

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

May 4, 2021

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

PSC Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach (arrived at 1:30 p.m.), Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Oriana Magnera, Valeria McWilliams (left 2:30 p.m.), Steph Routh, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak

PSC Commissioners Absent: Jessica Gittemeier

Guest Presenter: Kristen Minor, HLC Chair

City Staff Presenting: Andrea Durbin, Arianne Sperry, Bruce Walker, Mindy Brooks, Sallie Edmunds, Daniel Soebbing, Sandra Wood, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Shannon Buono, Joe Zehnder

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.

Three of our esteemed commissioners are leaving at the end of their terms the end of this month, so we will have some appreciations at the end of our meeting today.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Routh: Yesterday the Oregon Legislature passed striking down the definition of "family" in zoning codes. It goes to the governor's desk this week.

Commissioner Smith: Behind me is a photo of Willamette Cove, a formal industrial site that Metro owns. We're in negotiations with DEQ about cleaning it up particularly as the NP Greenway Trail runs through it.

Commissioner Larsell: I had a meeting yesterday for the Economic Development subcommittee of the EPAP, and Jaimes Valdez from PCEF came. It was so interesting, but I felt a little destabilized. I'd like to see some regular reports from them – it's the quietest huge deal we've ever seen. What does this mean for planning and sustainability? I'd like to know more about it and get more familiar with it.

Chair Spevak: Jessie sent a coordination email about the housing subgroup work. The idea of a virtual meet-up with the Seattle planning commission is slated for next Tuesday evening. This won't be the only chance for this, but we will keep this to under a quorum of PSC members.

Director's Report

Andrea Durbin

- DOZA starts at Council next week on May 12.
- Eric Engstrom provided an update about Shelter to Housing Continuum project and its adoption at Council.
 - Prohibit shelters in a variety of natural area overlay zones.
 - Parks and open spaces – Council prohibited temporary shelters in the OS zone in addition to the permanent shelters suggested by PSC.
 - Current housing emergency extended 1 year.
 - Bureaus to examine land for additional shelter options.
 - Allow shelters up to 20 beds on institutional sites in single-dwelling zones.
 - Tiny houses on wheels – no changes to PSC's recommendation.

Commissioner Houck: Is Council taking formal action on inventory of potential sites? Eric: We can ask.

Consent Agenda

Consideration of Minutes from the April 27, 2021 PSC meeting

Commissioner Houck moved to adopt the minutes. *Commissioner Routh* seconded the motion. (Y9 – Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

Garbage & Recycling Rates

Hearing / Recommendation: Arianne Sperry, Bruce Walker

Presentation

Bruce provided an overview of the program. Curbside includes single family homes up to and including 4-plexes. 5-plus and businesses are part of the commercial system, for which the City does not set rates. Private haulers provide collection services for both sectors.

An independent CPA review of residential hauler financial records was done since our PSC briefing last month. During the pandemic, drivers and staff have remained healthy, and this is an essential service to the public. Today Arianne will share the factors that are the basis for the rate increases we see.

Arianne: The key rate factors influencing rates this year are:

- Metro garbage tip fee increase.
- More garbage, recycling, and food scraps/yard debris collected from households.
- Higher fuel costs and wage increases.

The proposed monthly rates, with a bigger rate increase than normal since Metro didn't make increases last year, are shown on slide 3. A bit over a 4% increase.

Today we are seeking PSC vote to recommend rates to Council. On May 19, we have the City Council hearing on Utility Rates, with July 1 being when adopted rates take effect.

Arianne also provided an update on the equity and diversity work and efforts in the waste collection system, shown on slide 5.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: Thank you for this presentation. It's clear why our rates are going up. I'm wondering if you have a sense of how they compare to the rest of the metro area.

- Arianne: All rates will go up because of the tip fee increase. Other jurisdictions are a bit behind us, so some won't have increased fees adopted by July 1.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: There was an article a few weeks ago that may have cast confusion about the rise of garbage that is in neighborhoods. One of the points was that it's not clear with the franchise system whose responsibility it is. Are residential franchisees supposed to pick up anything outside of the bins? What is your opinion on that?

- Arianne: Residential franchisees are only responsible for what's put out by residents curbside.
- Bruce: Part of the point of the article was to say where someone can go to report trash problems. Much of the illegal dumping is related to homeless camps. There has been a pause on cleaning up those due to the pandemic, but that process is changing. We are involved, but the major work is being done by the OMF impact reduction program and Metro's illegal dumping program clean-up. It is a clear priority.

Commissioner McWilliams: You mentioned that part of the increase is about potential increase in wages for workers. Have they received additional benefit during the pandemic at all?

- Bruce: For clarity, we don't negotiate the union contracts – that is between the companies and the employees. Some companies have provided some additional wages, which were captured in their financial reports. But we don't take part of those negotiations.

Commissioner Magnera: re: the Waste Equity Advisory Group. Where is equity in the contracts? Have companies been bought/sold?

- Arianne: The WEAG has been through iterations. They broke into small groups in late summer and fall to address things like access to capital; opportunities in affordable housing; looking beyond the franchised/permitted haulers, can we broaden the definition of equity to others who are in the system (e.g. gleaners). One of the things is some research we're now doing on other models for capital access and financing for collection vehicles, which is a big hurdle for people trying to enter the franchise system. I can talk more in-depth about the advisory group and work on ownership and contracts, etc at another time.

Chair Spevak: A couple years ago we looked at the diversity decreasing in terms of franchise ownership. So we talked about an “on ramp” to make this easier to enter the system. I’m also hearing in the franchise world itself things haven’t changed much yet.

- Arianne: We did make changes to the franchise agreement when we renegotiated it last time e.g. when a franchise wants to sell. We don’t have a lever for saying to whom they must sell. We have been working on building capacity steps at a time. We can have a follow-up discussion at a later date.

Written Testimony Received

Testimony

1. Beth Vargas-Duncan, Portland Haulers Assn: We believe the rate-setting process is fair for customers and haulers, and we support these as staff shared today. Seal your garbage bags and right-size your carts. Also please remember to recycle right! Regardless of challenges confronting us, PHA members have consistently worked with staff to achieve sustainable results. *see written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith: You mentioned the request to seal bags. I understand this, but in my neighborhood, we have gleaners in both recycling and trash cans. Do haulers have advice on how to deal with this and opening bags?

Beth: Obviously as the customer we ask that you do seal the bags. We recognize individuals may access bags for their resources. No changes in the customer behavior, but our drivers watch for litter around the carts and clean that up. If there is an increased problem, it would be good to contact the provider or the City.

Bruce: One of the primary items people are going through carts for is the returnables. So you can keep those out of your carts and set them aside your cart – this sends a signal to the gleaners that these are ok to pick up.

Chair Spevak closed testimony at 1:15 p.m.

Commissioner Houck moved to recommend the Garbage & Recycling Rates to Council as shared today. *Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

(Y9 – Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The motion passes unanimously.

Ezones Map Correction Project

Work Session: Mindy Brooks, Sallie Edmunds, Daniel Soebbing

Presentation

Work Sheet

Mindy introduced the project and today's session. First, the policy decisions about which natural resources to protect were adopted between 1989-2004. The graphic shows those plans and plan areas. Each of these plans included an ESEE that said what resources to protect – streams, riparian areas, forest canopy, etc., and what level of protection – 'c' zone, 'p' zone, etc. These plans are still in effect today. While there isn't exact consistency between the plans, all of the policies include protections for streams, riparian areas and forests. With this Ezone Project, staff are not proposing changes to the adopted protection policies, except for wetlands which we will talk about in July. Policies for streams, forests, woodlands, steep slopes and wildlife habitat are staying the same. But the data about where the natural resource features are located is out of date. This is what we are fixing. Because the data is old, the adopted policies about what to protect do not align with the actual features.

We are not proposing to change the adopted definitions of features or mapping protocols, with the exception of wetlands. In 2012, the City adopted the Natural Resources Inventory as factual basis for the Comprehensive Plan. The NRI includes the feature definitions and mapping protocols. Metro confirmed the city's NRI as being in substantial compliance with Title 13. Staff are using those definitions and mapping protocols to update the feature maps.

The two primary definitions that are used across the city are – streams and forests. We correct the feature maps based on these adopted definitions and protocols and we then apply the adopted policies from those previous plans and the result are the corrected ezone boundaries.

Commissioner Houck: You can say the data is out of date, but it actually has been refined so we can more accurately pin-point where the resources are. It's matter of scale. With finer resolution maps of course there will be corrections. If aerial photos at 30 meter resolution is used the data will be far less accurate, or precise, than if the resolution is at 5 meters. Therefore the data is not "out of date", the resolution is more granular.

To clear up a misunderstanding from the last work session, there are few situations where a property owner disagrees with staff about the feature mapping. But there are many situations where the property owner disagrees with how features are defined or they object to correcting the ezones on their property.

Staff have prepared a table that includes all site visits since June 2020 as well as all testimony on the project. A few rows from the table are on the screen. The names have been removed for privacy. The table includes a summary of testimony, if provided, and summary of resource features, previously adopted policies about what features to protect and the proposed ezone corrections. The table concludes with the status of discussions with the property owners. The table is organized by property owner last name with a page number for the maps that show the before and after site visit feature mapping and the existing and proposed ezone boundaries.

Staff hope this table and maps will make it easier for the public and commissioners to understand proposed ezone boundary changes and property-specific concerns. The table and maps will be posted on Wednesday to the [project website under the documents tab](#).

Mindy provided two examples from public testimony: Feature Map Dispute and Objection to Ezone Application.

Commissioner Houck: Something to consider is when a property owner knows there is a review being done, they may try to game the system. This happened in a Beaverton Goal 5 inventory I did. The property owner went out and hydroaxed the understory hoping to reduce the habitat value. Ironically native plants emerged making the site even more valuable for wildlife. Did you see evidence of this?

- Mindy: We haven't seen this on site visits, but we have seen people get permits in advance of changes to their property – this is common. But we have not seen removing the resources ahead of the change.

Commissioner Bachrach: How big is this forest site example? And how is it different from the forested canopy on the OHSU site?

- Mindy: The example presented is not an isolated patch of forest, it is contiguous to a stream. The OHSU property was an isolated forest patch. Most of the west hills, the policy is not to protect isolated patches of forest. The policy is to protect forest contiguous to streams.

Item 1: Site Visit Corrections

Staff Recommendation: Update the Natural Resources Inventory in Volume 3 to incorporate the results of the site visit feature map corrections. Since the last work session, staff have continued to complete site visits to update the feature maps for streams, forests and steep slopes. The recommendation is to amend the Natural Resources Inventory with the feature map correction shown on maps in Attachment B.

Commissioner Bachrach: It looks like each site visit was on the invitation of the owner. [yes] We are not meeting with disputes about what the feature is. They are objecting to the project, not the feature itself. We are asking to correct the feature data. I want to be sure that if someone has a substantive objection with a rationale they get the same consideration we gave to Audubon and OHSU.

- Mindy: There was no disagreement.

Commissioner Houck: I think it's time to move on with this project. Jeff, I believe the City has met with 350+ individuals and has given due consideration to issues raised. There will be some people who don't want an 'e' or 'p' zone on their property, but if the stream is there, it's there and has the same overlay other property owners have with similar resources.

Commissioner Magnera: I am supportive of the point that we are allowing respected institutions that we may not be allowing others. And I also appreciate the work staff has done to connect with people.

Mindy: The requests from Audubon and OSHU are to be treated consistently by applying the policies as we do for private properties. Other requests are to not applying protection to streams and forest, which would mean that we change the policy. If we change policies for streams and forests, it could make us out of compliance with Metro Title 13.

Chair Spevak: I don't want to overrule staff on what a stream or protected area is.

Commissioner Houck: Mindy would you please, once again, describe why the Commission was asked to consider OHSU and Audubon Society. My understanding was it was a matter of consistency.

Discussion about consistency about OHSU and Audubon's properties. Staff clarified this.

Commissioner Larsell: I support staff on this, and they have done a great job connecting with property owners.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: What I'm gathering is that there is a consistent approach throughout. What is the recourse from property owners who still may want to challenge their designation?

- Mindy: City Council will have a public hearing and property owners can testify if they still disagree with the mapping or think the policy should be different. After City Council, there is a quasi-judicial process if people want to have their site reviewed on a 1-off basis to correct the feature mapping. The ezone boundaries follow the features, so the ezones would be adjusted through the quasi-judicial process.
- *Commissioner Houck* pointed out that individuals property owners do have a recourse as Mindy has pointed out.

Commissioner Larsell moved to update the Natural Resources Inventory in Volume 3 to incorporate the results of the site visit feature map corrections show in Attachment B. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

(Y6 – Houck, Larsell, McWilliams, Routh, Smith, Spevak; N3 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Magnera; A1 – Schultz)

The item passes.

Item 2: Wildfire and Vegetation Management (code)

At the last work session, we introduced this amendment to expand the existing exemption for trails in the ezones to also allow for fire breaks that meet the same criteria – not paved, setback from streams and wetlands, no trees removed. It was suggested that the exemption also be updated to increase the allowed trail width from 30 inches to 36 inches to meet federal ADA trail standards.

The exemption now adds fire breaks and increases the trail width to 36 inches as shown in Attachment C. Because a similar exemption is in 33.475, River Environmental Overlay, staff recommend also increasing the trail width to 36 inches in that exemption to be consistent between code sections.

Amendment A: Amend exemption 33.430.040.D.9, as shown in Attachment C, to allow the exemption to apply to creating fire breaks between vegetation. Also amend 33.430.040.D.9 to increase the allowed trail width from 30 inches to 36 inches.

Amendment B: Amend exemption 33.475.405.V, as shown in Attachment C, to increase the allowed trail width from 30 inches to 36 inches.

Commissioner Houck moved Amendments A and B. *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded.

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

The project will return at the July 27 meeting for a final vote. Please send potential amendments to staff by June 30.

Mindy shared an appreciation for our departing PSC members – it has been a pleasure working with you.

Commissioner Houck: I have been involved in this work for over 40 years and have conducted numerous Goal 5 inventories in that time and have observed others, including the city's. They have gotten better and better and this work is superior to anything I've seen. Thank you to staff for all your work and for responding to concerns and issues PSC and property owners have brought up.

This project work session is continued to July 27, 2021.

Historic Recourses Code Project

Work Session / Recommendation: Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Sandra Wood, Shannon Buono

Original Amendments Memo

Amendments Memo for May 4

Potential Conflicts Disclosures

- *Chair Minor* resides in Irvington and has listed multiple properties on the historic register throughout my professional life.

Brandon highlighted the amended memo, particularly about Amendments 6, which we'll discuss here.

Amendment 6A and 6B: Expand the historic resource review exemption for solar energy systems (Bortolazzo, Smith, Spevak).

Amendment 6A revises the solar energy system exemption from historic resource review. PSC commissioners raised several areas of concern, requesting staff reevaluate the proposed exemption and revise in a way that exempts most solar installations in districts from historic resource review. Under this amendment, solar energy systems and skylights will be allowed on all pitched roofs in districts without historic resource review. An alternative, Amendment #6B, would further exempt solar energy systems from historic resource review in both Historic and Conservation Districts, allow non-exempt solar energy installations to be reviewed Through a lower Type I procedure, and strike the skylight exemption provided in Amendment #A. 6B allows solar installations on a much larger area. Solar energy systems would be included in a Type 1 review. Walk back the proposed exemption of the skylight review.

Commissioner Magnera: We want to ensure our CAP goals are well executed for new and historic buildings too.

6B

Commissioner Smith moved. *Commissioner Bortolazzo* seconded.

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

The amendment 6B passes.

Amendment 7: Expand the historic resource review exemption for window replacement in single dwelling zones (Spevak).

This amendment exempts replacement of certain windows in single-dwelling zones in Historic and Conservation Districts from the historic resource review. In addition to the requested exemption, staff were asked to coordinate with BDS staff to identify additional opportunities to streamline review of window replacements in single-dwelling zones in situations when historic resource review is required. Staff provide two options for this amendment, with 7A being the initial amendment request and the alternative 7B being the staff preference. Both versions of the amendment expand upon proposed amendments that would allow for replacement of non-historic windows on contributing buildings and allow for basement windows without review.

This amendment exempts replacement of certain windows in single-dwelling zones in Historic and Conservation Districts from the historic resource review. In addition to the requested exemption, staff were asked to coordinate with BDS staff to identify additional opportunities to streamline review of window replacements in single-dwelling zones in situations when historic resource review is required. Staff provide two options for this amendment, with 7A being the initial amendment request and the alternative 7B being the staff preference. Both versions of the amendment expand upon proposed amendments that would allow for replacement of non-historic windows on contributing buildings and allow for basement windows without review. There is a new Type 1 for windows that wouldn't meet exemptions for non-contributing.

We understand 7A and 7B may not work for the Landmarks Commission, but B works better for BDS staff.

Chair Minor: Landmarks Commission wants to revise this amendment (either version). Looking at the text, we see the same #1 clause (already-replaced windows for something better). We agree. For #2 clause, there are two parts – one about contributing and one about non-contributing resources. It's the non-contributing exemption that makes no sense to us. Who does it benefit? Moving from Type 2 to a Type 1 review could be a way to improve affordability.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: Bottom line is that you seem to be ok with some parts of the amendment, but what would an amendment look like that the Landmarks Commission agrees with?

- *Chair Minor:* We could live with the first part of clause 2 (contributing resources and changing out windows that face the rear). We will push back about non-contributing resources to be allowed to change our windows.

Commissioner Bachrach: A reminder about the policy discussion that led us here. I felt strongly that the language on non-contributing resources is a compromise for me – I don't think there should be any restrictions if they are a non-contributing resource.

Chair Spevak: I agree with Jeff on this one. I feel like staff worked out a system that would get windows to fit into the fabric of the district.

Commissioner Schultz: I want to put on the record that I absolutely appreciate the expertise from the Landmarks Commission. But we didn't hear about other performance factors. I have lived experience of changing out windows and know the benefits.

Chair Spevak moved amendment 7B. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y9 – Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, McWilliams, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak; N1 – Bachrach)

Amendment 8: Refine historic resource review exemptions to allow for removal of meters (Spevak).

Amendment #8A refines the exemption related to meters to allow for removal of meters as well as installation without requiring historic resource review. Under this amendment, several exemptions will be expanded to allow for removal by deleting the words that limit the exemption to “installation and alteration” — this clarifies that removal is also exempt from historic resource review. An alternative, Amendment #8B, would further exempt outlets, mechanical equipment, and conduit to facilitate typical solar energy storage systems and electric vehicle charging outlets.

Staff supports 8B as it builds on and improves 8A.

Chair Spevak moved Amendment 8B. *Commissioner Routh* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The amendment passes.

Amendment 9: Expand the historic resource review exemption for new detached accessory structures in residential zones (Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Spevak).

This amendment increases the allowed size of detached accessory structures in residential zones that are exempt from historic resources review. Under this amendment, larger detached accessory structures will be allowed in Historic and Conservation Districts within certain parameters. To better ensure the expanded exemption results in design compatibility in historic areas, the amendment includes an additional clear and objective regulation related to doors.

Chair Minor: We are ok with this. We want to create more incentives and help for people who are putting a new ADU and renting it out.

Commissioner Houck moved Amendment 9. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

Chair Spevak: Does this enable big 2-car garages?

- Brandon: We thought about it, but the design standard about windows can alleviate that. Structures will change over time, but we're really interested in the architectural compatibility and not as much about the use.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The amendment passes.

Amendment 10: Refine reuse incentive code language for clarity (Bortolazzo).

This amendment removes unnecessary language from the explanatory text of the historic resource reuse incentives section. Under this amendment, the sentence related to the possibility of historic resource review being required when an incentive is provided will be removed because it can be misleading and it is not necessary.

Commissioner Bortolazzo moved Amendment 10. *Commissioner Routh* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The amendment passes.

Amendment 11: Allow residential infill incentives in the Commercial Residential (CR) zone.

This amendment allows residential infill incentives to be used in the CR zone.

Commissioner Routh moved the amendment. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The amendment passes.

Amendment 12: Amend incentive C.6 (Retail Sales And Service and Office uses) code language and amend historic preservation incentive review approval criteria (Smith).

This amendment revises the Retail Sales And Service and Office Use incentive to ensure multi-dwelling housing is not lost as a result of use of the by-right incentive. Additionally, the amendment would restore existing language in the historic preservation incentive review approval criteria to ensure consideration of adopted neighborhood plans.

Commissioner Smith moved the amendment. *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The amendment passes.

Amendment 13: Consolidate historic resource type descriptions and definitions (Bachrach).

This amendment consolidates historic resource type definitions in Chapter 910, Definitions. Chapter 445, Historic Resource Overlay Zone, will provide references to the 33.910 definitions.

Chair Minor still supports having the definitions in multiple places. Without it being in 33.445, there is not place for the Purpose statement.

Commissioner Bachrach: I requested consolidation because we have definitions in 910 and historic had slightly different descriptions.

Commissioner Houck: Having sat through Design Commission considerations, I appreciate the comment about the Purpose statement.

Chair Spevak: I think putting it all in one place makes sense, but I'd trust staff where to place it.

Commissioner Houck moved Amendments 13. *Commissioner Bortolazzo* seconded.

Commissioner Routh: I wanted to confirm that *Chair Minor* is more comfortable with this in the definition section with something to point to in the code. [yes, thank you.]

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The amendment passes.

Amendment 14: Minor and technical amendments (Routh).

The following are minor and technical amendments to improve the clarity of the recommended zoning code amendments.

Commissioner Bachrach moved the amendment. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

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

The amendment passes.

Motion

Commissioner Schultz moved to direct staff to continue to refine Historic Resources Code Project Volume 1 staff report and Volume 2 commentary as necessary and recommend that City Council adopt Historic Resources Code Project Volumes 1 and 2 as amended. *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded.

Many kudos and appreciations to this project team – it was thorough, thoughtful, and well done.

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

Ideas for the PSC's letter to Council.

- *Commissioner Bortolazzo:* Historic Design Guidelines haven't been updated for a while. I would plug to prompt an update to these guidelines.

Chair Minor shared appreciation for this work with the project team and the PSC. We are proud to support this package and see it moving ahead.

Commissioner Houck: I'm looking forward to future conversations about historic and cultural landscapes.

Sandra: Thank you to Chair Minor and the PSC. I want to particularly thank Kat, Mike, and Chris for all their work. We will miss you tremendously.

Commissioner Appreciations

Andrea: I have the honor of working with Chris, Mike, and Kat for just a couple years, but you have provided invaluable insights and contributions to some of Portland's biggest, most aspirational, longest-term plans: Portland Plan, CC2035, West Hayden Island, Residential Infill Project, Better Housing by Design, DOZA, and the river plans.

Chris

- Longest-serving PSC member (as is Mike) since the Commission being formed in October 2010.
- As we know, a huge bike/transportation advocate... but also a key member of the PSC to keeping us looking at our Climate Action goals/efforts.
- Countless advisory committees and groups.
- Winner for PSC best attendance record! You've never missed a meeting in your 11 years of service.

Mike

- Longest-serving PSC member (as is Chris) since the Commission being formed in October 2010.
- A voice for integrating nature in the city.
- Inventories of our rivers and the first to use the term "green infrastructure".

Kat

- We stole you from the Design Commission in 2012. Definitely their loss and the PSC's gain.
- Design perspective, but also a perspective from the implementation aspect... and the people aspect.
- PSC Chair 2016-2019.

Chair Spevak: When they joined PSC...

- There were 80K+ fewer people living in Portland.
- The Comp Plan in effect was from 1980. (They are now the only remaining commissioners who voted on the current comp plan).
- We still had parking minimums in nearly all zones – with a barely-discovered exception near transit. Nothing to mention for bike parking in the zoning code.
- Zoning code had special occupancy rules based on who's married to whom.
- Portland hadn't done updated river planning for the south, central or north reach (now 2 out of 3).
- We were building ADUs at the whopping rate of a couple dozen a year.
- IH was illegal anywhere in OR.
- Deconstruction of old homes was optional.

When I considered applying for PSC, my first call was to Mike, then to Chris, to sort out how to transition from outside advocate to balls-and-strikes policy recommender.

Kat – Mentor & friend. Grounded, creative, sense of humor, runs a Great meeting (including telling me to clam up when I talk too much)! Younger than many of us – but still PSC mom.

They're not leaving us!

- Chris still has a freeway expansion to block.
- Kat's running one of Portland's largest design firms.

- Mike gets to figure out if retirement is something he's capable of do.
I've still got all their phone numbers, and will be calling when I need their wisdom

Serving with them has been a chance to help shape policy – and also make friends – who also happen to have a shared love of Portland and care enormously about its future.

Joe: We have been working together for a long time in a wonderful and intense setting. Mike introduced me to natural areas being part of city planning and how we should operate. I started working with Chris when I first came to Portland in 2001 or so on the Northwest District Plan. Working with you, Kat, as Chair, was outstanding. We worked through so much over those years, but your graciousness and thoughtfulness you provided in your leadership was so valuable.

Commissioner Bachrach: With you all departing, I become the longest-serving PSC member. I've learned so much from each of you. Thank you all – you've made it interesting and fun.

Commissioner Larsell: You three have provided so much guidance. I have relied on your insights and leadership for helping me when reviewing documents and new information, before I know really how to respond. You have provided leadership about how we listen and how we treat each other.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: Thank you to Mike for your passion on urban ecology. Keep the articles and information coming. Thanks to Chris for all your work and for your leadership and diligence on meetings. Kat, I hate to lose a fellow architect on the PSC. Thank you all for your commitment.

Commissioner Routh: Mike is one of my favorite people to disagree with – and learn from. Thank you, Kat, for all our conversations – your thoughtfulness and humility especially. Chris, I've known you the longest, and you've been a great mentor.

Commissioner Houck: I sent my heart-felt thoughts to all of you. I hope you read them. And, yes there is a typo. It should read "In Livable Cities is Preservation of the Wild " you all do not need to email me that "if" should be "is." Please read this as my thank you and my hopes for the PSC in the future. I have incredible respect for the integrity, hard work, and dedication of everyone I've served with on the PSC. I feel exactly the same way about the staff. You are par excellence bar none.

Commissioner Smith: It's been an incredible privilege and incredibly rewarding to work on the Portland Plan, then Comp Plan, and then made it real. I've served with an amazing group of people on this Commission throughout the past 11 years. Advice for the future: We have broad legislative authority under the code. We should maintain separate identities from BPS if we think we can add benefit to the community. Thanks to all I have worked with.

Commissioner Schultz: I started mid-West Hayden Island Plan, which was a huge learning curve for me. Thank you to everyone's leadership and guidance in this journey. I looked at my timesheet, and I'm now over 1600 hours working with and for the PSC – and it went by so fast because it was so enjoyable. I am the one to thank all of you. It has been an honor, and I have grown so much in being a part of the PSC. You've made me so much more receptive to differing ideas and perspective. The work that staff does and how you work for the community is so embedded in all aspects of your work. Big virtual hugs!

Commissioner Houck: Since Chris and now Kat mentioned West Hayden Island, I have to add that the WHI decision represents what I have hoped for, an integration of land use planning law and

sustainability principles. We could have simply accepted the fact that Metro exempted WHI from balanced cut and fill. Instead we looked at the loss of floodplain ecological function and required the Port to mitigate for those losses.

Dee Walker, PBOT: I wanted to join in today because I want to appreciate the affect you have on other people – so welcoming and never intimidating. You’ve made me a better agent in the way I view things. What’s important is how we work together to make the best for everyone, and I appreciate getting to work with you.

Chair Spevak suggested a meeting in person for a gathering in a yard to share our thanks and appreciations... some time in the future. This is such a functional Commission, and staff is a huge reason for that, and the longevity of these PSC members is a huge reason too. You’ve made better leaders of us all. Cheers, kudos, and appreciations to Kat, Chris, and Mike!

Adjourn

Chair Spevak adjourned the meeting at 3:56 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken