



PORTLAND HOUSING BUREAU

Portland Housing Advisory Commission
Tuesday, March 1, 2015
3:00 p.m. – 5:00pm
Portland Housing Bureau, Ste. 500
421 SW 6th Ave.
Portland, OR 97204

- ✓ = PHAC public member action item
- ▶ = PHB staff member action item

March Meeting Minutes - FINAL

Members Present: Betty Dominguez, Cobi Lewis, Dike Dame, Elisa Harrigan Sarah Zahn, Thomas Brenneke, Wayne Miya, Amy Anderson, Daniel Steffey, Maxine Fitzpatrick, Nate McCoy, Stephen Green

Members Excused: Jean DeMaster (LOA)

Staff Present: Matthew Tschabold, Sawyer Sheldon

Guests Present: Victoria James

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
Call to Order	Sarah calls meeting to order. Sarah asks if there is public testimony.	
Public Testimony	<p>Stacy Drake Edwards, with the City of Portland, manager of the Prime Contractors Development Program (PCDP). Works with program that gives opportunity to build capacity with minority and women certified construction firms. Expressed the desire to build relationship with Portland Housing Bureau and to gain a better understanding of the grant. Wondered how is there a policy with the city of Portland that mandates on construction projects that they have a certain percentage of minority participation, yet there is money that comes through these programs that do not have that percentage? Expressed that it is a great opportunity for minority contractors because a lot of them are in building; and that it is a win-win situation because the grants are applicable to minority and low income families and looks at the economic support that goes with it. Stacy said that she would love support, guidance and leadership on how PCDP program can provide better participation work with grant programs and wanted to know if there was a way that language can be added that offers support to the directors of those programs in order to build a partnership. Stacy introduces Windol Cador to speak.</p>	

Windol Cador, with Duke Developments in the PCDP and recently got into the PHB program. He would like to speak to the process, as getting into the program was complicated. He wonders if there is a way to streamline the process. He knows other contractors that would like to access the program who feel the same. He suggests that there should be a spot online where people can look for everything that is needed to apply, as well as time frames for submission. He also suggested having a point person to contact with questions in order to maximize efficiency.

Nate said that he knows both of these individuals and tipped them to looking at the Housing Bureau's Home Repair Program to gain experience with the Bureau. He mentions how the committee has talked about having better outreach programs within the community. When Windol came to an event and felt like there was a barrier to introducing himself to the programs he thought it should be brought to the committee's attention. He continued by saying that as the committee reviews their programs it should also think about what can be done to minimize these types of barriers, to accessing the program. He thinks that offering a list of preferred contractors, who have already been vetted through the City of Portland and the PCDP, as a list of choice, trusted, contractors, would be a great product to offer the residents of the city.

Stacy clarifies that there is a diverse list, but there are only a few certified firms on it. The City cannot count the firm unless it is certified by the State which is a misnomer; you can look at the list but they do not count when you are looking at participation. She another option to consider is a way to help contractors get certified and a better way to explain to them what certification means. After they get certified the jobs they accomplish while working on those grants, can be made applicable to other facilities and bureaus that are looking for contractors who are certified. However, they can't do that unless they are certified in the program and can be counted.

Dan is struck when reading the agenda materials because PHB has great program performance but he didn't see anything about minority participation in contracting. He adds that one of the places we could start working on this would be to collect and record that data so PHB can know where they are and where there is room to grow. Dan adds that he knows that other jurisdictions, like Metro, have a very well run program for qualifying minority vendors so that they can just go for maximum dollar amount. He finished by saying that building a program which could be a one stop shop for all the city bureaus would be a good place to start.

Stacy adds that is what PCDP does, which is why they have so many partners within the city and other bureaus. The goal is to work with as many bureaus as possible and grow that

	<p>capacity. She offered to come back and make a full presentation at a later date so that she could provide a deeper understanding of what they do.</p> <p>Dan continued by saying that we should use the bully pulpit of the PHB to talk about the multifamily housing industry in general. Who are PHB's providers and who are the people that are benefitting from city money? How are they performing relevant to the committee's goals? He goes on to say that PHB should be collecting that data because anything that can be done to expand on that would amplify the effectiveness of PHB's programs to recruit minority vendors.</p> <p>Amy Anderson asks Windol if he had to pick two subjects that could make the application process simpler and recruit contractors in to the program, what they would be.</p> <p>Windol responds that the easiest thing would be to improve communication. He thinks having guidelines that communicate requirements and benchmarks for the program are important, including deadlines and a bureau contact person with clear availability. He adds that e-mailing back and forth can be slow and lead to confusion; he finishes by saying that even though people are busy, it can be really helpful to sit in front of someone and get an answers to questions.</p> <p>Amy asks if a web page that specifies and details the process would be helpful.</p> <p>Windol agrees that a website would be great.</p> <p>Sarah comments that the PHAC could benefit from a presentation by Stacy, which will need to be coordinated to get it on the agenda. Sarah went on to say that PHB in general has been very focused on its program participation with subcontractors, developers, and owners, but there hasn't been a lot of cross coordination with Stacy's program. She went on to say that it makes sense to coordinate and think about where there are intersections in the programs.</p> <p>Dike agrees that a good place to start would be to find out from staff how many projects PHB has in the pipeline and what the percentages and numbers are for those projects right now. He asks to see the statistics at the next meeting.</p> <p>Stephen adds that there is a big difference between having good intentions and changing outcomes. He thinks it would be beneficial to meet with other contractors to see why they don't bid; it's not enough to say we have the work and they aren't bidding.</p>	<p>Matthew or Cheyenne will coordinate with Stacy Drake to schedule a presentation for the PHAC</p>
--	--	---

	<p>Antoinette answers that it had to do with caps on public services that are encountered with CDBG.</p> <p>Dan asks if the committee would see a draft before the April meeting.</p> <p>Kim answers yes, they should have a mostly completed draft around mid-March and they will send a completed version around when updates are sent to the committee.</p>	
<p>PHB Program Performance <i>(Meeting 1 of 2)</i></p>	<p>Matt Tschabold gives presentation on PHB Program Performance.</p> <p>Betty asks if anyone knows when the city will announce the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) numbers.</p> <p>Javier answers they would have them in April.</p> <p>Sarah follows up by asking if there was a better NOFA estimate.</p> <p>Javier responds that they said \$100,000 per unit, so with that they guessed about 700 units. He continues by saying that they did an internal review and now they are starting an external one, so sometime in April they will take that to Kurt and the Commissioner.</p> <p>Betty asks if the home repair numbers in the presentation include NE Strategies implementation.</p> <p>Matt responds that they don't yet because the numbers are from Fall 2015 data.</p> <p>Maxine asks if the home repair loans are overlapping with other loans.</p> <p>Antoinette answers that they probably do not overlap very much, but adds that this data goes all the way back to 1974, so there are probably a few anomalies, but not many.</p> <p>Wayne asks if we have data for each type of homeownership product PHB offers.</p> <p>Matt responds that they don't right now, but that can be provided to the PHAC by the April meeting.</p> <p>Dan asks for an overview of MCC program.</p> <p>Andrea gives an overview and shares that they probably approve around 120 loans annually and that despite best efforts, there are few minority home owners in that number. She would be happy to come back in the future to provide more detail to the committee if wanted.</p>	<p>Matthew will provide data on each PHB homeownership product by the April meeting.</p>

Antoinette introduces Victoria James of PHB who will talk about some of the deeper evaluations they have done based on the home repair data. Antoinette explains that they looked at the last 2 years of home repair loans and looked at the names from the loans and the one still on the house.

Victoria explains the results She said that in total they had 924 households, they looked at the last names of the owners at the time of the loans and the names on the home now; if the names remained the same they guessed that the residents were still living in the house. If the names had changed they then had to ask why. If the owner name changed completely then it was assumed that they had probably sold their homes, there were 124 of those. If only the first name changed and the surname remained, they estimated that it was probably a case of passing the home to a family member, and that they had 34 of those. Then they looked at whether or not the owner lived in the house. If not then it was probably a rental, they had 38 of those. Of the people that sold their homes most were in the 0-30% or 30-50% range.

Stephen asks for clarification that this was for the home repair grant for elderly or disabled peoples.

Antoinette replies affirmatively.

Discussion continues concerning the applications of Short Term Rental Assistance (STRA) and other programs concerning the elderly and what sort of owners rent out their homes, and why.

Matt asks the group what they want out of meeting number two in this series.

Tom asks Matt to explain the 0-30% group on slide number 7. He asks if they are rent burdened and how they could be that overburdened if they get tax deductions.

Matt explains that there is a greater number of households in our own units that are earning only 0-30% than we have 0-30% units.

Sarah adds that in an attempt to eliminate barriers to housing, PHB allows people who are only making 1.5 times the rent into units. She said that this is an attempt to have fewer barriers to stable housing for people and that some people choose this option knowing that they will be rent burdened on day one. People do this for a number of reasons such as being in a better location, so they can have better access to public transportation or better schools.

Amy is interested in learning more about slide 12; she wants to know more about STRA, and was curious about the seeming discrepancy of white vs black populations. She said that both populations seemed equal in terms of money going out to them, but that there are huge gaps in

	<p>other statistics. She would like to know how PHB determines success rates, and asked if PHB is tracking how many of the residents can then sustain their rents.</p> <p>Betty thinks it's important to remember that this is short term assistance and that many people only need help once or a few times, or are domestic violence survivors that need hotel vouchers for 2-3 months. She then suggested a report on STRA to explain some of the number break downs.</p> <p>Matt clarifies that STRA is a preventative measure as well, so that was another reason. He thinks they can look into it to see why there is such a stark difference. It could also be that when you look at the whole numbers that the proportion of African American households that need STRA is greater than the number of African Americans that are homeless.</p> <p>Maxine asks how these goals match with PHB's equity goals.</p> <p>Matt answers that PHB can bring back data so the committee can look at the proportion of households by income levels, and by race / ethnicity so they can see how these compare to the proportions of households being served in any of the service categories. This can then be used to see if there are any populations being over or under served in any service category.</p> <p>Betty says that another thing to remember about STRA's is that a lot of the assistance goes to eviction prevention. This happens when people are already housed but they have something that comes up short term that needs to be addressed; so they only need help for 2-6 months, but it could maybe up to a year or as little as just a few weeks.</p> <p>Amy asks if last summer's eviction numbers and processes were any indication, and if there aren't any places to rent, where are the recipients renting and staying on short term assistance.</p> <p>Amy would like to know how people use the vouchers that are given to them and where they end up.</p> <p>Antoinette said that they map that data and can show geographically where they end up.</p> <p>Sarah suggests that maybe the committee could get some of the providers in to talk about the challenges and opportunities they face.</p> <p>Betty shares that at the county they have 19 contractors that they use and offered to bring a list in so the committee can discuss it if they are interested. She also suggests that she could ask the county's STRA person to come give a presentation if people are interested.</p>	<p>Matt will bring back data on household income levels broken down by race / ethnicity and by service categories.</p>
--	---	--

	<p>Betty asks, of the 154 homes sold who got repair money, if they repay the grant amounts upon sale of the home.</p> <p>Matt answers that no, the numbers are so small that they aren't worth pursuing.</p> <p>Antoinette adds that the repairs are often building code violations or compliance ones as well.</p> <p>Maxine asks for the maximum grant amount.</p> <p>Antoinette answers that it was around \$3,500, and that it usually goes to the disabled or the elderly.</p>	
<p>Inclusionary Housing Programs <i>(Meeting 1 of 4)</i></p>	<p>Matt gives a presentation on Inclusionary Housing Programs.</p> <p>Elisa asks before the presentation starts, if there will be an opportunity to present data to wider audience. She suggests that the minutes or the PHAC website would be good options because the data could be used to feed into other conversations that are happening right now.</p> <p>Matt agrees, but that adds there is already a larger conversation around inclusionary housing happening in Portland right now. He went on to say that looking at Senate bill 1533, it looks like it's going to move through the process, and that there is an intention at City Hall to look at inclusionary housing programs in a comprehensive way. He added that we can't just look at the MULTE, then ignore the MULTE and look at SDC waiver, then ignore those to look at mandatory zoning; they can all be a part of an inclusionary housing program. They can work as a whole or in concert, or not, they can complement each other or not. He thinks that it's something that the larger community, the City, the development community, and the PHAC, as advisors to the Bureau should discuss. He finished by saying that with everything going on, it's not efficient or effective to fail to consider all the programs that are already working right now. He adds that city council passed resolution 37187 which committed the city to a public process, so he thinks that will be the venue where a lot of this discussion will be held.</p> <p>Betty asks how the zoning and exemptions are going to play out with Metro's existing program.</p> <p>Matt answers that it was his understanding that they are mutually exclusive.</p> <p>Betty adds that she has worked with Metro for several years on that program, and that she is worried about conflict which may diminish other programs.</p>	

	<p>Matt responds that unfortunately that will probably have to be a legislative issue to be discussed later.</p> <p>Maxine asks why the housing is at 80% AMI when that is not affordable to most of her clients.</p> <p>Matt responds that the votes weren't there for less than 80%; but that this leaves a legislative path for better levels of affordability in the future by offering opt-out programs instead of mandatory ones. He said that a tradeoff could be to provide a 60% program that is not as intense as an 80% one. He added that there is a path to achieve both goals which is why there is a need to look at how all of the programs interact with each other since now there is a revenue stream built in with the tax.</p> <p>Maxine shares that she remembers a property tax exemption for 10 years for including 20% affordable housing units, which could also go up to 80%. She said that there is the critical need that is not being address and asks what the value of that exemption is compared to the value it brings to the neighborhood.</p> <p>Matt responds that there are a lot of questions that still need answers, such as will there will be a mandatory 80% program or should our incentive program be 80%. Will the mandatory programs and the incentive programs have the same terms? The local and city governments will have to answer all of these questions. PHB needs to work with its partners on the NEXUS study to make sure to get the analysis right and answer the questions of what the costs and benefits are to the markets, and what the impacts are to affordability in order to calibrate all of our programs and find the overlaps.</p> <p>Dike remarks that the fact that we are eliminating a decades old prohibition is huge. He added that the numbers may not be what we want but they are something, which is more than we have had in the past.</p> <p>Kurt says that there are lots of things not in bill that need to be sorted out. For example we are not talking about 20% city wide, we need to look at residual land values to see which areas can / cannot support those costs. He said that there will probably be areas that can support the costs because they are well served by transit and well connected to opportunities, and other places that can't support that additional cost. Kurt said that there is nothing in the bill for the duration of affordability either and that there needs to be a durable stock of housing; not just short term gains. He added that we need to be sure we are thinking beyond ten years. He added that there could be a robust market for non-profits developers who sell their interests to private developers as well. He adds that setting a fee in lieu of rates because there is nothing in the bill about that.</p>	<p>Matt to provide data on how the city's stats tie in to our numbers.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>He finished by saying that the bill will not affect projects that are already vested and financially feasible, as long as they build within 2 years.</p> <p>Matt asks the PHAC what additional information they need to help move the discussion forward next month.</p> <p>Dike suggests an analysis of how city stats tie in.</p> <p>Stephen suggests it would be helpful to have another developer, who is not on the committee, in to hear their perspective.</p> <p>Kurt adds that speaking of metrics, like the ones from the beginning from the meeting, all of PHB's metrics track people who are low and extremely low income people, but that metrics don't currently monitor those of moderate income; that needs to be considered in the State of Housing 2016 report. He added that we know that people are struggling, like in North Portland, but we don't currently have a way to quantify that so there needs to be a tool built to do that.</p>	
<p>Good of the Order</p>	<p>Elisa motions to approve the January 25th meeting minutes. Maxine seconds. The minutes are approved by the members.</p> <p>Sarah adjourns the meeting.</p> <p>The next PHAC meeting will be held on Tuesday April 4th, 2016.</p>	