



600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

# Meeting minutes

Meeting: Metro Housing Oversight  
Committee Meeting 3

Date/time: Monday, April 3, 2019

Place: Metro, Council chamber, 600 NE Grand Ave, Portland, OR 97232

Purpose: Outline Metro Council's outcomes approach, discuss time of the implementation strategy, and review and discuss the possible committee tools

---

## Attendees

Manuel Castañeda, Serena Cruz, Melissa Erlbaum, Dr. Steven Holt, Mesha Jones, Jenny Lee, Ed McNamara, Steve Rudman, Bandana Shrestha, Shannon Singleton, Andrew Tull

## Absent

Mitch Hornicker, Tia Vonil

## Metro

Emily Lieb, Eryn Kehe, Jes Larson, Laura Dawson Bodner, Ashley McCarron

## Facilitators

Allison Brown, Hannah Mills

## Next meeting

Wednesday, May 1, 9:00 a.m. – 12:00 p.m.  
Metro, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, Council chamber

## Welcome and Agenda

Allison Brown, facilitator with JLA Public Involvement, welcomed the Committee and introduced Eryn Kehe, Metro, for a brief announcement. Eryn explained that a community leadership forum will be held on April 26 as a part of Metro's development of the implementation strategy for the housing bond, and invited the Committee to attend.

Co-Chair Shannon Singleton asked the group to introduce themselves explaining their hope for how the Committee can work together. Below is a summary of their responses:

- Strike a balance between slowing down on behalf of racial equity and the urgency for completing this work
- Ensure the work is done efficiently and thoughtfully
- Deliver on the desires of the voters
- Ensure oversight of how the funds are being spent
- Exceed the goals for housing production and provide more benefits to the people
- Have sensitivity towards the different capacities and issues of each of the jurisdictions
- Ensure transparency and accountability
- Involve the community in the process
- Continue the momentum, passion, and commitment present at these initial meetings



600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

# Meeting minutes

- Ensure consideration of equity beyond who benefits, but also in economic and workforce development
- Shift the culture and momentum to ensure the Committee functions equitably
- Set a precedent for future committees, bonds, and processes in regards to racial equity

Emily Lieb, Metro, briefly updated the Committee on the Phase 1 projects. Below is a summary of her update:

*Metro Council approved the concept endorsement for the first Phase 1 project – the Mary Ann Apartments in downtown Beaverton. This development will have 54 units, 29 of which will be family units, and 11 will be deeply affordable. Beaverton is asking for \$3 million from the bond. This is an early endorsement and therefore there is no approved funding at this stage. Beaverton is submitting an application for low-income tax credits and depending on whether the application is approved, this project may come back in a different form. Metro Council was pleased that a project had come forward so soon. Ed McNamara and Mesha Jones were volunteers in evaluating the project.*

Ed added that the project has a good overall team with their developer and contractor, but noted that it is an expensive project. He expressed his belief that jurisdictions should be bringing cost effective projects to ensure the highest production using housing bond funds. Emily responded that the project is relatively efficient and that \$3 million is not a large amount, however, the state subsidy is significant. Mesha explained that from a resident's perspective she had concerns about parking, public transportation, and added amenities for the residents.

Emily explained that the hope is that every committee member will get the opportunity to participate in those conversations, and that two to three more Phase 1 projects are expected to come forward before the cutoff on June 30.

Co-Chair Steve Rudman noted that these are competitive resources, and that jurisdictions will be encouraged to leverage bond funding with other funding sources in order to accomplish housing production throughout the region.

A committee member asked what percentage the \$3 million plays in the total cost of the project and what it pays for in terms of the Committee's goals. Emily responded that \$3 million covers approximately 14% of the total cost, and explained that it is difficult to know what it pays for. The committee member expressed the hope that there would be a way to look at how the investment is addressing the bond's goals. Emily responded that Metro is planning to analyze the value of the bond investment and display those results. She added that the Mary Ann Apartments would not break ground until 2020 which will allow time to do additional engagement, and that the development will have a partnership with the school district to work with high school students and engage them in construction trades.

## Public comment



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

# Meeting minutes

Allison asked if there were any members of the public who would like to submit comment. No comments were submitted.

## **Outcomes-Based Approach Presentation**

Using a PowerPoint presentation, Jes Larson, Metro, explained that she would be taking this time to address the Committee's previous questions, and to review the local implementation strategies and potential tools. Below is a summary of her presentation:

*Drafting of the regional programs began as soon as the measure was referred. Once the voters approved the measure, Metro began drafting the work plan with a focus on defining the program implementation, balancing regional standards, and creating specific metrics for determining outcomes. During this process, Metro was also receiving feedback from the jurisdictions and developers. Metro Council worked to balance this feedback and developed the directives of creating clear regional expectations, consistent measurement of outcomes, implementation flexibility, and understanding local needs and opportunities.*

*The regional policies considered community engagement, advancing racial equity, and workforce requirements. Metro Council decided that setting a regional goal may inhibit the action of jurisdictions and therefore set an outcomes-based approach. This decision was made in an effort to recognize the unique challenges and opportunities in each jurisdiction, balance the need for flexibility with the confidence in success, foster positive competition and innovation. In this sense, we are not evaluating whether the goals are good enough, but rather whether the jurisdictions have set goals.*

*The primary role of the Committee is to provide program oversight on behalf of the Metro Council to ensure that investments achieve regional goals and desired outcomes, and to ensure transparency and accountability in program activities and outcomes.*

The Committee was directed to a handout in their packet summarizing the best practices identified by Metro staff in regards to operationalizing racial equity in affordable housing. Jes explained that the practices were developed using nationwide research and would serve as an outline for jurisdictions in what it means to advance racial equity.

Emily continued the presentation:

*Metro Council directed staff to establish consistent regional metrics and monitoring protocols that align with state standards. Metro will be building on the existing statewide framework and identifying how to fill gaps. This will allow Metro to measure a variety of outcomes metrics, including unit production, tenant demographics, MWESB contracting, workforce participation outcomes, and engagement and partnership outcomes.*

*In 2020, the Committee will submit an annual report to Metro Council with an evaluation of jurisdictional and regional progress towards outcomes, as well as recommendations regarding changes to the implementation strategies, and regional technical assistance needs.*



600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

# Meeting minutes

## Discussion and Questions

The following is a summary of comments and questions made by committee members.

- Under Metro Council direction, jurisdictions will not be required to engage in all of the outcomes and performance metrics?
  - Emily responded: *Jurisdictions are not required to set a goal, but there is a requirement that they set economic development goals for advancing racial equity. The goals may look different depending on the jurisdiction, but they will be measured the same. A good example is looking at permanent supportive housing – there is a charge to set goals, but it isn't a requirement.*
  - Co-Chair Rudman added: *When considering MWESB, goals will not be set by Metro, but there will be expectations. It's a good faith effort.*
- Part of the job of the Committee is to lead with racial equity both through creating ways to track performance and setting requirements. Letting each jurisdiction determine how to execute racial equity is inconsistent with the charge of the Committee.
  - Co-Chair Singleton responded: *The Committee has the ability to recommend approval of a plan with a 10% MWESB goal with the expectation that they reach 20%.*
- Can the Committee recommend edits to the Metro Council work plan? Metro has the opportunity to set requirements in each area, specifically in regards to racial equity and goals for MWESB. Developers know how to meet requirements because they have done work in Portland. If this cannot be revisited by Metro Council, this could impact participation in this Committee.
- Jurisdictions will make the effort to ensure they receive funding, and it's important that jurisdictions aren't just making it appear that they're abiding by the requirements. It would be easy for jurisdictions to use the same contractors each time, but the goal is to spread the wealth.
- Contractors appreciate having set targets, even if it means they may not qualify for the work. Flexibility in the requirements can make it difficult to respond effectively.
- It's important to recognize that equity work needs to be done in the workforce as well. Consider creating opportunities for the younger generation to engage in workforce through the construction trade.
- The bond has the power to make a real difference, especially if the bond is leveraged and supports community-led projects, such as the library in Cornelius. Flexibility makes sense for this bond because each jurisdiction is starting from a different place. If we set hard requirements we may be missing opportunities for informal networks to receive funding. Finding a balance between using our power to achieve these goals, and allowing enough flexibility is important.
- The bond has the opportunity to serve as a model for the future. Consider setting aspirational benchmarks, understanding that some jurisdictions are starting from ground zero. It would be beneficial to allow the Committee to recommend changes to Metro Council, not necessarily suggesting static requirements, but something that provides a roadmap for success in reaching the goals.
- It's important that there is a feedback process between the Committee and Metro Council, especially in regards to the concerns raised at this meeting relating to the evaluation criteria around MWESB goals.
  - Metro staff is committed to exploring the best path forward with the committee Co-chairs.

# Meeting minutes



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

## Implementation Strategy Calendar Review

Emily explained that the committee members will be receiving calendar holds for future meetings, and directed the Committee to the handout illustrating the draft calendar. She noted that the calendar proposes monthly meetings for the rest of 2019, and then quarterly meetings beginning in 2020. Additionally, she pointed out that meetings will be set to allow for three hours if needed. Allison asked the Committee if they were comfortable with these changes. Below is a summary of the discussion.

- Holding some of the meetings in the jurisdictions may increase public comment.
- Consider reserving the first two hours of the meeting for Committee discussion, and then having the last hour for conversations with the jurisdictions.
  - Emily responded: *The last meeting put forward two ideas – to interact with the jurisdictions prior to plan submission, and also a meeting following plan submissions to interact with the jurisdictions and ask questions. The meetings in May and June would have brief presentations from the jurisdictions to help the Committee understand where they are coming from. The review meetings will take place from July to November with one to two strategies for review at each meeting, as well as time for the jurisdictions to answer questions. It's important to recognize that if the Committee cannot come to a decision at one meeting, it would be difficult to carry it into the next meeting, potentially resulting in a delay.*

## Tools for Success

Emily directed the Committee to the evaluation tool in their packets, explaining that it was developed using the Committee's feedback from the last meeting. She explained that the Committee would receive the implementation strategies prior to the meetings and then submit questions that will be sent to the jurisdictions to prepare them for the discussion. The Committee agreed with the proposed calendar, review process, and evaluation tool. Below is a summary of the Committee's discussion:

- If the Committee would like to keep the options of holding pre-meetings, it's important to consider the public notification requirements. If multiple members want to meet with staff prior to a Committee meeting, and a quorum of members attended, the meeting would be a public meeting.
  - Co-Chair Singleton noted that some members may be able to dig into a strategy better than others, which would allow the time to flag concerns to assist the conversation.
  - Metro staff added that they would be available to meet with committee members one-on-one.
- What about holding subcommittees around specific issues or jurisdictions to promote informed discussions around the findings?
  - Co-Chair Rudman noted that the main task is approving the local implementation strategies, and that it's important to ensure that the subcommittees are not meeting to approve a plan. Additionally, Co-Chair Rudman explained that the Committee needs to have the time to hear concerns, engage with staff, and discuss as a whole.
- A subcommittee would essentially be the same thing as a pre-meeting, and would be for the purpose of getting information, not for making suggestions. Additionally, it would be comprised of different members at various times.



**Metro**

600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

# Meeting minutes

- If there is enough interest in participating in a subcommittee or pre-meeting, it's important to note that attendance does not have to be capped as long as it's planned with enough time for public notice.
- Would it make sense to just extend the meetings to be four hours long rather than scheduling pre-meetings?
  - Emily responded: *If the meeting is longer than three hours, it would need to start before 9 AM.*
  - A Committee member suggested keeping the meetings from 9 AM – 12 PM and then extending them if necessary.
- The Committee agreed to schedule three hour meetings that can be extended if necessary.
- Holding meetings in the different jurisdictions is great in regards to equity, but it's important to note that the timing of these meetings isn't optimal for public attendance.

## Next Steps and Close

Emily explained that prior to the May meeting Metro will have a schedule for jurisdictional attendance at the May and June meetings. Additionally, Emily noted that Metro may be reaching out to the Committee for more volunteers Reviewing Phase 1 projects. Co-Chair Rudman asked whether the jurisdictions have had the chance to review the evaluation sheet. Emily explained that the jurisdictions were invited to attend this meeting. Co-Chair Singleton expressed her belief that considering the Committee's feedback on MWESB goals, the approach was still a draft. Emily committed to following up on this issue. Jes added that Metro staff would work with the committee chairs to discuss the approach.

Jes thanked the Committee for their participation and encouraged members to reach out to Emily if they had suggestions for refining the process.

Co-Chair Singleton expressed her appreciation for members' willingness to be vulnerable, and reminded the Committee that in order to meaningfully address racial equity, it would require striking a balance between slowing down and understanding the urgency of meeting housing production needs.

The meeting was adjourned.