

November 13, 2017
East Portland Action Plan (EPAP) Housing Subcommittee Meeting
East Portland Neighborhood Office
Meeting Notes

The Goal of the Housing Subcommittee is: To find common ground in supporting a range of housing types in East Portland as a means to strengthening livable communities, encouraging healthy, complete, and stable neighborhoods, and promoting family wage jobs. A range of housing types is meant to include rental housing and home ownership as well as housing for people at various income levels.

The Purpose of the Housing Subcommittee: The purpose of the EPAP Housing Subcommittee is to agree upon productive strategies for housing and to prioritize action items involving housing for East Portland. These strategies and action items might include (but not be limited to): encouraging housing for people in a range of income levels---including affordable housing for low-income people, promoting high quality housing development and construction standards, and encouraging property rehabilitation as well as new construction. The EPAP Housing Subcommittee will work with a lens of preventing displacement, protecting tenants' rights, promoting enhanced housing inspection enforcement, supporting local schools, encouraging job creation and economic development, and strengthening neighborhoods.

The EPAP Housing Subcommittee will strive to promote, for all East Portland residents, quality housing by design which in turn promotes stronger educational systems; an increase in living wages jobs, greater economic opportunity, stronger educational systems, enhanced transportation, and healthy neighborhoods throughout East Portland.

=====

Housing Subcommittee Meeting

November 13, 2017

Meeting began at 6:02 pm.

Attendees: Frieda Christopher, Leslie Lum, David Sweet, Nick Sauvie, Robin Cash, Morgan Tracy, Judy Low, Linda Bauer, Roger Meyer, David Potts, Char Pennie, Bob Rosholt, Yesica Arevalo, Tyler Bump, Andy Miller, lore wintergreen, John Mulvey.

Welcome and Introductions: Frieda welcomed everyone and each attendee introduced themselves. Frieda said she would facilitate tonight. Also John and she decided that each month we would ask what advocacy had been done during the prior month and have an agenda item “Future Agenda Items” to give all members an opportunity to ask for future agenda items.

1. Residential Infill Project (RIP).

Morgan Tracy and Tyler Bump from the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) presented on the discussion draft of the proposed Residential Infill Project. Morgan said that the deadline for comment has been extended to November 30.

He discussed the origins of the project, which came about due to public concerns about the size of new single-family homes in the city. Many people have been complaining about large-scale houses being out of character with traditional smaller houses, so one goal of the project is to limit single-family home sizes. Another goal is to correct a “glitch” in the code regarding how building height is measured when a property is on a grade.

Linda noted that neighborhood plan districts contain setback requirements that supersede the rest of the code.

Morgan also talked about the proposed “A Overlay,” which is aimed at increasing housing opportunity. This “Housing Opportunity Zone,” which attempts to increase the supply of housing, was recently changed to exclude a large portion of East Portland. Tyler explained that BPS’ analysis was intended to protect areas with an elevated risk of involuntary displacement. The analysis is based on four factors that are indicators of vulnerability to displacement: (1) share of renter households, (2) share of households under 80% MFI, (3) share of the population

that identifies as a community of color, and (4) share of population over age 25 that does not have a four-year college degree.

Frieda suggested that many areas of East Portland have large lots and that these ought to be eligible for incentives for building ADUs.

Lore asked about how the RIP impacts the need for homes for larger families, which is a particular problem in East Portland. Morgan said that, in some ways, there's a conflict in goals, since the project is intended to discourage the trend toward "McMansions." He said that he'd expect that under the new code we'd see fewer demolitions of existing large houses.

Andy suggested that the city look at enhancing the relocation assistance program for those areas that are at risk of displacement, which would discourage evictions without suggesting that East Portland is an area with less development opportunity than the rest of the city.

John presented a draft letter to BPS raising concerns about (1) the lack of adequate incentives to ensure affordability along with density and (2) the stigmatic impact of declaring East Portland to be outside of the city's "Housing Opportunity Zone." John also distributed an article regarding Seattle's efforts to promote housing development, which are much more aggressive than Portland's (attached).

Due to time running short, it was decided that amendments to the letter would be accepted by email through Friday the 17th, and objections to consensus on sending the letter would be accepted through Wednesday the 22nd.

Follow-Up: Via email, Linda blocked consensus on the letter. She gave no reason.

2. Oregon Department of Housing and Community Services Statewide Housing Plan.

Following up on the presentation by the Department at our last meeting, John asked the group to brainstorm issues that we should ask to be included in the plan.

Ideas generated included:

- adequate funding for current state programs, including ideas for revenue sources
- transparency in agency decision making; clarity about what the state wants to fund
- focus on inclusive neighborhood redevelopment
- focus on permanent affordability
- intersectionality: housing and health; housing and educational outcomes
- unique needs of East Portland, an area with similar population to the City of Salem
- focus on homeownership
- need to find geographic balance around the state
- focus on preservation of existing affordable housing
- plan must be aggressive in identifying solutions --what will it take to solve the housing crisis?
- needs of larger families in East Portland
- support for “wraparound” housing, housing with support programs
- need help across the whole housing spectrum

3. Tri-Met Bond Update.

Lore updated the group on the planned Tri-Met transportation bond, which is likely dead for now. It’s possible that the bond will be brought back as a Metro bond that could include both transportation and housing bond.

4. EPAP Strategic Priorities.

Lore asked the group to review our strategic priorities and consider additions or amendments. Andy informed us that the Portland Housing Bureau would be creating a strategic plan and suggested that our committee look for opportunities to participate in that process.

Frieda explained we will have this on each meeting’s agenda to make note of what had happen the prior month regarding advocacy so it will be easy to compile the mid-year report.

Lore shared that this is important, AND it is essential that the Housing Subcommittee have a next steps advocacy plan for the Strategic Priorities and Displacement Recommendations that Housing took to the general EPAP and were approved by full consensus.

Frieda reported the following:

- Sept. 23rd Frieda and Andy participated in Rep. Keny-Guyer's Bike Ride Town Hall to share information on affordable housing.
- Oct. 3rd Frieda and John met with representatives from Portland Bureau of Transportation regarding funding for housing for East Portland as part of Tri-Met bond.
- Oct 31st Frieda participated in Operations meeting with Mayor and his bureau's directors and advocated for affordable housing.

Actions: Frieda will ask Michelle DePass to present at our December meeting a timeline on PHB's budget preparation process.

John will ask Rep. Keny-Guyer if she can attend our January Meeting and share what on housing might be brought up during the short session.

5. Mobile Home Parks Update.

John updated the group on developments at the city regarding mobile home parks. Leslie has been tasked with supporting work at BPS to create a special zone or overlay that would protect the parks from being redeveloped.

6. Committee Communications Strategy.

John asked the group for direction regarding events and other announcements that committee members would find useful but which are not a good fit for including in our monthly agenda mailing. He suggested creation of a Facebook page where people who are interested in these types of announcements could get them without cluttering up our mailing list. There was a discussion regarding the use of FaceBook and the time that would be involved. Yesika requested that the posting offered on Facebook also be included in the Housing Subcommittee meeting reminders as in the past. After some discussion, the group agreed to start a Facebook page for posting of information.

7. Green Lents letter re Affordable Housing in the Lents Town Center.

Nick brought a letter from Green Lents to Prosper Portland and asked for our endorsement. The letter asks how Prosper Portland will ensure that the more than 200 new publicly-supported rental units coming online in the Lents Town Center would serve low-income people, renters, people of color and recent immigrant communities from the Lents area.

Due to time running short, it was decided that objections to consensus on sending the letter would be accepted by email through Friday the 17th.

Follow-Up: Via email, Linda blocked consensus on the letter. Her concern was: "I object to sending the lens green letter. I do not think that minorities should be considered before single parents with children or veterans ."

8. Announcements.

Lore announced that EPNO has a white board that it no longer needs and it is available if someone would like it.

The meeting was adjourned at 7:56 pm.

Next EPAP Housing Meeting: Monday, December 11, 2017, 6pm.

Childcare and Translation needed? Contact lore: 503.823.4035 or lore.wintergreen@portlandoregon.gov



Seattle releases full housing affordability rezone plan

Instead of specific neighborhoods, this affects 'urban villages' across the city

by Sarah Anne Lloyd | Nov 9, 2017

Today mayor Tim Burgess and city councilor Rob Johnson released a plan to implement mandatory housing affordability (MHA) rezones throughout the city. It's a key part of the city's Housing Affordability and Livability Agenda (HALA), expected to generate about 6,000 affordable homes in the next 10 years out of HALA's goal of 20,000.

"Whether you're one of the 70 people moving here every day or you've lived here for 70 years," said Johnson under a rain tent at Broadway Hill Park, the city "will be affordable to you and your family."

These rezones have been implemented on smaller scales throughout the past year, first with the U District, then downtown, Chinatown International District, and a few hubs along 23rd Avenue in the Central Area.

The new plan seeks to harness growth in what they've dubbed "urban villages"—neighborhood hubs that provide both housing and employment, the majority of them near transit. You can view an interactive map of the zoning changes here:

<https://seattlecitygis.maps.arcgis.com/apps/MapSeries/index.html?appid=d3425fef5b884c29a710761c163b347a>

The basic idea is this: Developers who build in these areas are allowed to build more or higher. In exchange, they need to either provide affordable housing on-site ("performance") or pay into an affordable housing fund managed by the city.

The performance-to-fee structure is designed to have the cost be about equal to the developer, and the city expects—or hopes—that an equal amount of projects will participate in both.

Units built for homeownership will be affordable to those making 80 percent of area median income, which varies based on household size. For rentals, they'll be affordable to those making 60 percent of area median income. Affordability will be preserved for a 75-year term.

The amount a developer has to build or pay is currently determined by two compounding factors: the usual housing cost of a geographic area and the scale of the zoning change.

For example, a high-cost area where a single-family zone bumps to

neighborhood commercial would net the highest return in affordable housing: 11 percent performance or \$32.75 per square foot. An area that's already low-cost and has minimal zoning changes would also have the lowest MHA requirement: 5 percent or \$7 per square foot.

When a developer pays a fee instead of building on-site, the Seattle Office of Housing will manage those dollars, leveraged with federal and state housing dollars. It's a priority to build city affordable housing near the projects that produce the funds. They'll be providing maps to the city council for annual review.

A year after the changes are implemented—they require city council approval and are still several months out—city council will have a chance to review the rezones to make sure they're working.

Family-size housing and development standards

52 percent of new apartment units constructed since 2012 have been one-bedrooms—and 29 percent have been studios. That leaves few options for families looking for lower-cost or denser housing in a market already dominated by housing for single people or couples in close quarters.

With the rezone comes stricter development standards, including some requirements for family-size housing. In certain low-rise zones, for

every four smaller units, a developer would have to build at least one unit greater than 800 square feet with at least two bedrooms.

The zoning provides other incentives in certain neighborhoods based on neighborhood feedback. In the Seattle mixed zones in Northgate and Rainier Beach, developers will be allowed to build higher when they include certain features in their buildings.

Other development standards set by this rezone include privacy standards and side façade modulation in low-rise zones without design review; a high-rise zone, mostly in First Hill with taller, more slender towers; landscaping requirements that prioritize trees; and required upper-level setbacks in zones higher than 65 feet.

Displacement and equity

Displacement is already a large concern in fast-growing Seattle—and the same fears have been echoed during the MHA process.

The city developed a matrix for evaluating urban villages, tracking displacement risk against access to opportunity, like transit, schools, and employment. The plan directs more capacity for housing and jobs into communities with low risk of displacement and high access to opportunity. In their matrix, this includes South Lake Union, Fremont, Uptown, and Ballard.

For neighborhoods with a high displacement risk and low access to opportunity, like Rainier Beach, Highland Park, Bitter Lake, and South Park, changes are minimal. A couple of exceptions were built-in for 100 percent affordable housing projects that already have a site ready to go.

For all communities at a high displacement risk, changes are concentrated within five-minute walks of frequent transit nodes. That's defined as either light rail or the intersection of two or more bus routes providing a level of service of 15 minutes during peak hours, providing access to at least two other urban villages.

Single-family zones

The rezone applies everywhere in the city that's not currently zoned single-family or industrial, excluding certain historic districts. But because urban villages encompass everything within a 10-minute walk to a frequent transit node, a small amount of the city's wide swaths of single-family zones, about 6 percent of them, are getting a tweak.

A very small number of single-family zones are getting bumped up to low-rise, but most of the single-family zones within urban villages are getting a carefully crafted new zone: residential small lot (RSL).

RSL zoning is actually stricter than single-family in many ways: It has a

floor-area ratio limit of .75, where no limit existed before. It has higher tree-planting requirements.

In exchange, RSL zoning codifies and incentivises a slight increase in density. This zoning allows for standalone, attached, or stacked homes, with up to three units in stacked apartments. It sets a maximum dwelling size of 2,200 square feet and sets limits to lot area to discourage standalone single-family homes.

All new buildings, of course, would be subject to the new housing affordability requirements.

While single-family zoning has been a bit of a sticking point among neighborhood groups, data from a city canvass of the 10,000 homes that would be affected by the change shows that people they reached were largely supportive.

Of the 13 percent that answered the door at one point or another, around 40 percent were either slightly or very supportive of MHA rezones with only 20 percent opposed—and the support only dropped a couple of points when they found out their neighborhood would be affected. Support swelled to more than 60 percent when they found out what their specific zoning would do, with more than half strongly supportive.

Regardless, the rezone doesn't require any redevelopment to take place, so property owners that don't want to redevelop their property can

keep on keepin' on. And 94 percent of the city's single-family zones will be entirely untouched by this proposal, although density could ever-so-slightly increase with upcoming changes to accessory dwelling unit rules—also a HALA recommendation.

Next steps

Like with the smaller-scale rezones, this proposal is being introduced to council—but this time as one big piece of legislation—likely within the next couple of weeks. That will trigger a legislative and public engagement process that will take several months.

A committee of the whole council (like the civic arena committee) will convene to discuss and propose changes to the plan. During that time, the city will host open houses, public hearings, and lunch and learns on specific MHA topics.

The city expects the city council to take action in the fall of 2018, although Johnson said action could happen in July or August. City staff have built a possible hearing examiner appeal into that timeline.

“Those who haven't found one of our rare vacancies are forced to choose between paying rent and paying healthcare,” said Susan Boyd of Bellwether Housing at the press conference. As long as she's been working in housing, she said, “housing and social justice advocates have called for an inclusionary housing program... this is the closest we've ever been.”

Published online at:

<https://seattle.curbed.com/2017/11/9/16629248/seattle-hala-mha-upzone-plan>

Subcommittee Name: HOUSING

EPAP Action item(s) being addressed: Housing and Development.1 – .6; Commercial and Mixed Use.1 - .2; Economic Development and Workforce Training.4.5; Public Safety.7.1; Housing Assistance and Safety Net Services.1 - .6; Equity.2.1 + 3.2

The Goal of the Housing Subcommittee is: To find common ground in supporting a range of housing types in East Portland as a means to strengthening livable communities, encouraging healthy, complete, and stable neighborhoods, and promoting family wage jobs. A range of housing types is meant to include rental housing and home ownership as well as housing for people at various income levels.

The Purpose of the Housing Subcommittee: The purpose of the EPAP Housing Subcommittee is to agree upon productive strategies for housing and to prioritize action items involving housing for East Portland. These strategies and action items might include (but not be limited to): encouraging housing for people in a range of income levels---including affordable housing for low-income people, promoting high quality housing development and construction standards, and encouraging property rehabilitation as well as new construction. The EPAP Housing Sub-Committee will work with a lens of preventing displacement and gentrification, protecting tenants' rights, promoting enhanced housing inspection enforcement, supporting local schools, encouraging job creation and economic development, and strengthening neighborhoods. The EPAP Housing Subcommittee will strive to promote, for all East Portland residents, quality housing by design which in turn promotes stronger educational systems; an increase in living wages jobs, greater economic opportunity, stronger educational systems, enhanced transportation, and healthy neighborhoods throughout East Portland.

Housing Subcommittee Recommendations:

1. The Housing sub-committee supports mixed-use and commercial zoning in commercial corridors in East Portland. This would promote greater economic development, prosperity, and encourage mixed-income housing development.(CM 1.1)
2. The Housing sub-committee supports single-family housing adjacent to commercial corridors to promote general homeownership, especially minority homeownership, as well as mixed-income and more innovative housing. (CM 1.1)

3. The Housing Sub-committee sees the need for increase in amenities, jobs, infrastructure, and public transportation in East Portland to support housing of people in all income levels and to attract more middle and upper income housing.
4. The Housing Sub-committee would recommend prioritizing voluntary Inclusionary Zoning in middle income neighborhoods as one tool to promote mixed-income neighborhoods throughout Portland and to advocate for the City of Portland, Multnomah County and METRO to develop a pilot project for voluntary Inclusionary Zoning within the City/County.
5. The Housing Sub-committee would recommend advocating ending discrimination based on having a Section 8 Certificate, so low income families would have a greater choice on where they could live. The committee supports changing the law at the state level to remove this discrimination.
6. The Housing Sub-committee, after exhaustive research, recognizes that East Portland does not have significantly more tax-exempt housing properties than any other area of Portland, either in numbers or as a fair-share. East Portland does have significantly more “affordable by accident” housing than other parts of the City, but this has nothing to do with properties being tax-exempt or not.

**East Portland Action Plan 2016 – 17 Strategic Priorities
with dedicated Housing Subcommittee Advocacy**

- N. METRO, City Housing Bureau with City Auditor, City Bureau of Planning and Sustainability, and Home Forward:** Establish policy and practice that balances regional affordable and American Disabilities Act (ADA) accessible housing supply and promotes fair share across Portland. (EQ.2.1) *Housing Subcommittee*
- O. City Housing Bureau and State of Oregon Legislature:** Increase opportunities for sustainable moderate income and minority home ownership. (SN.2.1+2) *Housing Subcommittee*
- 1.
- P. City Housing Bureau:** Fund a housing rehabilitation program for East Portland to improve the safety, appearance, and affordability of existing housing stock. Involve the East Portland Action Plan Housing Subcommittee in the development of the program. (HD.2.3) *Housing Subcommittee*

Housing Subcommittee Displacement Prevention Recommendations for East Portland

Community Benefits Agreements (CBA)

This is a contract with a governmental agency, real estate developer, or other jurisdiction to provide specific benefits to the local community or neighborhood in exchange certain provisions from that community or neighborhood. On public projects, CBAs can be negotiated with the initiating government agency and can be included in a Request For Proposals (RFP) with contractors. With private developers benefits can be negotiated in a contract established with community groups who then accept (or don't oppose) project adjustments. CBAs have funded workforce training, local hiring, childcare access, affordable housing units, re-location stipends, reinforced access to family-wage jobs, and other public benefits.

Rent Stabilization

Just as Oregon has property tax increase protection, Rent Stabilization protects tenants in residential multi-family properties from excessive rent increases by mandating reasonable gradual rent increases, while at the same time ensuring the landlords receive a fair return on their investment.

Just Cause Eviction (JCE), Code Enforcement, and Renter Education

Just cause eviction controls are laws that protect renters by ensuring that landlords can only evict with proper cause, such as a tenant's failure to pay rent or destruction of property. While JCE provides such protections for renters, landlords retain full right to evict a tenant for breach of rental contract. Code Enforcement compels landlords to improve unsafe building conditions. Code Enforcement can ensure that multi-family dwellings are owned and managed responsibly. When housing code violations are found and not corrected, the government can impose significant penalties upon landlords. Rights and responsibilities education for renters must be included as an active component of JCE and Code Enforcement, to ensure the systems are reasonably monitored and enacted.

Anti-Displacement Impact Analysis

Impact Analysis is a tool that requires multi-family and commercial developments to provide a pre-build assessment of the effect such development will have on displacement in the area (usually a one-mile radius).

Housing Acquisition Rehabilitation to Insure Affordability This applies public housing dollars to purchase existing multi-family developments in poor condition and to rehabilitate the facility for use as affordable housing to be managed by a public entity or non-profit that serves low-income populations.

No Net Loss/Affordable Housing Preservation Ordinance

No Net Loss is when a City has to maintain a fixed amount of affordable housing through preservation, new construction, or other replacement of lost units. The Affordable Housing Preservation Ordinance is the establishment of a policy to ensure that the amount of housing affordable to low and moderate income persons does not decrease over time.

Broadening Homeownership and Cooperative Ownership

This establishes programs to increase opportunities for low-income households to have the opportunity to purchase a home. It means that some of the barriers to homeowners are removed so that homeownership becomes easier for groups of people who are often unable to purchase homes for themselves. Cooperative Ownership of multi-family developments occurs when a group of people form a collective business corporation to share ownership of a building. Co-op members work together to reach mutual goals based on democratic control and decision-making. Co-op members may or may not be residents of the shared ownership building.

Inclusionary Zoning

This requires developers to make a percentage of housing units in a new residential development available to low and moderate income households. In return developers receive non-monetary compensation in the form of density bonuses, zoning variances, expedited permits, or similar provisions that reduce construction costs or promote the developers goals. This can be done in developments with many single-family units or in multi-family developments.

Owner-Occupied Homeownership Retention for People with Low -Income

As house values rise taxes rise and people living on limited and fixed incomes are not able to afford the taxes. While benefiting at the point of sale, people cannot afford to stay in their often long-term residences and cannot find another home in the area that does not present the same conditions.