



**Bureau of Planning and Sustainability**

Innovation. Collaboration. Practical Solutions.

---

## MEMO

**DATE:** September 5, 2013  
**TO:** West Quadrant Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee Members  
**FROM:** West Quadrant Plan Project Team  
**SUBJECT:** Meeting 6 (September 16<sup>th</sup>) Packet

---

Thank you for participating in the West Quadrant Plan Stakeholder Advisory Committee. The next meeting is:

Monday, September 16, 2013  
5:30 - 8:30 p.m. (dinner will be served starting at 5:00 p.m.)  
1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 2500A (second floor)

Enclosed with this memo is the packet of materials for this meeting, which includes:

1. Agenda
2. Updated Project Schedule
3. Draft West Quadrant Plan Outline
4. Meeting 5 Summary
5. Draft West Quadrant Plan Concept Development Workbook

Beginning on the second page of this memo is a list of topics identified by the SAC for further discussion, with preliminary directions proposed by staff based on input received to-date, including the West Quadrant Charrette. Following the topic list are a few items that follow up on informational requests from the July 16 SAC meeting.

In preparation for this meeting we ask that you:

1. Review all the materials enclosed with your packet
2. Note if there are any changes for the Meeting 5 Summary

On-street metered parking or garage pay parking is available nearby. The City does not reimburse for parking but instead encourages use of alternative modes, including nearby transit, biking or walking.

If you have any questions before September 16<sup>th</sup>, please feel free to contact Karl Lisle at (503)823-4286 or via email at [karl.lisle@portlandoregon.gov](mailto:karl.lisle@portlandoregon.gov).



The following six discussion topics, originally discussed at the July 15<sup>th</sup> SAC meeting, emerged through staff analysis, charrettes and public discussions on the plan so far. SAC guidance is needed on what the West Quadrant Plan should recommend on these topics.

Based on this work and public input, Staff has drafted a direction statement for each of these topics areas as a starting place for SAC discussion (see list below). At the September 16<sup>th</sup> and October 21<sup>st</sup> SAC meetings, the committee will discuss these topics, the direction statements and how the topics are addressed in the layer maps. These comments will be used to produce a revised draft of the layer maps for review at the November 18<sup>th</sup> SAC meeting. Targeted community outreach will also be conducted with the draft maps and workbook, and an open house is tentatively scheduled for late October.

## 1. The Waterfront

### A. Development along the Willamette River

Direction: Encourage more activity along the Willamette River by:

- improving parks and open spaces,
- completing greenway trail connections along the riverfront,
- improving connections to the riverfront, and
- increasing development intensity and scale along the river; and
- increasing mixed-use and residential redevelopment of vacant and underdeveloped sites by Waterfront Park along Naito Parkway.

Commentary: Residential, commercial, and mixed use development will increase activity and vibrancy along the waterfront, connect it to other parts of the quadrant, and create a critical mass necessary to achieve desired distinctive and vibrant river-oriented urban places.

Concept Layer Maps: *Land Use Emphasis (1), Attractions (1a), Building Height (1b), Street and Development Character (2), Open Space (3)*

### B. Bridgehead Redevelopment

Direction: Increase maximum allowed building heights on the blocks immediately around the Morrison, Hawthorne and Steel Bridgeheads to encourage redevelopment and increase activity close to Waterfront Park and the river.

Commentary: Large-scale bridgehead redevelopment will increase vibrancy and activity as well as create prominent gateways to Downtown. Increased height limits would be limited to several blocks nearest the bridge ramps and would not include any areas within the Skidmore or Yamhill historic districts.

Concept Layer Maps: *Land Use Emphasis (1), Attractions (1a), and Building Height (1b)*

### C. Naito Parkway/Waterfront Park



Direction: Improve pedestrian and cyclist conditions on Naito Parkway and Waterfront Park to provide better connections to and along the Park.

Commentary: With sidewalks on only one side, and limited east-west pathways on the park connecting to the waterfront path, relatively minor improvements to Naito Parkway and the park could enhance bicycle and pedestrian conditions and help support new development and activity. A separated bicycle path should be added to the Parkway to reduce bicycle/pedestrian conflicts along the waterfront.

Concept Layer Maps: *Street and Development Character (2) and Open Space (3)*

## 2. Old Town/Chinatown

### A. Historic Districts

Direction: Reinforce the character of historic districts and be sensitive to scale where architecture is of key significance. Maintain the 75-foot maximum height limit in Skidmore/Old Town while being more flexible with new development scale and design in New Chinatown/Japantown to encourage investment and redevelopment.

Commentary: This responds to the widely-held opinion that cultural history is of primary significance within the New Chinatown/Japantown historic district and that rigid architectural requirements and massing limitations may not be necessary and in fact could be discouraging needed investment in that area.

Concept Layer Maps: *Land Use Emphasis (1), Attractions (1a), Building Height (1b), Street and Development Character (2)*

### B. Surface Parking Lots

Direction: Increase new infill development on surface parking lots through incentives, regulatory changes, and investment strategies – particularly within historic districts.

Commentary: Although they serve a current need, the West Quadrant's many surface parking lots do not positively contribute to the character or vibrancy of an area.

Concept Layer Maps: *Land Use Emphasis (1), Attractions (1a), Building Height (1b), Street and Development Character (2)*

### C. Entertainment District

Direction: Support the evolution of safe nightlife activity in the Old Town/Chinatown area while actively managing the district to reduce negative impacts and encourage a vibrant mixed-use daytime environment.

Commentary: The entertainment district provides a unique experience in the region and is often very active during evening and weekend hours. However, there are many conflicts with nearby businesses, residents, and social services; additionally, the



entertainment uses tend to limit daytime vibrancy as they are typically closed until the evening.

Concept Layer Maps: *Land Use Emphasis (1), Attractions (1a), Building Height (1b), Street and Development Character (2)*

### 3. Development scale and height

Direction: Allow for dense, relatively tall development in the main downtown core, and do so in a way that respects the scale of adjacent historic areas and established residential neighborhoods. Specifically:

- Restrict maximum heights for new development in the Skidmore, Yamhill, and NW 13<sup>th</sup> Avenue Historic Districts.
- Determine where and how to allow height increases in several areas:
  - parts of the New Chinatown/Japantown Historic District,
  - the southern portion of the Pearl District,
  - the southern part of the Transit Mall near Portland State University, and
  - at key bridgehead sites (see “Bridgehead Redevelopment” above).
- Evaluate existing and potential new view designations in the West Quadrant to ensure new development preserves important public views.

Commentary: Encouraging dense development in the West Quadrant focuses regional growth, effectively utilizes existing infrastructure, reinforces the economic role of the downtown, and provides an opportunity to leverage high-quality design and amenities. Note that the maximum heights under discussion would be inclusive of all bonuses and incentives. Generally, increases to existing maximum heights would require the provision of public benefits or amenities through an updated bonus and transfer system.

Concept Layer Maps: *Land Use Emphasis (1) and Building Height (1b)*

### 4. Transportation System

Direction: Develop a more intentional street hierarchy by strategically adjusting the function of the street network to improve efficiency, clarity and convenience for all modes of travel, particularly for the bicycle and pedestrian networks.

Commentary: There is an opportunity to adjust the West Quadrant’s transportation system and how it functions, including re-examining the one-way street grid in some areas and establishing a clearer street hierarchy that takes into account access needs of different transportation modes, street scale, streetscape design, and adjacent building forms and uses.

Concept Layer Maps: *Street and Development Character (2)* and transportation concept maps (under development for October meeting - not in draft concept workbook)



## 5. Parks and Open Space

Direction: Rethink open space design, function and programming to provide:

- a wider range of experiences and activities,
- locations and types to serve a variety of needs and users,
- safe and pleasant pedestrian connections to and between open spaces; and
- improvements to address open space deficient areas and opportunities for habitat restoration.

Commentary: Access to parks and recreation opportunities is a critical basic amenity in dense urban areas. While most of the West Quadrant is well served, work remains to be done to meet the needs of current and future populations on the North Pearl waterfront, in Goose Hollow, around Portland State University, and in South Waterfront. Some existing parks (notably Waterfront Park) should be improved to broaden the range of experiences available.

Concept Layer Maps: *Open Space (3), Attractions (1a)*

## 6. Housing Locations

Direction: Provide the opportunity for new housing in all parts of the West Quadrant while focusing residential services and amenities in established residential neighborhoods and housing priority areas.

Seek a balance of affordability throughout the district by encouraging workforce housing everywhere, and seeking more affordable housing opportunities particularly in areas that currently are deficient.

Provide a range of housing types, including student and senior housing and units suitable for families with children.

Commentary: Having housing in every district can increase livability and district appeal and vitality — even in employment-focused areas. Future housing development should also include a range of affordability and types. With housing located more evenly throughout the West Quadrant, better residential services and improved connections to services will be needed.

Concept Layer Maps: *Land Use Emphasis (1)*



*Matrix of Identified Discussion Items (from July SAC meeting) and Corresponding Concept Layer Maps*

Concept Layer	1: Predominant Land Use and Building Height	1a: Attractions & Special Places	1b: Building Height	2: Street & Dev. Character	3: Open Space	4: Green Systems
Development along the Willamette River	X	X	X	X	X	X
Bridgehead Redevelopment	X	X	X	X		
Naito Parkway	X	X		X	X	
OT/CT Historic districts	X	X	X	X		
OT/CT Surface Parking Lots		X	X	X		
OT/CT Entertainment district	X			X		
Development scale and height	X					
Transportation *				X		
Parks and open space		X			X	X
Housing locations	X		X		X	

Please note: Food cart culture/micro retail opportunities and livability (sidewalk behavior and homelessness issues) were both dropped from this list of directions as they are not concept level issues, but rather issues that will need to be addressed during the plan development and implementation phases.

\*Additional information and maps under development on transportation for October 21 meeting.

### ***Follow-up from July 16 SAC meeting***

#### **1. Information on housing affordability definitions, strategies and needs assessments:**

While the City does not have an adopted definition of affordable housing, most housing programs run by the City use the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) definition of affordable housing as that which costs no more than 30 percent of a household's monthly income. Most City of Portland affordable housing programs are targeted towards households at or below 60% of annual Median Family Income (the 2013 MFI for a family of four in the Portland region as determined by HUD is \$68,300). The City of Portland/Multnomah County 2011-2016 *Consolidated Plan* includes a section on housing needs assessment and a 5-year strategic plan for spending federal housing funds: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/51008>. In addition, PHB is also working on a draft citywide housing strategy: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/article/458993>.



2. **Gentrification study:** Susan Anderson drew the SAC's attention to the recent *Gentrification and Displacement Study* prepared for BPS, in particular Appendix D: Annotated Policy Toolkit: Best Practices, starting on page 76: <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/62635>.
3. **Definitions of low-, medium- and high-rise buildings:** While there are no universally accepted definitions for these terms, staff proposes the following distinctions for the purposes of West Quadrant Plan discussions:
  - Low-rise = 1-6 stories
  - Mid-rise = 7-12 stories
  - High-rise = 13 stories and above

These definitions are useful within the context of planning for the Central City, the densest part of the region, but may not be appropriate in other parts of the city.

While there is some variability, floor-to-floor heights in typical Central City commercial buildings are approximately 14 feet, while in residential buildings they are closer to ten feet. First floors for both building types are typically about 14 to 16 feet.





**Central City 2035: West Quadrant Plan  
Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #6**



Monday, September 16, 2013  
1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Ave., Room 2500A  
5:30 – 8:30 pm (dinner served at 5:00 pm)

**Meeting Preparation**

Please Read: Meeting #6 Packet. Prepare comments on the plan outline and concept layers workbook maps 1, 1a, 1b).

Please Bring: Meeting #6 Packet.

**Meeting Purpose**

- Initiate the Concept Development phase of the West Quadrant Plan process by presenting draft concept map layers and collecting feedback.

**Desired Outcomes**

- SAC familiarity with Draft Concept Layer maps
- SAC confirm that maps summarize SAC and charrette work to date, discuss unresolved topics. Identification of SAC desired modifications to Draft Concept Layer maps 1, 1a, and 1b.

**Agenda**

Time	Item	Purpose	Presenter/ Participants
5:00 pm	<i><b>Pre-meeting dinner</b> will be served starting ½ hour before the formal meeting start</i>		
5:30 pm	<b>Welcome and Announcements</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Overview of Agenda</li> <li>• Corrections to Meeting Summary</li> <li>• ACTION: Approval of Meeting Summary</li> <li>• Schedule and Event Updates</li> </ul>	Information & Summary Approval	Co-Chairs Kirstin Greene Kirstin Greene Karl Lisle
5:40 pm	<b>West Quadrant Plan Outline</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Introduction</li> <li>• Discussion                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Does this outline make sense?</i></li> <li>○ <i>Where do we need to focus attention?</i></li> <li>○ <i>Is there anything missing?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Information & Discussion	Nicholas Starin Kirstin Greene, All
6:00 pm	<b>Draft Quadrant-Wide Concept Layers Introduction</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Purpose and place in the Plan and process</li> <li>• Presentation of draft urban design principles and concept layer maps                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ Areas of general agreement</li> <li>○ Topics for discussion</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Clarifying questions                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>○ <i>Are SAC members clear on their purpose?</i></li> <li>○ <i>Any clarifying questions?</i></li> </ul> </li> </ul>	Overview	Karl Lisle Mark Raggett SAC Members
6:40 pm	<b>Public Comment</b>		Open
6:50 pm	<b>Break</b>		

7:00 pm **Draft Quadrant-Wide Concept Layers, Discussion** SAC Direction to Staff SAC Members

- Discussion on Predominant Land Use Layer (1)
- Discussion on Attractions and Special Places Layer (1a)
- Discussion on Maximum Building Height Layer (1b)

Staff needs the SAC's general concurrence on these concept maps with any changes in direction

- *Do these maps generally reflect discussion to date?*
- *Are there any key areas of disagreement in the SAC or misunderstanding by staff?*
- *With the changes discussed tonight, do we have general agreement that the maps will represent the SAC's direction on these concepts?*

***This discussion will continue at the October meeting with more on these and the other 3 draft layers in the workbook (Street & Dev. Character, Open Space, Green Systems)***

8:20 pm **Closing Business** SAC members

- Final Remarks
- Meeting Evaluations

8:30 pm Meeting Adjourned Co-Chairs

### **Reminders**

- Meeting #7: Monday, October 21 (same place and time)
  - Draft Concept Layer Discussion (Continued)
  - Transportation Discussion
- Expect Meeting #7 packets via mail approximately 7-10 days before the meeting.
- Please review your packets for relevant information and homework assignments.

Outreach work continuing through all phases of the project include: Website updates and news items, monthly email updates, stakeholder and organization meetings as well as broad news and media publications for events.

Project Phase	Outreach Tool	Purpose	SAC Mtg and Date	Meeting Topics
Phase 1 KICK-OFF	West Quadrant Reader Online Survey	Introduction Orientation	Mtg. 1: Mar 11	1. Introductions and Charter 2. Process Overview / Work scope 3. CC2035 Concept Plan Overview
Phase 2 ISSUES AND IDEAS	Charrette Week with Open House	Identify Issues and Opportunities	Mtg. 2: Apr 1	1. Central City Planning and Reader Overview 2. Systems Issues and Opportunities
			Mtg. 3: Apr 22	1. Issues and Opportunities 2. Discussion and Directions
		Generate Ideas and Directions	Mtg. 4: May 20	1. Issues and Opportunities 2. Discussion and Directions
			Charrette Week Jun 10	SW and NW Quadrant Charrette 1. Subareas and Policy Areas 2. Technical Work and SAC Review 3. Working Drafts and Open House
Phase 3 DEBRIEF	Web package of Charrette results Commission Briefings	Feedback	Mtg. 5: Jul 15	1. Charrette Report and Discussion 2. West Quadrant Plan Concept Direction
Phase 4 CONCEPT DEVELOPMENT	Open House #1 (three alternatives)	Feedback	Mtg. 6: Sep 16	1. Draft West Quadrant Plan Outline 2. Draft Quadrant-Wide Concept Layers (1, 1a, 1b)
			Mtg. 7: Oct 21	1. Draft Quadrant-Wide Concept Layers (2, 3, 4) 2. Transportation Discussion 3. West Quadrant Districts: Boundaries and Goals
			Open House #1 Late Oct	Draft Concept Presentation and Feedback
			Mtg. 8: Nov 18	1. Open House Results 2. Approval of Draft West Quadrant Concept Layers 3. Draft District Boundaries, Goals
Phase 5 DRAFT PLAN	Open House #2 (Draft Plan Presentation)	Feedback and Endorsement	Mtg. 9: Jan 21*	1. Draft Staff Report: West Quadrant Plan 2. Review and Discussion
			Open House #2	Draft West Quadrant Plan Presentation and Feedback
			Mtg. 10: Feb 18*	Continued Discussion
			Mtg. 11: Mar 17	Public Comments
			Mtg. 12: Apr 21	Final Review and Approval
FINAL PLAN	PSC & CC	Adopt Plan	May - July	-----

\* Note: meeting date on 3<sup>rd</sup> Tuesday due to holiday on regular meeting time of 3<sup>rd</sup> Monday



# West Quadrant Plan – Draft Outline



## Chapter 1: Introduction

1. Plan Purpose
2. Planning Process
  - a. Stakeholder Advisory Committee
  - b. Technical Advisory Committee
  - c. Public Outreach and Events
3. Relationship to Portland Plan, Comprehensive Plan and Central City 2035 Concept Plan
  - a. Portland Plan: Equity; Thriving Educated Youth; Economic Prosperity and Affordability; Healthy Connected City
  - b. Comprehensive Plan Update
  - c. Central City 2035 Concept Plan and Quadrant Planning

## Chapter 2: Background

1. History
2. Previous Planning and Existing Policies
3. Existing and Future Conditions
4. Issues and Opportunities

## Chapter 3: West Quadrant-Wide Concept

1. Urban Design/Plan Principles
2. Concept Layer Diagrams and Descriptions
  - a. Land Use
  - b. Attractions and Special Places
  - c. Maximum Building Heights
  - d. Street and Development Character
  - e. Open Space
  - f. Green Systems

## Chapter 4: District Goals, Policies and Implementation Actions

### 1. Pearl District

- a. District Goal (brief description of overarching vision for the district)
- b. District Concept Diagram (graphical description of the overarching vision for the district, generally taken from the quadrant-wide concept layers)
- c. Policies, Implementation Actions and Performance Measures (organized by CC2035 Concept Plan policy areas)
  1. Regional Center: Economy and Innovation
    - a. Policy Topics: economic development; jobs; arts and culture, public safety, equity
    - b. Implementation Actions (e.g. zoning changes, infrastructure projects, programs)
    - c. Performance Target: Number of Jobs
  2. Housing and Neighborhoods
    - a. Policy Topics: housing development, preservation, affordability and diversity; neighborhood amenities and services; complete community; historic and cultural resources
    - b. Implementation Actions (e.g. zoning changes, infrastructure projects, programs)
    - c. Performance Targets: Number of Housing Units, Affordable Units, Family Friendly Units
  3. Transportation
    - a. Policy Topics: connectivity and mobility; active transportation; transit; Transportation Demand Management; portals; parking; strategic investments
    - b. Implementation Actions (e.g. code changes, infrastructure projects, programs)
    - c. Performance Target: Commute Mode Split
  4. Willamette River

## West Quadrant Plan Draft Outline

- a. Policy Topics: river habitat; river access; river recreation; riverfront and bridge head development
  - b. Implementation Actions (e.g. code changes, infrastructure projects, programs)
  - c. Performance Targets: Lineal Feet of Vegetated River Bank
5. Urban Design
- a. Policy Topics: diverse and distinctive urban places; connections; street character; public realm; open space; pedestrian-oriented development; transitions between neighborhoods; bridgeheads
  - b. Implementation Actions (e.g. zoning changes, infrastructure projects, programs)
  - c. Performance Target: Active Street Edges
6. Health and Environment
- a. Policy Topics: natural resources; green infrastructure and tree canopy; green buildings and energy; sustainability; human health
  - b. Implementation Actions (e.g. zoning changes, infrastructure projects, programs)
  - c. Performance Target: Tree Canopy

**Repeat for other districts: Old Town/Chinatown, Goose Hollow, Downtown, West End, South Downtown/University District and South Waterfront.** Policy topics will vary by district.

## Appendices

1. Details of Selected Implementation Action Items (additional information about certain items listed in the action charts)
  - Recommended zoning code and map changes
  - Description of future work items or projects
2. Summary of Public Outreach
3. Bibliography (list of major documents produced during project)
4. Resolution



**Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #5**  
**Draft Summary**  
**July 15, 2013; 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	Y
Doreen Binder	Transitions Projects	Y
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	Y
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	Y
Patricia Gardner	Pearl District Neighborhood Association	Y
Greg Goodman	Downtown Development Group	N
Patrick Gortmaker	Old Town / Chinatown Community Association	N
Jodi Guetzloe-Parker	Columbia Pacific Building Trades Council	Y
Sean Hubert	Central City Concern	Y
Cori Jacobs	Downtown Retail Advocate	Y
Michael Karnosh	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	Y
Nolan Leinhart	ZGF Architects	Y
Keith Liden	Portland Bicycle Advisory Committee	Y
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	N
Dan Petrusich	Portland Business Alliance	Y
Steve Pinger	Northwest District Association	Y
Valeria Ramirez	Portland Opera	Y
Veronica Rinard	Travel Portland	N
John Russell	Property owner and developer	Y
Bob Sallinger	Portland Audubon Society	Y
Katherine Schultz	GBD Architects, Planning and Sustainability Commission	N
Mary Valeant	Goose Hollow Foothills League	Y
Karen Williams	Carroll Investments	Y
Jane Yang	NW Natural	N

**Alternates**

<b>Representative</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Present</b>
John Bradley	Northwest District Association	N
Dave Harrelson	Confederated Tribes of the Grand Ronde	N
Rick Michaelson	Alternate for John Russell	N
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	Y
Raihana Ansary	Portland Business Alliance	N
Peter Bilotta	Portland Opera	N
Chet Orloff	Alternate for John Russell	N
Tony Bernal	Transition Projects	N

**Project Team/Staff**

<b>Representative</b>	<b>Role</b>	<b>Organization</b>	<b>Present</b>
Susan Anderson	Director	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Joe Zehnder	Chief Planner	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	Y
Elisa Hamblin	West Quadrant Project Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Mark Raggett	Urban Design Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Nan Stark	River Planner	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Mauricio Leclerc	Transportation Planner	PBOT, City of Portland	Y
Sallie Edmunds	CC and River Team Manager	BPS, City of Portland	N
Troy Doss	SE Quadrant Project Manager	BPS, City of Portland	N
Desiree Williams-Rajee	Equity Specialist	BPS, City of Portland	N
Lew Bowers	Central City Manager	PDC	Y
Kirstin Greene	Facilitator	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y
Alisha Morton	Facilitator Assistant	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y

**Public**

Kenton Kullby	Alida Beck	John Charles
Ben Bortolazzo	Suzanne Lenard	
Kai Bates	Wendy Rahm	

**Welcome and Announcements**

Karen Williams welcomed participants. She said co-chair Katherine Schultz is participating with the staff on the agenda and other discussions but she is in China currently and apologizes for having to miss the meeting. Karen said we appreciate the input that we receive from her and are glad she will continue as co-chair.

## **Overview of Agenda**

Kristin Greene, Facilitator, reviewed the agenda. She explained there are no decision points tonight. The 6:20 agenda item is about the email that Karen sent out a couple weeks ago acknowledging the cramped agendas that we have had thus far and the need to potentially discuss the subareas further. The subareas will be discussed throughout the rest of the process as well.

**Karen Williams:** People have asked me questions about when we are going to actually write zoning code. People are looking for more orientation on the path. When does code start to initiate?

**Staff:** This meeting is an important transition point. This is the end of gathering information and ideas. Today we will report on what we have heard so far from you and at charrette. At the next meeting we will shift gears to bring you staff proposals based on what we heard. And we want to get your reaction. We will actually have some concept maps and we will have the beginning of policy statements for the subareas that we are looking at through this process. Rewriting the Zoning Code is the last step in the process. It is a very detailed level of work that won't happen for another year. Once all three quadrant plans have been completed we will start the process of rewriting the zoning code with very clear guidance from the quadrant plans.

**Jeanne Galick:** When do we respond to the ideas that have been printed here from the charrette? I have some questions on how you came up with these things.

**Staff:** Tonight.

**Patricia Gardner:** Once you start the zoning code process, do you have an estimate for how long it will take?

**Staff:** Our hope is that the quadrant plans give us pretty clear direction so we can go straight into draft plan language with a smaller committee and a fairly basic public process. A year or less would be the hope. Our goal is to start by next summer and finish the following summer (2015).

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

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

**Keith Liden:** I don't believe I made comments on page 8 about Chinatown. It wouldn't have been me.

**Staff:** We will look into that correction.

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

Elisa Hamblin gave an overview of public involvement events coming up. She said the first open house will be in the fall. It will be the same material as in our September meeting. She asked SAC members to let the project team know if they have any neighborhood or group to which you would like staff to present the material for discussion. The second open house will be at the beginning of next year. There will continue to be a lot more opportunity any of SAC organization members and the public in general to weigh in on the content of the plan development.

### **West Quadrant Charrette Report and Presentation**

Karl Lisle gave an overview of the charrette process in which about 80 people participated. We spent a whole week working on these items. He explained since the maps were in the meeting packet we will only go over questions that you might have without reviewing them entirely.

*Map 22 – the Big Ideas Map.*

- Interest levels in the Willamette River and its importance for the Central City is very high. Opportunities for the future of the riverfront include:
  - The opportunity to organize development and create new river oriented communities along the river.
  - Opportunities to improve habitat and natural systems.
  - Physical and emotional connections and spatial relationship of the city to the river.
  - Completing and improving the Willamette River Greenway Trail.
  - General recognition that we could do a lot more with Waterfront Park. Yes, it's great today but it could be better.
- Housing – general sense that we want housing of some kind everywhere in this quadrant. Even the office core would be more appealing for new office development if it had some housing in or near it.
- Improvements to the multimodal and pedestrian/bike network throughout. Having a clear, safe, well defined, urban loop trail to link places throughout the West Quadrant.
- Freeway capping. People remain extremely interested in this notion – particularly in the stretch between Goose Hollow and the West End. The approach has evolved to be about more targeted nodes where you could achieve specific goals and objectives.
- Retail is important in placemaking, and key mainstreet environments should be recognized and encouraged to grow.
- Broadway and Burnside intersection – notion that it should be more of a civic space that means something to people – it's the “Main and Main” of Portland, yet is pretty forgettable today.
- Jefferson “High” Street – a real opportunity to create focal point for Goose Hollow and tie it into Downtown.
- Naito Parkway – over time and incrementally, could it be possible to create a new face of the city fronting Naito and also improve connections between the city and the river. Perhaps Naito won't always be needed as a larger four-lane street.
- Rethinking the sea wall so that you could actually get down to the river in more places than today.
- Event spaces are important, but shouldn't be the only thing in Waterfront Park.

Mark Raggett went over the highlights from mapping exercises focused on the five policy areas from the Central City Concept Plan.

*Map 13 – the Regional Center for Innovation and Information Exchange Map:*

- Strengthening the gravity downtown – PSU, OHSU expansion in South Waterfront.
- Education and innovation quadrant at the bottom of the quad.
- Businesses and opportunities in the area south of Burnside.
- Post office site and other sites that could be attractive to large businesses that can't fit on one block – these are larger sites.
- A lot of interest in getting housing. More housing around office core to make it more active and vibrant, and therefore attractive to new offices and businesses.

*Map 14 – Housing & Neighborhoods:*

- Housing everywhere is a big theme.
- Waterfront - how can we get more people down there living and owning etc.
- There should be a lot of different residential experiences.
- We need to maintain and expand the mix of affordability. Keep open to all.
- Increase mix of housing options and sizes.
- Goose Hollow might make a good area for housing for families. Wheel shaped icons represent potential alternative sites for k-8 school or other amenities.
- Student housing was also a common theme throughout the quadrant.
- With the nightlife in Old Town might be a better fit for housing with students.

*Map 15 – Willamette River:*

- Potential redevelopment sites. Looks like we have a long way to go with that. There could be a lot of unique specialized micro-communities along the waterfront.
- Water taxi could be more feasible if people were living/working/playing down here.
- Waterfront Park – great today, but the Saturday Market is a great example of a smaller unique use. We need to get a few more unique experiences in there. More of the park for more people more of the time.
- A lot of historic districts on the waterfront.
- Bridge head locations might be opportunity to bring more heights and more development intensity/density. Create pattern of taller buildings at the bridgeheads.
- Park is up and the water is down. We need more opportunities to actually see the water.
- Existing transportation issue.
- Esplanade on the west side. Concrete parkway is at capacity during the summer in its current mixed bicycle/pedestrian configuration. Where can we put those people now?

*Map 17 – Urban Design:*

- How can we build on existing attractions that we have today at the waterfront such as Hawthorne Bowl, Public Market. Can some events held there now move to the Rose Quarter?
- Centennial Mills – opportunity for new destination and attraction.
- How can we give people clear information for traveling safely to the river?
- River is not visible a few blocks away. Waterfront districts are aware of the river, but a few blocks away don't know it's there.
- Tying the Pearl, NW and the rest of the quadrant together. We have a lot of districts and different places in the West Quad – need to think about how each of these is special. We should plan for their uniquenesses.

*Map 18 – Health and Environment:*

- Open space ideas and a lot of green system ideas. One of the ideas is to bring more of the green character of the west hills into the West Quadrant.
- Being more strategic about stormwater and how/where it is going. Stormwater facility and treatment facilities next to each other – can we blend them into one facility?
- District Energy systems – how can we create more? PSU in the south end and one in the north end – Brewery Blocks. A lot of potential capacity.
- Open space needs – Goose Hollow needs a new park. Interest in new open space at Centennial Mills – improvements to Waterfront park. New open space around PSU to support growing residential population with limited amenities in their housing situations – Halpern Sequence. Lots of interest for pocket parks, plazas etc.

Mark then briefly went over three concept layer maps.

*Map 19 – Land Use Emphasis:*

- Pretty flexible zoning system today.
- Most focused zoning is mostly residential – limited to a few small areas.
- This map is taking a look at being slightly more intentional. Flexibility would remain, but emphasis/incentives could help encourage certain types of new development. Blue – office core; light grey – institutional uses; brown – residential. Hatch red – retail core. White – mixed.

**John Russell:** On the map, the areas that are indicated as housing, presumably that applies to the second floor on up? Ground floor ought to have all kinds of uses.

**Staff:** Yes, this is predominant building use with other amenities at street level.

*Map 20 – Maximum Heights:*

- Mostly tweaks to existing.
- Keeping most historic districts low and maybe even on NW 13<sup>th</sup> keeping it low.
- It also has existing policy for tall buildings in the North Pearl District and in South Waterfront.
- Proposed extending greater maximum heights along 5<sup>th</sup> and 6<sup>th</sup> avenue towards PSU.
- We propose increasing maximum heights on the few blocks immediately around the Morrison and Hawthorne bridgeheads.
- Key public views i.e. Mt Hood are also on the map. These views need to be reexamined – determining what the views are will help us determine where to restrict heights.

**John Russell:** This would apply to residential not office?

**Staff:** Height limits would apply to all new development, but it is possible to allow certain types of development (uses) to be taller than others.

**Jeanne Galick:** South Waterfront isn't it lower against the greenway?

**Staff:** Yes.

**Catherine Ciarlo:** Is the floor to area ratio (FAR) such that it would be narrower in profile?

**Staff:** In South Waterfront, yes, to some degree, in the North Pearl, yes, definitely. In the Office Core, there is much more available FAR, so taller buildings can be considerably wider (necessary for office floor plates). This is the likely subject of a lot more future conversation.

**Jim Gardner:** What about Point Towers? Do we have adequate tools to make that happen?

**Patricia Gardner:** We are getting one that is going through the design commission that is 9000 square feet in the Pearl that is definitely a Point Tower.

**Staff:** Where Patty is talking about we have a lot of tools.

**Bob Sallinger:** I was involved in South Waterfront. The city had a lot of aspirations – greenway and point towers. I don't see ability to get there unless you have a regulatory element to make sure they happen.

*Map 21: Street and Development Character:*

- Moving to be more intentional with where we encourage certain types of ground floor uses. Trying to get intentional about key streets.

- Retail core – a district in which retail – even multi-story retail would be strongly encouraged on all streets, and perhaps required on certain key streets including Yamhill, Morrison, and Broadway.
- Civic Corridors – retail main streets, active busy sidewalks with lots of storefronts and pedestrian traffic. May have fewer or smaller trees than some streets. Can come in a variety of scales.
- Boulevards – more park-like avenues like SW Harrison Street. Somewhere for residents to go out and walk the dog with occasional retail use. But has unique landscaping with some setbacks and a larger tree canopy.
- Flexible network – streets with a high quality, safe and quiet pedestrian environment including some segments that could be closed off to traffic permanently or at certain times.

*Charrette sketches – Jefferson Main Street. Rendering #25.*

- Suggests capping of I-405 on Jefferson. Jefferson is envisioned as a vibrant main street and capping to support retail liner buildings could continue that character from Goose Hollow into the West End. At least go into downtown a little.

## **Sub Areas Discussion**

Kirstin asked SAC members if there were any topics they would like to discuss further.

**John Peterson:** I really like the idea of bringing Waterfront Park back and bringing the people to the water. You cannot see people from the sea wall.

**John Peterson:** On Map 13, I suggest the creative incubator space go south of Burnside as well.

**Mary Valeant:** From the equity perspective a K-8 location should be more central downtown, potentially Goose Hollow or West End. The northwest location is very close to Chapman already. That is not fair to the South Waterfront families.

**Karen Williams:** We need to consider freight mobility through downtown. What kind of streets there are and the idea of turning Naito Parkway into more pedestrian friendly and it is the major freight corridor. Those are great amenity ideas but we have to think about the entirety of the system.

**Jeanne Galick:** I would like to see a map concentrating on parks and open spaces and opportunities for restoring habitat.

**Staff:** There will be two more concept maps like these three concept maps you've seen today. One will be on parks and open space and another will be on green systems.

**Nolan Leinhart:** I am pretty excited to see a health overlay on these series of maps. Has there been any conversation about air quality? Are there interventions that we can make improvements to air quality around freeways?

**Patricia Gardner:** I am confused about the focus on housing. We are in competition with Hillsboro etc for a whole lot of jobs. Are we trying to turn downtown into a bedroom community? Where is the emphasis on this? Where is innovation and employment? Everyone is going from downtown to Hillsboro, Beaverton etc.

**Staff:** What we are doing now is reporting on what we heard from the charrette. People are looking at the Pearl and seeing it as a successful neighborhood with a lot of housing and other uses now want to be there too.

**Patricia Gardner:** The Pearl got that housing bonus. This emphasis on housing bonus on the central city scares me.

**Staff:** That was not the intent. There is interest in housing. We obviously need to strengthen housing, but most places will not be focused solely on housing.

**Staff:** It's right to have the question – what's the right amount of housing in the different districts? We will include this in the questions.

**Bob Sallinger:** It's easy to get lost in these maps. I am much more interested in quantification. I am less interested in the green boulevard than if you are going to meet the tree target that the City has set for years. Shallow water habitat – quarter mile mark that NOAA has set – will we meet this? If you're going to put in housing – how will that affect the regional transportation system? Need to look more at it from quantitative view and how this really ties into River Plan South and Central stretches? We are talking a lot about the river which is great. Another

process will look at the same thing – will they one up the other or will we have to marry them together after the end?

**Staff:** River Plan Central Reach is integrated with the Central City Plan – South Reach is not at this time. We have River Plan staff on the team.

**Jodi Guetzloe-Parker:** I like lots of housing and mixed use. I also know with that kind of structure we need access to outdoor spaces, schools and also food. I heard a food drought mentioned. We also must have access to food if we have outdoor spaces, schools and family housing.

**Herman Colas, Jr:** I am interested in getting info on the river and the ability for people to see what is happening in the river. Are we talking about taking the walls and stepping them down at some point in time?

**Staff:** As one potentially possibility yes.

**Herman Colas, Jr:** I remember around 1995 that we had to put boards for water to not flood the city. If the sea is going to rise we are likely to see that kind of water again if not more so. Have we thought about this?

**Staff:** If we wanted to actually step down the sea wall, we would have to do a lot of research etc to make sure we retained or improved our current level of flood protection.

**Staff:** The elevation of the sea wall would be maintained just moved further back. In this type of scenario, some of the park could flood, but in the summer when we want to use it more intensely, it wouldn't flood. This could actually provide a little more protection for the city.

**Doreen Binder:** We were there in the waterfront in 1995 and the City gave us sandbags made of paper. Tell me about the Burnside – Couch issue. Where does it fit in?

**Staff:** We didn't talk about it a lot more. We have an adopted policy and that is still the intent of the action. It just hasn't happened. The intent is to make it a couplet – each a one-way. None of these maps say that it would or wouldn't happen. They are at a higher level. New Mayor has said it's not a super high priority for him, but it's on the shelf.

**Doreen Binder:** We work for years on projects and then another project comes in and over shadows that.

**Staff:** Primarily we elect someone else and we try to bring the policies and all your time in front of the new elected officials.

**Jessica Engelmann:** Map 6 of South Downtown. There are pedestrian streets that I find to be strange to call them out as pedestrian streets. What's the intent? The whole West Quadrant – if we are having people live and work downtown their main mode of transportation will be walking and biking. The network needs to acknowledge that and plan for it.

**Staff:** Quite a few are pedestrian-only streets. The one new one was College Street as an idea. Most streets in the South Auditorium District is ped/bike only now. Montgomery is mostly that way. On College Street, the idea was to build a happening student/university-oriented retail street. Maybe it's not pedestrian all the time, but perhaps it gets closed at night and is lively. Thousands of students are now living along that corridor, and we would expect more in the future. SW 4th Ave was talked about quite a bit as a potential retail street as well. The South Park blocks are a great N-S green connector for PSU students. We are looking for east/west connectors for students to move through the expanding campus.

**Keith Liden:** On Page 3 for Waterfront I'm kind of curious that it doesn't acknowledge TriMet ped/bike bridge. Page 4 connections between West End and Goose Hollow are particularly

important. Jefferson needs to be called out for bike not just pedestrian. The I-405 crossing of Burnside needs to be talked about more. On page 5 the I-405 capping needs to be more emphasis on the capping part but also how people get across I-405 period. Loop is a great idea, but not really taking you where you want to go. On page 6 for South Downtown the circulation intent is not very clear. Very inwardly focused, doesn't talk about getting in and out of there.

**Jason Franklin:** The South Downtown Map seems like it didn't capture the intent and the richness of South Downtown. It appears to be more of an existing conditions map and doesn't get at a number of the things that we talked about. Please go back to your notes – PSU / city integration; create more diversity of businesses, incubator space; connection to South Waterfront; and ideas for eco-district for this area.

**Staff:** Thank you.

**Blake Beanblossom:** Please clarify pedestrian vs. pedestrian friendly streets. Pedestrian streets – are those no vehicle traffic? And pedestrian friendly are vehicle traffic with sidewalks etc.

**Staff:** Yes.

**Patricia Gardner:** There is a lot of history of pedestrians streets – some of them work and some of them don't. We don't want to go down the road with a bunch of pedestrian only streets in the Central Downtown retail core. We need vehicle traffic. Are the festival streets actually good? Are they working? We need some data to show that they are a good idea.

**Staff:** That is a point well taken. On Map 21 the green streets on the map are flexible streets – might be paths, might be pedestrian friendly streets, might be pedestrian only. We are not trying to do pedestrian only- we are looking for a whole range of things.

**Patricia Gardner:** Please don't back away from it if it makes sense, just don't do it because people want it if it doesn't fit in that area.

**Catherine Ciarlo:** I have two comments. South Portland earlier at beginning of process, the Lawrence Halprin blocks are my favorite spot. In fact those are failed urban planning yet it's quiet and beautiful. It's our challenge to look at the failed efforts from earlier on and integrate them into a better system. How to get more people through there – how to move bikes better through there. More generally in terms of the whole quadrant. I appreciate what Karen said about freight streets. Street hierarchy is very important – if we do it in a thoughtful way.

**Jim Gardner:** Pedestrian streets aren't really streets at all. The nomenclature is confusing. They are not streets, they are pedestrian ways. Please get the terminology right.

### **Public Comment**

Suzanne Lennard: one issue that I am concerned about is the health and wellbeing of families with children. Map number 14 in two areas the proposal is to house them in areas of high density – which means high rise. This is not ideal for families with children or elders or more vulnerable groups. High rise should not be combined with housing for children. It's a height issue and the experience of living in a building away from the ground level. And in terms of the environment at the street level next to high rise buildings.

Wendy Rahm: there are so many good things about this, but will highlight just a few: Naito and making it more pedestrian friendly; cultural district and making it more pedestrian dominant; and

livability – pretty much a consensus that a healthy economic base needs people to come support it. Putting residents downtown will improve business and small business certainly which is a reason to argue for more housing in downtown. If that's the case then we need to talk about livability, which gets to height – Map 14, talks about high density. Dense is better than high density. We should talk about high density as it implies high rises. We can hopefully zone for mid-level rises. We are arguing height vs. density. We can have very dense areas with mid rise. We seem to be talking about form over people. Long term livability issues vs. short term profits. I see that as an issue to be discussed.

Cathy Galbraith: I spent many hours in 2009 and 2010 working on the proposed opportunity sites (against) and working towards new guidelines for Skidmore District. Many of the same issues and potential solutions are in the documents here today. For the West End I echo the sentiment about the human scale buildings and the non-protected historic buildings. PSU district has some of the city's oldest housing and don't see how we discuss affordable housing there. The significance of historic districts is not what they were but how they are important now. The best thing about the buildings in these districts is that they still stand. Poor conditions, lack of investment etc are issues that affect all buildings not just historic buildings. The buildings are waiting to make a contribution. I echo Wendy's concern about the heights issue. Solution is to be always leaning towards broad, tall buildings. They have the downside of impacting those districts very detrimentally. Skidmore, Old town and Chinatown are saturated with low income services and housing. Last thing, there are a lot of long term challenges in Skidmore, Old Town and Chinatown. There is complicated ownership. I get concerned when we talk about picking off buildings that are less historic and identifying the "upper class" of buildings. We have two very long and small districts with promises made about cleaning these up. We need design requirements within these districts and seismic upgrade. Stop concentrated low income housing and services down there.

Bing Sheldon: I am a resident dinosaur in the City, I have lived here since 1969. It is 45 years later and we are still talking about the Skidmore, Old Town Historic District. If you don't fix this problem now it won't get fixed. We have an opportunity now because the high tech community enjoys the kind of neighborhood that is down there. They are "too hip". They like this strange diverse neighborhood because they can dress however they wish. Please fix this in this planning effort. We have poured lots of public money into it and we still don't have an answer. Parking is definitely an issue that needs to be solved – lot of small lots, height restrictions. There needs to be a source of parking, please make this a front burner issue. The city is developing all around it. Only hugely subsidized developments have been done down there. I would rather see it done even if it isn't perfect.

### **Identified Conflict/Decision Points**

1. Development along the Willamette River
2. Naito Parkway
3. Bridgehead redevelopment
4. Development scale and height
5. Entertainment district
6. Food cart culture/micro retail opportunities
7. Modal (transportation) demands

Kirstin said others topics that stuck out from our conversation so far include how much residential and where; and transportation network – which might be number 7. Are there other major areas? We'll be looking to vote on these to establish priorities.

**Sean Hubert:** The Entertainment District should be broadened. Incremental approaches to seismic retrofits. Pay attention to Skidmore District.

**Jeff Martens:** Same thing. Entertainment District should be broader.

**Jeanne Galick:** I would like to see discussion on parks and open spaces not just the Waterfront.

**John Russell:** Changing relative economic development of asphalt parking lots. When I was born there were not any asphalt lots. Central City was in that era 4<sup>th</sup> – 6<sup>th</sup> and Pine to Morrison. Areas around that got decimated for asphalt parking. It grandfathered them in, and you cannot build anymore – you cannot demolish a building to put up parking etc. Economics of asphalt lots in Skidmore District – land is worth several times its use for parking. I have buildings next to those lots and I would trade them for brothels. You cannot imagine the Pearl with asphalt lots. We need to change the economics of those lots.

**Brian Emerick:** A lot of the maps don't show those connected – Skidmore and south of Burnside. They need to connect together into one unified plan as they have similar problems. One item that was brought up was that we need better design guidelines but we actually do have those and staff sent out a link after the last meeting.

**Catherine Ciarlo:** We would be well served to think about parking i.e. pricing of parking.

Kirstin asked the group if it would work to change 5 – to Skidmore/China Town/Old Town from Entertainment District.

**Staff:** The intent of number 5 is to highlight the conflict that happens in that area a couple nights a week. Instead of changing number 5, recommend adding Historic District – making connection between the districts and enforcing their character.

**Brian Emerick:** Skidmore and Chinatown are different from Old Town and we need to distinguish between the two.

**Patricia Gardner:** Housing in general should be on the list. In the Pearl District market rate is going for \$500/square foot. Market rate condos that are very expensive; market rate rentals are also expensive; then low-income rentals that are highly subsidized. We need to have the conversation about what type of housing goes where and how we are going to get it. Housing will not get cheaper to build.

**Marvin Mitchell:** When discussing livability and housing, we need to recognize that we have a tremendous problem in Portland with sidewalk behavior. We need to separate housing and homeless with irrational sidewalk behavior. This is different than homelessness. This sidewalk behavior can deter events, tourism. We need to make a distinction between homelessness and illegal behavior.

**Blake Beanblossom:** I echo what Marvin said, particularly with youth homelessness.

Kirstin asked the group take a break and using the dots indicate which conflict areas you want to discuss the most. We will talk about what is most important to you first and then continue the conversation at the next two meetings.

**Break**

SAC members indicated the topics that caught SAC members wished to discuss first. After voting, Kirstin reported that the topics with the most votes were housing, transportation and parking in that order.

### ***Housing***

Kirstin said that we have heard in terms of housing— how much providing and where. Let's start there. We will start the discussion tonight and see how far we get.

**Patricia Gardner:** Let me explain what we have learned in the Pearl. In the 1988 the plan had a large residential blob on it. In the Central City Plan – things were put into place that helped it along. The residential bonus helped. Residential bonus is the only bonus that was ever used. Whatever the tools are – having the proper ones in place makes a big deal. Residential only use the residential bonus and if tool that gets used – do not expect to see anything else get used. They won't use any of the other bonuses out there. Economics – who is living here? Are we creating a stratification of renters? What does that mean for work force housing? Where are you getting money for low-income housing when urban renewal is going away? Seven years from now there will be no more funding from urban renewal. Economic issue also. We also need to consider livability. Where does housing really want to be? If you put it next to Jeld-Wen field there will be complaints. In Pearl – it's mixed use. We all have to get along. Some other areas are more pure. There may be more conflicts that are not necessarily being thought of. How do you deal with the ground floor? You can't have retail everywhere. You have to have a clear retail strategy. What do you have on the ground floor if it's not retail? With all due respect to the ladies who gave public comment tonight about height, our experience is 180 from that. Kids and elderly do live in tall buildings.

**Marvin Mitchell:** When I look at the map and residential overlay, I think we should have residential sprinkled throughout, but not necessarily turn other places into pure residential. Downtown I would like to see residential – you can't have vibrancy if it's purely office. I'd like to look at all mixed use. I am very happy that West End didn't get sucked into downtown. So far we have retained as a district worth having because of what is there. North end will probably get higher buildings because of what is in place, but there is a mix there. Mix of residential throughout where some areas will have more than others. I like mid-rise buildings because you have more eyes on the street and it makes it more of a neighborhood. Need good range of residential throughout the quadrant.

**Ben Duncan:** I agree with the location of housing and the example of air quality resonated with me. Funding is limited, but why we hear people desire housing is because we are seeing the investment in the Central City and the desire for people to live there. It is becoming more enticing for people to live here and access the things we are talking about and the visions we are creating. How do we fund the values that we want to see the city look like? As a city we need to decide what we value and put money where we can reflect that.

**Dan Petrusich:** There are very few locations that currently have required residential overlays. The area on Burnside from NW 23<sup>rd</sup> to I-405 and a few other blocks in Goose Hollow have required residential overlays. I think it's a really bad idea and I don't know how it got in there. If for example, any of those blocks were to be redeveloped, someone might come in with a commercial use and be required to put some sort of residential over it. This could potentially kill it. Example – the BMW dealership – if they want to rebuild they would be required to put 10 apartments. They will not do that. I think we need to get rid of that requirement. The best thing

we have talked about is flexible zoning. That's why Pearl District is successful and why nothing has happened in Goose Hollow.

**Karen Williams:** I think the issue of workforce housing in downtown is really important and has had short shrift. Portland Business Alliance reviewed the history of housing development in various income classifications in various parts of Portland. There were not strong market forces to develop workforce housing in the middle because you could build and earn more. Starting families (bank tellers, shop employees etc) for those folks to be able to live downtown in an affordable way gives us a diversity to have healthy neighborhoods downtown. With the demise of tax increment there really is this stratum for which there isn't incentive/funding at all. There should be SDC waivers or tax abatements to promote healthy neighborhoods to fill in that stratum.

**Keith Liden:** To follow-up on what Karen said, there needs to be a market reality to make-up for some of these differences we are talking about. The City could figure out where the sweet spots are if we are clear what we want and what the market will support.

**Staff:** We can accommodate some level of market check in the next 8 -12 months. But the other thing to add is that we will rewrite the zoning code and that bonus system for the Central City following completion of the quadrant plans. We have a new model for how we are going to look at and calibrate those bonus programs. We have learned that with many of our current bonus programs – what you get for what you give – there is no market incentive to participate in those programs because the cost of what you give exceeds the value of the additional FAR gained. We need to better encourage the use of the bonus programs, and one way to do that is to make sure they make financial sense to developers.

**Jessica Englemann:** It is really important to start thinking about what new territory there is for market realities. Demand that isn't going to show up in past numbers is a demographic that is moving out of the city because they cannot find what they need in the city. People turn 30 and move out of the city when they start having kids because things are not there that meet their needs. We really need to think about where the schools are etc. Mid-rise is a human scale building – this is very important to livability. Housing and transportation patterns need to be looked at together. I live downtown – I walk everywhere, I have a car and use it once a week. My husband walks to work. Not everyone in the family will be traveling out of the city for work. Having housing near jobs doesn't mean that everybody will still drive out to Hillsboro.

**Catherine Ciarlo:** I really appreciate the comment about workforce housing downtown and also appreciate the comments about defining what we should stand for. System Development Charge (SDC) waivers, tax abatement – I've worked in the transportation bureau and the City is desperate for SDC funding.

**Ben Duncan:** how do we define workforce housing? Is there a medium family income (MFI) number?

**Karen Williams:** It's about 80 – 120% MFI.

**Ben Duncan:** Perhaps we could weigh in as a group and agree on a definition.

**Staff:** the definitions should be consistent with the city's housing strategy. We will work on that.

**John Russell:** About 60 – 70 years ago, the federal government decided to create housing projects in the central cities – projects. Feds said the Columbia Villa in Portland was a horrible project. The City is unwittingly doing the same thing. There are multiple buildings where all the

people in the building are low income. Trying to get it so that every building / housing unit would have to have 5% low income. We got so close that home builders in Salem passed a law to prohibit this. Inclusionary zoning – the City needs to ask the State permission to look at this. Mix of incomes in one building works.

**Jim Gardner:** The discussion of trying to figure out how to provide workforce housing is one that we are not going to come up with an answer for. Market forces – between extremely expensive land and what you build will be quite high end value and will have some very low income. There won't be the in between. SDC waivers, tax abatement and inclusionary zoning would be the closest. It may be time to admit that it is financially infeasible to build workforce housing. Perhaps we should look at places just right outside of West Quadrant – i.e. close in SE, or just to the West.

**Staff:** That's a big issue. Let's in the meantime between meetings look for information on the housing strategy.

**Jeanne Galick:** I would like to define mid-rise over high-rise. We just had a big discussion about it. I consider Pearl mid-rise and South Waterfront high-rise.

**Dan Petrusich:** It's in the building code.

**Staff:** Let's share that with each other.

**Marvin Mitchell:** We need to try and find some creative way to work on the workforce housing. There is a parallel with the people who need workforce housing and the homeless who need help. If we just go upstream a little bit – it solves problems later on.

**Herman Colas, Jr:** With workforce housing, are we still talking about low-cost housing or subsidized housing? Workforce housing says to me people who are working who cannot afford to pay rent.

**Karen Williams:** Workforce housing refers to median family income, people would have to pay more than 30% of their income to afford housing downtown. Housing for that income then according to HUD is not affordable. Housing officials then look at subsidies to make it more affordable for workforce housing.

**Herman Colas, Jr:** I have developed housing in NE Portland and Gresham. Mississippi and Alberta used to be housing where workforce people used to be able to live. In Gresham, I build there but I do not live there. A lot of the folks that used to be in this inner part of Portland are now out there. The same thing is starting to happen in Gresham. Are we ever going to have a place where workforce people can live?

**Doreen Binder:** We should be ashamed for what we have done here. We have to look at mixed income housing. What is right and what is our focus? We can't all live in the Pearl or Hawthorne etc. We cannot keep pushing people out.

**Ben Duncan:** There is this tension between acknowledging that we can't find the place for workforce housing but we need to stop pushing people out. Values and creative policies like inclusionary zoning would help.

**Staff:** You can see how incredibly important and complex this topic is and we will continue to talk about it in several meetings.

**Patricia Gardner:** If we can crack this it will be as big of an idea that Portland can come up with. We are not alone in this. There are other tools and we should look at co-ops, rent control, etc. Part of it will be public and part will be private. How is Manhattan able to do it? That would put Portland on the map if we can fix / address this.

**Staff:** We have been working with PSU on mapping gentrification in the city. I think this would be a great topic to bring here. We have mapped against income, education, people of color etc. We looked at those that have flipped already and those that will be next. We came up with a menu of 20 items that other cities have used that we haven't necessarily looked at yet.

**Karen Williams:** Ben made an important point – choices of community with what our values are and making decisions with funding.

Kirstin encouraged those who have yet to give any remarks tonight, to please do so now. She asked SAC members to complete their meeting evaluations forms.

Karen Williams adjourned the meeting at 8:21 pm.