



**Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #12**  
**Meeting Summary**  
**April 21, 2014; 5:30 – 8:30 pm**  
**1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., Room 2500A**

**Members**

<b>Representative</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Present</b>
Blake Beanblossom	The Standard	Y
Doreen Binder	Transitions Projects	N
Catherine Ciarlo	CH2M Hill	N
Hermann Colas, Jr.	Colas Construction	Y
Ben Duncan	Multnomah County Health Equity Initiative	N
Brian Emerick	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	Y
Jessica Engelmann	Oregon Walks	Y
Jason Franklin	Portland State University	Y
Jeanne Galick	Willamette greenway advocate, South Portland resident	Y
Jim Gardner	South Portland Neighborhood Association	N
Patricia Gardner	Pearl District Neighborhood Association	Y
Greg Goodman	Downtown Development Group	Y
Patrick Gortmaker	Old Town / Chinatown Community Association	Y
Jodi Guetzloe-Parker	Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council	N
Sean Hubert	Central City Concern	Y
Cori Jacobs	Downtown Retail Advocate	Y
Michael Karnosh	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	N
Nolan Leinhart	ZGF Architects	Y
Keith Liden	Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee	Y
Jeff Martens	CPUsage	Y
Marvin Mitchell	Julia West House; Downtown Neighborhood Association	Y
Anne Naito-Campbell	Civic activist and property owner	N
John Peterson	Melvin Mark Capital Group	Y
Dan Petrusich	Portland Business Alliance	Y
Steve Pinger	Northwest District Association	Y
Valeria Ramirez	Portland Opera	Y
Veronica Rinard	Travel Portland	N
John Russell	Property owner and developer	Y
Bob Sallinger	Portland Audubon Society	Y
Katherine Schultz	GBD Architects, Planning and Sustainability Commission	Y
Mary Valeant	Goose Hollow Foothills League	Y
Karen Williams	Carroll Investments	Y
Jane Yang	NW Natural	N

## Alternates

Representative	Organization	Present
John Bradley	Northwest District Association	N
Dave Harrelson	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	N
Rick Michaelson	Alternate for John Russell	N
Lisa Frisch	Downtown Retail Advocate	N
Martin Soloway	Central City Concern	N
Kevin Myles	Alternate for Jeanne Galick	N
Bing Sheldon	Alternate for John Russell	N
Carrie Richter	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	N
Len Michon	South Portland Neighborhood Association	Y
Raihana Ansary	Portland Business Alliance	Y
Peter Bilotta	Portland Opera	N
Chet Orloff	Alternate for John Russell	N
Tony Bernal	Transition Projects	N
Paddy Tillett	ZGF Architects	N
Harris Matarazzo	Alternate for Brian Emerick	N
Chris Kopca	Downtown Development Group	N

## Project Team/Staff

Representative	Role	Organization	Present
Susan Anderson	Director	BPS, City of Portland	N
Joe Zehnder	Chief Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Karl Lisle	West Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Nicholas Starin	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	N
Kathryn Hartinger	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Mark Raggett	Urban Design Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Debbie Bischoff	River Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Mauricio Leclerc	Transportation Planner	PBOT, City of Portland	Y
Sallie Edmunds	Central City Manager	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Troy Doss	SE Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	N
Desiree Williams-Rajee	Equity Specialist	BPS, City of Portland	N
Lisa Abuaf	Central City Manager	PDC	N
Sarah Harpole	Senior Project Manager	PDC	Y
Kirstin Greene	Facilitator	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y
Alisha Morton	Facilitator Assistant	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y

## Public

Rebecca Liu
Marlene Weiner
Judy Buffo
Joan Kvitka
Cathy Galbraith
Amy Swanson
Jackie Peterson

Marcus Lee
Lynn Longfellow
Ruth Ann Barrett
Bernie Bottomly
Zach Fruchtengarten
Allison Leak
Kathleen Lagana
Anne Kennedy
Wendy Rahm
Lauren Russell
Ken Tyrrell
Michael Hodge
Terry Chung
Peter Fry
Debera Hong

**Welcome and Announcements**

***Overview of Agenda***

**Karen Williams, co-chair**, welcomed all SAC and community participants. She then reviewed the meeting objectives.

**Kirstin Greene, facilitator**, went over the schedule of remaining meetings, agenda and format of the night’s meeting. She asked those in attendance to focus their comments specifically on the three district drafts under review and explained that once again, the group would be using the voting cards: green for general agreement, red for opposition, yellow for concern.

**John Russell**: On page two of the packet under Old Town/Chinatown discussion items, the memo indicates there is considerable opposition to draft policy RC2 regarding surface level parking. What the memo does not state is that there is considerable support for this concept as well.

***ACTION: Approval of Meeting Summary***

**Kirstin** asked SAC members if they had any corrections or comments on the meeting summary. There were none. Kirstin asked SAC members to provide any changes via email and stated that the SAC Meeting #11 summary will be considered final on Friday and posted to the [website](#).

