

Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission

November 10, 2020

12:30 p.m.

Meeting Minutes

PSC Commissioners Present: Jeff Bachrach, Ben Bortolazzo, Mike Houck, Katie Larsell, Oriana Magnera, Steph Routh, Katherine Schultz, Chris Smith, Eli Spevak [2 open positions]

City Staff Presenting: Joe Zehnder, Sandra Wood, Brandon Spencer-Hartle, Nicholas Starin, Eric Engstrom, Al Burns, Justin Douglas (Prosper Portland) Kimberly Branam (Prosper Portland), Leslie Goodlow (PHB), Elaine Howard (Prosper Portland Consultant)

Documents and Presentations for today's meeting

Chair Spevak called the meeting to order at 12:30 p.m.

Chair Spevak: In keeping with the Oregon Public Meetings law, Statutory land use hearing requirements, and Title 33 of the Portland City Code, the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission is holding this meeting virtually.

- All members of the PSC are attending remotely, and the City has made several avenues available for the public to watch the broadcast of this meeting.
- The PSC is taking these steps as a result of the COVID-19 pandemic and the need to limit in-person contact and promote social distancing. The pandemic is an emergency that threatens the public health, safety and welfare which requires us to meet remotely by electronic communications.
- Thank you all for your patience, humor, flexibility and understanding as we manage through this difficult situation to do the City's business.

Items of Interest from Commissioners

Commissioner Smith: A couple of transportation updates:

- Roes Quarter Project: ODOT has released the Finding of No Significant Impact. Of note is that they have removed the portion of the project over the Esplanade to avoid river impacts.
- Interstate Bridge Replacement Project is has started to convene. They are defining the project to follow up where the Columbia River Crossing left off.

Question: Is this body going to weigh in on the "climate test" that is being developed as part of the Climate Emergency Declaration? I would be interested in doing so. My understanding is that this would establish a shadow price on carbon that would be used to evaluate carbon impacts of new projects.

Consent Agenda

- Consideration of Minutes from the October 27, 2020, PSC meeting.

Commissioner Smith moved to approve consent agenda. *Commissioner Routh* seconded.

(Y9 – Bachrach, Bortolazzo, Houck, Larsell, Magnera, Routh, Schultz, Smith, Spevak)

The consent agenda passed unanimously.

Historic Resources Code Update

Briefing: Sandra Wood, Brandon Spencer-Hartle

Disclosures

None.

Oral Testimony

1. Carrie Richter – Land use attorney testifying as the Chair of the Policy and Advocacy Committee of Restore Oregon. Support of the proposal generally with some recommendations for improvements. *See written testimony*
2. Michael Andersen – Researcher at Sightline Institute. Testimony highlighting the environmental issues and noting the nuances of determining whether historic preservation or denser infill is “greener.” *See written testimony*
3. Sam Noble – Wants to see legislation that goes further to limit neighborhoods use of Historic District designations to block the creation of new housing. *See written testimony*
4. John Liu – Testimony on the demolition requirements in Conservation Districts. *See written testimony*
5. Sam Stuckey – Testifying on behalf of the Old Town/Chinatown Community Organization in regards to FAR transfers. *See written testimony*
6. Rod Merrick – Eastmoreland NA Land Use Chair. *See written testimony*
7. Heather Flint Chatto – Testifying on behalf of PDX Main Streets. Testifying on historic commercial districts. Please include streetcars and streetcar districts in the proposal. *See written testimony and petition*
8. Steven Cole – President of the Irvington Community Association. This project is being rushed without adequate time for neighbors to understand and comment. *See written comments*
9. Bert Sperling – Eastmoreland resident. *See written testimony*
10. Patrick Hilton – I’m discouraged by the public process. Historic districts are more than exclusionary enclaves for the privileged – they are part of the ecology of the city and drive tourism – an important primary and tertiary economic driver for the City.

11. Daniel Hernandez – Irvington homeowner. Concerned that the proposal would make him want to leave Portland because it would damage the quality of the neighborhood.
12. John McCulloch – Developer of affordable housing through the McCulloch Foundation. Testified in support of a strong historic preservation program.
13. Angela Uherbelau – Testified in support of the proposal that would make her neighborhood (Irvington) more accessible to communities of color and make it more affordable.

Chair Spevak closed testimony at 1:06 p.m.

Before the round-robin discussion, Brandon reminded the Commissioners of the main themes and goals of the project and of the next steps for the project:

Themes:

1. Identification
2. Designation
3. Protection
4. Reuse
5. Administration

Value Statements:

1. Meaningful and tangible connections to the past
2. Extending the useful life of existing buildings
3. Acknowledge, address, and reverse past harms
4. Identify and prioritize underrepresented histories
5. Evolve to meet changing needs

Equity Goals

1. Improve code language procedures
2. Expand exemptions
3. Ensure representation of all communities
4. Improve public access to and expand housing and economic opportunities in historic areas

Discussion

Commissioner Bachrach: We've been moving in a policy direction that encourages more housing and density. A key policy concern I have is that we are letting the goal for more housing and density be subsumed by the historic concerns – there needs to be balance. I also have concerns about how we are managing contributing and non-contributing resources in districts.

Commissioner Smith: I'm a little concerned about the timeline for this project – it is short. I'm very interested in the roles and interplay between the PSC and the HLC. I'm also concerned about the language for the affordability test – it is vague and may be abused. I'm interested in liberalizing ADU opportunities.

Commissioner Magnera: I'd like to look more at the exemption on solar panels and whether we can expand that to include anything that reduces carbon impacts. How do we get it to the right balance of climate and environmental concerns with historic preservation?

I agree with *Commissioner Smith* that we need to nail down the affordability test better.

I want to also discuss the challenge of addressing justice and equity, which was raised in some of the testimony. I think that this project may address equity but does not solve for justice. The project gets at equity looking forward by setting policy to make historic districts more accessible to BIPOC communities or enabling them to stay in the neighborhoods, but in terms of justice, particularly in the Conservation Districts which are largely located in historically Black neighborhoods that have gentrified, the damage has already been done. This project does nothing to address that. I would like to explore opportunities for repair and reparations.

I'd also like to look into cultural history and the way culture is a part of the present and the future and helps neighborhoods thrive. An example of how we're not addressing cultural history is the Rinehart Building that was once the Cleo Williams Social Club on Mississippi. The cultural significance has been lost and it is now instead a testament to gentrification.

Chair Spevak: Reopened Testimony at 1:28 due to an oversight.

14. Linda Nettekoven: I hope this project can be developed in light of new ways of looking at historic resources and underrepresented communities such as African American or LGBTQ communities.
See written testimony

Commissioner Houck: I support the hierarchy with Council being the decision maker and the PSC being the recommending body, expanding exemptions, removing parking requirements and owner consent, and incentives for adaptive reuse. I would like to see historic landscapes added to the proposal. I do have some concerns. I think the 400 sf limit on ADU's is too small – it should be in the range of 700 to 800 sf. I would hope that the PSC relationship with the HLC would be similar to the Design Commission with more collaboration, including holding joint hearings.

Commissioner Larsell: I want to know more about the meaning of affordability. I'm also curious about the types of permitted businesses and would like more info on the demolition reviews. Reading through the testimony, there was a lot of testimony about the HLC and I want to make sure that commission is fully supported and that it's made clear that we are not trying to encroach on their role.

I also want to know more about the interplay between RIP and the demolition proposals.

Commissioner Routh: Can we get clarification about the community engagement process? Also, is the HLC the deciding body for resource designation?

Brandon: Since 1995, the City has deferred to the National Register to make the designation decisions for landmarks and districts. In the current code, the PSC is the recommending body for districts and HLC is for designation of landmarks. This relationship will remain, but the designation options change.

Commissioner Routh: I'd also like to revisit the owner consent issue. I'm really excited about Ms. Uherbelau mentioned, I'd like to make sure we are expanding the concept about who's neighborhood

we are talking about in terms “our” history and addressing a sense of belonging. One piece about adaptive reuse – seismic, solar panels. I was pleased to find a provision about this in the proposed code.

I agree with the added exemptions. I’d also like to talk about what the priorities are in terms of ADA and accessibility and preservation since we are an aging region. I understood the 2017 cut-off was a change in the ORS. I also want to appreciate the new tiered system and how it allows us to have a more nuanced look at historic resources and belonging and community and how that relates to history and under-represented history. Ballot Measure 9 in 1992 was when I became politically active because my home of my birth would not be open to me without it – as I have lived and thrived here. The Egyptian Room was critically culturally important that doesn’t exist for the LGBTQ community anymore. Having the conversation about what belonging mean, without it being as binary as it may be, and as we’re working on the Albina Vision Plan and incorporating this to bring a greater sense of belonging to more communities makes this a very special project.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I want to also weigh in on the discussions about the recommending bodies for legislative and quasi-judicial designations and how we create partnerships and a creative tension between the two. I also want to discuss the HRI from the 1980’s and updating that through this project. I also want to comment on the idea that the most sustainable building is one that already exists - I think it can be argued both ways looking at the embodied energy of an older building versus the energy efficiency of a newer building. I think there is a more nuanced way of looking at this issue and it could be better informed with more research and data. I also have concerns about the timeline.

Commissioner Schultz: My primary point was very eloquently expressed by *Commissioner Routh*, which is that to me success of this project is preservation of buildings, places, culture, ideas and most importantly it encapsulates the entire community and the history of our common past. And to do that, we need to have broader engagement.

I look forward to more discussions with the HLC and the role of both committees and the interaction of the designation process for resources and structures and land areas. They have more expertise about buildings and structures and we have more expertise on land use and how it relates to the land use goals and the Comp Plan. I think we should also codify how the two commissions work together – this collaboration would strengthen both commissions.

I am very supportive of the tiered system and think it is generally going in the right direction and a means to engaging the broader community.

In direct response to the neighbors from Laurelhurst and Irvington– I got a real sense of distrust and fear and protection of their neighborhood, but I don’t see this proposal as a means to diminish those places or to take away the importance of them, though I also think that we need to have conversations with the broader community about history and what needs to be preserved. I do not think that this proposal is the time to discuss listing or delisting resources. There needs to be more analysis and discussion and testimony before we make any of those decisions.

Chair Spevak: I do struggle with the districts that we have now. This project was brought to us in the context of the racial history of Portland and zoning as an exclusionary tool. It seems like these districts are using historic preservation as a way to avoid contributing to the solution for our current housing crisis. I know that some are supportive of adaptive reuse within districts, which is great. But the creation of these districts is a relic of the past and is more representative of who can afford to pay for

consultants and navigate the National Park Services' process to get them registered. I think that the future of preservation is more about specific landmarks and smaller districts that capture more stories.

I want to piggyback on the need for more information and data on the issue of embodied energy vs. energy efficiency.

In terms of the purview of the commissions: currently, historic designation is effectively a way of downzoning, so long as the HLC has the authority to reduce density and height. I'd like to see that discretion removed.

Commissioner Schultz: I can't say I disagree with any of your points, but I think we need to be clear here: are you proposing that as part of this work we list or delist districts?

Chair Spevak: If we are opening it up to more than what staff brought to us (i.e. looking at listing/delisting) I would want to reopen testimony. I know we also need to be cognizant of staff time and resources. Maybe we need to be looking at that as a follow up project. If the question is "how do we use this project to address racial justice" then I think we need to look at ways to reduce the size of the large districts in relatively white and wealthy neighborhoods. They are used to support areas of the City that already have a lot of support. I don't see listing/delisting as a standalone code project – it would need to be part of something larger. While I'm not necessarily pitching that as part of this project, I am concerned it won't happen if we don't include it.

Commissioner Schultz: One way to maybe do that is to see if there is a way that triggers BDS to look at this. Under the current code, there is no trigger that requires us to look at local designation when a neighborhood requests national status.

Chair Spevak: I would like to talk to the HLC to find a way to force the conversation. An example is that if a neighborhood proposes designation, it automatically triggers the local designation process.

Commissioner Bachrach: My understanding of this issue is that we are trying to address Eli's concerns about the inequities of historic district. We are only required to have demolition requirements, but through this project, we are proposing to add new land use restrictions on those districts that were designated nationally but not locally. We don't need to delist the districts, rather we can use the regulations to determine what level of protection we need to apply in the districts. I think we're getting to some of the ends that Eli is trying to get to without needing to delist districts.

Brandon S-H: Just to clarify, this proposal isn't going to be relitigating the regulations broadly for City-designated districts.

Commissioner Magnera: One piece of testimony that caught my eye talked about displacement and mentioned a policy in Baltimore that tied a homeownership funding plan to historic resource preservation. I'd like to learn more about how historic resource preservation interacts with other issues such as housing affordability and displacement and what other cities are doing about it. I also want to know more about who we aren't hearing from – there has been testimony from people have managed to stay in their homes in the districts for a long time, but what about the people that have left or been displaced? I know that we're looking at Title 33 with this project, but would be the next steps of this project that goes beyond Title 33.

Sandra Wood: Just to clarify, several commissioners have requested more info on the community engagement process. I would invite you to read pages 20-21 of Volume1 of Brandon's staff report as a starting point.

Chair Spevak: I generally support staff's recommendation on the purview of the HLC and PSC, it may be that for a very small area of district, it would not need to come to the PSC since it may not impact land use and buildable lands inventory.

Commissioner Bachrach: For the record, there was a time when the PSC and HLC did meet and it may be good to revisit having coordination meetings to work through some of these issues.

Chair Spevak: Kristen Minor, chair of the HLC, has been invited to our upcoming work session so we can discuss coordination with her at that time. The hearing is continued until December 8 at 5:30 pm.

Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Plan

Briefing: Nicholas Starin; Justin Douglas (Prosper Portland), Kimberly Branam (Prosper Portland), Leslie Goodlow (PHB), Elaine Howard (Prosper Portland Consultant)

Presentation

Nicholas introduced the project and the other presenters.

This proposal, the 13th amendment to the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area (ICURA), is to increase the indebtedness of the ICURA by \$67 million to a total of \$402 million. Urban renewal is governed by Oregon Revised Statutes that are separate from the land use statutes but require major amendments to the urban renewal district to be brought to the land use decision body.

Approximately 70% of the new funds (\$45 million) will go to PHB for affordable housing that implements the N/NE Neighborhood Housing Strategy. The remaining 30% (\$19 million) will be used for Prosper Portland projects and programs to implement the N/NE Community Development Initiative Action Plan. These initiatives advance economic opportunities for communities that have not benefitted from previous urban renewal efforts in the area, particularly the African American community, and to address the legacy of involuntary displacement in North and Northeast Portland.

Staff recommends that the PSC take the following actions:

1. Recommend that the Portland City Council adopt the 13th Amendment to the ICURA Plan, and
2. Send a letter to City Council finding the 13th Amendment to the ICURA Plan conforms to the City of Portland Comprehensive Plan.

There will be a PSC hearing on November 24 and City Council hearings December 16 and 23.

Kimberly Branam, Executive Director of Prosper gave an overview of the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area and how tax-increment finance (TIF) works.

Leslie provided some more background on the N/NE Neighborhood Housing Strategy and the need for funding in the ICURA, which is out of funding for affordable housing set aside. The Housing Strategy came out of a controversy over locating Trader Joes on a Prosper property in the ICURA. The strategy

was developed to see that planning for spending would be guided by the community itself and focuses on preventing displacement, creating new homeowners, creating new rental homes, and land banking. Part of the strategy is a preference policy to prevent displacement and an Oversight Committee to oversee programming and spending in the ICURA. The preference policy is intended to serve historic community and survey shows that has been successful. Leslie walked the commission through the progress that has been made towards meeting the Housing Strategy targets and showed examples of some of the projects that have been developed. PSU studied the outcomes of the Housing Strategy preference policy and found that it is serving the intended community.

Prosper developed an Action Plan in 2016 with the N/NE Community Development Initiative, which is designed to use TIF resources to foster economic prosperity among communities and individuals that have not fully participated in or benefitted from economic opportunities in the Interstate TIF District with special emphasis on supporting Black Portlanders.

To date, Prosper staff have engaged community groups and other stakeholders and will next be going to the County Commission and then holding hearings before City Council.

Commissioner Bortolazzo: I'm wondering if there is a plan to shift more money to loans to stretch the dollars?

Chair Spevak: What happens to loans that are paid back?

Kimberly Branam: There is a strong demand for grants and we are trying to modify loan products to create more of a revolving loan program.

Commissioner Smith: I'm very supportive of the goals to address housing needs in the ICURA since, from the start, too much was dedicated to light rail and not enough to housing. What is the financial impact to the revenue sharing partners?

Kimberly: Increasing the indebtedness would delay the return of the TIF proceeds to the taxing jurisdictions by two years. The impact to the City would be \$8 million dollars for each of those years.

Elaine: We don't trigger revenue sharing with this proposal, so revenue sharing won't actually happen during those two years.

Commissioner Bachrach: I'd be interested in how many TIF dollars and other subsidy dollars go into each unit?

Leslie: I'd have to do some research for all subsidies but it is about \$100-150k per unit from TIF dollars. There are no other City subsidies – perhaps from other sources such as state or federal funding.

Commissioner Bachrach: Going forward what is the goal for additional housing units?

Leslie: We're looking at about 350-400 units.

Commissioner Bachrach: Do you expect the subsidy to go up?

Leslie: Yes, we are anticipating increasing the subsidy to the higher end of the range (\$150k) because of increases in construction costs.

Chair Spevak: How much of the housing is for rental vs. owner and how would the affordability requirements “stick” to the property?

Leslie: We haven’t planned the programming yet, so we won’t know until we get to that point.

Chair Spevak: Do you have any specific locations for additional housing? Also, looking at the cost breakdown, I see the administrative costs and wonder if there is a way to lower the admin costs for more money to go to housing.

Kimberly: We’re not actively looking to purchase any properties, rather we’re looking to support existing property owners. As to administrative costs, there are certain costs including debt management, legal, accounting, and auditing and the reality of it is that without that funding Prosper would not be able to do those functions.

Commissioner Magnera: How much of the funding is being distributed for new construction? Is there funding going towards preserving existing multifamily and converting it to affordable housing or creating opportunity for tenant purchase or cooperative living as a supplement to single-family home ownership?

Leslie: The funding is going to building new units. The oversight committee has not prioritized rehab or existing units. The priority is to build new units to let displaced residents move back to the neighborhood.

Chair Spevak: How much has the oversight committee or PHB connected with existing tenant organizing groups in N/NE?

Leslie: We conducted outreach over the course of 6 months with tenants and homeowners and there are renters and homeowners on the Oversight Committee. So far, we haven’t heard requests for money to go to rehab projects.

Chair Spevak: Thanks to the presenters. We look forward to seeing you at the November 24 hearing.

Shelter to Housing Continuum Project

Briefing: Eric Engstrom, Al Burns; April Rohman

Presentation

Eric Engstrom introduced the Shelter to Housing Continuum project. The purpose is to provide more opportunities to support transition from shelter to housing through zoning and other City code amendments.

Several City titles will be amended but the PSC’s formal role will be the Title 33 amendments. The PSC can include recommendations for changes to other City titles in the transmittal letters.

The project originated from the last extension of the City's State of Housing Emergency, which directed staff to make permanent changes to City codes to address the housing issues before the Housing Emergency ends on April 4, 2021. We're hoping to have these code changes in effect before that date, which is why there is a quick turnaround for this project.

Jessi shared some accomplishments under the Housing State of Emergency, which includes administration of both the City and Metro bonds for housing, the N/NE Neighborhood Housing Strategy, Inclusionary Housing, a Supportive housing plan, the Rental Services Office, and a transition to the Joint Office of Homeless Services.

April shared some of the accomplishments for JOHS, which included doubling the number of government-funded year-round beds, transforming the adult shelters with 24-hour spaces and space for pets and partners, and allowing for family housing to give each family space of their own.

Eric clarified some terminology: Shelters are intended to be transition with no minimum stay requirements as a Community Service Use and the occupants are clients or guests; while Housing has a 30-day minimum as a Residential Use and occupants are tenants or owners. Under this proposal we will be adding a third category of shelter: Outdoor Shelter (new), Mass Shelter, and Short-Term Shelter.

Under housing, there is Household Living and Group Living. With this project we are proposing to delete the definition of Household, which has an outdated view of a household as a family or domestic partnership living.

Changes with this Project

April gave some context as to what has been happening with traditional shelters. Prior to the state of emergency, almost all shelters were clustered in the Central City with no new beds in over a decade and a number of barriers to entry. Under the emergency, the number of beds was not only increased, but also a transformation of how shelters operate and where they are located. Now there more shelters in outer areas of the City and also expanded services to where people are with over 1400 year-round beds, population specific models, and over 7000 people served.

For Short Term and Mass Shelters under the emergency, we were able to expand where shelters are allowed without a Conditional Use, increase the number of shelter beds in the CM2 and CI2 zones, and clarify that clients may stay longer than 30 days in Short Term Shelters.

AI provided more information about the code changes. There are three areas of focus for this project:

1. Facilitate where shelters are allowed and what sort of support services are allowed
2. Establish new types of outdoor shelters as a type of community service
3. Provide more opportunities for group living

For temporary facilities:

- Add an allowance for temporary shelters when an emergency is not in place
- Also facilitates seasonal weather-related temporary facilities

Day facilities:

- Clarify allowances for day storage and hygiene facilities
- Clarify that institutions may provide meal services without additional approval

Outdoor Shelters (new type):

- Facilities may be sited quickly for 180 days as temporary activities

- Expand (but still limit) allowance for outdoor shelters in Industrial Zones

Housing Flexibility through Group Living:

- Remove code complexity barriers to the production or retention of group living arrangements
- Allow group living arrangements by right in the same places that household living is allowed by right
- Simplify definitions to clarify difference between housing and shelter, group living and household living
- Remove the current definition of household, legalizing roommates and all household types.

The definition of household is not inclusive of all Portland households and limits many living arrangements that can be built and occupied.

Group Living

- Current SRO regulations are unclear and complex
- The term “single-room-occupancy” will be eliminated, everything that can be in SRO format may also be done under the liberalized group living regulations

Tiny Houses on Wheels and RV’s

- Under state law, these are vehicles, not buildings
- Allowed as sleeping structure in Outdoor Shelters, church parking lots, and in campgrounds (which are a commercial use)
- BDS is temporarily not enforcing a ban on permanent residential occupancy, pending policy decision about how we want to regulate them

Policy Options for THOWs

- Continue to disallow
- Allow as temporary activity
- Allow as permanent housing

Next Steps

- PSC Hearing December 8, 2020
- City Council in early 2021
- Effective date spring 2021

Discussion

Commissioner Smith: I’m pleased that we are removing the definition of household. Generally, I think the new categories make sense. I’m concerned that we won’t be allowing shelters in the Open Space Zone.

Commissioner Magnera: How much influence did Dignity Village, Hazelnut Grove, and Right to Survive have in creating these proposals? How many unhoused people were engaged in the process and how much influence did they have over the final product?

Eric responded that they worked with Home for Everyone to connect with people who are experts in this topic and to include people with lived experience.

Commissioner Magnera: My question is more about how much was from providers versus those with lived experience and how much was consultation versus co-creation?

Eric: We did work with both providers and those with lived experience, and while they did not write code, they did have an opportunity to weight in.

April: We recognized that this was a code project and focused in the land use concerns, though JOHS advocated for separating the programmatic concerns from the land use code issues so that those decisions could be made in other venues.

Commissioner Magnera: Are there zoning changes that would allow for short term shelter uses for camping on underutilized lands on private property e.g. vacant lots? What would be necessary to allow or incentivize this?

Eric: There are temporary provisions that allow for a temporary shelter for 180 days without a Conditional Use. Also, there is a provision that allows for temporary shelters under an emergency declaration.

Commissioner Houck: I think this is exciting. We need an alternative that allows a shift for shelter housing from sensitive natural areas. I have a major problem with including Open Spaces generally as suggested by Chris. There are open spaces and there are open spaces. I would be willing to have a discussion but am not supportive of including Open Space at this time.

Chair Spevak: I'm also excited by this project, because it addresses several types of housing to start spanning the gap between the cost of a tent and the cost of the least expensive full new affordable home, which from our prior presentation we learned that a new unit requires a \$150k subsidy. If I were going to suggest a stretch for this project, it would be to open the doors more for the private sector to create inexpensive housing alternatives to being out on the streets. One option for that is tiny homes on private property. This is already happening extensively since the city stopped enforcing action against them. But that depends on the decision of whichever commissioner is in charge of BDS, so could be changed at any time.

Commissioner Magnera: How much has the planning side of BPS talked to waste management on the sustainability side about waste generated by RV's and camping?

Al responded that we did look at connections for waste and City sewer. The City has requirements for sewer connections, which is something that can't be accommodated easily on a temporary shelter site. But one of the themes of the project is addressing services for shelters.

Chair Spevak: We will be continuing this discussion at a December 8 hearing.

Adjourn

Chair Spevak adjourned the meeting at 4:22 p.m.