

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, February 24, 2015

3:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Karen Gray, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin (arrived 3:15 p.m.), Maggie Tallmadge

Commissioners Absent: Katherine Schultz

City Staff Presenters: Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Deborah Stein, Bob Glascock, Marty Stockton, Leah Treat, Art Pearce, Peter Hurley, Mark Lear

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 3:00 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Gray* mentioned that she and *Chair Baugh* will meet with the EPAP Housing Committee and will have conversation with Division-Midway Alliance regarding issues around housing. Additionally, *Commissioner Gray* will serve on the SB 215 OEIB Committee, a Senate committee on education, which will meet Tuesdays in March.

Director's Report

- Last week at Council, *Chair Baugh*, *Commissioner Shapiro* and *Commissioner Gray* were reappointed to their positions on the PSC.
- For the TSP hearing tonight, we will open cards for testimony for the public at 4:30 p.m. this afternoon.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from 2/10/15 PSC meeting

Chair Baugh asked for any comments for the consent agenda.

Commissioner Shapiro moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Shapiro, Smith, Tallmadge)

Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Deborah Stein, Bob Glascock, Marty Stockton

Documents: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7171504>

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7233311/File/Document>

Eric provided an overview of the flow for today's work session and the overall timeline for the rest of the PSC work sessions for the Comprehensive Plan update. At or before the March 10 session, we will figure out if we need additional work sessions to make sure we get through all the items before the PSC.

The written public comment period remains open through March 13 at 5 p.m. As of today, we have 3,236 public comments collected. We still have the helpline open for the public to ask questions about any of the Comp Plan proposals.

We have not done a formal survey or inquiry about the helpline inquiries or feelings about it from the public, but we have gotten some good feedback and thanks for the added staff services.

On the Map App, we have evidence that this style of outreach increases the amount and range of testimony we're getting, so that is a good sign for public involvement opportunities.

Deborah introduced the two topics for today's work sessions and then introduced Bob Glascock and Superintendent Don Grotting from David Douglas School District.

David Douglas School District Capacity

Bob provided some background including a reminder about the overcrowding in David Douglas schools. We want to talk about possible collaboration between the City and DDSD to assist in relieving the overcrowding in the school district.

DDSD is still working on their 10-year facility plan. For their elementary schools, these exceed target enrollment and it's projected by 2033 that there will be 800 students at two of the elementary schools, 200 more students that each can hold capacity-wise.

In the state of Oregon, if a school district puts together a 10-year plan, as part of the City's periodic review, we must include the facility plan in our Comp Plan and cooperate with them to identify land for school sites. Several of the metro area's school districts have already adopted plans (e.g. Beaverton) as adding schools as a required service for adding housing growth. There is lots of documentation necessary on the part of the school district to make this happen. Using this strategy for school districts that are in both Portland and other cities (e.g. Centennial) is more challenging, but this comment process could be available to them if they adopt objective criteria in a school facility plan.

Today's first discussion question is whether the PSC likes the idea of a collaborative approach for the City to work with DDSD to approve objective criteria and apply them for zoning map amendments. The PSC will consider map changes to residential densities at its March 10 meeting. Both program (school capacity) and map changes go hand in hand to address school capacity. The March 10 staff report addresses residential densities, including map changes affecting David Douglas School District.

Superintendent Grotting thanked the PSC and City staff for their working with DDSD. We are looking at numerous avenues and possible land to purchase for expansion. DDSD says they can respond in a timely manner for response on zoning amendments, which was a question from the Bureau of Development Services initially.

The second question is about how the City may work with DDSD to find and acquire new school sites if the PSC has direction and/or feedback to BPS and DDSD.

- Superintendent Grotting: The school district recently purchased the Elks property on NE Halsey, but DDSD won't be able to develop the property in the short-term.

Commissioner Gray asked how overcrowding has affected some work in DDSD.

- Grotting: One of the things is that we have no available elementary classrooms, making kindergarten classes in the 30-35 student range. PE classes in upper grades have upwards of 70 students. We can't get any more desks in our rooms due to the lack of space. Also, when some new housing developments come in, especially in East Portland, we're lacking other services that support safety and law enforcement and

places for the residents to be. We are putting a moratorium on open enrollment and transfers due to the overcrowding situation and have even had to bus students out of their home enrollment area at times.

Commissioner Gray noted that DDS has very high academic achievement. In terms of the objective criteria that could be created to allow or disallow development, what are examples?

- In Beaverton, there is a square footage assessment (per student). If there is a proposed development, the assessment looks at square footage of classroom space.
- We also are proposing to look at the type of housing (e.g. if there are developments specifically for senior housing that wouldn't affect class size / student population). The number of school-aged kids by housing type is a way to look at what capacity and housing development may be allowed or not.

We are looking at a 2-pronged strategy. One is the large issue, primarily for Powellhurst-Gilbert where we're looking to down-designate; there will be more details on this at the March 10 PSC meeting. Where we see places that are suitable for higher designation except for school enrollment, that's where we're looking at the zoning map amendment possibility. Today we're looking for a general nod for these approaches for the City to help ease capacity and pressure for the school district.

Commissioner Houck was initially skeptical about the down-designation, but he is impressed with the memo and the delineation of the legal background provided. He also liked that in the future, if capacity needs are met, we could go back and reconsider the capacity and zoning. At an earlier hearing it was noted that Parkrose is under-capacity. What is the reality of districts working together to address some of the capacity issues?

- It's complex. It comes down to funding, and it takes school districts to vote and agree to these ideas. PPS would likely not be interested in this as they would be losing tax base.
- Parkrose has land and capacity to build additional housing.

Commissioner Hanson asked about the process and communication between City and school districts. This sounds like a service provider situation. The district would respond to applications based on projected enrollment and react to it. I would suggest we include things other than land use actions. For example, some apartments allowed by right increase school demand. The school sites question is a difficult issue. I understand that many schools carry a residential zone and have a conditional use over it.

- Most schools will keep residential plan designations and zones. Most schools will remain conditional uses in residential zones. Staff is looking at a change to high schools—changing the Comprehensive Plan designation to Campus Institutional, and retaining current zoning designations. As part of the Campus Institutional project, we are looking at high schools. We have discussed a possible are not yet looking at a Schools Zone, but it's not an immediate step.

I think the conditional use is a good criteria and process for now. I have lots of experience in Washington County, and there are often boundaries of SDs that are different from boundaries of cities, but there is precedence to change them. It's important to understand where the student population is being generated to make sure everyone is well-informed.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about identifying additional properties for the school districts to acquire. This speaks to what the City should be doing both for schools and issues of housing citywide.

- Grotting: This is not formal in the facilities plan yet. We've met with the City and County, and we've talked about opportunities and trade/share options. But it's not a quick process.
- The City is committing to collaborate in ways that we can, even if it's not finding additional sites. We also have a number of policy statements in the Portland Plan about

schools being centers of community that offer more than just education. Location, accessibility, co-locating are encouraged.

Commissioner Hanson asked what this means for Comp Plan designations and zoning in East County. Are there adjustments?

- In the March 10 staff report, you'll be looking at adjustments to densities. Where we have some influence on this is where we can adjust residential densities to relieve some housing and capacity pressures.

Commissioner Gray noted Human Solutions is building just a block within DDSD from the Parkrose District line. This could be a time to discuss boundary change that is a benefit to both districts. The collaborative approach is good but we need to keep it open for other districts in the city as well.

Chair Baugh asked if the service requirement looks like an overlay.

- It functions this way where the zoning doesn't match the Comp Plan designation.

Chair Baugh also noted that when looking at service levels we need to include transportation, sidewalks, Safe Routes to Schools, etc. You might have capacity in the district, but the other amenities are also necessary.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction for the school capacity approach.

Community Involvement Policies

Marty gave context for today's discussion, which includes three specific items: Community Involvement Policies: Promoting Inclusive Planning; Role of Neighborhood Associations; and Community Involvement Committee.

She highlighted two City groups, the Public Involvement Advisory Council (PIAC) and the Community Involvement Committee (CIC).

Commissioner Shapiro asked for a distinction between PIAC and the CIC.

- The CIC started in the Portland Plan process and continues through the Comp Plan. It is charged to review public involvement process for Periodic Review specifically. PIAC is appointed by City Council and advises Council (the CIC advises staff and the PSC) on citywide public involvement best practices.

Promote Inclusive Planning

Proposal: Clarify the term "community" as inclusive with broad application, including neighborhood associations, and is a replacement for the term "citizen."

This proposal is to particularly include non-geographic and communities of color under the equity framework from the Portland Plan. We have heard some confusion about what the word "community" means. In the existing Comp Plan, we use "citizen" involvement, as does Statewide Planning Goal 1. Staff decided to change the term to make the phrasing more inclusive. When we use the word "citizen", that can exclude people from the conversation.

Commissioner Smith noted this makes him sad. Citizen has always implied a measure of active involvement and engagement. I know why we have to go there to change the terminology, but I also don't like it.

- This has come up a number of times with the CIC and PIAC. We do want all community members to strive for this, but some people do feel it's exclusionary.

In some ways, where we have a list of groups, "community" is a way to make sure we haven't forgotten anyone. There are places in the document where we can tighten up how we use the

word community, but we intend for it to mean everyone.

Commissioner Oxman supports this, but who gets to define “community”?

- This ties into the next question and the role of Neighborhood Associations and who’s entitled to participate. It also goes back to what the Comp Plan is and what a legislative process is and who gets to participate in it. For example, there are limitations on who we send notification to about legislative processes and amendments. This includes formally-recognized and self-defined groups.

Commissioner Oxman noted it’s a difficult topic. It would be helpful to try to reflect the idea about obtaining maximum appropriate involvement so people understand what they’re participating in. Clarity in this would be helpful.

Commissioner Houck had a similar position as *Commissioner Smith*. But I agree with what we’re doing and the philosophy behind it. The loss of the individual taking responsibility is difficult for me. Can we use the definition to be explicit that it’s not just the collective but also individuals?

Commissioner Shapiro noted the key to being a member of community is participation. If you’re willing to participate in an action, you are a member of a community.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction for the use of the word “community” in place of “citizen”.

Role of Neighborhood Associations

Proposal: Add language to the Chapter 2 introduction referencing the history of Portland’s neighborhood system.

We received lots of testimony about this topic, questioning the Neighborhood Associations’ role in the Comp Plan, specifically in Chapter 2. There was some clarification and desire for Neighborhood Associations to be more acknowledged; some wanted to be the only avenue for community involvement for the Comp Plan. This proposal is for a new introduction to acknowledge the neighborhood system with the direction of wanting to have inclusive engagement in planning. For Working Draft Part 1, from *Commissioner Houck*, we have the term Civic Infrastructure in the neighborhood system within a new policy.

Commissioner Smith has served as a Neighborhood Association officer and supports the acknowledgement for the Neighborhood Associations system. I understand who does and who does not use this system as a forum. I have concerns of the opportunities and burdens of this system. The relationship with ONI is formalized, funding is involved and we want to be even-handed even as we widen the net to include more people. Resources and burdens should be even. I want to be sure opportunities and burdens are well matched.

Chair Baugh noted the role of the Neighborhood Associations is appropriate, but it points back to community as something we want to embrace and the differences between groups. We want to embrace and provide avenues for all people to engage.

Commissioner Rudd asked about extending funding to the other groups and if we’d include that in policy. Where does the funding live?

- This policy wouldn’t direct this specifically, but over time, ONI could change its funding allocation/procedures.

Marty paraphrased the desire for a potentially new policy to have better clarification to operationalize resources and the burden to qualify. We need to think about if Chapter 2 is the right place for this. ONI is currently having the conversation about an approach to look at a more equitable distribution of resources based on other factors as well.

Commissioner Smith commented that resources should be used to broaden outreach, but if Neighborhood Associations are not the sole voice, we may want to revisit the historical regulatory burden on them.

Commissioner Houck noted that current funding is not necessarily about providing money. It could be more staff interaction, engagement with a broader array of folks.

ONI has been funding Diversity and Civic Leadership (DCL) group, similar to funding Neighborhood Associations in the recent years. There could be more evolution like this over time.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction for adding context about the role of Neighborhood Associations and acknowledging their history in Portland.

Community Involvement Committee

Proposal: Revise Policy 2.14 to task an independent body, rather than a subcommittee of the PSC, to oversee the Community Involvement Program.

The PSC has been serving as the state-recognized committee for community involvement until Periodic Review for the Comp Plan, which is the role of the current CIC. This is somewhat of a hybrid group as *Commissioner Shapiro* sits on this group, and there is an open spot for another PSC member.

PIAC stated that they feel an independent group should serve this role. The CIC noted to the PSC that a separate, independent body be the ongoing CIC. In the staff proposal, we have suggested revising policy 2.14 to have the CIC be an independent body from the PSC.

Commissioner Shapiro agrees with the recommendation. It is important for a separate group to be responsible for outreach but to also share their work with the PSC more frequently. The selection of the CIC was culled from a few hundred applications. I encourage the continued equity and diversity of and within the group.

Commissioner Houck asked if there would be PSC representation on the committee. There should be.

- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted that yes, one or two PSC members should be included, not necessarily as a chair.

Chair Baugh asked if the BPS role of support would change.

- Practically, probably not. BPS would still staff this group.

The connection between the CIC and their reporting to the PSC is something we should strive to operationalize. Other cities have something of a hybrid model on their CICs and have adjacent meeting times to ensure cross-over between the groups.

Commissioner Oxman likes the idea of a blended model. It seems that because we're involved with the same set of issues, we should look to have at least some integration and connection would be helpful.

PSC members confirmed the connection between the PSC and the CIC but that the group membership could be separate (with the assumption that 1-2 PSC members would be part of the CIC).

Commissioner Houck asked about non-profits and if we intentionally didn't reference them.

- We've used the word "organizations" to be more inclusive.

Status of Adopted Neighborhood and Area Plans

This discussion is a response to PSC members' questions about currently existing neighborhood and area plans. We have about 60 of these plans. Early in the Comp Plan Update process we did go through these and pull out policies that cross many of the plans to build them into the new Comp Plan.

Staff suggests that plans remain in effect (Policy 1.15) unless a situation comes up where a new Comp Plan policy conflicts with an older area or neighborhood plan. In that case, the new Comp Plan would supersede.

We look to the area plans in quasi-judicial land use cases. We also consult them to guide coordination of capital improvements. And they continue to guide advocacy for neighborhoods. All these functions continue to be valid. We will build in language about how the plans will continue to be used.

Language in those plans will be reviewed based on advice from the City Attorney and the PSC (e.g. not having mandatory verbs and that they are all balancing).

Commissioner Rudd asked about Policy 1.15. Are all the plans adopted by Ordinance?

- Yes. Though some pieces are adopted by Resolution.

Chair Baugh noted a concern about the Albina Plan and communities looking for different direction from their neighborhood plans. We need to be clear that what takes precedent and what part(s) of the plan takes precedent. I'm worried about PDC funding based on different plans, too.

- Some choices will have to be situation-specific as cases arise.
- Part of what we're trying to do is pull the principles that were developed in neighborhood plans, so there are ideas that are citywide that we want to pull up to the overall Comp Plan level. Ideally we would go through and clean up each of the plans, but we don't have the resources to do so at this time. There is an important role for neighborhood-specific strategies, but we don't want to pull all those into the overall Comp Plan.

Commissioner Houck noted that the Comp Plan does trump older plans if there is a conflict.

We are specifically referring what we do with existing plans, but we will also provide guidance about what we do with area plans in the future so we don't set up potential new conflicts. We hope that individual communities will take a look at what they currently have and do some refreshing as their own advocacy agenda to reflect the values of people who live there today versus when the plans were written.

PSC members confirmed the staff direction about adopted neighborhood and area plans.

Transportation System Plan

Hearing: Leah Treat, Art Pearce, Peter Hurley, Mark Lear

Documents: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7171504>

Presentation: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7233312/File/Document>

Written Testimony Received: <http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/Record/7171505>

Chair Baugh introduced PBOT Director Leah Treat. Director Treat introduced herself and gave a

short introduction about the TSP as we all PBOT's recently published two-year plan, [Portland Progress](#).

Recommendations in the TSP commit to an equitable and prosperous city and are well-aligned with the Portland Plan, Climate Action Plan, Comp Plan and serving underserved people. These are also consistent with goals for PBOT.

The Portland Progress document includes two-year action plan for PBOT. It outlines the beginning steps to TSP work. Director Treat particularly highlighted the chapter on Vision Zero and the chapter on Equity. She thanked staff and PSC members for their work.

Commissioner Houck noted that the street system is about 40 percent of the land area in the city. I'm happy with previous integrated work between bureaus including PBOT, BES and BPS. But I am concerned with recent issues related to water bureau and bureau of environmental services that there might be a retrenchment with regard to interbureau collaboration and meeting multiple objectives with projects. I'm hopeful we see even more cooperation between bureaus, especially relating to streets and stormwater, going forward.

Commissioner Smith noted his excitement about bike share. Thank you to Director Treat for your leadership on Vision Zero in Portland.

Commissioner Shapiro noted NYC's Vision Zero agenda, which has drastically changed that city. Does Portland's plan seek to do this?

- We are setting off on a bold agenda, which is taking lots of collaboration and partnerships that we're still building. We certainly have a different form of government than in NYC, but our plan is just as daring as their plan.

Peter provided background about the policies, projects and programs. The PSC held a hearing on these components on November 4, 2014. Staff will be providing some minor updates based on those recommendations.

This the first update to the TSP since 2007. We have looked through potential projects in the plans that have been adopted since 2007, but there is also a process before the 2040 TSP that will identify projects that will be incorporated into that update as well.

There are implications for the limited funds that are available; this is the major limiting factor. We have a realistically aggressive funding plan, but the only way we can achieve all the outcomes in the plan is with funding.

Staff went through the 5-step process they used to determine which projects would be included in the TSP (slide 6). There are 7 consistent outcomes that are the foundation upon which much of the analysis occurred.

Criteria were not weighted, but staff is now looking at how the majority of projects and programs achieve multiple benefits.

Mark provided background about how staff put together the financial plan (slide 19-20). In the next few months, there will be more analysis and discussion to get more feedback. The three funding scenarios show that the biggest increase is in the local funding streams between the existing, constrained and unconstrained scenarios.

Freight revenue in the constrained model looks at historic spending for locally-led projects and maintenance, which is about \$108M for 20 years. In the constrained model, we are looking at another \$88M for 20 years. But lots of this funding could go to maintenance.

Art walked through some analysis about the initial list. This is a first taste of our “recipe”, which we may hear that we’re missing ingredients, which is part of the process.

Slide 27 shows (in blue) the number of projects in the constrained list that meet the 9 criteria. Most of the projects that made it into the constrained list meet more than one criteria. Four projects met zero criteria, and they are not recommended to be on the constrained list.

How does the investment strategy support the growth we want to see and the community attributes we want? This is an investment strategy we want to use to get us to the future we’re striving for.

Commissioner Gray asked about unpaved streets, high-crash corridors and the map of projects. Is there an overlay of these three components together? It looks like crashes in the unpaved areas don’t match where the projects are.

- We want to make sure we’re putting our investments into areas that have high need and expected higher population growth.

Where should City resources go? That is the question for the evening. We are primarily looking at multi-modal, pedestrian/bike and freight improvements. We have partner agencies working with us on other aspects too.

Testimony

Jim Owens, Phil Selinger, Linda Nettekoven, TSP Transportation Expert Group (TEG): Most of the policies and goals adequately respond to the Network PEG comments. Specifically... policy direction that recognizes the TSP to support regional and economic growth; reduces carbon emissions; promotes equity; promotes the Centers and Corridors strategy. Some stronger terms are necessary as the PSC has discussed about other policies before. The proposed draft assumes coordination, but often this hasn’t been true. The TEG is most concerned about lack of process to resolve conflicts among, for example, the transportation hierarchy. The hierarchy fails to recognize the need for autos and freight; there needs to be more guidance about how the hierarchy will be used. The City should work with TriMet. Trails should be recognized as part of the transportation network. Inadequate emphasis on regional coordination. Proposed parking policies are premature. Project selection process and list includes the result of a programmatic category to target smaller projects that could otherwise be lost. We have comments that the PSC should consider. We have been trying to test and develop the criteria list simultaneously, and we want to make sure it is still refined over time. We are also concerned that people are confused by the prioritization and that smaller projects are categorized separately from the list. Supportive of outcome-based criteria. We’re supportive of PBOT’s realistic financial plan and for reporting performance results. We’re concerned about the correlation of the list of projects with those shown on the Map App, so we still need a consolidated map. Staff has worked hard to touch lots of groups, but the TEG is still concerned people don’t understand the relationship of the TSP to other projects and plans. The greatest concern is the abbreviated time for people to comment on the list between the release in late January and the deadline of March 13. *See TEG written testimony.*

Commissioner Smith is the PSC liaison to the TSP TEG. The TEG didn’t necessarily get to conclusions on lots of the work, and it does feel hurried. Is the TEG done with the work it needs to do, or has it been truncated too early?

- We are never really done. We will review the public comments and will comment to PBOT on those comments to provide additional recommendations on goals and policies. We see the evaluation work as a test run, and we need to continue this and be fully involved. At this point, the TEG has not focused on individual projects.
- A concern is that with the sprint we’ve been doing is a bifurcated result, where people who are in the know are more able to comment, but what about community support if you don’t know about this? People with little experience with the transportation realm

aren't as able to comment and provide feedback.

Commissioner Houck would like to send his questions to the TEG to ask for feedback instead of asking for comments today.

Communication between now and the March 10 work session is helpful.

1. Terry Parker: Any bicycle projects in the TSP that reduce auto capacity should be removed. Streetcar expansion should be derailed. *See written testimony.*
2. Jeanne Harrison, NWDA Transportation Committee: The Committee has approved a streetcar extension for NW Northrup. A study should be added to see about an extension to Montgomery Park. Access to the Conway area is also vital and is a key recommendation from the group. What about major reconstruction projects in the list? Support program areas but would like to know what the projects are. *See written testimony.*
3. Marianne Fitzgerald, SWNI: I'm concerned about the time crunch. More detailed comments will be submitted by SWNI soon. All Centers and Corridors need projects on the TSP to make complete neighborhoods. SW Barbur is a key priority for pedestrian and bicycle improvements. I appreciate that project ranking is based on outcomes, and we'd like access to this.
4. Jennifer Vitello, Cathedral Park NA: Commented on project #30050 and the 2004 St Johns Lombard Plan. Under the Comp Plan, this area will turn into a high-density urban center, which is promising. Our concerns arise with transportation because street don't have pavement, they lack of sidewalks, traffic lights and there are few through streets. I support the project to have improved transportation in the neighborhood but am concerned about lack of bicycle access.
5. Jeremy Byron Tennant: Discussed impacts on Woodlawn. He recommends the 13th-14th Ave bikeway to be completed soon, as should the 22nd Ave bikeway. He's concerned with the freight priority program and how that won't harm Woodlawn. You should consider Portland seeks an exemption to Goal 9 so equity and environmental justice can be fulfilled.
6. Brad Perkins, NNEBA: we need more living wage jobs. Oregon's most important planning goals started with SB 100 that instituted the UGB to limit sprawl. We need to continue this big picture approach to secure needed financing for transportation projects. The PSC and PBOT need to have a stronger voice with ODOT. *See written testimony.*
7. Dan Lerch Walters: Build the Sullivan's Gulch Trail. It's on the constrained list, and I think the full trail should be done within the first 10 years of the plan. It's vital to the 40-mile loop trail to make this a world-class biking city. This trail separates contact points so we will reduce injury. The health of Sullivan's Gulch is poor, and we can restructure it with more native species and trees.
8. John Gibbon, PURB: Handling stormwater is a major cost driver and should be included in the TSP. We need to push for policies for concurrency that work for both transportation and stormwater management. The Tabor to the River stormwater system did create a good transportation project and has saved people money. The PSC needs to be strong on planning for best outcomes together.
9. David Martin, Bridlemile NA: Spoke to Hamilton St and Shattuck Rd. Neither have

pedestrian facilities, and there is not a good way for people to walk to the school. We have repeatedly asked for these projects to be included in the work. Hamilton St received the most positive comments on the Map App. Shattuck was number two on the list. The NA remains at a loss about how these projects remain unfunded. The Hamilton project had a steep price tag, but we think it could be done for considerably less.

10. David Sweet, Cully Association of Neighbors: in May 2012, the PSC approved the Cully Main Street Plan, which includes projects to test range of improvements on Cully streets. The recommendation was not included on the TSP list, and this needs to be added. 10 other projects on the list are important to Cully, constrained for \$10M. But this raises the risk for Cully's most vulnerable residents. BPS was also to use Cully as a case study for a test to displacement and gentrification. There are a number of anti-displacement strategies that we propose be included. *See written testimony.*
11. Laura Young, East Cully NPI, Cully Blvd Alliance: It's critical to have thoughtful and intentional investments in Cully. Look beyond the price and see what the investments can do for local living-wage jobs and reduce the effects of forced displacement.
12. Steve Messinetti, Habitat for Humanity: There has been a huge increase in the number of families coming to HFH for help in the past years. Housing affordability is at a crisis level in Portland. The cost of housing has seen a 60 percent increase in the past 10 years. We appreciate the equity lens, but please consider strategies to ensure the transportation improvements don't result in displacement. In Cully two-fifths of households are at risk for displacement. We want to see improvements that will increase quality of life, but we need to make sure they don't displace people they are intended to support.

Commissioner Smith asked about the alternative street project in Cully. The Council did not decide to fund this, so a reminder that voices need to be brought to Council as well.

13. Alan Hipolito, Verde: Partner with HFH in Living Cully to address multiple disparities. We've addressed the needs for low-income people to engage the community. This includes a street that's piloting alternative street design standards. Anti-displacement work is extremely difficult, but we need to include this in our work together. I support the previous testimony and only want to support the TSP improvements if they include the anti-displacement measures as we've submitted. We need responsive leadership for new and more powerful anti-displacement tools.

Commissioner Houck noted that he and Hipolito worked together in the Coalition for a Livable Future on securing a racial impact/displacement impact statement for north interstate light rail and wanted to know if there were lessons learned from that experiences that might be applied to requests for displacement impact statements.

14. Laura Campos: "Intersectionality" is a word that I'm interested in. How does the demolition delay policies and anti-displacement policies work together and interrelate? They create a system of discrimination. I worked on the original Comp Plan. The majority of people in Portland are not property owners, so they don't see the benefits afforded to owners. My work has largely been with people on the margins. I do have a valuable perspective on planning because of this. Please listen to communities of color because their perspectives are very important.
15. Barbara Quinn, Friends of Baltimore Woods: Project #103570, Cathedral Park Whistle-Free Zone, is a long-standing goal of the neighborhood. It improves N Bradford to make it more accessible for trucks and autos. This frees up N Decatur for bikes and

pedestrians and the natural area of Baltimore Woods. This is especially important as the neighborhood is projected to grow.

16. Rebecca Hamilton, Pedestrian Advisory Committee: The submitted list reflects the PAC's priorities. We support citywide programs to fill the gaps and the green transportation hierarchy. We also support the Vision Zero policy to guide transportation investments. Update the 1998 Pedestrian Master Plan for inclusion in the TSP. *See written testimony.*
17. Jocelyn Gaudi, Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee: Shared goals for a safer, more equitable and sustainable network are important. We ask the PSC to incorporate: 1. Inclusion of the transportation hierarchy; 2. Inclusion of bicycle transportation hierarchy; 3. Support the TSP selection criteria; 4. Request that PBOT define which projects fall into the programs categories to clarify and evaluate PBOT's prioritization. *See written testimony.*
18. Arlene Kimura, EPAP and Hazlewood NA: EPAP submitted a list of prioritized projects, but the EPAP process doesn't seem to be fully incorporated in the TSP list. With the studies going on, we don't have the information about mixed-use zoning. We need a list of those potential impacts. Equity is a goal, but I don't see it; not because of lack of trying, but this is not a fast process. It takes a long time to get to know people. More time and effort needs to be built in to planning.

Chair Baugh asked about EPAP's projects not being incorporated into the TSP list. We haven't been able to get full resolution about this.

19. Jill Statz: The committee of best practices looking at how to off-set displacement and gentrification concerns. We need to further assess and mitigate for transportation investments for existing populations as well as for long-term impacts on affordability, particularly for minorities. We need to extend efforts to make displacement policies actively, not retroactively. Providing stabilization and support for existing community members is imperative.
20. Ryan Bass: Advocating for 2 projects that should be included, SW Shattuck Rd and SW Hamilton bike improvements. These projects had a majority of comments on the Map App. We want safety and to be able to get around our neighborhood. There is huge community support for these projects. What we really need is just a sidewalk on one side, and we don't feel like we need all the funding allocated in the TSP list.
21. Eavan Moore, CAT: Protection of renters' rights is vital to strengthening Portland. Growth and change should benefit everyone, especially our most vulnerable. CAT collected 158 comment cards, and everyone supported more affordable housing. Rent control, water costs, just-cause notices for evictions, landlord certification and affordable housing in every neighborhood are key items we want addressed. BPS can impact affordability, and CAT looks forward to working with BPS and the PSC as well as tenant leaders to identify the right solutions to keep people in the communities they helped to build.
22. Raihana Ansary, PBA: PBA encourages job growth, livability and prosperity. We have the [Cost of Congestion Report](#). We appreciate the economic benefit criteria to help prioritize projects that help create quality middle-income jobs but are concerned about difference in funding levels and a shift away from multi-modal system. The freight revenue slide in the PBOT presentation was helpful. Projects that add traffic lights should be prioritized. Comparing Projects #20068 and #20077 highlights the discrepancy of prioritizing some modes versus all.

23. Leah Gray, CAT & EPAP Housing Committee: Lives on fixed income, but spend about 40 percent of her budget on housing. I've had continued trouble with the housing complex, which refuses to repair, and people then get evicted, then the owners raise rents. We need to tie immediate financial impacts to violations like this.
24. Don Baack: Laura Foster's testimony is important; please be sure to read this carefully. In SW, 42 percent of streets are substandard, which is far worse than any other part of the city. On trails, we are happy to see these included in transportation, but we still need to have public conversations to make sure this is structured for all modes. We need to make sure greenways are applicable to transportation options for pedestrians. We also need to focus on the F4 / Marquam Hill Rd. *See written testimony re: Red Electric.*
25. Jason Franklin, PSU: PSU generates many pedestrian, bike and transit trips. 40 percent of new students are from families of color. Pedestrian/bike safety downtown is actually quite lacking in the district, and the TSP doesn't address these concerns. We need more time to work with PBOT. Most of the infrastructure is in place downtown, but there are continued needs particularly in the West Quadrant Plan. 2 projects that should be included in the TSP are the Broadway Cycle Track and SW 4th Ave Streetscape.
26. Cristina Palacios, CAT: Spoke to displacement and the Comp Plan. People are confused because they don't know how the Comp Plan will affect them. Please reach out to the people who need to know what's going on. Housing is a very important piece in a 20-year plan. Many tenants who live in substandard housing cannot afford to move. We need to enforce housing codes and ensure that people aren't continued to be pushed out. Title 6 should be used as a tool to be used consistently.
27. Mike Connors, Hayden Island Manufactured Home Community: Objecting to the proposal for removing the N Hayden Dr improvements from the project list. It's inconsistent with the other policies and plans for West Hayden Island. In the TSP, there are projects linked to the project that are remaining including the WHI rail yard expansion. We need consistency throughout the plans. *See written comments.*
28. Jim Howell: 2 projects not in the list including streetcar extension and the MAX 2050 Plan. Regarding funding, we can't use state funding for bicycle transportation projects. But SJR16 would refer to the voters the opportunity to change this rule in the next general election. *See written testimony.*
29. Jessica Engleman: We are on track to shift from private vehicle system to walking, biking and transit. We should focus on the "interested but concerned" populous. This means that before adding to the network, we should improve the gaps and strengthen what we have. Removing on-street parking will be a contention point. We should make parking expensive instead of cheap. Public transit should be faster and more reliable. I also support the Green Loop proposal.
30. Jacqueline Conley, Gladstone Square Tenants Association: I strongly support the anti-displacement recommendations. There is a lack of respect for many community members in substandard housing developments. We are working with CAT to help get needs met and make voices heard. Tenants have been threatened by management companies, even when asking for upgrades based on maintenance and code violations. The community lives in fear, and we need to increase and provide affordable housing and programs that have outreach included. All community members deserve to be heard.

31. Brian Posewitz, SMILE Transportation Committee: 1. Support the Reedway pedestrian/bike over way. 2. Support the Tacoma Main Street improvements, but we would like to see it on the constrained list. 3. SE 13th Streetscape improvements: would like to see the project have additional pedestrian crossings, particularly at Lambert. 4. Outer Milwaukie: would like to see this extended south of 17th with additional pedestrian crossings. 5. Concerned that a project doesn't close the gap on the Springwater Corridor, but now see that it's on the list.
32. Edward Hill: Transportation is integral to healthy communities. Improvements are often tied to big investments where historical patterns of planning have created displacement. We need solutions to mitigate these effects. An equitable process is necessary. There are over 50 pages in the Albina Plan that have been abandoned, but the plan should be included in the next iteration of the Comp Plan. Community plans should be prioritized to ensure people can access the prosperity of the region and goals in the plan.
33. Danell Norby, Housing Land Advocates: TSP policies may improve quality of life for low-income communities, but they are only experienced by people who live in healthy connected neighborhoods. Well-intentioned investments often displace people. We support the 11 anti-displacement measures put forth tonight, especially land banking and affordable units and new market-rate housing.
34. Anita Yap, APANO / Jade District: Thanks to City staff. The Jade District is one of the most diverse zip codes in the state. Anti-displacement policies and community benefits are not one-size fits all. I'm most concerned about displacement of small businesses. Right-of-way improvements don't necessarily fall under land use policies, but the TSP policies should include the community benefits for suggested improvements. In terms of the Comp Plan Map versus the Zoning Map, we should fine-tune how we look at displacement for both residents and businesses. Policies in the Comp Plan should come first, before any zone changes happen.
35. Todd Struble, APANO / Jade District: I appreciate that equity is a core value. 88 percent of students in Jade District schools receive free or reduced lunch. There is investment coming with Powell-Division and 82nd Ave improvements, but we have unique challenges. Things that work in Cully may not work in our area. Tools that would help include: 1. Working with ODOT to transfer the 82nd Ave jurisdiction to PBOT; 2. The Metro purchased vacant furniture store that will be a TOD should be maintained as affordable housing; 3. More green space in needed.
36. James Lopez-Ericksen, CAT: Thanks to the PSC and today's testifiers. Community forums on displacement need to include racism, and I hope this is part of policies and procedures in place. I have been trying to think about meeting displacement and gentrification at its core via a historical and cultural flyer about the history of each neighborhood. That could help new businesses work with the community that already lives in the neighborhood to show how everyone can benefit.
37. Rick Grogan: Has lived downtown for 7 years, and rent has increased about 5.2 percent annually but 16 percent this year. But we had a verbal agreement that there would not be increases this year, but Home Forward won't enforce the agreements.
38. Pamela Phan, 1000 Friends of Oregon: Works with the larger coalition that brought forth ideas for anti-displacement work. We have provided options that we'd like to work with the PSC and staff about to see how we can make them possible. We are encouraged by policies in the proposed draft and the TSP. The promise of smart growth

needs to be done equitably. We are fully supportive of the communities of color and low-income tenants' testimony. We do support infill and density to help create opportunities for more people.

39. Raquel Valle: Part of the tenant association at Gladstone Square, working to organize to get repairs done and to take up harassment issues among tenants. The management company allows tenants to attack people for the color of their skin and the language they speak. People should not have to worry about trying to make their lives and homes better in the place they live. We need further community outreach to support our efforts. *See written testimony.*
40. Tabitha Boschetti: PSU students looked at streetscape improvements, community benefits and zoning. Our scenarios for the future of N Fessenden looked how the changes affect displacement and people's outcomes. Proposals that minimize displacement support lots of other benefits. See <https://futurefessenden.wordpress.com/> for the project details.
41. Pia Welch, Portland Freight Committee: With the transportation hierarchy, there is still confusion on which street classifications it would be applied to. Street design is based on surrounding land uses and the transportation network. How would the hierarchy help to resolve conflicts? We propose the hierarchy not be included for freight-oriented streets. Freight needs to be treated more like it is in the Vancouver BC plan. All modal needs must be reviewed. Project selection criteria - would like to see more work done on this. *See written testimony.*

Chair Baugh closed oral testimony for the Transportation System Plan and for the Comprehensive Plan.

Discussion

Commissioner Rudd: Please pass housing comments to PHB. We should see what can be policies included in the Comp Plan / TSP versus addressing issues via other avenues. I would be curious about if we've looked at LIDs and ability to get funding that way. Regarding partnership projects, do we have assumptions about how this would work? For example, where we would need to do a match, are these assumptions concerning a source of dollars or an expectation that we can contribute land for the match? There were comments about the level of support about what got comments on the Map App, but I'd want to understand how we are looking at community support with the consideration that there may be equity issues related to the use of the Map App.

Commissioner Smith will read and review the suggested language on anti-displacement policies. The hierarchy proposal is a question we need to address. When will the scoring for the project list be available? [TEG members will review initially for feedback then will provide in about April.] Sooner is better. I will want to talk about the CRC's role and breaking it up into smaller projects that make more sense. I have individual projects that I'd like staff to consider that I'll email. Also, can we allow another 30 days for people to review the project list to provide opportunities for staff to comment?

Commissioner St Martin echoed the comment to have people get access to the scoring criteria. The details about the bucketed program list – when will that be ready? [This is on the immediate to-do list for staff.] Look at how to include the displacement language.

Commissioner Gray was impressed with the testimony about anti-displacement tools and the number of comments tonight. Tenant rights, which perhaps aren't specifically about the TSP, certainly are about people living in our city that don't have opportunity. There is history with

the EPAP projects and the TSP, and there have been lists going back and forth. We've collected the lists, and the true-up on that would be very good. We could use some more information on that. I have a number of work items I'll send to staff.

Commissioner Houck focused on the multi-objective comments. In the 7 outcomes, climate change was included, but only when talking about reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. I hope it includes climate adaptation as well. The notion of collaboration between BES and PBOT to get to multiple objectives is imperative. We need to be integrating the missions of the bureaus. I was pleased to hear about the small project compilation that can have great impact on various parts of the city. I do want to reiterate that not all trails are transportation projects. There is a need for trails that solely provide access to nature.

Commissioner Tallmadge agreed with *Commissioner Smith* about the timeline and lack of time community members have had to review the project list. I appreciate the testimony and comments about public involvement, which should continue and increase to meet communities where they are. We need to show leadership with anti-displacement strategies, particularly in the context of transportation.

Commissioner Oxman was impressed with the TSP overall and the process. He's interested in seeing the scoring and how that plays out. Given the history of transportation funding, I do think I can be a bit nervous about project funding. I'm supportive of the transportation hierarchy, but the implementation will be a very tricky issues as it gets to intergenerational conflicts, ability/disability, highly-functioning transit system and financial versus time costs of transportation.

Chair Baugh commented on inclusion and the need for a more inclusionary process about the TSP. I heard a different view between people of color and others. We need to make sure people understand the plan and implementation and how that will help people. The community benefits tie seems like how does transportation provide community benefits; this is an intriguing idea to explore. Vision Zero is the right thing to do, but I'm concerned that PBOT has picked bikeways are part of this, where I think pedestrian should be the initial priority. I'd like to see the rationale for bikeways versus sidewalks. We have put lots of emphasis on economic analysis, and freight has to carry this. But what about diesel emissions? We need to look at the balance of this. I want to see if the Albina Plan for transportation and what's in the TSP are in conflict or which would be prioritized with the new TSP (and Comp Plan overall). Regarding housing, jobs and prosperity, the streetcar and transit ways on Powell-Division, etc. are long-term projects, but transit improvements are not guaranteed. It's great that East County will get transit improvements, but we need to continue the frequent bus service, which could disappear with the next economic down-turn (whereas streetcar, with laid-down tracks, wouldn't). How do we leverage the streetcar that has development opportunities to bring benefits to the rest of the city?

What are the implications for extending the deadline by 30 days?

- There is a state requirement to have a proposed plan by July 2015. Ultimately the state can remove funding if we fail to meet the deadline, and we've already used up our allowed extensions.

Commissioner Smith asked about how this would impact the PSC work session schedule.

- The March 10 work session is to be about housing and residential designations as well as the transportation work you heard today. Adding work sessions in May would push the PSC vote into May, and that would affect other project timing coming to the PSC.

The two April hearings for the PSC are on the EOA and the Scenarios Report. Those provide opportunities to comment on these specific topics, which can relate to the TSP.

Staff would need to think through the implications for missing the state deadline and the potential to add time to the PSC schedule for the Comp Plan. Lots of testimony came today from organizations that have reviewed the work. People can also testify in front of City Council after the PSC sends its recommended draft to them.

We need to have a constrained list in the current status to meet the state guidelines for the TSP. More transportation work comes in Task 5 for the Comp Plan later in the calendar year and into early 2016. Then the next TSP update will be prior to the 2018 RTP.

The main to-do items to meet periodic review are to look at items that are on the unconstrained (or constrained) list to make sure they either are or aren't on the correct list.

Benefits agreements are on the table and would be part of the implementation (Task 5) phase. They could be more like contracts as opposed to zoning work.

Commissioner Rudd noted that if we move forward and close the public hearing, we can still give staff direction to meet with these specific communities.

Also the TEG will continue their work, and the PSC can ask the TEG members for their perspectives in future hearings.

Chair Baugh noted that TSP comments can be made at the April hearings as they relate to the topics at these hearings. Staff will have to go back if there are significant comments at those meetings if the PSC directs them to review specific comments.

We will stick with the current plan and will close oral testimony tonight but continue written testimony through March 13 at 5 p.m.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting 9:03 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken