

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

February 12, 2019

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, André Baugh, Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck (left at 1:30 p.m.), Katie Larsell, Daisy Quiñonez (left at 3:45 p.m.), Chris Smith, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin; (1 open position)

Commissioner Absent: Katherine Schultz

City Staff Presenting: Joe Zehnder, Sandra Wood, Morgan Tracy, Tyler Bump, Phil Nameny; Liz Hormann, Sarah Figliozzi (PBOT)

Vice Chair Spevak called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Houck: I've been reading about the opportunity zone issue, which sounds like significant impacts on affordable housing and other issues. Is BPS looking into this?

- *Joe:* We have not looked at this yet. The critique of it so far (the City did not propose these; they came from the state level) is that it will raise capital for a designated part of town, so it makes development there an attractive. But the amount of tax benefit back to the developer may not be a great deal for lower-income, which is the intent of the program. We can get with our economic team and Prosper Portland to talk through the implications. Since we have IH, the development of residential units in the Central City is already there. It could create a risk for under-developing sites. But it's not clear yet how it plays out.
- *Commissioner Larsell:* I was also interested in this because it looks like it is put in places that don't necessarily need more investment.

Vice Chair Spevak: HB2001 would require cities to allow middle housing in their residential zones with reasonable restrictions. We are ahead of the curve here in Portland. I am also wondering about a potential presentation about carbon impacts for the PSC... which things play the most impact in carbon impacts.

- *Joe:* Within BPS, staff is developing a "curriculum" on which of our planning moves have the most impact. We can bring this to the PSC as well once it's complete.
- *Commissioner Houck:* I hope the information and presentation will include adaptation and sequestration information as well.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the January 22, 2019 PSC meeting.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve consent agenda. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Baugh, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Quiñonez, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

Bike Parking Code

Briefing: Liz Hormann, Sarah Figliozi (PBOT)

Presentation

Sarah provided an overview of the project. The PSC had a public hearing on the topic two weeks ago. We're talking about short-term and long-term bike parking. We're also talking about requirements that are typically required to be on-site (as opposed to bike staples and corrals). They are determined by use categories.

Staff walked commissioners through the Amendments Table.

1. Bike Valet

Commissioner Smith proposed this amendment to allow existing OHSU bike valet to count towards future code requirements and remain uncovered. Due to a number of reasons, including spacing, location, and lack of cover, the existing bike valet would not have been able to be counted towards OHSU future code requirements. The proposed amendment would rectify this.

Commissioner Smith proposed this for a consent list.

Commissioner Bachrach: Why wouldn't we also allow other entities in the future to use valet for other requirements.

Commissioner Smith: Being under the tram, they can't put a cover over the parking, so that's the waiver we're giving them. An adjustment in other areas could be done with an adjustment modification process.

Commissioner Baugh: This seems to limit size, but this is a growing area. What happens in the future when you need more spaces?

- Sarah: The challenge is that OHSU can look at other locations to meet their needs in the future, but 500 spaces is what's feasible in this area.

2. South Waterfront Standards: 100 percent bike parking requirement

Commissioner Smith proposed this to remove the 110 percent bicycle parking requirement in South Waterfront in response to OHSU's testimony. Staff did not find any justification in the commentary of the South Waterfront plan district that would support keeping the requirement in light of the increasing requirements across the board.

Commissioner Smith proposed this for the consent list.

Commissioner Baugh: The 110 percent is to ensure there is enough bike parking. I'm concerned about the removal of it – how do we meet the future demand in the district?

- Liz: Staff supported this under current code. We updated Table 266 and now think the numbers match the new goals and targets.

3. Rack standards: two-points-of-contact including frame

Commissioner Smith's amendment responds to online testimony that suggested that the design standard that calls for two points of contact could exempt some styles of vertical bike racks. Therefore the amendment proposes that the two points of contact only applies to horizontal racks and removes the proposed language that requires that the frame support the bike in a stable position. There isn't a strong staff position; we were trying to eliminate bad horizontal rack structure.

Commissioner Smith: The concern was that the original language could exclude some good vertical racks. This opens the range of secure racks that are available.

Commissioner Bachrach: There will be different kinds of racks and bikes in the future, so I'm slightly concerned we're limiting new ideas. One solution I was thinking of was to put language in the adjustment section of the code that includes something about flexibility in the rack standards.

- *Commissioner Spevak:* I actually appreciate this performance-based code (it's like parking spaces for cars). So I agree that racks will change over time and we need two points of contact, but that's the only restriction.

4. Map 33.266-1: Bike parking areas

Commissioner Smith proposed an amendment that would add Swan Island to the Standard A, geographic tier. Staff don't agree with this amendment: The current tiers are based on the already adopted Pattern Areas and designated Bicycle Districts, to add other areas without thorough review is not an approach supported by staff.

Commissioner Smith: I agree about pattern areas, but we've already made an exception for Gateway. I heard from a community member that we focus on residential areas, but the logic for employment areas is different. The question is what the employee mode split will be. We thought Swan Island is a special case because it's close-in and the TMA has encouraged active transportation. This will be on the North Portland Greenway. So the proximity and particular place it sits on the network makes sense to me that the higher standard would apply. Daimler supports the higher standard.

Commissioner Smith moved amendment 4. *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Commissioner Baugh: My concern is we haven't given employers there the time to digest it. Could we come back to it to add it in later? I'm supportive of the concept but not the lack of outreach.

Staff will be connecting with employers on Swan Island between now and Council if PSC passes this amendment.

Commissioner Houck: We've done Policymaker rides, and I was impressed with the TMA there.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Quiñonez, Smith, Spevak, St Martin; N -- Baugh)

The amendment passed.

5. Table 33.266-6 Wholesale sales

Commissioner Smith proposed an amendment to add a requirement for short-term bicycle parking for the Wholesale Sales use category. The amendment would add a use category that was previously not included in Table 266-6, requiring that establishments such as Cash & Carry provide employee and visitor bike parking. Staff do not have a strong position.

Commissioner Smith: This came out of personal experience for Warehouse Sales. I propose this for consent.

Phil: Wholesale generally means you're selling to another business. A membership is still in Retail Sales And Service. So generally if the public can go and purchase, it's retail.

6. Table 33.266-6 Parks & Open Area

Commissioner Spevak proposed the amendment to ensure that parks have a minimum of 8 short-term visitor spaces. The minimum provision rate after the minimum 8 remains the same as the Proposed Draft.

Vice Chair Spevak proposed this for the consent agenda.

PP&R is concerned about this requirement for smaller parks. But we recognize we can continue to work with them, and if something specific comes up, we can work with them before Council.

Commissioner Baugh: I would like to see PP&R's concerns so we can review and address them.

Commissioner Larsell: Would it be the same for trailheads?

- Liz: Parks and Open Areas are broadly defined, so staff will check in with PP&R and provide information at the next meeting.
- *Commissioner Houck*: There continues to be issues about where trails are allowed on trails and not. It would be beneficial to have racks at trailheads where bikes are not allowed on trails.

Vice Chair Spevak: I realize Open Space applies to cemeteries and spaces that we may not be thinking about as well.

This topic will be discussed at the next PSC meeting.

7. Table 33.266-6 Schools (K-12)

Commissioner Smith proposed an amendment that would increase the amount of required long-term bicycle parking for Schools (K-12).

- Option 1: *Commissioner Smith* proposes doubling the amount of long-term bicycle parking for K-12 uses.
- Option 2: Staff are providing Option 2 that uses the rate increase methodology but increases target mode splits for schools to 25 percent in Standard A zones and 20 percent in Standard B zones. For High School rates both Standard A and B use 25%.

Commissioner Smith: The prior proposals seemed low to me. Schools are a feeder system to getting to our mode split goals. I would still aspire to the higher targets.

Commissioner Baugh: This would be for new schools.

Sarah: This is for both student and staff parking. Proposed design standards allow long-term parking to be outside for accessibility, so it has slightly different security and location standards in other long-term parking areas. 100 percent covered and within 100 feet of the main entrance. There is also a standard that at least 10 percent be in a bike locker or otherwise enclosed (e.g. for staff).

Commissioner Bortolazzo: To be sure I'm understanding, if we do Option 1, that is 33 percent, versus Option 2 would be about 25 percent.

Vice Chair Spevak: Has PPS provided feedback on these options?

- Liz: We met with them about security. They've received notices and the various drafts, and we've worked with all the districts and our Safe Routes to Schools team at PBOT as well. They have not responded about the additional information.

Commissioner Smith: I propose staff reach out to all the districts before we vote on this at the next meeting.

Commissioner St Martin: We should look at following a methodology instead of just picking a somewhat random, doubled number.

8. Table 33.266-6 Office

Commissioner Bortolazzo proposed the amendment to reduce the Office requirement.

Proposed Draft rates are 1 per 1,800 square feet for Standard A and 1 per 3,500 for Standard B.

Staff don't support this amendment. The Proposed Draft numbers were verified and data was collected to come to our numbers.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I am trying to respond to testimony that asked us about some of the standards. I think we need to fine-tune the standards. It's also based on my experience as a daily commuter. Appendix D shows that the market is responding in a fairly elastic way, going well above code for class A offices at least. I don't want to be over-burdening some office spaces with racks that don't get used. I would peg Standard A.

Current code is 1 for 10,000 square feet.

Commissioner Smith: I would oppose this as staff applied the methodology, which is based on the 15 percent mode split we were considering in the TSP when we launched this. I agree Central City has its own standards, but I'm worried about office buildings elsewhere where we want bike community to continue to grow as an option.

Joe: We have a hard time keeping up with code updates and regulation updates.

Commissioner St Martin: Is work from home part of the mode split category? That seems like a big push on the business side.

Commissioner Bortolazzo proposed to revise the amount of required long-term bicycle parking for Office Use in Table 266-6 to require:

- Standard A - 1 bicycle parking space per 3,500 square feet.
- Standard B – 1 bicycle parking space per 5,000 square feet.

Commissioner Bachrach seconded.

Vice Chair Spevak: I'm inclined not to support this.

Commissioner Smith: It goes to the heart of what is happening: raising the standards and making it without a choke-point for biking. This strikes at the heart of it, so I'll be voting against it.

(Y3 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, St Martin; N6 – Baugh, Houck, Larsell, Quiñonez, Smith, Spevak)

Amendment 8 did not pass.

9. Horizontal requirements for Elementary (K-5) schools

Chair Schultz proposed this amendment to specify that horizontal racks are only required for students at Elementary Schools (Grades K-5). Staff's intention was to protect young users and to simplify code. But we're supportive of this.

Commissioner Smith noted his daughter commuted by bike as a freshman and sophomore. She's just over 5 feet tall, and she would have struggled with a vertical rack option.

Vice Chair Spevak: My daughter would have trouble with the vertical rack.

PPS was aware of the horizontal requirement. The change is that it will be about K-5.

If *Chair Schultz* wants to re-propose this at the next meeting, we will vote on it then.

10. In-unit: Adding design standards to in-unit bike parking

- Option 1: In-unit bicycle parking must be provided in a dedicated enclosed space, near the front door and the rack cannot be removed.
- Option 2: In-unit bicycle parking must be located within 15-feet of the front door of a dwelling unit and the rack cannot be removed.
- Option 3: No change.

The first option specifies that the parking must be in a dedicated, enclosed space, near the front door, and that the rack cannot be removed. The second option specifies that it should be within 15 feet from the main entrance and the rack cannot be removed.

PBOT and BPS staff support adding design standards and prefer Option 1.

Also, PBOT and BPS staff do not support the addition of “the rack cannot be removed” because it is adding unnecessary verbiage. The zoning code requirement implies permanence. If required bike parking is removed, it is a code violation. This is true for everything in the zoning code and does not need to be specified.

BDS has concerns about adding design standards within the dwelling unit.

Commissioner Smith: We are going to look at 20 percent in-unit allowance. If we’re aiming to the higher number, I think standards are needed to make sure it’s done well. I do want the language about the rack not being removed. I am leaning to Option 1.

Commissioner St Martin: “The rack cannot be removed” seems quite harsh. The building should support it, but if you need the space, it seems harsh.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I support that we make sure the space is provided somewhere, but I don’t know if that needs to be dedicated in a room.

Commissioner Baugh: I’m supportive but don’t want to language about removing the rack.

Phil: Regarding code-writing, we have 1700 pages of code and hundreds of development standards. If you modify it and providing something that meets the code, you can do that through permit review. If you just remove something that’s required, that becomes a code compliance issue. Bike parking is not any different.

Commissioner Smith: We have to get the “interested but concerned” to ride. So if they have to squeeze their bike into their bathroom to store it, that is not easy for them.

Option 1 without the language about the rack not being removed. Larsell seconded.

(Y5 – Baugh, Larsell, Quiñonez, Smith, Spevak; N3 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, St Martin)

Amendment 10 passed.

11. In-unit: small site (12 or fewer units) exception to in-unit requirements

The working group's proposal is that for sites up to 12 units, 100 percent of the long-term bicycle parking can be provided in dwelling unit. Option 1 represents the proposal out of the PSC Working Group for a threshold for an in-unit exception for smaller sites.

From the Proposed Draft: *For buildings with no elevators, required long-term bicycle parking must be located on the ground floor.*

While this accessibility issue was discussed at the Working Group, there was not a consensus recommendation from the group. Staff feel very strongly that a user should not have to carry a bike up stairs to access required bicycle parking.

Commissioner Bachrach: I think this should apply across the board whether there is an elevator or not.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: The purposed of the work group was to look at the smaller units in that light of them being smaller. That same rationale should be applied if you have an elevator in the building or not. For smaller projects, this is in keeping with the spirit of the proposal to have more flexibility in the smaller buildings.

- *Commissioner Baugh:* I support this. There is a good rationale for small buildings here, but that shouldn't apply to larger buildings.

Vice Chair Spevak proposed Option 1. *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Baugh, Bortolazzo, Larsell, Quiñonez, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

Amendment 11 passed.

12. In-unit: remove exceptions for affordable housing developments

14. Table 33.266-6: threshold for when short-term and long-term bicycle parking apply

This also came out of the small site Working Group was to set a threshold for when short-term and long-term bicycle parking standards apply for multi-dwelling uses.

Option 1 Represents the proposal from the Working Group

Set the following thresholds for when bicycle parking is required:

- Exempt all sites with 4 or fewer units from both long-term and short-term bicycle parking;
- Exempt sites with 5 to 12 units from short-term bicycle parking; and
- Require both long-term and short-term bicycle parking for all sites with 13 or more units.

Option 2 is a revised staff proposal. Rather than placing establishing three thresholds, it sets a new base threshold of 5 or more for when any bike parking (short- or long-term) is required.

Commissioner Smith noted there is consensus for Option 2. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

Option 1 represents the spirit of small to large in terms of threshold.

Commissioner Bachrach: By applying short-term 5-12 units, there is only a 1-rack requirement. That is minimal enough.

(Y8 – Bachrach, Baugh, Bortolazzo, Larsell, Quiñonez, Smith, Spevak, St Martin)

Amendment 14 passed.

The rest of the amendments and vote will occur at the February 26 PSC meeting.

Vice Chair Spevak passed the chairing duties to *Vice Chair Smith*

Residential Infill Project: Revised Proposed Draft

Briefing: Sandra Wood, Morgan Tracy, Tyler Bump

Presentation

Disclosures

Vice Chair Smith: While it's not clear whether the proposed changes create a potential conflict of interest for PSC members because the changes affect such a broad class of property owners in single-family zones, in the interest of transparency, we have the following declarations:

- Commissioners *Smith*, *Baugh*, *Quiñonez* and *Bachrach* do not own properties in single-family zones in Portland.
- All other PSC Commissioners own between 1 and 3 properties that are in single-family zones.

Are there any other disclosures PSC members have to make?

- *Commissioner Spevak* will recuse himself from Item 7 (Continue to allow different building forms and site arrangements through a planned development)

Memo and Substantive Changes information.

Sandra introduced the project background, PSC work, and next and final steps before the PSC. She reminded the Commission about the early discussion the Commission had about their goals for the RIP (slide 7). The key goals include: equitable benefits and costs; more housing options; and less expensive options.

There were 8 substantive changes in the Revised Proposed Draft. Morgan walked through the whole table and highlighted these major revisions.

Housing Options and Scale

1. Allow for more housing types.

By incorporating allowances in the base zone, the Revised Proposed Draft is shown on slide 12. Land area represented is up to 93 percent (as opposed to 67 percent in the original draft).

Commissioner Spevak: For the unmapped items, are there other constrictions?

- Morgan: Sewer, water infrastructure are additional potential constraints addressed by requirements in other city titles. The initial proposal excluded private streets and state highways, but we updated those standards and language in the new proposal. City-maintained streets, state highways and private streets that connect to them are all eligible for the additional housing types.

There is a minimum lot size restriction as well (slide 13).

Commissioner Smith: I thought we talked about an amendment about lot size, but the Commission didn't feel strongly.

- Morgan: We did establish two categories of lot sizes, depending on the number of units. The commission previously directed that we reduce the minimum lot size for 3-4 units in the R7 zone from 6,300 sq ft to 5,000 sq ft which is reflected in this revised proposal.

2. Limit the overall size of structures

- a. Use floor-to-area ratio (FAR), that is less than what is achievable today. Combine FAR for site.
- b. Scale the FAR to increase with the second and third units.

The original proposal included up to 250 square foot addition every 5 years. But when we moved to the escalating FAR system, this provision undermined those incentives. So we removed that allowance and will rely on the incentives in the proposal.

Commissioner St Martin: I thought this was about additions and alterations. Did I miss that?

- Morgan: The initial draft had one size. With the new incentive FAR for building a duplex or triplex, the other series is for adding to an existing house. With that in place, if we had 250 addition allowance, that would basically eliminate the incentive over 10 years. We want to have more unit uptick.

Commissioner Bachrach: But this is apples and oranges; we want to encourage people to add more units if they redevelop. But we want to give flexibility.

We will flag this for further discussion.

Like the last proposal, attics and basements are excluded from FAR calculations. Any building with a roof and walls does count towards FAR (e.g. ADU, shed, etc).

The PSC did not specifically ask to remove historic incentives. These have been incorporated into base zone incentives per PSC direction.

If a historic resource has been allowed to be demolished, the site will be treated like other sites. Other current protections and incentives for historic remain in place.

3. For 3 or 4 units, at least one must be visitable

We did additional work on exemptions based on PSC input and questions.

St Martin: How are the exemptions evaluated?

- Morgan: In Volume 2, there is a very specific description of each exemption, for example what we describe as exemptions for “a raised lot” refers to a measurement made between the grade at the sidewalk and the front setback.

4. Require at least 2 dwelling units on a vacant double sized lot

This applies to R2.5, R5 and R7 zones (expanded from just R2.5)

5. Rezone half of the historically narrow lots

Rezone about half from R5 to R2.5. Allow remaining R5 lots to be built with attached houses as proposed by PSC members. R5 lots will have lower FARs.

6. Allow small flag lots through PLA

There were limitations on the backyard house initially. PSC asked staff to cap the size and apply design standards slightly differently for R2.5. In R5, these lots would be substandard sized 2500-3000 square feet,

and so therefore additional restrictions are in place so that development on these lots is more similar to detached ADU's. In R2.5, the flag lot is a standard size lot, so the flag lot house won't be subject to additional restrictions.

7. Planned developments

Align cottage cluster allowances with land division rules. The PSC found there wasn't the same level of scrutiny between a land division site and a similar size planned development site. So staff aligned rules for review procedure; FAR limits; visitability requirements; and ADUs.

In terms of density, R5 and R7 zones can allow a four-plex. Because the average lot size in these zones is large enough to allow 3 or 4 units surplexes, there is not a conflict in terms of density on each lot. For R2.5, the lot size for 3 and 4 units is mis-matched with the density standard. So in R2.5, you take the site size, divide by 2500 then double the density.

For building coverage, the standard depends on how big the lot is. The suggestion from the PSC was to set a single standard by zone (not by lot size). Staff looked at that, but by setting a specific standard in the plan development chapter we don't have the ability to modify it now, so that reduces flexibility, counter to the purpose of plan development. Ultimately staff proposes to leave the current code and allow modifications to be requested on a case-by-case basis.

Building Design

8. Revise how height is measured

No significant change from the original proposed draft.

9. Building features and articulation

No significant change from the original proposed draft.

10. Provide greater ADU flexibly

Removed the additional limitation on detached ADU height which corresponded to the height of the primary structure. Also, by switching to a combined FAR for the site, the size of the detached ADU is no longer capped at .15 FAR

11. Modify parking rules

Minimum parking requirements have been deleted.

Vehicle area limits (parking and driveways) were discussed more recently with the BHD project. PSC wanted greater consistency between RIP/BHD projects. Staff developed this proposal: for narrow lots, duplexes, triplexes, and fourplexes, driveways and parking is prohibited between the building and the street. Driveways to the side of a building, or a driveway that leads to a parking space inside the building (a garage) are allowed. Houses on lots wider than 32 feet are also exempt from this standard.

PSC also wanted to align garage limitations between townhouses (multiple units on one lot) and row houses (each unit on its own lot) as these differed only by the presence of lot lines, not what they look like. For 1, 2 and 3 units, the garage wall is limited to 50% of the combined building façade (treats rowhouse and townhouse alike, as well as other arrangements of units in a duplex, triplex or fourplex). At four units, the garage is still limited to 50%, but additionally at least 50 percent of the non-garage wall is required to be contiguous. This helps limit curb cuts.

12. Improve buildings on narrow lots

These items have remained the same from the original Proposed Draft.

- a. Limit the height of detached houses
- b. Require attached houses on less than 25-foot-wide lots

Commissioner Spevak: I'm still not understanding the water/sewer constriction in item 1.

- Morgan: Water and sewer connection requirements are in a separate city title. The zoning code is silent on this. If there is insufficient infrastructure to support the proposed development, then either improvements would be required, or the proposal could not be built.

Commissioner Spevak: Compliments to staff on getting this all together.

Commissioner St Martin: HB2001 and if there are impacts?

- Joe: We are demonstrating how to implement a version of the bill everywhere. The provisions about siting are more generally stated, so if they become more specific that might become an issue that we will have to evaluate. The SDC provisions may be problematic for cities to implement, but we are mostly in line with that. The bill is still a work in progress.

Displacement Risk Analysis

Appendix H: Analysis and Mitigation Strategies

Questions staff looked to address:

- Who is vulnerable to displacement?
- Where is redevelopment most likely to occur?

Strategies to mitigate displacement in single-dwelling zones.

Equitable access to opportunity is essential for everyone and the prosperity of the city. Two Comprehensive Plan Policies require this:

- *Policy 5.15 – Gentrification/displacement risk*
Evaluate plans and investments...for the potential to increase housing costs for, or cause displacement of communities of color, low- and moderate-income households, and renters. Identify and implement strategies to mitigate the anticipated impacts.
- *Policy 5.16 – Involuntary displacement*
When plans and investments are expected to create neighborhood change, limit the involuntary displacement of those who are under-served and under-represented. Use public investments and programs, and coordinate with nonprofit housing organizations (such as land trusts and housing providers) to create permanently-affordable housing and to mitigate the impacts of market pressures that cause involuntary displacement.

With RIP, staff looked at what the difference is between the “do nothing” or “baseline” scenario and what the project is recommending.

Tyler framed the discussion: there are lots of maps and numbers. But displacement is about people. We have to respect the experience of people and use that lens. It's most important to look at trends and what the proposal does to advance our goals and Comp Plan policies.

We had to define what displacement means for this project (slide 34):

- Direct displacement
- Indirect displacement
- Induced displacement

Tyler walked through the framework for displacement work. The analysis focused on citywide and displacement risk area geographies. The inputs look at:

- Where redevelopment happens
- Where vulnerable households are
- Amount of low-income renters in single-family zones

And what the impact to households most at risk is.

The displacement risk areas are the gentrification and displacement typologies we've been looking at for about 6 years now. We're taking the concerns about vulnerable households and integrating this into our projects.

Renters, communities of color, low-income households and households with less than a bachelor's degree are where we focus our attention on.

For RIP, we looked closely at renters in single-family structures who are low-income (≤ 80 percent MFI). This is about 14,000 households citywide (slide 41). This map aligns closely with the risk analysis map.

Slide 43 is the baseline scenario and shows the likelihood for new units and locations for R2.5, R5 and R7 zones. There are geographic differences about where these units are likely to go. This is the baseline if we didn't do RIP and where we expect growth would go.

Commissioner Spevak: Some of the highlighted areas are multi-dwelling zoned. I assume you're just looking at the single-family zones in those areas.

- Tyler: Yes, this analysis is specific to single-dwelling zones.

Commissioner Quinonez: Does this take into account market and construction forecast?

- Tyler: This is based on Metro's revised forecast, which averages out per year. So we feel comfortable using these numbers for our forecast.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: This is slightly surprising and more evenly spread east-leaning that I expected.

- Tyler: Here we have more vacant lots or portions of lots in the east neighborhoods.

With the RIP proposals compared to the baseline, we have slide 44 (map 7). Blue areas show fewer units, green is about the same, then the warmer colors show increasingly significant changes. This is specifically about new units on this map (not the displacement risk results). Unit allocation is like pouring water into a cup. When the cup fills up, it begins spilling out to other areas.

Map 8 (slide 45) shows the baseline displacement risk based on the current Comprehensive Plan growth scenario.

RIP decreases displacement risk and the intensity of risk in most places (slide 46). This is mostly due to seeing more units built with each redevelopment and fewer instances of redevelopment as a result, so there is a less likelihood for a low-income renter to be displaced.

East Portland is a good example to show the differences between the scenarios (current / do nothing versus RIP). The numbers on the legend and in the map show households being displaced. We can look to aggregate numbers based on slightly larger geographies since that seems like it would be helpful.

Commissioner Spevak: What are some policy levers we could contemplate to help reduce displacement?

- Tyler: We still have work to do here and think about. We need to work with the community as well. If we start tweaking things in smaller areas, I am worried we push things to other areas.

Commissioner Bachrach: The analysis seems to confirm the theory we had with RIP. I wonder why there are some pockets that don't seem to be getting the benefits the rest of the east side seems to be getting.

- Tyler: We have a higher share of vulnerable households in some areas. So these areas may still be seeing the benefits, but there are more households impacted in different ways.

Commissioner Quinonez: Have you looked at land values or costs per lot would be baseline versus with RIP? have you looked at what upzoning does to land costs in other cities? I looked at a report in Chicago that noted prices when up and there wasn't a significant uptick in construction.

- Tyler: We have to think about regulations and what we're proposing. The proposal combines an upzone in terms of number of units, but a downzone in allowable square footage. Land values is what's driving a lot of this too, and we're looking at this. Land value is accounted for in this work.
- Joe: A critique of the Chicago study is that it illustrates where they upzoned, they didn't expand the "cup" as Tyler has been describing. In Chicago, the zoning is very different than here.

Commissioner Baugh: Are the numbers on page 47 of the Revised Draft (Volume 1) still valid?

- Morgan: Yes, this did not change in the updated draft from the original proposal.

Commissioner Baugh: We are displacing minorities, and they can't come back in. Even though you're creating more housing through RIP, the housing is still not affordable to them.

Sandra noted what we're trying to measure for displacement: a person living in a single-dwelling right now? Or what are we creating with these new units through RIP? This report measures the renters being displaced. It doesn't look at the benefits of how many units will be built to provide opportunity to move back. This is specific to RIP. It doesn't take into account inclusionary housing and other proposals.

Commissioner Spevak: Under current zoning, there is less opportunity and it's much harder on the ability to move back (since there are fewer and larger units being built to pick from).

Commissioner Baugh: I know race is a hard thing to talk about. But keep in mind, it would be good to look at income levels and populations of color.

Commissioner Larsell: I'm interested in the mitigation portion of the discussion. If the City doesn't have robust mitigation policy, then history will repeat itself. I don't think the PSC can put these measures in place in terms of funding authority.

Commissioner St Martin: Are the changes being shown 100 percent of what could change? Or do they factor in the Johnson modeling?

- Tyler: It's a bit less than what the Johnson report showed. It's similar in terms of the number and outcomes, but we're working with the 123,000 households number based on Metro's forecast.

Sandra talked about the potential mitigation strategies as noted in the report. The strategies build on the work Dr Bates did as well as testimony we heard during the RIP process. They are generally grouped in two categories: low-income renters and low-income homeowners (slide 49). We expect the voice of the PSC will bring this to the attention to Council when RIP is shared there. Coming to the PSC today, we wanted to share your proposals via the Revised Proposed Draft. We finished the displacement risk analysis very recently.

Vice Chair Smith: In future sessions, will we have time to discuss mitigation strategies?

- Sandra: We think so.

Commissioner Baugh: Thank you for the work on the displacement analysis. I appreciate that as we start to make decisions.

Commissioner Larsell: I hope you look at cost when you bring up mitigation strategies with Council.

Commissioner Bachrach: Thank you for the analytical framework. It doesn't sound like we're have specific RP mitigation concerns. So I think it's important that we don't mix the two. RIP is not a significant creator of more displacement.

Joe: The analysis has given us information to try to look at if there is a differential impact on households of color; we can try to tease this out. The baseline proposal from the Comp Plan has these displacement powers and impacts in it too.

Commissioner St Martin: The maps help us target areas where we should look at for programs, whatever the programs are.

Commissioner Spevak: The analysis shows something similar to what cities all over the country do. RIP pulls this back a bit in changing single-family zoning. It doesn't totally change it, but it does remove a situation that has driven awful displacement. We know it isn't a full solution, but the status quo is worse if you're a vulnerable resident.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: In principle I agree with *Commissioner Spevak*. Thank you for the analysis and conversation today. I am still struggling with what the numbers and maps really mean. For Map 11, I'd like to understand the magnitude if we relate this to the overall number of households in displacement risk areas. Does this inform the overlay map that tells us where this applies or not? Should we consider some areas to be pulled out of the overlay?

- Sandra: We could keep chasing changes and trying to think about if there are levers.

Vice Chair Smith: I think of this as a flood-control project. If we're just a little smarter about where we put the channels to even out the flow, that might be a way to look at this.

Sandra reminded commissioners that their proposed amendments are due to staff by Tuesday. The next work session will be on February 26, and the vote is slated for March 12.

Adjourn

Vice Chair Smith adjourned the meeting at 4:21 p.m.