

## **Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission**

**June 12, 2018**

**4:00 p.m.**

### **Meeting Minutes**

**Commissioners Present:** Jeff Bachrach (arrived 4:25 p.m.), Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Andrés Oswill, Katie Larsell, Michelle Rudd, Chris Smith, Katherine Schultz, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin (arrived 6:20 p.m.)

**Commissioners Absent:** André Baugh

**City Staff Presenting:** Eric Engstrom, Tom Armstrong, Bill Cunningham; Teresa Boyle (PBOT)

**Other Presenters:** Chris Ford (Metro); Dave Unsworth (TriMet)

*Chair Schultz* called the meeting to order at 4:05 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

### **Items of Interest from Commissioners**

*Commissioner Houck:* Led and went on a couple events led by BPS staff last weekend including a walk on the west side of Willamette Greenway to kick off the South Reach planning project, between South Waterfront and Elk Rock Island. There will be a series of walks, bike tours coming up. Information is on the [BPS website](#).

*Commissioner Spevak* will be joining several people, including *Commissioner Houck*, for a bike tour of Portland's street trees as part of Pedalpalooza this Sunday.

### **SW Corridor DEIS**

Briefing: Eric Engstrom; Teresa Boyle, (PBOT); Chris Ford (Metro); Dave Unsworth (TriMet)

#### Presentation 1

Eric introduced the project team. Today we'll talk about the light rail project itself and the draft environmental impact statement (DEIS). Eric gave a history of the project coming before the PSC and previous briefings.

The role of the PSC includes: (1) The DEIS public comment period is open until the end of July, and the Commission could comment. And (2), at the conclusion of the DEIS process, Metro will adopt the locally-preferred alternative (LPA), the route. Typically each city also endorses the LPA, and Portland City Council will do that late this summer or in September, so we'd ask for a letter from the PSC for that. There is not a formal land use action for us to take right now, but it could lead to future TSP amendments once the project is designed and we understand the impacts more. So we may circle back to the PSC at that point.

Teresa provided an overview of the light rail project and the role of each of the partners. The DEIS has been published, and today is an overview and frame to understand the document. She gave background about the alignments in Portland that were studied in the DEIS.

The FTA has created an Initial Route Proposal, so all the environmental processes put together a combination of alignments to give people a sense of what the project could be. This is only an alternative, not *the* LPA.

City initiatives are shown on Slide 8, and a timeline is provided on Slide 9.

## Presentation 2

Dave showed the corridor (Slide 2) and the 2040 Growth Concept map. We are connecting the dots to town and regional Centers, and this the next corridor that needs to get done to accommodate our expected growth in the region. We won't solve congestion, but we will look to ease it.

The corridor is about more than light rail. We started with land use plans in particular the Barbur Concept plan, and we have worked to develop housing and development strategies as well.

Chris noted the grant that Metro received for the equitable development strategy work. This has supported concept projects and workforce housing examples in the corridor. Equitable development and inclusive growth are important in pursuing this project.

We anticipate in 2035 (about 10 years after the line is built) that we forecast 43,000 rides per day. This is the equivalent of adding more than a lane on I-5. Bus rapid transit (BRT) was discarded as an option due to the inability to handle the expected transit volumes.

The comment period for the DEIS begins on June 15 and will be open through July 30. The DEIS highlights variations between the alternatives. There is substantial increase in corridor mobility.

Slide 20 shows the difference between the build/no-build option. A through route provides better connectivity between Tigard and Tualatin; better transit service for Downtown Tigard; lower operating cost; and more cost-effective and reliable operations. We believe the Barbur alignment is better than the Naito option due to faster speeds and lower impacts.

What is the Initial Route Proposal?

- Single light rail route for further design, study, funding in the Final EIS
- Included (option to be defined)
  - Marquam Hill connection
  - PCC Sylvania shuttle
  - Operations & Maintenance facility
- Work to do:
  - Stations and Park and rides
  - Design refinements
  - Station access improvements

*Commissioner Houck:* I'm pleased to see the Federal Government is still concerned about environmental impacts. I like to interact with our internal City staff, and I'd like to get a hold of those contact folks.

*Commissioner Spevak:* For park and ride areas, are these surface or structure lots? Does financing allow for housing on top?

- Yes, most park and ride are structured. Barbur West End is a place of interest to combine park and ride with a commercial and housing node. Structured park and rides will reduce impact on amount of property. We modeled at the largest footprint, so many are structured, but that may change during the design phase.

- From housing strategy perspective, we have been thinking about how housing can be integrated near stations.

*Commissioner Smith:* Thank you to staff who met with me. Of course I would prefer park and ride space to be for housing and commercial rather than parking, particularly if it is free (while TriMet is still charging for bikes). Jurisdictional transfer is important in the project, and I have a strong preference to put light rail in Barbur. I also want to discuss the Newberry and Vermont viaducts. You're looking at an option to go around rather than fix them, but avoiding them is a mistake. If we're fixing the street, we should fix the full street and figure these sections out. I want to also say that whatever you do with these viaducts, there will be a continuous bike/pedestrian path for the length of the project. [YES] The issue we talked about is that I think we do integration of bike and transit planning wrong: the FTA allows bike facilities in a 3-mile radius to get funded. We use that to a degree, but I believe if we built out everything in the Portland Bike Master Plan, we would make connections easier and attract more riders. Without this, we are missing a segment of the bike mode share, and I hope we can include that in our comments.

*Commissioner Rudd:* I appreciate looking at the broader picture like the job creation and housing policies your discussed. The summary of the DEIS says that these are separate projects, but you talked about going through the local process and having terms and conditions. How does everything get tied together? This seems off to me, because if we think doing these great improvements increases displacement, why don't we mitigate?

- These conversations tie it all together. The DEIS is a capital projects review and aren't necessarily covered in the DEIS. Each chapter does talk about impacts and mitigation. Direct displacements are discussed where we have an impact to a piece of property, we have to relocate a family or a business. But for indirect impacts, the EIS and Fed Govt don't see this the same way. But we have been engaged with BPS and PHB. TriMet will work to collaborate with Portland related to remnant project property that could be available for affordable housing if the City can help with the increment funding.
- The housing strategy, which you were briefed on last month, is aimed at this issue. At the political level is where we see it tied together. Council has noted we will be asked to contribute funding, and the housing strategy is a key component of this and implementing the strategy... land and housing.

*Commissioner Oswill:* This is encouraging work, especially the MOU. Does that only apply for SW Corridor properties?

- Yes, this has been drafted for Southwest Corridor. We aren't acquiring full pieces of property for the Division Transit Project, and we have partial impacts on most properties along that alignment.
- We are looking at how we can apply the broader strategy for affordable housing widely.

*Commissioner Oswill:* I'd like to see a copy of the MOU to understand it better. Is there contingency plan if the Metro housing bond doesn't pass?

- The strategy has that referral question as part of the MOU, so we're on hold until we see how the voters treat that. We'll have to revisit this if it isn't passed.

Eric noted last month's housing strategy discussion included a small group of PSC members working with staff to help draft a letter. I'd suggest a similar small group work here to include DEIS and LPA. The group would report back to the full PSC with their draft recommended letters. The DEIS letter would need to be ready for the July 24 PSC meeting, so that's the near-term priority. We talked about having maybe 3 meetings with this group between now and end of July and one more in August.

- *Chair Schultz* supports this. We will move forward with the small group.

On the SW Corridor housing strategy small group, we have commissioners *Smith, Baugh, Larsell, Bortolazzo,* and *Oswill*. This group will also take on the DEIS review and drafting the letter.

## Better Housing by Design

Hearing: Bill Cunningham

### Presentation

Bill provided an overview and background about the project and noted the memo he provided with comments and questions already received from PSC members. This project updates Portland's multi-family zoning code. It only looks at regulations for areas that already have multi-family zoning, not any expansion. This is about 7 percent of the city's land area, but we are expecting about 23 percent of the city's growth to be in these areas.

Major topics include:

- Diverse Housing Options and Affordability
- Outdoor Spaces and Green Elements
- Building Design and Scale
- East Portland Standards and Street Connections

Bill also shared information about the types and categories of written testimony we've received via the Map App (slides 13-14). The written record is open until June 25 at 5 p.m.

### **Disclosures from PSC members**

- *Commissioner Bortolazzo*: Otak, the firm I work for, was hired to do some prototype testing for this project. I was the project manager for that.
- *Commissioner Spevak*: I own 3 properties in multi-dwelling zones.
- *Commissioner Smith*: My primary residence is in the R1 zone.
- *Commissioner Bachrach*: My primary residence is in a multi-family zone and own 2 other properties, both of which are built out.

### **Testimony**

1. Yesika Arevalo, East Portland Action Plan (EPAP): We support the project to improve the framework for affordability for multi-family development. We appreciate being able to work with BPS to achieve EPAP's goals, and we are in support of the FAR bonus and by measuring space instead of units.
2. Bob Johnson, Terwilliger Plaza: We serve 350 residents including seniors and employ 170 staff. RH and RM4 designations are not good for us. Please eliminate the lot coverage requirement in RH. Concern about timing since we will be spending lots to RH standards, but if we miss the deadline, the zoning change can cause a 6-month-plus delay as well as a financial burden. Can you guarantee that the zoning we start planning under will be held?
3. Sarah Iannarone: Thanks for staff's outreach on this project. Street frontages with minimums (item #18) isn't necessary. Reconsider anything lower than 90-foot frontage. For cross-walk connectivity across superblocks, like in East Portland, we need to think about connectivity to transit areas.
4. Terry Parker: Absence of required off-street parking is a major issue. FAR bonuses need to be significantly reduced. *See written testimony.*

5. Leon Porter: Lives in an R2 zone. With the housing emergency, we need to facilitate development of more inexpensive housing. BHD can't obstruct development of new rental housing, so the rules need to be relaxed so housing gets built. Also focus on allowing single-room occupancy building in the new R1 zone. Support Sarah Iannarone's testimony.
6. Phillip Norman: Concerned about very dense housing south of Gateway and no discussion about what can happen at Gateway Center itself. I imagine parks, wonderful housing, large complexes of opportunity housing and office buildings. I want to see people coming to Gateway other than to catch a train.
7. David Hollenshead: Carless residents tend to buy cars once they're here for a while. Lack of parking significantly raises the cost of housing, and for the disabled, cars are mobility devices. Generally, increased development seems to be encouraging crime against homeowners.
8. Doug Klotz: Staff has come up with a good change with using FAR rather than unit count. However I'm disappointed to see that very few rental units will be built in inner Portland. We need townhomes and condos for those who can afford them, but we don't want to shut renters out. Better opportunities along corridors (CM2) where we can increase entitlements more. *See written testimony.*
9. Zoe Lynn Powers, PHK Development: We're developing a mostly vacant lot, but this will change to RM4 zone. In keeping with character of this, property is well-served by transit. "Transit station" isn't well-defined. Request amendment to recognize more multi-modal transportation options. *See written testimony.*
10. JoZell Johnson, NWDA: We both support and have concerns about changes. We did not realize 4:1 was already applied and is being changed to RM4 in NW in the historic district. This creates conflicts with existing historic zones. For this area, we want to change this back to RM3. *See written testimony.*
11. Jessica Richman: Agree with NWDA's letter. I did not know about the change to 4:1 and other earlier changes. The NA was not aware of the changes. My letter asks that instead of RM4 we see RM3 here (2:1 FAR). Within the historic district, most properties were 2:1 RH, and most are built at 2:1 or less. *See written testimony.*
12. Aaron Parecki: Rents in Hollywood and owns a single-family with a detached ADU that is rented out. I support the proposal because it allows me to add additional housing units, which we need to help the housing crisis.
13. Tamara DeRidder, RCPNA: Recommendations for the aggressive push for density without a study of impacts isn't comprehensible. Parking reductions don't consider lack of supply. Don't support bonus FAR features. Truth in zoning is important. Duplexes and triplexes should have a 1:1 parking spots per unit and larger should be 3:4. *See written testimony.*
14. Mark Wyman, Arbor Lodge NA: Scale and pace of development in this neighborhood is about profitability. BHD doesn't look to rezone here, it does look to improve quality of life. Support infill

with quality housing while preserving the neighborhood. Support limiting density bonuses, preservation of trees. Flexible approach to minimum density. Encourage retaining outdoor space requirements, enhanced TDM requirements, 10-foot setbacks. Adopt transitional step-down requirements as noted in the proposal. *See written testimony.*

15. Bradley Bondy: Renter in SE. Parking requirements should be eliminated when site is within walking distance of a bus stop. Would like to see increase in FAR and lot coverage in all multi-family zones. In inner neighborhoods, would like to see it raised further to match mixed-use zone counterparts. Front setbacks should be reduced to 5 feet or eliminated when ground floor is 2 feet above grade or when there is a courtyard.
16. Allen Hines: Renter in SE. Parking being eliminated is really difficult for disabled people who need to travel and get to facilities. Encourage more consideration for parking for those with disabilities. Support more affordable housing for everyone. Visitability requirements are an equity issue and we need to make sure all new housing is visitable.
17. Miles Sisk: Support greater density in corridors. At least a 2:1 FAR and jump to 3:1 for projects going for inclusionary zoning bonuses. Decrease set-backs. Young people are having more and more problems finding housing near schools, and they're competing with everyone else moving here, which is about 100 people per day.
18. David Schoellhamer, SMILE: The project still needs changes to encourage fewer large houses being built. BHD should adopt two approaches from RIP: limit on FAR for detached homes (.5:1) and limit the number of units allowed. Follow principles of form-based coding. *See written testimony.*
19. Mike Beamer, Green Hammer: We support goals and general direction of BHD. Do we want to leave energy efficiency out of the proposal? There is little that directly notes energy use of buildings, and I think this should be addressed. A FAR bonus for meeting energy-efficiency standards could be used. How can the proposal increase flexibility to increase affordability and options? Height should be increased. Increase flexibility in height and coverage help respond to context.
20. Sandra Ward: Run a support ground for people with head injuries. New apartment building was recently built, and there was a mess on the street. Now the garbage man can't come down the narrow street due to the construction. Not happy with new tenants or the builders. I'm tired about all the inconsiderate people on the street, so I don't want any more building on my street.
21. Larry Cross: SE Portland. Applaud efforts on this project, especially inclusion visitability. Equity and inclusion is important to ensure changes are beneficial to all. Visitability should be a requirement in all new residential construction, regardless of type.
22. Dani Zeghib: Lents neighborhood; I own a 9000-square foot R2 lot. I was going to develop this into up to 10 units, which could be housing for several families and roommate situations with a courtyard. With the BHD proposal, that would half the square footage allowable in R2 zones. Form-based codes would be good, but if we half the building envelop, that means today's large houses will be harder to convert into smaller units for future residents. BHD proposes to cut in half FAR in R2, and there are unintended consequences with this. Don't decrease FAR. If anything, we should

increase the 3-bedroom FAR bonus.

23. Harold Carlston: Glendoveer/Hazelwood. Higher density is putting the cart before the horse. East of 122<sup>nd</sup> is kind of a desert without anything to walk to, though I know there is a vision to improve this. It's at least a mile from my house to get to a grocery, and there are no family restaurants; it's difficult to not drive as much as the City would like. I would caution putting higher density in before having centers in these areas.
24. Anthony Bencivengo, Portland Tenants United: We ask the City to live up to State Planning Goal 10 to address encouraging affordable rental housing to deal with the housing crisis. Minimum density for all multi-dwelling zones (as equivalent mixed-use zones). Supports IH bonuses but FAR bonuses along may not incentive enough. Additional incentives for very affordable housing. Extend to mixed-use commercial zones. Create loan program. Support comments by disability advocates... housing should be accessible for everyone.
25. Gracie Jacobs: Concerned with multi-dwelling housing in my neighborhood. It affects transportation safety. People are parking in green space because there isn't enough parking on the street east of 122<sup>nd</sup>.
26. Cindy Hurley: Concerned about no parking requirements. At least 50 percent of the people drive. Most bicyclists do have cars as well. Raw sewage is another huge issue with density, and I want to be sure we're able to handle this.
27. Jenka Soderberg: Support affordable housing. Worry with proposed changes is that there should be a focus on infill development, but this seems to be about more high-rise apartments in outer southeast. Hope for a focus more on infill in inner Portland instead of out where there is little transportation and other infrastructure that supports livability. *See written testimony.*
28. Claud Gilbert: HAND member. Lots of BHD goals are laudable. However, I believe the potential repercussions will undermine the Ladd's historical district. Current zoning in R1, which will go to RM2, which is out of context with the district. There is a holistic integrity to the neighborhood that will be lost. RM2 instead of RM1 is preferable with an h-overlay.
29. Steve Maxon: 3 years ago wanted to create affordable housing and have tried to make this happen. It's been nothing but a nightmare and an uphill battle. #19 (footage of lot). Put emphasis on providing housing, not parks and nature sanctuaries.
30. Rick Michaelson: City staff deserve praise and thanks. I support using FAR instead of the unit system. We have to fine-tune this and see how it works with other plans in the city. We're not being consistent. *See written testimony.*
31. Aida K: Concerned about safety and zoning changes. Buildings are coming up where we don't usually have large complexes. Issues with safety in terms of demolitions. Issues with zoning of setbacks. Businesses that have been there a long time are being pushed out. Affordability is an issue.

32. Mary Ann Schwab: I've been trying to get the parking meters to work for 45 minutes. Upset with what I'm already seeing with RIP in the Sunnyside neighborhood. Apartments are coming in without parking. The units aren't affordable. We are being cheated out of affordable housing. Instead of seeing open space augmented, there will now be 256 units built in a too-small area.

*Chair Schultz* closed oral testimony at 6:33 p.m. The written record will remain open until June 25 at 5 p.m.

## **Manufactured Dwelling Park Zoning Project**

Hearing/Recommendation: Tom Armstrong

### Presentation

Tom provided an overview of the project including the proposed changes and zoning. There are three new amendments from staff (slides 6-7) and a number of proposed amendments from PSC members as well (slides 8-10).

*Commissioner Bachrach*: Do you want to have background about the proposed amendments now before testimony?

*Chair Schultz*: We are going to get into testimony so we can hear those who have come out to speak to us tonight. We'll see after that if we have discussion tonight.

### **Testimony**

1. John Mulvey, EPAP committee: Mobile home park dwellers deserve a stable home. 47 of the 56 parks in the city are in East Portland, and residents don't have meaningful recourse if the owner wants to redevelop. In the past 2 years, 6 parks have closed. Please support these code amendments. Thank you to BPS staff, particularly Leslie Lum.
2. Sarah Iannarone: I second everything John has said.
3. Mark Wyman, ETO: context regarding the challenges we face in helping manufactured homeowners and renters lower their energy use and associated utility bills. *See written testimony.*
4. Doug Klotz: Seconded John's comments and support the project.
5. Anthony Bencivengo, Portland Tenants United: It's important to preserve mobile homes for renters. Relying on the market for affordable housing is a failure. Mobile home parks provide housing that needs to be preserved. 50 mobile home parks have high displacement risk, and we can't allow these sanctuaries to be destroyed. A designated zone creates better stability, so we support this project as a step in the right direction. We also need tenant opportunity to purchase; we need rent control; and we have to expand tenant collective bargaining rights. We hope this project is the beginning of the work.
6. Stevi Ray Daniels: Urgent need to protect our community members. We help each other. But displacement is a constant threat. This proposal will help prevent displacement, and it won't cost the City anything. Please vote yes.



7. Vanessa Stephens: Cedar Shade Mobile Home Park resident. I love my park's community. We connect with each other and help each other. I want to save my park. Thank you for working on this project.
8. Linda Dentler: Arbor Mobile Home Park. I never thought I'd live there. When you have to fight for what you're doing, you learn more. Without this place, I wouldn't be able to have a home. Lots of us seniors want everyone to vote yes on this project. We don't look for special help, we just want your help.
9. Laura Peraza: I've lived in Cully since 1999. The mobile home parks are important for us because they cost much less than an apartment. This provides opportunity for us to have money to enjoy with our families. We have the opportunity to provide our children a better life. The community is important, and we support each other. If the park closes, the community will be split and lost. We strongly ask you to approve the proposal.
10. Teresa Walton, Cumberland: Our park has 51 homes, 387 people. 63 percent are working-class families. 35 percent are seniors living on fixed income. We are a stable population. For most of us this is our first real home, and we take great pride in this diverse community. We are managed by a company based in California that sincerely believes in affordable housing, so we have the luxury to maintain and improve our homes. Plots of land around us have all be sold and redeveloped. We live in fear that a developer will swallow us up. Please support this MDP proposal to preserve our neighborhood.
11. Tarri Borchers: Affordability issue, particularly for seniors, but also for young professionals who are moving away from Portland due to the housing costs. Pride and joy of ownership. Substantial research shows devastation that can happen with forced relocation of seniors. Support comments of those before me. This is a fantastic first step, but we need to continue the conversation.
12. Juana Hernandez: My family and I have lived in Cully for 19 years. Our life is in this community. It would strongly impact us if the park gets closed. The closure would be like losing someone in our family. We have done many upgrades for our house, always with the support of our neighbors. Please support the proposal to protect our houses.
13. Wayne Repp: Viking Park retirement park. Does the City want to help us or not? As I sit here and hear testimony, I think this is a good thing. You represent our city. Think about the people who are retired, on fixed incomes, and can't afford someone coming in to bulldoze our homes and put apartment buildings in. This protects my home.
14. Edith Duggan: 100 units. I'm grandma of the park and have been there 17 years. if something happens to my park, I would be homeless. We have many families with children, and we're all family there. It would be a shame to lose this, so please help us.
15. Richard Young: It's obvious what would happen if mobile home parks got bulldozed. What is going to happen to the people, and what will it cost the City? This is what you have to consider. I don't understand the zoning. I just want to see a common language to understand.

16. Mel Vietzke: Lived in Cully for 45 years. Sold our house a year ago and moved to SE manufactured home, where lots of people have kids. When a developer buys a park, they don't care about the people; they only want to make money. If you don't approve this, so many people will be living in cars with their children or on the street. Please support the MDP proposal.
17. Marilyn Littlejohn: My community is important, and we need to keep affordable housing in Portland. We need the security to continue to be able to live there.
18. JoAnn Herrigel, Elders in Action: 4000 calls per year from older adults in the tri-county area; 50 percent of the calls are about housing. We can't do much to help people find affordable housing, so we are here to help maintain all affordable and existing housing for people. 12 mobile home parks are designated as 55+, and a high percentage of parks also have an older age average. We appreciate your positive vote on this project.
19. Jamie Willey: Families within families within families. Rent increases every year hurts families in need and livability. Vote yes to keep our mobile home parks. They are stability for all of us. I've lived at Rainbow Village for 19 years. We do what we can and help each other. I've moved 63 times. My home is the first stability I have. Please vote to keep our homes.
20. Earl Sturos: Kelly Butte park for 15 years. It's a beautiful home, and we love this place. In the last week, we've had surveyors throughout the park, and we don't know what this means for us.
21. Carol Chan, Rose CDC: We urge you to adopt the MDP project tonight. We want to build new affordable housing; it's about funds and land to build on. Don't allow market-rate developers to kick low-income Portlanders out of their homes.
22. Jenny Frey: Glenwood Park gave us a second chance. Don't take our homes. We need them. Please support this proposal.
23. Jake Antles, Cully Association of Neighbors: Advocating for lower-incoming housing options such as in mobile home parks. We support the MDP project. We have 6 mobile home parks in the neighborhood, and we ask you to help with providing stability for these neighbors.
24. Mike Connors, Hathaway Larson, representing Hayden Island Mfg Home Community: Appreciate the desire to bring stability to mobile home parks. But we don't think this is the right approach. We're concerned about the RMP zone that limits the use of property to the existing zone. We understand the goals, but the legal policy and practical problems are important. Measure 49 claims will be taken by mobile home park owners. *See written testimony.*
25. Veronica Martinez: The mobile home park allows me more opportunity than living in an apartment. I can use my yard and have a garden. The community is also important, and I feel much better when we live in the park. We feel more secure here. Please approve this project.
26. Ana Valeria Martinez: Rainbow Villa. We used to go from apartment to apartment. It would be a bad idea to take away the mobile homes. My parents have put so much into this. We don't have savings to move. I am speaking for this community and the younger generations in these parks who want a

stable future.

27. William McArthur: Lives in the Hayden Island Mfg Home community. We intend for this to be our last home, but now we received communications from the manager where he describes what can happen if the company that owns this property sells it.
28. Chelsea Powers, Brentwood-Darlington: The project affects 4 parks in our neighborhood. The proposal for a new base zone for manufactured dwelling parks is critical to helping protect affordable housing. *See written testimony.*
29. Melecia Torres: We've lived in Cully since 2005. We have 5 kids. We lived in a 2-bedroom apartment, but then we moved to a 3-bedroom apartment, but I couldn't afford this. Please vote yes to support my home and where my kids live.
30. Cindy Smith, Janice Smith: We can't afford anything else, and we are scared. The owner of our park passed away recently, so we don't know what will happen with us. This is a multi-generational facility. My job is only minimum wage, so I can't afford anything else. We have pets, so an apartment might not even be viable. Thank you for your consideration.
31. Victoria Keiffer: Recently refinished refurbishing our house. We have significant investment in it and now own it outright. We plan to retire here. We have a good neighborhood. We have lots of seniors who have been there for years as well as lots of families. I appreciate you allowing us to keep this.
32. Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon: We support the MDP project and the ADPDX proposals. This ordinance is consistent with State Land Use Goal 10 to encourage adequate numbers and types of housing. In terms of Measure 49, I don't think that's an obstacle. *See written testimony.*
33. Cameron Herrington, Living Cully: A number of policies we've heard about instead of this have been investigated, and they are illegal in Oregon. The best way to help mobile home parks is to protect the zoning as this project proposes. I am alarmed by some of the amendments. Residents want to preserve their homes that they live in. *See written testimony.*
34. Susan Knoke: Mobile home parks are safe and welcoming. We can't deal with the developer sharks. Please save us with this project. My husband served for this country, and you need to fight for us now.
35. Stuart Wall: Marcy Manor owner didn't disclose there were 9 homes hooked to the water meter, so I haven't been able to sell my home. They wouldn't pay the property taxes on the land they're collecting rent on; I am paying it. I would like to represent the 9 families behind me who could lose everything.
36. Xochitl Toscano: Lost our house in 2012. I now live in a mobile home park and don't want to have that loss again just because someone comes in and buys us out. Please vote yes on this project for all the families.

37. Barry Joe Stull: Client of JOIN non-profit. I had to vacate my old property, but it has been sitting vacant for years. I want you to be the good people.
38. Greg Lee Ramirez: Lived in Portland most of my life. Across from Gateway used to be manufactured homes, where many of my friends lived, which was taken down. And to this day, 16 years later, that lot is empty. I just want to keep my home.
39. Susan Cook, Meadowcrest Park: Our concern is that we have 74 percent of our population on fixed income. We are private ownership. Our concern is restrictions. We have 3 different types of zoning on this property, and taxes are being raise \$3-5k/year, and those have to go onto renters. So affordable housing is being lost. We have no recourse at this point. We are trying to maintain our current residents, but we don't know how this will continue to be affordable. *See written testimony.*
40. Maria Teresa Mejia: Rainbow Villa. I am able to pay the rent here with my 4 kids who are now grown up. It's mostly a Spanish-speaking community. We need these houses to keep our families together and let our kids go to school. We don't have anywhere else to go if we lose our houses. We are vulnerable. Please keep these parks open for us and our communities.
41. Michael Osborne: I've lived in my house for 33 years. This is crazy that I might lose my house. Where will my wife and I go? I can't start over.

*Chair Schultz* closed oral testimony at 8:24 p.m.

Tom noted we can make time on the July 10 PSC meeting for your discussion. We can keep the written record open through Friday, June 22 at 5 p.m. By this Friday if PSC members have outstanding questions or issues for staff to work on, we will get out the additional information before the July 10 meeting.

*Chair Schultz* thanked PCC, Commissioners, and for everyone who testified tonight.

### **Adjourn**

*Chair Schultz* adjourned the meeting at 8:26 p.m.