

## Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, May 26, 2015

3:00 p.m.

### Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Andre' Baugh, Don Hanson, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Howard Shapiro, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin, Maggie Tallmadge

**Commissioners Absent:** Karen Gray

**City Staff Presenting:** Joe Zehnder, Susan Anderson, Troy Doss, Eric Engstrom, Michelle Kunec-North, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

*Chair Baugh* called the meeting to order at 3:04 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

### Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Houck* noted that 29 years ago Mayor Bud Clark designated our City bird as the great blue heron. Tomorrow morning at Council we will discuss again having herons in our city. We sometimes lose track of the spiritual and philosophical dimension of what we're doing in our planning today. *Commissioner Houck* then mentioned he asked then Oregon poet laureate William Stafford to write a poem to commemorate the city bird. The result was "Spirit of Place" which he read.
- *Commissioner Schultz* thanked the Anti-Displacement group and the thank you video they shared with PSC members.

### Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the May 12, 2015 PSC meeting.

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

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y10 – Baugh, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

### [Documents and presentations for today's meeting](#)

### Central City 2035 SE Quadrant Plan

Briefing: Troy Doss

Troy provided an overview of the project as noted in the [presentation](#).

The Plan proposes rezoning at the station areas themselves: OMSI to EX, with no housing in the area; Clinton Station would be more of a mixed use with some housing. Expanding the Employment Opportunity Subarea (EOS) is another component. We don't have great tools to address compatibility issues, so we're also proposing to update design standards.

Troy also provided an overview of testimony we expect today.

In terms of overall change in the district, 70 percent of the growth and impacts will be at OMSI

station and Clinton station, Southern Triangle and expanding the EOS zone.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about shared parking.

- This would lift the ban that's currently in place so there could be agreements between businesses for employees or customers.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about the industrial disclosure and contact with other jurisdictions that might have influence (e.g. around air quality/pollution).

- We have not had contact with other jurisdictions, but we have internally in the City with BDS and ONI.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about MLK and Grand being multi-use corridors and freight streets. Is there a conflict there?

- They are also regional highways. They connect major freight hubs and will need to continue to do so. But adding signalization and improvements will slow the speed of traffic to help with safety issues. Zoning has been in place for about 30 years, so we're not proposing to change that.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* commented on the couplets. What about additional housing in the area?

- The couplets would be either EX or EOS designations.
- District-wide we would have 3200 units for housing total in 2035 (there are 1100 units today with 1300 planned or in development). Lots of the additional proposed housing would happen quickly, but there is still room to have as many as 5000 units in the district.

*Commissioner Oxman*: Where will big box stores be allowed?

- We're proposing to cap retail at 40,000 square feet per site, which is like in the Pearl and SoWa. A big box store is around 100,000 square feet.

*Commissioner Smith* asked about Action Item RC9. Can you explain this?

- You'd pass through to the Ross Island Bridge. It's a mix of commercial uses right now. The idea of not doing housing there is because it's an on/off-ramp for ODOT with high traffic volumes. We also made a conscious effort to change zoning within the zone but not increase capacity. More residential would impact employment lands.

*Commissioner Smith*: I'm supportive of the shared parking. But given how bikeable the area is, wouldn't it make sense to have a TDM component as well?

- We are increasing bike infrastructure to better work with what we have. We're trying to create safer routes to help too. We are trying to maximize the existing parking supply before moving to add beyond that.

*Commissioner Schultz* noted the islands without the EOS overlay. What is staff's opinion on that?

- The area north of Couch was a big topic. There are traditional office buildings and many that could be rehabbed to that. It's not heavily dominated by industrial use, so we think it will transition to an EOS-compatible area. The MLK-Grand EX zoning stops at SE Clay. So we thought to extend EOS for higher-density employment but not additional housing capacity.

*Commissioner Houck* noted that he has issues regarding natural resources, and he'll send those questions to staff.

## **Testimony**

*Commissioner Hanson*, SAC co-chair, introduced the SAC's work. It was a great group that met 13 times. This proposal is a good balanced approach for the district.

1. Debbie Kitchin, CEIC and SAC co-chair: The CEIC has a number of issues as noted in their written testimony. We'd like to add an action item to add work on the Morrison Bridge ramps. We'd also like to add safer bikeways in the district as part of the Green Loop, but we'd like to have more flexibility to move some of the pedestrian/bike enhancements separated. A right-to-work policy like a right-to-farm policy is also something we'd like to see. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith* commented on the name of the proposed policy and suggested changing that. For the Morrison Bridge ramps: The I5 south connection is important. Why the other ramp?

We still need access from both sides, but it could be modified since it's mostly smaller distribution trucks in the district. The south ramps could be modified, but we're adamant about maintaining north side ramp for large truck use. Minimizing reduction of freight movement is what we're after.

2. Peter Stark, CEIC and SAC member: For the most part, the Plan is well done, but there are still issues. The industrial sanctuary as it stands is a benefit for the city. This is a different model and district, so modifying zoning could have incredibly disastrous repercussions. We don't necessarily agree with EOS expansion; we should limit it up to 3,000 or 5,000 square feet, but not 10,000 as proposed. Expansion of the new EOS to fill the holes is good, but we would only support it to plug holes. Expansion of EXd to Industrial south to the Southern Triangle is too far and would remove industrial lands for development. I also support a Marine Commercial Overlay, which has not yet been discussed.

*Commissioner Shapiro*: What's the concern with 3,000 versus 10,000 square feet? What do you fear with the 10,000?

We're already giving concession with the industrial office model. Traditional office may have a higher lease rate (demand), therefore removing opportunity for industrial office. It's a question of where we want to put our investment.

This was a common topic at the SAC with different opinions.

3. Doug Klotz, Pedestrian Advisory Committee and SAC member: The PAC endorses the SE Quad plan. *See written testimony.*
4. Mike Tevis, SAC member: Thanks to the BPS staff team for this effort. I endorse the plan with three major edits: (1) EOS should be extended to the entire district. (2) We need to add parking by considering 4 large district parking structures and/or a density bonus consideration. (3) Immediate station areas within a quarter-mile should allow for residential use for vibrancy and safety of the station areas. *See written testimony.*
5. Carrie Strickland, SAC member: Supports the plan. Expansion of the EOS is critical, and we should include the "islands" as part of the expansion.
6. Jonathan Malsin, Beam Development and SAC member: I'm very supportive of the final draft plan but also support the expansion of the EOS throughout the district. The CES should include a broad range of industrial users. Industrial office space is doing very well, particularly in the CES.

*Commissioner Shapiro* asked about the 3,000 versus 10,000 request.

I think that is a mistake. Some uses help to drive density of industrial office. It's not

the retail that's gentrifying. It would be taking a step backward to limit the square footage to 3,000.

*Commissioner Hanson* asked about the islands. They were put in place to stabilize business that are there now.

Acknowledging that the islands are left are just off EOS in either direction, so I think they would be exaggerating the line. Potential conflicts would be around noise and the "right-to-work" issue between an apartment/condo and the industrial users.

7. Bruce Burns, SAC member: Supports the Plan as currently crafted but agrees with amendments proposed by the CEIC. My main concern is about how many new jobs we'd create and still maintain the industrial sanctuary. Improving the livability should be accomplished with this plan. There is optimism and opportunity to grow, particularly in the Southern Triangle. Mixed use corridors will be zones EXd and should attract premier development.
8. Romeo Sosa, VOZ and SAC member: Supports the plan. VOZ works with day laborers and the MLK Works Center to connect people with jobs. The SAC group was good to work with and developed a vision for the next 20 years.
9. Sam Sauter, Sauter Rental Properties: Owns a 1907 building with apartments upstairs. We're concerned about the future, and we'd like to have housing as a future development option. The proposed use might be ok, but we're still concerned about what can happen with our family's site in the future. The new, non-traditional industrial uses are concerning.
10. Christe White, OMSI: OMSI is currently zoned EG2. Today in this zone, residential uses are permitted as a conditional use with several criteria to be sure you're compatible with the industrial area. OMSI has asked to retain that residential option as a conditional use. Limited housing is an appropriate use and is integral, but under the SE Quad plan it would be reduced. OMSI sites are not adjacent to heavy industrial uses. *See written testimony.*
11. Susan Keil, OMSI: OMSI came to the eastside in the 1980s. The location helps us achieve our mission of science, education and the jobs of the future. We have had good relationships in the area. Our campus is ready for development. We have property we can develop on and have a shared vision with our neighbors. We're right near the new transit station, and we should have the flexibility for the kind of development you'd expect near a large transit section. It's the last piece of waterfront with a public access opportunity close to the Central City. This is an ideal place for development for people who want to live and work and enjoy the space. Housing is important to this kind of flexibility to achieve development potential for the long-term future. *See written testimony.*
12. Paddy Tillett, OMSI: Station areas and other parts of the area should be planned differently. Without housing, retail isn't viable in the station areas, but that's what we're planning there. Housing complements what OMSI is doing and is essential to successful TOD. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Smith* asked if this is the only housing in this part of the district, is it viable?

We believe so because it would be part of the mixed use development near the station area as modeled elsewhere.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted this was an issue the SAC wrestled with. As I do the math on the concept plan, it's 600-700 units possibly. There is no context for it, but you also can't just look at what's going on today. Compatibility with industrial uses is also an issue. The conditional use process allows the City to review and see what is or isn't compatible.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the OMSI District Plan and clarification of what properties OMSI owns.

We've looked at the full district, beyond the ownership of OMSI, to understand the potential. This allowed us to consider opportunities for new transit access and influence of the station.

13. Jim Morton, Edy, Morton & Edy, LLC: Site at 1319 SE MLK. In 2002, they looked to change zoning from IG1 to EXd. After many hearings, we decided we couldn't do that zoning change because it would require we remove the back dock on 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave, rendering the property inoperable for the tenants. We support the Plan without having to remove our dock as was verbally assured by staff.
14. Sam Beebe, Ecotrust: Ecotrust recently bought blocks in the area. We thank staff and support EOS overlay on our 2 blocks. *See written testimony.*
15. Mike Lettunich: Owns 3 blocks near Franz Bakery. Supports the Green Loop and its going through the district. Our tenants bike commute, and part of the parking issues in the district are alleviated by using bike access into the city. Green loop should be on 6th, not 7th. Cyclists, generally, don't want to ride near high density, fast moving traffic. If the goal is more bike commuting/use, then please put it on 6th Ave. It is sensible for EOS overlay for the full district.
16. Barbara Grover: Supports the Plan. I still see issues in the district that overlooks the 4<sup>th</sup> Ave alignment. We import bicycles via large freight containers and our customers are cyclists and families. There is transit-user conflict in the district, so we need to make sure our alignment is correct for and in the district. Parking is an issue for both recreational users and employees. There is a lack of availability of services for those who work in the district.
17. Tom Rocca, 7 Hills Properties: Supports the Plan; it's comprehensive and deals with lots of the issues. We think the EOS should be district-wide to reduce conflicts because the islands leave inconsistencies that we'll likely have to deal with later. *See written testimony.*
18. Scott MacLean: 1127 SE 10<sup>th</sup> property owner. In the current plan, this property stays IG1 and will be across from the new Orchard Supply and bike routes on the other side. I haven't seen a traditional industrial tenant wanting to move into the area in the last few years. Traffic and lease rates are the biggest problems for traditional industrial tenants, but the EOS is well thought out and fits of the entire district. EOS is a good compromise and border zone.
19. Cameron Herrington, Living Cully: The Anti-Displacement Collation thanks the PSC and bureau staff. Regarding the SE Quad Plan, this is exactly the type of implementation plan that needs to be incorporated. All the new development will have an impact on property values and housing costs, and we need to be careful with the displacement impact of our planning decisions.

20. Karly Rose Foster: Noted the importance of the anti-displacement proposals. Transportation and infrastructure improvements will impact my ability to stay in the neighborhood.
21. Roger Gertenrich: Leads a grassroots project in SoWa in an effort to support an outdoor maritime display. 31 organization have given us letters of support, including OMSI. The first phase is done, and we have tremendous support. There is funding for a grant for planning and design of the North Greenway. The key is that next year the design and planning will occur. *See written testimony.*
22. Barry Smith: Supports expanding the EOS throughout the area and employment zones should be allowed to keep their housing opportunities.
23. Jordan Winkler, Winkler Development Corp: Supports the Plan and amendments to extend EOS over the whole area. The Plan should be able to be flexible to accommodate new industries, and it doesn't detract from existing IG uses.
24. Ian Stude, PDX Bicycle Advisory Committee: The BAC has significant concerns about bicycle transportation in the CES. We support the Green Loop and want to see both 7<sup>th</sup> and 9<sup>th</sup> avenues as Green Loop routes. The omission of 9<sup>th</sup> Ave is a concern since it's noted as a major city bikeway in the 2030 Bike Master Plan. We're also interested in facilities principally for bicycle transportation which aren't yet included. *See written testimony.*
25. Olga Sanchez, Milagro & #CEIDCreatives Coalition: Thanks to SE Uplift and their space we use. We advocate for affordable live-work spaces; personal and property safety; health; public spaces; support for small- and mid-sized cultural organizations; addressing homelessness. I request continued work between the City and the CEIDCreatives. *See written testimony.*
26. Dale Bernards, Lindquist Development: Supports the proposed use for the Southern Triangle but want to change zoning to EX. Planned housing in the area would be good for businesses to create an active 24/7 environment.
27. Mike Redmond, Creative Woodworking: There is a bike boulevard on SE Salmon, which is very dangerous. We hear lots about freight priority in the area. Our business moved here in 1993 because it is industrial zoned. But with all the change, we are being told we can't load from the streets (Taylor, 10<sup>th</sup> and Salmon). Where do you want this business to be located? I'm looking for time to move if I need to instead of continually being ticketed. The half-hour truck loading zoning and permits are required for truck loading. Looking for changes in operational practices, not necessarily zoning changes.  
  
*Commissioner Smith* asked about the property and not being in the EOS zone. It is currently EXd. EOS could change the mix of neighbors.
28. Noel Johnson, Killian Pacific: Own about 8 blocks in the area. We are generally supportive of the Plan and the process. Our approach is to be long-term, and the Plan balances immediate concerns relative to long-term goals for the city. We would suggest the EOS zoning has some potential improvements to be made. We also appreciate OMSI's perspective.
29. Susan Pearce, HAND and SAC member: Generally supports the plan. Priorities: protection for existing homes in the HAND section of the SEQ, most or all of which pre-date the designated industrial sanctuary. We'd like to see protection for homes just outside the SEQ east of 12<sup>th</sup> Ave and north of the UP railroad. We support the EX zone

in Clinton Triangle with mixed use development. Building height should not be overwhelmed or become a brick wall. We are more concerned about mass than height and are strongly in favor of the open space. HAND did not discuss housing around OMSI, but in the past we have opposed this area for housing. *See written testimony.*

30. Renee Strand, Holst Architecture: Supports the Plan and urges the EOS be applied to all IG1 zones in the area as a holistic approach rather than the island/spot-zoned approach. *See written testimony.*
31. Ryan Hashagen, Portland Pedals: Our building at MLK and Davis is proximate to suppliers. Staff bikes to work. The main concern is lack of safe active transportation route, particularly north-south, throughout the district and conflict is from single-occupancy vehicle traffic. The Green Loop would make doing business and safety a priority.
32. Peter Fry, Bolliger-Sons: The Plan is very good and is visionary. There is one property that we'd like to see changed as noted in the letter. *See written testimony.*
33. Mary Ann Schwab: My concern is about air emissions in the area. Commissioners Fritz and Saltzman are considering moving R2D2 to the area as well. This is a very busy area, and I don't want to see any families living here. We need to protect kids, and this is not an appropriate place for families.
34. Emma Pelett, City Liquidators/Pelett Properties: Owns 13 parcels in the CES; 823 SE 3<sup>rd</sup> Ave is the main office. This is a park deficient neighborhood, and we need a place for the people who work here to be outside. Support UD9, UD3, HN4, UD7, T19 and UD6. Parks offer an opportunity to escape without leaving, which is something we need in the industrial area. Keeping the people in the neighborhood there after work through a night market or an active viaduct is also important.
35. Bob Sallinger, Audubon: Natural resources and access to nature issues are similar to the West Quad plan. They are anemic and incomplete relative to the rest of the Plan. I hope the deficiencies will be rectified as they were in the West Quad. Natural resources and the river are absent from sections of the Plan. There are lots of placeholders for green features, which should have been integrated earlier on. The Green Loop almost disappears in this quadrant. Greenway expansion needs to be defined. *See written testimony.*

*Commissioner Houck* noted that he has heard different response when he's asked about the number sites planned for fish and wildlife habitat enhancement and restoration in the central reach of the Willamette. He asked about the number of potential enhancement or restoration sites.

My sense is that it doesn't line up with the West Quad right now. I need to reference the whole plan, but the aspirations on the SE Quad plan don't line up.

36. Curt Davis: Owns about three-quarters of a block at 7<sup>th</sup> and Lincoln with 3 apartments, brewery, studio, engineering firm and parking lot included. I support EOS as it supports growth for the district. There is a caution about restricting growth and not listening to supply and demand and market needs.

[Written testimony received](#)

*Chair Baugh* closed testimony at 5:30 p.m.

## Discussion

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about expanding EOS and the ability of that to expand the number of jobs. Do we know about the nature of those jobs and salary level?

- We can provide that. We know what's going in there today. This is a 20 year plan, and we don't want to make the same mistakes as the last plan and provide flexibility for changes.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about the changes between IG1 and EOS. There is support on both sides but probably some confusion about what's different.

- IG1 is light industrial that allows for manufacturing, production, industrial services and sales. It restricts 3,000 square feet per site for other uses such as retail. There is a conditional use possibility. EOS is an overlay over the IG1 that allows for industrial office as well as the other IG1 uses. Creative industries are EOS. You can also do 5,000 square feet retail and/or office by right. The proposal is to take away the conditional use option. The islands are suggested to maintain what is currently there.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked if there was discussion about "the islands" versus maybe changing IG1 to be surrounded by EOS to maintain the overall same balance of property with a bit of a buffer. When you come back, I would like to hear about rationale about not having housing at OMSI and about multi-modal transit and potential conflicts and resolutions.

- We didn't discuss this buffer idea.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* noted the disagreement about rent potential and lease rates between traditional industrial and traditional office.

- We can provide more information. You are going to pay more for office than traditional flex space.

*Commissioner Hanson* commented on the OMSI housing situation. Lots of the comments against this were based on (1) conflicting uses and (2) it's not a good housing site. But one thing I'm thinking about is it could be more of a student housing site than a family housing site. It has great transit access. I was on the fence before, and I like the suggestion of keeping a set of CUP criteria about doing housing there as an evaluation process. The CEIC letter poses other questions. Commercial Marine Use Overlay sounds complicated, and I'm not sure exactly where you'd do the overlay.

*Commissioner Shapiro* supports the EOS overlay. The dissenting opinion is something I'd support as well. I'm equally concerned about the OMSI site and like the idea of the conditional use possibility for housing. I'd like some more creative thinking around the two islands and opportunities there.

*Commissioner Rudd* is interested in hearing about where we have done shared parking elsewhere in the city. On the conditional use permit for housing, I'd like to see all the conditional use permit criteria. Student housing is an interesting idea, but I'm not sure if the area will be affordable given you are talking waterfront.

*Commissioner Smith* supports the BAC call for showing the bike facility on 9<sup>th</sup> Ave. Regarding OMSI, they talked about a hotel and residential. (A hotel is currently allowed.) Have we done any kind of a displacement/risk assessment for this plan?

- For bikes on 9<sup>th</sup> Ave, that is one of the bikeways on the TSP as is MLK, 11<sup>th</sup>/12<sup>th</sup> and Water Ave. We only showed items that we're adding, not what's already being including in the TSP.
- 9<sup>th</sup> Ave should show as a priority street for bikes.

*Commissioner Houck* noted natural resources are missing from the mission statement and stakeholder priorities. Was this a reflection of the SAC, and do you agree with it? I was involved



with the original Willamette Greenway habitat inventory, working with Bureau of Planning staff in 1984. The resulting 25 foot setbacks don't allow for integration of recreation and habitat protection and restoration. It is simply too narrow. We can't do both restoration and allow for recreational opportunities without expanding the greenway setback.

- I don't agree with that it does that, but natural resources are well addressed throughout the Central City plan. It wasn't a big issue for the SAC. We know we need to get the waterfront right. The vision is there, but we're open to further details.

*Chair Baugh* agrees with the other commissioners' comments. The one concern is the conflict with the loading zones and changes as an issue of gentrification and displacement of businesses. I would like to understand what PDC is going to do to help businesses survive and expand, or, if they need to move, that they find an alternative site in the city that helps them be successful. PDC also has a role for housing in this plan. Parking is another issue. The parking strategy is inadequate, and we need a better one. My sense is that in 5 years, you won't be able to park here.

Staff will accept other commissioner comments by this Friday so we can respond at the June 9 work session and PSC recommendation.

## **Comprehensive Plan Update**

Work Session: Eric Engstrom, Joe Zehnder, Michelle Kunec-North, Peter Hurley (PBOT)

Eric provided an overview of today's Work Session. We have a number of different issues to discuss today. We are almost done with the strike-through-and-underline policies and updated map, which will be coming to the PSC in early June. Today is a last chance to clean up issues and get general direction. We're getting into the actual language, which will be available in about a week.

### *Full- and Half-Block Zoning*

This is about mixed use designation and relationship to the housing behind it. Often existing houses are built to a shorter height than what's allowed. We can avoid the relationship issue by allowing full-block mixed use zoning. An example is the Tupelo Building on Mississippi Ave. A full-block development on the front half with townhouses that are shorter on the back.

Where there is full-block zoning, we have a cross-section diagram for full-block zoning. We still care about the height relationship, so we are proposing to impose a bigger setback and vegetation, or we allow residential uses to have a step-down built into the development.

Where there isn't full-block zoning, we provide for a step-down that corresponds more closely to the adjacent zone. If you're in a denser place, the step-down will be lower. If you're adjacent to RX or RH, you won't have any step-downs since the height limits are comparable to the mixed use zones.

We are not recommending to have consistent full-block zoning in all Civic Corridors. We already have quite a bit, but this is plan-specific determination that should be made (e.g. in area plans). There isn't a one-size-fits-all recommendation. We would suggest allowing both going forward and will address these issues in the Mixed Use Zone project.

*Commissioner Schultz* asked about mixed use zones. Does that cover all the corridors? The current code doesn't have enough clarity about the set-backs, and it's subjective, which causes strains.

- Civic Corridors are already mixed use zones. We are proposing clear and objective set-backs in the Mixed Use Zones project.

PSC members confirmed staff's direction.

#### *Open Data and Broadband*

The staff memo dated May 21 has a couple sections, mostly relating to Chapter 2 and Chapter 8. The memo notes where we have City policy, siting policies suggested by open data stakeholders (staff did not recommend including the full suite) and staff's recommendation that condenses the concepts. Much of the issues is about what is relevant for the Comp Plan and land use policy and where items may fit into other City policies.

*Commissioner Smith* is frustrated with the process. I provided my recommendations a number of months ago and just got this memo last Friday with no time to process it. I still feel good about the full set of recommendations. I've been following the national conversation, and other cities are putting these into their Comp Plans. I understand Oregon is a different state with different laws (e.g. LUBA). It's interesting we're ok with tenants' rights but not digital inclusion as components of the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner St Martin* asked about applicability in the Comp Plan. Information flow is almost important as how trucks get down the streets.

*Chair Baugh* agrees with *Commissioner Smith*. In Policy 8.114 we use "encourage", but in the sub-policies, we use "provide" and "support", which are a stronger sense than "encourage". Also, we need to ensure everyone has access to open data and the City provides this.

*Commissioner Smith* would like to work with staff to refine the language.

Susan noted that many items comment on providing City financing and other specifics. We need to look at this in comparison to other policies. In some cases, we want to use "provide", but we can't say that if we don't have the financial capacity and ability to go to that. We do need to prioritize. Policy 2.11 takes the very specific implication of open data and make it a bit more general. I don't want this to be a one or two person issue. Movement of information does help us get to our goals, but it's hard to understand if it's not a priority for others in the Comp Plan.

*Commissioner Houck* noted he doesn't fully understand the issue and welcomes further education. I was prepared to make a motion to adopt all the language submitted by *Commissioner Smith*. If there are elements that aren't appropriate for the Comp Plan, I want to know where those policies can live.

*Commissioner Rudd* would like to talk about the trade-off of including these policies in the Comp Plan versus other City policies. We want to make information available, but there are issues if we put it into the Comp Plan versus elsewhere.

*Commissioner St Martin* will work with staff and *Commissioner Smith*.

#### *TSP Project Update*

Peter noted the revisions to the January 30 memo that PBOT sent to the PSC members. Most changes are in response to the 1300 comments staff received; they are mostly relatively modest. Many people commented that the projects on the list were too large and expensive to land on the constrained list. Staff looked at phasing options that could be on the constrained list. As a result, we could include more (smaller) projects on the constrained list. There is also a new citywide map that shows the updated projects.

As we move into the final deliberation and recommendation for the Comp Plan, the list is the first final deliverable. We didn't want PSC members to lose track of this as we enter the final stretch, which is why we brought it forward today.

*Commissioner Houck:* Are the additional projects on the constrained list? Are they mostly in a small category?

- They were mostly mid-range (\$2-20M). We reviewed them, re-scoped the projects.

*Commissioner Smith* noted that process-wise, we just got this message today. When will we have time to discuss this?

- June 9 and June 23 are focused on PSC members' review and amendments to the draft recommended draft plan. PSC members will be able to look at the full plan, project list, maps and policies. If we need more time, we can push out the recommendation timeline.

*Chair Baugh* asked about the full TSP. Will it be reissued with these recommendations?

- These are the elements of the TSP that move forward with Task 4. Other elements are part of the implementation (Task 5) portion. This establishes the big picture policies, project list and financial plan.

*Chair Baugh* asked about sending questions about the TSP.

- Commissioners will send questions to Julie by June 1 for staff response.

Alternative street design is a component we're looking at as well.

#### *Anti-displacement policies*

We had significant testimony about this topic and have met with stakeholders a few times. The May 10 memo from staff was rather general, and the May 21 memo is more explicit about policies and language staff proposes to include.

The first piece of recommendation included community involvement and adding emphasis about people who are adversely affected by decisions. Added elements to Chapter 2 goals and specific language about burdens and benefits and environmental justice.

Section 2A was about impact analysis, and staff has added specific emphasis in chapters 1, 3 and 5 including the equity principle in Chapter 1.

2B, Mitigation, included adding "mitigate" into Policy 3.3.a. Policy 3.3 in general is now more specific.

2C is more specifically about community benefits. Staff recommends that we add a policy in Chapter 6 about Urban Renewal Plans.

We don't recommend policy changes in 2D because they are more about tax policy, so it's not quite a Comp Plan topic in staff's opinion.

3A and affordable home ownership: added 5.28 and other existing policies.

3B to reference land banking: added a specific policy.

3C added language about "permanently affordable" to policies in Chapter 5.

New policy re: specific target and emphasizing the need for better funding strategies to meet the target.

More specific reference to inclusionary zoning should that become an option.

Renter well-being policy (not typically a Comp Plan policy) added to housing safety and

conditions section.

4A topics and tools are more about community development, which isn't necessarily a land use or zoning tool.

4B is being looked at in the Central City and Mixed Use Zone projects.

*Commissioner Schultz* is thrown off by the term "well-being". What is the definition? Maybe there is a better term or we define it somewhere.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted that items she pulled off the consent list are related to defining the words "well-being". What about "health, safety and welfare" as a more clearly established/understood phrase?

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about a meeting of the lawyers and the groups. Did that happen?

- Yes, we met. It was one of probably several meetings. We traded information about views on legal issues. There was general agreement that issues staff flagged in the April memo are legitimate. In the short term, we want strong policies in the Comp Plan, and we have general agreement that the recommended policies are legal to do. We may need to explore more about specific tools. The issues that need to be identified were confirmed, and the policies are being discussed.
- There was a lot of validation of issues staff raised, but we haven't yet reached conclusion. A moment of consensus was that if we were to build policies to authorize us to go down a particular path, we want to make sure we have a policy basis to pursue a family of approaches... not necessarily the very specific of an item. The math for this is similar to the housing bonus study that we're completing.

*Commissioner Houck*: I think staff has been responsive to the information we've had. I also had the same problem with "well-being". What about "renters' stability"?

*Commissioner Hanson*: We are being responsive here.

*Commissioner Oxman* asked about onsite versus off-site housing mitigation (e.g. with land banking). What are the differences in community benefit in light of recent publications about improved outcomes for children who move to better neighborhoods?

- When we look at the bonus approach, this would have a ratio of bonus to housing. It can be provided onsite or, for a little less better deal, you could pay into a housing fund. It gives more opportunity for the households. This is how we're proposing this in the draft study.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about further study of certain tools.

- We have the impact analysis policy in Chapter 5. We discussed the question of impact studies and when you use it (e.g. scale of a project). In Policy 5.11 we say "legislative and land use decisions".

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about recommendation 2D: Staff noted that taxes are not appropriate in the Comp Plan, but what about a linkage fee?

- This is more of an exaction. Where there are windfall profits, there would be a tax applied to capture funds for public benefits. In a condition of a land use decision, we don't know how to do this. Council can adopt different property tax implications, but it's not a zoning code issue.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*. I also have language suggestions that I can provide to staff. For example, in Policy 3.3.d, can we add strategies other exactions?

- Exactions are relatively broad. Other things we might do, if you analyzed them in terms of land use, are likely forms of exaction.

*Commissioner Tallmadge*: Through the community involvement section, I would emphasize that

“encouraging equity” is both a process and an outcome.

For 2B, mitigation, *Commissioner Shapiro* asked if this was a compromise.

- Staff took the general idea and put it into the policy. We were adding it to a particular policy, which is why it may not be exactly the language the coalition proposed.

*Commissioner Hanson* noted this is the kind of situation where we need to be careful about how we pick our situation where we put language. Push back from the private development world will be a question about putting this all up front. Incentives and exactions both need to be reviewed.

- If the objective is to find the means to build affordable housing, what is within the public jurisdiction’s grasp? A bonus exaction isn’t producing much. But we need to look at bonds and other forms of public finance.

*Commissioner Tallmadge* asked about land banking. Should there be mention of non-profits to land bank or create land trusts as well?

- We could just say “support land banking...”.

*Commissioner Rudd* noted that one common developer comment on housing affordability is that increasing supply helps affordability and asked that staff respond to that argument.

- If you do not increase supply, you cannot be affordable if you’re a place where people want to live. Nationally this is a phenomenon. In Portland, we have lots of apartment buildings in the pipeline. We tend to be a conservative market in terms of how much gets built.

**PSC members confirmed staff’s direction.**

#### *Verb strength*

Eric reminded the PSC that all policies are balanced, regardless of the verbs. We wanted to be sure the verbs are not circularly-defined, which we’ve fixed in this iteration.

*Commissioner Houck* is ok with the verbs as defined in the May 21 memo.

*Commissioner Rudd* confirmed the expansion of the definition of “protect”. I do think the text of the plan needs to include a statement that no verb can trump.

- The new introduction and “how do you use the plan” language being added to the body of the Comp Plan draft help define this.

**PSC members confirmed staff’s direction.**

#### *Surplus property*

This memo closes the loop on Policy 8.74.

*Commissioner Houck* commented on the disposition of property. When Commissioner Saltzman was at the County, we got them to adopt a “green screen” to look at each property’s ecological value. Is the City looking at a screening process like this? Outside the scope of the Comp Plan.

#### *Consent list review*

This is the list of items that commissioners had pulled for discussion from the staff consent list. The memo outlines the original language, commissioner requests and updated language.

#31, #32 and #40

Well-being language confirmed (with definition).

#34 confirmed.

#46. *Commissioner Baugh* was concerned about dropping “pedestrian or bike” safety (and just saying “safety”).

- Staff will rewrite to include “safety includes x, y, z” and move Policy 7.32 to Policy 8.40.

#63 parking policies confirmed.

#83. *Commissioner Oxman*: The parking hierarchy is a pretty radical change. Language that clearly states is necessary. This still doesn’t quite say what it needs to say, and I’ll work on language edits. I’m concerned to have enough clarity for public support and that there is a consistent reading by staff over the next 20 years to implement the policy.

- *Commissioner Smith* is comfortable with the text that’s in this version.

Staff also recommends moving the special accommodations concept to be first on the list. And to have people and movement of goods and services into Policy 9.7.

#### *PSC disclosures about extra Comp Plan conversations*

Commissioners confirmed the list of disclosures of contacts outside PSC meetings that commissioners have had.

#### *Next steps*

We have 3 or more meetings left:

- June 9 and June 23: you will have a link to the update map, a strike-through edited Comp Plan and the TSP list and the updated CSP. These meetings are opportunities for PSC members to raise final issues about the proposed plan. For amendments, we will ask for a motion and a second. June 23 is also the hearing on the Growth Scenarios Report.
- July 14: final vote on the as-amended final document.

PSC members’ comments on the SE Quad Plan are due this Friday, May 29.

Comments on the Comp Plan are due on Monday, June 1.

#### **Adjourn**

*Chair Baugh* adjourned the meeting 7:50 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken