



Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association, c/o Encorepreneur Cafe, 1548 NE 15th Ave., Portland, Oregon 97232
<http://www.sullivansgulch.org>

Meeting Minutes

Regular Monthly Meeting of the SGNA Board of Directors
 March 13, 2018 7---9 PM
 Encorepreneur Cafe
 1548 NE 15th Avenue

Minutes Regular Monthly Meeting of the Board of Directors

Publication Date:

Approved: 04/10/2018

Meeting Day, Date & Time: March 13, 2018 7:00 PM

Attendance of Members of the Board of Directors – Quorum of 10

Note: A- Denotes Member is in Attendance. E- Denotes Excused. U- Denotes unexcused.

D Brook - DB	A	D. Lerch-Walters - DLW	A	D Pirofsky - DP	A	Betsy Konop - BK	E
MB Christopher – MBC	E	K LaForge - KL	U	A Meyer - AM	A	Ron Boucher - RB	A
S Weaver- SW	A	J Frewing -JF	A	J Hoffinger - JH	A	Linda McDowell - LMD	A
M. Brown - MB	A	K Hansen - KH	E	K Francois - KF	A		
C Tanner - CT	A	M Rowe - MR	E	C Jensen – CJ	E	DJ Heffernan (Non-Board LUTC Chair) - DJH	A

Guests: David Peterson, Lin Coward, Deanna Hunt, Takatoshi Muneno

All motions and votes are marked in *underline and italics*.

All votes were completed by show of hands.

I. Welcome, roll call of Board members, introduction of guests

- a. Takatoshi Muneno- Professor of Civic Engagement in Japan, Interest in Portland's Neighborhood Associations
 - i. Asked to take photos for academic article to be published in Japan with no names listed other than the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association. Board had no objections.

II. Open Mic: Time for members of our community to raise concerns/questions

- a. 21st and Mutlnomah- JH
 - i. Demolition is done, foundation is underway. Excavation to be done in April. Should be on schedule.
- b. City website development (construction) soon to be posted to SGNA website – DP
- c. Concerns about approving measures and initiatives without hearing both sides.- AM
 - i. Echoes AM's concerns – MB
 - ii. Wonders why other organizations are less concerned about this when they approve initiatives and measures - KF
 - iii. Perhaps we should be more diligent in asking committees to provide more information to the board regarding recommendations. - DB
 - iv. Notes that NA's started as advocacy organizations and worries that they don't become another form of bureaucracy. SW
 - v. Per ONI bylaws, NA's are allowed to endorse initiatives and do advocacy work. - DP
 - vi. Is outreach a reasonable expectation for each board member to do before every vote of this nature? – AM
- d. Gulch Garden on 25th and Mutlnomah- LMD
 - i. Garden bed plots are open for 50\$/yr. Community members are encouraged to contact her if they are interested in a bed.

III. Request and Approval of additional Agenda Items

IV. Approval of February Minutes

- a. Vote Change- DLW
- b. Deanna's Comment on Parking near Construction – JH
- c. Spring Cleaning trash bins, re: construction company. - JH
- d. Motion to approve minutes by RB. Seconded by DLW.
 - i. Motion carries unanimously.

V. Treasurer's Report

- a. Authorization to Change Banks – MB
 - i. SGNA's bank has moved out of the neighborhood. Would like to use an Oregon bank that is somewhere close to the neighborhood.
 1. OnPoint Credit Union?
 - a. Not in neighborhood, close by though. -DB
 2. Albina Bank- DLW
 - a. Lots of local involvement in Portland
 3. Signers? – DB
 - a. President and Tresurer-DB
 - b. Good to have 3. – DLW
 - c. Vice President as 3rd? – JH
 4. Some banks are restrictive with Non-Profits and Signers- JH
 - a. Will Check before committing to one bank. - MB
 5. AM motion to move SGNA banking accounts to OnPoint Credit Union, with authorized signers being Treasurer, Vice President, and President. Seconded by DB.
 - a. Motion carries unanimously.

VI. New Business

- a. Discussion of proposed changes to city's Multi-Family zones
 - i. For a More Detailed breakdown of changes by DJH, see IX a
 - ii. Deadline to comment on changes is coming soon. - DJH
 - iii. Changing permitted number of houses by square footage and allotted households to a form base code. -DJH
 - 1. Limitations will be based on the actual dimensions of the structure on the lot.
 - 2. Greatest impacts will be between 16th and 21st in the SGNA.
 - a. Most structures will be limited to 2 stories.
 - b. Bonuses will be accessible through providing things like affordable housing.
 - 3. Marketplace will have a greater impact on new developments, rather than the city controlling it so tightly.
 - 4. Promoting Affordable Housing and Design (Landscaping) Programs that can be accessed to increased building capacity.
 - iv. Bonuses can be traded between lots? – LMD
 - 1. FAR (Floor Area Ratio) can be sold. - DJH
 - a. Restricted to local developments.
 - i. Miles? Neighborhood? Local is undefined.
 - 2. Bought FAR could be sold to exceed lot restrictions? – LMD
 - a. No, limitations would still be in effect, only bonus is moved. – DJH
 - v. Restrictions on Protecting Historic Homes are less now? – LMD
 - vi. Concerns by minimum density limit.- DJH
 - 1. May be required to demolish and replace a home, rather than renovate to meet the minimum.
 - 2. No grandfather clause for existing homes.
 - vii. Why doesn't the city encourage single room rentals? – LMD
 - viii. Fewer requirements for off street parking. Lot must be over 7,000 sq ft.-DJH
 - 1. Is it better to improve carless living instead of pushing for more off-street parking.
 - ix. Design review now required for the zones with tallest buildings. – DJH
 - x. People are most concerned about living next to a massive building in a small house. – DB
 - 1. Form code can help with this. Forces more considerations for neighborhood character. -DP
 - xi. Would like to see bonuses for internal conversions. -DP
 - xii. Would like to simplify the process for building ADUs. -RB
 - 1. Create an expedited review process maybe? – DJH
 - xiii. Create time period to move houses before destroying them if there is interest. – LMD
 - 1. Concerns that delays create further delays for creation of affordable housing. – JH
 - xiv. Do to the changes require building facades to be broken up with porches, etc? -David Peterson
 - xv. Motion by CT to authorize DJH on behalf of the NA to write a letter voicing these concerns to the city in the next day and provide a copy to board before sending it on. Seconded by DP.
 - 1. Motion Carries Unanimously

- b. Discussion of Changes to Residential Infill Policy
 - i. For a More Detailed breakdown of changes by DJH, see IX b
 - ii. Has less effect on Sullivan’s Gulch as there are few lots to which it would apply within the neighborhood. - DJH
 - 1. Many are concerned that it will turn smaller lots into multi-family lots.
 - 2. But it would limit the creation of the “McMansions”.
 - 3. Limits are still applicable by FAR.
 - iii. Because this would have few effects on the neighborhood, it seems a commenting letter is not necessary. – DJH
 - iv. Could landowners start consolidating lots to circumvent the regulations? Would this mean we are losing homes? -LMD
 - 1. Ownership of the land in the neighborhood is spread to some many different people, that this seems hard to accomplish. – DJH
 - 2. Many homeowners in the neighborhood are actively working to save homes. – KF
 - 3. Worries about how eviction laws intersect with this. – LMD
 - v. Might be worth asking the city to move set-back distance from 15 to 10 feet. – DJH
 - 1. Add this to the previous letter. -DB
 - vi. What is the FAR limitation? – JH
 - 1. 50%. -DJH

- c. Alameda Neighborhood letter regarding the graffiti removal program – CT
 - i. See IX d
 - ii. Is happy to see the money put its use in other places. – SW
 - iii. Would like to know more about the budget for context before making a decision.-AM
 - iv. Most points the SGNA would say seem to already be in the Alameda letter. -AM
 - v. Feels that this type of activity that is a good community building process. It is upsetting ONI took this away. – Lin Coward
 - 1. Perhaps we could do this on our own? – LMD
 - 2. Could ask solve for help. - MB

- d. Discussion of potential permit parking zone west of 21st incorporating PBOT Policy Changes
 - i. See IX e
 - ii. Three neighborhood principles outlined in letter draft. - CT
 - 1. Because of SGNA commitment to equity we want to ask for a subsidy for low income households as part of the permit zone.
 - 2. Because of SGNA commitment to the environment we want to encourage more public transit.
 - 3. Because of SGNA commitment to supporting local business, we want to work with businesses in the area to make this happen.
 - iii. Does this consider the needs of seniors? – LMD
 - iv. Concerned about how this impacts the furthest west portion of neighborhood. - Lin Coward
 - 1. Willing to help with letter.
 - v. This only commits us to doing the research, not actually creating the zone. – David Peterson
 - vi. Motion by CT for this application with these outlining principles to be finished and submitted to the city, with review by the Land Use Committee. Seconded by DP.
 - 1. Motion carries unanimously.

- e. Planning for Spring Clean Up – MB
 - i. The solve clean up will occur on Earth Day (April 21st).
 - ii. This would only be cleaning up the outside areas.
 - iii. Will be doing scouting for areas to work in the neighborhood soon.

VII. Committee Updates

- a. Safety & Livability
 - i. Replacing Gulch-O-Rama with multiple block parties - KF
 - 1. Doesn't want to exclude the possibility of Gulch-O-Rama however. - KF
 - 2. It is a budget issue though. – DP
 - 3. Why not try this a one year trial. - MB
- b. Land Use and Transportation
 - i. See IV a and b
- c. Communications – DP
 - i. Met on Monday. (DP, DB, SW, CT, and Emily)
 - ii. Primary concern is that the committee members are burning out. Prior asks for help haven't worked thus far. We need more people to be involved so that we better represent the neighborhood.
 - iii. We have ideas that we are asking the board members for help.
 - 1. Yard Signs- DP
 - a. Surveys by DB have shown they are the SGNA's best advertisement.
 - b. Asking board members to either have a single sign they are responsible for or we need a to create a new sign team.
 - c. Board members would like to be responsible for one sign per person 5 to 6 times per year.
 - 2. Newsletters- DB
 - a. Could each board member also take two square blocks per person to distribute twice annually.
 - b. Looking for new designers and graphic designers.
 - c. Sell ads in the Newsletter to local businesses? - DP
 - iv. Could board meetings be include volunteer opportunities every month? -KF
 - 1. And divide the tasks into smaller tasks. – DB
 - v. Do we need to worry about regulating Gulch Net Email listserv? – DLW
 - 1. It doesn't seem we have legal liability. -DP
 - 2. Was raised in reflection to events from previous years with other NAs. – SW
 - 3. Many people feel uncomfortable with the way the discussion occurs and choose not to be involved. How can we change this? - SW
 - 4. Dog excrement is really becoming an issue though. – DP
 - 5. It doesn't seem like it is the majority of dog owners. It is only a small minority. - KF

VIII. Adjournment

IX. Relevant Documents

a. Proposed Changes to Multi-Family Zones via DJH

Multi-family zoning changes

- The draft regulations allow conforming development in the current R1, R2, and R3 zones 'by-right' (i.e. subject only to administrative review in most instances). Development in other MF zones are subject to design review.
- Development density would no longer be regulated based on sq. ft. of lot area per dwelling unit (e.g. the existing R2 zone allows one unit per 2000 sq. ft.). The zones regulate building size, which are limited by Floor Area Ratio (FAR) [the ratio of improved floor area to the size of the lot], height limits, and lot coverage limits. Density is a function of how the owner chooses to use the available space in the building, building code requirements, and market conditions.
- FAR bonuses are offered to projects that add new affordable housing, preserve existing affordable housing, or that preserve historic structures and/or large trees. The changes also introduce an innovative transfer of development right (TDR) option that allows owners to sell their development rights to other multi-family development projects. For example, if Owner 'A' preserves affordable housing for a 0.5 FAR bonus, 'A' can sell the floor area bonus to another developer so long as the receiving project meets the FAR, building height, and lot coverage limits in its location.
- The current R-2 and R-3 zones would be combined into a new RM1 zone. This effects SGN west of NE 21st Ave, most of which now is zoned R2. Buildings in this zone can reach 35', cover 50% of the lot, and have a FAR of 1:1. This will easily accommodate four units on a typical 5000 sq. ft. single-family lot conversion. The density could rise to six or eight units with a 0.5 FAR bonus.
- The current R1 zone would be renamed RM2 - a higher density zone than the RM1. There is some land designated on the Comp Plan map to be R1 but it currently is zoned R2.5 (SFR) or R2. Development in this zone can reach 45' in height. Lot coverage would be increased as well (i.e. from .5 to .6). One can easily envision 20 - 24 unit projects on lots measuring 10,000 sq. ft..
- The current RH zone would be split into two new zones – RH3 and RH4 – with FAR of 2:1 and 4:1 respectively. These buildings could rise 65 and 100 ft. Development in these zones would be subject to design review.
- Along corridors the zoning would allow some commercial use of ground floor spaces in the RM2, RM3, and RM4 zones (e.g. along NE Weidler). The aim is for live/work and small service commercial.

Adjustments to multi-family site development standards (focusing on the RM1 and RM2 zones):

- The draft regulations reduce required on-site parking: none for lots ≤ 7500 sq. ft and .5 parking spaces/unit on sites over 7500 sq. ft. Current zoning parks MFH at 1:1 ratio.
- Limit pavement for surface parking – Max of 30% of site and 15% max on asphalt.
- Allow a broader mix of design types (e.g. four-plex/six-plex buildings, courtyard row houses, etc. Entrances oriented to street, courtyards, or common areas.
- Require setbacks that reflect existing neighborhood development pattern (e.g. 10' minimum in RM1).
- Simplify side-yard setbacks in RM1 to make it easier to develop on small sites (mirrors typical SFR setbacks).

- Limit front-facing garages (i.e. IXNE to townhome blocks with row of tuck-under garages).
- Establish minimum density requirements (i.e. it will be harder to replace one SFR building with another, or add units at the back of a lot in a MFH zone) ADUs are excluded from this calculation.
- Adds flexibility to count green roofs, courtyard plantings, etc. toward landscaping.
- Expands Resign Review to all RM3 and RM4 (formerly RH) zoning. This affects land in SGN now zoned RH that is between NE 16th Ave/NE 17th Ave south of Weidler (and south of NE Multnomah between 16th and 21st.

b. Proposed Changes to Residential Infill Project Code Summary via DJH

Residential Infill Project (RIP)

- In many respects the City’s RIP initiative, which affects single-family zoning, is less impactful in SGN because we are only home to one single-family zone – R2.5. This is Portland’s highest density SFR zone and is applied to most properties east of NE 21st Avenue. The proposals affect all SFR zones in the city but the impacts to the R2.5 zone are less significant than in other zones. The changes are intended to ensure future housing is in scale with existing housing, expand housing choices by allowing more types of accessory dwellings on existing lots, and provides a clear and objective pathway to develop on small narrow lots.
- For the R2.5 zone, the City proposes to limit the size of new/replacement houses to 1750 sq. ft., which is an FAR of 1:1 on a 2500 sq. ft. This limit does not apply to below grade living space. Building heights would be limited to 30 feet (i.e. 2.5 stories). Building coverage would be set at a .5 coverage ratio. As with the MFR approach the City is focusing more on form and coverage than on density. A significant change is proposed to the front setback in the R2.5. It would increase from 10’ to 15’.
- The City is proposing a “Housing Opportunity” overlay on SFR zones that are within ¼ mile of MAX, centers, or corridors, the inner-city ring and other areas deemed to be accessible to services, schools, and parks. All of SGN falls with the HO overlay. Properties in the overlay may build two ADUs – one attached and one detached - provided one of the ADU’s is ‘visitable’ (i.e. meets certain ADA standards). Duplexes are allowed on any lot. Tri-plexes are allowed on corner lots. There also is an allowance for a bonus unit if that unit is affordable.
- The SGNA-LUTC discussed these changes and did not find them out of line with much of that existing character in the neighborhood. We don’t have the ‘McMansion’ problem that confronts neighborhoods with R5 and R7 zoning. We already have significant housing diversity in our R2.5 zone. The changes were not considered that radical.
- NECN supported the changes with the following caveat related to the R2.5 zone.
 - *2) In the R2.5 zone, minimum front setbacks should be 10ft (15ft in R5), except where less is allowed due to the context of neighboring properties. The allowable maximum height in the R2.5 zone should remain at 35 feet. This will promote an orderly transition from the lesser intensity of the R5 zone, to the greater intensity of the R2.5 zone, which in turn steps down from the mix of uses and scales found within our centers and corridors.*

c. Better Housing by Design SGNA Comments Letter

Subject: Better Housing By Design Discussion Draft Comments

Dear Bill:

I am submitting this letter on behalf of the Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood Association (SGNA) in response to the City's request for comments on the subject proposal to amend the City's multi-family housing zones. The SGNA Board reviewed a summary of the draft proposal at its March 14 meeting. SGNA is generally supportive of the proposal to rename the City's multi-family residential zoning districts and alter the approach to regulating development density. We have several general concerns and recommendations that we would like to share with you in this letter. We have submitted responses using the on-line BHBD Comment Form.

SGNA is concerned that the form-based design requirements in the draft code amendments, while meeting the need for clear and objective standards so that the new RM1 and RM2 zones may be reviewed through a non-discretionary Type 1 approval process, do not provide sufficient guidance to ensure that new development takes on characteristics consistent with existing development themes and patterns in the neighborhood. We would like to see some language introduced into the code that references acknowledged City design guidelines that are contextual to the character of different parts of the city. Such guidance should not be proscriptive with regard to building style, materials, color, etc. In our inner-northeast neighborhood, the design guidelines that the City adopted as part of the Albina Plan would provide a good starting point for a set of flexible guidelines that would be applicable in most of inner NE and SE Portland. We would like to work with the City to develop such guidelines as a way, hopefully, to encourage designers/developers to seek compatibility with prevalent neighborhood design characteristics.

SGNA supports the proposed FAR bonus proposal provided the FAR bonus affords no alteration in the height limit or coverage ratio of buildings without going through an adjustment process.

SGNA supports the transfer of development rights concept. We think that for tree and historic structure preservation the TDR should be limited in distance so that the housing inventory benefit accrues to the neighborhood. Given the variations in neighborhood sizes and shapes we think a distance criteria should be used to limit the TDR related to non-affordable housing bonuses.

We also recommend that the City administer a TDR bank to facilitate these exchanges and, in limited circumstances, purchase the TDR to provide liquidity and certainty on the 'sending' side of the exchange. There likely will be many more 'sending' offers than 'purchasing' offers.

We support the proposal to allow commercial uses in the RM zones within corridors with the caveat that the scale of commercial spaces is limited. Live/work units, or small leasable ground floor/mezzanine and maker spaces that do not exceed the foot-print of a typical small retail shop. That limit could be 1000 sq. ft. for example.

SGNA has reservations about the proposal to require that large MFR developments need to include a TDM program. We feel that the City needs to do more to incentivize residents in all MFR districts to abandon their cars. Design guidelines should be developed that require

safe taxi/car share pick up/drop-off locations in close proximity to all MFR developments, incentives to sponsor short duration car share services, transit pass discounts, etc. The financial burden this requirement imposes on large private MFR development is likely to hurt the affordable housing aims the City seeks. At a minimum, as a separate policy initiative, the City should identify and fund mechanisms to help offset part of the financial burden that TDM requirements will impose on large scale MFR development. We would rather see the City approach this issue systemically rather than targeting large developments.

SGNA also is concerned that the minimum density requirement may lead to an acceleration of SFR demolitions. We would like the City to consider language that would exempt this requirement for property owners that retrofit existing structure to add living spaces in existing homes by converting them to boarding houses, co-housing, or stand alone living quarters. A standard for such conversions is needed so that the exemption applies to larger structures that meet reasonable MFR density targets.

Lastly SGNA would like to see the City establish specific measurable goals for the BHBD project and monitor if these changes are have the intended effect. The program includes a specific set of goals. These need to be expressed in quantitative measurable terms so that over time we can monitor if it worked. There is no discussion of this in the program.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "DJ Heffernan", with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

DJ Heffernan, Chair
SGNA Land Use and Transportation Committee

d. Alameda Graffiti Letter

Alameda Neighborhood Association
www.alamedapdx.net

February 25, 2018

Dear Mayor Wheeler and City Counselors,

I am writing on behalf of the Alameda Neighborhood Association to voice our opposition to the Office of Neighborhood Involvement's proposed budget, which would eliminate the Graffiti Abatement program. Graffiti is a livability issue which affects residents throughout Portland and we stand with the Richmond Neighborhood Association in urging you to maintain funding for this essential program. While we understand that ONI must make changes to absorb a budget reduction in 2018-19, *eliminating* the city's only program to address graffiti, a program with strong community connections and a highly visible impact is contrary to the interests of our residents.

Defunding the program seems particularly unwise when graffiti is on the rise in Portland and sends the wrong message to vandals, residents, and visitors alike that livability and safety are not a priority. The city's March 8, 2017 Graffiti Abatement Report to City Council indicates that reported graffiti incidents have increased 200% in the past five years and validates our perception as a neighborhood association that there has been a dramatic increase in graffiti incidents, not only in our neighborhood, but throughout northeast Portland. We are particularly concerned about the rise of hate/bias graffiti of which the 2017 report notes there were 25 reported incidents in just three months and none had been reported in the five years prior.

Furthermore, we are troubled that the elimination of abatement services would disproportionately impact disadvantaged residents and businesses. We agree with the above referenced report's assessment that:

"The consequences of eliminating free removal services will most heavily have an impact on Portland's most vulnerable community members... it will also send a message of empowerment to those whose greatest desire is the continued oppression of the historically oppressed in Portland."

If ONI's mission is *"to build inclusive, safe and livable neighborhoods and communities"* then maintaining graffiti abatement services that directly support vulnerable and/or historically oppressed community members should be a priority. Thus, we view the proposed cut as a poor way to save money, because of the partnerships the Graffiti Abatement program supports engaging residents in volunteer service and leveraging community resources to combat graffiti and install murals. If anything, we hope ONI would follow the lead of other major cities such as Denver and increase funding to immediately remove graffiti, which has been shown to be most effective in discouraging vandals.

e. SGNA Parking Zone Program Application

- What is the parking problem?

Sullivan's Gulch Neighborhood is one of the most densely populated areas in the city. It consists of a mix single family dwellings, apartment buildings which provide adequate parking as well as multi-family dwellings and apartment buildings with limited or no parking provided. During day-time hours, there is virtually no on-street parking available between NE 21st Ave and NE 16th Ave. Other portions of the neighborhood have some limitations in on-street parking, and residents of a small section of the neighborhood, NE 28th-NE 32nd, are in the process of applying for parking permits.

Furthermore, we anticipate that the parking problem will be exacerbated with increasing density in the neighborhood. The condominium building under construction at NE 21st and Multnomah, will eventually have 640 units with XX parking. The planned building which will replace the current Lloyd Cinemas will have xx units with xx parking spaces.

- What do stakeholders believe to be the probable cause of the problem?

The problem has multiple causes – limited parking availability for densely populated area; use of the street parking by commuters who do not live or work in this neighborhood to access public transit at the Lloyd Center Max Station; to a limited degree, use of neighborhood parking by employees and customers of businesses in the Broadway-Weidler Corridor.

- What are the proposed boundaries of the congested area for an APP zone?

The proposed boundaries are NE 17th Ave to NE 21st Ave and NE Weidler, north side to NE Multnomah, south side. There is currently no on-street parking on NE Weidler.

We believe that Sullivan's Gulch is an ideal neighborhood to experiment with the programs, because it is a close neighborhood that's attractive to commuters, and like many similar densely populated neighborhoods, it is expected that the population will increase dramatically as new housing becomes available. The neighborhood association would look forward to working with PBOT to come up with new solutions to the parking problem.

Our neighborhood supports the following principles in the development of transportation management district.

1. As an economically diverse neighborhood, we are committed to equity. We are concerned about equitable distribution of parking permits, assuring that low income residents have the means to purchase a permit. For example, we would explore setting a permit rate that would allow sufficient funds to subsidize an established number of permits to low-income households.
2. Our neighborhood is also committed to reducing greenhouse gases. We would want to develop a plan that incentivizes neighbors to reduce the number of cars they own, thereby reducing the number of cars on the street. For example, we would explore a partnership with zip cars or other car-share programs to develop an incentive program to neighbors, to use car share to replace one or more of their personal vehicles.
3. We are committed to sustaining the economic viability of the neighborhood, supporting local businesses. We will collaborate with NEBBA to ensure that the parking plan does not interfere with customer parking, and to explore means of reducing the number of cars in the neighborhood. For example, availability of subsidized transit passes for employees may achieve this goal.

We will need help from the city to:

1. do an inventory of parking availability, both on- and off-street in relation to the population of the neighborhood
2. estimate the proportion of cars in the neighborhood which belong to non-residents
3. determine rates and # of permits per household given the analysis of supply and demand and the needed subsidies