-use since the use supports this type of development. *See written comments.*
  27. Tom Bouillion, Port of Portland: Thanks to staff to ensure economic prosperity e.g. in Policy 6.34. Manufacturing jobs offer opportunities for living-wage jobs and have a high employment multiplier effect. They provide ongoing revenue streams and property taxes. Bringing brownfields back into use is another good policy and is a key strategy. But some chapter 7 policies make chapter 6 policies impossible to achieve, e.g. Policy 7.46. I urge staff to look at how policies are in conflict and rectify, including with Policy 1.3 - internal consistency in the plan. *See written comments.*
  28. Greg Theisen, Port of Portland: Chapter 6 policies don't fully support economic development for the city. Future annexation of WHI has been supported by PSC and Council and the need for additional 500+ acres. Middle-income jobs for Portland would fulfill the equity goals in the Portland Plan. Future development triggers infrastructure development that would general \$20M in tax revenue over 10 years. Portland's future need to link to the international marketplace, and we need the harbor to link us. *See written comments.*

*Commissioner Houck* Tom Bouillion's comment regarding floodplain values. We need more details from staff about the NOAA fisheries Biological Opinion on FEMA's floodplain program that will have significant impact on not just flood storage, but ecosystem values of floodplains and FEMA information to see what the implications are.

29. Micah Meskel: I'm dismayed that in N/NE there is strategy to develop greenspaces, similar to WHI and area golf courses. This is counter to Portland being green and sustainable in our development. It's counter to develop greenspaces, and it's not what the community wants... especially with WHI. What about the mitigation package the PSC recommended?
30. Cyd Manro, Division Design Committee: The first measure of success of Portland Plan is about equity, and inclusion is impossible without affordable housing. Rent in new developments on SE Division are, for example, \$1300/studio; \$1500/1-bedroom. If this is what we can expect, then the Portland Plan isn't working. Beyond increasing "market rate" housing, we displace people and exclude people including families that can't live in a studio or 1-bedroom apartment. I don't feel included as a renter in SE. Market rate is 250 percent of what I currently pay. I know we don't have laws to have affordable housing, but we need to offer better incentives that are in the best interest of developers and people who need housing. *See written comments.*
31. Bruce Sternberg: Offered some edits to the text. The Complete Neighborhoods statement should include "and retain the features that contribute to their positive nature". One size doesn't fit all... and "and provides methods for neighborhoods to have say in their development". Enhance local context: inner neighborhoods should have a distinction as well.

32. Doug Klotz: Much in the plan is headed in the right direction, and will help with slowing climate change. We talk about complete neighborhoods, but a component needs to be the willingness of builders to build. Mixed use zoning in the inner neighborhoods is working and making better places to live. Mixed use should allow at least as much development as current and offer trade for affordable housing. Also look at R1 zoning, where little multifamily housing is built. This should be rezoned as RH or redefine to allow for more housing to be built. *See written comments.*
33. Erin Madden: Moved to Portland 16 years ago due to Portland's access to outdoors and Open Space. The designation of 300 acres on WHI as industrial is a step backward. There was significant public process before, but now without a mitigation package, it's inexcusable. WHI is a natural area, not for a deep-water port. Restoration could create jobs for years to come. The City should focus on ways to restore WHI, at least recommending that full mitigation is included. WHI should be Open Space for all 800 acres to expand the city's green legacy.
34. Dean Pottle: Owns a political speakeasy in NE Portland. Consider making this block (including 4047 NE Fremont) commercial.
35. Jeff Meyrowitz: Currently in an R7 zone. Request to rezone to R2 to be consistent with current dwellings. We are surrounded by R1 and general commercial. Multi-unit condos have been developed close by recently too; we're .2 miles to Barbur Blvd. with easy access to TriMet and parks too.
36. Laura Campos: Worked on original Comp Plan. Areas in N/NE were historically non-white, which is not the case anymore. Improvements make land value increase. Unless people own their homes, they will be priced out of the city. Non-white home ownership needs to be a policy. The majority are not property owners but are incentivized to attend meetings where decisions are made that won't ultimately benefit them. Equity to add more apartments pits home owners against renters and doesn't create a healthy relationship. Property ownership is primarily white. We need a rent freeze to give renters a chance to try to own and benefit.
37. John Gibbon, SWNI: Request for a 90 day extension beyond when we see the draft mixed use and institutional zoning plans. 5 years ago, when it was the Planning Commission, we were trying to give people an understanding of what the changes to neighborhoods would be, but that was laid aside when we entered the Portland Plan process. People were told that was important to build community consensus, but now we're hearing the results of laying it aside. If you're going to use trails as a component to transportation system, we need to have a policy that actively supports them.
38. Pamela Ferguson, Hayden Island: Opposes industrial designation on WHI. We should protect and increase habitat here.
39. Peter Teneau: The WHI zoning is a reversal. Industrial zoning has again trumped environment for purpose of development. If there were no other sites, that would be one thing. We need to keep the zoning intact as Open Space. Coordination with Port of Vancouver could help since port operations are a regional matter. WHI belongs to Mother Nature. *See written comments.*
40. Randy Bonella, Multnomah Village Business Association: (1) Extend time for public input. (2) The stormwater overlay misses a broad swath of SW Portland. Relook at this overlay to ensure build-out of infrastructure is possible. (3) Mixed-Use designations need to reflect unique aspects of different neighborhoods and business districts. (4) Get rid of provisions that allow for non-conforming uses, e.g. R2.5 in R2.



41. Jeff Geisler: Need more neighborhood involvement on lots of aspects of the Comp Plan. Hayden Island is an island, and we're not like other neighborhoods in Portland. See *written comments*.
42. Lillian Karabaic, Code for Portland: Works as a volunteer who works with civic data. Supports adding an open data policy to the Comp Plan. We already have an open data resolution, passed in 2009. It makes tech innovation and information available more equitably and easier to access. We could open many more data sets by adding a policy in the Comp Plan so Portland can become the #1 city for open data (Seattle is currently). Data needs to be license-free, machine readable.
43. Joe Rossi: Rossi Farms at 3839 SE 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave. The farms are on both sides of NE 122<sup>nd</sup>. Concerned about rezoning. In the area, there is lots of residential R7, multifamily and Parkrose schools. But the area needs general commercial to become a walkable community. We're not near industrial properties, which are north of Sandy Blvd. Why are we creating an island of industrial property here? We need small businesses to support our families and the area.
44. Margaret Davis: Beaumont-Wilshire neighborhood. Lost daily bus service a few years ago, and there have been big buildings without parking. We need engagement with neighbors and associations. Make neighborhood dialogue required before development starts. We need infrastructure to match neighborhood and development. The PSC should drop "sustainability" from its name so long as demos continue at the current pace. Losing 100 units of affordable housing impacts us all and mostly helps exploitive developers from outside the city. If we want the green city's reputation, we would incentive real infill.
45. Barbara Quinn: The proposed 300 acres rezoning on WHI for industrial goes against prior feedback and testimony from the last few years. Reconsider and don't negate the public process. Make industrial and manufacturing zones from brownfield sites, and not just in North Portland. We need to consider air quality in North Portland, which is already remarkably poor. Roosevelt High School is in the top 1 percent of schools affected by poor air quality in the nation, and almost all the other schools in North Portland are in the top 3 percent. We have a huge environmental justice issue if industry is concentrated in North Portland only.
46. Martin Slapikas, HiNoon: Testified about WHI including a map that shows WHI is in fact an island. The 2013 IGA with the Port was stating they were looking for public funding, and that was offensive. The bay on the island is a concern if we have increased traffic. The goals of creating complete neighborhoods are not serving this area. One size does not fit all. We don't have an emergency evacuation plan.
47. Roger Averbeck, SWNI transportation committee: I've encouraged neighborhood representatives to read the Comp Plan, look at Map App and discuss with their constituencies to provide input. My frustration is working with the Map App: there are three layers, but you can't overlay them. I am trying to see where the new areas of Centers and Corridors have corresponding TSP projects to support them, and it's not true in all cases, but we need that. A parking policy also still needs to be worked out. I will offer more complete comments in the near future. I still encourage staff to make the tools as easy as possible to use for everyone.

Written Testimony Received between July 22 and September 16, 2014 is available online at <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6968053/>.



**Written Testimony** received at today's meeting:

- Nader Rassouli
- Alastair Roxburgh
- David RedThunder
- HILP
- Timme Helzer
- Bill Kielhorn
- Multnomah Neighborhood Association
- Carol McCarthy
- Terry Parker
- Tad Savinar and Lindley Morton, SQUISH
- Red Hills Holdings
- Tom Bouillion
- Greg Theisen
- Doug Klotz
- Jeff Geisler
- Kelly Hossaini
- Peter Teneau
- Mary Ann Schwab
- Robert Bernstein
- Cyd Manro
- Ken Forcier

The hearing will continue October 14 at 5 p.m. at the Parkrose High School Student Center.

**Discussion about themes heard today**

*Commissioner Gray:* I've been collecting the testimony and categorizing it. I will pass on my questions to staff. I'm fascinated by the technology points, especially broadband and open data.

*Commissioner Smith:* What can we do policy-wise to up our brownfield work? How do we achieve affordability without inclusionary zoning – do we have everything in the plan that we can? A question for staff: what is the role of the City in permitting the propane terminal at the Port? This Comp Plan is our first plan of the 21<sup>st</sup> century, so we should include technology (broadband, open data) as a fundamental component to citizen involvement.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* I agree about the comments of having technology available for everyone. WHI is a conversation we need to continue in a work session to come to closure about. Regarding people who didn't feel they have sufficient time: I think we're allowing time with the public. Citizen involvement is critical, and I think the schedule accommodates that. Policy 5.17 talks about aging in place, but what about elders "being useful" in the community too?

*Commissioner Oxman:* There is lots in the plan that I like – it's visionary, and it's largely coherent... even radical in some areas. Some things we need to dwell on are: housing issues (housing for families); WHI; transportation hierarchy (I'm mixed on this; it's positive and clear and articulates where we say we want to go, but there will be difficult transitions to get there); balance between employment and other uses in mixed use zones. Zoning is the primary implementation strategy, but it's a very blunt instrument.

*Commissioner Schultz:* The plan overall is visionary, with some minor issues I'm still working through. Competing priorities that we need to work through are how to prioritize the policies and the goals (if we should); industrial lands and environment; and working with neighborhoods struggling with change.

*Commissioner Rudd:* In the Portland Plan we wanted to prioritize and focus on actions that moved us forward on more than one of our priorities. The beginning of the draft Comp Plan talks about how we will balance policies in the plan but we have to be very clear about the language we are using if we are going to achieve that balancing. Protect, for example, is very forceful extreme. We need to understand the difference between words like protect and encourage and exactly what they mean people are going to do. The glossary is helpful for that but after we make amendments to the language we need to come back and compare them all and understand if we are in fact giving one thing a veto power over other considerations. One thing we've not yet heard about tiny houses (like really tiny), and how we'll deal with that movement.

*Commissioner Houck:* This plan is a huge stride in the environmental front compared to original Comp Plan. I've submitted comments about different policies with recommendations about where language can be greatly strengthened to accomplish our policies and priorities. What I heard about is the time issue for neighborhoods. The impression I got is that they don't meet during the summer and that has been a problem with them developing a formal position – can we help them catch up in a coordinated manner? I'm not concerned about individuals who have had and will have plenty of time. About affordable housing, I've included feedback from housing advocates in my comments. When we formed the Coalition for A Livable Future in 1994 we made a run on Metro to get mandatory inclusionary zoning in our region but Metro didn't go for it. I'm glad to see the issue of inclusionary zoning is in the draft Comp Plan. WHI is still a huge issue – I think it should be taken off the table (zone it as Open Space or at least Farm and Forest and not consider it for development in the future), or we better make sure that we memorialize in the Comp Plan what the PSC worked so hard to achieve regarding mitigation. The Goal 9 issue versus environmental concerns is something we'll continue to wrestle with since we're a land-locked city. Noise is a huge health and quality of life issue. Are there areas of the city where it's considered "noise free" or more controlled about what noise is allowed?

- There is an issue that we're developing the mixed use zone and institutional zoning project. Usually you do policies then write code. Policies give guidance to zoning. But because we've started these two projects before finishing the Comp Plan, there is some knowledge but not certainty, so people are wondering what these zones mean. There may be an opportunity (and we hope to clarify the zones before you vote). The PSC will have to ask before making its recommendation "do we need more time after the definitions are out" to let people react and testify.
- The parking management plan for centers and corridors will need to rely on the new Comp Plan policies.

*Commissioner St Martin:* Broadband and open data are very important to take a look at. In asking about extra time for people – there is calendar time, and there is work time. Every comment that comes in gets reviewed and considered. Obstacles and opportunities for brownfields should be looked at in addition to WHI. And a question about equity and WHI – are all the jobs middle-income on Hayden Island? What are the pollution issues? There's also the evacuation issue, especially if there is development; we need to address this.

*Commissioner Hanson:* This is a great plan and a good foundation and framework. The spot zoning issues are good to consider and need to be evaluated going forward. I'm concerned about stabilizing mid-income jobs. How can we make brownfield development more feasible? Are we overregulating these sites? Campus institutional zone concern and compatibility with the surrounding area needs to be considered. Regarding WHI: is it practical to add the IGA into the mix? Can we? If we don't, does the whole thing go back to square one?

*Chair Baugh:* This is a visionary plan, which we started in the Portland Plan. We included health and equity, which haven't been talked about before in a planning context. In the Comp Plan, we need to talk about technology in a visionary and inclusionary way. When we talk about

brownfields in the context of prosperity, we need to ask: for whom (lower income? middle?) and where in the city is this prosperity occurring? How does this connect with people and where they live? In terms of institutions, what are we doing for the neighborhoods, not just the institutions? We need to ensure the neighborhoods have a voice about the growth and allow them to grow and be part of the area. The Rossi Farm example is a good policy question: how do we look at land along, for example, 122<sup>nd</sup> regarding the healthy connected neighborhood objective?

Susan: As you're reviewing the plan, think of topics that are still missing in the plan. Look at the verbs. And let us know you outstanding questions.

**Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 8:06 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, September 9, 2014

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Michelle Rudd, Teresa St Martin

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Karl Lisle, Sallie Edmunds, Eric Engstrom

**Other Staff Present:** Javier Mena, PHB; Lisa Abuaf, PDC; Kimberly Branam, PDC; Art Pearce, PBOT; Courtney Duke, PBOT; Peter Hurley, PBOT

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:34 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 08/12/14 and 08/26/14 PSC meetings

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y8 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Tallmadge)

### CC2035 West Quadrant Plan

Hearing: Karl Lisle

#### Documents:

- [Packet](#)
- [West Quadrant Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #12 Summary](#)

#### Presentation:

[http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6963195/view/westquad\\_presentation.PDF](http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6963195/view/westquad_presentation.PDF)

*Commissioner Schultz* thanked the staff's efforts for the work. There are a lot of great big ideas, including activating the waterfront.

Karl provided an overview and reminder about the project's plan area. The West Quadrant is a piece of the update of the Central City Plan, which is being updated from the 1988 Central City Plan. By the end of 2015, staff will come back with the final package together to a new proposed Central City 2035 Plan.

### Testimony:

1. Karen Williams, West Quadrant SAC Co-Chair: Privileged to co-chair of the SAC. The 33-member group met 16 times, with public comment at every meeting. People offered many responses to proposals but also their heart-felt contributions to making Portland a better city. There were some disagreements, but everyone had a desire to contribute to Portland as a community. The majority of the group strongly endorses the proposed draft, and there are 3 minority reports included in the packet before the PSC. It is important that Portland move forward. The Green Loop, freeway capping and wholesale reimagining of the waterfront are major components that are transformative to advance the Central City. A healthy urban core makes for a healthy region overall.
2. Cameron Whitten: A member of various boards and civic committees who lives in NW Portland. Thanks to staff for the great work with the plan. I had a specific focus of looking at the housing and neighborhood portion. With the new development agreement to waive SDCs in Chinatown, affordability is set to expire in 10-15 years, but part of the benchmark of this plan is to ensure affordable housing in 2035. Looking at different geographic regions of the West Quad, there are different types of housing mentioned (senior, workforce, etc), but 0-60 percent of MFI (low-income) housing is missing. We need to talk about and guarantee access to all to live in the inner city.
3. Ethan Seltzer: PSU professor and past Planning Commission member; sharing ideas from other past PC members including Bing Sheldon. The group has a concern for the Old Town / Chinatown (OT/CT) district, which is a unique resource. Every plan has identified that area as a key component of the city. But the promise of the area is unfulfilled, and we should turn that around. We endorse the plan's work in OT/CT and Skidmore, particularly RC2 - development of parking strategy as a means to redevelop surface parking in the area. This is applauded. Redevelopment is now make parking a land use issue, not just a transportation issue. It will be challenging but vital to the district to implement the plan.
4. Michael Harrison, OHSU: talked about the treatment of South Waterfront. OHSU appreciates the partnership with the City. The university will build 3 new buildings in SoWa soon as part of the quest to diagnose/treat cancer early. OHSU is committed to active ground-floor uses, but they are not sure the plan has the optimal places for retail designated. He asked for staff to work with OHSU before the CC2035 Plan is adopted to learn more about future OHSU plans. Regarding the parking policy, many patients will be driving to and home from surgeries, so he requested the phrase "while maintaining and enhancing patient and visitor planning..." be included in the plan as it is in the N/NE Quad plan parking.
5. Wendy Rahm: Concerns about the building height component. We should amend the height map and lower the West End to 100 feet to preserve over 100 unprotected historic buildings. What's not needed is more tall towers from downtown. We can increase density while preserving the current form. Urban needs are often different from single-family neighborhoods. An alternative example, from Patrick Congdon's model, is dense, compact mid-rise buildings that preserve the human-scale and connectivity of the area. We should focus on citizens' needs, not opportunities for profit.
6. Jill Sherman, Gerding Edlen: a former PC member. She is generally supportive of the plan. Regarding OT/CT and surface parking, it's not yet redeveloped because projects are not feasibly financially. Incentives like SDC waivers will more likely get additional development in the near-term. She also encouraged more thinking around district parking and how the public sector/PDC could formulate a plan to provide parking. Allowing parking for residential projects could also do double-duty (e.g. if they are

able to be used by shoppers, etc during the day). A diversity of building heights makes a district interesting.

7. Michael James: Supports the minority report from NWDA. Density can be accomplished with medium-rise buildings. Portland is so unique with a charm and Parisian quality. He is not convinced the economic forecasts are accurate, so the high-rise proposal would not be sustainable. Portland's economic future may not be as rosy as the plan suggests, which would lead to empty buildings, which is bad for the economy and for the people who live here. He supports Steve Pinger's minority report.
8. Raihana Ansary, PBA: Appreciates the plan's focus on the Central City as a regional and economic center. PBA submitted the OT/Skidmore report with recommendations that support business vitality and district livability. The height increases are in strategic areas as noted in the plan. Central City is the economic hub of the region and should continue to absorb both housing and job growth. PBA opposes imposing taxes or closing surface lots. We need to be able to support growth and different modes to the Central City including freight.
9. Pat Scruggs: Thanks to those who have worked on the plan. I applaud the plan's work to address a vibrant waterfront and Central City. It has strong technical merits to leave the legacy we want, except for the height limits at bridgeheads. 325 feet is too high; it's not sound environmentally or economically. Some of the environmental aspects of the plan have been divided or put into other plans. The relationship with the place matters to the economic viability of the region.
10. Jeanne Galick: The plan has good ideas but fails to address environmental and habitat issues fully. There need to be specific benchmarks for air and water quality, green infrastructure requirements, and we should reinstate river policies and goals that help maintain and improve the water habitat. The plan needs to address the potential for conflicts between public activity and habitat. Strongly opposed to the bridgehead height allowance increases. There is no compelling reason to triple current heights, and it constitutes spot zoning. We could change Naito Parkway into a pedestrian-friendly boulevard that could be a far more effective tool to activate the riverfront.
11. Suzanne Crowhurst Lennard, Institute for Making Cities Livable: Provided data on effects of high-rise housing in writing prior to this hearing. The argument to promote high-rise buildings is primarily economically-driven. But rapid growth is not sustainable, and high-rise buildings may accelerate inequities. Research shows that generally people living in high-rise buildings have more mental health issues, especially for those living at higher levels.
12. Jeff Nudelman, Harsch Investment Properties: Thanks to staff and those who participated in developing the plan. Harsch has been a Portland-based company for over 60 years, adding value to real estate and improving communities where the company works. We support the City's work and partnership and own properties throughout the West Quad. I'm concerned that a reduction in existing height limits will not be consistent with goals of the City, and they are not what we've been planning for on properties we currently own and plan to redevelop.
13. Taz Loomans, The Old Historic Church: A architect and professional urban planning blogger. The 250 foot height allowance should be reduced to 100 feet, which is more appropriate for the character of the area. High-rises diminish livability. The Old Historic Church will be dwarfed and overshadowed with a higher limit and not fit within the historic context. It is possible to embrace progress without raising the height limits.

