

# Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

January 14, 2020

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

**Commissioners Present:** Jeff Bachrach (left 2:30 p.m.), Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Daisy Quiñonez, Steph Routh, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak

**Commissioners Absent:** Akasha Lawrence Spence, Oriana Magnera

**City Staff Presenting:** Sandra Wood, Lora Lillard, Phil Nameny, Eric Engstrom, Barry Manning; Nick Falbo, Mauricio Leclerc, Kate Drennan (PBOT)

*Chair Schultz* called the meeting to order at 12:31 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

## Items of Interest from Commissioners

*Commissioner Houck:* I sent a note to members and staff about upcoming South Reach walks and opportunities to familiarize yourself via bike and boat and walking with this area so when we have conversations about the plan, people will have a better sense of what's on the ground there. I'm happy to take up to 5 PSC members (fewer than a quorum of members) and staff out.

## Director's Report

Andrea Durbin

### *Council Updates*

- Passed the tree code resolution last week (which will be coming back to PSC for a briefing in May; hearing expected in the fall).
- Tomorrow and Thursday will kick off the Residential Infill Project hearings at Council. What's being considered is what the PSC recommended. The first package of amendments will be at the January 29 Council session with a follow-up in early February. We can share this with the PSC.

### *Residential Garbage and Recycling Rate Change*

- Last Spring, you may recall, when we were conducting our annual residential rate review, we weren't yet certain how the voter-approved Clean Energy Surcharge would affect residential garbage and recycling rates. We followed the administrative rules drafted by the Revenue Division that included garbage and recycling collection as an industry subject to the surcharge. We added about \$0.17 per month into the rates for costs associated with the Clean Energy Surcharge. In December, City Council voted to exempt residential garbage and recycling collection from the Clean Energy Surcharge. Last week Council adopted new rates to reflect this change. The new rates remove the costs associated with the CES and reimburse customers for

the amount they have already paid toward the Clean Energy Surcharge since July 1, 2019. The new rates will be in place from February 1, 2020 through June 30, 2020 and we will conduct our annual rate review as usual this Spring.

- I wanted to thank *Chair Schultz* for your leadership as Commission Chair for the past 4 years. Thank you for your leadership and the role you've played.
  - *Chair Schultz*: It's been an honor to serve in this role. I feel so fortunate to be a part of this group.
  - *Commissioner Bachrach* also appreciated *Chair Schultz*.

### **Consent Agenda**

- Consideration of Minutes from the December 17, 2019 PSC meeting.

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

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Quiñonez, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

### **Vote for 2020 PSC Officers**

Decision: PSC

*Commissioner Smith* noted his honor of being Vice Chair and partnering with *Chair Schultz*. I move a 2020 slate of *Commissioner Spevak* for Chair, and *Chair Schultz* and *Commissioner Routh* for Vice Chairs. He provided introductions and appreciations for the three potential new officers for 2020.

*Commissioner Larsell* seconded.

*Commissioner Routh* thanked the commission and noted her newness. Thank you for bringing the new commissioners along very quickly.

*Commissioner Spevak*: It would be an honor to serve as Chair. When I joined the PSC, I had to get family permission for my time commitment. This relies on officers and staff to make the meetings and preparation worthwhile and necessary.

*Commissioner Larsell*: *Chair Schultz* has been a wonderful leader, and I know how hard it is to run meetings as smoothly as you've run them. I'm pleased with the new slate, particularly the continuation of leadership in different positions. *Commissioner Houck*: I'll second both of those points.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Quiñonez, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

## **River District Master Street Plan Update**

Hearing / Recommendation: Nick Falbo, Courtney Duke (PBOT)

### **Presentation**

Nick introduced the topic. This is a proposed update on the River District Master Street Plan, which is a follow-up to the briefing we had last month. This is part of the TSP, which regulates the layout of new streets and pedestrian connections. The USPS concept is to bring the street grid through the site with a few specific updates (slide 3).

The proposal includes:

- Modify the Master Street Plan designation of NW Kearney St through the USPS Master Plan site from “New Pedestrian Connection” to “New Street”.
- Remove the frontage road along Broadway Blvd.
- Remove Irving St segment through the new North Park Block.

The changes were made about the functions of the street, and full street connections give more eyes on the street and works well in typical or average urban streets with motor-vehicle oriented access needs.

Nick provided clarity on the connections as requested at the December briefing (slide 8).

*Commissioner Houck:* Is the route for the Green Loop set now? There was discussion about alternative options.

- Long-term identified that it passes through this site to the Broadway Bridge. This was reaffirmed with discussion on the USPS site.

### **Written Testimony Received**

#### **Discussion**

*Commissioner Spevak:* Where do the street types apply?

- Nick: New conventional streets would be on Kearney St and Johnson St, which will be a special design in the site, as is the extension of Park Ave.

No public testimony was offered at the meeting. *Chair Schultz* closed testimony at 12:55 p.m.

#### **Motion**

*Commissioner Quiñonez* moved to approve the River District Master Street Plan as proposed and forward it to City Council. *Commissioner Spevak* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Quiñonez, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

## Expanding Opportunities for Affordable Housing

Briefing: Eric Engstrom

### Presentation

#### Disclosures

- *Chair Spevak*: I have been in conversations with one church in my neighborhood. There may be specific zone changes that I might need to bow out of.
- *Commissioner Bachrach*: I represent a church on the eastside that has a land use application pending. This won't have a direct bearing on them.

Eric introduced the project. This is a Metro-funded project grant, and the purpose is to look at community, mission-based organizations with land resources to look at potential barriers for using sites. We are looking to streamline regulatory barriers. Nan Stark at BPS is our staffer for this project, but I'm presenting on her behalf today.

There was a technical advisory committee that included BDS, Housing, Prosper Portland, BES, and PBOT staff. Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon was the grant partner. Carlton Hart Architecture and the Nielson Group provided consulting services. The three organizations receiving those services were the Muslim Community Center, Bethel AME EDC, and Trinity Lutheran.

The BPS proposal is about zoning changes, but the grant project developed recommendations related to other barriers too. Two examples of that are that BDS have more of a concierge approach for these projects, and that the City create a fund to help finance infrastructure associated with the projects. BDS has acted on the recommendations by identifying a point person for these kind of projects. The infrastructure question is a bit more complex and needs to be considered along with other City priorities.

The project looks specifically at institutions that exist in residential neighborhoods as conditional uses. It allows housing to be added to the site without further amendments, which streamlines the current process.

The overall proposed zoning changes are on slide 4; Eric elaborated on these (slides 5-13).

*Commissioner Schultz*: Does a new site boundary need to be determined as part of the process?

- Eric: You can subtract out a parcel through this process, which would be tracked. Housing wouldn't necessarily change the boundary of the site.

The current conditional use code often requires institutions maintain their parking, even when the site is close to good transit. Other land uses are no longer required to provide parking in these locations, so this is consistent with broader land use policy and frees up more land for needed housing.

*Commissioner Smith*: Why aren't we waiving 100% instead of just the 50% for parking when developing housing and the site is near frequent transit? If I have the choice between storing cars and providing living space for people, I'm going to go with people.

- Eric: We will check in on this before the PSC hearing on February 11.

*Commissioner Spevak:* This is a pretty wonky area of the zoning code. Sometimes churches have lots of property but under current rules they can't simply sell off pieces. And they want to be conscious of the need for housing. Some institutions want to build housing in partnership with an organization like a CDC. So this project will help streamline and remove barriers.

Even though we are exempting housing from Conditional Use (CU), there may be still instances where a CU review is needed. For example, if the project exceeds the size thresholds mentioned earlier for non-housing elements, or if other conditions of previous approvals need to be amended.

Criteria for these sites are (see page 23 of Proposed Draft): They must meet at least one, and most meet several and most are being changed to allow possibility for community benefits, particularly affordable housing.

- Adjacent to the zoning that is proposed or matches CP designation.
- On a corridor or TSP-designated collector street.
- Rectifies a NC use or split zone situation.
- Is in the ownership of an institution or CBO.
- Creates a pathway for providing community benefits.

In terms of infrastructure barriers, staff examined potential street improvements, traffic issues, stormwater, sewer, and water constraints. Several of these sites will trigger frontage or street improvements, or utility extensions as development occurs. The traffic conditions on Taylor's Ferry are a potential issue for the W. Portland Methodist site, but the planned light rail station only a few blocks away should mitigate that (slide 15).

The PSC hearing will be on February 11, 2020.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* I had questions about the zoning map. The first is on page 32 of the Proposed Draft. I'm curious what the scenario is where we give a private developer the benefit of a zone change with only a potential owner (Hacienda).

- Eric: There is a transaction underway, which we're tracking. We aren't giving zone changes to private, for-profit developers. There is a community-based organization in the process of purchasing this site. We have criteria and screened them. Many projects could benefit from the code but don't need to be rezoned. I expect you'll get testimony from organizations who would want to be in the list. We were careful to write down the criteria we used. We aren't creating island zoning (page 23 of the Proposed Draft).

*Commissioner Larsell:* If more are found and they're wanting to do the same rezoning change, I would think we want to include/support them as well.

This is a one-time project. We don't have a rolling legislative process to collect these requests and potential changes.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* I also would like an explanation or justification. We have one change on page 34, taking a residential zoned site to a commercial mixed-use site. I'm not sure it's justified by the surrounding zones.

- Eric: This site has some non-residential use and services/facilities on it that wouldn't be allowed in a residential zone.

*Commissioner Schultz:* This is about 11 sites. A sentence or two about why each is hitting the criteria would help us review the proposal more fully.

*Commissioner Bachrach:* Can't we find a way to streamline or eliminate the subdivision requirement in these projects? A subdivision is more expensive and takes even longer. If a church owns a large property and they want to develop housing (or sell to a housing developer), they're going to have to go through a zone change, just to create one separate lot.

- Eric: We have had discussions about the need to look at the land division code overall as part of a future work program. The subdivision code is in state code, so it's a larger issue than just looking at Portland's code, which is far beyond the scope of this project. There are some substantive differences between this and condominiums in terms of what you end up with and infrastructure.

*Commissioner Smith:* I'm aware of people preparing testimony for Council for RIP tomorrow. With regard to more institutions wanting to take advantage of the zoning testimony, if we get written testimony before the hearing, can staff provide analysis to screen these? And if we get testimony day-of, is it possible to provide recommendations to the PSC before we vote?

- Eric: I'm more confident on being able to provide this if we receive testimony before the hearing; day-of may require an extended timeframe to look at the sites.

*Commissioner Larsell:* Could someone use these changes in a way that we're not interested in them doing?

- Eric: Zone changes don't dictate what they build, so we can't guarantee they're building affordable housing or type of use if we're rezoning to mixed-use. There are minimum density requirements on vacant sites when they get developed. If an institution is adding housing to a site, we haven't dictated how many units need to be built.

*Commissioner Larsell:* It seems like what we're talking about is the very beginning of the journey to come up with housing. Are there other foreseeable barriers?

- Eric: Financing may be an issue, as infrastructure issues may arise or already be there. Part of the grant was to hold coordination and networking events for the institutions, and we are compiling a guidebook related to the work.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* Looking at streamlining the subdivision code as a future endeavor is very enticing, though I know it's a bigger can of worms. Perhaps we look at this more closely as an exploratory session with a subgroup of PSC members. It could have potential big benefits to lower the barrier to home ownership.

*Chair Schultz:* Is there support for a working group to get together and brainstorm this with staff support?

- Andrea: Let's get this back to the BPS team. That body of work would affect our current work, and we'd want the timing to fit well.
- *Commissioner Bachrach:* DRAC did an informal look at this and produced a memo that we might review.

*Commissioner Spevak:* I support the suggestion as well. As part of the review, if we can, we can review the process in other jurisdictions in the state as well.

## Streetcar Expansion Project

Briefing: Barry Manning, Eric Engstrom; Mauricio Leclerc, Kate Drennan (PBOT)

### Presentation

#### Disclosures

- *Commissioner Schultz*: I have a potential conflict, and I'll just listen in on this briefing.
- *Commissioner Smith*: I have served as a member of the Portland Streetcar Board for a number of years.

Eric introduced the staff and topic. This is an FTA-funded grant.

Kate shared the project background. In 2018-19, staff did the Phase 1 study, looking at land use cases (slide 4), five scenarios, and did an initial equity analysis. This serves as the basis of the next study phase.

The past few years have seen many changes in the past few years. There is an opportunity now and support from the local property owners in Northwest, and they have self-organized to explore a Local Improvement district to support transit investments.

Streetcar extensions have been studied and recommended in numerous plans. These include the Transportation System Plan, Regional Transportation Plan, and 2035 Comprehensive Plan. Streetcar is a highly effective transit mode. Streetcar ridership is as high as our busiest transit lines. Since adding cars in September 2019, streetcar weekday ridership increased 24% in the first two months.

Barry highlighted the study area and potential alignments and explanations about alternatives. Zoning will be a big question to see what is appropriate and if streetcar will serve the area on the Northwest area. On the eastside, it's mostly employment and mixed-use zoning as well as higher-density residential.

Expected outcomes are different in the east- and westsides (slide 15).

We are doing some targeted outreach to under-served groups, contracting with community-based organizations to communities that might be impacted by the new streetcar. We will come back to the PSC and then Council with the land use changes late in this calendar year or early 2021.

*Commissioner Smith*: I've been involved with streetcar for a long time. Streetcar is good at creating dense places where people want to live. People build close to the allowed FAR. The first two lines are good with City strategy alignment. I'm struggling a bit with how this corresponds to existing goals and what opportunities it presents. I'm interested in looking at tradeoffs between developing in Northwest as opposed to looking at other Inner Ring neighborhoods. The Hollywood line would be more about making more development happen. If we go to Northwest, can we recapture the investments to create more affordable housing? I'd want to see a very strong plan for how we ensure affordable housing.

- Eric: What we're trying to study is how streetcar can be the tool to help shape neighborhoods – a package between transportation and housing. It's about a decision about how and where we want the Central City to build out. It is a legitimate question about where we want to push the growth, so this project helps us have that discussion in terms of the near Central City growth.

*Commissioner Quinonez:* It's great to hear this will spur affordable housing, but are there plans to do a displacement risk analysis of housing and businesses? Do you have a plan for more community involvement on the eastside?

- Barry: Part of the whole equitable development strategy needs to include a displacement risk analysis for housing, which isn't scoped yet. We initially will be meeting and asking questions of small businesses on the eastside, renter populations, and lower-income folks. We are also looking to meet with workers in industrial areas. On the eastside, our strategy is to have larger community workshops since the work is at a higher level than on the westside. We have three events planned and are reaching out to communities in the area.
- Kate: Prosper Portland is a partner in the project, so they are helping craft the displacement analysis and other work and agreements to funnel money back into strategies.
- Eric: In NW, a policy tradeoff is to look at industrial zoning (less property value) and what changing the zoning may do.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* For the potential eastside alignment, does it make sense to look at it from a broader loop perspective? Like looping all the way down through Sandy.

- Kate: We don't think we have specific operational plans about exactly where the streetcar would go. They would be built in different phases, so we're not necessarily looking at one alignment that connects the two segments.

*Commissioner Routh:* On the racial equity analysis, if I remember correctly, PBOT's racial equity goals are specific to income and race by census tract. Is that identified in this analysis? Is that map available in the alignment?

- Kate: Yes, race, income, and language proficiency. In existing conditions, we did look at demographics. This is in the existing conditions report, which is available online. The part of the city that has the highest equity populations is along 18<sup>th</sup> and 19<sup>th</sup>.
- Eric: Along the alignments, there are more people in the area for jobs (during the day), so we looked at employment information as well.

*Commissioner Routh:* When I think of studies, it's a prologue to investments. What's the landscape for federal funding, and where do you see potential pick-up of transportation funding for the City?

- Kate: If we move forward, it's still a question if we would federalize the project. We've done a mix in the past with streetcar. We are trying to lay the foundation to apply for federal funds if we decide to go that route.

*Commissioner Routh:* I live in East Portland, and we have vast disparities in transportation investments.

- Eric: I know this is a common reaction to streetcar. The scale of costs is a magnitude difference. So the assumption in the Comp Plan and TSP when we allocated projects, there is more on a magnitude different improvement being made on the East Side.
- Kate: Ridership on the streetcar moves lots of people who live along the line, so building housing and providing an affordable option is important.
- Mauricio: This is a great opportunity that we're exploring. However, at the end of the study time, we'll understand what the accompanying support and infrastructure we need to be in alignment with Citywide goals.

*Commissioner Larsell:* I noticed there's usually a bunch of development and a little bit in East Portland. I am wondering why the East Portland alignment wasn't picked. Gateway seems like a good opportunity.



- Eric: The screening process in the Comp Plan that led us here included some ideas in East Portland. We studied Gateway and Foster and 82<sup>nd</sup> and 122<sup>nd</sup> as potential investments. But it's a bit of a mix between private investment allure, so we looked at economics along these alignments before we got to this project. The difficulty with making streetcar financially work there is that the property values are still low enough, and it wouldn't make financial sense for residents, so the economics of development aren't there. The conclusion of that prior work was to focus on North-South bus improvements in East Portland as our priority.

*Chair Spevak:* Can you provide a more detailed statement about how the funding and resources are shared?

- Eric: Inevitably there will be some City funding coupled with the LID and potential federal funding.

*Chair Spevak:* Eastside and westside are coming to us together even though they're in different phases. I know land use changes will come to the PSC, but what else?

- Eric: Typically the PSC identifies projects on the TSP (which already happened). And land use changes. You don't have a formal role in choosing the final alignment, but the PSC typically does have briefings and check-ins as alignments and projects solidify.

## **Design Overlay Zone Amendments**

Work Session: Lora Lillard, Phil Nameny; Shem Harding (Deca Architecture)

### **Presentation**

#### **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 the interest of transparency, we have the following declarations:

- *Commissioner Smith* owns property in the design overlay zone.
- Commissioners Schultz, Spevak, Bortolazzo, and Lawrence Spence work for architectural or development firms who conduct work in Portland.

Lora introduced Phil and Shem Harding (consultant) and provided a reminder of the purpose statement and three tenets. Today's discussion is about the Public Realm tenet. We have an active Standards Working Group of PSC members and a Design Commissioner. This group met at the beginning of the year and worked through these standards before today's discussion.

Items for discussion are on page 3 of the [spreadsheet](#). If people want to pull anything off the consent list, we can do that at the end of the session.

#### *PR18: Location of Utilities*

Phil noted the proposed amendments to change the standard so that screening/setbacks of utilities must also occur from major public trails such as the Willamette River Trail within the river setback in the Macadam Plan District. The work group didn't have an opportunity to review this. There is a possibility Macadam Design Guidelines would be changed with these Citywide design guidelines, which could happen with the South Reach project.

PSC members are generally supportive of the amendment.

*PR19: Pervious Paving Materials*

Possible amendment: Consider increasing the points to 3 points (currently 2 points), but also apply this option only to larger parking/ vehicle areas. There was question about whether in relationship to all the vehicle area and setbacks if maybe looking at them holistically would make sense.

The PSC workgroup may support increasing the number of points but only if it achieves an impact on stormwater (i.e. not just creating one pervious paver space). The standard should only be applicable to sites providing a certain threshold of paved area such as a minimum number of parking spaces or a square footage of vehicle area. (Note that the BHBD project limited overall vehicle area to 30% and asphalt to 15% of site area within RM1-RM4 zones.)

*PR20: Large Site Parking Setback*

Possible amendment: After discussion, the PSC should determine if this setback has value, and what features would be allowed/ required within the 10-ft or 25-ft setback. An alternative would be to create a more limited percentage of parking frontage than the 50% allowance within the base zone. The workgroup would like the greater Commission to discuss the benefits of setting back the parking and whether just a setback is adequate without additional guidance/requirements of what features would go in the setback. It is not clear if a utility/garbage/bike parking building is a better use than a parking space.

*PR20: Large Site Parking Setback*

Proposal to expand the setback requirement above to also require a setback from major public trails or the river setback, depending on what option is easiest to measure from. This amendment is intended to provide the similar benefit to the new standard listed under PR 18.

*PR21: Parking Areas*

Sites receive a point if they don't provide parking. This is a relationship question between the this and previous sections that we are awarding points to for doing something outside of parking to use the site for other improvements that are more beneficial to the public realm. This is something of a "give me" point versus providing an actual benefit.

*Commissioner Smith: Why wasn't PR19 required?*

- Phil: It is not always feasible to use pervious pavers citywide as a viable solution (e.g. in the West Hills).

The idea of having parking lots with 10 or more spaces could be a threshold.

- *Commissioner Bortolazzo:* I like the idea of 10 or more spaces – if you do parking, you do it in a specific way.

PSC members are supportive to revise PR21 for sites with 10 or more parking spaces.

Lora: We will talk about point allotments all together at a future discussion. Once we finish this set, we still have the Context Standards, then we want to recalibrate where we are, which we'll bring to the 3x3 first since design guidelines are being reshuffled simultaneously to the PSC's discussion. We think that the points discussion will be with a smaller group (3x3) first to make sure we're all in alignment.

- Schultz: Maybe it's the 3x3 and the Standards group. There is alignment with the design guidelines, but there might be priorities within the PSC that are slightly different.

For PR20, there are the two items to discuss.

*Chair Schultz:* For the setbacks, I'm curious about why we'd want this. It's along a transit corridor, so if you're just setting back for paving, it doesn't necessarily accomplish anything aside from creating "leftover" space.

- Lora: There would be an active use, but that's not how it was written, which is why we want to discuss.

*Commissioner Houck:* The new one was specific to the Willamette River Greenway, specifically the South Reach. In that case, there is quite a different experience if there is a large parking lot right next to the Greenway, there as opposed to vegetation that complements the greenway.

- *Chair Schultz:* Yes, this one I'd completely agree with. But let's also give it a point or two.
- *Commissioner Larsell:* You're mentioning the river, but are you thinking about every major public trail? Yes.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* If the intent is to incentivize active uses, it's a bit convoluted. The 25 feet is an inefficient use of the land since it's an in-between dimension. I'd lean towards reducing this setback. There is a possibility with a river or major trail it's justified, but for all other cases, maybe 15 feet is more applicable.

*Commissioner Houck:* This came specifically from the South Reach work. Right now it's 25 feet as the greenway setback, but it's likely to increase.

*Commissioner Spevak:* What about on a greenway 25 feet and street 15 feet?

*Chair Schultz:* I'm questioning if the standard makes sense for a street.

Phil: In some locations, we haven't allowed parking between a building and the street, which is something we can expand on for this. There is also information in the different base zones.

Andrea: Doing further work for the streets aspect could be helpful in terms of the competing needs and demands for right-of-way.

*Chair Schultz:* Do we support 25 feet in the greenway and major public trails proposal for PR20? This will include landscaping standards.

- PSC members are supportive.

Lora: The intent of this was to limit the amount of parking along major public streets, which we can come back with more clarity.

PR21 giving an optional point for including no parking on a site.

*Commissioner Smith:* How does this balance against economic incentives since developers already have incentive (cost) to not provide parking. So maybe we reword this so it's just for larger sites? I don't know what the threshold would be.

*Commissioner Spevak:* That makes sense to me. I might boost it up to two points.

*Commissioner Bortolazzo:* I'm in favor to increase this to two points. I'm not sure I'm seeing the distinction between small and large sites. We are trying to incentivize a certain behavior that we want overall, so I'd be inclined to leave it as it is.

PSC members support for a threshold to get the point(s). Staff will work on what the threshold would be. 20,000 square feet is what we've been using for other lots.

PR1 Ground Floor Height Standards for new buildings – a requirement to have a vertical clearance minimum of 12 feet commercial and 10 feet residential. There could be a 3-point bonus to raising to 15 feet and 12 feet respectively. This discussion will be at the 3x3 then will come to the PSC with the group's discussion and recommendation.

*Commissioner Routh:* For PR4, it includes *Commissioner Bachrach's* comment from a few meetings ago. Is affordability an enduring benefit? Is it just for a few years?

- *Commissioner Spevak:* I suggested we remove this from the criteria, but the group disagreed. This is for 10 years.

*Commissioner Smith:* We had a PSC working group with Prosper Portland on this program, which was very challenging. If we do it, we can expect low take-up. If we are doing it, we should work closely with Prosper.

- Phil: Prosper was supportive of this to support their program.

Lora highlighted the next steps in the DOZA process:

- Standards Working Group 1/16 – Context
- PSC Work Session 1/28 – Thresholds, Process, Costs
- PSC Work Session 2/11 – Standards for Context
- PSC Work Session 2/25 – List of Amendments
- Week of 3/9 – 3x3 meeting to align standards and guidelines

We will continue the DOZA work session to January 28, 2020.

## **Adjourn**

*Chair Schultz* adjourned the meeting at 3:24 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken