



PORTLAND HOUSING BUREAU

Portland Housing Advisory Commission
Tuesday, April 5, 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

April Meeting Minutes - Draft

Members Present: Betty Dominguez, Dike Dame, Sarah Zahn, Thomas Brenneke, Amy Anderson, Daniel Steffey, Maxine Fitzpatrick, Nate McCoy, Stephen Green

Members Excused: Jean DeMaster (LOA), Cobi Lewis, Elisa Harrigan

Staff Present: Matthew Tschabold, Sawyer Sheldon, Cheyenne Sheehan, Jennifer Chang

Guests Present: Patrick Gihring, Morgan Masterman, Kate Dean

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
<p>Call to Order</p>	<p>Sarah calls meeting to order. Sarah asks if there is public testimony.</p>	
<p>Public Testimony</p>	<p>Trevor Rowe, Vice President of Construction at Williams and Dame Development makes a statement in support of changing the Design Review (DR) appeal body for Type IIX affordable housing applications. He is currently working as a development consultant with Bridge Housing to take a project through as a Type IIX rather than a Type IIX in an effort to expedite affordable housing development.</p> <p>His concern is that the design commission has been empowered to hear appeals. He believes there are people in the community who attempt to appeal decisions for reasons inconsistent with the purpose of the design review process. It is easier for complainants to file an appeal because of lowered barriers such as reduced price threshold and reduced burden in providing testimony in opposition. Consistently when he is in front of the design commission with an affordable project, commissioners comment that they don't want to hear about money – they believe there should be an even higher standard for affordable housing. Trevor strongly disagrees with this way of thinking. It's important to address the current housing crisis by approving affordable projects quickly. He recommends that PHAC make a recommendation to</p>	

City Council that they add to the temporary evaluation period a provision that appeals for Type IIx affordable housing applications be heard by City Council.

Dike asks Trevor to talk a little about the Land Use Board of Appeals (LUBA).

Trevor continues by saying that LUBA is a winnable appeal if a design solution cannot be negotiated with City Council but it is time consuming. There is a path to expedite the design process by having the DAR weigh in on what is most important and trusting professional design and planning staffers to implement those recommendations, and then have the appeal body be City Council in order to avoid LUBA. If the process is kept as is, they will have to go before LUBA.

Today if a Type IIx is appealed by anyone, for a mere \$250, the appeal is heard at design commission. He sees that as a risk because they will use that as an opportunity to be picky about the project and the only place to go from there is LUBA. He thinks the process should be changed for Type IIx projects so that if there is an appeal, that appeal is heard at City Council and if it's appealed from there it would go to LUBA. Appeals heard at Council would include testimony from staff regarding why they approved the project and that the project was heard at design review by two DAR's – their recommendations were implemented prior to approval, and then they would give Council reasons why they should deny the appeal.

Sarah asks if they are currently going through DAR and wants to know if that's part of the current requirement or if it's something they elected to do.

Trevor responds that they are required to do one DAR and because their project is complicated and high profile, BDS staff requested they go back to DAR and get more feedback; so they voluntarily went through DAR a second time.

Sarah closes this topic by saying that a motion can be made after public testimony is complete.

Diane Linn, Executive Director of Proud Ground passes out copies of a report they have just produced called Solving the Affordable Home Ownership Gap which was mentioned in the Oregonian today. Proud Ground wanted to share it with PHAAC and rather than send it in the mail, she wanted to bring it to today's meeting. She hopes the data in the report is useful to the PHAC and she will answer any questions the members/staff may have.

ADMIN NOTE: *The report can be found on their website at <https://proudground.org/about/news/report/>; the full PDF version can be found [here](#).*

Public testimony ends. The PHAC discusses a motion related to Trevor Rowe's testimony. The final motion is made by Matthew as follows; The motion is for a PHAC recommendation to

	<p>Commissioner Saltzman and City Council, that with respect to the Type IIX design review for affordable housing, that any appeals go to City Council. The motion is seconded by Betty and passes unanimously.</p> <p>ADMIN NOTE: Post meeting the PHAC sent a letter with their recommendation to Commissioner Saltzman regarding the they Type IIX appeals process. That letter can be found here.</p>	
<p>PDC Economic Opportunity Program</p>	<p>Jennifer Chang of the Portland Housing Bureau is the PHB Contract Manager for PDC’s Economic Opportunity Initiative (EOI). This presentation is in response to several commissioner’s request for more information on this program; what types of programs it entails and who these programs serve. She introduces Patrick Gihring of Worksystems Inc. (WSI) and Kate Dean and Morgan Masterman of Portland Development Commission (PDC).</p> <p>Jennifer gives some background on EOI. It was created in 2004 as a strategy to reduce poverty through economic opportunity. It was initially part of the City’s strategic plan through the Bureau of Housing and Community Development (BHCD) which became PHB in 2009. At that time the EOI program and its funding was moved to PDC who has been managing and overseeing the initiative since then. The purpose of EOI is to assist low income and very low income households to gain increased economic self-sufficiency through providing services in three main categories; microenterprise, adult workforce services, and youth workforce services.</p> <p>The EOI is funded annually with approximately \$2M of federal funds through Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) administered through PHB. The City also invests approximately \$2M in general funds to the same initiative and administered through the Mayor’s office.</p> <p>In Spring of 2012 PDC, in consultation with city staff, made the decision to co-invest the City’s workforce resources through EOI with WSI. This was done to maximize leveraging opportunities and utilize resources that both Worksystems Inc. and PDC had to offer. WSI now directly administers the adult and youth workforce programming and PDC provides the oversight and monitoring of the funds and coordinates EOI funding with other economic development resources and initiatives in the community.</p> <p>EOI serves more than 1200 households each year and helps households to secure and maintain stable housing. Over the past two years through the Home For Everyone (HFE) collaboration a workgroup has developed strategies around better alignment of housing and employment for households experiencing homelessness. Though that the City as well as</p>	

the HFE partners have identified EOI as a key effective partnership that would be worth increased investment.

Patrick Gihring presents the [Economic Opportunity Initiative Workforce Development Programs Presentation](#).

Amy asks if they are doing any work in supporting the expansion of the non-traditional health care workforce. The certified peer wellness specialist and community health worker seem to be the models that the community is asking for. The trainings are not as extensive or expensive and it gets people out working in the community at the level that is being requested by those in need of these services.

Patrick answers that that area has been flagged as an important area as far as community feedback. Because of this feedback the healthcare occupations grant will bring a lot of training resources which are especially important to the reentry community who may not be able to work in more traditional healthcare roles due to a criminal record. Another occupation they are looking at closely is a health care coach – this takes a person who has recovered from an illness and they become a peer coach for another individual going through the same illness or health condition.

Kate Dean of PDC continues the [Economic Opportunity Initiative Workforce Development Programs Presentation](#) at slide 12. They are increasing their work with WSI to layer them into communities of importance. They operate programs in East Portland in the Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative (NPI) districts so services are layered in those areas.

Kate ends the presentation and offers to answer questions. They have also brought a video of testimony from participants in the program that they'd like to share. Since time is short the video is not watched but can be viewed at the following link;

<https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=-8pMDfx1yJ8>

ADMIN NOTE: *Testimony begins with introductions at minute 51:00 and goes through about 1:08:00.*

The PHAC has questions and comments on the program.

Nate is very surprised and dismayed that only 3% of jobs in this program are in construction – he wants to understand this especially in light of the current building boom in Portland. He is concerned that people leaving the program are still making such low wages. He is not satisfied especially if the goal is to get people out of poverty and into living wage jobs and eventually home ownership. As the executive director of NAMC-Oregon Nate advocates for

MWESB business owners and similar work to WSI but with a construction focus. When people come out of training in a construction program, they are making wages that are double the EOI program based on this presentation. He doesn't understand why the focus is on hospitality etc., traditionally very low paying jobs, and hardly any focus on the trades which are traditionally much higher paying, living wage jobs. He believes their program is a good program but that they are missing a huge opportunity with lack of investment in construction opportunity. At the end of an apprenticeship or training, there are organizations that can help graduates get a job that the EOI program is not working with.

Betty agrees and needs more specificity in the presentation regarding the report and numbers.

Kate clarifies that the first part of the presentation focuses on the youth program. The 3% mentioned by Nate is for youth placement in construction, not adult placement. An improvement they are working to make in the youth system is that they are trying to get people into more career path training and jobs. They have noted the same kinds of trends that Nate is noting – on the youth side, that is one of the things that PDC and WSI are talking about, getting youth into career path work, of which construction is an option along with health care and others. It is difficult as the youth in this program are often in their very first job. A lot of the program focus is on labor attachment and gaining some work experience. On the adult side, it's a little better, though maybe not as good as they can possibly be.

Patrick jumps back in to revisit slide eight of the presentation "FY 14-15 Adult Outcomes" and clarify those numbers. He explains that this program will serve people anywhere from one to three years in total with an average of about one-and-a-half years. In terms of the total number of adults in the program, they don't all end in the same year. The total capacity of the entire program in FY 14-15 was 725 adults, but of the adults who complete the program there is only a subset of adults that complete the program in a given year, this is why the number of adults exiting the program with employment, 288, seems low. Until you compare it to the number of individuals in total who exited the program in that year, 406. Of those 406, 71% or 288 exited the program with employment. As the program expands into healthcare the total number of people served will grow much larger, but there won't be employment results on those adults until a couple years out.

Dan points out that regardless of the number of people who exited, their average wage was only \$13.03 per hour. He reiterates Nate's point that many of the trades pay a lot more than that. While this may be a first job for some of the participants, he hopes that there is follow-up with these adults to help them upgrade their skills and increase their wages. In order for

an adult to be sustainable in this City the wage needs to be \$20 and up per hour. Moving the wage up substantially should be a goal of the program.

Patrick thinks some of the dynamics of these numbers is that a lot of this is focused on very low income adults. [Constructing Hope](#) is a good example of a pre-apprenticeship training program. At the point of program exit they are starting their journey into an apprenticeship so the wage is not what it will ultimately be after some time and experience. This is also a good choice for people who have criminal records.

Maxine asks if in future reports they can split the minority populations up by race/ethnicity. The greatest disparities whether in health, housing, employment etc., are in African American communities. She doesn't see an outreach, association, or affiliation with groups that can help address that like the Urban League or any similar program. She asks for improvement there.

Patrick adds that the enrollment in EOI on the youth side is about 23% African American and about 25% on the adult side of the program.

Nate adds that if you cannot identify and work with minority owned contractors in your outreach, people who look similar to the folks you are trying to engage, whether adult or youth, there will always be instability and lower level of impact on minority groups. He knows that minority owned businesses hire minorities at a much higher rate than non-minority businesses, period. If we don't show kids people that look like them in the fields they are interested in, then there will always be a struggle with these numbers. He stresses that they should be involved in talking with Urban League and organizations like NAMC if they hope to address disparity. He would like continued enhancement of the program because there are a lot of dollars at play that are not being fully utilized at present.

Betty adds, as the Director of Policy and Equity at Home Forward, she feels strongly that the older youth that are in Home Forward housing programs not be the next generation of renters. The only way to break the cycle of poverty is to get them into living wage jobs - a greater push towards the trades for these youth will help create an attainable path to living wage jobs and wealth building through home ownership.

Kate would be happy to have follow up conversations on these issues with the PHAC.

Dan adds it is encouraging to see the high percentages of 0-30% MFI households being served by the EOI.

	<p>Sarah looks forward to data a few years out showing how many graduates have stayed employed and increased their wages.</p> <p>Sarah thanks the guests for coming and presenting and moves the meeting forward to inclusionary housing.</p> <p>ADMIN NOTE: For more information on the EOI Workforce Development Initiative see their website at http://www.pdc.us/for-residents/eoi.aspx</p>	
<p>PHB Program Performance</p>	<p>This agenda item was canceled due to time constraints and will be rescheduled for another meeting.</p>	
<p>Inclusionary Housing Programs (Meeting 2 of 4)</p>	<p>Matthew presents the Multifamily Inclusionary Housing Program presentation along with some handouts; Comprehensive Inclusionary Housing Program Development Concept Draft (this information will be completed on the draft as the study is completed) and the Comprehensive Inclusionary Housing Program Development Framework Draft.</p> <p>After the presentation Matthew opens the floor to questions.</p> <p>Maxine asks if the housing being constructed under inclusionary zoning will be noticeably different from other new construction.</p> <p>Matthew says no, it will probably be very similar to housing constructed under the MULTE program. The affordable units will probably look the same or similar to market rate units in the building. They are specifically looking to avoid the “poor door” catastrophe that happened in New York.</p> <p>Nate comments that he remembers a developer talking to the PHAC at one point about the differences in construction materials in market rate units versus affordable units. He asks if there will be specifications around the minimum building standards for affordable units e.g. around sustainability, energy efficiency etc.</p> <p>Matthew explains that while those decisions have yet to be made, he can’t imagine PHB supporting any significant materials differential between market rate and affordable units.</p> <p>Dan asks if the driver for the economic incentive needed will be predicated on assumptions about the cost of construction, operation, and rent movements. And if so, he wonders if we are relying on the panel of experts to tell us what those numbers are.</p>	

	<p>Matthew explains that no, the consultants as independent technical experts will develop the prototypes and the financial assumptions for the model. They will share those with the panel of experts, who will weigh in with their own perspectives. Ultimately it will be the independent consultants who will make the final decision on the financial assumptions in the model itself. There will also be some internal modeling done based on in-house expertise and information for comparison.</p> <p>Dan thinks the byproduct of this work might be to alleviate the argument that affordable housing costs more to develop than market rate housing. A good economic analysis could at least eliminate this argument from the discussion.</p> <p>Tom asks if it's fair to ask for ongoing updates on this issue at the monthly PHAC. Matthew responds that there will be monthly PHAC updates throughout the process.</p> <p>Betty asks if there is anything new around the construction excise tax. Matthew believes Commissioner Saltzman intends to submit a proposal for a construction excise tax in the near future.</p> <p>Dan wants to acknowledge Dike and Sarah for the inordinate number of hours they are spending on priority items tangentially related to the PHAC i.e. lifting the ban on inclusionary zoning, as well as sitting on the panel of experts etc.</p> <p>Sarah wraps up the discussion by saying that Commissioner Saltzman has put together a great panel encompassing a variety of interests. She encourages the PHAC members to ask questions of her and Dike. They plan to download what they learn to the PHAC as time goes on.</p> <p>She asks if there is anyone else who would like to make public comment as there are a few minutes left.</p>	
<p>Public Comment - 2</p>	<p>Joe Walsh represents Individuals for Justice. He doesn't understand why there are no homeless people on the PHAC. He wants to know why. R2D2 has a number of advocates who could sit on the commission. He is angry about the 10-year plan to end homelessness having failed. There are still 3,000 people on the streets. He says the governor came here and was stunned. He objects to food being served at this meeting. He is mad about the fact that the same non-profits keep getting the funding. He says Salt Lake City got all their homeless off the streets by giving them apartments and then focusing on services. He takes a shower every morning like everyone else but a homeless person doesn't have that option. He wants everyone on the PHAC to look in the mirror tomorrow and tell themselves that they aren't doing their best job. He thinks</p>	

	<p>homelessness should be dealt with by people who are homeless as they are the experts on homelessness.</p> <p>Jes Larson of the Welcome Home Coalition is curious about the future Inclusionary Zoning (IZ) and Construction Excise Tax (CET) fit into the conversation that was already underway about the possibility of a linkage fee. These are all interrelated in development to inspire affordability, but she hasn't heard the Linkage Fee program mentioned in a while.</p> <p>Matthew responds that one of the components of establishing a linkage fee is the economic and technical feasibility analysis through the Nexus Study which has not been lost. It is a piece we are requesting from the consultant. To some degree there is an acknowledgement that the CET and linkage fee is asking developers to pay twice. There needs to be more discussion of how to calibrate those two items. The scope of work for the Nexus Study has been expanded to include the analysis needed.</p> <p>Matthew mentions a final item – the PHAC charter needs to be updated. Staff will pull the charter and make necessary changes, then bring it back for PHAC feedback at the May meeting.</p> <p>Dike asks if they will get a transmittal of the motion passed today in memo for to the commissioner. Matthew answers that members will receive communication on that soon.</p> <p>Matthew also announces that Wayne Miya has retired from his position at Our House and from the PHAC. A recruitment for new members will be opening soon.</p> <p>Sarah ends this portion of the meeting and invites members to stay for the Consolidated Plan Hearing commencing after a short dinner break.</p>	
Dinner Break	Dinner break from 5:30 – 6:00 p.m. – meeting resumes with the Consolidated Plan Hearing.	
Consolidated Plan Hearing	<p>Sarah brings the meeting back to order with several members of the PHAC staying as well as Federal Funding Oversight Committee (FFOC) members in attendance.</p> <p>Prior to the presentation Kim McCarty gives background on the Consolidated Plan Hearing.</p> <p>Every five years HUD requires updates to the City's five-year consolidated plan. There were a number of public hearings last fall to garner public opinion and comment on the plan. The community was asked what they believe are the City's housing and economic development needs. This meeting is convening to share with the public the planned actions and general goals for the next five years, as well as specific actions for the upcoming FY 16-17 annual plan.</p>	

Kim begins the [Consolidated Plan Hearing Presentation](#) – there is also a handout called [Consolidated Plan Consortium Summary 2016-2020](#) made available to everyone present.

City and County approvals of Consolidates Plan and One Year Action plans should be complete by June 15th to submit final Consolidated Plan to HUD by June 30, 2016.

The purpose of this meeting is to garner additional public comment and opinions to make changes as necessary to the plan before submitting for City and County approvals.

Kim introduces members of the consortium from City of Portland, City of Gresham, and Multnomah.

Laurie Wells; Representing City of Gresham
Katrina Holland; Representing Multnomah County
Maxine Fitzpatrick: Representing City of Portland
Betty Dominguez: Representing City of Portland

PHAC Members attending are Dan Steffey, Sarah Zahn, and Amy Anderson as well as Betty Dominguez and Maxine Fitzpatrick.

Betty Dominguez explains the FFOC – it is an interjurisdictional committee made up of public figures selected by the participating jurisdictions which are the City of Portland, City of Gresham, and Multnomah County. In making those appointments jurisdictions are encouraged to take into account the income, racial/ethnic and cultural diversity of their respective jurisdictions. FFOC members are expected to provide a balanced citizen-based perspective on the matters delegated to it by the jurisdictions. One of the roles of the FFOC is to hold public hearings as required by the consolidated plan, recommend the allocation of federal housing and community development formula funds to the jurisdictions in the consortium, and recommend the allocation of federal funds to address homelessness pursuant to the continuum of care work with jurisdictions in the consortium. The consolidated plan does have a citizen participation plan element to provide opportunity for citizen comment, which is why everyone is here this evening.

The process of public comment is to invite speakers to the table where they are given three minutes to make their comments/observations. There are also comment cards available for those who would like to make a comment in writing rather than speaking at the meeting. Additionally, there is a fair housing survey available – the data is being collected to identify barriers to housing choice and will be used to develop a report that outlines strategies to mitigate identified barriers. The survey can be accessed on-line [here](#) or a PDF printable version of the survey can be found

[here](#). At the end of the submittal period there will be a random drawing where it's possible to win a \$100 gift card to the grocery store of your choice. Five winners will be chosen. Surveys should be completed online or returned to Portland Housing Bureau by April 30, 2016.

Betty opens the comment period by reminding those in attendance the purpose of the meeting is to hear comments and concerns but not to answer questions. Comments made are:

- The Portland Action Plan draft budget says there is a little more than \$8.5M for "New Affordable Housing" but it isn't specific about what that means. She would like more specific information.
- Commenter works with individuals who have significant persistent mental illness (SPMI). She finds it challenging that her clients, especially aging clients are being terminated from their housing programs. When looking for additional resources, because the clients are not physically disabled they are being turned away and often end up on the streets without much assistance or any at all. She wants to know where to get housing resources for this population. Per disability and aging services they are not considered disabled and do not qualify for personal care attendants, skilled nursing facilities, adult foster care etc. but these people are disabled.
- Commenter says that people who are disabled being excluded from housing programs as well as rents for everyone being increased. Reentry populations are very challenged finding housing. He is begging to look at the 10 year plan to end homelessness and ask why it didn't work. He wants some out of the box thinking. He wants to know why these problems still exist. Doing the same thing over and over creates the same outcomes and nothing is getting done.
- In the Portland Action Plan for the City of Gresham, commenter doesn't see any new affordable housing funds.
- Commenter wonders about accessibility and affordability for populations with high barriers (like criminal records, low incomes, bad credit) to housing. Regarding screening fees, she thinks there should be a fund of dollars set aside to help with those. Also, there needs to be additional low barrier affordable housing resources for people without incomes or with extremely low incomes.
- Commenter thinks there should be a federal screening tool online where anyone can access that and the people needing the information can get it there to avoid costs to the individual. He thinks mental health is one of the biggest issues that brings people to homelessness and that early childhood development and education interventions are part of the solution.
- A commenter mentions she is houseless and that in regards to goal number two of the plan, she feels like they are working within the structure of PHB but it seems important to figure out a way to work with all the other bureaus. She says that one of the biggest problems houseless people have is being criminalized. Interrupted sleep makes people crazy – sleep is a

human right. She knows HUD requires that there not be laws against people who are houseless and thinks there are many homeless people who are not criminals or addicts. There should be resources being used to de-stigmatize people living without a house. It's not fair to ticket people living in their cars. She thinks the city can lead the people in starting a conversation with houseless individuals. She thinks the city should offer a toolkit with ways that citizens can organize. None of this is in the plan and it's a big oversight. As far as disability and aging, everyone will age, the question is what treatment we will get when we get there.

- Commenter thinks when it comes to funding services, there should be an equity lens. For immigrants, refugees and non-English speakers they can't access services because of language barriers. There aren't enough resources for tenant education – the price is low and the payoff is large. There aren't enough legal services available to people in regards to tenants' rights, so they can fight illegal practices. He would like to see more funding for these things.
- Commenter thinks property management and landlord education is important. She has a ton of reasonable accommodation requests refused by landlords and property managers. They only get dealt with when she takes elevates them to the Fair Housing Council.
- Commenter looks at the adopted budget, and looking ahead to FY 17-18, the funding drops so much due to the lack of TIF. She is concerned about that and hopes that we are looking at a way to fill that gap.
- Commenter worked with Erik Sten on the housing commission. He thinks a lot more can be done especially when looking at hotels and apartments out there that could be purchased by the City or County and turned into housing. He thinks we need to look at alternative ways of building affordable housing more cheaply as well. He also thinks more SRO's should be available where a bathroom and kitchen would be shared, but each person has their own room. He is surprised that in Seattle they have done so many great things and thinks Portland should do those things too. He thinks developers doing a good job and inexpensively should be interviewed for ideas. He also supports workforce housing.
- Commenter is a mental health counselor and works with houseless people. Many houseless want housing but it's not available. Permanent supportive housing is needed as opposed to temporary shelter. She wants to advocate for more housing being created. On goal two, housing population appropriate program delivery, she would like that further defined.
- Commenter says that 17,000 people are hanging on that will be on the street at some point that are couch surfing, living in garages etc.
- Commenter has her master's in public policy from OSU researching best practices for serving LGBT people experiencing houselessness. LGBT people are not listed in special populations in the community needs assessment. The data is not collected on the form so you can't say how many of this population is in attendance. She knows that's being worked on. She knows that 40% of homeless youth are LGBT. And they are not represented in this plan. HUD released new guidelines for single shelter, trans people need to be included and have specific services.

Shelters need to be accessible to trans people. She understands the lack of data, but there are various agencies collecting this information locally. She feels strongly that this should be included in the consolidated plan – without this group being included in the data, they will never get funding.

- Commenter is senior and disabled and on Cascadia’s housing board and on the PHAC. She feels all our voices are being heard. A four-county 9 month survey on population needs was just completed. The population increase is enormous and many have entered the community with needs. She feels we need to work better together and that it takes everyone from the community to improve things – the community members need to be more active at the local and state levels. She thanks everyone for making it possible for her to have a new bathroom a few years ago, and she got the help she needed to make it accessible. These programs are helping people, but the percentage of people that can be helped is smaller than the needs that exist. The allocations need to be able to serve more people. It’s important to figure out how to leverage resources and include populations and who is providing services to whom and how successful they are. She asks everyone to complete the survey. She discovered a program called the 1915i plan that gives 20 hours of in-home service to anyone in a mental health roll. They can hire their own helper and the State will pay them at \$14 per hour.
- Commenter mentions that tenants are afraid to ask for modifications and improvements or even basic repairs because it’s prompting no-cause eviction notices.
- Commenter notices on the FY 16-17 Portland Action Plan that the only grant block without administration behind it is the emergency shelter grant.
- Commenter thinks there are more needs than resources available. There has been a lot of talk about communities that need help and services. These plans are brick and mortar heavy. He wonders how people are being served. Balancing the needs for services and housing is important. The bulk of it falls in Portland, but there is need throughout the metro area as well.
- Commenter add that the funding dollars for case managers and workers to do those programs and services are important.
- Commenter is a property manager. He has a different perspective as a housing provider. He thinks we can do better and more cutting edge. Private landlords are people who you know, not large corporations. It’s not always as easy as telling landlords what they should do. People need places to sleep. There is unused land and underutilized housing. As a landlord, when they find out someone is living in a garage, they get evicted for breaking their lease. Mental health is a massive issue - some tenants put in 25 maintenance requests a year, others put in none. A certain segment of the population would be better served in non-privately owned housing. Short term rent assistance can stop evictions and is really important. Some people are evicted for as little as \$300-\$400. People may not realize that landlords have to treat everyone the same and treating everyone the same means that everyone has to live by the same rules. If a landlord treats one tenant differently than

	<p>another, they open themselves up to a fair housing claim if they make special accommodations for someone.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Commenter says it would be nice to see how input from the public meetings in the fall specifically impacted the decisions made in the con plan we are seeing today. <p>Betty thanks everyone for their participation.</p> <p>Kim encourages everyone to go on the website and view the consolidated plan. There is more detail on the needs assessment, market analysis, and other documents. There will be more information added as it becomes available.</p>	
<p>Good of the Order</p>	<p>No announcements or items.</p> <p>The next PHAC meeting will be held on Tuesday May 3rd, 2016.</p>	