



Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

---

## MEMO

DATE: February 19, 2014  
TO: Community Involvement Committee  
FROM: Diane Hale on behalf of the Comprehensive Plan Team  
SUBJECT: What We Heard from the Public, CPU Part II

---

This report summarizes comments gathered through workshops, public meetings, online feedback forms, the Map App and emails and letters submitted by the public within the comment period of October 2 through December 31, 2013. The purpose of this report is to share with the public an organized summary of what staff heard. An outline of the report is included below:

I.	Introduction	1
II.	Summary of Public Comments	3
	a. Topic Summaries	3
	b. District Summaries	13
	c. Event Summaries	26
III.	Demographic Data & Meeting Feedback	37
IV.	Attachments	41

### I. Introduction

A variety of different tools and events were used to solicit comments from the public during the Comprehensive Plan Update Part 2 process. A total of 910 comments were submitted directly through the CPU online commenting tool, the Map App. The Map App is an interactive web tool with a series of maps showing the locations of various proposals. Additionally, staff received over 200 emails, letters from individuals and community groups, and comments submitted through the comment form on the BPS website.

Community members also provided feedback to staff at a variety of events hosted by BPS and events hosted by other community partners. Staff attended 98 workshops, meetings, and other community events during the three-month comment period, with over 1,948 people in attendance. Feedback from each event was compiled by staff, sorted by topic and district, and incorporated into this summary. These events are described in more detail below, and a complete list of all workshops, meetings, and events during the comment period is included in Attachment A.

The feedback that staff heard regarding the CPU Part 2 varied widely, from comments on the City's outreach process, to feedback on specific bike lanes that warrant attention, to parcel-specific zoning request changes. The sections in this memo were authored by a dozen BPS staff members after reading all comments pertaining to their area of expertise. As a result, there is some



City of Portland, Oregon | Bureau of Planning and Sustainability | [www.portlandonline.com/bps](http://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.*

repetition of themes between Districts and Topics, for example, and some different voices among sections of this memo. Where comments express conflicting viewpoints on the same topic, staff has conveyed these conflicting viewpoints rather than smooth these over in any way. Finally, please note that staff has generally summarized comments rather than include them verbatim, primarily since there were numerous comments expressed by multiple parties expressed in slightly different ways.

#### Part 2 Events:

- Fifty-one community meetings, where organizations invited staff to introduce and engage members with Part 2 concepts, tools and products like the Citywide Systems Plan, Map App, and the Companion Guide. Many of these meetings were tailored to specific group interests or geographies.
- Thirty-three training events, where staff primarily focused on going through the Map App and the Companion Guide.
- Three information sessions hosted by the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability were held downtown and in East Portland, where staff provided an overview of the Part 2 concepts, tools and products.
- Three District Mapping Conversations were held in West, East and North Portland, involving interactive discussions focused on specific issues and questions facing those districts.
- Three community events where staff set up tables and talked to the public in North and East Portland and Downtown.

#### *How will this feedback be used?*

All of the input from meetings, workshops, community partners, online feedback forms, and other communication with staff has been sorted by relevance into Part 2 topic areas, and by district. Staff has reviewed each comment, along with internal analysis and critique of each chapter. The feedback received here for the Working Draft Part 2 is also guiding further revisions to the Part 1 policies.

The entire revised package, (Goals and Policies, Urban Design Framework, Land Use Map, Citywide Systems Plan, and Transportation Systems Plan), together comprising the Comprehensive Plan Update Proposed Plan, will be submitted to the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) in summer 2014.

#### *Next Steps and Upcoming Involvement Opportunities*

Opportunities for engagement and feedback for the Comprehensive Plan Update are ongoing. Staff will provide ongoing project updates and, as needed, early consultation to groups and organizations now through the summer. BPS staff are working to revise and improve the Map App in preparation for the Comprehensive Plan Proposed Plan in the summer. Along with the Proposed Plan, Summary of Changes memos corresponding to each chapter will summarize substantive changes made to the chapter and why those changes were made, highlighting where public feedback played a role.

The community will be invited to review the Proposed Plan this summer. Accompanying the release of the Proposed Plan, public open houses will be held to share an overview of the Proposed Plan and how to provide feedback, in the form of public testimony, to the Planning and Sustainability Commission (PSC) leading up to the hearings scheduled for fall 2014. The PSC hearings will require notification to the legislative mailing list. During the hearings process, written and oral testimony on the Proposed Plan will be received and considered during the deliberations. PSC will then recommend the next version of the Plan to City Council.

#### *Early Implementation*

Many comments received on Part 2 relate to zoning code changes and other implementation. These comments will carry forward into the Early Implementation phase of the Comprehensive Plan Update and may inform next steps. BPS is also currently working on or preparing for a number of early implementation projects so that these actions will be ready to be adopted soon after the City Council adopts the new Comprehensive Plan.

Early implementation projects include:

- Mixed Use Zones Project
- Institutional Zoning Project
- Community Involvement Program
- Industrial and Employment Land Supply
- Transportation System Plan
- Housekeeping
- Inter-Governmental Agreements
- Zoning Map Changes

While the projects described above are necessary to comply with State requirements, there are other priorities that BPS is considering. The timing of these projects will depend on the availability of funding and staffing. These additional projects might include revisiting East Portland multi-dwelling and single-dwelling zone development standards, evaluating tools like impervious area standards to reduce stormwater runoff, and reconsidering how the City regulates schools and clarify regulations around parks and open space.

## II. Summary of Public Comments

Nearly 1,100 comments were received during the Part 2 process. Comments ranged widely in content, from site-specific feedback to general observations on the project process. All comments received are summarized by topic, district and key event in the following sections. Please see individual sections for more information regarding the summaries. It is important to note that these summaries are not intended to convey weight for particular topics and there is some duplication among these report sections. For example, centers are addressed in the topic summaries and are also relevant in each district summary.

### Topic Summaries

Comments were sorted into the following general topics for review and analysis by staff:

#### Topic (# of comments received)

Comprehensive Plan Process (25)

Centers, Corridors, and City Greenways (305)

Employment/Industrial (191)

Transportation (505)

Watershed Health and Green Design (225)

Infrastructure (108)

Land Use (340)

(Comment totals exceed 1,100 because many comments fall into multiple topics)

General highlights of the comments are provided below according to the general theme. Please see other sections for more detailed comment summaries by district and event.

## Comprehensive Plan Process

Twenty-five public comments were submitted concerning the Comprehensive Plan Update process. These comments cover a broad spectrum of topics regarding public involvement. In general, the following themes were expressed through the comments:

**Early involvement:** Reinforced the need for the community's opportunity to meaningfully participate. Commenters suggested that City staff begin with a very general and broad idea, and then first seek community input before technical work starts. This would allow the community to really shape and inform a fuller picture of what the project would entail and the problem(s) it would help to improve.

**Community empowerment:** Recognized the added challenges faced by people with fewer resources and time free to participate and expressed interest in employing, training and empowering people to work within their own communities; with already established relationships they can be more effective in engaging communities than someone outside of the community would be. Other commenters stated that in some cases participants should be paid for their time.

**Map App:** Regarding specific issues with the Map App (an online platform that was used to both provide information and receive public comments) commenters requested more time to review the Map App and provide feedback. Some felt that the visuals left on the map by other commenters made it difficult to add their own comments.

**Advisory committees:** Regarding the use of advisory committees, commenters identified that meetings should be held in the evenings, so that the general public would have access to attend and participate as a majority of people work during the day. Paying to park downtown is also an impediment.

**Continuing involvement:** There is a need for continued public review and comment within the Comprehensive Plan Process and for the public feedback received now to influence future refinement projects that may address the details people care about (e.g., historic districts and zoning entitlements).

## Centers, Corridors, and City Greenways

Over 300 public comments were received related to centers, corridors, and city greenways. The majority of comments generally supported or did not question the policy direction for mixed-use centers and corridors; most comments concerned the details of implementation. A smaller number of comments related to the selection and mapping of centers, corridors, and city greenways. The following themes were commonly expressed through the comments:

### **Centers implementation:**

- Improve centers as more pedestrian-friendly places, with better pedestrian crossings and sidewalks, as well as pedestrian-oriented development.
- Allow for more local retail and other services in many centers, such as groceries, pharmacies, health clinics and other services. Comments also called for including public parks, play areas, and public art in centers.
- Ensure adequate vehicle parking.
- Provide safer pedestrian and bicycle connections to allow nearby residents to get to centers. Regarding Southwest Portland, many comments indicated the critical need for safe pedestrian

and bicycle improvements along busy corridors, which are often the primary connections to centers.

- Comments about East Portland reflected concern over the amount of multifamily development occurring without services. Suggestion included downzoning of areas outside of centers and major corridors, and additional focus on providing cultural facilities.

#### **Growth and change:**

- Allow mixed-use development and higher densities close to light rail stations or in core areas of centers.
- Concern about the impacts of development on historic resources and about new development that is out-of-scale with the character of nearby residential areas. Some comments called for design standards, compatibility with the historic scale of particular centers, and transitions in scale between higher- and lower-density areas.
- Suggestions about the need for area-specific planning, and where and how development should be guided in specific locations.
- Concern about growth in centers impacting housing affordability and causing displacement.

#### **Corridors:**

- Corridors need to be more pedestrian friendly, with more crossings and pedestrian-oriented development. Some comments called for more mixed-use development along corridors, with 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, N Fessenden, and SE Chavez (near Hawthorne/Division) cited most frequently. Several comments expressed a desire for additional residential density along some corridors.
- Improve corridor vitality through neighborhood economic development, additional commercial services and addressing crime.
- Include green street approaches, landscaped medians in wide streets and street trees along corridors.
- Attention should be given to conflicts between trucks and pedestrians. Most comments on this topic sought to prioritize pedestrian safety, while a few raised concerns that center and corridor policies may compromise freight routes.
- Corridors need to be more bicycle friendly, with the need for safe bicycle crossings most frequently identified.
- 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue was identified in several comments as especially needing improvement and investments.
- Focus improvements in centers and neighborhood business districts, rather than along lengthy corridors between these places.

#### **City Greenways:**

- The role of City Greenways as transportation connections needs to be strengthened, and greenways should be considered as part of a more comprehensive network of bicycle facilities.
- Need to restore and maintain existing historic greenways, such as Reed College Place and the Springwater Corridor.
- Requests for additional City Greenways included N Fessenden, N Denver (north of Kenton), SE Steele, NE Glisan through Gateway, and 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.
- Concerns about potential greenway issues, including costs to adjacent neighbors, the fairness of focusing improvements on greenways when nearby streets are not paved, and requests that cyclists pay for greenway improvements.

- While some comments expressed support for greenway connections to the rivers, there was also a request that City Greenways not be located in prime industrial areas, such as the Columbia Corridor.

#### **Centers and corridors mapping:**

- Support for designating Hillsdale and West Portland as Town Centers and Parkrose as a Neighborhood Center.
- The Map App included a question about whether a Neighborhood Center is appropriate at SE 122nd and Foster, but this proposal received no support, with one comment specifically relating that this location would not be a viable center.
- Requests for additional Neighborhood Centers at the following locations: Heart of Foster (Foster & SE 64th), 28th & Burnside, Garden Home, Marquam Hill-Homestead, Lair Hill, Linnton, New Columbia, NE 15th & Fremont, SE 52nd & Flavel, SE 72nd & Flavel, and SE 72nd & Harold. Some of these locations are small commercial nodes, lacking enough commercial or multifamily zoning to become the mixed-use districts intended for centers.
- Suggested adjustments to center locations included showing Sellwood-Moreland as two centers instead of one, showing N Mississippi Avenue as a separate center, and shifting the Creston neighborhood center to SE Foster & 50th. Some comments suggested including SE Division in the Belmont-Hawthorne-Division center, while another comment requested that each of these main streets be a separate neighborhood center.
- Requests for the designation of additional Neighborhood Corridors included SE 11th/12th, SE Bybee, SW Taylors Ferry, SW Multnomah, SW Capitol Highway, and St. Helens Road through Linnton (as a Civic Corridor).

#### **Employment/Industrial**

Over 190 comments submitted on the Comprehensive Plan Update Part 2 were related to employment and industrial lands, and to issues surrounding contamination and brownfields. Comments within employment are summarized according to more specific themes, below.

**West Hayden Island:** Staff received 89 comments opposed to the draft industrial designation on West Hayden Island.

- Many respondents simply urged no development on West Hayden Island.
- Other comments called for protection and restoration of West Hayden Island as a natural area, preference for development of brownfields instead of West Hayden Island, and objections to a marine terminal's relatively few local jobs.
- In contrast, letters from Portland Business Alliance Port of Portland, and Columbia Corridor Association supported a market-feasible West Hayden Island proposal for continuing Portland Harbor expansion.

**Industrial land supply:** Various organizations submitted divergent comments on whether and how to meet the anticipated shortage of industrial lands by 2035.

- Comments from the Portland Business Alliance, the Port of Portland, and Columbia Corridor Association support new industrial areas and intensification initiatives to meet shortfalls, emphasizing family-wage jobs and traded-sector growth.
- In contrast, Portland Audubon and Columbia Slough Watershed Council questioned the size of shortfalls and whether to meet them. Priorities are contested between accommodating forecast

industrial growth and expanding restoration areas and environmental zoning in the same districts.

**Brownfields redevelopment:** Many comments urged that brownfields be a high priority and that the industrial land strategy should prioritize development of brownfields before converting land to industrial use. However, support for how to do so diverged widely. Some expressed either support or strong opposition to brownfield financial incentives, which tend to be a central feature of expanded brownfield programs in other states.

**Overlapping Freight Streets and Civic Corridors:** Opinions varied in Parkrose on the proposed designation of NE Sandy as a Priority Truck Street and Civic Corridor. A few people urged diverting trucks from Sandy to Airport Way in order to support more main street functions on Sandy, while some others noted growing truck congestion there and limited potential for development as a center. Similar concerns were raised in Linnton and St. Johns. Others recommended various freight network improvements and for transit service to be expanded in industrial areas.

**Golf courses:** A few comments addressed the draft industrial designation on parts of airport area golf courses, including opposition to loss of open space, support for owner rezoning requests to industrial, and inclusion of Portland International Raceway. Some commenters noted that potential for golf course reuse is overstated, and Columbia Corridor Association and the Port of Portland added concern about counting it to offset impacts of new environmental zones and open space.

**Campus institutions:** A few comments expressed either support or apprehension about specific institutions and their growth.

**Prime industrial land:** Some support was expressed for no-net-loss of industrial land. However, the Linnton, NW District, and East Columbia neighborhood associations also suggested specific map changes from industrial to other uses.

**Dispersed employment land:** Notably, no comments were received on the new dispersed employment area proposals, except for some questions and implementation suggestions made at the All-PEG and Health Equity workshops that highlighted this topic. See the event summary section for more information.

## **Watershed Health and Green Design**

Over 200 comments related to watershed health, green design, habitat and wildlife, air quality, and other environmental concerns. Many comments identified tension between meeting the need for employment and industrial lands versus environmental health and sustainability. Other comments focused on a broad range of issues, including air pollution, support for urban habitat corridors, green infrastructure, and the need to adequately prepare for natural hazards and improve city resilience. Comments are summarized according to common themes, below.

### **Air quality and public health:**

- There was considerable concern about air quality and public health. Many commenters suggested that the Comprehensive Plan Update should better promote a vision of clean air and healthy communities, and provide more policies and procedures that require consideration of air quality when planning for future industry in Portland.

- Many comments focused on existing air quality problems in North and Northeast Portland due to existing industrial uses, in Southeast Portland due to freight movement, and exposure to pollution at area schools.

#### **Industrial lands shortfall and improving watershed health:**

- Strong support for the clean-up and redevelopment of brownfields to help meet the industrial land supply shortfall and development of strategies to enforce cleanup of contaminated sites by “industrial polluters”.
- Some comments opposed converting private golf courses in the Columbia Corridor to industrial use due to loss of open space and uncertainty as to whether the golf courses would actually convert to industrial use in the next 20 years. Suggestions were made to instead prioritize development of brownfields and improve habitat at the golf courses.
- Support for intensification of industrial uses on developed sites and a call to establish programs to prevent rezoning of industrial land except in extraordinary cases.
- Many comments opposed industrial development on West Hayden Island due to concerns about air quality, noise, and loss of habitat. However, the Port of Portland and the Columbia Corridor Association supported industrial development on the island.
- Concern about the technical assumptions for future industrial land needs, and suggestions to find other strategies to meet job objectives that do not involve converting additional land to industrial use. It was also suggested that the City should address the State Land Use Planning Goal 9 requirement not to exceed the carrying capacity of land, air and water systems.

#### **Urban habitat corridors and areas:**

- There was broad support for maintaining and enhancing Urban Habitat Corridors and Areas throughout Portland. A general theme was protecting, maintaining and enhancing natural areas for multiple benefits such as biodiversity, stormwater management, and reducing risk from hazards such as landslides.
- Other comments expressed support for removing invasive species and supporting pollinators, and tying habitat corridors to climate change preparation strategies.
- Regarding the location of habitat areas, comments supported encouraging growth within the city and protecting resources at the fringe of the urban area, and identifying existing parks, schools, remnant backyards and other non-developed lands as part of the urban habitat corridors.
- Differing opinions about habitat corridors and prime industrial lands ranged from agreement that these habitats areas should be maintained and enhanced with a focus on ecological site design, to suggestions that urban habitat corridors not be shown in prime industrial areas.

#### **City Greenways and Trails:**

- A number of commenters supported maintaining the existing trails system and completing the City Greenways and trails network throughout the city.
- Some commenters cautioned about the cost of greenways and burden of repair being placed on the community, and expressed concerns about equity and using limited public funds to enhance improved rights of way, when so many streets and sidewalks do not meet standards.

#### **Green infrastructure:**



- Include tree planting or street greening as an investment strategy in the Citywide Systems Plan
- Protect existing trees throughout the entire city as part of urban habitat and recognizing canopy targets.
- Recognize the urban form function that the urban forest provides, including continuity that ties each part of the city to the rest.

**Stormwater, natural hazards and resiliency:** Commenters recognized the interconnectedness of these issues, and had the following suggestions:

- Many comments supported protecting existing urban tree canopy and other green infrastructure (e.g., streams and wetlands) to achieve multiple goals including managing stormwater, reducing heat islands, reducing landslide risks and providing habitat.
- Avoid risk and promote resiliency in natural systems by prohibiting or severely restricting development in hazard areas, including floodplains, steep slopes, and potential fire hazard zones.
- Balance stormwater management functions and accommodation of growth.
- Continue to purchase and restore floodplains, and consider how flooding might change with climate change and/or if flood control features (e.g., levees, seawalls) were to fail.
- Having a plan to help neighborhoods after an earthquake, including determining if buildings are safe.

## **Infrastructure**

Over 600 comments related to infrastructure projects and policies as described in the Map App and Citywide Systems Plan. General infrastructure comments, as well as comments specific to transportation, parks and stormwater, are summarized by themes below.

**Asset management:** A number of commenters expressed support for asset management programs to prioritize strategic, preventative maintenance and improvements to the City’s infrastructure systems.

**Economic development:** Some commenters requested a greater discussion throughout the Citywide Systems Plan of the role of infrastructure investment, such as investments to accommodate job growth and promote freight mobility, in supporting economic development and vitality. Commenters expressed a desire to see more highlighting of economic prosperity highlighted as an investment objective. Finally, commenters suggested that the potential equity lens for infrastructure investments integrate questions, criteria, or considerations of related job creation and employment opportunities, particularly for underrepresented groups.

**Rate increases:** Some commenters expressed concern about the potential economic and equity impacts of future sewer, stormwater and water rate increases. They requested that the Citywide Systems Plan include additional discussion of the primary drivers of water, sewer and stormwater rates. They also recommended that the City focus on sound management of infrastructure systems to optimize cost-effective service provision to minimize impacts on rate payers and maintain regional competitiveness.

**Regulatory mandates:** A few commenters noted a need for additional clarity and comprehensiveness regarding the City's regulatory mandates, as well as a discussion of how they contribute to the protection of human health and safety and the environment.

**Goals and policies:** Commenters requested some changes to plan structure, such as the inclusion of associated goals and policies in the Citywide Systems Plan document, rather than a reference to the separate Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies document. A few commenters noted a desire to revisit policies and procedures related to public notification for the sale of surplus public property.

**Green infrastructure:** A number of commenters expressed a desire for better integration of green infrastructure and natural systems throughout the Citywide Systems Plan. Specifically, they called for 1) a clearer definition, description and discussion of the infrastructure, economic, environmental and social services and values provided by these systems; 2) treatment of green infrastructure and tree canopy as an asset class (including information on value, condition, needs, investments, etc.); and 3) description of the role of green infrastructure in meeting the City's regulatory requirements.

**Trails:** A few commenters requested more comprehensive and coordinated planning for trails across the recreation and transportation-related chapters of the Citywide Systems Plan, as well as corrections to alignments of trails in southwest Portland.

## **Parks and Recreation**

**Investment strategy:** Some commenters requested that the Citywide Systems Plan include a more complete investment strategy for Portland Parks & Recreation, akin to those included for other systems. Specifically, commenters expressed an interest in including projects and strategies to address maintenance backlog, and additional information on alternative funding sources.

**Natural areas:** Some comments reflected a desire to more clearly describe the role of Portland Parks & Recreation in protecting and enhancing the City's environment and natural resources, including habitat restoration in natural areas. Other commenters suggested a need for improved public access and passive recreation in natural areas such as Forest Park, Beggars Tick, Rosemont Bluff and Dickinson Park.

**Existing parks:** A number of commenters expressed interest in development of planned parks or improvements to existing parks to provide additional recreation opportunities. Specific locations include Beech Park, Gateway Green, Lents Park, Rose City Park, and Kern Park. Commenters also identified maintenance and security concerns about existing parks and other facilities, including vandalism, dense tree canopy and lack of lighting.

**Trails:** A number of commenters supported expanding the trail system, particularly to create connections to existing trails, and provide access to natural areas. Completing the Springwater Corridor Trail through inner Southeast Portland was of particular interest. There was also support for additional family-friendly trails for off-road mountain biking, but other commenters were unsupportive of mountain biking based on concerns about potential impacts to natural habitat.

**New parks:** Commenters identified desired park acquisition areas, including locations for improved recreation access to the Willamette River and a desire for additional parks in the Hollywood Town Center, Goose Hollow, West Portland Park, Madison South, and Kenton neighborhoods.

## **Stormwater**

**Site-specific comments:** A number of commenters identified locations in SE, SW and NE Portland with stormwater management problems (e.g. flooding and erosion) during storms. The Linnton Neighborhood Association expressed support for the area's designation for future study as a 'stormwater management challenge area', noting that future infill development could exceed the area's stormwater management capacity.

**Watersheds:** A few commenters requested additional information in the Citywide System Plan regarding each watershed's specific challenges and current and future management strategies.

**Drainage Districts:** Some comments suggested that the Citywide System Plan better acknowledge the role of the Multnomah County No 1 and Peninsula Drainage Districts No 1 and No 2 in providing stormwater conveyance and flood management in the Columbia Slough Watershed.

**Brownfields:** A number of commenters requested additional discussion of the City's future investment in brownfield remediation and clean-up of the Portland Harbor Superfund site.

## Land Use

Close to 350 comments related to land use, including zoning designations, residential compatibility issues, pattern areas, and land-use related implementation projects. The comments are summarized according to common themes below. Note that many individual land use requests were also submitted through the public comment process, and not every individual request is addressed below. See the district summaries for more location-specific information.

**Mixed use zoning:** Main streets and civic corridors should have mixed use or commercial zoning that allows for the activation of the streetscape, while remaining sensitive to adjacent areas with lower intensity of uses/development.

- Consistent commercial or mixed use zoning on corridors, with requirements for ground floor active space, would encourage an active pedestrian environment along the street, and provide opportunities for neighborhood serving commercial.
- Applying commercial or mixed-use zones on the entire corridor would eliminate much of the non-conforming use issues that exist on many of our main streets.
- Transitions and neighborhood context are important between the zoning on the main streets and development elsewhere. Stepdowns and setbacks are important to mitigate impacts on livability.
- Additional design criteria and/or standards should be considered to achieve these transition and street activation goals.

**Nonconforming uses:** Outside of main streets, the city should address existing nonconforming uses, especially small commercial buildings in residential zones.

- Many nonconforming uses have existed for over twenty years and serve as viable neighborhood commercial hubs, despite the City's desire for them to be redeveloped under the changed zoning. Changing the zoning would allow further investment in these uses and development.

**Scale and type of redevelopment in established residential neighborhoods:** Many comments suggest that redevelopment can create a lot of impacts to the neighborhood without providing any increases in livability and/or acknowledging the benefit of housing preservation. Issues include:

- Many comments focused on the changes that teardowns and new housing can mean for residential neighborhoods. For example, new housing is often out of scale with the neighborhood and limits sunlight in neighboring yards. Frequently, new housing is also much less affordable than the house it replaces.
- Skinny houses can still be an issue in some areas, effectively creating R2.5 development within the R5 zone.
- Several areas with multi-dwelling residential zoning contain established single-dwelling residential neighborhoods, often in lower income areas. Haphazard development can occur in these situations, creating compatibility and transition issues. Other areas with multi-dwelling zoning don't have a transition zone between them and lower density zoning. Several comments question the logic of these zoning patterns.
- The city does not have a strategy for preserving existing housing stock. Even within historic districts, lots with houses may have R1 zoning, which creates redevelopment pressure. Some of these areas should be downzoned in an attempt to direct new development to centers and corridors.
- Related to the above issues, the city should re-assess older plan areas such as Albina to determine their effectiveness in improving the neighborhood and consider using design standards in residential areas to address concerns.

**Notification and involvement:** Neighborhood and associated groups would like to be notified of development and events in their areas and be given more discussion opportunities earlier on in the planning process. Comments surrounding notification and neighborhood involvement focused on:

- On all levels, commenters suggested that the notification process needs to be refreshed, and notification language should be clear and easy to understand. Commenters particularly noted concerns around demolitions, citing a desire to prepare their area for impacts from demolitions. Notification should be more consistent across different zones as well.
- Institutions within residential neighborhoods should still go through the Conditional Use process to ensure neighborhood notification and review.
- In general, neighbors would like more of a say on what will be built within their neighborhoods and main streets, particularly when publicly owned land is involved.

**Infill projects:** Infill projects have generated some additional issues that don't necessarily fall under the above topics. These include:

- Micro-apartments should not be considered as group living and should be subject to the parking standards for multi-dwelling development.
- Parking policy should be revised to consider a 'right sized' set of requirements tied into the area's existing parking demands and transportation alternatives.
- Development review should incorporate traffic studies for mixed use or residential infill.

- Garbage and recycling standards often don't work with condo/rowhouse developments proposed on a single lot.

**Efficient use of existing industrial land:** The City's industrial land policy and zoning should be to work more efficiently with what we have, rather than a continued search for new land.

- The city should focus their efforts on the redevelopment of brownfields first.
- Some commenters stated that the city should not consider industrial zoning for West Hayden Island or golf courses unless other land supplies have been exhausted. Other commenters state that ensuring a significant amount of additional employment land is a priority.
- The city should clarify its priority for designating EG lands. These lands are intended for employment growth but there have been recent approvals for residential development on these lands.
- Designating land uses for employment by itself won't benefit under-served populations unless corresponding training and hiring requirements are also implemented.

**Infrastructure and land use:** There should be a better link between an area's infrastructure planning and its land use planning.

- Land use planning should be done in conjunction with large scale infrastructure projects such as light rail to consider greater development opportunities adjacent to stations.
- Up zoning and multi-dwelling development should be done in conjunction with street, utility, parks and school improvements, to better link services to densification.

## District Summaries

The following discussion summarizes all comments received during the public comment period, sorted by general themes according to district: North, Northeast, Southeast, East, West, and Central City. Many comments reflect the content of Mapping Conversations or other public meetings described in this report introduction, some of which were tailored to specific group interests or geographies. For a complete list of all 98 workshops, meetings, and other events conducted during the comment period, please see Attachment A. Other comments reflect more general feedback on the district or a specific theme.

### North District Summary

Staff received 209 comments pertaining to Portland's North District. Topic areas that received considerable district attention included development of West Hayden Island, industrial lands, centers, corridors and greenways, transportation as related to bike and pedestrian needs, and the Columbia River Crossing. More detailed summaries of comments by topic area are included below.

#### **Employment/Industrial:**

- Air quality was identified by commenters as a major concern for North Portland, often linked to industrial land use practices and impacts.
- A few comments stated that North Portland accommodates more than its share of industrial and employment land, and that it may be questionable to allocate more land in this area for industry.

- It was also suggested that the City focus on cleaning up brownfields and intensifying use on existing industrial land wherever possible, instead of converting natural areas and golf courses to industrial use. Many of these commenters also thought that the key to meeting demand for employment in the City is to increase the density/intensity of existing industrial lands.
- Many commenters also suggested that West Hayden Island is a key habitat and natural resource area and should not be developed for industrial use. However, some commenters support development of a new marine terminal.
- Some comments addressed the draft industrial designation on parts of airport area golf courses specifically, and expressed opposition to loss of open space and support for owner rezoning requests to industrial.
- Some comments noted that potential for golf course conversion to open space is overstated, and Columbia Crossing Association and the Port of Portland added concern about placing too much reliance on golf course conversion to address the industrial land shortfall or to offset impacts of new environmental zones and open space.
- Commenters also identified Portland International Raceway as an option for conversion to a mix of industrial and open space uses

#### **Centers and Corridors:**

- Commenters generally supported small, local business growth on corridors.
- Respondents identified a need to provide better linkage between Lombard Street and downtown Kenton.
- Find a way to better serve the New Columbia and East Columbia/Bridgeton areas by creating centers, or better linking them to proposed/existing commercial centers.
- Business vacancy and vitality on key corridors should be addressed, by rezoning if necessary.
- Consider commercial and mixed use opportunities on Fessenden/St Louis. Rezone to accommodate these uses.
- Support for more walkable/pedestrian oriented development on N Lombard and in St. Johns. Zoning should support that aspiration.

#### **Transportation/Access:**

- Support for Lombard as a pedestrian and bike-friendly street that supports retail and mixed use development. Improve sidewalks and bike options on Lombard. Add bike/pedestrian features to existing rail crossing bridge.
- Support for a streetcar line along Lombard.
- Improve pedestrian and bike connections along Denver, north from Kenton.
- The Columbia River Crossing project needs to change or be revised.
- There is strong support for trails on the peninsula, including the North Portland Greenway Trail.
- Improve neighborhood connections between Linnton and the Willamette River. A suggestion was to link NW 107<sup>th</sup> with the river and an existing City-owned beach.

#### **Land Use/Development and Neighborhood Character:**

- Consider changes in zoning on Lombard between St. Louis and Bruce.
- Support more local businesses and limit fast food outlets.
- Concern about infill and small lot development changing the character of neighborhoods.

### **City Greenways and Urban Habitat Corridors:**

- Strong support for greenways and urban habitat corridors in and around St. Johns, including links to the Willamette bluff trail and to the river.
- Fessenden between the railroad cut and McCoy Park would make a great greenway. It has wide medians and would connect two parks and the Peninsula Crossing Trail to bike lanes; would be great to make it a more walkable, bikeable street.
- Denver Avenue and Lombard between Fortune and Hurst (St. Johns) may also be appropriate greenway candidates.
- Extend the greenway along Willamette Boulevard, and also on key streets intersecting Willamette.
- Concerns about the cost of developing greenways were expressed. Some comments pointed out that it may be more important to fix the substandard streets and sidewalks first.
- Add amenities to the Columbia Slough Trail, including educational signs, public art, drinking fountains and benches.

### **Infrastructure:**

- Kingsley Park needs funding for improvements, and Linnton lacks a developed park.
- Plan for parks deficient areas, such as the East Kenton/North Interstate corridor.

### **Comprehensive Plan Update Process:**

- Respect and acknowledge citizen input; many people in North Portland and the Peninsula feel that decisions do not respect community desires.

## **Northeast District Summary**

Staff received 165 public comments that were focused on Northeast Portland. Transportation access, historic preservation and neighborhood character, and the 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Corridor are some of the topics that received considerable attention in Northeast Portland. Comments are summarized and grouped by topic below:

### **Transportation/Access:**

- Individuals commented on the need for safety improvements, particularly for pedestrians and cyclists, as well as for children, older adults and physically challenged people. Commenters also frequently noted that sidewalk connections on school routes are needed improvements to ensure safe access for children walking and cycling to school.
- There was also interest expressed in streetcar extensions, specifically along Sandy Blvd, Cesar E. Chavez Boulevard, Alberta Street, and Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard connecting to the Broadway Bridge.
- Many individuals focused on needed enhancements for cyclist safety and access, including: better connectivity over freeways and to the future Sullivan's Gulch trail; an 80's bikeway from the Airport to the Springwater Corridor; connections to Gateway Green; utilizing NE 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue as a multi-modal parkway between the Columbia River path and the Airport, via new Colwood property, Thomas Cully Park, and Rose City Golf Course.

### **Infrastructure, Development and Neighborhood Livability**

Commenters raised issues about the impacts of development in some areas where new development is changing residential neighborhoods and affecting livability.

- Comments identified the need for parks in Hollywood and Sumner neighborhoods, a community center for the north/central area of NE Portland, and improvements around MAX station areas.
- Development-related comments included:
  - Impacts of new RX zoning on the residential area adjacent to Williams Ave;
  - Need for revitalization, including use of vacant buildings in the northern section of NE Martin Luther King Jr. Boulevard, near the 60<sup>th</sup> Avenue MAX station area, and in the Cully neighborhood.
  - In small business districts like NE Fremont Street and 42nd Avenue, require 0.75 parking spaces for each new apartment unit built, and limit heights to three stories to retain the quality of life and character of the neighborhood.

### **Historic Preservation**

Commenters were interested in preserving older residential homes in the face of development pressure.

- The Eliot Neighborhood Association land use committee submitted a proposal to address preservation of the older residential area, including the suggestion to re-designate all R2 (multi-dwelling) to R2.5 (single-family) within the Eliot Historic Conservation District between N Williams and NE MLK and parts of NE MLK to 7<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Concern that the plan seems to put historic homes more at risk. Can lots be down-zoned to protect the homes?
- Will being identified as a center enable commercial uses in areas now zoned residential to be expanded in a manner that puts 100+ year old buildings at risk of redevelopment?
- How does the Centers map reflect Conservation Districts? There seem to be many historic homes in this area that are at risk with the "Center" idea. Why not work toward corridors?
- Teardowns and large new homes are changing the nature of single family neighborhoods. We need to better mix these development types, and also better define remodeling versus new construction.
- Other zoning related comments included suggestions to:
  - Create a new overlay that requires housing in parcels zoned for non-residential (Commercial or Employment) uses.
  - Rezone residential areas along MLK to EX. Primarily this is a change from RH to EX.
  - Rezone RX parcels to EX, RH or R1.

### **82nd Avenue**

Many commenters were interested in focusing on planning for 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and addressing issues in that corridor such as revitalization, safety, parking and transportation. These comments are representative:

- Downzone 82nd Avenue. Its strip malls take small businesses away from neighborhood business districts.
- Encourage owners of large parking lots to redevelop.
- 82nd Avenue is a corridor that hasn't had a major planning process in more than 20 years. This should be corrected in the near future, to help strengthen both businesses and the neighborhood.
- Neighborhood watch and other efforts helped to close a business associated with criminal activity. In order for 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue to thrive, we need more planning efforts to help address crime.
- Pedestrian and bicycle access to and from, and along 82nd Avenue needs a lot of improvement.



### **Employment/Industrial**

- Some comments addressed the draft industrial designation on parts of airport area golf courses specifically, and expressed opposition to loss of open space and support for owner rezoning requests to industrial.
- Some comments noted that potential for golf course conversion to open space is overstated, and Columbia Crossing Association and the Port of Portland added concern about placing too much reliance on golf course conversion to address the industrial land shortfall or to offset impacts of new environmental zones and open space.
- Commenters also suggested that the City should focus on cleaning up brownfields and intensifying use on existing industrial land before converting natural areas and golf courses to industrial use.

### **Watershed Health and Stormwater Management**

Comments also identified specific places where stormwater or situational flooding is a concern, including Northeast 45<sup>th</sup> near Simpson and Whitaker Ponds.

### **Southeast District Summary**

During the CPU public comment period, staff received 350 comments concerning Southeast Portland. Major themes emerging from these comments include improvements to city streets, thinking about future high capacity transit, suggestions regarding zoning or land use designations, and feedback regarding neighborhood centers and corridors. More representative comments are included below.

#### **Transportation:**

- Sidewalks, center dividers, pedestrian crossings, and other safety improvements were recommended across the Southeast district, particularly on 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue and areas around the Portland Community College Southeast Center campus.
- Foster Road received a number of comments, many referring to earlier planning efforts along the road. Comments seemed evenly split between supporters of a “road diet” for Foster Road, including the provision of bicycle lanes, and those advocating for maintaining the existing lanes devoted to automobile traffic.
- Unpaved streets in Brentwood Darlington and sections of Woodstock received a lot of attention. Commenters would like to see these sections paved.
- A number of comments identified alignments for bike paths and bike lanes throughout the district.
- Safe routes to schools safety improvements were requested around school sites.
- Parking issues related to apartments remain a source of frustration for some respondents.

#### **Land Use:**

- Down zoning (R7 to R5) and removing underlying (R5) Comp Plan designations were suggested by both the Reed and Eastmoreland Neighborhood Associations.
- Eastmoreland Neighborhood Association also requested amendments to their Plan District boundary and text.
- A number of requests for commercial zoning were submitted to accommodate existing non-conforming uses such as the Laurelhurst Market and Music Millennium on Burnside.

- Comments were submitted supporting increased density and commercial activity surrounding existing Max Station areas (60<sup>th</sup> Avenue) as well as station areas under construction along the Orange Line.
- Numerous comments were also submitted objecting to the demolition of existing housing stock to support construction of new, larger homes often seen as out of character with the existing neighborhood, or subdivision of vacant lots following home demolition for the construction of multiple new dwellings.

#### **Centers and Corridors:**

- A number of additional neighborhood center designations were suggested, including, but not limited to: Flavel between 52<sup>nd</sup> and 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenues; Foster Road between 60<sup>th</sup> and 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenues; the intersection of Milwaukie Boulevard and Bybee; Brentwood Darlington; and around 28<sup>th</sup> and Burnside.
- The proposed Belmont-Hawthorne-Division Town Center received mixed reaction from commenters. A number of respondents expressed confusion over what such a designation would mean on the ground, while a number of others were inclined to adjust the Town Center circle so that it better matched their experience of the activity along these three commercial corridors.
- Woodstock representatives called for a number of rezonings along Woodstock Boulevard and adjoining properties to support increased vitality for this commercial district.
- A number of comments were submitted regarding Cesar Chavez Boulevard suggesting increased commercial zoning along certain sections or other means of treating this roadway as an important North/South corridor linking a number of commercial areas.
- Air quality is poor along McLoughlin Blvd (and other arterials) and should be considered before adding any additional residential density along this corridor.

#### **City Greenways and Urban Habitat Corridors:**

- Support was expressed for the draft of Urban Habitat Corridors proposed for the Johnson Creek and Crystal Springs areas.
- Commenters expressed disappointment over the lack of city maintenance for the Reedway Place Parkway and other city greenways.
- The Springwater Corridor was the subject of numerous comments ranging from support for its completion through the “Sellwood Gap,” to safety issues such as a lack of police patrol and presence of homeless camps and drug activity along certain stretches.
- Support was also expressed for improving neighborhood connections between Brooklyn Neighborhood and the Willamette River.
- Lone Fir Cemetery, 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue between Mt. Tabor and Mt. Scott, and Eastmoreland Golf Course should be added as part of a City Greenway and/or a Habitat Corridor.
- Street greening, including tree planting and other amenities along specific corridors, was suggested at SE Stark and at SE 50<sup>th</sup> from Powell to Division.

#### **Infrastructure:**

- A number of comments pointed out parks that are unkept and used as homeless parks and offered suggestions for park improvements, such as a fenced dog run at Berkeley Park. Comments also noted the City has not kept its word regarding a SE Community Center.
- Others commented on the appearance of the rental property on Grand just South of the Oaks Pioneer Church.
- Others commented on the disposition of surplus City property such as the PF&R property near Orange Line Union Station.

#### **Stormwater Management:**

- Storm related flooding is a concern at/around SE 20<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Belmont, SE 28<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Woodstock, and in Eastmoreland.
- Support was expressed for combination curb bump-out and bioswale to address multiple issues at SE 12<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Harrison.

#### **Employment/Industrial:**

- There was widespread support for rehabilitation of brownfields.
- There was also acknowledgement of Providence Hospital's importance in providing employment opportunities, goods and services to the surrounding neighborhood.

### **East District Summary**

Staff received 218 comments on the Comp Plan Update Part 2 related to East Portland. Major themes for Southeast Portland include infrastructure, citywide equity, and how to create more complete neighborhoods. Many East comments, in particular, were also focused on centers, and what these centers will need to be successful. The following summary provides a snapshot of the majority of comments, grouped by themes reflecting either topic summaries, or other common themes that emerged among commenters.

#### **Infrastructure, Services, and Amenities**

Many comments in the East Portland district centered around specific facilities, services, or other improvements that people would like to see more of, and feel are currently lacking compared with other areas of the city.

- There were many requests for improved park services and better access to parks (many of which are located behind developed properties with limited street presence).
- Commenters wanted to see more grocery stores such as New Seasons and Trader Joe's, more farmer's markets, and increased variety and choice for grocery shopping.
- It was expressed that East Portland currently lacks access to arts and culture despite major potential to become a second center, especially at Gateway and Lents. Currently, this potential is hurt by lack of reliable transit service at night and on weekends from East Portland to downtown. Suggestions included utilizing Marshall High School as a mixed use center with medium density housing and urban amenities such as theaters and an amphitheater at Lents Park.

- One suggestion was to mark the Gateway Park property (south of Halsey, between 104th & 106th) as a park development site.

### **Neighborhood Character**

Many comments expressed concern over the amount of potential residential development and infill without services and amenities in place to accommodate the growth.

- There is general support for focusing growth in centers, especially in the existing Lents Town Center and along corridors in Gateway. However, this support was tempered by a stated need for zone changes to limit big box retail and encourage smaller, neighborhood-serving commercial in Lents. Some commenters suggested downzoning in specific areas of East Portland.
- In tandem with density concerns are issues about building appearance and site design, including design standards that reflect the various characteristics of East Portland neighborhoods. This wish is reflected in comments ranging from design requirements for the Lents EcoDistrict to desires for better transitions between buildings and better site planning for multifamily developments. East Portland residents are also largely in favor of rules to generate better-looking and improved construction standards for residential development.

### **Transportation**

Comments related to all modes of transportation make up the majority of the feedback that staff heard concerning East Portland during this commenting process. Some community groups reviewed the Transportation System Plan line by line, while others used the East Portland in Motion project to express support or suggest priorities for identified projects. In addition, there are comments directed at TriMet (improved bus service, safety) and ODOT (suggestions for 82<sup>nd</sup> Ave and Powell Blvd). Many comments are very specific, citing street sections in need of pedestrian or bike improvement, locations where speeding cars make other modes of travel unsafe, and existing crosswalks that need additional safety measures. Comment highlights are summarized below:

- Connection of Fremont to 148th would create high volume, high speed traffic through residential area – see TSP. Bikeway or Pedestrian access only.
- Continuous sidewalks should connect the University of Western States campus from NE 132nd to Halsey, and from Morris Court/Siskiyou to campus, for improved safety.
- 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue would benefit greatly from a streetcar service. It is one of the few bus lines that is at capacity, and the development/livability opportunities are immense. Imagine if Montavilla, Division, Foster areas were unified by an 82<sup>nd</sup> streetcar.
- Connecting NE Oregon Street from 102<sup>nd</sup> to 99<sup>th</sup>, across the vacant parcels, would greatly enhance circulation in Gateway.
- Use the existing sewer/water easement to push a bike/pedestrian multi-use path through farm, to connect Argay to Wilkes, on NE Fremont (near 148<sup>th</sup>).

### **Centers and Corridors:**

- Parkrose Center: The Parkrose business and residential community is energized around the subject of increasing the capacity of Sandy Blvd as a Priority Truck Route and many comments reflect this. Comments also reflect the community desire to decrease and slow traffic on Sandy, especially through the commercial core (99th to 121st), to make improvements to freeway

on/off ramps and signage, to move truck traffic to Airport Way, and to keep Parkrose a designated Center.

- Lents Town Center: The Foster Lents Integration Partnership (FLIP) was a multi-bureau effort to engage the Lents TC community and identify catalytic projects that both the city and the community could promote. The timing works well to integrate some of the outcomes from FLIP into the Comprehensive Plan. FLIP also highlighted the need to better integrate the area east of I-205, although the challenges are very different from those west of I-205. How can the area east of I-205 be better integrated?
- Gateway Regional Center: Most of the comments concerning Gateway Center were from property owners requesting specific zoning changes, or related to the Transportation System Plan and proposed street improvements. There were several comments in support of growth along the corridors within or adjacent to Gateway, such as:
  - Encourage new development along major urban boulevards like 102<sup>nd</sup> that have exterior lighting, so that in dark Portland winters the area is bright and welcoming.
  - Additional comments focus on the multi-use path along the MAX line, access to Gateway Green, and improving the safety and pedestrian experience at the transit center, especially the lack of sidewalks on the south side of NE Pacific Street.
- 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue of the Roses: 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue is receiving more interest from surrounding neighborhoods who are coordinating their efforts to review past planning studies so they'll be more informed about the opportunities and constraints for 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, and prepared to participate in a potential future planning process. A few comments suggest zoning changes, and/or changes in the roadway to help improve the safety and comfort for pedestrians, and improve economic development in the corridor.

#### **City Greenways and Urban Habitat Corridors:**

- Specific locations where commenters mentioned they would like to see street greening activities in the form of tree planting and other amenities included SE Division from SE 82<sup>nd</sup> to SE 92<sup>nd</sup> Avenues, portions east of SE 82<sup>nd</sup> where the street is an eyesore, and SE 82<sup>nd</sup> Avenue.
- Suggestions for additional urban habitat and corridor designations included land Southeast 82<sup>nd</sup> and Siskiyou, Wetlands in East Columbia Neighborhood, and Maywood Park.

#### **Watershed Health:**

- Comments overwhelmingly support the natural areas in the Johnson Creek Watershed, and include suggestions for planting improvements, adding amenities to natural area parks, continuing the work of floodplain restoration, and expanding impervious surface limits to be watershed-wide.
- Suggestions also included continuing to buy up developed properties and convert it back to natural flood mitigation areas, potentially with Metro's Natural Area Levy funding, to reduce risk and save the public money in future flood events.

#### **Employment/Economic Development**

There are relatively few comments related to employment and economic development in East Portland, but the community is aware that overall "livability" includes access to family wage jobs and healthy businesses existing within the community.

- In several group discussions, brownfield rehabilitation was identified as a need, although there were no written comments on the topic.

- When looking at giving institutions more development capacity, there should be some consideration of how they actually contribute to the community.
- Create transit connections between employment centers that bypass downtown.
- Employment density should be increased in the area around the Flavel MAX stop. Allow for mixed light industry office space development.

### **Resiliency and Emergency Preparedness**

Some in the community feel that East Portland is particularly at risk during an emergency situation due to the high level of poverty and high numbers of new immigrants.

- Many comments focused on resiliency tactics for emergency situations that will have the added effect of “raising all boats” and integrating new Portlanders more quickly.
- Given that so many people are food insecure, what is the City doing to help people after a disaster?
- On a more ongoing basis, what is being done to either bring grocery stores and/or reduce density in areas with fewer services?

## **West District Summary**

About 100 public comments were received pertaining to Portland’s West District. The following summary is organized by themes for ease of reference. Major themes include Centers, Corridors and Healthy Connected Neighborhoods, Transportation, Infrastructure, and Watershed Health. For clarity this comment summary has been divided into *Southwest* and *Northwest* sections based on the District Coalition boundaries of Southwest Neighborhoods Inc. (SWNI) and Neighbors West Northwest (NWNW).

### **Southwest**

For the Southwest the majority of comments related partly or in whole to transportation, while comments related to centers and corridors and infrastructure also carried considerable weight, followed by watershed health and land use concerns.

### **Centers, corridors and healthy connected neighborhoods**

Generally comments supported the idea of growth being focused in the proposed centers and corridors and offered nuanced considerations of existing conditions and needs in southwest.

- Citywide distribution of vibrant centers should be balanced with strategic investment decisions that will reflect nearer term market realities and higher growth areas. Centers should also be designated based on how they function in the context of the communities they serve versus an arbitrary size threshold.
- Redirect the Urban Design Framework regarding West Portland Town Center to reflect prior council approved language for this center that calls for addressing the “deficiencies that are preventing the ‘Crossroads’ from achieving its potential as a Town Center.”
- West Portland Town Center (“Crossroads”) is well positioned to absorb more density but needs a focused town center planning effort, as recommended in the Barbur Concept Plan, to begin addressing the transportation deficiencies and potential land use changes to meet city and regional goals as well as serve nearby neighborhoods.

- Requests were made for additional Neighborhood Center locations included Garden Home, Marquam Hill-Homestead and Lair Hill.
- Requests were also made for the designation of additional Neighborhood Corridors included SW Taylors Ferry, SW Multnomah (from Multnomah Village to Garden Home) and SW Capitol Highway (from Multnomah Village to Portland Community College's Sylvania Campus).

### **Transportation**

The majority of transportation related comments centered on needed active transportation facility, trail or transit service improvements, and the funding to carry these projects out.

- Transit service and access in many parts of southwest, particularly away from the central corridor, needs to be improved. Transit dependent populations like high school students and seniors need non-peak service and safe pedestrian facilities to access transit.
- SW Capitol Highway is the vital link between Hillsdale, Multnomah and West Portland. It needs to be upgraded and developed. In Hillsdale, SW Capitol has conflicting state and local freight/truck classifications that need to be aligned.
- There were suggestions for future high capacity transit alignments including routes that serve OHSU, Hillsdale, Southwest Community Center, Washington Square and Tigard.
- Need expressed for pedestrian facilities or safety upgrades in specific locations included: SW 30<sup>th</sup> Avenue north of Multnomah Village, SW Coronado west of Tryon Creek State Park, SW Broadway Drive at Davenport and other areas, SW Boones Ferry south of SW Stephenson and SW Taylor's Ferry between Capitol Highway and SW 48<sup>th</sup> Avenue.
- Establish and maintain a logical and clear hierarchy and relationship between the current Comprehensive Plan and other plans such as the Barbur Concept Plan and Portland Bicycle Plan.
- "Green streets" should not preclude needed active transportation facilities. The City needs to improve its practices around resolving the conflicts between water quality requirements and costs for needed infrastructure.
- Marquam Hill needs upgraded and appropriate transportation facilities to support future growth and provide basic levels of safety and livability for surrounding neighborhoods.

### **Watershed Health, Urban Habitat Areas and Corridors, and Stormwater Management**

In the Southwest environmental and stormwater and transportation infrastructure issues often overlap. The following is a sampling of other related comments:

- More effort needs to be made to find ways to balance development needs and natural systems. Directing growth to the boundaries of the region provides no net environmental benefit.
- Natural and habitat areas across southwest need restoration, maintenance and protection.
- The Urban Habitat Corridors are applied too broadly in southwest. The key work is to figure out where the critical areas and linkages are and how they should be treated.
- Areas of southwest have existing Codes, Covenants, and Restrictions (CCR's) that limit how the land can be developed or divided.

### **Parks and General Infrastructure:**

- The area south of I-5 is deficient in recreational park facilities.
- Public investments in infrastructure and maintenance must go to areas of existing housing and businesses. Investments should not focus just on infrastructure associated with new

development, like South Waterfront. Investment should be made in areas with serious infrastructure deficiencies like residential southwest and outer east Portland.

- The question of whether the City should consider limiting the level of development in certain areas of the city based on infrastructure inadequacies still needs to be considered.
- Map App and growth scenarios analysis do not offer as good a tool for planning as would review and consideration of the City's infrastructure spending history by location.

#### **Resiliency and Emergency Preparedness:**

- Earthquake hazard preparation, response and recovery need much more attention than a few general policy statements.

#### **Comprehensive Plan Update Process:**

- Please continue to improve efforts to reach out to underrepresented communities as well as younger participants as part of planning efforts.

#### **Northwest**

For the Northwest the majority of comments related partly or in whole to transportation. Other major themes included land use concerns, centers, and infrastructure.

#### **Centers, corridors and healthy connected neighborhoods**

Few comments were directed specifically at the designation of the one NW Town Center proposed.

- Preserve historic buildings and character in NW Portland as these limited and irreplaceable resources are an important part of the city. In particular the City should strengthen its commitment to historic preservation city-wide, update the inventory of historic resources and review zoning designations that allow development that is inconsistent with historic area goals.
- Strengthen the Comprehensive Plan to allow only sensitive and appropriate infill development particularly in areas with historic structures. Land use map designations should be updated in these areas to better match current uses and historic district goals.
- Strengthen provisions for affordable housing for elderly, special needs and other very low income populations in this and other centers.
- Provide more retirement or progressive long term care options in inner NW Portland. NW is a prime place for connecting young and old for a more rewarding life for all.
- Building heights proposed along Burnside, along with other areas adjacent to the Central City are too high. The conclusion that the proposed heights achieve the dense and walkable neighborhoods desired is premature and more careful consideration is warranted.

**Transportation:** A broad range of comments were received related to transportation. Transit service and access, congestion and safety improvements were common themes.

- Frequent transit access for the NW district is inaccurately represented as there is currently little, if any, frequent transit service.
- Traffic from growth west of the city (north of Highway 26) is already impacting city roads and neighborhoods and the growth trend continues. These impacts should be considered and addressed as part of the Comprehensive Plan Update given that existing facilities like Burnside, Hwy 26 and parking at the Sunset transit station are congested or at capacity and there are no other transit options on the few roads that feed into Portland.



- Importance of incorporating the Con-Way Master Plan recommended improvements into the TSP was noted as critical to relieving congestion in the next 10 years.
- Make the streetcar more financially self-sustainable along with fares that cover a larger share of the total costs.
- A western bypass highway to the west of Portland would render it a bedroom community for the rest of the Metro area.
- Washington Park and nearby transit access by surrounding communities is hindered by the lack of safe pedestrian facilities. Future Washington Park parking revenues should in part be used to improve surrounding intersections and pedestrian facilities.
- A balanced approach to parking is needed in the Comprehensive Plan. Citywide or one-size parking solutions are ineffective. A rational system for determining off-site parking needs for development would be welcomed as would an expansion of well designed, affordable and secure accessory parking structures for residents and businesses in NW Portland.

### **Infrastructure**

Infrastructure comments predominantly centered on Parks issues.

- Northwest Portland needs a comprehensive community recreation center like the Southwest Community Center, built in a way that fits the landscape and the population's needs. Some NW residents currently drive over 6 miles to use such community facilities elsewhere.
- Support for and opposition to mountain biking in Forest Park.

### **Draft land use, area or parcel specific mapping proposals:**

- Concern and questions were raised as to why portions of inner Northwest (in the Northwest District Association boundary) were being called out for potential conversion to the Residential 5,000 (R5) zone from the existing High Density Residential (RH) designations. One commenter noted that Residential 1,000 (R1) or higher is more appropriate here.
- Revise the land use designations in the area west of I-405 to be more compatible with and better reflect the mixed-use evolution that is occurring with mixed residential, light commercial, professional office and micro-business uses.

## **Central City District Summary**

Thirty-six comments were received relating directly to the Central City. The following are highlights of these comments:

### **Transportation:**

- There were many very specific transportation comments on the full range of modes: motor vehicle, bicycle, pedestrian and transit.
- There was also concern about the financial cost of transportation improvements and cost of transit services generally.
- There were several comments about the role of the Central City as a regional transportation hub. This included support for maintaining Union Station as the passenger rail terminal for the region as improvements are made to that system.
- There were several comments seeking to remove the Eastbank Freeway and about land uses along the waterfront in the Central Eastside.

**Other:**

- One person observed a need for a more inclusive, open process.
- There was some criticism of the quality and the value of public art.

## Event Summaries

Below are summaries of a few key events hosted during the public comment period for the CPU Working Draft Part 2, that were focused on engaging the community interactively on selected topics. Three Mapping Conversations built on conversations held in the spring focused on locally specific issues or questions facing certain districts. The All-PEG meeting, the Our 42<sup>nd</sup> Avenue meeting, and the Health Equity meeting provided additional insights regarding elements of the Comprehensive Plan Update.

### All-PEG Meeting

1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue

Friday, October 18, 2013

Attendees: Approximately 50

Staff: Comprehensive Plan Update Team

The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability formed eight Policy Expert Groups (PEGs) to help develop, review and provide comments to City staff on proposed policy recommendations for the Portland Comprehensive Plan Update. The Policy Expert Groups met from June 2012 through June 2013. Each group consisted of approximately 15 to 25 members, representing both community and government viewpoints, as well as specific skills and expertise that related to each PEG topic including Community Involvement, Economic Development, Education and Youth Success, Watershed Health and Environment, Infrastructure Equity, Neighborhood Centers and Corridors, Residential Development and Compatibility, and Networks.

In October 2013, BPS hosted an All-PEG meeting to allow for additional opportunities for PEG members to share their expertise, insights from other PEG members and hold policy discussions. Staff previewed the Working Draft Part 2 and walked through the Map App. PEG members engaged in three map exercises to gain exposure to the Map App and discuss specific topics addressed in Part 2.

Below is a short description of PEG group feedback according to discussion topic. The full summary of map exercise discussions can be found on the Comprehensive Plan web site <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/473108>.

#### **“How should we create healthy, connected “complete” neighborhoods in East Portland?”**

- Consider putting extra resources into schools that serve mostly vulnerable populations, for workforce education.
- One of the biggest equity issues has historically been how we allocate citywide funding. East Portland doesn't get citywide dollars in the same proportion as other parts of the city.
- There is an inherent tension between equity and infrastructure. As we build out, we create circumstances for economic displacement. Be mindful of how rapidly people are moving so that infrastructure projects are not chasing moving populations.
- We need four things for equity: infrastructure upgrades without displacement; frequent transit service and connectivity; economic and workforce development that is culturally specific; and mixed housing opportunities.

- Transit improvements and infrastructure improvements in East Portland need to be better coordinated. Even if you put all the right things in an area (sewer, parks, sidewalks, etc.) if you still can't reach it on transit, no one will move there.
- Don't develop new town or neighborhood centers just because there aren't other circles (centers) nearby. Instead, focus on where population and where transit are in place, and leverage existing amenities and services.
- Don't forget Cully and Parkrose, neighborhoods that have felt left out for many years. Cully has high Communities of Color. Those Neighborhood Prosperity Initiatives struggle because businesses are not already there, and they have a high number of residents who are low income. Parkrose has busy traffic (Sandy).
- Addressing the stormwater issue could present an opportunity because we can build green systems and get multiple values. We shouldn't deemphasize development in the stormwater-challenged areas.
- Lacking North-South transit connections. We need to help create/enhance connectivity to the North. Colombia Corridor businesses are growing but lack bus access and Trimet schedules that accommodate swing shifts.
- Don't put highest density near highest pollution. Move centers of Gateway farther East so that residential density is farther from freeway.

**“How should we create healthy, connected “complete” neighborhoods in Southwest Portland?”**

- One size doesn't fit all, with topographical or other constraints, maybe more emphasis should be put here on digital commerce/ order groceries online, for example. Look at areas where sidewalks could fill important gaps, such as near schools and bus stops.
- Connectivity and transit rise to top of factors needed for healthy, complete, and connected communities.
- The bus system currently is currently radial from downtown, but inter-district connectivity is critical, too, and is lacking (you can get downtown easily but can't get from center to center or from neighborhood to neighborhood by bus or walking).
- Create center of place with a focal point that can give a place a more distinctive identity. Parks, plazas, and other amenities around which housing will spring to get to 7000 density. Hillside has the beginning of this, but its southern strip needs to punch through, and the other side of Capitol Highway is still a mess.

**“Where and how should we meet forecast land needs for additional Dispersed Employment Areas?”**

- We need to better blend together discussion around: dispersed employment, Neighborhood Prosperity Initiatives, infrastructure and proximity to transportation, links to jobs.
- Can we have industrial parks with open space, for example Dawson Creek?
- Powell lacks complete intersection. Can't maximize potential- drives traffic into neighborhoods.
- The area off McLoughlin and south of Tacoma off of Milwaukie has a lot of potential, and could be a focused area for this type of development.
- Concern about dispersed employment areas near residential areas. They need to have a kernel of support already, and can't be forced. They need to be allowed to evolve naturally.
- Consider dispersed employment in areas along SE 82<sup>nd</sup> and Stark.
- All the areas identified have or are near habitat corridors. In these areas, there may be additional infrastructure costs due to habitat areas.

- If we increase opportunities for employment and industrial development, we need to ensure that we maximize the number of jobs created. One idea is to establish quotas when we up-zone so that the job potential of these areas is realized.
- Talk with ethnic communities about where they are looking for employment opportunities.
- Consider making Airport Way a better freight route to reduce conflicts on Sandy and then improve Sandy for housing and a complete neighborhood.

### **East Portland Mapping Conversation**

Midland Library

Sunday, November 3, 2013

Attendees: Approximately 20

Staff: Marie Walkiewicz, Tyler Bump, Bob Glascock, Bill Cunningham, Spencer Williams, April Bertelsen, Chris Scarzello, Uma Krishnan

The East Portland Mapping event hosted topic stations with information about Watershed Health, Economic Development, Centers & Corridors, and Transportation arranged around the room. A center station provided desk space where individuals could work on personal laptops, fill out comment cards, or color the East Portland map, and a sixth station provided Comprehensive Plan background information and Map App training. Representatives from TriMet also attended to provide East Side Service Enhancement Plan information. Each topic station exhibited a large paper map of the main topic, and had laptops running the Map App to allow for interactive discussion.

Many event participants entered comments directly into the Map App at one of the computers set up around the room. Some attendees, however, either discussed their ideas with staff, or wrote feedback on maps. Following are brief summaries of feedback that staff collected in conversation and in writing:

#### **Centers and Corridors**

- In East Portland, two of the proposed neighborhood centers, Parkrose and SE Foster and 122<sup>nd</sup> Avenue, either lack conditions needed to create a center (population and/or conducive zoning) or have conflicts that present tradeoffs (freight route; environmental issues). However, these centers can help fill service gaps.
  - What factors should be prioritized in determining whether these places should be designated as centers?
  - If they do not become centers, how can we better serve these “gap” areas?
  - To become a town center, areas shown also need more parks, services, and choices for restaurants/grocers. Centers should be a focus for investment to serve existing residents and future growth in the area.
- Generally, in order to make strategic use of resources, the draft plan proposes a citywide strategy that prioritizes investments in centers that have the largest population and the highest needs (see diagram on back of this page)
  - What are the positives and negatives with this approach?
  - How should equity be considered? Should centers with vulnerable populations be prioritized for public investment?

#### **Economic Development**

- The East Portland community showed enthusiastic support for more opportunity to provide living wage jobs.

- One idea is to convert multiple small areas in East Portland into dispersed industrial job centers.

Additional questions that staff were asked to consider included:

- Neighborhood compatibility (considering noise, odors, freight movement, hours of operation, etc)
- Prioritizing employment opportunities for vulnerable populations
- Environmental justice issues
- Farmland conversion at Wilkes and 122<sup>nd</sup> and Sandy

### **Watershed Health**

- Grey out Maywood Park to show Habitat Connection
- Remnant backyard ROW in parts of East Portland provide opportunities for urban habitat corridors
- Stormwater issues, especially at Powellhurst-Gilbert and Powell
- Powellhurst-Gilbert Neighborhood Association looking to purchase with David Douglas schools SE 136th South of Division, want to buy property to grow David Douglas memorial plants
- Jenne Road & Foster Rd hardwood wetlands – NRI doesn't show it on Hammersmith Rd
- Expand impervious surface limits to other Johnson Creek Subdistricts
- Community Greenway from around 106<sup>th</sup>/108<sup>th</sup> to around 155<sup>th</sup>/157<sup>th</sup> along Bush

### **Transportation**

- Policy should be written to add requirements (for new developments or major remodels that add residential density) that traffic is directed onto streets that have capacity (if a property has access to more than one street and the capacity differs, or PBOT/TSP identifies one street as a higher classification). The policy must apply to land use reviews as well as administrative reviews (land division, property line adjustment, etc) and development review. (What appears to happen now is that the developer gets to decide which street to access and therefore avoids making any improvements, but also putting more of a burden on a smaller street that does not have capacity for additional traffic).
- TSP project #80008 - construction estimate is too low, travel lane widths are 7 feet not 9 feet, widening is limited by the creek on one side and steep topography on the other side.
- From the East Portland Neighborhood Land Use/Transportation subcommittee: All of the TSP projects identified for East Portland need to stay in the TSP (with the exception of the projects that are 100% complete) but most, if not all, of those incomplete projects show funding levels that are grossly inadequate to complete the job.
- Street, sidewalk, and bike lane improvements should be prioritized throughout East Portland.

### **Community members also provided observations concerning:**

- Need to preserve hardwood wetlands, environmental resources,
- Need to focus on resiliency and natural disaster planning, and
- Support for selective downzoning in areas where there is a lack of infrastructure.

### **Our 42<sup>nd</sup> Ave Meeting**

PCC Workforce Center  
Wednesday, November 6, 2013  
Attendees: 30  
Staff: Nan Stark, Tyler Bump, Eric Engstrom, Marty Stockton, Lora Lillard

The questions posed to meeting attendants were as follows, with diagrams indicating zoning and transportation networks, where appropriate:

*Have community priorities been identified correctly (below)?*

- Needed and affordable goods and services
- Higher quality employment, such as production
- Opportunities for entrepreneurship
- Housing

*CG, other options for Commercial zoning, and non-conforming uses*

- Examples of CG, what it can look like: Does it meet community priorities?
- Non-conforming: Does prescribed zoning fit priorities? What would work better given community goals?

*Transportation Network: Does it look right, what are priorities?*

- Pedestrian crossings, bike routes, speed limit, sidewalks.

#### **Feedback Heard at the event:**

*Community priorities:*

- Needed retail and services. Ideas included a Traders Joe's or other grocer at 42<sup>nd</sup>/Killingsworth opportunity site, a pharmacy, retaining existing businesses, and supporting new/potential small businesses.
- Concern was expressed about housing affordability and displacement potential. Priorities identified included retaining affordable housing, keeping household costs down, retaining a high population of households with children, achieving the right mix of residential & commercial, and providing adequate parking for new housing.
- A need for family activities was also identified. Priorities that people envision for the community included seeing children playing in street/sidewalk, making childcare affordable, and identification of the Community Center as an opportunity site.
- Preserving open space was also of importance to attendees.

*Commercial/Nonconforming/Employment:*

- Enhance Employment opportunities through support for existing and new businesses.
- There shouldn't just be one zone along all of 42<sup>nd</sup>. Shift to CN2 and CS from Killingsworth to Prescott and Prescott to Fremont.

*Transportation Network issues/concerns:*

- Safety improvements are needed for neighbors and customers to successfully access businesses and transit.
- Pedestrian connections to residential areas adjacent to commercial district.
- Access to transit and safety concerns for people of all abilities, elders, ADA.
- Near NAYA - lots of kids, unsafe conditions especially at bridge and along Columbia; also at Lombard /Holman; bioswale and giant sign.

- At 42<sup>nd</sup>/Killingsworth major intersection, Fernhill Park, PCC, and Whitaker there are many safety issues, including a need for better visibility and lighting, especially at major intersections and bus stops, and sidewalk deficiencies.

### **Health Equity in the Comp Plan Workshop**

Oregon Public Health Institute and Multnomah County Health Department

Thursday, November 7, 2013

Attendees: Approximately 25

Staff: Deborah Stein, Michelle Kunec, Steve Kountz, Marty Stockton

The Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, Oregon Public Health Institute, and Multnomah County Health Department hosted an interactive workshop to discuss the City of Portland’s Comprehensive Plan Update. The goal of the workshop was to educate stakeholders on the Working Draft Part 2, provide a demonstration of the Map App, and solicit feedback. The workshop used a Health Equity lens to explore the dynamics between power structures, decision making, and inclusion/exclusion of groups affected by policy and investment decisions. Participants examined and discussed two primary topics: 1) Creating complete neighborhoods in East Portland and 2) Dispersed Employment.

#### **Key Takeaways: Complete Neighborhoods in East Portland**

Participants reviewed Map App layers related to complete neighborhoods, and felt they highlighted the disparities between East Portland and the rest of the city, as well as the enormity of the challenge of bringing East Portland’s infrastructure up to the level of the closer-in neighborhoods. To meet this challenge, participants noted the importance of evaluating how we prioritize development and investment decisions. To this end, they found the “Investment strategies for complete centers” diagram useful.

Participants described both positive aspects and potential challenges or negative impacts of the centers and corridors strategy to create complete neighborhoods:

- While they felt the overall approach of investing in centers and corridors to create complete neighborhoods would benefit East Portlanders, they acknowledged the need to make sure neighborhoods outside centers and corridors do not languish due to a lack of resources.
- Participants suggested considering down-zoning areas outside of centers and corridors to direct growth towards centers and make sure these areas do not experience growth without needed infrastructure.
- They also suggested making incremental investments over time so existing residents and businesses can adapt to changes.

Participants listed a number of City-led processes that have been effective in engaging and sharing decision-making power with communities in East Portland as examples for future work, including the East Portland Action Plan, East Portland in Motion, the Diversity and Civic Leadership program, Cully Main Street, and Budget Mapping exercises. Participants noted that creating sustained funding mechanisms for change, empowering people to work within their own communities, relationship building, and engaging under-represented groups while addressing challenges to their participation are critical to sustaining such efforts. During the discussion, participants also reflected on the importance of early and effective community engagement in decisions regarding development and investment in East Portland, to inform and shape both how a ‘complete neighborhood’ is defined and how it is achieved.

### **Key Takeaways: Dispersed Employment**

Participants discussed proposals for where and how the City could meet forecasted land needs for additional dispersed employment areas.

- Participants generally agreed that East Portland could benefit from more local job opportunities.
- However, according to participants, providing sufficient land for employment is only one component of creating economic prosperity in East Portland. A comprehensive strategy would also consider issues like: job training; pedestrian access and transit service; design and siting of employment and commercial uses; and use of community benefit agreements or other tools to encourage local hiring.
- Developing such a strategy would require community engagement in decision-making to ensure the needs of local communities are addressed.
- In addition, participants noted that while increased employment uses could provide more middle-income jobs, shorten commutes, and build the tax base, they could also bring increased pollution and traffic and potentially displace other local businesses.

### **North Portland Mapping Conversation**

University of Portland

Wednesday, November 20, 2013

Attendees: 31

Staff in attendance: Barry Manning, Deborah Stein, John Cole, Diane Hale, Spencer Williams, Steve Kountz, Roberta Jortner, Madeline Kovacs, Bob Hillier (PBOT)

This workshop provided an overview of the Comprehensive Plan Part 2, with an additional focus on specific questions about the Kenton station area, St. Johns Town Center area, and along Lombard Street. General feedback was also welcome. Below is a summary of feedback/comments from the meeting arranged by topic:

#### **Transportation**

- Suggestion to transfer the US 30 designation from N Lombard to N Columbia Blvd.
- Support was expressed for constructing a new North Willamette River Crossing connecting US 30/Washington County with North Portland/Rivergate Industrial Area.
- Desire to remove trucks from N Decatur Street and concerns about constructing an expensive retaining wall as part of the proposed North Portland Greenway Trail.

#### **Environmental**

- General support for the Urban Habitat Corridors, including potential Urban Habitat Corridor linking Pier and Chimney Park to the Willamette bluff, and extended Greenway Corridor along Willamette Blvd (to include quieter side streets) to link to this corridor.
- Concern about impact of 4-foot chain link fence on Waud Bluff trail (traps or blocks wildlife passage).
- There is a need for more greenery in the area in general.
- Consider extending Greenway along Willamette Blvd to St. Johns.
- Need to consider how enhancing Urban Habitat Corridors and Greenways will affect maintenance costs and potentially burden property owners with cost and maintenance activity,



particularly those who might not be able to deal with or afford it. (There are many renters in this area – the City should help.)

- There are many unimproved streets, and we need to prioritize these over greening up already nice improved streets. There are also many unimproved parks and parks with no finished frontage. This is a fairness issue.
- Add portions of Fessenden as a Greenway Corridor. There is a new plan out here, includes median strips with trees, redirected truck traffic, and new divided bike lane. Link to Cathedral Park.
- Various questions about the fate of the golf courses, potential restoration opportunities, and interest in protecting the Columbia Slough.
- Concern that a new bridge to West Hayden Island continues to be shown in the existing Transportation Systems Plan; it seems misleading since City is not proposing to move this forward.
- A few attendees expressed that residential uses along Columbia Blvd in Kenton are not appropriate. One person thought the Industrial-zoned parcels along Columbia should stay in industrial use, but seemed fine with employment too.

#### **Centers/Corridors and Land Use**

- General agreement that Commercial Storefront (CS) zoning along Lombard would be fine. Attendees liked the focus on pedestrian oriented developments.
- Concern was expressed about encouraging mixed use development at the TriMet/PDC parcels, because it would dilute the efforts/compete with commercial activities happening currently along Denver Ave.
- Concern about changing the zoning before the reconfiguration of Argyle Street is completed, even though commenters understood that Argyle construction might not happen for about another 20 years.
- There was also concern expressed about investing in infrastructure projects along streets, then having new development come in and tear up or redo the recent infrastructure investments. This could be inefficient and a waste of public money.

#### **Institutions/Employment**

- Institutions should be required to check in with the city and neighborhoods at least every 10 years to make sure they are reminded of, and held accountable for, their commitments made at time of development permitting.
- Institutions should be made to take responsibility for the traffic they generate, particularly surrounding special events such as athletic events or concerts that draw large crowds.
- Retain environmental overlays in any new zoning scheme.

#### **North Mapping Conversation Follow-Up Meeting**

University of Portland

Wednesday, December 18, 2013

Attendees: About 20

Staff: Barry Manning, John Cole, Deborah Stein, Diane Hale, Spencer Williams, Roberta Jortner, Steve Kountz, Bob Hillier (PBOT)

This meeting of North Portland Land Use Group (NPLUG) participants and other activists was a follow up to the November 20 Comprehensive Plan District Mapping event, providing neighborhood activists and land use specialists an opportunity to learn more and provide additional comments. Below is a summary of feedback/comments from the meeting, organized by neighborhood area.

### **General Comments**

- Questions and concerns about industrial development and the proportion and overall amount in North Portland.
- Concerns about air quality linked to industry and freeways.
- There are equity and environmental justice issues associated with industry and air quality, particularly with respect to New Columbia.

### **East Columbia**

- Inventory/assessment of park space needs should be done as part of comp plan.
- Concerned about conversion of Open Space (OS)/habitat areas to Industrial Sanctuary (IS). If this is the approach, all options should be on the table (for example, Portland International Raceway).
- Neighborhood has other specific zone change and transportation issues to address.

### **St. Johns**

- Address auto-oriented zoning on Lombard east, west and within the town center, and change to more pedestrian-oriented zoning.
- Consider more opportunity for mixed use development in Fessenden/St Louis corridor.
- Future study should be conducted along Willamette Boulevard from Richmond to Tyler for commercial/mixed use.

### **Cathedral Park**

- Land use representative was not in attendance.

### **Kenton**

- Improve safety and access for pedestrians and bikes to the north of Denver Avenue.
- Need to develop a service/commercial node in West Kenton or create better transportation connections to Lombard.
- Explore ways to jump start development on the Argyle/TriMet sites and fulfill Kenton Downtown Plan. Attendees were amenable to plan and zone changes if they further this goal.
- Some were concerned about Portland International Raceway being zoned Industrial (IS).
- Interstate Urban Renewal Area plan called for more parkland in Kenton to support density. People were curious as to how and when will this happen.
- Ongoing concerns about the need for better design quality, particularly given the historic and conservation district designation.

### **Portsmouth**

- Air quality concerns are a major priority.
- There was support for the creation of a neighborhood center on Lombard. Should also create a mini-center in/near New Columbia and/or enhance connections to Lombard.

- People also support services/investment/future look at nearby Columbia Way/Fessenden area as neighborhood mixed use node.
- People also wanted to see greenway designations and connections to Peninsula Crossing Trail.
- Concerned about environmental justice and equity implications of the Comprehensive Plan Update.
- Need more outreach to communities of color.

#### **Hayden Island**

- Many attendees were concerned about or opposed development on West Hayden Island.
- Need to create gathering areas for community on the island: Mall redevelopment lacks anything (consider requiring such plaza space/open space/pocket park in commercial/other zoning code).
- May need to revisit Hayden Island Plan and zoning depending on Columbia River Crossing outcome.

#### **Piedmont**

- In this area, it is often hard to find good activity hubs. People support pedestrian/mixed use orientation on Lombard Street nodes.
- Focus some Urban Renewal Area/PDC energy on MLK Jr. Blvd. north of Rosa Parks.
- Concern was expressed about lack of attention to air quality issues in the Comprehensive Plan, and how this relates to industrial development and freeways.

#### **Arbor Lodge**

- Again, people were concerned about air quality.
- Desire more open space with plans for increasing density.
- Maintain neighborhood character by requiring higher quality design and enforcing items like ground floor window requirements for development on Interstate.
- Look to provide more activity in ground floor of commercial/mixed use buildings.

### **Southwest Mapping Conversation**

Multnomah Arts Center

Sunday, November 16, 2013

Attendees: 26

Staff: Joan Frederiksen, Eden Dabbs, Sallie Edmunds, Bill Cunningham, Spencer Williams, Mindy Brooks, John Cole, Courtney Duke (PBOT), Marie Walkiewicz (BES)

The Southwest Mapping Conversation provided information sharing and discussion opportunities. A presentation in the first half of the event covered an overview of the main Comprehensive Plan Update components including the five key directions of the plan. It also covered key issues for southwest, including ideas about growing in centers and corridors and issues related to stormwater management and transportation infrastructure gaps.

An open house format in the second half of the event included staffed stations covering Transportation and Watershed Health as well as opportunities to participate in two focused conversations related to the Hillsdale and West Portland Town Centers.

**The Town Center conversations included discussion and feedback on the following questions:**

1. What do you think about the concept of centers and designating Hillsdale/West Portland as Town Centers? What opportunities or issues do you see in designating these town centers?
2. What do you see as the key things needed in this center to make it a complete/connected neighborhood? What would your priorities be in terms of improvements or investments given limited funding?
3. What could the City do to help centers in southwest Portland grow and become more complete in ways that reflect their uniqueness? (Some ideas could be: variations of street standards, green infrastructure, designing with nature, customized SDC's, etc.)
4. Are there infrastructure or other issues that need to be addressed outside of Hillsdale or West Portland to make the idea of complete communities work in Southwest Portland?

**Participants shared insight on their different areas of Southwest Portland:**

- Generally, interest and support was heard for the five key Comprehensive Plan directions, but concern was voiced for how current infrastructure gaps in pedestrian and bike infrastructure would be funded and carried out and how watershed health would be preserved.
- Both Hillsdale and West Portland discussion groups expressed support for the Town Center designations.
- The West Portland discussion group participants advocated for additional commercial services, active transportation facilities and improved development site design outcomes. Most also agreed that additional growth or density was needed to achieve at least some of these aspirations.
- The Hillsdale discussion group focused largely on the need for active transportation facility and town center access improvements, including to surrounding areas.
- Another discussion thread included the issue of aging in place and families and providing opportunities for getting around safely to services without a car. This also correlated with the discussion of supporting smaller more dispersed commercial nodes to fill gaps.

### III. Demographic Data and Meeting Feedback

Demographic data was requested at the seven BPS-hosted events to help ensure that a representative cross-section of Portlanders were participating in the Working Draft Part 2 process. Many events for Part 2 were hosted by other community groups, and therefore the sample size for the demographic data is quite small. Forty-one demographic data responses were submitted from workshop and meeting attendees (only 4% of total commenters). The following tables summarize the data received. Citywide data from the 2011 American Community Survey is included in selected tables for comparison.

Please note that this demographic data very likely does not reflect the demographic picture for the much larger number of Portlanders who submitted comments on the Comprehensive Plan Update Part 2. In part, this is due to challenges presented by the same technological platforms that helped to facilitate the collection of such a large volume of comments. Mainly a full 89% of comments for the Working Draft Part 2 process were submitted anonymously online, either via the Map App or BPS website comment button. This means that even if staff had been able to distribute and collect comment cards for every event attendee, staff would only have accurate demographic information for those 11% of commenters who physically attended a City or community hosted event.

In the future, if these online platforms continue to broaden and increase public participation and feedback in the planning process, staff will need to incorporate new tools to capture demographic information. One suggestion has been to incorporate a demographic information request form following online commenting, so as not to add a step that may deter potential commenters, but capturing more demographic information overall. Staff are also confronted with the ongoing challenge of consistently capturing demographic information from commenters who submit feedback via email correspondence, physical letters, or group letters via neighborhood associations and other community organizations.

## Workshop Participant Demographic Data

### What is your age?

	#	%	Citywide 2011
Under 18	0	0%	19%
18 to 24	2	5%	10%
25 to 34	9	23%	20%
35 to 44	13	33%	16%
45 to 54	2	5%	14%
55 to 64	7	18%	12%
65 and older	7	18%	10%
Total	41	100%	101%

### What best describes your household income?

	#	%	Citywide 2011
Less than \$10,000	2	5%	9%
\$10,000-\$14,999	2	5%	6%
\$15,000-\$24,999	0	0%	11%
\$25,000-\$34,999	2	5%	24%
\$35,000-\$49,999	10	25%	19%
\$50,000-\$74,999	9	23%	
\$75,000-\$99,999	7	18%	11%
More than \$100,000	8	20%	20%
Total	40	100%	100%

### How did you learn about the event?

	#	%
Business	1	2%
Child's School	0	0%
Community Org/Center	13	32%
E-Mail	8	20%
Friend/Relative/Co-Worker	2	5%
Internet Posting	1	2%
Library	1	2%
Newspaper/Magazine	2	5%
Radio	0	0%
Television	0	0%
Multiple	5	12%
Other	8	20%
Total	41	100%

### How do you identify your gender?

	#	%
Female	24	60%
Male	16	40%
Other	0	0%
Total	40	100%

### Does your family own or rent your home?

	#	%
Renter	6	15%
Homeowner	35	85%
Total	41	100%

### Do you live in a?:

	#	%
House	36	90%
Apartment	4	10%
Total	40	100%

### How did you get to the event today?

	#	%
Drove Alone	19	46%
Mass Transit	3	7%
Car Pool	8	20%
Bike	3	7%
Walk	7	17%
Multiple	1	2%
Total	41	100%

### How do you identify yourself?

	#	%	Citywide 2011
Native American or Alaska Native	0	4%	0%
Asian	1	4%	2%
Black or African American	0	10%	0%
Hispanic or Latino	0	8%	0%
Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander	0	1%	0%
White	39	64%	95%
Other	1	7%	2%
Total	41	100%	100%

### What languages are spoken at home?

	#	%
Chinese	0	0%
English	38	100%
Russian	0	0%
Somali	0	0%
Spanish	0	0%
Vietnamese	0	0%
Other	0	0%
Total	38	100%

**Number of people in your household?**

	#	%
1	4	10%
2	24	59%
3	9	22%
4	4	10%
5	0	0%
6	0	0%
7	0	0%
More	0	0%
Total	41	100%

## *CPU Part 2 Evaluation of Meetings*

Meeting evaluation cards were also distributed at meetings, asking the public to assess whether they felt that time had been well spent, whether they had learned something of value, and whether they felt they had been able to participate meaningfully. From October 2 to December 31, 2013, at District Mapping Conversations, Information Sessions, and dispersed outreach opportunities, staff received a total of 48 meeting evaluations.

Over 90% of all respondents said that they had both learned about a topic of interest, and that they had the opportunity to ask questions about an issue of importance to them. Over 90% of respondents also felt that the workshop materials were presented clearly, and were easy to understand. Thirty-seven out of 45 respondents thought that meetings were “just the right length.”

Staff also heard that respondents were less clear on next steps, and how their input would be used to further the planning process. Nine out of 45 respondents circled “disagree” when asked if the workshop clearly presented next steps in the process, and eight out of 46 circled “disagree” when asked if the workshop had clearly explained how their input would be used. Some respondents also said they thought that more effort can be made to explain specifically how public input is processed, and cumulatively impacts the planning process. One respondent mentioned a desire that the presenter had known more about the surrounding area, and drawn on more local examples for explanations. Another raised concerns about the focus on technology instead of plan content, stating: “The workshop focused too much on the Map App and how to use it – feedback from the public should be about what should/shouldn’t be in the plan.”

Participants at the October 18 All-PEG meeting, in particular, appreciated the meeting’s unique format: Following an over-arching presentation about the CPU Part 2 and the Map App layers, small discussion groups were arranged around tables supplied with computers showing the Map App, as well as a large printed map highlighting a particular discussion topic. This format, respondents said, enabled them to both become familiar with the high-tech aspects of the Map App that they could in turn show others, but also allowed them to engage on the issue at hand regardless of technical ability. Participants also liked seeing people with diverse perspectives on each issue around them at the table, and felt they gained valuable perspective engaging in small group discussions focused on the same trade-offs and tough questions facing the City given current resources. Lastly, enthusiastic support was given to the suggestion of somehow incorporating the “four neighborhood types bubble diagram” into the actual Map App.



## Attachment A: Events and Participation Log October 1 - December 31, 2013

Date	Organization	# of Participants	Content
10/1/2013	Public Involvement Advisory Council	20	overview
10/1/2013	Central Eastside Industrial Council	25	overview/Map App
10/1/2013	Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association Land Use and Transportation Committee	12	overview/Map App
10/2/2013	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE)	25	overview/Map App
10/7/2013	Central Northeast Neighbors (CNN), Land Use Transportation	12	overview/Map App
10/7/2013	East Portland Action Plan Economic Development Subcommittee	15	overview
10/9/2013	East Portland Land Use and Transportation Committee (LUTC)	12	overview
10/9/2013	Kenton Neighborhood Association	15	overview
10/14/2013	Portland Commission on Disabilities - Accessibility and the Built Environment Committee	12	overview
10/14/2013	Powellhurst-Gilbert Neighborhood Association	16	overview
10/14/2013	Fessenden	4	overview
10/14/2013	St. Johns Neighborhood Association	25	overview
10/15/2013	Southwest Neighborhoods Inc. (SWNI) Land Use Committee	8	overview
10/15/2013	AIA-APA-ASLA – Urban Design Panel	20	overview
10/15/2013	Overlook Neighborhood Association	20	overview
10/16/2013	Woodstock Neighborhood Association Land Use Committee	12	overview/Map App
10/17/2013	Development Review Advisory Committee (DRAC)	25	overview
10/17/2013	PSU: Intro to Urban Planning (Instructor Greg Schrock)	60	overview
10/18/2013	All-PEG Meeting	50	workshop
10/21/2013	SE Uplift Land Use, Sustainability and Transportation Committee	16	overview
10/21/2013	SWNI Transportation Committee	17	overview
10/21/2013	Eliot Neighborhood Association	9	overview
10/22/2013	Comprehensive Plan Brownbag (Portland Building)	34	overview
10/22/2013	Mill Park Neighborhood Association	13	overview
10/22/2013	Rose City Park Neighborhood Association	48	overview/Map App
10/23/2013	Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods, Land Use and Transportation Committee	16	overview
10/23/2013	SWNI Board	25	Map App

<b>Date</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b># of Participants</b>	<b>Content</b>
10/23/2013	PBOT Budget Advisory Committee	8	overview
10/24/2013	PSU: Intro to Urban Planning (Instructor Greg Schrock)	60	overview
10/24/2013	Comprehensive Plan Information Session (1900 Building)	10	overview
10/24/2013	Division/Midway Alliance Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative	13	overview
10/24/2013	North Portland Land Use Group	17	overview/Map App
10/28/2013	Columbia Slough Watershed Council	25	overview
10/28/2013	Citywide Land Use Group	13	overview
10/28/2013	University Park Neighborhood Association	15	overview
10/29/2013	InCight Meet Business Fair – Individuals with Disabilities meet Business/Job Fair	35	tabling
10/29/2013	Comprehensive Plan Information Session (Parkrose High School)	20	overview
10/30/2013	The N/NE Business Association ( NNEBA)	31	workshop
11/3/2013	East Mapping Conversation	14	workshop
11/4/2013	East Portland Action Plan Economic Development Subcommittee	15	overview
11/4/2013	Central Northeast Neighbors (CNN), Land Use Transportation	12	overview
11/4/2013	North Portland Neighborhood Chairs	12	overview
11/5/2013	Portland Business Alliance, Land Use Transportation Committee		overview
11/5/2013	Public Involvement Advisory Council	25	overview
11/5/2013	Wilkes Neighborhood Association	19	overview Map App/ Discussion
11/6/2013	Metro Technical Advisory Committee (MTAC)	20	overview
11/6/2013	NE 42nd Avenue Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative	30	workshop
11/6/2013	NWDA, Land Use and Transportation Committees	20	overview/Map App
11/6/2013	East Portland Neighborhood Chairs	13	overview/Map App
11/6/2013	Linnton Neighborhood Association	18	overview
11/7/2013	Kenton Business Association	18	overview
11/7/2013	Portland Freight Committee	30	overview

<b>Date</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b># of Participants</b>	<b>Content</b>
11/7/2013	Health Equity Comp Plan Workshop	20	workshop
11/7/2013	Community Alliance of Tenants	1	overview
11/7/2013	Design Commission	7	overview
11/8/2013	Superintendents' Council	12	overview
11/11/2013	Montavilla Neighborhood Association	28	overview/Map App
11/12/2013	North Industrial Neighborhood Association (NINA)	15	overview
11/12/2013	East Columbia Neighborhood Association	15	tabling
11/13/2013	EPAP Education Subcommittee	10	overview/Map App
11/13/2013	Oregon Opportunity Network	10	overview
11/13/2013	City Club Bicycle Transportation Advocacy Committee	7	overview
11/13/2013	Lewis & Clark: Environmental Justice Law class (Jon Oster, instructor)	12	overview
11/13/2013	East Portland Land Use and Transportation Committee (LUTC)	9	Map App
11/14/2013	Urban Forestry Commission	15	overview
11/14/2013	Buckman Community Association Comprehensive Plan Forum	45	overview/Map App
11/14/2013	Mappy Hour	70	workshop
11/15/2013	82nd Avenue Business Association	8	overview/Map App
11/16/2013	Southwest Mapping Conversation	26	workshop
11/18/2013	SE Uplift Land Use and Transportation committee	18	overview
11/20/2013	Infill Builder Group – Home Builders Association of Metro Portland	20	overview
11/20/2013	North Mapping Conversation	31	workshop
11/20/2013	NWNW Hill Communities	2	overview/Map App
11/21/2013	Parkrose Business Association	45	overview/Map App
11/21/2013	SW Trails	24	overview/Map App
11/21/2013	East Moreland Neighborhood Association	26	overview
11/23/2013	Terwilliger Plaza	65	overview/Map App
11/23/2013	Fix-It Fair – Parkrose High School	35	tabling
11/25/2013	Citywide Land Use Group	8	overview

<b>Date</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b># of Participants</b>	<b>Content</b>
11/26/2013	Historic Parkrose Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative	25	overview
11/29/2013	Organizing People Activating Leaders	2	overview
12/2/2013	Art Institute of Portland: Environmental Science class (professor Laura Nappi)	20	overview/map app
12/3/2013	Art Institute of Portland: Environmental Science class (professor Laura Nappi)	18	overview/map app
12/3/2013	Public Involvement Advisory Council	20	overview
12/4/2013	Portland Parks Board	20	overview
12/4/2013	Center for Intercultural Organizing	2	overview
12/4/2013	South Portland Neighborhood Association	15	overview/map app
12/5/2013	Portland Freight Committee	30	
12/9/2013	Richmond Neighborhood Association – Board Meeting	28	overview/town center discussion
12/9/2013	East Columbia Neighborhood Association	15	overview
12/9/2013	Kenton Neighborhood Association	15	overview
12/10/2013	Cully Association of Neighbors	45	overview/map app
12/11/2013	EPNO LU/Transportation committee	9	review / comment on the TSP
12/17/2013	SWNI LU Committee	14	overview / discussion
12/17/2013	North Mt. Tabor Neighborhood Association	7	overview/Map App
12/18/2013	Sellwood-Moreland Improvement League (SMILE) – Board	15	Comp Plan Map discussion
	<b>Total of 98 Part 2 events</b>	<b>1,948</b>	