

Elana Pirtle-Guiney

1-The next Portland City Council will be unlike any that we’ve ever experienced in the past. How should Council operate and what will Council need to accomplish in the next two years to make the new form of government as effective and respected as it can be?

Portlanders passed our extensive charter reform to create change. But reforming how city councilors are elected, who we represent, and what our job is, doesn’t automatically create culture change. And that’s the change we really need. The new Council must take actions that fundamentally change how City Council interacts with Portlanders, how and when Bureaus work together, and how the City works with the County, Metro, and the State.

Here are just a few of the things I have talked to voters about when they ask how the new Council will operate:

1. Councilors must be actively accessible to our constituents. City Hall has been too hard to reach – not geographically, but functionally. We must plan our committee schedule so that Councilors can be in district for full days every week – hopefully more than once a week. And councilors should have hours in the early morning, evening, or weekend. We’ll need to find balance between creating a culture where anyone, even the parents of young kids, can serve, while also being accessible to all Portlanders, including having office hours that Portlanders who work 9-5 can get to.
2. We must create streamlined, straightforward, constituent services. There should be no wrong door – no “our office doesn’t handle that issue,” or “hmm have you tried calling someone else.” Councilors should share a single constituent services staff person (or staff team) per district so that constituent concerns are handled seamlessly, offices aren’t inadvertently working against each other, and no one is picking and choosing what issues to address.
3. Once elected, Council’s collective priorities within the first six months (we will certainly have many additional issues we work on, but our collective agreement on what goes first) must be:
 1. Creating and refining the new Council system so that we can work effectively;
 2. Immediately implementing best practices, informed by front line workers and affected communities, on two key issues – (1) sheltering and ultimately housing homeless folks (a historically county-led issue that the City has many touch points with), and (2) requiring additional bias training for police officers who will be implementing the post-Measure 110 substance use diversion program within our public safety system, and who will need training to implement it without bias;

3. Identifying budget leads from within Council who can immediately begin to review Bureau proposals and prepare to create a values-driven, future focused, budget; and

4. Beginning to create culture change by calling Bureaus in to committee hearings where they can talk about their cross-bureau collaboration on a variety of issues, and where we can create opportunities for more efficient, effective, government through further collaboration.

4. By two years into the new system, Portlanders should be able to say:

1. I know who to call when my community has a concern,

2. Things are getting better,

3. City government functions reasonably well, and

4. I understand why Council is making the decisions they are making.

There are a number of other issues that I, personally, am looking forward to digging in on, but I think that these must be collective priorities.

2-Current City Council members have suggested that we need to relax environmental and natural resource regulations in order to address the housing crisis. What is your perspective on this issue? What is your top natural resource and environmental priority?

I disagree. I think there are other ways we can speed up development to increase housing quickly without having to choose between our community's future sustainability and resilience, and our current housing crisis.

The first two things we should do are increase the speed of permitting and take advantage of the housing currently available.

I have talked to a number of folks who work in construction and development, and multiple City employees who have worked in various permitting bureaus, and everyone agrees that we could decrease the time it take to get permits by 25-30% simply by hiring navigators. Navigators would have two goals: (1) ensure that every bureau or division completes their work between meetings with a person or company seeking a permit and (2) ensure permit seekers know how the system works and don't waste time being shuffled between bureaus or divisions. For large, experienced developers, this would mean getting big projects online months earlier (large projects often take two years to permit, a 25-30% decrease in permitting time could cut 6-8 months off that). For smaller projects or new developers this would mean increased access and success. This will cost the City money – both in paying for navigators and also because the navigators' work will cut down on the number of meetings and length of permitting time which will cut down on fees paid. It will also make our system more accessible, more stable, and more successful and grow our economy over time.

Additionally, story after story, anecdotally, in newspapers, and that we all see as we navigate our City, tells us that there is available housing in our City already. The PCRI-owned home that a friend says has been empty across the street from them for years.

The empty home a community member I met while canvassing said hadn't had a resident since they moved in next door to it 10 years ago. The 20% vacancy rate in affordable apartments because the rent is still too high. The empty lot across the street

from me, personally, because the owner insists he won't sell an empty, standard sized, city lot for under a million dollars. There are tax changes and other incentives that can get these homes back into our usable housing stock far faster than developing new properties. Certainly, we need to build more homes faster. But we also have available homes and lots that could be quickly developed. That tells me that we are not creating the right incentives to fully utilize the homes we have.

Perhaps some of our environmental regulations need to be reviewed. If we conduct a review and learn that some regulations are not actually achieving their goals and are slowing down the development of needed housing stock, I'm certainly open to changes. But our future sustainability and resilience is also important, and right now I see actions we can take to increase available housing that doesn't put our future at risk.

3-Vehicles are Portland's largest source of emissions and continue to climb. For example, a number of cities have restricted downtown vehicle use. How should Council address this issue?

We need to continue to make other forms of transportation easy options. When it is easier, faster, more convenient, to bus, bike, or walk, more people will bus, bike, and walk. We also need to acknowledge that for some people cars will be the most convenient option and we need safe infrastructure for cars as well (some jobs require frequent travel around the City, many of our last-mile solutions for transit riders are not easy to navigate with young children, etc.).

We should consider policies that ensure that every time a street is upgraded safety measures for bike-ped (many of which slow car traffic, which creates another incentive to switch to bike/ped/transit) are added. If curb cuts are being added at an intersection does it make sense to add curb extensions? If a road is being repaved should we be adding separated bike lanes? These things add to the cost of projects in the short term, but it decreases total costs to do the projects simultaneously.

Additionally, many neighborhoods including downtown are interested in having more car-free street access. Some blocks have been closed to cars or narrowed to one lane to create pedestrian space. There should be a clear process that residential and commercial neighbors, neighborhood groups, and the surrounding community, can go through if they're interested in this. We should direct Civic Life to consider "car free Saturdays" or similar regular times that bring programming to car free areas to both build community, support local businesses, activate downtown, and encourage car-free navigation of downtown.

And for programs like this to succeed we must update our city's master plan to consider what the purpose of main streets are: Which are main thoroughfares that allow for faster car traffic, bus lines, and movement of people between sections of the City? Which are

commercial business districts that should have dense mixed-use development and better bike-ped and local bus lines? Right now, commercial development continues to

bring increased density, restaurants, and small shops, to streets that were once main thoroughfares (this is occurring on Killingsworth, Lombard, and many other streets in N and NE Portland). We are dropping speeds on these streets to increase safety. We need to decide if we are slowing all car traffic down or shifting car traffic, and where we want cars vs. busses vs. bike ped.

Finally, once we have updated our master plan to consider the balance of through car traffic, development, bike/ped, and transit, we must make sure we are continuing to coordinate with Trimet so that our transit system and development are building toward what Portland will look like in twenty years.

4-There are a number of new and recently built market rate apartment buildings listed for sale for under \$250,000 per unit. The Portland Housing Bureau is financing a number of affordable housing projects that are costing more than \$500,000 per unit. There are some extra costs associated with affordable housing financing and with building more 2BR and 3BR units, but not nearly enough to explain the difference. What specifically would you do to more effectively use our limited resources for affordable housing?

This differential is, frankly, shocking. Historically the differential in cost for affordable housing has been chalked up to the complex financing, more durable materials and better energy efficiency, and construction costs. As more new apartments and condos are built using highly energy efficient materials it is hard to believe that remains a significant cost diver. And given that most affordable housing projects do not pay prevailing wage or operate under Project Labor Agreements, construction costs should not outpace those in the private sector (in fact, they might be lower at times). If the complex financing behind most affordable housing projects and efforts to provide appropriate, family-sized housing, is doubling the cost of housing we must figure out how to better finance housing now. That needs to be done in partnership with the County, Metro, and the State, who all help fund housing.

There are a few places I would start in determining how we can drive down costs:

1. As I said in question 3, I think we can speed up permitting and drive down costs across the construction sector by hiring navigators whose job it is to ensure projects move through the planning and permitting phases at the City as quickly and efficiently as possible. On large projects like affordable housing complexes this could lead to significant cost savings.
2. I want to determine what the actual cost drivers are that are leading to that differential and determine how we can address them (if we should address them. If, for example, costs are primarily driven by apartment size and use of materials to make apartments more energy efficient and lower cost over time we may decide to accept the higher up-front costs).

3. If costs are being driven by the layered financing and higher costs due to higher risk, we should rethink how we provide affordable housing. We could rely more heavily on publicly-owned affordable housing. We could increase the percentage

of housing required, and decrease the income level it must be affordable for, in our inclusionary housing policies and rely more heavily on mixed-income housing for families who don't need on-site supports and services. Relying on the private sector to build affordable housing buildings is just one model. In a housing crisis we should be using all models, but we can change the mix if we find costs are more efficient in some models than others!

5-Ireland used Citizen Assemblies to deal with difficult issues such as Abortion. Please watch this two minute video and let us know if you think Citizen Assemblies could help Portland come together
<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=dKSgPtnN0s0>

This reminds me of the Citizens Initiative Review process for ballot measures in Oregon. In that process, research says time and again that the statement from CIR is one of the most informative statements voters have when they are making decisions but campaigns on both sides of measures often feel like the commission is repeating information they would have shared anyway. Essentially, the CIR statement becomes a representative synopsis of how voters might interpret the available information, if every voter had time to do their own research.

I'm generally supportive of anything that brings people together across our usual divisions of neighborhood, ideology, income, and the statements from participants in the Citizen Assemblies who talk about meeting people they wouldn't have otherwise is compelling. I also absolutely think we need more community conversations about big issues including more long-form polls that explain what trade offs are actually in play. This would be one way to get that input. I would want to learn more about whether this model gets better results than long-form polls or, if it doesn't, if the bridging of communities has had lasting positive affects or not. If so, I'm in. If not, I worry that the time and cost may not be worth the outcome.

If we were to use a process like this, I think interesting projects to have conversations on would be the I5 bridge replacement project, how Portlanders view our future city as it relates to transportation and development (we have many corridors that have been car thoroughfares but now have walkable commercial districts on them, and these things don't go together. We want safer bike infrastructure but want bikes on fast, direct streets which are often car thoroughfares. etc.), or the role of police in our community (what do people think community policing should look like? If Portlanders truly want fewer police what should their focus be? This should be a community conversation).

6-What is another City doing that Portland should replicate?

I'm really interested in places where cities and counties have successful partnerships, especially in places where the county has communities outside of the city's metropolitan area.