

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

October 23, 2018

5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, André Baugh, Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Michelle Rudd, Chris Smith, Katherine Schultz, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin

Commissioners Absent: Daisy Quinonez

City Staff Presenting: Julia Thompson, Karen Guillen-Chapman, Joe Zehnder

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Larsell: Last month I attended a couple of activities in the community with BPS staff. One was the bus ride with the Fair Housing Council, and it was amazing. We got to hear from the community about what had happened in specific areas on the tour throughout the city. We got a sense for how the city doesn't show its scars; you don't see what has happened before. I also went to the Tribal Nations Summit at the end of September, which was also very impactful.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- We're about to start the budget process. Each year we have a budget advisor committee (BAC) that works with the bureau. This year, a big part of that is to get the group to understand our work program. The most representative group we thought of would be a 3-person group from the PSC, community representatives (carbon reduction, energy) and 3 BPS staff. It's probably a 2-meeting responsibility this year, and since we're going over the workplan tonight, that is like an overview for PSC members to join the BAC. Julie will send tentative dates, which will be included in meeting notes.
- SW Corridor LPA is at Council on November 1. *Commissioner Smith* will represent the PSC's recommendation.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from September 25 and October 9, 2018 PSC meetings

Commissioner Smith moved to approve consent agenda. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Rudd, Smith, Schultz, Spevak, St Martin; A1 – Spevak)

BPS Strategic Plan, Workplan and Budget

Work Session: Julia Thompson, Karen Guillen-Chapman, Joe Zehnder

Julia (BPS' Business Operations Manager) introduced Karen, BPS' new Equity Manager. Karen most recently comes to BPS from BDS and has background in planning and solid waste and recycling work.

Karen shared a bit about herself and her hopes and aspirations for her work with BPS. She's worked with Hacienda CDC and PCRI and has a background in environmental services and planning work. Karen has worked for PP&R and BDS in equity roles with lots of good mentors. BPS is really unique because it influences Citywide the work other bureaus do in terms of the built environment and racial equity initiatives.

Julia walked through the [2018-20 BPS Strategic Plan](#) as context for the workplan discussion this evening. The first pages set the context we're working in: expectations of growth, equity, racial justice, and climate action, and our goals for 2035. BPS is a convener and coordinator of complex plans, and we work in collaboration with many others. For a bureau of about 105 people, this is a deep and mighty workplan.

Joe introduced the work session. This is time for the PSC to weigh in on the [work program](#) for the next fiscal year and through next 3 fiscal years. We'll focus the discussion welcome in the big groups of tasks.

The first large grouping of work, Comprehensive Plan, is the long-range planning piece you all know well. One of our core items is the development and upkeep of the Comp Plan and related codes.

Chair Schultz: When does the next Comp Plan process restart?

- Joe: The gap in the last update was 20+ years. So we don't want to do that again! Hopefully we would be gearing up for an update by 2030. But maintenance and changes for the current plan continue (area plans, corridor plans, etc). We have to keep updating our EOA and our findings about the city, so we can make changes and defend them. Periodically we then stop that process and restart for the next plan.

We have about 40 planners and 10 in technical services overall. So we're drawing from across the bureau to get the work done. We want to review and refresh our strategies, particularly reminding Council about our equity initiatives laid forth in the Portland Plan.

Commissioner Baugh: It would be good to go back and test the overarching values, e.g. equity, from the Portland Plan. Do they have the same meaning, and does Portland still have the same values around how we view equity and prosperity? That will influence PSC recommendations in the future and how we use the equity lens, health, education, etc in our recommendations.

- Joe: These topics come up throughout the workplan, and what you described is what we're after.

Commissioner Houck: Under the EOA update, is there any thought about pursuing issues related to Goal 9 (Industrial Lands) in terms of an exception or legal analysis?

- Joe: Every time we update the EOA we get questioned. Reevaluation of harbor lands is a good example. Other things that change are the Metro forecasts, and we'll have a new one in about a year.

Commissioner Rudd: When we're looking at updating the BLI and EOA, I want to be sure there is a look at how the various development restrictions may limit our potential to increase density on existing industrial land. Be sure to look at how realistic it is to get more jobs on existing sites.

Health Connected City work is the next major bucket with 5 bundles nested within it. It includes place-based work and transit corridor work including the streetcar alignment for the next lines.

Commissioner Rudd: With streetcar planning, does that include housing analysis like we saw with SW Corridor and associated improvements like bikeways?

- Joe: Yes. That one is about the first of the lines (Hollywood to Montgomery Park), so it affects housing production, and it could include jobs as well.

Commissioner Spevak: Is the upzoning around transit stations included with the SW Corridor work?

- Joe: It could be. The SW Corridor MOU included a statement for TriMet to work with City bureaus to see where more development can occur around transit stations. We're starting at West Portland Town Center, which is mostly commercial.

Commissioner Smith: On the next streetcar corridor, we have to think about the future of the area north of Vaughn and what that looks like. I'm more curious about Macadam: What's the intent of looking at that plan?

- Joe: We could adjust some zoning on the Macadam corridor, which is from the 1970s, and is an impediment to what we think could happen on the corridor. This item doesn't have a funding source identified (we didn't get the grants we applied for), and it's not the highest priority for us.

As a reminder, this workplan is a forecast and the universe of potential work to accomplish our large goals. It will depend on funding and pace of other projects.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: Under budget analysis, if the box is white, does that mean the project is not yet funded?

- Joe: Budget analysis is where we feel it may not have as much momentum behind the project as others do. Every year when we do the budget, we have to find things we know we won't have the resources to do. Typical funding being white means we're not sure how we'll fund it at this point.

Commissioner Bachrach: When we had our retreat last year, one issue we talked about was how the PSC has some influence on what is priority and the budget implications of different work programs. I'm still wondering that same thing: is there a role for us to discuss and influence what should be a priority?

- Joe: That is what we're trying to do and start tonight. If you have something that you think is absolutely not a priority, we are happy to hear about it. The BAC is another chance to follow-up on this discussion for PSC members who want to be involved in that.
- *Chair Schultz:* The way I've been looking at this is that we can't influence too much if a project is already in progress, but please verbalize your concerns if there are things you think shouldn't continue. If you want to see things that aren't on here, bring those up as well. This doesn't mean we're going to get things all realigned based on PSC input, but at least we can share our input.

Commissioner Larsell: I did notice East Portland coming up throughout the workplan, but it's very distributed. Some things are mentioned, but I'd love to see Gateway and Lents spelled out. I've been advocating for a quadrant-equivalent plan for East Portland. I see things dribbling in, but I'd like to see the work be done in a coherent way as a total, complete plan.

- Joe: Gateway and Lents are further along in the workplan, so we'll see them later in the document.

Commissioner Spevak: The BAC last year was a small group of stakeholders. I've suggested ideas for the BPS workplan, and I'd like to discuss other PSC members' ideas tonight too.

Commissioner Houck: I would worry about micro-management at some point. I think this big picture overview is a good level.

Joe continued through the workplan overview.

Commissioner Rudd: Updating the Johnson Creek Plan District is related to the Lents project but doesn't appear to have funding. During the process I worked on, the state asked what they could do to support. What can they do to help with this?

- Joe: There is technical work on our end (e-zone map updates and River Plan are the priorities right now). We need to find time and the opening to do the code work. BES has potential funds we can use for this. And the state... especially if they have money.

Local historic landmarks districts: If we can get the State permission for creating those, we could manage this better and tailor the regulations better. But as of now, it's Federally-designed and led, so we have little control.

The economic development work is building the foundation to see how our policies and codes are working on the economy: job production and industrial lands are included in this review.

We'll have continued code updates including DOZA and other RICAP projects.

Community engagement and action includes all the work we've done in building the long-range plans. We need to improve on this work and work on developing ways for community-led planning.

Smart Cities includes our work around IoT and Open Data among other technical work.

Discussion

Commissioner Smith: I have two big thematic comments. I second Katie's call for a focus on East Portland... something like a big, bold plan for East Portland. The other of course is transportation-related, and I see bit of it here. As a City we have to think about how we make the mode shift happen. Nothing here that I see ties together how we'll push land use plans to include mode shift goals for what we're aiming for in our big plans.

Commissioner Spevak: I agree there should be a major topic about East Portland. I'm particularly interested in the connectivity issues. PBOT and financial modeling, as well as lessons from other cities, are important. It also has to do with mode split: we can't let that huge area of the city be a place where you have to use a car for 75 percent of your trips. The other topic is more about historic and design. I had a good meeting with PHLC and feel there is a nice area of overlap interest to do a code project that would probably reduce some heights and clarify some authority of that commission to reduce the delta of what we've approved and what they feel comfortable approving. There is a big discrepancy right now, and PHLC has the authority to approve height or not. The current system doesn't work.

Commissioner Larsell: Item H2 isn't noted as being funded, but that's a big anti-displacement strategy. I'd like to see more emphasis on that. In Section G, it would be great to see an evaluation of anti-displacement strategies project on the list.

- Joe: That's what Item G5 intends.

Commissioner Bachrach: I agree with *Commissioner Spevak* on the historic preservation code rewrite. I'd say this is higher priority, but I don't know higher than what. To pick a bigger topic, I think housing right now is the City's top priority. While Section G lists programs that affect the housing crisis, I would prioritize those, and I would like to see a housing vision to look at all the components to say, "here's what we need to be doing." Adopting RIP is a tool, but it won't move the dial on the housing problem in the next year or two.

- Joe: Item G3 is the kind of thing you're talking about.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I agree generally with *Commissioner Bachrach*. The EcoNW report about the underproduction of housing in Oregon is something to review. I support the East Portland approach others have noted. Something I might have missed but don't see is about seismic retrofits on existing commercial buildings.

- Joe: That was a PBEM project.

Commissioner Baugh: I agree about East Portland and housing strategy work. I realize the Smart Cities and transportation and mode change is quickly changing and has support, e.g. AVs. It brings to mind an equity question in that the mode split is going to occur in a way that some people will be left behind. It impacts if buses will even be viable in 5 years.

Commissioner Houck: I'd like to know more about Items E4-9 and dig into them more in terms of timing and priorities.

Commissioner St Martin: This is an amazing amount of work. I do have the question about how we prioritize it all. I agree that housing is a big nut to crack. On Item G5, we've spent lots of time talking about new housing production, but we also need to talk about saving homes... repairs, different forms of house-sharing, etc, and using what we have in a creative way.

Commissioner Rudd: Part of solving housing is providing more jobs. So keeping our eye on that element is important as well.

Chair Schultz: Throughout our work, we've continued to talk about the importance of our centers, but we seem them in projects randomly. We don't take time to necessarily understand each center individually. I'm concerned we'll end up with people from the neighborhoods that are frustrated if we don't focus on the specifics of individual centers.

Joe: In addition to the list of ideas, we have the difficulty in seeing the priorities in how we're showing and talking about in the workplan. We'll attempt to bring this back to show you all an update before the budget is due in late January. And again, we are asking for 3-4 PSC members to join our BAC this year.

Commissioner Smith: It seems that lots of us have wanted PSC input. But tonight is a snapshot in an ongoing process. It's important for the PSC to get regular updates on this 3-year vision. The piece that's still missing is the inception of projects getting on this list. Are there ways for commissioners to get involved earlier? This feels like it's mostly baked by the time we get to see and discuss it. How do we influence years' 4 and 5 work, for example?

- Joe: We should keep this broadening and the discussion flowing as we head into the later years on the workplan.

Chair Schultz: We continually comment about working on projects "at some point". Maybe coming up with a way to track those comments could be a good start. If a lightbulb goes off in your head, feel free to send it to Julie, who can help track.

Joe: What we'll grapple with is understanding the importance of the issue. But when we look at where development activity is concentrated, it's not always around things on the workplan.

Commissioner Spevak: In this general discussion, I was hopeful we could delve in to topics we've brought up (e.g. getting to our mode splits). We don't talk about these things together outside of meetings. It would be

nice to have more time to discuss as a Commission with time to discuss more details. I'd like to continue the discussion about things we've identified.

Joe: Making space is something we can try to do in looking at our upcoming agendas. When the discussion comes around the workplan, there are so many pressures that they sometimes truncate the discussion like *Commissioner Spevak* is suggesting.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 6:31 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken