

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

April 30, 2019

5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak (3 open positions)

Commissioners Absent: Daisy Quiñonez, Katherine Schultz

City Staff Presenting: Arianne Sperry, Bruce Walker, Bill Cunningham, Tom Armstrong

Vice Chair Spevak called the meeting to order at 5:01 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest

- *Vice Chair Spevak* published an *ABCs of ADUs* book with AARP. You can get it for free on AARP's website. They have been active across the country to make this type of housing available.
- *Vice Chair Spevak*: The author of *The Color of Law* is being brought to Portland to keynote the Build Small, Live Large Summit.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- *The Color of Law* will be the Multnomah County Everybody Reads book this year.
- 3 new PSC members will be nominated by the Mayor. After the recruitment process we had 70+ applicants. The nominees include Akasha Lawrence, the founder of a conscientious real estate development firm and organizer of a large social network of African-American professionals; Oriana Magnera, climate and energy policy coordinator at Verde; and Steph Routh, former executive director of Oregon Walks who is currently consulting and has a temporary position with PBOT and is a longtime resident of Lents. Candidates will go through training and their first meeting will be June 11.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak*: This is the first time someone from the PSC (me) participated in the interviews. Lots of time and fantastic pool of candidates. Nice to have someone who serves to talk with people applying.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the April 9, 2019 PSC meeting

Commissioner Smith moved to approve consent agenda. *Vice Chair Spevak* seconded.

(Y6 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Smith, Spevak)

Garbage & Recycling Rates

Hearing/Recommendation: Arianne Sperry, Bruce Walker

Presentation

Bruce reintroduced the annual rate review for residential service. He thanked those who have done the heavy lifting—Arianne and representatives from some of the hauling companies that are here. He gave an overview of the agenda and noted we have not included the Portland Clean Energy Fund surcharge in the rates today. It would add another \$0.20 per month.

Rate review

- Last year, City Council adopted a hefty increase of \$2.55 to true up the costs of the changes in recycling markets. Bruce is a member on the statewide steering committee working on these issues, and the role we play is key messaging to residents and education about what is allowed in the program. Although prices for recycled materials remain low, they have not worsened since last spring and thus the amount in the rates for processing recycling will stay the same.
- Key rate factors (slide 3):
 - Upward pressure from yard debris/food scraps tip fees, driver wages, and inflation.
 - Downward pressure from lower vehicle depreciation and hauler efficiency.
- Our current method of applying Metro's fees is the most advantageous for rate payers, which was a question that came from the PSC. We will continue to monitor this approach in the future.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak* noted that other facilities are negotiating lower tip fees than what's published. Do you have that information?
 - Arianne: We don't get the actual price haulers are paying at each facility; we just get their total costs for the disposal component.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak*: What if some facilities were offering an unpublished, privately-negotiated agreement—what would we do to get the lowest rates? Do we get that information?
 - Arianne: We have a sense because if haulers are taking a lot of their material to another facility, we can get a sense of what their cost is per ton. We can't pinpoint to the penny when they're taking it to a lot of facilities. We used to do an average weighted tip fee based on the variety of composting facilities they went to, and we could go that direction in the future.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak* is not concerned with proposal now, but if we are seeing a trend we need to act on it. Can we put it into our agreement that we get from haulers what they're paying?
 - Bruce: We get their reported tons and cost that are reviewed by a CPA, which would allow us to come up with some very close cost comparisons. The challenge is the balance between the gate rate, a negotiated rate, and the travel time to those facilities, which is also reviewed by a CPA. It's more complex than just the tip fee but we are looking at a more detailed review in future years because we anticipate what you're alluding to will occur.
- Proposed rates will increase less than inflation because of increased efficiencies.

Ratemaking policy

- There are disadvantages to excessive disincentive premiums. There is an equity component in that they penalize larger households. They also discourage customers from right-sizing their containers.
- Residents have not increased their cart size as expected. We are proposing to reduce the penalty so people have room for all their garbage in the container rather than doing wishful recycling that leads to contamination, especially since standards for recycling are higher now.
- We are proposing to reduce the premium from around \$2.50 to \$2 for a 60-gallon cart and more for the 90-gallon cart (slide 5).
- The proposed rates are about a 2 percent increase, which is less than inflation.

Next steps (slide 7):

- Rate utility hearing at City Council: May 15
- FY 2019-2020 rates take effect: July

Written Testimony Received

Testimony

1. Beth Vargas Duncan, Portland Haulers Association: Every hauler that provides residential services in the City is a member of the association. PHA members work cooperatively with BPS staff to provide modern and efficient waste collection services and advance opportunities for more diversity in the waste management industry. Each year we go through this robust rate review process and work with the City's rate consultant to determine costs of service. PHA believes the rate review setting process is fair with the right balance of independent review and transparency. Last year we had an expedited rate review process due to the recycling market changes and we greatly appreciate the quick movement on that. Not every jurisdiction across the state was quick to respond, which caused further disruption. The recycling conditions are still depressed, but Oregon DEQ works with stakeholders to identify methods to control costs and maximize recycling. We support the rate adjustment presented. We agree it's important to encourage customers to right-size their bins.

Motion

Commissioner Smith moved to recommend the proposed rates; *Commissioner Bachrach* seconded.

Vote

(Y6 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Smith, Spevak)

Better Housing by Design

Work Session/Recommendation: Bill Cunningham, Tom Armstrong

Disclosures

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 multi-family zones, in the interest of transparency, let's disclose any potential conflicts of interest:

- *Vice Chair Spevak* owns or has an interest in three multi-dwelling-zoned properties but all are built out so will not be affected.
- *Commissioner Bortolazzo*: OTAK was hired to do code modeling early on for this project.
- *Commissioner Bachrach*: My house is in R1, and I own 2 other properties in multifamily zones but that will not impact this decision.
- *Commissioner Smith*: My principal residence is in R1.

Presentation

Bill gave an overview of the agenda (slide 2): an update on the displacement risk analysis followed by votes on amendments and the whole package to be recommended to City Council.

Displacement Risk Analysis Follow-Up

Tom discussed the questions raised by the PSC relating to the Displacement Risk Analysis.

- We did additional analysis around questions that came up at the April 9 work session: Could we estimate how many additional inclusionary housing (IH) units could be realized, and what is the expected price/rent levels of new development?

- The analysis shows that the BHD changes create more opportunity for larger projects, which creates opportunity for more IH units, but 2/3 of that opportunity is out in East Portland where the larger lots are. That faces a challenge of creating financially feasible development. This is the same sort of analysis we faced with the Residential Infill Project (RIP)—the achievable rents and market values in East Portland are not high enough to cover the development costs of a new project, so even though the zoning is enabling a lot more capacity it's not clear the market will be able to deliver all those units.
- Tom reviewed the methodology analysis (slide 5). It was similar to RIP but was based on new capacity created, so it was more similar to the Johnson Economics potential analysis—we haven't done a growth allocation analysis of the likely outcome over the next 20 years. This is more based on future capacity.
- We focused on RM1 and RM2 because with those zones we're going from unit-per-acre regulation to FAR regulation, which provides a lot more flexibility for smaller units and more units inside a building. That both means more projects reach the 20-unit IH threshold and more projects already at that threshold will have more units. We think we'll get more 20+-unit projects and more inclusionary units.
- Tom reviewed the benefits we see (slide 7) re: housing capacity and increased IH bonus, deeper affordability bonus, and the bonus for 3-bedroom family units at 100% MFI.
- Changes to FAR make it easier to get a 20+-unit project; a bigger bonus will also lead to incremental increase in size of projects.
- Chart on slide 10 shows the increase in units. The left side shows projected Comprehensive Plan zoning units and the right shows projected units with BHD. The top shows East Portland and the bottom shows the rest of Portland. This reflects that a lot of RM1 and RM2 is out in East Portland, and East also has larger lots where the 20-unit threshold is more achievable.
- This is also shown in the table on slide 11. It shows that the difference in capacity between East and the rest of Portland is most significant on large sites.

Commissioner Smith: How does this relate to the growth allocation model? Is this affecting the percentage of units that will be affordable or the total number of units? If the latter, how does that fit with the growth allocation model?

- Tom: This is not a prediction of the allocation of units that will get developed over the next 20 years but of the capacity that will be created. This is more akin to the analysis Jerry Johnson did for RIP that looked citywide at what houses and lots are at the value that is likely to be developed.
- *Commissioner Smith:* Is this a zoned capacity number or a market number?
- Tom: It is a zoned capacity number. We are creating this capacity for beyond the 20-year horizon. We have not yet modeled the interaction between RIP and BHD in the 20-year constrained growth forecast. This is a high estimate; the opportunity.

Commissioner Larsell: I appreciate that you went to all this trouble; however, what kind of information does it give us? Are you saying that BHD isn't going to have an impact in East Portland because they won't build there, or it will be that the impact is smaller units so they won't fill out the sites the way they would in a higher-income area?

- Tom: Through these changes, we are creating the opportunity for bigger projects that could have more IH units. We are removing whatever zoning constraint there has been. That can only get you so far on the market side of things. The differences in rent levels between East Portland and citywide—the analysis for BHD and RIP show that the East rent levels, at least today, can't support all the other construction and development costs and land values. That's why we're not seeing that much development in East—only 11% of recent units have been built there. We are creating some level of opportunity for developers that can figure

out how to make the numbers work, but we cannot confidently predict how much will be built especially out in East. The flip side is that in the inner neighborhoods with smaller lots, these changes will work in the way RIP is intended to work in the inner neighborhoods and produce similar types of housing if not a bit more units.

- *Commissioner Larsell*: Seems like all the analysis has had that split between inner and East. I wish it was easier to tell what exactly was going to happen. I know this is all new analysis, but I think that is the future and I'm hoping that as this department goes forward that it starts looking at displacement—not just at looking how it moves through a city but also how to mitigate. I've heard people in BPS talking about mitigation as if "it's not what we do," but it needs to be. The Housing Bureau is concerned with housing people that are already displaced. I don't believe they're actually analyzing to see if there are zoning and programs to be put in place to keep displacement from happening. That's the direction we have to move in. It's hard to make a decision without having all the information and hearing what we need to do to counteract it. I just sent out the commissioners an article from *The Washington Post* that talked about a RIP style of project about the type of mitigation to keep homeowners in place. I would like to see this department become experts on that. I also know this project got started without a lot of questions around displacement; I realize you are doing catch-up and the bar keeps moving.
- Tom: *Commissioner Quiñonez* said last time that this project is different than RIP because of the potential to create more housing units in neighborhoods where people are under pressure. The flipside is we share your frustration in that we have been a bureau that has been about the zoning code and map and that these issues require so much more than that, so we have to retool and sort out among the City bureaus who's responsible for what. We have to look at all of the layers—zoning, development permit fees, systems development charges, etc. can be a barrier to development. We have the Development Review Advisory Committee (DRAC) run by BDS that's a forum for that, but we have to be more innovative to address these issues.
- *Commissioner Smith* agrees with *Commissioner Larsell's* comment. The national and West Coast dynamics pushing people to Portland will continue for a howled, which will make displacement an ongoing problem and we need to own it as a bureau and a commission. I have been on the commission long enough to have used some of the first work by Dr. Lisa Bates—the ability to process this has grown, so I appreciate what staff has done.
- Bill: We were able to push the envelope due to the unique aspects of multi-dwelling development. We hear that a lot of our affordable housing is multi-dwelling buildings that are already built. We created a transfer of development rights for preserving existing affordable housing. Our deeper affordability bonus is geared to nonprofit development. These are harder to apply to a single-dwelling context. We haven't seen other cities try these yet.
- *Commissioner Bachrach*: We start with the zoning code, our purview, and *Commissioners Smith* and *Larsell* are asking us to expand our scope of what our staff does. I would be cautious about what we're asking for—it's one thing when doing large-scale master planning, but when we're dealing with the zoning code, there's a limited toolbox to tackle these larger issues so we need to be cautious about overreaching. A little bit of what we saw with RIP and now here is that we're asking staff to quantify what can't be quantified. I would hate to see us get paralyzed by analysis we can't do. We did this in RIP based on speculative, soft evidence. We should not take every idea put in front of us and manipulate it into a response to displacement. We have asked staff to go too far with this study—it is too speculative.
- *Vice Chair Spevak* sort of agrees, but what we're doing now with RIP is not consistent with this. The analyses are different. Was that as speculative?

- Tom: The BHD analysis is more speculative. The one we covered last time identified 300 or so sites, half of which were single-family house rentals that would be at risk. In that sense, it was similar to RIP that showed while citywide there was a decrease, in some neighborhoods, some single-family rental households would be more at risk. From there, the discussion around BHD was that unlike RIP there are a lot of benefits of this proposal that help mitigate that increase those displacement impacts.
- *Vice Chair Spevak* read a note from *Chair Schultz*: One of the benefits of this project she wants to get into the letter is it helped increase clarity on our anti-displacement goals and understanding of what analysis needs to be done.
- *Commissioner Bachrach* appreciates the tack on displacement that BHD is taking that emphasizes the benefits. We didn't take that approach during RIP, but if there were no benefits to RIP we wouldn't be doing it. It will create more housing and more workforce housing, which is equally important in the city's Comp Plan. If we continue to use this as a lens, we need to figure out which approach to take. Both need more work before we start relying on them to analyze zoning code changes.
- Joe: In the budget we'll find out about this week, there was a request for the bureau to undertake an anti-displacement action plan. It would fund and direct us to move into this topic as *Commissioner Larsell* was talking about. They see that many bureaus touch pieces of an anti-displacement strategy, so one of the things we would do is pull things together and quantify to Council the cost of mitigation approaches. That work is coming one way or the other in the next year. This analysis shows that for this type of construction, the basic economics is more likely to produce units in inner neighborhoods than outer. That's the opposite of what we heard from RIP, which makes perfect economic sense—different scales of projects, different economics. What was bedeviling us about RIP is that every time a house is torn down and replaced, you get more units, but you would not get the scale you would with BHD.

Vice Chair Spevak: Footnote shows analysis doesn't include sites that would avoid IH requirements by building multiple buildings under 20 units. Seems most sites would do that.

- Tom: We haven't seen enough behavior of 18- to 19-unit projects.
- *Vice Chair Spevak*: I don't think you'd build 20-unit buildings anyway independent of IH, so we may be significantly overcounting the number of IH units in this analysis.
- Tom: Yes. This is on the high side of the estimate.

Amendments 5-12 to Revised Proposed Draft

Amendments 5-8 were discussed in the April 9 work session. Amendments 9-12 are minor technical amendments proposed by staff (slide 15). *Chair Schultz* had suggested bundling these together as one consent motion.

Motion

Commissioner Smith moved to approve amendments 5-12 as bundle. *Vice Chair Spevak* seconded.

Vote

(Y6 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Smith, Spevak)

Amendments 1-4 to Revised Proposed Draft

1. Allow daycares as a limited use in multi-dwelling zones, regardless of location (slide 17).
 - Oregon has one of the top 10 most expensive daycare costs in the country; we can't pretend zoning changes will solve that, but we can remove the zoning barriers.
 - Staff supports the amendment.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak*: Large multi-dwelling sites with lots of people are a natural location. Conditional use review is required now and I'm not sure why we have that hurdle. It won't be used very often, and I don't see a reason to limit them just to major streets.
 - *Commissioner Bortolazzo* supports and believes 3,000 sf is the right size—around 60 children. Across the state, is there a certain size that works from an economic or logistics standpoint? Just want to right-size what we allow.
 - Bill wasn't able to get good info on the range of size of daycares. Part of limiting it is that residential development will still be the predominate use in residential zones. Currently for residential we allow home childcare uses up to 16 children at any house, so this would bump up that potential to 60 children based on state guidelines of 50 sf/child. You could still seek a larger size through conditional use and there are other existing allowances for places of worship or former places of worship. Can be difficult for daycares to compete with commercial use so this is another option.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak*: Many daycares are in old churches that are not seismically reinforced because the rent is cheap and the occupancy group is the same.

Motion

Vice Chair Spevak moved adoption; *Commissioner Smith* seconded.

Vote

(Y6 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Smith, Spevak)

2. Exempt bicycle parking from FAR calculations (slide 18).
 - Currently the draft exempts vehicle parking up to .5 FAR to discourage surface parking and mirror the regulation in the mixed-use zones. The Bicycle Parking Code Update changed the mixed-use zone to also exempt bicycle parking. This amendment would extend that exemption from mixed-use to multi-dwelling as well.
 - Staff supports this; it provides consistency in regulations between zones.
 - *Commissioner Smith* supports, but that [bike parking] code is perhaps still a bit of a work in progress—we spent a lot of time talking about in-unit versus bike room parking. The existing language and proposal would also exempt FAR from in-unit spaces, which we did not dive into and doesn't make policy sense because bike room space is dedicated to bike parking, but in-unit space is not required to be used for bike parking. Does not make sense to give an FAR exemption. The bike parking staff is pursuing some language concepts that will go to Council.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak* proposed an amendment to the amendment to not allow the exemption for in-unit parking.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: Staff needs to evolve that in the bike parking code as well, so the mixed-use and multi-dwelling codes are consistent.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak* rescinded his proposal.

Motion

Commissioner Smith moved to adopt this amendment and direct staff to track policy developments on this in the bicycle parking project and apply parallel changes to this section of the code; *Vice Chair Spevak* seconded.

Vote

(Y6 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Smith, Spevak)

3. Modify the pedestrian standards to allow a pathway to an entrance up to 4 units to be as narrow as 3 feet wide (slide 19).
 - The current code is written this way and this revision keeps that for sites up to 4 units. Even if you have 30 or 40 units in a site, individual pathways leading to individual entrances up to 4 units would be narrower. Part of the intent is to reduce amount of paved area on site; allow other elements.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak*: Originally I had wanted to reduce the 5' width; less impervious surface.
 - *Commissioner Smith* confirmed that we don't create any ADA issues going down to 3'.
 - Bill: Correct, even ADA access ramps can be 3 feet.

Motion

Vice Chair Spevak moved adoption; *Commissioner Houck* seconded.

Vote

(Y6 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Smith, Spevak)

4. Set a maximum width of 15 feet for required pedestrian connection for large sites.
 - For more than 5 acres in size—not very common. Applies when meeting City connectivity standards of one connection every 330 feet.
 - Typically, a pedestrian ROW is 15', but PBOT occasionally needs more space to provide space for lighting fixtures or trees or when there is a slope, for example. One issue staff identified that makes staff not support this is that Title 17 provides PBOT and the City Engineer authority over public streets and right-of-way (ROW). Our zoning code specifies that except in specific situations, PBOT is responsible for determining the standards. Sets up a code conflict between Titles 33 and 17. PBOT has to consider proportionality of what they require and try to keep their pedestrian standards, but they would like to retain the authority to ask for greater widths when it's needed due to site-specific issues.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak* proposed this because there are certain large-lot situations where a developer knows that if they can do a subdivision, PBOT will require a route through the middle. When they require the street to go through they can set how big it must be, which can stop the development or move it next door and the street never gets built. This would give PBOT a hook to push ROW through a site that they might not otherwise have. Let's let PBOT require the ROW but make sure it really is a pedestrian ROW. I've since learned that PBOT has that right anyway but has not exercised it—to require a ROW dedication even if no land division is proposed. They can do this whether we put it in the code or not, so I feel less invested than when I first proposed it.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: Is the motivation to not allow excessive requirements to impede development?
 - *Vice Chair Spevak*: Yes. The ideal would be to have the connection go through but make sure it's narrow so that it's not expensive and actually happens. We sometimes lose the opportunity to connect the grid for peds and bikes because developers flee them.
 - *Commissioner Smith*: The idea of using Title 33 to regulate Title 17 makes me queasy.
 - *Vice Chair Spevak* agreed; that's why he supports less now.
 - *Commissioner Bortolazzo*: There was a parallel PBOT study done with BHD that looked into greater flexibility for ROWs. How would that fit with this amendment?
 - Bill: That was looking at new, narrower street connections that could work in more situations to get connectivity. This is different in that it's about connectivity on very

large sites, so the other end of the spectrum. Their plan focused on ways to do connections with less land consumption, so this does connect with that interest. PBOT is updating their pedestrian design guidelines, which set some of the dimensional standards for pedestrian facilities. Denver Igarta worked with this project.

- *Commissioner Bachrach*: As your DRAC rep, a common issue that arises is 1) complaints about conflicts between Titles 33 and 17—that we put requirements in the zoning code but PBOT has broader authority that trumps the zoning code, which creates a conflict to navigate, and 2) unlike Title 33, which is supposed to be clear and objective, PBOT manages Title 17 with guidelines, so there is often no clear standard and you are stuck negotiating with PBOT. (The good news that developers also want flexibility.) PBOT will do what they want, regardless of this proposal.
- *Vice Chair Spevak* withdrew this amendment.

Consideration of entire package

Motion

Recommend that City Council:

1. Adopt the Better Housing by Design Revised Proposed Draft volumes 1 – 3, as amended, and appendices A – G as legislative intent and background;
2. Amend the Zoning Map and Comprehensive Plan Map as shown in Volume 1;
3. Amend the Zoning Code and the Comprehensive Plan as shown in volumes 2 and 3.

Direct staff to:

4. Revise the staff report and code commentary to clarify proposals and findings, as necessary;
5. In the event that the Better Housing by Design Project is considered by City Council prior to the Residential Infill Project, make necessary changes to Volumes 1-3 to accommodate this change in sequencing.

Discussion

Vice Chair Spevak: What if one passes and the other doesn't pass? Is there a reason not to pull things from one code project to another if RIP doesn't pass City Council?

- Joe: We'd have to do a thorough search, but the only substantive item that we would pull over from RIP is the one Bill mentioned about restricting parking locations. We would like to propose that you let us to complete that work, bring the list to PSC leadership, and if anything crosses a line to be reconsidered, we can do that here.
- *Vice Chair Spevak* wanted to raise the concern that people would try to solve the problems RIP is solving in BHD without actually passing RIP.
- Joe: We will share that list before we move forward. We don't know the sequencing yet, but we want to be prepared to move forward. The anti-displacement work will tie these two projects together—it won't hold up these projects, but it needs to be in motion.

Commissioner Smith moved items 1-5; *Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

Commissioner Bachrach is pleasantly surprised this has gone through with so much less consternation than RIP even though there is a bigger impact, potentially.

Commissioner Larsell thanked staff and thinks this Project will have a good impact and not the same kind of neighborhood-wide displacement that RIP has the potential for. Still very hard to know what will happen based on the sties.

Vote

(Y6 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Smith, Spevak)

Things to include in the PSC's letter to Council

- *Vice Chair Spevak*: BHD should be presented to City Council as a companion piece of code to RIP—as a package. With the RIP vote, we cast with our vote our concerns about displacement, and we should in our letter include something saying that with this package, we know that there will be people displaced from homes that are redeveloped and we're comfortable with that, and we restate our enthusiasm for the City to fund work by this commission to study displacement. I think we have great mitigation in both projects and we should be consistent. We've already written that in the last letter and this would be a similar opportunity to do the same.
- *Commissioner Smith* has a little trouble with the notion we are okay with displacement. It's fair to say that there is risk here, and I've heard there's more comfort with the ratio between benefit and burden—the upside is that this project results in a lot more housing units.
- *Vice Chair Spevak*: I worded that poorly; we have discomfort with displacement and encourage the City to look at mitigation.
- *Commissioner Bachrach*: We don't know whether the people renting a house that will be torn down won't be able to afford the replacement dwellings. We want to be careful in this apologetic assumption. We may be displacing 2 people renting a house and creating 4 affordable units.
 - *Commissioner Houck*: We're talking about potential.
 - *Commissioner Bachrach*: Anything's potential. It's drawing attention to a negative potential but not a positive potential.
- *Commissioner Bortolazzo*: I like the idea of presenting RIP and BHD as a package; there is a strong underlying philosophy behind both which is to regulate the form and liberalize the density. The income levels a family 3 needs to afford units in new versus the current code is essentially half.
- *Commissioner Larsell*: There are some wonderful design changes for East Portland so it would be good to have that benefit and others in the letter. More livable space for people when development comes is the biggest positive.

Adjourn

Vice Chair Spevak adjourned the meeting at 6:52 p.m.