



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

MEMO

DATE: January 9, 2012
TO: Planning and Sustainability Commission
FROM: Joe Zehnder, Chief Planner
CC: Susan Anderson, Director and Eric Engstrom, Principal Planner
SUBJECT: Proposed Draft Portland Plan Memo 6: Work Session Discussion Guide II

At the work session on Tuesday, January 10, 2012, the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) will have the opportunity to continue their discussion of the themes and issues from the public testimony provided in response to the Proposed Draft Portland Plan. There will also be an opportunity to discuss issues that PSC members noted in their own reading of the plan. Provided below is a proposed work session agenda. Background information that may inform the conversation is provided on subsequent pages of this memorandum.

PROPOSED PORTLAND PLAN WORK SESSION AGENDA

1. **Newly Raised Themes** - Staff would like the PSC to discuss staff's recommended responses for responding to two themes that emerged from the public testimony received after the PSC work session on December 13, 2011:
 - a. Traded Sector and Target Industries
 - b. Local Measures and Actions
2. **Selected Updates to Previous Staff Recommendations or PSC Direction** - On December 12, 2011, staff provided the PSC with initial recommendations for how to respond to major themes in the testimony. Staff would like to revisit a short set of the previously discussed topics because either staff feels that the PSC should receive an update on process to date or additional information surfaced that compels staff to ask the PSC to reconsider prior direction. Status updates on all topics discussed at the December work session are also provided in this memo.
 - a. Action Item Review Criteria
 - b. Active Transportation and Bicycling
3. **PSC Member Round Robin Discussion**
4. **Process, Schedule and Deliverables**



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | www.portlandonline.com/bps
1900 SW 4th Avenue, Suite 7100, Portland, OR 97201 | phone: 503-823-7700 | fax: 503-823-7800 | tty: 503-823-6868

Printed on 100% post-consumer waste recycled paper.

ORGANIZATION

This memo is organized as follows:

1. Newly Raised Themes
2. Updates to Previous Staff Recommendations or PSC Direction
3. Schedule and Deliverables

1. NEWLY RAISED THEMES

A. Traded Sector and Target Industries

Staff received a number of letters whose authors interpreted the traded sector section of the Economic Prosperity and Affordability strategy in contradictory ways. Staff also received a number of comment letters offering critiques of an economic development strategy that is based on increasing the strength of the traded sector in Portland. Finally, staff received letters that criticized the target industry focus described in section A1 of the Economic Prosperity and Affordability strategy and the related measures provided later in the plan.

Given these issues, staff feels it is important to provide the following:

- A summary of the criticisms of the traded sector economic development approach.
- A definition of traded sector businesses and a description of why staff recommends retaining the focus on traded sector growth.
- A definition of Portland's target industries.
- An explanation of why export growth is used as a measure.

Traded Sector Critique, Definition and Response

Criticisms of the traded sector section of the strategy generally fall into the two following categories:

- Resource use and environmental quality - This criticism posits that international trade is inefficient and an unsustainable use of energy resources. This critique also posits that trade will result in environmental degradation.
- Local Business Focus and Import Substitution - This criticism is based on a preference for patronizing local small business over non-local businesses and opposition to economic globalization trends. This criticism assumes that traded sector businesses in Portland are primarily non-local firms and that traded sector businesses do not play a role in import substitution.

Traded sector businesses are defined as businesses that sell goods and services to those outside the region; they often also sell goods to those in the region. There are small, medium and large traded sector businesses in Portland. Traded sector businesses are defined by their business activities, such as exporting goods and services, not by their size.

This strategy relies on the idea that by focusing on increasing the strength of Portland's traded sector businesses, more wealth will come to and stay in the Portland region. Portland-based traded sector businesses offer goods and services to local, national and international clients. Each time a traded sector business sells their goods or services to customers outside Portland, those sales bring more money into the region. If the wealth created by selling goods and



services outside the region stays in Portland, it will be a resource to start new businesses and support the amenities we would like to have available to all Portlanders.

In addition to selling goods and services to those outside the region, traded sector business sell goods and services to Portlanders. Their offerings provide Portlanders with an opportunity to purchase a wide-array of locally produced goods for both business and personal needs. The strategy does not exist as an alternative to the "buy local" path.

Historically, in Portland, traded sector businesses have provided higher paying jobs than other business sectors, such as retail.

Target Industry Critique, Definition and Response

Some readers expressed confusion about what kinds of businesses are included in the target sectors. Some readers wanted to know if certain Portland Harbor firms, that contribute significant jobs to Portland's economy are included in the "advanced manufacturing" category. Others mentioned that they would prefer to target other sectors, such as bicycle businesses, housing construction and local food businesses.

The target sector industries identified in the Portland Plan include the following: advanced manufacturing, athletic and outdoor, clean tech, software, and research and commercialization. Information on what these sectors include and why they were selected can be found here: <http://pdxeconomicdevelopment.com/industries.html>.

The advanced manufacturing target sector is named for its use of high technology tools, engineering and metallurgy, and not for its products. This has caused some confusion. In Portland, advanced manufacturing is primarily comprised of metals and transportation equipment industries, including Gunderson and Schnitzer. You can see a more complete description at: <http://pdxeconomicdevelopment.com/cluster-manufacturing.html>.

The plan measures traded sector growth narrowly through international exports. Some have pointed out the confusion of defining traded sectors by trade outside of the region but measuring it by international exports (p. 93). Admittedly, this is an incomplete measure because traded sector firms do more than simply export goods. However, a more inclusive and reliable data source for traded sector growth has not been identified. In the meantime, the existing measure has the advantage of emphasizing the challenge of increasing global competition in traded sectors.

Staff recommendation:

1. Revise language to clarify that traded sector strategy is not about emphasizing the growth of multinational firms over Portland firms, and to clarify what kind of firms fit into the different traded sector clusters.
2. Convene a meeting with PBA, WWC, Port, and CCA leaders to follow-up on their comments and discuss options.
3. Consider amending the policy section of the plan, so that a broader array of businesses have the opportunity to become target industries. Policy 4 of the Business Cluster Growth section (p.38) already supports partnerships to foster other expanding sectors.



B. Local Measures and Actions

There have been a variety of comments on the local actions. Staff would like to acknowledge that Portlanders are known for being very active, involved and thoughtful residents with a great sense of what their communities need and want. This reputation was earned and it is deserved. Projects like the East Portland Action Plan embody this drive. Staff would like to acknowledge that locally-drive action plans like EPAP are essential to the success of the Portland Plan and hopes that the Portland Plan will serve as an inspiration for other communities to develop their own locally-focused action plans that will reinforce and support the citywide effort, policies and planning framework set forth in the Portland Plan.

Staff recommendation:

1. Ad text to the implementation chapter that highlights the potential role of community-driven action plans like the East Portland Action Plan.

2. UPDATES TO PREVIOUS STAFF RECOMMENDATIONS OR PSC DIRECTION

At the previous work session on December 13, 2011, the Planning and Sustainability Commission discussed staff recommendations for how to respond to the following 13 issues and themes, (themes A through M) in the Recommended Draft Portland Plan. During the work session, PSC members also stated that historic preservation and the role of community character as an important theme to address. Historic Preservation and Community Character is listed as item N.

- Purpose and use of the Portland Plan
- Action Item Review Criteria
- Basic Public Services
- Equity and Disability
- Resiliency, Emergency and Hazard Planning
- Youth
- Multigenerational City
- Active Transportation and Bicycling
- Community Action
- Implementation
- Healthy Connected City - Adaptation and Relationship to Economic Prosperity and Affordability
- East Portland
- Housing
- Historic Preservation and Community Character

With the exception of the Action Item Review Criteria and Active Transportation and Bicycling, there were no significant changes to either staff's recommendations or the PSC's recommendations from the December 13, 2011 work session. Direction provided by the PSC at the December work session is described below.

A. Purpose and use of the Portland Plan

The PSC did not recommend any revisions to this description.

B. Action Item Review Criteria

On December 12, 2011, staff provided the PSC with a recommended set of criteria to use when reviewing the existing actions in the plan and determining whether to add new actions. During deliberations, the PSC recommended revising the criteria as follows:



- Combine the criterion that called for multi-objective actions and the criterion that calls for leveraging resources.
- Add the word “integrate” to the criterion that called for multi-objective actions.
- Define multi-objective actions.
- Add a criterion that directs the review to consider equity impacts, specifically, when determining if the action leverages resources.
- Integrate the “follow-up” questions into the criteria.

Staff reviewed the PSC recommendations and revised the criteria. Staff found that combining the criteria as recommended muddled the intent of each question. Staff believes that the criteria provided below, although longer, if used as a checklist, will be more functional than a shorter combined list of criteria, while still meeting the intent of the PSC recommendations.

Revised Recommendation: The PSC directs staff to use the following criteria when responding to public testimony and reviewing the plan for clarity:

1. Review each existing and proposed action for compliance with the checklist of criteria listed below. Each action should meet at least three criteria. If an action does not meet at least three of the criteria, it should be amended or removed from the plan.
 - a. When implemented, will the action help achieve goals in more than one of the Portland Plan action areas?
 - b. Does the action have clear, specific deliverables and measurable outcomes?
 - c. Does the action integrate and leverage existing resources?
 - d. Is there a bureau or partner agency that is willing implement the action? Does the action align with their strategic plan?
 - e. Does the action have positive equity impacts? (see “Making Equity Real on p. 10 of the Portland Plan).
 - f. Is it likely and possible the action can be started and/or completed in the next five years?
 - g. Does any action that meets criterion c (integrate and leverage resources) also meet criterion e (equity impacts)?
2. After initial revisions are complete, consider the revisions in light of the following questions:
 - h. Do we have enough dependable actions that we know will get the job done?
 - i. Are we satisfied with the level at which each of the nine action areas were addressed?



- j. Do we have enough bold actions? Bold actions are inspirational actions that challenge ideas, have significant impacts but that may also be difficult to complete?

C. Basic Public Services

On December 12, 2011, staff recommended the following revisions to the PSC:

1. Revise the introduction of the plan to provide more information on basic public services. To do this, staff will work with the Water, Police and Fire bureaus to ensure that appropriate policies and actions, if applicable, are added to the integrated strategies.
2. Develop an action that directs the City to develop an evaluation approach that can be used to determine how to consider equity impacts of infrastructure investments and programs. This lens also needs to provide a way of balancing equity needs with basic system needs, grey and green.

Staff is proceeding with the revisions proposed to the PSC on December 12, 2011. As directed by the PSC, staff will make the additional revisions provided below:

3. Add an implementation action that directs City bureaus to define how the identify level of service.
4. Add an action that prioritizes sidewalk improvements.

D. Equity and Disability

On December 12, 2011, staff recommended the following actions and revisions to the PSC:

1. Review the plan to identify areas in which accessibility issues and the concerns expressed by and for persons with disabilities can be better and more explicitly addressed. Work with the Portland Commission on Disability, the Portland Housing Bureau, the Office of Equity and Human Rights and others.
2. Review photographs in the plan and revise photos to ensure that Portlanders of all ages and abilities are included in the document.

Staff is proceeding with the revisions proposed to the PSC on December 12, 2011. As directed by the PSC, staff will make the additional revisions provided below:

3. Add an action item that supports revising section of the Zoning Code that provide various bonuses in exchange for a set of community amenities. The eligible community amenities list should be revised to include providing a certain, to be determined, amount of accessible units in a development, as permitted by all applicable regulations.
4. Strengthen the equity elements in the economic prosperity and affordability strategy.

E. Resiliency, Emergency and Hazard Planning

On December 12, 2011, staff recommended the following revision to the PSC:



1. Staff recommends adding actions or policies that relate to the Local Energy Assurance Plan (LEAP) process and planning efforts currently underway at the Portland Office of Emergency Management.

Staff is proceeding with the revisions proposed to the PSC on December 12, 2011. As directed by the PSC staff will make the additional revisions provided below:

2. Add additional text to the introduction that addresses the concept of resiliency and describe how the Portland Plan components contribute to Portland's resiliency.
3. Add an action or policy that addresses Portland's neighborhood emergency teams.
4. Address gathering spaces in more detail in Vibrant Neighborhood Hubs and tie gathering spaces to hazard response.

F. Youth

On December 12, 2011, staff recommended the following revision to the PSC:

1. Review the specific actions recommended by Multnomah Youth Commission representatives, such as expanding the Youth Pass program and supporting the Multnomah Educational Service District Outdoor School for inclusion in the plan.

Staff introduced the idea of creating a formal and on-going relationship between the PSC and the Multnomah Youth Commission and establishing an annual check in. The PSC thought that a once a year check in was insufficient. The PSC also recommended addressing youth safety more explicitly. Additional revisions are provided below:

2. Explore opportunities for establishing a position for a youth commissioner on the Planning and Sustainability Commission and coordinate with the Multnomah Youth Commission.
3. Address police-youth relations and youth safety in the plan.

G. Multigenerational City

On December 12, 2011, staff recommended the following revision to the PSC:

1. Develop additional text that highlights the actions and policies that support the needs of an aging population and will make Portland a great place to live for Portlanders of all generations.

Staff is proceeding with the revisions proposed to the PSC on December 12, 2011. As directed by the PSC staff will make the additional revisions provided below:

2. Add additional information about senior services in Portland.

H. Active Transportation and Bicycling

On December 13, 2011 the PSC discussed the fact that some who commented on the plan were concerned that bikes and Portland's bicycle infrastructure is not receiving the attention it needs in the Portland Plan. Staff stated that bicycling and bike access is a core component of the Healthy Connected City strategy and improving the bike commute mode share is critical to meeting our commute mode goals; however, pedestrian and transit trips are also critical.



During this work session, the PSC noted that the meaning of the term “active transportation” was unclear. For example, it was unclear if transit is considered a component of active transportation. It was recommended that the phrase active transportation be removed from the plan. After discussing this recommendation with PBOT staff, staff strongly recommends continuing to use the phrase active transportation. The phrase active transportation is widely used in transportation policy and removing the phrase may complicate future funding requests. Staff recommends adding a clear definition of active transportation to the plan.

The PSC also noted that it is necessary to clarify and define the relationships between bicycling and the Intertwine, civic corridors, neighborhood greenways and neighborhood hubs. In response to the PSC deliberations and staff discussions that occurred after the December 13, 2011 work session, staff developed the following revised recommendation provided below. Additional issues discussed included: streetcar in East Portland, the relationship between bicycling and economic development and funding challenges.

Revised Recommendation: The PSC approves directs staff to revise the Portland Plan to improve the clarity of text relating to bicycling and active transportation as follows as described below:

1. Add additional text focused on the relationship between health and active transportation. The section would provide a clear definition of active transportation and describe the benefits of active transportation for personal, community and environmental health. It would also include references to bike, transit and pedestrian-related actions in the plan (same as 12/12/11 recommendation).
2. Add text that defines active transportation, which includes walking, biking and transit.
3. Integrate information about transportation systems into the Urban Innovation section of the Economic Prosperity and Affordability strategy.
4. Add text that describes the relationships among major bikeways, civic corridors and neighborhood greenways.
5. Clarify the purpose of the diagram on p. 76 and provide information on how these ideas may be implemented.
6. Add text changes that recognize that transportation is a component of The Intertwine.
7. Add better describing how bicycles will connect into hubs safely.
8. Amend the streetcar corridor planning action to emphasize that one of the corridors should serve an area outside of the Central City.
9. Improve the definition of a “complete neighborhood” and describe the relationship between complete neighborhoods and active transportation.
10. Place greater emphasis on the financial challenges we face in meeting our active transportation goals (i.e., the need to develop new funding sources or additional funding sources for active transportation infrastructure investments in light of declining gas tax revenues).



I. Community Action

On December 12, 2011, staff recommended the following revision to the PSC:

1. Staff recommends adding information to the implementation section that would provide community members with a path to support and help implement the Portland Plan.

Staff is proceeding with the revisions proposed to the PSC on December 12, 2011. As directed by the PSC staff will make the additional revisions provided below:

2. Identify a clear path for non-governmental organizations.

J. Implementation

On December 12, 2011, staff recommended the following revision to the PSC:

1. Add an action that directs the City to revise the budget process to better reflect the Portland Plan goals.
2. Add actions that specify when the plan will be evaluated and revised.
3. Write text revisions or add an action that more clearly expresses the relationship between the Framework for Equity and Implementation.
4. Create a work plan that provides Portlanders with a mechanism to become more involved in implementing the plan on an individual, household or group level.

Staff is proceeding with the revisions proposed to the PSC on December 12, 2011. As directed by the PSC staff will make the additional revisions provided below:

5. Identify a clear path for non-governmental organizations.
6. Create a work plan that will make it easier for more people to become involved and use language that is accessible to a diverse audience.

K. Healthy Connected City - Adaptation and Relationship to Economic Prosperity and Affordability

On December 12, 2011, staff recommended the following revision to the PSC:

1. Add text to the plan that explains the benefits and synergies between the Economic Prosperity and Affordability strategy and the Healthy Connected City strategy.
2. Revise text to recognize the importance of protecting the environment for future generations and adding text that recognizes the intrinsic value of nature.

Staff is proceeding with the revisions proposed to the PSC on December 12, 2011. Staff would like to note that recommendations addressed under active transportation and bicycling, youth and resiliency and emergency and hazard planning will result in changes to the Healthy Connected City strategy.

L. East Portland



The PSC did not recommend any revisions to East Portland-related recommendations. It should be noted that the PSC recommended revised a streetcar related transportation action (HCC Action 34) to address streetcar needs in East Portland.

M. Housing

The PSC did not recommend any revisions to the Housing-related recommendations.

N. Historic Resources and Community Character

During the work session, the PSC identified an additional theme not identified by staff: historic resources and community character. Numerous letter authors, including the Landmarks Commission, were concerned that historic preservation and the importance of respecting community character were not addressed in the plan. The PSC provided the following direction to staff:

- Mention the importance of historic resources and the need for an historic resources inventory.

4. PROCESS, SCHEDULE AND DELIVERABLES

The Proposed Draft Portland Plan was released in mid-October 2011. The official comment period on the plan was from October 18, 2011 to December 28, 2011. All written testimony received during that period and until January 5, 2011 was provided by the PSC for review. Testimony received after the December 28, 2011 was forwarded as a courtesy to those who took the time to read and comment on the document.

The PSC held three public hearings on the plan on November 8, 15 and 29 and held a work session on December 13, 2011. The PSC will hold a second work session on January 10, 2011. At the January 10, 2012 work session, PSC members will continue to discuss public comment and their own responses to the plan.

On January 24, 2012, when deliberations are complete, staff recommends that the PSC provide staff with final direction on how to proceed with plan revisions and direction for drafting the PSC's recommendation to City Council.

After formal direction is provided to staff by the PSC, staff will complete revisions and develop a working version of the Recommended Draft Portland Plan for PSC members to review at a work session in late February or early March. The working version of the Recommended Draft Portland Plan will be provided as a Word document and will not be presented in layout. During the work session, staff requests that the PSC review the content revisions with respect to their earlier direction.

After the PSC review the working version of the Recommended Draft Portland Plan text, staff will proceed with revisions to the text and develop the Recommended Draft Portland Plan for City Council review in full layout.

