

Meeting: Build Small Coalition
Date/time: November 19, 2020, 10:00 a.m. – 11:30 a.m.
Place: Zoom virtual meeting

Attendees

Evan Manvel, Elizabeth Decker, Eric Ridenour, Kol Peterson, Ezra Hammer, Dan Rutzick, Andrew Morphus, Eric Ridenour, Patty Morgan, Eli Spevak, Nate Ember, Susan Brown, Robert Liberty, John Miller, Michael Anderson

Metro staff

Rebecca Small, Ted Reid, Clint Chiavarini, Laura Dawson-Bodner

I. Introductions and updates

Rebecca invited introductions. Attendees introduced themselves and provided a brief update.

II. Portland RIP

Rebecca said that after the Portland RIP passed, there were challenges including the requirement for separate water meters.

Comments included:

- All four commissioners unanimously opposed the Water Bureau, and Bureau staff presented a revised proposal for meters allowing them to be shared among multiple units, thus reducing the potential cost compared to the separate unit requirement. This will change the methodology for the overall fixture count and results in a 70-80% reduction in SDCs. Installing a separate water meter will be entirely optional.
- To the fixture count for overall project, add fixtures for the ADU so you know whether to upgrade the pipe – there will be a dramatic reduction.
- Elizabeth works with Roseburg and Newburg. The concern is while requiring separate water mains, HB2001 implements OARs for single family residences; have to give the same for duplexes.
- This came up in the HB 2001 discussion; give people maximum flexibility.

III. Green Building & Building Codes, & Oregon Greenhouse Gas Goals

Rebecca suggested laying groundwork for a discussion next year on green building as it pertains to smaller building types.

Comments included:

- Andrew said he continues to promote simple solutions such as LED lighting, heat pumps and smart controls. His background was in retrofitting. The regulatory structure thinks that retrofit work was not cost effective.
- Susan replied that cost does not always equal value in the finance world. Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac programs used to take into account reduced energy costs to be able to loan more because eventual home operating costs would be lower. Maybe it's time to look again at that language and interpretation.

Rebecca asked if there a way this group can close this information gap, to offer something that pencils out to marketable product.

- Ezra said consider financing products –Portland Clean Energy Fund is setting aside \$50-70 million per year to do significant energy upgrades. Maybe this could be gap financing.

- Andrew said scale housing to combat climate change by building cost efficient, energy efficient new housing stock while heavily insulating existing housing stock. New construction codes will not eliminate the massive amount of energy waste in the latter.

Break

Rebecca said there is an opportunity for BSC to advocate to the City of Portland for small, inexpensive housing on private property. The Shelter to Housing Continuum project is working to make more flexible rules to provide small housing for unhoused people. A side benefit would be it would help homeowners make ends meet. This plan was recently presented to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability hearing. Comments are being accepted. BPS is open to an amendment to allow tiny homes on private residential property.

Action: Rebecca requested the BSC send a letter of support for an amendment for tiny homes on private residential property. There was a supportive show of hands. Kol volunteered to write a first draft.

Request: Rebecca noted an additional way to provide support: Go to this link [<https://www.portland.gov/bps/s2hc>] to the Bureau of Planning and Sustainability's map app to provide individual comment.

IV. HB 2001 Model Code update

Elizabeth shared that LCDC met last week for hearing and consideration of adoption of model code and draft administrative rules. They did not make a final decision; legislation was sent back and they will attempt another rulemaking meeting before the final LCDC meeting in early December.

Ted and Elizabeth described the issues. Speaker Kotek put the brakes on the commission's adoption of HB 2001. The performance measure approach is off the table. Three topics were identified for the advisory committee to address:

- Master planned communities: Currently, housing types (middle housing) can be excluded from master plans. Master plans are defined as 20 acres or more and adopted by city council. This will affect all buildable lands. All are in 4 different master planned communities.
- Infrastructure constrained areas would not be subject to provide middle housing. They want more discussion.
- Setting design standards – there is an opportunity for cities to have different design standards if they can prove existing standards prevent missing middle housing.

Elizabeth said it sounds like infill is the point of HB 2001; this could be a missed opportunity for adding middle housing to existing residential communities.

V. HB 2001 Implementation oversight

Elizabeth asked for input on oversight of implementation of HB 2001. This will be a challenge for some cities to implement. She posed the following questions:

- How and when do we get advocates involved?
- Almost every city is using a Planning Commission as they get started. Get involved at the beginning, or wait until formal public hearing process, close to the June 22 deadline?
- What is the BSC role - watchdog, observer, advocate?

- What groups are already working on this?
- Include LCDC staff to interpret and understand the code?
- Where should BSC get involved – smaller cities, at state level, larger cities?
- Models to use? For example, in the RIP project, Portland for Everyone was funded/staffed through 1000 Friends of Oregon.
- Fair Housing Council of Oregon and Housing Land Advocates use the PAPA process.
- Focus on interested parties? Examples: When the BSC offered code audit, background report, and one day conference on ADUs.
- Is there a ‘new 1000 Friends of Oregon’? Is it the BSC?

Robert Liberty shared some historical information. He also said:

- Enforcement will have to continue after adopted/implemented at local level.
- The monitoring of PAPAs enforcement – LCDC does this, but HBA, BSC, church groups, other groups could do the same.
- Metro has enforcement authority which is rarely used. The new Metro Council should be briefed on their enforcement authority. Metro has a role and has not stepped up in the past; same with LCDC.
- This will not be easy. There needs to be vigorous options in addition to gentle educational components.
- An early communication from Metro and LCDC that this is serious would be helpful.
- HB 2003 is forcing market regions to share responsibility. There is a surge of money moving around, possibly as a result of the pandemic and to a lesser degree, climate change refugees. Foreign money is looking for a safe haven in real estate.
- Generally, Metro Council offer a response to a policy, rather than Metro providing a coordinated political strategy to deal with what is coming. The COO needs to consider and plan.
- Advocacy groups need to have a coordinated approach including who will have which role.
- Parts of region are getting poorer, others are getting wealthier – this is not good for the region.

Ted Reid added that Council shies away from enforcement. Typically, Metro staff will be on city advisory committees regarding their comprehensive plans; 2040 grants and UGB expansions are other sources of leverage.

Actions: Rebecca suggested writing out next steps – monitoring, notifications. Kol proposed a small group meeting prior the next BSC meeting to determine next steps. Rebecca and Kol will initiate.

VI. Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at noon.