

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

April 13, 2021

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

PSC Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach (arrived 12:36 p.m.), Ben Bortolazzo, Jessica Gittemeier, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Oriana Magnera (arrived 12:48 p.m.), Valeria McWilliams, Steph Routh, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak

PSC Commissioners Absent: Katherine Schultz

City Staff Presenting: Joe Zehnder, Mindy Brooks, Daniel Soebbing, Sperry, Bruce Walker; Brian Poole, Mauricio Leclerc, Zef Wagner, Dana Dickman, Matthew Kelly (PBOT); Kim Kosmas (PF&R)

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Chair Spevak called the meeting to order at 12:31 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.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- There is the next S2HC hearing at Council tomorrow on two issues – tiny houses on wheels and allowance for shelters to be established on institutional properties in single-family zones.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the March 23, 2021 PSC meeting.

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

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

Vision Zero

Briefing: Dana Dickman

Presentation

Dana: Thank you to the PSC for continuing to engage on this topic – we appreciate being able to share with you each year, though sharing information about traffic deaths is never fun.

Fifty-four people died in traffic crashes in 2020 in Portland – the highest since 1996. We are trying to enact a generational change, and this is a reminder of the urgent need. This high number of traffic deaths was not a unique issue to Portland last year. We saw a rise in fatalities by significant margins throughout the country last year.

The connection between vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and traffic deaths is an important factor and one of the strongest indicators of deaths by vehicles each year. PF&R crash responses from last year (COVID) showed a huge decrease immediately after the stay-at-home orders last March. Then we see crashes come up as the ban was lifted, again a drop with the later-year ban, etc. The diminishing congestion led to aggressive driving behavior, so we have corresponding information from PPB highlighting that as well.

We were able to get more information about the racial disparities, particularly for fatalities, in 2020. The full dataset we get from ODOT does not have this associated, but we have been working with PPB to understand those who are killed in traffic. Black residents are killed at about twice the rate of white in Multnomah County. Eighteen percent of fatal crashes were Black Portlanders, three times the population percentage. Thirty-five percent of deaths were BIPOC, another statistic that's well above the actual population here. There is a correlation to living on high-crash corridors, and we're working with public health partners to address this.

Last year, we saw a significant increase from the two years prior. In 2018, we only had 9 motor vehicle deaths. The increase has come lots from highway and single-vehicle crashes... high-speed, roadway departure, and wrong-way drivers on the freeways. This trend continues into 2021 as we're seeing an increase in highway deaths, high-crash corridors, and a swing in the crashes on those streets in terms of percentage of total. We need to be collaborating more with our partners (e.g. jurisdictional transfer, etc).

Many peer cities when talking about fatality numbers don't include state facilities or highways – but we do in Portland regardless of if we have the jurisdiction or authority to change. In the future, we may look more at surface streets versus highway.

Commissioner Smith: ODOT has 5 freeway expansions planned in the metro area, which would likely cost about \$5B, but they have no budget to deal with safety on their surface streets.

Commissioner Gittemeier: How often does drug/alcohol use influence these crashes? I'm curious about the increased mental health crisis based on COVID impacts.

- Dana: in the 10-year dataset, we see about 50%. We don't have a complete dataset for 2020, but it would appear impairment is directly related to the high speed, and we would conjecture mental health was a big part of this (but the data doesn't actually give us a number).

Commissioner Routh: Do you have a break-down of mode by jurisdiction?

- Dana: We do sometimes have fatalities with a pedestrian on a highway. I don't have a specific number today, but I can get you that break-down.

Dana noted some good news! We have been able to do road reorganization on 3 high-crash corridors in the past 18 months – SW Capitol Highway, NE 102nd Ave, outer NE Glisan. The initial data shows we are getting safer streets here and are changing behaviors.

PBOT has a new dashboard to share more information with the public about Vision Zero work: www.visionzeroportland.com. We are looking to have radical transparency and create more of a dialogue with community about this work. Please let us know if you have questions, data examples, etc we could add.

