

CWG Meeting #7: Responding to outstanding questions.

Collaborative Working Group	
In-Person	Online
Tanya Hartnett	Christina Ghan
Bob Sallinger	Jon Isaacs
Corky Collier	Cassie Cohen
Heather King	Cara Nolan
Sarah Taylor	Steph Roth
Benton Strong	
Debbie Silva	
Other Participants	
Patricia Diefenderfer, BPS	Deb Meihoff, facilitator
Tom Armstrong, BPS	Marie Walkiewicz, BES
Steve Kountz, BPS	Marco Mejia Yepez, BPS
Jeff Caudill, BPS	Daniel Soebbing, BPS
Shea Betin Flaherty, Prosper Portland	Jessica Mooring, BPS
	Julia Michel, BPS

Notes

Technical difficulties with recording. Missing first 28 minutes of the meeting in the recording and presentation slides were not recorded.

Transportation and Warehousing Sector Clarifications

- General frustrations with not having access to information ahead of meeting, explicitly expressed by Steph Roth and Bob Salinger, noting that engaging with information presented is not possible at this time given the overload and complexity of information. Steph will follow up with staff with a lot of questions once they can digest the information.
- Shea Betin Flaherty: Transportation as a traded sector cluster - Sector that depends on outside and other firm activity to generate results presented today. Are we developing new warehouse transportation technology or is it growing because we have other activity happening in other clusters. How does this play out when thinking about growth?
 - Steve Kountz: It's a different type of cluster. 50 - 60% traded sector activity vs 100% traded activity. Support local commerce as well as production. The literature is emerging on logistics clusters, with more of an emphasis on transportation. Typical traded sector cluster agglomeration characteristics also occur here. There's concentration, competition, networking with other firms, produce innovation and high and middle wage jobs.

- Patricia Diefenderfer: Framing clarification. These types of industries have a high demand for large sites but we don't have a lot of large sites to accommodate uses. These provide a source of jobs that are an important part of the economy but at the same time, cities that are in this stage of urbanization have limits to how much of these types of uses can be accommodated. As cities evolve and space becomes more constrained, how do they respond to these needs?
- Sarah Taylor: Wants to learn more about the age of people working in warehouses, shift times, how long people stay in these jobs, career paths of middle wage jobs and training opportunities. Big concern about Roosevelt students being recruited by the warehouses, working late shifts, disrupting high school education. Need to give high schoolers apprenticeships rather than recruiting them out of high school.
- Corky Collier: We need to make sure we don't abandon our population that doesn't have as much opportunity. The opportunity in this sector for BIPOC or people without 4-year degrees is better than any other sector. Let's welcome that message.
- Steph Roth: When talking about warehousing uses and jobs per acre, how are we looking at this in terms of verticality vs acreages used horizontally? What is the relationship between middle wage jobs and living wage jobs? How is cost of living in region mapping to the potential for wage increases within these sectors?
- Patricia Diefenderfer: Framing clarification. As we think about future job growth, how do we ensure that we cultivate middle wage jobs? We aren't saying this is the only way to do it, it's that this is the existing context that's supportive of middle wage jobs. Where can we draw more connections between advance Portland strategy and what can we do to cultivate middle wage jobs in different sectors.
 - Shea Betin Flaherty: Commercial trucking and the licenses involved are great entry level jobs, this is where we have success in current workforce development investments. Current trend in the economy where we have concerns - losing competitiveness because those firms that are driving innovation and demand for warehouse and transportation, (industries that are bringing in outside money, bringing in larger federal contracts) are concentrated in warehousing and medical. But that's still trading amongst ourselves and that's not growing opportunity. Maintain and increasing to middle wage jobs is important, but we can't lose sight of the growth.
- Benton Strong: Framing clarification. Do we have information on who is working in low to mid-tier income range of warehousing and transportation jobs. Can we compare them with income ranges from other sectors of economy. Are they about the same? Different? This could provide some guidance on what sectors need investing in.
 - Steve Kountz: Wage distribution - We've been fairly flat with middle wage job growths. If you look at all jobs in the economy, middle wage jobs been growing, that's also a national trend. Where are the opportunities to grow that? Transportation and warehousing, health care and admin jobs can move the needle with middle wage jobs.
 - Benton Strong: The benefit of this sector is in the growth of middle wage jobs. This is a critical sector (even new jobs in warehousing and transportation) to building the family wage and middle-income job sector in this region. Not everyone wants to work industrial jobs but also don't want to work retail either. There are realities we still need to face.

- Deb Meihoff: This conversation is put on pause until CWG members can take time to absorb information.

Follow up Questions about Environmental Protections

NRI Ranking System

- Tanya Hartnett: How does this compare to what Metro put together? Is this cross-referencing with Metro?
 - Jeff Caudill: Metro provides guidance and all jurisdictions have to be compliant. This definition of resource protections is a response to that and we have been determined to be compliant. As we make changes to Portland's rules, we just need to make sure we continue to be compliant with Metro's Title 13.
 - Daniel Soebbing: We still need to plan for job growth. There is a balance to strike between land readiness and environmental protections with Metro's requirements, similar to Portland. Note that Metro says to limit, not necessarily prohibit, development in resource protection areas. Not very prescriptive, they leave it up to jurisdictions. Also note that they are less strict for high value industrial sites.
- Corky Collier: Why is there little difference shown between 3 scenarios?
 - Daniel Soebbing: The main difference between the scenarios is the amount of P-zone in each scenario. The minimum scenario is not applying C-zone to medium ranking resources, which means it is applying relatively small buffers compared to other scenarios. Difference in e-zone acreage - 15 to 20% increase between minimum compliance and climate resilient scenario. Climate resilience scenario has protection zone buffers. Almost no 'no build' areas in minimum compliance scenario.
- Bob Salinger: Will any of these scenarios achieve the FEMA biological opinion? What are the implications of not meeting the biological opinion? Are the mitigation ratios going to apply in the exempted industrial zones?
 - Daniel Soebbing: Biological opinion is built into all scenarios. We are applying c-zones, outside of MCDD jurisdiction, between 0 and 170 ft anywhere in the floodplain (including developed areas). Building in specific code revisions to address riparian buffer requirements, additional landscaping on sites that don't have it as a criterion.
 - Jeff Caudill: Mitigation ratios are incorporated into the e-zones, except for the three industrial zones that were exempted. North Reach and T6 are the remaining areas that we are accounting for with all estimates of constraints. Title 24 specifically identifies the three industrial zones.
- Bob Salinger: there are more extreme weather events so we need to recognize reality and think about these sites differently – that bigger buffers have an impact. For the flood zones, are you accounting for the 1996 flood zones and 100-year floodplain? and accounting for FEMA updates?
 - In the zoning code, it's both. We don't have updates yet but plan to incorporate when we do.
- Daniel Soebbing: With most jurisdictions, if there is discovery of a new stream that wasn't on the map before, all the regulations would apply no matter automatically. E-zones don't work that

way. If e-zones are not there, then regulations don't apply. Portland does not have resource discovery like other jurisdictions.

- Heather King: Metro applies a filter that attributes lower levels of protection on industrial lands. How does that compare to what is being proposed today?
 - Daniel Soebbing: Portland has c-zones and p-zones, we don't have much more nuance. C-zone is consistent with what Metro requires for lower value resources and industrial areas. P-zone is higher level of protection, applied immediately around water features. Lighter scenarios have a lighter application of e-zones.
 - Jeff Caudill: As we work through scenarios, we are thinking about ways we can compromise and still be consistent with Title 13. Scenarios we have now aren't set in stone, they can be adjusted. We can land somewhere between benchmarks.

North Reach

- Sarah Taylor: Do we have the latest building land inventory data? This process feels like a justification for increasing industrial land. I live in North Portland and there seems to be a lot of vacant land. We need to recycle the industrial land we have.
- Corky Collier: For North Reach, should we and how could we have mitigation sites play a bigger role to allow industrial use in North Reach but offer a set aside option for protecting natural areas?
 - Jeff Caudill: From BPS perspective, given land constraints, mitigation banks become increasingly important, especially with North Reach. Need to provide options for development, industrial and housing. Not much opportunity at this point.
 - Patricia Diefenderfer: Going to look at types of investments that need to be made to unlock opportunity.
- Bob Salinger: Environmentalists are very open to talk about mitigation bank approach but remember that salmon are going through Portland harbor.
- Bob Salinger: How to protect large industrial sites. Recent RECAP process provided code amendments that no longer require riverfront sites to be completely river dependent uses. If you have multiple sites on the site, the back parcels can be used for other purposes. That is a strategy to disassemble large sites. Terminal 2 is the largest site opened on the river but the City just created a situation where the largest site on the river is likely to have different uses on the back and front and leave small orphan sites next to the river. We can no longer lose these large sites. We need to be careful about chipping away these valuable large lots.
 - Patricia Diefenderfer: There can be sites that have true river front uses, but other functions on the site and need that flexibility. We are talking about large sites generally, not just along the river.
- Benton Strong: There are more 50-acre sites with multiple uses on it. Even if we are splitting up our land, doesn't mean we are doing different things on them. We need to be practical about these conversations when talking about these facilities.
- Cassie: can you send out a week before the meeting.

Next Steps

- Next meeting: May 10th, look over the scenarios/policy choices and their trade-offs.

- Cassie Cohen: request to send meeting materials to CWG members a week in advance.
- Staff will let CWG know if staff can send materials a week ahead of time. If not, staff will reach back out about rescheduling the meeting.
- Staff to set up office hours to answer follow up questions about today's meeting.