14. Jacqueline Peterson, Old Town History Project: Has been working in OT since the mid-1990s. She attended most of the West Quad SAC meetings. On page 28 of the plan, the map has 5 white spaces, all of which have height limitations. The OT/CT height increases to 175 feet in the heart of Chinatown.
15. Terry Chung, PCHMF: OT/CT has presented the idea that history and place are important. OT/CT is the only historic place left in Portland where people live. Others have been pushed aside by redevelopment. Consider the height limitations: 175 feet destroys the historic nature of the area. How will that help the livability of Portland, where people want to come? My vision is to turn the area into a historic-designated area. Create a “museum complex”, which would be a destination. Are the height limits as proposed equitable to the minorities in the area?
16. Kal Toth: Past professor of engineering at PSU and UBC. Moved to Portland because it was a livable city compared to Vancouver where high-rises have created “vertical sprawl.” We should reevaluate the height limits in the plan.
17. Grant Higginson: Retired public health physician. Lives in the Harrison Towers. Commends the bureau and PSC on the work in this plan. He agrees with the big issues that frame the document and implementation actions and is a proponent of new development. He is also concerned about the height allowances, particularly for the South Auditorium area. High-rise living may damage the healthy demographic mix of the community. He’s concerned that height comments are a NIMBY issue, so I’m only asking that you not increase existing limits unless there is a real reason to do so. RC-6 is a great policy, and I’m also excited about RC-5 that will benefit the community greatly.
18. Helen Ying: Vice-chair of OT/CT Community Association and a concerned citizen. As we continue to make Portland the best city in the nation, need to stay true to the goals of the Portland Plan. OT/CT is a vital hub for the city, but today it is lacking that vitality. We need to move away from an “all or nothing” approach and be innovative and strategic to balance the history while making progress. Diverse viewpoints need to come together to collaborate and design guidelines. Parking is limited in OT/CT, so closing surface lots will not help since that will make it more difficult to lease open space. We should work with PDC to redevelop surface lots, not close them.
19. Patricia Gardner, Pearl District NA: This plan builds on decades of past plans. The Pearl District is a great location for growth in the Central City and is a key location for density throughout the entire city so other areas of the city can remain as is. Portland is quite low-density at this time; it has room to grow in rich and livable ways that welcome people of all incomes and abilities. As a reminder, there is no change to FAR with the height suggestions in the plan.
20. Roger Leachman: Opposed to the height increases and emphatically seconds the comments of those before me who have spoken about height issues. A trailer park is more connected than a high-rise. My 6-story building creates a neighborhood feel, where I meet my neighbors. Community erodes in impersonal too-tall towers.
21. Joan Kvitka, South Auditorium Greenway Environs (SAGE): Supports the South Auditorium proposal. Open space should be integrated with high-density and a balanced approach. Protection of the Halprin Open Space is vital to Portland’s commitment to leading by design. The Green Loop must blend with the development. We need to stabilize connectivity and create linkages for bikes/pedestrians to the new bridge and South Waterfront.



22. Daniel Kaven, Kaven & Co: Developer and designer. Regarding the height increases in OT/CT, 100 feet versus 175 feet, it's cheaper to develop a 6-story (70 feet), but it's a less substantial, inferior structural system. The extra 3 floors don't provide the economy of scale we'd need. 175 feet allows for high-quality and long-lasting buildings to help build the vibrancy of the neighborhood.
23. Deanna Mueller-Crispin: West End resident. The cultural history in Portland is being lost. The older buildings offer public benefits such as affordability. 100+ historic buildings need to continue to exist in human-scale surroundings. The 460 foot limits in the West End was an unfortunate misstep that needs to be rectified, but the draft plan perpetuates the problem. What are the true public benefits of tall buildings? Public benefits in existing buildings would support low-carbon development goals instead of demolishing and replacing.
24. Lynn Longfellow, Oregon Nikkei Endowment: Voiced concerns with the OT/CT district regarding heights. Chinese and Japanese American community members have been discussing the need to preserve OT/CT. The recommendations in the plan to raise heights show that the concerns of the community have not been taken yet. This is the only historic district where height increases are being proposed. The value of diversity and retention of the district should be prioritized. Portland has historically done a poor job of acknowledging the work and role of its diverse communities. We need to keep the current scale of the district and maintain 100 foot max building height.
25. Wilfred Mueller-Crispin: Shared examples from German cities show that high-rise is non-livable; they are for business means only. They create an environment that is not very conducive to people going to visit the area, and they crowd out the historic aspects. He's not against high-rises, but we don't need huge companies to create economic viability.
26. Debbie Kitchin, Central Eastside Industrial Council (CEIC): Board and members are concerned about the portion of the plan that would impact ability to move freight out of the area. The Central Eastside saw growth even in the recession. We need to be able to move products to market easily and efficiently. We are concerned about the proposed bridge ramp changes; the CEIC wants freight movement to continue with access to I-5, Naito and Highway 30.
27. Justin Fallon Dollard, Portland Public Schools: Served on West Quad SAC as technical advisor. He focused on Lincoln High School's proposed zoning change to central commercial. He recognizes the unique location of the high school and opportunities to develop partnerships. There has been important work done by staff on the proposed zoning update, which has the community excited. Timeline for rezoning for Lincoln is proposed in the next 1.5 years.
28. Bob Sallinger, Audubon of Portland: Submitted a minority report on the SAC process. Environmental representatives both wrote minority report. It is less a matter of conflict than the fact that we didn't really get to the environmental issues, which is a big disappointment. There is a lack of actions, vague notes and lots of placeholders for what should be very baseline components. We have discussed with staff since the end of the process, but it needs to be part of the process. The plan doesn't connect back to other plans (e.g. the Climate Action Plan and Watershed Plan). There are not really bold or innovative aspects in the West Quad plan; we're resting on our "green laurels" instead of being a leading city. We need river recovery and salmon recovery components to be included. We have an opportunity to reconnect people to the river for ecological reasons as well. There should be ecoroof requirements included for buildings as well.

29. Mary Vogel: Lives on SW 12<sup>th</sup> with “too much air and noise pollution”. She endorses the freeway caps as part of the plan to reduce pollution and make neighborhood more livable. A minority report shows that there are not enough specific actions for green and environmental needs. We need to increase tree canopy in the West End with specific street tree goals. Building commercial buildings without street trees leaves a blank streetscape.
30. David Gold, Goldsmith Blocks: OT/CT focus. The increased height limits fosters development, but closing surface parking lots will create more challenges for the district. Uwajamaya would have been a great project for OT/CT, but it failed because it wasn't financially viable with lease rates and parking issues. The 100 foot limit will probably create 75 foot buildings; 175 will likely get same FAR but higher quality buildings. If we just figure out how to build “something” on a parking lots, we don't get anywhere.
31. Ann Forsthoefel, James Beard Public Market: The public market does want to take empty parking lots and create building lots there with a plaza connecting them. It will connect river to downtown. The new market plan estimates show it would create 350 jobs and attract about 850,000 visitors annually. The market site is a foot of Morrison Bridge, and the proposal works with current height allowances.
32. Reza Farhoodi: Lives in Central City. The plan works for vision of the city. We don't want arbitrary caps. Demographics are changing, and cities are naturally dense places. We should concentrate density in the Central City to create vibrant neighborhoods outside this area. Portland has many traditional single-family neighborhoods, and it makes the most sense to build tall and dense in the inner city. I approve the plan as drafted.
33. Jason Franklin, PSU: Member of the West Quad SAC. Thanks to staff for the work on the plan and increased FAR at the University Place site of PSU. PSU sells education, and it Portland. We need a dense downtown core and area around the university. I encourage the PSC to adopt this plan. The Mayor asked the SAC to think big and to think of a new vision for downtown. That has gotten lost in the discussion about height. We need to look at what things will make downtown a great place for the future of Portland, e.g. the Green Loop and reclaiming the riverfront.
34. William Galen: Objects to the proposed height limits. The blocks are too narrow to accommodate huge buildings, and the area will be threatened with large buildings.
35. Chris Kopea, Downtown Development Group: You can't pick a more inopportune height than 100 feet. Buildings of this size offer lesser amenities and safety; it's not a good type of structure for the long-term. Over 75 feet is substantially more expensive, but it is much more durable and flexible in terms of design. Skidmore/OT district hasn't redeveloped because of the rent structure there, not because of the surface parking lots. We need to focus on how to make buildings work.
36. Dan Petrusich: Flexible zoning is not controversial; we should change areas to have several types of zoning. The Pearl District is a great success from this. Supports the Lincoln HS rezoning. Regarding height limit increases, he recommends adoption of increases at bridgeheads. We might need a bit more work at OT/CT. Also, increased heights don't necessarily mean increased density. Portland is the “shortest” city on the West Coast with only 4 buildings over 400 feet. Even in Paris, there are tall (600 foot) buildings. He recommends the West Quadrant Plan as drafted.

37. Tom Neilsen: Read the testimony from Michael Mehaffy. Portland needs to maintain its leadership in planning and sustainability. The supply-side model is not the answer to our problems, as has been shown in LA, London and elsewhere because it creates expensive urban cores, which is not equitable. The proposed move to deregulate heights is unwise. Livability is Portland's greatest asset.
38. John Czarnecki: Architect. He appreciates the efforts on the West Quad Plan but noted intended density and locations of taller buildings must be analyzed. He supports the minority report provided by Steve Pinger, which has the formal support of the NWDA.
39. John Russell: Skidmore still has not developed... why? It's not due to a lack of investment or time. It is unique in the preponderance of surface lots, which creates a dead neighborhood. How can you revitalize an area without buildings in the area? He is happy with the wording in the draft plan but doesn't want to give up on the surface parking issue.
40. Steve Pinger: Member of the West Quad SAC and NWDA planning committee that drafted the minority report. This is not intending to be "anti-tall building". It is to encourage a meaningful distribution of tall buildings in specific areas, not all throughout the West Quad. What are the impacts of big buildings to people on the street? That is the question to assess the public benefits.

**Written Testimony Received:**

- Joseph and Lynn Angel; JC Milne
- Cliff Breedlove
- Nancy Catlin
- Mary M. Cramer
- Jo Durand
- Peter Finley Fry
- Janet Flaherty
- William Galen
- Jere Grimm (x2)
- Robert D. Hermanson
- Martin and Sandra Jaecksch
- Suzanne Lennard
- Michael W Mehaffy, Sustasis Foundation
- Jeff Merrick
- Bob Sallinger and Jeanne Galick
- NWDA (and revised report)
- Stephanie Oliver
- Anne O'Neill
- Shirley Rackner
- Wendy Rahm
- Barbara Ryberg
- Martha Van Dyke
- Amy Veranth
- Mary Vogel (and revised memo)
- Rudolph Westerband
- Andrew Steinman
- Norma Dody
- Brooks Hickerson
- Paula Lifschey
- Deanna Mueller-Crispin
- SAGE (South Auditorium Greenway Environs)

- Andrew Steinman
- Sharon Whitney
- AIA/APA/ASLA Urban Design Panel
- Ramona Kearns
- Koren Backstrand
- Unico
- City of Portland Bureau of Environmental Services
- Sheila Brandlon
- Jack Rocheld
- Lucille Chomowicz
- Portland Historic Landmarks Commission
- Don Drake
- Michael Harrison, OHSU
- Ted Grund
- Jeff Nudelman, Harsch Investment Properties
- Debbie Kitchin, CEIC
- Wendy Rahm
- Taz Loomans
- Raihana Ansary, PBA
- Pearl District NA
- 

*Chair Baugh* closed public testimony. The written record will remain open until October 1.

#### **Discussion about themes heard today**

*Commissioner Houck* asked staff to come back to address issues about the lack of environmental specificity, in particular the inherent conflict of river development and climate change issues. He has concerns about building heights but needs more information from a design perspective to make an informed recommendation.

*Commissioner Oxman:* We heard a lot about building height. We need to know more about the proposed increases. What do we embrace, and what do we risk losing when we add height?

*Commissioner Gray* is drawn to subject of OT/CT. She is saddened by Portland's Chinatown, which is so unlike the vibrant Chinatown in San Francisco.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* No one today discussed mixed-age housing. We need a provision for seniors to comfortably and affordably live in the area. Height concerns are a classic example of the two sides of development. What are best practices in other cities around the world?

*Commissioner Schultz:* It's a testament to previous planning projects how many people testified today; it is great to have all the voices and perspectives. We could have included more housing-specific targets in the plan.

*Commissioner Smith:* On the height issue, we have a process challenge because this is not a West Quadrant question; it's a Central City or all Portland question of "Paris versus Vancouver". We will be a hybrid, but which direction will we lean toward? The 1980 Comp Plan pushes us towards Vancouver, but now we're hearing questions about it. Can we make space between the quadrant plans and have a conversation about what height means at that time? The West Quadrant Plan moves toward Vancouver... and how we can do it well. I'm concerned about bridgeheads and stepping down to river as well as OT/CT equity issues. I'm intrigued about public versus private benefits of building height. Regarding parking in Skidmore, I'm open to a variety of tools, but I also don't want this same discussion in 30 years... we need an action plan, not just aspirations.

*Commissioner Tallmadge:* Talking about affordable housing, there is an increased attention to workforce and middle-income housing, but not affordable housing. We need to increase housing for all income levels, but where will we compensate for people who may be pushed out of OT/CT? Historical preservation, economic development and affordability need to be balanced. We need to reevaluate the financial feasibility and resiliency factors of buildings and height limits.

*Commissioner Hanson:* I'm not alarmed by the height increases but would advocate a more "surgical" approach. Too much height in too many places isn't good, but we can do height in the right places. Save the buildings that already have the right scale, and make them blend in more. Taller, more slender buildings could be a good choice. I'm also keenly interested in the first 30 feet of tall buildings. Environmental issues - are they in the right place? They probably need to be in this plan, but where are the best placed? We need more clarity about flooding on the Willamette shoreline and how we can deal with those issues. Ross Island is also a concern as noted by *Commissioner Houck*.

*Chair Baugh:* Thanked all the testifiers today who shared their perspectives. We can't look at height or parking in isolation; they are linked to all other aspects. The health and height questions, and height to demographic concern is intriguing. Environment is a critical component too. Low-income housing is a missing component.

## **Proposed Amendments to Six Portland Urban Renewal Areas**

Briefing: Javier Mena, PHB; Lisa Abuaf, PDC; Kimberly Branam, PDC

### **Document:**

- [URA Documents Packet](#)

### **Presentation:**

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6963194/view/URAAmndpresentation.PDF>

### **Objectives:**

- Reduce impact of urban renewal on taxing jurisdictions
- Provide resources to meet City's community development , economic development, and affordable housing goals
- Support Portland State University (PSU)

### **Proposal:**

- Close or reduce: Willamette Industrial, River District, Airport Way, Education District Urban Renewal Areas (URAs)
- Extend and expand: North Macadam, Central Eastside URAs
- Solidify partnership with PSU via Development Agreement

North Macadam and Central Eastside URAs have a hearing at the October 21 PSC meeting.

### **The package:**

- Will return over \$1B of property tax value to the tax rolls in FY15-16
- Will provide an additional \$5M to taxing jurisdictions next fiscal year
  - approximately \$1.5M to the City of Portland
- And, provide an additional over \$150M (\$67M NPV) to taxing jurisdictions over 30 years
  - Over \$45M (\$20.7 NPV) over 30 years for City of Portland
- The package of changes to the 6 URAs - and a close out approach for the South Park Block URA that add \$5M to affordable housing - leaves Portland Housing Bureau

- effectively held harmless (NPV of \$1.5M)
- Align TIF dollars where we believe we have the key opportunities
  - And areas where it's important for the city to have resources to invest in

The PSC is not being asked to approve the Plan, but rather make a recommendation to the City Council on the conformance of the changes to the existing Comprehensive Plan.

When we next come to the PSC on October 21, staff will have draft amended URA plans and reports (including findings and conformance) for the two substantial amendments.

Proposal for North Macadam URA:

- Expand N Macadam to include about 35 acres of the Education URA
- Release remaining Education URA acreage and property tax revenue in FY15-16
- Extend last date to issue debt by 5 years
- No change to maximum indebtedness

PDC is analyzing particular sites like ZRZ's 30 acres, OHSU's Schnitzer campus, the Harbor/Naito area and Lincoln Station and identifying infrastructure and development investment that follows on the City's West Quad findings and URA plan goals.

They are in the midst of negotiating development agreements with PSU and ZRZ that identify the partnerships needed to implement development at the south end of the Central City and commits to public investment in projects like SW Bond, the Greenway concurrent with adjacent development.

Expansion and extension of the CES URA:

Investments at the north end of the district are concluding with the completion of the Burnside/Couch couplet and active projects on all properties at the Burnside Bridgehead.

Over the past year, PDC has worked closely with BPS and the SE Quad committee in looking at the strategic sites. The analysis has supported BPS and the to better understand land use and transportation opportunities and impacts while identifying development related next steps that can run concurrent to BPS's zoning recommendations. Specific areas of opportunity that we have analyzed are at sites like the 3 parcel ODOT blocks at the center of the district and the Clinton Triangle.

The URA amendment findings focus on these key opportunity sites for future redevelopment while assuming current zoning so as to remain in conformance with existing code, plans and strategies.

**Discussion: What will be helpful for PSC members to deliberate on these issues?**

*Commissioner Hanson:* Does the boundary for the North Macadam URA preclude greenways at the river's edge?

- No, that was already completed.

*Commissioner Smith:* I looked at the URA amendments during the budget process last year. They are well thought-out and constructed. Has there been an equity analysis done on the dollars moving around?

*Commissioner Shapiro:* What about greatly adding to affordable housing? Please include this.

*Commissioner Gray:* Concurred with *Commissioner Smith's* question about equity and where the reductions are. Regarding public outreach, how has it been done in East Portland happened?

- We will ensure the conversation with EPAP has happened. The Airport Way URA

changes were more administrative; we are not collecting additional taxes aside from paying off there, so this was an opportunity to right-size the acreage and free up funds in case we want to add another URA or area in the future.

*Chair Baugh:* On the list for your outreach, there are lots that are downtown focused, but I didn't see a specific conversation with them. We will have to evaluate the proposal against the existing Comp Plan, but we talked about the lack of affordable housing in the new plans. What is the connection to the future downtown plans specifically for affordable housing? What is the displacement policy within URAs?

- Staff showed the impacts to affordable housing by URA (slide).
- We have an eye towards the new plans, and the changes are intended to seize the new plans, particularly in the Central Eastside (e.g. Clinton Station opportunities).

As we look at the changes to the URAs, looking at additional resources for affordable housing to achieve goals we have outlined. In North Macadam, there is an additional \$23M proposed. Staff will show the balance of what opportunities are.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* In the calendar, we see meetings with us and with the PDC Commission. I'd like to advocate for another joint meeting with that Commission in this kind of planning before the fact going forward.

