

**Lower Southeast Rising Area Plan
Project Advisory Committee (PAC) Meeting #4
February 28, 2022; 6pm – 8pm
Zoom Meeting**

www.portland.gov/bps/lower-se-rising/events/2022/2/28/lower-southeast-rising-area-plan-project-advisory-committee

Meeting Notes

Meeting began at 6:05 p.m.

Attendance

Committee members: Kathy Brock, Nancy Chapin (she/her), Ryan Ernst (he/him), Julie Garner (she/her), Jed Hafner (he/him), Pam Hodge (she/her), Michael Kennedy (he/him), Aron Klein (he/him), Eleanor Manning (she/her), Valeria McWilliams (she/her), Ben Waterhouse (he/him), Anna Weichsel, Tim Williams (he/him)

City staff: Cassie Ballew (she/her), Kevin Bond (he/him), Bill Cunningham (he/him), Mauricio Leclerc, Lora Patiño Lillard (she/her), Bryan Poole (he/him), Marty Stockton (she/her), Valeria Tapia (she/her)

ODOT staff: Hector Rodriguez-Ruiz (he/him)

Public: Justin Krug (he/him)

Welcome

Introduction

- What fun winter activities have you done or are planning to do this season?

Public Comment

- Justin Krug (he/him): issues logging in through zoom.

**Project Overview and Timeline/Process Schedule
Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):**

Updated the PAC committee on updates to the project plan and the project boundaries. Focus is to increase livability for Brentwood-Darlington and surrounding neighborhoods. Ensure that there is housing stability, as well as improve access to employment, schools, local services, amenities, and recreational opportunities. Focusing access on active transportation improvements for walking and biking.

We are halfway through the planning process and project timeline. We have so far shared existing conditions, issues, and needs with public in the Fall. Now we are starting to look at alternatives which will go through the Spring and Summer. As we do continue to engage in public outreach and participation. In late Summer and Fall will start prioritization and implementation strategies. Then drafting the plan, and move forward with the legislative process in the Spring of 2023

Presentation: Pin It, Portland—Winter Public Involvement, Public Feedback Highlights, and Discussion
Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):

- Invited PAC and participants to look at Pin it, Portland mapping tool through website and review community insights by public. Notified that the tool is now closed but, is open for the public to see comments submitted.
- Recapped of community engagement that occurred during Summer: Online Kick-off Survey pertaining to project area. The survey highlighted the project need to require further spatial input for the project and that is how Pin it, Portland tool was piloted. To view transparency of feedback and specific locations. Noted that tool could be used for possible future City projects. Pin it, Portland mapping tool was kicked off in October, allowed for public feedback and went through January 2022.
- Feedback resulted in a Bureau collaboration, specifically with the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES). BES questioned where in the project area is there pooling or puddling of water. Staff collaborated and engaged with Woodstock and Brentwood-Darlington Neighborhood Associations to get targeted feedback from the community for specific places where work needs to be done.
- 629 comments, 595 comments were actual distinction comments. Removed comments used as voting tool, staff testing, or repeated comments. With this tool you could choose community insight categories Environment, Housing, Land Use/ Zoning, Other, Public Facilities, Public Safety, and Transportation. The community member could choose specific spatial location.
- Shared findings from the Pin it, Portland mapping tool and Memo. Public safety was the largest community insight submitted. There were several community insights that had overlapping category, particularly with transportation and public safety.
- Highlighted chart should the percentage of Community Insights by Category for the mapping tool regarding the categories of Environment, Housing, Public Facilities, Public Safety, Transportation Zoning or Land use, in the project area. Reported the number of community insights submitted for each category on the mapping tool in the Core Focus Area Overview—Brentwood Darlington and the Areas of Concern/Opportunity. Public Safety and Transportation were the main themes that community provided feedback on in the Brentwood-Darlington.
- Memo summary of the Pin it, Portland tool will be posted early March 2022. Memo summary will cover the core project area of Brentwood-Darlington and the overall project area. All comments submitted to tool will be included in appendix of the memo and be organized by category.

Sample quotes received on Pin it, Portland mapping tool:

- **52nd Ave & Duke St:** “SE 52nd between Duke and Flavel streets is one of few areas that have some shops -- sidewalks are badly needed along SE 52nd.”
- **52nd Ave & Henderson St:** “We want more street trees and infrastructure that allows for street trees and shade for our few areas that have sidewalks (although there are many places on 52nd where the sidewalks are washed out). No one wants to walk here, especially with the high volume of traffic, lack of trees, and continues sidewalk.”
- **Knapp St & 57th Ave:** “Lower income housing development on vacant lot. Is target for houseless persons to camp on edge of undeveloped property leading to inhumane and dangerous living

conditions. Incredible opportunity to create transition housing for families, women in need, veterans.”

- **72nd Ave & Flavel St:** “I agree that the 72nd and Flavel cross streets is a great place to create a strong business area. It already has the makings of it with a grocery store, a bar/restaurant, and a food cart pod "Cart or Rama". It central to the entire Brentwood-Darlington area in which most residents would be able to walk or bike here. Other business areas are more on the outskirts of the neighborhood so if something is to be created in which most neighbors can access and has infrastructure and businesses already in place, then the 72nd area is an important location to focus on.”

Discussion and Questions:

- **Julie Garner, PAC (she/her):** Can we see the comments, or will they be in the report being sent later? Is there a legend regarding what the symbols mean?
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** Legend was available on the Pin it, Portland mapping tool website. Not sure if now is still available to see because of the tool being closed. The bus symbolized the transportation category.
- **Valeria McWilliams, PAC (she/her):** Any demographics of people who submitted comments?
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** No, we did not as demographic questions on the Pin it, Portland tool which has pros and cons. What we did do was ask if the community wished to opt-in to emailed or updated about the project. Are there any thoughts back on asking demographic questions in the future, if so we can relay information to the BPS tech team.
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** I think this is something that we can explore in a survey that asks after for demographic information. The feedback is good, and a good strategy, and we do recognize that we need that. Showed the Pin it, Portland mapping tool, highlighted where to find the category legend, and how to view community insights.
- **Anna Weichsel, PAC:** Did you also collect information about how people learned about the tool. Might be an interesting to see because it could help gain information about how people are getting access, and about the information channels that exist. Could support on how to better access. Noted the outreach from the neighborhood association website, but that it is also a particular group of people that use it. Would like to equalize access for wider input.
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** That is a great thought. We didn't ask people this round how they heard about the tool. But we are discussing possibly holding a transit focused workshop in March. Possibly have conversation or add a conversation how in the next public outreach hold questions like these. Would appreciate feedback on how to best get the word out for public open house. Do not have time tonight, but critical to think about.
- **Aron Klein, PAC (he/him):** Did any pins come in languages other than English? Did anyone respond in other languages?
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** That was a question we were asking the online team. The response we received is if done by Google browser there is the ability to use translator that is one way for other people to read in alternative languages. Is something we can better about. The staff needs to be trained on how to access those ability modes. We also did not receive any responses in other languages.
- **Valeria McWilliams, PAC (she/her):** Great tool for community engagement, congratulations on the great number of responses!

- **Justin Krug, public (he/him):** Would like to know if there are any plans for speed bumps or other traffic speed controlling measures on SE Steele, particularly in front of Woodstock Elementary School. If not, what are the appropriate channels available for residents to advocate for these kinds of changes?
 - **Response by Ryan Ernst, PAC (he/him):** Scott would be a good contact to ask about speed bumps. Scott.Cohen@portlandoregon.gov

Walk-thru of draft Community Development Scenarios and Discussion

- **Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** We will be walking through presenting the early draft of the Community Development Scenarios specifically scenarios that have to do with Land Use and the City spatial policies. A step back of why we are initiating this project, we are looking at this area, includes Eastmoreland, Woodstock, Mt. Scott Arleta, Brentwood-Darlington, and Lents. There is not a designated center or corridor in this neighborhood particularly in Brentwood-Darlington. Showed the maps used for grant proposal. One map showing people are traveling outside of the community to meet their daily needs. The second map is a PBOT map showing the street network lacking adequate and is deficient in the transportation network for the Lower SE community.
- What led to the grant: Brentwood-Darlington Neighborhood Assessment and Action Plan (2017) by the community and Portland State University's Master of Urban and Regional Planning(MURP) workshop group. The assessment provided the recommendations for the neighborhood that focused on Housing & Equity, Infrastructure & Transit Recommendations, Economic Development Recommendations.

Focus Areas have now been changed to Community Development Scenarios

A preview of the land use Community Development Scenarios was shared, which included the following:

1. SE 52nd Ave (Woodstock to Flavel Drive)
 2. SE 72nd Ave (Woodstock to Crystal Springs) updated to (Foster Rd to Harney St)
 3. Flavel Street MAX Station (Flavel & 92nd)
- **Comment by Julie Garner, PAC (she/her):** Excited, something I've mentioned. Near where I live, excited to see something happen there.

Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her): We are looking at four Community Scenarios. Each scenario is additive, we will be building and adding to each scenario. As we get to scenario three and four, there may be a particular component the community likes or doesn't. The options can be blended or removed and are open to your thoughts and opinions on the scenarios.

- **Base Case** – no change
- **Enhanced Commercial Nodes/MAX Station Area** – zoning map/code changes coordinated with transportation improvements
- **Corridors** – Proposed new Neighborhood Corridor designations (52nd and 72nd). Zoning map changes with transportation improvements
- **Centers + Corridors**—Proposed expansion of existing Neighborhood Centers (Woodstock and Heart of Foster). Proposed new Neighborhood Center (72nd & Flavel). Proposed new

Neighborhood Center designations (52nd & 72nd). Zoning map changes with transportation improvements.

Lora Patiño Lillard, BPS (she/her): Presented and shared link to concept board including the proposed Community Development Scenarios <https://app.conceptboard.com/board/y7xq-h58a-kiao-gcdk-s0bh>. Noted the concept board is a tool used as a virtual pin up space and provided overview of tool, legends, and maps. Reviewed that the scenarios will be covered by less change to the most change.

Scenario one: Wouldn't be making any zoning changes, focus areas of growth and changes, will continue to be out of the neighborhood in areas that have zoned capacity for growth.

- Lents Town Center, 82nd Ave, Woodstock being designated neighborhood corridor.
- Existing Woodstock, and Foster neighborhood center, which all currently have capacity for growth.
- Imagine transportation improvements would be focused on how to connect people to goods and serviced in those areas.

Scenario two: A little bit of changes that can occur without comprehensive changes. Think of intersections community members want changes in. Update and allow more density in areas that are existing Neighborhood Centers/Corridors for apartments and commercial. Also offer to update and allow more density in areas that the community members desires such as:

- 52nd bump up residential density
- Ogden & 52nd Commercial node, bump up to mixed used node
- 72nd not a lot of change, most would be along Woodstock
- Duke & 72nd enhance node within our current comprehensive land use designations
- Focus transportation improvements to get to services along these intersections.

Scenario three: Is about Corridors and is looking at growing focused on midblock.

- 52nd and/or 72nd
- Designating one or both as Neighborhood Corridors.
- Land use that allows more goods and services to be allowed in those areas
- Focused on already naturally occurring nodes
- 72nd: Residential where could support more growth
- Similar to what you see in Woodstock or along 92nd

Scenario four: Also shows corridors, 52nd and 72nd, but has additional suggestions.

- Existing Neighborhood Center at Woodstock, extending it down to encompass the intersection at Duke and 52nd. Increasing density for that neighborhood center and bringing it down into the neighborhood.
- Similar concept on 72nd and heart of foster neighborhood. Bring some of the density already on Woodstock and Foster. Bringing it East and West, to allow for more residential density.
- Focus along Flavel and 72nd with both mixed use and residential that could support mixed use center, propose new neighborhood center, and extend out.
 - Support node in East-West direction towards 82nd Ave and support Flavel Max station.

Discussion and Questions:

- **Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** shared questions in chat
 - What excites you or your curious about on any of the scenarios presented?
 - Any impressions on the legibility of the diagrams, the storytelling of a progression that this project is trying to convey, and how we should refine for a public conversation?
 - Are there specific questions on the draft Community Development Scenarios for the public?
 - What other important community landmarks we missed?
 - Are there infrastructure bureau ideas on what we should propose/need to say about the SE Flavel & 92nd MAX Station?
- **Michael Kennedy, PAC (he/him):** Scenario four looks fantastic to me. But in the in the areas that would be increasing density, is there any conversations with TriMet to provide services to?
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** We have hired Jarret Walker and Associates to assist us with transit analysis on this project. We will be having either in March or April meeting a transit focused conversation with the committee. Definitely will be talking about transit with all the proposed scenarios. Interesting key findings by Jarret Walker. Have been lucky to have Grant O Conner from TriMet participating and observing in this project. Grant is also on our TAC. Is something we need a clear understanding on, the future of transit improvement is only going to occur if we go with more aggressive Community Development Scenarios. One of the tradeoffs we need to consider with this project. TriMet, does not have any necessary commitments with this project. In a service enhancement project was noted that there are some future lines that at this point may be reconsidered for equity and population reasons. There is the potential to do advocacy for transit but is tied to both land use and transportation decisions on this project. Transit is very much a discussion that will continue to happen during this project.
- **Julie Garner, PAC (she/her):** Kind of going on the transportation conversation, excited for any changes. Even when I'm cycling, or driving, cars go very fast on 52nd, 72nd, and 82nd. If increasing density in these areas will streets be redesigned to be more difficult to speed on (more bicycle friendly)? More street calming. With 72nd it is a narrow road, and with parking on both sides, when I'm riding on it, which I rarely do. I just have to go into the lane, and they are very aggressive streets. With these new designs will you be making them more safe for people on it.
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** It will depend on the preferred alternative that comes out of this project. There are trade-offs. Will discuss more as we move the project forward. If we go on 72nd with higher density scenario would need to look at possibly removing parking and proving more access to commercial opportunities or be providing access to adjacent streets.
- **Nancy Chapin, PAC (she/her):** Financing wise - it is it either/or for managing all of these proposed projects?
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** You can pick and choose scenarios, not one or the other. Really this changing the zoning for the development to happen. But wouldn't be a project that happens all at once.
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** Yes, this is correct. Nancy did we understand your question regarding financing?

- **Nancy Chapin, PAC (she/her):** I was wondering as you look across there are added things to fourth scenario and was wondering if there have to be some choices. But, if just zoning that wouldn't be costing a lot more
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** Is a question that's coming up internally too. This is not necessarily where the financing question is coming in but is in the transportation improvement to support. We are not there yet but are there funds to support transportation improvements. All of this would have to happen in the private sector or through community development groups who receive public funds for development.
- **Michael Kennedy, PAC (he/him):** See that on scenario four there is a lot of shading for parking lots. How do we incentivize the conversion of parking lots into high density housing?
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** Zoning can be a tool for broader recognition of geography. With zoning there can be speculation or interest from real estate. At the same time there have been areas in our city that have been up zoned like i.e. gateway and haven't been developed to their highest extent. This is where agencies like Prosper Portland come in. Urban renewal districts, NPIs, Housing Bureau bond funds.
 - **Response by Kevin Bond, BPS (he/him):** Also, many zoning tools available, like low or no parking minimums, transit-oriented and transit-supportive development standards. (Didn't say this, but also density and FAR bonuses.)
- **Zoom chat question:** How do these scenarios interact with Residential infill project (RIP)?
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** RIP applies to the 'yellow' single-dwelling zoned areas on the scenario diagrams. What that allows is the ability for more duplexes, and additional accessory dwelling units, additionally, allows for further development if focused on affordable housing project. With multi-dwelling house, ability to do more townhome, garden apartments of 3-4 stories based on intensity. We want that zoning to be adjacent to services, amenities, and transit. Support broader housing types and affordability. Portland is the first city to permit inclusionary housing. 20% of units that are affordable in the private market.
 - **Response by Lora Patiño Lillard, BPS (she/her):** The basic level of service, and all other scenarios are affected by RIP. The new ability to increase residential density, the area will continue to grow. When think of the future 20-25 years from now. The areas in yellow will have more people. While raises the question of where we would want good and services to a neighborhood that's growing.
- **Anna Weichsel, PAC:** Is there a tool to have incentives to have certain areas developed first? A certain kind of programming in mind that could change some of our daily behavior on how we get around town. We need a larger part of our community to become attracted to a different type of lifestyle. Are there any experimental projects or educations to show these alternatives?
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** Would love to explore this question more with you and the committee. It could be that there may be existing tools that support this. Typically, it is an urban renewal districts like Lents for example, where Prosper Portland purchases property where there is more of identifying the parcels and intersections where growth is most desired to happen first. That is a specific tool with urban renewal districts. The way that a community can identify and assist with that vision, is there a way we can do some prioritization/recommendations within this plan what the community and City would prefer to see in development.
 - **Response by Kevin Bond, BPS (he/him):** Development is incentivized wherever the city is investing. Spending money on infrastructure improvements, NPIs. Redevelopment

would follow that. What we are looking at here is how we would want to prioritize these changes to both allow for transportation improvements, land use, growth, and development.

- **Response by Bill Cunningham, BPS (he/him):** Zoning does play a role, talking to local community development corporations like Rose CDC. They could provide input to what zones would be most attractive for affordable housing development to happen. TriMet, has a transit-oriented development grant program where they fund development near transit. But, does highlight convergence where infrastructure and services are and where development can happen and use tools to encourage it.
- **Pam Hodge, PAC (she/her):** At first blush, Scenario #4 seems the most appealing. What are the potential downsides of this comprehensive approach?
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** Sounds like there is some consensus between the group to see changes and growth.
 - **Pam Hodge, PAC (she/her):** Would love to see specifically what pros and cons exist for each of the alternative scenarios presented for public discussion. To help public understand why you would want or not want to choose a particular scenario. We have so many existing deficits in the study area, that it seems more is better. But, having staff comments on pros and cons, could be a way to structure the discussion.
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** Absolutely, one thing that staff is working on for the online public house that we will have an online survey that has questions, but with each of these scenarios' city staff will be working on a matrix to evaluate each of these scenarios to come up with a list of potential pros and cons (and differences) between them. Each scenarios have a change of access to services, the ability for there to be affordable housing, ability for transit improvement and access.
- **Ryan Ernst, PAC (he/him):** Do we have comps city wide for each scenario?
 - **Response by Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):** Not really, but it's something we could look into potentially, but in a different form. Very much think scenario four, has a lot of similarities to Cully neighborhood. That would be kind of a comparison, be we can probably find some other comparisons, and ask public to bring forth some good examples of these.
 - **Response by Bill Cunningham, BPS (he/him):** Did something like this during the 2035 Comp Plan process. For all the centers of the city, and we can compare what's present here to Cully, Montavilla, Multnomah Village, and other neighborhood centers.

Potential Street and Active Transportation Improvements

Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):

Presented slides noting that have been working to identify where street improvements are needed. Also looking at how to improve the bike network and prioritizing pedestrian crossings. Shared draft maps illustrating:

- Potential improvements on busy and local streets – Major Corridor Needs, Intersection Improvements Needs, Local Street Paving Needs, Local Street Safety Needs (including traffic calming zones), Funded corridor and intersection improvement projects
 - Learned from public feedback, that we need traffic calming particularly in Brentwood-Darlington neighborhood. One each street on the map the issue or need is highlighted on the pertaining street, calls out existing projects already funded. Highlighted Steele and 72nd Ave.

- Potential bicycle route improvements—Neighborhood Greenway network gaps, Bikeway network deficiencies, Bikeway network gaps, Existing bikeways, Existing neighborhood greenways, Funding neighborhood greenways
 - Which of these make sense and which should be prioritize? We are focused to improve access and mobility in the project area.
- Still in draft form, looking for feedback of issues or needs missing, how to make the information more digestible.

Shared Transit Network Analysis map done by Jarrett Walker who is partnering with City to analyze possible transit improvements. Three alternatives being explored that would improve access to jobs and services. More information to be provided in next meeting. Map exhibited the “Existing access to Jobs and Places for People in 45 minutes at 12:00 PM.” Highlighted that Brentwood-Darlington has a gap of access.

Discussion and Questions

- Are any major projects missing? Funded projects we missed?
 - Ideas for how to more clearly visualize improvements for the public open house?
 - Ideas for how to start considering project prioritization?
- **Aron Klein, PAC (he/him):** Surprised to not see quadrant between 72nd and 82nd, Duke and Flavel, with any indication of needs. Some of the blocks seem very gridded, except Duke and 72nd, the only north south street 78th between two schools. High speed cars, no sidewalks. I’m curious, where those fits? I think there is a future bike path there? But, feels like a gap of attention, curious if on your radar.
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** yes, there is a funded project already for a neighborhood greenway that will construct possibly later this year along that area. We do want to clean up our maps to make the information more accessible and clearer regarding transportation deficiencies and needs.
 - **Anna Weichsel, PAC:** For the public engagement workshops, would be helpful to have actual photos and images of the crossroads and point of discussion. Not everyone has experience of working with maps, would be super helpful for discussions. Based on feedback from people biking, on Knapp crossing 52nd and 45th. A lot of people coming from Brentwood-Darlington crossing over from the schools or to Woodstock area are cared of the crossing on 52nd and 45th especially with people with children. Would be especially for bike paths, see who’s using them in the small bits and pieces, not only in the long connectivity. There seems to be small scale traffic in the neighborhood that people with children go, and different needs, and safety issues.
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** Very helpful comments. Will say that the Knapp and Ogden Neighborhood Greenway is funded for 2023. There is also a gap from 52nd to the west as something that needs to be addressed, Knapp and 42nd is also we heard of.
 - **Anna Weichsel, PAC:** It is very dangerous for them to turn on Knapp and 52nd, wouldn’t for bicyclist
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** Something we’ve heard. There are a few things we’ve done for these types of intersections. Different types of turns, crossings

treatments depend on context, we can look at that. I hear you on maps, that is something we will do for then open house to make it easier to understand.

- **Ryan Ernst, PAC (he/him):** If I am seeing correctly, It looks like SE46/45th is under developed in biking but was literally repaved and bike lanes were enhanced. 2ish years ago. The BDNA has tossed around the idea of asking for Ogden, Rural, Knapp one ways at some point.
 - **Response by Bryan Poole, PBOT (he/him):** Yes, the part of is because of that hill. So need to take that into consideration because of the hill. We can share out these maps after meeting. They are preliminary and in early stages.

Updates and Next Steps

Marty Stockton, BPS (she/her):

- It (most likely) needs to still be online due to COVID-19 health and safety precautions.
- The online open house/survey opportunity will be available for a month or longer.
- We plan to also have safe "drop-in" hours located in the project area.
- Parallel engagement with the Latinx (via Latino Network partnership/DPO) and other communities are being planned.

Upcoming dates:

- March/April TBD (Special Meeting on Transit)
- Next Committee meeting, Monday, April 25, 2022 (Meeting #5)

Action items for Project Team:

- Developing comprehensive list of issues and needs
- Working on possible solutions, evaluation and prioritization criteria
- Preparing for spring engagement
- Will be sending doodle poll for next meeting
- Conversation about open house

The meeting ended at 8:05 p.m.