

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, September 23, 2014

5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Michelle Rudd, Teresa St Martin

Commissioners Absent: Maggie Tallmadge

BPS Staff Present: Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 5:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- Last night in New York, 9 cities were chosen as Climate Leaders in the world by the C40. Organization of the 40 largest cities in the world plus Portland. HCN, the primary strategy in the Portland Plan. Recognized the importance of land use planning as a key determinant to reduce energy use and carbon emissions.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 09/09/14 PSC meeting

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Grey, Hanson, Houck, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, Rudd, St Martin)

Comprehensive Plan

Hearing: Joe Zehnder

Documents:

- [Testimony memo](#)
- [Errata memo](#)
- [Comp Plan relationship to Mixed Use Zones and Institutional Zones projects memo](#)

Presentation:

http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6993476/view/cp_presentation.PDF

Chair Baugh noted that tonight and for the hearings, the PSC is just listening to what the public has to say. Deliberation and discussion will occur later.

Joe provided an overview of the Comp Plan and where we are in the process.

The Comp Plan includes proposed land use maps, policies, project lists, and a supporting document, the Citywide Systems Plan. There is also the Urban Design Direction report, which

serves as an illustrated guide to some of the urban design and city form policies.

Much of the testimony we expect will relate to the proposed land use map. The Comprehensive Plan Map covers all of Portland and some not-annexed areas within our urban services boundary. Our proposal is to leave much of the existing Comp Plan map as it is today.

This is the first of four scheduled hearings on the Proposed Comprehensive Plan. We'll have hearings on October 14 and 28 then on November 4.

On November 4, the PSC will need to decide if you are ready to close the record, or if you would like to accept comments for a longer period. You will also get an update on the TSP from PBOT on November 4. They will publish a revised project list in mid-October.

On November 18 we have scheduled the first work session to begin discussing what we've heard from the public. Three things will happen in that session:

First, we will get an update on outreach from the Community Involvement Committee (CIC).

Second, we will go over City bureau comments with you. We have asked City agencies to prepare comments and bring their observations to you on the 18.

Third, staff will deliver an initial recommendations memo. The purpose of this memo will be to identify the agenda for subsequent work sessions in 2015. We'll identify the major topics and issues arising from the testimony that warrant more in-depth discussion. We will also bring you a "consent list" of smaller amendments that we recommend based on the testimony. These consent items will be smaller changes that in our judgment can proceed without detailed discussion in a work session.

This is not really the first Comprehensive Plan Hearing.

- In 2007/08 the Commission held hearings on the proposed work plan.
- In 2009/10 the Commission held hearings on the public involvement strategy and creation of the CIC, the group that oversees our outreach efforts.
- In 2010-2012 the Commission held hearings to establish the facts (the background reports), and to set the overall direction via the Portland Plan. The adopted background information includes the Buildable Lands Inventory (BLI), the Housing Needs Analysis, a new Natural Resources Inventory (NRI), among other things. You also reviewed the Growth Scenarios Report and the Employment Opportunities Analysis (EOA), both of which we will return to the PSC in early 2015.

Later next year you will have hearings on more detailed implementation including zoning codes and maps.

Last Thursday the PSC received documents from staff:

1. A memo identifying a few errors in the proposed maps and policies. We will be updating the Map App in the coming week, and notifying impacted property owners.
2. A letter from Eric Engstrom providing staff's thinking about the requests you have received for extension of these hearings.
3. You also received a brief summary of the comments received to date, along with the full packet of comments.

Within the written testimony you received this month on the Comprehensive Plan are several letters from recognized neighborhood associations requesting a 90-day extension of the comment period. The letters express a desire to know the specifics of potential new code provisions before closing testimony on the proposed Comprehensive Plan Goals and Policies and Comprehensive Plan Map.

However, before specific code provisions can be proposed, the Comprehensive Plan needs to first define desired outcomes through goals and policies, and the plan map. Establishing goals and policies and directional maps before developing more detailed implementing actions is essential. The specifics of any zoning changes that will be adopted to implement the new Comprehensive Plan will be subject to additional public hearings before final action by the PSC and City Council.

I also want to reiterate that the Comprehensive Plan is building from the direction we set with the Portland Plan. In 2012 City Council adopted the Portland Plan, which was a strategic plan covering all aspects of local government activity. The Comprehensive Plan is more specific to the physical development of the city – to land use, and the provision of needed housing and employment. While the Portland Plan was adopted by resolution, the Comprehensive Plan is adopted by ordinance and becomes binding policy for the things it governs.

Commissioner Houck asked about the EOA and if we will take another look at that.

- We submitted it to the state, it was approved, and we know it's going to change, so we took it (and the scenarios report) back for amending it. It is an iterative still.

Testimony:

1. Nader Rassouli and Peter Finley Fry: Owns 1.28 acres at 6141 SW Canyon Ct that's zoned R20 that I'd like to have rezoned to R2. The property is directly adjacent to Highway 26 and is close to public transportation. There are commercial properties and fire station close by. Originally the property was part of Multnomah County and designated rural, and it was annexed to Portland after the 1980 Comp Plan. Now in an urban area with urban needs and services. I would like to develop it into a multi-family campus. *See written testimony.*
2. Ken Forcier: BPS writes the code and instructs other bureaus about code interpretation. If there is conflict within the code, we should bring it into compliance. Why is there a right to a non-conforming situation when it's new? Is there a grandfather right? When we apply this argument to a development, we need to first decide if development is a grandfathered right. Non-conforming new construction isn't ok, for example R2.5 in R5 neighborhoods. Skinny houses disrupt the neighborhood character, are an oxymoron, and conflict with the zoning code. Please review Table 110-6 in the code. *See written testimony.*
3. Herman Kachold: Concerned that the 300 acres on West Hayden Island (WHI) is going to be zoned industrial after our years of fighting for it. Industrial zoning on this acreage isn't what was recommended in 2013 by the PSC.
4. Stefan Karlic: WHI industrial zoning circumvents the 2013 PSC recommendation. The Comp Plan would open the door for the Port to develop without having to meet livability expectations and needs of the community. This is one of Portland's last large natural areas. There is plenty of industrial land; clean up the brownfields, and leave WHI alone. All 12 Measures of Success of the 12 Portland Plan would be met if we start cleaning up brownfields.
5. Lucinda Karlic, Hayden Island Livability Project (HILP): This is a regional issue what happens on WHI. I've shared a resolution from HILP, of which a majority came from the PSC. Clean up brownfields to supply more jobs. *See HILP written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith: The language about WHI is based on the last Council action which is a 300/500 split. Some of us are frustrated that we don't see the result of the PSC recommendation yet. I've asked staff to draft policy language for discussion based on what the

PSC recommended. I hope we'll get testimony that informs if it should be industrial, open space, etc.

Commissioner Houck clarified and asked for people to provide ideas about what the language about WHI should be so we can incorporate those ideas into the plan.

6. Timme Helzer: Thank you for the decisions you made in July 2013 about WHI after many months of analysis. We weren't delighted, but we believe you got it right. There were significant mitigations to potential destructive processes and results. But others have totally disregarded this work, rolled back the clock and are recommending something that goes in the opposite direction. There are 5 points in the document we prepared for tonight's hearing (*see the HILP letter*). There is no protection in the new zoning proposal, and there is no improved transportation infrastructure.
7. Kelly Hossaini, Portland Business Alliance, Chair of Land Use Taskforce: Participated on Comp Plan PEGs, and I commend BPS staff who developed policies to guide growth. The plan shows the importance of economic development, but needs greater priority to achieve a prosperous, equitable city. Good living-wage jobs are declining in Portland. BPS' own report ("Industrial Middle of Portland's Changing Income Distribution") finds that industrial lands sustain these mid-income jobs and they are needed for an equitable city. PBA requests are to ensure an adequate industrial land supply; edit the green hierarchy of transportation so it does not apply to freight corridors and movement of goods; and prioritize internal inconsistencies in the plan, for example Policy 6.39 versus 7.29. *See written testimony.*
8. Alastair Roxburgh: If there were a marine terminal on WHI, it would severely impact the health of the community, especially air quality. There are already air quality problems on WHI, and this would exacerbate it. To achieve air quality goals, we'd need to reduce industry by up to 90 percent to be ideal as per federal standards. We need to minimize impact on green areas and livability; and work with our neighbors to make sure there isn't duplication or wasteful spending on duplicating infrastructure. There is significant harm to WHI acres if 300 of the reserve is split off. This is one of Portland's greatest habitats. Remain engaged in the process about WHI.
9. Janet Roxburgh: Concerned about the mapping of WHI to industrial. We need to leave it alone and restore WHI. There is much pollution in the area, and lots of people are getting sick, much of which is because of what's in our air. I'm also concerned that the Port is wanting the propane terminal, and Vancouver is wanting an oil terminal, both of which are dirty. Jobs will become hospital jobs because more and more people will be getting sick. We need more natural areas, not more industry.
10. David RedThunder, HILP: *Shared a 15-page photo description to the PSC.* There is legal as well as illegal hunting on WHI. There are already too many problems with the environmental quality on the island.
11. Dixie Johnston: Tried to compare the new proposal with the existing Comp Plan, but it's difficult because things are very different in the two plans. There are two things in ORS 195, 196, 197 that refer to State Goal 1 (citizen involvement) that talks about recognized associations by the City, and I know of three: business associations, neighborhood associations, PSC. All these groups have rules and regulations that must be followed. Neighborhoods can lose their charters if they don't follow the rules. Is the PSC appropriate to advise on community involvement in land use decisions? Yes. But what does citizen involvement require? Is this to protect neighbors or businesses?
12. Ellen Wax, ED, Working Waterfront Coalition: Balanced policies matter, and the

- wording matters. Concerns about conflicting policies and clarity of the language as well as the strength of the words. The verbs are not balanced between chapters 6 and 7. “Protect” is used much more in chapter 7, and it’s restrictive. The economic development chapter doesn’t reconcile with the environmental. Policy 1.3 is ensure internal consistency in the plan, and this needs to be followed. WWC is concerned with the imbalance, and with the protection of jobs and protection of industrial land supply.
13. Phil Grillo, Working Waterfront Coalition: Middle-income jobs are important especially in Portland as an equity issue. Portland has a low high school graduation rate, and if we believe in equity, we need to grow middle-class jobs. In Portland, most middle-income jobs that don’t require college are especially along the industrial corridors and harbor. The policies in Chapter 6 are a good starting point, but we are concerned they will be undercut by policies in Chapter 7. Policies 7.11 and 8.59 make it difficult for water-related businesses to expand. When harbor businesses make investments, they produce jobs and tax revenue for the City. The PSC should review BPS’ report as a basis for further discussion.
 14. Ann Gardner, Working Waterfront Coalition: Harbor sites have deep water and rail access, which is essential. The opportunity to grow and create middle-income jobs needs more unique harbor land. It’s estimated that the cost to clean up brownfield sites is about four times the value of the land, so it’s highly unlikely that harbor brownfield sites that are need will work when we look at the funding gap. The EOA will not meet the shortfall of 600 industrial acres, which is exacerbated by 120 acres based on Policy 7.46. We need adequate resources to stimulate economic development in the harbor.
 15. David Johnston: Agrees with Dixie’s comments about needing more time for neighborhoods to review the proposed plan. The timing currently downplays rights of citizens. On institutional zones and conditional uses: the proposed institutional zoning shows a complete lack of consideration to surrounding neighborhood, and institutions should serve the surrounding neighborhoods. The Comp Plan should inform the work to include more consideration as is the current plan for the needs of the neighbors and residences in the area. The rights of individual land owners around the campuses are very important. We need to include the surroundings as an important part of the zoning.
 16. William Kielhorn: We need more time for citizens and neighborhood associations to review the draft plan. It was released in late July when neighborhood meetings were on hold or sparsely attended. There have been at most 2 neighborhood meetings since the plan’s release, which is insufficient for us to get together. Mixed use zones and institutional zones are not yet defined, and the draft should not be submitted until all zones and all parts of the plan are completely defined. There is still lots to be done. Much of the language is open to multiple interpretations (e.g. Goal 1.D). Rewrites will take lots of time, and we need to take the time to get it right. We need to address the plan’s significant omissions (e.g. noise). Please give us time to modify and enhance the plan.
 17. James Peterson, Multnomah Neighborhood Association: Circulated an extension request for 90 days after the mixed use and institutional zones have been defined. We would like Multnomah to be designated a neighborhood corridor. The more you read the plan, it’s very poorly written; the more you read it, the more confused you become. All the answers we’ve asked should be in the document since this is a plan for 20 years.
 18. Carol McCarthy: Allow the public more time to review the plan. State Goal 1 places primary importance on public involvement. Citizen involvement is not adequately encouraged in the plan. The role of the neighborhood associations is almost non-

- existent. Goals and policies should not have aspirational language. We need metrics for each goal to see the effectiveness of the policies, and we need to be able to amend them. Policy 1.1 should be stated “comprised of” instead of “includes”. We need the hearings to be open for at least 90 days after mixed use and institutional zones are defines.
19. Terry Parker: Policy 9.6 appears to be politically-motivated policy carryover. Hierarchy status is social engineering, and it is not constitutional. Special privileges are given to those higher on the hierarchy. This needs to be completely removed as policy. It’s discriminatory. *See written comments.*
 20. Brandon Bunke: Remove the WHI industrial zoning. The urban growth boundary wasn’t created so we can continually cut out more greenspace to add industrial areas. We’re creating more problems that we’re going to have to clean up later. The state supports restoration of the wild salmon runs, which is one of the pioneering industries of Oregon. Accessibility to WHI is already poor. If we add commercial traffic, how will that improve the bridge that connects Portland and Vancouver? A reason that Portland stands out is due to our greenspace, and if we chop those spaces away, we lose the appeal of Portland.
 21. Chris Anderson: A tech entrepreneur, who chose Portland because it was the number 1 city for bikes. What about broadband? I know it’s invisible, but we need a policy about broadband equity. In 2010 the City did a big push for open data (accessible data, made easily available). We should include a policy in the plan. I also have frustration about bike transportation: I was sold on the idea to come to Portland, but in countries that have the bike success, all bike trips in town are more direct than the car trips. Our grid system is holding us back. We need to add diverters that force cars onto serpentine routs. On local streets, there should be traffic diverters everywhere.
 22. Tinsley Hunsdorfer: WHI is critical habitat. We need to remove WHI from the zoning or designate it as Open Space. If it maintains the industrial zoning, the mitigation package recommended by the PSC last year should be locked in place beforehand.
 23. Bob Sallinger, Audubon Society of Portland: The WHI hearings went on for 5 years. We are now upset that it’s back in the plan. Keep faith with your commitments you made in 2013. WHI should have a holistic set of actions. This was the right choice, and the Port withdrew its annexation application. But the Comp Plan now locks in 300 acres of industrial land without locking in the mitigation package. We need a paradigm shift: don’t convert greenfields to industrial. We need to focus on brownfield remediation, etc. Reconsider how we find industrial lands and focus on clean-ups. *See written testimony.*
 24. Robert Bernstein: Look at this plan with open eyes... what do you want Portland to look like in 2035? The growth is unsustainable. WHI should be removed or set as Open Space. Do mitigation first before you do any development. If you’re going to talk about planning, don’t think about the Port – it’s wasteful and harmful to the environment and the people and the species. It’s an equity and social justice issue. Habitat for creatures is continually degraded by industrial use. We’ve lost times the amount of environmentally-sound land as we have.
 25. Tad Savinar and Lindley Morton, The Squish: This is an area in NW Portland bounded by Naito, NW 20th Ave, Highway 30 and the Fremont Bridge ramps. We want to support and enhance this area where people work. It’s not like the Central Eastside. BPS staff understands this as a neighborhood and has done a good job in the proposal. Ours are just tweaks based on our being in the area. *See written comments.*

Commissioner Houck noted the comments that are site-specific. How are we tracking those and to what level of detail can we consider those?

- Staff will compile all comments, categorize, and then PSC will get the information. The ones you have specific questions about will be discussed in the work sessions that the PSC will have. Staff will make recommendations, but the PSC will discuss.
26. Robert Barnett, Red Hills Holdings: 2802 SE Ankeny property, a block from Burnside and SE 28th. It's currently zoned R2.5 and has been legal non-conforming use for decades. We're asking to bring our property in as a mixed-use since the use supports this type of development. *See written comments.*
 27. Tom Bouillion, Port of Portland: Thanks to staff to ensure economic prosperity e.g. in Policy 6.34. Manufacturing jobs offer opportunities for living-wage jobs and have a high employment multiplier effect. They provide ongoing revenue streams and property taxes. Bringing brownfields back into use is another good policy and is a key strategy. But some chapter 7 policies make chapter 6 policies impossible to achieve, e.g. Policy 7.46. I urge staff to look at how policies are in conflict and rectify, including with Policy 1.3 - internal consistency in the plan. *See written comments.*
 28. Greg Theisen, Port of Portland: Chapter 6 policies don't fully support economic development for the city. Future annexation of WHI has been supported by PSC and Council and the need for additional 500+ acres. Middle-income jobs for Portland would fulfill the equity goals in the Portland Plan. Future development triggers infrastructure development that would generate \$20M in tax revenue over 10 years. Portland's future need to link to the international marketplace, and we need the harbor to link us. *See written comments.*

Commissioner Houck Tom Bouillion's comment regarding floodplain values. We need more details from staff about the NOAA fisheries Biological Opinion on FEMA's floodplain program that will have significant impact on not just flood storage, but ecosystem values of floodplains and FEMA information to see what the implications are.

29. Micah Meskel: I'm dismayed that in N/NE there is strategy to develop greenspaces, similar to WHI and area golf courses. This is counter to Portland being green and sustainable in our development. It's counter to develop greenspaces, and it's not what the community wants... especially with WHI. What about the mitigation package the PSC recommended?
30. Cyd Manro, Division Design Committee: The first measure of success of Portland Plan is about equity, and inclusion is impossible without affordable housing. Rent in new developments on SE Division are, for example, \$1300/studio; \$1500/1-bedroom. If this is what we can expect, then the Portland Plan isn't working. Beyond increasing "market rate" housing, we displace people and exclude people including families that can't live in a studio or 1-bedroom apartment. I don't feel included as a renter in SE. Market rate is 250 percent of what I currently pay. I know we don't have laws to have affordable housing, but we need to offer better incentives that are in the best interest of developers and people who need housing. *See written comments.*
31. Bruce Sternberg: Offered some edits to the text. The Complete Neighborhoods statement should include "and retain the features that contribute to their positive nature". One size doesn't fit all... and "and provides methods for neighborhoods to have say in their development". Enhance local context: inner neighborhoods should have a distinction as well.

32. Doug Klotz: Much in the plan is headed in the right direction, and will help with slowing climate change. We talk about complete neighborhoods, but a component needs to be the willingness of builders to build. Mixed use zoning in the inner neighborhoods is working and making better places to live. Mixed use should allow at least as much development as current and offer trade for affordable housing. Also look at R1 zoning, where little multifamily housing is built. This should be rezoned as RH or redefine to allow for more housing to be built. *See written comments.*
33. Erin Madden: Moved to Portland 16 years ago due to Portland's access to outdoors and Open Space. The designation of 300 acres on WHI as industrial is a step backward. There was significant public process before, but now without a mitigation package, it's inexcusable. WHI is a natural area, not for a deep-water port. Restoration could create jobs for years to come. The City should focus on ways to restore WHI, at least recommending that full mitigation is included. WHI should be Open Space for all 800 acres to expand the city's green legacy.
34. Dean Pottle: Owns a political speakeasy in NE Portland. Consider making this block (including 4047 NE Fremont) commercial.
35. Jeff Meyrowitz: Currently in an R7 zone. Request to rezone to R2 to be consistent with current dwellings. We are surrounded by R1 and general commercial. Multi-unit condos have been developed close by recently too; we're .2 miles to Barbur Blvd. with easy access to TriMet and parks too.
36. Laura Campos: Worked on original Comp Plan. Areas in N/NE were historically non-white, which is not the case anymore. Improvements make land value increase. Unless people own their homes, they will be priced out of the city. Non-white home ownership needs to be a policy. The majority are not property owners but are incentivized to attend meetings where decisions are made that won't ultimately benefit them. Equity to add more apartments pits home owners against renters and doesn't create a healthy relationship. Property ownership is primarily white. We need a rent freeze to give renters a chance to try to own and benefit.
37. John Gibbon, SWNI: Request for a 90 day extension beyond when we see the draft mixed use and institutional zoning plans. 5 years ago, when it was the Planning Commission, we were trying to give people an understanding of what the changes to neighborhoods would be, but that was laid aside when we entered the Portland Plan process. People were told that was important to build community consensus, but now we're hearing the results of laying it aside. If you're going to use trails as a component to transportation system, we need to have a policy that actively supports them.
38. Pamela Ferguson, Hayden Island: Opposes industrial designation on WHI. We should protect and increase habitat here.
39. Peter Teneau: The WHI zoning is a reversal. Industrial zoning has again trumped environment for purpose of development. If there were no other sites, that would be one thing. We need to keep the zoning intact as Open Space. Coordination with Port of Vancouver could help since port operations are a regional matter. WHI belongs to Mother Nature. *See written comments.*
40. Randy Bonella, Multnomah Village Business Association: (1) Extend time for public input. (2) The stormwater overlay misses a broad swath of SW Portland. Relook at this overlay to ensure build-out of infrastructure is possible. (3) Mixed-Use designations need to reflect unique aspects of different neighborhoods and business districts. (4) Get rid of provisions that allow for non-conforming uses, e.g. R2.5 in R2.

41. Jeff Geisler: Need more neighborhood involvement on lots of aspects of the Comp Plan. Hayden Island is an island, and we're not like other neighborhoods in Portland. See *written comments*.
42. Lillian Karabaic, Code for Portland: Works as a volunteer who works with civic data. Supports adding an open data policy to the Comp Plan. We already have an open data resolution, passed in 2009. It makes tech innovation and information available more equitably and easier to access. We could open many more data sets by adding a policy in the Comp Plan so Portland can become the #1 city for open data (Seattle is currently). Data needs to be license-free, machine readable.
43. Joe Rossi: Rossi Farms at 3839 SE 122nd Ave. The farms are on both sides of NE 122nd. Concerned about rezoning. In the area, there is lots of residential R7, multifamily and Parkrose schools. But the area needs general commercial to become a walkable community. We're not near industrial properties, which are north of Sandy Blvd. Why are we creating an island of industrial property here? We need small businesses to support our families and the area.
44. Margaret Davis: Beaumont-Wilshire neighborhood. Lost daily bus service a few years ago, and there have been big buildings without parking. We need engagement with neighbors and associations. Make neighborhood dialogue required before development starts. We need infrastructure to match neighborhood and development. The PSC should drop "sustainability" from its name so long as demos continue at the current pace. Losing 100 units of affordable housing impacts us all and mostly helps exploitive developers from outside the city. If we want the green city's reputation, we would incentive real infill.
45. Barbara Quinn: The proposed 300 acres rezoning on WHI for industrial goes against prior feedback and testimony from the last few years. Reconsider and don't negate the public process. Make industrial and manufacturing zones from brownfield sites, and not just in North Portland. We need to consider air quality in North Portland, which is already remarkably poor. Roosevelt High School is in the top 1 percent of schools affected by poor air quality in the nation, and almost all the other schools in North Portland are in the top 3 percent. We have a huge environmental justice issue if industry is concentrated in North Portland only.
46. Martin Slapikas, HiNoon: Testified about WHI including a map that shows WHI is in fact an island. The 2013 IGA with the Port was stating they were looking for public funding, and that was offensive. The bay on the island is a concern if we have increased traffic. The goals of creating complete neighborhoods are not serving this area. One size does not fit all. We don't have an emergency evacuation plan.
47. Roger Averbeck, SWNI transportation committee: I've encouraged neighborhood representatives to read the Comp Plan, look at Map App and discuss with their constituencies to provide input. My frustration is working with the Map App: there are three layers, but you can't overlay them. I am trying to see where the new areas of Centers and Corridors have corresponding TSP projects to support them, and it's not true in all cases, but we need that. A parking policy also still needs to be worked out. I will offer more complete comments in the near future. I still encourage staff to make the tools as easy as possible to use for everyone.

Written Testimony Received between July 22 and September 16, 2014 is available online at <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer.dll/webdrawer/rec/6968053/>.

Written Testimony received at today's meeting:

- Nader Rassouli
- Alastair Roxburgh
- David RedThunder
- HILP
- Timme Helzer
- Bill Kielhorn
- Multnomah Neighborhood Association
- Carol McCarthy
- Terry Parker
- Tad Savinar and Lindley Morton, SQUISH
- Red Hills Holdings
- Tom Bouillion
- Greg Theisen
- Doug Klotz
- Jeff Geisler
- Kelly Hossaini
- Peter Teneau
- Mary Ann Schwab
- Robert Bernstein
- Cyd Manro
- Ken Forcier

The hearing will continue October 14 at 5 p.m. at the Parkrose High School Student Center.

Discussion about themes heard today

Commissioner Gray: I've been collecting the testimony and categorizing it. I will pass on my questions to staff. I'm fascinated by the technology points, especially broadband and open data.

Commissioner Smith: What can we do policy-wise to up our brownfield work? How do we achieve affordability without inclusionary zoning – do we have everything in the plan that we can? A question for staff: what is the role of the City in permitting the propane terminal at the Port? This Comp Plan is our first plan of the 21st century, so we should include technology (broadband, open data) as a fundamental component to citizen involvement.

Commissioner Shapiro: I agree about the comments of having technology available for everyone. WHI is a conversation we need to continue in a work session to come to closure about. Regarding people who didn't feel they have sufficient time: I think we're allowing time with the public. Citizen involvement is critical, and I think the schedule accommodates that. Policy 5.17 talks about aging in place, but what about elders "being useful" in the community too?

Commissioner Oxman: There is lots in the plan that I like – it's visionary, and it's largely coherent... even radical in some areas. Some things we need to dwell on are: housing issues (housing for families); WHI; transportation hierarchy (I'm mixed on this; it's positive and clear and articulates where we say we want to go, but there will be difficult transitions to get there); balance between employment and other uses in mixed use zones. Zoning is the primary implementation strategy, but it's a very blunt instrument.

Commissioner Schultz: The plan overall is visionary, with some minor issues I'm still working through. Competing priorities that we need to work through are how to prioritize the policies and the goals (if we should); industrial lands and environment; and working with neighborhoods struggling with change.

Commissioner Rudd: In the Portland Plan we wanted to prioritize and focus on actions that moved us forward on more than one of our priorities. The beginning of the draft Comp Plan talks about how we will balance policies in the plan but we have to be very clear about the language we are using if we are going to achieve that balancing. Protect, for example, is very forceful extreme. We need to understand the difference between words like protect and encourage and exactly what they mean people are going to do. The glossary is helpful for that but after we make amendments to the language we need to come back and compare them all and understand if we are in fact giving one thing a veto power over other considerations. One thing we've not yet heard about tiny houses (like really tiny), and how we'll deal with that movement.

Commissioner Houck: This plan is a huge stride in the environmental front compared to original Comp Plan. I've submitted comments about different policies with recommendations about where language can be greatly strengthened to accomplish our policies and priorities. What I heard about is the time issue for neighborhoods. The impression I got is that they don't meet during the summer and that has been a problem with them developing a formal position – can we help them catch up in a coordinated manner? I'm not concerned about individuals who have had and will have plenty of time. About affordable housing, I've included feedback from housing advocates in my comments. When we formed the Coalition for A Livable Future in 1994 we made a run on Metro to get mandatory inclusionary zoning in our region but Metro didn't go for it. I'm glad to see the issue of inclusionary zoning is in the draft Comp Plan. WHI is still a huge issue – I think it should be taken off the table (zone it as Open Space or at least Farm and Forest and not consider it for development in the future), or we better make sure that we memorialize in the Comp Plan what the PSC worked so hard to achieve regarding mitigation. The Goal 9 issue versus environmental concerns is something we'll continue to wrestle with since we're a land-locked city. Noise is a huge health and quality of life issue. Are there areas of the city where it's considered "noise free" or more controlled about what noise is allowed?

- There is an issue that we're developing the mixed use zone and institutional zoning project. Usually you do policies then write code. Policies give guidance to zoning. But because we've started these two projects before finishing the Comp Plan, there is some knowledge but not certainty, so people are wondering what these zones mean. There may be an opportunity (and we hope to clarify the zones before you vote). The PSC will have to ask before making its recommendation "do we need more time after the definitions are out" to let people react and testify.
- The parking management plan for centers and corridors will need to rely on the new Comp Plan policies.

Commissioner St Martin: Broadband and open data are very important to take a look at. In asking about extra time for people – there is calendar time, and there is work time. Every comment that comes in gets reviewed and considered. Obstacles and opportunities for brownfields should be looked at in addition to WHI. And a question about equity and WHI – are all the jobs middle-income on Hayden Island? What are the pollution issues? There's also the evacuation issue, especially if there is development; we need to address this.

Commissioner Hanson: This is a great plan and a good foundation and framework. The spot zoning issues are good to consider and need to be evaluated going forward. I'm concerned about stabilizing mid-income jobs. How can we make brownfield development more feasible? Are we overregulating these sites? Campus institutional zone concern and compatibility with the surrounding area needs to be considered. Regarding WHI: is it practical to add the IGA into the mix? Can we? If we don't, does the whole thing go back to square one?

Chair Baugh: This is a visionary plan, which we started in the Portland Plan. We included health and equity, which haven't been talked about before in a planning context. In the Comp Plan, we need to talk about technology in a visionary and inclusionary way. When we talk about

brownfields in the context of prosperity, we need to ask: for whom (lower income? middle?) and where in the city is this prosperity occurring? How does this connect with people and where they live? In terms of institutions, what are we doing for the neighborhoods, not just the institutions? We need to ensure the neighborhoods have a voice about the growth and allow them to grow and be part of the area. The Rossi Farm example is a good policy question: how do we look at land along, for example, 122nd regarding the healthy connected neighborhood objective?

Susan: As you're reviewing the plan, think of topics that are still missing in the plan. Look at the verbs. And let us know you outstanding questions.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting 8:06 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken