



## **Central City 2035 Steering Committee**

### **Meeting Minutes – July 10, 2012, 5:00-6:30pm**

**1900 SW 4th Avenue, Room 7A**

#### **Group members in attendance:**

Amy Lewin, Veronica Rinard, Bill Scott, Ethan Seltzer, Mary Wahl, Michael Zokoych

#### **Group members not in attendance:**

Chet Orloff (Co-chair), Michelle Rudd (Co-chair), Andre Baugh, Bernie Bottomly, Wink Brooks, Erin Flynn, Patricia Gardener, Heather Hoell, James McGrath, Jeff Miller, Linda Nettekoven, Paddy Tillett

#### **Staff in attendance:**

Susan Anderson, Shannon Buono, Troy Doss, Peter Englander, Elisa Hamblin, Steve Iwata, Kevin Kilduff, Mark Raggett, Nan Stark, Joe Zehnder

#### **Public in attendance:**

Suzanne Lennard, Wendy Rahm

#### **Agenda**

- Welcome, Introductions, Agenda Review
- Planning Framework
- Urban Design Concept
- Next Steps
- Public Input

#### **Introductions**

- Joe Zehnder welcomed the group and excused the two co-chairs who were unable to attend. He outlined the agenda for the evening and turned the time over to Troy.

#### **Planning Framework**

- Troy introduced the revised version of the policy framework. He noted new changes were incorporating comments that he had received as well as minor word changes and editing versus substantive changes. Page 2 does include a new policy 13 which talks about economic diversity. It tries to identify policies and agendas that are in place elsewhere. Everything else is just a little bit of word-smithing here and there.
- Troy asked the group how they would like to review the document. Joe suggested it be reviewed page by page.
- Troy stated a word of two was replaced on the first four goals.
- Veronica Rinard asked if on number 6 under policies if we want to say cultural events and institutions. She was also confused about the use of the word tourism.
- Troy said we could just scratch the word tourism in the last reference.
- Joe asked to move onto page 2, which includes a lot of the clean-up that we talked about last time.
- Michael Zokoych questioned the need to call out specific types of businesses in policy 13. He felt instead we should rely on the term diversity.
- Joe stated that it's in alignment with the Portland Plan and the definition and purpose of reducing disparities. Some version of what we're talking about and groups that experience structural barriers. It's nothing other than the characteristic they have that puts them as part of that group
- Michael stated he understood but some groups were being left out.
- Joe stated there was better honed language that's available to broaden the terms.
- Bill Scott stated he felt it should say more than just diversity, you need to say what you mean by that.

- Ethan commented that you really don't mean economic diversity. He asked what an emerging business was.
- Susan stated it's a legal term; an emerging business is a small business. She agreed with Joe about pulling language from the Portland Plan and show the relationship to equity.
- Joe stated there was more information in the previous version of the policies.
- Ethan offered that staff should work out language.
- Joe clarified timing of public comment and offered time for ongoing comments during the meeting.
- Suzanne Lennard (audience) encouraged staff to put goal 5 back again.
- Troy stated goal 5 was removed in because it seemed redundant with goal 2.
- Suzanne stated goal 2 doesn't include social interaction and the resulting creativity.
- Troy asked for any other comments on page 1.
- Bill commented he didn't notice it was missing.
- Troy said we could find a way to bring it back.
- Joe asked for clarification and Bill stated it was the kind of economy we are looking for.
- Michael asked if you could replace the word with social qualities?
- Joe said it was about density of activities and interactions.
- Veronica commented it was about meeting spaces.
- Ethan said goal 12 could agree with it.
- Peter Englander wondered about the concept since much interaction is taking place in non-public spaces. These policies will help justify these 3<sup>rd</sup> spaces.
- Joe stated Michael was right and it can be incorporated and included with public realm as well. He moved the group to page 3.
- Michael asked for the reasoning of using 'and' rather than an ampersand.
- Troy stated it was a stylistic choice.
- Wendy Rahm (audience) asked that the wording in goal 5 be changed to 'dense' vs. high-density. She felt it was important to distinguish between both.
- Joe asked for reactions on that comment and stated the group did discuss it before and stuck with it.
- Ethan said we could be so bold to say Oregon's highest density center.
- Joe stated the purpose is to call out that there is a range of densities.
- Bill felt the suggestion could work.
- Amy Lewin stated the suggestion was made at the last meeting and was resisted.
- Wendy stated that you have high-density in other parts. This is the housing and neighborhoods section and if you are talking about livability you should use dense. Portland can be the leader in more livable cities.
- Joe stated that we did have this discussion and was afraid we could lose the intent.
- Troy referenced the original document in the Advisory Group days that stated it as the most dense and successful urban center in Oregon. People had issue with the word most at that time.
- Veronica didn't feel the reference or comparison to other places was necessary. If other cities change is the comparison still accurate?
- Bill said most successful is ambiguous.
- Ethan reminded the group this was direction for the quadrant plans. What do the quadrants need to know?
- Troy said a successful dense, mixed-use center.
- Ethan, Peter, and other agreed.
- Mary Wahl asked for clarification as to the change.
- Suzanne suggested adding a reference to social living as a key component to healthy active living policy. Physical health in many ways is also dependent on social health. Being part of a community can dictate your physical health.
- Bill asked if there was language for this in the Portland Plan?
- Susan made a suggestion to the wording: "Central City neighborhoods to support physically and socially active and healthy lifestyles."
- Suzanne agreed.

- Michael made an objection that this was forcing a value system on certain people that some ways of living are better than others.
- Joe felt it was really just pointing to research about the determinants of health including social connections.
- Bill agreed with Joe. The City has an interest in supporting this.
- Mary agreed.
- Joe moved the group to page 4 of the document.
- Ethan asked about policy 4. It seemed like a blanket statement that may not be applicable to all the quadrant plans. There may be quadrants where there is no tourist or commercial use. He was concerned that we should every opportunity everywhere.
- Bill asked why we don't use language about where appropriate.
- Ethan stated he had a made a suggestion similar to that before but that it was not received well. The quadrant work should determine where it is and is not appropriate.
- Veronica stated it wasn't a blanket statement because it just says increase opportunities.
- Ethan said it wouldn't increase everywhere.
- Bill said it doesn't say throughout.
- Joe said it's a balancing effect.
- Susan commented that these policies can be in conflict with each other, it's just the nature of the document. They need to be read together and acknowledged that there is a balancing.
- Troy stated we typically have language supporting the balancing and appropriateness.
- Joe said one way to think about it is as each says where appropriate.
- Michael said you start the document that way.
- Joe commented that we have to include swimmable, fishable, trails, connections.
- Michael stated that he felt this issue doesn't need to be clouded.
- Ethan asked if everyone was confident that the quadrant planning will be able to deal with this issue than that is great.
- Veronica said goal 8 talks about habitat and people. Inherent in that is some planning around habitat.
- Troy stated that political and physical realities in Portland make it almost impossible along the waterfront.
- Susan asked if the word choice of increase was creating a quantitative statement.
- Joe stated that was an intentional choice
- Ethan said then put where appropriate.
- Bill increase means increase in total amount, not everywhere.
- Steve Iwata highlighted what has happened in the N/NE Quadrant. For instance they looked at river access there but there was little opportunity.
- Peter commented they did things where appropriate.
- Mary had some disagreement with the statement in question. The integration language was missing. The Willamette River is the one place where we should talk about net increase.
- Troy asked if seek was an appropriate word.
- Mary agreed with that option.
- Michael felt that the intention was to increase. There is and should be an opportunity for these plans to be put before the city and to be judged. In order to develop our riverfront we need to increase commercial and tourist activity on the river, point blank.
- Joe commented that the intention is to not do that were not appropriate.
- Veronica said it's like everything; it's up to the quadrant.
- Joe asked if this is read as a mandate to the quadrants to implement this at any costs, which is not typically how these policy documents have been read.
- Ethan we need to include that language somewhere.
- Joe clarified the concept of applicability.
- Michael everything that comes up for development will be judged on its merits.
- Bill said this language is fine but we do need the statement up front about the applicability of policies in different areas.

- Joe asked the group if this was appropriate. The group agreed. Joe then moved the group on to page 5 on Urban Design.
- Bill and Michael both agreed it looked good and has come a long way.
- Joe stated it was the most improved section. He then moved the group onto page 6 on Health and the Environment. Previously there was a lot of discussion on this.
- Ethan and Michael both agreed it looked good.
- Suzanne asked to go back to page 5 and suggested social be added to policy 5.
- Joe asked for reactions.
- Bill felt it was acceptable.
- Michael asked if it was okay to not be social in your recreation.
- Joe clarified and moved the group back to page 6.
- Ethan stated it looked good.
- Suzanne felt including social health was very important and suggested new sentence: Encourage social health by fostering community and a hospitable public realm.
- Joe asked for reactions.
- Peter asked for clarification about how that would be implemented. He wanted to know how we would do something differently to achieve that goal.
- Suzanne said the central issue was about getting people to know each other and the overall health of people and the community.
- Peter stated he was simply looking for how we would do that. He was not disagreeing with the concept. How would we intentionally do that?
- Suzanne stated by fostering the development of squares and mixed-use around them. Also places that allow and encourage interaction.
- Veronica felt that was what was covered in signature open spaces in the urban design section where the term social was added.
- Michael stated he wanted to stand up for the case of privacy. The government should not necessarily mandate or promote that type of a lifestyle that may include privacy.
- Amy gave an example of her own neighborhood and how the social interaction occurs there.
- Troy said when she described that it's a little bit different than the urban design element.
- Amy continued with a further example and highlighted the need for design to include a larger social consideration,
- Joe said the design of the public realm and these type of concerns are consistent with past efforts within the Central City. Adding the concept with what we mean about health is consistent. What is the group's level of comfort?
- Veronica said bringing in the residential design concept makes it not redundant.
- Joe asked for approval by the group.
- The group agreed to the change.
- Michael asked to go back to page 5 and change human-scaled to pedestrian-scaled.
- Joe stated the terms were interchangeable and the group agreed to the change.

### **Urban Design Concept**

- Troy stated there had been some changes to the urban design diagrams and asked Mark to come up and introduce them.
- Mark Raggett highlighted the changes on the Urban Design Concept – including the freeways, adding of some districts, descriptions of the key moves. On the Urban Design Framework – removed some district names, labeled streets, removed and added some open spaces.
- Joe asked if these made sense. They will come with some description of the legend items as well.
- Peter stated that he was curious about gateways and didn't know if that was reflected in the policy document.
- Mark directed the group to page 5, policy 7. Where the gateways would manifest themselves is in the Central City of subdistrict urban design guidelines. We would be more specific and targeted in those experiences.
- Troy said every plan we have done has had gateways planned. These ones now will have some weight and give direction to design commission.

- Mark stated they would be subject to some change and movement as well.
- Joe said that for instance in the N/NE Quadrant the one gateway at MLK and Grand is the way it's manifested in the plan is an increase in height. That is how it can be expressed.
- Ethan commented that the history of gateways in Portland is not a happy one. They are mostly meaningless. We need to provide some clarity for the quadrants plans.
- Mary asked if having fewer gateways on this diagram gave them more gravity
- Ethan said a lot of these are actually familiar. What is our intent and what do we want to do with these things.
- Joe said fewer will help. It makes it more meaningful because they are not just everywhere.
- Troy stated there will be more detailed urban design diagrams happening at the quadrant plan level. We don't want to see development turning its back to the street.
- Peter said that's a good way of redefining them.
- Ethan said and then when you get done with these gateways you can deal with Gateway!
- Michael asked since this is a long-range plan if we would want to see more change happening on the ODOT blocks.
- Joe felt that was a good point.
- Bill asked how Michael's constituents would feel.
- Michael said they had been trying to do something there for years.
- Amy questioned why there was not a white dot there.
- Joe agreed with this question. There might be able to get more there.
- Peter asked about the area between the Burnside and Morrison bridges. There are still a lot of missing teeth. The west side of Naito Parkway should have some change there. This essentially follows the Old Town neighborhood boundary. Also, he wasn't sure if there would be as much change as shown at the end of the Steel Bridge.
- Mark offered some clarification about that area.
- Peter said the NW Natural block will not develop.
- Michael said he didn't agree because there is so much in there already that has to redevelop.
- Joe clarified we were on the west side of the river.
- Amy wanted clarification of what redevelopment meant in historic areas.
- Peter was also curious about the area near the post office and Steel Bridge in the River District.
- Mark commented it might be too big and Peter offered some changes for the area.
- Ethan asked what we indicating as our desire to see what happens at the NW Natural site.
- Peter said he sees more happen further south.
- Ethan commented that there was no harm in suggesting as a city what we would like to see happen there.
- Peter stated that was a good point.
- Joe commented that this diagram gives an impact and power of what we want to see.
- Peter stated his argument about west of Naito that much more important.
- Ethan made a suggestion for how to accomplish redevelopment there.
- Joe asked for further comments or reactions from the group. There were none.

### **Next Steps**

- Troy stated this was an endorsement and then discussed the next steps for the development of the Concept Plan. The schedule is to release in early August a public review draft. In September there will be a Planning and Sustainability Commission hearing. Members of the group are encouraged to come and testify on September 11. City Council is tentatively scheduled for October. Both this and the N/NE Quadrant will be adopted by resolution. This will leave room for changes necessary after the Comprehensive Plan adoption and future quadrant plan work.
- Ethan asked for clarification about when these would be effective.
- Joe commented on how everything will work together and Troy offered further insight.
- Michael asked for clarification of what a resolution is.
- Joe said it is non-binding and offers direction. It doesn't create a change in code. An ordinance is a legislative action which changes code. The resolution gives City Council direction for action.
- Troy said it allows flexibility.

- Mary asked if this group would be notified of presentations.
- Joe also offered staff to come and present to neighborhood groups.
- Susan recommended an organized group of people should come and testify at Planning and Sustainability Commission and clarify that there is a lot of work behind it.
- Troy said that this has been filtered down a lot and thanked those who participated throughout the process.
- Joe felt the policies were exquisitely clear and simple and expressed appreciation for everyone's participation and help. He was confident in its effectiveness.
- Michael asked about in relationship with the Comprehensive Plan and whether the PEG would be able to have access to this document.
- Joe assured him that they would.
- Troy clarified he was meeting with others to discuss that integration.

**Public Input**

- There was no public comment.
- The meeting was adjourned at 6:15 pm.

DRAFT