

## **Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission**

**November 12, 2019**

**12:30 p.m.**

**Meeting Minutes**

**Commissioners Present:** Jeff Bachrach (left at 2:55 p.m.), Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck (arrived 1 p.m.), Oriana Magnera, Daisy Quiñonez, Steph Routh, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak

**Commissioners Absent:** Katie Larsell, Akasha Lawrence Spence

**City Staff Presenting:** Sandra Wood, Lora Lillard, Michele Crim, Alisa Kane, Andria Jacob, Kyle Diesner; Staci Monroe (BDS)

*Chair Schultz* called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

#### **Director's Report**

Joe Zehnder

1. Tree Code (Title 11) that PSC heard in September will be considered in 2 separate meetings at City Council. Chris will attend tomorrow's session (extension of the sunset dates), and Eli will attend on December 5 on behalf of the PSC (consideration of amendments from the PSC and UFC).
2. Updates for projects going to Council:
  - November 20: Fossil Fuels re-adoption at 2 p.m. time certain.
  - November 21: Better Housing by Design at 2:45 p.m. time certain to continue the work session.
3. Last call for PSC members to apply for the BPS BAC. Applications are due by November 17, 2019.

#### **Consent Agenda**

- Consideration of Minutes from the October 22, 2019 PSC meeting.

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

(Y7 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Magnera, Quiñonez, Routh, Smith, Spevak; A1 – Schultz)

## Design Overlay Zone Amendments

Work Session: Sandra Wood, Lora Lillard; Staci Monroe (BDS)

### Presentation

*Chair Schultz:* We have two hours for our first DOZA work session. The goal of today's work session is to formulate our testimony on the Citywide Design Guidelines. As a reminder, the Design Commission will make a recommendation on the Guidelines to City Council. The PSC will make a recommendation to City Council on everything else in the DOZA package. We'll start with a brief presentation by staff. Then we will discuss the purpose of design review, the three tenets and the guidelines.

### **Disclosures**

At the last meeting Commissioners shared their potential conflicts of interest. While it's not clear whether the proposed changes create a potential conflict of interest for PSC members because the changes affect such a broad class of property owners, in the interest of transparency, we have the following declarations:

- *Commissioner Smith* owns property in the design overlay zone.
- Commissioners Schultz, Spevak, Bortolazzo, and Lawrence Spence work for architectural or development firms who conduct work in Portland.

Sandra introduced herself and Lora. We have three guidelines to talk about today, and we'll focus on Volume 3 of the DOZA report (Citywide Design Guidelines). She provided a reminder about base zones and overlay zones.

Lora noted that the purpose statement sets the framework of the three tenets. Today we are discussing the qualitative and descriptive design guidelines. The guidelines and standards are to achieve parity.

The three tenets are benchmarks that frame how the design standards and the Portland Citywide Design Guidelines are written. While the standards provide clear and objective measures and the guidelines provide criteria that offer flexibility and encourage innovation, these parallel regulations both strive to achieve the same outcomes rooted in these three tenets.

Design overlay is a tool for evolving in the future. The tenets have buy-in. Sometimes the area has an established context, and sometimes it is evolving. The 'd' overlay promotes design excellence through tools that build on context; contribute to the public realm; and promote quality and long-term resilience.

At the PSC before, there was a discussion about making sure we have bumpers, so the 'd' overlay doesn't do everything in the place. This overlay relates to goals 3 and 4 of the Comprehensive Plan.

*Commissioner Magnera:* What tenants did you consider that didn't make the list we have in the draft?

- Lora: We discussed other larger goals such as equity. We decided it shouldn't necessarily be a tenant, but it is the overarching framework and lens.
- Sandra: The Design Commission is basing their work these tenants already.

*Commissioner Spevak:* I'm wondering on the quality and long-term resilience how staff thought through these guidelines and building and zoning code requirements. Green roofs is an example.

- Sandra: They are not mutually exclusive. The tenants are good to have in all parts of the city. But if a developer is building in a part of the city where they're setting the context, they could bring those to the forefront. That is the expectation of design review in the areas with the 'd' overlay.
- Lora: The next work session will dive into the purpose statement more, along with the map, so the PSC can dive into that discussion more next week.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* Since we are going to come back to consider the purpose statement, I'll then ask this to come back to, which has to do with the tension between 'd' regulations and the cost of housing. It does have at least some additional costs. If we look at the purpose, we could ask if we want to add something like "design review not to inhibit the manufacturing of housing in the city".

- Sandra: Today we are talking about the tenants, which is part of the guidelines.

*Commissioner Houck:* There has been a sentiment for many years that the Design Commission (DC) has not paid enough attention to the natural areas and benefits I urge that the language read in context... "...for people, in harmony with nature".

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* Building on what *Commissioner Bachrach* said, for the first statement about context, I'm wondering if we make sure we don't create obstacles for housing could be a way to make sure that happens.

*Chair Schultz:* Housing is of critical importance. But there may be a time when industrial lands is also of importance. So we need to figure out the balance of jobs, economy, housing, environment, and what we're trying to accomplish here.

*Commissioner Magnera:* It's not just an issue of housing, but it's about affordability more generally. I would consider the affordability piece and the equity statement more in the purpose statement. Culturally-specific design could be something we add or ask the DC to consider as well. Our statement should ensure equity.

Lora noted there are 10 proposed guidelines for the new plan (currently 16). We are aiming to delete redundancies and put one guideline within each statement.

Lora noted the preamble for using the Design Guidelines (slide 9). Questions the PSC should consider in our discussion today are:

- Do the guidelines support the three tenets laid out in the Purpose statement?
- Is there something missing within the guidelines that would better support the three tenets?

#### **Public Realm components**

- #5 Design the sidewalk level of buildings to be comfortable, pleasant, and human-scaled. (slide 14)
- #6 Provide opportunities to pause, sit, and interact. (slide 15)
- #7 Minimize and integrate parking and necessary building services. (slide 16)

*Commissioner Spevak:* If I were to add to #5, I would try to capture something about variety. In the images, they all have greenery. I know that's not a requirement, but elevating natural space, perhaps in #6, could be helpful.

*Commissioner Houck:* The images don't reflect trees that I think are incredibly important from an urban heat island and general winter and summer seasons. Having something that reflects a more robust urban canopy would be helpful. I do really like having images for people to know what we're talking about.

*Chair Schultz:* Street trees are required, so I'm interested in how we're seeking to move the needle. Maybe we show trees in open spaces.

*Commissioner Magnera:* Who does design review serve? #5 starts to get at that. If equity is an overarching theme, I'd like to see it more clearly stated. Can we add language that's culturally-specific or serves the neighborhood, etc. The public realm should be culturally-specific to people who live in the neighborhood.

*Commissioner Spevak:* The right-of-way (ROW) can enhance the public realm. If people are adding to the greenery, there should be something of a benefit for them.

- Staci: Standard improvements in the ROW are typically exempt from Design Review. The UFC and PBOT regulate what's in the ROW. When there are conditions that prevent trees from being planted, that's when DC gets more involved... when you vary from the standard.

*Commissioner Routh:* For #5 I'd like to talk about universal accessibility to add that component. When we talk about housing affordability, we should also be talking about people maintaining residence throughout their lives.

*Chair Schultz:* There are points in the standards that address these in a different way – putting residential houses on stoops is an example. We'll have to think about this.

Sandra: For #5, I would suggest that some of these ideas fall within the design approaches instead of changing the language itself.

- *Commissioner Bachrach:* I totally support that. This statement succinctly captures the intent.
- *Commissioner Magnera:* Naming things still matters. If we care about accessibility or otherwise to ensure it's in the statement and what should be considered.
- *Chair Schultz:* I support putting something in the design approach. The statement is broad enough to push me to use the design approaches, the background statement, and the images.
- *Commissioner Houck:* On this particular guideline, I'm much more concerned about the impact on people as opposed to nature per se.

PSC members are supportive of components for #5: Ideas should be put into background and imagery. Perhaps there is a guideline missing to express some of the ideas brought up in this conversation. The second sentence in the background describes what "comfortable" means in the context and names the why and how.

*Commissioner Houck:* Does the DC refer to the background as part of their decisions?

- Staci: Yes. Because the guidelines are so broad, the background sections are very valuable to us. Staci provided a bit of background about how design review works generally.

*Chair Schultz:* We need to strengthen the correlation between the standards and design guidelines – like cross-reference everything. Some have a much stronger correlation right now than others do. I should

be able to use the standards to meet the design guidelines and vice versa. In the background, there is a minor statement in the background (page 35 of Volume 3): this could end up discouraging oriel windows, so I suggest this get stricken. I have concerns about the imagery that's been selected – in general the images don't relate to standards or vice versa, or it seems like it's an image that relates to something else than the one it's place with. Though I do think #5 correlates well.

*Commissioner Houck:* Much of what I have in my statements are specific word changes. As individuals can we also share our ideas with the DC?

- Sandra: Yes, the PSC should focus on the standards and guidelines and tenants today for what we share as comments to the DC. Individual PSC members can write personal testimony to the DC. At the DC's meeting on December 5, we will present the PSC's letter, not individual commissioners' statements.

Lora: On page 8, there is a disclaimer that the images are examples – they are not all inclusive of options.

#6 Provide opportunities to pause, sit, and interact

*Commissioner Magnera:* I support the language, but I want to propose "Provide opportunities to rest and be welcome, pause, sit, and interact".

Commissioners generally support this language.

*Chair Schultz:* I'm supportive but am a little concerned about what it means to "rest"... does this relate to sitting or sleeping or both?

- *Commissioner Magnera:* I could provide some background language to support what "rest" intends – a space for people to feel welcome and safe, inviting for all.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* I'm concerned this could be quite contentious. To put into design review some language like this could be too great a burden on design review.

*Commissioner Quiñonez:* I'm supportive of the word "rest" to invite a longer-term use of the public space.

Sandra reminded the Commission that design review is typically used for private property.

*Chair Schultz:* I don't support the word "rest". I do like "pause". I'm more inclined to "pause, sit, interact, and feel welcome".

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* We are trying to make the spaces inviting for everyone. But we can't address every issue in the design guidelines. We are trying to promote the social interaction. Stopping for a long period of time is beyond the intent.

*Commissioner Routh:* I appreciate the perspective here and the tension between welcoming spaces and having amenities specific only to pause. I want to be sure the amenities are more welcoming and permissive and inclusive.

*Commissioner Houck:* The most significant word I'd like to add is "welcoming".

*Commissioner Magnera:* We aren't solving for a public policy problem here that proving more prolonged rest on private property is important. Buildings serve all folks in our community; "rest" signifies that.

Joe: I appreciate the discussion. Daylighting what you think with a specific recommendation is about what success looks like. Design review does not affect use of property – it's not that tool.

The phrase "rest and welcoming" supported by a majority of PSC members for #6. *Commissioner Magnera* will provide an extra sentence for the background statement.

#7 Minimize and integrate parking and necessary building services.

*Commissioner Smith:* I find a conflict between bike and auto parking. "minimize" does not make sense for bike parking, but it does for auto. I'm struggling with how to deal with the differentiation. The upper left photo on page 44 don't meet the standard for long-term bike parking.

- Lora: We discussed bike parking in the 3x3 and thought the short-term bike parking should be mentioned and integrated into Guideline 6. Guideline 7 is more about long-term bike parking. "Integrate" is probably a better word than "minimize".

*Commissioner Smith:* That language helps. There is more opportunity for conflict in that the code allows more ground-floor bike parking, but now I'm wondering if we're creating conflict for windows looking into the bike room where the code says we can.

*Chair Schultz:* I support "integrate" and strike "minimize".

Joe: I want to clarify that this is about public realm as well. #7 is the impact.

For #7, Commissioners support using the word "integrate" and striking "minimize".

*Chair Schultz:* It's confusing we have bike parking addressed in two different guidelines. I think it could all go into #7.

**Context components tell about scope and scale and site-specific opportunities.**

- #1 Respond to the citywide urban design framework, building on pattern area characteristics and advancing the aspirations of center, corridor, and transit station.
- #2 Build on the character and local identity of the place.
- #3 Create positive relationships with adjacent surroundings.
- #4 Integrate and enhance on-site features and opportunities to meaningfully contribute to a location's uniqueness.

#1 Respond to the citywide urban design framework, building on pattern area characteristics and advancing the aspirations of center, corridor, and transit station

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* On the inner neighborhoods (page 15), I have some language ideas. I would suggest replacing "complement" with "acknowledge" to better reflect the historic natures of the context. For eastern neighborhoods, "create mid-block connections" is something we talked about in BHD. It seems the developer needs to provide the connection, so I'd consider "encourage" or "explore" since this sounds like it's going beyond an expectation.

Commissioners are supportive of these language changes in #1.

*Commissioner Houck* I have some word smiting that I'll submit to DC and staff separately.

## #2 Build on the character and local identity of the place

*Commissioner Quiñonez*: What constitutes a neighborhood contact meeting?

- Staci: There is a requirement for projects (developing throughout the city) have to post when they are adding to the site, and they have to have a meeting if they are adding more than 20,000 square feet on the site to let the community hear what's coming. Changes don't have to be made; it's just an opportunity for the developer to consider comments.
- *Commissioner Smith*: It helps to ensure that neighbors aren't surprised about what's coming and being built. For design review, it's like a first round of the public process.

*Commissioner Houck*: I like that nature is included in the graphic on page 33. The use of headwaters at Tryon Creek development is a good example.

*Commissioner Routh*: Is there an opportunity to merge the neighborhood contact and community engagement processes to streamline and incorporate more feedback?

- Lora: What we heard from the public was that engagement should be honored and should take place outside of the neighborhood contact meeting, so we wanted this separate.

*Commissioner Magnera*: I'd like to add a bullet about preserving resources that preserve a community. I would also add an element of culturally-responsive design to support the community that's there.

- Sandra: Is that separate or in-line with "site and area observations"? It's similar to this but a separate bullet.

PSC members support adding the bullet about culturally-specific and demographics in #2.

## #3 Create positive relationships with adjacent surroundings

*Commissioner Bortolazzo*: On page 27 in the first paragraph, I would replace "relate" with "acknowledge". Relate implies mimic or replicate, but we can better imply this with acknowledging.

PSC members support this language change in #3.

*Commissioner Bachrach*: There is an inherent tension about historic architecture without being forced to replace what's there. Page 26 second paragraph, it says "complementary architecture". Does this mean you have to make it exactly what's there? Or similar? The last sentence in that paragraph "recognizing current zoning..." versus the adjacent form. I don't want us to be pushing the needle too far to have to mimic what's there versus.

*Chair Schultz*: I like "complementary". But in terms of imagery, there are 5 out of 8 that talk about (show) stepping down and related building heights, but that is addressed in the Zoning Code. I also have an issue with the "positive relationships... recognizing underlying zoning..." sentence because it's in conflict.

- *Commissioner Bortolazzo* concurs with the imagery issues.

*Commissioner Spevak:* This is the most likely place where design review can drive up costs.

*Commissioner Smith:* This is a critical question, but I'm not sure this is the place to debate it. Will we review the Zoning Code at a later point and discuss this there?

- Yes, this is a precursor for that conversation.

Lora: The sentence was included for the public and applicants and decision-makers; it's not just what you see on the ground, but it's also about what the adjacent surroundings are – to help people think about what's possible too.

*Chair Schultz:* I think it's fine just to strike the statement. Or: Buildings must meet underlying zoning code.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* The letter to DC today is about the guidelines. Should we also say we'll likely adopt zoning regulations about the DC not modifying height or zoning in their review? That could be helpful.

- *Chair Schultz:* I think this is a weighty decision that we can't yet state in the letter – it would need more time with us.

There is concern about the last statement is shared among commissioners but will be further discussed and not included in the letter to the DC. We will note there are too many images showing step-downs as an issue.

#4 Integrate and enhance on-site features and opportunities to meaningfully contribute to a location's uniqueness

*Commissioner Houck:* Page 30, top paragraph... "natural resources such as "large trees". What does that mean? It should just say "trees" and delete "large".

Commissioners concur with striking "large" as a descriptor to "trees" in #4.

### **Quality tenent**

- #8 Support the comfort, safety and dignity of residents, workers and visitors through thoughtful site design
- #9 Design for quality, using enduring materials and strategies with a clear and consistent approach
- #10 Design for resilience, health and stewardship of the environment, ensuring adaptability to climate change and the evolving needs of the city

#8 Support the comfort, safety and dignity of residents, workers and visitors through thoughtful site design.

Lora: Quality is not just about the building; quality of experience, and wholistic to the site. This is quite new. It's about offering multi-functional spaces.

Commissioners concur with #8 as stated.



#9 Design for quality, using enduring materials and strategies with a clear and consistent approach

*Chair Schultz:* What do you mean by the building openings heading with permeability and contrasting shadow lines?

- Lora: This is about anything about how you enter or open the building. Permeability is allowing the sense of openness and welcome. Depth relates to the visual cues and how it's articulated through the building openings.

*Chair Schultz:* I don't have a language suggestion right now, but we need to clarify this. "Offering permeability and changes in facade depth to create shadow lines." The comment on the execution of details is hard for me. How much time we argue about details about facades is excessive. This just opens the door right back to that. I don't know we give enough background that explains what we mean by that last bit on page 51, design approach, quality. I don't want us to talk about details all day long, so maybe we call out specific places. Let's define what we're talking about or just strike it.

- Lora: This combines current quality & permanence and coherence guidelines in the current set.

Regarding building openings in #9, PSC members support to clarify the sentence.

PSC members support deleting the reference to the "execution of detail" in #9 as well.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* Page 51 first paragraph: "Masonry used at the ground level". I get the approach, but it feels somewhat limiting. I'm not sure it relates to #9, and it's a bit down in the weeds. It implies a traditional approach with heavier materials at the bottom, but there are other ways to do it.

- *Chair Schultz:* I agree with deleting this sentence. Some of the images don't relate this well.

Delete the last sentence of this paragraph in #9.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* In the second paragraph on page 51, is it something we want to delete as well re: "attention to detail"?

- Lora: "attention to" is different from "execution".

#10 Design for resilience, health and stewardship of the environment, ensuring adaptability to climate change and the evolving needs of the city

*Commissioner Spevak:* I think the features as all building code or base code issues. It seems like a laundry list of things that don't get to the public realm necessarily. If we're setting up two different codes for buildings, I don't want it here in design.

*Commissioner Houck:* I would disagree and like the language in here. Ecoroofs providing habitat and for people is important. If done well, they provide great access to greenspace in park and greenspace deficient areas. The word of concern I have is what I consider to be weasel words "where possible" in the fourth paragraph. How is "possible" defined? "Development should strive to..." is stronger and active. For solar panels, I'm pleased to see the reference to "and/or" with ecoroof.

*Commissioner Magnera:* I think both commissioners Spevak's and Houck's comments are valid. We need to codify some of the concerns related to energy efficiency. We should have a larger conversation about the purpose of design review. But for the DC, it wouldn't make sense to remove #10 without further discussion.

*Commissioner Smith:* Design review is about places we'll see the most intense development. there are corresponding standards for each guideline.

*Commissioner Spevak:* I am bringing this up because I want things to be parallel. Design review is about where it is needed more.

*Chair Schultz:* I support the change to "strive". I am supportive of this guideline and the City moving here. I'd rather have it here than in code for places we feel the code doesn't need to mandate. It helps tie design guidelines further back to the Comprehensive Plan goals.

Using "strive" instead of "when possible" is supported by PSC members in #10.

Should we strike guideline #10 entirely? Only 2 PSC members support.

Positive support for things PSC members support:

- *Commissioner Quiñonez:* Guideline #8. This is thoughtful and thinks about dignity and everyone who uses the space.
- *Chair Schultz:* This is a monumental improvement over tools we have today. Why aren't we replacing Central City Design Guidelines with these? We can debate this. I think these are that much better.

We will be holding written testimony open until November 15.

We have a very quick turnaround to get the testimony letter to DC. Please look for an email from Julie on Thursday (11/14) and provide edits promptly. The PSC Officers will finalize the letter on Friday morning.

This agenda item is continued to our next meeting on November 19, 2019.

## **Climate Action and Renewable Energy**

Briefing: Michele Crim, Alisa Kane, Andria Jacob, Kyle Diesner

### Presentation

Michele introduced the discussion today and the team. We are sharing information about the emissions trend; a 100% renewables update; Climate Action Plan process and the climate emergency; and the vision for future of Portland's climate work.

Kyle highlighted the IPCC report that says we have to get to 50 percent of carbon emission reduction by 2030. That buys us some time in later years before 2050 for technology advances that will be needed for success. 80 percent reduction from 1990 level is the goal for the City and County. Net zero by 2050 is the goal in Portland.

There are community-wide emissions inventories as well as consumption-based inventories. Today is just about sector-based inventory, IPCC 4<sup>th</sup> assessment.

Emissions have declined since the peak in 2000, but reductions have hit a plateau in recent years. We should be proud of our progress, but we have lots more to do still. We have to focus on transportation-related emissions going forward. Transportation emissions are 8 percent higher than in 2000, unlike the other sectors which have decreased.

Electricity sales have declined since a peak in 2000. Voluntary green power reduces carbon impact. Natural gas sales have been high due to colder winters. Metro area daily VMT per person has remained relatively flat.

ICLEI did some work for us to see what has increased our emissions. They highlighted:

- Carbon intensity of grid
- Carbon intensity of transportation fuels
- VMT per person
- kWh per job
- kWh per household
- Therms per household

To get to net zero by 2050, there are a number of ways to do so (slide 23).

*Commissioner Smith:* I want to focus on the VMT reduction. I tend to frame this as part of our TSP. If the mode shift curve isn't as steep as the population growth curve, then the streets get more congested. I argue for bikes and transit. But then I hear back that if we just electrify the system things will resolve. But the grid is still 60 percent fossil fuels, and that doesn't help with

- Kyle: We are working on a decarbonization pathway to articulate this better in 2020. The efficiency and mode shift are important. We have to do both and in parallel.

Andria shared information about the 100% Renewables work. [\[handout\]](#)

In 2017, Council passed the 100% renewable energy resolution. Buildings and transportation. Required BPS to come back to Council every 2 years. we will be there on December 12 with a report on what we've done in the past couple of years.

100% renewables speaks to the energy piece – heating and powering our buildings and how we get around. The four pillars of getting to a net zero economy is comprised of include:

- Efficiency
- Clean electricity
- Renewable transportation fuels
- Building electrification

The sequence and the social and economic considerations are more difficult. A core piece is about justice and a just transition, language we're starting to use more in our work. The Resolution has 26 individual directives, many around justice.

The report to Council on December 12 will share what we found. We have not nearly gone fast enough to high net zero carbon goals as expressed, so we have lots to do. Resources are a hindrance that we are

*Commissioner Magnera:* How does the resolution deal with legacy hydro?

- Andria: It recognizes the benefits of existing hydro here.

Michele gave an update about implementation of our current Climate Action Plan (CAP). Today we're not talking about adaptation, so it's only half of the pie. The City has had a number of Climate Action Plans (2015 is the most recent). It is focused on actions that City and County government can take – not necessarily community members or businesses. Action statuses are shown on slides 25 and 26. We're in the process of writing a status report, and a number of things are in the "on track" category since many things are on-going.

We have been asked to develop a climate emergency declaration to catalyze new high impact actions to counter our emission reduction plateau and pivot to community-centered action. In the meantime, there is so much happening that can inform this work (e.g. PCEF, ZeroCities, community solar projects, a sustainable consumption strategy, etc).

The climate emergency work is to first focus on getting feedback from frontline communities, communities of color, under-served communities, and youth. We expect this will come together early in 2020.

We are planning on updating the CAP, which Alisa shared, with a goal to center frontline communities in this work. We are trying to use initiatives to reframe the idea of climate issue including Targeted Universalism (John Powell).

Reducing barriers and creating community is important. We need to look more systemically and holistically including concepts about providing free bus passes to youth.

How do we create equitable community benefits that drastically reduce carbon emissions?

*Commissioner Smith:* Thank you for the focus on equity. I know TriMet is on the verge of making a decisions to remove youth passes in Parkrose. I think I can speak for the commission that we would appreciate hearing from you more often.

*Commissioner Houck:* I'm looking forward to the climate adaptation end of things. As important as the equity question, green infrastructure initiatives across the city will help achieve our goals particularly if we're serious about focusing on sequestration. I have been talking with BES, PSU's ISS, and others to have the PSC be a convener for the broader public (outside of regular Commission meetings at times). Staff referenced John Powell. We brought John Powell here in 1994 talking about housing issues. Can we get him back here? He was a hugely powerful voice for affordable housing then.

*Commissioner Spevak:* Thank you. I agree with Chris. I would like to hear about what the PSC can do in support of this work that may be clear policy and more difficult politics. Is electrification part of the climate emergency? And in terms of convening, I'm a fan of fuel switch for buildings; but we have to think about the impact on prices, particularly for those who have fewer means.

- Michele: I don't know if that will be in the climate emergency. That being said, it's a conversation we need to have, so having the PSC work through that could be a way for you to provide assistance and move the issues forward.

*Commissioner Routh:* I would love to hear how the PSC can work on developing comments related to, for example, the T2020 bill or ODOT's RTP list.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* Thank you for the presentation. We heard that transportation emissions have risen. As we switch to electric and shared, are we doing all we can to channel the conversation in the right direction?

- Michele: PBOT knows about these issues. We are trying to support them in that. With the CAP, which we update about every 5 years, we see how different things are (technology; ride share; etc), we know we need to do climate planning more dynamically and quickly. PBOT has been leading the AV discussion and work even nationally. We need to be nimbler and quicker to make changes, but how do we do bigger, bolder, faster action with centering community voices? There is some tension there, and we need to be looser and more iterative too.

*Commissioner Smith:* It's hard to see all the impacts, for example with Uber and Lyft. We sometimes think the core is pricing.

*Commissioner Magnera:* What do you need to do more community-based work?

- Michele: Building staff capacity to think about the work differently. Digging deeper and asking other questions is a new way of doing our work. Staff that are doing that work and leading need to be more diverse. And doing the work to build trust and get past asking the same questions over again are important. We need to listen to communities, not necessarily come to them with what we think.
- Alisa: Moving at the speed of trust is an issue to overcome. There is community coordination happening well beyond the City purview. We need to change the pace of the work and be more flexible with timelines. Rethinking this is a huge piece. The community working on this is well over-capacity too. We (the City) need to help figure this out. We need to resource ourselves differently... not just staffing. The City needs to find a way to fund this.

Michele will work with the PSC leadership and BPS staff to come back to the PSC more frequently, perhaps with the climate adaptation plan. If you think of things or what a climate lens may be on a particular project, we are happy to try to share that with you.

*Commissioner Spevak:* Getting a climate lens on legislative projects and code work is an example that would be helpful in the work that comes before the PSC.

## **Adjourn**

*Vice Chair Smith* adjourned the meeting at 3:52 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken