

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

December 11, 2018

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, André Baugh, Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Daisy Quiñonez, Michelle Rudd, Chris Smith, Katherine Schultz, Eli Spevak, Teresa St Martin

City Staff Presenting (BPS unless otherwise noted): Joe Zehnder, Tom Armstrong, Bill Cunningham, Morgan Tracy, Tyler Bump; Laura Lehman (BDS)

Chair Schultz called the meeting to order at 12:32 p.m. and gave an overview of the agenda.

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Rudd: Went to the Oregon Business Plan Summit last week. One item focused on Harvard research about census tracts and low-income kids, where they grew up, and how they were faring 30 years later. In some cases, if you moved kids to wealthier area, their opportunities improved; others didn't. Some who move to more moderate-income areas had a bump. Some got left behind. With Inclusionary Housing, we are trying to create opportunity. Hoping throughout City bureaus we are looking to figure out which neighborhoods are doing well in terms of mobility and replicate those non-zoning programs other places.

Commissioner Baugh noted BPS received an award from NACM-Oregon for the advancement of equity relative to the garbage. Thank you for your diligence in this. The workplan is at City Council on December 19.

Commissioner Spevak: I was in Washington DC last week and met with AARP and APA leaders for a brainstorming session to make ADUs more broadly available. Many places are looking to Portland for how to do this.

Commissioner Larsell: Had asked BPS to put on a class for PSC members on the Economics of Housing. Maybe I am the only one who needs this, but I do want to understand it more deeply.

Director's Report

Joe Zehnder

- At Council tomorrow: PSC members' term extensions for those whose terms are due up in January so we can have you continue through RIP and BHD votes. Fox Run MDP and the IH extension are both on the afternoon agenda tomorrow.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the November 27, 2018 PSC meeting.

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

(Y11 – Bachrach, Baugh, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Quiñonez, Rudd, Smith, Schultz, Spevak, St Martin)

Disclosures

- *Commissioner Smith*: My principle residence is in R1. Received email from Doug Klotz. This is a legislative process, and there is no legal requirement to disclose ex parte contact. The City has a lobbying ordinance, and it sets the bar at a level before a disclosure is required. I was part of drafting this, and individual citizens do not have a disclosure burden. I would ask we discuss this at an Officer Meeting to understand further.
- *Commissioner Rudd*: My concern is that some people don't realize that some Commissioners are still receiving input from the public after we've announced the record is closed, so it's important for everyone to know so they can weigh in as well.
- *Commissioner Spevak*: 3 properties in MF Zoning. Contacted by Doug Klotz with suggestions/requests about BHD.
- *Commissioner Bachrach*: Principle residence and 2 other properties in MF Zone. I'd work on a brainstorming about our ex parte disclosures for our meetings. Agree with *Commissioner Smith* about external contacts... but also... I haven't gotten emails!
- *Commissioner Bortolazzo*: Otak was hired in the initial part of this study.
- *Commissioner Houck*: I've gotten exactly one email about RIP.
- *Chair Schultz*: We will discuss the ex parte disclosures at an Officer Meeting. I have received emails from Doug Klotz too.

Better Housing by Design

Work Session: Tom Armstrong, Bill Cunningham; Laura Lehman (BDS)

Presentation

Bill introduced today's work session. We'll focus on items that both are in RIP and BHD, and where there are some differences in the two proposals. When I refer to housing types today ("all housing types"), I am focusing on the smaller housing types built in both single-family and multi-family zones. We also have an update about the visitability bonus and East Portland.

I also included responses from PBOT that have been topics in the past in today's packet. This is for informational purposes. We can forward additional questions to PBOT, but we are not focusing on these unless they have bearing on zoning. You can also include these comments in your letter to Council.

1. Front Garages

The intent of front garage and parking limitations is to:

- Contribute to pedestrian-friendly street environments.
- Continue neighborhood patterns of front yards/gardens.
- Preserve options for on-street parking and street trees.

Bill provided background about front garages and parking as well as a comparison of what is/isn't allowed in new single-dwelling zones. He walked through alternatives and trade-offs of front parking and rear parking options as well as with no parking.

Commissioner Houck: When it comes to imperviousness it's important to distinguish between impervious and effective impervious. In a situation where there is more impervious surface, if there are trees, the effective imperviousness is what is important. The canopy intercepts rain which never hits the ground which means the effect of the impervious surface isn't as great. The more the vegetation, the less the stormwater runoff.

Both BHD and RIP would prevent garages from occupying the majority of ground-level facades (50 percent limit). Both proposals also allow front garages when occupying no more than 50 percent of facades.

In terms of differences, we regulate attached houses (on different lots) differently than townhouses (on an undivided lot):

a. Calculation of 50 percent garage limit:

- BHD: Based on combined frontage of attached units for all housing types.
- RIP: As above for duplexes/triplexes/fourplexes, but calculated separately for each unit for attached houses.

b. Both limit front vehicle areas to 40 percent of frontage, but:

- BHD: Does not allow parking in front of front building line for any type of housing.
- RIP: Allows front parking for duplexes and triplexes, but not for fourplexes or narrow attached houses.

c. Front parking limits for duplexes and triplexes:

- BHD: Not allowed between front building line and street.
- RIP: Allows front parking (as long as limited to 40 percent of frontage).

Chair Schultz: Can you remind us about the parking pad in front of duplexes?

- Bill: For BHD, no parking is allowed between the unit and the street. Having a large paved area and asking PBOT for a curb-cut is what we regulate. There are requirements in terms of landscaping, but we do also see situations where people park on their yards, which is an enforcement issue.

d. Front parking limits for duplexes and triplexes:

- BHD: Not allowed between front building line and street.
- RIP: Allows front parking (as long as limited to 40 percent of frontage)

Commissioner Spevak: How does this relate to building your parking area behind the building or when the building is an L configuration?

- These limitations don't talk about anything behind the building. That would be allowed. It's a matter of BHD allowing parking to the side, but RIP does allow it entirely in front of the building.

e. Differences in limiting front parking for attached houses:

- BHD: Does not allow parking between front building line and street, but can be to side of building front and in front of other portions of building.
- RIP: On narrow lots, parking prohibited between any portion of building and street (but allowed for duplexes/triplexes).

Commissioner Spevak: I wish we had more alleys in this town. But seriously, these nuances we're describing will confuse people. I hope staff has put some thought into recommendations to make it symmetric between the two projects.

- Bill: Yes, that is something we're looking at doing, unless we hear that the differences are important. BDS prefers an approach like this regardless of the zone. But we also want to consider the arguments to have different approaches between the zones based on what we expect to be built there.

f. Differences in limiting front parking:

- BHD: Does not allow parking between *front* building line and street, but can be to side of building front and in front of other portions of building.
- RIP: On narrow lots, parking prohibited between any portion of building and street (but allowed for duplexes/triplexes).

Commissioner Bachrach: Does the Bureau of Development Services (BDS) care about attached housing and if it should be regulated the same or differently depending on zone?

- Bill: BDS does like the idea of consistent approaches, regardless if the lot is one or divided.

Chair Schultz: Among the pieces that we're looking at is also the pedestrian environment.

Should the 50 percent limit on the width of front garages be based on the combined frontage of attached units, or be calculated separately for each unit? Does it make a difference if side-by-side units are on separate lots (attached houses), or are located on an undivided lot (townhouse-type duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes)?

Should we base the 50 percent garage limit on combined frontage?

- A. Allow for all housing types, including attached houses.
- B. Allow for all housing types, except attached houses.
- C. Both A and B (different approaches are fine).
- D. Never allow – limit garages to 50 percent of each attached unit, whether or not on separate lots.

A is the BHD proposal; B is the RIP proposal, which shows the differences between the divided and undivided lots. D would also be consistent regardless of the land division or not. There are prototypes on the back side of the [handout](#).

Chair Schultz: With individual lots and attached houses, if you have the 50 percent combined frontage limit, if the lots aren't developed simultaneously (or changed down the road), do we have a regulatory environment that has now set up a weird environment?

- Bill: There is more of that risk because they would have separate permits because they are separate lots. We'd have to explore this for the potential long-term changes over time. One thing that would have an impact would be if PBOT would be accepting of a new curb-cut. Option B would allow a different treatment for the divided lots.

Commissioner Baugh: Are we driving an attached (or non) housing type by what we recommend? If we include attached houses, is that better for the developer and their customer, so we'd see more of those built?

- Bill: Builders still prefer an arrangement with separate parking for each unit.
- Tom: If we assume most developers want to provide off-street parking, you're likely to drive them more towards the duplex/triplex units that can have this because they're all on one lot (so they have to do a condo agreement).
- Bill: RIP is driving more towards attached houses on narrow lots.

Commissioner Smith: The policy framework I'm approaching this from is the impact of curb-cuts and if we're allowing the privatization of parking. One for one is a poor outcome for the community as a whole. Which approach would minimize this? For very narrow lots, presumably you couldn't have a space at all.

- Bill: Rear or shared-access parking is an option for the small lots. D would get you farther along in terms not allowing garages in either case.

Commissioner Bachrach: I'd like to see consistency regardless of the lot type. There isn't a clear rationale if they look and function the same. The market doesn't want a condominiumized triplex.

- Bill: A or D gets at this.

Commissioner Bachrach: My other concern is if we want to encourage smaller housing types, I'm torn between the aesthetics of lots of curb-cuts versus what the market wants and what will sell. It's a tough dilemma.

Commissioner Houck: I'm in Chris' camp both in terms of reducing curb-cuts and figuring which would provide more opportunities for street trees.

Commissioner St Martin: I'm thinking about A... if you allow it along the combined frontage, you can have a variety of types in the same place.

Commissioner Quiñonez: If we went with A, if all 3 units had garages, would zoning allow for one to turn a garage into an ADU?

- Bill: Yes, if they are separate and meeting building code requirements. It could also be easier to achieve the visitability regulations.

Commissioner Larsell: I'm inclined towards A.

Commissioner Houck: I'm I live in a 4-plex where parking is tight. We have a very narrow driveway to the side, and we usually have 3 cars parked there.

Chair Schultz: I'm leaning towards D, but it's a little extreme. Is there a greater-than-50-percent option? That limit may not be working well as a metric. I'm supportive of the approach to allow access on the side to back parking.

- Bill: Staff could look at this.

Commissioner Rudd: We still need to be thinking about neighborhood parking permit programs in the future. If you have a garage and curb-cut, could we monetize this? There is a benefit to having some garage on the lot. A continuing plea for a permitting program.

Commissioner Baugh: I'm leaning towards D, which would provide a better pedestrian environment.

Commissioner Spevak: I'm agreeing that sometimes we're trying to affect something outside the zoning code. If we had a fee for curb-cuts, that would get more to the issue. I'm not expert on this: is 50 percent because of the house width and minimum garage opening?

- Bill: Garages should not be the predominant feature on the front. The space has to do with the garage space/size and structure.

Commissioner Spevak: If you have 6 townhomes with zero property lines between them, someone is submitting 6 different building permits. Does BDS evaluate this as one facade?

- Laura: Usually for new construction, we'd see a single set of drawings in one set. For alterations, it would be an individual building permit, but we'd have to ask for information about what other units look like.

Commissioner Bachrach: Can you talk about PBOT's requirements and regulations?

- Bill: One thing they don't answer is if front garages or spaces are allowed. If the Zoning Code allows it, they manage how it meets the street and curb-cuts. Slide 41 shows PBOT's administrative rules regarding shared driveways.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I'm leaning to a balance toward providing a consistent pedestrian environment and uses at the ground floor. 50 percent is a step in the right direction. So I'm leaning towards A. Can we encourage having the garages next to each other to save space on the curb?

- Bill: PBOT does have leverage to do this and have the driveways side-by-side. Option A would leave room for this.

Commissioner Rudd: With infill design prototypes, would we expect a price differential between the configurations?

- Bill: Attached with rear access are selling for a good amount of money. I'm not sure how this compares to a front garage for each.

Straw Poll (can vote more than once)

- Option A: 8
- Option D: 5

Commissioner Baugh: Can we look at Option D with modification? I know 50 percent is the magic number, but can we regulate allowing a garage with a strict limit that at the end of the day we limit the number of garages?

- Bill: We can explore this about one combined curb-cut for set of attached houses. But we'd have to talk with code staff and PBOT.

Commissioner Smith: We had a parking subcommittee for RIP, and we looked at some of these issues. We found it would be difficult to do this in the Zoning Code.

Commissioner Spevak: My concern is that builders will avoid the attached housing type if they can't build garages. But a riff on Option A would be to lower the 50 percent to encourage people to think about more than one house at a time.

Straw Poll (one vote only)

- Option A: 7
- Option D: 4

2. Front Parking

Issue: Should limitations on front surface parking vary by housing type/lot configuration, or should the same limitations (if any) apply to all housing types?

Should we allow parking in front of buildings?

- A. Do not allow for any housing type (BHD approach).
- B. Allow for all housing types, except fourplexes and attached houses (RIP approach).
- C. Both A and B (different approaches are fine).
- D. Allow for all housing types (as long as no more than 40 percent of frontage).

D does not solve the curb-cut issues just raised in the previous vote. A and D provide consistency.

This is about paved area on land, not the garage as in the previous topic.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I would go for consistency between the two, so either A or D again. D limits the space to 40 percent, so 60 percent will be flexible. It allows for having or not having a garage, so there could be more habitable space. If you look at the back of the handout, there are trade-off between front-loaded and back-loaded areas. Allowing more flexibility is a more consistent approach, and I think D does this better.

Commissioner St Martin: I think there is a difference between a driveway and a parking space.

- Bill: It is about allowing parking spaces between the building and the street and if it should be limited.

Commissioner Houck: I think last time we talked about the situation, there is nothing to prevent someone from using the space for another use.

Chair Schultz: I'm in support of A.

Commissioner Baugh: It's based on the frontage. So a narrow lot it would still be just 40 percent of the lot?

- Bill: Yes.

Commissioner Rudd: Thinking in the context of RIP, are the driveways normally to the side or front in these neighborhoods?

- Bill: With single-family they are often to the side. With duplexes, the parking pad is associated with each unit.

Commissioner Spevak: Paved versus parking areas... can we get it from the other side of the coin, where we have a landscaping requirement (no parking, no asphalt)?

- Bill: It's possible. It's how you write the regulations. But it's really about how the two relate.

Commissioner Spevak: I wouldn't care as much about parking if I knew a certain percentage would be required to be landscaped.

Commissioner Larsell: If RIP is going to change single-family neighborhoods, I think the pedestrian environment is going to go a long way to having people be happier.

Chair Schultz: This is forcing some pretty deep set-backs when we're trying to allow for autos in the front, which is a poor pedestrian environment.

Straw Poll:

- **Option A: 9**

3. Parking to the Side of the Front of a Building

Issue: Should parking located in front of portions of buildings, but set behind the front building line, be allowed for narrow lots? We are not going to allow parking between the front and the street. But what about if it's set to the side, even if it's in front of a portion of the building?

Options

- Allow for all housing types, including attached houses.
- Allow for all housing types, except attached houses.
- Both A and B (different approaches are fine).
- Never allow – no parking in front of any portion of buildings.

Commissioner Houck: Would that potentially be in addition to garages?

- Bill: You could not have both have a garage and separate parking in front of another portion of the building. These parking spaces to the side could be in a set-back, so it takes a bit less site area.

Commissioner Baugh: How far is the partial parking back? If people don't want parking in front, we're seeming to say this is a slight grey area that we can poke at.

- Bill: Parking is not allowed within the first 10 feet of the street in this proposal.
- Tom: So it's 30 feet back, but it doesn't address the issue around curb-cuts.

Chair Schultz: I think the wing does add a lot to the environment. BHD lets you build the wing, but RIP says it's either there or not.

Commissioner Rudd: When I think of a skinny house, I think of the garage being dominant. Will those become non-conforming? In some cases, we've made pre-existing uses conditional uses.

- Bill: Existing development would be legal non-conforming. You couldn't add the front garage to become further non-conforming. It's really about moving forward and what we allow in future development.

Commissioner Houck: I walk most mornings by a house where the vehicle is parked on a legal side pad, but it's so large it takes up at least half of the sidewalk. So the more we do this, we give up lots of pedestrian space in terms of what we actually see on the ground.

Straw Poll:

- Option A: 9

The rest of the information shared today is updates to previous work session topics:

East Portland deep rear setbacks (slides 22-28).

Alternative option for centralized open space (at least 10 percent) would work.

Chair Schultz: Thank you for this follow-up.

Development bonus for visitable units (slides 29-30).

Staff Proposal:

- Provide a development bonus providing 25 percent additional FAR for projects providing visitable units.
- To qualify, at least 25 percent of units would need to be designed to meet visitability standards (same as RIP).

Commissioner Smith: Thank you for the follow-up.

Commissioner Spevak: I like the general approach, but if you have to meet accessibility requirements, does this upzone all the RM3 and RM4 properties by 25 percent?

- Bill: Not necessarily. Most of the elevator-type apartments would be meeting the IH requirements. It won't be useful for large projects already subject to IH. Higher level of access than what the building code requires.

Commissioner Smith: We're trying to make some things consistent between BHD and RIP. A triplex is the high end of RIP and the low end of BHD, so I don't think they necessarily need to be consistent.

Chair Schultz: The reason it's a bit different is that a triplex is mandatory in certain multi-family zones.

General PSC support for this staff proposal for visitable units.

Bill reminded the PSC that the next time BHD will come before them is at the April 9 meeting, where we expect the PSC to make its last reconciliations and finalize the recommendation to Council.

Chair Schultz: I find the information from PBOT about gaps and street connectivity in East Portland a repeating of statements, and they don't deal with the concerns we've had about consistency. It doesn't change anything, so I'm going to try to get a better plan for East Portland that isn't so ad hoc.

Residential Infill Project

Work Session: Morgan Tracy, Tyler Bump

Presentation

Morgan introduced the project and today's session. He gave an overview of the current housing mix in Portland, current homeownership tenure, growth share of different housing types and a comparison of the April 2018 and September 2018 draft RIP proposals.

Housing affordability is clearly an issue as noted in slide 10. These households are not percentage shares, but actual numbers. Many have been priced out or have left the region. The increasing number of higher income households is not explained by changes in wages, which remain generally stagnant. Instead, this reflects in-migration of higher income households and about an equal amount of out-migration of lower income households to areas outside the region.

Tyler shared information about the relationship between housing price and interest rate changes (slides 11-12). Even though home prices have dropped slightly, housing has not actually gotten less expensive, even though price has gone down 5 percent. The difference is offset by the higher interest payment. The monthly payment here does include property tax.

The other key component is the foundational concept of size of unit relative to price (slide 13). The relationship is bearing out between single-family and multi-units.

Tyler then jumped into the economic analysis findings provided by Jerry Johnson. It's best to think about these things thematically to see how the needle is moving towards the overall policy outcomes the PSC wants.

The review is based on the revised proposal against current allowances using the most-often seen type of house in the zones. The development prototype proformas include items related to the physical program; development costs; revenue/income; and development feasibility indicators.

Tyler shared how Jerry works with the information and the analysis. He gave examples of the pricing bins (e.g. 5-6 are like Montavilla and St Johns; 9-10 are Inner SE neighborhoods; 1-4 are variations in East Portland). There are very different market conditions throughout East Portland, even though we sometimes group and think of all East Portland as just one variation. This plays into the net new units in the proposal (slide 18). The work assumes highest and best use, in other words how a proposal to build achieves the greatest return. Other conditions like market preference or demand may result in a different type of development.

Tyler gave an example using pricing bin 8. This is similar to North Tabor and Arbor Lodge, which are mostly in the middle range of housing affordability (slides 21-24). The single-family is about 170 percent MFI and the duplex is 110 MFI for ownership.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: As a unit gets smaller, wouldn't the price for rent increase?

- Tyler: Costs and prices could vary, but there is a range, so we wanted to pick one value to represent the range.

For the triplex (90 percent MFI) and fourplex (80 MFI), because the unit sizes are smaller, and the cost of land is being spread across more units, the prices drop.

Commissioner Spevak: On the single-family example, the house shown wouldn't be possible with RIP, correct?

- Morgan: Correct, the examples in these slides are illustrative of the house *type*, not the development size as it is shown here.

Slide 25 summarizes the changes in the updated proposed draft and shows a detailed comparison of the totals from the previous staff proposal and revised draft. We are looking at the net impact. Jerry Johnson found that we're likely going to see 24,000 additional units (by allowing tri- and fourplexes everywhere and the broader geography of the map). We are also seeing total construction investment going up.

Commissioner Smith: The replaced units (demolitions) are compared to a baseline. What was this?

- Tyler: About 1300, and it goes up to about 1500 replaced units. So many things have happened in the market in the past 1.5 years, so there is some variability. We can follow up with more technical aspects.

Findings from the previous (original) proposed draft are highlighted on slide 27.

The revised proposed draft findings are on slides 28-29. There will always be demand for single-family houses. In R2.5 with a fee simple unit, there will be a large demand for that too. Homeowners are interested in this, and it's easier for the private market to produce (versus condo issues). 2-3 bedroom ownership options have pent-up demand, but they are harder to make happen. To the extent we can bring them in, it's likely we'll see more of them than we have in the past. Not every renter want to be in large, multi-family buildings. So we will see a variety of unit types for a variety of different reasons.

Triplexes and fourplexes where feasible will produce a highest and best use, but they won't necessarily be built. So we are looking at the share of each unit type. The highest and best use scenario does show the 24,000+ new units, but that may be more than what's actually built. It is a realistic idea of what is possible, but there will be wiggle room over the next 20 years.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I'm interested in the two empty pricing bins. I would assume the models go through the standard approach for building construction. But if there is sweat equity involved, that would trigger some development potentially.

Morgan: Also, the models doesn't do predictions on ADUs. Similarly, internal conversations could create more units, but this analysis doesn't account for this since it's so hard to model, and there is too much variability.

Commissioner Spevak: I appreciate noting the parts of the project that would increase units outside of this work. Given the choice to build any type, people often just build single-family. I think average cost per square

foot is consistent in the model across all housing types, but we know it's more expensive to build multi-unit as opposed to a single-family. This update is encouraging to me, even if we damp it down. We're heading in a good direction. But we are still a bit stuck on ownership models for these housing types.

Commissioner Baugh: I am discouraged by the numbers of units in the lower price bins. The low income and very low income go down, and they don't see the increases in income over time, so they have relatively less money to spend over time relative to inflation. People of color, I suspect, are at levels 1-4, and we're only putting 3 percent of our effort there. I am concerned we are leaving them behind in this proposal.

- Morgan: The point behind sharing (the affordability trends in slide 10) is that it is our current scenario, having nothing to do with RIP. The options for lower income households are limited and becoming even further limited as lower priced homes get bid up by higher income buyers. We are taking an approach of allowing for more options for people at different price levels, not just the expensive single house. But this is a zoning tool, and it can't solve for all housing problems. There is a need that will require subsidies to deliver housing below market rate. As we apply these zoning changes more broadly to areas we were hands-off before, we are looking at what those displacement risks are, and will return to discuss those findings. It's important to think of RIP as one of many tools needed to address this issue.

Chair Schultz: I'm having a hard time connecting this to the numbers. You're [*Commissioner Baugh*] talking about a general population group that can't afford living in the inner city today. This proposal is allowing more option at a more reasonable cost than it would without RIP.

Joe: The big benefit of RIP is getting the most in terms of the amount and range of housing we can out of our land supply. It's neighborhoods that in many ways are extremely well-served based on previous investments. Knowing people are still moving to Portland, the more supply we can create, the better off we'll be in terms of the spectrum of housing. This study is heartening because we are seeing more duplexes, triplexes and fourplexes. And they are more attractive in all single-family zones. And it's not lighting up the market across the city in the next 20 years; it's not throwing over our whole housing supply in a gigantic upzoning. In a place like N/NE, it's one of the markets where we can see more of this development.

Commissioner Larsell: Can you tell us what was most exciting about these results? I'm most interested in seeing what happens in the different neighborhoods.

- Morgan: When we walked out of this room in September, I was concerned that our impacts on demos would be much more substantial when we increased FAR and the map area. Tenure types is very important. And compared to the original proposal (which was emphasizing the compatibility over housing diversity), we see burdens and benefits more equitably distributed.
- Tyler: Unit production in the pricing bands are more than what we saw in the previous analysis. Seeing these in the markets where they are also helps us push the needle to advance other Comp Plan goals.

Commissioner Smith: I am very happy with how this turned out. I remember at the beginning I was hoping to get people housed in the 80-100 MFI range. I'm glad to see what we have done. This is not the only tool, so it's promising. We are creating opportunities for people to live in high-opportunity neighborhoods where they wouldn't have been able to before.

Commissioner Rudd: Can you take a look at the housing portion of the Comp Plan and see what ownership/rental split there? I'm hearing both that we will see a high number of new units and that we won't see a high number because not all will be built out. What are you assuming in terms of production when you look at whether public infrastructure can support this? I'm curious how we are looking at infrastructure impacts and if we can handle the high-end number expectations if they are all produced. Giving people

opportunities to live in high-opportunity areas may not change people's lives, as I noted earlier. I want to see what else we're doing.

Commissioner St Martin: Demolitions were a concern at the beginning. Do you have a demo count by bin?

- Tyler: We do not, but we can look into that.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I'm also relatively pleased with these results. But I'm slightly concerned that we are painting a better picture if the combined effect of price per square foot goes up and rental prices go up. I don't think you have to rerun all the numbers.

Commissioner Bachrach: I agree with *Commissioner Smith* whole-heartedly. I think this is a great result, and the numbers do point us in the right direction.

Commissioner Houck: I'm very pleased as well, and I'm glad to see articles already out there getting the information to the public. Perhaps there will be less a concern that Armageddon is coming. It resonates with me in that three friends and I were able to cobble together our funds to buy the fourplex in partnership. We would not have been able to do that without the fourplex being an option as we all had limited income, and we now all individually own our units. As others have said, we need other tools to address many issues, but this is great work for this one tool.

Commissioner Spevak: On the housing affordability side, we know that zoning, on its own, isn't up to the task of getting housing costs down to the level needed to be affordable to very-low income residents. Displacement is a factor. It has to do with how much subsidy is needed to allow people to live in Portland. For the housing that will need to be subsidized, with these housing types it won't take as much to bring the cost down to a level people can afford.

Commissioner Baugh: Who will benefit? What about people of color and very low income? We're making inner Portland attractive. So when you do the displacement analysis, please be sure to do an analysis called out for these groups.

Commissioner Quinonez: Is it possible for us to approve this and recommend to Council that we consider adding on rental protections, funding for more options, etc. I am excited about the results and of course am concerned about displacement, but I don't know if there is anything else we can do within zoning regulation to address this.

- *Chair Schultz:* Yes, for sure. We can include comments in our letter to Council for items we want to see included but that aren't in our purview.

Chair Schultz: I also was encouraged and support looking into more opportunities for home ownership.

Adjourn

Chair Schultz adjourned the meeting at 4:08 p.m.