



PORTLAND HOUSING BUREAU

Portland Housing Advisory Commission
 Tuesday, October 6, 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

October Meeting Minutes - FINAL

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

Members Excused: Jean DeMaster, Stephen Green, Coby Jackson, Wayne Miya, Sarah Zahn

Staff Present: Matthew Tschabold, Cheyenne Sheehan, Mike Johnson

Guests Present: N/A

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
<p>Welcome & Review Meeting Minutes</p> <p>Unscheduled Agenda Item – Program Updates, General Discussion, and MACG’s Letter to PDC</p> <p><i>Correction: At the 11/3/15 PHAC, Betty Dominguez was concerned that the last bullet point was incorrect. After reviewing the meeting recording there was a misstatement that the MULTE program impacts home ownership, but it should have been stated to impact rental housing. This correction was</i></p>	<p>Elisa is acting Chair until Commissioner Saltzman appoints the new Chairperson – she is running late due to traffic.</p> <p>Cheyenne asks several commissioners present, (Dike, Tom, Amy, Elisa) to complete the Conflict of Interest Form for City Board and Commission Appointments.</p> <p>While the Commission awaits Elisa’s arrival to officially begin the meeting, Matthew takes the opportunity to summarize the PHB program updates for October which include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The agenda for the NNE Oversight Committee Agenda for the 10/6/15 meeting • Impacting Homelessness - a summary of PHB’s new contract with the Urban League of Portland offering funding for rapid housing services to 50 households experiencing homelessness or housing instability to be housed by the end of November • Impacting Rental Housing - Kurt Creager’s letter to interested agencies/developers guiding them on the 2015 Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) • Impacting Rental Housing - The new and improved Multi-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program (MULTE) 	

<p><i>made in the highlighted portion.</i></p>	<p>Matthew also gives the commission a summary of new legislation proposed by the City to increase protections for renters by requiring more notice of no-cause eviction (90 days, up from 30 days) and more notice in advance of rent increases, depending on how long the renter has lived in the unit and the percentage increase in rent, requiring a minimum of 60 days, and up to 90 days' notice.</p> <p>The State of Housing Emergency legislation coming out of the Mayor's office includes two pieces of legislation. One establishes the code and authorization for City Council to declare a housing emergency in the City. The second, to declare the actual housing emergency.</p> <p>In addition there are a number of actions the City may take in respect to relaxed zoning/building codes during the state of emergency to provide shelters, for one example.</p> <p>In regards to the finalization on the decision to increase TIF to 50% for affordable housing, there will be a Council work session on Tuesday October 13th. The work session will be similar to the September 1st PHAC meeting, but with more detail for the Council. PDC will go through their plans, obligations, and policy targets for each URA with Council. There will be a more robust discussion between PDC and PHB with the Council and at the end of the session council members may declare their intentions on updating the policy.</p> <p>* Elisa arrives at the meeting*</p> <p>Near the end of October (Matthew will supply the date to PHAC) there will be a hearing at Council and PHB and Commissioner Saltzman will move to update the policy – City Council will decide to vote or delay the vote at that time.</p> <p>Dike redirects the conversation on TIF to address a request from MACG. In Leah Greenwood's letter and analysis of September 1st (found here – scroll to testimony #6), Leah went into great detail regarding the TIF set aside in each URA, including contingency dollars projections through FY 2019-2020, and specific budget recommendations to get to 50% of TIF for affordable housing.</p> <p>*ADMIN NOTE: <i>For these minutes the letter, analysis, and budget recommendations provided by Leah Greenwood to the PHAC on September 1st will be known throughout the rest of this document as the "Greenwood Letter."</i></p> <p>Dike feels that PDC did not adequately respond to the Greenwood Letter's recommendations. He recently met with MACG at their request. They would also like PDC to answer to the specifics of the Greenwood Letter and recommendations.</p>	<p>Matthew will supply the PHAC with the date of the vote to increase TIF set aside.</p>
--	--	--

	<p>MACG presented Dike with a letter to PDC requesting a detailed response addressing each recommendation and URA included in the Greenwood Letter, and asked for Dike's support. Dike would like the PHAC as a whole, to consider supporting MACG's letter request to PDC by making a motion.</p> <p>Cheyenne leaves the meeting to make copies of MACG's letter to PDC and passes them out to members and public attendees for review.</p> <p>Amy asks whether it's possible to do an analysis on the vacancy rates of affordable units in the City.</p> <p>Elisa answers that getting those numbers is challenging and depends on whether or not you are speaking of rent restricted housing or private market housing. There is an analysis done by Multifamily NW and released once or twice a year with general vacancy information, but there is no reporting requirement for private market housing. For rent restricted housing we do know, in general, that there are long waiting lists and those building are generally at capacity.</p> <p>Elisa asks that before the discussion continues the meeting be officially called to order. She asks whether there is a motion to approve the September minutes.</p> <p>Betty requests to have the link to the PDC Strategic Plan from the September minutes, sent to her for her reference, as an active link. There are no other amendments or requests.</p> <p>The motion to approve the minutes is made and seconded and September minutes are approved by the Commission.</p> <p>Elisa returns the discussion to the issue of MACG's letter to PDC to respond to the Greenwood Letter.</p> <p>Dike believes that the Greenwood Letter speaks to the issue of getting inside each URA and gaining a complete understanding of what funds and contingencies are available, as well as PDC's priorities for those areas. He believes that since the City is in a state of housing emergency, it makes sense for the City to prioritize projects based on that reality.</p> <p>Dike would be fine with PHAC either endorsing MACG's request or writing its own letter to PDC and copying the Mayor and Commissioner Saltzman. He thinks when the City reviews the TIF increase to 50% they should have a response from PDC to each issue brought up in the Greenwood letter, in order to help them make a decision.</p>	<p>Cheyenne will send link of PDC Strategic Plan to the members and make the link active in the final PDF version posted on the PHAC website.</p>
--	---	---

	<p>Nate adds that in PHB’s upcoming NOFA there will be \$60 Million, some of which may be spent by PDC in addition to the TIF money they are already spending and it would be nice to have more information on what might be allocated in each URA to make sure the Bureau is able to stretch these dollars as far as they can go.</p> <p>There is discussion among the commission as to whether PHAC should write a letter supporting MACG’s letter or make its own parallel request of PDC.</p> <p>General agreement among the PHAC is to simply support MACG’s letter rather than doing one of its own.</p> <p>Dan Steffey moves that the PHAC make a request to PDC that they respond to Leah Greenwood’s letter of September 1, 2015 as requested by MACGs letter of September 30, 2015 and send it to Patrick Quinton with a copy to the Mayor, Commissioner Saltzman, and City Council. The motion is seconded by Dike and passed unanimously by the members.</p>	<p>Motion made by Dan Steffey – seconded and passed unanimously by the PHAC commissioners present.</p>
<p>Public Testimony:</p>	<p>Elisa calls for public testimony and announces that those present who would like to testify will have three minutes.</p> <p>Pam Long makes the following statement: She is a resident at 333 SW Oak at the Oak Apartments an affordable housing project run by Northwest Housing Alternatives. She has been a resident there for eight years. She has seen a lot of tragedies at this building with people committing and attempting suicide. She has also seen a lot of rent increases, sometimes twice in the same year. She has also seen managers of the building require tenants to pay extra money each month, in addition to their rent, and no one catches them. The tenants are supposed to abide by their lease agreements, but they don’t seem to have to abide by any agreements. Pam says there are many residents there who are afraid to come out of their residences for fear of eviction. She doesn’t think a tenant should ever have to sign something, under duress, late at night after they’ve taken their meds. The people from HUD inspect the building, but they always inspect the same units which are the nicest ones, and are not indicative of the units where the residents are living. The units HUD doesn’t see have holes in the bathtubs, broken call buttons. People felt safe in their homes because at least if they fell, they could push the call button, but now they don’t work. There are no smoke alarms in the bathrooms. Management is always trying to evict people. She has fought very hard to keep her home there. She used to be able to walk, but now she is in a wheelchair because she got hurt in the building’s elevator. She couldn’t sue because she is afraid of getting kicked out and having no place to live. There was a 79 year old man who lived in the building for 31 years and they gave him a 24 hour notice to vacate. He was a sex offender many years ago, but he’s had no problems in the building and they</p>	

Correction: Per Betty Dominguez at the 11/3/15 PHAC meeting, 333 SW Oak is a HUD contract, not a Section 8 project based contract. Home Forward has no oversight, control, or authority over this property. This correction was made in the highlighted portion.

kicked him out. She says they charge the residents money for all kinds of things like pet deposits when you don't even have pets. End of testimony.

Betty adds that 333 SW Oak is a tax credit project owned by NW Housing Alternatives and is a HUD project. Tom wonders why there have been rent increases.

Pam says it's going up and when a resident gets recertified they are going after people who have already been through recertification and saying that they owe more money. She feels they have no rights there.

Elisa adds that there will be some legislation proposed by the Mayor and Commissioner Saltzman tomorrow around renter protection. It won't address every concern that renters have, but it is a big step. She encourages Pam to reach out to Legal Aid Services of Oregon (LASO) as well as the Community Alliance of Tenants (CAT) if she needs some support. Elisa would be willing to spend some time after the meeting speaking with Pam on other options if she would like.

Dan asks the group if there is a resource person they know of who can answer requests of residents if they feel like they aren't being fairly treated.

Betty answers that for Section 8 issues residents can make complaints to the Housing Authority (Home Forward) but they don't oversee the management and operation of properties.

The Oregon Housing Community Services (OHCS) is suggested by Tom as an organization who has a good system in place that could be helpful.

Amy asks if a building has an issue where multiple tenants are experiencing grievances, would it be better if they all band together and write a letter to someone or should each person make inquiries about their own individual situation.

Elisa suggests that CAT would have a very concrete answer to that question, so they should be contacted for advice.

There is no further public testimony.

<p>Unschedule Agenda Item – Program Updates</p>	<p>Elisa asks if there are any further questions from the Commission on Matthew’s program updates.</p> <p>Nate says he has had community members reach out to him regarding PHB’s first Home Repair meeting for N/NE and how there was a lack of attendance by communities of color. He would like to know if there are people working on more effective outreach for tonight’s meeting. He wonders if the problem might be the times or locations for the meeting. He asks for follow up at the next PHAC to find out if it was well attended.</p> <p>Matthew answers that regarding outreach, he’d like to speak with Andrea Matthiessen. He knows that that last meeting was during the day, which could have affected attendance, but tonight’s meeting is an evening meeting so he does anticipate it will have more attendance.</p> <p>Cheyenne adds that in the course of backing up the front desk this week, she has had multiple calls asking about the meeting and adds that it has been posted on social media and the Urban League has been working on outreach as well so she suspects the evening meeting will be better attended.</p>	
<p>PHAC Work Plan</p>	<p>Elisa moves the meeting on to the work plan item.</p> <p>Matthew begins that at the end of the retreat the PHAC commissioners were asked to put a dot next to the items in each issue area that they thought were most important. Matthew wrote up the results from that work and created the PHAC Draft Work Plan.</p> <p>Matthew gives a debrief of the Work Plan and summarizes the components – the first being items to add to the regular meeting schedule for quick staff updates by program managers.</p> <p>Elisa adds that would like these items sent in an email with the agenda and meeting materials ahead of the PHAC meeting so she can have time to review ahead of the meeting. If commissioners have questions on any of the updates they can be brought up in the meeting.</p> <p>Matthew agrees that he will send program updates monthly ahead of the PHAC meeting and the group will touch on them only if someone has an item they would like to discuss.</p>	<p>Matthew will email program updates to the PHAC ahead of each month’s meeting</p>

Matthew continues on to the issue area development. At the retreat each commissioner was asked to identify the issue areas of most importance to them and those results by commissioner priority were:

- Resource Development
- Rental Unit Production and Asset Management
- Bureau Program Goals and Outcomes
- Linkage to Workforce Development
- Home Ownership

Under each issue area are the specific issues of interest to the PHAC based on their feedback at the retreat. On page two near the bottom of the page are the recommendations from staff on how to move forward and build these items into the work plan based on both the discussion during the retreat and individual discussions with commissioners.

Matthew emphasizes that this is just a starting place and there is a lot of room for changes at this point in the process. Under the title of “Draft Focus Issue Cycle” staff are recommending that each issue area is worked as an issue area. In order to allow for staff to do research, compile information, and provide requested information to the commission on each issue area, they are asking that each issue be addressed over a 4-month period of time.

Meeting 1 (month 1) – Staff scope issues/sub-issues to be addressed and outline the recommendations

Meeting 2 (month 2) – Staff come to PHAC to review initial background research and evaluation and ask follow up questions of PHAC

Meeting 3 (month 3) – Staff will work with PHAC to develop an initial set of recommendation on issue areas

Meeting 4 (month 4) – PHAC will finalize their recommendations

Staff believes that by grouping the issue areas together it will create some efficiencies in staff time and enable them to focus their time and research efforts.

The four-month window provides opportunity for the group to digest the issue, for staff to engage necessary city or external partners, and the public to be aware of it and weigh in at the meetings.

On page four of the [PHAC Draft Work Plan](#) there is a draft of the monthly meeting schedule that shows a general template of how the meetings could work over the next 12 or 13 months.

There are some regular agenda items that PHAC is mandated to address. In the first column is the meeting month and year. The second column shows the agenda item that needs to be addressed based on different timelines.

PHAC is about to move into three to four months of budget discussions. Once budget discussions are complete, data from PHB program performance data will start to become available in late winter which will influence the discussions on programs.

Governance discussions tend to start in May before the start of the new fiscal year. These discussions will include new members/orientation and any changes to the charter and/or code.

Updating the work plan will take a couple of meetings each year.

The legislative agenda and market analysis begins in fall which will lead to a new budget cycle.

In the far right column, based on PHAC's prioritizations at the retreat, are the issue groupings over the four-meeting cycle. While there is some overlap, there are never more than two issue areas being discussed by PHAC at once.

Matthew emphasizes that this draft monthly schedule is not concrete, he is interested in the reactions of the PHAC members as the finalization of the work plan begins.

On page three is the general template for the PHAC monthly meeting – this is a basic template that will change with emerging priorities. Based on feedback from Elisa earlier in this meeting, the bureau updates will be sent via email, which will allow more time for other items. At least 60 minutes of each meeting will be dedicated to individual focus areas and general agenda items will have between 20 – 40 minutes. The idea is to balance the ongoing information needs of PHAC, the business needs of the Bureau, and focus areas around a set of tangible recommendations around funding, programming, and legislation.

The commissioners thank Matthew for the explanation and Elisa comments that she finds the templates helpful. She is concerned that the draft meeting schedule looks aggressive considering the fact that the budget takes up so much time. She thinks it's worth considering creating subcommittees outside of PHAC if members would consider being involved in those – especially those with particular areas of expertise. She thinks it could be helpful for PHAC to

utilize those individuals in order to keep the discussions within the PHAC meetings at a higher level. If members are not interested in forming sub-committees she thinks it would be helpful to relax the focus area timelines on the draft meeting schedule. She bases this on her experience in past years at setting the scheduled timelines at an aggressive pace and found that it can sometimes cause frustration within the group.

Betty likes the focus and specificity of the current templates and finds it a great pathway moving forward. In response to Elisa's concerns about the aggressive timelines, she believes there is time in the schedule to push focus areas out further if the group deems it necessary.

Elisa thinks it might be helpful if at the end of each quarter or a couple of times a year, to bring back the schedule as a whole and review it as a group and then make timeline changes as needed.

Matthew accedes that the focus areas could be staggered more to allow more flexibility in the timeline. Then only every other or every third meeting would be finalizing recommendations on one focus area and scoping another with the goal to overlap those outside of challenging periods like the budget cycle. During those challenging periods focusing on only one focus area, rather than two makes sense.

General assent from the group is heard.

Elisa adds that there will be items that could come up throughout the year that weren't planned, as recently happened with the TIF set aside, so having some flexibility built in to the schedule makes sense to her.

Dike adds that in the past there have been discussion among the group that most members would be willing to meet more frequently if needed. He feels that's one way to resolve issues with the timeline while staying on schedule. When there are important issues that need to be addressed quickly, maybe the PHAC could meet twice within a month, instead of just once.

Betty agrees and adds that those decisions should be made as the need arises.

Dan agrees that if an issue needs to be addressed more than once in a month, that flexibility is important.

General agreement from the group is heard.

Matthew offers that one of the virtues of having multiple meeting on a single focus area, is in the scoping of a focus area it may be determined by the group that a task force or work group

	<p>is needed, there is a four-month (120 day) window that would allow that work group to meet and staff to adjust and/or respond to the needs of the PHAC.</p> <p>Feedback from the group concludes and Matthew offers to take the schedule and make adjustments to the budget component to create more of a focus area in terms of workload, then send it back out to the group.</p> <p>For the November meeting PHAC will tackle the first focus area – resource development – and staff will be prepared to scope out the task so PHAC can begin to build its recommendations.</p> <p>Betty asks if there is room in the schedule to do a collective debrief/discussion about the new State of Housing Report.</p> <p>Matthew responds affirmatively if that is what the group would like – staff is prepared to present on State of Housing whenever PHAC would like it added to the schedule.</p> <p>There is discussion among the group on where a State of Housing presentation would fit best in the schedule but there is no final decision. Matthew says he will look at the schedule some more and see where he can make it work.</p> <p>Work plan discussion concludes.</p>	<p>Matthew will make adjustments to the draft schedule to create a focus area around the budget and return it to the group for review.</p> <p>Resource Development will be the first focus area discussed at the November meeting.</p> <p>Matthew will look at the schedule some more and find a place for the State of Housing in Portland to be presented to the PHAC.</p>
<p>City Budget Process</p>	<p>Mike Johnson makes a presentation on the City Budget Process. He wants to focus this presentation on where PHAC fits into the budget process. He recently went through a two-day session with the City Budget Office (CBO) in an attempt to improve the process.</p> <p>The budget process is driven by each bureau’s budget advisor committee (BAC). For PHB the BAC is the PHAC plus two bureau staff which is in accordance with the City’s Office of Neighborhood Involvement Guidelines which require one represented and one non-represented/non-management staff person. Those two individuals for PHB’s BAC are being selected by the Bureau’s labor representatives and Kurt Creager. These two staff will be joining PHAC for the budget portions of the PHAC meetings over the next several months.</p> <p>From October through December the budget discussions are preliminary in nature. In November PHB will ask PHAC to weigh in on budget development. The requested budget is submitted in January or early February to Council and the CBO.</p>	

	<p>The budget stages are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Requested Budget – January to February - Proposed Budget – February through late April - Approved Budget – May - Adopted Budget – June to late June <p>To give the PHAC time to give useful feedback, PHB will begin providing PHAC with information. In December decisions/recommendations should be solidified and provided to Kurt and Commissioner Saltzman to decide their final requested budget in January.</p> <p>Sub-BACs are generally only needed in years where budget cuts are bad and have not been necessary in the last couple of years.</p> <p>After the January requested budget stage, PHAC will be updated periodically on the budget process through June.</p> <p>Changes to the budget can be made during the year during the Budget Monitoring Processes (BuMPs). The cover sheet for the fall BuMP was included in the PHAC materials. The BuMP makes it possible to request additional funds out of general fund contingency if it is available. There are guidelines required by the City financial policy on what is allowable. PHB is leveraging the housing state of emergency being declared this week as an opportunity to make a few requests out of a very small general fund contingency.</p> <p>There is another adjustment done in the Spring to take project budgets that aren't being expended as quickly as planned and move some those dollars into the next year so they can be fully utilized.</p>	
<p>Housing Bureau Fall Supplemental Budget Request</p>	<p>The requests made for this fall's BuMP are listed in the document and include;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - A Nexus Study to identify the link between residential and commercial development, low wage jobs, and the demand for affordable housing. When that study is complete it will give some perspective on whether linkage fees are necessary/advisable and lining it up to go to Council etc., ahead of the appropriate legislative session. - Housing Choice Voucher Success Fund is to increase the success rate of Section 8 voucher. The utilization rate has dropped to below 75% due to low vacancy rates. This is a partnership with Home Forward working toward an economic study of fair 	

market rents for our area so it's not necessary to rely on HUD's which are three years behind the current market.

- N/NE Home Retention and repair program will use the funds to prevent displacement and support home retention and repair for 50 – 60 homeowners in N/NE but outside the Interstate URA.

The rest of the BuMP is for re-budgeting resources that don't look like they will be spent in the current fiscal year for various reasons as noted in the document.

Elisa asks if the request for Housing Choice Voucher Success Fund request is restricted to the veterans' homelessness strategy.

Mike responds that this is outside of that effort – resources have already been established for the veterans' strategy.

Betty adds that HUD measures Home Forward's utilization rate which is normally around 90%. Currently utilization rates are so low because residents are unable to find housing even with extensions to the vouchers. The appeal has been made to HUD that due to high rents, they need to be able to raise their payment standards to achieve higher utilization.

Mike adds that current voucher amounts are up to 120% of fair market rents but HUD won't allow a higher percentage. The investment in the Housing Choice Fund will allow the voucher amount to be raised.

Maxine asks if discrimination has been found to be part of the low utilization rates.

Betty responds that it appears to be purely market driven, with rents being so high and vacancy rates being so low.

Maxine responds that even though it may be underreported there are many reports that people with vouchers are having a difficult time securing residents because private landlords don't want to deal with vouchers.

Betty adds that it is illegal for landlords to discriminate. She continues that the issue with utilization in the metro area is so bad that many voucher holders attempt to port their vouchers to other counties because they think they'll have better luck securing housing. The Housing Authority has MTW status from HUD which gives Home Forward the ability to raise their housing payments well above every other housing authority in the state. In 10 zip codes across the county they have raised their payment standards to allow voucher holders

to live in more expensive inner neighborhoods. But even with that flexibility the market is so much higher than what they can pay Home Forward has asked HUD for permission to raise those levels again and HUD has said no based on their three year old research. She shares a map of [Home Forward's Payment Standards for Multnomah County](#).

Maxine just read a story about a family with a voucher who was trying to secure a rental in a good neighborhood, but the property managers said they wouldn't rent to them in the neighborhood they wanted, but they showed them a property in a lower income community and said they would rent them a residence in that community. Maxine adds that she knows that's not one of the issues they are talking about regarding current utilization in Portland, in general, but it is happening.

Betty responds that they have 9,000 section 8 vouchers in use in the Portland area now. 60% of those are held by elderly and/or disabled individuals. The other 40% are families or different situations. She concedes that there will always be some stories out there like the kind that Maxine shared, but in general it's just the market conditions.

Elisa adds that utilization is a statewide problem right now. At Meyer Memorial Trust they are looking at it at the statewide level, though it is particularly problematic in the Portland Metro Area. It is often hard to tell if it's discrimination or not because it can often be subtle – but even if it's blatant the tenant may not realize it and may not report it.

At this point the conversation continues with many people speaking at once.

Matthew interrupts to say that the \$425,000 being requested in the Fall BuMP for the Housing Choice Voucher Success Fund is to pay for two things. One is the assessment of the market in order to raise the vouchers to match more closely with current fair market rents, and the other is to support navigators. These are individuals who work with Home Forward to help households trying to navigate the process of finding an apartment.

Elisa says that's fine, but navigators won't work unless there is additional flexible funding for the vouchers because of the low vacancy rates and high rents.

Mike adds that there is of the \$425,000 only \$25,000 is being requested for the study. The rest of the dollars will go to flexible funding and navigators. He thinks the funding for the navigators is about \$150,000.

Someone from the audience asks when the budget comes before the PHAC to be reviewed.

	<p>Matthew answers that the budget will be the main topic of the next four meetings of the PHAC for the FY 2016-2017 budget which begins July 1, 2016 and ends June 30, 2017.</p> <p>Elisa asks if there is anything else that needs to be brought up for discussion as there is some extra time now.</p> <p>Amy comments that she has been doing some research on the Rent Well Program and how effective it is – she has been hearing that it is no longer being used as a tool. She wonders if this program can help voucher holders to improve utilization rates.</p> <p>Betty says she knows the classes are still going on through various providers.</p> <p>Amy expresses an interest in becoming a trainer but she thinks only Home Forward and Central City Concern offer the program and she isn't sure that landlords even care if someone has been through Rent Well because they have their pick of tenants due to the lean market.</p> <p>Betty and Elisa add that there are Rent Well Programs run through other agencies as well, funded by pass-through PHB dollars.</p> <p>Elisa thinks if she wants to get linked up there are ways to do that.</p> <p>Amy wonders if there is availability for community members to take it for less than \$50 per class, which is the current going rate for the classes and impossible for very low income people to afford.</p> <p>Elisa responds that maybe SNAP can provide her with some connections outside of the meeting.</p> <p>Matthew says Amy can talk to him about this more. He knows the program has been shown to be somewhat effective. He thinks, again, that the main issue for folks securing housing right now is the vacancy rate. There does seem to be some signs that this is loosening a little.</p>	
<p>For the Good of the Order</p>	<p>Elisa announces that tomorrow the Mayor and Commissioner Saltzman will be putting forward an ordinance to increase renter protections. If commissioners are interested in supporting it, you are welcome to attend at the Council Chambers. If you aren't able to attend Matthew will send an email update to the PHAC.</p> <p>No further announcements. Elisa adjourns the meeting.</p>	<p>Matthew will send an email update regarding the renter protections ordinance.</p>