## **Comprehensive Plan Update: Citywide Systems Plan and Transportation System Plan**

Briefing: Eric Engstrom; Art Pearce, PBOT; Courtney Duke, PBOT; Peter Hurley, PBOT

### **Document:**

- [CSP Changes Memo](#)

### **Presentations:**

- Citywide Systems Plan
- Transportation System Plan:  
<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6963196/view/TSPPresentation.PDF>

Eric provided an overview of the Citywide Systems Plan.

Today, Portland's City-owned infrastructure is worth \$31B. That's about \$50,000 per person in Portland. The Citywide Systems Plan (CSP) is a supporting document to the Comprehensive Plan. It relates to the Significant Project List, which is adopted as an element of the updated Comp Plan.

The Citywide Systems Team is a multi-bureau partnership (PBOT, PWB, PP&R, BES, OMF, BPS) that meets regularly to prepare background information for the Portland Plan, this work and the project lists.

Draft CSP draws on a number of previous plans. Much came out of the PEGs for the Working Draft and now the Proposed Draft of the Comp Plan.

The State of Oregon's Growth Management Act requires cities and counties to develop and implement public facilities plans. At a minimum, the public facilities plan (PFP) must describe transportation, water, and sewer facilities needed to support the land uses designated in the acknowledged Comprehensive Plan. Portions of the CSP will serve as the City's state-mandated public facilities plan.



The CSP goes beyond the state planning requirements and includes chapters related to parks and recreation and other essential facilities, such as technology and civic assets. This was done in the interest of more coordinated and comprehensive planning and to recognize the critical roles these systems play in meeting the needs of Portlanders and supporting the overall mission of the City of Portland.

The CSP is organized into:

5 citywide chapters

1. Overview of the planning context and process;
2. Description of the City's asset management approach;
3. Discussion of how CSP supports the CPU Guiding Principles (equity, prosperity, human health, watershed health, resiliency);
4. Summary of infrastructure systems and investment strategies;
5. Relevant goals and policies from the Public Facilities and Transportation chapters of the CP Goals & Policies document.

Bureau-specific chapters include:

- inventories of existing systems
- discussions of infrastructure needs
- investment strategies

Projects on the Map App are the same as those included in the CSP. Members of the public can make official testimony through the MapApp.

Eric walked through the various infrastructure components in the proposed CSP for each specific component (BES, PWB, PBOT, PP&R, and other essential facilities and systems).

*Commissioner Oxman:* There are a number of ways to cost things out. How is this calculated?

- There are procedures, and the City has been working to standardize the procedures among different bureaus. Maintenance is not traditionally part of the land use / growth management framework. Portland has a growth-management strategy to grow up, not out. The CSP purposefully brings in maintenance more so than previously, but it's still not completely consistent.

*Commissioner Houck* was surprised not to see dollar amounts listed. How do we set priorities without knowing what the costs are?

- The Comp Plan doesn't choose what gets built; the CIP and Council budget decisions do. This provides a menu of what priorities are.

*Chair Baugh:* If we're trying to make decisions about the Comp Plan, we do need to have a ballpark about what we're putting into one neighborhood versus another.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about broadband. We rely primarily on the private sector to provide it, but Portland is about 200<sup>th</sup> in terms of connection speeds, and it's not equitably available around the city. The City potentially has influence over broadband and access since we have fair amount of fiber resources. This should be included in the plan.

- We talked lots about this as well as electric utilities. One thought was to take the step to include parks, and in the next few years we could review what the City's role is for broadband and utilities.

Staff is hosting three Open Houses about the Comp Plan Update: Sept 10, 16 and 18. The hearings at the PSC are September 23, October 14 and 28, November 4.

Art, Courtney and Peter introduced the Transportation System Plan (TSP), which is a focus on the transportation of the Comp Plan.

The TSP is the 20-year plan to guide transportation investments in Portland. The TSP meets state and regional planning requirements and addresses local transportation needs. It includes:

- Policies that guide the maintenance, development and implementation of
- Portland's transportation system.
- A list of projects and a financial plan that will accommodate 20 years of
- Population and employment growth.
- Master Street Plans and modal plans.
- Strategies and regulations for implementation, including street classification maps.

We know growth is coming

- 120,000 new households by 2035
  - 150,000 new commute trips per day
- And... the current roadway system can't support growth with current mode split

We need a Balanced System

- More safe choices for short trips
- Saving space for longer trips and trips that must use vehicles
- A system that works for everyone, including:
  - Commuters
  - Parents
  - Shippers
  - Disabled residents
  - Diverse populations

We are trying to distill all the directions that transportation can go. There are seven outcomes that are informing how we're orienting the TSP.

Chapters 3, 4, 6, 8 and 9 of the Comp Plan all include policy changes to transportation-related policies.

Peter walked through the four different revenue scenarios. Regardless of how optimistic we are, in comparing to the candidate project list costs, it is 2-3 times the cost of the projected revenue. So we have to prioritize to determine where we'll spend the limited funds we do have.

There are a number of projects as well as maintenance and operations that need to be prioritized. We are not doing a full call for new projects, but some projects will be studied to see if they'll land on the priority list in the future.

7 evaluation criteria to prioritize projects:

- Safety
- Access
- Cost
- Equity
- Environment
- Health
- Economics

Staff will take the smaller list of projects and evaluate them based on these 7 criteria. The eighth item is community support or opposition, which will play a role via the TSP hearing.

Different areas of the city have gaps and deficiencies, so part of the evaluation criteria (access / network) captures this. We want to create a full network of access instead of just individual projects.

After the evaluation, we will have a prioritized list.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the weighting of the criteria.

- They are currently not weighted. If there are adjustments we have to make, that will help to make modifications in the process, but we can't make those adjustments until we complete the exercise.
- *Commissioner Hanson*: You should take a project or two to test them through this process to try out the methodology.

*Commissioner Gray*: Where are projects that have disappeared off lists going? How is staff communicating to groups when projects look like they're disappearing?

- On October 13, there will be an updated candidate list.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the expenditures being 2-3 times available revenue. Is this typical?

- The Metro regional TSP has a large unconstrained component. It is typical to have the constrained list with this gap. This is why we doing an Our Streets program – to help chip away at the larger need. There is a significant gap that is a major issue to achieve the 20-year targets.

The first TSP hearing is part of the Comp Plan hearing on November 4. We will also have a TSP-specific hearing on February 24 with the revised and sorted/prioritized list and additional policy changes that come out of work sessions with the PSC this winter.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about West Quad and the 40 percent of the public realm being taken up by the transportation system. Is that explicitly integrated into your thinking? We have many opportunities to improve that public realm. BES makes an explicit statement that exposes how we value green infrastructure, which is an accounting problem. I'm hopeful we can have an action item that says that Portland will work with partners to attack that problem at a national level to change the accounting system to capitalize green infrastructure.

- Yes, see policies in Chapters 3 and 4. We are recommending the street for use for movement and for people.
- We don't yet have the tools to account for green infrastructure, but we are trying to do this. It was a hot topic in conversations. It relates to maintenance, too, because we have to maintain it.

*Chair Baugh*: PBOT should coordinate with BPS that is working with groups (e.g. IRCO) who may think about transportation much differently than we do. This should be included in how we evaluate and look at projects.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 5:00 p.m.

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, August 12, 2014

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Sallie Edmunds, Eric Engstrom, Kathryn Hartinger, Roberta Jortner, Karl Lisle, Barry Manning, Nicholas Starin, Deborah Stein, Marty Stockton, Joe Zehnder

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

*Commissioner Smith* asked to amend the record regarding his involvement with other committees. To the list he gave previously, he wishes to add: the Climate Action Plan update, TSP update and City Budget Advisory.

*Commissioner Schultz* thanked *Commissioner Houck* for the invitation to the Ride of the Visionaries. It was great: great contacts, great conversations, easy ride.

### Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Nothing to report at this time.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 7/22/14 PSC Meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Houck* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved.

(Y9 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### Comprehensive Plan Update: Maps

Briefing: Eric Engstrom, Roberta Jortner, Deborah Stein, Marty Stockton

Documents:

- [Down Designations](#)

Presentation:

[http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6927653/view/PSC\\_compplan\\_maps.PDF](http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6927653/view/PSC_compplan_maps.PDF)

This is the second of three briefings about the Comprehensive Plan Update; the third will be in September. We want to touch on some mapping issues you'll be hearing about.

With regard to the Map App, even though items are presented in a fragmented way, it's important to remember that it's actually a cohesive whole. You will be adopting the entire map, not just the changes. You'll be recommending adoption of 100 percent of the map.

Through all of our analysis, the city has an enormous amount of capacity. We are making sure that where we add capacity makes the most sense. We want to encourage growth where it can most effectively support complete neighborhoods, active healthy living, meet demand for jobs, reduce carbon emissions, etc. We also have the opportunity to deemphasize growth.

We think we'll be hearing some testimony on some of these areas: job growth, natural hazards, residential densities further from centers, and jobs and housing in East Portland.

What's the difference between the Comprehensive Plan Map and zoning? Essentially the difference is that the map is looking in to the future, while zoning is what is allowed today. For the most part, these match up, but in some areas they don't. That difference may be due to a longer range vision of what that place might be but other things need to happen before it can realize that vision.

Staff gave an overview on proposed map changes to add capacity for job growth. This is one of the core things that is part of the process — if we accomplish nothing else, we need to hit our projected job need, housing needs and supporting infrastructure.

- Colleges and hospitals: There's an effort to take the larger colleges and hospitals and give them employment designations. Lewis and Clark, Reed, U of Portland. PSU and OHSU already have employment designations.
- Gateway District employment area: There's a small change in Gateway. Gateway is the city's largest Center outside of the Central City. Much of Gateway was subject to a lot of up zoning in anticipation of Gateway becoming a second downtown to serve East Portland. A small section there is currently light industrial and we're proposing to move that back to an employment designation with a thinking that as places like the Central Eastside increase in value and become denser, some of that activity could move out to Gateway and create an environment similar to what's there now.
- 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue: There's a similar change South of Montavilla north of the PCC campus. Currently, existing uses are auto uses and light manufacturing - and we are proposing to retain that strip as a more employment focused area. This is a preliminary step in terms of taking a much more focused look at 82<sup>nd</sup> after the Comprehensive Plan work is complete.
- Additional new employment sites in East Portland: At what's currently Rossi Farm, we are looking at rezoning away from high density housing and change the mix to include more employment. We know there's a mismatch of jobs/housing, particularly in East Portland. We're looking at that balance.
- Golf courses: There aren't many places where we're looking at additional industrial land. But there is one place where we're suggesting some conversion (see the map). Changing the designation to a mix of employment and industrial land would create an opportunity should property owners want to take advantage of that. Zoning changes would wait until future agreements are reached.
- West Hayden Island: The Comp Plan covers Portland's urban services boundary, so in some cases, this goes beyond the city boundary. The thinking is that we have an existing policy framework that represents a status quo situation on Hayden Island. It's been brought into the Urban Growth Boundary, it has not been taken up by Council.

What we've done here is establish a special designation for West Hayden Island that embodies that policy mix; we believe it represents that status quo policy. This is not an annexation decision, but it is consistent with the 2010 recommendation of 300/500 acre split. Putting it in the Comp Plan does not cause annexation but it sets up a policy/mapping basis for what we do next if a proposal comes back. This is not a zoning decision. This is a placeholder designation.

## Discussion

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked if the college map change reauthorized large institutional "creep" into neighborhoods, particularly hospitals.

- *Staff:* The proposal is to map the existing boundaries of the campus. It would address issues within the existing boundaries, not change the boundaries.

*Commissioner Smith:* Help me understand the distinction between the Institutional Campus designation and the underlying zoning and what that allows. My interest is in seeing a more holistic knitting of these institutions into the community, instead of a hard edge. How will that designation translate into zoning?

- *Staff:* Many campuses have low density residential zoning underneath and have to go through a Master Plan conditional use update process every few years. By designating these with an employment use, we create a different approach than the conditional use approach. We wouldn't change everything at once. We would implement things as existing Master Plans sunset out. At that time, campuses would have the opportunity to switch to the new zone - but there would still be a review process and Master Planning processes. These are trailing the policy and map proposal by 6 months to a year. We are hoping to have public review documents out for review this winter.

*Commissioner Baugh:* On the hospital, this change gives them the right to update the Master Plan without going through the Conditional Use process, but they also wouldn't have to engage the community in that large process?

- *Staff:* The process for updates are just being updated. It won't be a conditional use process, but there will be required community engagement. We are not moving to a blank check, by-right approach.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Before you get to zoning, during the Comp Plan process, is there a way to build the community engagement in?

- *Staff:* The policies do have statements about the intent - there is material that talks about that in the Comp Plan policies.

Staff gave an overview of proposed map changes to address natural hazards and drainage constraints.

[VIDEO]

To add a little more detail, the areas that you just heard about make up about 720 acres, which is less than 1 percent of the city. The areas on the map represent a unique convergence of areas with a lot of development potential and those with natural hazards and infrastructure constraints, making down designations an appropriate tool. We expect some property owners to be concerned about reduced development potential and impacts on property values. We know that some neighborhoods will actually support the proposal - Linton, areas near Oaks Bottom, etc.

You're going to hear a lively mix of comments. We know that this tool won't eliminate all risks or improve current conditions - the city will need to continue to invest in green and grey infrastructures, and continue to work on natural hazard mitigation strategies into the future.

**Staff reviewed proposed map changes in residential areas further from Centers and Corridors.** We do expect to hear a great deal of testimony from advocates and opponents of these changes.

*Commissioner Houck:* What I thought I heard was that by being very strategic, we won't run into the conversation of expanding the UGB while protecting natural resources. What I'm hearing is that we have the opportunity to get out of that lose-lose conversation we've had over the years about not protecting natural resources because we need to expand the UGB. Is that an accurate understanding?

- *Staff:* Yes, we do have enough residential capacity, largely because we're seeing dense, mixed use, transit oriented development that makes this possible.

*Commissioner Houck:* You're going to hear a lot of comments about West Hayden Island. When I look out ten or 15 years, my experience in the past is that somebody will point to that map and say West Hayden Island was designated for jobs. In my opinion, you noted that, through the language and map designation, we have gone to the status quo, which was the City Council proclamation. In my opinion, the status quo is all of the work we did that resulted in the recommendation from the PSC that put specific requirements on mitigation should the island be developed. I don't know how we convey the intent of the status quo to future decision makers.

- *Staff:* The Map App is a communication device. We simplified things for the App. The actual Comp Plan Map is a little different and there will be discussion of the policies that go with that.

*Commissioner Houck:* Seems to me there could be more blue up there related to industrial lands. Why was there no discussion of brownfields and intensification of uses?

- *Staff:* The map doesn't show everything. For example, the Central City is not included. We didn't map the brownfield program but we do know where they are.
- *Director Anderson:* You need to look at the policies and the map. That's how you get the complete picture.
- *Commissioner Houck:* Roberta's presentation talked about hazards but I didn't hear reference to flood plain. It seems to me that is an issue as well.
- *Staff:* There is one significant area (Powell Butte South) that is in the floodplain, but again, we were looking for the convergence with development density. These are mostly residential areas. In industrial areas, down designations aren't really the right tools. We are interested in looking at impervious area limits, and broadening those to other areas.

**Staff reviewed proposed map changes in East Portland.**

We are also proposing a number of residential down designations in East Portland that are designed to reduce development pressures in areas where the infrastructure hasn't caught up to the existing densities (122, 136<sup>th</sup> Avenue), we're seeing strains on the David Douglas School District and we'd like to reduce some of that pressure and allow infrastructure to catch up.

As you know, East Portland has about 25% of Portland's population, but 40% of the city's children, so we really need to look at infrastructure as well as things like Safe Routes to School. As you also may know, we're working with all of the large school districts to make sure we're sharing data about enrollment projections, etc. Some in David Douglas are significantly over capacity. We will be having MOUs and IGAs with each of the school districts to work together over time.

*Commissioner Oxman:* In East Portland, what's the venue to discuss policy approaches to this problem? How do we consider the demographics? How do we educate kids? How do we create



housing in a better fashion? How do we get to that conversation?

- *Staff:* The housing policies and the public facilities policies both address this. The public facilities chapter defines public schools as public facilities, which changes their relationship to land use.

*Commissioner Baugh:* I am concerned about conflict policies in East Portland — transportation and investment policies — we have transportation policy that says we're going to target dense areas for investment, and this leaves the low density folks who already don't have sidewalks to continue being a low priority for transportation investments. How do we balance?

- *Staff:* We're doing at least two things to balance. We're not taking away all the growth for one. There's already quite a bit of density out there. We're making small downward adjustments, but there will still be transit-supporting density. We're also making it more explicit in the policies that we need to look at the equity component in addition to the density. This is a way to catch up the places that aren't caught up.
- *Director Anderson:* Part of this too, we can really pull it apart for you if there are only a certain number of these big questions. We can help you really get down to what it is we are proposing.

*Commissioner Baugh:* I want to make sure people have access to things like sidewalks - those things are connected to bigger things like the Climate Action Plan. I would appreciate you breaking things down.

## CC2035 West Quadrant Plan

Briefing: Sallie Edmunds, Karl Lisle

### Documents:

- [Staff Memo](#)
- [Briefing Packet](#)
- [Proposed Draft](#)

### Presentation:

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6927655/view/>

*Commissioner Schultz* introduced the plan. She gave an overview of the SAC process: 33 people, 16 meetings. Staff did a great job. We have a number of "big ideas" — the riverfront, the "Green Loop," capping of I-405, a Times Square on Burnside. There were some great ideas that came out of that. In general, the committee had pretty good consensus. Some concerns were expressed: strengthening of the environmental goals, a fair amount of discussion about building heights, especially with regard to the West End, and also a lot of testimony about a more holistic historic preservation strategy.

Staff reviewed previous planning efforts and the project timeline, the Concept Plan and the idea of a Center of Innovation and Exchange

*Commissioner Shapiro:* We are also a Central City that is recognized as a center of creativity. I'm wondering if "creativity" could be added to that language.

- *Staff:* It's a great point.

Staff gave an overview of the West Quadrant boundary and each of the seven districts.

*Commissioner Smith:* In the beginning of this process, there was some consideration of including some areas of the Northwest District Association area. What happened with that?

- *Staff:* Yes, we had an earlier version of the map that included some areas, like Conway and Kelly Triangle. These areas were dropped, largely because Conway moved on

separately on its own; with regard to the southern area, we dropped it because we don't have ODOT fully engaged in this process and at the table.

Staff reviewed the process, the stakeholder advisory committee selection process, and the plan outline.

*Director Anderson:* The way we're doing this process, is that we adopted the N/NE Q Plan and Concept Plan by resolution, not by ordinance. It's an iterative process, we're learning things as we go, and we're feeding those back in to the earlier processes. By next fall, we'll have put it all together for your review and eventual adoption by City Council. It will eventually become part of the Comprehensive Plan. We know that not every detail is in the plan.

Staff reviewed issues on which the Commission is likely to hear testimony:

- **Building Heights:** staff reviewed existing and proposed height maps, highlighting areas of proposed change, both increases and decreases, and gave rationales for each. There are not changes proposed in Goose Hollow, the West End, most of South Downtown, and most of downtown except at the bridgeheads.
- **Old Town/Chinatown:** what you'll hear most about is this one little three block section, related to RC4 in the Old Town/Chinatown draft. People are somewhat split on this, but the language is in the plan as a "study," to reflect that we need to think about this. We did some modeling of heights in OT/CT, and met with members of the community a lot. Opinions are really split. There are also action items in the plan about updating the Nation Historic designation, etc. There's more going on than just height, but that's probably what you'll hear most about.

*Commissioner Smith:* My neighborhood paper has made this the cause of the day. What kind of skyline do you want to have? But two questions that come up were related to social isolation and building efficiency if you go above a certain height.

*Commissioner Houck:* Shade and wind tunnel impacts too.

- *Staff:* We're not completely convinced by the social isolation argument.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* This is a much richer conversation. This is very important to set aside this conversation.

*Commissioner Bough:* Is there information you can get to us on the different sides of the argument?

- *Staff:* Yes.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Can we also get them [the other Commissioners] the Skidmore work? Many of these issues are the same issues. Can we get copies of those documents out to people?

*Commissioner Houck:* There are some really interesting visualization tools out there. I don't know if they've come down in cost. There are some pretty sophisticated tools that would give you a better idea of what things would look like. Are these drawing online in color?

- *Staff:* It's all online. And we're trying to create this flexible box to show people the size - but we need to be careful about showing too much detail and stepping on the role of design review.

Other issues:

- **Parking:** There is a desire to see surface lots redevelop - there are a number of items that look at this. There were some items proposed - the idea of taxing operational income and phasing out the legal use of these lots for parking. These were soundly

rejected by the SAC, but I don't think they're gone and you may hear about them again.

- Bridgehead height: It's not getting rid of the old policy of step-down, but it is a new interpretation of it, in a specific area. As one way to encourage more development and signature development in the Morrison Bridgehead area.
- Environmental stewardship: You have a minority report that states that we missed the boat on environmental issues. My response to that is that most of these things are in Chapter 4 and are identified in Chapter 4 as items we need to work on - but not to the level of specificity that those SAC members would like. This being an interim step kind of creates this problem. In some ways we agree with parts of the criticism. We have also added some new language (p. 144) that we think helps with this discussion.
- West End heights: We are not proposing to change heights in this district. It is an interesting mix of taller, new buildings and lower, older buildings. As we look at the targets in terms of jobs and housing, we are likely to see some taller buildings and some lower buildings. Staff was not interested in looking at an eight story West End. We think the existing taller buildings have added some vitality. We do agree that there are risks for historic preservation and there are some unprotected properties. There are some improvements we could make in terms of design. We do have several actions about historic preservation. We also have an action about increasing flexibility. We have also committed to looking at design standards and zoning tools to ensure good development.

Staff reviewed the next steps: the PSC hearing on September 9, a City Council hearing likely in October, and then a lot of work to do over the next year - to integrate the Concept Plan, quadrant plans, and a whole bunch of code work. We also have additional efforts (height/bonus study, scenic resources study, code development, including parking, and Willamette Greenway Code Development) that we need to work on.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* I never thought I could sit in a deck chair in Times Square, but I can. That idea resonated with me. We have a few existing centers - Powell's, and Providence Park - these might be better Times Square options. The other comment I want to make is that I have friends in Old Town/Chinatown, and they say that the City has been dragging its feet in this area - and what I see here is a lot of general, good stuff, but not a lot of specifics. I'd like to see a little more attention paid here.

*Commissioner Houck:* The overriding question I have - is related to changes to the draft. In the minority reports there were references to major changes between the last to versions. In order to make a judgment whether these were appropriate or not I'd like to see what language changes were made on the environmental issues. I think it would be helpful for all of us.

*Commissioner Hanson:* We've done three quadrants that form the Central City plan. Has the Central City gotten bigger?

- *Staff:* It was expanded a little bit over the years - Goose Hollow, Burnside. At this time, we're not proposing to expand the boundary but it could happen through the SE Quadrant.

*Commissioner Rudd:* The issue of activating the Waterfront has been an issue for a long time. People aren't waiting for us - they're touching the water now. We're starting to see more and more conflicts. If there are some test areas you could look at to identify where some of these difficulties are coming up and how this might be addressed in the policies, that would be helpful.

*Commissioner Houck:* Ross Island never makes its way into these plans. If we're talking about animating the river and bringing more people to the river. Over the past several weeks, I've been hearing a lot about incredible incursions on Ross Island, including camping, fires, toilets, littering. This is a huge issue we're going to have to deal with. At some point, we're going to have to be very explicit about impacts on these natural resources. I'm all for getting people to the river in a respectful way, meaning addressing potential negative environmental impacts before they happen.

*Commissioner Hanson:* On Chinatown, it's an incredible reservoir of land. Of sites that are underutilized and also some that are really unique. It's also very transit rich. The more we can do there the better.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* Tourism — we're seeing more and more — Times Square speaks to that. I want to look at "walking streets," like they do in Europe. As we develop Times Square areas, and walking streets, we're also looking at bringing a lot of people into these areas.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Great job — thank you for your efforts. Great presentation.

*Director Anderson:* I think we'll have an opportunity - after the hearing on September 9 - to make a decision on that date, but there might also be very differing opinions. I want to keep this on schedule. How do we get there? How can we raise the issues we know are going to come up - and can we start having those conversations offline because if we do them here, it's always rushed. Let's talk about how you want to do that. You have 3 or 4 weeks, it's not a lot of time. It's a commitment to diving in early and getting us comments early.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Let's take these home and dig in to it. If we can get our comments to you, and also if we can aggregate comments — you know where the public is going to come from — but we can get some background on the thinking behind the plan. How did we think about height and the Waterfront, and Ross Island, 5 years ago? Some of these things have been thought about before. Why would my decision change? Or my thinking process change? If you could refresh our memory on that work, it would be great.

- *Staff:* The height opportunity sites on the edge of Skidmore District- those are not in here.

*Commissioner Baugh:* But there were some discussions about height and why we wanted it in some places and not in others, that would be helpful.

*Commissioner Houck:* There won't be a work session on this?

*Director Anderson:* At this point, we were just planning on having the hearing, and then a discussion after that. If you can make a decision great, we don't want to rush things, but I want you all to understand that we spent a lot of time thinking big picture with the Portland Plan - you need to jump in and look at the issues. If anyone needs a pep talk, call me.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Is the opportunity there at the officer's briefing to preschedule the work session if we think we're going to need it?

- *Director Anderson:* Sure.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* This is an incredibly important piece of work. I'm concerned that other bureaus are all at the table, and I want to make sure what we advance is supported. I want our endorsement to reflect PDC's excitement and PBOT's excitement.

*Commissioner Rudd:* We're going to look at heights separate from design guidelines in Old Town/Chinatown?

- *Staff:* Yes, they would come after. We don't think we can get them both done.

*Commissioner Baugh:* This gives general direction to the future work — the height maps, the environmental work, etc.

*Director Anderson:* Yes, but that being said, details are important, so get your comments to us early.

*Commissioner Baugh:* In terms of partners — PDC, PBOT, BES, and Multnomah County — will these folks be available at the hearing?

- *Staff:* Yes, we can work on that. They have been engaged, and we can do what we can to get them here.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Let's get comments to Karl in the next week and a half, two weeks.

## **Mixed Use Zones Project**

Briefing: Eric Engstrom, Barry Manning

### **Presentation:**

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6927651/view/>

Project context (Urban Design Framework, Comp Plan Maps, Mixed Use Codes Project, and Refinement Plans): This is a necessary tool to implement the Comp Plan Map. This project is not doing the mapping. This project looks at the different regulations that might apply once those places have been identified.

Staff reviewed the Urban Design Framework, the proposed Comprehensive Plan Designation - Mixed Use Change Areas map, as well as highlights of future refinement work.

Much growth is directed at housing and employment growth in centers and corridors and our job is to figure out how to make that work. We want to fine tune our tools to be a better fit with the Comprehensive Plan.

The project has its roots in the Complete Neighborhoods concept, as well as the direction of encouraging job growth and successful neighborhood business districts. Some of the things we're thinking about in this work include building scale, transitions, required retail areas, residential areas, design, affordability and equity.

Things not addressed in the project: parking, Central City development zoning, mapping of various areas, and residential development and design standards for single and multi-dwelling residential zones.

Staff continued by reviewing the public outreach process: PAC, community meetings, walks, roundtables, open houses, PSC and City Council hearings

*Commissioner Houck:* Do you include landscape architects when you talk about design?

- *Staff:* We didn't include them specifically in this roundtable, but we will include them in the future. They provide a unique perspective.

A few highlights from the outreach process:

- Common themes from walks: address building scale and articulation; provide scale transition; encourage continuity of retail; preserve or protect significant building and key places; incentives for open space and plazas that are open to the public; improve design and use better materials; encourage housing mix; promote affordability of

commercial space as well as housing; address parking; consider allowing more intensity on key large opportunity sites.

- Roundtable highlights
  - Developers: certainty, flexibility, simplicity; incentives; lot size sensitivity; ground floor commercial/active use; predictable design system; other city requirements that conflict with zoning objectives
  - Architects/Designers: clear, concern about regulating materials choices, height, FAR; “setback budget”; design system needs overhaul to work better
  - Affordable housing developers: certainty, flexibility, simplicity; incentives don’t work the same; concern about expanding design review; mixed use development/ground floor commercial uses add costs - BOLI wage regulations apply for commercial development.
  - Neighborhood business: Parking; regulations that support compatibility; not every place is ped/mixed-use district – some places should remain flexibly for autos; concerned about loss of affordable commercial space; desire for commercial/active ground floor uses in key places.
  
- Assessment Report: Staff reviewed components of the report, would like Commission to review and provide feedback.

## Discussion

*Commissioner St. Martin:* Does active ground floor use include community use space?

- *Staff:* Yes, active use doesn’t only mean retail space - it can mean community space or even lobby space. We want to make sure that when buildings are built, they can accommodate those uses in the future.

We are still in the assessment phase of the project. We’ll be back with the concept work once we get into that, and then probably again as we transition into code work. It was important to brief you now because you’re about to hear a lot about the mixed use map designations.

*Commissioner Schultz:* You have a lot of mixed zone blocks in Portland. As you’re talking about transitions, are you looking at these mixed zone blocks? Is that more of Comp Plan issue?

- *Staff:* Those are more of a Comp Plan mapping issue. In our work, we will be looking at the transitions between these zones. How might we transition on site? This is kind of a tool box approach. You have areas where it will be difficult to get rid of the mixed zone blocks - such as SE Division.

*Commissioner Schultz:* Is there a focus on alleviating the pressure on the mixed zone blocks? Are you cleaning it up? Design Commission constantly gets in a battle on those mixed zone blocks between the residential community and what’s happening on those corridors. Stepback and transitions might help, but developers design something based on what’s allowed and then the community comes in and says no and goes to Design Commission.

- *Staff:* We’re not cleaning all that up. Part of the problem is that that back half block is often zoned for multi-dwelling housing but it hasn’t developed that way.

*Director Anderson had to leave the meeting; Chief Planner Joe Zehnder replaced her in the Director Chair.*

*Joe Zehnder:* What we’re seeing with Comp Plan is that some of these half blocks in particular centers get refined on a case by case basis. What staff will be working on is those transitions.

*Staff:* And we’re not alone in this problem. We’re hoping to learn from other cities and come up with good tools.



*Commissioner Schultz:* At the intersection of zoning code and guidelines, there's this issue of quality of materials. It's such a subjective thing. You hate to list them, but what's quality to you might be different for me. It's that intersection between these two things that make things really confusing for both communities and Design Commission.

- *Staff:* The community would like to have more opportunity for review, the development community would like more of a clear path. We're going to have to see where that balance falls. We did hear a lot about materials - but also that they change all the time - and maybe there's a threshold level that we agree with as a community, but not go into a lot of detail.

*Commissioner Schultz:* I don't know how you address this in the code to allow for this transition of material quality over time. Also, retail requires greater height and that's challenging getting floors on top of that retail height.

- *Staff:* We heard about that - and allowing for more flexibility.

*Commissioner Hanson:* We're going to be making decisions about code and about mapping. Are those going to run together? Are they on track? In parallel?

- *Staff:* You're first getting the concept map and the urban design framework. Then we're going to review the palette of zones that could be applied there - and then you'll be getting maps to look at. One process can inform the other.

*Director Zehnder:* Within these areas that you're broadly designating as centers and corridors, there's going to be a different set of new zones with new standards that we'll apply through a separate process later - but for a certain type of center, we want to choose between this and that - and what's the best way to apply that?

- *Staff:* For example, looking at Division, what kind of place is this? A Center? A Civic corridor? Then, are we looking at smaller scale zones? Bigger? What kind of place do you have? What kind of zones are appropriate there?

*Commissioner Baugh:* Regarding Powell-Division Transit - when I looked at Powell, it didn't seem like there were a lot of changes on Powell. Is this looking at the transit oriented development and then we're trying to enhance that in some way?

- *Staff:* On the mapping side, Powell and Division already have fairly intense mixed use zoning, so there wasn't a lot of change proposed there and it's a little early to do some of the refinement work. On the code side, there will be a need to make sure the more intense zones in the palette work well with transit, etc.

*Director Zehnder:* With this project, you're kind of building the toolkit. It's easier to figure out how to apply things in areas that are already Centers. We're starting to look at places like 82<sup>nd</sup> with Powell/Division, Montavilla, etc., as centers and stations along the larger corridor. When we identify these areas, then you'll have a toolkit for those places.

- *Staff:* Most of the places we're talking about are pretty well served by transit - so I'm guessing most of these zones will be transit friendly, so then there's just the question of intensity.

*Commissioner Baugh:* As I look at the cultural diversity of the businesses in the City - how do you preserve those businesses? Many of those lots are very small, and someone will just amass those smaller lots into a larger lot and price out those small businesses, changing the face of that neighborhood. How do we create a mechanism to prevent this? How do we ensure prosperity for all?

- *Staff:* There are some examples out there to look at, and we did hear about it, and it's something we'll work to address in this work.

*Commissioner Schultz:* There are communities today that don't have mixed use zones, and it's



important to remember that Portland is at the leading edge of this. This is great work.

**Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 4:11 p.m.

Submitted by Kathryn Hartinger

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, July 22, 2014

6:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Margaret Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Don Hanson

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Eric Engstrom, Kevin Martin, Deborah Stein, Julie Ocken

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

*Chair Baugh* welcomed the two new PSC members, Teresa St Martin and Margaret Tallmadge. They each briefly introduced themselves.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted that she has volunteered to be on the short-term multi-unit rentals work group. She is also sitting on the URA amendments committee with PDC. The Central City 2035 West Quadrant Stakeholder Advisory Committee wrapped up last night with general consensus. The few outstanding issues are around the West End (heights); historical resources inventory within the district, but this should be done citywide; Old Town / Chinatown / Skidmore development and parking lot issues. The project team will brief the PSC at the August 12 meeting, with the hearing on September 9.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted that it's good that we are working with PDC on the same level and is happy *Commissioner Schultz* is working on the URA group.

PSC members noted the committees that they currently serve on:

- *Commissioner Rudd:* Design Review
- *Commissioner Smith:* Streetcar Board; CAP update
- *Commissioner Schultz:*
- *Commissioner Houck:* CAP update
- *Commissioner Shapiro:* Citizen Involvement Committee
- *Chair Baugh:* Port Strategic Direction Committee
- *Commissioner Gray:* East Portland Action Plan, Ending Homeless Council (joint City/County), PDX CAC

*Commissioner Gray:* August 2 there is a Chinatown community clean-up that would be great to see people participate in.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 6/24/14 PSC Meeting

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved.

(Y8 – Baugh, Gray, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith; Abstain 2 – St Martin, Tallmadge)

## Comprehensive Plan Update: Overview and Policies

Briefing: Eric Engstrom, Kevin Martin, Deborah Stein

### Documents:

- [Proposed Comprehensive Plan](#)
- [Proposed Citywide Systems Plan](#)
- [Urban Design Direction](#)

### Presentations:

- [Comp Plan Overview](#)
- [Map App](#)

Susan Anderson introduced the plan. She thanked the numerous staff and advisors and volunteers who helped get it to this point. This is a reminder that we haven't had a new Comprehensive Plan since 1980. There's been so much change since then in Portland, and this is a new plan for the next 20 years.

Eric Engstrom provided background about the Comprehensive Plan. It is a state-mandated long-range plan to prepare for and management growth. It's a decision-making guide about land use and transportation and the physical development of the city.

Background reports include Buildable Lands Inventory, Infrastructure Conditions & Capacity, Housing Needs Analysis, Economic Opportunities Analysis (EOA) and the Natural Resources Inventory (NRI). We will be resubmitting the EOA, which is the only piece not accepted by the state earlier in 2014.

We are planning for a forecast of an additional 122,000 new households and 140,000 new jobs in the next 20 years. Most of the change is focused in centers and corridors.

The Comp Plan builds off the Portland Plan, which was adopted in 2012. This is a narrowing of the Portland Plan's scope to focus on the land use aspects. The central question is about the 12 measures of success in the Portland Plan and if the Comp Plan is advancing those.

There are 4 elements to the Comprehensive Plan:

- Goals and Policies
- List of Significant Projects
- Comprehensive Plan Map
- Portions of the Transportation System Plan (TSP)

The Citywide Systems Plan (CSP) and the Urban Design Direction are background and informational pieces about the plan.

The plan includes 7 key directions as noted on page I-9 of the full plan (also within the Introduction on the same page).

The Urban Design Framework (UDF) communicates the big picture of where the city is going physically. It also helps define place-types and language, but it is not a zoning tool. See pages I-6 and I-7 of the full plan (and the Introduction). It shows the different scales and hierarch of centers in the city.

The goals and policies portion includes 10 chapters. Goals are long-term outcomes we hope to achieve by implementing the plan. Policies are preferred direction and describe what must be done to achieve the broad goals.

Eric highlighted some of the top changes in policies since the 1980 plan:

- More direct focus on equity
- Explicit integration of public health goals and considerations
- Robust community involvement chapter
- Recognition that one size does not fit all
- Emphasis on complete communities and growth in centers and corridors
- Policy to encourage affordable housing in opportunity areas
- More planning for institutional campus growth including hospitals, colleges and large high schools
- Consideration of watershed health, integrating nature in the city, green infrastructure, climate action
- Maintaining existing infrastructure, financial constraints
- Multimodal transportation system performance standards
- For goods movement, greater emphasis on transportation investments to improve access to industrial lands
- For people movement, priority in design and investment given to most vulnerable road users
- Greater transparency in how infrastructure projects are selected to be built
- Emphasis on schools as multi-use facilities and assets that serve the community

*Commissioner Houck:* I assume the new direction on affordable housing to not put it where there aren't services but still without overly concentrating it.

- Yes, and especially with more emphasis on accessibility of locations.

Comprehensive Plan Map includes 4 categories of changes:

- Centers and corridors
- Jobs
- Risks and service gaps (either hazards, public health and safety issues; and areas that lack sidewalks, enrollment capacity of schools)
- Neighborhoods, parks and open space

The Central City is "blank" at this point because the CC2035 Plan will be working on that and will be integrated into the Comp Plan Map.

Kevin Martin shared an overview of the updated Map App. Maps are a good way to communicate to the public what we're doing. People immediately see where they are, where they work, and they are quickly more engaged. We are reaching a wider demographic that wants to look at things when they want to, 24/7, so we are now better able to engage that group and make them compelled to find out more.

Version 1.0 of the Map App was much more conceptual. It brought lots of people to the table. 22,000 unique individuals visited the app within the three months it was live. About 1200 people provided feedback. We found that people prefer to share discussion -- give feedback and see what other people have said as well, which was not a component of the original app.

*Commissioner Smith:* Did you explore any ways to include and engage with gameification?

- This is another tool we're looking at.

This version (2.0) continues to be difficult on mobile devices, but it's improved since 1.0. Both Map Apps have been produced completely in-house.

We've received about 50 comments today, the first day it became live. People can leave testimony for the PSC directly in the app.

Kevin provided a demo of the Map App (<http://www.portlandmaps.com/bps/cpmapp2/>).

Eric continued:

The Citywide Systems Plan (CSP) includes infrastructure information about a variety of City services: water, sewer, wastewater, transportation etc. For the state we are required to have a public facilities plan, a subset of the City's CSP, which includes the water, sewer and transportation aspects.

The investment strategy is another aspect of the CSP; see page 21 of the document.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that one of the big issues is that there has been an inability to capitalize lots of the green infrastructure. Is this (trees, etc) considered part of the capital in the city?

- There was effort to upgrade our treatment of green infrastructure in this version.

The Transportation System Plan (TSP) includes policy, projects, financial plan, street classification and street plans. Parts are included in the Comp Plan, and other parts are supporting information and implementation tools. This is coming in pieces: the citywide policies are in Chapter 9 of the goals and policies. The project list is not yet ranked, and we don't yet have financial plan or transportation modeling. That will evolve over the next year. In 2015, there will be more specific implementing measures.

There are many criteria that will be used to rank the TSP projects. It is a narrowing process through this fall and through to implementing projects.

Deborah shared information about the process Comprehensive Plan Update and community involvement.

Now we have a proposal, so we are shifting into a new realm. We have new audiences, so we have new approaches to engaging people.

Main objectives of the outreach now include:

- Widely share the plan, what it means and doesn't
- Make information easy to understand and help people understand difficult topics
- Continue to engage people who have been involved
- Bring special effort to engage people who have never heard of the Comp Plan: property owners, tenants, small business owners, residents in areas that we have identified as being at risk of gentrification
- Help build capacity and education people about how they can provide input and testimony

A few weeks ago we sent out a mail to all properties designated as mixed use and what we're proposing for all commercially zoned mixed use.

Next we have a postcard that will be sent early next week to property owners that are affected by other potential map changes.

A month prior to the first PSC meeting we will be sending legally-required notices to property owners. The verbiage on these notices is prescribed, so we wanted to lead with the other notices in a more friendly way.

We have set up a Comp Plan Helpline with staff at the phones who can answer calls, explain information and can walk people through their questions. We've had the line up for a couple weeks, and it has proved to be a great way for people to say what's confusing, what their fears are.

The Helpline staff can also help inform us about what people are asking the most about so we can fine-tune our messages and work better to get people the information they are looking for.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* How does the immigrant analysis work into this?

- We did an assessment of areas with high numbers of people with limited English proficiency and areas at risk of gentrification and displacement and overlaid them with proposed changes. We are working with the community engagement liaisons who work with immigrant communities throughout the city to open the door for us to learn what kinds of issues are most important to different communities.

We started a display in the lobby of this building today, which will be ongoing for the next months. We are also scheduling community open houses (likely in East Portland and St Johns) to talk with the community. A virtual open house is being developed as well. We have had ads in community newspapers, which will continue through August and September. Staff is doing some tabling at events. District liaisons will have “office hours” in libraries, community centers, etc to allow people to come talk to them at their convenience. We are also arranging for targeted small business outreach to make sure the business (especially if they’re not the property owner) know about the mixed-use changes. And we’re working with the Diversity and Civic Leadership (DCL) organizations.

In our conversations, we are sharing information about how people can provide testimony to the PSC and how they can use their voice now and in future policy discussions.

We will have a few more briefings with the PSC before hearings. At the hearings, staff will not have extensive presentations. After the last hearing, staff will work with the PSC to draft a directional statement at the end of public testimony that will help inform the work sessions in late 2014 and early 2015.

#### **Discussion**

*Commissioner Smith* asked about the sometimes confusing zoning code and the mixed-use project. Revised zoning is not an output of the Comp Plan.

- Revised zoning is the 5<sup>th</sup> step in the Comp Plan Update. Today’s release is the 4<sup>th</sup> component, and following after is a suite of implementation projects including the Mixed Use Zones project. The implementation projects will come to the PSC shortly after the Comp Plan.
- The Comp Plan Map is the map of the long-term land use plan. The Zoning Map is what we allow today. They are two different maps, and this is often confusing to people.

You mentioned we would be designating new Town Centers. Metro also has a classification of Town Centers. Do they match?

- Ultimately we have to reconcile the two plans. We also have Neighborhood Centers, at a level below Town Centers. For Town Centers we will bring a proposal to Metro to reflect what we would like to adopt.

*Commissioner Gray:* I’m very interested in the immigrant mapping. How will the information about different demographics be presented to the PSC?

- We’re using the information to inform our outreach to make sure we’re reaching people with the right liaisons and interpreters. Now that we have a proposal, we have a consultant doing an analysis of what we’re doing to see about unintended consequences of mapping, policies and proposed investments that might inadvertently do something we are not intending. That will be brought to the PSC as part of the staff work and/or proposed amendments.

I’m happy in the CSP that the guiding principles include issues around using an equity lens.

*Commissioner Houck* noted he was testifying to the Planning Commission 30 years ago about the Comp Plan. I’m impressed with the work and the huge shift from 1980 regarding natural

resource issues. One concern that's a bit down in the weeds: I did try the map with an iPhone, and the job category showed all of West Hayden Island (WHI) all included. This was a concern. In policy 6.41, there is just a generic reference to WHI. I would like to see if we could have a more explicit reference to the mitigation package for WHI and discuss what designation might be appropriate. Thinking about how we could meet our job goals in the city and the EOA, we will still run into the state Goal 9 issue, and I hope we can be creative about it.

*Commissioner Shapiro* complemented the staff's work on all the components of the plan.

*Chair Baugh* noted the amazing work and thanked the staff for their professional work. It gives lots of information to the public about our vision and what we're trying to do for the future. On the immigrant maps, will we get that information?

- We can put it together to present to or share with the PSC.

As we looked through the policies and look at vulnerability maps, we need to tie these together to mitigate some of the housing concerns and make sure we have jobs in the right places. And look at strategies to help mitigate these issues. Take a deep breath now; we have about 7 months before we make a recommendation. I encourage all the PSC members to get comments into staff as you have them so we can start to look at the issues up front.

*Commissioner Gray*: Procedurally, as we read through the documents and have questions, how do we need to ask and share our input?

- Email your questions (PSC members') to Eric and Julie. Susan is happy to meet individually with PSC members too. The better educated PSC members are, the better able the commission is to make an informed recommendation.

*Chair Baugh*: Also remember to think about the future... the city, Council, and how people will read and implement the plan 10 years from now.

For the policies in particular, they are mostly used as findings for ordinances. We have to show the basis for why we are making decisions (in the future) based on the Comp Plan policies.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 7:55 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator



## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, June 10, 2014

12:30 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Michelle Rudd

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Deborah Stein, Sallie Edmunds, Debbie Bischoff, Mindy Brooks, Julie Ocken

The new **PSC Youth Commissioner**, Maggie Tallmadge, was introduced before the meeting. Maggie is an active of a number of outreach groups and has worked with a huge variety of people really from around the world. She has participated as a member of the UN Major Group on Children and Youth and has been on the General Assembly floor, speaking to delegates and other major groups. Closer to home, she has worked with Verde and NAYA and has a great sense of Portland's needs in terms of groups and areas in the city that need a strong advocate.

Update about other **open PSC position**: Jackie and Susan met with two candidates last week and will meet with two more this week. Hopefully the Mayor will have a recommendation in the next week or two, and then we'll confirm both new PSC members in early July.

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 1:02 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

*Commissioner Smith* mentioned watching last week's RICAP 6 hearing the short-term rentals portion.

- *Chair Baugh* noted that Council heard much of what the PSC heard as well as concern about condos and apartments as well as vacation rentals. There were 2 amendments to the original ordinance. Council heard concerns about inspections and affordability of housing.

*Chair Baugh* attended an "immigrant tour" of East Portland last week with *Commissioner Gray*. Many immigrants who come start out in, for example, Hillsboro and Beaverton, and wait to get a house or apartment in Portland proper due to the lack of availability of affordable housing.

- *Commissioner Houck* noted that he was flying back from Seattle, and wound up on a much delayed flight with a family who was emigrating from Russia. There was such a community here of a couple hundred people greeting them in Portland.

### Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- RICAP 6 update: As others have noted, the first hearing was at Council was last Wednesday. As the PSC did, Council split RICAP 6 into the short-term rental (STR) amendments and the group of all the other pieces. The "other" bit will have the second reading tomorrow. We now have a Council work session about the STR amendments scheduled for Tuesday, June 24 at 10 a.m., and the earliest the next Council meeting for that portion of RICAP 6 will be July 2 at 2 p.m.

Requiring inspections, number of bedrooms that can be rented, options for multifamily buildings and vacation rentals are issues that Council had questions about.

3 amendments were made that will further be discussed at the work session:

- BDS inspection the first time, then self-inspections.

- Require carbon monoxide detectors.
- BPS and BDS to come back to Council in 2016 with an impacts report.
- BPS budget: for RICAP, BDS was directed to fund 2.5 positions to continue the program in FY14-15. The budget also moved \$500,000 to ongoing funding (instead of having to continually ask for one-time funding). This will support 3.5 district liaisons and 2 positions for on-going code work. For 2014-15 specifically, PDC will pay for 2 positions to work on code issues and implementation issues for the Central City. Much of this is thanks to the Mayor's priorities including healthy connected city work.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 5/13/14 PSC Meeting
- [R/W #7452](#), proposed vacation of a portion of NE Vancouver Way south of NE Gertz Rd
- [R/W #7712](#), proposed vacation of a portion of E Burnside Street west of NE MLK Jr Blvd

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.  
(Y6 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith)

### Comprehensive Plan Update Schedule

Briefing: Deborah Stein

#### Documents:

- [Comp Plan at PSC Schedule](#)
- [Revised Schedule](#)

Deborah provided an overview of work around the Comprehensive Plan that will come to the PSC as noted in the [Revised Schedule](#). There will be 3 briefings before, and separate from, the hearings; the hearings will really be devoted to public comment, so the briefings will come before the meetings where the PSC hears public testimony. Briefings are divided into an overview and goals and policies; map; and Citywide Systems Plan (CSP) and Transportation Systems Plan (TSP). Our guess is that most testimony will be about the map (proposed changes) and project list.

We are scheduling 4 hearings on the Comp Plan update. The first and fourth will be in this building, and the second and third will be in the community. The community ones will likely be based where the most map change proposals are located. At any hearing, the public can testify about what they want, but we are giving a theme for each hearing.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the November 4 meeting starting at 4 p.m.

- This helps to span the work day and evening to accommodate different people's schedules. Staff can look at a different (evening) time for this meeting if that's preferable for PSC members.

The launch date for the Proposed Comp Plan is July 21. PSC members will receive a copy at their July 22 meeting.

*Commissioner Smith* is on the TSP Expert Group. He noted that the group has asked to expand the project list, especially because there are old projects that would be judged against new projects with the new filter being applied. Also, the TGM grant for the on-street parking work is being done in parallel time-wise, so there is a major piece that we won't be able to digest and fit into the list.

Staff has started to get the word out about the Comp Plan Update via the Curbsider, culturally-based newspapers and other local news and the [BPS website](#). We are doing our usual outreach to business and neighborhood associations.

Between now and July 21 we will publish a preview of the map app, which will be interactive: people can type in an address, and the map will show what may be changing on and/or near a property. The map app is being designed to be used on mobiles as well.

BPS will send out postcards to anyone whose property may be affected by the map changes. We are setting up a customer service structure to allow BPS to be ready for questions that we'll receive from the public about the map changes. There will be a phone bank, drop in "office hours" in different locations that we'll advertise, and trainings to help people feel informed and educated so they understand what may affect them in the proposed changes.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted that one of the comments about the original map app was that it would have been useful to have demographic information. Is that a component this time around?

- There is a way for people to provide testimony to the PSC through the map app. We want to capture demographic information, but that will be decoupled from their identifying information. We are still working on capturing the information for reference and to see who uses the app but keeping it separate.

I've been getting lots of questions and confusion about implementation. Will we have information about that part as well?

- The postcards will be differentiated e.g. for property owners who will be affected by the mixed use zoning project. We will also have some public involvement events to share work in progress, which will feature both the Comp Plan Update work and implementation project information regardless of where in the process each project is.

If there were a one-stop area on the website about each part/piece, that would be helpful.

- We are developing lots of FAQs and revamping parts of the website to help clarify all the components to the Comp Plan Update.

Staff will be meeting with various organizations that have memberships of people who may be affected to provide trainings for these groups so they can also help explain the projects to their groups.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about working with ONI.

- Yes. We will work with ONI and our Diversity and Civic Leadership partners to get the word out and to hear from them about best ways to get the word out.

*Chair Baugh* asked about getting bureau comments to the PSC within an appropriate time frame (e.g. not at the last hearing).

- Definitely. And we have had conversations with bureaus already on getting the Proposed Draft ready for publishing and review.

On trying to get Council and their staff engaged and informed about the Comp Plan early, how can we get them up to speed sooner than later?

- We will work to help give the same coaching and information for constituents.

## **Willamette River Goal 15 Inventories**

Briefing: Debbie Bischoff, Mindy Brooks

### **Documents:**

- [Staff Memo](#)
- [Proposed Goal 15 Inventories Report](#)

Debbie introduced the team working on this project, including Mindy Brooks, Sallie Edmunds and herself.

The Willamette River Inventory was last completed in 1986 as part of 1987 Willamette Greenway Plan. It responds directly to statewide planning Goal 15.

This Goal 15 inventory, along with other information, will be used to inform updates of City's plans along the Willamette River. The first use of this inventory will be to inform development of the River Plan/Central Reach, which is part of the Central City Plan, currently underway and expected to be adopted in 2016. Updates to the Willamette Greenway Plan for the rest of the river will follow.

The reason we are preparing this inventory is that during the appeal process for the River Plan/ North Reach, LUBA ruled that they could not determine if the information in the legislative record satisfied the Goal 15 requirement. So, going forward we want to have a Goal 15 inventory that is labeled as such and that contains the information that is specifically set forth in Goal 15 to address this concern.

Staff has been letting people know of the process through the River Plan enews, BPS website and through over 5000 notices sent to property owners in the inventory area and others. Two public open houses were held. Staff have talked with about 30 people at the open houses plus phone calls, all from "inquisitive people;" there hasn't been any concerns raised, just questions so far. Staff has also notified interested agencies and have met with DLCD staff who will provide testimony to the PSC.

The maps in this inventory feature geographic representations of regulatory, land use, ownership, environmental, recreation, historic and cultural information. The inventory provides map information for the area along the river that we consider through the overlay zone boundary. The data sources are primarily from BPS' GIS team and County sources.

The Willamette River Greenway is about 17 linear miles. Within its boundary is about 6730 acres. Each reach has different characteristics: the North is heavy with industrial employment; Central has more mixed-use and urban development; and the South has comparatively more open space and natural area.

Overall, 62 percent of the greenway zoning is in industrial and 20 percent is open space.

Debbie walked through a number of items and highlights in the report. For example:

Page 7 highlights private and public property ownership by reach area. *Commissioner Houck* noted there may be some errors, so staff will revisit this list and will provide amendments to it at the June 24 PSC hearing.

In terms of natural resources (page 8), it is of course mostly the Willamette River. But the South Reach has other significant natural features too (e.g. Oaks Bottom Refuge).

Recreational needs (page 10) are required to be addressed, and a summary is noted on page 11. Staff used the Parks Vision 2020 Plan as the base for this inventory, along with individual park and natural resource master plans.

The PSC public hearing to recommend the inventory as updated supported information to the Willamette River Greenway Plan.

This work is purely an existing conditions report and does not change policies and regulations.

Actions and any policy changes will come through specific river plans like the Central Reach as part of the Central City 2035 Plan.

*Commissioner Houck* noted he sent questions and observations to staff. How this inventory could be used to relate to other policies in the future. Did you do comparisons from the original plan to now?

- This is mostly GIS work-based, unlike when *Commissioner Houck* worked on the first inventory and walked the greenway. When we update the more detailed inventory, like we did for the North Reach, we bring in relevant information from past work and other plans. There is lots of background information to use as a great starting point.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the recommendation. Is this part of the Comp Plan?

- This replaces the 1987 original inventory for the Willamette Greenway as supporting information, which ultimately is part of the Comp Plan. It will also answer the LUBA question about the inventory that arose during the River Plan / North Reach work.

*Commissioner Houck* is impressed with the work by staff. He has been involved in natural resource work for 40 years now. BPS, BES and Parks have really enhanced their ability to do this work. What about the low-medium-high rankings?

- These rankings are an output of the Natural Resources Inventory (NRI). The High-med-low ranking is based on that methodology. When we do the planning work we'll look to prioritize restoration, etc.

There has been lots of work done that looked at whole river in terms of potential restoration (the Bank Design Notebook). This will also be used as a resource, especially as we update the Central City Plan.

Susan thanked staff on this work. All components, including technical aspects, writing and layout have all been done in-house.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about boundary lines jogging mid-river.

- These are based on the City boundary, Urban Services Boundary and where we have planning authority.

Ownership map: do the colors mean anything?

- Used just to define properties, not color-specific.

Historic and cultural resources: how are these determined?

- State worked with the City to inventory resources within the city. This hasn't officially been updated in about 25 years. A property owner can request to be taken off the list or added to it, but that's the only updating that's gone on.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about Goal 15 being applied on the Willamette, but not Goal 5. I think Goal 5 provides a more robust opportunity to protect resources.

- We have to comply with Goal 15, and have the option of whether or not to follow the Goal 5 process within the Willamette Greenway Boundary.. The intent behind Goal 15 and Goal 5 is different and we will discuss the application of those goals during the planning process.

## Adjourn

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 2:08 p.m.

**Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission**  
**Tuesday, April 8, 2014**  
**12:30 – 3:15 p.m.**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith  
**BPS Staff Present:** Joe Zehnder, Sandra Wood, Julia Gisler, Julie Ocken  
**Other Presenters:** Terri Williams (Revenue); Mike Liefeld (BDS); Alan Lehto, Steve Kautz (TriMet); Denver Igarra (PBOT); Malu Wilkinson (Metro)

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

**Items of Interest from Commissioners**

*Commissioner Houck* mentioned that on the way to the meeting he was walking through the Park Blocks and was hearing the Pine Siskins in the trees as a reminder of spring and nature in the city.

*Commissioner Smith:* The PSC may want to weigh in on the RTP (Regional Transportation Plan) update. For the first time, there will be a specific streetcar category in the RTP. PBOT has been soliciting input for prioritization of projects on the list. The Portland Plan has direction that in the first 5 years to do corridor analysis projects (1 outside Central City), but there were no projects outside the Central City on the current draft list. The way Metro has set up the process, there isn't time to do analysis on a project like this. PBOT staff's preference is to use the TSP (Transportation Systems Plan, part of the Comprehensive Plan) to analyze then submit a list of RTP amendments. We should tell Metro we're disappointed that the RTP won't explicitly reflect the Portland Plan goals.

- *Chair Baugh* noted that this is a process question of Metro about not including an equity lens in the RTP process. The TSP process led by PBOT is a way we can follow the Portland Plan, which will come before the PSC. We could then amend the RTP after the TSP is adopted to get Portland's preferences included at a later date. It's the realization that we have partners that are not yet caught up to have improved processes around including equity as a lens to prioritize projects.
- *Commissioner Gray* added that the PSC heard a presentation about the Metro equity lens. So this is a great time to operationalize what they said they are doing.
- *Commissioner Smith:* Moved that the PSC write a letter to Metro. *Commissioner Houck* seconded. The motion was approved with a unanimous "aye." *Chair Baugh* will work on drafting the letter and will share it with the PSC before sending it.

*Commissioner Hanson:* The SE Quadrant Plan Advisory Committee is looking especially at the southern triangle area. We're having another conversation in May followed by design charrettes in June. There is also a sub-committee of the group looking at transportation issues in this area to make sure there is a balanced approach to people and freight movement.

*Commissioner Schultz:* West Quad SAC has 3 meetings left. The group has gone through all West side sections and is now tackling issues that haven't been resolved to build consensus about the SAC's recommendation will be. Building heights in the West End and how to motivate development on surface parking lots, especially on Skidmore lots, are two of the major topics.

*Commissioners Gray* noted the City Council had a water and sewer rates meeting at Parkrose HS. Staff did a presentation and people were asked to say where they were from, and most were from the west side of the city.

## Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- BPS staff members interviewed six candidates for the Youth position on the PSC. There were two top candidates that Susan and the Mayor's staff will interview within the next week or so. We also have about a dozen candidates for the other opening on the Commission, and we're starting to review those and will try to have both new Commissioners appointed in May.
- Audit Services will release its report on BPS organics programs (yard debris and food scraps) at the end of this week or early next. It recommends that BPS work on increasing food waste collection by businesses and multifamily residents and also continue to work on waste prevention. Both of these recommendations are consistent with established BPS program direction.
- The Housing Bureau has another MULTE (Mixed-Use Limited Tax Exemption) application to submit to our "expanded" Investment Committee in a couple of weeks. Karen and Don were the PSC representatives for last year's work, so today we're looking for 2 PSC members to work with the Housing Bureau this year. The time commitment would be limited to a couple of times a year (unless the program changes in the future) and includes reviewing project write-ups of 4-5 pages -- just one project this round, but could be multiple in future rounds -- and attend the Investment Committee meeting to provide feedback on the project(s). Meetings are always on Thursday mornings at 9:30 at PHB. The upcoming meeting is scheduled for 4/17 and will probably only last about 30 minutes. The next meeting will probably be on or around 8/21.
- Today's RICAP 6 briefing that's first on the agenda is specifically about the short-term rental proposal. We will be having a hearing on the full RICAP 6 proposal at the next PSC meeting on April 22. The PSC officers will meet with staff this Thursday for their regular check-in meeting prior to the hearing. So far all the testimony we've received is about the short-term rental portion, and Julie will be sending testimony we've already received along with other meeting materials to everyone at the end of this week.

## Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 03/11/14 and 03/19/14 PSC meetings
- [R/W #7511](#): Proposed Vacation of SW Moody Ave north of Ross Island Bridge

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Hanson* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith)

## RICAP 6: Short-Term Rentals

Briefing: Sandra Wood, Julia Gisler, Mike Liefeld, Terri Williams

### Documents:

- [Staff Memo](#)
- [RICAP 6 Proposed Draft](#)
- [Staff Amendment Memo](#)

### Presentation:

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6473573/view/>



Today's presentation is to share what we've learned, what the proposal is and have time to ask questions about the short-term rental piece of RICAP 6.

Staff shared a presentation to introduce the proposal, which is slightly changed from what they presented to the PSC in January.

The definition of short-term rental is renting overnight accommodations on less than a 30-day basis. Some of the most common examples are hotels and motels. Short-term rental is a commercial use category subject to building code regulations and transit lodging taxes; as commercial uses you will find these mostly in commercial areas.

Peer-to-peer rentals are a new form of accommodations. In a private home, you can get a roommate, or rent an ADU or rent your whole house on a monthly basis. A majority are in houses where the host lives on-site.

Peer-to-peer listings in Portland has grown about 10 times over in the past three years.

Staff reviewed what other cities are doing.

- NYC and San Francisco have basically banned short-term rentals.
- Resort towns (e.g. Cannon Beach) have a long history of regulating rentals. In Cannon Beach specifically, there is an unlimited number of properties that are allowed to rent up to two times per month as well as 92 unrestricted, but those permits are only good for 5 years. Inspections are part of the permit process.
- Ashland has prohibited rentals in single-dwelling zones because peer-to-peer was undercutting B&Bs and small hotels.
- Austin is one of the first cities to have short-term regulations (began in 2012). They started with 2 types of permits (owner-occupied and vacation rentals). Recently they amended the ordinance to deal with multi-dwelling structures, which includes a percentage cap on the number of units per building.
- The Amsterdam City Council recently created a "private rentals" category, which is very flexible. It allows people to rent a portion of home for unlimited time without inspection or permit, using only a complaint-driven system. The owners do still need to pay taxes.

Short-term rentals are largely within residential zones. Staff provided an overview of the policy about residential zones and what other uses are allowed in them. Short-term rentals are similar to Home Occupations, which require permits, as suggested in the RICAP proposal.

Accessory Short-Term Rental as the new name is more accessible for peer-to-peer activities and includes B&Bs. Staff is still figuring out what to do with vacation rentals, but the proposal is to not allow those. There are two types of short-term rentals: Type A (1-2 bedrooms) and Type B (3-5 bedrooms). Most B&Bs that have been approved through Conditional Use processes are the bigger ones (Type B).

There are 10 provisions included in the RICAP 6 proposal about short-term rentals (summary of Ch 33.207 Accessory Short-Term Rental Regulations, presentation slide 26-38).

Staff originally proposed short-term rentals could be allowed in any unit. Now the proposal is to only allow them in houses, attached houses, duplexes, manufactured homes, ADUs, not in condos or apartments. Those renting out the space need to meet primary residence criteria, but they do not necessarily need to be the owner of the building.

Staff had heard people were concerned about safety of the rooms. In proposed draft said "the operator of an accessory short-term rental can only rent legal bedrooms." It would be difficult

for residents to know if their rooms are legal or not. As noted in today's amendment memo, this language has changed to:

The operator of an accessory short-term rental can only rent bedrooms that BDS has verified:

- Met the building code requirements for sleeping rooms at the time they were created or converted; and
- Have smoke detectors that are interconnected with smoke detectors in adjacent hallways.

Re-inspection is required on renewal of permit (every 2 years). The inspection fee estimate of \$180 includes the inspection charge.

The proposal removes the limit on Private Social gatherings.

Background about the City's Transient Lodging Tax (Occupancy Tax): The overall rate is 11.5% in Multnomah County, plus a 1% tax by the state. 11.5% is collected by the City for City and Multnomah County combined. Everyone who rents a dwelling unit for 30 days or less is required to collect this tax from the guest and pay to City's Revenue Bureau. The City receives about 6% of the 11.5% tax. Due to the growth in peer-to-peer rentals, there is now a private home exception if the use is incidental, defined as 7 days or less over the course of a calendar year, unless you advertise or are a B&B. All other incidents require tax payment and remitting to the City.

#### Discussion

*Commissioner Hanson* asked if staff has thought about enforcement. It seems like it would be complaint-driven even if the language is clear.

- There currently isn't a level playing field; short-term rentals are not allowed without a Type II conditional use review. We know they are happening, and when we receive a complaint, we enforce. This tries to get to making this fair.
- BDS enforcement is mostly complaint-driven. With home occupations we have very few complaints, mostly because of neighborhood notice requirement. The notification provides thresholds for what is allowed. With current short-term rentals, the enforcement is difficult to prove. There is a big burden of proof needed by the City to enforce. This short-term proposal is potentially easier to enforce because a permit is required.

The biggest difference in neighborhoods will be parking, which we'll likely hear lots about.

*Commissioner Schultz:* The current code says that as long as you're related, you can have as many people living there as you want... "who live together in a dwelling unit" plus 5 additional people. Is this the operator's full household plus the potential of 5 additional people?

- The language that's already used for household living is the same language. We are not proposing a change to this. It already allows for 5 non-related persons to live in the house.
- If someone owns a house and has 2 non-related people (e.g. college students renting), then they could only have 3 additional people on a short-term basis.

The language for this application is potentially confusing.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted the Mayor talked about Airbnb in the State of the City address.

- Staff has heard feedback from Airbnb on original proposal and expect they will provide testimony to the PSC.

Is there a health inspection for the kitchen facilities?

- B&Bs are regulated by the state and County, and are defined as 2+ bedrooms. 1-2 bedrooms don't typically have kitchens where the host would be cooking for short-term renters.

*Commissioner Smith* noted he's a fan of the sharing economy, but the City is a bit inconsistent about it. He's happy to see the inspection is now included in the proposal. He also noted a press report that suggested someone could put an RV in the driveway to live in then rent out their house.

- Occupation of an RV outside of an RV park is illegal in residential zones. Also, the City has a duty to make sure they are properly insured, but we don't regulate that. On the revenue side, Airbnb will collect the fees and taxes for their services? Will it include a list of the residences?
- We are working towards that, but it's not finalized. There won't be a list unless the City performs an audit. This will be happening but not at 100% of locations.

*Commissioner Rudd* went back to the definition of "household." The existing definition references marriage. Is there something in the code or other City provisions that protects same sex couples in this context? Staff will check with the City Attorney about this question.

Why is there a limit on the ability to have multiple home occupation permits and still rent a room? If the existing home occupations don't have external impacts why can't they rent rooms as well (e.g. if someone is working at home, why can we also rent a room)?

- For home occupations, there is a Type A, so you don't need a permit. For Type B (one employee or up to 8 customers per day), short-term rentals are not allowed.

What about international organizations (e.g. couch-surfing or house-swapping)?

- These are not included in the proposal.

*Commissioner Oxman* commended staff on the proposal. Is the City business license/tax required for short-term rental?

- It depends on gross receipts. If the host is making \$50k or more, then they are required to pay the business tax. If less, they still need to file but they are exempt.

Growth of listings chart: is this for single episode?

- A listing on a website is noted as each individual property. This would be a snapshot in a point of time.

Section 1B on page 57 regarding historical landmarks: was the continuation of B&B language retained for a reason?

- It was not intended. This will be edited by staff.

*Commissioner Gray* appreciates the process for the short-term rental proposal to allow people to rent in a legal way. Why are Type B fees so much more than Type A?

- Type II Conditional Use is a land use review and requires considerable staff time. It's like a mini legislative process for each request. The fee is what BDS has assessed with Council approval. This is the crux for this proposal to make the short-term rentals easier and less expensive.

When you heard feedback about the proposal, was there data presented from those who had issues (e.g. livability, parking issues)? Are these philosophical questions?

- Most feedback is anecdotal. There isn't a track record in other cities, and Portland is different and is sensitive to our uniqueness.
- *Commissioner Smith* commented about the Planning Commission's approval of ADUs and the impact on neighborhoods. Concerns and reality had little connection.

Why are we not allowing vacation rentals?

- We are being sensitive to the availability of housing stock in the city. We want to preserve units for people who need to live and work in Portland. The research to look at vacation rentals is larger than a RICAP project.

*Chair Baugh* asked about residential zones: "allow for some non-residential uses but not to sacrifice neighborhood character." NYC and SF doesn't allow in rent-controlled areas even though people could rent rooms to increase their livability. Density of units: there is incredible density with more than one Airbnb sites. Is there an unintended consequence if 50 or more percent are renting out rooms? Does the City take on the risk in terms of loss of property value?

We don't have rent control, but we have low-income neighborhoods. If you take rental rates in some of these areas, if you rent 15-20% of the month, there is a substantial business case to be able to rent a room. How do we not prevent that process from not going forward? Regarding complaints, if a neighbor says no, what happens?

- The proposed process is that the notice is informative: requirements, contacts, who's accountable, to open a dialogue between operator and neighbors. It's not a vote. This has been effective for BDS so far.
- If you're renting a room in a house and you can rent out a room to help cover your costs, that would be fine and is a benefits for the renter. But leases often don't allow this.

Is the entity that receives the permit required to show the permit (e.g. post on the wall)?

- We don't currently have this in the proposal. These types of permits are usually required by and given by the Fire Bureau. We could consider this. It will be available online to see if the address is permitted. Hosts could choose to advertise this.

### **Future of Transit: TriMet Service Enhancement Plan Initiatives**

Briefing: Alan Lehto, Steve Kautz, TriMet

#### **Presentation:**

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6473575/view/>

*Chair Baugh* noted his participation on the TriMet Equity Advisory Committee. This is a great project and move forward for TriMet.

TriMet's work is to connect communities and allow people to get where they need to go, now and in the future. We want to be partners with cities and counties in the region to help guide transit service and growth to where it makes the most sense. This project is a part of how we have that conversation.

Last month TriMet was able to add back service on 13 frequent service lines to 15-minute or better service for weekdays. It's proposed in FY15 budget to add back weekday evenings and the highest ridership times during the weekends. After a mid-year check on the budget, our hope is to be able to add even more service on weekends near the end of the fiscal year to restore frequent service levels seven days a week on all Frequent Service bus lines and MAX by the end of June 2015. (This is contingent on the continuing growth of the economy and the outcome of the current labor contract proposal which we hope to have settled before the end of 2014).

The TriMet annual service plan tried to include three areas: basic system maintenance, optimize and restore, and increasing capacity. As resources rebound, we're focused on the Maintain and Restore aspect for FY15 focused on Capacity, Reliability, and Frequent Service (which also increases frequencies).

Portland-Milwaukie Light Rail line is on schedule and on budget to open in September 2015.

Efforts around the future of transit recognize this is a big region, there are lots of stakeholders to have dialogue with and we need to look at where growth is happening.

TriMet is engaging communities to understand current needs, plans for growth, demographic changes, equity needs, and create a shared long-term vision for transit service to support current and future needs.

Enhancement Plans are being developed in five subareas. The vision for the Westside was completed in 2013 and the Enhancement Plan work continues with year-by-year

implementation. Work is now underway in SW, SE and Eastside; North-Central will be the final area.

Dividing the region into five areas provides identity and focus for outreach and community engagement, and it matches available staff with the scope of active work.

Boundaries do not limit how improvements are considered, and TriMet is maintaining a “network perspective” throughout, thinking about how each area informs and considers other areas.

SE area process includes a bus service plan aligned with PMLR opening in Sept. 2015. They are just starting in to North-Central area.

The process also considers connections with services operated by other transit systems (SMART, Canby, Mollala, Sandy)

Recommendations in the vision for Westside included:

- Importance of need for connections throughout the region.
- Less waiting, faster trips.
- Safe places to wait for transit and to walk to transit.
- Bridging the last mile.
- Community transit - making connections where a fixed route may not make sense (e.g. where there are long distances between stops/areas or if there are few people using the system)

All of these components are things staff is hearing in the other areas as well, but it applies differently on the ground in individual places.

TriMet is currently talking to partners, community agencies, neighborhoods, jurisdictions, going to community meetings where people are. They have done surveys and analysis to get needs/wants/wishes lists.

TriMet staff met with PSC leadership last September and wanted to come back early in the process to share with the full PSC. This has been a positive experience for TriMet in talking to people about how they rely on transit, their needs and wishes.

#### **Discussion**

*Commissioner Houck* noted he sat at Metro’s Climate Smart Communities workshops, where the equity community was well represented. There were similar conversations about TriMet and the need for better connections. This presentation was consistent with those conversations. Questions: I’ve given up on getting my bike on MAX because of the limited availability to put them; is there anything we can do about the lack of bike space?

- Given the length of the trains, we are fairly constrained. Multi-car trains and commuter rail trains in other places provide this, but we can’t do that. We are trying to have better bike storage opportunities, e.g. both east and west of the tunnel, which is a big congestion point.

*Commissioner Shapiro* wants to be more partnered with TriMet actions so we are talking with the same voice to City Council, Metro, etc. I appreciate that TriMet is coming to talk with the PSC and hopes to continue the conversation.

- TriMet, PBOT and BPS staff have been discussing how we can strengthen the partnerships.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that one area the PSC has concern/interest in is job access in East Portland. When the East area plans come together, we would like to come together with TriMet staff again. What about conversations with OPAL and their concerns on transfer times and dedication of resources to high-capacity versus frequent transit?

- How can we help each other to better understand needs? That is the main question for this project. The process is more about the transit network rather than specific capital improvement projects.

*Commissioner Rudd* asked for clarification of the local circulation concept described as a supplement to fixed routes.

*Commissioner Oxman* appreciates that community transit networks are on the agenda. There are lots of ways to organize community transit systems to move people efficiently.

*Commissioner Gray* appreciated the comment about OPAL and their Bus Riders Unite project. She also appreciates that Steve meets with the EPAP technical advisory group about transit regularly. Shouldn't the future of transit follow the predicted population and job growth forecasts? E.g. expected growth in East Portland.

- This is exactly what we're looking at: understanding the census, working with City staff to see where changes in demographics and development are going to be happening. City staff is sharing growth forecast scenarios with TriMet.
- There are a number of things pointing to the need to do a dramatic transit growth in the next 20 years. For example, we need to double service to get to the mode share targets. The Westside vision is approximately a doubling of service to keep ahead of population growth, congestion, connecting people to their needs, and keeping ahead of climate change. Though the other Enhancement Plan areas are not far enough along to know yet, we do expect them to have a similar level of significant growth in service.

*Chair Baugh* thanked the TriMet staff for the presentation to start strengthening the partnership. OPAL has been very engaged with the TriMet committee I'm on. I also appreciate the comment about looking forward and working with City staff to get people who may not yet be riding transit to have the option to.

*Commissioner Houck* talked about the BRT (bus rapid transit) option. The response I often get is that people won't ride them, even on dedicated lines. A main concern is that "people don't want to ride a bus." How much thought is going into the quality of the ride and vehicles to make a more enjoyable bus experience?

- There is a higher-end experience of a bus in BRT, which we'll hear about in the SW Corridor briefing next (because BRT is one of the two build alternatives in the corridor being studied). This is the "highest and best" for a bus. Powell-Division corridor could be a BRT variation as well. BRT development includes stations rather than stops; trying to reduce delay; and making it a highlight of the visible transit system. The jury is still out on how well BRT does this. As far as the system as a whole, the newest 3100-series buses are a step above the older buses; they're more comfortable, quieter and lower emission. We are also pursuing grants to explore other technologies e.g. for testing electric buses, prospects for CNG.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about wireless as a rider amenity.

- It is expensive. It's only currently available on WES because it came as part of the package. It's not a first priority as we're restoring service.
- *Commissioner Rudd* advised that it might be possible to get someone else to pay to provide wifi. Commercial apps where a company pays for wifi service if you download their app are a model that is used (e.g. in airports) that could be looked at.

## SW Corridor Plan

Briefing: Denver Igarta, Malu Wilkinson

### Document:

- [Statement on Vote from Tigard Mayor Cook](#)



**Presentation:**

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6473574/view/>

In 2009 the region went thru process to identify 16 High-Capacity Transit (HCT) Corridors based on a range of criteria. The process prioritized implementation of the most viable corridors for future system expansion, and the Southwest Corridor (SWC) was identified as a near-term regional priority. Powell-Division was another corridor identified for near-term implementation.

Portland's Barbur Concept Plan was initiated in 2011 and is informing the SWC work. The Barbur Plan aims to leverage high-capacity transit investments to achieve a more walkable, vibrant Barbur Boulevard.

Adopted in October 2013, City resolution endorsing the SW Corridor Plan gave direction to continue process with partners:

- Continue City of Portland participation
- Use Barbur Concept Plan to inform HCT refinement
- Form a Community Working Group (this group now meets monthly)
- Refine supportive multimodal projects

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about how Tigard is somewhat resistant to rapid transit. Do they remain active on the SWC group?

- Yes, and Commissioner Novick asked staff to share his statement about it: the vote was close, and the vote doesn't appear to prohibit Tigard from working on the corridor planning. We would be more comfortable if Tigard had a clarifying vote in which citizens say in effect, "It's OK to study." It appears quite likely that will happen. Half of the mileage of any alignment would be within the Portland city limits. We have quite a stake in this project.

Tigard Mayor Cook and City Council also made a statement, and they feel like they have the backing from citizens of Tigard to continue moving forward. The vote was within around 200 people, so it was quite close, and it was potentially an unclear ballot measure so Tigard will be asking for clarification this fall.

Significant growth is expected in the SWC, which is expected to reach 206,000 people by 2035. This has been a vision-based approach to look at connecting places that the cities thought are most important to connect.

Phase I: The Southwest Corridor Shared Investment Strategy was adopted last year. One of the key recommendations was the service enhancement planning as noted in the TriMet presentation today.

We are now in the refinement phase to look at HCT design options based on the steering committee direction. We are using land use planning to understand opportunities for the different station area options.

A Purpose and Need Statement guides all Federal transportation projects, and the PSC weighed in on this statement for the SWC Plan. The statement will be reopened when (assuming) the project moves forward into the scoping for the Environmental Impact Assessment.

