



PORTLAND HOUSING BUREAU

Portland Housing Advisory Commission
Tuesday, August 2, 2016
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

August Meeting Minutes - FINAL

Members Present: Amy Anderson, Betty Dominguez, Elisa Harrigan, Maxine Fitzpatrick, Nate McCoy, Tom Brenneke

Members Excused: Daniel Steffey, Sarah Zahn, Stephen Green, Cobi Lewis

Staff Present: Matthew Tschabold, Cheyenne Sheehan

Guests Present: Jennifer Chang, Javier Mena

As always, find all PHAC meeting materials archived at PHAC's website at <http://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/phac> and click "Meeting Archives" in the gray block on the left side of the page.

| Agenda Item | Discussion Highlights | Outcomes / Next Steps |
|--|--|-----------------------|
| Call to Order, Roll Call, Minutes | <p>Sarah could not attend this meeting, Elisa is sitting in as PHAC Chair.</p> <p>Elisa calls the meeting to order and explains that the public has an opportunity to to ask questions or testify at the beginning of the meeting by completing a testimony card. She asks that the public not yell questions from the audience. There isn't public process or participation within the PHAC meeting. The public is invited to observe or testify, but not participate in the meeting as a whole. The public is invited to submit questions or concerns by email to matthew.tschabold@portlandoregon.gov , write their question or comment on a comment card, or speak with a Commissioner or staff member after the meeting.</p> <p>Elisa opens the floor for public testimony.</p> | |
| Public Testimony | <p>Pam Long, a Portland resident, testifies that she has a friend who is a Vietnam vet and a convicted felon. He makes good money each month, and has been living in a motel because it's hard to find a place to rent when you have a felony conviction. Since living the motel his health has suffered and he isn't doing well. He needs to get in to housing so he can have stability and security. She feels for him. She lives in a complex where many people have physical and mental disabilities and it can be</p> | |

challenging to have people with mental disabilities living altogether in the same complex. According to the ADA, if where you live causes your disability to get worse, something has to be done about it. She is emotional because she sees that where a person lives can cause more problems. When she moved into the place she lives now, she could walk. She has lived there eleven years and now she has to use a mobility device and can barely walk because of the where she lives. She's been trying hard to deal with all the problems. The residents have to sign a contract to live there, but the managers don't have to sign a contract saying what they are responsible for. If things are stolen they don't care. The residents are scared. Many people have been locked in elevators for multiple, she was hurt in one. Cars get stolen that are parked right out front. She thinks the management is to blame and they don't care for the people with disabilities who live there.

Elisa asks Pam if she can clarify why she is testifying today. She asks if Pam is asking the Commission for resources and support, or if she just wants to share her experience.

Amy thinks she's looking for all of the above. They need more support and someone to help navigate the management of the building and figure out if there is mistreatment of the tenants and what to do about it. This complex is owned by Northwest Housing Alternatives in Gresham and Amy isn't sure what to do to help Pam.

Elisa suggests Pam speak with Matthew after the meeting to find out which PHB staff might be helpful to her. She also suggests that Pam call 211 Info for additional resources. She appreciates Pam sharing her story and concern for adults re-entering the community post-prison as well as individuals with disabilities.

Austin Rose, of Portland Tenants United, testifies on behalf of residents of the Springwater Trail. He has been working with them for the past several weeks ahead of Mayor Hales' planned sweeps of the area. He has spoken with many of the people there experiencing houselessness and he is at the meeting today to listen and hear about the work being done around the Terminal 1 Project. He is here to relay things that people experiencing houselessness on the Springwater trail have told him regarding their feelings on the Terminal 1 proposal. People are worried about this project. No one he spoke with is interested in being a resident at Terminal 1. They are concerned that the project is too large. Many people are afraid to go to shelters if the numbers served are even 100. They don't feel safe. The proposed numbers for Terminal 1 are worrisome to some people. And they are refusing to go. The term 'Prison' has been thrown around out there. He wants the PHAC to be aware of this and think about this and how that money could be used for more successful options for people living on the street. He thinks throwing all eggs in this basket doesn't seem like a solution to their problem. He thinks it's possible to think about ways to bridge all the problems with long-term solutions rather than stop-gap measures. He thinks members of the houseless community should be brought in to help shape these programs through collaboration.

July Meeting Follow-up

Elisa moves the meeting on to July meeting follow up. Cheyenne asks if the Commission can approve the June/July meeting minutes first as there was no quorum at the last meeting.

Betty moves to approve the June minutes. It is seconded and approved unanimously by the members.

Amy moves to approve the July minutes. It is seconded and minutes are approved unanimously with three abstentions because those members did not attend the July meeting.

Matthew addresses follow up items from the July meeting. One of those items was to get more information on Minority, Women, and Emerging Small Business (MWESB) contracting and sub-contracting work in PHB program areas, specifically rental development and home ownership. Matthew provides again the [most recent report](#) that was sent to the members on MWESB contracting. This report is more specifically for the rental development program from 2008 – 2015 and does not include the home ownership program, home repair, or lead program. Andrea Matthiessen is in the process of pulling data on those programs. He doesn't want to go into detail on this report, but if the PHAC has a desire to do a deeper level of analysis or a comparative analysis, that is something that can be requested from the data team.

The PHAC had previously asked about data on soft costs, today's document is focused on hard costs. One of the staff of the rental development team under Karl Dinkelspiel is working on a PHB policy with respect to soft costs. When that policy has been written PHB will be asking PHAC for feedback.

Dan asked a question at the last meeting about costs for operations and whether PHB collects data on property managers involved in PHB's portfolio of regulated units and their MWESB status or efforts. That is not data that PHB currently collects, but it is possible that it could be collected in the future. It will take some time and some staff capacity to get there.

Nate thinks PHB should look not just at the Property Management company itself but at who they contract with to do their in-house projects. He thinks just making sure the Property Manager has an equity plan of some kind would be positive, and then tracking whether they subcontract with MWESB companies.

Betty clarifies that the purpose of collecting that data would be to encourage their MWESB participation. There is no way PHB can really dictate who they work with or how they run their business.

| | | |
|--|--|--|
| | <p>Elisa asks Matthew about the subcommittee that PHAC formed to look at the MWESB issues and the status on that.</p> <p>Matthew answers that the subcommittee has not yet been called to a meeting because the rental development staff and the data team are still pulling the data.</p> <p>Elisa feels wants to know not just that data is being gathered, but to what end. That would be a task for the subcommittee. She would like to have an approximate date range for the first meeting because she wants to be sure that it isn't just getting pushed out further and further.</p> <p>Betty considers Property Management to be a professional service, similar to tax credit attorneys or tax credit accountants; property managers in affordable housing are specialists because there are so many compliance issues. She wants to make sure that once PHB collect the data, which would be a lot of work, that there is a plan for what to do with it.</p> <p>The discussion continues about the reasoning from several perspectives for collecting MWESB data. The general consensus is a greater understanding of the equity issues in the community, PHB, and the City at large.</p> <p>Amy adds that the point is to use an equity lens to make programs more balanced and equitable from beginning to end.</p> <p>Maxine thinks the information being provided in the report today is good information but she would like to know how the information provided stacks up against PHB's equity goals.</p> <p>Javier Mena explains that if you look at the reports from 2010 to 2015 you will see a progression of MWESB utilization. Over the past two years PHB has been actively involved at the early phases of contracting, to positively impact utilization. There have been cases where PHB has gotten involved with developers who didn't seem like they would meet the 20% MWESB goals and influenced them to change their thinking on certain line items to enable MWESB contractors to bid on those. There has been an increase over the last several years especially in minority contracting. He believes that there is more work to do but that the work being done by PHB and partners has been moving in a positive direction. Javier adds that while there are some projects on the report who did not meet the 20% goal, PHB learned from those situations and continues to work with partners to reach those goals. The new goal is 35% participation.</p> <p>Maxine comments that it would be helpful to have the goal information included in the report so it is easy to see what the goals are and if they are being met.</p> | <p>Elisa would like an approximate date for the MWESB subcommittee meeting to be shared with the PHAC.</p> |
|--|--|--|

| | | |
|--------------------------|--|---|
| | <p>Betty reiterates that she is very supportive of the MWESB goals around construction and hard costs, but she is less enthusiastic about professional services and soft costs because PHAC and PHB cannot mandate changes to those costs since they aren't receiving public funding. A developer can ask the property manager to produce and equity plan, but PHB cannot. PHB can ask, but can't mandate.</p> <p>Tom thinks that just by asking it could positively influence awareness.</p> <p>Javier adds that PHB started looking at professional services over the past few years and there has been a change in the approach by PHB's partners. Many do think about MWESB when engaging professional services, like architects. While PHB isn't engaged with the architect, PHB is engaged with the sponsor who has awareness of the Bureau's equity goals and they tend to address the goals in their planning.</p> <p>Matt will work with the subcommittee which is comprised of Andrea Matthiessen (Homeownership Program) and Karl Dinkelspiel (Rental Development Team) and several PHAC members to gather and review the data and come back to PHAC with a recommendation. He doesn't know if the committee will be able to meet ahead of the next PHAC meeting, but he commits to finalizing the data with the program managers and setting a meeting with the subcommittee in late August to early September.</p> <p>Elisa wraps up by saying the subcommittee will continue to work on this. She thanks the staff for putting the information together and asks if the report can be emailed out with a paragraph of Javier's comments regarding PHB's goal attainment to members that are not present today.</p> | <p>Matthew commits to finalizing data with PHB staff and setting a meeting with the subcommittee before the next PHAC meeting.</p> <p>Elisa would like the report emailed to the members not present, with a paragraph from Javier on how the data stacks up against PHB's MWESB goals.</p> |
| <p>Terminal 1</p> | <p>Jennifer Chang speaks on the work being done in preparation for Terminal 1. Terminal 1 is based on Haven for Hope in San Antonio, Texas. You can find information on Haven of Hope on their website at http://www.havenforhope.org/new/about_facts campus.aspx .</p> <p>Jennifer appreciates the public testimony made at the beginning of the meeting around Terminal 1. She hopes to address some of those concerns today.</p> <p>PHB is taking two actions related to the use of Terminal 1, a City-owned site, in response to the city's State of Housing Emergency and in support of our community-wide efforts to find solutions to end homelessness for those experiencing it. These actions will be presented at next week's August 10th Council meeting.</p> | |

Terminal 1 is located at 2400 NW Front Avenue, Portland OR 97209 and is a large paved lot with a 96,000 sq. foot warehouse located on Front Avenue connecting to Naito Parkway in downtown Portland on the Willamette River. The site is 14.48 acres land, and zoned industrial.

PHB proposes entering in an Interagency Agreement with Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) for lease of the 96,000 sf. warehouse on Terminal 1 site, for potential provision of emergency shelter for up to 400 individuals for Winter 2016. Discussions are ongoing regarding this proposed plan in partnership with [Oregon Trail of Hope](#), led by housing developer [Homer Williams](#). Planning is currently underway to determine feasibility of the site for mass shelter and will be coordinated by staff from the City and the Joint Office of Homeless Services.

PHB is submitting a grant proposal in mid-August to Metro's "Equitable Housing Planning & Development Grants", to fund predevelopment work and comprehensive analysis on the Terminal 1 site for feasibility of programming that includes longer-term services and housing of the broader Oregon Trail of Hope (OTOH) program concept. The idea is that the project would align both locally and nationally known best practices for serving households experiencing homelessness. The funding would be used to hire a consulting team to work in close coordination with the non-profit partner, jurisdictional, and community stakeholders to identify issues related to the site. Items being addresses will include:

- Oregon Trail of Hope is led by housing developer Homer Williams (Williams & Dame Development), who established a nonprofit entity by the same name. The program concept is a multi-service center or "service campus" offering an array of support services, emergency shelter and housing options for people experiencing homelessness, with focus on chronically homeless people. The model is based on San Antonio's "Haven of Hope" program.
- PHB proposes to hire a consultant (or consultant team) to perform a comprehensive feasibility analysis to include:
 - Program vision for site, in coordination with City, County, OTOH and community stakeholders, including people with lived experience of homelessness
 - List of critical and alternative uses
 - Development and operating pro forma
 - Site ownership and organizational model with risk/benefit analysis
 - Implementation plan, including financial feasibility and sustainability
 - Master plan for site, including phased development and cost estimates
 - The timeline is estimated at 12 months to perform the feasibility analysis.

Elisa wants to make sure that impacted community members e.g. the houseless community will be involved in evaluating the services provided, the RFP's etc.

Jennifer says yes, they will be included in the process.

The City supports these actions because:

- The City continues to be in a state of crisis for housing affordability, with more than 1,800 individuals living unsheltered in our community on any given night. Of these, 57% report having one or more disabling condition(s) and almost half (48%) have experienced chronic homelessness.
- Evidenced by local needs, including our 2015 Point in Time Count, City-declared State of Housing Emergency, and work of our community collaboration, A Home for Everyone, there is a great need to increase housing and service resources for people experiencing homelessness.
- People living with a disability and who have been homeless for a long time (chronically homeless) are particularly at risk for harm and victimization due to being unsheltered.
- The OTOH concept proposes garnering robust outreach with private partners to bring in new funding from the housing developer, business and faith communities.
- The City is committed to exploring this opportunity for the potential private/public partnership it may bring to further our end homelessness efforts, both in the short-term (providing expanded shelter capacity) and potentially for longer-term housing opportunities for people exiting homelessness.

Many significant questions and issues need to be addressed regarding this opportunity, which is the primary purpose of the request for funding to conduct the feasibility analysis.

The assessment will provide valuable information, including:

- feasibility of site for intended use
- program concept and model and its responsiveness to local identified needs, including alignment to local and national best practices for service delivery and housing
- proposed plans, opportunities and challenges of short-term and potential longer-term uses of the site
- financial feasibility and sustainability
- impact of program operations on community/neighborhoods

PHB will coordinate the work with existing efforts in our community, including A Home for Everyone and the Joint Office of Homeless Services, the City's state of emergency efforts, and will look to strategically align opportunities to existing and upcoming resources like the Unity Center.

Amy explains her connection to the Terminal 1 project. She was invited to be on the board of Oregon Trail to Hope (OTH) because in her over 20 years as a volunteer she has a good understanding of the needs of this community. The board would like people with the most knowledge and understanding of the houseless community to be part of this project. They are meeting with advocates and community members connected from all over the City and the Springwater Corridor. They have connected with [Boots on the Ground](#) and [Right2DreamToo](#) to help them navigate the complexities. [Ibrahim Mubarak](#) has said that he would be willing to run the project. The goal is not to alienate people or create a jailhouse environment. It's to take a building and allow people to sleep inside, out of the weather, and include services, a community center, activities, and programs that promote health, wellbeing, and safety. Information will be gathered from all over the community and creating a peer-delivered service model to deliver services to impacted people. No one wants the four-wall warehousing model of concentrated living. There is no other site in Portland that has over 12 acres of land that is central and suitable for people to live on. It's important that this project is successful and that people are excited about this project reflecting their needs and values. They are developing a community model that promotes growth, health, and happiness.

Nate is concerned based on the previous public comment made today by Austin Rose that the bigger vision that Amy just expressed is not getting out to the houseless community. He wonders what the marketing situation is right now.

Amy responds that the problem is when it's so early in the process people see the site on Facebook and immediately react negatively thinking this is going to be warehousing the homeless, before they've even heard the vision for the project. They are just automatically negative without having heard about the plans. In order to get this off the ground by December, the board is working to try to hear as many voices as possible while also communicating that this isn't going to be a warehousing/jail type of project. So many houseless people are not well physically, and they need to be housed someplace safe and healthy. The messaging should be much clearer in the next month or so. The point is all moot though if the land is not able to be secured first.

Betty adds that the program this is based on [Haven for Hope](#) in San Antonio has been very successful and has had incredible outcomes. If OTH can find a way to publicize that information & dispel misconceptions about what this program is, that would be helpful.

Jennifer explains that OTH has reached out to faith based organizations, community partners, the business community and jurisdictional groups like A Home for Everyone (AHFE) and the Joint Office to End Homelessness. They will be at the AHFE Coordinating Board meeting tomorrow to discuss their proposal.

| | | |
|--|---|--|
| <p>Public Questions/Comments about Terminal 1</p> | <p>Javier adds that this proposal fully engages the private sector. It is almost fully a private sector funded project. The City's budget has already been allocated and this proposal does not include any City outlay of funds other than facilitating the process by making the site available and the \$100K grant for the feasibility analysis. Beyond that OTH in partnership with the Joint Office and the Community will determine how they will bring this project to fruition. Commissioner Saltzman has been very vocal in his support of this effort, but OTH is expected to raise their own capital for the structure and operating funds. PHB will cover the lease for the land and that will be it. The program is currently structured to be no more than 18 months. Part of this is because of the industrial zoning. They are getting around zoning issues temporarily because of the Housing State of Emergency.</p> <p>There is concern from Elisa about the short term nature of the program. Moving people all the time can be traumatic for them. She would love to see a longer term solution. 18 months seems like a good pilot, but not enough.</p> <p>Amy states that Medicaid is offering assistance with housing dollars. The State is looking for pilot projects that would help people develop ideas around housing help. She just wanted people to know and offers her help navigating the process.</p> <p>Elisa open up the floor for quick questions/comments from the audience.</p> <p>Catherine Stevens says this is a larger scale effort for the houseless population in that it serves around 400 people. Houseless women are very concerned about their safety in shelters that also house men. 90% of women who live outdoors are sexually assaulted or experience domestic violence. What is the plan for making this a safe space for women?</p> <p>Jennifer answers this will require a lot of partnership with domestic violence survivors. The goal is to make the space responsive and trauma informed in terms of how people access the services. Since this is still so early in the process with the program concept feasibility of the site to be used for shelter still under discussion, the programming and details around services are not fully formed at this time. It will be very important to include appropriate agencies in the shelter configuration, design, and services as the program moves forward for the safety of all residents of the program.</p> <p>Pam Long wonders if it could be like a boot camp thing. With showers and toilets and an area for tents and then residents can go into the community and start giving back to the community.</p> | |
|--|---|--|

| | | |
|----------------------------------|--|--|
| | <p>Susan Madeira asks if someone can address that while the discussion is currently on private sector funds, if it becomes about public sector funds then it will create a sense of competition amongst programs. This is an expensive project and if there are public funds going to it, that means they have to come from some other existing housing program or service.</p> <p>Javier answers that as currently proposed, private funds will operate the site. No public funds will be invested other than for the lease payment to the Bureau of Environmental Services (BES) who owns the land currently.</p> <p>If people have additional concerns or comments, they can attend the AHFE Coordinating Board Meeting tomorrow at 3:00 PM or attend the City Council meeting on Wednesday August 10th. You can also contact Jennifer Chang directly at jennifer.chang@portlandoregon.gov.</p> | |
| <p>Fast Start Program</p> | <p>Javier presents the Fast Starts program and provides a memo explaining the program from Director Kurt Creager.</p> <p>Javier gives the following background; the way PHB has generally made resources available for development has been mainly through the Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) process. PHB announces the funds/sites available and the criteria and targets expected and asks for proposals. Proposers submit their proposals and those who know and are comfortable with the process generally score well and others, like new proposers or smaller proposers who have less resources and/or experience dealing with the intricacies of City funding and expectations, usually don't score well. It generally takes \$5K -10K to submit a proposal and the proposer doesn't know if they will be chosen for a particular project. This tends to mean that the same partners get the funds every year. While PHB is generally comfortable with this and the NOFA will continue to be the Bureau's main funding process, the Fast Start program is being designed as an alternative way to provide funding outside of the NOFA process.</p> <p>The Fast Start program will be open to any developer who has at least \$1M in unrestricted funds available, at least 10 years of development experience, and are willing to agree to PHB's equity goals and policies. Developers who wish to participate will send PHB a statement of qualifications, PHB reviews and approves as appropriate in order to build a list of developers who can be counted on to develop sites as they come available outside of the NOFA process.</p> <p>The announcement of this program was released last week and PHB is expecting letters of interest from developers by the deadline of September 1st. Once those are received the Bureau will be condensing qualified developers into a list using a yet to be determined review process which won't be determined until they know how many applications have been received. Once the list is complete a process will be created to determine how a developer from the list would be selected for a project.</p> | |

Betty asks if the list include out of state developers or local developers. Javier answer that both will be included.

Tom asks how the selection process will work.

Javier answer that is yet to be determined once a list of interested developers is complete. If there are only a few, selections could be rotated. If there are a lot, then they will have to come up with a different process. This is a five-year pilot program and they want to be sure that the developers are able to get financing and hit the ground running on short notice. Developers could be building a turn-key project and once it's built PHB will buy it from them, any number of different options. How the proposed developer will be selected is still being discussed and cannot be determined until the list is complete.

Betty asks if letters of interest from out of state developers are accepted and the Bureau has no experience dealing with them how they will be vetted. Also, in the materials presented it says there is an attachment A but there doesn't seem to be an attachment A.

Javier responds that fact finding will be done before anyone will be added to the list. The point is to make sure that developers who get on the list can deliver a project. Within the NOFA process from the beginning through selection, to groundbreaking is about two years. The hope with the Fast Start program is that once a developer is selected groundbreaking will happen within three months or so. Attachment A, which was not provided, is a copy of PHB's reservation letter; it basically says that the developer agrees to certain requirements (equity, MWESB contracting etc.) in order to receive funding from the City.

Elisa thinks assets of \$1M seems like a lot, and asks why they are so high.

Javier answer that PHB often provides predevelopment funds which takes time. They want to be sure a developer on the list can begin a project without asking for predevelopment funds. They have to be able to capitalize pre-dev costs on their own.

Nate asks if this an already vetted program and if there even a conversation to be had with the PHAC. If not, he asks why was this not brought to PHAC before the announcement went out. PHAC shouldn't be seeing stuff like this after all the decisions have been made, but should be part of the conversation. The program doesn't appear to speak about the equity goals. He thinks there is a lot of work to be done on this program. It looks like it's really made more for out of state developers than local developers. PHB shouldn't be the only bureau vetting these developers. He wonders if there should there be an oversight committee so the community can be involved. The Bureau has done a

great job in getting to the point where equity finally feels real, but this doesn't appear to add to the equity goals. Smaller developers should be being welcomed as part of this program, but the language is only open to "superior" developers. This seems great for PHB if the purpose is just to do things quickly, but the NOFA process has been working great, and he doesn't understand why that is being done away with.

Javier replies that the NOFA is not being replaced with Fast Start. Fast Start is an additional process that can be used outside of the NOFA. There is an equity portion in the Fast Start program. Javier understands that this looks like a cooked process and to a certain degree, in terms of the "ask" that's true. The exchange that PHB wants to have, not only with the PHAC, but with the development community and others is, once the list is created, how will the developers be selected for projects as they become available. Equity is a required component of the Fast Start as well as the NOFA process regardless of whether the developer is out of state or local. It is true that PHB is not inviting developers to be part of the Fast Start if they are on the fringe of meeting capacity requirements because the goal is to get units built. Smaller developers are not precluded from partnering with larger developers who have the required capacity.

There are several members that comment that the materials presented today don't make it clear that Fast Start and the NOFA will both be being used for development concurrently and they think it should be made clearer within the Fast Start materials, for future reference.

Amy asks if there is any way to take a two-tiered approach on the Fast Start program. For example having a list of higher capacity developers for large projects, and smaller developers for smaller projects.

Javier thinks that's an interesting concept that PHB hasn't considered. Once PHB knows which developers are interested and there is a list, that is something that could be considered. He reiterates that the NOFA will still exist so if a developer cannot participate in the Fast Start they still have the option of being considered for projects through the NOFA.

Elisa asks if PHB has talked to Bill Van Vliet from Network for Oregon Affordable Housing (NOAH) to see if they have a sense of the universe of possible developers who would have that level of reserve available. That \$1M minimum may disqualify some of the culturally specific developers.

Javier explains that while they have had many conversations with Bill and NOAH none have been specifically about the Fast Start program.

Maxine asks what prompted the need for this change and what happened to cause the PHB to feel the need to establish a process like this. It feels a bit authoritarian. She is concerned about PHB's staff

| | | |
|---|--|---|
| | <p>capacity for objectivity in creating the list. It removes community input and involvement in the process and the only authority or decision making comes from PHB staff. Based upon her years of experience working with PDC and now PHB it makes her uncomfortable that three or four staff people with experience in housing but not really out there in the community can make a determination and be culturally sensitive as to whether or not PCRI for example has the capacity to be shortlisted or fast tracked on a project. She doesn't believe so based on her historical experiences with the Bureau. She is very concerned about PHB staff having all this authority without any kind of appeal process.</p> <p>Javier answers that PHB has been talking about an alternative funding mechanism for the last three years. The last few NOFAs had a tremendous number of proposals, some very good ones, who did not receive funding. There are developers, both public and private, who have brought property to PHB outside of the NOFA or projects that were not ready to go at NOFA and PHB and developers missed opportunities because of that. PHB's director has been keen on getting an alternate program rolling which has expedited the process, but this is not new.</p> <p>Maxine responds that the first she heard of it was when she got the memo in the mail. If PHB has been discussing it for years, she wonders why the community wasn't privy to those discussions. These are public resources and there should be some form of public accountability.</p> <p>Javier adds that once PHB has the list of developers who want to participate PHAC and others will be involved in creating the selection process. That discussion still needs to be had.</p> <p>Elisa asks if a task force or work group will be put together that will include at least a few PHAC members after the applications come in to make recommendations and come up with a selection process.</p> <p>Javier says he is sure that PHB can do something like that. The original plan was once the list was created to engage a working group or broader conversation to discuss selection. He sees the timeline for this as somewhere between September and October. Development funding will come from whatever resources are available whether they be off the top of the NOFA funds, TIF, CET etc.</p> <p>Javier appreciates the feedback. He anticipates coming back to PHAC in September when they have a better idea of developer interest to talk again about next steps.</p> <p>Matthew adds that the Fast Start memo was distributed to some of the development community, but has not yet been announced to the public. It will be released to the public soon.</p> | <p>Javier anticipates coming back to PHAC in September to talk about next steps for the Fast Start program.</p> |
| <p>Inclusionary Housing Program Development Update</p> | <p>Matthew gives a short process update. PHB is in the process of getting the financial feasibility analysis back from the consulting team. The financial feasibility analysis consists of 28 different</p> | <p>Matthew will send inclusionary housing</p> |

| | | |
|---------------------------------|---|---|
| | <p>development pro forma scenarios based on different zones and different FAR capacities in order to complete a feasibility test of what an Inclusionary Zoning requirement would have on the market. The different versions of those analyses are coming back but won't be complete or ready to share publicly for a few more weeks. Commissioner Saltzman does intend to offer program recommendations in September. As these analyses come back he wants to make sure the PHAC is informed during the month of August and he will send information as it is developed. The next Inclusionary Housing Panel of Experts meeting is August 23rd. If there are questions about materials, please give him a call.</p> <p>Elisa is concerned that the turnaround time is too tight for the Panel of Experts to give meaningful recommendations to Commissioner Saltzman.</p> <p>Matthew responds that the Commissioner was very clear with the Panel of Experts that he didn't expect them to vote on or agree on a proposal. He intended to receive diverse opinions from the Panel – there will be supplemental info being sent to the Panel of Experts before the meeting so they have time to review. He reminds people that over the course of the last few months the panel has had the opportunity to weigh in at various phases of the analyses. This approach was taken deliberately in order to vet each stage of the analysis in public.</p> <p>As for community involvement, a community forum was just held hosted by the Coalition of Communities of Color and OPAL last Thursday. There will be another forum later in August hosted by the Portland Business Alliance and a third forum in September sponsored by the Oregon Opportunity Network.</p> <p>There are two PHAC members on the Panel of Experts, Dike and Sarah.</p> <p>Tom asks if there will be a conclusion on this by the end of the year and Matthew responds that will be up to Bureau of Planning and Sustainability (BPS) and Council, but he thinks that's the goal. Finishing the Comprehensive Plan is a priority for the Mayor, and Inclusionary Housing has become part of the Comp Plan update because it is a land use action and related to the Central City 2035 plan and the mixed use zones plan.</p> | <p>analyses to the PHAC as they become available.</p> |
| <p>Good of the Order</p> | <p>End of meeting. Next meeting will be September 6th.</p> | |