Portland Housing Bureau

N/NE Neighborhood Housing Strategy
Oversight Committee
September 15, 2015
10:00 am -12:00 pm
Portland Housing Bureau
421 SW 6th Ave, Suite 500

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

September 2015 Quarterly Meeting Minutes

***Members Present*:** Dr. Lisa Bates, Reverend T. Allen Bethel, Katrina Holland, Virgie Ruiz, Jesse Beason, Sarah Zahn, Lisa Faust, Bishop Steven Holt

Members Excused: Orlando Williams, Lolenzo Poe

Staff Present: Matthew Tschabold, Andrea Matthiessen, Javier Mena, Michelle DePass, Martha Calhoon, Cupid Alexander, Dana Ingram, Leslie Goodlow

Guests Present: *Travis Phillips, PCRI*

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
Welcome	Bishop Holt welcomed everyone and introductions were made.	
Grant Warehouse Site	Karl Dinkelspiel presented the group with an update on the Grant Warehouse Project (refer to attachment). Sarah Zahn explained that PCRI would be the longtime owner and operator of Grant Warehouse Site. Travis Phillips of PCRI stated that there was a concern about how move-in cost could become hurdles for residents. He outlined PCRI's strategy to address this concern and other concerns before placing residents into units. They are looking for community input with people in the community who represent the residents and businesses. He mentioned that Grant Warehouse aims to be a mixed income community and that PCRI	

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
	is seeking to form an internal sub-committee for input on the project during the design process. Dr. Lisa K. Bates asked a question with reference to PCRI having resident represented on the sub-committee and inquired if the resident representative would be a volunteer or compensated position. Sarah explained the position would be a volunteer position. Dr. Bates questioned, "why the project was not zoned for max capacity?" Travis explained that at this early stage of the process the developers have not determine the project's building specifics. He specified that the focus is to balance the space for housing low income units, large family units, and community green space. The building is subject to the resources allocated by the Portland Housing Bureau.	
Bridge Meadows Project	Javier Mena updated the group on the Bridge Meadows project (refer to attachment). Dr. Bates asked if it was too early to determine when closing will happen on the property. Javier anticipates project will close and begin construction next year. Maxine Fitzpatrick, PCRI Executive Director explained that this project is a joint venture between PCRI and New Avenues for Youth. She informed the group that she believes the project will be completed by next year and she invited the community to the opening when the project is completed. Dr. Bates asked about projects that are funded TIF and their relation to the preference policy. Javier explained that although many of the projects funded through the various funds are directly related to the preference policy. This specific project and the demographic they serve will not be related to the preference policy. Dr. Bates asked if the project was envisioned to serve African Americans at risk of homelessness and in foster care.	

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
	Javier said the goal of PHB is to continue the project that Bridge Meadows had develop and started, and to ensure it is a part of the community. Dorinda Schubert added that although they do not know the specific numbers that they will work harder with communities of color to identify the demographics of incoming youth because of the awareness of that children of color are over-represented in communities of color. Dr. Bates asked if they worked with any specific groups on the Bridge Meadows project. Dorinda stated to create the project that they partnered with New Avenues For Youth, The Home Builders Foundation, and the City of Portland. Katrina Holland asked what the African American population at Bridge Meadows was. Dorinda answered that the population of African Americans was ~25% and had representatives from other diverse communities of color. Dr. Bates commented that there was a need for PHB to ask for more specifics of its partners and community funded projects. She supported the idea of housing targeting youth exiting foster care, but would like the RFP process to outline upfront the understanding of specific outreach mechanisms and targeting specific needs for people of color specifically in the local community. Bishop Holt pointed out that the project began before the current standards of the RFP process, but going forward the new project will follow the new RFP protocol.	
Home Repair Update	Andrea Matthiessen updated the group on Home Repair Loans (refer to attachment). Felicia Tripp asked on the next report if we can make reference to where the applicants were referred from. Felicia asked if there could be a distinction of the applications that did not want a lien on their home on the next report. There was a question about the general fund resources. Andrea mentioned that general funds have already been allocated.	

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
	A question was posed about the people who were declined and if they were given information about other resources available. Andrea stated that declined applications were given other information to help them towards stabilization. There was a question about if the approved applicants were given a list of contractors to work with on home repair projects. Andrea communicated to the group that PHB has a list of contractors that they have worked with in the past on other projects. She mentioned that the list was not closed and people were not limited to PHB's list of contractors, and could choose any contractor they wanted to complete their home repair project.	
Home Ownership Proposal	Andrea Matthiessen updated the group about the home ownership proposal (refer to attachment). Dr. Bates asked a question about the ongoing conversations concerning the allocation of resources and what point are the conversations on the subject matter. Andrea explained that PHB has asked partners to work collaboratively versus combatively to identify what resources they would like for down payment assistant and new construction of units. Dr. Bates asked for clarification about the subcommittee that will propose the allocation of resources and if the subcommittee consist exclusively of contractors who will receive those fund. Javier confirmed Dr. Bates assertion and pointed out that existing partner have been successful in the past with projects and the resources will go directly to the home buyers. Dr. Bates expressed her disdain for the practice of a subcommittee that consisted exclusively of contractors that would work on the project. She expressed that the subcommittee should include member of the community that are directly impacted by the specific barriers, and those that will go through the preference policy.	

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
	Dr. Bates asked if PHB can implement an RFP process for subcontractors who will receive the money, specifically asking if those asking for allocations can outline 1) how they serve AA populations, and 2) if engagement with AA communities hasn't been strong, what organizational changes and/or mechanisms would they employ to strengthen their engagement with AA populations. Katrina asked if the process was too far along to reevaluate the possibility of incorporating Dr. Bates' suggestion. Javier indicated that the process was not too far in order to look at that and that PHB would.	
Preference Policy Update	Matthew Tschabold updated the group on preference policy (refer to attachment). Bishop Holt asked Matthew how PHB would connect applicants to the program. Matthew explained that the process included a set of recommendations beyond the preference policy and that PHB is still examining different ways to connect applicants to the program. He also told the group that PHB would implement a web tool that would reference former, or current addresses to determine the amount of preference point an applicant would receive. A community member ask if the preference policy unintentionally bias older family households. Matthew explained that the preference policy did not bias older families, and that families with ties to the neighborhood would receive preference points. Another community member asked if the preference policy was related to prior community members who wanted to move back to North and Northeast. Bishop Holt stated that, that was the preference policy's goal. Another community member asked Matthew if there was any testing done in regards to income and financial stability. Matthew explained to the group that testing primarily focused on preference points and how points would be allocated.	

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
Land Banking	Javier Mena spoke to the group about the land banking agenda. He explained that PHB has received many referrals concerning different properties. One of the properties PHB is looking to acquire is owned by the Jesuit Volunteer Corporation located on Williams St. PHB is working on drafting a proposal for the property. Bishop Holt asked Javier to explain what land banking was for anyone who did not know what it was. Javier told the group that PHB was allotted three million dollars with the goal to acquire new land sites. One of the sites would be used to develop rental units and the other site would be used in support of homeownership development. Bishop Holt asked if PHB is looking at land owned by other bureaus that have yet to be utilized. Javier said that it is something that PHB is looking into and that PHB is in conversation with Tri-Met about a parcel of land on interstate. If PHB were to pursue and acquire the land, that they would have to use TIFF resources to gain the parcel. Katrina Holland asked Javier if they looked at potential land with the “highest and best use” in mind. Javier said yes, when PHB looks at potential parcel PHB analyzes the best uses, what could be built, and what are the restrictions and limitations. Katrina asked if highest and best use was kept in mind when looking at properties to purchase, given that the property on MLK & Alberta was not purchased at a 'highest and best use' price from the Portland Development Commission. She indicated that since Majestic was able to purchase PDC land at a price that was not highest and best use -- and also received a grant from PDC, that PDC essentially provided subsidies, likely as an investment, to Majestic Realty. She then asked if PHB had approached PDC about asking for additional resources to beef up land-banking purchases since $3 million, in today's market, is not very much. Given the deal struck between Majestic and PDC, would PDC would be willing to allocate similar resources to PHB's land-banking endeavors Javier told the group that PHB has had conversation with PDC regarding increase of TIFF resources for the interstate corridor and that it is PHB’s desire work to that aim.	

Agenda Item	Discussion Highlights	Outcomes / Next Steps
	Dr. Bates mentioned that she would like to hear more about the collaboration with the PDC. Javier said he would have more concrete information in the next 30 days and will share it at the next meeting.	
Wrap-up	Next scheduled meeting will be held on October 6, 2015 from 6:00 p.m. to 7:45 p.m. at Maranatha Church	