



**Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #10**  
**Approved Summary**  
**January 21, 2014; 5:30 – 8:30 pm**  
**1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., Room 2500A**

**Members**

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

## Alternates

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

## Project Team/Staff

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

## Public

Wendy Rahm
Suzanne Lennard
Cathy Galbraith
Rebecca Liu
Lynn Longfellow
Mary Vogel
Andrew Yaden
Jeremy Young
Eve Nilenders

---

Reza Farhoodi

---

Allan Classen

---

Scott Shumaker

---

Marcus Lee

---

### **Welcome and Announcements**

Co-Chair **Katherine Schultz** welcomed SAC members, underscoring the transition at these next two meetings – to focus on the district level detail – goals, policies and action items.

### ***Overview of Agenda & Calendar Review***

Facilitator **Kirstin Greene** reviewed the agenda. She went over the format for the district-focused discussions. She said co-chair Karen Williams could not make it tonight, and sends her apologies.

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

**Kirstin** asked SAC members if they had any corrections or comments on the meeting summary.

**Jeanne Galick:** Regarding Jim Gardner’s comments on the widening of the sidewalks, the comment recording didn’t catch the gist of what he was saying on why we would widen. He is not here tonight, but hopefully he will correct the summary himself.

**Kirstin** asked SAC members to provide any changes via email and that the SAC Meeting #9 summary will be considered final on Friday and posted to the website.

### ***Calendar and Event Updates***

**Karl Lisle** gave a brief overview of the schedule including the remaining SAC meetings, district area meetings with the neighborhood associations, and open house in March. Karl asked SAC members to let him know if there are other groups the team should reach out to for the district area meetings. The full schedule can be viewed in the meeting packet online here: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/477588>.

**Katherine Schultz:** We have heard testimony from Wendy Rahm that she has had great success getting people to meetings. Maybe we can work with her to get more involvement, particularly for the West End meeting.

**Wendy Rahm:** I’m happy to help.

### **Willamette River Central Reach Workshop Results**

**Debbie Bischoff** gave a brief overview of the workshop results. The Willamette River Central Reach Urban Design Concept handout can be viewed here: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/479549>.

Participants provided ideas and comments from the river’s perspective rather than from the land perspective (e.g., boaters and people who use the river). There is keen interest in acknowledging the past and preservation for the future. Human access in and along the river is

key. Specific to the West Quadrant, participants want to expand recreational boating and felt that human access and habitat can be compatible at locations like the Hawthorne Bowl. Participants also suggested clustering commercial uses and attractions. The concept will help shape the District Plan, Southeast Quadrant Plan and overall Central City Plan.

The City will be soliciting comments until March 31<sup>st</sup>. We are also presenting to the Southeast Quadrant SAC and will have a display at the open house in March. The concept will evolve over time and may be refined and changed based on feedback.

**Jeanne Galick:** Were there ideas about how to fund these things at the workshop?

**Staff:** Let's make sure we don't lose that but it will be more important in implementation.

**Steve Pinger:** On both sides of the river, destinations are a block or two away from the river. Are there thoughts about how more intensive/substantial activities can occur on the waterfront?

**Staff:** That is the balance that we need to achieve. We want more activities to happen.

Perhaps we can achieve this at OMSI with lightrail coming in and then the Greenway. We are looking at adjacent redevelopment along Naito to increase human presence and activity at the waterfront. The east side is more of a challenge.

**Patricia Gardner:** I have been on past committees looking at the freeway loop and it's been suggested to get rid of the freeway on the east side and put it underground. Since this is a 25 year plan is that being discussed at all when talking about the Central East Side? If you don't say it, it will never happen.

**Staff:** It is known that people want to do something better with the freeway on the east side. Our assumption is that it is beyond 25 years. The SE Quadrant process will likely say something about it longer-term. Figuring out the details of it is beyond our plan.

**Patricia Gardner:** We are looking 20 years in the future. Three committees (one after another) that have all said get rid of it. If it's not even in the document, then 20 years from now it seems crazy to not even have as a topic of the conversation.

**Staff:** We will likely put something in the plan about continuing to work on the issue for eventual relocation of the freeway.

**Katherine Schultz:** Cycling back to what Steve said, we have such hard edges at the river with few opportunities for pedestrians to be on the water. Boating, etc. would also be great.

**Staff:** We have heard this desire from the public as well. On the east side there is one opportunity for a beach and access to the water. On the west side there are two. There are also opportunities at docks for boating access.

**Katherine Schultz:** How you offer opportunities for the public at large to gather on the river and make it like a public hangout is important.

**Catherine Ciarlo:** Do you talk about how current large events would mesh with some of these things suggested on the map?

**Staff:** This is just an initial concept. We know there are issues and things to address. That will come out in the details of the plan. This is more of a pictorial acknowledgement. We know we need to look at this.

**Debbie** said that staff is starting to work as a larger team, taking feedback for further refinement. There is a section in the packet related to Willamette River policies that staff would like feedback on. Some policies may rise from the District level to Quadrant or Central Reach-wide level. Please send comments directly to Debbie or to Karl and the team will get them.

## **Green Loop Concept Presentation**

**Mark Raggett** gave a brief presentation of the Green Loop Concept. The key objectives are to support public health, businesses, trail system enhancement, bicycle riding and green building and growth. The Green Loop document / handout can be viewed here:

<http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/478158>. The full presentation can be viewed online here: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/480420>

**Dan Petrusich:** Does the loop match the trolley?

**Staff:** It shadows it.

**Nolan Leinhart:** What did you find in your research about fitting into widths of right-of-way? From other places? Were there successful examples of mixing it up? Or just on the greenway? I am excited to see this on the Park Blocks, but it will be hard to figure out how to make it work since the curb-to-curb is very narrow.

**Staff:** There are a lot of success stories of mixed use, ped/bike only, and mixed street environments. We could do this with narrow streets.

**Jeff Martens:** This is great and I have no objections. I would encourage you to think about how the Green Loop could plug some holes for the park needs of kids and people with families. Since this goes through all regions of the Central City, how could it fill some gaps?

**Mary Valeant:** I love the idea. I didn't have a vehicle for several years. Getting from point A to point B on a bike is important to the success of the City. How can we incorporate more fast track, true commuting, cycling opportunity along or over the I-405?

**Staff:** This wouldn't be the only part of the network. There would be other areas that would cater to faster riders. This would cater to a much larger chunk of riders in addition to these commuters/confident riders.

**Steve Pinger:** Is there a general sense of what the implementation strategy might be?

**Staff:** We don't have that now. We have to work with our partners to map this out. We will think about this most likely in the summer.

**Jeff Martens:** I keep hearing transportation. Is this a transportation initiative or another type? If we need to move people on bikes through the city then a lot of this isn't needed.

**Staff:** This is a combined set of initiatives. Transportation is part of it. It also has a big open space, pedestrian and future development organization piece to it as well.

**Jeff Martens:** We need to decide if transportation is the key element or if it's bigger than that. Can it be a core transportation thing with parks and retail? That's a big conflict.

**Staff:** Your point is taken. We are looking into this and are working together.

## **Public Comment**

Co-chair **Katherine Schultz** asked members of the public to introduce themselves and limit their verbal testimony to two minutes. Additional written comments are welcome at any time. The public will also have the opportunity to contribute at the upcoming district area meetings.

**Jackie Peterson:** I am hearing support that the language and tone is heading in the right direction. We like the emphasis on historic districts. I appreciate recommendations for the portion south of Burnside. There is starting to be a conversation about north of Burnside to address problems. Glad to be part of the solution. We really do envision a major transformation

of this district. I think it's possible. It would be a good idea to have round table discussions with property owners.

**Cathy Galbreith:** I see a height reduction that we can campaign for in Chinatown, but find myself not trusting it. There is still confusion with the 75 foot height. I don't disagree that the National Register nomination process could use an update but the door could swing both ways. A group of us did a historic building inventory at the request of the Landmarks Commission. Please get this information. I found Steve Pinger's emails on density and heights to be exceptionally good discussion between SAC and staff.

**Wendy Rahm:** Tonight I am happy to announce that I am recently taking heart from other quarters. You may have read the many articles in the London *Financial Times* and the *New York Times* about current thinking in urban planning circles, echoing what you have been hearing from the public attending these meetings. The world out there is changing. More importantly, there are increasing numbers of Portland voices you should be listening to.

You all might have read the January 8 *Oregonian* editorial, "Meeting Challenges with Vision": a clarion call to keep Portland Portland. You may have read my letter, published the following Sunday, that reinforced that call to "keep Portland Portland," as applied to the unprotected, historic buildings in the West End. You also may have read the op-ed by Michael Mehaffey in last Sunday's *Oregonian*, outlining why devaluing and destroying historic buildings is done at great risk, even those buildings that some may dislike. You may not realize that Mr. Mehaffey is a well-informed, internationally recognized sustainability consultant who has worked at senior levels of government in the UK and around the world. He knows what the rest of the world has learned and is saying about tall buildings, historic preservation and sustainability. He has spoken several times to you. Like him, I don't want Portland to become sidelined as passé in urban planning circles. This committee just might be taking us there.

And you have hopefully read Alan Classen's articles in the *NW Examiner*, arguing for mid-rise buildings and recently pointing out the problems with voices being left off of important committees around town and of sidelining public in-put. Does that ring a bell here?

You also should have read the Executive Director's letter in the latest Boscoe Milligan publication, *News and Notes*, on building heights, density and staff pushing back hard against voices both for historic preservation and for midrise development. The letter calls for specific protective language, especially for unprotected ("contributing") buildings, in the West Quadrant Plan.

And lastly, I have two artistic entertainment recommendations for you: The first is a new play by well-respected American playwright Amy Freed that will be mounted by Artist Repertory Theater in Goose Hollow, called *The Monster-Builder*. It will enlighten us all about how starchitecture projects and planners are shaping our world, with unhappy results. My last recommendation is the movie *Her*. The backdrop of this horrifying movie is tall, glassy, cold, impersonal, dominating, and ultimately dehumanizing tall buildings, mirroring a dehumanized people, used to social isolation and nearly incapable of relating to real-life people.

At some point, we need to stop and think about the repercussions of for profit industries and isolated planners leading us away from our history and our humanity, building tall buildings as places to *park* their money but tall buildings *they* wouldn't consider living in permanently with *their* families. Committee members: There are similar calls coming from many other voices besides mine.

**Mary Vogel:** I would like the river planners to give us some examples where habitat has in fact been improved by bringing in a lot more human uses. This needs to be done carefully. It hasn't materialized in the plan yet how that will be done.

**Rebecca Liu:** Thank you for moving the higher building limitation line back to the west side of 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue. New Chinatown is a unique place. It is our ground zero: original groups of Asian immigrants started their journey here. They have struggled with hardships, but are resilient and made the most remarkable success stories. We cannot lose historical buildings. Trading historical assets for development is not wise.

**Lynn Longfellow:** Thank you for making that change that Rebecca mentioned. I appreciate changes in the latest draft. There is great importance in the historic district and in protecting multi-ethnicity and diversity. We truly support development and revitalization of the neighborhood and want to be part of the solution. Japanese and Chinese people have a shared vision for this neighborhood. We have started to meet and formed the Old Town Heritage Group, moving forward and exploring sites. We want to be a catalyst for change. We do want to ask you to be mindful of where the proposed height increases are and their size. We aren't against the height, but you cannot separate history, culture and character from the place.

### **Discussion Draft District Goals, Policies and Actions Introduction and Discussion**

**Karl** said that tonight we will review the first three of seven district area draft policies. The *Introduction to West Quadrant Discussion Drafts – Goals, Policies and Actions* handout can be viewed online here: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/article/477588>.

He explained that staff tried to focus on what was unique to each area. As you go through the drafts you will see places where staff has indicated policies or actions that may bubble up to a Central City-wide item – and come out of the district document. Karl asked the groups to focus on the district *policies* tonight. He then asked if there were any questions about the draft policies and how they are supposed to work.

**Cathy Galbreith:** Do you want people to pay attention to the timeline?

**Staff:** We will take your comments, but do not want to spend a lot of time discussing it tonight.

**Katherine Schultz:** Goal statements - are they goals or just statements or what is already there?

**Staff:** They are goal statements but written in a way that makes it sound like they have already happened. They are like a mini vision. We want to know if this is the right target information.

**Jeanne Galick:** Consider the overarching things for the Central City Plan such as housing. In Downtown, we want a mix of housing, but in Old Town we want less of a mix – when is it appropriate to add these things?

**Staff:** We are a little confused about that as well. The Concept Plan provides a good overview of policies relevant to the entire Central City. We continue to identify things that we need to say about the whole Central City, but there will be additional comments to make things specific for the district plans (i.e., type of mix of housing). In Goose Hollow we know they want additional park space. That's a place where we would want to say something specific about parks in that district. For housing, we could say we want to have a balance of types in the Central City – and in districts with a current imbalance, we could add specifics on how to correct that imbalance. In the case of Old Town/Chinatown the vast majority of housing units today are very low-income

restricted units. To achieve the desired balance there, we need policies and actions intended to increase the supply of middle or upper income units.

### **District Discussions on Discussion Drafts and Report Back**

**Karl** briefly reviewed the discussion format and goals. Tonight there will be a small group discussion on Goose Hollow, Old Town/China Town and South Downtown/University District. There is also a fourth table for members of the public to discuss these three sub-districts. Members of the public are welcome to sit in and listen to the SAC member discussion or have their own discussion with staff at the public table. Karl also said that the feedback sheets need to be turned in by Friday.

**Karl** reminded SAC members to consider the equity checklist during their discussion tonight. Are there equity considerations that we should be aware of? We did have an equity lens early in the process. We forwarded an updated version in the packet for you to think about. Ask yourself if there are things that could be big equity issues moving forward.

### ***Public Group Report Back***

**Rebecca Liu** gave a brief overview of the public group's discussion.

#### *Old Town / Chinatown*

District goals:

- Everyone at the table felt pretty comfortable with the goals.
- The language in the last part of the goal, "safe and respectful" should be more specific and corresponding action items should be identified. Law enforcement attention or an increase in patrolling might help to improve these issues. That element of the goal lacks identifiable action items.

Policies:

- Cultural assets – add *art*. It's not just culture and history. It would be great to have a multicultural art / museum complex.
- We discussed parking and how that would be affected.
- Entertainment district – it needs to be included somewhere in here as it affects all aspects of the district – not just housing, but businesses as well. As it exists right now, it has a negative impact on businesses and residents. Property and business owners need to be part of the conversation to come up with solutions. We love the idea of the entertainment district but not the form that it is in today.
- Urban design (page 6) – there is a sentiment that the protection of buildings in historic districts needs to be included further.
- Policy UD2: Update of National Register. We would like to take it out.

*Goose Hollow:*

- There needs to be an historic survey done in Goose Hollow which has not been done yet. There is concern about losing historical housing.
- Thought that "residential" language should be added to the district goal. Goose Hollow is a family friendly "residential" community.

- Concern about RC1 in the actions. Concern about historical portions of area but also concern about shading to the north.
- Switch from RX to CX was a concern and we would like it put on hold.

### ***Old Town / Chinatown Table***

**Karl** gave a brief overview of the Old Town / Chinatown discussion. He said there was a lot of great discussion and we only finished about half of it. We will have a follow up via email and other conversations.

District Goals:

- We got it pretty close but didn't really capture the entire area – left off areas outside of historic district.
- Regional hub / transportation emphasis needs to be included.

Policies:

There are three big things that need follow-up:

- We need to balance housing and social service concentrations.
- Entertainment district – there is not a lot of love for it. SAC members do not like it in its current form. Entertainment component need to be revitalized, but in a different way.
- Burnside-Couch couplet project to address deficiencies in that area. Need to discuss that further. Need an action item that gets us to a solution there.

### ***Goose Hollow Table***

**Kathryn Hartinger** gave a brief overview of the Goose Hollow discussion.

- We need to be clearer about differentiating what area in Goose Hollow we are talking about in different areas of the draft.
- Need to elevate Burnside issues. The group felt policies were needed in both housing/neighborhoods and transportation.
- Activate Salmon. There is interest in Salmon as an active Green Street with retail.
- Need to be clearer about open spaces being for active/recreational use.
- Need to add an urban health piece under environment. With Goose Hollow so close to I-405 and Hwy 26, we need to be looking at air quality.

### ***South Downtown / University District***

**Mark** and **Debbie** gave a brief overview of the South Downtown / University District discussion.

- District is a key link between downtown, southwest, South Waterfront, etc. and we need to strengthen that role.
- There are issues around getting into and around this district. It is hard to know what is interesting in this district. Hard to get into these places that have neat functions etc.
- Need to elevate I-405 and freeway as policy. There is an issue with the barrier they create. We are not speaking about this loudly enough in the policies.
- Comments about this being a green city and the sustainability aspects of PSU and the larger district need to be fleshed out further. Environment needs to be better addressed here.
- Waterfront also needs to be addressed. We cannot take for granted human use and environment being compatible.

- This is a mixed neighborhood, not just a student neighborhood. How do we encourage this mix and provide for housing and amenities that service a broad range of groups – i.e. families, elderly etc.
- Environment should be mentioned in all overarching goals.
- Would like to see more development of retail corridors (i.e. Broadway).
- How to encourage jobs and synergy between PSU and technology companies that might want to locate in this area.
- Inclusionary zoning requires broader conversations.
- Interest for more parks in this area with more playgrounds and amenities for families with children.

**Kirstin** asked SAC members to give us any additional written comments by the end of the week via email.

Co-Chair **Katherine** thanked everyone for their active participation.

The meeting adjourned 8:22 pm.