

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, December 11, 2012

12:30-3:30pm

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray (arrived 12:50pm), Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Lai-Lani Ovalles, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Irma Valdez (arrived 1:20pm)

Commissioners Absent: Katherine Schultz

BPS Staff Present: Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Sandra Wood, Tom Armstrong, Spencer Williams, Michelle Kunec, Julie Ocken

Vice Chair Shapiro called the meeting to order at 12:30pm and provided an overview of the agenda.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Smith noted that the City Club has a presentation on 01/11/13, "Negotiating Portland's Development Projects". John Russell and Brian Libby are the presenters.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Title 13 (Metro's Nature in Neighborhoods title) was approved of compliance at Council. There is no new proposed regulation. There is an IGA between the City and Metro that now goes to Metro, which outlines existing and voluntary programs for the next 10 years to continue compliance.
- BPS presented the Curbside composting 1 year report at Council. Garbage has been reduced by 38 percent, which is more than other places we've heard about. Most people have adjusted. We've also tripled food composting and yard debris within the past year.
- We are starting the next quadrant work for CC2035 (West Quadrant). Last week we held the Goose Hollow workshop, and the second one is tomorrow. The Advisory Committee is currently being formed for this quadrant as well.
- We have asked Mayor-elect Hales to come to a January or February PSC meeting for a brief introduction. We will have a PSC retreat in the spring and will ask him to join for a portion of that as well.
- BPS (and all City bureaus') budget is due on February 4. We are facing another round of major cuts. Irma is on the Budget Advisory Committee.
- There is not a late December PSC meeting. Thanks for the great work this year! It's been busy and intense for the commission this year. We appreciate your time and efforts. The next meeting will be January 8.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of [Minutes from 11/27/12 PSC meeting](#)

Chair Baugh asked for any comments to the consent agenda. *Commissioner Smith* moved to approve the minutes. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an *aye* vote.

(Y8 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Ovalles, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith)

Comprehensive Plan Update

Briefing: Tom Armstrong, Sandra Wood, Spencer Williams

Scenarios Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/5362756/view/>
Documents:

- [Staff Memo](#)
- [Comp Plan Timeline Flowchart](#)

In April, we started looking at members for the 8 Policy Expert Groups (PEGs). The PEGs started to meet in June. This is part of the public engagement strategy as each PEG is comprised of both public agency staff and community members. We've also received about 7000 hits each month on the Comp Plan Update project website, and staff creates and sends a monthly e-newsletter that summarizes the PEG discussions.

The Background Reports were approved at City Council for Factual Basis (Task 2 for Periodic Review). We are now working on Task 3 – Alternative Scenarios and Task 4 – Developing the plan. Task 5 is the implementation portion.

The public discussion draft (Working Draft, Part 1 – Goals and Policies) will be published in January 2013. There will also be an Urban Design Framework produced in January. The Scenarios Report is also to be published in January. The PEGs will then dig into the draft, and the public workshops will begin in mid-February. Part 1 is on a citywide scale; Part 2 is more specific to various districts.

Part 2 will be published in summer 2013. This will include a “60 percent” proposal for the Urban Design Framework and other components also at 60 percent. There will then be public workshops for Part 2. Sixty percent refers to the fact that there will be some policies that have “placeholders”, giving options for the public to contemplate and share their ideas with staff to edit and update before the Proposed Plan is complete.

The components of Parts 1 and 2 will be included in the Proposed Plan (all components, 75 percent complete). The PSC will have hearings on the Proposed Plan in mid-2014.

Part of the first phase is the Alternative Growth Scenarios report. Staff approached this as a technical analysis about how we could grow to provide a base for public discussions.

- Explore different growth patterns based on current plan and policies.
- Measures of Success from Portland Plan provide performance measures to look at if we grow in certain patterns and how the city will perform based on these measures. This is based on geography and creates the evaluation framework.

Today's presentation is an overview of what will be in the report based; it's on a presentation that's already been given to some of the PEGs. There is a lot of data and information, so this is a foundation for initial understanding.

Portland's expected growth by 2035:

- 132,000 more households
- 147,000 projected new jobs

Our existing zoning has enough capacity to accommodate this growth, so we have some choices about where growth happens.

There are four general options/scenarios about where and how growth can occur:

- The default builds direction from Metro 2040 and recent trends over the last years.
- Centers/hubs.
- Corridors.

- Central City focus.

Growth distribution ranges depending on which scenario is chosen. For the default, staff looked at where growth has been occurring over the last 15 years and projected that forward for the next 25 years.

Metro 2040 is corridor-focused with high-density mixed-use along the corridors. Exploring the patterns, we have a lot of capacity but without a focus to a particular area. If we can prioritize specific corridors and/or centers, we can maximize existing infrastructure as well as new investments.

Central City provides a base for all scenarios. In the Central City scenario, this intensifies even more.

Making the bridge from the Portland Plan measures to the Comp Plan. Performance measures will help support conversation and discussion.

One of the Portland Plan goals is: By 2035, 70 percent of Portlanders walk, bike, take transit, carpool or work from home.

We can increase level of frequent transit (TriMet definition, which is 17 minutes currently). Citywide, we are currently at 47 percent. With new growth, most is occurring in areas where there is already good transit. There are slight differences between the four scenarios, but all are about 55 percent. There is behavior change, pricing and other tools aside from land use that can influence how people commute.

From the Portland Plan regarding complete neighborhoods: By 2035, 80 percent of Portlanders can safely and easily walk, bike or roll to local services and amenities to meet their household needs.

- Currently the number is 45 percent citywide. Scenarios range 48 to 53 percent.
- *Commissioner Smith*: None of the scenarios get us close to the 80 percent goal. Are there other measures (pieces of the overall) that we can look at to get us closer?
- *Chair Baugh*: What are alternative transportation measures and investment strategies, connected to housing and jobs policies, that could be considered as well to push the percentage up?
- Tom: Right now we have a system that allocates all the growth but not the 25 years of investment. As we move into Part 2, we can offer ideas to offer investment options to show it might impact options. This is where we can look at trade-offs on investment strategies and how we can push the needle.
- *Commissioner Shapiro*: What is our leverage with other agencies (e.g. TriMet)?
- Tom: We need to have a specific scenario to then try to match the other agencies' priorities and investments.
- *Commissioner Smith*: TriMet is working to high-capacity transit; SW corridor will likely be that investment. Is that the best investment? Or is it more frequent transit in east county? How much do you concentrate in one corridor versus multiple areas? We would have to advocate if we want TriMet to change its direction. They have to weigh the benefits to specific areas and benefits to the region overall.
 - PSC members could meet with members of the TriMet board to share perspectives.

It would be good to look at a matrix of what makes a complete neighborhood; elements could be prioritized in terms of investment to at least get areas closer to having most things available.

In the Transit and Active Transportation policies, the aim is to prioritize centers as places linked by convenient transit service and that are easy to access and get around by walking, biking or wheelchair.

There are pockets of the city that may be easier to bring closer to 20-minute-ness. We can think about if there are ways we can focus growth and investment in areas with larger gaps. As we go from the first to second phase of the project, we can look at policy choices, decisions and impacts.

It may be cheaper/quicker/faster and other components if you make changes where things have more amenities already. But that misses the equity component; it may be more expensive to build infrastructure in areas such as east Portland. There is a question of when you go for efficiency versus effectiveness/equity.

Summary of Growth Scenarios:

- Choices for Prioritizing Growth: our existing zoning has enough capacity to accommodate the projected 147,000 new jobs and 132,000 new households.
- Legacy Landscape: two-thirds of households that will be here in 2035 are already on the ground. Underserved areas, without investment, will likely continue to lag behind.
- Dual Priorities: assist in prioritizing growth in high performing areas and filling gaps in performance to meet citywide goals.

Commissioner Smith noted he was recently a guest on Portland Afoot, trying to explain the Comp Plan process relative to active transportation.

Chair Baugh noted the good work around equity we laid out in the Portland Plan. We are now looking at how we connect the plan in a real on-the-ground and monetary way. We'll have to make difficult choices as we look at investments. The PSC will have to advocate for the population in other areas of the city to ensure we live up to the values of the Portland Plan.

Commissioner Gray: Is the growth projection the same as the financial projection / percentage? This is a huge equity issue.

- Tom: We recognize that whether growth happens in east Portland, for example, there is a minimum level of service we need to provide throughout the city. There are still competing priorities, but our investments are not necessarily contingent on growth.

Equity is the PSC's lens. It should be primary in how we consider work going forward. We need to advocacy this as Portland's priority. Budget recommendations look at efficiency, so we need to change that conversation both within the City and with our partners.

In November, PEGs focused on their specific topics using an equity lens. Commission members shared key issues from their work on the PEGs:

- *Commissioner Valdez*: The Residential Development and Compatibility PEG will discuss gentrification tomorrow. The last discussion was small group discussions that brought people out of their comfort zones and created a healthy dialogue.
- *Commissioner Smith*: Networks and Neighborhood Centers PEGs have both started equity discussions and trainings, which were great. At the Neighborhood Centers session, Lisa Bates from PSU talked about a numerical methodology about gentrification. We have ways to be quantitative about gentrification information (which areas are likely to see it and areas that are more vulnerable).
- *Commissioner Houck*: The Watershed Health and Environment PEG is far ahead of where the City has been in the past. Equity conversations have been interesting – some people we would expect to be focused on equity were equally supportive of intergenerational and interspecies equity. There is an interest in the environment for its inherent value. At the Economic Development PEG meetings, much input has been

about industrial lands. We want to make sure the Watershed PEG has input to these discussions, and there is a subcommittee to cross the discussions. There is still an issue of a lack of attention to and understanding of the economic development potential regarding the contribution of the environment to the city. Hopefully the Watershed PEG will be able to put values on a healthy environment to a healthy economy, but there is still lots of work to do.

- *Commissioner Shapiro*: The Community Involvement PEG is interested in the verbiage. It focused on volunteerism at one point, regarding the word “rely”. We *rely* on citizens to help in our success. Volunteerism is a strength of Portland, so people who care about their community put their time into it.
- *Commissioner Gray*: Education and Youth Success had some key issues. Regarding equity, the conversation that assumed that equity was a new topic for us. Our conversation focused on what white power and privilege mean. We’ve also talked about IGAs with the City and how/do the school districts benefit, which varies depending on the district. Perhaps public school buildings need to have different standards from other buildings.
- *Commissioner Rudd*: Infrastructure PEG members are talking about balance. There is a chicken and egg issue with TriMet in that increasing transit requires existing ridership. We should look at partial communities where that will enable us to serve more of the city’s residents as we make investment choices. It is important to keep our eye on economic development to enable us to finance the desired investments and recognizing the need to have partnerships and look for ways to leverage investments like TriMet does with federal dollars linked to dense land use/transit investment.
- *Chair Baugh*: The Neighborhood Centers PEG has also been talking about how cross-pollination between PEGs will be helpful to be able to understand connections to other PEGs’ work.

Health Policy Scan

Briefing: Michelle Kunec

Document: [Health Policy Scan](#)

Susan introduced the project. We are just learning about how to understand about health impacts of planning on healthy communities. Staff teamed with Oregon Public Health Institute (OPHI) for this health policy scan. We can use this information to better integrate health issues into the planning we’re doing, specifically for the Comp Plan Update, but for projects and plans going forward as well.

Michelle shared the health policy scan. The purpose was to form a starting point about discussions about health for the Comp Plan update. There is information in the Human Health and Safety background report and in the Portland Plan. Environment and socio-economic status need to be included as inputs to health and creating healthy communities. We have been lacking some policy guidance in some planning areas, so this scan can help us inform future work.

In addition to partnering with OPHI, we received a Communities Putting Prevention to Work (CPPW) grant. The project included a scan of source documents from a variety of locations, health-focused language and health-based policy toolkits. The final scan document is meant to be a resource, not something that will be put before Council for a recommendation.

The inside of front cover is the document statement and information about how it’s organized. The document covers a range of topic areas and arranges policy statements into policy themes in each topic area. Included also is a notation about where the selected policies came from.

We do have strong policy in our existing Comp Plan, but we are looking to further it in the update process.

Michelle provided a presentation to the Comp Plan Update staff in the City and distributed the document for consideration for draft language in new Comp Plan. We have also asked OPHI to use this resource to check if there are areas we can make improvements to our policy. In general have incorporated many topics areas in and from the previous Comp Plan.

Commissioner Shapiro: Why did you select the cities noted?

- Michelle: Some of them have been looking at health for a long time. Some are newer in relating health to planning and policy. We tried to get highlights from around the country to develop our list of policy themes.

Commissioner Houck: Kirk Biehl did analysis for Metro on the role of parks and recreation opportunities and their relation to human health. He is with NCNM and would be a good reference.

Commissioner Gray: What about wellness and nutrition in the context of the Youth, Education and Schools section?

- Michelle: We weren't looking top-down for a comprehensive policy document, only at what's existing in other sources. We focused on municipal city documents, which didn't necessarily include school-related policies. Much of this section comes from the Portland Plan.
- Most of what's in the Comp Plan focuses on land use. There are other policy issues that are addressed, but other things could be helpful to hear about as we develop new policy in the PEG work.

Chair Baugh: The Climate Action Plan is not listed.

- Michelle: We are looking at the CAP with the Comp Plan, but it is not listed here.

West Hayden Island

Work Session: Eric Engstrom

Documents:

- [PSC questions to staff](#)
- [PSC WHI questions sorted](#)
- [Proposed Technical Experts](#)
- [Proposed Timeline](#)

Mayor Adams addressed the PSC and thanked the commissioners for their work during his tenure. The Portland Plan is a primary example of the coordinated efforts and the PSC's work in putting the plan together, which will remain a living document for future improvement. The fundamental assumption is that working in partnership can be a better and more efficient use of existing money we have. About WHI, thanks for setting the timeline - and that there will be a timeline and recommendation to City Council.

There will be one last draft from the Mayor in early January that has two major edits: (1) added \$5M for recreation improvements (funds from future City Council applying the Enterprise Zone, working with a private sector provider to work with the Port); and (2) an update in the IGA that will recognize the expectation that the City pursue the Thunderbird site as a park (State or State-funded park), which the Port supports. Mayor Adams thanked the BPS team and Director Anderson's leadership.

Commissioner Houck noted that while he has been a skeptic of this process around WHI, Mayor Adams has made a huge contribution via the draft IGA he presented in November.

Commissioner Oxman thanked the Mayor for his efforts on health impact mitigation.

Chair Baugh noted the timeline that is before the PSC. He asked that the commission and staff agree to the timeline as the first step at the conclusion of today's meeting. We have 99 percent of the questions out to staff, which largely drives the timeline.

Eric noted the schedule proposal and walked through the three components: timeline, process to address questions and the technical experts.

The proposed schedule takes the PSC timeline through April 9. The driver of the schedule is working back from a presumption of staff needing to produce a new draft and time for the public to comment on it, culminating in a hearing at the PSC.

At January 8 PSC meeting, staff will provide an overview of the IGA. This will include the relationship of time/money development over time.

The proposed three work sessions are divided based on the types of questions. Environmental/mitigation is scheduled on January 22. February 12 will be on community-related questions (health and transportation primarily). The third session will be on economic need, benefit and financial timeline (business plan aspect). Staff will then produce a new draft then have a briefing about it. There is about 1 month between the plan being released and the PSC hearing. The presumption for the work sessions is that staff will provide a briefing packet/memo with recommendations along with feedback and input from technical experts prior to each session. Port staff can be available at work sessions for questions.

Commissioner Houck noted that the release of the new draft would only be 9 days after the final work session. Is that realistic? Glad to hear technical experts can be available for PSC questions.

- Eric: We will bring pieces to each work session, so we'll be updating the draft throughout the timeline. The only risk is if the PSC has big issues with the staff's proposal at each session.

Commissioner Smith: How does the public track on this process? We need to build a schedule that won't require too many adjustments. The 1 month between draft and hearing sounds fine, but I'm not sure if just one hearing will accommodate everyone who wants to testify.

- The commission confirmed we should schedule 2 hearings, at least as a placeholder. If the second is not needed, the commission could vote at the second meeting.

Commissioner Oxman asked if flipping work sessions 2 and 3 might make sense. That could give the commission more time between the last work session and the hearing.

- Eric noted this will likely depend on the availability of experts. We've proposed the economic session last since we need to see the whole picture before judging the viability... this is getting to the substance before the business plan. *Commissioner Valdez* and *Commissioner Hanson* agreed with Eric's work session schedule.

Documents will be made available to the public a week prior to each PSC work session.

Staff will work with technical experts and key stakeholders including the Port, community leaders and environmental organizations. Staff will also work to reaffirm and discuss the project with tribes to include their perspectives. Staff will report out at the work sessions.

- Susan: If you have key issues that need to be addressed before the individual work sessions, staff can provide more information prior to the scheduled times.

PSC members asked [almost 100 questions in writing](#), which staff sorted into approximately 20 topics. Staff tried to combine common questions and create prioritized topics the PSC may want to discuss. If there is a topic missing, or one we don't think need more than a written response, let staff know.

- *Commissioner Gray* asked if the PSC needs some in-between times to meet and if the commission is open to saying if we need an extra meeting, etc. *Chair Baugh* noted it would be good to be open if the commission needs more time to address issues or questions. This decision can be made as we get into the process.
- *Commissioner Smith* noted additional items that should be elevated: (1) Vancouver as an alternative is really multiple questions (Do we need both facilities? In which order? Can we control the order?). This should be a public discussion. (2) N Hayden Island Dr is part of a bridge/no bridge question, but how do we make sure there is excellent bike/pedestrian access from the manufactured home community?
- *Commissioner Houck*: We need the same expectation regarding responses. Some items in Column A ("We have a clear answer to this already written, with supporting data") have differences of opinion, so we'd like input from technical experts to provide input. Column A items do still have questions and should get a check-off without discussion.
- *Chair Baugh* asked about how staff recommendations and technical experts will provide input to the PSC. Eric noted staff will send the questions to experts. Staff will provide their recommendation and experts' input in writing prior to each work session.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted that tribal interests and treaties are to be provided in writing only. Can we have that verbally and for discussion as well? We are open to feedback on changing this.
- *Commissioner Houck* requested some presence from tribal representatives at work sessions to provide a forum if they are interested in continuing the conversation.

Staff noted that we don't have assurance that all listed experts and stakeholders will engage at this point; this is the first draft before we check-in with the people listed.

Commissioner Oxman asked about Column C ("more research needed") – what is the timeline for items listed here? How much research will be done before/after the PSC's recommendation?

- Eric noted some items are extremely long-term and staff would be able to give a "yes we can get this done" type of response but noted that not all Column C items will be complete before the PSC's recommendation.

The recommendations about the IGA will be directional. On March 5, staff will present a fully updated IGA. *Commissioner Oxman* asked for staff to provide a track-changes version based on the Mayor's recent IGA version for each iteration so edits/updates are clear.

Commissioner Valdez requested the commissioners don't hold back the progress of the project and discussion at the work sessions, noting that details are important but that the sessions need to move forward.

- Eric noted that the AC had a similar conundrum. This is a tough project with many components.
- Susan noted that what we bring in the draft will make some people happy and some upset in various parts of it. Staff will take all the information and will make a best recommendation with expert input.

Commissioner Smith commented that various straw polls were done during the Citywide Tree Plan process. *Chair Baugh* noted that staff will provide recommendations; the PSC will have to say it agrees (or doesn't) with the various items that come before the commission.

Commissioner Hanson noted the technical expertise on the commission itself and on the AC. There was disagreement on some details with the AC. We need to stay with a structured

approach and a structured schedule. Consistency is important; if we deviate much from the schedule, we need to pause and make sure everyone knows.

Chair Baugh: Lots of the questions are about regulating the Port – making them do things. Much of this seems to be things ports are doing up the coasts already and what we’re asking is 20th Century instead of looking to the 22nd Century when the port will be functioning. Kitzhaber already wants to recognize the importance of ports and the greening of ports via the Pacific Coast Collaborative. Is there an option for the Port to say they will have an initiative to make this particular WHI port green so we leapfrog this portion? This would be a vision and documentation of intent of how the port would act and operate.

- Eric noted this topic is embodied in the cluster of questions. The best practices document attempts to get to this. The criticism of this approach is that it is not binding enough.
- Susan suggested Andre’ script a letter to Bill Wyatt about including a commitment of port operations in the IGA.
- *Commissioner Houck* wants “nuts and bolts” to make sure we meet standards via regulations in addition to a broad vision.

In the review of the experts lists, some PSC members asked for other outside legal resources. Staff commented that we need to work through the City Attorney but can look at this option (and also for tribal and Goal 9 issues). Core project staff is not listed in the experts list. Staff noted people who have already been involved in the WHI project. *Commissioner Houck* did provide staff with additional recommendations to the experts list.

Staff will provide an [updated draft schedule](#) of the upcoming WHI PSC sessions.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 3:13pm.

Submitted by Julie Ocken, PSC Coordinator