Commissioner Smith: Thank you, Dana. I wanted to ask about the speed cameras, which are an effective tool. I heard some are held up in procurement, and there is a bill in the legislature I'm curious about too.

- Dana: The bill is to allow Portland to use fixed-speed cameras after the pilot ends in 2024 and allow other cities to use these cameras. The other would allow non-sworn officers to review the citations. We don't believe our traffic officers is best used doing the review of citations, and the legislation is like how our parking enforcement works. Regarding procurement, we have been trying to get a new contract to add cameras (red light cameras and additional fixed speed cameras).

Commissioner Routh: Infrastructure particularly BIPOC communities have identified and investments – how are community-specific investments working? One of the “e’s” is enforcement. How is PBOT working on traffic violence?

- Dana: Lighting has a good story and is becoming a significant investment in Vision Zero. We worked at PBOT to identify savings from other programs for further lighting updates we'll implement over the next 4 years, with a focus on large streets in East Portland. Because of community feedback, we deemphasized enforcement from the beginning and worked with our current traffic enforcement. There has been more of a focus on automated enforcement over the past couple of years.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: As a follow-up to the question about impairment, do you have data broken down by what kind? I'm glad to see the improvements, and they look cost-effective – what's the plan to do more of this work, and what are the obstacles?

- Dana: Sometimes we have the impairment information, but PPB sometimes stop at alcohol if they are well over .08. We are moving forward on outer Stark, and we have plans for 122nd, and the outer Division safety project will start next year. We're working with our planning team on the full high-crash network and hot-spot areas. With the focus on pedestrian safety, we are doing small-scale interventions (e.g. left-turn calming).

Commissioner McWilliams: Reassessing how speeding tickets are disproportionately affecting BIPOC communities and those who can't pay the tickets. What about the timeline and process to create a pilot project is?

- Dana: Some things are more at the state level (payment plan fee). There is a bill to reinstate people's licenses if they were revoked just for failure to pay a traffic violation.

Commissioner Magnera: Are you tracking data on how impairment is being enforced about race? What about disability data regarding enforcement and how people are treated in those scenarios? I would like

to request a conversation about race and enforcement at a PSC meeting re: zoning, race, and traffic infrastructure.

- Dana: The police are required to track data related to their stops – PBOT doesn't have this information, but we can check. The PSC could ask PPB these questions for a briefing too.

Chair Spevak: For the PSC to support the Vision Zero work, we would like to see things we're tracking (e.g. Streets 2035) where work can support this further. I'd like to talk more about things related to jurisdictions too, even for things where the City doesn't own the street.

- Dana: A more in-depth conversation would be great. I can compile a list and then have a follow-up conversation.

Columbia/Lombard Mobility Plan

Briefing: Brian Poole, Mauricio Leclerc, Zef Wagner

Presentation

Brian: The focus of the plan is how we address safety on these two high-crash corridors. The goal of the Columbia Lombard Mobility Plan is to identify and prioritize projects and strategies that will improve safety, connectivity, and access for people walking and biking, and improve the reliability of freight movement along and across the Columbia and Lombard corridors.

This plan focused on the Columbia and Lombard corridors, approximately from Interstate Avenue to I-205. The goal of this plan is to identify and prioritize projects and strategies that will improve safety, connectivity, and access for people walking and biking, and improve the reliability of freight movement. The plan that emerged is a corridor plan with additional recommendations for improving bike connectivity in the adjacent area.

In general, the plan recommends the following:

- Better delineate Columbia Blvd as a freight corridor, improving travel time reliability while improving access and safety
- Improve the safety of NE Lombard Street by better managing speeds, improving walking/biking facilities, and adding crossings without significantly impacting traffic operations.
- Improve access to jobs and recreation, specifically for those walking and biking
- Provide low-stress east-west bicycle routes
- Improve travel time predictability
- Mitigate pollutants

For biking and pedestrian work, we focused on improvements that run across and parallel to the corridors. Many of these projects are multi-use paths, like the Columbia Slough trail or along NE 92nd Ave. Other projects are neighborhood greenways, sidewalk connection projects, and/or pedestrian/bike bridges (overcrossings) over highways or corridors. Some are new facilities, while others are improvements to existing facilities.

A full project list is available at <https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2021/appendix-f-colo-project-list.pdf>.

There are further recommendations outside the scope of this project that include better management of driveway access, improving integration of stormwater management, improving sidewalk conditions, reducing noise and other pollution, improving the freight permit process, planning for regional freight movement and interchange improvements, and increasing transit service.

We are starting to scope the next TSP update, and the revisions are suggested on slide 12. Slide 13 slide describes how projects have been prioritized as high-, medium-, or low-readiness in the implementation chapter of the plan. Generally, all the projects in the plan are seen as “good projects” and necessary, but we wanted to better focus the work plan for the bureau and set expectations on what projects might be implemented first.

Projects in “**high-readiness**” category most likely to be implemented first, as they:

- Address an identified safety need
- Do not need additional project design or refinement
- Can be implemented quickly
- Have a clearly identified source of funding

Commissioner Larsell: I hadn’t realized how much this touches on East Portland – and some of the connectivity issues across I-205. I want to commend you for this. For other bicycle planning, are they mostly for recreation or commuting? If for getting to jobs, I’m thinking especially about safety and getting to work on a trail and needing good lighting, etc.

- Brian: We’re focusing lots on commuting in the Cully area of the Columbia corridor. We are looking to improve the quality of the road/path here. There is a jobs connector shuttle planned for Cully and possibly in Parkrose as well. There is a huge unused ODOT ROW in the Sumner neighborhood, and one thought we’ve had is to use this as an affordable housing site right next to light rail.

Commissioner Houck: I was pleased you’re talking about the connections to the Columbia Slough. There is a lot of critical habitat there, though, so in addressing safety, we also don’t want to add to light pollution. I hope the lighting is pedestrian and nature friendly. I also hope you’re coordinating with BES and the Urban Forestry Commission.

- Brian: We’re working with them and with Broadmoor redevelopment to look at trail options there. We will have to deal with some coordination with the Port and FAA for some of this work, but we have been having conversations. Vegetation in industrial areas is difficult, but we are working with BES.

Commissioner Gittemeier: I would like to see opportunities for bioswales and native plantings, especially in this area that has so much concrete. I’m sure you’re already thinking about this.

Commissioner Magnera: I’ve walked many times between Verde and Hacienda, which has lots of safety issues – so I’m very excited about this work. What is the plan to balance the needs of industry with the needs of community?

- Brian: We had a diversity of perspectives on the advisory group. The biggest challenge for freight is adding too many signals. We want to add these where there is lots of pedestrian activity.
- Zef: What freight and community want didn’t seem to be as far apart as we might have expected. It’s in the details though.

Chair Spevak: Have you thought about swapping Columbia with Lombard with the state? In terms of process for the project, some of the ideas are sticking things into the TSP. When this goes to Council, what is the process?

- Zef: ODOT needs to invest in the streets before the City accepts them as an asset, which takes a lot to make it happen. If you add in the idea of a swap, that makes it more complicated.
- Mauricio: The TSP puts the concepts of various plans into list, and then we sort that – and the PSC has a role in that.

Solid Waste & Recycling Rates

Briefing: Arianne Sperry, Bruce Walker

Memo

Bruce introduced the annual rate-making process for residential collection. This includes single-family homes and up to 4-plexes; larger and businesses are part of the commercial sector, and we do not set rates for that. Collection services are by private haulers – who have been able to make collections as an essential service throughout the COVID-19 pandemic.

This program has provided partial funding for sideguards to garbage trucks to protect cyclist from side impacts. We're pleased to let you know about three-quarters of the nearly 400 trucks in Portland haulers' fleets are now with sideguards, so there's been lots of progress here.

Dirty diesel was mentioned earlier in the meeting and BPS has required haulers to purchase newer, cleaner trucks. The latest EPA standards for truck engines were set in 2010 and haulers have phased out older trucks.

Arianne walked through the memo, including how the per-customer composite costs are created. Rates are designed to allow haulers the opportunity to earn a 9.5% operating margin and also include a 5% franchise fee paid to the City. BPS applies incentives for waste-reduction (smaller cans). The major services levels available to customers are shown on page 2. We have seen larger carts requested during the pandemic as people are at home more. While we want to encourage thoughtful consumption, we also want to encourage customers to find the right-size service levels for their household.

The components of the rates are outlined on pages 2-3. Market conditions for recycling are relatively flat. New voter regional tax that funds housing services for individuals experiencing homelessness does affect garbage and recycling companies, but we don't expect this to be a big cost driver.

COVID-19 financial relief pilot program provided one-time garbage bill credits in the crisis. We will be evaluating this this coming summer to develop an interim hardship assistance program while we work with our regional partners to explore options for an ongoing bill assistance or hardship voucher program.

Commissioner Gittemeier: I have four large topics of questions: Clean fleet requirement – how does that interplay with fuel requirements, including moving toward collection vehicles that are not powered by fossil fuels? How is the profit margin of 9.5% determined and allocated? I am particularly interested in the requirements for haulers around labor and wages. Finally, I'd like to know more about recycling education. I know it's a lot to address here.

- Arianne: Yes, I will touch on the operating margin, as that relates to rates. The rates are built on the average cost to provide service and include the opportunity for a 9.5% rate of return. However, the 9.5% is not guaranteed and companies do not always realize it based on the actual costs their company faces on any given year. The franchise agreement establishes the rate calculation methodology and the 9.5% operating margin is in that agreement. We review the franchise agreement every five years and can start that process again toward the end of 2022.

Commissioner Smith: Thank you for the work on the sideguard project.

Commissioner Magnera: I am curious about the financial relief program. The evaluation plans, including the customer experience and the demographic analysis, could be helpful for review.

Chair Spevak: I would like an update on your equity and diversity work.

Ezone Map Correction Project

Work Session: Mindy Brooks, Daniel Soebbing, Kim Kosmas

Presentation

Mindy introduced the work as well as staff who are available to answer topic-specific questions if there are any today. She provided an overview and reminder of the project.

Packet of consent amendments (items 7-12)

- Industrial and employment lands
- Mapping protocol corrections
- Ezone violation clarifications
- Resource enhancement definition
- Urban Service Boundary
- List of scenic documents

Commissioner Routh moved to accept the packet of amendments as noted. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

Item 1: Feature Map Amendments

These are amendments to the specific sites.

Commissioner Smith: We had lots of testimony about property mapping corrections. We are making amendments based on that work. Will the people who testified have a chance to tell us if we got it right?

Mindy: The site visits (about 400) were done before your June hearing, but since then we have completed 215 visits. Those people had an opportunity to testify again in February at the continued hearing. We just have one property owner we're still in conversation with. Everyone will have an opportunity to testify again when the project goes to City Council.

Commissioner Bachrach: The property owners who have contested before, are we seeing the findings and conclusions as part of this?

- Mindy: Yes. There are staff recommended amendments to the feature mapping as part of this package, and as part of the previous briefing memos. Each site and the rationale for the proposed change to the feature mapping are included in the memos. That we are aware of, all but one property owner has been satisfied feature map corrections after the site visit. We are still working with that one property owner. There are a few properties which are property owners asking us to apply the ezones differently to their features; we are going to look at two of these in the next proposed amendments. This right now is about our site visit work and feature mapping updates.

Commissioner Houck: There is an established methodology that has been used for many years to map the features. If a property owner disagrees, there is still this baseline there, even if a property owner doesn't agree.

Mindy: We provided before and after maps for each property in your packet. We are asking you to approve the feature map changes and direct staff to update the Natural Resources Inventory. Then staff will apply the standard policy guidance to the features: 'p' zone to streams, wetlands and riparian areas, 'c' zone to forests contiguous to waterbodies, on steep slopes and unique features. We will have a final mapping in July at your last work session and a recommendation.

Chair Spevak moved to update the NRI and in Volume 3 to incorporate the results of the site visit feature map corrections found in PSC memos dated August 25, 2020, January 29, 2021, and April 2, 2021.

Commissioner Houck seconded. [with the caveat that all property owners who had a dispute have been appeased]

(Y10 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

Item 2: Audubon's Request

Audubon has requested to be treated consistent with other private properties, and staff concurs with their request. Apply the ezones as requested, reducing the level of protection for the southernmost forest from a 'p' zone to 'c' zone for the areas greater than 50 feet from the stream. Maintain 50 feet of 'p' zone around the stream, consistent with citywide policy. Update Volume 1 and Volume 2 to reflect this change.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I just want to be sure we're being consistent and not prioritizing some requests. I assume this is like giving a 'c' zone to a large private property owner.

- Mindy: Correct.

Commissioner Houck: There are two sites we're discussing. Are there others who have made similar requests?

- Mindy: Yes, others have request we apply the ezones differently. But these are the two we have been asked to treat consistently with other private properties.

Commissioner Bortolazzo moved to accept the Audubon amendment as noted. *Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

Item 3: OHSU's Request

Treat OHSU consistently with other private property owners and not apply an ezone on the isolate forest patch on their property. Staff recommend applying the ezones as requested. Update Volume 1 and Volume 2 to reflect this change. This is about an acre forest patch. Mindy described how this is applied and that typically in the West Hills and Johnson Creek Watershed, isolated forest patches are not protected with ezones unless the forest patch is contiguous to a stream or wetland or is a unique feature such as oaks.

Commissioner Larsell moved to remove the 'c' zone as requested from the isolated forest patch west of the Children's Hospital and to update Volumes 1 and 2 to reflect the change. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Smith noted that to an outside observer we are giving institutions what they asked for versus the general public (though I'll vote yes).

Mindy: In other situations where there is isolated forest patch, we have not applied the ezone to those properties unless it's a unique feature. In other testimony, private property owners are asking for different zoning than is consistent citywide; here we are trying to treat OHSU consistently.

Commissioner Bachrach: I also have the optic concern. I hope we can use this approach when we look at properties with findings when we look at isolated land.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

Item 4: Wildfire and Vegetation Management

- Amendment A. Amend the commentary, as shown in Attachment 4, 33.430.080.C.7.a(3) and 8, to clarify the exemptions for tree removal and pruning. Commentary is adopted as legislative intent.

The existing exemptions of 33.430.080.C.7 and 8 are consistent with the recommendations of Portland Fire and Rescue and provide appropriate allowances to minimize wildfire risks by removing or pruning trees and vegetation around existing structures.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: 10 feet sounds very close, but I assume that's what's recommended.

- Mindy: This is the current exemption in the code, which we're not proposing to change.
- Kim Kosmas: Within the 0-5 foot zone, we've asked for non-combustible material, but if they want to replant, we emphasize fire-resistant plants.

Commissioner Routh moved to amend the commentary for 33.430.080.C.7.a(s) and 8, as shown in Attachment 4, to clarify the exemptions for tree removal and pruning. *Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

Wildfire and Vegetation Management

- Amendment B. Amend 33.430.040.D.9, as shown in Attachment 4, to allow the exemption to apply to creating fire breaks between vegetation.

This is to exempt fire breaks in ezones, which we want to treat like trails to minimize the spread of wildfires.

The existing exemption allows for non-paved trails that are no more than 30 inches wide to be added within the ezones. The amendment clarifies that this applies to fire breaks as well. The same conditions apply to the fire breaks as currently apply to trails – no paving, no more than 30 inches wide, at least 15 feet from water bodies and no trees greater than 6 inches can be removed.

Erin Spens (PF&R) asked if the exemption could be expanded to allow 36-inch-wide trails because that would comport with ADA requirements for minimum trail width.

Commissioner Houck noted that not all trails need to be ADA compliant, especially in ezones. Many trails in Forest Park are not ADA compliant. However, Springwater Corridor and similar trails should be.

Commissioner Magnera said that if we can make trails more accessible we should.

Commissioner Houck moved to amend 33.430.080.D.9 as shown in Attachment 4, to allow the exemption to apply to creating fire breaks between vegetation. *Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

30 inches (width of trail) is the existing trail exemption. 36 inches is the ADA requirement.

Staff will get input from BDS and will return at the May 4 meeting with a recommendation.

Item 5: Septic Systems

- Amendment A. Amend 33.430.040.C.3 and 33.430.040.D.9, as shown in Attachment 5, to allow the exemption to apply to new septic systems. In addition, clarify both exemptions as they relate to gardens, play areas and structures.

33.430.040.C.3 is an exemption that allows changes to existing outdoor areas. The amendment would allow new septic systems within existing legal disturbance areas. The amendments also add clarity by removing “such as” and adding a definitive list of allowed uses including gardens, play structures, etc.

33.430.040.D.9 is an exemption that allows an additional disturbance of no more than 500 square feet for outdoor areas. The amendment would allow a septic system to qualify. The same conditions apply to septic systems as other outdoor areas – maximum 500 square feet, setback 30-50 feet from water bodies and no trees greater than 6 inches can be removed. The exemption also set a maximum disturbance for the entire site based on Table 430-1. The amendment also adds clarity by removing “such as” and adding a definitive list including gardens and play areas.

Commissioner Houck moved to amend 33.430.080.C.3 and D.9 as noted in Attachment 5 to allow the exemptions to apply to septic systems and to clarify the list of allowed activities. *Commissioner Bortolazzo* seconded.

(Y9 – Bortolazzo, Gitemeier, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak; A1 – Bachrach)

Septic Systems

- Amendment B. Adopt a new standard, as shown in Attachment 5, that applies to new septic systems that do not meet the exemptions

33.430.155 is a new standard for septic systems when the exemptions cannot be met. The standard allows for no more than 2,000 square feet of disturbance as long as no trees greater than 6 inches are removed and the disturbance area is setback from streams and wetlands. The disturbance area must be replanted with native plants. If the standards cannot be met, then Environmental Review would be required.

Commissioner Houck moved to amend the zoning code to adopt a new standard 33.430.155 for replacement septic systems as shown in Attachment 5. *Chair Spevak* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

Item 6: Multnomah County Drainage District

Proposed Amendment: adopt a new standard, as shown in Attachment 6, that allows minor upgrades to specific flood control structures, not including levees, when they are coupled with natural resource enhancement.

Recently MCDD has had to go through Environmental Review for very minor safety upgrades, such as adding a handrail to a ramp, to pump houses and other flood control structures. Review for these kinds of minor changes is not a good use of city staff and resources. A new standard, rather than exemption, would allow for a minor increase to the impact area of certain flood control facilities when coupled with natural resource enhancement actions to improve overall conditions. Standards are reviewed via a Plan Check. Note – Repair, maintenance and replacement of existing flood control structures is already exempt from 33.430, as long as the footprint is not increased. And Environmental Review would continue to be available for improvements that cannot meet the new standards.

Commissioner Houck: The drainage district has gotten significantly more in line with conservation issues in the slough, so I'm comfortable voting yes on this.

Commissioner Routh moved to amend the zoning code to adopt a new standard 33.430.185 for minor changes to flood control structures, as shown in Attachment 6. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y10 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Gittemeier, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak)

Next Steps

May 4 work session to discuss any further proposed amendments (please submit by this Friday) and site visit corrections as well as the Wildlife and Vegetation Amendment B.

July 27 work session to discuss the wetland inventory and any remaining items and final vote.

Chair Spevak continued the work session to the May 4 PSC meeting. Thank you to staff for your work.

Adjourn

Commissioner Spevak adjourned the meeting at 3:46 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken