

West Portland Town Center Plan
Community Advisory Group
Monday October 7, 2019 – 6:30 to 8:30 pm
Meeting Notes

Location: Markham Elementary School – 10531 SW Capitol Highway - Cafeteria

Group members present: Chris Chiacchierini, Terri Preeg-Riggsby, Marianne Fitzgerald, Chris Smith, Mohamed Salim Bahamadi (formerly Saalim Ahmed Saalim), Katherine Christensen, Dacia Grayber, Pam Phan, Rachael Duke

Guests: Fatma Abdallah and Amina (UniteOregon alternates)

Group members absent: Javier Moncada, Beth Omansky, Ramsay Weit, Adrenalina Corrales and Brandon Brezic

Staff present: Joan Frederiksen, Ryan Curren, Samuel Garcia

Partner staff: Libby Winter -TriMet, Seemab Hussaini – UniteOregon, Mimi Phillips – Portland Bureau of Transportation

Introductions, past meeting summary and public comments:

Samuel convened the meeting. After introductions and icebreaker about things attendees had learned in the past week, the meeting ground rules, as developed at the last meeting were reviewed. They were displayed in poster form near the meeting tables.

The group was asked for any changes, questions or concerns regarding the August 5 meeting minutes.

- An omission was noted for members present list. We will add Rachael Duke who was present.
- Regarding August's agenda item related to Health Equity Impact Assessment memo:
 - o A reiteration of a past question and concern about the cancer rate data source was shared, noting that confidence in assumptions in data leads to confidence of findings.
 - o A question was raised regarding further explanation of the methodology in regard to using the census boundary and the town center boundary.
- More generally to all the existing conditions memos for the project, a question was raised as to whether those had been shared. Joan: I intended to send them before the CAG meeting but have not done so yet. They will be posted this week.

Related to the existing conditions memos, Ryan asked group to ground truth observations and use their knowledge of area to provide staff feedback. He also invited anyone who wanted to dig into the methodology or data to let us know so that a meeting or subcommittee could be set up to discuss and explore the data and reports. Other questions or comments as follows were voiced:

- Will you do or have you done a displacement risk analysis [for WPTC area]? Specifically thinking about who and where they might be living in the WPTC and using a baseline and projecting impact based on the transit investment.
- CAT doing outreach to work with families, what choices they have if they face displacement. Neglect of building is what market is doing right now. Lack of repair is trigger for displacement. Future rent increases are an ongoing concern.
- In response Ryan noted that we have the baseline assessment done, which shows what the existing conditions are. A future memo will look at possible changes, if light rail goes through and BTC builds out, that you can expect, and what prices might be – particularly if what is predominantly built are market rate units.
- Another member noted that we need to create strategies - and feels like land banking may be really important – and we aren't doing them. Seems that we are saying the same things in different places/meetings but we're not necessarily seeing motion.
- When asking these questions, we could vaguely ask these questions, but we should plan to ask for the ask and the exact answers.

Updates/announcements

Ryan gave an update on the work being done to develop a Barbur Transit Center (BTC) concept including the September 6 workshop that some CAG members attended. The idea with this BTC work is that when LRT opens in 2027 it will also come with some affordable and market rate housing, commercial and other uses on this site. The concept will provide a development scenario that can be studied and analyzed.

This work is not intended to come up with a develop proposal/agreement. However, it will give agencies and ODOT an idea of what could happen so they can start to consider redevelopment possibilities.

Ryan will send out the two designs that appear to be moving forward.

Other questions or comments as follows were voiced:

- The center running option is nightmare for the intersection at 41st/Barbur/Taylor's Ferry.
- Workshop also discussed parks and open spaces.
- Was there a conversation about level of affordability and types of units? Ryan: No but the Equitable Housing Strategy provides a lot of guidance on this.
- Why consider office here when we have a surplus of office and we need affordable housing?
- Talked about prioritizing affordable housing in phase 1 of BTC redevelopment.

Next, Libby Winter with TriMet gave an update on the SW Corridor Light Rail project. The project is facing a budget shortfall of \$400 million. Changes to the light rail line's terminus, narrowing Barbur Blvd. to one lane in some locations, a mix (hybrid option) of these changes and seeking additional funding are all being considered to bridge the gap. The project Steering Committee is expected to make a decision at their November 18 meeting. Public comments are requested via email/mail or at the following upcoming project meetings:

- Steering Committee - November 4 - 6 p.m. – Tigard Library
- Community Advisory Committee – November 7, 5:30 p.m. – Tigard Public Works
- Steering Committee - November 18, 9:00 a.m. – Tigard City Hall

West Portland November 9 public workshop

Joan described the upcoming November 9 event explaining that this workshop/event was an opportunity to dive deeper into the physical considerations and infrastructure of the town center, whether buildings, open space, roads or other supporting infrastructure. The main part of the workshop will be focused around two exercises with maps and questions. The first will explore what we've heard already and what additional high level/big picture concepts or considerations the community wants us to think about integrating. The second exercise will be finer grained and ask community members to consider a variety of building, street and open space types and give us feedback on those and where they should/could be located in the future town center.

Joan asked for comments and question related to the planned workshop. The following comments and question were raised:

- Regarding the maps we have shown/are using. Some of these show three boundaries: TC, study area and census boundary. Which boundaries are we talking about? Let's be clear for the workshop.
- There is a difference between the north and south areas and want to talk about the differences of the two, infrastructure wise and otherwise.

Staff invited all to attend and extend invitations to their networks and inquired as to who would be able to attend the Nov 9 workshop and requested that each member try to bring or send five additional people.

Community benefits through land use regulations and related tools

Ryan introduced the next topic. The town center plan work has one major big tool: zoning code and map and urban design. Much of actors who look at that code are private developers. You can have conditions around public benefit with those zoning code rules. Then the question to consider is what is the role of zoning in equity goals?

Explaining a slide noting range of public benefits, he explained that there are a range of things that can be controlled with land use/zoning tools on one side of the spectrum and by Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs) on the other, then there is some middle ground of things that can be found in both of those tools. Today we want to talk about how we could put public benefits in the zoning code and what those would be.

During this presentation the following comments or questions were raised:

- Is this different from a Community Benefits Agreement (CBA)? Ryan: Yes, this is about rules that could apply across the plan area/district, not about one set of agreements (typical CBA) with one private developer.
- In that case, we should use a term other than "community benefits" because confusing – use "public benefits" or even something simpler.
- Concern that this assumes that what is required is what gets built. Today in many parts of SW no street or storm infrastructure is being built with new development. Just because it is in the code doesn't mean that is what is happening. While you allow it and some pay fees, it is simply not getting built. Across I-5 we have worst infrastructure in city. (can't find the stormwater system

plan). Hoping this plan makes a difference. We get infill but no infrastructure. Ryan: That is a good reminder that we need teeth to get follow through. Also, keep in mind that if it's a totally new idea, may need to develop a new program to make it happen.

Ryan shared a list of the type of public benefits that in current zoning code are incentivized through regulations. He also went over the list of past incentives not taken. Noting that requirements also come up against feasibility considerations. He referred the group to the handout that also listed some of this information.

Terri directed group to look and consider the handout with the Draft WPTC goals and the Equitable Housing Strategy introduced with EHS and WPTC goals as a starting point. Refer group to the goals handout.

Rachael and Terri then led a discussion to list out public benefits/opportunities to be sought or explored with the town center work, as well as burdens we want to avoid or be aware of.

Discussion questions: *What benefits do we want? What burdens do we want to prevent?/ What things do we want to keep from happening?*

Benefits/Opportunities

- Keep SDC's and other generated funds within the neighborhood
- Create lower impact environmental/green building requirements
- Safe pathways/sidewalks
- Access existing amenities
- Range of housing opportunities, including: homeownership models like co-op, community land trusts, Habitat for Humanity and rental housing
- Zero displacement
- Affordable commercial for low-income, women, minority-owned businesses
 - "Mercado"
- Wider sidewalks
- Fill gaps in existing transportation infrastructure
- Augmented tree standards? Where?

Burdens

- Naturally occurring affordable housing (NOAH) redevelops
 - Preserve instead
- Development w/o sidewalks
 - Keep SDCs in the area
- Air toxic concentration near affordable housing
- Air/noise mitigation
- Increase of cars and people leads to reduced safety
- Land values and property taxes rise
- Chain retail – homogenous
 - Caution that might limit a store like Winco, which most in the community will use
- Anti-speculation code

- Commercial rents increase
 - Increase years of Prosper programming

Comments and questions raised during the discussion and development of the above noted lists included:

- Curious about what the [zoning] regulations were in the 60's when this area was built. Why did the developers then find it good to build these apartments back then?
- CAT sees that the quality of the apartments in West is better than in East Portland. Have heard a lot of families say they moved to this area because the apartments were of better quality.
- Stormwater is one of the pieces that makes up the \$400 million LRT shortfall.
- Ashcreek commons, and affordable townhouse development near 64th and Barbur has no surrounding sidewalks. It is good to plan for more units but it has be safe for people. Make required infrastructure happen.
- Good points have been raised already. When we are talking about zoning and carrot/stick, haven't seen much implemented where there is a focus on preservation or upgrades to existing spaces. Using TC plan or zone options to incentivize/require restoration of existing sites.
- Sometimes existing incentives are not taken advantage of
- Don't allow the transfer of fees to other areas and require that SDCs/other fees are used here in the TC. Need a System Development Charge (SDC) policy to state that there be a balance between using SDC funding for Light Rail (LRT) investment and using it for local street and other local town center needs. Wouldn't want all of allocated SDC funding to be used up by LRT.
- We know that when new investment there will be cost impact, unintended consequences, and forcing people out. Is there an example of where code could require certain improvements for existing development?
- Traffic back-ups in future can make air pollution worse. There will be transition time before more will take LRT.
- Air toxics near affordable housing is a burden to avoid
- Renewables needed
- Reduce sound/noise pollution
- Safety benefits – how can new development code impact that? Choose to make an investment
- Avoid increase of cars
- access to natural areas as benefit desired
- Inclusionary Housing (IH) – most developers are choosing the 80% average median income (AMI) level related requirements. 60-80% AMI homeownership levels may meet some of the desire in this area.
- Keep diversity of incomes in the area - One way is to say that we want the ratio to stay within a certain range.
- Create many different types of home ownership, not just SF homes. Cooperative ownership models. Folks at CAT's tenant meeting last Saturday raised this issue.
- With some of those different housing models, who pays the taxes? In COP affordable housing property owners don't pay taxes. But home ownership community/land trust pay property taxes.
- What happens to low-income home owners when the taxes spike with later investments?
- Considering the book Color of Law, can we write a zero-displacement zoning rule? If we open up that link we open up the area to the vulnerability. Ryan: There are options we can look at.

- Is zero displacement for group of people or all people? Group members responded that displacement means people without a choice, or perhaps better stated as “involuntary displacement”.
- Are we trying to keep displacement impacts for all people? What about SF residents impacted by rising costs?
- Looking at it from social justice lens trying to level the playing field, and important to consider those most vulnerable.
- Related to promoting business opportunities – which was a common theme heard on the June walking tour - may be more about what you don’t want... ways to limit chain retail.
- Yes, but be careful. Big box restriction would rule out a WinCo for example, which much of the community would use, and would be too bad. Use it carefully.
- In trying to fit in zoning code language about minimizing displacement, consider code that talks about speculation. There is a Boston Chinatown area example – that has anti-speculation code. Stabilizes property values. Maybe a better type of tool.
- Stabilize rent for apartments and shop spaces – and make it really affordable, not just “affordable”
- Ryan explained the commercial incentives today – prosper program – which provides discounted rents for 2 years. You can never go back and take back that incentive.
- Why aren’t we talking about 10 years.
- Other benefits would be broader /wider sidewalks so more population can be more comfortable; supporting human traffic.
- Sidewalk in front of Starbucks is very deficient – 80% of people take cars because transit and street waiting areas are awful.
- Living within ¼ mile of transit stop is not enough, need access to that transit that is safe/comfortably.
- We need to address existing corridor deficiencies.
- There has never been a public discussion of how to get more people to PCC. Libby (TriMet) responded that a shuttle from 53rd Avenue station is in the cost analysis.
- Trees – build in an open space commitment to plant certain number of trees - bolster current tree standards and consider ability to provide carbon offset.

Staff thanked the group for the good discussion and ideas. The evening’s conversation will be compiled and shared through CAG notes for further work or discussion. Look for more on this in the coming months. At an upcoming CAG meeting we will discuss public benefits that would need tools other than the zoning code and map and how to prioritize those and situate those in an equitable community development framework for the town center.

Public comments – There were no general public guests.

Next steps, reminders and closing

Samuel thanked the group for their time and attention tonight. Reminded everyone that at the next meeting we will discuss report back of our November 11/9 design workshop and begin the conversation of prioritizing community benefits to be included in the Equitable Community Development Framework

With that, meeting the adjourned.