

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

February 23, 2021

5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

**PSC Commissioners Present:** Jeff Bachrach (arrived 5:37 p.m.), Ben Bortolazzo, Jessica Gittemeier, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Steph Routh, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak [1 open position]

**PSC Commissioners Absent:** Oriana Magnera, Katherine Schultz

**City Staff Presenting:** Andrea Durbin, Rachael Hoy, Lora Lillard, Sallie Edmunds, Mindy Brooks, Kyle Diesner, Daniel Soebbing; Stacey Foreman (OMF); Patrick Sweeney (PBOT); Jeff Heilman

### Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

*Chair Spevak* called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m.

*Chair Spevak:* In keeping with the Oregon Public Meetings law, Statutory land use hearing requirements, and Title 33 of the Portland City Code, the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission is holding this meeting virtually.

- All members of the PSC are attending remotely, and the City has made several avenues available for the public to watch the broadcast of this meeting.
- The PSC is taking these steps as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the need to limit in-person contact and promote social distancing. The pandemic is an emergency that threatens the public health, safety and welfare which requires us to meet remotely by electronic communications.
- Thank you all for your patience, humor, flexibility and understanding as we manage through this difficult situation to do the City's business.

### **Items of Interest from Commissioners**

*Commissioner Routh* noted the articles about Portland police officers guarding dumpsters outside groceries. BPS has a goal of reducing food waste, and Kroger is a big partner in this work. In the pandemic, there have been issues with access and deliveries. I would call question to whether deploying police to guard dumpsters is the highest use of City resources, but I wanted to note that in multiple layered crises, issues of resource and priorities show themselves. We are in the midst of budget season, and BPS staff have more demands on their time, and they are also dealing with the pandemic and the request that the bureau is being requested to cut budget – resources and staff. And... I will be knitting to focus myself today.

*Commissioner Smith:* I mentioned the repaving/repainting project on Hawthorne that didn't include bike lanes, and I've drafted a letter that I'd like the PSC to consider sending the PBOT Director. I will make a motion that we send that letter, but let's have this conversation after our listed agenda today.

*Commissioner Larsell* seconded. We will table the issue until the end of the regular agenda.

*Commissioner Houck:* Harriet Tregoning and I were classmates back in 2003 in the Harvard GSD Loeb Fellowship. I was chatting with her today and she mentioned she had worked with Eli and Kol Peterson on the national ADU program. She gave Eli lots of kudos for his contribution to that effort.

*Chair Spevak:* The Portland Noise Review Board has asked to collaborate with the PSC about self-service car washes in the future. We will share this letter with PSC members and discuss next steps later.

*Commissioner Houck:* When we talk about sustainability and what we should be working on and not, noise is a huge issue. There is lots of information about soundscapes. I would be interested in the discussion about noise in the city – both for animals and humans.

## **Director's Report**

Andrea Durbin

- Thank you to *Commissioner Routh's* note about food issues. BPS is working with the Pacific Coast Collaborative to cut in half our food waste by 2030. We have a new partnership with the Oregon Food Bank to connect grocers to food and rescue approaches.
- Projects going to Council: EOA-H-B (individual sites) on March 3; Shelter to Housing Continuum on March 17.

## **Consent Agenda**

- Consideration of Minutes from the February 9, 2021 PSC meeting.

*Commissioner Smith* moved the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Bortolazzo* seconded.

(Y7 – Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

## **Low-Carbon Concrete**

Briefing: Kyle Diesner; Stacey Foreman (OMF)

### Presentation

Kyle introduced himself and Stacey.

Embodied carbon is the sum of all the greenhouse gas emissions (mostly carbon dioxide) resulting from the mining, harvesting, processing, manufacturing, transportation, and installation of building materials. The global warming emissions associated with these materials, along with emissions associated with construction itself, are the “embodied carbon” in a building.

Lifecycle emissions (shown in the pie chart on slide 3), are like the embodied carbon emissions, but also include emissions from the use of buildings and disposal at end of life. All materials, food, and goods have embodied carbon – often these emissions occur outside of the City of Portland. Given the lack of direct local control over these production-phase emissions, regulatory approaches and incentives that encourage smart choices during design can greatly reduce embodied carbon in new buildings. Whole building LCA is a growing practice for engineering and architectural firms and often show potential

reductions in embodied carbon of 30-50% based on small changes to materials, like use of low carbon concrete, mass timber, or recycled steel.

According to AIA, for new buildings, embodied carbon emissions typically equal about 20 years of operational emissions. According to Architecture 2030, embodied carbon will be responsible for 72% of the carbon emissions associated with global new construction between now and 2030. It is therefore crucial to address embodied emissions now to disrupt our current global emissions trend, and because the embodied emissions of a building are locked in once the building is constructed and cannot be taken back or reduced. It is important to frame discussions of embodied carbon in global context as embodied carbon emissions from buildings are not produced locally and are not included in our local carbon reduction goals.

Currently 21.2% of global carbon emission occur from the production of just three building materials – concrete, steel, and aluminum.

While I noted that Portland has not adopted reduction targets for embodied carbon, we do track these emissions. Portland was the first city to conduct a local consumption-based emissions inventory. We use a model developed by SEI to assess the global emissions that result from household, gov and business spending on 536 commodities in a single year. The model uses data from Bureau of labor statistics on consumer spending in Multnomah County and models out the lifecycle emissions associated with the spending. These consumption-based or lifecycle emissions are more than double the emissions we produce locally. So embodied carbon is really the elephant in the room as we're addressing climate change. If we're going to achieve net zero emissions, that means that cities must address both our local emissions and the global emissions that result because of our spending.

Construction in 2015 accounted for 9% of total CBE in Multnomah County. It's the third largest sector in terms of these upstream production-phase emissions, behind food and beverages, and provision of services (banking, engineering, telecommunications). Most embodied emissions from construction come from the production of building materials, rather than their transportation, wholesale and retail distribution, or their end-of-life disposal.

Historically polices at the State and local level have focused on reducing end of life disposal for construction waste, which from a lifecycle lens, is a relatively negligible share of the environmental impact. Efforts must be made to reduce the production-phase emissions or otherwise reduce demand for new building materials.

Cement manufacturing accounted for 145,600 MT Co<sub>2e</sub> embodied carbon in just 2015 in Multnomah County, based on spending. It is the single largest source of source of construction sector embodied carbon, accounting for 15% of those emissions. This chart compares the emissions from cement to Lime and concrete manufacturing, showing how much of an impact comes from the cement itself. Cement manufacturing in 2015 was 25% due to household demand, 28% due to government demand, and 48% due to business capital investments. This speaks to the importance of broader public policy to reduce emissions from cement beyond government procurement.

Stacey Foreman share the efforts of the City's procurement policy, which has been a critical step to begin advancing this work. This started in 2016 with a supply chain analysis when we were prioritizing where to focus our work. Construction and concrete especially is GHG intensive, so we want to focus on that.

In Spring 2019, we published a draft plan and initiative that is broken into 3 phases (slide 11). Required EPDs for any mixes used began in January 2020. In phase 2, we are looking at what the market is doing around us. In phase 3, we will look to establish Global Warming Potential (GWP) Thresholds by concrete mix class. We are looking at Marin County as an example to establish meaningful thresholds.

The Sidewalk Pilot Test case study shows the potential of what we can achieve with low-carbon concrete. Lower-carbon mixes lowered the carbon footprint of an average sidewalk ramp by 23-34%. If PBOT used such slag mixes for all 1,000 annual curb replacements, it would lower the carbon footprint of the concrete used in a year by 733-1,211 MT CO<sub>2</sub>e. This is equivalent to 17%-27% of the CO<sub>2</sub>e annual emissions associated with the electricity used by PBOT's street lights and traffic signals.

The work in phase 3 is working with a stakeholder group that we started earlier this month. The group is to be tasked to suggest a GWP threshold resulting in meaningful carbon reduction for City concrete use and the best way to implement this.

There is still much to do and understand:

- Concerns over current supply constraints for alternatives to Type I/II cement (*market is still transitioning*)
- Constraints with silo/storage capacities at producers' facilities
- Concerns over project impacts – need to understand these better, do more pilots
- Concerns over stakeholder awareness/education – need to do more engagement

The workgroup will have recommendations to give to the bureaus, and we'd love to see support for those recommendations. If we're going to do incentives, we have to push the envelope with Low-GWP Mix, but we are limited by funding. You can support the use of low-carbon concrete in your own projects, and sharing the information about that is most helpful since there is limited information available.

Marin County adopted the world's first building code that limits carbon emissions from concrete, on November 19, 2019. The code focuses on concrete performance, creating standards for composition that "maintains adequate strength and durability for the intended application" while reducing embodied carbon. The code includes compliance pathways that either reduce cement levels or utilize low-emission supplementary cementitious materials. The code still allows the use of higher amounts of cement where that performance is needed. The code lays the groundwork for research into other avenues for developing low-carbon concrete and has the potential to be adopted by other regional, state, or national levels. More analysis would be required to determine whether this can be adopted by Portland, but this is something we have the authority to pursue, and it would be a relatively effective and efficient means to begin reducing embodied emissions from new construction. It's also worth considering other more comprehensive approaches, given that cement is only about 15% of embodied carbon from local construction. A more comprehensive embodied carbon standard, similar to what City of Vancouver has been pursuing, may be more effective to create market flexibility and spur innovation to meet the scale of the challenge.

C40 has a new Clean Construction Declaration with goals to:

- Reduce embodied emissions by at least 50% for all new buildings and major retrofits by 2030, striving for at least 30% by 2025.

- Reduce embodied emissions by at least 50% of all infrastructure projects by 2030, striving for at least 30% by 2025.
- Procure and, when possible, use only zero emission construction machinery from 2025 and require zero emission construction sites city-wide by 2030.

The C40 declaration or other directives from Council in this regard would help to build momentum to advance these policies within Portland.

Kyle provided examples of projects in which this work is applicable and can be applied.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* I like the idea of a proof concept and the sidewalk example. There are only a few case studies, but do you have more information or data from other sources? Are the results matching?

- Stacey: The City is the first I'm aware of to do this, and we've been getting lots of calls about it. I've seen only a couple other studies low-carbon application on a building, but very little has been shared.

*Commissioner Gittemeier:* I was wondering what the timeline looks like. And in the case study, it didn't seem like there were many concerns or negative consequences – are there, and would there be an issue with pushing this to the private sector?

- Stacey: In the case study, we tested 30-50%, and we were able to substitute fairly well. But this is just one application of many. The work group is looking at other applications (e.g. driveways) and the question is if there is more load, what are the issues? The sticking point is what it means for other applications. What else do we need to know about using the higher-replacement mixes and what it means – that has a huge supply chain affect and project work.

*Commissioner Routh:* Related to procurement, has there been conversation about the opportunity for COBID-certified and DMWESB firms?

- Stacey: For the sidewalk project, they are COBID-certified firms. The committee is both large and small producers to engage all sizes of suppliers. We also have looked on the contractor side, with a COBID-certified contractor on the group. We are looking to this work group to help understanding about messaging and work we need to get out there.

*Chair Spevak:* Thank you for this presentation and for joining us tonight. In a recent project, I was able to use low-carbon concrete with direction from Jordan Palmeri (DEQ). But some of this is just prescribed, and I want to learn more. If it were defaulted to low-carbon, people would likely just go with that. I understand this is an unfunded project, but I hope we can work with the bureau to better understand what are low-effort, high-impact that we can support and move forward.

Andrea: Thank you to Kyle and Stacey, particularly Stacey's leadership around sustainable procurement and contracting.

## Earthquake Ready Burnside Bridge

Briefing: Rachael Hoy, Lora Lillard; Patrick Sweeney (PBOT); Jeff Heilman

### Presentation

Rachael introduced the topic. BPS staff have been participating on the TAC, urban design, and active transportation advisory groups to support this project. As it continues, we will work with PBOT, who is managing City interests on the project. In the next phase, with the recently-released draft EIS, we will offer feedback through the lens of the CC2035, CAP, and Comprehensive Plan.

Patrick noted that PBOT is the lead bureau, and we manage project coordination with the City bureaus. The seismically-improved bridge is great, but designing a new downtown river crossing is lots of work to ensure the details are taken care of. There is a City Council briefing scheduled for March 25.

Jeff introduced the project – the core purpose is to create a seismically-resilient river crossing in downtown Portland. Jeff shared the timeline and when decisions should be made. The NEEPA process should be complete this year, and then the final design and construction work will follow over the next 4ish years.

Engagement and coordination, particularly with the DEI work is especially important to help groups understand the project, getting their feedback, and providing that information to decision makers.

Areas of interest to the PSC:

- Sustainability
- Community health
- Coordination

Jeff continued with information about the Draft Environmental Impact Statement. This may appear to be shorter than previous EIS', but we are now only allowed 150 pages of text. If those want more details, a list of the technical reports by topics are available (slide 9).