***Calendar and Event Updates***

**Karl Lisle** outlined the topics for SAC review as well as the project schedule. He noted that after discussion with the co-chairs, a July meeting was added to the project schedule. At tonight’s meeting and the next [April and May SAC meetings], we will review the seven district drafts revised based on input from the SAC and the public. At the following two meetings [June and July SAC meetings], we will look at the entire package.

Project staff has done a lot of outreach since the last meeting. Please see the feedback summary from the meeting packet. We got a lot of good feedback from about 700 people. We

are not done talking to community groups or other folks. We are still going out and having meetings and having conversations with folks from the community. Don't hesitate to contact us.

**John Russell:** [In the feedback summary, under] Old Town China Town, the statement "tear down hazardous buildings" worries me.

**Staff:** It does not mean that we are putting that in the plan, it's just what we heard from the community members. This is just a report back on feedback.

Karl went over the meeting packet. Each district section starts with a revision summary, followed by the revised district draft. At the end of each section, you will find the implementation action details. The working Central City-wide policy recommendations are also included in the packet: previously we had only a placeholder for these items. This document is guidance for next year's work during which the team will pull all of the quadrant plans together. The last new things in the packet are the two height maps – one is existing and one is a slightly refined version of the proposed height map.

**John Russell:** Building heights – I'm worried.

**Staff:** We want to hear your worries and then we can figure out how to address them. We should talk about it in the context of each area tonight. As we go through each section we can make changes based on the conversation.

**Karen Williams:** And then there is the process to update zones according to the new policy.

**Staff:** Yes, this is the guiding document for the zoning exercise that will follow this process. Part of the work that we need to do is revise the bonus system as well. Some of that could be linked as well.

### **Goose Hollow SAC Revised Draft District Goals, Policies and Actions Introduction and Discussion**

**Kathryn Hartinger** went over revisions and highlights. Key discussion items for Goose Hollow:

- Zoning action regarding the "flats"
- Other

**Mary Valeant:** A lot of people want to see residential here and clearly nothing has happened. A retail corridor is needed and the RX zone won't allow for that. This needs to be resolved.

**Greg Goodman:** There are not a lot of developable sites left in the "flats." People want to be in mixed use areas. Virtually all the product up there is residential. I wouldn't think we are doing an injustice to go CX. I think you will do well for housing product by having some CX. If you look at older buildings up there, how can we convert to retail on the ground floor?

**Dan Petrusich:** Having been the president of the neighborhood association there, I know there was overwhelming support to make the flats CX. This area is getting sucked up into a controversial project with the MAC club. This is not what we spent years envisioning. It's all about block seven. As a result of one meeting all this work is being trashed because of one project.

**Mary Valeant:** What does RX mean and what does it look like on the ground floor? What you're saying you want, by the definition, is CX and it's just the name that scares people.

**Dan Petrusch:** Flexible zoning gets you more of everything – housing, commercial, retail. Three to four years of work should not be trashed because of block seven.

**Patricia Gardner:** I was president of the neighborhood association in the 90s. The flats have a really strong core. If there was a cap across the freeway you could have a seamless connection to downtown. A lot of Goose Hollow is residential currently. Jefferson has the same problem. There is not a lot of developable space there. The existing buildings and street layout in the flats gives you the best hope of creating that core that could create a complete neighborhood.

**Staff:** This is good feedback. We believe that we can come back and make a case about additional flexibility (something like CX) here. We can look at other examples to show how this has worked in other areas.

**Kirstin** asked the SAC members if they were comfortable with this direction. Discussion followed.

**Jeanne Galick:** If we switch to CX will there be a design overlay with that?

**Staff:** Yes.

**Dan Petrusich:** If you take the word residential out and it's fine.

**Mary Valeant:** I'm comfortable with it. I know the neighborhood wants to see residential.

**Jeff Martens:** Why don't we just say one or the other - mixed use or residential.

**Cathy Galbraith:** (member of the public) I know Mary is doing a wonderful job representing the neighborhood. I thought CX was pretty bold. In the highlight summary there is statement that historic preservation is important given the public reaction. This statement needs to be stronger. Redevelopment conflicts with two policies on page four of the Goose Hollow section. Preserving or institutional uses – contrary with the MAC club project. There can never be enough parking according to them. Preserving housing that is already there is important as is the character of the neighborhood.

**Keith Liden:** You are trying to have more retail on three streets. I am concerned there wouldn't be enough market for that. Are there sections that we should focus on first? And then if booming we extend it. It would be difficult to activate all three streets at the same time. There are action items about improving the streetscape on Burnside. There needs to be more about changing the character of the traffic. Street light timing – is off. Only time you have slow traffic is when you have a lot of congestion.

**Staff:** The impression that we have is that in terms of a big move that is distinctly different – Jefferson is the bigger of the two moves. And there is a desire to continue to build up the flats.

