

Residential Infill Project – Part 2 (RIP2)

Community Engagement Plan

July 2021

City of Portland

Bureau of Planning and Sustainability



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

City of Portland, Oregon



LANGUAGE ACCESS

The City of Portland is committed to providing meaningful access.

To request translation, interpretation, modifications, accommodations, or other auxiliary aids or services, contact 503-823-7700, Relay: 711.

Traducción e Interpretación | Biên Dịch và Thông Dịch | अनुवादन तथा व्याख्या | 口笔译服务 | Устный и письменный перевод | Turjumaad iyo Fasiraad | Письмовий і усний переклад | Traducere și interpretariat | Chiaku me Awewen Kapas |
翻訳または通訳 | ການແປພາສາ ຫຼື ການອະທິບາຍ | الترجمة التحريرية أو الشفهية

www.portland.gov/bps/accommodation

For more information:

Visit the web: www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/rip2

Contact staff:

Morgan Tracy, Project Manager
morgan.tracy@portlandoregon.gov; 503-823-6879

JP McNeil, City Planner
jason.mcneil@portlandoregon.gov; 503-823-6046

Introduction

This community engagement plan will guide the planning process for the Residential Infill Project – Part 2 (RIP2). Including community engagement as an essential element to planning projects supports an inclusive process that is responsive to community needs using an upstream approach to minimize unintended consequences. Equitable process and representation directly contribute to more equitable outcomes for vulnerable populations. The overarching goals of the community engagement process are to inform the broader public about the project and create opportunities for the community to provide crucial considerations on their vision and concerns regarding land use, transportation/infrastructure and equitable development. This community engagement plan is a working document that will be revised as new ideas and other adjustments are identified.

1. Project Overview

In August of 2020, City Council adopted the Residential Infill Project - Part 1 (RIP1), which was a five-year project that sought to address two needs in Portland's single dwelling zones: a need for a greater range of housing choices in the city, in the form of “middle” housing, and a desire for new development to be of a more compatible scale with existing development. The result was a series of zoning changes that expanded the allowances for duplexes, triplexes, quadplexes, second ADUs, and, in certain cases where a deeper level of affordability is achieved, up to six units on one lot. The RIP1 changes applied primarily to Portland’s higher density single dwelling zones (R2.5, R5, and R7), representing 90% of the single-dwelling residential lots in Portland, but did not include the lower-density single-dwelling zones comprised of the R10 and R20 zones. The outcomes of RIP1 generally align with the mandates of House Bill 2001, a bill passed by the Oregon legislature that requires cities to provide a certain level of "middle" housing in single-dwelling zones; however, because the R10 and R20 zones were not included in RIP1, this project will address those zones. RIP2 will also need to address two housing types required under HB2001 in all single-dwelling zones: cottage clusters and townhouses.

In addition, in 2021 the State legislature passed Senate Bill 458 which establishes an expedited land division process for middle housing developments that enable these projects to create individual lots for each middle housing unit. This project will examine and incorporate, as needed, any changes to the land division standards and procedures in compliance with this legislation which takes effect on July 1, 2022.

The main objective of RIP2 is to satisfy remaining compliance obligations under HB2001 and SB458, as well as bring a level of parity in all of the city’s single-dwelling zones by carrying forward the additional allowances in RIP1 (deeper affordability bonuses, additional ADUs) to the R10 and R20 zones. RIP2 will also likely require some minor changes to the adopted RIP code, such as updating the Constrained Sites ‘z’ overlay that limits the types of middle housing on lands with certain natural resources and hazards.

2. Past Community Engagement

As discussed above, this is the second part following on to the five-year effort of the Residential Infill Project. The first part was a significant effort that required substantial resource commitment and represented a major evolutionary change in what is allowed in these Portland’s single-dwelling zones. As such, it generated a great deal of interest and input and necessitated a robust community engagement process. Project staff convened a Stakeholder Advisory Committee comprised of community members, architects, developers and other affected Portlanders in the early Concept Phase. Over the course of 18 months, they discussed issues and opportunities, ultimately helping to form a Concept Report that was presented to City Council. Council held public hearings and, with some amendments, approved the Concept Report in December of 2016.

Following the approval of the Concept Report staff began developing the Zoning Code and map amendments needed to make the Council’s concepts rules for residential neighborhoods. In October of 2017 a Discussion Draft was published and the public had a 2-month window of opportunity to comment on the proposals.

Comments received informed the proposals in the Proposed Draft, which then went before the Planning and Sustainability Commission for public hearings. The PSC heard extensive public testimony and deliberated for nearly 12 months before voting to recommend the plan to the City Council. In the spring of 2020, City Council held public hearings and heard from over 100 people in addition to receiving over 500 written pieces of testimony. In response to this testimony, staff held work sessions with Council to identify possible revisions to the proposals, which were incorporated into the final product. The policy was adopted in August of 2020. The changes become effective on August 1, 2021.

Background work for RIP2 began in late 2020. Through the winter, staff focused on setting up the administrative framework for the project, obtaining grant funding and hiring consultants, drafting a project scope, and conducting existing conditions research. Staff also worked internally with other City bureau representatives on a parallel project, the Infrastructure Based Time Extension Request (IBTER) process, to study infrastructure-constrained lands as authorized in HB 2001.

Early in the project, project staff heard from BPS and other City staff that, in light of recent moves to further center racial justice and advance equitable planning practices in our work and the expected limited impacts that RIP2 would have on those goals, there was an opportunity cost in scoping this project to the scale of RIP1 when the resources could instead be allocated to other BPS projects that have the potential to better advance those goals (e.g. the Shelter to Housing Continuum, the Anti-displacement Action Plan, or the Spatial Justice Project). Further, unlike RIP1, with the passage of HB2001 the City has certain compliance obligations and a deadline of June 30, 2022 to complete the project.

Staff also engaged with members of the public in drafting a project scope for RIP2. Early engagement included targeted outreach to housing stakeholders involved with RIP1 and focus groups with small-scale developers to garner feedback on the cottage cluster portion of the project. The Planning and Sustainability Commission (on 3/9/21) and the Community Involvement Committee (on 2/9/21) held similar discussions. The purpose of these discussions was to identify whether the project scope should be more limited to respond to the outstanding compliance issues, or broader to include more significant changes, similar to the efforts in RIP1.

All stakeholders largely agreed with staff's working project scope – to keep this effort limited to compliance with the State legislation and achieve parity in R10/R20 zones with what is allowed in the higher density single-dwelling zones. Consequently, the scope of this project will not be on the scale of RIP1 and will not include a formal stakeholder committee. Meeting the State deadline of June 30, 2022 would drive the engagement plan.

3. Equity Considerations

Policy Overview

Chapter 2 of Portland's 2035 Comprehensive Plan outlines the goals and policies for community engagement in planning processes. Promoting social justice and equity through community involvement in planning efforts is a significant emphasis in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan.

Beyond community engagement and equity, RIP2 asks questions about housing development, land use, and infrastructure that are addressed in multiple Comprehensive Plan goals and policies. These include policies about housing (housing supply and affordability, middle housing), public facilities and services (system development and capacity, cost-effectiveness), environmental health (natural hazards and natural resource protection) and urban form.

Demographic Scan and Study Area

The RIP2 study area encompasses all the Portland's single-dwelling zones, since cottage clusters and townhouses which were not part of the RIP1 project, will be permitted across all of these areas. R10 and R20 zones are new geographic study areas that were not studied in RIP1, but will need to be evaluated for the full suite of middle housing types, both those mandated in HB2001, as well as the additional types introduced in RIP1 (second ADUs and deeper affordability six-plexes).

The demographics of the higher density single-dwelling zones (R2.5, R5, and R7) were analyzed extensively during the RIP1 process, much of which was incorporated into the Displacement Risk Analysis (RIP1, Volume 3, Appendix B¹). This report found that overall, the RIP policy changes would result in less displacement overall in the city than the status quo policies; however, the changes would result in some increased displacement risk in a few select areas -- portions of the Brentwood-Darlington, Lents, and Montavilla neighborhoods.

For the purposes of the RIP2 demographic analysis of the R2.5 through R7 zones, the project team will rely on the work that was done during the RIP1 study. This research is suitable for an analysis of the proposed changes in RIP2 that would impact these higher density zones.

For the R10 and R20 zones, a demographic analysis was included in the RIP2 Existing Conditions Report. The geographic extent of these lower density single-dwelling zones is much smaller than the higher density single dwelling zones and largely includes lands on the outer edges of the city, mostly in east Portland and the west hills. Given the dispersed nature of these zones, one of the key takeaways of the demographic analysis was that it was difficult to make generalizations about these zones as one unit of analysis. Rather, it was more useful to further break them down into two geographic units: east and west. This is because the analysis found a large difference in the makeup of these areas as a whole, but similarities within the east and west geographies.

The key demographic findings of the R10/R20 Existing Conditions Report are that:

- The east areas are generally more racially mixed, have lower income-earners, and have lower levels of advanced education.
- The west areas are generally whiter, higher income-earners, with more formal education.
- Homeownership is higher across both areas than is found citywide and both areas trend older than the citywide average.

Race and Ethnicity

- The west areas are predominantly white, with about 85% of residents identifying as white.
- The east areas are more varied, but generally have higher proportions of Black, Asian, and Hispanic populations than found citywide.

Income

- Individual incomes in eastern subareas are substantially lower than those in the west, with over 35% earning over \$75,000 a year in the west compared to about 15% in the east.

Education

- In the west areas, college attainment is much higher, with about 72% of residents receiving bachelor's or advanced degrees. The east areas have a lower educational attainment of about 29%. Citywide educational attainment is 52% with college degrees or higher.

Housing

- There are more renters in the east areas than in the west (35% and 22%, respectively) and more homeowners in the west than in the east (78% and 65%, respectively). The homeownership rate is higher in all of the R10 and R20 zones (east and west) than the city rate, which is 54%.

¹ https://www.portland.gov/sites/default/files/2019-12/vol_3_appendix_b_displacement_risk_and_mitigation.pdf.

Benefits and Burdens

This project is scoped to consider changes in land use allowances and housing incentives that may provide significant benefits to some parties or potentially create burdens for others, depending on the outcomes. This may include changes to land use values or allowances for uses that have variable benefits and burdens.

Land Value		
Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, townhouses, Cottage Clusters	Benefit	Burden
Increased property values due to newly allowed housing types	Property owners who see improved property values on resale. Builders, developers, investors who achieve higher profits, due to additional units being sold or rented	Property owners who may be unable to directly capitalize on benefits. Low-income property owners who become subject to predatory speculation Lower-income buyers looking for low cost “sweat equity” entry homes Builders who spend more acquiring properties, in turn burdening buyers from higher housing costs Renters who are involuntarily displaced due to redevelopment
Decrease in value due to reduced building scale allowances	Potential buyers looking for smaller, lower cost housing	Builders, developers, investors who may be less able to obtain normal rate of return on project.
ADU’s		
Increased opportunities to add revenue-generating options by leveraging existing equity to add ADU’s.	Benefit	Burden
	Property owners (all-income levels) Potential buyers/renters looking for smaller, lower cost housing	Some-low income homeowners who are unable to capitalize on benefits without sufficient capital/equity
Housing/Community Stability		
Duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes	Benefit	Burden
Increased allowances for additional housing units in many parts of the city – generally as rentals or condos	Renters and homebuyers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased access to more neighborhoods • Smaller, lower cost units and more supply. • More rental options in locations that supplement apartments in centers and corridors. • Broader spectrum of housing type and arrangement to adapt to changing household needs • Improved energy efficiency = lower utility costs • Less pressure on UGB expansion and extended commutes. • Increased housing supply slows average rent increases 	Renters and homebuyers: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduced prevalence of single lot, single dwelling housing types may make existing single dwelling supply more costly and out of reach. • If developed as rental units, these housing types do not provide homeownership opportunity • Redevelopment can change the market dynamic of an area, leading to increased rents, cultural change and greater displacement. • Locating housing in areas not well served by transit/near amenities and services could saddle lower-income households with higher transportation costs.

Townhouses/Cottage Clusters	Benefit	Burden
<p>Increased allowances for additional housing units in many parts of the city – generally as condos or fee-simple homeownership</p>	<p>Renters and homebuyers:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Increased access to more neighborhoods • Smaller, lower cost units and more supply. • Broader spectrum of housing type and arrangement to adapt to changing household needs • Less pressure on UGB expansion and extended commutes. • More opportunities for lower cost or entry level homeownership creates more entries to generational wealth building. • Cottage clusters add flexible options for intentional communities and large families seeking greater independence within close proximity 	<p>Renters:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expanding allowances could incent property owners to increase rents or redevelop, or result in cultural changes in neighborhoods • These housing types are less frequently positioned initially for renters.
ADUs	Benefit	Burden
<p>Increased allowances for ADUs in conjunction with a house or duplex – generally rental but could be condo</p>	<p>Renters who may have increased access to more neighborhoods</p> <p>Renters and condo buyers who may find smaller, lower cost units and more supply.</p> <p>Smaller households who have a broader spectrum of housing choices and arrangement to adapt to changing household needs</p> <p>Larger intergenerational households who have flexible options to live within close proximity to family</p> <p>Senior households who can remain in place through on-site caregiver or universal design housing.</p>	<p>First time homebuyers who may have fewer options. Except when created as a condominium, ADUs do not provide homeownership opportunities, and increase the overall value of a property, putting it further out of reach of lower income homebuyers.</p>
Planning and Policy		
Planning staff resources	Benefit	Burden
<p>Resource and staffing commitments necessary to complete legislative zoning project</p>	<p>Low density area property owners (tend to skew towards higher income, whiter demographic)</p>	<p>Vulnerable populations (low-income, POC, renters) in other geographic areas of the city, or with different planning needs.</p>
Services and Infrastructure	Benefit	Burden
<p>Funding and prioritization of limited infrastructure and service dollars</p>	<p>Low density area property owners and investors who may benefit from city investments and added services</p>	<p>Vulnerable populations (low-income, POC, renters) in other geographic areas of the city, who may see funding diverted from planned service enhancements</p>

Power Dynamics

It is the City's practice to consider power dynamics as part of an engagement plan because the stakeholders with the most at stake do not always have the most power to impact project outcomes. This should be considered as engagement plans are formulated.

The Portland City Council exercises the greatest power in this project because Council has sole authority and discretion to amend the City Code, Comprehensive Plan Map and Zoning Map, although the Council is constrained by the limits of what is permissible in State law, notably in this case – HB2001 and SB458.

Second in the power dynamic are organizations, agencies and individuals experienced in participating in and influencing the deliberations of City Council. These include:

- The Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission
- Various Bureaus of the City of Portland
- Recognized Neighborhood and Business Associations
- Other advocacy organizations
- Political campaign donors

Third are individuals and organizations motivated to participate, but less experienced in doing so or face barriers to readily participate. These might include:

- Faith-based organizations
- Residential property owners
- Renters
- Community or other organizations not benefiting from official City recognition
- Social service organizations
- Houseless community
- Students attending schools in the study areas

Least in power are those persons that have no direct or clear stake in the outcomes of the project but may be indirectly impacted by the outcomes. These could include persons that may be employed in areas where land use changes are planned, neighbors of properties which may be impacted by changes in land use or transportation, and future generations of Portlanders that will live with the outcomes of decisions that are made now. These people may be the least likely to influence a Council decision, although their interests may be presented by proxy through advocates and the testimony of other concerned individuals.

4. Role of Community Engagement

The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) will involve a variety of stakeholders and interested parties in the RIP2 process. While many components of this project are a continuation of the work done with RIP1 or a response to the State's middle housing mandate in HB 2001, engaging communities and stakeholders on the details where Portland has a choice can inform decisions about the project outcomes.

Community stakeholders with direct interests in the effort are:

- Property owners and businesses
- Service agencies (e.g. TriMet)
- Affordable housing providers and developers (e.g. Habitat for Humanity, PCRI, Hacienda, etc)
- Middle housing advocates (e.g. Portland: Neighbors Welcome)

-
- Developers and homebuilders
 - Neighborhood and Business Associations

Other community stakeholders with diverse and broad interests could include:

- Organizations representing communities of color (e.g. Imagine Black, APANO, etc.)
- Organizations representing tenants (e.g. Community Alliance of Tenants, FHCO)
- Advocates representing the houseless community (e.g. Street Roots, JOIN, Transition Projects)

Input from the community will be used to help inform choices about aspirations and options for land use and development and the best ways of implementing the HB 2001 mandates. The role of the broader community is to provide advice and feedback and inform the planning team about localized conditions, needs and opportunities that may not otherwise be known.

Community input may help to inform any proposed changes to the site and design standards for cottage clusters and townhouses, framing the extent to which the RIP1 allowances should be extended to the R10 and R20 zones, and identifying options for more equitable development outcomes.

Overview of Engagement Approach

The focus of this project is Portland’s single-dwelling zones, although there are two components of the project with somewhat differing geographies. The first component is “RIP parity”, which focuses on how to extend the changes from RIP1 to the R10 and R20 zones. The second component is “HB 2001 compliance” which focuses on changes that pertain to all of the city’s single-dwelling zones. While the audience for the “RIP parity” component is narrower than for the other component (it only impacts some single-dwelling zones), the two audiences overlap; therefore, staff determined that a single, broad approach to community engagement for the entire project made the most sense.

As noted above, RIP2 is a continuation of the RIP1 project and, as such, it will build off the extensive community engagement that was conducted for that project rather than start from scratch. This also takes into consideration the time and energy focused on the single-dwelling zones during the RIP1 process and recognizes that there are opportunity costs to focusing so many BPS resources on the single-dwelling zones when there is other work to be done, some of which may better align with the Bureau’s commitment to centering racial equity and social justice in its work.

To that end, a broad, high-level community engagement strategy is warranted for RIP2 that uses the community engagement process from RIP1 as a foundation. Given the uncertainties with the continuing COVID-19 pandemic, staff is planning on holding all community engagement events remotely via Zoom or other virtual platform until public health guidelines are issued allowing for social congregation that would be appropriate for community events.

RIP2 Engagement Elements

- Focus groups with housing providers, home builders, and housing advocates
- Public open houses
- Equity-targeted groups (residents and business owners of color; renters, low-income residents)
- Neighborhood District meetings
- Community meetings – attend relevant organization meetings where underserved and/or underrepresented populations are present and represented
- Other community meetings and focus groups as needed

Community Engagement Considerations

Community members may be concerned about issues such as housing affordability, residential displacement, residential demolitions, crime, traffic and traffic safety. Communications and outreach efforts need to acknowledge this, identify connections to those areas of concern, and be ready to direct those interests in the appropriate direction if they are beyond the scope of this project.

The project team is committed to conducting outreach to underrepresented groups or communities that may be impacted by decision making but may not be likely to participate through other channels. The intended audience for this work may include renters, low-income households, and persons of color.

Another consideration is the possibility of participation fatigue in planning projects. Community members have been and will continue to be asked for feedback on many complicated projects with multiple affiliations (BPS, PBOT, ODOT, PDC, Metro, etc.). Given the limited range of choices available within this compliance-focused project, setting realistic expectations for community participants will be crucial.

5. Concurrent Efforts

The project will be coordinated with several ongoing and recently completed public planning projects, including:

- Infrastructure-Based Time Extension Request (IBTER) study
- Shelter to Housing Continuum
- Anti-Displacement Action Plan
- Spatial Justice Project
- Environmental Zones Project
- Floodplain Resilience Project

6. Project Timeline

August 2020 – December 2020	Project startup and scoping
January 2021 – July 2021	Existing conditions and concept development
August 2021 – October 2021	Public review of concepts
November 2021	Publish code language and map amendments
November 2021 – January 2022	Public hearings at Planning and Sustainability Commission
March 2022 – June 2022	Public hearings at City Council / final vote

7. Community Engagement Principles and Goals

The City of Portland recognizes that equity is realized when identity -- such as race, ethnicity, gender, age, disability, national origin, sexual orientation-- has no detrimental effect on the distribution of resources, opportunities, and outcomes for group members in society. BPS is committed to the fair treatment and meaningful engagement of all people, regardless of income or identity, with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of plans, policies and procedures in the course of the bureaus' work.

Fair treatment means that no group of people, including a racial, ethnic, or a socioeconomic group, should bear a disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial,

municipal, and commercial operations or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies. Meaningful engagement means that: (1) potentially affected community residents have an appropriate opportunity to participate in decisions about a proposed activity that will affect their environment or health; (2) the public's contribution can influence the regulatory agency's decision; (3) the concerns of all participants involved will be considered in the decision-making process; and (4) the decision makers seek out and facilitate the engagement of those potentially affected.

BPS acknowledges the injustices that have occurred historically from prior local decision-making. Meaningful participation helps ensure that the benefits and burdens of future decisions are equitably distributed. BPS's commitment to non-discriminatory engagement includes supporting special efforts to engage minority, low-income, people with disabilities, people with Limited English Proficiency, senior and youth populations.

BPS's public engagement plans, policies and practices are guided by and in conformance with the City of Portland Title VI Civil Rights Program and Plan.

In June 2013 the City Council unanimously adopted the Civil Rights Title VI Plan which included the Environmental Justice Policy and Analysis Guidelines. The City of Portland also adopted by Ordinance the [Non-Discrimination Policy Statement](#) and the Non-Discrimination Agreement for Certified Local Agencies. These support implementation of the City of Portland's Civil Rights Code, located in Chapter 23.01 Civil Rights, which was adopted on October 3, 1991 by Ordinance Number 164709.

The process will further be guided by the City of Portland [Public Engagement Principles](#), adopted by the Portland City Council in August 2010. The principles represent a road map to guide government officials and staff in establishing consistent, effective and high-quality engagement across Portland's city government.

8. Community Engagement Equity Framework

To uphold the values of inclusiveness and equity, which are fundamental to our City's Public Engagement Principles and the Portland Plan, this project will strive to not only encourage participation from diverse and underrepresented Portland communities, but also apply an equity lens throughout the process. The project will do this in the following ways:

- Facilitate an early discussion with stakeholder groups to:
 - Develop a shared understanding of an equity lens and framework for the project
 - Identify key project issues and identify the communities that are impacted
- Update the community engagement plan if needed to include an assessment of these issues and impacted communities, prioritizing the engagement of these communities.
- Incorporate strategies including but not limited to holding focused discussions with impacted groups/individuals at key milestones during the process.
- Materials intended for the general community may include multi-lingual messaging and resources if needed.
- A demographic profile of the geographies covered by this project guide the style, design and translation of materials and interpretation services.
- The selection of members for focus groups, and other means for the public to consult and collaborate on this project will include consideration of racial and social equity.
- Processes for such engagement will consider culturally-responsive approaches to maximize inclusion for diverse participants.

9. Community Engagement Steps

A community engagement summary is listed below, followed by more detailed steps.

Step	Topic	Timeframe	Engagement Type
1	Early Info Gathering and Sharing – RIP 1 Update and RIP2 preview	10/20 – 6/21	Focus Groups, CIC, PSC
2	Concept Development	6/21 – 8/21	Focus groups, Technical advisory groups
3	Feedback on Concepts	8/21 – 10/21	Virtual open house, Neighborhood District Coalitions and other relevant group meetings
3	Proposed Draft to PSC	11/21 – 1/22	Public hearings, legal notices
4	Recommended Draft to City Council	2/22 – 6/22	Public hearings

Step 1 – Share Information: Early Information Gathering and Sharing

October 2020 – June 2021

This phase consists of meetings with the stakeholders and early project outreach and information sharing about what was included with the RIP Part 1 adoption. We will also collect and analyze data including demographics that allows us to identify the most vulnerable populations in the portions of the study area not analyzed during RIP1 (the R10 and R20 zones). The primary focus of this phase is to provide information to community members about the project and begin to understand potential intended opportunities and unintended consequences.

Category	Action
Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Consult with BPS Comms Team • Cottage Clusters Focus Groups • Develop project web site content • Initiate interested parties list • Meet with Community Involvement Committee (CIC) • Outreach via email and other communications
Data and Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Collect/compile existing conditions data
Outreach and Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups with affordable housing developers and homebuilders • Initiate (or continue contact) with the following organizations: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ Neighborhood Associations via the District Coalitions ○ Portland: Neighbors Welcome, Habitat for Humanity, AARP, 1000 Friends, Sightline, Community Alliance of Tenants, Homebuilders Association of Portland, others TBD
Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Focus groups • CIC • RIP1 info sharing and RIP2 preview to identified parties and groups • Attend community meetings
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Community Engagement Plan • Existing Conditions Report

Step 2 – Concept Development

June 2021 – August 2021

Work with technical advisors in partner agencies and consultants to develop initial concepts for further refinement through subsequent public discussion. The primary focus of this phase is to research and analyze the guidance provided by the Department of Land Conservation and Development regarding HB2001

compliance requirements. From this and other research, begin developing general concepts to test with infrastructure bureaus. Feedback on what the scope parameters for RIP2 should be are also part of this step.

Category	Action
Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Outreach via existing email/other communications
Data and Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic/Development Feasibility Analysis Coordinate with IBTER study of infrastructure and goal protected lands exemptions
Outreach and Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued engagement with stakeholders • Conduct outreach with underrepresented communities
Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hold focus groups or roundtables (as needed) • Attend meetings of established community organizations • Technical advisory groups • Meetings with identified parties/groups
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic Analysis • Concept Report

Step 3 – Feedback on Concepts

September 2021 – October 2021

Engage community in more detailed concepts for RIP2. This primary focus of this phase is to provide information and solicit feedback specifically on Cottage Cluster concepts and townhouse development in all single dwelling zones and for RIP1 allowances for middle housing in the R10 and R20 zones. A virtual meetings and ongoing communication with community and nonprofits organizations will be features of this phase of engagement.

Category	Action
Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update project website • Emails to interested parties list • Outreach via existing email/other communications
Data and Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic/Development Feasibility Analysis Coordinate with IBTER study of infrastructure and goal protected lands exemptions
Outreach and Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued engagement with stakeholders • Conduct outreach with underrepresented communities
Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Attend meetings of established community organizations • Technical advisory groups • Meetings with identified parties/groups
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Project website launch • “8-pager” information sheet • Staff Report with supporting appendices • Map App

Step 4 – Proposed Draft - Planning and Sustainability Commission

September 2021 – January 2022

Engage and inform the community about detailed zoning code and map amendment. These proposals will be presented to the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) in a series of work sessions and public hearings. The PSC will hear from community members and deliberate potential changes to the proposal before formulating their final recommendation to City Council.

Category	Action
Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update project website • Emails to interested parties list • Outreach via existing email/other communications • Press releases • Legal notices, including Measure 56 public notice
Data and Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Draft report
Outreach and Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continued engagement with stakeholders • Testimony submitter via Map App
Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Virtual information sessions • PSC worksessions • Public hearing(s)
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Proposed Draft report (Volume 1, Staff Report; Volume 2, Code and Commentary; Volume 3 – Supporting Appendices) • Draft Zoning Map changes

Step 5 – Recommended Draft to City Council

March 2022 – June 2022

Incorporate changes made by the PSC into a Recommended Draft. The recommendations will be presented to City Council who will hold a public hearing before they make a final decision.

Category	Action
Communications	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Update project website • Emails to interested parties list • Outreach via existing email/other communications • Press releases
Data and Analysis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As needed
Outreach and Relationships	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Share process information and respond to questions from stakeholders • Testimony submitter via Map App
Events	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • City Council public hearing • City Council work session
Deliverables	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recommended Draft Report (Volume 1, staff report; Volume 2, Code and Commentary; Volume 3 – Supporting Appendices) • Recommended Zoning Map changes

10.Engagement Opportunities/Tools

Besides the major public outreach components listed above, there will be a range of engagement opportunities and communication tools used to ensure that members of the public are able to find information and engage in the process. The community engagement opportunities will be organized to allow people to engage across a spectrum of interest levels:

- **Inform/Educate:** Some people are just learning of the project and want to track the process and stay up to date on the latest project news.
- **Consult:** Other people want to be slightly more involved, making sure the process and outcomes are broadly addressing the topics they are interested in and generally going in the right direction. These individuals will desire to weigh in and provide feedback at key points in the process.
- **Collaborate:** Another group of people want to be deeply involved in the ongoing project work, closely tracking the process and providing thoughtful and meaningful input into the products.

In general, the level of community engagement for RIP2 will take the form of ‘Inform’ and ‘Consult’. Because this project is largely ensuring the City meets its compliance obligations with state legislation, and there are additional technical constraints to the work relating to infrastructure requirements, there are limited opportunities to engage at a consultation or collaboration level. Nevertheless, project staff will make it clear where the City is able to make policy choices within the state mandate framework. These choices must be measured against the City’s adopted policies in the 2035 Comprehensive Plan as well as other relevant state and regional land use requirements.

Public Meeting Events

Given the limitations of social distancing and the uncertainties of COVID protocols, staff is planning to hold all public meeting events and open houses virtually. This will include virtual open houses with an opportunity for community members to comment on the proposals, targeted Zoom meetings with stakeholders, virtual focus groups via Zoom, and attending Neighborhood District Coalition meetings virtually.

In the event social distancing guidelines are lifted by public health officials during the course of this project, staff will explore shifting some public engagement opportunities to more traditional in-person events. For these in-person events, Staff will ensure that public meetings are held within the project areas and make sure the venues are directly on or close to one or more public transit lines. Staff will provide directional signage to the specific meeting room and to the restrooms in the venue. Prior to deciding on the location, staff will field-verify that the location has full and acceptable ADA accessibility. If the ADA accessible route is different from the main entrance, staff will make sure it is open during the meeting and clearly marked with directional signage.

Interested Parties Email List

Staff will establish and maintain an email list for interested parties to stay informed of project milestones and engagement opportunities. All virtual engagement tools will include an opportunity for members of the public to add their email to the interested parties list by indicating so or the request to join through the project email address which will be listed on the project webpage and on public outreach materials. Members of the public may also be added to the interested parties list by including their email address on sign-in sheets at all public meetings, open houses or project events.

Staff will initiate the interested parties email list by broadly announcing the availability of the list to potentially interested organizations such as neighborhood associations, business associations, and cultural groups located in or near the project areas. Staff will also send notice to the over 1,000 members on the RIP1 project mailing list. Those interested parties will be asked to affirm their interest in receiving future emails rather than continuing to use this previous list for future unsolicited emails.

Webpage

A project webpage will be maintained on the BPS website. Project review materials, documents, meeting announcements and status updates will be provided on the project webpage.

Community News Outlets

Staff will provide press releases to local and other community news outlets advertising key public meetings and project milestones, as relevant. The postings will be tailored to reach underrepresented populations. Project staff may purchase advertising or earn media for the plan and upcoming public meeting events in local community publications.

11. Decision Making Process

Decisions on any elements that change allowed land uses, policies, or funding priorities will be considered by the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission who will make recommendations to the Portland City Council who is the decision-making authority.

12. Accountability and Evaluation

As part of this public engagement plan, staff will be responsible for gathering and disseminating the public's input to decision makers and back to the public at large. This is a necessary component for a successful project. Staff will compile public comments throughout the planning process. Comments will be integrated into ongoing work and made available on the website. If appropriate, staff will brief the Planning and Sustainability Commission and City Council on the progress of the plan, results of outreach efforts and public input. Commission and Council decisions will be communicated to stakeholders and the public through the website, electronic/hard copy mailings and local media outlets.

13. Community Engagement Evaluation

Evaluation of the public engagement will be completed during the process and upon completion. Tools for evaluation may include:

- Informal feedback from stakeholders.
- Providing opportunities for all participants in the planning process to voluntarily report their demographic information to comply with Civil Rights laws and inform interim adjustments to diversify community engagement as-needed.
- Short questionnaires following events.
- Working group member evaluations following strategic milestones for professional feedback.
- Team debriefs following meetings and events to discuss needed adjustments.