Jeff showed an orientation to the bridge and the different areas/sections (slides 10-14).

The Recommended Preferred Alternative is the long span. We are looking at different bridge types, evaluation criteria, and other factors contributing to this choice. Bridge-type decisions will be made in the spring/summer. The comment period on the Draft EIS goes through March 22.

Patrick noted the 45-day comment period. The PSC can comment individually, or if there is a collective decision for the PSC to write a letter to the project (Federal Highway Administration), you're welcome to choose that. Rachael and I can help coordinate that. We don't need a decision tonight on the letter.

*Commissioner Houck:* Something like 8% of peregrine falcon nests in the state are on bridges in Portland. The most successful nest in Oregon is on the Fremont Bridge. One of the designs looks similar to the Fremont which might be attractive to Peregrines. Are you checking in with Bob Sallinger about this? He is a state expert on Peregrine nesting.

- Jeff: We haven't connected with Bob, but we can check in. It's the one that looks like the Fremont Bridge.

*Commissioner Smith:* I'd love to see a dedicated west-bound transit lane. As part of the later design work, I assume there are vibrant streetscapes to be developed at either side of the bridge. This bridge crosses the river, mainline railroad, as well as I5. What happens to those facilities in the long-term is still in question. The I5 structures will have a shorter life than this bridge. Are your support structures creating constraints we should worry about?

- Jeff: One of the advantages of the long span is that it clears spans from the east side of the railroad to the west side of I5.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* From a designer standpoint, you didn't get much of a chance to talk about it, but I realized how less visually-impactful this looks. What is the process to look at the visual impact?

- Jeff: EIS didn't get too into this. The Urban Design Advisory Working Group has helped developed recommended criteria to evaluate the different bridge types. Visual, aesthetics, urban design are large components. The girder bridge gets rid of the super structure next to a historic district, which is of interest.

PSC officers will discuss the option of writing a letter on behalf of the Commission.

## **Ezone Mapping Correction Project**

Hearing: Sallie Edmunds, Mindy Brooks, Daniel Soebbing

### Presentation

PSC members introduced themselves to the testifiers.

### **Disclosures**

None.

Mindy provided a brief overview and reminder about the project. Environmental overlay zones are our primary tool to protect streams, wetlands, flood areas, forests, steep slopes, and wildlife habitat. To work as intended, the zones need to align with the actual features. That is what we are doing in this project. Correcting the ezone boundaries to apply to streams, wetlands, forests, and habitat.

Protecting the natural resource is a critical part of our climate resiliency.

The Ezone Map Correction Project implements the goals, policies, and requirements in these adopted plans.

The Climate Action Plan calls for protection urban natural resources including streams and tree canopy. The Comprehensive Plan directs BPS to keep regulations up to date including making sure the zoning tools align with the existing natural resource features.

The Climate Emergency Declaration, adopted just last June, states that the City shall protect, restore, and manage rivers, streams, wetlands, floodplains, trees, and unique habitats to mitigate the risks from climate change, sequester carbon, and build resiliency and directs BPS to update regulations that protect and restore flood areas to reduce the impacts of future flooding, to protect and enhance tree canopy to reduce heat island impacts, and to integrate green infrastructure in planning.

In addition, the ezones are the primary tool we use to demonstrate compliance with State land use Goal 5 and Metro Title 13.

Rivers, streams, and wetlands are the natural green infrastructure of the city. These features hold and move water downstream to the Willamette River. Climate change will cause warmer wetter winters and more water that needs places to move. Protecting these features protects homes and businesses and reduces costs associated with maintaining and building more pipes.

To support our climate resiliency strategies, we need to make sure the environmental overlay zones are appropriately applied to the existing natural resources. This image shows a stream that is not protected and should be. The purpose of this project is to correct the overlay zones to align with the features.

Mindy shared the project timeline, leading to today's hearing, which is a continuation of the hearing that started last July. We sent M56 notices to all impacted properties and there was a hearing on July 27. We received roughly 270 pieces of written testimony and 30 people testified at the hearing. Of those, over 90% were about the feature mapping. The PSC decided to continue the hearing from July to today to allow site visits to continue and for people to have another opportunity to testify if they were not satisfied with the outcomes of the site visits. We've completed more than 200 site visits last fall and this winter and have updated the maps.

In November, when new wetland mapping was shared with BPS, we sent letters to people who didn't have wetlands mapped previously explaining the project and offering free wetland determinations. We opened written testimony again in January and sent M56 notice to people whose zoning proposal has changed as a result of wetland mapping or site visits. As of this afternoon, 30 people had provided written testimony and we have 19 people signed up to testify today.

*Commissioner Houck:* Thank you for addressing some of the questions that came up at the last meeting. This is a tweak in the work to ensure we have accurate information. This also relates to Metro Title 3. From a wetland perspective, this is doing people a favor.

## **Written Testimony Received**

### **Testimony**

1. Michael Harrison, OHSU: Thank you to staff who have met and looked at the site and shared information about appropriate zoning for OHSU. One thing we identified is that there is a large section of 'c' zone where our children's hospital is. Removing trees when we constructed the building leaves an island of trees in an area that doesn't have water features, and staff indicated you wouldn't see a 'c' zone applied elsewhere in the city. We decided since this is potentially an expansion area for the children's hospital, we ask to have this removed from this area. We would still follow Title 11 for tree preservation and replacement. *See written comments.*
2. Sean Ma: Homeowner. Concern about changes to existing zoning on my property (3306 SW Scholls ferry Rd). This is an R20 with a 'c' overlay. It appears that the project will encourage part of my R20 into R20 c overlay on the SE side of my lot. I have been working with BDS to build a home here, and to develop this, I need this portion of my lot unchanged. I urge the PSC to respect the right of each property owner.

3. Steven Edelman: NW North Road in a de-annexed property with City zoning. It is not possible for staff to determine percent tree canopy coverage accurately. *See written testimony.*
4. Laurie Rutenberg: We started a process to develop our property 5 years ago – with \$200k already invested in alignment with City values. We have a preliminary plat approval for 17 lots and a through street. We have a tree preservation plan and a mitigation plan. We think this development balances city goals for housing, safety and protection of trees.
5. Gary Schoenberg: The reality is sad because if the remapping goes forward, the neighborhood we propose will not go forward. The remapping says to address health concerns, but throughout SW Portland, it is a despicable land grab. There will be other properties like ours that are lost. We don't envy this task to deliberate over this large swath of land, but we ask: how much have you heard from scientists about the claims this makes about health? Sustainable development is what we need, which is what our project proposes. The project manager says development can still take place when the proposed mapping takes place, but that is inaccurate and misleading.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* I don't understand that you said you received a preliminary plat approval. Are you required to dedicate land to satisfy the 'e' zone requirement?

We are incentivized to complete the project, but we are in a COVID world, and that is creating challenges. If we are unable to find a developer/builder to do this project, we can't do it with our own resources, and the change in zoning would decimate the value of the property.

6. Leslie Goss: Provided testimony at the July 2020 hearing. Thank you for your service and for allowing me to testify again. We are property owners you plan to change from 'c' to 'p'. We oppose this. We are on a flat, level acre with a stream on the western boundary. 20 years ago we stripped English ivy and planted beautiful vegetation that provides natural screening to our neighbors. We don't want the change to the 'p' zone and the restrictions to gardening. We are discouraged by the work we'll have to do to repair from the storm. With the pending change, you are creating incentive just to put up a fence instead of replanting.
7. Micah Meskel, Portland Audubon: We support the efforts to update the ezone maps. Nature close to home is a shared value for our members and all Portlanders.
8. Michael Robinson, Schwabe Williamson Wyatt: *See written testimony* on behalf of our clients Leslie Goss. City should survey the area and the centerline of the stream, which you can't establish just by walking or looking at the aerials.
9. John Rawlins: Determination of wetlands and the 'e' zones. When the plan first came out, I raised the issue of misidentification of wetlands that would be determined by BES. But they didn't do visits last year, and I haven't seen an update about this for this year. I'm concerned the ezone project is moving forward without this wetland determination.
10. Theodore Labbe, Urban Greenspaces Institute: Thank you to Mindy for her great work on this project, and I support moving forward with the project recommendations. You should be thinking about both the large, overall rezoning as well as individual properties.

11. Chris Peskin: My concern is about ezones and wildfires. PF&R and fire wise committee. Managing wildfire risk is a community effort. I am providing this out of concern for all property owners in 'e' zones. The last briefing showed what property owners can do to manage fires on their 'e' zone properties. PF&R does not appear to be aligned with some of the recommendations that are allowed/not in 'e' zones.
12. Joseph Schaefer: Land use planner on behalf of 4700 SW Humphrey (and 2 other properties). The proposed maps follow drip lines of some trees on the properties that creates a meandering boundary. But it must be practical for BDS and property owner to implement, which this doesn't do. The boundary should be a uniform line consistent with the current 'c' zone boundary. 'e' zone maps shouldn't include existing gardens then exempt. Native vegetation on these properties should be preserved.
13. Craig Kiest: The corrected map should remove overlays on the 1215 SE Hessler property. This was fully landscaped by 1968.
14. Devin Holmes: Last summer I testified in support of the project, but with the continuous changes and the length of time the project is taking is decreasing my support. I'm worried about not being able to make decisions about house renovations and am concerned if the proposed ezones shown today will change again. I encourage you to make a recommendation and move this forward so property owners have certainty. I want to understand the final impacts on my lot.  
  
Commissioner Spevak: The PSC is never the deciding body. Council will hear this project after the PSC makes our recommendation.
15. John Gibbon, Quail Park HOA: The water line that ran through the 'c' zone that would have been an 'e' zone from Ridge Drive has been taken over by the City, and they will install a main, which is a real benefit. *See written record.*

*Chair Spevak* closed oral testimony at 7:13 p.m. The written record will remain open until this Friday, February 26, 2021, at 5 p.m.

Mindy shared the schedule slide. We plan to bring zoning code amendments to you in April and the final zoning map amendments in July. If there are other ezone topics PSC members would like to discuss at these work sessions, please let us know.

### **Commissioners' Round-Robin**

*Commissioner Houck* asked for some data about M56 notices, testimony, and site visits.

- Mindy: Just under 17,000 M56 notices were sent in June for the July hearing. About 600 M56 notices were sent in January due to changes due to site visits and newly mapped wetlands. Last July there were 275 written testimony and 30 more as of today. 33 people signed up to testify in July, and 19 today. We did well over 200 site visits after the last hearing. 500+ since the start of the project. Wetland determinations are being done by BES and their consultant this spring. They are organizing these because they need a wetland scientist onsite. So before the July PSC work session, we will have the wetland information as well.

*Commissioner Houck:* I would like more information on the Fire Bureau's response as well. What I was getting at by asking for those figures is we started with 17,000 notices; we got what 250 written comments last hearing plus oral testimony. Tonight we had 14 or so testify. My point, of course, is there has been a funnel effect from a potential 17,000 comments from notified property owners and now very few comments. This project covered the entire city. There are bound to be a few discrepancies, which is what we heard tonight.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* Thank you for the work and site visits so far. I'd ask staff to follow up with those we heard from today. There was a question about storm damage and what the approach should be. We heard about "manufactured" streambeds and criteria we determine those. And the meandering boundaries – what are the criteria when the delineation line is very jagged? Comments about fire and different types of trees and if PF&R has been properly involved in the decision-making process.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* For all the property owners who aren't satisfied, I think the City should explain to us (PSC) to know why the City disagrees with the property owner so we have all the information. It's not just evidentiary – there is a policy balancing as well. The economic and social impacts are also important. I'm also interested in what PF&R's work and coordination is, and I agree with some of the BDS testimony. Someone tonight said staff has been using a national vegetation system analysis – what is that and how do we use it?

- Mindy: We use the National Vegetation Classification System that Metro uses under Title 13. 60% canopy coverage for forest; 20-60% for woodland; medium structure for shrubland. It does not consider the type of species. So we are consistent with Metro inventory.

A testifier made the point that when someone wants to develop near a stream, they are required to do a survey of centerline – why?

- Mindy: They are not required to do a survey if they are ok with where the ezones are. if you believe they are incorrectly zoned, there is a free zoning map correction process that can be done at any time. Many developers choose to do surveys at the time of development to set the lines.

I'm a bit confused that we're calling this a map correction process, so we're going back to what's previously mapped and correcting and updating it. But back then, climate resiliency wasn't a policy, but now we're using ezones as a main tool to implement these new policies. So it sounds like we're saying ezones are a new broad-reaching tool relative to new policies, so that means we're expanding – and it's more than just a map update from what we did years ago.

- Mindy: The functions we're trying to preserve are the same. We applied the ezones under Goal 5 to protect streams for flow and flooding. We are still protecting those same functions and protecting those functions is how we are resilient to climate change. In this project we are making sure the overlay zones align with the features.

*Chair Spevak:* As we get things back, we might need to be reminded from staff about projects. The extension project for COVID-related project may be relevant.

- Mindy: We will share further details about this in writing with PSC members.

*Commissioner Larsell:* You answered one of my questions about how are people, after this goes through, discover the mapping is wrong, they can still ask for a correction. And people currently can still ask for a site visit.

- Mindy: Yes, please ask us.

The fire thing is my only concern then. But that's not really part of this project, is it?

- Mindy: Correct. In the last memo, we did try to spell this out – though it is complicated. Title 33 explains some things, and it relates to Title 11, which has further provisions. We have forwarded the testimony requests to Urban Forestry look at deciduous trees as well.

*Commissioner Houck:* The fire issue has come up, and I want to reiterate that the incidents of fires in Portland we've observed are important – e.g. the UP hillside fire showed that the native vegetation didn't burn, but the Himalayan blackberries (invasive) did.

The first work session is slated for April 13, at the PSC meeting that starts at 12:30 p.m.

## **Letter to PBOT Director**

PSC Members' discussion

*Commissioner Smith* shared background – the proposed draft letter and the project report. This is not a capital project; it is a maintenance project. PBOT looked at different striping patterns, but I think there is a big missed opportunity here. PBOT reduced the number of auto lanes, but the project does not include bike lanes. This relates to the climate emergency – we should be trying as hard as we can for two climate-friendly modes. The TSP says we should be getting to a 25% bike and 25% transit mode share, but mode shifting is not happening. Anything we can do to improve bike mode share is important. The decision report says that parallel neighborhood greenways to Hawthorne. This is great, but it doesn't address land use and getting to the final destination (Comp Plan Policy 9.20).

*Commissioner Houck:* The last sentence is important to me. Without that caveat I might not be supportive. I think this is a persuasive argument, and I hope PBOT will be willing to continue discussion. I appreciate this last open sentence.

*Commissioner Routh:* What we have been talking about and going forward with the PSC's role in sustainability, we think about where transportation fits in the PSC's portfolio. This project is a catalyst that sparked the conversation, but I don't know if I could support the letter being specifically about Hawthorne. I'm more supportive of suggesting our being full partners with PBOT moving forward to achieve goals such as the mode split. I am concerned about PSC getting into the business of looking into every maintenance project.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* I appreciate Chris' concern but am more in alignment with Steph's comments. Maintenance is not within the PSC charge – we are more about the bigger picture. We need to have clear and consistent communications from this body. This project is a one-off outside of our purview, and it erodes our credibility by focusing on one project.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* I am in the same place as Steph and Ben. I don't think this is the right way for us to jump in. The mode split is the goal that we should be engaged in. In that context, we should be reaching out to PBOT at an appropriate time.

*Chair Spevak:* I am more supportive of a letter. It worries me that no one else will take action if we don't. For process, it's a fair question – PBOT should come to talk to us about mode split, but they haven't yet. There is a Bicycle Advisory Committee. We are guardians of some of these core documents, but we shouldn't have to micromanage. We should be able to raise our hand as ask what was/wasn't taken into account though as we are to be keeping an eye on the bigger picture.

*Commissioner Smith:* I am not sure if this is going to Council or not. The BAC was frustrating because PBOT identified challenges of bikes and auto turning can slow down transit, which is an issue. BAC wanted to work on the intersection at Chavez, but PBOT made the decision without the advisory committee's input. To those who have concerns about jurisdiction, the ordinance that created the PSC makes climate embedded. The TSP is clearly in the PSC's purview, so I think we should comment on it when we're not achieving the goals. For the business district, it's about access to a class of users.

*Commissioner Larsell:* I like that it goes across silos – that is what we need. But I'd be worried about a letter that isn't quite in alignment, particularly without full PSC buy-in.

*Commissioner Routh:* This perhaps is a bit more about scope and indicators brought up by this project and how we move forward.

*Commissioner Smith:* I am happy to recraft the letter to clarify that while there are issues specifically with the Hawthorne project, it's a large question about achieving bike share and climate goals.

*Commissioner Houck:* Isn't the proposal to focus on the bigger picture and this is a specific case in point that caused us to have a larger conversation?

*Chair Spevak:* I'm hearing that the letter should reference this but has a bigger picture of PSC working with PBOT on the TSP and climate action-related items. *Commissioner Smith* supported this friendly amendment. *Commissioner Larsell* seconded with the friendly amendment.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

## **Adjourn**

*Commissioner Spevak* adjourned the meeting at 7:58 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken