



Stakeholder Advisory Committee Meeting #16
Draft Summary
July 21, 2014; 5:30 – 8:30 pm
1900 SW 4th Ave., Room 2500A

Members

Representative	Organization	Present
Blake Beanblossom	The Standard	N
Doreen Binder	Transitions Projects	Y
Catherine Ciarlo	CH2M Hill	N
Hermann Colas, Jr.	Colas Construction	Y
Ben Duncan	Multnomah County Health Equity Initiative	N
Brian Emerick	Portland Historic Landmarks Commission	Y
Jessica Engelmann	Oregon Walks	N
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	N
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
Tamera Kennedy-Hill	Travel Portland	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	Y
Dan Petrusich	Portland Business Alliance	Y
Steve Pinger	Northwest District Association	Y
Valeria Ramirez	Portland Opera	Y
John Russell	Property owner and developer	Y
Bob Sallinger	Portland Audubon Society	Y
Katherine Schultz	GBD Architects, Planning and Sustainability Commission	Y
Mary Valeant	Goose Hollow Foothills League	N
Karen Williams	Carroll Investments	Y
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	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	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	N
Chris Kopca	Downtown Development Group	N
Charles Kelly	ZGF Architects	N

Project Team/Staff

Representative	Role	Organization	Present
Susan Anderson	Director	BPS, City of Portland	N
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
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
Mindy Brooks	Environmental Technician	BPS, City of Portland	Y
Sallie Edmunds	Central City Manager	BPS, 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	N
Kirstin Greene	Facilitator	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y
Alisha Morton	Facilitator Assistant	Cogan Owens Cogan	Y

Public

Wendy Rahm
Suzanne Lennard
Mike Lindberg
Cathy Galbraith
Jackie Peterson
Joe Angel

Gary Reddick
Mary Vogel
John Czarnecki
Kristine Sarles
Shirley Rackner
Daniel Trubman
Maxine Cracry
Pete Bowling
Reza Farhoodi

Welcome and Announcements

Overview of Agenda

Karen Williams, Co-chair, welcomed participants. She thanked SAC members and staff for all their hard work and effort. Tonight, we will go through the final draft document and take comments from each of you. Assuming we reach a quorum, we will take a vote and that vote will enable us to forward the plan on to the Planning and Sustainability Commission and City Council.

Kirstin Greene, Facilitator, reviewed the agenda and purpose of the meeting – to agree on a set of recommendations for the Planning and Sustainability Commission. Several folks are not able to be here tonight, including Jessica who just had a baby girl on July 7th. Jessica and two other members sent in emailed comments which will be read into the record. SAC members have copies at the table.

ACTION: Approval of Meeting Summary #15

Kirstin asked for comments on Meeting Summary #15. Members approved the draft by unanimous vote.

Calendar and Event Updates

Project Manager Karl Lisle reviewed the contents of the meeting packet. Some updates: the City just launched a Central City Scenic Resources Update. You can find information on the Central City 2035 website. PDC is working on updates to Urban Renewal Areas throughout the city including some within the Central City.

Presentation of Revised Draft West Quadrant Plan

Overview of plan document

Karl then presented the general content of the Revised Draft West Quadrant Plan. His full presentation can be viewed online here: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/61672>.

Keith Liden: Would the City potentially lobby to Metro to change the (population and employment) targets if you don't agree?

Staff: We could potentially use Metro's Central City number and suggest moving things around within the Central City. We will publish the draft Comprehensive Plan tomorrow morning. If we

find we need to change our thinking about other parts of the City, that action could create a dynamic that might change our thinking for the Central City (numbers).

Patricia Gardner: We will already take care of an increase of 2,000 households by next year in the Pearl District. Thinking about it from a 2035 perspective these numbers (+5,000) may be too low. Where is the expansion past that point? Does it include the Post Office site?

Staff: Those targets could be low for the Pearl, but at some point the Pearl District will run out of easily developable space and the historic district sees infill development. Central Downtown won't see much growth as it's already really built. The places you see the most growth are the north Pearl, South Waterfront and a concentration around Morrison bridgehead, the Glisan corridor in the northern part of Old Town / Chinatown, and the West End and Goose Hollow will have some infill. The rest is dispersed. The Post Office redevelopment numbers are included, but it's pretty low. This doesn't max out the redevelopment capacities. We don't need the Post Office site to get to these numbers.

Patricia Gardner: My concern is you will end up with more development. If the number is too low then we won't have the ability to deal with it from a transportation and infrastructure perspective. Should we estimate high so we make sure the infrastructure is there?

Staff: There are a few considerations. Development is cyclical. We are trying to respect the notion that the Pearl should absorb more employment overtime. We are also just looking at the west side in this plan. There is a lot of development potential in the Central City. The Lloyd district has a lot of new development possibilities as well. We will better be able to see how this plays out as we put the whole package together.

Katherine Schultz: Did you consider development under construction right now?

Staff: It's not in the 2010 numbers, but it will be in these targets.

Jeff Martens: This concerns me. The Pearl is going to be a lot more than that so what are we going to do about it?

Staff: Again, remember the horizon is approximately 25 years and development is cyclical. As other parts of town come online, this will create competition with development going into the Pearl. If we are dead wrong and it all goes to the Pearl then infrastructure and transit will need to move with it. In the 25 year look, the household numbers Metro produces tend to be pretty reliable. The jobs numbers haven't been as reliable. We are comfortable with the order of magnitude that we are spreading around the Central City.

Patricia Gardner: Do we have enough capacity so there is political support for the build out that will happen? If we need infrastructure yet don't have the argument in the Plan because the number is low then we shoot ourselves in the foot if we needed more improvements and it takes political will. I would almost rather you went in with higher numbers to help get those infrastructure improvements that may be needed.

Staff: The Metro model is pretty sophisticated and has been pretty accurate. When you get down to the micro-geography level then it may not matter so much. We need to spread it around. We are going to take another look at these numbers once we get all the quadrants complete.

Steve Pinger: Northwest is in part of this study area. Since 2012, there have been 1200-1500 units constructed or in the works. This is an intense amount of infill with none of them being large developments. Infrastructure assumption needs to be in there to meet these needs.

Revisions since last draft

Kathryn Hartinger reviewed revisions since the last draft considered at SAC meeting #15. Her full presentation can be viewed online here: <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/bps/61672>.

Bob Sallinger: I found a lot of changes made to the environmental section that I don't see highlighted that I don't understand. There a lot of surprises for me in this. I expected the changes to be outlined very clearly on paper and in this presentation. You didn't give us the time and information. I am not comfortable voting on this tonight and won't be able to give you full comments without a full list of changes.

Staff: Point well taken. Let's discuss your specific concerns after the public comment period.

Dan Petrusich: On this bullet "Reordered Low-Carbon Development sub-policies, revised Green Building sub-policy language to "require" rather than "encourage" why did you change to require from encourage?

Staff: The Climate Change Action Plan is finding that a lot of things that were incentivized or promoted as best practices are expected now. We wanted the two to be talking the same language. The assumption is for new buildings.

Dan Petrusich: If it's new buildings, that's one thing. The implications would be much different if the assumptions were for existing buildings as well.

Steve Pinger: The revised EN3 was for bird friendly design, but now includes these other items.

Staff: Those other items should be under urban design. The content is good, but possibly needs to be reorganized as they are different concepts. Thank you.

Public Comment

Katherine Schultz, co-chair, facilitated the public comment period.

Wendy Rahm: Thank you for adjusting the West End part of this plan to recognize it as a unique and important historic area in Portland that needs protection. There is a critical need to lower the building heights and the Floor to Area Ratio (FAR) to pre-2002 levels specifically in the West End. Before the area was deemed blighted because of the undeveloped parking lots, heights were more sensible. FAR should be 6:1 and height should be 100-175 feet. Experts agree this would preserve this unique economically vibrant human scale area. Developing the undeveloped parking lots will be crucial. Developments need to be mid-rise at 8-10 stories. Authenticity is attracting young professionals. Buildings at the park need to be 100 feet max to preserve the ambience and scale of the parks. On page 154 of the Draft Plan, I appreciate staff crediting me as an alternate but that was only for one meeting. At every other meeting I have been part of the public. I request my name be deleted as having been an alternate. I also suggest that the section on Shape the Skyline be revised or deleted. New urban models no longer cite skylines as a goal but focus on designing livable streets instead. Focusing on

skylines makes this plan look out of date. The views that are most important are from the streets of the street from a pedestrian perspective. Finally, I request one additional action item for the West End. There needs to be master planning for the West End.

Wendy's full comments can be viewed as an attachment to this summary.

Suzanne Lennard: Portland's renowned livability is intimately connected to its human scale that makes the public realm hospitable. On a bright, sunny, walkable neighborhood street we are inclined to linger, to watch children play, to stop at a sidewalk café. Characteristics of a sociable urban street include human scale buildings with residential windows and balconies; active and open street level façade with cafes and shops; calmed traffic; wide sidewalks; trees and benches; and a street with room-like proportions, with building heights no greater than the street width. High-rise buildings diminish the hospitality of the street. They throw shadows on surrounding streets, darken the street by blocking out the sky, they can create a canyon making the street noticeably darker, colder and windier. In the South Waterfront, more high-rise buildings are inevitable. The North Pearl has many good high-density human scale blocks that will inevitably be overwhelmed by surrounding high-rise. It would be a mistake to destroy the predominantly human scale central sections of the Pearl District. These early developments epitomize the characteristics of a livable neighborhood. Lowering of height limits from Glisan to Lovejoy would protect the character of this neighborhood. What is not inevitable, and should at all costs be prevented, is the destruction of one of the most historically significant neighborhoods in the city, the West End, by further high-rise incursions. The neighborhood has potential for high-density low-rise mixed-use development on the numerous parking lots that would complement the West End and make it a healthy, livable and equitable city center neighborhood suitable for families with children, elders, and a workforce population. Heights need in the West End need to be reduced to 100 – 175 feet.

Mike Lindberg: I am here to testify to the damaging role of surface parking in downtown. I was once Director of Public Works and was on City Council. Many people have lost sight of the fact that the City's dream was much larger - to expand development that we have downtown all the way to the waterfront to provide smooth transition to Waterfront Park. Development there should have generated millions of revenue. Surface lots should be banned. The Portland Development Commission (PDC) came up with creative approaches to downtown housing and other development. The same approach should be used in Old Town / Skidmore. I support the language that is in the current draft. This ought to be assigned to BPS and PDC as implementing agencies. Parking lots in the Skidmore Historic District need to be addressed as zoning and development issues. While I was on City Council, we took down the old sea wall that blocked views. For last 25 years, Portland has been working to bring more development to the waterfront.

Cathy Galbraith: Please reflect on the meeting summary that I was at the last meeting under the public list at the beginning. At a meeting of this significance, there are at least 40 things that I want to comment on. I will touch on the historic section of the revised Plan. The historic section of the plan indicates that at one time the Chinese population was 10% of the City's population and Portland had the highest level of cast iron fronted buildings. We know that of the 200 cast iron buildings, there are only 22 left. Those districts are not places where you experiment with height lightly. We have come here meeting after meeting driving you all crazy talking about our concerns for these two districts. There is still too much use of the word "encourage" for the historic districts. What the SAC has reviewed is not really a plan but a large series of blocks that are there to meet development opportunities. To get to the issue of environmental concerns, we had good discussion at last meeting. There was a study released

in 2012 that looked at four cities around the country and six building scenarios. For a new house in Portland it would take 50 years to overcome the impacts of its construction. And it takes about 42 years for the new average energy efficiency building to cancel negative impacts of building.

Jackie Peterson: I represent members of the Japanese and Chinese community and am a board member of the Portland Chinatown History Museum. I am happy that you all decided to back away from the action item that proposed a zoning change to 175 feet on the western half of new Japantown. Studying the height limits here is a critical issue. In effect, by placing this study in the 2035 column, it becomes part of the zoning recommendation. Whereas design guidelines and new nomination for district discussion and encouraging in a 2-5 year window are preferred. At least remove 175 feet in this half of the map. Please consider a fit within the goals and action items and how this discussion will occur without putting the cart before the horse.

Joe Angel: Thank you for the work you have done. As seven years on the Planning Commission, these jobs are thankless but if it wasn't for you this City would be a different place. I would like to raise an issue about stormwater management. I am not against it, but rather for it. I am against taking out large sections of streetscape and parking and ability to have outdoor seating for restaurants by putting in these above ground stormwater management items. There are other ways to do this. Retail businesses are being killed by this kind of facility on Division. This engineering solution does not take into consideration a vibrant retail community. We need to find a solution that is different either underground or on a boulevard where these things can be made to look beautiful but not on commercial streets. I also want to encourage angled parking. Angled parking provides an easy way to park, good access to businesses and increases capacity for retailers. Think of your retailers when you finish up this Plan. They all pay taxes and have huge abilities to create jobs. We need vibrancy to stay in business.

Gary Reddick: Thank you. I am speaking to the West End and specifically page 62. I am in support of the language encouraging ground floor commercial flexibility within the RX zone. There are special / unique properties that could benefit from this flexibility in that zone. I would suggest that some of the sites not be necessarily limited to the ground floor but encouraged even on the second and third floor. There is a lot of residential that could be encouraged on this site. Modest amount of commercial does not erode the intent of the RX zoning. Limiting flexibility to the ground floor is sort of a half step.

Mary Vogel: First I wanted to speak to a point that was just raised by Joe Angel about stormwater management. I disagree. We have some excellent stormwater facilities/green streets that incorporate seating. A green street can actually enhance a pedestrian experience and people being seated. It's more of a matter of good design. I encourage you to continue to incorporate stormwater management in streetscape design. I am delighted to see the 2035 performance target for tree canopy included here. I encourage you to include it in implementation actions on page 66. I would like to help write a couple implementation actions for tree canopy. I've sent you many comments about this.

John Czarnecki: Thank you for allowing us to testify. Thank you for revising the language on number 31 - historic resources and district on page 172. I think that new language is brilliant. We are talking about places as well as buildings, not just objects. Another thing that is excellent about it is promoting infill development that builds upon the character of established areas. That was one of the real challenges when I sat as Chair of Landmarks Commission. Character needs to be discussed. You'll notice that on the cultural and historic resources table on Page 148 that the West End is not listed. If we go to page 132, we see that 160 West End buildings

are either on the national register or qualify and that doubles the number of resources on page 148. Please have the Plan be consistent within itself and add West End to that table. On page 57, the two photos for the West End do not capture the unique character. Please consider using other photos to be capture the character and not just tall buildings.

Kristine Sarles: I have a long term relationship with the city. I am actually greatly concerned with this West Quadrant Plan. It will take the most livable city in the US and turn into the most unlivable. The City's character will be demolished and it will be an unrecognizable city. Portland is a very small city. If you go from I-5 to north Park Blocks – how many cars can fit in this area? Currently we are gridlocked. It took me 30 minutes to get across the Broadway Bridge. Low level parking, high rise development – where will the cars goes? There is no place for them to go. We are not Chicago, Vancouver BC. People won't stop driving. You're just increasing traffic to a scale that will make this city miserable and a terrible place to live. I truly love Portland. There is not the real estate for these cars. Portland originally had short blocks in part to discourage tall buildings. An OPB program compared Seattle to Portland and Portland was a superior city because of low building heights and small blocks. There are a lot of developers on the SAC. That is part of the problem.

SAC Discussion and Action

Kirstin said Karen Williams had to leave due to pain from her recent car accident. Kirstin read the written comments from Patrick Gortmaker and Jessica Engelmann. Those will be included as an attachment to this summary.

Kirstin indicated that Patrick Gortmaker, Jessica Engelmann, Karen Williams, Nolan Lienhart, Hermann Colas, Jr (who are not able to be here-Mr. Lienhart came briefly to the meeting but had to leave) and Mary Valeant have all signed their approval in support of the Plan. She asked SAC members to use their voting cards to answer the question "Do you endorse the Draft West Quadrant Plan as revised?" Kirstin reminded SAC members that even if they endorse the plan as revised, they can still submit a minority report on particular items.

Karl said that Mary Valeant's received comments /changes were amenable and fair and we can incorporate those.

Dan Petrusich: Considering RC2 for Goose Hollow, Goose Hollow has lost 1,600 jobs and we are trying to add 2,000 back and the only place to do that are on the Flats. On page 135, I would like to add language that staff is considering zoning and encouraging job growth there.

Jeanne Galick: I'm glad we put big ideas into this draft, but the plan really lacks any specificity except for on Waterfront Park. Turning Naito into a boulevard or adding a section for feasibility for partial or full closure for Naito on evenings / weekends should be mentioned even if you don't agree with it. We also need very strong historic preservation measures. We have heard about this over and over and the idea is not in here. The idea of capping the freeway should be brought up front. These are just some of the ones that we have talked about. I would like to see a plan for the next generation of parks – how are we going to do that? How are we going to have spaces to recreate in these corridors?

Kirstin: Some of these ideas are in the executive summary. Some of the big themes may not be called out to your satisfaction and one of the purposes of the executive summary is to call those forward. It can be hard to find them in the full document.

Bob Sallinger: I did not have enough time to review with my organization and come back tonight. You have also given us 10 days to come back with a minority report. The major changes are not all highlighted for us to easily access. I do read this very closely. There were major changes in environment section. There were only six implementation actions and many are shortened or gone. I could do this for every chapter. This is a very different document from what we have seen before. It puts a bad ending on a good product. This document is confusing. Some have been moved around and I couldn't find it. Staff tells me that it is there just moved. It shouldn't be a treasure hunt at the end. I know it's not intentional and these documents are hard. A lot of language is incredibly weak on the environment. There are some major areas that are placeholders and that's just wrong. I think it was a mistake to kick the river planning to a side small process. Overall, the environment comes off as an afterthought. This document does not hit the mark on the River, green infrastructure or climate change. Those are the big three. This isn't where I expected to be at this meeting. Staff is willing to work with us but how will we get committee vote on any of that. We need more time.

Staff: Sorry first and foremost for your frustration. There is concern and confusion about the edits and where we think they are. On the edits, that was an oversight. Any changes should have been outlined since the last draft. We used a shared, cloud based document that could be edited by a bunch of staff at the same time. This was the first time using such a system. I deeply suspect that some of the edits didn't get flagged in a way that got cataloged appropriately. That was an error. I believe that the items you're referring to got moved into the Central City-wide section on page 170. On page 174, there is a long list of items related to - and came out of district plans - climate change. These actions were then removed from their district sections. These are important enough to be raised to the whole Central City rather than just in this quadrant. A lot of it is still in here.

Bob Sallinger: I have read it and a lot has been changed or removed. They need to not only be in the Central City-wide section but also in the districts. We are not seeing a document that we can react to. I understand that the Central City-wide actions will be in the front of the full plan.

Staff: Environmental recommendations will come up to the front of the document if it is Central City-wide. I am sorry it's frustrating. Yes, the format regarding the Central City-wide section has created some confusion. We definitely need to fix this for the final document. Central City-wide will be up front, district level will follow and the quadrant specific goes away.

Doreen Binder: Will environmental issues be taken out of the other quadrant plans and combined?

Staff: If they are relevant to the whole Central City then yes. If they are specific to a creek or shoreline in a specific district then they will stay in their respective district. This is the first quadrant plan to do this. The N/NE Quadrant is done and we are in the midst of SE. The West Quadrant got into more detail than the other plans.

Doreen Binder: Will there be a section up front that talks about environmental issues?

Staff: Yes. The section in the back of this draft is the first draft of that.

Jeanne Galick: If you combine these what takes priority? Does citywide policy trump district policy?

Staff: Central City applies to whole Central City. What we have left in the district is where there is a particular interpretation for that particular area. And we wouldn't want to insert Central City-wide policy in that specific area.

Staff: Many of the goals in the districts were general and there weren't implementation actions associated with them or they were general and in those cases we brought them to Central City-wide. If we had specificity for the sub-districts we tried to clarify that further. I would like to talk more about if we lost something in that process or have a walk through with Bob.

Katherine Schultz: For clarity was there any intent to remove actions or thoughts?

Staff: No. We were trying to remove duplicity of general policy and be as specific as possible in specific sub-district areas.

Bob Sallinger: The City never came in and put actions to make them meaningful. If you removed things that didn't have actions associated to them then we failed here. There should have been specificity on those issues. We can come up with real targets and actions by the districts.

Patricia Gardner: On page 88 - UD6, I'm not sure where the Johnson Street View Corridor came from. Height in the 90s was changed because of the view corridors for the West Hills. It would be good for this language to reflect the BPS work on this subject. I would like to add one that you may want to consider for the entire Central City. We have been trying to get an update to the historic resource inventory. The entire Central City historic resource needs to be updated. It would help the community.

Keith Liden: I think that some of the implementation actions are vague. I know that you have a lot of them. We need to focus on the big ideas. The Green Loop implementation action is 2-5 years. We need more conversation about how we will pull this off. Capping of 405 – I like this idea but I don't think there is enough here to guide the City very well. I question why PBOT is the lead agency. It's mostly ODOT right-of-way and is mostly an urban development project. That is not in PBOT's house. Obviously they have to be involved. Seems it could be Planning, PDC and a private sector partner. We need more explanation on how we are going to do things, rather than just we will do it in X amount of time. The Times Square idea on Burnside seemed like there was more discussion in Old Town /Chinatown but it is technically Downtown. That is a great idea that should be built on more. This is a real opportunity area. It warrants a big idea and could really be a help to change Burnside.

Staff: There is an Appendix A item where we sketched in the Times Square notion. Additional action on this is UD10. We could add it to the text in the Big Ideas section. On freeway capping, that is a good point. All of that is true that you pointed out. Everybody thinks it's cool but nobody is lined up to work on it.

Jeff Martens: None of this is likely to happen unless staff does it. It is a guide to tell City Council and staff what we think should happen. I don't think it's underrepresented. It's up to staff.

Staff: These discussions we are having here are critical. Capping has great potential to improve livability, development conditions, and recreational opportunities and help create a much better pedestrian environment. It's not a super high priority from the Oregon Department

of Transportation's regional-mobility perspective. It's not a dead concept but will need a champion to work with ODOT.

Jeff Martens: Just because we don't have a champion here doesn't mean it won't happen. I trust that staff will do your job well and if it's not a priority over the next 20 year to you I trust that. I trust you doing your job taking our comments into consideration.

Staff: The next time you see this it will look like a policy plan for the whole Central City and there will be a work plan that draws from it for the whole Central City. We have our ideas in here and it's an annual process to promote those through. We need to keep the priorities alive or readjust them accordingly. Community support helps.

Brian Emerick: I share Bob's frustration. The Plan was completely reorganized and it is difficult to see the all the changes. I am still concerned about the height proposal in Chinatown RC4. It says study but seems like we are really saying it. Page 140 new zoning to encourage housing etc could include height bonus, what does that mean? Does it mean we will allow more FAR / height in this loop hole in the appendix? Development and historic guidelines – now it says “through a community process development and adopt historic guidelines.” Of course it will go through a community process. What is the intent of that? Page 103 UD11 and UD12– were those in there before? I don't remember these. I am concerned that we are adding new urban design elements at the end of the process.

Staff: I'm not sure if they were new. I think these came from the Portland Business Alliance Skidmore-Old Town-Chinatown Task Force recommendations.

Brian Emerick: I am concerned about what UD12 means. I was hoping to see a stronger statement on sustainability. On page 174, building retrofits moved up. There needs to be a stronger statement about existing buildings and sustainability. This just talks about retrofits. Finally the Historic Resources Inventory update keeps coming up. It's a huge issue right now and there is a lot of pressure. This should be a Central City goal.

Staff: Making an action about doing the update for the Central City is much more time consuming and expensive, there therefore perhaps less likely to happen. Maybe we can rewrite it for the whole Central City but prioritize the West End. That was the reason to keep it to the specific district. Other text change around community process came out of this process and public comments. The intent was to recognize that folks in the district wanted to be part of the discussion.

Marvin Mitchell: I agree with a lot. I'm yellow because I still need time to review this. I understand it is a tough job to take all these counter views and come up with a document. More emphasis on the capping should be included. This is a big idea and it could help develop a different type of downtown. I applaud what has been done so far but there are some minor adjustments to be done.

John Russell: I read every word and am impressed with the work product. For RC20 on page 96, the timing should be current. Structured parking has to precede elimination of surface parking. If you have any doubt about eliminating the Morrison ramps look at the illustration on page 128 and how you get into those buildings.

Jason Franklin: The tone was a little off compared to some of the others for the South Downtown / University description in the executive summary. The last sentence about

improving connectivity reads that the whole area is challenging. I would like to see PSU at the beginning of that sequence. On page 48, regarding quadrant wide policies on transportation, there is no discussion about bike or ped travel. I think it got stuck back in the back some place. In areas where you look at policies the important policies should be up front and central. On page 53 it talks about the Waterfront Master Plan. It is a key big idea in the document but this action gets stuck in 6-20 year timeframe. I would like to see that bumped up to 2-5 year. On page 115 there is a picture of food carts in the South Downtown / University district section. I would recommend taking a look at the picture and tell a better story specific to this district. Transportation policy #2 on page 121, I believe it should be connectivity between PSU and Willamette River Bridgeheads not just Willamette River.

Steve Pinger: Everyone has a copy of my emailed comments. My concern is that this is a lot and I have struggled to adequately review in the timeframe that we were given. It seems that this needs to be distilled, focused and organized. When I was reviewing the revised plan, I kept referring back to 21-24 which are urban design principles which I think are focused, distilled and strong. I kept having trouble aligning those strong principles with the full plan. Moreover, there are fundamental contradictions in the Plan. The first two principles refer to enhance existing character and diversity of West Quadrant and refer to new businesses etc. I worry that there is a lot of excessive entitlement and a lot of height allowed. At the level those entitlements are allowed they are working in opposition to these goals. We want density, but it needs to be distilled, focused and organized. Right now it is spread out so broadly so we are missing the mark on achieving our goals.

Kirstin called for a final vote with one/green indicating endorsement of the Draft West Quadrant Plan; two/yellow general comfort with endorsing the plan with some reservations; and three/red indicating SAC members do not endorse the plan.

- **One/green:** Doreen Binder, Hermann Colas, Jr, Jessica Engleman, Jason Franklin, Patricia Gardner, Greg Goodman, Patrick Gortmaker, Cori Jacobs, Tamera Kennedy-Hill, Nolan Leinhart, Jeff Martens, John Peterson, Dan Petrusich, John Russell, Katherine Schultz, Mary Valeant, Karen Williams (17)
- **Two/yellow:** Brian Emerick, Sean Hubert, Keith Liden, Marvin Mitchell, Valeria Ramirez (5)
- **Three/red:** Jeanne Galick, Steve Pinger, Bob Salinger (3)

Kirstin reminded SAC members that minority opinions are due by August 1 (*Note: the deadline was later extended to August 8*). She explained that if you submit for yourself rather than a group of members that doesn't lessen the weight of your concerns.

Jeanne Galick: How will our concerns be addressed? What's the value of the minority report?

Staff: Your minority opinion will accompany the Plan as it advances to the Planning and Sustainability Commission. We can make some of these changes but we won't be making them all. We want to clarify what happened with the changes / moves that Bob is concerned with. You should assume that some of these items will go forward in the Plan accompanied by your minority report.

Katherine Schultz: I can tell you that hearing any minority opinion is very important to the Planning Commission. If Karl doesn't address what you're concerned with then send in your comments because the Planning Commission will hear you and listen. Make your opinions known.

Tamara Kennedy-Hill: If you're in support but have clarifying questions and comments does that need to be by August 1 or just before it goes to Commission? If we wanted to write a letter on certain things with a couple questions – when does that need to be to you? Not major concerns.

Staff: We are available to talk with anybody at anytime. There will be opportunities to address these things. The minority opinion piece by August 1 is something that you strongly need to have called out and will go along with co-chairs transmittal letter that represents this group as a whole. You can submit letters of testimony (or come and speak) for the Planning Commission hearing on September 9th. There are other ways to get other things in for review.

Kirstin invited each member to offer any closing thoughts.

John Petersen: Portland is a wonderful city and we all share this thought. There is a lot in here but a lot is not brand new. I hope that what comes out makes some positive difference that wouldn't have happen otherwise – capping freeway, activating Naito and Waterfront Park and fixing Burnside. These big ideas could help us become the leading edge city that we deserve to be.

Dan Petrusich: This has been a good process. It has been good to get all the different perspectives. As we get to implementation I hope that jobs do not get lost. Look at how we have evolved over last 25 years. This was the key job area and the commute was downtown and people lived in the suburbs. Now downtown is a bedroom community for the suburbs. We are starting to see companies move back downtown. Some realize to stay competitive that employees want to work and live downtown. It's only starting. There were 100,000 jobs added in the 90s and all those were in the suburbs. Please keep this in mind. Downtown will be much stronger when it's both a great place to live and also work. The migration of jobs will come downtown.

Bob Salinger: I am disappointed in this process. It is one of the easier landscapes to deal with, thought it was the least I had to worry about. But instead it accomplished the least. This plan does not lead the charge on the environment. We are lying on our laurels. Portland is just coasting right now. This is a coasting plan. This is the easiest landscape that you've had to deal with. You could have kicked butt and you didn't. We will try to go on the treasure hunt and find where things went. It's there but things have also been downgraded where there was real possibility.

Jeanne Galick: Primarily, the original charge was to be bold and think of big things. There have been some strong ideas but because they are not easy to put into regulations they have been thrown out. Some of the controversial ones should be put back in like flat density rather than towers. I would like them at least in front in the big ideas so councils and commissions can at least see them.

Keith Liden: I agree with Steve that this plan needs to be distilled more. How will you distill it to a final version that will be helpful to the public when you it to the take the Planning Commission? How you will take this plan to the final rolled up plan?

Valeria Ramirez: The final product before us today lacks specificity regarding jobs and economy. I really thought there would be more and informing a lot of the discussions more than it has. Trying to find the sections and some has been moved back. The only thing I can find is

office. We have some idea of what kinds of activities might take place in the city over the next 20 years.

Jeff Martens: I came into this process skeptical of what City bureaus, committees and employees do and now have a great amount of respect for the work that staff has done. Staff has been respectful dealing with the 33 of us, which I think is way too big. We have made crazy requests of you and you have followed through. Our city is the way it is because of the staff. I have great respect for public and SAC here as well.

Brian Emerick: The level of volunteer effort is great. Staff has done an amazing job. The key challenge is trying to get down to specifics.

Tamara Kennedy-Hill: I have been involved in meeting with Karl and Debbie outside the meetings and reading all packets. We see a lot of potential. As housing shapes the future landscape of Portland, need to keep it vibrant. We want to stay involved.

Jason Franklin: Kudos to staff. This is hard work. Thank you for taking the time to listen to my numerous rants on various things. Thank you for moving the waterfront to the front of big ideas. I encourage you to take this seriously and dig into it and see what we can do to give Portland a 21st century riverfront that we deserve from environmental and economic function perspective.

Sean Hubert: Kudos to staff. As an affordable housing advocate this is a good balanced plan. Take a look at some bolder things like how state regulations and policies impact zoning here in Portland. My "2" vote is really about the balance of historic preservation and height recommendations as there is still tension here. I would like to see the timing of Old Town / Chinatown plans moved up to 2015 rather than 2-5 years. That is most fragile neighborhood covered by the Plan.

Marvin Mitchell: Great job of handling this diverse group and getting everything into one document. I still need to go through it because it seems confused somehow. How is equity addressed? I would like more specificity in housing and other issues around that. This is a great jumping off point though.

John Russell: I am very impressed with the end product. One comment that I have is that we often didn't as committee members have the humility that we should have had. We didn't ask staff's opinion often enough.

Joe Zehnder thanked all participants. We took this call at the end for the bigger ideas to heart when we got the first email. This needs to play more prominently than we currently have it. Thank you for reminding of this. We promise that we won't let that slide. Thank you for staying with us on what is a really complicated thing conceptually. You all really added a lot to the process.

Katherine Schultz: It's been an amazing process. Thank you to all who participated from the public. I look forward to all of this coming through to the Sustainability Commission. I'll take with me what I heard hear during this process.

The meeting adjourned at 8:30 pm.