

**Portland Plan Advisory Group**  
**Discussion Notes: Draft Economic Prosperity and Affordability Strategy**  
**May 13, 2011**  
**1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 7A**  
**8:30 a.m. to 10:00 a.m.**

**Attendees**

Linda Nettekoven (Portland Plan Community Involvement Committee), Chris Smith (Planning and Sustainability Commission), Jesse Beeson (Portland Community Land Trust), Eric Engstrom (BPS), Steve Kountz (BPS), Steve Dotterer (BPS), Shane Sasnow (Forward Motion, Facilitator)

**Discussion**

1. The household prosperity metrics in the strategy (5-8) include specific targets. Are those targets too aggressive or unrealistic? Should we set aspirational or realistic targets?

*5. Access to housing*

- The 2035 targets are not clear without specifying current performance. Staff response: the current share of housing stock affordable for low-income residents is about 10%, compared to the 2035 target of 15%.
- Metro has current data on cost-burdened households in which transportation and housing cost exceed 50% of income. The 2035 target that 70% of households are not cost burdened makes more sense than the RTP target.
- Why are 2 targets set for one goal? It is inconsistent.
- The housing accessibility target should account for the aging population and expanding needs to accommodate disabilities. A different metric for proximity to transit is needed for seniors, closer than ¼ mile. Staff response: proposed neighborhood hubs address closer proximity.
- An action should be added to improve age-awareness and age equity, to be a positive city for aging. Accessory units in homes owned by seniors are an opportunity.
- These targets are not too aggressive.

*6. Education and training*

- This one lacks a numeric target. It could set a job placement target. Staff response: part of the intent for the alignment goal is to increase training/education to fill gaps by skill/income level, which a general placement target would not address.
- How should the target account for importing skilled workers? Distinguish between hiring residents and non-residents.
- The wording is awkward. The statement has no apparent actor. Who's watching alignment of education to jobs?
- Measuring alignment would differ for educational fields, technical training, and apprenticeships.
- The medical field is shifting as reimbursement rates require more lower-skilled supporting services around hospitals. Training is needed for these services.

*7. Neighborhood economic vitality*

- This target is complicated by a mix of metrics: 90% of neighborhoods, market leakage, and metrics for economic health.
- Too aggressive? It's hard to say.

*8. Household economic security*

- This target is interrelated to #5 on housing access, but not explicitly. How does 15% low income housing stock relate to 90% self sufficiency? Look at that relationship and clarify it.

- Starting the statement with “how” to meet the metric is unusual. Why do it this way? Response: The intent is partly to not increase the share of self-sufficient households by pricing out lower income households – the San Francisco experience.
  - #8 is OK. The purpose is captured, but the metric may not confirm the purpose.
  - Clarify if the 15% metric for low-income housing affordability means 15% subsidized housing. Self-sufficiency means not living in subsidized housing, so how can we have a higher share of subsidized households than the share of households that are not economically self-sufficient?
  - Two issues: avoid the San Francisco scenario; and recognize the continuous stream of new people needing assistance.
  - An external measure is relevant here. Does increasing self sufficiency in Portland reduce it in Beaverton?
2. Are there other quick-starts we have missed – other actions that would more effectively implement the goals of the strategy?
- An action is needed to address our aging demographic and its most vulnerable populations. For example, facilitate siting of assisted living facilities. Another example is to be intentional about certain areas, such as Hollywood’s trend of attracting seniors. The mismatch of single-level homes and transportation access is also relevant. Elevators are not economically feasible in older and low-rise buildings. Shared housing and accessory units are an option. An aging strategy for planning and land use is needed.
  - None of the actions address locating affordable housing near transit. New tools and incentives for different housing types could be proposed.
  - Action 18 should also address state housing subsidies, converting 30-year to 60-year affordability terms.
  - Seattle has new incentive-based zoning. Take a look.
  - Add policy direction not to up-zone without benefit criteria.
  - Utility costs are not addressed in the strategies. Energy retrofitting is missing. For example, lead the conversation to change FHA and Fannie Mae guidelines. Try again on the city “feebate” proposal. Educate the appraisal industry to consistently understand the value of green buildings.
  - Where is the role of tourism addressed?
  - On p. 9, add an action to coordinate training and childcare to get single parents into jobs.
  - Address non-conforming commercial development in action 33.
3. Do the actions reflect the stated commitment to disparity reduction and equity?
- In action 24, state the hiring agreements approach more clearly.
  - Expand action 37 to address racial/ethnic disparities.
4. Which actions should be dropped, or changed, and why?
- Some actions read like policies, and policies include some actions.
  - How to influence federal policies more effectively? Identify federal legislation/investment proposals and coordinate with the region to support federal changes. Gut check Portland v. national perspectives.

## **Portland Plan Advisory Group**

### **Discussion Notes: Draft Healthy Connected Neighborhoods Strategy**

**May 13, 2011**

**1900 SW 4<sup>th</sup> Avenue, Room 7A**

**10:30 a.m. to Noon**

#### **Attendees**

Noelle Dobson, Oregon Public Health Institute and PPAG; Linda Nettekoven, Hosford Abernethy and PPAG; Jane Hansen, ASLA, Design Commission; Drake Zuma, Homebuilders Association; Eric Engstrom, BPS; Steve Dotterer, BPS; Alexandra Howard, BPS; Shane Sasnow, Forward Motion (facilitator)

#### **Health**

1. Noelle presented recommended actions developed by the Portland Plan Human Health, Food and Public Safety TAG as replacements for actions 45, 46 and 47 in the March/workshop version of the strategies. The group reviewed and discussed the recommended actions. Issues discussed included:
2. Developing a memorandum of understanding between the city and the county that sets standards for sharing information.
3. Developing a process for formalized cross-disciplinary exchange between health and planning.
4. Changing the way we distribute money and investments and developing a more conscious process for assessing how funds are allocated, keeping in mind that there are geographies and communities that may need greater investment.
5. The need to integrate health into the Comprehensive Plan and developing health equity impact assessments that could be used to evaluate projects and could be included in the front of the Comprehensive Plan.
6. Access to healthcare
7. Need to add actions or policies related to healthy building design, (noise, materials, pollution, etc.).
8. Comp Plan and Portland Plan
9. The group discussed the difference between the Comprehensive Plan and the Portland Plan, noting that the Portland Plan needs to focus on changes and the things we do well can continue to live in the Comprehensive Plan.

#### **Community Connect Language**

1. Linda Nettekoven asked staff to check the language in the strategy against the language in Community Connect. There may be useful language in Community Connect.

#### **Recommendations**

1. Add an action related to building design for health
2. Add an action to create health maps, including noise maps
3. Address environmental health as well as human health (or perhaps it should go in greenways)
4. Amend action 39 to include the Caruthers multi-use path
5. Add an action related to retrofitting existing housing (health improvements)
6. Add an action that says how you are going to improve engagement with residents. Some noted that this could go in the Comprehensive Plan.

7. Include more information on displacement reduction, like community benefits agreements and land trusts.
8. Make sure that the policies and actions are clearly related and connected.
9. Include an action relating to disaggregating data
10. Actions 17, 18 and 19 are all about eco-districts even though the section is called Sustainable Urban Form. Change the section title or amend the actions. Doesn't watershed health play into a sustainable urban form?