



# June 12, 2025 Climate, Resilience, and Land Use Committee Agenda

**City Hall, Council Chambers, 2nd Floor – 1221 SW Fourth Avenue, Portland, OR 97204**

In accordance with Portland City Code and state law, City Council holds hybrid public meetings, which provide for both virtual and in-person participation. Councilors may elect to attend remotely by video and teleconference, or in-person. The City makes several avenues available for the public to listen to and watch the broadcast of this meeting, including the [City's YouTube Channel](#), the [Open Signal website](#), and Xfinity Channel 30 and 330.

Questions may be directed to [councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:councilclerk@portlandoregon.gov)

**Thursday, June 12, 2025 9:30 am**

---

**Session Status:** Adjourned

**Committee in Attendance:**

Councilor Sameer Kanal

Councilor Dan Ryan

Councilor Angelita Morillo, Co-Chair

Councilor Candace Avalos

Councilor Steve Novick, Co-Chair

Councilor Novick presided.

Officers in attendance: Diego Barriga, Acting Council Clerk

Committee adjourned at 11:32 a.m.

## Regular Agenda

1

\*Amend Flood Hazard Areas Code to comply with Federal Emergency Management Agency National Flood Insurance Program Pre-Implementation Compliance Measures (amend Code Chapter 24.50) (Emergency Ordinance)

**Ordinance number:** 192083

**Document number:** 2025-217

**Introduced by:** Mayor Keith Wilson

**City department:** Permitting & Development

**Time requested:** 50 minutes

Previous agenda item

**Council action:** Referred to City Council as amended

Motion to amend Exhibit A as shown in Morillo 1: Moved by Avalos and seconded by Morillo (Aye (4): Kanal, Morillo, Avalos, Novick; Nay (1): Ryan)

Motion to refer the Ordinance as amended, Document Number 2025-217, to full Council with the recommendation it be passed: Moved by Morillo and seconded by Avalos (Aye (4): Kanal, Morillo, Avalos, Novick; Nay (1): Ryan)

2

Appoint and reappoint members to the Portland Parks & Recreation Board (Report)

**Document number:** 2025-235

**Introduced by:** Mayor Keith Wilson

**City department:** Parks & Recreation

**Time requested:** 30 minutes

**Council action:** Referred to City Council

Motion to refer the Report, Document Number 2025-235, to full Council with the recommendation that the appointments be confirmed: Moved by Morillo and seconded by Kanal (Aye (5): Kanal, Ryan, Morillo, Avalos, Novick)

3

Discussion on funds from Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund for office conversion (Presentation)

**Document number:** 2025-236

**Introduced by:** Councilor Angelita Morillo; Councilor Steve Novick

**Time requested:** 40 minutes

**Council action:** Placed on File

Portland City Council, Climate, Resilience, and Land Use Committee  
June 12, 2025 - 9:30 a.m.  
Speaker List

Name	Title	Document Number
Steve Novick	Councilor, Committee Chair	
Diego Barriga	Acting Council Clerk	
Sameer Kanai	Councilor	
Dan Ryan	Councilor	
Angelita Morillo	Councilor, Committee Chair	
Candace Avalos	Councilor	
Claire Adamsick	Council Policy Analyst	
Jason Butler-Brown	Engineering Supervisor, Portland Permitting & Development	2025-217
Patricia Diefenderfer	Chief Planner, Bureau of Planning & Sustainability	2025-217
Eric Shaffner	City Attorney	2025-217
Cherice Bock	(Testimony)	2025-217
Mary Stites	Staff Attorney, Northwest Environmental Defense Center	2025-217
Tanya Hartnette	(Testimony)	2025-217
Adena Long	Director, Portland Parks & Recreation	2025-235
Kitty Firth	PP&R Board Appointee	2025-235
Sally Bernstein	PP&R Board Appointee	2025-235
Myrah Rafi'ah Beverly	PP&R Board Appointee	2025-235
Andre Buenacosa	PP&R Board Appointee	2025-235
Tommy Schopp	PP&R Board Appointee	2025-235
Jacob Karson	PP&R Board Appointee	2025-235
Sam Baraso	Program Manager, PCEF	2025-236
Lisa Abauf	Interim Executive Director	2025-236
Ranfis Villatoro	Co-Chair, Portland Clean Energy Benefits Fund Committee	2025-236

Portland City Council, Climate, Resilience, and Land Use Committee  
June 12, 2025 - 9:30 a.m.  
Testimony List

Name	Document Number
Cherice Bock	2025-217
Mary Stites	2025-217
Tanya Hartnette	2025-217

## **Portland City Council Committee Meeting Closed Caption File**

**June 12, 2025 – 9:30 a.m.**

This file was produced through the closed captioning process for the televised city Council broadcast and should not be considered a verbatim transcript. The official vote counts, motions, and names of speakers are included in the official minutes.

**Speaker:** Good morning. I call the meeting of the sleep deprived climate resilience and land use committee to order. It is Thursday, June 12th at 9:30 a.m. The clerk, please call the roll.

**Speaker:** Canal. President Ryan here. Morillo here. Avalos. Present.

**Speaker:** Novick here.

**Speaker:** Claire, could you please read the statement of conduct?

**Speaker:** Good morning, and welcome to the meeting of the climate resilience and land use committee. To testify before this committee in person or virtually. You must sign up in advance on the committee agenda at [Portland.gov/agenda](https://portland.gov/agenda), slash climate resilience and land use committee. Or by calling 311. Registration for virtual testimony closes one hour prior to the meeting. In-person testifiers must sign up before the agenda item is heard. If public testimony will be taken on an item, individuals may testify for three minutes unless the chair states otherwise, your microphone will be muted when your time is over. The chair preserves order disruptive conduct such as shouting, refusing to conclude your testimony when your time is up, or interrupting others testimony or committee deliberations will not be allowed. If you cause a disruption, a warning will be given. Further disruption will result in ejection from the meeting. Anyone who fails to leave once ejected is subject to arrest for trespass. Additionally, the committee may take a short recess

and reconvene virtually. Your testimony should address the matter being considered. When testifying, please state your name for the record. If you are a lobbyist, identify the organization you represent. And finally, virtual testifiers should unmute themselves when the clerk calls your name. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Thank you claire. We have three items on our agenda today. First, we'll return to an item we continued from the may 29th meeting on the flood hazard areas code. That's something that we have to get. Approve some amendments today to send to full council. We have amendments to the amendments to consider from councilor morillo. Then we will consider appointments to the Portland parks and recreation board. And finally, we'll have a discussion about the mayor's proposal to use pcef funds for office to residential conversions. Diego, could you please read the first item?

**Speaker:** Item one amend flood hazard areas code to comply with federal emergency management agency national flood insurance program pre implementation compliance measures.

**Speaker:** Thank you again. This item was continued from our last committee meeting on Thursday, may 29th. Councilor morillo has some amendments, but first, just for a couple of minutes, I'd like city staff to come up and explain why we have to do something on this this next month to meet fema deadlines. Thanks.

**Speaker:** Thank you chair.

**Speaker:** Please proceed whoever the best person is.

**Speaker:** Good morning. Councilors. My name is jason butler brown. I'm with Portland permitting and development. The kind of the. I'll try not to tell a long story, but. Fema has been directed by noaa fisheries to revise their national flood insurance program, to adopt new requirements to make it comply with the endangered species act. Fema has been in the process of working on those

changes over a period of several years. But most recently, we received a letter from fema that was in July of 2024 that directed the city of Portland, as well as more than 250 other jurisdictions in Oregon, that we would need to adopt what fema calls the pre-implementation compliance measures. And they told us that there were a handful of different pathways that we could use to meet those requirements. The pathway that the city chose was to adopt a model ordinance language, and fema directed us that we would have to have that model ordinance in place no later than July 31st of 2025.

**Speaker:** Thank you. One other thing I wanted to ask while you're up here is that I was looking at a document you sent us which said that there was one amendment that reflects a concern of some of the advocates that you could support. It said that staff could support an amendment to remove fish egress from the flood storage habitat criteria. Is that something that could be done, you know, like at the stroke of a pen?

**Speaker:** Yeah. So Jason Butler Brown, Portland permitting and development again, we did draft some proposed amendment language that was recently posted to the website. And it does do a little bit more than just simply remove the definition of fish egress and fish accessible when we define what is a characteristic of flood storage. So the amendment language.

**Speaker:** Would you mind speaking up just a little bit more straining to hear you. Thank you.

**Speaker:** I will try to project, but not too loud. So the amendment goes. And basically undoes available flood storage habitat. What we tried to do was distinguish between what is considered habitat for fish and what is considered flood storage that primarily just stores water during a flood, but isn't necessarily critical for fish habitat. Fema doesn't have a clear set of criteria that describes what

exactly is fish accessible or fish egress able, other than these are volumes of water that are available that fish can reach and that fish can leave from during a 100 year flood. So when we remove those requirements, it undoes a handful of different definitions. And simply put, what we have is an amendment that applies the pre-implementation compliance measures, ratios of flood storage compensation to all areas within the fema 100 year flood plain in the adopted.

**Speaker:** Okay, so are you talking about an update to from the last meeting, exhibit a, title 24, which is what I have, or are you saying you posted something that replaces this?

**Speaker:** Councilor patricia diefenderfer, chief planner, bureau of planning and sustainability. For the record, the amendment that was just posted this morning is reflective of this issue. It is trying to be responsive to the issue and also clarify how and where within the floodplain hazard area these regulations would apply. And in some, what this means is that these rules would apply in the entirety of the floodplain area and would not be narrowed by any of these definitions. So I think we both achieve the objective of addressing one of the issues that was raised in the letter in question, and also make make it more clear for implementation purposes.

**Speaker:** Okay.

**Speaker:** And that's what's on what's been posted and being introduced by councilor morillo that.

**Speaker:** Oh okay.

**Speaker:** So quick question.

**Speaker:** So councilor morillo you are introducing the change that staff has suggested. Okay. Thank you. Councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Chair novick I just have a question about the I'd like a visual so I know the area pretty well. And so when you give us these descriptions and you



say, simply put, it's not so simple for me to understand what you just said. And so visuals would help. So if you could ever provide them along the north beach, that would be great. I'm quite familiar with the area.

**Speaker:** Yeah, I would say in particular councilors. This issue is germane to areas where the floodplain tends to be a little bit further away from the source of the water body. And so we do have a visual that we can show an example that we think is illustrative of this is some residential, some single dwelling residential areas near johnson creek. And I think if we just allow one moment, jason can bring those visuals up.

**Speaker:** And I was thinking more of the willamette river.

**Speaker:** So yeah, I think we can I don't know if we have an example of that, particularly along the willamette, because I think it's a little bit less of an issue along the willamette. The areas that are within the floodplain there, and staff can correct me if I'm wrong. The areas within the floodplain there are actually it's less of a they're not further flung from the water body, and therefore it's less of an issue about whether fish could get there and then have the ability to get back.

**Speaker:** And that helped a lot right there. Because I think in this conversation I'm always thinking north reach. So just by the fact that you said that was connected to johnson creek north, that was helpful.

**Speaker:** Sure.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** I'd now like to move to councilor morillo amendments and ask and ask if you could identify which of your amendments are staff has bought off on and which of them they have not, if that's possible.

**Speaker:** Well, it's a 28 page document. So yeah, for clarity, these are amendments that were brought by advocates who are legal experts in this area. But then they

were reviewed by city staff and attorneys as well. So what you see in green is something that the city staff have reviewed as well. So I guess my question, I know that we have some advocates in the room who are working on this issue and who are online potentially, who may be able to speak to this. I think the question we have to address is essentially, do the advocates feel like we did right by them as far as addressing their concerns, while also staying within the bounds of the legal constraints that we have at the city? Let's see.

**Speaker:** I councilor may I ask a question of staff?

**Speaker:** Go for it.

**Speaker:** So I'm now looking at councilor morillo amendments with all the things in green. So since staff are here, I wanted to ask you, are you okay with all of these, or are some of them things that you're dubious about?

**Speaker:** Councilors patricia diefenderfer for the record, I think the version that you all are looking at, not all of the changes that are shown in green are the latest changes. The green includes the changes that were originally made to the ordinance that from the baseline of the ordinance that is in the code currently in the building code currently. So maybe I could ask jason to just very quickly run through what is the latest changes, unless I'm wrong about that.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** I have to say I'm going to have a hard time following the latest changes on the fly without actually reading them.

**Speaker:** If I could. Eric shoffner city attorney's office, the changes you see in green in text. Those are from last time. The changes this time are primarily reflected in the margin as deletions, because pretty much all the changes were deletions from the text. And one correction to what councilor morillo said the advocates did not

draft this language. They provided commentary, and this is essentially a response to that.

**Speaker:** So okay.

**Speaker:** Okay, I think I am looking at the document that shows deletions. But again, I just want to be sure these are all concepts that staff is comfortable. With that hopefully address some of the concerns the advocates have.

**Speaker:** Yes.

**Speaker:** Thank you. And I think councilor morillo had asked some of the advocates to come forward.

**Speaker:** I think some folks are trying to figure out how to get online right now, so I'm trying to facilitate that. If councilor Ryan, I see his hand is raised.

**Speaker:** Yeah. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Yeah. So I appreciate that I'm hearing about this process. We've been quite busy with meetings lately. So we're in real time discovering some of this information. Did you also listen to those who provide the living wages along the waterfront? Any of the companies that are also partners in this process, were they included in any of those conversations?

**Speaker:** Councilors. The document that's before you all reflects the city's original ordinance, draft ordinance, along with those deletions of those few, there's three definitions that are meant to clarify and make it more clear what is intended to be implemented, how these rules are intended to be implemented over time.

Substantively, there has been no significant change. There has been no further outreach with other individuals. We briefed the councilors. As you know, we briefed you all in three separate meetings, and we did have a meeting with some of the conservation groups just to try to go through their letter and better understand their issues. Ultimately, though, the bulk of the issues that were raised in that letter,

there were four substantive issues which we briefed you all on. We are not staff is not recommending changes on any of those issues other than to make these changes to definitions. That will clarify one of the concerns about how and where these rules will be implemented. There was a concern that somehow the one some reading of these definitions could be interpreted as narrowing the floodplain area in which these rules would be applied. And what we're doing is simply clarifying the definitions in such a way that it's clear that that is not the intention. The intention is not to narrow the floodplain area to which these rules would apply, but rather to apply these rules to the 100 year floodplain as designated on maps.

**Speaker:** I appreciate everything you just said. I didn't hear though. If there was any dialog. I'm hearing a lot of dialog with the advocates on the environmental side, which is great. I just wanted to ask the question if there was also dialog with groups like working, waterfront.

**Speaker:** And such.

**Speaker:** I can also say that I've had some communication with groups that represent the industrial areas, who were simply trying to reach out and understand what is the meaning of these, these rules.

**Speaker:** And I raise that because they offer some of the last working class living wages in our city. And so I'm advocating for a lot of union members in Portland. Thanks, thanks.

**Speaker:** Okay. Yeah. So councilor morillo thanks.

**Speaker:** I as folks are getting a zoom link to log in. I just wanted to read something that mary steitz, who is a staff attorney with the northwest environmental defense center who came and had some concerns about the original language, she wrote, we believe that the changes suggested in the document last night represent a great improvement, and we would be pleased to

see them pass today. She's currently watching on youtube, and our wonderful staff are helping get folks online. So but I think overall, this is indicating to me that there was a good dialog between staff and the advocates on this, and that it would be a good improvement on the language.

**Speaker:** So let's see, I'm trying to figure out. How did if somebody moves the amendment, how we describe the amendment, the amendment that's currently posted or something like that.

**Speaker:** Yeah, I think maybe the city attorneys can help us with that, but I think that would be appropriate. Yeah.

**Speaker:** Point of information. So are we going to be like, do we need to debate all of councilor morillo amendments? Then should we go about that route and then implement it? Or also I see that we have testimony. Should we do testimony now? Maybe.

**Speaker:** Usually that's how we've always.

**Speaker:** Done it is. Yeah.

**Speaker:** You read it in and then everyone testifying knows what the amendments are.

**Speaker:** Okay.

**Speaker:** Do we have public testimony scheduled for today?

**Speaker:** No one has signed up.

**Speaker:** No one has signed up.

**Speaker:** I don't believe councilors. I would just like to clarify that. I don't believe that there was the ability to sign up for testimony to testify today.

**Speaker:** I've seen a lot of head nodding.

**Speaker:** Okay.

**Speaker:** Can they sign up.

**Speaker:** Now then? Because they're here?

**Speaker:** Written testimony is still available, but you are welcome to open up to verbal if you so choose.

**Speaker:** So they.

**Speaker:** Just come.

**Speaker:** To you.

**Speaker:** I would recommend so yes.

**Speaker:** Thanks.

**Speaker:** We can move. If there are.

**Speaker:** People we don't have much time. But if anybody. And do you think that we should have oral testimony. Would you like to say that?

**Speaker:** There's 28 pages worth of amendments here that were worked on with the staff and the city legal team? So I feel like it's in a really good spot. That's not going to harm us as the city trying to do this work. So with limited time, I guess I want to check. Is councilor kanal online ready, prepared to vote if necessary? Or does he need more time?

**Speaker:** I am online prepared to vote if necessary. I that's that's not a statement as to whether or not I support or oppose taking public testimony, but i'll let the co-chairs figure that out.

**Speaker:** I don't oppose public testimony. We just have limited time today, and we had testimony at the last meeting. But I am not leading this meeting. You are councilor novick. So I'm actually going to leave that question to you.

**Speaker:** I think, as councilor morillo said, actually, let me be unconventional. Can I see a raise of hands of how many people would like to testify on this item? One, two I think that we have time to have have three minutes of testimony from two people.

**Speaker:** After we hear the amendments.

**Speaker:** Yes. Let's see, since it's 28 pages of amendments, I asked the clerk and the city attorney how do we read the amendments into the record? How should we describe them?

**Speaker:** Councilor city attorney's office. As far as reading them into the record, I don't think you would need to read the whole thing. But I know in the past, amendments have been referred to by the in the past, the commissioners name. So these could be the morillo amendment. Perhaps one way of doing it.

**Speaker:** They're all publicly posted, so they should be available. I don't think we're moving it yet. Right. We're just hearing testimony. So let's just move on with the testimony portion.

**Speaker:** Can't we or do we? But people.

**Speaker:** I'm sorry. Point of order. A lot of people didn't know about these amendments. There's people here that just found out about them. It's democracy to read them into the record before they testify. And yes, we should take the two that are here. Point of order. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Councilor. I'm sorry, but we simply we can't read all of these voluminous amendments into the record in order to. I apologize for that, but we need to get this done today, so I'd appreciate if we could hear from the two people that want to testify.

**Speaker:** Not even highlights.

**Speaker:** There's a lot of highlights, and it wouldn't be very like structure, use or condition, etc. Ordinary high watermark. It's a lot of technical definitions.

**Speaker:** It's not.

**Speaker:** Councilor if it helps, we can quickly walk through what is new from the last draft. As we noted, not all of the text changes are new. There's a limited portion

of them that are new from the last draft, and we can we can walk through that really quickly. Okay. It'd be best if we do so by just directing to the page number and the item within the page number. That is different.

**Speaker:** Point of information. Before you do that. So am I looking at exhibit a? Is that what you're reading from?

**Speaker:** You're looking at the last posted document on the documents. It's titled morillo amendment.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** Yeah. So good morning, jason butler brown again from Portland permitting and development. So when we're looking at this file, what we're seeing is that we have the amendment language on the left side. And on the right side, we have a panel that shows the comments. And when we scroll down. What we see are a handful of definitions that have been deleted. So the first definition that we're deleting thank you is the available flood storage habitat definition.

**Speaker:** Page two of the amendment.

**Speaker:** Page three we delete fish accessible flood storage and fish accessible flood storage. In addition on page three we delete flood storage habitat. The definitions and then moving through the document.

**Speaker:** On page four there's deletion of the word and the deletion of the phrase and does not include.

**Speaker:** Those were original to the amendment language.

**Speaker:** We're just going to outline the new changes.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** So my apologies. We're jumping down to section h now which will be on page. H of 060.

**Speaker:** 21. Page 21.



**Speaker:** Yeah. So on page 20 we have a deletion of habitat from section h. The title section there. And then on 21, like patricia was just noting, we have a deletion of some language about in areas of available flood storage habitat. The volume of flood water displaced. The reference to available flood storage habitat has been removed. And we focus on just simply the volume of flood water displaced. And then on page 22, we delete the subsection b which reads areas that are not available. Flood storage habitat. The volume of flood water displaced by fill requires a compensatory volume equal to or greater than the displaced volume, a ratio of at least 1 to 1. So that's all of the changes. And what it effectively does is apply the pick'em ratios of flood storage compensation to all of the fema 100 year flood plains within the designated areas.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** That concludes the outline of the changes. So we'll step back and let the public testify.

**Speaker:** Now that.

**Speaker:** We hear from the two people that wanted to give testimony.

**Speaker:** Chereece bach, tonya hartnett.

**Speaker:** Good morning. Councilors. My name is theresa bach and I'm climate policy director at 350 pdx. And I wanted to first of all say thank you so much to councilors for working on this for a couple extra weeks, and to city staff for taking time to meet with folks and work out some of these amendments. I think it's been a little bit challenging when we don't all have the same amendment language and have things in a timely manner because of all of the other major things that you all are dealing with this week. So totally understandable, but it makes it a little bit challenging to get on the same page, but appreciate the work that's being done. I think that we are still concerned about this being a little bit weak compared to what

we would like to see, and it's setting a precedent for, you know, as we're trying to do the north reach plan and other things to be able to say like, oh, these groups already have these 8 to 10 year exemptions. And also we are concerned with the climate impacts of building in flood plains. We understand the nature of zoning laws that we can't take away those zones immediately, but appreciate thinking in the future about how do we deal with that so that we don't build things in a floodplain that are going to be detrimental to community? And I also think it's really important to emphasize the riparian setbacks and make sure that those are enough to, you know, because it is really doable. We have examples from toyota and other places, other industries along the riverfront that are doing those riparian setbacks. So making sure that those are enforced and done well. So thank you. Appreciate all the work that can be done. I think it's okay to go with go ahead with this today, but with the caveat that we don't want something weak to be put in place, that then we have a hard time strengthening later. So I'm not sure if we can do anything about that at this exact point, but just to say that we would like to come back and strengthen a few of those things later in the process. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Thank you. I see mary steitz is online.

**Speaker:** Yes. Can you all hear me?

**Speaker:** Yes.

**Speaker:** Okay, great. Also, I would like to apologize in advance. Ironically enough, I'm working at a coffee shop because my wi-fi is out because of a storm that hit austin, texas, where I am currently testifying from. So apologies for background noise and my general chaos, but I would like to thank the councilors that took the time to reach out to us and work with us and hear our concerns and meaningfully integrate those. We really do appreciate the time and effort that goes into this, and think that this is a great step forward, especially the removal of the fish. Accessible

and accessible definitions. Not only does that bring this language back one step closer to being true compliance with the spirit of a biological opinion, it's way more in line with basic notions of floodplain connectivity, and is going to ultimately protect people just as much as it does protect species. Just for the record, I would like to reiterate that there are still some underlying concerns with the grandfathering provision. We acknowledge that there might be conflict with state law, but we are open to future discussions that kind of remove the incentive to get land use decisions that will last for ten years for the purposes of evading mitigation requirements. And we'd also state again that we think that the language prohibiting development in riparian buffer zone could be bolstered to come more in compliance with the biological opinion and limit those uses to what is expressly expressly noted, including water dependent uses. For example, sorry, this is a little bit off of the cuff, but again, thanks for reworking that definition for eligible areas, because yes, it does need to apply to the entirety of the sfa. That's what nmfs intended, and that's what's supported by the science. So I'm happy to answer any questions. And we really look forward to continuing good dialog to make sure that we are protecting our species, but also our communities from ever increasing flooding damage. Thanks so much.

**Speaker:** Thank you very much. And I expect us to return to the question of development of the riparian buffer zones and the use of mitigation banking and some of the other issues you've raised. Please go ahead.

**Speaker:** Hi, I'm tanya hartnett with working waterfront coalition. I'm sorry I missed my name the first time because I'm not used to being called. So on this working waterfront. Represents all of the industrial businesses along the north reach of the willamette. And at the last meeting, we very much agreed with what city proposed. And we want to make sure that, you know, of the three options, we

understand what they proposed. We are fine with and that they're and we want this to this to be passed as not a permanent thing. Right. There are other things being put in place with the eoa, the comp plan, the seismic mitigation, all of those meetings and all of those policies that are being worked on right now are going to be the permanent policies. So this should definitely be just temporary. And then to comment regarding what the new. Document that came out this morning, we can't really comment on it because we didn't have time. We weren't allowed to look at this. You know, I'm we just need to have time. We want to be more cooperative. And we totally appreciate the councilors that met with us and staff in order to discuss this. And everybody has been really great in this process, but we just want to make sure that we have more cooperative if mitigations are going to be put into play and that we don't, you know, have five minutes.

**Speaker:** Councilor morillo did you have a question for.

**Speaker:** No. Just afterwards.

**Speaker:** Okay.

**Speaker:** I am okay.

**Speaker:** Thanks for being here, tanya. And I'm sorry that you just were informed, but can you tell me how many workers are you representing today?

**Speaker:** Thousands. And you know, they all have family wage jobs. It's not working wage jobs. It's family wage jobs. So jobs with insurance, family insurance, you know, and jobs that allow them to, you know, live in Portland.

**Speaker:** Yeah. Another great union jobs. And I also realize they're working right now so they can't come and testify. Thanks for representing them.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** Councilor morillo.

**Speaker:** I just yeah, I appreciate the folks that came and testified last minute. And I apologize that this very technical change is happening on a week that I think was pretty brutal for council, if I can be very frank with everyone, we had a pretty a 12 hour marathon council session again for the second time last night. And so I think out of best practice, I would love to get these things out a lot earlier in the future. I have a question for city staff, but essentially from what I heard from us speaking before, these changes can be made now. But this also isn't the complete final version of the plan. It will continue to be worked on over the course of the next year. Is that correct?

**Speaker:** Yes. Thanks. Council maria patricia diefenderfer, for the record, yes. As you noted in the powerpoint slide that we presented to council, this committee on may 29th, the last meeting, there's an ongoing work program that's by geographic area that's allowing us to update the rules, the permanent rules, through those processes that will that are, you know, multi bureau multi-year conversations about what are the best regulations to put in place tailored to the different contexts and geographies that we have in the city, with the overall goal of ensuring that we have a community wide approach to floodplain regulations, that is community wide and that is consistent or complies with the regulations at a community wide level, including regulations, changes to regulations, but also other components of that work plan, which is to for the city to do floodplain restoration projects itself, and for mitigation banks to be developed so that they become options, you know, additional options for mitigation, for projects. So that is the entirety of the work program. And yes, there is much opportunity to flesh out these regulations through those long term processes.

**Speaker:** Thank you for laying that out for everybody who's interested in this topic. That was really helpful. And I think something that I heard from folks is that there's

a concern that if we have some lax regulations here, that they will be kind of grandfathered in and then we won't be able to make those changes later or they'll be treated as a precedent. And I guess I just want to have it on the record that I think some of these changes are good. I feel comfortable with some of the advocates saying, okay, some of these things make us feel better about this, and there's still more work to be done. And I think I'm just stating my commitment that we will make sure that the other concerns about the environmental impacts are addressed moving forward as well. So thank you.

**Speaker:** Thank you. I think that it might now be time to entertain a motion to adopt the amendments. The ordinance document number 2025 217.

**Speaker:** So moved.

**Speaker:** Is there a second?

**Speaker:** Can I second my own amendment second.

**Speaker:** Yeah. I don't know. Why not. Councilor avalos moves to adopt the amendments to the ordinance document number 2025 217. We have a second. The motion has been moved by councilor avalos, seconded by councilor morillo. Is there any discussion? Councilor Ryan?

**Speaker:** Thank you, chair novick I do have a question about I know that I meet with whoever does reach out and I haven't met with everybody. I think the advocates you speak of, I don't know if I haven't met with them for a while, but I have met with them in the past. But I just want to make sure that we're bringing in and holding everything in terms of the people who are attached to this issue, which should be almost everyone, of course. And I really applaud the staff for being inclusive. I could tell when we listened to you last time that you had a lot of different points of view in your head, and you were managing that really well. Everyone seemed equally upset with you, which is ironically a good sign sometimes.

But I do have questions for other councilors. Did the who who did everyone meet with? Also, I know that the working waterfront reached out and I just can't tell if they if others met with them. I think some of you did.

**Speaker:** I did.

**Speaker:** You did did the councilors.

**Speaker:** We they met with my staff and then I have a meeting with them personally coming up.

**Speaker:** Okay.

**Speaker:** Good. And councilor morillo. I don't believe I had a meeting with them. No.

**Speaker:** Okay.

**Speaker:** I think it's so important when we when we have these issues that are very challenging and important to talk about. And also for me, you need a lot of time to understand them. Thank you for meeting with me last week. That was very helpful that we take some time to make sure that we hear all those voices. I know there's this insurance pressure and there's this urgency around this to move it along, but this is complex. And so I'm really leaning into the staff. But I also think as legislators, we have to make sure that we do that democracy balance. And I really appreciate those of you that have taken time to reach out to the working waterfront. I went on the tour, I think, recently, and it was really good for me to be out on the water listening to your stories and hearing from some of the workers who usually cannot ever get to meetings. So I just hope that everyone leans in and takes that tour. It's very good to have that holistic perspective. Thanks, councilor.

**Speaker:** I think what happened here is that there was sort of understanding that some big picture issues that were controversial between the advocates and the working waterfront coalition, which has sort of been deferred, and what staff did

was work with the advocates to do some clarifications on certain issues where there's not a big ideological divide. Patricia, is that more or less correct?

**Speaker:** I would say that the clarification, yeah, the clarifications just ensure that there's a common understanding about how the rules will be implemented going forward. Yeah.

**Speaker:** And I just think the word advocate should be shared. It's both.

**Speaker:** That's true. Right. The environmental advocates as.

**Speaker:** Opposed to.

**Speaker:** What working waterfront advocates.

**Speaker:** You're right. We need to define it.

**Speaker:** Yeah. Thanks. Seeing no one in the queue for further discussion, will the clerk please call the roll.

**Speaker:** Canal on the amendments, I vote aye.

**Speaker:** Ryan.

**Speaker:** Because I haven't spent much time with them at this moment in time, I usually am a no until I can get to a yes. So at this moment, I'm a no.

**Speaker:** What do you.

**Speaker:** I just wanted to clarify that I think I saw that I got an email in the inbox from working waterfront for a boat tour that I didn't attend, and they sent a letter on the fema buyout, but I didn't. It wasn't a meeting request, so that's probably why I didn't meet with them. But on the amendments, I vote i.

**Speaker:** Avalos.

**Speaker:** Thank you. I want to thank councilor morillo staff advocates for their extensive work on these amendments and for navigating the legal and technical complexities of the fema compliance, the esa protections, and the local implementation. It's clear that while this package doesn't solve every concern



raised, especially around long term habitat protection and development limitations, it is necessary and time sensitive step to keep Portland eligible for flood insurance and disaster relief. So I really appreciate that this is an interim measure, and I'm encouraged by the city's commitment to reengage after fema's nepa process is complete in 2026, i'll be watching closely to ensure that our long term plan meaningfully strengthens habitat protections and centers community and environmental resilience. So thank you. And I vote aye.

**Speaker:** Novick.

**Speaker:** I want to thank councilor morillo and her staff for working on this to the city staff and the environmental advocates working on this over the last couple of weeks. Hugely appreciated. And as councilor avalos stated, there's related issues that are that will continue to take up in the future. But I'm really pleased that these amendments are so shipshape and as it were, i.

**Speaker:** With four votes and one no vote, the amendment is approved.

**Speaker:** I would now like to entertain a motion to have the ordinance document number 2025 217, as amended, be sent to full council with a recommendation to be adopted.

**Speaker:** So moved.

**Speaker:** Can I hear a second?

**Speaker:** Second?

**Speaker:** Councilmember moves ordinance number 20 2517, as amended. Be sent to full council to due pass recommendation councilor avalos seconds. Is there any discussion? Councilor kanal.

**Speaker:** Yeah. Thank you for the work on this to councilor morillo staff as well. And thank you to the city staff and everyone who's weighed in. I waited to comment on this just because I think it was outside the scope of the amendment. More on

the overall. My staff did meet with both advocates and working waterfront coalition. I'm looking forward to meeting directly on this issue with both groups as time goes on. I think that the timeline today dictates that we are likely to have to forward this on at this meeting. There are some things that I think are worth daylighting here while we have the time, because I imagine we will not be given a lot of time for this at the full council, which is a separate issue. But so I wanted to take the opportunity to, to talk about that. I'm still a little skeptical about the concept of mitigation banking as a whole. The staff justification that developers generally prefer to mitigate on site anyway because it's cheaper and faster, doesn't justify what might be a heavy burden in terms of creating additional opportunities. And I'm not sure if it would be significantly burdensome to require mitigation on site if, in fact, it is spatially feasible to do so. So I'd love to hear that information, and I would welcome that either in public or feel free to kind of update there later. And then similarly, I do think that there was a valid request that I saw in writing to define more clearly who decides whether a project is river dependent or not. And I don't know if that got answered in the conversation. Do you know if that got was that part of the amendments that I missed it somewhere?

**Speaker:** That is not that is defined in the code. And that's a long standing provision of the code that is not being affected here, that that definition has, you know, is a long standing definition that staff have a lot of experience implementing and understanding what is river dependent and what isn't.

**Speaker:** Sorry.

**Speaker:** The question was not about what is or what is not river dependent. The question was about who determines that on a specific case by case.

**Speaker:** It's defined in the code. I mean, I can have others speak to that, but it's explicitly defined in the code.

**Speaker:** Okay.

**Speaker:** Well, I will just note that at least one of the, the, the sides that we're talking about on this issue did, did not feel as adequately defined enough. I'm happy to bring that up if there is an issue. After we did clarify it at the full council. But yeah, just wanted to kind of daylight both of those issues here and appreciate the time to do so. Yeah. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Seeing no one else in the queue. Will the clerk please call the roll.

**Speaker:** Canal the motion to refer with a due pass recommendation, I vote aye.

**Speaker:** Ryan.

**Speaker:** Yeah. I really respect the staff in this process. So my vote isn't reflective of you. I think I do have some concerns, and I hope to get to a yes by the time this comes to the full council. What I've experienced is what feels like a little bit of a slippery slope, where we have attorneys representing plaintiffs writing amendments. At least it feels like drafting, and I just am uncomfortable with that. I think that the staff are the experts, and then there's advocates on both sides, and then you all listen to that and provide us with the right policy. It felt it felt imbalanced in this process. And so I'm mostly calling out a checks and balance moment at in this, in this vote. And so at this moment, because of what I've experienced in this process, I will vote no.

**Speaker:** Morillo.

**Speaker:** So, as the staff stated earlier, they worked with the advocates to receive feedback, and then they drafted the language and they did a very good job collaborating with the community and balancing the legal challenges and the difficult timeline to ensure that Portlanders are safe and have a floodplain insurance. So I'm very grateful to all the work that people did. We will continue to

strengthen our environmental protections. Thank you, staff, for all the work that you do and I happily vote i.

**Speaker:** Avalos i.

**Speaker:** Novick i.

**Speaker:** With for I votes. The ordinance as amended is referred to the full council with the recommendation to be adopted.

**Speaker:** Thank you so much counselors. We appreciate it.

**Speaker:** Thank you very much. And we have we have three minutes ahead. Wow.

**Speaker:** Time certainly.

**Speaker:** Will the clerk please read the next item.

**Speaker:** Item two appoint and reappoint members to the Portland parks and recreation board.

**Speaker:** This item comes to us from Portland parks and recreation. I'll hand it off to director long to talk with us about the parks board and the slate of appointees before us today.

**Speaker:** Good morning. For the record, adena long, director of Portland parks and recreation. I'm so pleased to be with you today to share our six nominees for the Portland parks and recreation board. First, I'd like to provide a brief overview of the Portland parks and recreation board. This advisory board was established by council ordinance in 2001. Its stated mission was to ensure that we strive to deliver the park system that Portlanders deserve. At that time, the board's purpose was to ensure the vision and recommendations of the parks 2020 vision were at the forefront of discussions about parks and recreation issues and trends over time, to advocate for parks on a city and regional basis, to provide continuity when transitions occur. In the leadership of Portland parks and recreation and on the City Council, and to provide a forum for public discussion and decision making about

parks issues. In recent years, the parks board has done important work on providing feedback and guidance on projects like healthy parks, healthy Portland letter writing and testimony at council regarding budget and other ad hoc topics. And they've served as ambassadors to the greater community. Our board membership represents a range of related professional industries, as well as personal connections to parks and recreation, such as sports and aquatics, landscape architecture, urban planning, natural areas and conservation, capital design and construction, public health, environmental stewardship, and the nonprofit sector. This year, the board's nominating committee primarily focused on finding candidates that represented a diversity of age, advocacy know how architectural professionals council district one and three representation, and, of course, an overall passion for parks and recreation systems. Three candidates that will serve a one year partial term from July 1st, 2025 to June 30th, 2026 are kitty firth, andre bonacossa, myra, raffi. Beverly. Also, sally bernstein will serve a two year partial term from July 1st, 2025 through June 30th, 2027, and tommy sharp and jacob carson will serve their first full term from July 1st, 2025 to June 30th, 2028. These partial term appointments are for when board members leave before finishing their three year term, so these appointments will ensure continuity in the board's work as an advisory body. And finally, adrian feldstein, who is a current board member, will be reappointed for a second full term. I'm going to give you a little background on our candidates, although they're all here either in person or virtually. So if you have other questions to ask them afterwards, I'm sure they'll be happy to hear from you. Kitty is a lifelong resident of Portland. She's volunteered for osu as a master gardener. Fans of fanno creek building committee for neighborhood house and the Oregon humane society. As a board member, she looks forward to ensure that the sense of fun, joy, discovery and ownership

remains with our citizens. Andre works for trimet in business development and has volunteered with the filipino bayanihan center on their documentary team and oxfam uk. He believes strongly in the role that public spaces, like our parks, play in bonding and strengthening communities across the city. Myra is a recent resident from chicago, has volunteered with friends of oak bottom, black futurist farm, wild diversity, and the blanchard house. She is enthusiastic to bring love of the outdoors to others who feel hesitant to go outside or may be more familiar with the more manicured style of parks. Sally has lived in Portland for 15 plus years, and works in the nature and conservation space for her entire career. She looks forward to supporting holistic planning and visioning that captures local community interests and priorities, and that emphasizes management geared towards ecological health and resilience. Jacob was born and raised in Portland and was inspired to work in policy through his time volunteering in the americorps. He is excited to contribute, to facilitate and lead our collective work to pass on a park system that is more beautiful, accessible, equitable and resilient for the future generations of Portland. Tommy, a longtime resident, has volunteered for a variety of organizations around the city, including swansongs Portland, zenger farm, the mazamas forest park conservancy, and greenlands community tool library. He looks forward to supporting the bureau in shaping a park system that reflects the evolving needs of all Portlanders. I would like to thank our volunteer board appointees who made time to be with us here today, both in person and virtually, and we appreciate your support in referring these appointments to full council approval. If you're going to be asking any of the candidates any question, I'm going to ask that you ask sally and andre questions first. They're joining us virtually as they have appointments, and I want to make sure that we can accommodate them first. Thank you.

**Speaker:** Thank you director. Does anyone have questions for any of the nominees?

**Speaker:** I have?

**Speaker:** Okay. Councilor kanal.

**Speaker:** So thank you, director long. I know you didn't shout her out by name, but I know you also joined me in appreciating michelle for the work that she does on on the parks board. I wanted to take the opportunity to ask you a question, if I could, and I'd be happy to wait. If there are questions for those two particular nominees, and I appreciate, I originally was oh, hi, I didn't actually see you behind. Sorry. Line of sight. Yeah, I wanted to ask, you mentioned districts one and three as priority viewpoints. There's a lot of district four appointees on here too. Can you speak to the overall balance of the parks board by by district after this? And by the way, I don't think it needs to be a perfect mix. I just wanted to understand, given that you mentioned it as.

**Speaker:** A yes, certainly I can't speak specifically. However, I can tell you that we've had underrepresentation in districts one and three, and that is the reason why we pursued candidates, in particular in those districts. We wanted to have a geographically balanced board.

**Speaker:** I know that we in district two have been overachievers in that for a long time, and I appreciate that. That area of focus. I would like to just note that it'd be great to see more from d1 in the future. I know we have two folks from d3 joining, but only one from d1 this time. So that was the first question. And then the other question I was going to ask. You actually answered it already with relation to the emphasis on recreation side as well as parks in there. So that concludes my questions to director.

**Speaker:** Counselor Ryan.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Chair novick I always like it when you show up. So thank you for being here. And it always feels awkward when we just vote on you. We don't hear anything out of your lovely voices. And so and I really loved hearing your backgrounds. They were excellent. I mean, to think that there's somebody who did facilities at the beautiful catlin gabel campus and somebody at trimet, someone that does urban farming. And just saying you have to be outside. I mean, it was really heartwarming. That said, putting you on the spot, you have to do this. You have to pick your favorite park and why. And I know it's hard. It's like picking a child. It's not fair. But life isn't always fair. So go ahead and tell us what your favorite park is and why. So we just get a flavor of how wonderful you are in person. Thanks.

**Speaker:** I have to say, you don't have to have to answer that question if you think the answer might tend to incriminate you.

**Speaker:** Who do you want to go first? Me.

**Speaker:** I mean you.

**Speaker:** Oh, okay. I was about to say, you know, I do not pick favorites. I love all my parks the same. Why don't we have kitty go first?

**Speaker:** Thank you. I'm kitty firth. I'm delighted to be here. And my favorite part is the what I used to know as the forecourt fountain. Or now the keller fountain. And what kind of city lets people encourages people to swim in their fountains. I was maybe fifth grade when my high school aged sisters brought me to swim in the fountain and climb up the waterfall and go behind the other waterfall, and I thought this was the coolest thing in the world. And not only that, what city lets people do that? And I want to be a part of that I always have.

**Speaker:** Great. Why don't we have sally go next?



**Speaker:** Hi everyone. I hope you can hear me. I'm Sally Bernstein, I would say, I mean, I have a lot of different favorite parts, but the moment that comes to mind is Gabriel Park. Just because I've spent so much time in it these past two years. I have twin two and a half year old toddler boys, and that living so close to there has just made my life a whole lot easier. The playground there is fantastic and I love all the nature. They love to just go and run through the trails and pick up sticks. And so I've really appreciated that and its proximity as well to the Southwest Community Center, because we spend a lot of time there as well with the twins. So thank you for all your time today. It's been really great to listen in on the conversation and I'm excited to join the board.

**Speaker:** All right Myra.

**Speaker:** Hi everyone. Good morning. My favorite part technically isn't a park, it's the Oaks Bottom Wildlife Refuge. In Southeast. It's really close to where I live now. And there's beautiful sounds of croaking and frogs at night. And every time I go bike down there, there's always someone else there walking in the dark and listening to them. It's really calming. And Andre.

**Speaker:** Good morning Andre. Thank you for having me. My favorite park would be Laurelhurst. When I first moved here, that was the first park I played tennis at, and I thought to myself, wow, this is really pretty. I'm originally from West Texas, so we don't have as many trees, so it's been really lovely playing there.

**Speaker:** I don't know about you all, but I got the most important bits of that. Tommy.

**Speaker:** Hello, I'm Tommy and my favorite park is Forest Park. I've spent a lot of time hiking in Forest Park over the years. It's really been central to my quality of life and experience as a Portlander, and last summer I was able to achieve a long term goal of hiking the entire Wildwood Trail in a day and adding to my blister collection,

and probably not going to do that again this year, but maybe next year. But I continue to spend a lot of time on the wildwood and leif erickson trail and just the north end of the park, which is kind of under underappreciated. So yeah, forest park close second would be powell butte.

**Speaker:** And jacob.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** My name is jacob carson. I have to say, I feel like this is a tough question. It's like picking your favorite family member, but I'd have to go with mount tabor. There's just so many great community events there. It's got an unbeatable view of the city, and you get a workout every time you go up to that top reservoir.

**Speaker:** Thank you for that. Great question, councilor.

**Speaker:** Councilor. Ryan. Anything further?

**Speaker:** No.

**Speaker:** I just really thank you for leaning in. And as you're in those meetings, getting deep into policy, just remember those favorite park moments. And it really helps when you're in meetings.

**Speaker:** Thanks.

**Speaker:** Seeing no one else in the queue. Diego, is there anyone signed up to testify?

**Speaker:** No one has signed up.

**Speaker:** Do we have any? Oh. Go ahead.

**Speaker:** Oh, yes, we move. Right.

**Speaker:** What? Do we have any discussion?

**Speaker:** No.

**Speaker:** Councilor kanal.

**Speaker:** Yeah, thanks. I just wanted to quickly say something up front. If this is placed on consent agenda at the full council, i'll be removing it has nothing to do with you. I don't want it to be brought across that way. I think this is a really important board. I want your voice to be heard when it makes recommendations. One of the ways that we get there is by forcing all 12 of us councilors to engage with your appointment, so that later, there can't be the excuse we've heard in previous forms of government that, oh, I didn't know. They don't represent the community. There have been a million excuses on it for advisory boards over the years, and I aim to take that away by forcing it to be discussed at the full. Council has nothing to do with any of you. I'm pleased to have been a former member of the parks board myself. Former parks commissioner dan Ryan appointed me to it. He asked me a very difficult question when before he appointed me about my favorite park as well. So I get it. But I just wanted to make sure that was that was clear here. And i'll also just ask rhetorically that you look at the conversation around partnerships with the county, around the use of community centers and for heating and cooling. That was a conversation just before I joined. It's, I think, always ripe for a new conversation. So it's a tricky one to get into. You may not want to do it first, and I recognize it, but I just wanted to suggest that as a topic to consider, because it is an ongoing conversation that that would benefit from community input.

**Speaker:** Thanks.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Councilor. I would like to entertain a motion to send the appointments of jacob carson, tommy sharp, katie firth, andre acosta, mayra rafia, sally bernstein, and the reappointment of adrian feldstein to the Portland parks and recreation board to the full council with the recommendation that the appointments be confirmed.

**Speaker:** So moved.

**Speaker:** Thank god. Is it you or me?

**Speaker:** Let's see. Wow, this is tough.

**Speaker:** Oh my god. Who's your favorite?

**Speaker:** I'll second it. I know I'm going to lose that argument.

**Speaker:** Answer on the record.

**Speaker:** Councilor morillo I'm.

**Speaker:** Saying i.

**Speaker:** I'm sorry for putting you on the spot, but would be you.

**Speaker:** So councilor mayor moves.

**Speaker:** Who's the.

**Speaker:** Who's the second.

**Speaker:** Councilor kanal seconds. Councilor morillo moves councilor kanal seconds to recommend the appointment and reappointment to the Portland parks and recreation board to the full council with the recommendation appointments be approved. Is there any discussion? Will the clerk please call the roll.

**Speaker:** Canal. Briefly, thank you to adrian for being willing to continue to serve. Thank you. We didn't mention them, but thank you to the five, their six, but five of the people who are leaving for the service that you provided to the board as well, and to all five of the new appointees coming up, I sally, I would make a joke that you have big shoes to fill because you're taking my seat on it and I'm excited for that. But I don't want to sell myself too highly here. I'm excited for it. And I definitely want to read myra's research about the mekong river and the impacts of climate change on indigenous communities. That was fascinating. And I think each of your bios provides something that I'd love to follow up with each of you on when there's time. And so thank you for the work that director long, you and michelle did, and

everyone else who was involved in getting a great crop of appointees. I will be excited to support this at the full council as well. I vote i.

**Speaker:** Ryan.

**Speaker:** Yes, thank you for serving and you can tell your hearts are all connected to the mission, so enjoy the work. It'll be messy at times. It should be. That's where Portlanders play. There's some difficult issues to get to, to talk about and debate. And it's that balanced nature. Recreation, you know, it's what Portlanders want. So I vote yea.

**Speaker:** Morillo.

**Speaker:** Thank you all so much for serving our community.

**Speaker:** I vote yea avalos.

**Speaker:** For the record, my favorite park is midland park, and if you haven't checked it out, you should I vote yea.

**Speaker:** Novick.

**Speaker:** Thank you so much for your willingness to serve. And you're now public officials. You're going to be brutally attacked in a variety of issues. I'm sure that everyone who said what their favorite park is, is now going to be attacked by the public for stating a favorite park. So I apologize on behalf of councilor Ryan for putting you in that position.

**Speaker:** I with five votes. The report is referred to the full council with the recommendation that it be accepted.

**Speaker:** It was the hardest question during the 2020 campaign.

**Speaker:** Thank you.

**Speaker:** Thank you, thank you, thank you.

**Speaker:** Will the clerk please read the next item?

**Speaker:** Item three discussion on funds from Portland clean energy community benefits fund for office conversion.

**Speaker:** So a couple of weeks ago, I read in the paper that the mayor was proposing to use pcef funds to fund office to residential conversions. The mayor cited strategic plan 14 from the pkf strategic plan as a basis for this. And I have to say, I read strategic plan 14 was rather puzzled at the how the mayor reached that conclusion. So today we have sam barrasso from pcef and lisa boothe from prosper Portland, who provide an overview of the office to residential conversion proposal. And I'd like to ask them specifically to point to the language of sb 14 that they and the mayor are relying on. And subsequently, we have invited testimony from rafael villatoro, pcf co-chair, to talk about this issue and the process that should be followed for trying to access piece of funds for this purpose. Mr. Barrasso, go ahead.

**Speaker:** Good morning, commissioners. For the record, my name is sam brass. I'm program manager for the Portland clean energy community benefits fund. And for the record, mount tabor is my favorite park. I'll turn it to you.

**Speaker:** Oh, you stole my park, sam. Yes. Good morning. For the record, lisa, I'm the interim executive director at prosper Portland, and we're excited to be here before you today to walk through this important intersection of climate action, central city revitalization and housing production. And with that, i'll hand it back to sam. Okay.

**Speaker:** So what we're going to do here is in response to the questions that you've teed up here, we're going to provide, first, an overview of the climate investment plan. Highlight strategic program 14, access to fair and flexible capital, and walk through how we're supporting office to residential conversions. Through that program, we'll close with obviously space for questions and discussion. And so

first and I think this is an important context here. The climate investment plan or sip as you'll hear us call it, is our roadmap for administering pcef funds over five years. The council first adopted it in September 2023 and amended it in December 2024. Now it lays out how we fund both strategic programs. These are programs that are in partnerships with government, nonprofit entities and private entities, as well as what folks are most aware of. Our community grants, which are projects led by community based nonprofit organizations. Now, later this year, you will have your first opportunity as council to amend the cip through our annual update process. The process starts with a pcef committee and concludes with council action in the fall and winter. These updates are really important and allow us, importantly, to refine our allocations, to make technical adjustments and to ensure the plan stays responsive to evolving needs and implementation. Lessons learned as we are learning many in this plan. Okay, so the climate investment plan and we know we're going to focus on strategic program 14. But first, to contextualize how the plan as a whole sits, there are 37 strategic programs with allocations ranging from \$1 million to over \$100 million for programs, for example, one of our smaller programs supports upgrading the cooling systems of the arlene schnitzer concert hall for \$1 million, while our largest program funds deep energy retrofit in 3100 single family homes or five years, that's \$140 million. What's important to recognize is that these programs vary in how prescriptive they are. Some are tightly scoped with defined activities and implementing partners, while others, like strategic program 14, were intentionally designed to be flexible. On the left side of this slide here, you'll see how some of the larger the larger programs, those over \$10 million are distributed across funding areas. You'll notice multiple programs focus on housing, both preservation and production, including support for clean energy and new affordable housing and programs that support, as I mentioned earlier, critical

upgrades in older homes. And then you see some of the other programs focus on transportation, green infrastructure and many others. And it's just acknowledge that this program, it's always important to think about the climate investment plan as a whole and that the scale of the investments we always think about, how do we support all the different sectors in advancing our climate work? Which brings us to strategic program 14, access to fair and flexible capital now, strategic program 14 and as you look at the broader plan in that particular program was created with the understanding that not every impactful project would neatly fit into a strategic program, that we would see priorities, we'd see opportunities, but that this program in particular was designed to one fill gaps by supporting projects that deliver strong greenhouse gas emissions reductions and community outcomes, but struggle with traditional financing. Two to complement other strategic programs by providing some of the gap financing as well as additional flexibility. We'll see in some of the other strategic programs, we have a requirement for match funding. And so some of the programing that was supposed to come out of this was supposed to support that, intended to support that. And then three deliver both an intention to deliver both consumer facing financing tool as well as commercial financing products. Now eligible partners to implement strategic program 14 include mission driven financial institutions like community development, financial institutions, credit unions, as well as public partners like prosper Portland. Because this program needed to be responsive and adaptable, it was one of the last to move into development as we've been prioritizing standing up our more prescriptive programs first as well, acknowledging just our capacity. Once that plan passed, we had many programs to turn up. And so this is one of the latter programs. So in the next slide here, I'm going to get into the timeline to date on the development of the



office residential pilot. Just so you get a sense for how the collaboration in the conversations have gone on.

**Speaker:** So I just want to note that you said that this isn't very prescriptive, but I'm looking at sb 14. And the second sentence is a legacy of discriminatory and predatory practices by traditional banking institutions, have created distrust in many low income communities of color and immigrant communities. Innovative financing tools are needed to address these disparities in ways that are flexible response to the community, accountable and fair. So I'd like you, as you go along, to explain how this proposal ties into that sentence.

**Speaker:** It's thank you. Councilor novick. I think what I would share there is and that's the reason I tried to draw the distinction, as you look at some of our other programs, like strategic program 3 or 6, where we clearly spell out exactly how the program is going to be implemented. And what you see in this particular program is, yes, when we brought our stakeholders our roundtables together to discuss what are the opportunities, those are absolutely some of the intentions of that particular program area to serve those sectors and serve those communities. And there was a recognition that as we rolled out the program, that we were going to need to figure out exactly how we did it. We did not want to just design financing products that ultimately had no end users, no pickup, no outcomes. And so I think that while the intention was to lay out one those priority groups, there was a recognition that that particular program was going to spin off many different projects and investment vehicles, and that is still on the table in discussion around how we implement this program. I mean, what we're speaking to here with the pilot is a subset of strategic program 14. So, so soon after council adopted the inaugural climate investment plan in September, 23 staff from broadly prosper Portland and Oregon deq began exploring the potential for office residential conversions to both

advance climate and community goals, particularly through the lens of embodied carbon impacts. That early collaboration led to the inclusion of office to residential conversions in Oregon, the state's application for epa's climate pollution reduction grants. And fortunately, in July of 2024, deq was awarded \$197 million from the epa, of which about 10 million of that was included and directed to support office to residential conversions statewide. So it was around that same time that then prosper and sf began discussing how we could pilot efforts in Portland, not just to activate downtown, revitalize underused downtown buildings, but to understand the ghg and community benefits of these conversion options.

**Speaker:** I apologize, but I'm curious as to the logic that got to the idea that office of residential conversions were. Result is a project that resulted in measurable carbon emissions reductions. It seems like the purpose of office of residential conversions is to create housing, not to reduce the carbon usage of the existing buildings.

**Speaker:** If you I promise I will hit that in the next slide, I will hit that in the next slide. And so but councilor novick I will, I will address that. And so it was to also better understand those impacts. And this conversation importantly was timely just as a national momentum as it was around office residential conversions had grown post-pandemic. So through the summer of 2024, pcf and prosper worked to develop an iga intergovernmental agreement to administer several programs in the climate investment plan, where we saw strong alignment with prosper's program offerings. This included investing in diversifying and expanding the pool of contractors that could work on climate action projects. Their efforts prosper's efforts to support small commercial businesses, and more moderate scale building energy upgrades that often struggle to access favorable financing. As we continued shaping this partnership, we did decide to launch a pilot focused specifically on

office to residential conversions, and that pilot came together in late 2024. And then we ultimately finalized that early program design earlier this year. So it's here that in this slide here, I think getting to your point, councilor novick, it's why are we leaning here into office residential conversions? One for decades, most of our climate work in the city in the state has been sector based. It's been based on sector emissions, those emissions that are generated within the state of Oregon as a result of us combusting fossil fuels when we drive our vehicles around, as a result of us using electricity that consumes some natural gas as a result of some of the production we might have in state. But as industries and production have gone abroad, many of those emissions haven't disappeared. They've just moved. And so what's been missing in earnest from the city's climate efforts, as well as the state's climate efforts, have been targeted actions on consumption based emissions. Those are the emissions that are embedded in the materials that we import here from abroad and use locally. Dick, in the city's analysis shows that while our inbound emissions so within the state of Oregon produced from within the state have gone down, that's and that's a big deal. Our consumption based emissions are increasing. This includes the embodied carbon in construction materials, something that traditional sector based emissions inventories don't capture. And so while we know the potential for embodied carbon savings is very real, to your point here, the available data has been highly variable. It's one of the reasons we've been pursuing this pilot to rigorously evaluate the ghg impacts alongside the community benefits like housing affordability, downtown revitalization, workforce development. We equally also want to understand not just the embodied carbon savings, but we will plan to compare those to the operational carbon savings, which is which is also part of this pilot, as you'll hear in a bit before lisa walks through the pilot details and the context around the pilot, I do want to emphasize one thing that makes this work. It

is in Oregon's distinct national leadership in consumption based emissions analysis. While most climate policies focused on that sector based emissions produced within the state, Oregon deq, led by Oregon, led by dick, has been at the forefront nationally, accounting for those emissions that are embedded in the materials and the goods that we import, that we've just exported out. And so when we started developing the climate investment plan in 2022, embodied carbon was flagged as a priority investment area. But we could not design a program, couldn't figure that out in terms of addressing that singular purpose. And so it was this pilot that allowed us to touch on that priority and has been strengthened by our partnership in deq. There's some other efforts we've been engaging to understand embodied carbon around mass timber. But I just want to note, if the council's interested in a deeper dive on that particular part, I do think it'd be wonderful. And we could encourage a conversation or arrange a conversation with staff that focus on that area.

**Speaker:** And can.

**Speaker:** I ask? I mean, I'm trying to figure out where the embodied carbon discussion comes from. I mean, if you're going to if somebody is about to build a building with steel and you say, well, subsidize them to build it with no mass, with cross-laminated timber, then you were changing the nature of the building to produce less, to have less embodied carbon. But if you have an office building sitting there and you convert it to residential, what is the point of comparison? You are what's what is less embodied carbon than what?

**Speaker:** Yeah, it's you're hitting on literally exactly the point. So we've got dcs contractor, the carbon leadership forum, to support that embodied analysis. And what we're looking at, we're trying to figure out what are those counterfactuals the general counterfactual we're starting from, particularly with these older buildings in

the central cities, this expectation that they will likely be demolished, that without approaching it as a conversion, you will demolish the building and build ground up. So it's what are the materials we get? And largely you're correct, the internals of the building are being redone. But there is the concrete, the timber, the exterior parts of the building that remain, and you build out the interior. So we don't fully I think the literature on there is variable. I want to acknowledge that. And I think there's literature that states embodied carbon can be pretty significant. You've got a graphic here in front of you from rocky mountain institute that starts to capture some of those different parts of it, but this is exactly what we wanted to tee up based on the universe of projects that could be relevant, which it is a narrow universe of buildings that fit this archetype that could be ideal target. What is the actual embodied carbon that we could understand vis a vis assuming that, you know, and I think that's the counterfactuals is what this study is going to tease out. What's our assumptions, that is that those buildings would be demoed and built new, as opposed to building housing with those existing structures.

**Speaker:** Well.

**Speaker:** As opposed to I mean, the other possibility is the buildings won't be torn down and rebuilt. They'll just sit there forever. So I don't think I'm not sure about the assumption that they would be torn down and something new would be built at that place.

**Speaker:** I will, so we will. We expect to have multiple counterfactuals just to tease out what some of it will. I expect one scenario to be that a building does get demoed and then the other is a building gets built new elsewhere. So it's just what is the reuse? And obviously there's going to be different deltas assumed in both. But I think I want to name and I don't want to oversell what it is. We do not fully understand the extent of the savings here, and that is that was a big part of the

objective. And we've been signaling that clearly to the folks that were willing to be guinea pigs as part of the process, that that was going to be a big part of the learning effort. Okay. With that?

**Speaker:** I think that's a good transition. So I think what I'd like to do is just walk over the kind of high level guidelines that we've identified for this pilot. And again, as sam mentioned, I think we're really moving into this phase to learn. We're in a learning mode. This is a \$10 million financing pilot that is focused on supporting office to residential conversion in Portland's central city. The goal of the pilot is to assess how targeted capital, particularly paired with clear climate and community goals, can activate vacant buildings, but also unlock high impact projects and have the climate benefits that we then test and measure, as sam mentioned, and what you see in front of you are some key guidelines. So we want to make sure that we're approaching our pilot projects consistently. So all eligible projects must include at least 20 units of housing that do meet the city's inclusionary housing requirements on site. The financing is structured to offer a 60,000 per unit support for the conversion itself, and an additional 25,000 per unit investment to cover energy efficiency upgrades. So we've actually split the pilot into two investments, one just addressing conversion, the other making sure that as conversions occur, they're installing high efficiency systems, things like hvac, hot water systems and appliances. The rents on any project that receives these resources must remain affordable to households at 60 to 120% ami for a minimum of ten years, and the loans include conditional forgiveness over that ten year period to incentivize that longer term middle income housing affordability and the climate performance. As part of our pilot, we're working closely with deq as well as ito, with the goal of having a better and shared understanding of measurable climate, benefits of conversions relative to demolition and or new construction happening elsewhere in

the market. To address those housing gaps. We also know there are impactful secondary benefits from conversion, including activating vacant buildings in our central city and thus stabilizing those property values, diversifying uses, and increasing 24 over seven foot traffic in those areas and introducing new housing, particularly adjacent to strong transit oriented infrastructure. This pilot is also meant to inform how we scale this type of capital investment going forward. And it's not just about one off projects, it's really about learning. So we do require, as you'll note on this site, we do require, as sam mentioned, that the pilot projects actually provide to us data regarding the performance of the building as as they move into design and construction that benefit both the climate and community. And with that, I think we'll just open it up to general questions.

**Speaker:** Who is eligible for these investments? Is it any old developer? I mean, the reason I'm asking is that the piece of the sb 14 says that solicit proposals from lending institutions, nonprofit organizations, public agencies to one provide loans and match saving tools for low and moderate income homeowners to provide loans for businesses, prioritizing small businesses to make energy related building improvements. Three provide loans, including lines of credit for businesses owned by members of historically under-resourced groups that procure goods or services that reduces ghg. Are the people who are eligible for these investments. Do they fall into those categories?

**Speaker:** Generally? I think what i'll say is, for instance, separately, we are actively working on consumer financing project, which will focus on some of those sectors here. Here, the focus is certainly developers and incentivizing and activating that work. I think one is separate from this. We are equally working with prosper on our small commercial building financing program, and that's been close to being launched here. And in that program, we've worked also with energy trust of Oregon

to figure out do we have the appropriate match resources there? So as we've gone on in developing each of the programs, we've tried to understand what are the gaps that are needed in the programs? And so while we started in 2023, laying out some of those assumptions, not all of those needs came to the surface as we started building out our other programs. And so I just want to name that. And I think this is this is the challenge with writing something at one place, knowing that it's going to be flexible, where I think anyone that was part of that round table would acknowledge that there was a lot of different ideas there. And coming to this point now, and as we implement different programs teasing out where the need actually exists to support this. So I think that's that's maybe my roundabout way of saying that we've got several other programs that are going to be turning out out of strategic program 14 that will absolutely address those target audiences. In this particular instance, the target is certainly developers. And i'll turn to lisa to speak to how you all engage with them.

**Speaker:** Yeah, absolutely. I think what I would add to that list, because we really do want this to be a learning moment, is projects that are feasible and ready to go where the rest of the capital is available for the convergence to, to occur. But for this investment, because we want to understand what's really happening in the projects, and for that to be available to us as a data set, we have to have projects that are real and will result in the other community benefits that we're seeking. So the conditions I would also add, we are focused in the central city. Is it a direct is are we providing loans or direct subsidy to developers?

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** It's structured as loans.

**Speaker:** It is structured as loans. Okay.



**Speaker:** So in the mayor's talking about 15 million. Is he talking about loans as well.

**Speaker:** Yes.

**Speaker:** Okay.

**Speaker:** We've assumed that what it would do is it would add additional resources into this pilot that would allow us to do this will probably allow us to do about 2 to 3 projects. We think it will probably add to that pool another 3 to 4 projects or a singular large project, because the when you look at it on a per unit calculation, that 85,000, if you take the 15 million and you divide it by the 85,000, it's about a 200 unit project.

**Speaker:** Okay. I just want to flag that. I don't see any language in sp 14 that suggests that we're going to make loans to generic developers, and that doesn't mean that it's a bad idea, but it just sort of what I'm thinking in terms of the implementation of the strategic plan, should we be worrying about going back to amend the language if we're doing something that doesn't seem to directly fall within it?

**Speaker:** I think, which I appreciate the question. Councilor. I think what I'll say is, I mean, there are and as we've learned in all of our programs, there are tweaks that we're making as we're catching just certain things that we stated back then that aren't working now. And so I expect that some of those technical adjustments will be coming before you all here later this year as we try to rightsize and say, okay, well, we thought we were going to do here. Not quite how it's working out, but but I expect that we will bring some of that cleanup language to you all later this year.

**Speaker:** Councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** Thank you, chair novak. And thank you both. Lisa, it's good to see you and thank you for stepping up this week. I appreciate it. And sam, it's always good

to see you. This conversation, as we all know, has been going on for a couple of years, but it's always been you hear two things. One, people just I think look at it so simply like, oh, just convert offices to housing, no problem. And then then others saying it doesn't pencil out. And so I appreciate the knowledge that I'm gaining from listening to this. So thank you. And I do think it's important that we have some model units, if you will. You have to blaze the trail so people can see that it can pencil out and it does work. And I really appreciate also your openness to like we're learning a lot as we go here. Is there any examples outside of Portland? You know, cities like new york that obviously have a lot of urban housing already. So it's not as it's not a foreign concept for people in new york city. I lived there for five years that live in manhattan or wherever in the city and are in densely populated areas. They've been doing it for a long time. I assume there's some examples there, and if I missed it, I'm sorry. I've been sitting in this chair like all of us, like most of the week. So a little rummy. So did you already mention that in the report I missed it?

**Speaker:** You want me to take us? I'll take a stab at this from the financing side. And then. So there are certainly examples. I think there are examples in pittsburgh, in new york, in boston, there are a lot of financial tools and regulatory tools that are being put forward because many central cities are struggling in the same way. We are. Very often those are property tax based tools which are giving breaks. Then for extensive period of time on property taxes and just having kind of gone through this budget cycle, we're working hard to figure out what do we do with the resources we have in hand in a way that aligns to the policy direction that we've received from council? I would flag that. I think there is at least a directive, if not a fund, actually, at the state level in california around conversions within their climate goals. Just acknowledging that there is a nexus between conversions and ghg benefits.

**Speaker:** So most of most of the market is private market that is building of housing. And so are you saying that you have to have government incentives or it just won't pencil out for anyone to dive in? And I think that's the point that I'm that you're landing and I appreciate that. So because right now, no one in the private sector that does building predominantly that's who does the building is going to jump in unless they have those incentives.

**Speaker:** Yes, that's absolutely correct.

**Speaker:** All right. And that's where.

**Speaker:** We're struggling in Portland. We all know our supply is much worse than most cities. Our size councilor kanal.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Yeah, I think I as it relates to the idea of office to residential conversions generally, I think I agree with everything councilor Ryan just said without notes. And I will say I this is a campaign issue for me, I think it's something that we're aware of. I think it's very, very clear that this has the impacts that I think councilor novick's first question was about with relation to reduction in emissions, all the different climate things. There's also the fact that it will help convert our downtown away from being a business district to being an actual neighborhood. And if you look at I also lived in new york, I think that that that example tends to inform a lot of people as to the benefits of this and also the challenges you face around windows and plumbing and all the different unique needs. Two years ago, I believe it was this count. Well, the commission at the time had a conversation about the seismic code as it applies to. Which standard is applied when a building is converted from office to residential, which I think was helpful in terms of being a step. So this is something that that we've been working on for years at the city. And I think it's really important. And just to finish the thought on the central city broadly, the post covid recovery nationwide has been better in downtowns that are arts and

culture districts or actual neighborhoods where people live than in those that are office and business districts. And I think we will also see benefits to labor in the city when we don't have this incentive of empty office buildings to incentivize employers to be trying to force their employees to come back to work. So there is a nexus here as well. However, where I'm not sold is on two particular parts of the application of this to sb 14. One is councilor novick. Second question around the second, sorry, not second question, question about the second sentence and the applicability here in the context of the legacy of discrimination and predatory practices that was brought up. And I understand that that is maybe not designed to apply to every project under this. This is one third of the dollar amount that is going into sb 14 in the current climate investment plan. So this isn't like an exception to the rule. This is a core part, right? Is that a fair assessment?

**Speaker:** Councilor canal that that is a fair assessment. It's I think what you'll see is not only this program in our other programs that as we get underway, we realize that some of the goals that we set out were not accurate. And that means that at times we have to come back and that will be and I think that's the part that it is a challenge. And as we try to implement programs and as we roll out in this five year time frame to get everything up to, to dial everything exactly right, but that will be part of the conversation when we come back to you all around where we're going to need to make adjustments, to have that conversation as transparent as possible, that we didn't quite as we rolled this out. This isn't quite what we thought it was going to be.

**Speaker:** And that's fair. And so that implies that we're going to be. Well, I think you've said it. It's going to be part of the amendment to the cip process. And you described that process as starting with the pcef committee. So I have to ask, where's the pcef committee at on this question?

**Speaker:** Yeah, we've we briefed the pcef committee in March on this and gave them an update that this has happened. We've we've subsequently had follow up conversations with individuals that had particular interest. On this, as it was, as we've designed and thought through the pilot, not as as a full committee, but we will be starting the conversations with the committee on the amendments. It will start as a subcommittee activity of the committee. Committee. Many times in July, we'll start convening a subcommittee to do that evaluation process on what are the extent of changes across our 37 programs? Where are we making adjustments? But that will begin there in earnest in July.

**Speaker:** I believe we actually have ron villatoro, the co-chair of the pcef committee. Here.

**Speaker:** Yeah.

**Speaker:** I would I'm happy to hear from from one of the co-chairs, if that's appropriate. But I also don't want to put him on the spot to speak for a committee as a whole. He's not inclined to do so. I know that's something that I you know, so I leave it up to you to invite him up. Chair novick I will also say that the other part of this that gives me pause is, again, something that. Councilor novick brought up, which is solicit proposals from lending institutions, nonprofit organizations and public agencies to and then all that. And I private developers don't do not seem to generally I think you described them as generic developers do not seem to fall into that. But you know, and I guess this is maybe linked to a broader question around should we be putting millions of dollars into projects that we don't have a stake in as a city, which I know is ties into asset management and social housing and a million other conversations that we're talking about here. But that that is the I don't want to put you on the spot to answer about that. And so perhaps consider this rhetorical, but it is a concern that I have around whether or not spending millions of

dollars, which, you know, the costs have gone up. This is not a huge, huge project that we're talking about here at this point anymore should result in an ownership stake for the city. And that that's my interest in, in that part of it. So i'll leave it there. Thank you.

**Speaker:** At this point, I actually would like to ask ron to come up and talk about his thoughts about this whole issue, and I'd be happy to hear you sort of hold forth how you think the committee should be involved in making decisions about whether this particular proposal should go through, whether you think that we need to adopt amendments to sp 14 in order to do things exactly like this, or whatever else you choose to say.

**Speaker:** Happy Thursday.

**Speaker:** For the record.

**Speaker:** My name is giannettino villatoro. I'm one of the co-chairs. Thank you for the invitation. I was just enjoying my seat back there watching this discourse.

**Speaker:** Sorry.

**Speaker:** I appreciate those good, good questions. Again, I just want to apologize for megan, my fellow co-chair who could not be here today. She just had a conflict. And unfortunately for you all, she's the one with the encyclopedic sort of institutional knowledge of the pcf. But I will do my best here today with respect to, I think, process. As you all know, we've taken the time as co-chairs visit with each and every one of you all, as well as as proposals come forward. We've sort of been beating the drum beat of process, reminding folks, hey, we really value and care about process, especially as we hear about new proposals we really want to hear how are you involving community? How are you involving not only organizations that advocated for pccep, but just broadly? How are we bringing community along for many new funding recommendations or policy recommendations when it

comes to how the process that we went through with the climate investment plan, sam and team have done a really good job just with the amount of time they had to have several different community stakeholder convenings on each of the subsequent programs that we see, including sb 14. My hats off to them. I could not do what they did and accomplish in the little amount of time. It was essentially an exercise of, hey, how high can you jump? And can you jump? By Tuesday, they were able to accomplish that. But we know, like in any kind of process, getting money out the door is the name of the game. But we also know that it's really important that as we think about strategic investments when it comes to pcef, things take time. We do need to ensure that we have a polished, refined proposal. Some of the things that we thought were right yesterday may be incorrect or wrong tomorrow, not out of mal intent, but just we just know more things about the future when it comes to sb 14, the mayor's proposal, we as a committee have received some updates, both at a subcommittee level. Sorry, small committee level as well as directly from the mayor, at least from the co-chairs perspective. We look forward to meetings this summer to get receive a formal presentation from either the mayor and or sam and lisa here at prosper. All the questions that you're asking are probably the kinds of flavors of questions we as a committee will have. We are not a rubber stamp committee. We are a committee that really likes to get into the weeds of policies and to make sure we fit the original intent of not just the program, but the each and every strategic program that's listed out. So anticipate a lively conversation in the future on this. I appreciate the conversation you've all had so far, but i'll say to you, like the same thing that I've said to the mayor and which I've committed to each of you, like we as a committee want to partner. We want to collaborate because when we partner and when we collaborate, we're able to achieve the great things that we want to achieve. When it comes to addressing the issues around climate and the

impacts to our community, but ensuring the best program that we can achieve with the Portland clean energy fund. And it's not going to be up to just sam to create that. It's not just going to be up to the committee to achieve the program. It's going to take all of us and not just the folks in this room, but also the community at large. And historically, we've debated about this before. There have been just communities that have been left behind, and those are the same communities that put forward this ballot initiative. When the city had its own opportunities to lead. So, again, you know, happy to take any questions. You know, I appreciate the conversation so far. Like what strategies could really achieve reducing our greenhouse gas emissions? The one thing I just want to say on that point is. Every strategic program, we can sort of say, hey, there's something that we could do better here, right? There's something that could really reduce greenhouse gas emissions, take transportation, take energy efficiency. But if you change aspects or say, hey, you know, we'll just wholesale change it, there are going to be community stakeholders that no longer see themselves in the pcf climate investment plan. And it's not we're not going to be able to quickly replace the months long, you know, engagement from various different stakeholders in this process. So, you know, I think, as sam mentioned, as we see potential tweaks and changes to programs, we hope that's an opportunity for the committee, this council, to engage. We as a committee have that value. But again, what we want to say, as we say, is how are we bringing community along. So expect that commitment from my end as a co-chair and as I transition just to a committee member and then expect that commitment from my end as a community advocate as I roll out at the end of this fall. So i'll pause there, happy to answer any additional questions. But yeah, appreciate the conversation so far.

**Speaker:** Thank you, councilor avalos.



**Speaker:** Thank you so much for this presentation. And I think that, you know, we're expressing a lot of mixed feelings. I think there's absolutely lots that we can debate about how we are effectively putting pcef dollars to use. But i'll just add my voice here generally to say that I think one really cool thing about pcef that we should embrace is the ability for them to be part of a capital stack, and as part of that capital stack, adding, you know, a layer to how we build our city that is climate resilient, right. And so I think that's what this shows. I mean, again, office to housing conversions, there's lots of feelings about that. And I think this investment is something worth exploring, you know, as a pilot and ultimately I think adds to the larger good of being able to help get units or any kind of buildings up and running, being part of that capital stack and then being able to again add this extra commitment from the city to ensure that as we're building, we're doing it in a way that is reducing ghg, that is building a more resilient future through the way that we build. So I generally appreciate that. And, you know, I'm definitely eager, as in the coming years, as we continue to talk about how we adapt the cip to our changing needs, because we should we should also be okay with the fact that, you know, we put stuff in the cip that maybe doesn't work, and then we need to change. And that's that's part of this. But I feel like overall, the way that sb 14 and all of the strategic partnership goals were crafted, they were crafted really thoughtfully with the help of community partners. I've sat in many of those rooms talking about how we maximize that, and that really is always at the center for me, as far as how we are maximizing impact, ensuring that communities at the center. So I just wanted to add my thoughts, but agree that these feelings are complicated and I think we're having a worthy discussion, but I believe this step is a good one. To also help just start moving these projects forward. Thank you councilor kanal.

**Speaker:** Thank you. Yeah, I just wanted to express gratitude to for coming up here and to say that I think. Loss of one of the trains of thought here. So I'm trying to make sure I don't forget something that that we're, we're not asking you to be the only community voice or the only avenue either. I think the pcef committee is vital. I don't want to diminish that role in any way, but I just I wanted to also express that the burden does not solely fall on you and your colleagues, nor nor just our city staff. That's part of our job as well. I did have a question for the staff that I had not asked earlier, which is what portion of the loans within the 15 million do you expect to be forgiven?

**Speaker:** So the focus now that we've really designed has been this initial pilot effort. Everything on the 15 million right now is really going to be developed over the coming months. And based on a little bit of what we've learned in our engagement efforts so far. And so I would there's none of it right now that we've teased that out on that 15 million portion. And that's going to be based on conversations we do have with stakeholders, others to see how do we continue to structure that? Right, using some of just our early lessons learned out of our engagement efforts in this initial piece of it, so that that's that's in many ways, the conversations we'll have, I think I assume through through the through our city leadership to hear from you all around your input on that, but as well as other stakeholders that are engaged in thinking about this, I think I just want to emphasize that that it goes back to what we said. We really were in a learning phase to say, what do we need to do to figure out how do we get some of these initial ones, right, and get some projects moving so we can learn, get some early data and move forward?

**Speaker:** Okay, thanks.

**Speaker:** I think if we're evaluating models or structures, that is a detail about an option that would be helpful for me to know. I don't expect you to. I mean, it would have been nice if you had all figured out right now, of course, that's always you know, and I know that you always have a lot of details to share with us. But in the future, when you come back, that would just be one of the even if it's you could do it this way and that would lead to this percent being forgiven, or you could do it this other way and it has this other percent. That's fine too, of course, but I just want to make sure that's not something that we're having to ask you later to go back and, and delay it to get that fact. Thanks, councilor.

**Speaker:** Ryan.

**Speaker:** Thank you, chair novak. I'm up here talking to I about what to cdf. I mean, i, I continue to struggle with acronyms, but anyway if I look distracted I was I really appreciate this conversation and I appreciate the humility that I heard as well that we are learning a lot here. I, I have a motto that I try to live by in a good day, which is it's not about being right, it's about getting it right. Not an easy thing to live by in the political sector, as there's so much noise as you're trying to figure things out and, you know, you have to be perfect all the time. I think this is one where I hope that we keep leaning into that, that we even fail forward a bit and learn from the mistakes that other markets are experiencing right now, because they're probably ahead of us in a few markets. And I just ask that you continue to lean into that. And I also ask that you consider partners that have skill sets that could really be helpful. And I think the more that the sectors come together, the better. Because what voters want are outcomes. They want all of this to succeed. I haven't met a voter that doesn't want that. Sometimes there's a mystery in what success looks like, and I think we just have to keep communicating that. And this is one where I think you could do a lot of bridge building, because I think there's a lot of people that are

tuned in to how this will work and how it could be successful. So I just ask that you continue to stay in this place of humility. It's very refreshing. Appreciate it.

**Speaker:** Councilor seeing no one else in the queue, we left some time for discussion and we might have a we might have a discussion about what we as a committee want to do further on this issue, maybe start talking about whether we as a committee should be engaged in any updates for the strategic plan. Do we have a specific role? But I am exhausted and I'm out of bright ideas, so I just throw it open to the rest of you to see if you have anything in mind. And if you don't, we can leave ten minutes early. Councilor avalos.

**Speaker:** Well, I think I was just maybe wondering if you wanted to share a little bit more about because, you know, you put this on the agenda. I know there was some discussion that you were having with the mayor about this. And so how do you feel about this? Honestly, I want to know.

**Speaker:** How I feel is that I actually still don't think that this proposal fills within the it falls within the boundaries of the language of sp 14. So my personal inclination would be to talk about revising the strategic plan before we invest money. In this process. I realized that we already have done some. So that's my that's my concern. I worry about rushing ahead into new project. I realize it might slow things down too much, but I worry about I'm a lawyer, and I think about trying to keep within the boundaries of the language.

**Speaker:** Yeah, I get that. I think that, you know, as I said a few moments ago, there's absolutely opportunities to discuss where we can adjust. And maybe I would ask that back to you all, I guess I'm not really sure. Like what the cip has to come back at some. I'm losing time. I'm losing track of the timeline. Like, help me understand. Are there opportunities that we can weigh in? And before you answer that, i'll say with the caveat that I'm also very cautious, that I don't want us to be too

much, you know, with our hands in the pot, because I think that it's important that it's community led through the committee. But it's clear that, you know, I think we're expressing to you all that we just want to make sure that is aligning with council's vision. And as new policy makers like we want to be more involved, but in a way that's not overwhelming. So I'm curious how you think about that.

**Speaker:** It's very much the topic internally, and I think we haven't moved the conversation up through leadership and ultimately to the council president and you all as well, to see how you all want to be engaged. We've certainly been meeting with the pcef committee over the past several months, talking about what the initial update process is going to look like. We updated last year, but we recognized that that was imperfect. And so that we've got to have something that feels a little better this year is going to very much be a practice year. We've signaled that a million ways over to the committee around how do we take 37 programs in community grants and start to evaluate where we make adjustments? We, as staff already know several places where we need to make adjustments. We already know programs that are fully allocated, and we may want to have real discussion around shifting resources and putting more money to them. So we're going to start that with the pcef committee and our hope and our follow up that we'd like to have at some point with the co-chairs is to tease out as we go through that process, at what point do we start having the conversations with with at least the co-chairs here, I assume, as a starting place to see how you all would like to be engaged.

**Speaker:** And i'll just add and we can talk about this as a committee, but it could be cool for us in general to maybe just do a joint pcef committee in climate committee and have a discussion. I think this is an opportunity as a policy committee to just invite those kinds of informal discussions.

**Speaker:** So I'd love that.

**Speaker:** Okay, let's do it.

**Speaker:** May I respond to that? I think yeah, I think again, as a co-chair, we would love that opportunity to engage again. I think like I mentioned earlier, it's going to require collaboration, building a relationship. I know. Councilor Ryan, in your former role as commissioner, we really wanted to kind of extend that partnership and continue evolving this relationship. So we're still committed to that. My selfish plug in as a as an advocate or a co-chair here for the Portland clean energy fund is continue to, you know, work and build a process here. You know, I think this will serve the council well, as well as the mayor's office and the city at large. The more that I think the committee is empowered to call the balls and strikes to be a good referee and a collaborative partner, I think the better this program can be. So I expect, again, follow up from us as the co-chairs and the committee on some of our recommendations in the future on that. But at the same time, we look forward to the conversation and recommendations from your respective ends.

**Speaker:** Councilor kanal.

**Speaker:** To your.

**Speaker:** To your question, chair novick about the involvement of the climate committee, I think this is a good place for it to go. I will note that no one councilor decides where things go within this council. We have committees and we voted on them, so I think that makes sense. And this is one of the three that that this kind of falls into. I think the other two being arts and economy and homelessness and housing. And we're we're great. I think we're we're very lucky in how this committee is made up. One of the two co-chairs of arts and economy on this committee. We also have the chair of house and home and housing on this as well. And I think if we might want to add in an invitation to councilor green, who's the other co-chair of arts economy, just to make sure that we have that the sort of conversation here.

And that's sort of. I'm the only one here who's not one of the co-chairs of those committees, by the way, to try and ensure that that this conversation isn't moving in three different directions in three committees, and also that we're saving time from the efficiency perspective, I think that makes sense. And I also am just to share a little bit of the same reservation I have as as councilor novick, but also a great deal of enthusiasm for the idea of office to residential conversion as a whole, and mindfulness of the risk that when you have a goal that doesn't always fit the vehicle, sometimes you try to change. There's a temptation to change the vehicle to make it work. That might be appropriate, and it is appealing up here to do that and say, all right, that's the goal here, and I'm going to do my best and encourage my colleagues to do the same, to refrain from deciding that that's the goal I want to pursue. Until I hear from the committee. I think that that, to me, is a really important part of that process of decision making for me. Thanks.

**Speaker:** Councilor Ryan.

**Speaker:** Thank you, chair novak. Two things. One, to follow up on that. I think for me, I just love that we're diving into it because it's one of those things when you're out in the community, it seems to be top of the list of people thinking they gave me this, like, silver bullet will just convert all the offices to housing. Why have you done that yet? And it's annoying, right? Because you sit there and you listen and tell them they're brilliant and all, and at the same time, you know, it's really complex, but you don't want to get into that in a five minute conversation. Okay. I didn't know I was going to say that. I hope it was helpful. I'm sure you experienced it as well. But I also want to say this, and this is important. I know that the governor is excited about this. I know that there are obviously the alignment between the state and the city. Anytime I see that, I want to grab it. And so when you have alignment with another elected official with a mayor, and they're doing the same press conference about

such things, you can't dismiss that as an opportunity. And so I just think that we have to harness that complexity and the complexity of the different stakeholders at the table. And I'm experiencing that today, and I thank you for that.

**Speaker:** Seeing no one else in the queue. Thank you so much, sam and lisa and ron, for being here today. Really hugely appreciate it. I also want to say that I am I am amazed at the level of articulateness of my colleagues this morning when I don't think any of us got any sleep. I'm incredibly impressed.

**Speaker:** Yesterday.

**Speaker:** Our next meeting is Thursday, June 26th. We'll be hearing a presentation on electrification. We'll be considering appointments to the planning commission. I hereby adjourn the meeting of the climate resilience and land committee.