

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, June 23, 2015

5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

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

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom, Tom Armstrong, Tyler Bump

Chair Baugh called the meeting to order at 5:06 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Commissioner Smith* participated in the Missing Middle Housing Ride as part of Pedalpalooza. It was focused on the policy aspects of why duplexes and other “interesting housing types” are not being built in Portland any more.
- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted The Monocle, a UK magazine focused on design and lifestyle. They have recently published a list global cities with the best quality of life, and the last city on the global list is Portland, the only US city on the list.
- *Commissioner Hanson* noted that he met with David Douglas School District and staff today to talk about the district’s growth and where they might expand. BPS, PP&R, PDC staff were at the table, which is an on-going conversation.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted that there was a meeting with the Mayor this afternoon about his upcoming trip to the Vatican to discuss climate change. The Pope’s Encyclical has similar topics included such as conversation about biodiversity and environmental impact analysis on ecosystem health, and what we need to do to create livable cities.

Director’s Report

- Susan added the Mayor will be going to Rome on July 21 with 16 mayors from other cities with similar carbon reduction goals as Portland. What’s notable about the list is that most of the other cities are large, mega-cities.
- Tomorrow we have the Climate Action Plan at City Council. We have about 20 people coming as invited testimony, and we expect a very good conversation. There will be some controversy about if we’ve gone too far or not far enough with the Plan.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of minutes from the June 9, 2015 PSC meeting.

Commissioner Houck moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

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

Revised Growth Scenarios Report

Hearing: Tom Armstrong, Tyler Bump

Tom and Tyler shared the [presentation](#) and background. This is part of Task 3 as part of looking at possible growth scenarios. The updated report reflects what and where we grow and how our investments impacts many of the Portland Plan measures, which is the evaluation portion of this work.

The presentation includes information about growth patterns in the proposed plan and highlights of a few performance measures.

Most choices are on the residential side on the multi-family side, where we expect 80 percent of our growth and development. Most of this is in the Central City and mixed-use corridors.

We look at where we have capacity to grow and where we're likely to grow based on recent development trends. Over the last five years, shifting development trends show that the market is favoring the Central City and Inner neighborhoods. One growth and investment strategy could be to support this trend, which may create some breathing room to improve conditions in East Portland.

Two-thirds of the households that will be here in 2035 are already on the ground today. This legacy development plays a huge role in future development patterns. By district, we expect lots of growth in East Portland, but not as much as we originally thought. Initially that was about 40,000 units, but now we're looking at about 27,000 in this huge geographic area of the city.

The two investment strategies we've learned are (1) support growth in the right places and (2) create more "right places" by investing to reduce disparities.

We also have learned that increasing transportation options and choices have multiple benefits. In 2035 we're looking at 61 percent of households with access to frequent transit, a large increase from the 47 percent today. A low-stress bike network access increases our performance from 56 to 72 percent of households with easy access to them. This is just the fiscally-constrained list, not the full Bike Master Plan being implemented.

In terms of complete neighborhoods, we need to create more centers and complete neighborhoods, especially in East and Southwest Portland. In the updated report, complete neighborhoods go from 63 to 73 percent of households that live in them.

The Proposed Comp Plan has a 3 percent decrease in total vehicle miles traveled (VMT), but this is a 27 percent per capita reduction. We also get close to the 2035 carbon reduction goals.

Discussion

Commissioner Hanson asked about the legacy landscape.

- Most of our residential neighborhoods that are off the centers and corridors we expect to remain mostly the same; most of those houses will be here in 25 years. So that leaves the majority of growth focused on the remaining one-third (mostly corridors and centers).

Commissioner Shapiro asked about equity and how it didn't come into the principles. Shouldn't this be explicitly be included?

- It is implied as an overarching principle, and it shows up in the focus on affordable housing in the report; and in complete neighborhoods and additional infrastructure investments in East and Southwest Portland we need to close the gaps to move the needle.
- We looked at increases in performance in the communities of color. Our commitment to equity shows up greatly in our infrastructure investments. Now we have to get ahead of this on the displacement side. But for the most part, communities of color performance was twice that of non.

Commissioner Smith asked about closing the gap to our Portland Plan goals. Are there policy levers we didn't push that we could to get us there?

- 80-85 percent of growth is happening where and how we want it. The other 15-20 percent is going to be based on the market, so we don't have much control over that.

Commissioner Houck noted this approach is consistent with where Metro was about 20 years ago in the Metro 2040 planning. Last time I talked about the term "density". The complete neighborhoods phrase is better to communicate to folks in terms of building a better community.

Commissioner St Martin asked about the gentrification measurement chart.

- Some measures we want to minimize development in gentrification-pressured areas. We asked if any of the scenarios would push more development into areas of high risk. We don't have a specific goal to shoot for, but we want to minimize the impact.

Commissioner Tallmadge noted a number of stages that can lead up to risk of displacement. If we back off of investments, what happens?

- We are monitoring and evaluating where we expect development to occur. Twenty-three percent of households are in high gentrification risk areas. Growth areas are largely complete, but we need to invest in affordable housing and fill in service gaps to support the growth. But we still have the heavier lift in East Portland and other under-served areas. This is the balance with preventative and mitigating activities.

Commissioner Gray asked about the baseline data for the communities of color slide (slide 48). What is the actual comparison?

- The chart shows we're closing the gap, but it doesn't define how big the gap is. We will work on getting you that specific information.

Testimony

1. Nolan Leinhart, 1000 Friends of Oregon: I urge the PSC to adopt the package of amendments from the anti-displacement coalition to make our communities more resilient. There are challenges ahead, and one of the greatest is to respond to inequalities in the city and region. The Portland Plan established equity at its core, and we want to see this goal come to policy in the Comp Plan.
2. Edward Hill, Groundwork Portland: You should fully adopt the amendments from the anti-displacement coalition that *Chair Baugh* and *Commissioner Tallmadge* have put before you in today's amendments. Our work is rooted in converting spaces into active, vibrant places. We need to reflect in detail and monitor our growth as a city. Continued inequities from the past 20 years are still in our headlines today. We must plan for inequity and work towards mitigation.
3. Cat Goughnour, Anti-Displacement Coalition: Thank you to BPS staff for working with our coalition to respond to the needs of our most vulnerable communities. We have an opportunity to approach new development to reduce segregation with this plan. Higher income areas in the city tend to be areas of low diversity. In planning for changing

demographics, we have to plan to uplift those who have been left behind.

4. John Gibbon, SWNI: Enhance medium-density housing by requiring if you build to a lower density, you'd still pay the SDC fees and be a non-conforming use. I'm enthusiastic about the growth scenarios in East Portland. If you look closely at the report, we see centers and corridors as the places where we'll have issues. Staff even notes that stormwater is better accommodated in corridors, not centers. SW Portland centers are questionable.
5. Pat Wagner: Linnton resident. We want to increase density but lost our land use plan in 2006 for our neighborhood. We want a zoning change from heavy industrial, and we could add tiny houses and increase density in this area. We have lots of dedicated people who are willing to work on this, and things have changed a lot in the past few years. *See written testimony.*
6. James Peterson: The expected 124,000 housing units has some flawed expectations and assumptions. *See written testimony.*
7. Sara Taylor: Linnton resident. This was the first European settlement in Portland. We have access to nature, employment/industrial zones and opportunity to develop. The piers are now empty, industrial storage. Our roads are clogged with people driving to work, not walking or biking. Please consider Linnton as a place to transform this area into a historically and environmentally model neighborhood.
8. Greg Theisen, Port of Portland: Growth Scenarios performance measures should include additional performance measures to include. Since 2010, Port has submitted over 10 letters and appreciate your consideration of them. The low forecast for harbor land development will impede City efforts to attract new business. Removal of Policy 6.41 (West Hayden Island [WHI]) restricts options for future marine terminal development in the Portland Harbor. *See written testimony.*
9. Jan Wilson: SW resident. A 1200-1300 square foot house is what people in my neighborhood treasure, and Growth Scenarios show that is encouraged. But little houses are being torn down to build huge houses. When that happens in SW, you lose tree canopy and ability to handle stormwater, particularly in the SW hills. Please find a way to keep new development out of residential neighborhoods.
10. Doug Klotz: Supports the Revised Report. Low-stress bike networks depend on building out the bikeways, so we need to make sure they actually get built to achieve these results. Middle density housing developments can only be built in multi-family zones, so I would propose single-family zones be modified to allow these duplexes and up to 6-plexes in proximity to corridors. *See written testimony.*
11. David Red Thunder: River spoils dumping needs to stop at WHI. We need to have a beneficial use and recognition that people live on WHI.
12. Nancy Davis: Supports the anti-displacement policies that have been proposed. We need policies that support diverse neighborhoods.

[Written Testimony Received](#)

Chair Baugh closed testimony at 6:16 p.m.

Discussion

Commissioner Hanson asked about Jim Peterson's request to have the record left open.

- If you left it open, you could vote your recommendation on July 14. But *Chair Baugh* has closed testimony.

Commissioner Houck noted Metro's 2040 Growth Concept. They removed 200 feet on both sides of streams and rivers, steep slopes, and floodplains from the buildable lands inventory. Regulations were predicated on this, so it's important to note this. We reference other aspects of the growth management strategy, so we should carry all components of this forward. Also, City Council just adopted the Watershed Scorecard, so I think we should reference that here too.

- We already have development within these areas. The reference is in the BLI, which informed the growth distribution model for the Growth Scenarios Report.

Commissioner Houck also commented on discrepancy between use of "green space" and "natural areas" that should be used consistently.

Commissioner Smith noted the progress toward Portland Plan goals – this is great. When we do transmit a letter to Council, we need to make sure to include the investment strategy.

Commissioner Hanson asked about the waterfront industrial / EOA issue that the Port has pushed back on again.

- This is about available capacity and how we designate WHI and matching the two. If we leave WHI as it is and not move that designation, how do you achieve a higher level of cargo forecast without that capacity? We think it's a difficult case to make.

Commissioner Rudd recapped prior a staff briefing that WHI was only place large enough for a rail loop, and that the mid-level forecast therefore relied upon intensification on existing land which required higher levels of investment. The low level was a PSC choice that was made but was debated, with, for example, Rudd favoring midlevel. We could go with the mid-level forecast.

- We could, but it would be harder to make the policy commitment and the bar would get raised to achieve this.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about the tension in Linnton.

- It factors more into the EOA than the Growth Scenario report. Scenarios is about growth pattern and our choices. Our employment areas are fixed on the ground; the EOA got into what sectors we want to growth. The EOA is where we explored those alternatives and capacity. Growth Scenarios took that as a fixed point, except for Neighborhood Business Districts, which follow the residential growth. Linnton questions get back to the EOA and scarcity of waterfront industrial and the Portland Superfund shadow; until that is resolved, we have that backlog. In Chapter 6 we have policies about brownfields and Superfund clean-up.
- *Commissioner Smith* noted the bubble chart. Linnton didn't get into the investment quadrants, and I know this doesn't fit our parameters for a complete community investment.

Commissioner St Martin clarified: goals, policies and the gap. The gap needs to come from market activity and things we need to do.

- Yes; innovation, private investment or additional public investment is needed to fully achieve our goals.

Commissioner Gray noted growth areas. I'm hoping we are really planning to invest commensurately in those places where we will see the most growth. I know we have to grow in

the Central City, but I'm hoping this also addresses investments and job growth in the eastern part of the city. Anti-gentrification and tools are part of this conversation. Are we planning on a formative assessment before the next 25 year plan?

- The Portland Plan's Measures of Success, and with every new jobs forecast for the EOA, and following development trends are all ways we will monitor.

Commissioner Houck was surprised about performance measures regarding green infrastructure and access. In the proposed scenario, we see a loss of access to natural areas. Even on the Esplanade, we do have encounters with nature. I'm surprised we end up with a net loss of 1 percent in terms of access to natural areas.

- One of the challenges of access to natural areas for new acquisition is we don't know what the access (physical/spatial) is. The map on page 76 of the report talks about what natural areas are.

We should just acknowledge this, we don't need to change anything. Riverview Natural Area will likely have additional access, but not a lot of people live nearby.

Commissioner Tallmadge asked about tracking and program evaluation for gentrification risk areas. Can you remind me what the framework for equity does, and if there is a reporting requirement or actionable work? I want to be sure we don't just have analysis for the sake of analysis.

- We have the gentrification risk area analysis, which we're in the process of updating. That is separate from policy or plan decisions. We still need to figure out after the Comp Plan and a new area plan or investment opportunity comes forward how we do some of that analysis.

Commissioner Rudd asked about ADUs and if they're included.

- We looked at recent trends and saw about 3,000 new ADUs (2.5 percent; 150 per year). So they're in there, and each housing type is a percentage.

Chair Baugh asked about prosperity measures and distribution of wages. Does our measurement include the jobs and distribution of jobs as we think about this?

- This reaches back to Portland Plan measures of success. This was specific to residential distribution but access to jobs is what we were measuring. The Growth Scenarios analysis doesn't measure economic growth. Many of the Portland Plan measures are better for monitoring trends, not forecast them out to the future. Growth patterns has such an indirect effect on things that we couldn't get to in this report. But in a progress report, we can look back on these measures.

Commissioner Houck noted the Forest Heights development and that it is what not to do in terms of watershed health.

In terms of voting and next steps, the things the PSC has left to vote on/recommend include: EOA; this report; and the actual Comp Plan with all its components.

Motion

Commissioner Shapiro moved to accept the Growth Scenarios Report. *Commissioner Gray* seconded.

(Y11 – Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge, Baugh)

Comprehensive Plan Update

Work Session: Joe Zehnder, Eric Engstrom

This work session continues our working through PSC members' comments and amendments. We realize that there are a few amendments from *Commissioner Oxman* that we missed in preparing the amendment lists, so staff will send those out in the next couple of days.

Amendments on the consent list are ones staff thought don't need discussion; they are fairly clear-cut and/or typos in nature. These are "Tier 3" amendments as noted on today's annotated agenda.

"Tier 1" decisions are those that had staff disagreement and/or Commissioner conflict. These are what we hope to get through tonight. "Tier 2" amendments are everything else. If we can get through Tier 1 items tonight, we can then try to get through the map and project list comments.

Chair Baugh noted the Tier 2 decisions should be reviewed by Commissioners after tonight's meeting. If there are items on this list that Commissioners want to discuss, we can do that on July 14. But we should have many of those amendments from the Tier 2 list go to the consent list if there aren't conversations necessary.

Commissioner Smith: Based on tonight's testimony, I might have a few more amendments to propose.

- Please have any final/additional comments and amendments to staff by July 7. PSC members should also identify what you want to talk about from the Tier 2 list or new items by July 7.

Chair Baugh asked if any Commissioners had items they want to withdraw from the amendment list.

- *Chair Baugh* withdrew Amendment 74 regarding ESCO.

The first bundle of tonight's amendments is related to anti-displacement requests. The Anti-Displacement Coalition is here tonight. Staff has met with this group several times and focused on their review of the Plan. Commissioners have sponsored outcomes from this group's meetings with staff.

Amendments 8 and 9 are both about the Introduction to the Plan.

Chair Baugh moved to adopt Amendment 8. *Commissioner Tallmadge* seconded.

Staff noted 8 and 9 deal with adding to the Guiding Principles. Staff thinks we should combine this into one amendment as noted in response to Amendment 9.

Commissioner Houck supports this, but he feels low-income communities should be included in considerations regarding equity. I understand we are using terminology development in the Portland Plan, which focused on race, not class or low income communities. I am willing to stick with race as the focus, but did want to indicate my concern that low-income communities, regardless of race, are critical to address.

Commissioner Smith asked about the term "remedy" in the proposal. How is this different from "reduce disparities" that we've used elsewhere in the Plan?

- *Chair Baugh* noted "remedy" here means there is a past impact. Anti-displacement is a forward-looking discussion.
- *Commissioner Rudd* suggested "address" as the verb in this context. In terms of the staff concern about exactions, I don't see exactions as a dictated tool and don't have

those concerns in this situation.

- *Commissioner Shapiro* noted that “remedy” suggests aggressive action and likes this word.
- *Commissioner Schultz* had the same question as *Commissioner Smith*. Who is responsible for remedying? This is a deeper conversation, and I feel more comfortable with “address” to note we’re trying to do better going forward.
- *Commissioner Hanson* said “remedy” means to me that something gets completely solved.
- *Chair Baugh* noted equity is a key policy of the Comp Plan. We should be clear of our intention of what and how we’re saying this. It is a cornerstone of our work, and my concern is that it has to be doable. I want to be sure that it’s clear for someone 10 years from now making a decision based on the Comp Plan that we’re clear about what the intent and expectation is. I’m willing to look at the staff recommendation about equity and changing “remedy” to “address”.

Commissioner Schultz asked if this should be broader than communities of color. Also, “prevent” is a tough bar.

- It is a majority of communities of color that have been displaced by land use policies, not necessarily other under-served groups.
- *Commissioner Houck* noted the rationale for focusing on communities of color is because it’s consistent with decisions that have been made in the past.
- *Chair Baugh* noted the word “prevent”. As I looked at this word, we use it lots of places throughout the Plan. If we start picking out this verb here, I think we open a Pandora’s Box to reviewing every time we use the verb. I feel like it’s appropriate in this context.
- *Commissioner Rudd* noted there is a proposed amendment to adjust the definition of “prevent” later on.

Commissioner Oxman asked about “remedy” would look like in a decisions process.

- *Commissioner Rudd*: As an example, the City could have a policy that designates funds to help people return to a neighborhood where their community once was.

Eric reminded the Commissioners about language added to page A-3 about policies not automatically going over others based on the specific verb used. This is a reminder that while verbs are important, there is not a “trumping” verb.

Joe noted that when you think about how we might use this, we need to think about future application. Part of the goal of the Guiding Principles is to make us think multi-objectively.

Eric noted that thinking back through in terms of land use decisions and making findings against this, one could imagine making a land use amendment to add an amenity and then saying that I can’t remedy past injustices so I can’t move forward with this improvement.

Chair Baugh withdrew the motion. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded withdrawing Amendment 8.

Chair Baugh is ok with the word “prevent”, but I am wrestling with “remedy”. I proposed that we adopt 8 and 9 as staff recommends with changing “remedy” to “address”. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

Commissioner Oxman asked if there will be new language for PSC consideration.

- What’s on the screen now is the language we are voting on:
Equity. Promote equity and environmental justice by reducing disparities, minimizing burdens, extending community benefits, increasing the amount of affordable housing, [affirmatively furthering fair housing](#), [proactively fighting displacement](#), and improving socio-economic opportunities for under-served and under-represented populations.

~~Inform and involve Portlanders in~~ Intentionally engage under-served and under-represented populations in decisions that affect them. Specifically recognize, address, and prevent repetition of the injustices suffered by communities of color throughout Portland's history.

Commissioner Shapiro noted that looking ahead to the future, we have other under-represented communities that aren't communities of color. Should we look at that?

- Under-served and under-represented are included.
- Susan noted we had this discussion in the conversation about the Portland Plan. We had significant data on the impacts of communities of color specifically. It doesn't mean that other groups are not included, but we focused on communities of color in the Portland Plan.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge).

Amendments 8 and 9 with the combined language passed.

Commissioner Tallmadge moved to adopt Amendment 16. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

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

Amendment 16 passed.

Commissioner St Martin moved to adopt Amendment 22. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Eric explained this amendment includes Policy 3.3 with the addition of Policy 3.3.e. Staff notes that the additional statement in 3.3.b. was duplicative from other policies, but it is fine as rewritten.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 22 passed.

Commissioner St Martin moved to adopt Amendments 35

Eric noted that Amendment 35 adds language to Policy 5.9.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 35 passed.

Amendment 36 is about Policy 5.11. There is an Amendment 36A to this same policy, so we might want to combine them. The first introduces a number of new phrases, and the second talks about what to do with the evaluation. *Commissioner Schultz* noted we can focus on Amendment 36.

Commissioner Shapiro moved to adopt Amendment 36. *St Martin* seconded.

Eric noted there is some duplicative language in using “significant new infrastructure” with the glossary-defined phrase “plans and investments”.

Commissioner Smith noted being concise is important and we should remove the duplicative statement.

Commissioner Gray asked about why this phrase was added by the amendment sponsors.

- *Commissioner Tallmadge* is ok with removing the word “significant” if that provides more clarity.
- *Chair Baugh* noted that this was intended to capture development in terms of public investment and that we take into account anti-displacement. I was actually against the word “significant”.
- *Commissioner Oxman* asked about the definition of “protected classes”. This is the Federal definition.
- *Joe*: The “plans and investments” phrase helps us throughout the Plan to clarify and define what is included.

Commissioner Gray would like to see a cross-walk of the amendments and the list of 11 proposed anti-displacement tools. Staff can provide this before the next PSC meeting.

Commissioner Tallmadge withdrew the motion. *Commissioner St Martin* confirmed.

Commissioner Tallmadge moved to adopt Amendment 36 as proposed. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y9 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge; N2 – Rudd, Schultz)

Amendment 36 passed.

Commissioner Schultz withdrew Amendment 36A.

Amendment 37 relates to Policy 5.14. Staff had the same note about the same phrase as in Amendment 36.

Commissioner Hanson asked if this policy includes SDCs.

- This is not a land use decision, it’s a legislative action by the City.

Commissioner Shapiro moved to approve Amendment 37 as shown. *Commissioner Tallmadge* seconded.

Commissioner Schultz noted that this is a broad policy but it seems like people are trying to get to specifics about particular buildings.

It’s not legal for staff to apply this to, for example, specific building permits. If we want this to apply on a case-by-case basis, that gets to rewriting the Zoning Code.

(Y7 – Gray, Hanson, Oxman, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge; N4 – Baugh, Houck, Rudd, Schultz)

Amendment 37 passed.

Amendment 19 is essentially a substitute policy for the original Environmental Justice text.

Commissioner Tallmadge moved to adopt Amendment 19. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Tallmadge wanted this amendment to help clarify this section.

Commissioner Smith noted this replaces “sovereign tribes” with “tribal communities”. The phrase tribal communities is broader, so that is concerning that we are elevating Federally-recognized tribes but potentially diminishing others.

Perhaps we separate these so this applies to the other amendment with similar language.

Commissioner Shapiro noted we have a list of groups but it’s not all inclusive of under-represented communities and groups.

Commissioner Schultz commented we could make this broader with using the phrases under-represented and under-served, for example.

Chair Baugh said Environmental Justice is pre-defined. *Commissioner Tallmadge* noted the phrasing is pulled from Federal language.

Commissioner Houck asked about “tribal communities and governments” and if this is the correct phrase. Is this consistent with the City’s work?

Susan reminded the Commissioners that language is the introduction to the section, so we have the opportunity to recognize the most groups and participants as possible. I would include both sovereign tribes and tribal communities.

Commissioner Oxman noted the intent was to broaden the definition and recognition of tribal groups. We should include “sovereign tribes” in the phrasing. I’d also reiterate that this is introductory language to set the context for looking at environmental justice.

Commissioner Smith commented on the role of introductory language in the Plan.

- When staff is making findings, we look at the introduction as purpose statements.
- *Commissioner Smith*: A previous version of this section had lots of stakeholder buy-in, so I’m going to oppose the change to make sure we have the correct language.

Staff also noted we just haven’t been able to connect with all the stakeholders. We could withdraw the amendment and resubmit it for the next discussion.

Commissioner Tallmadge withdrew the statement. *Commissioner Oxman* withdrew the second.

Staff will bring this amendment back this amendment with revised language to the July 14 meeting.

Amendments 49, 50, 51 are all amendments to Policy 6.39, the prime industrial land retention policy. There are sub-policies (a) through (e), and we’re specifically looking at the words “prohibit” and “protect” in addition to other language.

Commissioner Houck moved to adopt Amendments 49, 50 and 51 as a package. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

Commissioner Rudd clarified the recommendation to use the verb “protect”. I am all for preserving prime industrial land, but normally when you’re trying to get a Comp Plan Map change, you have to show your proposal furthers the Comprehensive Plan policies as a whole to a better extent than the existing designation. This would be a difficult burden but one might for example, be able to identify substitute land better suited to the designation for a swap.

- Eric noted that section 6.39.a applies to quasi-judicial Comp Plan amendments.

Commissioner Houck reviewed Chapter 7, and he is now comfortable with the verb “protect” here so long as protect is used in Chapter 7 as well.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendments 49, 50, 51 passed.

Amendment 42 adds a bullet to the introductory language about “what this chapter is about” in the economics chapter.

Commissioner Houck moved to adopt Amendment 42. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 42 passed.

Amendment 43 is about Goal 6C regarding business district vitality. It elaborates on the quality of life elements in the Plan.

Commissioner Houck moved to adopt Amendment 43. *Commissioner Shapiro* seconded.

Commissioner Hanson asked about the reference to SW Washington in the amendment.

- *Commissioner Houck*: We have access to those landscapes, and they are part of our local physical geography. This was very intentional to include, even though it’s outside the Portland jurisdiction.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 43 passed.

Amendment 44 adds “creative”.

Commissioner St Martin moved to approve Amendment 44. *Commissioner Schultz* seconded.

(Y11 – Baugh, Gray, Hanson, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Schultz, Shapiro, Smith, St Martin, Tallmadge)

Amendment 44 passed.

Amendment 52 is about Policy 6.41. Staff thinks this amendment is redundant to policies in Chapter 7 (7.15 in particular).

Commissioner Houck moved to adopt Amendment 52. *Commissioner St Martin* seconded.

Commissioner Houck noted that while staff thinks this is, it is not duplicative. The Superfund policy language is about brownfields, not about improving environmental quality. There is another outcome from the Superfund process, and we need to specify this.

Staff then thinks we should amend 7.15 if we are changing 6.41. We can propose a new version of 6.41 and 7.15 to bring back in the next meeting.

***Commissioner Houck* withdrew his amendment. *Commissioner St Martin* withdrew the second.**

Amendment 63 is similar to Amendment 19. Staff will return with language as noted above and as noted in other policies.

Next Steps

On Thursday, PSC members will receive an addendum of amendments that we missed in this packet from *Commissioner Oxman* and *Commissioner Houck*.

Staff will work with PSC members on language as noted above in today's discussion. Items deferred from today will be brought back on July 14.

PSC members will review the consent list and other "Tier 2" amendments within the next 2 weeks. If there are amendments listed that Commissioners want to talk about, please let staff know by July 7 which items they need further discussion and clarification about at the July 14 meeting.

Staff will let PSC members know what the full agenda for the July 14 meeting will be once all the amendments are in. The expectation is we'll vote on July 14 if the amendments are mostly moved to the consent list; this could move to a vote on July 28 if we need more time. *Commissioner Houck* noted he will not be in town on July 28.

Susan noted that we shouldn't just rush to put items on the consent list if Commissioners want to have discussions about the items. If you have a concern about an item, please feel free to contact the Commissioner or staff.

Chair Baugh reiterated we need to continue to be deliberative and do this right.

Staff will issue an addendum sheet including compromises, edits and staff input a few days prior to the July 14 meeting.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting 8:47 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken