



## Lower Southeast Rising Area Plan Project Advisory Committee Meeting: June 28, 2021. 6pm – 8pm

### Meeting Notes

Meeting began at 6:05pm

#### Attendance

Committee members: Anna Weichsel, Aron Klein, Ben Waterhouse, Carolanne Fry, Eleanor Manning, Jed Hafner, Julie Garner, Kathy Brock, Melani Lambert, Michael Kennedy, Nancy Chapin, Nick Sauvie, Pam Hodge, Ryan Ernst, Tim Williams, Valeria McWilliams, and Vivian Schoung

City staff: Marty Stockton, Bryan Poole, Shane Valle, Corrine Montana, Zef Wagner and Scott Goodman (note taker)

#### Welcome:

- A reminder and thank you that today was extraordinarily hot (a high of about 114 degrees)
- The preferred meeting times based on the doodle poll is for the fourth Monday of the month (3<sup>rd</sup> Monday is the close backup)
- The Public Advisory Committee will be taking the Summer off, although there will be emails and outreach. The next meeting will be in September (9/27/21). The committee needs a minimum of 7 meetings (plus the kickoff meeting that already happened)
- The next meetings are September 27 and November 15 (3<sup>rd</sup> Monday for November because of Thanksgiving)

#### Introductions:

- Where do you live?
- What would you like to see resulting from this project?

#### Public Comment:

- No representatives for public comment.

## **Presentation: Project Recap, Existing Conditions Atlas**

The existing conditions atlas highlights many of the racial, socioeconomic, tenure, and zoning differences in comparison with the rest of Portland (see Power Point presentation and associated documents for full report). Public advisory comments and questions included the following:

Question from Michael Kennedy about the “knocking down” of single-dwelling zoning. Response: RIP (Residential Infill Project) allows duplexes or two ADUs (Accessory Dwelling Units). Affordable housing providers can provide even more (affordable) units per lot, but this is still not at the same allowable density and scale as what is permitted in multi-dwelling zoning.

Question from Anna Weichsel about the appreciation of property values in this area and whether there are projections for how the RIP will influence development. Response: there is a need for more up to date information especially as the market changes so rapidly. Anna suggested we could look at how real estate developers are speculating/analyzing development.

Question from Vivian Schoung about the blank spaces on the gentrification-at-risk map. Response: These other areas are not identified as vulnerable as they do not consist of the demographic indicators involving vulnerable populations. While both areas on the map consist of rising property values, the residents in the “blank spaces” benefit from the rising property values rather than at-risk for potential displacement.

Question from Jed Hafner about how walking routes to bus stops affect this plan in terms of commute calculations. Response: this is a part of the analysis.

Concern from Aron Klein regarding the misleading perception of “existing conditions” analyses that include adopted policy, specifically referring to the Transportation System Plan Bike Network map. Response: Adopted policy is the goal rather than what is on the ground. It is an existing condition of adopted City policy, which in many cases is more “aspirational” than actual as far as what has been implemented, which can indeed be confusing when including adopted policy in a compilation of existing conditions.

## **Small Group Breakout Discussion**

What stood out to you in the Existing Conditions Atlas?

Michael asked if it’s likely that we will have future meetings in person. Bryan said indoor meetings aren’t yet allowed, but perhaps outdoor events will soon be possible.

Aron, Ben, Kathy, Nick: Bus access and bicycle network are important. The disparity between the city aspirations and the actual (poor) connectivity are concerning. Also, it’s difficult to get to the MAX station. Disparity between frequent bus access from northern Mt. Scott Arleta to the focus area

Anna, Eleanor, Valeria: It would be useful to compare this information not just to the City of Portland, but also to other neighborhoods (North Portland, Division, etc.). How did we end up with less tree canopy and resources compared with other neighborhoods? What’s the inventory of ADA (American Disabilities Act) ramps here and what’s the development of those resources look like in this plan?

Jed, Nancy, Pam, Ryan: We would like access to the presentation slides to be able to analyze them more leisurely. We are surprised by the new guidelines on pedestrian crossing spacings. There is a concern about the lack of trees. Ryan chatted how the parks here lack trees compared with other city parks.

Carolanne, Michael, Tim, Vivian: The data is too old to use for any good recommendations. We need to see the impacts of the Foster road diet on the other arterial roads. Zef responded that Covid has altered our data collection capabilities, but this is likely to improve with things opening up. Late Summer and Fall ought to provide more meaningful data to use as baseline information. Covid has also led to more excessive speeding.

Several committee members chatted that they appreciated the small discussion group opportunity.

### **Presentation: Public Involvement Plan (PIP)**

The current public involvement plan draft sections that most need committee feedback/focus are: equity considerations, public involvement process, community stakeholders, and the key priorities identified by community-led efforts. We want to include "Imagine Black" and APANO Jade District plans in the appendices alongside the Brentwood-Darlington Neighborhood Assessment and Action Plan.

Regarding the benefits and burdens: this project is scoped to consider land use and zoning code, transportation improvements, and other public actions, which will affect different populations differently. It's very helpful to have information and input from the most vulnerable communities. There will be a committee exercise to help with the matrix of benefits and burdens going out after the meeting.

Current key equity goals include:

- Expand active and green transportation access
- Increase commercial opportunities and neighborhood-serving businesses
- Reduced household costs
- Improve public amenities in deficient areas accompanied with anti-displacement strategies
- Collaboration is welcomed for policy, technical expertise and funding
- The process and the approach are as important as the result

Nick suggested in the chat that more affordable housing and more multifamily zoning should be key equity goals (Nancy agreed in the chat).

For this project, there are four advisory bodies: the technical advisory committee (agency and city bureau representatives), the project advisory committee (this group), the planning and sustainability commission (this group will make recommendations to the City Council, committee member Valeria is on staff there), and City Council (with a public hearing and public notice, the City Council is the ultimate decision making entity).

Regarding community participation for the project advisory committee, this project will focus on the "inform" thru "collaborate" levels (this also includes "consult" and "involve"). We plan on including an interactive online map survey and multi-lingual paper surveys as well. City staff developed and held a walking tour that was carried out for staff, but perhaps we will put together a community walking

and/or bike tour as well. Carolanne chatted that she benefited from a Lents Green Loop walking tour and would appreciate one for this project too

Additional feedback is welcomed for the jamboard as well, especially regarding key equity goals and what should be added/changed.

Question from Michael about equity and whether the city will address why it is this way and the City's role in redlining and other racist practices (he says Irvington has a good example to look at). Response: Zef says the city is working on this and will address other issues as well such as property tax disparities.

The meeting ended at 8:05pm.