

Manning, Barry

From: Pastor, Andrea
Sent: Thursday, May 6, 2021 7:34 PM
To: Manning, Barry
Subject: RE: MP2H (Streetcar) In-House Review Draft

Hi Barry,

It was great to chat with you for a bit this morning. Sorry it's so late in the day to be getting you this, but I'm working around a baby's schedule . . .

I have a few comments, but overall I was happy to see that the proposed plan hybrid does a pretty good job of maximizing jobs and housing, and preserves industrial lands near the river.

I just sort of wrote these as I was reading the document, so I hope they're not too hard to follow.

Pg 7 & 8: Equity index analysis- Narrative does not match numbers on map. Area north of Thurman and below Nicolai is a 4 and the part west of 19th which is an 8 and a 6, much higher than citywide averages and that's not mentioned. Would be good to include a bit more of an explanation of the tool.

Scenario alternatives:

It would have been nice to have the Do Nothing scenario included. I noted that you received that comment from public feedback also. I know I was definitely wondering what the base numbers were throughout and they're only mentioned in passing much later in the document. I kind of want to quibble with the language that was chosen for the scenario names. "Enhanced Industrial" vs "Employment" is kind of confusing and there isn't really a discussion about just how likely it is that we would see a marked preference for creative office uses over industrial once that's allowed.

In Scenario 2, do you define 'high-density employment' anywhere? Maybe a quick explanation of how many people work in an area per acre in the different types of land uses.

"Scenario 3 . . . The scenario allows the continuation of many of the area's industrial uses, but would allow for development of residential, commercial and mixed-use buildings over time." This language again doesn't explain the market reality that while IG uses might be allowed, they would become increasingly unlikely.

Typos: pages 26, 27 (ancho should be anchor), page 54 under use prohibitions (commercia should be commercial)

Map on page 32 is difficult to decipher, especially the zoomed in portion.

Page 49- the estimate of cost mitigation for contaminated sites should include a range, not a maximum figure, which seems high.

Section 6- Why doesn't this cover Equity in Hiring/Contracting practices or other Public Amenities.

Page 57- It would be nice to include more detail on possible public benefits, perhaps citing elements that are included in other plan districts with negotiated CBAs. This is the main point that the rest of the anti-displacement team was hoping to see. Would it be possible to include examples and references for future negotiations if and when the streetcar is built and city money is used to make needed improvements to the ROW? Presumably that is when we will have additional leverage necessary to extract public benefits, so it would be good to have a list of ideas ready to go. This would

potentially serve as an aid for any community groups who did eventually want to try to get involved in advocacy with developers.

Anyway, hope these notes help! Here's the link to the [ADAP Foundation Report](#). Enjoy!

Andrea Pastor
503-823-7845

From: Manning, Barry <Barry.Manning@portlandoregon.gov>
Sent: Monday, April 19, 2021 5:15 PM
To: Jeffrey, Jamie <Jamie.Jeffrey@portlandoregon.gov>; Montalvo, Teresa <Teresa.Montalvo@portlandoregon.gov>; Gastaldi, Gena <Gena.Gastaldi@portlandoregon.gov>; Bertelsen, April <April.Bertelsen@portlandoregon.gov>; Lillard, Lora <Lora.Lillard@portlandoregon.gov>; Kountz, Steve <Steve.Kountz@portlandoregon.gov>; Nielsen, Benjamin <Benjamin.Nielsen@portlandoregon.gov>; Snook, Jamie <SnookJ@TriMet.org>; Hibsichman, Kate <Kate.Hibsichman@portlandoregon.gov>; Conner, Jessica <Jessica.Conner@portlandoregon.gov>; Tschabold, Matthew <Matthew.Tschabold@portlandoregon.gov>; Agarwal, Maya <Maya.Agarwal@portlandoregon.gov>; Saling, Mike <Mike.Saling@portlandoregon.gov>; Lyons, Adam (Civic Life) <adam@necoalition.org>; Filgueiras, Joana <filgueirasj@prosperportland.us>; Dan Bower <dan.bower@portlandstreetcar.org>; Andrew Plambeck <andrew.plambeck@portlandstreetcar.org>; Jennings, Paul <Paul.Jennings@portlandoregon.gov>; BOLEN Glen A <glen.a.bolen@odot.state.or.us>; Dabbs, Eden <Eden.Dabbs@portlandoregon.gov>; Buono, Shannon <Shannon.Buono@portlandoregon.gov>; Phillips, Nikoyia <Nikoyia.Phillips@portlandoregon.gov>; Frederiksen, Joan <Joan.Frederiksen@portlandoregon.gov>; Pastor, Andrea <Andrea.Pastor@portlandoregon.gov>; Abuaf, Lisa <AbuafL@prosperportland.us>
Cc: Starin, Nicholas <Nicholas.Starin@portlandoregon.gov>; Wagner, Zef <Zef.Wagner@portlandoregon.gov>; Engstrom, Eric <Eric.Engstrom@portlandoregon.gov>
Subject: MP2H (Streetcar) In-House Review Draft

Hello MP2H Technical Advisors and Interested Staff:

The Montgomery Park to Hollywood Study (MP2H) NW In-House Review Draft is attached for your review and feedback. This draft is not intended for public review. Your feedback will help staff develop a Discussion Draft for public review. **We ask that you review the portions of the document that are relevant to your interests and provide feedback to the MP2H project team on or before May 6, 2021.** Comments should be sent to Barry Manning via email.

The MP2H Study considered alternative futures for an area in NW Portland that is currently undergoing change, and considers the opportunity to transform it into a mixed use district served by a planned extension of the Portland Streetcar if key land use policy, economic and equity issues can be addressed. The MP2H In-House Draft describes this opportunity for change and an approach to implementation. A companion high-level concept report for the NE portion of the MP2H study area is expected in the coming weeks.

This NW-focused In-House draft includes two volumes. Volume 1 describes the study background, vision, alternatives analysis, and implementation approach for the NW study area. (Some of the graphics included in this document will be updated, and some additional graphics will be added, for the public Discussion Draft.) Volume 2 includes draft changes to the Portland Zoning code to help implement the land use portions of the vision. Both volumes are included in the attached file. A Word version is available on request.

Please note that the implementation approach included herein relies primarily on bonuses for affordable housing and affordable commercial space to achieve some of the public benefits expected with a significant change in land use. These bonus provisions can be found in Volume 2, Zoning Code Amendments, which includes a new plan district for the area – 33.590, Vaughan-Nicolai Plan District – that includes the bonus provisions.

The project team is still exploring options for developing a public benefits agreement that may augment or possibly substitute for the bonus provisions in this plan district. However, we ask that you review and comment on the code approach described in plan district for proposed intent, viability, and code implementation clarity as applicable to your agency interest.

If you have any question, please contact BPS project staff Barry Manning (barry.manning@portlandoregon.gov; 503-823-7965) or Nicholas Starin (Nicholas.starin@portlandoregon.gov).

Thank you.

Barry Manning, Senior Planner

(He/him)

City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

1900 SW 4th Ave, Suite 7100

Portland, OR 97201

barry.manning@portlandoregon.gov

Phone: 503-823-7965. *Due to COVID 19, I am currently working remotely and have limited phone access.*

Please use email to ensure I receive your message and can set up a call if needed.

The City of Portland is committed to providing meaningful access. For accommodations, modifications, translation, interpretation or other services, please contact at 503-823-7700 or use City TTY 503-823-6868.