**Mary Valeant:** The stadium district and the flats are the same thing. We need to pick one name so that we are clear on the boundaries. We need to add "public" to green open spaces. To Cathy's point about residential character, could we get rid of "west of 18<sup>th</sup>"? There are some historic homes there that are east of 18<sup>th</sup>.

**Staff:** I think it's just residential only – not a mix. We are open to those changes.

**Mary Valeant:** The historic inventory is a larger issue. We need to do more than just maintain resources. We need to be more specific about how the inventory is maintained. We should have another overlay for family housing. Vancouver BC has something similar to this – proximity to school, housing, open space. We should have a guideline that housing has to adhere to - like elderly housing does.

**Jeanne Galick:** That should be an overall city policy.

**Mary Valeant:** Agreed. It is very important to Goose Hollow but should be city wide.

**Staff:** We have some work to do on CX vs. RX. We will work on changes to the Central City base zones next year. What's important to clearly establish in the West Quadrant Plan is the intent. We can work out the specific tools to implement that intent over the next year as we put the Quadrant Plans together and get into code writing.

**Dan Petrusich:** And performance targets it says to add 2000 new jobs within Goose Hollow. If you don't put them in the flats then where are you going to put them?

**Kirstin** said if we remove references to residential and emphasize reference to mixed use do SAC members have a general comfort level with this direction? **Karl** added that we would take out "with a preference for residential."

A majority of SAC voted "one" with green cards indicating they were comfortable with the direction for Goose Hollow with the revisions. Three people indicated a "two" for moderate comfort level. Comments follow.

**Mary Valeant:** Add to transportation as an action item to restoring Vista Bridge as a gateway to the city.

**Jeanne Galick:** There needs to be an action item to conduct a historic inventory.

**Staff:** We do have that - UD7.

**Patricia Gardner:** It needs to be up the food chain as far as priority goes.

### **South Downtown SAC Revised Draft District Goals, Policies and Actions Introduction and Discussion**

**Mark Raggett** gave a brief overview of the revisions to South Downtown. Key discussion items for South Downtown:

- Changes to heights along the south Transit Mall
- Changes to the South Auditorium area including heights and FAR
- Other

**Patricia Gardner:** How do you get to 460' height with a 6:1 FAR? It seems like you have to adjust more than just 2:1. FAR is kind of low so they will have a hard time getting to those heights. If you can't get to the heights then why bother?

**Staff:** The 460 foot height is kind of irrelevant. We are going to work with FAR rather than heights. There are some big blocks here. Or we could increase the FAR.

**Patricia Gardner:** If you like the concept of the ridge then you need to have the FAR to support it. If that's the concept then it's pointless if you can't get to it.

**Sean Hubert:** How to incentivize FAR transfer? You might actually be able to get policies to do it. There needs to be coordination around the policies.

**John Russell:** I agree with Patricia. PAC West Center is 425' and is 14:1 FAR. Now that you've increased the height, FAR should be increased. Density is a good thing in some circumstances especially where you have great transit.

**Karen Williams:** I am surprised to see this 6:1 and only moving to 4:1 from 2:1.

**Steve Pinger:** I think this is an area where tall buildings should be. It goes with the goals that have been articulated for 40 years now. I have concern with the amount of allowances already – will this water down the market? Do we need to have tall buildings in this many places?

**Staff:** This feedback is very helpful to us. The notion about greater amounts of receiver sites is something we need to think about. We might be interested in more height here.

**Nolan Leinhart:** I agree with Karen that 4:1 seems low for a transit adjacent site.

**Dan Petrusich:** I agree with Patty. FAR is too low. It's a big opportunity site for PSU.

**Patricia Gardner:** I appreciate that you are cleaning this up. The RC2 and RC3 transition is a much nicer map.

A majority of SAC members agreed with the direction of RC2 with only one member voting “two” moderate level of comfort.

### ***Public Comment***

**Cathy Galbraith:** There is one statement on page three of this section, “encourage public and private redevelopment in the district, while respecting and supporting the existing residential neighborhood....” This is the only place where there is anything about existing affordable housing. Some of the oldest buildings in downtown Portland are being used for affordable housing south of PSU campus. Develop incentives for the development of student and family housing. What about the existing affordable housing? What is the statement “Collaborate with PSU on historic preservation efforts” in reference to? When I submitted my online comments – I objected to the proposal to eliminate the master plan proposal with PSU. The Master Plan should be required to be implemented. Like every institution there is never enough land to do what they want to do. PSU needs to have a master plan process.

**Joan Kvitka:** We already have a neighborhood here that we would hate to see overshadowed by an identity as a transit mall. American Plaza is at the southern terminus of the couplet. We are the stewards of the Lee Kelly Park. It's maintained by the condo association. We walk through this area all the time. We take the most advantage of walking from Keller to the hills and valleys. We come through an urban greenway. Canopy is extremely important down here. Please refer to it as Lincoln Street rather than Lincoln Transit mall. We understand that we live



in vibrant neighborhood including OHSU, PSU etc. University Place is going to be transformed with new identity. We want it to be consistent with the neighborhood that is already here. The western portion of the couplet in the Halprin area – green canopy and open spaces need to be incorporated. This open space sequence put Portland on the map. We want to see that this is an opportunity for this neighborhood and to keep the green within urban living. Canopy, open spaces, parks are all important.

**Kirstin** asked SAC members to consider policy RC3 – simplification of the somewhat complex map.

**John Russell:** I realize that this is tortured, but isn't accidental. The theory they had was that these are the two Halprin walkways. There was intended to be a spine that would be in between. 200 Market building is above 300' now. Portland Center and American Plaza – there is a spine. If you don't reflect that then you are missing something. Naito has 100' limit and raising it to 250' is a huge mistake. I agree with people that if you have unlimited height then you essentially don't have zoning. There is limited transit in that area. I did meet with American Plaza folks and Lincoln Street is about to open a light rail station. It is a whole different world. They're arguing for a master plan that looks at the whole area – both sides of Lincoln.

**Keith Liden:** I do believe we need a little bit more thought about what we are doing here.

**Patricia Gardner:** I knew nothing about the spine that you were talking about. In the north end we already have a building above 250. Need more thought.

**Karen Williams:** We should consider the suggestion for master planning around Lincoln Transit. It is a major change to have lightrail going through Lincoln Street.

**Steve Pinger:** Do we know what the neighborhood thinks about the height proposal?

**Jeff Martens:** Do they like it or not? I did read the letter from the neighborhood.

**Staff:** They are clear about what they want – open space, canopy and parks.

**Jason Franklin:** We are fine with the increases in heights and FAR it's needed. A lot of things are needed such as more height along 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and loosening the regulations there. I don't agree with a master plan for the area. It's a small site of only 4 acres. This would be a mistake.

**Joan Kvitka:** (member of the public) It's a valuable property to the university. We understand there is going to be change. We are concerned about where the tall buildings get located. 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue is a logically commercial strip. Moving it in closer to our building changes the feel of our neighborhood. We need shadow zone protection of the Kelly Gardens.

**Judy Buffo:** (member of the public) We were just invited to the table last month and are surprised we haven't been here for the last year. Push back would be warranted to give us time to review this. What will happen to our quiet neighborhood? You are truncating property south of the transit mall. We are homeowners, not a transient community. We are not students. We are trying to maintain a neighborhood in an area that wants to be transient. Please read in detail what we wrote up for you.



**Kirstin** noted that a majority of SAC members are in support of the proposal for RC3, with three not in support of the general direction and two moderately comfortable. Kirstin asked staff to consider the comments tonight.

**Kirstin** then asked participants to consider policy question RC5.

**Patricia Gardner:** Why is it not 6:1 rather than 4:1?

**Staff:** At least three-fourths of you said that the FAR wasn't enough on south Transit Mall. We will look at this further (a lot of greens / ones).

**Jessica Engelmann:** Why should we go to 6:1? What's the logic?

**Staff:** We are trying to find a spot that is in between. A lot of people feel it's nice at 2:1 and others feel it should be bigger. Given the large lots, 6:1 could be too big. We were trying to balance this out and transition from Central City to the neighborhoods to the south.

**Staff:** With the 3:1 bonus, we are assuming a potential 7:1 here. We just need to model this better so that you can see what we're talking about.

**Jason Franklin:** What is the likelihood that the bonuses go away?

**Staff:** They won't go away but they will likely change.

**Nolan Leinhart:** Do they apply in other areas that are 6:1? The bonuses are a wash.

**Staff:** We could reexamine this.

**Nolan Leinhart:** The blocks are not huge; they are large for Portland but not huge. There are a lot of things you could do with them such as internal pathways etc. It doesn't mean it would be oppressive.

**Jason Franklin:** With 2:1 you get a lot of low rise. With 6:1 you get a lot more that interests people. With 2:1 and 4:1 you won't end up with a lot of green spaces.

**Steve Pinger:** Naito and First area is not exactly 'no man's land' but it is a transitional area. Using density as a tool how are we trying to influence urban design of this odd area? More guidance is needed for what we are trying to accomplish. Those are all mid-60s fairly urban buildings on that strip.

**Jeanne Galick:** We need to take what the neighborhood said into consideration. How do we keep their neighborhood the way it is and still allow for development? Consider phasing in of the FAR changes.

**Jessica Engelmann:** Mary said look at other examples about what you can do with family housing city wide – brilliant idea. I would like to see some other implementation actions around community center, Portland parks and rec, playgrounds. It's falling in between discussions. Day care facilities – would like to see specific day care / preschool strategy. Serves both urban families that live and work there. In the Transportation section – parking within PSU access study, I didn't see anything else about parking strategy beyond that particular one. Is it all encompassed in that study?

**Jeanne Galick:** In transportation on page 5 it is important to include South Portland as one of the places that we are trying to connect to. The implementation action on page seven - improving greenway trail is out 6 – 20 years. I would like to see that far sooner than that.

**Jason Franklin:** Redevelopment on page three – south Lincoln – 4a talking about Lincoln Station is fairly important for the district. We need to talk about it there. On page three improved connections – NW College of Natural medicine – small typo. PSU page six under transportation “enhance multi-modal access to PSU” - the connections to bridges are very important. Urban design – different strategies there – South Park blocks should be mentioned in the policies.

**Bob Sallinger:** Page nine talks about performance targets – trees and canopy targets but this is not discussed in implementation actions. Riverfront districts – connection to Climate Change Action Plan. That plan wants us to pull back and we are suggesting adding more.

**Keith Liden:** We have a policy about the green loop but no implementation action that I could see. If it's a policy needs at least one implementation action to go with it. Bridges across 405 – very important Barbur to 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and it's neglected. The bike transit corridor will be happening there. Transportation / urban design – “studying the circulation 26 to 405...” is more an action item about how it effects local streets and urban environment. Right now is very hostile to bicyclists. This is not just how to get more cars through in a better way but reduce things like Jackson being part of a cloverleaf.

**Karen Williams:** Thank you members of the public who are here. I also just have a general sense of discomfort largely prompted by the public comments and the changes going on in this area in the next 20 years – transit changes, PSU valuable contribution to the community, increased development and density at PSU and how that will change the number of people on this area. Presence of these changes can either be a disaster or a boom. I don't have a feeling that we as a group have talked about this. We are doing a lot of good housekeeping here, but I'm not confident that we have taken the vision of the impacts and what it means for this area.

**John Russell:** If you do a master plan for the whole length of Lincoln then those things could get ironed out then. When looking at the whole area RC5 is incomplete.

### **Old Town / Chinatown SAC Revised Draft District Goals, Policies and Actions** **Introduction and Discussion**

**Nicholas Starin** gave a brief overview of Old Town / Chinatown revisions. Key discussion items include:

- Action on Skidmore surface parking lots
- Preservation/height tool in New Chinatown/Japantown
- Changes to height limits
- Other

### ***Public Comment***

**Katherine Schultz, co-chair,** asked for public comments.

**Rebecca Liu:** I would like to thank you for modification of language after hearing the voice of the community. Old Town/Chinatown has been a vibrant part of the history of the city. Chinese could own property as of 1943. When the China Gate was built in 1986 it was in the height of life. Light rail and street cap projects have left over a decade of construction. The majority of businesses were forced out of the area because of the economic hardships. Portland is friendly and protective of the Chinese people. That's why we once had the second largest Chinatown on the west coast. The height limitations moving from 100' to 175' jeopardizes the integrity of the Chinatown historic designation. This is only one of the historic districts in the area. Why are we singled out? I hope we can preserve history and heritage. We are asking that you do not trade skyscrapers for our heritage.

**Marlene Weiner:** We own surface parking lots in Chinatown. We are lifelong native Oregonians. The final surface parking plan allowed for existing surface parking lots to be grandfathered in. The free market can absorb them organically. This has been tested over the past decades in Portland. The City is struggling to recover from recession. Old town is still struggling. We have come to be aware of John Russell's theories as to essentially scapegoating downtown surface lots as villains plaguing all of downtown. We disagree. We know he has personal distain for surface lots. This is the first time that we have been brought to the table. We are very much looking forward to it. Looking to embrace public testimony we had some more organized thoughts – and don't appreciate the time limit on comments. We will provide you with the full copy. It is disingenuous to invite comment and then limit it to two minutes. *A full copy of Marlene's comments are included as an attachment.*

**Cathy Galbraith:** The number one adoption step for Skidmore / Old Town is to adopt a five year plan. Staff should have a presentation and discussion about it. Where did the abandoned building comments end up? References about incentives, about family housing and affordable housing – where are preservation incentives? On page six there is a conflict under housing and neighborhood section. Still have segment about the Chinatown National Register nomination – what does this mean? There really is no trust between the community and the plan proposed about this. We are afraid that more buildings will be characterized as unsafe and torn down. National Trust for Historic Preservation prepared an incentive study that proposed demolition denial. It looked at incentives all over the country and we have a lot to learn from this. The 175 foot height in Chinatown is still too high. Visuals in this process have left a lot to be desired.

**Amy Swanson:** Surface parking lots have zero to do with impeding growth and development. They provide much needed economic benefit and parking space. Suggestions by John Russell to the SAC are off point. In fact these proposals could generate strong negative consequences of their own. Extreme parking positions are harmful and have a strong negative impact on local business owners. These positions include detrimental higher parking rates and punitive parking taxes. Boarded up closures of non surface lots would exacerbate the issues. Mr. Russell looks at Chinatown as an asphalt blight. It is a potentially beautiful area of our city with sadness of human blight. No surface owner views parking as the best economic use of the space. The Weiner family and other surface lot owners have a proud presence of ownership. Essentially, surface lots are needed parking spaces for the sustainable viability of retail and business offices.

**Jackie Peterson:** I assume all language in the section about historic preservation and character is not disingenuous. We need to do something about preserving this unique National Historic District. It is the only historic district that tells the story of Portland and the multi-cultural aspect of it. There is a difference between Skidmore and Chinatown. That's a lot about "not white." There is historical importance and architectural importance. What in this proposal

provides us with the tool to preserve these buildings? I don't see anything. Same with the 5 year plan. We are only talking about six square blocks. I think that this is an equity conversation. It could be a vibrant heritage tourism district. Every building that is empty is a mixed use building. Mixed use redevelopment. It's a small area – we can do this and we owe it to our Asian American population.

**Marcus Lee:** I am here again as a concerned, involved member of the Chinese American community. My great grandfather was part of the initial wave of Chinese immigrants in the late 1800s. He was originally on SW 2<sup>nd</sup> between Alder and Morrison and then moved to NW 4<sup>th</sup> and Flanders. That historically significant building was demolished years ago for a large high rise building. Portland is following a path of action to single out this National Historic District and it threatens this area's designation. Other cities and communities elsewhere are actively preserving and restoring these types of districts. Portland is moving backwards yet we pride ourselves on this history and our weirdness. We need to lend a hand to the restoration and preservation of these historic structures. I have to speak out against any action that threatens the historic status. Need to celebrate the heritage of place left by our ancestors. *A copy of Marcus' comments are attached.*

**Lynn Longfellow:** I have been here before to testify. Thank you for all the language and work that is being done in this plan. It helps to reflect what the community has expressed. I have concern about the recommendation to raise the height limits – RC4. It's a discussion that could be explored further and 175' is in conflict with the policy number two on page 3. Physical character would be greatly impacted by 175' height limits. We have formed the Old Town Heritage Group with a mission statement that we hope can be a catalyst. In the oldest part of the city – we see a renaissance of an ethnically diverse, human-sized area. We want to continue to be a positive force but also an advocate for protecting this area's unique roots.

**Ruth Ann Barrett:** I live at 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue and Flanders. I attended my first neighborhood meeting and there were no neighbors there. The residents are 70% between 40-65 years old and they are all men. They are very poor. Many make under \$15k / year and 70% live on less than \$25k / year. Something isn't quite right. A lot of older white guys make up Chinatown. How it got that way – I don't know. You don't want them standing in line on the sidewalk. I thought that was very sad. Economic, social and environmental integration equals sustainability. I am seeing a heavy emphasis on built environment. You never look at what I think is the cultural and social commons – you eliminate that in favor of what I think is more comfortable. Without diversity and culture it isn't going to work.

**Bernie Bottomly:** I am part of the Task Force that was mentioned earlier and we have a sheet in your pile of papers. Several SAC members are also on the Task Force. The task force is made up of 40-45 business owners, tenants etc. We are struggling with all the issues that are being raised here to revitalize the area. Key right now is the rent that you get in that district. It doesn't support the type of investments that would see these types of improvements / infill. We are focusing on strategies that will improve the situation and find ways to increase the value of historic preservation and creative ways to give bonuses for FAR transfers and encourage a requirement that it be reinvested. We haven't tackled the height issue. We felt that it would stay at 75'. Our conclusion with the parking issue is that the stick approach is not one that we think would be successful. We need ways to bridge the gap between rents and cost of improvements. The gap is too big for a tax mechanism to work. Area is over subscribed for folks looking to park there and we cannot recommend closing surface lots. There will be 30-40 recommendations that we will get conclusions on in the next several weeks.

**Zack Fruchtengarten:** I purchased the Fleishner Meyer building several years ago. We could have moved to any neighborhood but we wanted to help revitalize Old Town. We had some requirements when we were coming out there. We needed a space that could accommodate our office and we needed parking. The building we own has a lot next to it. The parking situation is terrible. Lots are full at 10 a.m. Tenants were interested in coming to the building but cannot secure enough parking to make it work. We bought the building and the lot. We wanted low rent and we wanted a place to sustain that rent. We also wanted the opportunity to develop. We have been approached to develop the lot. The cost of development doesn't pencil out. We would love the opportunity to develop the lot in the future. We have to wait for the market demands to pencil out. The building was half vacant for many years. If we would have known that you were proposing to remove the surface lots we would have gone elsewhere. We are invested in this neighborhood.

**Karen Williams,** co-chair, said we are at 8:20 with an ending at 8:30 pm. We are proposing to stay until 9 pm so that we can deliberate on this topic tonight.

Most SAC members agreed. Some had to leave.

**Jeanne Galick:** I have one concern. In all other sections in the city we are having the parking discussion. It's difficult to balance one whole area to let them have all the parking when they have more public transit than any other district. This is a disconnect.

**Patricia Gardner:** Judging by all the comments tonight, I don't want to touch this with a 10 foot pole. I want to punt the parking discussion to the next year.

**Sean Hubert:** I understand John's concerns with the parking situation there. I agree that it breaks up the vitality of the neighborhood. For the 690 employees it is a huge concern in the area. One suggestion is for publically owned parking structures. Phasing out the surface parking would be good but we need to do it within the context of meeting current and future parking needs in the district. I am in general support of SP3.

**Jeff Martens:** I think the question is not about surface or not. It's about parking in general. We need to have adequate parking – surface or not is not important. While I appreciate the commentary from citizens tonight – I would love to hear more solutions from you. We are giving up our nights to come up with solutions. Telling us to keep our hands off of the area isn't helpful. Please come up with the solutions instead of this. I have a business there, I love it. We have good intentions here. We are trying to make it work so help us get there.

**Patrick Gortmaker:** We have to take this on. A parking strategy is critical. Five year action plan will bring over \$57 million into the district. We have been focused on incentives to help the situation. Looking at sticks, if all development occurred we would be about 1300 stalls short of the 2008 parking strategy by PDC. Private development to PDC owned property – several private developers have tried to develop the surface parking lots. There is a gap that needs to be incentivized.

**Brian Emerick:** I don't know right solution, but we need to find something. We need parking in the district – that's a known. We don't have critical mass. There are a lot of empty lots in the district. We need a game plan that thinks about parking in an intentional way. Surface lots are inefficient for a parking strategy.

**Kirstin** said there is a lot of agreement on policy RC2 – to develop a parking strategy.



**John Russell:** I don't know where to start. In the early 1970s the City Council declared asphalt lots to be a blighted use. City Council said you cannot create an asphalt lot in place of a building. Parking in the district, is it for the tenants in the district? Parking is needed for the district within the district – it's not clear. I have asked this before – about Waterfront Park and helping it achieve its goals. I wasn't even the one who assembled the committee. I am a member of a bigger group. I own five historic buildings. I would like to see them prosper. They are surrounded by parking lots. This affects the rents that I can get. A tax on lots to subsidize the development that they claim to believe is necessary. I don't argue that there are incentives needed. We have never seen them materialize. It's the only idea that we could come up with to get the incentives to subsidize the development. If there's a better way to do it we are all ears. We are not decision makers. Good ideas, bad ideas should not stop here. I would urge you to think of yourself as somebody who wants to see more discussion happen on something that we think is terribly important.

**Blake Beanblossom:** I would like clarification now or in email on the topic of whether we can make a recommendation on a tax. We should move on from this. I would not want to be associated with this group if we propose to tax surface lot property owners. We rarely talk about fostering the business environment. A lot of us are contributing significant time. Tax recommendation seems to be outside this scope. Seems it's overreaching.

**Staff:** We are trying to be creative about what we want to consider and think about. These ideas are definitely on the outside of where we are usually operating, but they are creative responses to what is essentially a land use and development problem. Long range comprehensive plans like this often do include directions to explore tools beyond the City's typical land use toolkit. So it is not the first time we have been out here. BPS would not be the agency to develop a tax on parking, others would have to do the work. What we are going to say about it in the West Quadrant Plan is what we are asking you to give us direction on.

**Karen Williams:** I have known John for a long time. I respectfully have deep disagreement with this proposal. I think it's somewhat circular because it says if we ask someone who owns surface parking to pay a tax for using their land for surface parking we are for one issue penalizing someone for an otherwise legal use of their land. Fundamental right concerns. Also says that we will take from the property owner an income tax and use it to subsidize the same property owner to develop their property. There is a circularity to this logic that is quite troubling. We would use taxing power to penalize someone to discourage them to use their land in an otherwise legal way. Portland has a troubling reputation around the country – socialist republic of Portland. It is difficult to develop things and where ownership rights of land and the ability to develop are pre-encumbered by public processes that we have agreed to live with. I would prefer not to see any recommendation for this in the work that comes out of the group. I also agree that the conversation can take place without us forwarding it.

**Patricia Gardner:** Everyone agrees there is a parking problem. They are going to have a year and a half to talk about it. The potential approaches don't stop the fact that there is a parking problem that we agree exists. What about an action item that we will talk about this. We are missing the point – we all agree to develop a parking strategy. You'll have time to talk about this.

**Jeff Martens:** Just say "there is a parking problem."

**Greg Goodman:** I actually do think we should take a position against the tax or closing parking

lots. You could get more from selling FAR and bonus FAR to historic buildings in the area and requiring that money gets spent on the historic building within a certain amount of time. The only reason people are there is because it's low cost and then you're going turn around and tax. That is not good. Consider closing cost from development standpoint - \$2 million lot or \$20 million building. Rents are \$18/ foot and you need \$38/ foot to build. There isn't demand. Talk about parking lots looking bad – one thing that looks worse than a parking lot is a fenced off property that isn't being used. There is a PDC-owned fenced-off property at 3<sup>rd</sup> and Oak. It's been fenced off for 7-8 years. Do a development on it. Show everybody that market rate works. We heard a lot of people from PSU talk. We listen to what the neighborhood says. It's important to do so. There are 30 people on the Skidmore / Old Town Advisory Group. John made a presentation to the group. Only one person out of 30 supported a tax on surface parking lots. The PBA Central City Committee voted unanimously opposed to it. The PBA board voted unanimously against it. We have come up with a lot of other ideas. We came up with a list of other ideas. Let's understand basic economics. Most of the newer buildings have happened on surface parking lots. Why should we be building a ton of buildings right now when there isn't the demand? Let's look at catalytic projects both residential and mixed use.

**Kirstin** stated that SAC members appear to support the core element of policy RC2 - developing a parking strategy.

**Greg Goodman:** On RC2 we should take a position for or oppose the taxing of surface lots. I think everybody would agree that we need a strategy.

**Staff:** Everybody appears to believe that there is a parking issue that needs to be addressed.

**Jeff Martens:** I don't see tax on this document?

**Staff:** The way it is written right now is open ended in that regard. Develop a strategy – to phase out surface lots. Tax is an idea on the table. Need a clear reading on the two options: ban on surface lots and tax on surface parking lot revenues.

**Sean Hubert:** I just want to say that we all know the district has a lot of impediments to achieve rents. Lack of parking is a concern when trying to lease out space. Phasing out the parking adds another impediment as well. From my vantage point we don't want to put another impediment on achieving rents in the neighborhood.

**John Russell:** Proponents have proposed a three legged stool. Create a public parking structure is the first step before you ever tax or restrict surface parking.

**Keith Liden:** I don't feel informed enough to make a recommendation on any specific technique. It seems like you have a bunch of interrelated items that make this a fragile area. I like the idea of a strategy – maybe needs to be broadened.

**Patrick Gortmaker:** RC2 does not include parking tax, only the phase out.

**Kirstin** asked if SAC members want to amend RC2 with regards to taxing or parking phase out. A majority of SAC members indicated they did not want specific reference to either tool in the appendix description of RC2.



**Kirstin** asked if SAC members had any comments on RC4 - additional heights and a transfer tool.

**Brian Emerick:** I am on the Landmarks Commission. We get requests from developers and a lot of what we look at is what is contextual to the adjacent properties. The move from 100' to 175' puts a lot of pressure on the Landmarks Commission. We need to give it more thought. Considering Skidmore / Old Town design guidelines, Skidmore doesn't even have design guidelines right now. We need to have more clarity for design guidelines and a vision of where we want to go. Right now that's 2-5 years in the plans. That needs to happen immediately. There is \$55 million of development coming into the district and we don't have any design guidelines.

**Patricia Gardner:** It's curious to me is that you're using height and not FAR. The bonus we have in Pearl is based upon FAR. I'm not a fan of raising the Historic District height limit. The FAR carrot might be better used for preservation of the buildings. It is a little confusing to be using height here.

**Staff:** The trouble here is that you don't have enough height.

**Katherine Schultz:** Why does the area next to the Historic District affect the status of the historic district?

**Staff:** This is inside the Historic District.

**Brian Emerick:** It is a sum of parts.

**Patrick Gortmaker:** This is a point that needs more clear understanding. Jeopardizing the status – we hear this all the time. What will actually trigger the National Parks Service to look at delisting the district?

**Brian Emerick:** Our charge is to uphold the National Parks Service guidelines / standards.

**Karen Williams:** Would the height change proposal run counter to the National Park Service standards?

**Brian Emerick:** It could. It is not clear what the outcome would be.

**Sean Hubert:** I support the Preservation Transfer Initiative. That piece is really good. I wish it was clearer in terms of not jeopardizing the district. We do want a catalytic project here. I think the neighborhood wants a catalytic project that doesn't jeopardize the historic district but revitalizes the district.

**Patrick Gortmaker:** I absolutely agree. Diversification of housing is important. Design guidelines are important. People would be less afraid of a 175' building height if there were design guidelines. You can find the balance to achieve height and everybody's goals.

**Patricia Gardner:** Why are we focusing so much attention on three blocks? If you can't change FAR, why wouldn't you take the height down below the 325' in the north end of the district? You don't have enough places to put the extra height. You need to drop the 325' and get bonuses up there. With those height limits you aren't going to save many buildings. Make more potential receiving sites.

**Kirstin** said that this conversation has to continue beyond tonight as it is after 9 pm.

**Karen Williams**, co-chair, thanked everyone for coming and for their hard work and patience.

The meeting adjourned at 9:07 pm.

