

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

May 8, 2018

5:00 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: André Baugh, Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck (by phone; 4:04 p.m.), Andrés Oswill, Chris Smith, Katie Larsell, Michelle Rudd, Katherine Schultz, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin (arrived 4:15 p.m.)

Commissioners Absent: Jeff Bachrach

City Staff Presenting: Eric Engstrom, Ryan Curren, Morgan Tracy; Teresa Boyle (PBOT); Matt Tschabold (PHB)

Other Presenters: Pam Phan (CAT); Sean Farrelly (City of Tigard); Malu Wilkinson (Metro); Dave Unsworth (TriMet)

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 4:01 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from April 24, 2018 PSC meeting
- RW #8528, NW Terminal St between NW 17th Ave and NW Upshur St

Commissioner Smith moved to approve the Consent Agenda. *Commissioner Baugh* seconded.

The Consent Agenda was approved with an aye vote.

(Y7 – Baugh, Bortolazzo, Rudd, Smith, Larsell, Schultz, Spevak)

SW Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy

Briefing: Eric Engstrom, Ryan Curren; Teresa Boyle (PBOT); Matt Tschabold (PHB); Pam Phan (CAT); Sean Farrelly (City of Tigard); Malu Wilkinson (Metro); Dave Unsworth (TriMet)

Eric introduced the project and tonight's presentation. We have several presenters today to discuss the SW Corridor Equitable Housing Strategy.

Teresa provided an overview of the SW Corridor Light Rail Project, which is when Council gave staff direction to develop an affordable housing strategy to go with the corridor development (in 2016). We will provide another briefing to the PSC on June 12 about the DEIS.

Malu gave an overview of Metro's focus on aligning efforts and strategies. They started Southwest Corridor by asking the cities to develop community-based land use visions, supporting that work with funding. We continue to search for both funding and opportunities to address multiple outcomes. We know that any major public investment brings change – some welcome and some challenging, so we applied for this corridor-based TOD grant from FTA for an Equitable Development Strategy to be partnered with continued study of a LRT.

Portland and Tigard's work folds into the overall SW Equitable Development Strategy. The overall strategy will include actions to support housing choices along with job creation, small business support, and workforce development. Our goal is to prepare communities for the changes and opportunities light rail and other investments bring to the SW Corridor.

We are working with community based partners to finalize scopes for six pilot projects to test potential actions for the SWEDS and to begin addressing the community and business needs in the area. Our work is overseen by a Project Oversight Committee that includes community, non-profit, educational and agency partners. The SWEDS will be complete in Summer 2019.

Malu also shared information about the regional housing bond. We want to help families and under-served populations find stable, affordable homes and opportunities. Over the last months, we've been working with various advisory groups and housing providers that have informed a framework that includes components as shown in slide 5.

Dave shared TriMet's values and their role in the project. We open the project in about 2026, so it's a while down the road, and lots of work needs to be done before that. We want to promote mixed-use and mixed-income. We are part of the solution.

Ryan: This work comes with a past of over committing and under delivering on our housing strategies. We want to do something different this time. The major indicators of whether we will do something different is whether we 1) commit now to capitalizing the strategy with new resources and 2) support the internal and community infrastructure to implement and evaluate.

You have a handout of the three overarching goals, the big ideas to achieve them, and our research findings, and housing targets. The final strategy will also have more info on opportunity sites and the partnership structures to implement this work. We've accomplished some things through this process but still have a way to go. I want to thank TriMet and Metro for their willingness to look at sites and Metro for their leadership on regional housing funding. We are interested in hearing what role the PSC wants to play in championing this strategy.

The advisory group met 7 times and weighed in on funding sources, targets, and the "Big Moves". The October launch event brought 100 + people together. We made headlines with Mayor's ask of a regional investment in housing alongside the transit project. Helped to focus the project on creating inclusive and integrated neighborhoods. Mayor and Saltzman followed up with letter to TriMet and Metro. We've given about \$70,000 in community grants. Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT) is the lead.

Pam highlighted the project's work in involving the community that is most impacted by this project. Unite, OPAL, Momentum, CPHA, and CAT have worked together to canvas and engage as many low-income tenants along the corridor as possible. We did a leadership development cohort to provide tenant rights information and issue-specific information. You have a letter from the CBOs outlining the priorities. They love the SW Corridor and their community. They are most interested in regulated, long-term affordable housing. The tenant protections and services in the near-term are what they value most.

The leadership cohort is having a session of their findings and experiences this Sunday at Markham Elementary School from 4 to 7 p.m.

Ryan shared the draft strategy and encouraged the PSC members to read through the handout, which has background about the strategy. We conducted analysis of demographic trends, real estate, zoning, jobs, and housing, all with an eye toward economic and racial disparities.

The area is rich in amenities and proximate to quality jobs and education. However, transit and congestion are major obstacles. Most of the 3,000 additional new households projected to move into the corridor in the next 10 years will find housing in the market. Achieving the most aggressive affordable housing targets will result in construction of approximately 1,300 regulated affordable homes. So we will have a minimum target of 1,700 market rate homes.

Sean shared information about Tigard's top three priorities: MOU with TriMet; promote the recently-enacted incentive for affordable housing exemption that Tigard Council approved; and the new URA in the Tigard Triangle, where the light rail line will come through.

The advisory group highlighted the biggest moves and priorities. New affordable TOD at each station and an equal number of building acquisitions. This requires new funding, so we looked at an MOU, which is being worked on. We are focused on the land and the new construction. The Metro bond includes preservation and new construction. And a new URA can preserve and develop up to 280 units. And the NOAH fund could acquire up to 555 units. We also have a Metro application in to begin station area planning and opportunity sites (slide 16).

Matt offered the three key challenges and asked for the PSC's input on their role. PHB has not traditionally operated in SW Portland; most of our funding has been in URAs.

Discussion

Commissioner St Martin: Great work. I think we do really need to diversify our support for housing. Do you have specific questions for us?

- Ryan: We have the key challenges, and they will require tough decisions. So advocacy and prioritization is important. In terms of implementation and accountability, a letter of support from the PSC at this stage would be helpful, as well as over the course of the strategy to note what we've done, what we have to do, and outcomes in the community.
- Pam: We need to think about past opportunities that the PSC have been able to green light that have previously fuel displacement. What do you want to do now on this project? As many protections to end displacement is what we're sharing.

Commissioner Baugh: Would the communities you represent move forward without all the tools? Or would you take some of them if we can get those before construction?

- Pam: It depends on the tools. There are a host of anti-displacement tools. PHB is working on the Portland side to ensure at least some of the services are available. CAT knows there are so many families losing their homes, so we will continue to ask for and fight for the solutions we've provided.
- Matt: PHB has asked for an additional \$2m in this year's budget for outreach and \$1M for increasing services. The \$2M has been approved, but not the additional. So current services will be maintained, but not new.

Commissioner Baugh: Would TriMet build this without the strategy being funded at least to the extent that community benefits are in place? What's the long-term funding strategy?

- Ryan: We can try to have a response for this at the June 12 meeting. Community center collaborative will have shared accountability and funding to move this and continue it forward, though we need to flesh this out more.

Commissioner Spevak: Is TriMet eyeing TIF funds to help fund the line? They should be available at the beginning of the district, so we don't get to the issues we had with the Interstate Line. In terms of the NOAH

fund, is that just bridge funding? That's how they usually operate. Is Tigard's tenant protection matched Portland's at this point?

- Teresa: We have done some early exploration. No conclusions yet.
- Ryan: Correct on the NOAH funding.
- The strategy TIF is not intended to be spent on light rail in Tigard Triangle.

Commissioner Larsell: Things are turning over quickly now. Are you ahead in terms of timing and having a good impact? Are you using new/different strategies than when the Yellow Line went in?

- Matt: People are being displaced at a significant rate all over the region. This may be the second time people have been displaced. We have lots of similar strategies about the Yellow Line, but this speaks to what gets funded first versus later.
- Ryan: Emphasis on building preservation and services came directly out of the engagement CAT did to center the strategy on the current situation as well as the long-term need.

Commissioner Smith: Nice work. Thank you to Pam and CAT especially. I was the liaison to the Barbur Plan, so thank you for your focus on involving the Somali community on this work. I'm going to focus on the third question (Resource a community-centered collaborative to champion the strategy). PSC has been a champion for equity. How can we best help you?

- Ryan: Accountability over the long-term. We want to roll out some annual indicators, and we hope you're an audience for that. In the near-term budget cycles, if there is a work group of the PSC who are interested in what some of the details of the proposals are, that could be a good body of work. A cautious letter of support (you like the product, but you want to be sure it's meaningfully implemented).

This isn't the only transit project happening. It would be good to see an integrated strategy (with the Division Corridor work).

Commissioner Oswill: It would be good to see an integrated, cross-project strategy. Business and community space is another way to keep culture in the area. It would be helpful to have a coordinated anti-displacement overview instead of piece-meal by project.

Commissioner Rudd: Will the PSC be asked to make a recommendation on a locally preferred alignment at the June 12 meeting? Will the draft DEIS have analysis of whether the light rail project increases displacement and review mitigation options if it does? Do we have a running list of laws that may impede work in terms of implementing this strategy like land banking and working with city lobbyists on addressing this? What about thinking about employment opportunities for those who may be impacted in terms of light rail construction? Wrap-around services to help people move up the economic spectrum so they don't continue to need affordable housing and the units may be made available to others needing help?

- Teresa: DEIS will not yet be released on June 12, so we will talk about the project and the LPA. It doesn't have a specific part about affordable housing.
- Ryan: We will talk about the project and ask for your direction and will respond to your other questions on or before June 12.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: Naturally-occurring housing is a unique feature of the SW Corridor. As you weigh options, perhaps that can help broaden the reach of the strategy. What are the parameters between acquiring new, older buildings versus new construction?

- Ryan: Timing and cost considerations are there. The analysis showed where opportunities and challenges were in terms of building sales occurring. It made the policy case clearer. And existing seed money can help of course.

Commissioner Houck: I'm happy this work is happening in this area as we are debunking the myth that this area doesn't need to worry about affordable housing.

Chair Schultz: Thank you for this work and the staff efforts. Is there anyone opposed to writing a letter of support for this project?

- *Commissioner Baugh:* A cautious letter I'm ok with.

Chair Schultz: Is anyone opposed to wanting to support and have our ongoing PSC advocacy in the letter?

Julie will circulate an email to the PSC members to see if anyone is interested in working more closely on this project in a smaller group.

Chair Schultz called for a 5 minute break to between projects.

Residential Infill Project

Hearing: Morgan Tracy

Tonight is our first hearing, and we know everyone wants an opportunity to speak. The Commission received a full briefing on the proposals from staff on April 24, so today's meeting is dedicated to hearing testimony. Testimony will be limited to 2 minutes per person maximum. If someone has already said something you were going to say, you can say you agree with them, but then we'd ask you share your other/different comments instead of simply repeating.

I will also ask our commissioners to please refrain from asking questions of testifiers unless absolutely necessary to clarify their comments so that we can get through as many people as we can this evening.

I will call up 4 people at once (in the order testimony cards were received) as well as the next 4 people to keep us moving quickly as we try to hear as many people as possible.

The hearing will continue to May 15, beginning at 5 p.m., at this same location.

As we did at the last meeting, I will share a statement about PSC members' potential conflicts of interest about this topic:

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 Oswill, Smith, Baugh 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.

Morgan gave a brief overview of the project and the 11 proposals:

Scale of Houses

1. Limit the size of houses while maintaining flexibility
2. Revise how height is measured
3. Improve front setbacks to better reflect those of adjacent houses
4. Improve building design

Housing Options

5. Create a new Additional Housing Options overlay zone
6. Apply the new overlay zone in select areas
7. Provide incentives for affordable housing and historic preservation
8. Encourage more cottage cluster development

Narrow Lots

9. Rezone some historically narrow lots from R5 to R2.5.
10. Improve building design for all narrow lots (less than 32 feet wide).
11. Revise rules for the R2.5 zone.

Morgan also highlighted the amount of testimony we've received to date, number of calls the call center operations has fielded, and open house events that staff has attended and helped the public understand the project's proposals.

Testimony

1. Daniel Newberry, Urban Forestry Commission: Thank you to BPS for putting together a plan that accommodates multiple goals. We'd encourage a few changes relative to the tree and impervious coverage area. Preserving space for large-form trees is what we want to see. *See written comments.*
2. Mary Vogel: Our focus is on providing housing opportunity in a small-scale way. RIP has major issues that fundamentally work against the goals of the project and aren't in line with small-scale housing growth. *See written comments.*
3. Terry Parker: The a-overlay promotes refill, not infill, development, which is against the Comp Plan goals. It is inequitable and goes against a number of City Council decisions. *See written comments.*
4. Mike Beamer: Local architect and homeowner with a basement ADU. Supports RIP and strategy that's being considered. Agree with input from Portland for Everyone.
5. Stephen Judkins: Lots of other people have quantitative assessments of the proposal and affordable housing it may create. In general a problem here is that we have an intention but that doesn't necessarily make things happen. I urge you to make sure the result is what matters. Again, allowing something to happen doesn't mean it actually happens. The process is a means, not an end. I don't think much affordable housing will be created based on economic analysis of this project.
6. Linda Nettekoven: I support much of the RIP proposal. My main concerns is about increasing affordable housing. The HAND neighborhood was largely created by infill, not demolition. I don't see how RIP can help go against demo of small houses that we're seeing so much of. This will increase economic segmentation. New structures are likely to provide choice for those who already have choice and not for those who are already struggling to stay where they are and afford where they are. *See written comments.*
7. Marshall Johnson: Participated on the RIP SAC. Homes are less affordable here than in any time in history, and there are policies roots as to why. Equity is the biggest issue that can be addressed in RIP, but the proposal doesn't go far enough to accommodate housing issues across the city. Lower-income households should be integrated. Diversity in housing options throughout the city will help us integrate. Missing middle housing options should be better integrated into the plan.
8. John Mulvey: East Portland is experiencing much housing instability. We need aggressive steps to be sure low-income Portlanders can purchase the housing that's being built. Expanding supply, without

doing more, is an empty promise. RIP may be inadequate to incentivize affordable housing construction. Share concerns about displacement of low-income people.

9. Fred Berkovitch: Moved to Portland (Sellwood) just over a year ago. Aesop's goose that laid the golden egg... the farmer killed the goose, and there were no more golden eggs. In 1968, during the Tet Offensive, the US military bombed a group of villages and killed 1000 civilians and wounded another 1500 and then justified it that in order to destroy the village to save it. Leopold in the Sand County Almanac... conservation based solely on economic self-interest is destructive. Do you want the city of roses to be the city of withered flowers?
10. David Sweet, Cully Assn of Neighbors: We welcome the opportunities the project will bring to Cully. But we need to see some improvements including needing to include all of Cully in the a-overlay (particularly the east portion of Cully). *See written comments.*
11. Aaron Brown: Support policy recommendations by Portland for Everyone. Having a large garage being built in the lot (with house) across the street from me doesn't make sense. Housing won't be more affordable unless we have more places to live. Garages alter who can live here because there aren't as many homes that can be built with we support building parking garages.
12. Neil Heller: Thank you to staff. I'm in real estate and part of the Incremental Development Alliance. I support RIP and the recommendations of Portland for Everyone. We should allow 1-4 unit structures in single-family zones. Housing scarcity and income inequality are at the heart of the argument. Removing whole sections of neighborhoods from the a-overlay perpetuates this. Apply the a-overlay broadly.
13. Barbara Strunk, UNR: RIP SAC member. UNR was endorsed by 45 neighborhood associations. Replacement houses in some neighborhoods were refill, not infill. We do want RIP succeed; reduce demos and increase number of small houses. Improve our neighborhoods. The expanded scope of RIP will not result in affordability. The proposal will likely increase number of demos and incentivizes new, larger houses. *See written comments.*
14. Jim Gorter, UNR: RIP SAC member. UNR has taken a variety of positions. But generally, RIP will be urban renewal in slow motion; it's not an infill project. It's based on the assumption that new housing will be built on the rubble of the old. *See written comments.*
15. Gerson Robboy: We have a lower demand for cars, and off-street parking is expensive and uses space that could be used for housing or green space. The affordable housing bonus needs to be strengthened. We need more multi-family and courtyard housing (up to 4 units), not just on corner lots. Support proposals of Portland for Everyone. *See written comments.*
16. Danell Norby: Expand the additional housing options (a-overlay) to be citywide. Much of East Portland is excluded, but the overlay boundary perpetuates the need for additional amenities. Expand the a-overlay to all single-family zones.
17. Fred Leeson, PCHR: Quoted Comp Plan policies. RIP will go against many of our policies that are working to increase housing and options. We are concerned about density, but the best results will come from the BHBD project. I support ADUs and internal conversations, but then we should eliminate short-term rentals. RIP is a "Christmas wish" of the development community.

18. Jodi Dubyoski, PCRI: Many friends have bought farther out due to costs. Remove barriers to the creation of tri- and four-plexes mid-block. The proposed a-overlay zone blocks path to creation for owners outside of the zone.
19. Kaitlin Berger: Support greater density and housing variety. Support Portland for Everyone's recommendations. Create more housing overall, more affordable, and more accessible. Housing choices in the a-overlay should be allowed in all neighborhoods. Work with Anti-Displacement PDX. Stronger affordable housing incentives. Allow increased FAR for duplexes and triplexes, and allow triplexes mid-block. Reduce setbacks in R5 zones to allow more room for ADUs. Update cottage cluster development.
20. Arlene Williams: I and my neighbors on R5 lots on my block ask to be excluded from the housing opportunity overlay. We live on a dead-end street that is 475 feet with no fire apparatus turn-around. Dead-end streets are dangerous. Portland's fire code is lax compared to most other jurisdictions. My street could not be built today, so how can you allow for the a-overlay here? Portland ROW code recommends dead-end streets have no more than 18 living units, but we have over 30 on this street. The overlay would allow 56 living units, which is too much. *See written testimony.*
21. Shane Kwiatkowski: Support Mary Vogel and Portland for Everyone. I've lived here for 28 years, and I am the golden goose that another testifier referred to. Portland doesn't provide enough options for everyone who is moving here and who have lived here for so long. The fire has met us, the flood is rising. I've already been priced out.
22. Henry Kraemer: Support recommendations for Portland for Everyone. Ensure developers actually and consistently build more units per lot. You must incentive tri- and four-plexes throughout the block. We need to do everything possible to bring the cost of housing down, and we need to do that by bringing the size of houses down. I want to keep the diversity in my neighborhood, but that only works if we make homes that are more affordable. *See written testimony.*
23. Tony Jordan, Portlanders for Parking Reform: Support Portland for Everyone. But also eliminate all existing residential parking requirements. Off-street parking is a personal amenity, but the community takes on more of the costs.
24. Justin Sawyer: I can only afford to live where I do, close-in in Ladd's Addition, because of housing options. We need to keep and give more options to allow everyone who wants to live here do so. RIP is good, but it can be even better if you include the Portland for Everyone's recommendations. Allow internal conversion in all areas of the city; allow housing option provisions throughout the city; eliminate minimum parking requirements altogether.
25. Kol Peterson: Shared slides/images from the ADU tour. These wouldn't be allowed under the proposal, but they are definitely a type of housing we want. We need to make sure we have a code that allows for practical solutions. *See written testimony.*
26. John Liu: In the a-overlay, median house is 1500 square feet versus 2500 in RIP. RIP provisions will be huge and not fit into many neighborhoods. Don't have a generic rule for infill. We need a contextual-based rule with reference to the local environment. E.g. you can build 10 percent larger and taller w/in the city block. This would naturally grow neighborhoods... smaller houses that fit existing, distinct areas.

27. Devin Sills: Exclusionary zoning and parking requirements prevent the poor and under-privileged from home security. Look forward instead of backward. Build more housing. This is the future we need to give people the freedom to create more housing; it incentivizes more affordable housing; and eliminates housing requirements.
28. Julia Metz, PCRI; Anti-Displacement PDX: The affordable housing bonus modification is good, as is the cap at 80 percent MFI requirements (not higher). But we need bonus units to be allowed on all, not just corner, lots. Thank you to staff for all their efforts on balancing this work.
29. Ervin Siverson: Some RIP SAC members called the proposal draconian. R5 should remain R5 as an amendment to RIP, which Council confirmed. RIP doesn't do much for house size requirements or encourage the development of smaller, affordable houses. The areas are arbitrary and inequitable. People are still moving here with cars, so parking minimums still have a place here.
30. Blaine Palmer: Appreciate the mix of housing types in Buckman. But we've lost diversity in my neighborhood. Value of my home has gone up, but affordability has largely disappeared.
31. Diane Linn, Proud Ground: Permanently affordable housing through community land trust model. Support Portland for Everyone proposal. Prioritize the critical need to open the door for more affordable home ownership opportunities. Portland just released its housing report. Proud Ground has about 450 families on our waitlist, and the average is about 55 percent MFI.
32. Natalia Bronner: Against RIP. It will impact the quality of life by burdening current infrastructure and over-crowded public school. RIP won't create affordable housing. And it dictates what homeowners can and can't do with their own property. Be cautious in recommending more density.
33. Elissa Meehan, Multnomah NA: We oppose the a-overlay, but we're not opposed to development. The City needs to move forward properly neighborhood by neighborhood because they are all different. The a-overlay will change the historic quality of our streets. We need to be supporting home-grown start-ups, not big developers.
34. Leslie Hammond, Multnomah NA: This would change the character of the neighborhood forever. Make sure you allow duplexes and triplexes on corners only. There is sufficient buildable land using those options. If mid-block units are built as duplexes or triplexes, we need more parking to accommodate them.
35. Steve Maxon: Homeless and recently given opportunity to put in sweat equity to build and live in affordable housing, but we haven't been able to move past the hurdles to get a permit. Trying to build affordable housing and an attached ADU. Square footage and ROW and landscaping requirements have been huge hindrances. We need further help with alleviating this and making the rules more flexible.
36. Amanda Petretti: The best part of RIP is that it leverages housing opportunities. In terms of ADUs, most people haven't built units. So private homeowners would have more restrictions with the current RIP proposal. This is a large hurdle to make a decision to build an ADU already. Don't introduce FAR to determine ADU size. Max 800 square foot of ADUs everywhere. Don't introduce complexities around FAR and site area. Modify ADU rules to encourage more, not confuse. Remove the barriers.

37. Travis Phillips, PCRI: Thank you to RIP staff. They have been attentive. Increased opportunity for simple development on narrow lots and in R2.5 zones. We'd love to see more affordable housing, but we know that bonuses don't get us there. Some elements need work: we can't solve all goals in every development. We need more housing all around, but requiring all three goals within one doesn't work. Expand the a-overlay throughout the city.
38. Nick Sauvie, Rose CDC: Support Portland for Everyone proposals. Take bold action to address the affordable housing crisis. Proposed RIP policies doesn't help all the way. We need to be much more aggressive and rezone for multi-family development. A-overlay: East Portland should not be red-lined from this overlay.
39. Danielle Zeghib: Bought into the market here before prices skyrocketed. RIP would benefit me personally. But I moved here because I couldn't afford to build a future in the other places I lived (SF, NYC). So I don't want to see this happen here. We need more opportunities to build multiple units. Don't push out our creative young people.
40. Miles Sisk: Supports proposals from Portland for Everyone and Small Developer's Alliance. We should be allowing 4 units on every lot in Portland. We have a great city and should be opening up opportunities to more people.
41. Ashley Henry, Business for a Better Portland: Tonight you can address both housing and parking. Allow internal conversions citywide. Remove parking minimums. I know you've heard from lots of people who want places and neighborhoods to remain the same. The small business owners I'm representing are out working tonight, making the community what it is. Consider these people who are already working and living here as well as the voices of those who are not yet Portlanders.
42. Paul Frazier: Supports RIP and Portland for Everyone's recommendations. Don't become San Francisco. The current amount of land we have is fixed, so we have to be more efficient with it. Change is hard, but it's what's right for the city in the long-run. Incentives work: if you make it marginally more attractive to build, you get marginally more units. Go further. Don't get bogged down by parking. Put the a-overlay on the whole city; don't be exclusionary. We are not hearing from all voices... those who can't afford housing, those who are working multiple jobs.
43. Sharon Nobbe: Speaking on behalf of those who don't work in the planning or development profession and don't understand zoning. There are confusing elements: FAR needs some refinement. It is complicated. We need some help there with training and education in a simple way. Look at beta testing RIP in small sections of neighborhoods to see the outcomes.
44. Robin Cash: Works at MHCC, where 1 in 8 students is homeless. We also see high rates of homelessness among students at other local colleges. Lack of accessible housing is pushing human trafficking, which is horrible. I am trying to build an ADU to help a bit. But I can't get a 30-year loan, and I can't even get a loan and rent at a low price. We have to have affordable loans for ADUs.
45. Laura Campos: I'm sharing from the *History of the Planning Commission*, a book I wrote 39 years ago. This was a warning back then. The auto will be replaced by bikes, and single-family homes would yield to multi-family. Call for affordability masks the true intent. RIP should be put to rest. *See written testimony.*
46. John Sandie, UNR: Disappointed in randomness of using historical lot lines to determine zones. RIP undermines Council's direction and decisions. Historical lots are an issue. The proposal is inconsistent

with the Comp Plan. Lack of and limited focus. Lack of interest in existing homes, putting them at unwarranted risk.

47. Stephen Pettengill: Promotes community housing configurations that provide social networks. Brookings Institute report on 70 years of housing policy indicated need for more comprehensive framework. Fannie Mae grant called for high opportunity communities with higher density and great quality of life. Lives in community of 70 people. Mentioned "Epidemic of Loneliness" report and health effects. Housing policy should focus/identify properties suitable for multifamily cooperative communities.
48. John Kesselring, representing his client, Sami Khawata: Property that was used as a tri-plex but the basement ADU was invalid. Property dates back to 1895. RIP misses the mark with the goal of affordable housing while not detracting from historic character of the neighborhood. But it only allows 2 ADUs (2 attached). So now my client has to build an ADU and change the character. Reconsider the 2 ADUs to both be internal (similarly for a duplex).
49. Patrick Taylor: East Portland for 25+ years and Sabin for about 20 years. Big changes citywide... more change in the past 2-3 years than in the last 20-30. Some have fallen the hardest on long-term residents and those with fewer resources. Rapid development has led to a housing crisis, which is why we're here today. I don't want to disparage the large houses or homeowners. I want to highlight disservice this will do to R5 homeowners on small lots. Under the restrictions, you're not allowing a house to be built on a 3000 square foot lot.
50. Steve Dixon: Rose City Park resident. Support and understand the goals of RIP. At this point, I couldn't buy a home here. I'm not sure the rezoning of R2.5 accomplishes what we want in terms of more housing. The defining of the district is somewhat arbitrary, and I don't believe that's good planning.
51. Richard Krahn: Support RIP with a concern that St Johns is just outside the a-overlay boundary. But some of the handouts from the City make me think the a-overlay should be applicable in my neighborhood.
52. Charlotte MacDonald: George Park (St Johns) resident. Recommend that BPS looks closely at this neighborhood and include it in the a-overlay. We fit in well to add to the proposal, as we've heard about areas in East Portland. I encourage you to extend the opportunity to build more units. I like the idea of a ratio for size.
53. Susan Lindsay: Thank you to the PSC for your service. RIP has a gross and disturbing deficit. West Hills has somehow been excluded as an area to expand housing options. How can this be? The plan squeezes middle class neighborhoods, denies opportunity for East Portland, and doesn't help to desegregate.

Written Testimony received

Chair Schultz continued the hearing to Tuesday, May 15, 2018, at 5 p.m. at this same location. The written record will remain open until Friday, May 18 at 5 p.m.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 7:28 p.m.

Submitted by Julie Ocken