



Portland Housing Bureau

N/NE Neighborhood Housing Strategy
Oversight Committee
December 15, 2015
6:00 - 7:45 pm
Maranatha Church
4222 NE 12th Ave., Portland, OR 97211

✓ = Oversight Committee Action item
▶ = PHB staff member action item

December 2015 Meeting Minutes FINAL

Members Present: Katrina Holland, Virgie Ruiz, Sarah Zahn, Felicia Tripp, Bishop Steven Holt

Members Excused: Orlando Williams, Lorenzo Poe, Lisa Faust, Dr. Lisa Bates, Reverend T. Allen Bethel

Staff Present: Matthew Tschabold, Andrea Matthiessen, Michelle DePass, Martha Calhoon, Cupid Alexander, Dana Ingram, Leslie Goodlow, Letimya Clayton, Cheyenne Sheehan, Karl Dinkelspiel

Guests Present: Travis Phillips – PCRI, Bill Hart – Carleton Hart Architecture

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
Welcome	<p>Bishop Holt welcomes the Committee and the public. He invites the public to look around the room at the posters with maps of the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area (ICURA) and the N/NE Study Area as well as the Oversight Committee's responsibility areas and details on the \$10 Million. He then introduces Leslie Goodlow.</p> <p>Leslie Goodlow of PHB announces that if members of the public would like to comment, they are welcome to comment on any of the listed agenda items. If there are questions on items not included in tonight's agenda they can either fill out a comment card with their comment/question and someone at PHB will respond to them, or they can call or email PHB, or submit a public records request. Business cards are available at this meeting with contact information for the Bureau. She also notes that sign in sheets are public records and also serve as a way to become part of the mailing list. The media will sometimes request public records and then contact people on the sign-in sheets for comment. If individuals do not want to be contacted by the media, there is a check box on the comment card that allows them to opt-out of media contact – this does not guarantee that the media will not contact you, but it will let them know that you are not interested in speaking with them. All attendees are welcome to speak to the media as they see fit.</p>	

For questions about personal situations or resources available, please use the contact information on the business cards provided.

Admin Note - Contact information on the business card is as follows:

N/NE Neighborhood Housing Strategy
421 SW 6th Ave., Suite 500, Portland, Oregon 97204
Phone: 503.823.1190 Fax: 503.823.2387
Email: NNEstrategy@portlandoregon.gov
Web: <http://www.Portlandoregon.gov/PHB/NNE>

Bishop Holt explains the N/NE Oversight Committee is made up of unpaid volunteers and are not government representatives. Committee members volunteer because they are concerned about what is going on in Portland around investment in the city, fair housing, affordable housing, gentrification, and displacement. The current committee members have volunteered their time as individuals to make sure that resources allocated by the City of Portland for affordable housing, and the promises that have been made to the N/NE Community are being kept. The individual committee members represent the community and the community interest.

The billboards posted around the room display the different categories of interest and accountability determined by public participation in previous community forums for allocated funds. These categories are;

1. Preventing Displacement
2. Creating Homeowners
3. Creating Rental Homes
4. Land Acquisition

Dollars were allocated to each of these items – the Oversight Committee is charged to ensure that the dollars allocated to each of these categories of concern, are in fact being used for those purposes, ask appropriate questions, deal with issues as they arise, etc.

Bishop Holt continues by saying that this is a public meeting, not a public forum. As such, items up for discussion, question, and comment, are limited to the two agenda items and he invites all attendees to participate after the information for each item is presented. If there are concerns based on the billboards or other items that are not

	<p>scheduled for discussion, Leslie announced earlier the best ways to be heard on those issues.</p> <p>Bishop Holt asks the committee if there are questions or concerns relating to October’s meeting minutes.</p> <p>Katrina asks if the committee will be going over the annual review at this meeting. Leslie responds that she will be sending out an email to committee members asking for feedback so she can prepare the annual report, but it is not up for discussion at tonight’s meeting. There are no further comments from the committee.</p>	
<p>Preference Policy Update</p>	<p>Bishop Holt introduces Matthew Tschabold, Equity and Policy Manager for PHB, to present the Preference Policy Update.</p> <p>For context, he explains the origin of the Preference Policy. One of the biggest concerns during the community planning process with respect to the \$20 Million was that there are a number of families who have had historic roots in the community who have been displaced and displaced generationally. The City, when putting money into new programming, e.g. rental housing or home ownership programming, was asked to put together a plan that would give priority to historic residents of N/NE Portland.</p> <p>Over the last 6-8 months PHB has been working with a group of community leaders to come up with a structure for a preference policy. He is coming before the committee today to present the recommended structure.</p> <p>Preference policies in affordable and public housing are not uncommon, although the structures can be technical – he asks that people feel free to interrupt with questions as needed.</p> <p>Matthew presents the PowerPoint presentation on the goals and structure of the policy. It can be found online at http://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/article/556995 from pages 2 through page 20.</p> <p>Questions asked by Committee Members after the presentation:</p>	

	<p>1. QUESTION: Regarding implementation and communication of the preference policy. Lotteries, lists, and public announcements were mentioned and one of the biggest hurdles for the bureau will be getting the word out and having people understand their options. Once a list has been established for a particular program or project, how dynamic will that list be? What kind of uncertainty could be created for folks who are on the list already, especially when subsequent applicants can jump to the top of the list?</p> <p>ANSWER: Matthew answers In terms of process, the list will not be that different from the way Home Forward administers their lists – although the structure will differ. PHB will have a list for each project, and the expectation is that the applicants will be aware of the preference policy and how it is applied. After lease up, as turnover dictates, the lists will be continually updated and the policy applied to applicants. There are considerations with respect to fair housing and access which would require certain open application periods – the Bureau will communicate clearly that the preference policy is in use when applicants apply. There is more than one way the policy can be implemented, which is still to be determined.</p> <p>2. QUESTION: Will the preference policy apply to current City programming that is already in place, or only new programming?</p> <p>ANSWER: Matthew answers that the unfortunate reality is there are a lot of buildings that PHB has helped finance that have existing contracts for building management. The agreements and conditions in place for those projects cannot be modified retroactively unless the building owner/manager agree. The exceptions to this would be if the housing provider asks for additional financing from PHB – if that were to happen, a new agreement could be written to modify terms. The other exception would be if a housing provider voluntarily asks to modify the terms in order to apply the preference policy – some partners have stated that they would like to apply the policy when it is complete. PCRI and Cascadia have both expressed interest in applying the preference policy. The commitment from PHB is to strongly encourage all of our partners in N/NE Portland to use the preference policy.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>3. QUESTION: How long will the preference policy be in effect? Is it tied to the sunset of Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) and Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area (ICURA)?</p> <p>ANSWER: Matthew answers that there is no intention to sunset the preference policy when ICURA sunsets. There is a legitimate policy question in that the policy was designed to achieve policy goals at a certain point in time in the context of North and Northeast Portland and there is a point at which, decades from now, where the effectiveness of the policy will change because the City condemnations and urban renewal that that took place are so far in the past that the policy may not be as relevant. There is commitment from the City to practice the preference policy as long as it's effective.</p> <p>4. QUESTION: Do you know when there might be a final answer on whether the preference policy will sunset?</p> <p>ANSWER: Leslie answers that she doesn't think that's a question the PHB has even pondered. At the moment PHB is trying to get it off the ground, and no energy has been put into thinking about the end of the policy. PHB did speak with the Commissioner today about the preference policy and he is excited about the first step being finalized today with the acceptance of the N/NE Oversight Committee. The next step is looking at what it applies to outside of the study area, whether it will apply to all of ICURA and what else will PHB do with it.</p> <p>5. QUESTION: Will it apply outside of ICURA?</p> <p>ANSWER: Leslie answers that it will apply in the N/NE study area and possibly all of the ICURA, but at this point, not beyond those areas. It would be difficult to apply this particular preference policy to Lents, as an example. Maybe there would need to be different preference policies developed for different areas of the city. This particular preference policy was designed for gentrification and displacement mitigation of N/NE Portland.</p>	
--	--	--

	<p>6. QUESTION: What is the timeline for infrastructure development for the preference policy?</p> <p>ANSWER: Matthew answers that after this presentation PHB will convene an implementation team to build out the tools necessary for implementation. This work is at the very beginning. One part is a web tool being developed that would allow anyone to type in an address and the tool would tell you how many points that address is worth. The Bureau is also buying software that administers lottery lease-up which applies a statistical randomizer. From a process standpoint PHB’s underwriters, contract managers, and construction coordinators will be part of the implementation sessions. The goal is that implementation infrastructure of the policy will not be a bottleneck that slows down. It will be quite a while until new units come online. Homeownership is a different question, those resources will be allocated soon and the Bureau will be ready to implement.</p> <p>7. QUESTION: Will the preference policy only apply to City owned housing, or will it apply to City subsidized housing as well?</p> <p>ANSWER: Matthew answers that PHB only owns one or two buildings, so the conversation is really about City subsidized buildings – and it would apply to all new City subsidized buildings. If PHB suddenly decided to own and operate buildings, it would apply to those as well.</p> <p>8. QUESTION: Will there be enforcement for housing providers who are “bad actors” and what consequences may be applied?</p> <p>ANSWER: Matthew answers that his answer is getting ahead of the implementation team, but since the policy will be co-administered by PHB working with the housing provider in a team with PHB always involved. As an example, applications are submitted to a secure location, then sorted and screened with representatives from the provider and PHB – the process will be co-administered every step of the way. In the case of something like a new tax exemption building being built by a private developer and not a housing provider. They would agree to use the preference policy as a condition for the</p>	
--	---	--

exemption and have PHB administer it, the developer wouldn't even need to be involved in the administration of policy. The developer is only interested in leasing the units, and they would be given an ordered list by PHB. PHB's housing partners have all expressed a strong interest and willingness to be part of this policy and the co-administration process will help mitigate any potential missteps.

9. QUESTION: If an applicant, community group, or housing provider gets confused at any point in the process, will there be a liaison at PHB who can speak with and guide them about the specifics of the policy?

ANSWER: Matthew answers that in anticipation of the preference policy being released, he has trained all PHB staff on the policy. This isn't to suggest that everyone has the same level of understanding and capability to answer questions. The policy is somewhat complicated and can be confusing. At this time there is not a point person assigned, but he is more than willing to serve as that person for now until someone is assigned as the preference policy person. In PHB's budget discussions there is a request for a full time person to work on the implementation piece and liaise with stakeholders.

10. QUESTION: What is the burden of proof for those impacted by condemnations and urban renewal?

ANSWER: Matthew explains that you have to assume that some people will lie to get access to public benefits for which they aren't entitled, but this issue must be tempered by the idea that the higher the burden of proof, the more difficult it will be for marginalized families to claim their benefit through the preference policy. There is a list of documents and resources that the Bureau will provide to individuals to help them access proof. PHB is trying to make access as simple as possible. PHB will work through test scenarios during implementation. The more complicated issues revolve around homes that were taken by the City, the current lists may not be comprehensive. If an individual knows their family had property taken, but they are not included in the list, PHB will be able to case manage with the individual, but because this criteria moves someone to the very top of the list, it's important to get definitive proof. PHB and City staff are

dedicated to assist and would like to ensure that time and cost impacts to families attempting to prove historical residence are as small as possible.

11. QUESTION: If the committee chooses not to accept the policy today, will the preference policy group go back to the drawing board?

ANSWER: Leslie responds that there is not a quorum of the N/NE Oversight Committee tonight. But the Committee is not being asked to approve the preference policy, they are being asked to accept it as is and recommend approval to City Council. If there are issues in the policy that need to be addressed before the Committee recommends approval, that should be done as soon as possible – Commissioner Saltzman is committed to having the preference policy approved before the end of 2015.

Matthew and Bishop Holt mention Dr. Lisa Bates, Katrina Holland, and Dr. Bethel were part of creating the policy and they would like to acknowledge their efforts in creation of the policy. Bishop Holt adds that there is a recommendation from both Dr. Bethel and Dr. Bates that the Committee move forward with a recommendation for the preference policy as it stands.

Bishop Holt polls the committee on whether or not they support recommendation of the preference policy.

- Sarah Zahn is in support of the policy.
- Katrina Holland is in support with hesitation due to her lack of clarity on the enforcement piece for housing provider “bad actors”. She is also concerned about how long it will be in force based on the history this community has had with the city. It would be nice to have firmer answers on those issues before moving forward, but she does support the content and implementation of the policy.
 - o Karl Dinkelspiel of PHB responds to Katrina’s concern around the regulatory framework the Bureau has in place for all its units. In order for a housing provider to be funded by PHB they are required to sign a contract/regulatory agreement. The agreement lays out all of the

	<p>frameworks, not just the preference policy, and an entity must abide by to receive PHB funds. The preference policy will be codified within the regulatory agreement and these agreements are enforceable by PHB. There could even be language added to the agreements to include steeper consequences for non-compliance, if necessary. This is something that can be considered as PHB begins the implementation phase as to how PHB can augment the existing regulatory language. Also the typical regulatory agreement is in force for 60 years.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Virgie Ruiz is in support of the policy. She believes it's been long enough and she wants to move forward. She's seen the work presented today and believes the community and the committee is further ahead than they've been in a long time. She looks forward to seeing results in the near future. - Felicia Tripp is in support of the policy and wants to move forward. She isn't concerned about accountability because she's seen so much community support around the policy. She would encourage transparency as lists and lotteries are very complex systems. She stresses working closely with the communications team inside PHB to work with providers. She wants to ensure for the people this policy serves that the system is simple enough to encourage them to apply. - Bishop Holt supports the policy. <p>Bishop Holt thanks Matthew for the presentation and the committee for their input before moving on to the Grant Warehouse update.</p>	
<p>Grant Warehouse Update</p>	<p>Bishop Holt asks the presenters to introduce themselves and identify the role they play in the Grant Warehouse project.</p> <p>Sarah Zahn is employed by Gerding Edlen Development and is an N/NE Oversight Committee member.</p>	

	<p>Gerding Edlen, along with Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives (PCRI,) and Carleton Hart architecture, are the project team selected to develop the Grant Warehouse site.</p> <p>Travis Phillips is the Housing Development Director for PCRI.</p> <p>Bill Hart is a partner/architect from Carleton Hart architecture.</p> <p>Travis presents the Grant Warehouse update presentation. It can be found online at http://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/article/556995 from pages 21 through page 27.</p> <p>He is excited about the work done so far. Initial outreach has just begun. Answers to frequently asked questions can be found on PCRI's website at http://www.pcrihome.org/grant-warehouse .</p> <p>Karl Dinkelspiel of PHB shares that Sarah and her team brought the idea of increasing site density from 52 units to 81 units if they had additional funding. PHB supported the increase of units and made a request for additional funding which was officially approved by Commissioner Saltzman today to increase funds from \$4.5 Million to \$7 Million.</p> <p>Sarah adds that in addition to the increase to 81 units they were awarded 20 project based section 8 vouchers through Home Forward last week which will enable them to provide a truly mixed income project with incomes below 30% Median Family Income (MFI) up to 60% MFI.</p> <p>They have also made a strong effort to increase the number of 2 - 3 bedroom units in the project. On slide 26 it shows the breakdown of the units by size – there are twice as many 2- and 3- bedroom units than is typical in a development of this size. The focus was to house more and larger families in the project.</p> <p>Questions asked by Committee Members after the presentation:</p>	
--	--	--

1. QUESTION: The 52 unit scheme and the 81 unit scheme both propose the same number of parking spaces, 28. These spaces are shared with the commercial users as well as tenants. Is this enough parking?

ANSWER: Sarah answers in providing 28 units of parking and 81 units of housing, they are meeting the minimum parking requirements per city code. They do acknowledge that this is not a lot of parking spaces, it comes out to about .3 spaces per unit which assumes 1/3 of units will be able to park a car onsite. In terms of retail parking they assume residential parkers will not be home in the daytime so the lot is shared with retail customers. Parking is expensive and takes up space that could otherwise be developed with units. While parking is needed they try to balance those needs and work with the community. They don't want to overburden city streets but they also don't want to lose the ability to provide affordable housing in areas where there is opportunity for increased density. There will be continued discussions with the neighbors and neighborhood association about the amount of parking being offered in the hopes that they can come to an agreement on a plan that all feel are reasonable.

2. QUESTION: Where did the additional \$2.5 Million come from?

ANSWER: Karl responds those dollars are part of the 50% increase in Tax Incremental Financing (TIF) from PDC to PHB which adds about \$32 Million in available dollars for development of affordable housing.

3. QUESTION: The increase in the number of units is positive and there is general excitement about the mixed income nature of this project. Referring back to Sarah's statement that this project roughly doubles the number of family sized 2-3 bedroom units typically seen in a development of this size is surprising seeing that there is such a need for family-sized housing. How do the number of 30 1-bedroom units benefit the community we are attempting to serve?

ANSWER: Sarah responds that there is a balance. She acknowledges that there are different family configurations who would find a one bedroom unit appealing e.g. a couple with no children, a single parent with one child, seniors downsizing. They felt it was most important to offer a range of unit types. From

a long-term marketability and management standpoint a mix of units is important. PCRI will be operating this project over the long term. A preponderance of families in one building can lead to management challenges. They are creating a diverse community by serving many family and household types.

4. QUESTION: Speak to the vision for the building or a concept you have in mind to create a balanced community that reflects the makeup of the neighborhood.

ANSWER: Travis responds that beyond the mix of unit types in the building the idea is to create a community within the larger NE Portland community. They are envisioning laundry facilities on each floor for families. The site includes a 1400-1500 square foot community room, bicycle parking, outdoor play and common areas that are separate from the busy-ness of MLK Blvd. There are many details to still be developed – these will be a topic of the upcoming community forums they are planning.

5. QUESTION: Is there a way to add any 4-bedroom units? When looking at available housing stock, N/NE Portland has no units of this size unless it is a single family house. Because of the section 8 vouchers it would be a great opportunity and benefit for larger families.

ANSWER: Sarah thinks it's something they can discuss as a project team. This is an initial concept design. There is room to reevaluate and redesign based on community reaction and feedback at the public at the forums to be scheduled.

Bill Hart adds that they really want to bring the culture of the community into the design of the building. They are looking to marry the past, present, present and future of the community in both the design of the building and the artwork. They would like the space to be intercultural and inspire hope in the future. They want this to be more than just a building or a facility, they want it to be part of the community at large.

Bishop Holt thanks the Grant Warehouse team for the presentation.

<p>Public Comments and Questions</p>	<p>Bishop Holt opens the meeting to public comment.</p> <p>No one is signed up for public testimony, but Bishop Holt asks if there are comments or questions on tonight's agenda items, please come up to the microphone.</p> <p>Shirley Peck testifies that she grew up in NE Portland from the age of 10. She has lived and worked here and she is currently retired. When she hears the word "project" it makes her nervous. Her father was in the military and they traveled a lot and she saw many people living in situations that looked like sardines in a can. She has no desire to live in a big city. Mr. Hart indicated that they will be encouraging past, present, and future to live in these buildings. She wants to get a vision of what they are talking about. She is concerned because she is involved and interested in community, culture, and subculture and she wants to be sure that the goal is not to create a uniform situation where activity and crime will increase. She wants to make sure it doesn't look like a ghetto and that people can live a full life there and not feel incarcerated or programmed, which feeds certain behaviors.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Karl responds that PHB shares her concerns. There are some buildings in the very close vicinity that are affordable housing buildings, with a similar number of units. Shaver Green on Shaver and MLK Blvd. is 82 units. Across the street from that is the Miracles Club which is about 40 units. - Travis responds about what PCRI's vision for the building. He acknowledges that the word project can elicit a negative stereotypical trigger and he would like to avoid the association of the word "project" with "housing project" if possible. PCRI has well established screening procedures for all residents to ensure that residents with criminal history challenges are addressed appropriately so as not to create a situation where crime is happening in the building. They want to be sure that there is equal opportunity for applicants, and also create an expectation that they be a positive community member. There will be onsite property management as well as resident services with the intention of creating a positive community. <p>Mitchell Shram testifies that he is a neighbor to the Grant Warehouse site – he lives about 5 houses away. He wants to know how many cars the project team expects will be</p>	
---	---	--

generated by 81 units. He wonders if the Magnolia is a good example of what they are expecting. He thinks it might be good to go back and look at what they did. He is concerned because the amount of parking spaces did not increase in the schematic when the number of units rose from 52 to 81.

- Sarah answers for similar projects where very low income families are being served, those families are less likely to own a car because it is cost prohibitive. They also find that smaller units are less likely to have car ownership especially in good transit locations. The larger units tend to have a higher percentage of car ownership. It is a guessing game. They want to work with the neighbors to make sure they aren't creating undue stress on street parking. They are planning for 1/3 of the units to have cars. In the original plan for 52 units they felt they had more parking than was necessary, they feel even with an increase in units that the number of parking spaces is balanced.

Mr. Shram asks Sarah if she believes that they are spot on in planning 81 units with 28 parking spaces.

- Sarah answers that it is always difficult to predict what parking demand will look like. They are trying to right-size parking based on experience, other properties in the neighborhood, knowledge of this particular unit and income mix, and how that affects car ownership. They are working hard to get to a number of spaces that feels like the right ratio for the project.

Mr. Shram notes that when the kick-off for the Grant Warehouse site happened last summer he heard a lot of talk from attendees about not having a place to park when they arrived. The nearby residents found that very interesting because a lot of the lack of street parking is due to the Magnolia. He would appreciate, in terms of livability that the team looks more closely at that.

Bishop adds that he strongly encourages community members who are concerned about these kinds of issues to attend the community forums to dialogue and have input into the project.

Nannette Carter Jofferey has multiple questions about the Grant Warehouse project.

She asks;

- In the 81 unit scheme what is the square footage identified for each unit size?
 - 1-bedroom 625-650 sq. ft.
 - 2-bedroom 725-800 sq. ft.
 - 3-bedroom 1150 sq. ft. with 2 baths

- What type of flooring will be in the units?
 - The apartments will be wood framed and the floor will be carpeted or linoleum flooring with only commercial space, no resident units, on the first floor.

- Will there be an elevator?
 - There are two elevators planned.

- How will garbage be dealt with? She is concerned about spillage and recycling.
 - It is so early in the design process that the trash details are not yet defined. They will work closely with Carleton Hart to determine the design.

Nannette is also concerned about parking. On MLK between 2:30 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. it is jam-packed with traffic. The only egress will be on side streets, correct?

- Sarah says there will be the ability to drive in and out of the project's parking lot from MLK and she expects that to be the primary access point for parking/visitors.

Nannette isn't convinced, she knows the area well. She says currently there is a vacant lot. On Cook St. cars are parked on both sides of the street, many of those cars belong to residents of the Magnolia. They have a small parking lot that is fee based for residents. She wants to know if the parking at Grant Warehouse will be free since it is shared with commercial spaces. She wants to get a visual of how people will enter and exit the building. There are two streets flanking the building and the street in front is MLK. Is she correct in assuming there will be egress on the side streets as well as on MLK.

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Travis responds that the entrance and the exit from the parking lot will be on Cook St. and on Ivy St. - There will be a building entrance on MLK but not an entrance to the parking lot. <p>Nanette responds that parking areas where they are planning egress are currently blocked by cars even though there are yellow markings there. There will need to be some kind of enforcement to prevent people from parking inappropriately on the side streets and blocking the driveways.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Travis responds that these are details that still need to be worked through. He believes that once the development is up and there is housing and business on the site there will be less likelihood that people will block the driveways. As for whether there will be cost associated with resident parking that is a detail they have not yet worked out. Once the design of the project is more fully complete to show to the community, the community forums will be a great place to continue having these conversations. <p>Bishop thanks everyone for comments and explains that this is not the appropriate forum for detailed questions on design. If there are more questions the public is free to follow up and attend the community forums to be scheduled. Our time constraints prohibit very detailed discussions at this meeting.</p> <p>Travis explains that he invites the public to attend the forums in person as that's a great opportunity for back and forth communication. But if you are not able to attend the forum he will share his contact information and PHB's information. There are multiple ways to stay in contact and receive information as its updated even if you are not able to attend the forum. On PCRI's website there are frequently asked questions about the Grant Warehouse project which will be continually updated as more questions come in, but there are no online forums for discussion at this time.</p>	
<p>Wrap-Up</p>	<p>January 14th, 2016 is the next meeting of the N/NE Oversight Committee. If you are signed up on one of the sign-in sheets you will receive an email reminder that will communicate the time and location.</p>	

	<p>Bishop asks that community members share with others who are impacted and invite them to these meetings to get up front, clarified, accurate, first-hand, information on items being discussed in these community meetings. He also strongly encourages community members to attend the Grant Warehouse community forums so their voices are heard early in the process. The only way to make sure that what is happening is to the benefit of the community is if the community is involved in the early stages and not just responding or reacting when plans are complete.</p>	
--	--	--