

The Portland Tribune

Proposed SE Foster Homeless Shelter Sparks Mixed Reactions

*By KOIN 6 News
December 19, 2017*

Monday night meeting draws big crowd and reveals split in neighborhood over shelter that Portland and Multnomah County is planning to open.

Opinions were split during a community meeting about opening a 100-bed homeless shelter on Southeast Foster Road on Monday night.

Portland and Multnomah County plan to open the shelter in a closed grocery store at Southeast Foster and 61st. Although the shelter is not scheduled to open until next summer or fall, it got mixed reactions from residents who live in the area at the meeting, which included Mayor Ted Wheeler and County Chair Deborah Kafoury.

City and county representatives said shelter need is great in Southeast Portland because of a large homeless population in the area. According to them, the layout of the former store works well after renovations and the site is close to transit, job opportunities and Portland Community College.

However, some neighbors argue it's a terrible location near businesses, homes and kids.

"You've sandwiched this facility between a youth development center and an at-risk high school. I don't think you could have tried harder to find a poorer location," said one resident.

Another resident, Bill Meyers, said, "I have seen problems in that area already without a shelter there. They leave all their garbage for everyone to clean up after them. I have to do that and the city has to do that."

Others were supportive, however.

"I am concerned that there is a lot of emotional knee jerk reaction to say that this is, 'Bad, bad, bad.' And I am like, 'What is so bad about it?' These people live in our neighborhood already," said Jeff Arasmith, who lives near the proposed shelter.

"One of the things we've offered is, to work with the school and some other folks to help us come up with expectations, and that's something we take very seriously," said Denis Theriault with the city-county Joint Office of Homeless Services, which is funding the project. "Folks who stay in our shelter, they have very strict codes of conduct they have to follow. You can't just be there and break rules. You have to be a good neighbor."

This is also proposed as a low-barrier shelter — for example, people can bring pets or stay with a partner.

Mayor Ted Wheeler — who was at the meeting — told the crowd that homelessness is one of the many major issues he's trying to tackle.

"It's an opportunity for folks to rebuild their lives," Wheeler said. "They take that opportunity seriously."

Multnomah County has also filed paperwork to open a 200-bed shelter in a vacant warehouse in the Old Town/Chinatown neighborhood.

Deadline Set for Crypto Filtration Plant

*By Jim Redden
December 19, 2017*

Oregon Health Authority required Portland Water Bureau to begin filtering Bull Run water in just under 10 years, and to take many other precautions in the meantime.

The Portland Water Bureau must begin filtering Bull Run water to remove a potential disease causing microorganism by Sept. 30, 2027.

The filtration plant approved earlier this year by the City Council could cost up to \$500 million.

Before the plant is completed and begins operation, the PWB must make numerous efforts to detect the presence of Cryptosporidium in the primary source of much of the region's drinking water, and notify both health officials and the public of all positive findings.

Those are among the requirements included in a bilateral compliance agreement between the PWB and the Oregon Health Authority that was signed on Monday. The Dec. 18 agreement needed to be negotiated after the OHA announced it was revoking a variance previously granted to the PWB from U.S. Environmental Protection Agency rules requiring Bull Run water to be treated for crypto, as it is commonly called.

The OHA granted the variance in 2012 because Bull Run water has historically been relatively free of crypto. Multnomah County health authorities say there is no proof anyone has ever been made sick by drinking it.

Many of the requirements in the agreement were already included in the variance, including notifying the public of crypto detections. The agreement also continues a program currently conducted by the PWB to collect samples of animal scat in the Bull Run Watershed and test them for crypto, which is found in many animals and spread through their feces.

New requirements in the agreement include:

- Slightly more frequent public notification requirements with specific required language.
- Commitment to work with OHA and public health partners on public health surveillance activities and to address a public health risk if OHA determines that one is occurring.
- Outreach plan for vulnerable populations and annual report on outreach activities.
- Quarterly status reports reporting on monitoring results, watershed activities and construction activities

Most strains of crypto do not cause people to become sick. The most dangerous strains are carried by livestock and humans. Livestock and unauthorized visitors are banned in the watershed.

Since the beginning of the year, crypto has been detected in Bull Run water 35 times.

You can learn more and track the monitoring results at www.portlandoregon.gov/water/75112.

You can read the agreement at www.portlandoregon.gov/water/article/666677.

You can read a previous Portland Tribune story on the issue at portlandtribune.com/pt/9-news/379157-265044-parasite-found-in-bull-run-before.

Willamette Week

Meeting Over Southeast Portland Homeless Shelter Turns Ugly: “We Have a Meth and Theft Problem”

*By WW Contributor, Zac Conklin-Farrell
December 9, 2017*

“The thought of having to hose down urine off the sidewalk at 10 am is not appealing.”

Opponents of a new homeless shelter planned for Southeast Foster Road booed Mayor Ted Wheeler and other local officials Monday night, complaining that the shelter would bring crime and squalor to their neighborhoods.

The homeless shelter, announced next week, is planned for a vacant grocery store on Southeast Foster Road and 61st Avenue in the Mount Scott-Arleta neighborhood.

Wheeler and Multnomah County Chairwoman Deborah Kafoury held a public meeting on the project at a Foster Road union hall last night. Residents were given one-week notice of the meeting, and have no vote in whether the shelter goes in or not. When that was confirmed, the crowd started booing Wheeler.

"We don't have a police precinct near," said Sam Neibi, a local resident. "We have a meth and theft problem here. If we have to host this thing, then give us the infrastructure we need."

Mason Layman, who owns a business near the Willamette Center, came out in opposition, urging neighbors to fight before it is too late. "My business has suffered crime, drug use, and theft, our businesses [in the building] have filed multiple reports with [police] and TriMet, that were no use. We are artists and it has made us become unsocial and unable to trust anyone we don't know near the building."

Local dance studio owner Alex Krebs put it more bluntly: "The thought of having to hose down urine off the sidewalk at 10 am is not appealing."

Wheeler said the neighborhood was selected because it needs a shelter: 22 percent of the city's homeless people live in Southeast Portland between the Willamette River and 82nd Avenue—more people living on the streets than in downtown and Old Town. (This sentence has been corrected to clarify an ambiguity in Wheeler's description.)

The mayor said he would consider raising the barriers to entry at the shelter in response to neighborhood concerns. He also reiterated that anyone using the shelter would need a reservation with the nonprofit Transition Projects.

"Its not fun to be homeless in Portland," he added.

Attendees of the hearing repeatedly objected to the site's location—it's near three schools and several bars and breweries. One speaker pointed out that people who use the shelter would have less than 50 feet to go before they found a place to get alcohol.

"The most innocent among us are children," said a woman named Amber, "and I don't think you could have tried harder to find a worse location." Jay Collins echoed: "The complete lack of regard for our community and children is apparent by the lack of communication by the city."

There were also supporters of the plan. One man wore a shirt that simply said "Jesus was Homeless" and another man held a sign saying "Foster Road Hate Free Zone."

"I know its scary to see change," said resident Haven Wheelock, "but I have seen the beauty that happens when these people get help."

Plans call for the shelter to open in late summer or early fall 2018.

Murmurs: Portland-Bound Amtrak Train Was Traveling at 80 Miles Per Hour Before Flying Off Rails

*By WW Staff
December 20, 2017*

In other news: Portland police sharpen their immigration policy.

Portland-Bound Amtrak Train Flies Off Rails

At least three people are dead after an Amtrak passenger train headed for Portland derailed from an overpass onto Interstate 5 near Olympia, Wash., on Dec. 18. The crash occurred during the first trip for the Amtrak Cascades along a new, \$181 million route designed to speed up train travel in the Northwest. The cause of the crash is still unclear, but National Transportation Safety Board officials say a data recorder shows the train was traveling 80 mph shortly before entering a 30 mph curve. A safety precaution called the "positive train control system," designed to prevent dangerous speeds, was meant to be installed along the newly opened high-speed route, but Amtrak said the system had not been activated when the train crashed.

Portland Police Sharpen Immigration Policy

The Portland Police Bureau clarified its policies on immigration enforcement this week, specifying what exactly officers may and may not do when interacting with undocumented immigrants. The new rules prohibit officers from asking about someone's immigration status except when that status might affect the investigation of a crime, such as human trafficking. Officers are also barred from participating in any operation whose sole purpose is to enforce federal immigration laws, and from arresting undocumented immigrants for legal use of cannabis. But police will still have some obligations: "If a federal immigration law enforcement agency requests emergency cover from the Bureau, members will provide cover," the policy says. The revised policy will take effect Jan. 18, 2018.

Neo-Nazi Fliers Strewn Near Portland State

Residents of downtown Portland found a handful of neo-Nazi recruitment fliers littering their neighborhood Dec. 16. The fliers, apparently created by a group called Patriot Front, were found on car windshields and park benches less than a block from Portland State University, suggesting they were intended to recruit college students. Patriot Front is a brand-new white supremacist organization started after a "Unite the Right" rally that drew white supremacists to Charlottesville, Va., in August. "My initial reaction was confusion and shock," says Allen Mottard, who found the fliers. "Am I really seeing Nazi propaganda outside my home?"

Car Stolen in Portland? Police Policy Says You'll Have to Pay a Ransom to Get It Back

*By Katie Shepherd
December 20, 2017*

Victims of auto theft feel as if they've been robbed twice after paying hefty tow fees to get their cars out of impound lots.

Last month, Josh Leslie walked out of his St. Johns home and realized his car had vanished.

Twelve hours later, police found his 1997 Subaru Legacy in the town of St. Helens. When Leslie went to fetch his stolen car, he learned it had been impounded by a towing company called Grumpy's.

To drive his stolen car off the Grumpy's impound lot, Leslie had to fork over \$405, in cash.

"Why are businesses allowed to make a profit off of crime victims?" he asks. "There just seems to be something a little bit wrong with that."

Motor vehicle theft is on a steep rise in Portland—in part because an Oregon Court of Appeals ruling impedes prosecutors' ability to take cases to trial without a confession. Portland now has the third-highest car theft rate per capita of any major U.S. city, according to a WW analysis of FBI crime statistics.

For many victims, a Portland police policy pours salt in the wound: When stolen cars are found, owners have to pay hundreds of dollars to get them back.

And there's one clear winner amid all the losers of cars: the city's contracted towing companies, which have made more than a half-million dollars this year alone from storing stolen cars, according to city records.

Portland Police Bureau policy is to give owners of stolen cars 30 minutes to retrieve their vehicles once cops find them.

Can't get there in half an hour? Police call for a tow.

Victims are often left to the whims of bus schedules or must rely on a ride from a friend. And bureau policy doesn't even require a courtesy call to the owner of the recovered car—it merely suggests officers make one. More than one victim told WW the first call they got was from the tow company.

Police admit the policy revictimizes owners of stolen cars.

"We do recognize that it's a hardship to have the vehicle towed and need to pay to get it out of impound," bureau spokesman Sgt. Chris Burley says. "We'd prefer not to do that. We'd prefer the person's car not to be stolen in the first place."

But police say their hands are tied: The City Council makes the rules, and they just follow them.

The rules may be changing soon. When WW informed Mayor Ted Wheeler of the city's towing policy this week, he pledged to discuss changing the policy with Portland Police Chief Danielle Outlaw.

"Let's all agree: Making a victim of crime pay \$300 or \$400 to get their vehicle back is adding insult to injury, period," Wheeler says. "If somebody wants to pick up the vehicle where it is and

they're able to do that, that's a common-sense solution. People should at least be able to have that as an option."

Portland's criminal justice reformers have demanded an end to the criminalization of poverty, noting how fees for minor crimes can ruin people's lives over a misdemeanor charge. But the crippling impact of such property crimes on low-income victims has received far less attention.

The cost of getting a car out of impound can be nearly as much as the value of the stolen vehicle itself. Although some insurance policies will cover the cost of a tow, many people who own old cars buy policies that cover just their liability.

The most commonly stolen cars in Portland are Honda Civics and Accords and Subaru Legacys—mostly models from the late 1990s. Most of those vehicles are worth only several hundred bucks to start with.

Grumpy's charged Leslie \$405. His 20-year-old Subaru is worth only about \$1,000, according to Kelley Blue Book.

"If [the tow fee] had been less than \$200, I would have written it off as bad luck," Leslie says. "But \$400 to get a car that had been stolen for less than a day? It just seemed ridiculous."

Tow companies have picked up 3,967 stolen vehicles this year as of Dec. 15. At a minimum, they have made \$729,928 from impounding stolen cars and charging their owners to get them back.

The minimum fee that can be charged for towing a stolen car in Portland is \$184—that's a \$128 hookup and towing fee, a \$38 city fee and an \$18 dispatch fee—but it is common for tow companies to tack on additional charges for storage and other costs, especially if the victim can't retrieve the vehicle right away.

Just five companies do the vast majority of the city's towing: 21st Century Towing, A & B Towing, Newhouse & Hutchins Towing, Sergeants Towing and Speed's Towing.

Tow companies are reluctant to discuss their arrangements with the city. WW called the six most frequently used companies, and five declined to comment on the record.

Clark Tenney, president of 21st Century Towing, says his company has towed vehicles for the city for about 20 years—and the owners of stolen cars have always had to pay to retrieve the cars. He says he agrees with victims: The city's policy puts people in a bind.

"There's a few [owners] that get a little frustrated," Tenney says. "You always get a couple who say it's unfair. We agree, but what else can you do?"

In fact, there are other ways to handle recovered cars.

Seattle police leave recovered cars where they find them unless they are illegally parked or pose a threat to public health or safety, or the owner asks to have the vehicle towed.

"It sucks getting your car stolen," says Seattle police Detective Patrick Michaud. "Paying a few hundred dollars just to get your car back seems a little bit silly."

Part of the reason Seattle police don't tow stolen cars: They don't want to penalize low-income victims of crime.

"If that owner doesn't want to incur that cost, we don't want to force that issue because some people might not have the money to get [their cars] back," Michaud says.

Portland police say they don't follow Seattle's example because the recovered cars could be stolen again.

"The Police Bureau does not leave a recovered stolen vehicle unattended after it is located," Burley says, "because there is the possibility the person who stole the vehicle may return and drive away in the vehicle or the vehicle may not be able to be secured and could be tampered with by other people."

That's cold comfort to Candace Starks.

She's had to pay towing companies to get her 1990 Toyota Camry back—twice.

The first time, in early 2015, police found her Camry a few blocks from her Northeast Portland house—and the tow cost her about \$287. The second time, the Toyota disappeared from the parking lot of Cascade Station shopping center in Northeast Portland. A tow truck picked it up in an empty field across the state line in Washington, and Starks shelled out another \$300 to get it back.

"They don't care that your car was stolen," Starks says. "It's super-frustrating because something already messed up happened to you and you're having to deal with paying to get your car back. It's kind of cruel."

The Portland Mercury

Hall Monitor: Scoff Medicine

*By Dirk Vanderhart
December 20, 2017*

Portland Probably Misspent Millions in Utility Funds. It's Finally Paying Some Back.

I REMEMBER quietly scoffing in February 2014, as an attorney argued that the City of Portland was allowed to spend money from its water and sewer ratepayers on financing city elections.

"There is nothing more connected to the operation of the sewer system than who sits on the city council," Deputy City Attorney Terry Thatcher told Multnomah County Circuit Judge Stephen Bushong, a little more than two years into a lawsuit over how Portland spends its utility funds.

Someone in the audience groaned. Bushong shot back: "Then what's the limitation?"

That was always the central question in the lawsuit over the city's water and sewer spending, filed in 2011 and almost certainly nearing a close with a Portland City Council vote on Wednesday, December 20.

Portland's City Charter says money from utility ratepayers must go back into the water and sewer systems—not into any old thing council feels like paying for. The plaintiffs in the case, including a former city commissioner, argued the city had lost its way. The city has maintained it has wide latitude when deciding how to spend the money.

Another scoff-worthy claim: Thatcher also argued in 2014 that money from the city's Water Fund could be spent to build Portland Loos—street toilets—because "we chose to furnish water to the citizens with this device."

Bushong didn't buy it. Nor did he feel that water money should be spent financing elections or on a number of other items the lawsuit raised. By the time each of the disputed expenditures had

been litigated, the judge found the city had misspent some \$17 million of its water and sewer money on unrelated items. (He found millions of other expenses were legitimate.)

Portland officials disagreed with his rationale, but rather than tying up the matter in the appeals process, City Council is on the verge of paying back a portion of that cash.

In a \$10 million settlement the council will consider, the city will pay high-profile plaintiffs' attorney John DiLorenzo and his team a cool \$3 million before the end of the year. Then the council will find \$7 million in its general fund by October 2019 to put back into its utility funds.

"While the City continues to respectfully disagree with some of the court's rulings in this matter, I am satisfied that this settlement is fair and equitable to the City and its ratepayers," City Attorney Tracy Reeve said in a statement announcing the settlement.

The settlement probably makes things tighter as Portland's spending rises faster than its record revenues. Later this week, the city will get its clearest picture yet of the budget outlook in the year to come. If this year's trend stands, there will be millions to play with on a "one-time" basis, but also pressing recurring costs that need long-term funding. And with the settlement, the City Council might find itself without \$10 million it could have put toward much-needed services.

But maybe it's worth it, if only to preclude the type of arguments the city made in 2014.

"The real value to the lawsuit is at least the current council will be pretty cautious that expenditures truly relate to water and sewer services," DiLorenzo told me last week. But he noted: "What if the council a couple years from now decides they're going to build a park and they want to use water and sewer funds for it? There's nothing that would stop them."

A New Fee Meant to Spruce Up City Streets Has Property Owners Enraged

*By Dirk VanderHart
December 20, 2017*

It's Also Got City Officials Contemplating Bizarre Workarounds

AROUND THE TIME Mavis Willford became a thorn in the city's side earlier this year, officials quietly considered burning down her home.

A 67-year-old employee of David Douglas School District, Willford had reason to make a fuss. She'd been on the verge of finally replacing her mold-infested manufactured home in East Portland's Mill Park neighborhood when she hit a major road block: a new fee meant to help fix hundreds of miles of deficient city streets.

Because of that fee—known as the Local Transportation Infrastructure Charge, or LTIC—Willford was surprised to learn she'd need to pay \$54,000 more than planned, potentially killing her aspirations for fungus-free living.

"We were doing okay until we got hit with that," Willford said recently. "I went down and I talked to a guy. I said, 'That's half the price of my home.' He said, 'That's the way it is.'"

Willford began complaining to anyone who would listen. She visited the office of Transportation Commissioner Dan Saltzman. She contacted the governor's office. She reached out to the city's ombudsman, Margie Sollinger, who investigates citizen complaints.

People wanted to help her, they said, but their hands were tied.

Under the LTIC program—passed by City Council in April 2016 and facing uncertainty and outcry from Portlanders of all stripes—citizens have no means of appealing the charge. It's levied on people seeking a new single-family building permit on land that sits on an unimproved or under-improved street, which can mean anything from a road of pocked gravel to one that has no sidewalks. Exemptions are currently granted only in limited cases, such as when a natural disaster destroys a house.

The only disasters that had befallen Willford's dilapidated home were moisture and the march of time, but officials at PBOT thought they might have a way to change that. If city firefighters were to burn her house down as part of a training exercise, they believed, Willford could be let off the hook under the disaster clause.

"It was considered," says Matt Grumm, a senior policy director for Saltzman.

It's hard to imagine a more unnecessary or drastic solution to a burdensome fee than burning down someone's house, but that's sort of where the LTIC is at this point.

A year and a half after the charge went into effect, it's facing outcry and veiled legal threats from citizens who say it's devastated their building plans. It's even getting the side-eye from neighborhoods that stand to reap the money it collects—money that can pay for roughly a quarter-mile of improvements each year.

"Although the program has successfully collected additional revenue for public improvements, it has also resulted in inequities that we encourage Council to address," read a letter to Portland City Council from Sollinger and Dante James, director of the city's Office of Equity and Human Rights. "For those with more modest means, the LTIC has proven to be cost-prohibitive."

The LTIC was passed last year at the urging of former Commissioner Steve Novick, and was aimed at addressing a longstanding challenge: the 250 miles of city streets that are either completely unimproved or lack sidewalks, curbs, and other amenities streets are supposed to have.

It's long been city policy to require property owners to pay for those improvements themselves, but the city has often given developers a pass on putting in sidewalks when they build on unimproved roads. When developers do spruce up streets as intended, it can lead to awkward results—like islands of sidewalk in otherwise undeveloped blocks.

The LTIC is supposed to put an end to those islands. Rather than forcing owners to improve their own street, the charge gives them the option of paying \$600 for every foot of their property that lines the road (a rate the city says is about what they'd pay to spruce up their own property). That money then goes into a fund that's supposed to bankroll targeted road improvements throughout the city.

According to data obtained in a public records request, the city has assessed more than 90 properties under the LTIC since it went into effect in May 2016. Charges ranged from \$6,000—for a Southeast Portland property that only had a driveway abutting an unimproved street—to \$120,000 for a corner lot in the shadow of Powell Butte.

More frequently, the charges are in the tens of thousands. Records show property owners in Southeast and Southwest Portland have been assessed LTICs most often—roughly 78 percent of all charges. To date, the city's collected about \$2.2 million in LTIC cash.

But though it's been collecting money under the LTIC, the city doesn't yet have a plan for using it. And while the charge has been taken in stride by infill developers, it's facing heated complaints from property owners looking to improve their own land.

At a Portland City Council hearing earlier this month, PBOT brought forth a tentative proposal for how it would spend the millions it's collected. The plan would prioritize neighborhoods with underserved populations, along with streets that are close to transit lines, but it immediately drew questions from council members.

Mayor Ted Wheeler wondered why the Portland Bureau of Transportation (PBOT) planned to spread its limited funds throughout the city, rather than focusing on one area at a time. Commissioner Amanda Fritz didn't believe the bureau had weighed equity appropriately. (The city zeroed in on Northeast Portland's Cully neighborhood, Southeast Portland's Division Midway district, and Tryon-Stephens in Southwest Portland for improvements.)

That wasn't the only challenge. Property owners who testified before council railed against the payment, and against the inconsistent messaging they've received from the city. One man, a doctor named David Farris, said he'd given up plans to build a home on ritzy Southwest Fairmount Boulevard because of an LTIC charge he says reached \$124,000. (It is not reflected on the spreadsheet PBOT released to the Mercury.)

"We want to sell now," said Farris, who brought an attorney with him to the council hearing. "The LTIC has effectively rendered our property... valueless."

Another property owner named Ken Paulsen says he is being forced to pay \$90,000 to build on his Southwest Portland property. "Granted, we need to find [a] way to fund road improvements," Paulsen wrote in a letter to the city council. "But how can it be fair to single out a person to carry an unjust portion of the burden?"

It's the latest blowback for one of Portland's most reliable quandaries. For decades, the city has puzzled over how to meet its transportation priorities without the money to pay for them (remember the blowup over a "street fee" proposed by Novick and former Mayor Charlie Hales?). The LTIC was one way of addressing that—but right now it's traveling a bumpy road.

City council appears ready to address at least some of the cost concerns. As part of the package that council's considering, the city would cap the charge at a maximum \$120,000, with smaller ceilings depending on a property's zoning designation. According to Grumm, with Saltzman's office, there's interest in allowing citizens to appeal the charge in the future, too.

But the council stopped short of enacting any fixes earlier this month. Amid the flurry of questions about the policy, Saltzman essentially dropped the matter.

"I'm going to suggest that since clearly this is an issue that's going to take more time than we have budgeted today that we... continue the hearing to sometime in January or February," Saltzman said at the time.

A hearing has yet to be scheduled.

As for Willford, the woman whose home the city considered burning down, it never came to that. Officials wound up fudging their own rules and deciding that the mold and rot in her home was enough to constitute a "disaster."

They never even mentioned the fire idea to Willford. Which is funny, because she would have accepted.

"I would have said, 'Go for it,'" she says. "It cost me \$9,000 to tear [the house] down."

OPB

Officials Have About 10 Years To Complete Bull Run Water Filtration Plant

*By Ericka Cruz Guevarra
December 19, 2017*

State and Portland city officials have agreed on a compliance schedule that outlines how the city plans to build and construct a water filtration plant in the Bull Run Watershed that will treat water for the parasite cryptosporidium.

The agreement marks the official end of a variance that made Portland the only city in the country that didn't have to treat its water for the parasite.

"The variance was the only one of its kind," said Edward Campbell, the resource protection and planning director with the Portland Water Bureau.

"We finally, over the course of this year, detected far too many cryptosporidium for us to maintain the variance. So that's why we've come to this form of compliance now."

The city has about 10 years to build and begin operating a water filtration plant in the Bull Run Watershed. Water that's treated for cryptosporidium will be served no later than Sept. 30, 2027.

The Portland Water Bureau is scheduled to submit a plan outlining details such as design, location and filtration type by 2020.

In August, Portland City Council voted unanimously to move toward building a water filtration plant that could cost the city up to \$500 million.

The Oregon Health Authority granted the Water Bureau three deadline extensions, giving the city time to finalize its compliance schedule.

"We think we've come to an agreement that serves the best interest of public health both immediately and then across the next decade, and that we've really strengthened our relationships with our public health partners and we're glad for that," Campbell said.