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MEMORANDUM

TO: Ernie Bonner
    Gary Stout
    Neil Goldschmidt, Mayor

FROM: Dennis Wilde, Chief Planner, District Planning

SUBJECT: DISTRICT PLANNING - PROJECT STATUS AND 76, 77 WORK PROGRAM

1. PLANS IN PROGRESS

A number of plans have been prepared by the Neighborhood Planning Section over the last two years. Those plans are pending review either by the Planning Commission or City Council. They are as follows:

A. MARQUAM HILL

Status: Marquam Hill was originally planned to be submitted to the Planning Commission in November of 1975. Staff work has been substantially completed. The hearing was postponed pending results of Veterans Administration Hospital siting study and the Planned Unit Development Regulations presently going through hearings before the Planning Commission.

Present Work Program and Time-Line: Marquam Hill Staff report will be completed in draft form by the end of August, submitted to neighborhood, special interest groups for review and comment, scheduled for first Planning Commission hearing December, 1976.

B. NORTHWEST DISTRICT

Status: Plan was adopted by City Council July of 1975. Subsequently, staff prepared a report on rezoning of the areas 9 and 11. The report was completed in October of 1975. Special hearings held by an appointed Hearings Officer were completed in December of 1975. In April 1976, the Planning Commission reviewed the recommendations of the Hearings Officer. (NOTE) It was anticipated that this entire process would be completed by December of 75, including final hearing by City Council. We are presently seven months behind schedule.

Project Work Program and Time Line: Final hearing on the rezoning of areas 9 and 11 is set for October 19, 1976. Subsequent to that hearing, the rezoning will be placed on City Council agenda.

C. CORBETT/TERWILLIGER/LAIR HILL

Status: Planning Commission held hearings in August and October as anticipated. An additional hearing was held in December and continued by appeal of the Red Cross. The final
Planning Commission hearing was held April of 1976. Preparation of final staff report and Planning Commission recommendations to Council has been completed. The City Attorney's Office is presently drafting ordinance language for rezoning of portions of Corbett. *(NOTE)* The hearing process for Corbett/Terwilliger has run six months over schedule.


D. MODEL CITIES

Status: Staff report to Planning Commission completed in November of 1975. Planning Commission held final hearings and adopted the Model Cities Comprehensive Plan on November 13, 1975. Subsequent to Planning Commission action, little activity was undertaken by staff to submit the plan to Council. No reason other than the pressure of other commitments, and the fact that we abhorred sending 85 policies to Council.

Work Program and Timeline: Completion of staff report to City Council due in August. Council hearing may be scheduled as early as September or October.

2. PLANS AND PROGRAMS FOR HCD

A. THURMAN/VAUGHN

Status: This project was not anticipated in July of 1975. Program study contracted through the Portland Development Commission with assistance from the Planning Bureau. Work began in January of 1976 when a consultant was selected. Planning Bureau assisted in the preparation of the work program, sat on the technical committee, reviewed the work progress and provided direct technical assistance. The plan was reviewed in a joint hearing by the Planning Commission and the Development Commission on April 13, 1976. Subsequently, discussions have been carried out with key property owners regarding acquisition of key parcels by the Portland Development Commission. It is considered important to secure the Forestry Center site for private development.

Projected Work Program and Time-Line: Participate with the Portland Development Commission in programming activities for the Corridor for third year of HCD (77, 78 Fiscal Year). Continue hearings with interest groups and neighborhood associations regarding development. Assist in securing needed housing projects in the Thurman/Vaughn Corridor. Include policies in N.W. Policy Plan for October Hearing. Put together program of private and public opportunities with state owned land in the Corridor.
B. UNION AVENUE

Status: Planning Commission held hearings on Union Avenue in August, September, October and December of 1975. In December of '75, the Planning Commission approved the Union Avenue Redevelopment Plan. Subsequently, the Plan was transmitted to the Development Commission with a recommendation that the Development Commission hold hearings on the Plan and recommend to Council a site or sites for renewal designation. In addition, it was recommended that the Development Commission take on project coordination for the implementation of improvements programmed for Union Avenue.

The Development Commission interviewed for Project Coordinator position in April of 1976, and did not hire. Instead, Thomas Kennedy, Director of Project Field Services, was assigned to coordinate the project. Since then, considerable staff effort has been invested in developing a development strategy paper and management plan for the implementation of improvements in the Union Avenue Corridor. Project activity presently underway includes: a) Lighting improvements, project administered by the Lighting Bureau, bids have been approved and contracts awarded; b) Highway improvements, project has been recommended for use of Mount Hood transfer funds. Local match will be provided through Housing and Community Development funding, total project cost is approximately $4.5 million - local match approximately $900,000; c) North Precinct relocation, project depended upon congressional override of President Ford's veto of the EDA Countercyclical Public Works Grant. Site selection studies conducted by the Police Bureau have been completed - City Council has indicated willingness to authorize $25,000 for preliminary design studies - at present no decision has been made to proceed further with planning for the North Precinct Relocation.

d) Investor Rehabilitation Loan Program. Development Commission presently negotiating loan package and administrative criteria with local financial institutions and key commissioners to the Development Commission;

3) Woodlawn Neighborhood Service Center. A small neighborhood oriented commercial center anchored around the Woodlawn Pharmacy. Marketing studies and preliminary design development presently underway, utilizing technical assistance from the Westinghouse Consortium and OMBE contract to MEDCO Inc.


C. ST. JOHNS

The improvement program for St. Johns Business District is being prepared under contract to the Development Commission
by SRG Partnership. Planning Bureau provided technical assistance in preparation of the work program and on-going involvement in the development of the Plan, including preparation and application of an Urban Reinvestment Task-Force Grant that will provide technical assistance to local businessmen. Downtown Plan was completed and submitted to joint Planning Commission and Development Commission hearing on June 14, 1976. Plan will be implemented through programmed activities using Housing and Community Development Funds and private efforts initiated by property owners in the St. Johns Area.

D. INNER SOUTHEAST COALITION

In October of the 1975, the Staff began a detailed reconnaissance of the seven Inner Southeast neighborhoods. The work program was prepared and reviewed with each of the seven neighborhoods, and work begun on the inventory of existing conditions of the neighborhoods.

To date, base mapping, land use inventory, zone changes, conditional uses and other information has been prepared for each of the neighborhoods. A detailed Neighborhood paper is being prepared for Sunnyside, the first of the series of neighborhood working papers. It is proposed that a neighborhood working paper will be completed for each neighborhood in the City of Portland over the next 18 months. In addition to the reconnaissance studies, staff will assist the Development Commission in annual programming for HCD improvement in the coalition of neighborhoods. This includes a neighborhood review of project priorities, preliminary feasibility for specific projects and recommendations to Council for projects to be incorporated in annual programming for HCD improvements.

3. BUCKMAN REZONING PROJECT

Status: As a result of planning efforts spanning six years in Buckman the neighborhood has initiated a large scale rezoning petition. A CETA employee, consequently, was assigned through the office of Neighborhood Associations to work with Buckman in the preparation of community's recommendation to the Planning Commission.

The CETA employee was transferred to the Planning Bureau in January 1976. About the same time that the Buckman Neighborhood Association recommendation to the Planning Commission was completed. Upon receipt of the request from Buckman, a staff study was initiated of the request for rezoning.

Work Program and Time-Line: A staff report has been completed and will be submitted to a first hearing before the Planning Commission on September 21, 1976. Basically, the staff recommendation is for a rezoning of a major portion of Buckman from Al to A2.5, with provision to allow Al density development based upon a conditional use application.
4. INNER SOUTHEAST COALITION PROJECTS

As the result of the work program drawn up for Inner Southeast Coalition, specific projects were identified to be pursued. These included a Park feasibility study for Hosford/Abernethy, recommendations regarding alternative uses for Oaks Bottom; assistance in relieving the parking congestion and traffic circulation problems around the Oregon State Food Stamp facility at 45th and Belmont. In addition, a composite policy plan will be prepared for seven neighborhoods of the coalition.

5. SPECIAL PROJECTS

In addition to programmed activities, the District Planning Section acts on a number of special projects each year. In the past, these included such activities as: disposition of the Fire Station at NE 28th and Davis in Kerns Neighborhood, participation on the Task Force for the disposition of the property in the Mount Hood Freeway Corridor, working with neighborhood groups in the Arnold Creek Annexation Area, staff assistance on the application to the City for assistance in converting Kenton Fire Station to public use, coordinating neighborhood involvement in special design activities such as the Couch Park and Macleay Park in NW Portland and others. These special projects usually cannot be anticipated and normally consume considerably more time than anticipated.

6. AIRPORT MASTER PLAN

The Bureau upon request from the Port of Portland has submitted a work program for work anticipated to be completed over the next 26 months as a part of the Portland International Airport Master Plan Study. No action has been taken pending approval and funding of the PIA Study and negotiation of a final work program with the Port of Portland.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Dennis Wilde
FROM: Michael Lyons

SUBJECT: Model Cities Comprehensive and Neighborhood Plans

The purpose of this memo is to comment on my meeting with the Model Cities Executive Board, 25 February 1975, which I attended in order to discuss the status of the Model Cities Comprehensive Framework and Neighborhood Plans. Our discussion centered around (3) three concerns: (1) Why no action had been taken on the plans to date, (2) what are the alternatives or strategies available, and (3) what is the process required for reviewing neighborhood plans. First I will direct my comments to these concerns and then offer specific recommendations.

1st concern: Lack of Action

The Executive Board expressed concern with the lack of action on the Model Cities Comprehensive Framework and Neighborhood Plans by the Planning Commission in light of the plans submission almost a year ago. I pointed out that from our perspective there were several reasons for this: (1) Many of the policies that were articulated in the comprehensive plan have come to fruition through de facto adoption, (2) there are few "hot issues" associated with the plans and (3) most importantly, there has been no assertion of the plans on the part of the Model Cities Board, staff, or neighborhoods. The Board's reaction was one of general agreement.

2nd concern: Alternatives

I raised considerations regarding the pursuance of the plans through formal adoption by the Planning Commission and City Council. The extensive use enjoyed by the comprehensive and neighborhood plans in their present status leads one to question what would actually be gained by "battling" the plans through the adoption process. It seems to me, at this point in time, the major benefit derived would be the legislative force ascribed an adopted policy document. This would have particular importance where down-zoning is proposed, i.e. Boise/Humbolt, Woodlawn, and Irvington neighborhoods. Additionally, there are several unresolved issues, Fremont Bridge ramp and Union Avenue, which may have major impact on adjacent neighborhood's invalidating earlier assumptions. Because of this, several alternatives were discussed with the Model Cities Executive Board. Obviously, one alternative is to pursue the adoption of the Comprehensive Framework and Neighborhood Plans in their entirety. A second alternative would be to go after the adoption of just certain elements or all of the Comprehensive Framework Plan and not pursue adoption of the Neighborhood Plans individually seeking official adoption of only those where zoning issues are involved. Finally, not to seek adoption of any of the plans and direct those energies towards greater involvement in projects with deliverable products or of major consequence. This would include Union Avenue, Walnut Park Development, Housing and Community Development Funds and the Fremont Bridge study. The
Executive Board took an askance view of the suggested alternatives which fell short of full adoption of the Comprehensive Framework and Neighborhood Plans.

3rd concern: Adoption Process

I expressed to the Executive Board the difficulties of the adoption process and the extensive citizen and staff time required. The problems resulting from approaching down-zoning where there has been insufficient representation of all interests was discussed at some length. I see this as a particularly serious problem with the Boise/Humbolt plan which calls for down-zoning in potentially controversial areas. I am also skeptical of adequate citizen interest, at this point in time, to support the plans through the adoption process.

Recommendations and Needed Actions

First, Ernie should apprise Neil of Model Cities renewed interest in pursuing adoption of the Comprehensive Framework and Neighborhood Plans. The Executive Board will be requesting a meeting with him in order to discuss the need for pursuing immediate adoption of the plans.

Secondly, it is my recommendation that the formal adoption of the Model Cities Comprehensive Framework and Neighborhood Plans occur. It is important for all the plans to be adopted if equal protection under the law, with respect to the requirements articulated by the Fasano Decision, is to be assured neighborhoods.

Thirdly, if the decision is made to pursue the adoption of the plans immediately, I recommend that the Model Cities Agency be made responsible for necessary revisions to the plans and for providing technical assistance to the neighborhoods involved. I suggested this to the Executive Board and the Model Cities Director and they were in general agreement with it. Although this would greatly aid the Bureau's staff, there would still be need for our staff to prepare the staff report and to "Honcho" the plans through the Planning Commission and City Council. Additionally, it would be necessary for Don's section to review and comment on the residential variable density concept inherent to the plans and, assuming it is a desirable approach, prepare an appropriate ordinance.

If you have any questions, please see me.

cc: Ernie Bonner
    Dale Cannady

ML/db
April 17, 1975

MEMORANDUM

TO: Gary Stout, Administrator
Office of Planning & Development

FROM: John Kenward, Executive Director
Portland Development Commission

SUBJECT: Review of Buckman Data Compiled by
Bureau of Planning

Staff has completed its review (see attached) of the data and findings prepared by the Bureau of Planning. The work is thorough and substantiates earlier analyses that have been made over the years.

Inasmuch as the paper does not draw any conclusions or recommend a course of action, we are providing some points for discussion in those directions. Our comments are aimed primarily at the City's ability to conduct a successful rehabilitation and stabilization program in Buckman. We believe that any actions taken in the neighborhood would have significant implications for other close-in Southeast communities.

Beyond the immediate concern of determining what assistance is appropriate in Buckman, lies the much larger question of future actions that will affect all of Southeast Portland. Problems of land use change, transportation, deterioration, low incomes and inadequate public facilities are problems that many Southeast neighborhoods face.

We would, therefore, wholeheartedly support an effort on the part of citizens and government (City and County particularly) to address these larger questions in as comprehensive a manner as possible while the City undertakes more modest levels of assistance through the Community Development Block Grant Program.

JBK:CEO:gc
Encls.
FEASIBILITY ANALYSIS
BUCKMAN NEIGHBORHOOD STABILIZATION
A Part of the "Southeast Project"

I. HISTORY

a. Tried unsuccessfully to be included in Model Cities Program. 1969
b. SEUL - locally funded for planning. 1970
c. CAP - Federally funded for rehab in small area, in S.W. corner. 1971

Program grant of $73,500 for rehab provided, but only $17,500 expended over a 1 yr. period. (B/W June 8, 1971 and June 8, 1972). 19 total rehab jobs completed (7 Federally funded, 12 privately funded) out of 125 residential structures with code violations.
d. Conventional rehab project - not funded. 1971
e. NDP - not funded. 1973
f. HCD - 1975

II. OBSERVATIONS

a. Following comments are based upon analysis of the B.O.P. Report, PDC staff discussions, and data previously compiled on Buckman by PDC Staff:

1) Buckman can be preserved as a residential neighborhood, but as multi-family rental and not predominant single-family owner occupied.

2) The boundary on the east should be moved from S.E. 28th to 33rd Ave. to include other areas of physical deterioration which are also zoned A1.

3) The area is in a state of transition from S.F. to M.F. Residential existing zoning not conducive to maintenance of S.F. properties and encourages speculation by S.F. property owners in anticipation of sale to M.F. developers.

4) Transition is not being controlled effectively - no design control, many developments without landscaping, "shoe-horn" apartment developments with front and side yards black-topped for parking.

5) Transition should be allowed to continue in most of Buckman, but should be controlled through public action. Such public actions could include:

a) Rezoning to A2.5 and/or R5 certain areas.
b) Establishing and enforcement of a design zone.
c) Establishing an urban renewal area that would:

1. Control all uses through an Urban Renewal Plan and zoning.
2. Create design criteria.
3. Provide public rehab subsidies and loans under the HCD Program. Before undertaking this kind of program a prequalification survey should be undertaken to determine whether or not it would be economically feasible to do; if the need really exists; if property owners want the assistance; and if they have the financial capability to assume rehab loans.
d) Implementation of an occupancy permit and certification system for rental units.

6) The potential exists for a giant sized commitment by the City. The problems in Buckman and the near Southeast part of the City are much greater than the ability of available public financial resources to handle effectively over a short period of time (3 years).

7) HCD rehab activities proposed in Buckman in the first year are designed primarily for single family properties, and therefore may be a contradiction to the comments being made in this analysis. Perhaps HCD rehab activities should be aimed primarily at emergency situations until a more comprehensive neighborhood stabilization program can be developed which takes into account all short and long range factors and consequences of any particular action or non-action.

8) PDC experience indicates that there are many illegal conversions of large S.F. structures to M.F. use -- a problem in that these do not qualify for Federal loans, as was the case in the CAP program.

9) There is a high percentage of absentee-owners (70%) in Buckman which may be a contributing factor to deterioration that has occurred.

10) Traffic volumes and circulation through the area add to the detrimental influences on the area.

III. CONCLUSION

Buckman is part of a larger area that is experiencing an irreversible trend from predominant S.F. to M.F. residential use. The Buckman neighborhood could probably be stabilized, through large expenditures over a long period of time (10 years) under certain conditions. These conditions are:

a. Stabilization should be aimed at multi-family residential land use.

b. The City would have to establish and enforce controls on design and land use in the area in order to have "controlled transition" -- either through design zones, code enforcement and/or urban renewal designation and zoning.

c. Develop an updated Comprehensive Land Use and Circulation Plan for Buckman and adjacent Southeast areas.

d. The City should expect to commit a large a amount of resources for at least 5 years to deal effectively with the problems of stabilization.

e. Move the eastern boundary to S. E. 33rd Ave. to include other areas of A-1 zoning, which also show symptoms of physical decline similar to that shown in Buckman.

PDC
ELY:gc
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MEMORANDUM

TO: District Planning

FROM: Ernie Bonner

SUBJECT: District Plan Documents.

We are approaching the adoption of the NW District Plan by City Council. Corbett-Terwilliger-Lair Hill and Marquam Hill are not far behind. Others shall be on the way the first of the year and I am hoping to have at least two of them ready for Council adoption by this time next year.

I think it is time that we establish some basis of understanding -- among ourselves and others -- as to what we expect to accomplish in this important effort of district planning and how we expect to accomplish it.

To that end, I would like to propose what the product of these efforts should be -- the product defined narrowly as the document or material we produce.

There are several objectives to be pursued in the publication of a document (or the production of a video tape, slide show, etc.):

1. It should state clearly what policies the Council has adopted to guide change and development in the area, and why those policies have been adopted. This is an important ingredient in subsequent efforts on the part of the Council, Planning Commission and Neighborhood Association to implement those policies. It should be an important and obvious consideration in the decisions of private individuals, groups and firms. Thus, those policies should be documented in a form which, by its very nature, indicates their official status and this documentation must be relatively well known if not widespread. Finally, the policies must be adhered to over some length of time and so must continue to serve as guides to both public and private decision makers.

2. The document must be capable of growth and change over time -- growth in its pages to accommodate a record of successes and failures in attempts to accomplish the plan in the future, and changes necessitated in those decisions and policies of the past. It must be a working document. As such, it must be current and relevant. It must be capable of growth and change without undue cost or complication.
3. The document should include as much attention to people as the process or policies do. This is not just to put the document into some kind of metaphysical harmony with the process or the policies. It is also meant to give individuals in that neighborhood that credit they deserve -- both as workers in the process of planning and as important participants in the success of the policies. We can't afford, nor is it desirable, to make a high school yearbook out of it, but that format is not a bad one to think about. Certainly people relate more to their high school yearbook than to any plan I ever saw. And if the document is to serve its important purpose -- to guide decisions over a long period of time -- a lot of people must respect and relate to it.

In line with the above, I therefore propose that in each of the district plans, the following should be documented, in both print and visual modes:

1. The people involved in the process of planning from that area as well as the people who live in that area. Pictures should show what the demographic, economic and social statistics show, as well as what the problems, assets and opportunities seem to be.

2. The process through which the plan went in coming to a decision by City Council. This should include time, place and number of meetings; issues brought before those who were involved in the process; successes and failures in the process; etc.

3. The planning policies adopted by Council for application to the area. This should include brief statements of intent, and should be backed up by more technical and detailed document, not in this document.

4. A 1-, 5- and 10-year program of measures to be taken to implement the plan. This would include responsible agency or individuals, costs and realistic goals for time required to accomplish. This is also an expression of neighborhood priorities.

5. A section on performance, noting both successes and failures in attempts to accomplish programs or policies.

The document should not be long -- 30 pages should be sufficient. It should be loose-leaf -- indicating the desirability and necessity for change as circumstances and experience dictate. This format also indicates that the decision making process is a continuing one and that the planning process must be consistent with that. This is particularly true of sections 3, 4 and 5. In fact, section 5 may not include anything in its initial publication. The Bureau will review, and modify if necessary, those documents for the Neighborhood Association every 3 years. Neighborhood Associations, themselves, may request modification at intervals of not less than 1 year.
This document will be prepared after Council adoption of the planning policies for the area. Materials submitted to the Planning Commission and City Council will follow the same format, but no attempt will be made -- prior to adoption -- to publish what might be thought a finished document.

It is my opinion that these documents should be standard at least in size and general format. I would also prefer that some common style run through the series though I can be talked out of that. It appears to me, though, that certain common elements for all district documents would help us in designing, publishing and modifying the documents. And I am sure that each neighborhood's particular "style" can still be captured within this standard format.
MEMORANDUM

To: Ernie Bonner
From: Gary Stout
Date: December 16, 1974

Subject: Your December 2nd Memorandum on District Plan Documents

In general I agree with your memorandum; however, I have the following specific comments. These comments should be included in your staff assignments in order to ensure that these district plan documents are useable for all planning and development purposes.

1) My overall impression was that your memorandum stressed the presentation of the district plan document, and perhaps greater emphasis could have been placed on specific contents. My detailed comments regarding content follow:

1. A district plan document will contain a land use plan.

2. The district plan document and land use plan should contain specific recommendations for re-zoning, if that is considered necessary. Any recommendations regarding zoning should be accompanied by any readily available fiscal analysis of the impact of building at the current zoning densities (i.e., sewer and water costs, traffic costs in congestion, etc.).

3. Although the Council and Planning Commission and neighborhood association policies are quite important, these policies should lead to specific and implementable recommendations (inferred in items 4 and 5).
4. Each district plan document should contain a program improvement budget, the previously mentioned zoning actions that may be necessary, the specific list of administrative actions that may be necessary to implement the plan (including, for example, the condemnation power, or even the potential use of the business license tax as a regulatory measure), and a listing of the private actions necessary for the neighborhood to undertake in order to accomplish the district plan improvement program.

All of these specific contents should be a part of an overall public and private implementation schedule for the district plan document.

5. I like your performance evaluation comment in item 5.

6. I would suggest that we give some consideration to changing the name from district plan document to some other name that is perhaps more representative of the total effort. For example, it may be called the planning and development program, the community development plan, etc. The point that I am trying to make is that the name of the document should indicate the overall philosophy that is involved, i.e. that the Planning staff is producing a (brief but comprehensive) report in a reasonable period of time that will be capable of implementation by the Portland Development Commission staff and/or Housing Authority staff, Building Bureau staff, Capital Improvements Program, administrative action, private efforts, etc.

7. I strongly support your suggestion that the planning document be short (I agree that 30 pages should be sufficient) and that it should be in a loose-leaf format for revision and updating.
8. In order to ensure that we are all working on the same concept, I would like the planning staff to prepare a rather detailed outline of the contents that you would believe would appear in each of these district planning documents (or whatever we call them).

9. We will not set up a dichotomy between district plans and HCD programs. Therefore it will be necessary to set up a much more stringent timeline. I want 6 months as our target date. Also, any new community development plans will be initiated as a part of an annual strategy for planning in that fiscal year. For example, inner neighborhoods, low and moderate income neighborhoods, developing neighborhoods, transition neighborhoods, etc.

This outline should be prepared and available for my review (and perhaps reviewed by the Mayor) prior to the end of the calendar year. In addition, I think that specific recommendations of the Planning staff regarding areas of potential future neighborhood planning activity should be transmitted to my office for review and subsequent recommendation to the Mayor at about the same time. I realize that this allows three weeks; however, I am concerned that Denny Wilde and the other district planning staff not be diverted from the HCD activity for the next several days.

GES/dym1

cc: Bill Scott
INTRODUCTION

This memorandum will explain the purpose of district planning from my point of view; delineate recommended criteria for neighborhood selection and Council approval of neighborhoods for planning activity; outline the minimum contents and output of a district plan; and propose a general approach whereby staff participation in district planning will decrease from state to stage as neighborhood participation increases. In many instances, I want to communicate my viewpoint on those things which should be omitted from the district planning process.

I. Purposes of District Planning

A. The purpose of district planning relates to the Housing and Community Development goals, i.e., conservation and enhancement of neighborhoods; conservation and enhancement of the housing stock; and greater economic opportunity, especially for lower income.

B. District plans are intended to be used for implementation. District planning is to be designed and oriented toward implementation at every stage of the process.

C. District planning will primarily stress physical aspects of neighborhood and housing rehabilitation and the planning process will refer social and/or other problems to appropriate bureaus and agencies.

D. District planning should involve the appropriate bureaus at all relevant points in the process (especially Public Works, Parks, Water, Traffic Engineer, etc.) to ensure credibility with these agencies.
E. District planning will involve outside agencies such as the Transportation Commission, School District, etc. on significant issues.

F. District planning will be, for one area of the community, a detailed enlargement of the comprehensive city-wide "framework" plan.

G. District planning will avoid extraneous, immaterial, irrelevant data, analysis and text in every way possible.

II. Criteria for Neighborhood Selection and Recommendations to Council will be:

A. The primary assumptions are that the district planning capability of the Planning staff is limited; that the primary purpose of district planning is implementation; and that the primary implementation tools are HCD, CIP, zoning, and private capital.

B. The secondary assumptions are that these tools work best in neighborhoods which are stable, but evidencing decline and neglect.

C. The final assumption is that the Planning Bureau should work primarily with OONA and PDC to identify neighborhoods that appear to have capabilities for district plan implementation (based upon the primary implementation tools available). Criteria for these implementation capabilities will have to be identified. It would appear that they would include such items as: a median income below that of the city; but high enough to repay housing loans, a homeownership rate high enough to encourage private rehabilitation efforts; possibly evidence of interest and willingness to work on neighborhood revitalization process (such as petitions signed by numbers of people desiring home improvements); and an expressed willingness of the district to work intensively on the planning effort in their district (including a commitment to the large number of meetings over a short period of time).

III. Basic Contents and Format of a District Plan

Four major subject categories should appear in every district plan:
A. A survey and analysis of the major assets and liabilities of the district or neighborhood. (Note that several physical subjects for this analysis are listed in the next sections.)

B. Based upon an understanding of the area's assets and liabilities, the establishment of goals. (This section should receive a great deal of citizen input, and the citizens should be fully informed of the assets and liabilities of the area prior to determining of these goals.)

C. The plan itself should be designed so as to maximize the area's assets and minimize or ameliorate the area's liabilities. (The physical subjects of the plan are listed later.)

D. The plan should contain an implementation schedule in order to ensure that the plan can be effectuated. The implementation schedule should list those public actions (financial, administrative, and legislative) and those private actions (various) needed to carry out the plan over a several-year period.

IV. Plan Survey and Analysis Contents

The survey and analysis portion of the plan should be brief and pointed. The minimum contents considered desirable are listed below:

A. Existing land use - This should primarily take the form of a map, and long textual explanations should be avoided at all costs. The text of the land use plan section should center on the problems and/or the opportunity areas of the district.

B. Housing - Especially a survey of existing housing conditions. This should primarily consist of an exterior windshield survey of housing conditions in the area, as expressed on a map. Areas of sound, deteriorating, or dilapidated housing should be delineated and described either on a map or within a brief text. The text should be concise and the data utilized should be very pointed. Possibly selected and limited census and/or Polk data could be used. However, the extensive and often useless housing data typically found in plans should be avoided.
C. Transportation - Again, this section of the plan should stress maps. There will be a map or maps indicating the major streets, the transit lines, the major traffic flows, location of accidents, etc. The maps and/or limited text should identify transportation problems and opportunities, hazardous conditions, any transit flow problems, neighborhood through traffic that should be diverted, street conditions (unpaved streets, etc.), excessive off street parking, etc. Areas of anticipated future problems should also be indicated.

D. Public utilities - The condition of utilities in a neighborhood should be indicated on a map or in a text, as appropriate (not necessarily line by line, unless there is some significant problem). This would especially relate to the following three topics:

1. Areas in which sewers are overloaded or are in danger of becoming overloaded in the near future;

2. Areas of poor water quality and/or inadequate pressure; and

3. Areas in which overhead wiring is considered to be especially unattractive.

E. Public facilities - This should be a basic inventory of the condition and use of parks, the condition and use of schools, and any other significant public buildings. Again, the emphasis should be on providing the essential data, not an exhaustive inventory, that has little value.

It should be noted that the above is a basic list of the minimum ingredients of the survey and analysis section of the plan. Possibly, after some evaluation, other essential items should be added to the standard list. In addition, each district or neighborhood will be unique, and some additional information may be desirable for collection and analysis in that neighborhood that would not necessarily be a part of the standard minimum contents of a district plan.

V. Establishment of Realistic Goals and Policies

These realistic goals and policies must be based upon the available information previously collected. In my opinion the word realistic is a key word. Any staff work
which orients the neighborhood toward targets that are completely unreachable or unrealistic can only serve to raise expectations that can't possibly be met by the City and/or private resources. It is essential that the goals and policies be specific to the neighborhood and that we avoid "canned" goals and policies that are so general that they could apply to virtually every neighborhood or district in the city.

VI. Preparation of a District Plan

In this context it should be noted that the term "plan" could be used interchangeably with the term "program". The plan or program is designed to maximize the assets, minimize the liabilities and fulfill the goals of the district. Each recommendation of the plan will find its way into the implementation program in the following section. In order to maintain continuity, the plan should deal with the same subjects as the inventory phase.

A. Land Use Recommendations - Describe any necessary zone changes, desired development or redevelopment, and other land use treatment. Recommend priorities for the pursuit of these changes (keeping Baker vs. Milwaukee in mind).

B. Housing - Provide a specific implementation program for improving the housing stock. This would include a roughly estimated total cost of these improvements (including both public and private resources) and an establishment of general priorities for housing improvement throughout the neighborhood.

C. Transportation - Make specific proposals for changes to the system. These could include new or relocated transit stops, pedestrian crosswalks, school crossings, intersection improvements (if warranted), diverters or other traffic controls needed. Stress should be placed upon safety improvements. General cost estimates should be provided and an overall priority of these improvements established.

D. Utilities - In the plan section, as in the analysis section, it is absolutely essential that the staff work closely with the sewer and water bureaus. The plan should indicate (in a summary) the work necessary to rebuild existing or future overloaded sewers, installation of backflow valves or other
devices necessary to relieve sewer problems, any water loops that are needed, underground wiring recommendations, etc. General cost should be estimated and the source of funding and the priorities should be established.

E. Public facilities - Any necessary park improvements, cooperative improvements that can be provided by the School District or in a joint School/City effort, etc. Again it is necessary to establish general costs, sources of funding, and priorities.

VII. Implementation Program

A. The overall implementation program for a district or neighborhood will most likely extend to 15 years or beyond in almost every case. This will be done in 5 year increments or groupings of projects. The first one to five years of that program will be quite detailed on an annual basis, and will be based upon the above information and all available public resources (HCD funds, tax increment funds, CIP funds, operating budget, legislative actions (zoning), administrative actions (neighborhood environment clean up campaigns, code enforcement, etc.).

B. The preparation of the implementation program requires close working relationships with the residents in the area. It is important that a program be adopted which establishes a means of accomplishing everything that can realistically be expected in the area.

C. It is important to note that there will undoubtedly be a tendency at this stage for both the residents and the planners in the neighborhood to develop a strong sense of one district's needs and concerns, and to assume either that other districts do not share these basic needs and/or that City resources are adequate to provide these needs in all neighborhoods. This sense of neighborhood "advocacy" is to be expected and is not unwarranted; however, it again raises the basic question of realism. I believe that what we are trying to do is prepare realistic plans and to implement these plans. Therefore, we need a program, not a "wish list".
D. Implementation schedules should be keyed to both public and private actions necessary to carry out the plan. It should be assumed that both public and private actions must move forward together in order for implementation to succeed. It should be clear that City staff would recommend to Council that public implementation not continue in the absence of private implementation.

E. Due to the inevitable delays in Planning Commission and Council review of plans and zoning programs, I would recommend that any initial implementation that depends upon a resolution of zoning issues (i.e., HCD housing funding, etc.) would be initially oriented to those areas of the district that do not require extensive rezoning.

VIII. General Observations

A. We have a number of neighborhood organizations that are willing to do a great deal of the survey work and other work involved in the preparation of a comprehensive plan, if they are properly prepared to do this work. (Concise, organized written materials are needed).

B. The pace of district planning should be expeditious. Planning, as all other activities, tends to expand to fill the amount of time available for it. If the plan extends over a period of one or two years, the neighborhood loses interest in the process and additional delays result. It should be noted that the pace of implementation (not planning) may depend upon the schedules of the Planning Commission, the Council, and resources available.

C. The objective of the district plan is to provide immediate and long term assistance that addresses the root cause of neighborhood and housing problems. Given limited City/private resources, this requires that staff and neighborhood people doing the planning have a good understanding of the problems, and realize that the strong coordination of available public/private resources is necessary for maximum effect at minimum public/private cost. The plan will not be oriented toward the provision of superficial improvements (even though they may be beneficial to some degree) but rather will stress a rational set of priorities in order to provide maximum benefits for minimum public and private costs.
D. It will be necessary to involve several other City agencies at the time the work program is prepared.

E. The experience of Corbett-Terwilliger has pointed out the advisability of working with the planning committee representing all major interests in the district so that, to the extent feasible, the major compromises and plan choices necessary to avoid unnecessary confrontations can be worked out in advance of Planning Commission and Council review.

F. A number of other plans, policies, and general information are available which should be used to the greatest degree in these district plans. This would include the LCDC comprehensive plan framework for the city, the Arterial Street Plan, the Five Year Capital Improvement Program, etc., etc. Additional information will be available as district planning moves into second and third years.

G. The above approach to district planning will require a great amount of self-discipline and self-management on the part of the district planners. The planners must be "self-starters", methodical, and committed to the process and to the schedules in advance. This is an easy concept to articulate and agree with, but very difficult to administer and monitor.

H. Before any final statement is made concerning the contents and directions of district planning, it will be necessary to specifically involve the staff of the Portland Development Commission to ensure that the proposal defines a product that they will find usable in the neighborhoods.

I. All of the above information in this draft explains my concepts and conclusions as one individual. I am certain that variations and other concepts will be suggested by the Planning staff. Therefore, I would appreciate it if these other concepts or suggestions were placed in a concise written form so that we may discuss them expeditiously, reach conclusions in the near future and move on with the program as quickly as possible.

The above includes my own notions and prejudices about how to proceed. I am willing to listen to other points of view, but let's quickly agree on how to go, and get started. Grab all your ideas in the next two weeks.