

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, December 14, 2010

12:30-3:30pm

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Karen Gray, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez

**Commissioners Absent:** Lai-Lani Ovalles, Jill Sherman

**BPS Staff Present:** Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner; Mark Walhood, CPII; Al Burns; Susan Anderson, Director; Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator

**Other City Staff Present:** Carmen Merlo, Director, POEM; Tricia Sears, POEM; Patrick Sweeney, PBOT; Jamie Snook, Metro

*Chair Hanson* called the meeting to order at 12:35pm and provided an overview of the agenda.

### Consideration of Minutes

11/23/10

*Chair Hanson* asked for any comments or edits by Commission members. *Commissioner Shapiro* moved to approve. The motion passed unanimously with an Aye vote.

(Y8 – Baugh, Gary, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

*Commissioner Smith* attended first Portland Plan speaker series event which was well done. There are multiple health impact assessment methodologies – and he would like a briefing about these tools for the full Commission. *Commissioner Oxman* mentioned he can help make those connections.

### Local Energy Assurance Plan (LEAP)

Action: Briefing

Documents Provided:

- LEAP FAQ
- Portland LEAP statement
- Steering Committee Schedule

PowerPoint –

Carmen Merlo, Director Portland Office of Emergency Management (POEM)

Tricia Sears, Project Manager LEAP

Carmen Merlo presented a overview of POEM: it's not a response center but instead is a coordination bureau. POEM assists with emergency events that require coordination between two or more bureaus, for example floods, landslides, and public health emergencies.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* Do you have relationship at all to the emergency cell phone network?

- Carmen: Not much. Here locally we are developing a separate system (versus from the State). PSSRP is looking at how the City will migrate to a new system.

Energy assurance – taking action to reduce vulnerability in case of an energy emergency - involves three primary areas:

- Emergency security
- Emergency preparedness
- Critical infrastructure protection

Portland LEAP is a plan that addresses our dependency on energy before, during and after an energy disruption on any scale.

- Effort to mitigate and energy disruption.

- Emergency plan that will provide an understanding of roles, responsibilities, and response actions for emergency response organizations, energy providers and energy distributors during an energy disruption.
- Goal is to have a coordinated plan by March 2012.

The Portland LEAP is funded by the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. We applied for the money through a proposal and funding was granted in April 2010. Portland is one of 42 cities and towns in 25 states to receive this money.

Carmen noted that the City of Salem and the Oregon Department of Energy are also funded by ARRA to craft plans.

Four committees to assist with LEAP

- Steering
- Neighborhoods and Small Businesses
- Industry, Response Agencies and Utilities
- Environment, Economy and Alternative Energy.

PSC *Commissioner Rudd* is sitting on the Environment, Economy and Alternative Energy committee.

Identifying and protecting critical infrastructure is a very challenging responsibility involving public and private entities. It is a responsibility that is becoming more recognized by the public. POEM lead and completed the Critical Infrastructure Protection Plan in 2007. From that plan, we found that energy is our most interdependent critical infrastructure. Critical infrastructure systems are "lifelines" because our lives depend on them.

Critical infrastructure are things necessary to ensure the continuity of security, safety, health, and sanitation services, support the area's economy, and/ or maintain public confidence.

Concern for energy availability

- Aging infrastructure – doesn't match demand profile for today's users (iPods, cell phones, PCs)
- Existing system is small compared to the level and extent of use. Population growth has occurred and the amount of electronic items we use has expanded tremendously.
- Natural hazards – occurring at a greater frequency

There are there crustal faults in the Portland area. Portland has three fault lines: East Bank Fault, Portland Hills Fault, and the Oatfield Fault. The Portland Hills Fault is the one closest to the NW Industrial Area. One of the areas of largest instability is our NW industrial area – a major hub of our energy sector. The Cascadia Subduction Zone is located 75 miles off the coast of Oregon and extends north south for a distance of 600 miles. This is another potential hazard to consider.

Planning scenario: 8.0 earthquake occurring mid-day. The resulting week-long impacts to the energy system would include:

- Olympic Pipeline: the pipeline is damaged and inoperable;
- Williams Pipeline: the pipeline is damaged and inoperable;
- PGE and Pacific Power: electric power is down.

As a result, questions about transportation, food distribution, heating/cooling homes and offices, water supply, and health/medical systems are compromised.

*Commissioner Smith*: What is the assumption about bridges?

- Not catastrophic, but it could take three days to assess the damage. At a minimum, the ramps leading up to the bridges would be compromised and closed during this time.
- Burnside and Marquam are only bridges that have been seismically retrofit.

Community planning is the link between POEM and the PSC.

In Portland, 90% of our refined petroleum comes from Puget Sound. Supply line to Portland comes into Linnton and the port. Docks and piers that petroleum comes in through were built in early 20<sup>th</sup> Century and are susceptible to liquefaction and other concerns.

Defining terms in the LEAP context:

- Vulnerability: The degree to which people, property, resources, systems, and cultural, economic, environmental, and social activity is susceptible to harm, degradation, or destruction.
- Mitigation: Risk Reduction. Comprised of strategies and actions to lower or lessen the impacts of a disruption or disaster. The can occur before, during and after a disaster.
- Resiliency: The ability to respond effectively to an emergency and recover quickly from damage “bounce back”.

The Portland LEAP builds upon actions and plans that have been made and ties them together into a community-wide plan. The reduction of reliance on energy builds a resilient community, protects the environment and creates a different economy. Highlights of a couple of important steps that have occurred in the past couple of years that relate to Portland LEAP:

- March 2007 – City Council passed Ordinance No. 36488 establishing a goal to reduce oil and natural gas use in Portland by 50% in 25 years and to take related actions to implement recommendations of the Peak Oil Task Force. That same ordinance directed the Office of Sustainable Development, now BPS, to develop policy options to improve building environmental performance, including reducing oil and natural gas use and carbon dioxide emissions.
- In 2007, the Oregon legislature adopted a Renewable Portfolio Standard which sets aggressive targets for Portland’s two electric utilities, Portland General Electric and Pacific Power. The utilities are required to quickly increase the percentage of renewable energy provided – from roughly 4% today to 10% in 2012 and reaching 25% in 2025.
- In 2008, the ODOE increased the Business Energy Tax Credit for renewable energy to 50% of project cost. This creates a great incentive for businesses to install renewable energy systems.

All of these steps work to create a protection network for our critical infrastructure.

*Commissioner Houck:* In the terminology, mitigation is used in a slightly different context. Typically in the context of climate change, we use “adaptation”. How much have you interacted with the Climate Action Plan? Are you talking with Metro – who has yet to create a CAP for the whole region?

- Carmen: When we talk about mitigation, we’re talking about lessening the impact. We have not yet worked with Metro, but we did have input into the Portland/Multnomah CAP and continue to work with BPS.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* Is there a plan for average citizens? Catastrophic earthquakes have been forecast for years in the area. What do I as a typical citizen do? I want to have a plan.

- Carmen: We don’t want people calling 911, but we are putting together a Community Action Plan to lessen their dependence on the energy sector.
- POEM is addressing the issue of immediate public information – emergency alert, new community alert system, social media.

*Commissioner Smith:* You didn’t mention neighborhood groups such as the NETs. In disruptions in the energy systems, we are exploring these systems at different scales. What about the district energy systems – do they increase our resilience?

- Carmen: NETs are very helpful. We are trying to promote less dependency on the energy grid. An example is the emergency coordination building to make it self-sustaining.

*Commissioner Rudd:* It's great to be getting Pacific Power, NW Natural in the discussion now. The LEAP will be a powerful end product.

*Commissioner Baugh:* What about city neighbors? What's the coordination with other local cities?

- Carmen: We are looking at this as a broader area, but with the main hub of Portland. As we noted most of our energy for the State of Oregon is located in the critical infrastructure hub in Portland. When we finish our LEAP, we will share it with close-by jurisdictions.

*Chair Hanson:* If some of the energy systems go down, is there a coordinated strategy for the hospitals in the instance of an emergency?

*Commissioner Oxman:* We have been working in health care community for a regional response – based on market area instead of jurisdictional lines. The approach is regional.

*Commissioner Gray:* The school districts had a coordinated plan for a “dirty bomb” a few years ago. There was not a debrief, and we never fixed it. The districts have individual plans but nothing coordinated.

- Tricia: We do have two members from schools on the LEAP committees as well as one person from the Red Cross.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Do we need to send a letter to City Council in support of this project?

*Chair Hanson:* We can do so. The project goes to Council in 2012, so we have some time.

## **Portland Plan: Factual Basis & Buildable Lands Analysis Update**

Action: Continued Hearing

Documents Provided:

- Household and Employment Forecasts and Development Capacity – This is a new version, published 12/10/10. A notable update is the update to growth capacity on page 8.

PowerPoint –

Eric Engstrom: Having read through Neighborhood Association (NA) comments, there needs to be clarification of what we're asking the PSC to do with this process:

- Adopt background reports.
- BLI methodology and how we move forward with scenarios.
- We're not making policy choices yet – this is just baseline information. The NA letters seem to address the policy questions rather than methodology.
- City Council will not review until spring 2011.

*Commissioner Smith:* About the neighborhood issues – there is concern that building at densities that current zoning allows creates stresses that NA groups are concerned about. There should be a formal process to refer items to the NAs.

- Eric: The role of the BLI is what would happen if we move forward with current policies. When we develop the next step (scenarios of how we want to grow as a community), the place to look will be in how we judge the alternative scenarios.
- *Commissioner Shapiro:* Eric did come to the CIC meeting, but maybe it was not clear to members. Perhaps there was some confusion of what the BLI work includes. The CIC meetings tomorrow morning, so I can bring this information to the group.
- Eric: We've started to talk with the CIC about how to engage the public in the land use scenarios. This discussion needs to continue. We have been conscious of broad based outreach, but we can also do better in connecting to the NAs as we get into land use decisions. The next step will be to ask how we have discussions about land use choices.
- Susan: Eric did do a presentation to the neighborhood land use chairs over the summer.

In today's report, staff asks the PSC for the following:

1. Background reports

- Asking PSC to put a stamp on as ready to move forward.
- Recommend adoption of 8 reports to incorporate by reference.
- Direct staff to move forward with updates to other reports.

## 2. Buildable Lands

- Accept methodology with continued refinements through spring 2011.
- Accept BLI maps with continued refinements through spring 2011.
- Discuss the scenario analysis criteria, with refinements.

### How the BLI is used

- The Buildable Lands Inventory is used to communicate where development could occur, given regulatory, infrastructure or physical constraints to development.
- It is used as a “base case” for discussion and development of alternative scenarios in which the potential effect of new investments, regulations, policies and/or priorities are tested.
- It is used to test whether the City can accommodate forecast household and employment growth.

The Default Scenario will show what is likely to develop, given the current zoning and regulations, planned capital investments and market factors. It is based on current regulations and does not propose policy changes.

Alternative Scenarios will show different ways to manage growth (for example, different investments, potential policies and different land use arrangement). In alternative scenarios new policies are tested.

### Today’s presentation and questions:

- Is proposed list of constraints to develop sufficient to proceed with completion of BLI?
- Is methodology used to determine whether the proposed constraints are 100%, high, med, low and 0% constraints to development acceptable?
- Are the draft maps sufficiently accurate to proceed to the development of the Default scenario?

### Methodology

1. Evaluate current zoning
2. Identify vacant and underutilized lands. See Appendix D.
3. Identify constraints. See Appendices B and C.
4. Subtract constraints from available vacant and underutilized lands
5. Add in infrastructure investments and estimate market effects

#5 is not yet done. Through #4 is the raw inventory. Then we take the “correction factor” of market effects and infrastructure investments in #5.

The draft scenario evaluation criteria include 13 points to help see how different scenarios’ impacts differ. Staff asks:

- Are these the right criteria?
- Will they answer the critical questions about how to shape land use policy for housing, jobs, etc?

### Recommendations staff hopes to come from the PSC include:

- Recommend adoption of 12 Portland Plan Background Reports
- Recommend adoption of eight reports to be incorporated by reference, and/or direct staff to finalize or amend the list
- Review list of Spring 2011 Portland Plan Background Report revisions, direct staff to continue with work plan

- Identify concerns with BLI methods, recommend adoption of methodology and further refinements (adopt final methodology report in Spring 2011)
- Feedback on proposed scenario evaluation criteria

*Commissioner Smith:* asked a question about the PBA letter regarding concern about sufficient employment lands.

- For general employment we are ok. The two places of potential shortfall are institutional and industrial lands.

*Commissioner Rudd:* On the memo about the Natural Resources Inventory (NRI) – any future regulations would be carried out in project area. Is the idea is that the map will be revisited at that point?

- Eric: In the map we asking for adoption, but not regulatory zoning based on this stage. We would be concerned if people think the map is inaccurate for a citywide scale (not an individual property). The question is if the map is wrong in a way that will come to conclusions that are inaccurate.

*Commissioner Gray:* On page 8 of the updated report, areas 3 and 14 are scheduled for growth factors of three times and above. What are these areas?

- Mark Walhood: 3 is West Hayden Island, 14 is the Gateway area. Current zoning plans show there is much underutilized land in these areas.

Eric: Right now there are no regulatory constraints tied to school district capacity which is a concern for areas like Gateway. During the alternatives analysis, we could look to develop plans to deal with this.

*Commissioner Baugh:* Also on page 8, can you generically describe those changes you made?

- What we found was a math error that undercounted single family zones... capacity went up in (for example) West Portland. New numbers show we are ok there.
- Small number changes throughout.
- Some of the denser area numbers went down a bit as well.

*Commissioner Oxman:* For the constraints scaling, how does the low/med/high get scaled into calculation? There are qualitative and quantitative aspects.

- Mark: On the constraint layers, everything was reduced to a number between 0 and 100 then taken into account.

Susan: It would be helpful to clarify use of refinements between now and the spring. How did we weigh each part?

Eric: What we are looking for now is a buy-in to the approach. If there is a specific number that we get feedback on within the next month that we need to change, we can bring that back to the Commission in the spring.

### **Public Testimony**

- Mary Peveto, Neighbors for Clean Air; on the Portland Air Toxics Advisory Committee Resident of highest density (NW Portland) with a concern that there is no local jurisdiction over the air pollution problem. Portland is not a green leader in this area – 54 area school have been deemed to be in industrial toxic spots in the top 5% country-wide. We need to consider adopting procedures that would truly make Portland the leader in livability by addressing the concerns of putting residents in harm's way through land use planning.  
*Commissioner Oxman:* where are detailed references about data? Mary: EPA risk assessment

- Michael Roth, Chair, Rose City Park NA

The RCPNA looked for things that may be missing, accurate, and add other ideas. Several areas missing and need more development in how they are implemented:

1. How services (City, County, Metro) integrate with these background reports – this is where citizens get most involved. A mission statement including equity and values-based management would go a long way to implementing policies.
2. Emergency management services – how do these interrelate with various background reports?
3. Age demographics with regard to how building and development affect different populations.

○ John Gibbon, SWNI – Chair of land use committee and PURB

SWNI comments: NA met on 12/07/10 and now don't think need to delay decisions to January meeting – the background reports look ok. There is a concern about the 0 to 1300 unit increase in the household forecasts and development capacity work from staff in the revised document. These are changes that SWNI will need to review again. Also, most of the SW neighborhoods have increased by a factor of three the single family homes category. We're now looking at impacting infrastructure that was devised for auto-based, spread out communities, but now we are coming back to the neighborhoods, saying we need to increase density.

○ Tamara DeRidder, Rose City Park NA

Air quality is broken in our land use system – reporting is deferred to DEQ. The toxic effects are a concern and mapping of the 19 areas of toxicity concern need to be included in the Health Background Report – we need to figure out a way to mitigate it. PSU has a periodic atlas of air toxics in the region. The toxic hot spots show along the interstates, where we're talking about building up density – should we count vacant available lands in these areas as buildable?

○ Linda Bauer

Infiltration map has a 600 acre error. The Water Bureau has found that the water does not infiltrate.

#### **Other Testimony Received**

- George M. Bruender, co-chair, NECN
- Ken Forcier, Chair-elect, Concordia Neighborhood Association
- Bonnie McKnight, Citywide Land Use Chair
- Gerry Uba, Principal Regional Planner, Metro
- Sandra McDonough, PBA

#### **Eric – Response to Testimony**

- Air quality: We are aware of regional mapping that shows toxic exposure issues related to freeways and industrial zones. In the evaluation criteria, that issue is not listed. We are proposing to quantify how many housing units land in those hot spots to rank merits of various land use options and are trying to figure out what the balance is. We will go back into the background reports to make sure these results are summarized clearly there.
- Values-based planning: We agree with this approach, and this is the intent of the draft goals statements in the Portland Plan to be the framework for setting standards and land use policies.
- The change in number of housing units in SW: There was an error in the original algorithm so that some low-density zones were not included in the total. This was simply a case of some zones not being added into the total – it was a systematic change in the whole algorithm. A reminder that the number is not a statement of what we want; it is simply a number based on current zoning regulations.

*Commissioner Houck:* The NRI is beyond reproach. *Chair Hanson* confirmed the methodology is sound. *Commissioner Houck* confirmed the air quality issue has not yet been addressed on a citywide or regional approach.

*Commissioner Baugh:* about the revaluation methodology and how to validate the work – are we setting up a process to do this?

- Eric: At the basic level, that is what we do during periodic review. The way decisions about growth get implemented is in zoning, and there is a zoning error process.
- Al Burns: We do coordinate our assumptions with Metro. It is an iterative process, and we recognize we use different but valid processes.

*Commissioner Smith:* We should build into our response a note about working with NA groups about the draft maps.

*Commissioner Valdez:* I want to reiterate the need for a joint meeting with PSC and PDC about job growth projections.

*Commissioner Baugh:* When we look at the supporting criteria – about revenue generation – that would track back to job creation. How do we clearly know we are generating jobs? Where is the criteria about jobs – how does that fit in?

- Employment revenue and residential (property tax) revenue are included here.
- The Commission should talk about the prioritizing of the criteria in the future.
- Projections about jobs are included in employment opportunities analysis report.
- Susan: We can have our economic planner join a PSC meeting to help explain some of these areas.

*Commissioner Houck:* The PBA letter puts us back in “environment versus jobs”, and I don’t agree with that. I don’t think there is prioritization to be done – we should be able to capture all points.

The Commission confirmed points about today’s BLI Questions:

- Is proposed list of constraints to develop sufficient to proceed with completion of BLI?
- Is methodology used to determine whether the proposed constraints are 100%, high, med, low and 0% constraints to development acceptable?
- Are the draft maps sufficiently accurate to proceed to the development of the Default scenario?

Background Reports – 3 actions were voted on:

- Adoption of 12 reports:
  1. Portland Plan Background Report: Economic Development
  2. Portland Plan Background Report: Energy
  3. Portland Plan Background Report: Economic Specialization
  4. Portland Plan Background Report: Food Systems
  5. Portland Plan Background Report: Historic Resources: Key Findings and Recommendations
  6. Portland Plan Background Report: Historic Resources: Understanding Historic Resources in Portland
  7. Portland Plan Background Report: Housing and Transportation Cost Study
  8. Portland Plan Background Report: Human Health and Safety
  9. Portland Plan Background Report: Infrastructure Condition and Capacity
  10. Portland Plan Background Report: Natural Resources Inventory
  11. Portland Plan Background Report: Urban Forestry
  12. Portland Plan Background Report: Watershed Health



- Recommend adoption of 8 reports to incorporate by reference
  - 1. Central City 2035: Subdistrict Profiles Public Review Draft – Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
  - 2. Climate Action Plan 2009 – Bureau of Planning and Sustainability
  - 3. Communities of Color in Multnomah County: An Unsettling Profile – Communities of Color Coalition
  - 4. Framework for Integrated Management of Watershed Health – Bureau of Environmental Services
  - 5. Making the Invisible Visible – Native American Youth and Family Center
  - 6. Next Generation Connectivity: A Review of Broadband Internet Transitions and Policy from Around the World – Berkman Center for Internet and Society at Harvard University
  - 7. Preparing for Climate Change in the Upper Willamette River Basin in Oregon: Co-beneficial Planning for Communities and Ecosystems – Climate Leadership Initiative for Sustainable Environment, University of Oregon and National Center for Conservation Science and Policy
  - 8. State of Black Oregon – Urban League of Portland
  - Direct staff to move forward with Spring 2011
- (Y8 – Baugh, Gary, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

BLI and Scenario Evaluation Criteria – 3 actions voted on:

- Accept the Buildable Lands methodology, with continued refinements through spring 2011.
- Accept the Buildable Lands Inventory maps, with continued refinements through spring 2011.
- Discuss the scenario analysis criteria, with refinements.
- *Commissioner Smith*: moved with refinements:
  - Staff reports and maps need to be forwarded to NAs prior to spring – letter to each NA land use committee for input.

(Y8 – Baugh, Gary, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Valdez)

### **Lake Oswego to Portland Transit Project**

Action: Work Session

Documents Provided:

- Memo from *Chair Hanson* and *Commissioner Smith* to PSC members

Maps:

- Streetcar Alternative Design Options
- Enhanced Bus Alternative

*Commissioner Baugh* and *Commissioner Rudd* recused themselves from this project.

Update from staff including a revised timeline of the project:

- Since last presentation at PSC, staff has met with the Multnomah County planning department about the jurisdiction of the PSC for unincorporated land (Dunthorpe area). We are leaning away from it being within our purview, so Multnomah County is talking with attorney offices. Today's discussion should focus for areas within Portland city limits. The IGA between the County and City is clear about land use issues, but since this is a transportation question, they are still looking into it; staff will get back to the PSC members with the outcome.
- The Draft Environmental Impact Statement (DEIS) has been published. The public comment period is now (started on December 3, 2010) through January 31, 2011. Comments will be received via web and at workshops.
- Federal and State agencies, libraries, neighborhoods along the corridor received copies of the DEIS.
- There will be a public hearing in front of the steering committee on January 24, 2011.
- The project comes back to the PSC on January 25, 2011.

- The Lake Oswego Advisory Committee recommendation will be made on February 8, 2011.
- The Steering Committee recommendation is on February 18, and Portland City Council on March 30, 2011.
- The final LPA action at Metro will be on March 31, 2011.

*Commissioner Smith:* Should the PSC hearing be on January 25<sup>th</sup> with a work session scheduled for after steering committee recommendation?

- There is room on the 02/22 PSC agenda to add a final work session for the PSC.

*Commissioner Smith:* We noted three issues to call Commission's attention to

1. The mode choice between enhanced bus and streetcar – based on our analysis, the enhanced bus doesn't have City of Portland's zoned capacity in John's Landing area (the streetcar would get us closer).
2. Alignment questions within John's Landing:
  - Existing shoreline ROW – doesn't help zoned development since streetcar farther from core of district
  - Macadam options would help zoning goals:
    - Use existing in-land option – preserves existing landscape and provides option for enhanced pedestrian and/or bike corridor
    - Add additional northbound lane
  - Riverdale area (may not be within PSC jurisdiction) options:
    - Use Willamette Shoreline ROW – challenging
    - Build into Riverwood Rd – would require a modification or elimination of access to Highway 43
3. The PSC won't take a formal position but will provide some suggestions to Mayor Adams

*Commissioner Houck:* How do the noted alternatives influence the potential pedestrian/bike trail alignment?

- Jamie: In the refinement phase of the transit, we also looked at how to move the trail forward for each alternative. Some are better for the trail than others, but all include trail options.

Clarification about access from Riverwood Rd to Highway 43:

- The slope grade difference is significant as you leave Highway 43
- We would want to keep emergency and pedestrian linkage

Susan: When the question about jurisdiction is resolved, what other staff work and/or public outreach will need to be done?

- Patrick: We have let County know we have a January 25<sup>th</sup> PSC hearing and need 30 day notice period. Staff has made daily phone calls to County to confirm process.
- Jamie: There has been extensive public involvement throughout corridor including individual property meetings, neighborhood groups, members on CAC.

Patrick referred to map to show potential bike/street intersection points as had been requested by *Commissioner Smith* at the November 9, 2010 PSC meeting. When PSC makes recommendation, we should ask staff to review bike and pedestrian access in John's Landing and South Waterfront areas.

*Commissioner Shapiro:* Who owns current tracks?

- There are six government agencies with ownership in the tracks.
- They agencies owns and maintain the right-of-ways, but it is becoming more expensive to maintain.

*Commissioner Houck:* I want to encourage that maintaining the regional trail is part of our preference.

*Chair Hanson* suggested the memo be revised and updated into a letter from the PSC to Portland City Council. The letter will include process notes.

### **Director's Report**

- Tree Project is going to City Council on February 2 at 6pm. It would be great to have a PSC member there along with someone from the Forestry Commission. *Chair Hanson* mentioned he could likely attend.

- Columbia Biogas was approved at Metro on 12/09/10

- o Issuance of solid waste facility franchise
- o Neighbors had raised concerns about potential negative impacts from odor, traffic and other issues but BPS staff talked through Portland's zoning/permitting/code enforcement process assured Metro that development would occur in a positive manner

- BPS hosted a successful Fix-It-Fair last month with over 600 attendees. There were many Spanish-speaking attendees with classes held simultaneously in English and Spanish. The next FiF is Saturday, January 22 at Parkrose HS. 8:30am-2pm. The last one will be at Jefferson HS on 02/26.

- The City is going ahead with the SW Corridor (Barbur) Concept Plan with Metro CET funding. The scoping of the project should commence in March and will be discussed w/ PSC. Other CET grants include Foster Lents Improvement Plan (FLIP) a joint project of PBOT, PDC and BES, and South Waterfront Portal engineering study.

- Possibility of the Port facilities tour instead of the 02/08 PSC meeting. *Commissioner members* confirmed this and we are moving forward with the scheduling.

### **Final Comments from Commissioners**

*Commissioner Shapiro*: concerned about the PBA letter (testimony) and that the PSC is not officially responding to it. Should a few Commissioners call Sandra McDonough to discuss and to establish a closer relationship?

Susan: We could have our economic planner come to an upcoming PSC meeting prior to the PSC's move with PBA. This briefing will be scheduled for early in 2011.

*Chair Hanson* adjourned the meeting at 4pm.