HCT destination options were initially based on:

- ridership potential
- operational efficiency
- plans for increased housing and employment in Tigard and Tualatin

... and were narrowed by/to:



- BRT or LRT from Portland to Tualatin, via Tigard
- Map segments represent over 50 design options
- Focus on most reasonable and feasible options to study further in EIS
- Use good information and public input to guide decision making

This still leaves about 50 design options, but 14 of these were taken off the table at the last steering committee meeting due to critical problems identified through public process or in early design work. Each of the options that were taken off has alternative options that work better.

The Southwest Corridor Steering Committee will be making a recommendation on which HCT design options, complementary multimodal projects and potential station locations should be studied further in an Environmental Impact Statement in June 2014. That work is anticipated to be collaboratively funded by the project partners, and is necessary to move the region forward to working with the Federal Government to partner in the funding of a major transit investment in the Southwest Corridor.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about new start funding. What's the line to make it viable?

- BRT needs to have at least 50% alignment in its own dedicated route.

*Commissioner Houck* is pleased to hear about green projects being included. Are those tied as stormwater run-off mitigation?

- There's a nexus, but that's not the reason we've included it. We are thinking of these as opportunities, but it is a way to start with projects that have already been vetted and decided as priorities.

Metro is looking at GHG reduction. Could the green projects be noted as another angle, that is for carbon sequestration (trees sucking up carbon as a reduction method)?

*Commissioner Smith* asked about what station areas are under consideration for significance now.

- Looking at all potential places that could benefit from the service. OHSU, Hillsdale, Mult. Village, PCC-Sylvania.
- There is a design option that would look at S Waterfront.

What are the ways to consider reaching OHSU?

- Tunnel options. Tram. Better pedestrian access from Barbur or a Naito station.

*Chair Baugh* noted he was not a huge fan of the project initially. But he's encouraged that equity is a criteria and noted he's now looking at the EIS to have a very robust Title VI and environmental justice review to address communities that the project needs to connect to. Without that, the project still looks like it's in a transportation plan silo. The connections to the community need to be truly actionable and doable as part of the Portland Plan objectives.

- *Commissioner Shapiro* concurred with the Portland Plan sentiment as a lens and ways for the PSC to provide further input to the project.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 3:31 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator

**Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission**  
**Tuesday, March 11, 2014**  
**12:30 – 2:45 p.m.**  
**Meeting Minutes**

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith

**Commissioners Absent:** Don Hanson, Mike Houck

**BPS Staff Present:** Joe Zehnder, Sallie Edmunds, Marty Stockton, Alex Howard, Radcliffe Dacanay, Julie Ocken

**Other Staff Present:** Dawn Uchiyama, Elisabeth Reese Cadigan, Marie Walkiewicz (BES); Brian Monberg (Metro)

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

**Items of Interest from Commissioners**

*Commissioner Shapiro* shared information about the Community Involvement Committee, which has six new members on it. The CIC is continuing the work on the Comp Plan, and there is still room on the CIC for one more PSC member.

*Commissioner Schultz:* The West Quad SAC had an open house last night at City Hall with about 75 attendees. This group is planning on wrapping up their work in the summer, and then staff will come to the PSC with a proposed plan for the quadrant later in the year.

*Commissioner Oxman* was in Sri Lanka, where he experienced “a whole different level” of population density compared to Portland. Also, in light of the recent legislated decision around the CRC, do we need to say anything more to Portland City Council regarding West Hayden Island?

- *Joe:* We just started to talk about this and what the implications are including what do we do with the Comp Plan and the Metro traffic model that assumed there would be a bridge. There were a number of things in the Hayden Island plan that also assumed a bridge for the street plan.
- *Chair Baugh* asked about the Climate Action Plan and any impacts the CRC decision might have on that plan too.

*Commissioner Gray* asked about the joint PDC/PSC meeting next week.

- *Joe:* The agenda is a presentation to both commission based on the Urban Land Institute presentation staff shared last month. The main impetus for this first meeting is to meet and work together on a project that both commissions have a stake in.
- *Chair Baugh* will meet with the PDC chair this week. This initial meeting is to establish a recurring, possibly every six months, time for the two commissions to meet together in a work session.

*Commissioner Gray* also noted that City Council has a Rates public forum with City Council on March 19 at 6:30 p.m. at Parkrose High School.

*Chair Baugh* mentioned that he and *Commissioner Schultz* met with the Mayor yesterday to discuss the issue of gentrification and how the PSC could help with some solutions for a process to address it.

## Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- The Climate Change Preparation Strategy is out for public comment through mid-April. PSC members should have received an email from Susan a couple weeks ago with information about providing comments/input to our staff.
- BPS has a new strategic plan for 2014-16. This is the second strategic plan since the Bureau of Planning and the Office of Sustainable Development merged. It reflects the continued combining of planning and sustainability objectives in our work.

## Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 01/28/14 PSC meeting
- [RW #7651](#): Proposed Street Vacation of SE Grand Ave between SE Hawthorne Blvd and SE Madison St

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.  
(Y7 – Baugh, Gray, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith)

## Stormwater Overview

Briefing: Sallie Edmunds; Dawn Uchiyama, Elisabeth Reese Cadigan, Marie Walkiewicz (BES)

### Presentation:

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6371413/view/>

Sallie introduced the BES team and how staff is working to integrate stormwater management in the update to the Comprehensive Plan. Today BES staff is giving an overview of the stormwater system and what we're planning to do going forward to address issues with stormwater management.

Marie thanked BPS for the opportunity to be collaborators in the update of the Comp Plan. It represents an evolution in land use planning.

Stormwater Management 101

What's Portland doing?

Why should planners care?

Updating the Comp Plan

What's ahead?

As background, staff shared a [video](#) about Seattle's stormwater management.

Many of the issues Seattle has are similar to Portland. Portland also thinks about and incorporates how we manage our stormwater in the four different watersheds Portland includes and about relationship of activities in different areas of the storm system to the places where the water ends up in our stormwater planning.

Another way to look at how stormwater is managed is the system: through either combined, UIC, or a MS4 system. Management is regulated by both the State and Federal governments. Both BES and private property owners have these assets, so we work with rate payers and private owners to manage the systems.

Stormwater concerns include:

- Pollutants (water quality or pollution prevention)
- Volume/velocity (detention or flow and volume control)
- Conveyance (approvable discharge point)

Stormwater hierarchy: from top to bottom, the methods to manage stormwater:

- Impervious area reduction (e.g. ecoroofs, impervious pavement)
- Onsite infiltration (e.g. sumps)
- Offsite conveyance (storm systems, including streams and drainageways, followed by CSO as a last option)

Portland is a leader in this area. We have a Stormwater Management Manual, have continually been making system upgrades, and provide incentives and technical assistance. But we've just scratched the surface about what we can do. We still need to make connections with other things happening in the community.

Developers have to find a balance to find a place to put stormwater within a project site while managing project costs. Some techniques include low-impact development; showing the systems as an amenity to the development; reduction in the number of impervious surfaces in the development; and providing incentives like the ecoroof FAR bonus.

When stormwater isn't managed well, there are a number of problems that are created including runoff, erosion, basement flooding and other property damage. Strategies for addressing these problems include preventing building structures in the natural path of water flow and retrofitting areas by removing some of the impervious surfaces there (e.g. Tabor School).

All Portlanders share in the challenges of stormwater management via sewer fees. The City doesn't own the entire separated system, so we need to work on shared solutions to address the separated system problems. Green infrastructure is often the most efficient – it helps with landscaping requirements, transportation systems and decreasing the urban heat island effect.

Transportation planning is another challenge for integrating stormwater. The city's west side and outer eastside don't have comprehensive systems to meet both needs. A new type of regional facility could play a benefit to the neighborhood, create system benefits and could provide for new development while retrofitting previously impervious surfaces. Looking at transportation and stormwater management together is important for creating an efficient system that is an integrated component of the urban development.

Developers are often not aware of stormwater management options, so it often becomes an add-on. Integrating earlier in design is the aim so the stormwater feature is a part of the site. Site coverage requirements currently often make it difficult to fit in stormwater facilities. Additional guidance in the code is necessary to help people understand their options so we can be preventing problems up front instead of needing to pay for them in the future.

The Stormwater policy and the Comprehensive Plan update is being looked at throughout the Plan, in the goals and policies section, public facilities plan and Comprehensive Plan Map.

The current 1980 Comp Plan looks at stormwater management primarily as a utility issue. It does not address connections with land use and transportation, green infrastructure or stormwater systems.

The update to the Comp Plan acknowledges that things are connected. It recognizes that trees, vegetation, soils, and waterbodies provide essential services, like groundwater recharge, managing the flow of water, and protecting water quality.

There is a recognition that each watershed has a distinctive set of characteristics that influence how water interacts with the landscape and development, but the goal is that it knits into urban form and landscape (e.g. within the urban design framework).

A new program at BES to help with Comp Plan implementation is Stormwater System Planning, which provides a bridge between engineers and watershed specialists within BES to put forth a vision and strategy. They are looking citywide to create a system risk assessment and then will look at local-scale alternatives and finally will prioritize projects and operationalize.

The Street-by-Street Program for residential street improvements (PBOT) responds to the neighborhood and offers options of different standards for different residential streets throughout the city. PBOT staff shared this concept with the PSC last summer.

Regarding land use tools and connection to Comp Plan implementation, BPS does plan to participate in the stormwater system planning to more deeply to explore land use tools we could use to help reduce the amount of stormwater run-off. For example, the Central City 2035 Plan policy asks us to expand use of green infrastructure throughout Central City. This could include more ecoroofs and greenwalls in this particular section of the city. Staff is exploring this and other ways to increase the use of these throughout the area.

We can't solve the problems with huge capital investments. We need to work within our means and do hundreds, if not thousands, of small things that all add up to a solution. Partnerships, programs, small investments, private investments, recruiting help from across BES and across the City can be used to harness the cumulative effect of many actions.

#### **Discussion**

*Commissioner Rudd* asked if the public owns property but it is not public right-of-way, what are the requirements for stormwater management.

- There are the same standards/requirements regardless of who owns the property.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about new technology and paving streets with permeable asphalt (for example). Who takes care of this?

- Pervious pavement has been around for a while and provides some solutions. In Portland we have some pilot projects, but it hasn't become a full-blown strategy before we resolve the street/stormwater facility question (PBOT/BES). The two bureaus are sharing responsibilities on the pilot projects. It's often a cost issue right now, but ultimately we'd like to make this more used throughout the city.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about stormwater requirements for new development. Has there been a study about on-site treating and whether SDC fees are correlated?

- Stormwater SDCs are very low, and we haven't looked at this correlation in a long time. We need to go back to review the SDCs in light of the current regulations, and SDC fees would likely increase since we haven't looked at them in so long. We are also looking at an overlap with other requirements for onsite management so stormwater isn't an add-on.

*Commissioner Gray* asked if in making sure there is a system for people developing properties, is there something within the permit process that requires people to understand the stormwater abatement requirements earlier in the process so people can't miss this fact.

- It is a component of the permit process, but it's often too late. We do want to integrate earlier outreach. BES has an outreach group, primarily to school children, but we do need to improve the outreach to the development community and to engineers with a goal to get to design professionals earlier in the process to help merge aesthetics with the functional needs.

BES has partnerships (e.g. with PBOT), but there is also ODOT. As you're developing systems, how does a systemization approach cover different agencies owning different property?

- ODOT is just realizing their requirements. PBOT and ODOT are key partners. We have looked at some joint projects, but the system planning piece has not yet overlapped. We are early in the relationship-building process. All our knowledge is evolving and developing.

*Chair Baugh:* how do you assess equity in the process?

- The BES level-of-service includes equity as a guideline. We are just beginning to analyze and map where equity failures are happening, and we're trying to quantify it. An example: people living in floodplain areas are often lower income with few options to move. BES is working to reduce flooding in these areas, which helps to improve conditions.

## **Comprehensive Plan Update - Working Draft Part 2 "What We Heard" Report**

Briefing: Marty Stockton

### **Document:**

- [What We Heard report](#)

This report is for the Working Draft Part II of the Comp Plan, which covered October through December 2013. Late last spring, Marty presented the Part I report to the PSC. Last summer's outreach and spring district mapping discussions also have reports. Prior to the Proposed Com Plan coming to the PSC, Marty will bring all 4 reports to the Commission.

This reporting phase included the online Map App tool, which was an incredible way for BPS to share all the data as well as concepts we're working with to the public. With the Map App, the public involvement process was slightly different from previous times. There weren't the big public workshops, but instead, the focus was on training people how to use the tool. Staff met with over 90 organizations to help people understand the app. Staff also hosted three information sessions and three district mapping sessions in areas where we had specific questions for the public (north, east, southwest). These were smaller events to get more information from the public.

BPS received over 900 comments through the Map App, three times the number we received in Part 1 Working Draft. We received over 200 letters and emails as well.

Staff started processing the comments in December. One thing that was important was, when we started grouping comments in the database, staff reviewed comments by topic but also by geography. The report shows topic summaries of the comments, district summaries by geography and event-based summaries as well.

We provided the CIC members with an earlier draft of this report. The CIC appreciated the three ways the comments were grouped to make it easy for a reader to find what were are most interested in. For example, outreach in East Portland accounted for 20 percent of the geographic groups comments. Many groups (32 percent) that staff met with don't have a particular geographic tie.

Tracking the demographics of participants was not the focus of this engagement, so we only received a total of 40 survey responses about demographics. Racial and ethnic diversity was not as much as previous outreach.

Staff are now working on the proposed plan for public involvement about the forthcoming Proposed Comp Plan Update.

The next question is “what are you going to do with this information?” Accompanying the Proposed Plan will be summary of change memos for each chapter to highlight the changes we’re looking to make in the updated plan.

*Commissioner Shapiro* noted he already announced the PSC opening on the CIC. Did we hear from enough people and feel comfortable this is representative of all Portlanders? Usually the more vocal people are heard and their comments are highlighted more. Are other bureaus/organizations helping to gather data?

- We are always trying to do better with our outreach. We have opportunities to do a deeper engagement with communities of color and under-represented groups. Right now we’re working on an approach to do that. As far as other partners, both ONI and PDC have been involved in the Comp Plan. This has been mostly on the staff level, but ONI is deeply invested in the community involvement chapter.

*Commissioner Gray* is glad staff is tracking demographics. Thank you. We still find the same people showing up to meetings and providing their input. We know we are not getting input from all the people we serve.

*Commissioner Smith* recognized we have a long way to go, but we should celebrate the Map App.

*Commissioner Rudd* commented that a way to modify the Map App would be to explain why we’re asking for the information from users. This could help to engage more people and would share information about why we’re the asking questions.

*Chair Baugh* noted the work is very informative, and it lays out some tension about the fear of change in neighborhoods with the desire for better neighborhoods. Our challenge is how we get more diverse perspectives into the conversation, and how we come forward with solutions.

### **Inner Powell Outer Division Project**

Briefing: Alex Howard, Radcliffe Dacanay

#### **Presentation:**

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6371414/view/>

#### **Documents:**

- Places document/map

The project aims to provide transit service to an area that really needs it. It is a regional project with Metro leading and PBOT and BPS participating.

The length of the corridor is Portland’s Central City through out to Gresham. The project will choose a transit route alignment and station areas and will explore where there are major nodes that we want to be able to serve. Rapid, reliable and quality service are what staff is considering when looking at options.

The land use vision within the nodes is core to the BPS part of the project. Staff expects this phase of the project to be completed in about a year. It will likely take about two years in design with development starting in 2018 and use in 2020.



This is a high transit use corridor. The project team is looking to make trips on corridor more pleasant, reliable and efficient. This corridor has precedent as a priority as it is highlighted in a number of other plans, so it has broad support.

Because we're serving a large area and working with many agencies, Metro is leading the project. We also want to make sure the outcome will meet local needs, so both Portland and Gresham are working on node identification, who we need to serve, areas we are serving and generally making more complete neighborhoods.

Key tasks include defining what a node is and creating a screening criteria to start looking at the nodes.

There are open houses this Thursday (Division-Midway Neighborhood Street Plan) and next Monday. Other engagement opportunities are coming in the spring that will be posted on both the Metro and BPS websites.

The springtime will allow staff to provide an introduction to the project, work on screening criteria for nodes and alignment options, and complete an economic corridor assessment. This summer, staff will use the screening criteria to narrow down the alignment and node options that will be shared in the fall. A proposed plan is expected in early 2015, and then the project will go through a public process led by Metro to ultimately bring the project to the PSC, Portland City Council, Gresham City Council and the Metro Council.

The Steering Committee includes elected officials and community members. Commissioner Novick is the City's representative. By including both elected officials and community members, we're trying to make sure the decision makers are also hearing what community members want in an official forum.

The Portland piece is focusing on the area from the Eastbank to 184<sup>th</sup> Ave, which is a very diverse geography. Roads are quite wide and auto-oriented, and land uses are often mixed. There are varying right-of-way and intensity of uses throughout the corridor.

## Discussion

What is optimal place for transit given existing conditions? As we develop criteria, we will look at the different requirements for uses to find some best-fit options.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* How can we be sensitive for how humans interact with the street? How do we balance these needs with transportation needs to build communities we can still walk in?

- The screening criteria recognizes this concern. We will look at the land use component and how we expect the areas to develop as well as the connected neighborhoods strategy and goals.

*Commissioner Smith:* The SW Corridor project is on its own track. This project seems to be moving much faster. What's important to the Comp Plan is also the north-south frequent service on 122<sup>nd</sup> Ave. How do all these projects fit together and support the Comp Plan?

- TriMet is currently doing their service enhancement planning. Another question we'll have is if we move from one street to another through the corridor, what the best connection street is. With the Comp Plan itself, we are looking at our centers. The Map App shows part of Division and part of Powell as Civic Corridors. Pedestrian connectivity Holgate to Stark are also part of the Division Plan. So we need to review all these components.
- One way we're looking at this vis-à-vis the Comp Plan: this Powell-Division corridor is already designated in the Regional Transportation Plan. Work here is aligned with Portland Plan objectives. Destinations linked by the line are helpful for community

development and equity. 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave is a major center location, so we can start to explore how we create a center on a stretch of 82<sup>nd</sup>. This project allows us to explore opportunities to provide neighborhood centers in farther east areas of the city. We consider this an implementation project of the new Comprehensive Plan.

Brian Monberg, Metro: The SW Corridor was identified as the priority, and it has been moving forward. Metro councilors are involved in both projects. SW is a larger corridor with more partners and more challenges. This project is in the planning phase like SW was a couple years ago. Opportunities with partners can bring capital investments to East Portland, and we want to make sure transit is coordinated. These projects are moving independently, likely with different funding streams.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the diversity of residents and businesses east of 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave. The project will likely create displacement for many. We need to quantify the displacement. How do we address this in the Comp Plan and going forward? How does prosperity translate for the people who are in the neighborhoods today?

- This is a key question that is built into how we're thinking about this project. The corridor also passes through two Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative areas, so this could be an opportunity to use these areas as a tool.
- We are trying to start the project with existing conditions and are using the vulnerability to displacement study as a base. Through the community workshop process, we can build in some mechanisms to pay attention to this and involve those who are affected.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about the City's work on this project. What are the public involvement methods?

- Metro is the overall convener, running the large scale project engagement. The City will help to refine the nodes options. We will conduct our own outreach as well as partner with TriMet on open houses. There will be a City-specific event so we can develop a proposal about the nodes. Community workshops will be about land use vision and development strategies.

We need to think about what the process is to validate recommendations and for the community to check-in to make sure we have the right answer.

- This is a slightly different plan than for SW Corridor. When we approached network of communities on Powell-Division, we received a different response. People feel like they have a foundation, there are functional community coalitions, and we have EPAP, PBOT work that's already been done, NPIs, etc, so there's lots of infrastructure for outreach. It is still good caution, and we will certainly check in with the community throughout the process.

*Chair Baugh* asked if school district representatives are part of the committee.

- The whole route is PPS, David Douglas and Centennial, so we will reach out to them. We will work with PDC about displacement and gentrification, NPI opportunities and challenges.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 2:55 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, January 28, 2014

6:00 – 8:15 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

**Commissioners Absent:** Gary Oxman

**BPS Staff Present:** Susan Anderson, Eric Engstrom, Morgan Tracy, Phil Nameny, Julie Ocken

**Other Staff Present:** Art Pearce, PBOT; Courtney Duke, PBOT; Jill Grenda, BDS

**Guests:** Jackie Dingfelder, Mayor's Office

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck* mentioned the upcoming [12<sup>th</sup> Annual Urban Ecology and Conservation Symposium](#) on February 10. David Montgomery from UW and Tim Beatley are the two keynote speakers. We will also have a brown bag discussion with Tim Beatley about his work on biophilic cities at noon on February 11 that will include staff from BPS and BES. PSC members will receive the invitation to the brown bag later this week. Beatley will also present to City Council on Wednesday the 12th. It's our hope that Council will sign a Biophilic Cities Pledge at some point in the future and join an international Biophilic Cities Network to share information on efforts to better design nature in cities.
- *Commissioner Hanson* provided an update on the SE Quadrant Plan. There are 30 people on the committee. Staff have presented background information about the sub-areas, and the group is just starting to look at ideas for going forward. Business people, neighborhood reps, OMSI and other stakeholders are members of the diverse group. The boundaries of the study area are the Willamette River, western edge of Ladd's Addition, Powell and Burnside.
- *Commissioner Gray* took a tour with Shelli Romero from ODOT to see the Powell Blvd Safety Project. *Commissioner Gray* is also participating on the PDX CAC Social Equity Committee, which has met 4 times and is developing a policy around contracting and employee equity. Finally, Commissioner Novick came to Parkrose schools to do crossing duty, which was a really positive event.
- *Commissioner Smith* mentioned the WHI plan and its end based on the Port's decision not to pursue it. The good news is that the Mayor declined to make any changes to the PSC's recommendation, which highlights the great work the PSC did in crafting its recommendation.
- *Commissioner Schultz*: The West Quad SAC finished up a broad brush planning and is now working on the finer-grained plans for different areas within the quadrant. The project should be coming to the PSC in about 6 months or so.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted there are 6 new members on the CIC. It's mandated to have this committee, and it's a great group that is diverse while being homogenous. There is still an opening for a PSC member.
- *Commissioner Rudd* noted that on February 5 is the inaugural [ULI Thriving Cities](#) event. The goal to bring diverse interests to keep economy moving and bring parties together early on in the development process.
- *Chair Baugh* noted that the PSC is recruiting a position for a youth member (18-25 year old). Staff will send a description to partners, local colleges, etc this week to share the announcement.  
Tonight is *Commissioner Valdez's* last PSC meeting. She has been a fun and valuable member of the Commission and has been a strong voice for equity and people and the prosperity of Portland. The Commission will miss her presence.

- *Commissioner Valdez* thanked *Chair Baugh* and the Commission. There are fantastic things going on for me, and I thought it was time to do something different at this time.

### **Vote for 2014 PSC Officer Slate**

Decision: PSC members

*Commissioner Rudd* proposed the slate of officers for 2014 as *Chair Baugh*, *Vice Chair Shapiro* and *Vice Chair Schultz*.

*Commissioner Hanson* seconded and the vote passed unanimously.  
(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

### **Consent Agenda**

- Consideration of Minutes from the December 10, 2013 PSC meeting.
- R/W #7560: Request for Street Vacation N Argyle St east of N Kerby Ave

*Chair Baugh* asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

*Commissioner Hanson* moved to approve the consent agenda. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.  
(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

### **Director's Report**

Susan Anderson

- Thank you to the PSC members' leadership on the various committees each member sits on.
- Thank you to *Commissioner Valdez*. She's served for 6 years on the PC and PSC and has consistently brought a broad range of perspectives to the table with a strong voice as an advocate for the community.
- At our last meeting we agreed that we would seek a more youthful member for the PSC. The youth position will be for someone 18-25 years old. We have drafted a position description and will send it out soon to local colleges and to all our partners, and to all of you to help us identify great candidates. The position will be a 2-year position to fit better with younger people's schedules. The Mayor appoints this position as he does all other PSC positions.
- We expect to have the draft Climate Change Preparation Strategy and the associated Risk and Vulnerabilities Assessment report available on our website to begin the public comment process during the first week of February. We'll have it out for public comment for at least 6 weeks and will send a link to the website when it goes live.
- BPS budget  
[\[resources handout\]](#)
  - We are short just over a million dollars – and are looking at potential layoffs of about 11 people. This is because we have continued to rely on one-time funding from the general fund, BDS, PDC, and grants from foundations and others.
  - We will ask Council for 4 decision packages. The first is an ongoing request for 3.5 positions. This is to provide ongoing funding for the DLs. We have 5 DLs in the neighborhoods and one for the Central City. We currently have ongoing funding for just about half of them. The request is for \$385,000.

- The second request will be a one-time ask to finish the Comp Plan. This ask is for \$350,000. And is the last request so we can complete the update.
- The third request is for \$250,000 to keep the RICAP program going. That makes small to mid-sized fixes in the code. Currently this is funded by the BDS, which could happen again next year, but we want to get funding regardless.
- Finally, the Mayor has encouraged us to look for new ways to address the clean-up of brownfields, especially in light of the recent turn around by the Port on WHI. The funding would go to develop new policy, technical and financial tools to help private cleanup and development happen more quickly. *Commissioner Houck* noted this could and should be leveraged with Metro and other partners.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted the philanthropic community could be helpful for grant opportunities. We are consistently looking at opportunities at all levels, but for basic City services, this has been limited. Housing and gentrification could be unique projects to look at.
- *Commissioner Schultz* noted that the bureau's BAC has been very supportive of these requests. It is time to right size BPS so we don't have to come back year after year with requests. The group wanted to push the innovation aspects and continue to have Portland be recognized as a leader.
- *Commissioner Houck* asked if it would be appropriate for PSC members to meet with the Mayor and City Commissioners to advocate for the BPS budget. *Chair Baugh* agreed and also asked about how the bureau can stabilize funding that's needed.
- Like with any issue that the bureau has brought to the PSC, it would be good to have a strategy to target some of the Commissioners. There will also be budget meetings in the community and the Council budget session. Over the 5 years of the planning and sustainability merger, there have still been great new programs and innovations, but our time has been much more focused on the project side instead of trying to create foundation partnerships.
- We would like to have the PSC also write a letter stating your opinions on the need for additional funding. We probably need that letter on the next few weeks, so perhaps we could work with *Chair Baugh* and *Commissioner Schultz* (as she is on the BAC) to draft something and then send it around for review.
- Introduction and welcome to Jackie Dingfelder, Mayor's Office, policy director. She is our lead liaison on planning issues.
  - The Mayor sends his thanks for your public service. Volunteers do so much of the work on day-to-day issues for the City.
  - I have a planning background and worked as a professional planner in a variety of realms including work on issues regarding land use, sustainability, watershed, energy.
  - Worked with 2 governors to establish the energy policy for Oregon. Chaired the energy and environment committee for the House.
  - Will be working closely with BPS on industrial lands.
  - Also is the liaison for ONI, and I would agree that steady funding for the District Liaisons is really important because there is so much going on at the neighborhood level.
  - *Commissioner Gray* commented the Parkrose has always counted on Jackie as a friend of the district who supports the needs of children in our school districts. She has been a champion in the legislature, and I know the work you do for the City will be great.
  - *Commissioner Shapiro* commented on the good news that Jackie will oversee ONI and that PDC is in the Mayor's portfolio as well.
  - *Chair Baugh* thanked Jackie and noted that the PSC looks forward to working with her.

- The best thing will be to work through Susan when the PSC wants an update from the Mayor's office; Jackie could also be available for one-on-one conversations.

### **Transportation Systems Plan (TSP) Update**

Briefing: Art Pearce, PBOT; Courtney Duke, PBOT; Eric Engstrom

#### **Document:**

- [PBOT Projects and Timeline](#)

#### **Presentation:**

<http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6320446/view/>

Eric provided an introduction to the project, which clearly highlights the importance of land use and transportation coordination. Work we've done in the past 18 months that contribute to this work include:

- Networks PEG laid groundwork for what's going into the TSP.
- The Draft Comprehensive Plan Ch. 7 is the tip of the iceberg.
- Urban Design framework and Centers and Corridors lay the groundwork for transportation planning.
- Health and equity are critical elements in how we think about infrastructure (from the Portland Plan direction).
- Map App – one layer is the beginning of the project lists and on-the-ground work.

The TSP is a 20-year plan for transportation improvements. Historically, it's been the public facilities plan for transportation. Portland's plan is to establish transportation goals, policies, and project lists as a component of the Citywide Systems Plan.

The State rule dictates what we need to include in the TSP. We also have the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP) from Metro that we need to be in conformance with. The TSP is part of the Comprehensive Plan; the goals and policies are in the Comp Plan Working Draft. There are a number of other smaller plans that overlap and roll up into the TSP.

We have a check-sheet from the State but we can also include other aspects so long as we are in conformance with the outlined goals.

Components of the TSP Phase 1 are in the Comp Plan Working Draft.

- Comp Plan Working Draft Chapter 7 (Transportation)
- Comp Plan Working Draft Chapter 6 (Public Facilities)
- Comp Plan Working Draft Chapter 5 (Urban Design and Development)
- Finance Plan
- New Project Selection Criteria
- Project List Revisions and Reformatting

TSP Phase 2 will include:

- Transportation policies and objectives
- District Policies
- Street Car and Bike Plan Integration
- Conformance with RTP and TPR
- Modal Plans
- Incorporating Other Plans
- Other issues: TDM, Parking, Health Equity, LOS
- Studies



- Street Classifications
  - Pedestrian
  - Bicycle
  - Transit
  - Freight
  - Emergency Response
  - Auto
  - Street Design
- Findings, ordinances, etc.

There is a new Transportation Expert Group (TEG) comprised of 25 experts. The group will meet monthly, and their first meeting is this Thursday. *Commissioner Smith* will be a member as a continuation of his work on the Comp Plan Networks PEG.

The Planning and Project Management groups at PBOT are merging, which will help to tie policy outcomes to the delivery of projects. This is a new change, but ultimately it will shift the bureau's work in a great way by making the TSP and other PBOT work useful and effective. Staff need to see it as relevant guidance that's important for the work we do. One of the big steps is to sharpen the approach and make sure we're using real criteria to see if we can meet the goals through the actions we're doing.

The TSP has historically been about linking to the capital program, but now we want to make sure it is relevant to actual work. PBOT is already bringing on additional staff, including an ask for additional staff in the PBOT decision package.

There are a few fast-moving aspects at PBOT including a conversation about bringing additional revenue to the bureau. This Friday the bureau expects to hire a consultant to help work on a 2-year action plan.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about the TSP. Public right-of-way is a huge aspect. What is PBOT doing to work with BES, for example, about stormwater facilities?

- Policies are drafted in a couple places in the Public Facilities Chapter and in Chapter 7, e.g. for uses for the right-of-way, stormwater facility, community use. Policies support the work of the Street-by-Street concepts as well.
- Phase 2 will include some more details and ways we can work differently in areas of the city.
- Health equity and climate change are areas we want to be sure are included in the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Gray* asked about bringing more revenue to PBOT. In other counties and locations, I've heard about controversial road fees and other ideas. Given that context, what are some of the ideas you've heard about raising revenue?

- There is a team at PBOT that is looking at funding structures, but things are not yet fully flushed out. There is a potential list in the TSP.
- The local street conversation is important.
- Susan noted we could ask the new Transportation Director, Leah Treat, to come and comment on to the PSC on a few topics of interest.

I recently met with Commissioner Novick re: Powell Division Safety Plan and how the roads are owned either by PBOT or ODOT. Can we start to blur lines about what people need as opposed to who owns the road and is responsible for it? It's about safety, economic development and commerce.

- There is a list of "thorny issues" that we need to keep sight of. It's not clear if the TSP is the right place to acknowledge this, but we do need to make sure the facilities meet the needs of the people and not just cars. There have been a number of conversations about jurisdictional transfers, and we could spend all our resources working through



that issue, so we need to be cautious about how much we allocate resources to it, though we all want to focus on it.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about selecting projects. What will the evaluation criteria be in general?

- There are existing criteria in the TSP, and staff have drafted some next criteria to have health equity, access to jobs and housing strong, climate change and if there is outside funding available. We are looking at these additions as new factors. Safety, especially for pedestrians and around schools, is very important as well.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if part of this effort ties into working with planning to resolve parking issues.

- We have some specific parking conversations set up, especially around Centers and Corridors that will start in the spring. Through CC2035 work, we are also looking at Transportation Management Program for the city center as well. Director Treat is interested in looking at other parking issues more broadly, and there is a placeholder in the PBOT budget request.

*Commissioner Smith* noted there are questions from the PEG process that are still unresolved including Civic Corridors and how to replace level of service (LOS) as a measure of how we're doing (cars instead of people movement).

- Both are "thorny issues." PBOT received a grant to move forward on multi-modal LOS work and is now looking at specific geographies to test these ideas. Hope to have this as part of the TSP in 2015. Part of the challenge is that LOS has different meanings at different levels of the conversation.
- For civic corridors, we're working on this during Phase 2 to see if there's something different we need in the classification description, see what projects are in those areas that need to be updated, if centers and corridors are part of the criteria/ranking.

*Commissioner Shapiro* focused on West Burnside between 10<sup>th</sup> and 11<sup>th</sup>. The evolution of this area makes it more pedestrian-focused. Powell on 92<sup>nd</sup> is another major issue.

- Some of these issues are at the more operational scale. The TSP should enable these more on-the-ground analysis and solutions. The goal of the TSP will be to help guide these conversations and show the trade-offs about allocating a finite space.

*Chair Baugh* commented that we've heard lots about neighborhoods and equity, so hopefully the TAG is a diverse and equitable group. Parking is a great issue, but it includes both a land use and a transit component. How you think about parking should include transit and TriMet. Also, health and equity are two separate issues/criteria as defined in the Portland Plan. Finally, regarding revenue to build, what do you end up building? How does the criteria evaluate what gets built? Impacts to the communities are definitely part of this conversation.

- These are great points and are similar concerns we've heard from the community.

*Commissioner Smith* noted there is a challenge. I worry that public opinion research could be different from the long-term work. How do we ensure short-term politics don't disrupt the long-term planning too much? Polling is a snap-shot. We need to be sure we're connecting with the guidance for long-term work.

- Whatever funding proposal comes through the process will only be specific to a group of projects and maintenance; it won't be the only way to fund work.

*Commissioner Houck* is pleased to hear that meeting multiple objectives with each project is one of the criteria.

Staff and PBOT Director Leah Treat will return to the PSC with the criteria, funding ideas and other updates.

## RICAP 6

Briefing: Jill Grenda, BDS; Morgan Tracy, Phil Nameny

### Document:

- [RICAP 6 overview](#)

RICAP projects have been on a revolving cycle since 2003. There was a funding gap between 2010 and 2013, but the current work, RICAP 6, has been funded for this fiscal year. The PSC voted to approve the workplan including 42 items in August 2013. There was some pressure to add items to the package. Many were not added, however, three additional items that are time-sensitive were subsequently added to the workplan at the request of the Bureau of Development Services and the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability.

Staff researched the 45 items using case history, and reviewing policy and code history for background and original code intent. They spoke with stakeholders and formulated decisions about moving forward on the items.

From the research, staff developed the [Discussion Draft](#) that is currently out for public review. Of the 45 items, staff proposed to not amend about 25 percent of the issues that were originally brought up, as noted on the summary sheet.

The Discussion Draft has been shared with neighborhood associations, DRAC, district coalition offices and others. This outreach continues through February. There is an Open House on February 11, and the notice/invite was sent to over 700 people. The comment period closes on February 21, at which point staff will make changes as necessary. A proposed draft will be released in March, with a tentative hearing at the PSC on April 22.

Susan encouraged the PSC to look at the proposed draft and ask clarifying questions before the hearing date so that the hearing can be a most effective use of time to hear and respond to testimony. RICAP is on an annual revolving workplan. In order to keep on schedule, we need to make a recommendation to Council so they can vote on it in May and make the code changes effective for the new fiscal year.

PSC members noted that if they can get a sense of what the input has been in mid-March, then they can get a sense of what can move forward quickly and what items might need more input. If there are issues that the PSC has burning questions on, they will ask staff. Staff can provide further updates and details on specific issues for PSC members.

We have already heard from a number of people. At this point, we are collecting comments, clarifying and responding to questions. If the PSC members are hearing questions or comments, please direct people to staff for any needed clarifications.

Staff highlighted some of the details on a few of the hot-topic issues:

- **Bed & Breakfast short-term rental issue:** The City has seen a huge increase in short-term rentals, e.g., AirBnB listings. We are interested in staying ahead of this trend and developing the appropriate level of regulations. "Streamlining" the process by allowing 1 and 2 bedroom rentals is specific to the current land-use amendments, but we are not proposing changes to add building and fire code related inspections. Using the "Type B" home occupation permit process as a model, there would be a single zoning inspection of the site to ensure that it remained residential in appearance and character. There is not a proposal to require permit renewals in the discussion draft. The maximum occupancy is the same as what is allowed for any household (i.e. family plus up to 5 unrelated individuals living in a house). There is a necessary balance

required: costs burdens versus “bootlegging” to avoid the permit process. A clear set of regulations with a low fee incents greater compliance and allows these sites to operate more transparently as opposed to being clandestine and secretive. The Transient Lodging Tax (a.k.a. room tax) is already applicable, but most people aren’t paying it, either to avoid detection or from lack of knowledge.

- Radio Frequency Transmission Tower Siting has not received many comments as staff initially thought it might. The proposal aligns with Federal Communication Commission (FCC) standards and regulations, which limit cities' ability to regulate based on radio frequency emissions. The revisions more clearly distinguish "personal wireless services" (i.e. Cell towers) from radio broadcast towers (like those in Healy Heights). Objective standards for modifying facilities are also included. We are not changing the conditional use thresholds that currently apply.
- Temporary uses. We are getting the chapter updated, since it has not been significantly updated since its adoption in 1991. Commercial filming is currently not addressed in the code. The proposal is to add commercial filming as a temporary activity, giving specific limits on how much time needs to pass before the site can be used for the same purpose. A “break in activity” is 4 times the amount of time that the activity occurs.

In addition to filming, we are adding provisions to allow temporary off-site staging areas for development sites. This generally is about staging areas for big buildings on small sites. This would allow staging construction materials nearby, with requirements that the site be restored after the staging use. One year is the language in the proposed draft, but some large projects take multiple years. Staff will evaluate whether this timeline should be revised for the Proposed Draft.

- Modified fence height regulations are not included in the package. Some of the past issues identified in the database are no longer applicable. There now doesn’t seem to be a demonstrated need to change the regulation.
- 3 items were added after the initial PSC workplan hearing:
  - Public art as an option instead of the ground-floor window requirement without land use adjustment. This applies outside the Central City only. To incent people to use public art and remove one level of the approval process. Interested in how buildings develop in corridors based on this amendment. RACC is advocating for this amendment.
  - Application of Zoning Code in Right-of-Way in historic resources overlay zone. Interested in how this relates bioswales and other "standard improvements" in the right of way.
  - Correcting the approval criteria for Comp Plan Map amendments to include the requirement that the proposed map amendment must also be in conformance with Statewide Land Use Planning Goals. This clarifies the omission in the current Code.

*Commissioner Houck* asked about item #26: Was there a group that wanted to do restoration work? To remove hurdles?

- This was a suggestion from environmental review staff to streamline the process. BPS staff met with BES staff to see about developing standards, but found that safely placing large woody debris is very specific to each site's hydrologic and topographic conditions. Therefore, creating "one-size fits all" standards was not desirable.

*Chair Baugh* asked about spectator seating at schools. Schools were concerned about square footage for seating.

- We haven’t heard from PP&R or the school districts yet. However, this item was spurred by concern of school districts and PP&R.

**Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 8:42 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator