

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

Tuesday, November 17, 2015

5 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Andre' Baugh, Mike Houck, Gary Oxman, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Teresa St Martin

Commissioners Absent: Jeff Bachrach, Howard Shapiro, Maggie Tallmadge [1 open position]

City Staff Presenting: Susan Anderson, Joe Zehnder, Tom Armstrong, John Cole, Radcliffe Dacanay; Dee Walker, Grant Morehead, Lance Lindahl, April Bertelsen (PBOT); Karl Dinkelspiel (PHB); Kate Deane (PDC)

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

Items of Interest from Commissioners

- *Chair Baugh:* This Thursday starts the hearings for the Comprehensive Plan at Council. I encourage all people who have a view to please provide your testimony to Council. This is a plan for the next 20 years for the growth of our city.

Director's Report

Susan Anderson

- As *Chair Baugh* noted, the first Council Comp Plan hearing on Thursday at 2 p.m. at City Hall. 2-3 p.m. will be a focus on the EOA, growth scenarios, CIC report and CSP. Then beginning at 3 p.m. will be the hearing on the Map, TSP and Goals & Policies. Other hearings are set for December 3 and 10, and we likely will have a fourth meeting in early January.
- The Fossil Fuels policies were passed at Council in the past couple of weeks. In terms of developing the code, we'd be happy to have PSC members weigh in, and we'll keep you apprised of our progress.
- The last 2 PSC meetings of the calendar year are on December 8 (12:30 p.m.) and December 15 (5 p.m.).

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Testimony for today's meeting

Campus Institutional Zoning Project

Briefing: Tom Armstrong, John Cole

Presentation

John provided an overview of the project. The PSC will have a public hearing about this project at the December 15 meeting.

The City's Employment Opportunity Analysis identified a shortfall of development capacity within the healthcare and higher education employment sectors (hospitals and colleges), and that these are

important job providers for the city. The 2010-2035 job growth potential is projected to be 22,700 new jobs, but there is only capacity for about 81 percent of these jobs under existing zoning regulations.

Subsequent policy language in both the Portland Plan and the Comprehensive Plan direct the City to provide for the growth of colleges and hospitals while protecting adjoining residential neighborhoods Comp Plan Map.

Staff worked with a Project Advisory Group (PAG) and had 11 meetings with these representatives from institutions, neighborhood associations and business districts. We also had about 50 additional meetings with others to arrive at the staff proposal.

The strategies in the proposal apply to 15 dispersed campus institutions. Each of these are 10 acre or larger sites with more than 100 employees. The majority are located near residential neighborhoods subject to either a recurring Conditional Use Master Plan (CUMP) or Impact Mitigation Plan (IMP). Not included are hospitals on Marquam Hill and colleges and institutions within the Central City because they are either subject to their own plan district or they have Central City zones applied to them, so they have other regulatory structures to provide for their growth.

High school campuses of 10 acres or more are included on the map, but as the project moved forward, we realized we didn't have the capacity to work with high schools at this time. Some of the work may provide a template about how the City regulates these campuses in the future.

The proposal includes 3 components:

1. Create 2 new Campus Institutions base zones that (a) encourage campuses to grow up, not out, and (b) focus on the edges and off-site impacts.
2. Apply zones to the 15 specific campuses and replace existing Conditional Use Master Plans and Impact Mitigation Plans.
3. Provide for a transitional period.

The proposed base zones are:

- CI-1 for larger college campuses typically located within residential neighborhoods with lower development typology.
- CI-2 for more intensive development associated with hospitals and PCC campuses.

Allowed Land Uses and Development Standards for each zone reflect this difference.

John walked through the application and how each of the two zones would look and function in terms of allowed land uses and development standards.

Commissioner Smith: Wouldn't the same criteria for CI-2 apply to Good Samaritan Hospital in Northwest?

- All hospitals will be zoned CI-2 in this proposal.

Commissioner Schultz asked about building dormitories - how they support the primary institution work and what the process for these building permits is.

- Staff in BDS who administer the zoning code currently need to determine dormitory building applicability. It's not necessarily ownership, but when the application is made, BDS staff need to determine the construction is in support of the primary function of the institution.
Commissioner Schultz would like more information about how this is determined.

Commissioner Oxman: For commercial uses by right, is this restricted by the mission of the primary use of the institution?

- Unrelated development could occur on a CI-2 campus.

Commissioner Oxman: What is the policy rationale for allowing this?

- Currently the activities occur on these campuses (e.g. a credit union on a hospital campus). The focus has to be for the interior of the campus, not the surrounding neighborhood in the

current zoning. The institutions noted that property, particularly for hospital campuses, is very valuable to them and proximity to other functions on central campuses. The trend is to push some of the campus functions away from limited properties so they can devote more attention to their primary mission.

Commissioner Oxman: What was the reaction of local/neighborhood business people to this proposal?

- There was some apprehension in the CI-1 zones. An example is a proposal for a retail activity (e.g. a coffee shop). Commercial development in a CI-1 zone is a Conditional Use, so that is limited and has a higher review standard. Especially with hospitals, people often saw the campuses as dead zones, so providing services would fill a perceived gap to complete the street.

Chair Baugh: Biotech firms are closely connected to the hospital work. How does that play here, in terms of a hospital sponsoring research institutions?

- We are encouraging this type of adjacency in the CI-2 zones.

Building heights at the campus edges would depend on to what the campus is adjacent to: single-dwelling residential zones versus commercial and/or multifamily residential zones. They have a limited land resource in terms of development capacity, so we are less concerned about spin-off businesses.

Commissioner Oxman: In the CI-1 zone, FAR is .5 to 1. Why is that the ratio you chose?

- In developing these standards, we looked at existing development code standards, and we drew from that code language unless there was a reason to change. FAR of .5 to 1 is currently what's applied to a campus development in a single-family residential zone.

In instances where unique development standards have been negotiated through the CUMP or IMP process that are more detailed than can be accommodated through the base zone standards, specific height and setback standards are included in maps at the end of the Chapter 33.150. We didn't want to create a base zone around very specific standards, but we have developed maps for UP and Good Sam campuses (page 73 of the proposal).

While the proposal includes two new based zones, other zoning code sections' regulations will remain, including environmental and design overlays and plan districts. Outdoor athletic fields and limited retail sales and service uses will retain conditional uses status and be subject to conditional use reviews.

Traffic and Parking issues were identified as perhaps the biggest off-site impacts by adjoining neighborhood interests. Institutions are willing to mitigate for traffic impacts but worry about proportionality. We are proposing to continue the review and negotiate under a base zone scenario.

Under the proposal, Transportation Impact Reviews, including both a transportation impact analysis that matches proportional transportation system improvements to institutional growth, and an ongoing transportation demand management program promoting public and active transportation options over single occupancy vehicles, will be required. Mitigation measures will be required to ensure the transportation network continues to flow. PBOT will rely on expanded transportation impact analyses and transportation demand management (TDM) programs to achieve mode split targets established in the Transportation System Plan (TSP).

The TDM includes how many parking spaces an institution will provide on the campus to meet the needs of their visitors. Currently the City has negotiated this. Under the base zone approach, we can still negotiate the parking.

Commissioner Smith: What's the trigger for the parking and transportation review?

- Every 10 years, campuses need to update the Transportation Impact Review, even if they don't project any changes. When they come in for a building permit, that new building needs to be

anticipated in the existing Transportation Impact Review, or the campus will need to provide a new update.

The transportation review is a Type 2 review. It's a Type 1 in the commercial mixed-use zones. Institutions are much large places and trip-generators as opposed to individual buildings along corridors.

Chair Baugh: I'm concerned because of the commercial side and the parking/transportation planning.

- Those concerns should be directed to PBOT when we get to the TSP hearing.

The base zone land uses and development standards will be established in Titles 33 and new Transportation Impact Reviews will be included in Title 17. Then these new zones must then be applied to specific properties.

The series of 15 maps in the staff report identify the geographic location and extent of the proposed CI-1 and CI-2 zones (pages 119-133). These boundaries with limited exceptions correspond to approved CUMP and IMP boundaries or institutional ownership where there is no CUMP or IMP.

We are including a five year transition period in the proposal; institutions and neighborhoods can continue to rely on development entitlements and operating conditions attached to existing impact and master plans for approximately the next five years. After December 31, 2020, new development will be subject to the new zones and applicable code sections.

During the course of this preparing this proposal, staff worked with an advisory group comprised of representatives of institutions, neighborhoods and business associations. Based on these discussions and other outreach efforts, the PSC may expect to hear concerns related to these themes at the December 15 hearing:

- Inability of base zones to address unique circumstances.
- Loss of development entitlements included in existing IMP or CUMP.
- Transportation Impact Analysis and Transportation Demand Management uncertainty.

Commissioner Oxman: Why isn't decreasing the number of parking spaces on a campus a trigger for a TIA?

- Campus-wide transportation impact analysis doesn't and a TDM program in place so when they come in for individual building permits that negotiation has already taken place. Regarding the 4 parking spaces proposal, there is nothing magic about that number aside from BDS staff requesting some threshold so minor improvements on the campus won't trigger the need to update a review.
- Regarding decreasing spaces and the impact of that change, staff will follow up with PBOT to get clarification.

Commissioner Rudd: Some institutions are concerned about their right to develop. Can you clarify the transition period?

- In the proposed code language, all conditional use plans expire on December 31, 2020. We are trying to get everything online sooner to ease the staff work, but we are also trying to find the "sweet spot" for the transition time.

Commissioner Rudd: What if the specific building isn't reflected in the plan, but the number of trips are? Would the institution have to provide an updated plan?

- No, this is something we are trying to alleviate in this process. Institutions can provide a metric to describe the number of trips coming from their site and how they will accommodate these trips without being specific to where the trips are coming from.

Chair Baugh asked about Good Neighbor Agreements being eliminated because of legal issues. What is the impact of the elimination of these?

- Staff can return with a response.

R/W #7942, N Lombard St between N Richmond and N Charleston Avenues

Hearing / Recommendation: Lance Lindahl, Kurt Krueger

Lance provided an overview of the proposed vacation area as described in the staff report. There is still uncertainty where the north-easterly triangle will revert to. Mr. Bolouri has been negotiating with the property owner to the northeast, but despite the property owners' interest, they don't have a signed agreement just yet.

Alan Jones of Jones Architecture provided a presentation about the proposal and the project, The Union at St Johns. It's a 4-story mixed-use building with retail on the ground floor. He walked through the background of the St Johns Lombard Plan as well as the proposed vacation. As Lance noted, they are still working with the adjacent property owner to the northeast, and they have received support from various other neighbors and groups.

Testimony

1. Kristine Munholland: Lives a few blocks north of the proposal. Would like to request mitigation including for the 20-30 mature trees that will be lost; we should increase the tree replacement requirement. Traffic in this area is crazy; be aware that congestion is real, and I'm concerned about both the vacation and the building proposal. Also we need to look at the signal timing and phasing of lights in the area.
2. Clinton (CJ) Doxsee: Supports street vacation. Ivy Island is not pedestrian-friendly as it is right now. The slip-lane is a problem, particularly because it is right at the entrance to the neighborhood, right near an elementary school. The St Johns Lombard Plan calls to create a stronger gateway, calm traffic and enhance safety. The proposed plazas with the relocated historical sign will forward these objectives.
3. Lindsay Jensen, ED, St Johns Main Street Coalition: Supports the vacation of Ivy Island. Some people don't think the St Johns Lombard Plan is valuable and relevant, but the Main Street Coalition thinks otherwise. The conversation should be about ensuring the public has permanent access and that safety initiatives are at the forefront. This is one of the core gateways, and the vacation is consistent with the vision of the plan.
4. Shamus Lynsky, St Johns NA: Supports the vacation. We've had 3 public meetings that addressed the development. There is a vocal opposition to the plaza, but many people are in favor of the vacation, particularly for safety reasons.
5. Tom Stubblefield, St Johns Main Street Coalition: I've been in St Johns since before the plaza was there. The light used to be on Lombard and Charleston, and then they moved it down to Ivanhoe. The proposed plan makes sense, and it provides for a safer intersection and gateway into the neighborhood.
6. Richard Tennant: Opposes the vacation. I was unable to get ahold of PBOT, and they haven't responded to my inquiries about Lombard. St Johns is a busy corridor with an infinite number of trucks coming through the neighborhood, creating negative health impacts. This is a safety question for the people of St Johns and the dangerous traffic corridor. *See written testimony.*
7. Susan Tennant: Has lived many years in North Portland. I'm concerned about the pollution in St Johns. You cannot discriminate in area of low income and high diversity. I'm worried for the health and welfare of our children and community.
8. John Teply: Opposes the vacation. We do need a gateway, and the proposal doesn't give it to us. The vacation solves the problem of the intersection, but the loss of the gateway isn't worth it. *See written testimony.*

9. Curt Schneider: Supports the proposed vacation. The vegetated island is pretty, but in this location, safety outweighs the current use. *See written testimony.*

Commissioner Houck: There was reference to 20-30 mature trees from the first testifier, and I know there is significant forest canopy on Ivy Island. We saw reference to trees in the development proposal. Do you think that mitigates sufficiently?

They are black willow trees on the island. There are probably a half dozen trees. I'm not sure about the mitigation, but seeing trees on the plans for the two proposed sites is promising.

10. Laura Hoffar: Ivy Island is aesthetically pleasing, but I am in support of the vacation. Traffic concerns are still real. I'd like to see the developers work with PBOT. I like the elimination of the slip-lane, but truck traffic and congestion still needs to be fixed.
11. Billy Tosheff: I represent the adjacent property owner, and she is in favor of the vacation. We are certainly happy to continue to work with the developer.
12. Barbara Quinn: Worked on the 2004 St Johns Plan. We don't have enough density to support a full main street, but we do want to support our small businesses and keep them. We want to create a better pedestrian district that is safer for the community. I fully support the proposal. The vacation and proposal creates a safer environment, removes the berm, and creates a new plaza and better gateway. *See written testimony.*

Chair Baugh closed testimony at 6:57 p.m.

Written Testimony Received

Discussion

Commissioner Oxman: I'm concerned about the questions of slowing of truck traffic and pollution. Has there been any modeling of this, particularly about the loss of the slip-lane?

- We will slow traffic down, and it will cause some delay for truck traffic. But that will better accommodate pedestrian concerns.

Commissioner Smith: There was a deliberate plan in St Johns about where the truck route should go, and this is where we put the trucks.

Commissioner Smith: About bicycle facilities, are there are no bicycle improvements in the proposal?

- We are proposing a striped and dedicated bike lane in this proposal.

Commissioner Smith: The Streetcar System Master Plan has a route out Lombard to St Johns. Does the geometry of the intersection allow for a streetcar? I realize this is early in the process to think about that.

- We've done the analysis for a TriMet bus to go through, which is good, but no specific analysis for streetcars at this time.

Commissioner Smith: Regarding the trees, do any of our policies point towards replacing them if they are removed in a vacation?

Commissioner Rudd: Once you vacate the property, wouldn't tree code provisions apply?

Commissioner Houck: The only consideration for the environment in the report was related to views, not to the loss of tree canopy. The project sounds great, but we have an issue of losing mature trees citywide. I'm just saying I'm concerned that we mitigate for the loss of tree on Ivy Island and the East Plaza.

Commissioner Smith: Under our different tree codes, are these considered street trees?

- These are street trees in the public right-of-way, so they would have to be addressed per the Tree Code.

Can we add a condition to ensure the replacement of trees is equal?

Kurt: The PSC's recommendation goes to Council. Your letter of support for the vacation could include the strong note about maximizing the number of trees to be relocated and what's in the public plaza.

Commissioner Rudd: I like the more general tree statement as opposed to the one-for-one replacement idea. We are getting a huge benefit with the vacation, and I don't want to constrain the use of the property so much that the developer can't develop.

Commissioner Houck: It's important to remember all tree replacement doesn't have to be on the property. There can be planted trees nearby or contributions to a fee in lieu that will allow for trees to be planted elsewhere. We still have a citywide goal of 37 percent tree canopy (currently at 33 percent), and we will never get there unless we have full mitigation for loss of tree canopy. What we are experiencing is a death by a thousand cuts. We have to address cumulative impact of canopy loss.

Commissioner Smith: Regarding more people coming to St Johns with this development, that is a citywide growth issue. If we can do development on the main street near services, that can help to reduce VMT.

Chair Baugh asked about transit stops in the area. Will they move to the plaza area?

- We did contact TriMet about the bus stop that is currently there as you enter the slip-lane. They feel like it's safer to not continue with the stop on that area of the highway, so removing the one in the slip-lane is the safest thing to do.

Chair Baugh raised a concern of the gateway to St Johns. Neighborhoods fight to be preserved and recognized in plans. I like the development, but I'm concerned about losing the gateway. I'm not in favor of moving forward unless the developer can recognize the gateway.

- We are proposing to relocate the sign onto the East Plaza. St Johns Boosters owns the sign. We are proposing to relocate it before you enter the slip-lane, which actually may enhance the gateway.

PBOT is working to explore a community plaza design effort if the property owners don't come to agreement before the Council hearing.

Commissioner Smith asked if the PSC wants to approve with the mitigation for trees. Or if we want to send it back to staff for the inclusion of a tree statement/proposal.

Motion

Commissioner Houck moved the staff recommendation with the requirement/condition for staff to work with the developer and Urban Forestry Program to develop the tree mitigation before the plan goes to Council. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

The motion passed.

(Y6 – Baugh, Houck, Oxman, Rudd, Smith, St Martin)

Powell-Division Portland Action Plan

Hearing: Joe Zehnder, Radcliffe Dacanay, April Bertelsen, Karl Dinkelspiel, Kate Deane

Presentation

April gave an overview of the project and provided context for the local action plan, which is the focus of consideration today.

The plan works to connect communities to education, healthcare and jobs in the corridor and beyond. The project is led by Metro in coordination with a number of agency partners and TriMet, which are all represented on the Steering Committee. The Steering Committee also includes community stakeholders, so everyone is at the table together.

There are four project goals:

- Transportation
- Well-being
- Equity
- Efficiency

Embedded in the goals are Portland Plan and Comp Plan policies that have helped to reinforce these goals so they are aligned.

We can return with more information for feedback about the Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) in the next couple of months, but tonight's meeting is about the local action plan for Portland.

The three major stages of the project timeline are:

- The planning process, in which the action plans (transit and local actions) were created. We just finished this portion.
- In September, we officially entered into Project Development (design) phase.
- If all goes well, construction will occur 2018-2020.

Metro has led the public outreach and coordination for the project, which has included engagement with:

- Youth and local businesses.
- Latino, Chinese, Vietnamese, Russian, Tongan, Bhutanese and Native American groups.
- Participation at community events and related projects' events.
- Staff sessions.

This is an umbrella plan with the aim of all the plans achieving the overall project outcomes.

Radcliffe walked through the Portland Action Plan.

The Design and Development Direction focuses on major opportunity areas that align with Centers and Corridors in the Comp Plan. Examples include 162nd Ave & Division; Division Midway; 122nd Ave and Division.

The plan also aims to achieve goals beyond transit to create grow emerging, complete communities such as in the Jade District. Health, safe and connected neighborhoods. Reduce existing disparities. Reduce involuntary displacement of residents and businesses.

Housing, PDC, PBOT and BPS have been working to sharpen and coordinate actions. The updated actions now include information about timing and funding, which wasn't available before. We are planning to ensure the City is coordinated to carry out community development actions and that community continues to participate in process.

Karl noted that the overarching affordable housing goal is to develop and preserve affordable units. There is very limited funding from PHB, which is mostly via TIF. But we have very few robust tools to ensure displacement doesn't happen here. PHB would have trouble finding the funding for the kinds of community building and development this plan calls for.

Kate highlighted work on strengthening business and job opportunities, which includes building on current work with NPIs, developing new programs that help businesses thrive and creating more job opportunities for local residents. We want to make connections intentionally.

The Design and Transit portion of the plan focuses on placemaking: it works toward the vision crafted by the community to increase safety and connectivity in opportunity areas and to work off the strengths of existing character of these opportunity area. Improving safety and active transportation; access to transit; and enhancing transit service and transfer are key components. We want to activate and reflect the communities in the corridor with opportunities such as food carts, farmers markets and depave projects.

Funding is mostly existing funding and grants. We can seek additional funds via the potential of a new URA, other options such as LISC and Raza Development Funds and additional budget requests. The coordination group is looking into this.

Testimony

Susan: This project is a great showcase of how we've worked across the "silos" in the City and with other partners. I think there is more interest in the project than the lack of testimony we've seen.

Chair Baugh closed oral testimony at 7:46 p.m. Written testimony will remain open until November 30 at 5 p.m.

Written Testimony Received

Discussion

Commissioner Smith asked about how all the components of the plan are adopted.

- By resolution by Council.

Commissioner Smith: Have we conducted displacement/risk analysis in this corridor?

- Displacement Risk Factors (slide 16) show the study area. The darker the color, the more displacement factors. Risk factors include:
 - Renters > 45%
 - Education Level / without a Bachelor's Degree > 56%
 - Household Income at or Below 60% MFI > 43%
 - Communities of Color > 27%

Commissioner Smith: The letter from the Steering Committee members asks for some fairly radical things. If we look at the history of transit project in Portland, we've seen lots of displacement. How do we do it right in this corridor?

- Joe: This is an evolution in how we are planning now. On the risk factor diagram, the impacts are about what's going on currently, even before BRT, showing that risk factors are independent of a transit investment. We need to pay attention to these factors regardless of transportation improvements. Actions we have in the plan are more focused and include dollar figures. This is a concise approach, but we know we still have the funding gap.
- Karl: We use about \$100,000 in City subsidy per new housing unit.
- We don't know the overall funding gap at this time.

Susan: When staff comes back, we can bring forward the key points from the PSC so we can put this all together in a letter of recommendation to Council. What you put in your letter to Council will have a big impact on funding.

We're going to make a public investment that we know has lots of benefits and negative consequences. I want to know the resources address.

Commissioner Houck: Gentrification is a two-sided coin. I'm interested in wealth-creation for people who own their homes can be quite a benefit. Do we have information about this side of the coin?

- Karl: I'm not sure we can quantify this, but for example, in N/NE the experience even of owners was that they felt uneducated, and many left their homes leaving a lot on the table. And another of other factors having to do with the homeowner that influence their ability to stay.

Commissioner Houck: A strategy might be around homeowner education. I know the Portland Housing Center has renter and home owner education programs. That should be one of the tools we use.

- Yes, but we can't use TIF for these types of opportunities, so it again is a funding issue.

Commissioner St Martin: With the displacement risk factors balanced with need for more affordable housing, we know we're not going to create enough. It's just as important to figure out ways to keep owners in their homes, which is a different set of tools. Give us some good ideas that we can support.

Commissioner Oxman: The Action Plan is good, but I'm also concerned about how the funding is being approached. Housing/social development is not funded like TOD. What can we do as the PSC? We see a lot of projects using grant funding for transportation and place-making, but the more development-oriented actions get a "should" comment – mostly labeled as funding that is TBD or not identified. What about setting specific housing and development goals, and the resources we need to accomplish them. We may or may not achieve the goals the first time out, but this approach states their importance and keeps the goals active at the program and policy levels. I think this is a healthier way to approach this perhaps. Is there something the PSC can do to promote a more accountable approach? There is opportunity for success here, but we need to acknowledge that it can be risky from a bureaucratic perspective.

- Karl: This is a citywide problem. PHB is developing a toolkit that could be applied citywide to help with this. Federal tools are very limited. PHB is proposing tools that will come before City Council that can help. The PSC can get behind these initiatives, which would be a huge step.
- April: It is through the Local Action Plan that the conversation about a new URA came up, thinking about how we fund this. Also, the transit project is not yet funded, so we are on the same plane as the local plan. The ballpark cost is in the \$150M range to maximize federal investment (\$75M cap... max project costs can be \$250M).

Commissioner Smith: There isn't currently a Local Improvement District (LID) included in the plan. What about asking the "winners" to contribute via an LID?

- At this time we aren't considering an LID. Conversation has been around SDC funds being part of the Portland contribution.

Commissioner Rudd: When looking at funding strategies, also look at ways to lower the cost per affordable unit.

Commissioner Schultz: Is a part of the effort someone taking the time to study what's happening today and where we end up? And/or are there other programs that can participate and learn?

- Joe: We do have this built in the project and are continuing work with Professor Bates at PSU regarding displacement and program design for the housing folks. In the next phase, Bates will look at the households and choices so we'll have information over time to see how this unfolds. The other way to do this is to do a fiscally constrained plan, but that will not be enough to meet our objectives; so this is the tension.

Susan: If we weren't doing the BRT at all, we'd be having the same conversation, maybe 5-15 percent "less bad". When you look at the displacement factors, we don't include the market factors, which really makes things shift and cause displacement.

Commissioner Houck: When Robert Liberty was Metro councilor, we looked at the concept of a windfall tax regarding the UGB. When the UGB is expanded and urban reserves established the result is dramatic increase in land value. With this project we need to think creatively and aggressively about how we can capture some of this increased value that gets invested to help things we want to do.

Chair Baugh: We know market forces play into it. In N/NE, we had a sense of gentrification, but we didn't know the extent to which it would occur. Today we know – we have data – we know it's going to happen. We need to mitigate the effects. This transit project can exacerbate the problem, and we need to do better than say we're going to look for funding and a plan while we still build. I can't support that. We have to show statistically, through Title VI, implications. I'm concerned because to me this seems like we have no mitigation measures, even just to preserve housing and the people currently in the neighborhoods. I can't recommend to propose this project to Council.

- *Joe:* This is a very good argument, and I wouldn't be surprised if that is ultimately the recommendation from the PSC to Council. But what we're talking about along this corridor is happening with or without BRT. Technically, we up-zoned this corridor in the 1980s, so land values were put in motion, and now, the market is finally catching up. We do need to look at the Title VI linkages.

Commissioner Smith: If this is \$150M, it doesn't seem unreasonable to find 10 percent or so of that to work on the community impacts. This investment will create lots of winners. We need to look out for those who will bear the burdens.

Karl: In our last count, we had 2000 people literally homeless and 20,000 people under-housed in Portland. This does shine a light on this issue and says it is a citywide problem.

Commissioner Rudd: Federal funding can in part be budgeted to things like public art. What can you spend the combined money on? I'd like to understand this better.

Joe: The proportionality question Chris asked may get at what Gary was saying – what is our target for success and how do we define it?

Commissioner Oxman thanked staff for the engaged conversation this evening for these important issues. *Chair Baugh* concurred.

The project staff will return to a PSC meeting for further discussion and a PSC vote / recommendation.

Adjourn

Chair Baugh adjourned the meeting at 8:35 p.m.