HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DATE: May 13, 2015
TIME: 5:30 pm – 7:30 pm
LOCATION: Room 209, 2nd Floor, City Hall

1. Agenda May 13 HCDC Meeting

   Documents: 05.13.2015 AGENDA.PDF

2. Review And Accept Minutes Of Previous Meetings Held On April 22 & May 4, 2015

   Documents: DRAFT MINUTES FROM 4-22-15 MEETING.PDF, DRAFT MINUTES FROM 5-4-15 SPECIAL MEETING.PDF

3. Review, Discussion And Possible Approval Of RFP For The Sale And Development Of City-Owned Propertly Located At 157 Brackett Street

   Documents: CITY PROPERTY DISTRIBUTION 157 BRACKETT STREET.PDF

4. Review Of Affordable Housing Tax Increment Financing Program

   Documents: AHTIF MEMO MAY 2015.PDF

5. 2015 HCDC Work Plan For Review And Discussion
   a. Discussion regarding the possible addition of 58 Fore Street to the May 27th Agenda.

   Documents: HCDC 2015 WORK PLAN FOR 05.13.15.PDF

Public Comment will be accepted on action items.
Councilor Kevin Donoghue, Chair

Next Meeting Date: May 27, 2015

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

DATE: **May 13, 2015 (Wednesday)**
TIME: **5:30 p.m. – 7:30 p.m.**
LOCATION: **Room 209, Second Floor**
Portland City Hall

A G E N D A

1. Review and accept Minutes of previous meetings held on April 22, 2015 and May 4, 2015.

2. Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of RFP for the Sale and Development of City-Owned Property located at 157 Brackett Street – See enclosed Memorandum from Mary Davis.

3. Review of Affordable Housing Tax Increment Financing Program – See enclosed Memorandum from Mary Davis.

4. 2015 HCDC Work Plan for Review and Discussion – See enclosed Work Plan from Jeff Levine, Greg Mitchell and Mary Davis.

a. Discussion regarding the possible addition of 58 Fore Street to the May 27th Agenda.

Public Comment will be accepted on action items. **Councilor Kevin Donoghue, Chair**

Next Meeting Date: May 27, 2015

Housing & Community Development Committee
Minutes of April 22, 2015 Meeting

A meeting of the Portland City Council's Housing and Community Development Committee (HCDC) was held on Wednesday, April 22, 2015 at 5:30 p.m. in Council Chambers on the second floor of Portland City Hall. Present from the HCDC was its Chair Councilor Kevin Donoghue, and members Councilors David Brenerman, David Marshall, and Nick Mavodones. Mayor Michael Brennan was present for a portion of the meeting. City staff present included Public Services Director Mike Bobinsky, Housing & Community Development Division Director Mary Davis, HCD Program Manager Amy Grommes Pulaski, Acting City Manager Sheila Hill-Christian, Transportation Program Director Bruce Hyman, Planning and Urban Development Director Jeff Levine, Economic Development Director Greg Mitchell, and Chief of Police Michael Sauschuck.

Item 1: Review and accept Minutes from previous meeting held on April 8, 2015.

On motion made and seconded, the Committee voted 3-0 to accept the minutes as published.

Item 2: Review of Prioritization of Encourage Strategies and Referral to Planning Board for Public Hearing of Ordinance Changes to Encourage Housing Development.

Jeff Levine introduced item by noting that he just returned from a national conference and that Portland is following a national trend with its encourage and ensure policy recommendations. Mr. Levine provided a summary of his recommendation on the priority of the policy changes being recommended.

Councilor Donoghue opened the item for public comment.

Betsey Remage Healey, Chair of the Homestart group on Peaks Island appreciates the support for the Peaks Island accessory dwelling unit proposal and would like to be included in ongoing conversations regarding this topic.

Seeing no further public comment, Councilor Donoghue closed the public comment session and opened the floor for Council comment.

Councilor Brenerman asked, regarding item #5 in the memo, based on the complaints about parking on peninsula, how does this help alleviate the parking problem? Mr. Levine referred to the method in Planning Board process that establishes parking needs and reiterated that the proposal recommends changes only on the peninsula and that this would not be one of the highest priority proposals.

Councilor Mavodones (regarding item #5) referred to previous comments from the community regarding cost of parking studies and asked if the purpose of the proposal in #5 was to alleviate the cost issue. Mr. Levine indicated that cost is one issue and certainty is another other issue. Councilor Mavodones asked about the assumption that space may be available in parking garages on the eastern part of peninsula. Do we know which garages have space?

On a motion made and seconded Item #2 was referred to the Planning Board with a vote of 4-0.

On a motion made and seconded Item #3 was referred to the Planning Board with a vote of 4-0. Prior to the vote Councilor Brenerman asked for clarification on the language to be forwarded to the Planning Board. Mr. Levine indicated that he would like the recommendation to have the basic language referred to in his memo. Councilor Donoghue asked if the R-4 zone should be included. Mr. Levine indicated that staff has not done outreach to the residents in R4 zone and would recommend not including the R-4. On a vote of 4-0 the motion was approved.

On a motion made and seconded Item #4 was referred to the Planning Board with a vote of 4-0.

No motions were offered on Items #5, #6 & #7. Councilor Donoghue indicated that items with no motion would not be included on the HCDC work plan.

Item #3: Public Comment, Discussion of CDBG Allocation Committee and Acting City Manager's Funding Recommendations.

Councilor Marshall recused himself from the remainder of the meeting due to a conflict of interest.

Amy Grommes Pulaski introduced the item and Sheila Hill-Christian outlined her recommendations.

The item was opened for questions from the Committee.

Councilor Mavodones asked about the increase in funding for the Amistad Peer Coaching Initiative. Ms. Hill-Christion spoke of the GA transition plan outlined in her budget proposal. This agency indicated an ability to assist more clients and offer additional services which would assist with the City's GA transition plan.

Councilor Donoghue inquired about residency/eligibility issues. Ms. Hill-Christian indicated that the Governor's changes will require income eligibility screening. Ms. Davis indicated that staff researched the residency status issue and confirmed with HUD that third-party non-profit providers could provide assistance to asylum seekers.

Councilor Brenerman ask for an explanation concerning the difference in the two Amistad programs being funded. Ms. Grommes-Pulaski offered an overview of each program.

Councilor Brenerman asked if the agencies receiving funding this year, received similar amounts last year. Ms. Grommes-Pulaski indicated that most were receiving similar amounts.

The item was opened for public comment.

Lori Moses of Catherine Morrill Day Nursery indicated she was pleased that the Acting City Manager recognized the value of affordable child care by recommending CDBG funding. She explained the partnership with YFO and the clients they serve. Ms. Moses indicated that this year's proposal included a partnership with the Opportunity Alliance. She stressed the importance of affordable child care to enable parents to work or go to school and that there are not a lot of options available that provide assistance with child care costs. Ms. Moses indicated that the scholarship program was extremely effective, it helps to transition families out of poverty and quality early childhood education helps to train future members of the workforce.

Todd Goodwin from Milestone offered thanks for the funding recommended for the HOME team program and indicated that they anticipate an increase in client contacts next year, and they are working to formalize a partnership with Amistad.

Victoria Foley, of the Portland Community Health Center (PCHC) Board of Directors indicated disappointment in the Acting City Manager's decision to not recommend PCHC for funding. She acknowledged the City's long history of supporting mental health treatment and indicated that since January 1 the PCHC has served over 1000 homeless individuals. She also indicated that in 2012 38% of homeless persons reported problems with substance abuse and 60% reported problems with mental health issues.

Joyce Racine, a member of the Board of Directors of PCHC, stressed that the PCHC program was targeted to most vulnerable in our community. She has been homeless, resided at Florence House and received assistance through the Healthcare for the Homeless program. She now has a home and is an active member of the Board of Directors because of the services she received.

Laura Phillips, Program Manager at the McCauley Residence thanked the Acting City Manager for recommending funding for quality child care.

Candy Knowland spoke about the Catherine Morrill/YFO child care program. As a single mom she would not be able to study as a full time student without the child care scholarship program.

Bill Price, a licensed clinical drug counselor and social worker at PCHC indicated that he was the only licensed counselor at PCHC and that the funding requested through the CDBG process would allow PCHC to hire additional staff and provide expanded services.

Christa Baade, from Coastal Enterprises, Inc. (CEI) thanked the Council for creating CDBG Employment Development Program and for the continued support of the program. She explained that the program was a collaborative and coordinated effort by various agencies. In the first 7 months of the project, they enrolled 75 participants; over 50 participants have completed job readiness training; in late February, 10 participants completed hospitality and customer service training, almost all of which have been offered jobs in hotels. They project is also working on a customized training program for new child care facilities. The program has resulted in four businesses partnerships so far.

Michelle Belanger from Youth and Family Outreach indicated that the Catherine Morrill/YFO program has provided assistance to 27 families, with 33 children, 10 of those families were previously homeless, and 5 were teen parents. The program eliminates barriers to working and provides quality meals for children. She supports the Acting City Manager's recommendations.

Jean Swanton, a neighbor of the Reiche School, was concerned that this Reiche School/Brackett Street Pedestrian Safety Project was not fully funded. She indicated that this was a very dangerous situation to have no crosswalks at an urban elementary school. She indicated that these issues were identified in 2009 and CIP funding recommendations were not moved forward. With all the changes in neighborhood and a 32% increase in the number of students in the past five years, she asked that the funding level be reconsidered so that the project could be fully funded.

Ian Jacob, President of the West End Neighborhood Association, stressed the issues with the Reiche School safety concerns. He indicated that two temporary crosswalks were put in place last fall but they have all but disappeared over the winter. With more development coming into neighborhood that will bring more traffic, he was disappointed that the CDBG Allocation Committee did not recommend this program for funding.

Becky T. a resident of the West End reiterated the comments of last two speakers. She has a child in the Reiche School and is concerned about future development that will add to the traffic in the neighborhood.

Jennifer Sporzynski of CEI spoke about the Microenterprise Assistance Program and the partnership with Cultivating Communities. She thanked the City for supporting the program and indicated that the program is meeting all its goals and is currently working with an existing pipeline of people wanting to start businesses. So far the program has worked with 42 clients.

Mark Swan, Executive Director of Preble Street offered thanks for the continued support of the Preble Street programs and indicated that this year that they requested flat funding. He appreciated the recommendations of the Allocation Committee and the Acting City Manager. He expressed concern with the City's planned closing of overflow shelter on June 1 and the end of providing homeless families with hotel stipends. He indicated that his was a significant departure from a long standing City policy and urged the City Council to conduct a public discussion about these changes. He indicated that in previous times when shelters have closed, there has been a significant public discussion. He expressed concern that the overflow shelter would be closing in 5 weeks without any type of transition plan.

Public comment was closed and Councilor Donoghue asked if the Committee members had any questions.

Councilor Donoghue requested a detailed explanation of the impact of the reduced funding for the Brackett Street improvement project and the bike parking project.

Councilor Mavodones asked for additional information regarding the history of the Brackett Street needs and why these improvements have not been completed sooner.

Councilor Brenerman asked if the funding provided to the Greenleaf Street will complete the project or will it need more money from other sources.

Councilor Donoghue also requested more information about the CEI Employment Development Programs, with information about the child care feature offered through the programs and the wages provided in the hospitality jobs.

Answers to these questions will be provided by staff to the City Council at the May 4th Special CDBG Meeting.

As this item was brought forth to provide an opportunity for comment by the Committee and the public, no action was required by the Committee.

Item 4: Public Comment, Discussion and Recommendation to City Council of Portland's FY 2015-2019 HUD 5-Year Consolidated Plan and FY 15-16 HUD Annual Action Plan.

Ms. Davis explained that initially staff intended to present the Five Year Consolidated Plan. However there were some problems with the HUD reporting system that will require a one-year extension to the current five year plan. Ms. Davis explained that as part of a county wide consortium for HOME Program funding, the City recently received guidance from HUD that recommended that the City and County five year plans be synchronized. As a result the City will be requesting a 1 year extension of our previous five year plan. Therefore the City and the County will both be submitting their five year plans next year. At this time, staff is requesting HCDC support of our one year Annual Action Plan, which incorporates the funding allocations reviewed in the previous agenda item. The allocation plan will need to be recommended to the Council.

Staff is also requesting a recommendation from the Committee regarding an update to the target neighborhoods, a proposed map is provided for the Committee to review.

Councilor Donoghue asked for an explanation for the changes to the map. Ms. Davis explained that staff reviewed information recently provided by HUD based on American Community Survey data. This map identifies new areas as “target areas” which include both block groups and census tracts. Target areas are areas the City would like to target funds, but would not eliminate projects elsewhere within the City. A few changes from the previous map include: Libbytown is no longer part of the target neighborhood and a few areas of the peninsula are also being included in the target areas, including the Old Port, Arts District, and parts of Baxter Boulevard.

Councilor Mavodones and Councilor Donoghue shared some concerns regarding the new map. They were puzzled that the map included some fairly affluent areas.

Councilor Donoghue expressed interest in focusing the HCD funds further, not diluting them more. He asked if the funds could be more focused. Ms. Davis explained that map was created with data provided by HUD from the American Community Survey. The data cannot be changed but the program can be more focused.

Councilor Donoghue would like to see a tiered idea of the data and wondered if we could defer to the previous map until further review of the new data can be done. Ms. Davis agreed that staff could provide more information on the map and defer the discussion until the fall to coincide with the five year planning process.

On a motion made and seconded, the Committee voted 3-0 to recommend City Council approval of the FY 15/16 Annual Action.

Item #5: Review and Recommendation to City Council of improvements and changes to the CDBG Allocation Process.

Ms. Pulaski presented the recommended changes to the CDBG Allocation process.

Councilor Brenerman observed that based on the current recommendations from Allocation Committee (AC) it appears the AC seemed inclined to provide the amounts requested by the applicants rather than splitting the funding so that more applicants could receive an allocation.

Ms. Pulaski explained that based on previous changes in CDBG allocation process the AC was given direction to fully fund projects. Providing partial funding recommendations means the process becomes more subjective so the AC recommends full funding in order to be more objective. It has been an issue that AC has struggled with over the last 5 years.

Councilor Donoghue asked about the Community Policing set aside of $150,000. What does that funding provide for the program? Chief Sauschuck explained that the funding covers about 68% of salaries for staff in the eligible areas. The CDBG funding has never covered the entire cost of salaries for program. Councilor Donoghue asked if the set aside amount meets the program needs. Chief Sauschuck indicated that the remaining cost of the program is covered by the general fund and that the CDBG funding covers approximately the cost of the three of the Community Policing Coordinators.

Public Comment:

Leslie Clark, CEO of Portland Community Health Center said that the process for CDBG allocations is laid out very carefully and with the scoring metrics clearly defined.   The process is designed to hold up to scrutiny.   PCHC would have appreciated the opportunity to address the need that the new Amistad program is addressing.

Bob Haines remembers that the process used to be a political process and now it is much more objective than it used to be but is it flexible enough to change with the times and needs.

Lori Moses of Catherine Morrill Day Nursery has observed the process changing over the years and has experience in writing the proposals. She believes that child care funding is critical yet child care falls short in the scoring process without bonus points.

Committee Comments:

Councilor Brenerman indicates that child care has been a funding priority for a long time, and supports adding bonus points for child care.

Councilor Mavodones indicated support for the recommendations minus the changes to the CDBG target area map.

Councilor Donoghue supports the child care bonus points. He would like the Council to provide more direction on policy/priority guidelines.

Ms. Hill-Christian suggested that the Council should review all health and human services funding and that CDBG should be a secondary support not the first funding resource to address community issues.

On a motion made and seconded, the Committee voted 3-0 to recommend for Council approval the staff recommended changes to the CDBG allocation process, without the new CDBG Targeted Area Map.

Item #6: Review and Recommendation to City Council to authorize Amended and Restated Lease with Nova Star Cruises at Ocean Gateway. Note: The Committee may go into executive session pursuant to 1 M.R.S.A. 405(6)(C) and (F) and 5 M.R.S.A. 13119-A to provide guidance to staff.

Greg Mitchell introduced this item and noted that the CEO for Nova Star is in attendance. He indicated that there are some changes to the lease that need to be made before bringing the item to the Council, specifically wording changes in regards to the repair and maintenance responsibility associated with the roll on/roll off ramp.

Councilor Mavodones questions whether the discussion would be appropriate for executive session.

Mr. Mitchell presented the issues and highlighted amendments to lease from his cover memo; in addition to the changes previously discussed with the Committee, there is some question regarding maintenance issues which varies from the language in memo.

Councilor Mavodones asks for clarification as to whether the Committee is being asked to accept the lease language as written or being asked to consider further changes regarding ramp maintenance assignment responsibility issue. Mr. Mitchell indicated that there will be additional changes to the language, however he believes a solution could be worked out before the Council meeting and the Council could review the revisions at that time.

Councilor Mavodones indicated that he would be more comfortable having the discussion in executive session.

On a motion made and seconded, the Committee voted 3-0 to enter executive session pursuant to 1 M.R.S.A. 405(6)(C) and 13119-A to give guidance to staff at approximately ---- p.m. At approximately -==== p.m., the Committee came out of executive session.

Councilor Donoghue made a motion to schedule a Special Housing and Community Development Committee meeting for Monday, May 4th and to postpone action on this item to the May 4th Special Meeting. The item was seconded and approved with a 3-0 vote.

Item #7: Executive Session: Pursuant to 1 M.R.S.A. 405(6)(C) and (F) and 5 M.R.S.A. 13119-A, the Committee will go into executive session to provide guidance to staff regarding: a. Direction on City proposed property acquisition and use plan to support DPS Bayside Relocation.

Public comment: Robert Haines asked for specifics of the topic to be discussed in executive session and questioned if the topic was appropriate for executive session. Mr. Mitchell clarified that the discussion would relate to property acquisition.

On motion made and seconded the Committee voted 3-0 to enter into executive session pursuant to 1 M.R.S.A. 405(6)(C) and 13119-A to give guidance to staff at approximately ---- p.m. At approximately 8:45 p.m., the Committee came out of executive session.

Item #8: 2015 HCDC Work Plan for Review and Discussion.

Postponed due to time.

On motion and made and seconded, the Committee voted 3-0 to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 8:50

Respectfully,

Mary Davis

Housing & Community Development Committee

Minutes of May 4, 2015 Special Meeting

A special meeting of the Portland City Council's Housing and Community Development Committee (HCDC) was held on Monday, May 4, 2015 at 6:30 p.m. in Room 209 on the second floor of Portland City Hall. Present from the HCDC was its Chair Councilor Kevin Donoghue, and members Councilors David Brenerman, David Marshall, and Nick Mavodones. City staff present included Director of Public Building Kathy Alves, Housing & Community Development Division Director Mary Davis, Planning and Urban Development Director Jeff Levine, Economic Development Director Greg Mitchell and Housing Planner Tyler Norod.

Item 1: Review and Recommendation to City Council to approve the Amended and Restated Lease with Nova Star Cruises at Ocean Gateway. Note: The Committee may go into executive session pursuant to 1 M.R.S.A. 405(6)(C) and (F) and 5 M.R.S.A. 13119-A to provide guidance to staff.

Greg introduced the item and highlighted the changes and updates made since the last meeting when the item was reviewed by the Committee.

Councilor Mavodones asked for clarification on the resolution to the maintenance assignment responsibility for the roll on/roll off ramp. Mr. Mitchell indicated that during the operating season, the ramp is only used by the ferry service and staff felt that Nova Star should be responsible for maintenance and repairs during this time frame.

Councilor Brenerman asked for confirmation that the City does not use the ramp during the operating season. Kathy Alves explained that the ramp is designed for ferry use only and is not able to be used for other purposes.

Councilor Donoghue asked when the new lease terms would go into effect. Mr. Mitchell stated that if the Committee approved the amendments it would go to the Council for approval on May 18th and if approved by the Council the effective date would be June 1.

Councilor Donoghue opened the item for public comment.

Bob Haines asked what would happen if the ramp was damaged during the season but the damage was done by a third party.

Steven Scharf asked why this was not a multi-year lease.

Mr. Mitchell indicated that the City wanted repair and maintenance to be the responsibility of the tenant. Mr. Mitchell also pointed out that this is a multi-year lease, these are amendments being proposed in the 2nd year of the lease. Ms. Alves indicated that if the damage was caused by a third party it would be an insurance issue (third party's insurance) and not the responsibility of the tenant.

On a motion made and seconded, the Committee voted 4-0 to recommend this item to the City Council for approval.

On motion made and seconded, the Committee voted 4-0 to adjourn. The meeting was adjourned at 6:50.

Respectfully,

Mary Davis

Portland, Maine   Yes. Life's good here.
Mary Davis
Division Director, Housing & Community Development Division

TO: Councilor Donoghue, Chair
Members of the Housing and Community Development Committee

FROM: Mary Davis, Division Director
Housing and Community Development Division

DATE: May 8, 2015
SUBJECT: Review and Recommendation to Proceed with a RFP for the Sale and Development of 157 Brackett Street

SUMMARY

Over the last several years, it has been a goal of the City Council and the Housing and Community Development Committee to increase the availability of housing in the City of Portland. The use of city sites for residential development has been one of the tools suggested to meet this goal.

COMMITTEE GOAL/COUNCIL GOAL ADDRESS

Promote Housing Availability – Provide increased availability in all segments of the housing market while ensuring that there is a suitable balance of housing opportunities among those sectors. Objective: Complete assessment of and, as appropriate, begin to offer city owned property to construct affordable housing.

FINANCIAL IMPACT

This site has an approximate assessed value of $126,300.

STAFF ANALYSIS AND RECOMMENDATION

Staff is seeking direction and feed-back from the Housing and Community Development Committee (HCDC) as to future action on a city-owned site located at 157 Brackett Street. The HCDC has discussed this item previously.

This parking lot is currently used as employee and visitor parking for Reiche School, parking for customers of area businesses and off-street and snow-ban parking for the neighborhood. There has been public concern regarding the development of this site. However, recently the Reiche School Leadership Team and the West End Neighborhood Association have expressed support for the issuance of a RFP provided the issues around parking and safety are addressed. Copies of the written comments submitted in support of this item are attached. On April 28, notice of this meeting was mailed to property owners within 500 feet of the site.

As you may know, the Department of Public Services submitted an application through the CDBG Program entitled Reiche School – Brackett Street Pedestrian Safety Project. Recently the City Council approved the CDBG funding recommendation of the Acting City Manager which included partial funding for this project, which will allow one of two proposed permanent crosswalks to be completed. This funding will be available on July 1. The RFP includes a requirement that the remaining safety issues be addressed in conjunction with development on the 157 Brackett Street site.

Housing and Community Development staff is seeking a recommendation from the Committee that the City proceed with an RFP process to solicit interest in this site for residential development. Staff recommends that the RFP include a condition that any redevelopment of the site must provide adequate replacement parking and Brackett Street safety improvements.

ATTACHMENTS
Draft of proposed RFP
Site Map
Public Comment
Response to City Council Questions regarding CDBG Application

City of Portland
Request for Proposals
For the Sale and Development of Property
Located at
157 Brackett Street

RFP # XXXX

Notice and Specifications

Sealed proposals for furnishing the City of Portland with the Development of Affordable Housing, as specified herein, will be received by the Purchasing Office, Room 103, City Hall, 389 Congress Street, Portland, Maine 04101, until Thursday, July 9, 2015 at 3:00 p.m. at which time they will be publicly opened. Proposals shall be submitted with the attached forms, and returned in sealed envelopes plainly marked on the outside "**SALE AND DEVELOPMENT OF 157 BRACKETT STREET**." Proposals that are late and/or submitted via fax or electronic communication will not be accepted. All proposals shall be held open to acceptance for sixty days from opening.

All questions must be submitted in writing to the Purchasing Office. These may be mailed; hand delivered, faxed to (207) 874-8652 or e-mailed to mff@portlandmaine.gov and be received no later than five (5) business days prior to the opening date. Questions received after this time will not be addressed. Any interpretation, correction, or change of this document will be made only by written addenda. Changes in any other manner will not be binding on the City of Portland.

The disposal of this real estate shall be on the basis of a negotiated proposal, with the City of Portland reserving the right to refuse any or all proposals. *All proposers are advised that the property will be sold "as-is" and "where-is", in its existing condition, with no warranties either expressed or implied.* The City disclaims any and all responsibility for injury to proposers, their agents or others while examining the property or at any other time.

Proposals from vendors not registered with the Purchasing Office may be rejected; receipt of this document directly from the City of Portland indicates registration. Should a vendor receive this Request from a source other than the City of Portland, please contact (207) 874-8654 to ensure that your firm is listed as a vendor for this RFP.

GENERAL INFORMATION

The City of Portland, Maine seeks proposals from qualified developers for the purchase and development of the property located at 157 Brackett Street (hereafter, "the lot"). The site is designated on the City of Portland Tax Assessor's Map as Map 045, Block E, Lot 031.

Summary of Request

The City of Portland is committed to provide a balance of housing opportunities and has set a goal to evaluate the use of city-owned property to construct affordable housing. As one step in accomplishing this goal, the City of Portland will accept proposals for the development of affordable housing on the lot located at 157 Brackett Street, Portland, Maine (Map 045, Block E, Lot 031), which currently serves as parking for Reiche School of approximately 24 spaces, and for neighborhood parking after hours. This parking~~, which parking~~ would need to be substantively replaced at no cost to the City, including access.

The City of Portland's Division of Housing and Community Development uses the RFP process to ensure that public resources are utilized for maximum public benefit while accomplishing specific objectives and providing fair access to all applicants.

General Guidelines

Development shall provide affordable rental or home ownership units. Note that "affordability" is defined by the standards outlined in Division 30 Section 14-485 of the City's Land Use Code.

Mixed income projects serving households that are very low, low to moderate, and middle income are eligible. Projects with mixed unit types including efficiencies, one, two and three or four bedroom units are also eligible. The minimum term of affordability is 90 years, to be secured by a land use restriction covenant in the deed.

The proposed use of funds, leveraging of other public and private resources, terms of affordability, design compatibility, readiness, financial feasibility, development experience, management capacity, and unit mix are among the scoring factors to be used in the review process.

This RFP outlines the scoring factors which will be used by the City of Portland to evaluate the proposals.

I. Background

The site at 157 Brackett Street contains approximately 8,460 square feet. It is located on near Reiche School, on the southwest end of the Portland peninsula, in a neighborhood which is largely defined by 19th and early 20th century buildings. The site is zoned B-1. It is currently used for parking of approximately 24 spaces for Reiche School, and by the neighborhood after school hours.

II. Goals for This RFP

The goal for the sale and development of the property at 157 Brackett Street is to promote the development of affordable housing with a high standard of quality, design, and livability. Proposals should not require a contract or conditional zone (although other rezoning consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan may be considered). Design principles should promote efficient use of land to create infill development that reflects and respects the existing pattern, streetscape, density, scale, massing, exterior materials and design elements that are reflective of the surrounding traditional neighborhood. Heights shall be less than or equal to the surrounding buildings and should minimize the impact of shadows on the adjacent public playground. They should also incorporate high standards of energy efficiency and "green" design criteria.

It is required that all proposals include a plan to provide a minimum of 24 parking spaces for use by the Reiche Elementary School and for the neighborhood after hours. This plan must include details on providing replacement parking before, during, and after construction at no cost to the City, including access.~~adequate replacement parking to meet the existing need~~. Proposals must also include a plan to provide safer and more accessible pedestrian crossings on the Brackett Street frontage of the Reiche Elementary School & Community Center.

SCOPE OF SERVICES

General Specifications

All proposals submitted for this funding must meet the following selection criteria to be considered further in the review process.

A. Eligible Projects

1) Projects must create ~~affordable~~ rental or ownership housing units affordable to households at 100% AMI or below. "Affordable" in this context means expected payments in rent or mortgage will not exceed 30% of income.~~.~~

2) Proposals must include a plan to provide a minimum of 24 parking spaces for use by the Reiche Elementary School and other uses deemed appropriate by the City.

~~2) Projects receiving funding through this RFP must include a written occupancy policy that prohibits smoking in the units and the interior common areas of the project in addition to including a non-smoking clause in the lease for every household and making educational materials on tobacco treatment programs available to residents through the resident service coordinator, occupancy specialist, or property manager, such as the phone number for the statewide Maine Tobacco HelpLine.~~

B. Site Information and Criteria

1) Purchase Price: Proposals under this RFP must include a proposed purchase price for the property. The City of Portland will consider a land swap proposals in lieu of a purchase price. The land swap must provide the City with at least 24~~adequate~~ parking spaces and access within ~~XXXX~~1320~~1750~~ feet of the Reiche Elementary School.

2) Local Approvals: Local land use approval is not required prior to submittal of the proposal.

3) The applicant must submit an analysis of the project in relation to local land use regulations and site feasibility.

4) Proposals must not require a contract or conditional zone (although other rezoning consistent with the City's Comprehensive Plan may be considered.)

5) Proposals ~~must~~should ~~also~~ include a plan to provide safer and more accessible pedestrian crossings on the Brackett Street frontage of the Reiche Elementary School & Community Center.

C. Financial Feasibility

Financial Projections: Financial proposals must be developed in accordance with the underwriting guidelines of the primary funding source, including adequate cash flow and debt coverage ratio should be submitted and may be reviewed by the City to determine that they follow sound accounting practices and are based on reliable assumptions.

~~D. Market Demand~~

~~Proposers must provide an analysis and discussion of market demand justifying the need for the proposed project.~~

~~E.~~D. Applicant Capacity

All applicants must demonstrate capacity to develop, own and manage the proposed project. In the case of a proposal for home ownership housing, applicants must demonstrate capacity to market the units for the sale. All proposals must provide evidence of a development team with the capacity to successfully complete the project including;

1) Key staff members assigned to the project with the abilities and experience to successfully complete the project within the proposed timeframe.

2) An architect, general contractor and professionals on the team with the experience and capacity to complete the project.

3) A management team with qualified personnel and the capacity and experience to operate, manage and maintain the affordable rental property of size and mix of the proposed project and/or effectively market affordable home ownership housing.

4) Qualified staff with the capacity to perform ongoing property ownership requirements such as budgeting, tax accounting and oversight of management and maintenance.

5) A portfolio of current affordable housing projects that are financially sound and meeting their established goals.

6) Support Services: Proposals containing rental units targeted to special needs populations must include commitments for support services to be provided to the residents.

~~F.~~E. Term of Affordability

Term of affordability shall be defined by the standards outlined in Division 30 Section 14-485 of the City's Land Use Code.

~~G.~~F. Design Compatibility

Projects must be designed to contribute to the character of the neighborhood and adhere to the following guidelines.

1) **Connect the Neighborhood** The development should not be an island unto itself, but rather blend into and enhance the surrounding community.

2) Design Considerations

a. **High Quality Design** Excellence in architectural and landscape design is expected.
b. **Traditional Design** Design shall be reflective of the surrounding traditional neighborhood and should create infill development that reflects and respects the existing pattern, streetscape, density, scale, massing, exterior materials and design elements of the neighborhood. Buildings should orient to the street.
c. **Green Design** The site and buildings shall be designed to meet the City's Green Building Code.
d. **Streetscape** The development shall enhance the pedestrian experience and the public realm. Alternative transportation modes shall be accommodated and incorporated in the project.
e. **Height** Heights shall be less than or equal to the average of structures in a 2 block radius.
f. **Permeability** Design shall be permeable or porous. View corridors are encouraged.
g. **Heterogeneity** Design of the buildings on the site shall be heterogeneous, not homogenous.
h. **Accessibility** Universal Design principles shall be incorporated wherever feasible, to ensure that the design is physically accessible to the greatest range of users.

~~H.~~G. Timeframe

The applicant must describe projected dates by which commitments will be obtained; the closing will take place, construction start-up, substantial completion, final completion and occupancy. Timeframes must be realistic and achievable. All funded projects must be able to start construction within 12 months of notice of award.

PROPOSAL REQUIREMENTS

Complete responses to this RFP, should include eight (8) complete printed copies ~~of each proposal~~ including one original bearing the hand written signature of an officer or employee having authority to bind the organization and one electronic copy (CD or USB flash drive) of each proposal and the following, in the order outlined below.

Note: All respondents should investigate legal and zoning requirements for proposed projects prior to submission of proposal.

i. Project Summary

A brief description of the project, no longer than two pages, to include the number and type of units, tenants or owners to be served, special features, the impact on the neighborhood and other ways the proposal meets the selection criteria and preference guidelines.

Photographs and maps of the site and area are required.

ii. All Proposals Must Provide The Following:

1) Proposals must include a purchase price for the property and/or a land swap proposal which accommodates parking of at least 24 spaces for the Reiche Elementary School, and for the neighborhood after hours.

2) Proposal must include the provision of a replacement parking area, for at least 24 spaces, before, during, and after construction at no cost to the City.

~~2)~~3) Conceptual architectural and site plans

~~3)~~4) A project schedule showing critical path events and their timeframe for completion;

~~4)~~5) Map showing location of site

~~5)~~6) Corporation/partnership articles and by-laws

~~6)~~7) Most recent audit or federal tax returns for the last three years, and financial statements for the last two years

~~7)~~8) A brief development team summary, including:

- The type of organization/ownership structure
- The names of Board of Directors, Corporate Officers, or Owners, as appropriate
- Name, title and relevant experience of individuals involved in managing the business entity and this proposed project. A copy of the 501(3)(c) exemption certification
- Brief description of similar projects completed
- A list of all projects currently in development with status and projected timeframe

~~8)~~9) A sources and uses funding statement

~~9)~~10) Preliminary operating budget identifying rents and expenses for the first year

~~10)~~11) A 15-year operating pro forma for the project

~~11)~~12) Evidence of financial commitments, or explanation of the ability and timing to secure those commitments. A statement describing the applicant's capacity for and experience in raising the type of capital needed to finance projects of this size and type.

~~12)~~13) Projects serving special needs populations must provide evidence of commitments of support services, and a description of the service provider and funding cycle for those services.

~~13)~~14) Applicant must include a management plan for the long-term management of the project. If rental use is proposed, ~~-~~includ~~inge~~ manager's experience and capacity.

15) If permanently affordable units are proposed, a~~A~~pplicant must include a marketing plan for the sale of home ownership units.

~~14)~~16) If City subsidy, through HOME, an Affordable Housing TIF, or any other source, is requested, details of the request and its justification should be supplied. Applicants should note that there is a competitive process for seeking many City funds.

~~15) An analysis and discussion of market demand justifying the need for the proposed project.~~

SELECTION PROCESS

Selection criteria will be used in reviewing and scoring the proposals.

I. Point System for Evaluating and Scoring Proposals (Maximum Points 100)

1. Proposed use of resources to achieve the City of Portland's goals and address demonstrated need. **~~25~~30 points**

   Maximum points will be awarded for those proposals that demonstrate sufficient market demand, create housing options which promote economic diversity in the neighborhood in which the development is located, ~~and include a policy prohibiting smoking~~and accommodate the City's identified parking needs.

2. Financial feasibility, including cost, development budget, operating pro forma and the provision of secured and leverage funds. **~~25~~20 points**

   Maximum points will be awarded for those proposals that include a complete set of financial documents to support the financing request, contain a realistic set of sources and uses development budgets and a pro forma operating budget, include sufficient reserves for operations and maintenance, including pre-funded reserves, and long-term financial sustainability of the project is highly likely.

3. Applicant's ability to complete project, including development team, experience, capacity, project readiness and timeframe for completion. **20 points**

   Maximum points will be awarded for those proposals that demonstrate a development team with a successful track record in projects of similar size, scale, type and complexity to the proposed project and capacity to fulfill their responsibilities and the readiness of the project to proceed.

4. Impact on surrounding neighborhood, including design compatibility, ~~and~~ environmental issues, and pedestrian safety issues. **30 points**

   Maximum points will be awarded for those proposals where site selection is appropriate for use, the design is consistent with neighborhood design characteristics, amenities and unit design are well thought out and appropriate, and meet the requirements of the City of Portland's Green Building Code.

II. RFP Evaluation and Selection Process and Timeframe

Proposals will be reviewed by an evaluation team that will include equal representation from City of Portland staff from the Planning & Urban Development Department and the Public Services Department, the Reiche Elementary School and the neighborhood. The following process will be used:

1) Upon closing of the RFP application period, all proposals will be reviewed for completeness.

2) Complete proposals will be reviewed under the scoring factors in order to recommend the most qualified proposals based on the information submitted. The proposal review team may confer with the applicants and/or third parties to clarify or verify information and request additional information.

3) Recommendations, along with all proposals and scoring information, will be forwarded to the City Council's Housing and Community Development Committee for review and approval. Their recommendations will be forwarded to the City Council for final review and approval. Public presentations may be required.

4) Applicants will be kept informed throughout the review process, specifically in regard to recommendations and funding levels.

5) The evaluation and review process should be substantially complete by ~~XXXXXX~~September 1, 2015. Applicants will be notified of their proposal status as soon as possible.

6) Based on City Council approval, a purchase and sale agreement will be negotiated (see legal requirements) and as appropriate, successful applicants will receive a letter of funds reservation. A letter of funds reservation is not a commitment letter but an agreement to set aside budgeted funds for up to six months, to allow the project sponsor to proceed with securing other commitments.

INSTRUCTIONS AND OTHER INFORMATION

A. The City of Portland reserves the right, at its sole discretion, to award all, a portion, or none of the available funding from this RFP, as well as reject any and all proposals for city funding, based on the quality and merits of the proposals received, or when it is determined to be in the public interest to do so. Furthermore, the City of Portland may extend deadlines and timeframes, as needed.

B. Confidentiality: Proposals received by the City of Portland shall become a matter of public record subject to public inspection, except to the extent, which an applicant designates in writing, proprietary data to be confidential and submits that data under separate cover, such information may be held from public inspection, as provided in Maine law: 5 MRSA Sections 13119-A and 13119-B

C. Compliance with Federal Law: The selected applicant will be required to certify that the development and management of the proposed housing will be in compliance with all applicable laws, executive orders, OMB Circulars and federal regulations, including but not limited to: Fair Housing Act, Equal Opportunity and Non-discrimination, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA), the Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Policies Act, the Davis-Bacon Act, the Lead Based Paint Poisoning Prevention Act, Flood Disaster Protection Act, Conflict of Interest, Contractor Debarment and Cost Principles.

LEGAL REQUIREMENTS

The selected developer will be required to provide a performance guaranty in the form of a letter of credit or a performance bond, the performance of the developer's obligations outlined in this Request for Proposal and subsequent contract to be negotiated with the City. This performance guaranty is separate from any performance guaranty that will be required as a result of the City's site plan review process.

The City shall convey the described real estate by quitclaim deed to the developer, or where the City has obtained a warranty deed for the real estate, it shall provide a warranty deed for the same to the developer. Any deed from the City will contain a restriction in the deed that the property must meet the permanent affordability requirements as described in this Request for Proposals.

In the event the City makes a financial contribution to a developer and to secure the developer's obligations, the City shall have a security interest in the form of a mortgage in the real estate to be developed. The terms of the mortgage shall be negotiated with the developer at the time of the commitment of funds.

EQUAL EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES

Vendor shall comply fully with the Nondiscrimination and Equal Opportunity Provisions of the Workforce Investment Act of 1998, as amended (WIA, 29 CFR part 37); the Nontraditional Employment for Women Act of 1991; title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, as amended; section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, as amended; the Age Discrimination Act of 1975, as amended; title IX of the Education Amendments of 1972, as amended; and with all applicable requirements imposed by or pursuant to regulations implementing those laws, including but not limited to 29 CFR part 37.

Reservation of Rights

The City of Portland reserve the right, at its sole discretion, to award all, a portion, or none of the available funding from this RFP, as well as reject any and all proposals based on the quality and merits of the proposals received, or when it is determined to be in the public interest to do so. Furthermore, the City of Portland may extend deadlines and timeframes, as needed.

The City of Portland reserves the right to substantiate any proposers' qualifications, capability to perform, availability, past performance records and to verify that the bidder is current in its financial obligations to the City of Portland.

All materials and equipment used as well as all methods of installation shall comply at a minimum with any and all Federal, OSHA, State and/or local codes, including applicable municipal ordinances and regulations.

The successful bidder shall agree to defend, indemnify and save the City of Portland harmless from all losses, costs or damages caused by its acts or those of its agents, and, before signing the contract, will produce evidence satisfactory to the City of Portland's Corporation Counsel of coverage for General Public and Automobile Liability insurance in amounts not less than $400,000 per person, for bodily injury, death and property damage, protecting the contractor and the City of Portland, and naming the City of Portland as an additional insured from such claims, and shall also procure Workers' Compensation insurance.

Pursuant to City of Portland procurement policy and ordinance, the City of Portland is unable to contract with businesses or individuals who are delinquent in their financial obligations to the City of Portland. These obligations may include but are not limited to real estate and personal property taxes and sewer user fees. Bidders who are delinquent in their financial obligations to the City of Portland must do one of the following: bring the obligation current, negotiate a payment plan with the City of Portland's Treasury office, or agree to an offset which shall be established by the contract which shall be issued to the successful bidder.

The City of Portland, Maine, reserves the right to waive any informalities in proposals, to accept any proposal or portion thereof, and, to reject any and all proposals, should it be in the best in the best interest of the City of Portland to do so.

It is the custom of the City of Portland, Maine to pay its bills 30 days following equipment delivery and acceptance, and following the receipt of correct invoices for all items covered by the purchase order. In submitting bids under these specifications, bidders should take into account all discounts, both trade and time allowed in accordance with this payment policy and quote a net price. The City of Portland is exempt from the State's sales and use tax as well as all Federal excise taxes.

XXXXX, 2015

Matthew F. Fitzgerald
Purchasing Manager

PROPOSAL

THIS PAGE MUST BE INCLUDED

The UNDERSIGNED hereby declares that he/she or they are the only person(s), firm or corporation interested in this proposal as principal, that it is made without any connection with any other person(s), firm or corporation submitting a proposal for the same.

The UNDERSIGNED hereby declares that they have read and understand all conditions as outlined in the invitation for bids, and that their proposal is made in accordance with same.

The UNDERSIGNED hereby declares that any person(s) employed by the City of Portland, Maine, who has direct or indirect personal or financial interest in this proposal or in any portion of the profits that may be derived there from, has been identified and the interest disclosed by separate attachment. (Please include in your disclosure any interest which you know of. An example of a direct interest would be a City of Portland employee who would be paid to perform services under this proposal. An example of indirect interest would be a City of Portland employee who is related to any officers, employees, principal or shareholders of your firm or to you. If in doubt as to status or interest, please disclose to the extent known).

The proposer acknowledges the receipt of Addenda numbered ______________________________
If Applicable

COMPANY NAME: ____
(Individual, Partnership, Corporation, Joint Venture)

AUTHORIZED SIGNATURE: ______________________________ DATE: _______________
(Officer, Authorized Individual or Owner)

PRINT NAME & TITLE: ____

ADDRESS: ____

____

TELEPHONE: ______________________________ FAX: ___________________________

E-MAIL: _________________________ FEDERAL TAX ID NUMBER: ____________________

NOTE: All bids must bear the handwritten signature of a duly authorized member or employee of the organization making the bid. This sheet must be signed and returned with the proposal package.

PINE ST
46 - 66
200
196
192
52
53
55
56
64
68
185
184
181
177
175
173
173
169
167
165
1
1
JOY PL
2
96
94
92
88
86
82
78
76
163 - 201
166 - 202
BRACKETT ST
151
149
147
143
139
135
129 - 161
132 - 164
132
132
CLARK ST
163 - 197
166 - 196
170
174
168
7
9
11
119
7
CUSHMAN ST
162
145 - 161
144 - 164
154
150
8
1 - 19
2 - 20
211 - 235
210 - 234
220
100 m

May 8, 2015

Councilor Kevin Donoghue
City of Portland
Portland, Maine 04101

Councilor Donoghue:

I am writing this letter in support of the Housing & Community Development Committee's consideration of issuing a request for housing proposals ("RFP") for a municipal parking lot located at 157 Brackett Street.

As you may be aware, I have entered into a contract to purchase 1 Joy Place, a property that abuts 157 Brackett, and I intend to submit a proposal if your committee authorizes staff to issue an RFP. I have also been a West End resident for the past 15 years and I have three daughters who attend the Reiche Community School.

Issuing a public RFP for 157 Brackett Street is consistent with the City's long-standing policy of using municipally-owned property to address Portland's shortage of high-quality, affordable housing. Recent projects completed under this policy include the Adams School Townhouses, Danforth on High Apartments, and the Nathan Clifford School Apartments. Additional projects are in the planning stages as a result of RFPs issued for 65 Munjoy Street and 65 Hanover/42 Alder Street.

The strategy of using municipally-owned property to create housing, in my view, has been a huge success for Portland residents. This policy has directly resulted in i) dozens of new housing units serving renters and buyers of all income levels and ii) thousands of dollars in new tax revenue. By way of example, Danforth on High Apartments was developed on a former public parking lot that had little social or financial value for the City and surrounding neighborhood. Today, the property provides housing for 30 low-income seniors and contributes more than $40,000 annually to the General Fund.

Not every city parcel is suitable for redevelopment and the planning staff and committee members have been mindful of that fact when considering 157 Brackett. The lot is an important and necessary parking resource for Reiche employees and visitors. As such, it is critical that the RFP contain i) a requirement that respondents clearly identify how parking will be replaced and b) a provision that allows the City to stop the RFP/sale process if proposed parking solutions are inadequate. However, if the parking issue can be addressed, it is appropriate for the Council to solicit proposals to determine if 157 Brackett can be utilized to achieve other important public policy objectives—particularly, in light of the City's current housing situation and its track record of success under this program.

Since HCDC first took up the matter of an RFP for 157 Brackett Street, I have participated in more than two dozen meetings to share my concept plan for a combined Joy Place/Brackett Street proposal. On multiple occasions, I have met with members of the Reiche staff, the West End Neighborhood Association, the Reiche Parent Teacher Organization, the city's Planning & Development Department, the Portland School District, as well as numerous property abutters and West end residents. The feedback I received focused on five topics:

1. **Housing**: There is an urgent need for more high-quality housing opportunities in the West End neighborhood.

2. **Affordable Housing**: The current area of greatest need within Portland's housing mix is for *affordable, homeownership opportunities on the peninsula*.

3. **Blighted Properties**: Abandoned, neglected properties in the immediate neighborhood are a significant life-safety concern, particularly given the 400+ kids who attend Reiche and LearningWorks programs each day.

4. **Parking**: The Reiche staff members need a dedicated parking resource – and need the resource to be well-maintained and managed, unlike the current situation with the 157 Brackett lot.

5. **Pedestrian Safety on Brackett and Clark Street**: The midblock areas on Brackett Street and Clark Street can be unsafe for kids coming to and from Reiche. There is a clear need for better designed and/or new crosswalks at these locations, as well as other traffic calming measures to improve pedestrian safety around the school.

If the city elects to issue an RFP for 157 Brackett, I will submit a proposal that is specifically designed to address all five of these issues. In addition, my plan will conform with current zoning requirements that govern developments in this part of the West End and meet guidelines established for new construction within an historic district.

I encourage you and the committee to approve an RFP for 157 Brackett to allow my proposal, as well as any other proposal, to come forward for further public review and consideration. I believe 157 Brackett can serve as a unique opportunity for the City to build upon a successful housing policy while tackling a number of neighborhood issues that have gone unresolved for too long.

Respectfully,

Todd M. Alexander

Todd M. Alexander

Mary Davis - 157 Brackett Street- HCDC Members for 5/13/2015 Meeting

---

From: Ian Jacob <iancasperjacob@gmail.com>
To: <mpd@portlandmaine.gov>
Date: 5/8/2015 1:27 PM
Subject: 157 Brackett Street- HCDC Members for 5/13/2015 Meeting

---

Dear Councillors Donoghue, Brenerman, Mavodones and Marshall,

I am writing on behalf of the West End Neighborhood Association (WENA) to urge you to support issuing an RFP for the City-owned parking lot at 157 Brackett Street, located between Joy Place and Fresh Approach Market.

There are two items that should be addressed in the issuance of the RFP:

1)- The unsafe traffic conditions on this section of Brackett Street in front of Reiche School and the Community Center entrance.

2)- The blighted and abandoned buildings of Joy Place and its associated hazards.

Thank you for your time and consideration as I am unable to attend the May 13 meeting.

Sincerely,

Ian Jacob
President, WENA

iancasperjacob@gmail.com
207-409-2030

Mary Davis - 157 Brackett Street - HCDC Members for 5/13/15 meeting

---

From: Rosanne Graef <rgraef@gwi.net>
To: <mpd@portlandmaine.gov>
Date: 5/6/2015 2:13 PM
Subject: 157 Brackett Street - HCDC Members for 5/13/15 meeting

---

Dear Councillors Donoghue, Brenerman, Mavodones and Marshall,

I am writing to urge you to support issuing an RFP for the City-owned parking lot at 157 Brackett Street, next to the Peopleâ€™s Building. In the issuance, there are two matters that should be addressed: 1) the unsafe traffic conditions that exist on this section of Brackett Street in front of the Reiche School and Community Center entrance and 2) the derelict buildings and associated hazards at Joy Place. While we have no way of knowing what proposals may come forth, there might be some viable and affordable options that would address housing needs as well as these two pressing problems in our neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration in reading this request as I am unable to attend the meeting on May 13.

Sincerely,

Rosanne Graef
30A Salem Street

From: Douglas Sherwood
To: Mary Davis
CC: Christine Keegan; Craig Worth; Janet Dibiase; Jeff Levine; Katherine...
Date: 5/7/2015 1:02 PM
Subject: Portland Public Schools response to draft 157 Brackett Street RFP

Ms. Davis
Mary

Good day!

As discussed about an hour ago, the Portland Public Schools supports the objectives of the draft RFP and believes its concerns reiterated below have been incorporated to the extent possible.

1. The current lot adequately supports 24 cars (please increase the "20" to "24" spaces as appropriate in the RFP document)...even more at dismissal. These spaces are critical to the successful operation of our school. Therefore, they must be replaced within a reasonable walking distance. We believe that within one city block is a reasonable distance. If the 1750 feet proposed by Mr. Levine meets that criteria, then we accept it.

2. As currently written (see Selection Process II), the evaluation team has representation from four distinct groups. If appropriate, we would suggest that each group have equal representation. For example, if City Planning and Public Services each have two members scoring each RFP, then the Schools and Community should have two members each.

3. The Portland Public Schools supports the changes recommended to the point system's maximum allocations for "Proposed use of resources..." (from 25 to 30) and "Financial feasibility..." (from 25 to 20) -- see Selection Process I.

4. Pedestrian safety to include safer and more appropriate street crossings has been duly noted in more than one section of the RFP. Nothing should be changed to diminish the critical importance of this issue in a neighborhood where traffic is heavy at arrival and dismissal times and congestion leads to obstructions.

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in this planning process!

Please don't hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or concerns.

Most respectfully submitted,
Doug

Douglas Ritter Sherwood
Facilities Coordinator
Portland Public Schools
353 Cumberland Avenue
Portland, ME 04101
Office: 842-5342
Pager: 741-8468
Cell: 239-5371

>>> Mary Davis 5/6/2015 10:07 AM >>>
Thank you Lori. Great changes. If anyone else would like to offer any revisions, please send them to my by noon tomorrow.

Mary P. Davis, Div. Director
Housing & Community Development Division

From: Kevin Brewster
To: mpd@portlandmaine.gov; jlevine@portlandmaine.gov
CC: Keegan, Christine; Bobinsky, Lorraine
Date: 5/5/2015 9:34 AM
Subject: RFP

To Mary Davis and Jeff Levine,
I am writing on behalf of the Leadership at the Howard C. Reiche Community School, in regard to the city's parking lot on Brackett Street. It has come to our attention that this space may be developed as a new housing development. Our concerns center on the preservation of parking for our staff, pedestrian safety and dangerous condition of the adjacent Joy Place property. We support the RFP process moving forward if these issues are addressed in any proposal. Thank you for your consideration.

Respectfully,
Kevin Brewster
Lead Teacher
Reiche Community School
874-8175

Memorandum

Planning and Urban Development Department
Housing and Community Development Program

To: Mayor Brennan and City Council

Cc: Jeff Levine, Planning and Urban Development Director
Mary Davis, Housing and Community Development Director

From: Amy Grommes Pulaski, HCD Program Manager

Date: May 1, 2015

Re: CDBG Follow Up Questions

On May 22 at the Housing and Community Development Committee, Councilors reviewed the HUD Annual Action Plan, recommendations by the CDBG Allocation Committee, Acting City Manager and for improvements to the CDBG program and process. Based on the discussion, Councilors had follow up question on the following applications.

Reiche School-Brackett Street Pedestrian Safety and Access Project (Phase 2)

What can be accomplished for $40,000 of the requested $118,000?

One of the two proposed permanent crosswalks can be accomplished using a $40,000 CDBG allocation. Depending upon which of the two locations is selected, additional streetscape elements proposed in the application may also be able to be accomplished. Because of the fewer (and less costly) complications of needed new drainage structures, it is likely that the crosswalk at the Reiche School playground/park, south of the bus pullout area, would be the selected location.

Why hasn't anything been done to date?

The Department of Public Services has been working with the Reiche School community, the neighborhood and Councilor Marshall on addressing school/community center pedestrian access and safety issues actively since 2011 (and before). Issues addressing the entirety of the school campus, including the Brackett St crossings, were identified. Since 2011, shorter-term, Phase 1 improvements and maintenance activities have taken place, including:

- upgraded crosswalk markings and signs at the four intersections surrounding the school campus
- new school zone signage
- new curb ramp and 2 new crosswalks across Clark St at Cushman and Spruce St to connect to the school entrance and playground/park
- tree trimming to make school zone flashers more visible.

The major sticking point for accomplishing quality crossings across Brackett Street is the size and configuration of the bus pullout area in front of the school. With the recent and potential future residential and retail development on Brackett Street, the pedestrian crossing concerns of the neighborhood were renewed last fall which resulted in the temporary/test crosswalks installed last fall and as well as submission of the CDBG application for Phase 2.

Bicycle Parking in East Bayside, Munjoy Hill, Libbytown and Parkside

What amount of bicycle parking can be accomplished with the Acting City Manager's recommended amount of $7,181?

We anticipate that bicycle parking for approximately 30 bicycles can be accomplished at this funding level, including the full costs of equipment, materials, installation and project management.

Greenleaf Street Reconstruction

Will the $218,000 in CDBG funds be sufficient to complete the project?

The CDBG funding being recommended for this project is to be matched with $85,000 in funding from the Sewer Fund Cash Operation Budget. This funding is for drainage and sewer improvements.

Coastal Enterprises Portland Jobs Alliance

What role does child care play in the Portland Jobs Alliance project?

Portland Jobs Alliance has requested 12 months of child care for the 2015-2016 program years. The intent is to provide short term assistance to help persons as they transition into their new job. Assistance is not intended to be long term. Historically, only about 6% of the participants of the program are single parents.

What are the wages for the hospitality jobs being filled?

Portland Jobs Alliance is dedicated to creating jobs in various sectors throughout the Portland economy. There have been eight positions created and filled to date in two different businesses. These jobs have not been in the hospitality industry, but are instead in education and dry/wet cleaning. The average salary for the positions created to date is $14.00/hour.

Mary Davis
Division Director, Housing & Community Development Division

TO: Councilor Donoghue, Chair
Members of the Housing and Community Development Committee

FROM: Mary Davis, Division Director
Housing and Community Development Division

DATE: May 7, 2015

SUBJECT: Affordable Housing Tax Increment Financing Program

Affordable Housing Tax Increment Financing (AHTIF)

This is a tool used by municipalities in Maine to assist in the development of affordable housing projects. The legislation can be found at M.R.S.A. Title 30-A Chapter 206 §5245 through §5250-G. The Maine State Housing Authority is the governing authority.

Under the statute, affordable housing is defined as a "decent, safe and sanitary dwelling, apartment or other living accommodation for a household whose income does not exceed 120% of the median income for the area". Income limits are defined by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

FY 2015 Income Limit Category	Persons in Family							
	1	**2**	**3**	**4**	**5**	**6**	**7**	**8**
120% Income Limits	64,932	74,208	83,484	92,760	100,181	107,602	115,022	122,443

Designated districts can be site specific or area-wide and must increase the amount of affordable housing or improve the health, welfare or safety of residents. Districts have to be primarily residential with at least 25% of the property within a district that is (1) suitable for residential use; (2) a blighted area; or (3) in need of rehabilitation or redevelopment. Thirty-three percent (33%) of the dwelling units within the district must be affordable.

Allowable Project Costs within the District:

1. Capital costs - acquisition of land, construction of public infrastructure, demolition, remodeling, repair of existing buildings, site prep, finishing work licensing,

permitting fees, planning, architectural, engineering, testing, legal and accounting expenses.

2. Financing costs - closing costs, administrative costs (municipal staff time to implement the development program), relocation costs, organization costs to establish the development program such as environmental studies and public notification, costs of recreational facilities, costs of child care (financing, construction, staffing, training, certification related to child care located in the district), case management and supportive services, and operating costs such as property management, utilities, repairs, maintenance, insurance real estate taxes, funding project capital reserve account;

Costs of improvements outside of the district have to be directly related to or made necessary by the improvements in the district. These can include:

1. Costs of construction, expansion or alteration of facilities not located with the district but required due to activities within the district – sewage treatment plants, water treatment plants, storm or sanitary sewer lines, water lines, electrical lines, improvements to fire stations, amenities on streets.

2. Public safety improvements made necessary by the district.

3. Costs of funding to mitigate any adverse impact of the district upon the municipality (public school K-12 costs and public facilities and improvements).

4. Costs to establish a permanent housing development revolving loan funds or investment fund.

   TIF revenue used for this purpose must be used for the development of affordable permanent housing (shelters, nursing homes, dormitories, residential treatment facilities, correctional facilities, etc. are not considered eligible types of permanent housing) anywhere within the City of Portland. The housing developed must be affordable to households earning no more than 120% AMI. Loans made through this fund must be repaid to the City and used for additional loans for the development of affordable permanent housing. The City has established, through the Avesta 409 Cumberland Avenue AHTIF and the Pearl Place Phase I AHTIF, an Affordable Housing Revolving Loan and Investment Fund. This fund is separate from the City's Housing Trust Fund. Based on the revenue designated by the district programs mentioned above, the fund will eventually receive approximately $50,000-$60,000 annually.

Funding Mechanisms

There are various mechanisms that can be used to fund approved project costs. The City can issue bonds or notes to finance project costs, provide a credit enhancement agreement to the developer to pay approved costs or reserve revenue to pay for public improvements, public facilities or other approved costs without issuing debt.

Area-Wide Affordable Housing TIF

I have included an excerpt from the written guidance I received from the Maine State Housing Authority on the topic of an area-wide affordable housing TIF.

> *"Creating a District around an existing residential area for the purpose of funding a revolving loan fund or investment fund still requires that there be some development of affordable housing within the District, whether new construction or rehab of existing housing. As noted above, the TIF statute defines a District as "a specified area within the corporate limits of a municipality that has been designated . . . to be developed" under a Development Program.*
>
> *There would be little point in creating a District for which there was no plan to build new housing or improve existing housing in the District. There are only two ways to increase total taxable (i.e., assessed) value of property in a District and thereby get tax increment revenues for use as allowed by the statute - it happens either through increased development (new construction or rehab) or as a result of inflation. Since only tax increment revenues from a District are available for the revolving loan fund or investment fund (assuming that that a town wants the benefit of full sheltering of the increased assessed value of the District), without any new construction of affordable housing or rehab of existing housing in the District, the town would be relying only on inflation for value accretion. In addition, at any point when assessed value is less than or equal to original assessed value, there would be no tax increment revenues for the revolving loan fund or investment fund. Since there needs to be a plan, with a time schedule, for the use of funds in a revolving loan fund or investment fund so that we can be sure that statutory objectives are met, we have not permitted a town to create a District for the sole purpose of capturing tax increment revenues that would result only from inflationary adjustments to property values with no development of new housing or rehab of existing housing in the District."*

Based on this guidance, the City would not be allowed to designate an area-wide affordable housing district, similar to the Downtown Transit Oriented TIF recently approved by the City Council, which was not tied specifically to affordable housing development.

This is not to say that a designated AHTIF district must be site specific, such as the ones previously approved in the City of Portland (Pearl Place, 409 Cumberland Avenue and 134 Washington Avenue). As an example, if a proposed affordable housing development requires the extension of a city street for access to the site, the district could be designed to include the area necessary for the street extension. Revenue generated by the AHTIF could be used to cover the cost of the extension of the street to the development site.

<u>Other Clarifying Information</u>

1. Revenue generated by an AHTIF cannot be used to subsidize rents.
2. If a revolving loan or investment fund has been designated as an approved use of AHTIF revenue, those funds must be kept separate from local housing trust funds.

<u>Existing Affordable Housing TIF</u>

Avesta Pearl Place Phase I – Oxford and Pearl Streets
Duration: 30 year term (FY08 through FY37
Credit Enhancement Agreement that returns a maximum of $22,000 annually to the developer and used to cover debt service. The council approved an amendment that allows additional revenue to be returned to the City in an Affordable Housing Revolving Loan and Investment Fund and a portion to the school system to offset impacts from the development.

Avesta 409 Cumberland Avenue – Forest and Cumberland Avenue
Duration: 22 year term
Credit Enhancement Agreement that returns 50% of the annual revenue to the Developer for project operating costs; remaining 50% is reserved to the City in an Affordable Housing Revolving Loan and Investment Fund.

Avesta 134 Washington Avenue
Duration: 20 years
Credit Enhancement Agreement that returns 50% of the annual revenue to the Developer for project operating costs.

Mary Davis
Division Director, Housing & Community Development Division

Low Income Housing Tax Credit Program

The Low Income Housing Tax Credit Qualified Application Plan (QAP) is the applicaton process by which Maine State Housing Authority allocates low income housing tax credits. The QAP requires that a minimum of 50% of the annual incremental property tax revenue be returned to the developer to pay operating costs for a minimum of 15 years. The scoring matrix provides 3 points for an application which benefits from a reduction in operating costs from tax increment financing. In a process that is highly competitive, these points can be the deciding factor for a project to receive low income housing tax credits.

Portland Oregon TIF Program

As mentioned in the report The Housing Challenge Portland, Oregon utilizes TIF revenue to finance affordable housing development. The TIF revenue is generated through designated Urban Renewal Districts throughout the city. Thirty percent (30%) of the revenue generated in Urban Renewal Districts is set-aside in an affordable housing fund and is used to "…ensure predictable and adequate funding and prioritization of housing…" for households earning at or below 100% of the area median income.

The Urban Renewal Districts are areas that are "..physically deteriorated, suffering economic stagnation, unsafe or poorly planned." The City uses the TIF revenue generated in these districts to finance capital improvements such as parks, streetscape improvements or community centers. In Oregon, the urban renewal program is authorized by the state.

The Portland, Oregon TIF program is not an affordable housing TIF program like the one in Maine. It is a general TIF with revenue set-aside to finance affordable housing development.

Conclusions:

While the Affordable Housing TIF program is a valuable resource available to the City to assist with the creation of affordable housing, it is not the sole answer to accomplishing Portland's housing goals. Used in combination with other tools, it can continue to be an effective part of our housing strategy.

Attachments
Explanation and History of Affordable Housing TIF Set-Aside in Portland, OR

AFFORDABLE HOUSING TIF SET ASIDE

Q&A

WHAT IS "TIF"?

Tax Increment Financing (TIF) is the primary funding mechanism for urban renewal in Oregon and Portland. It helps fund many public projects, including affordable housing development. It is a revenue source based on local property taxes that is limited to funding the physical development of property ("bricks and mortar") for the purposes of urban renewal – including infrastructure (streets, utilities, etc.), commercial development, housing, and economic development projects.

WHAT IS THE "TIF SET ASIDE" FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING?

It is a policy adopted by the Portland Development Commission (PDC) and Portland City Council that requires PDC to spend a minimum percentage of its total tax increment resources in urban renewal areas (URA) on eligible affordable housing activities.* The Airport Way and Willamette Industrial urban renewal areas are exempt from the policy. In most of the other URAs, the policy requires spending 30 percent of total TIF resources for affordable housing. Many other communities, including the state of California, have TIF set asides for affordable housing.

WHY DID PDC AND THE CITY ADOPT THE TIF SET ASIDE POLICY?

The City and PDC have very broad and diverse revitalization goals, and TIF is a key resource for meeting those goals. Ensuring that affordable housing options remain in Portland's neighborhoods as revitalization occurs and property values increase is an important part of the City's urban renewal strategy. The City Council and PDC adopted the TIF set aside to ensure that affordable housing goals are met in urban renewal areas, and to ensure there is a consistent and predictable level of funding.

In addition, guidelines were adopted to ensure that the focus of the TIF set aside is on implementing two primary City priorities: affordable homeownership in support of families and bridging the minority homeownership gap (Operation HOME), and low-income rental housing for extremely low-income households and formerly homeless individuals and families (the 10-Year Plan to End Homelessness). For more information about affordable housing, see a copy of PDC's ***Affordable Housing Fact Sheet***.

HOW DOES THE TIF SET ASIDE WORK?

The TIF set aside ensures that a certain amount of funding will be available for housing as part of overall urban renewal efforts in nine of Portland's 11 urban renewal areas (URAs). There are guidelines for each URA about how this funding should be spent to meet the citywide housing priorities. The level of funding for different types of housing will be forecast each year as part of PDC's annual budget process.

Investing in Portland's Future

PDC
PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

WILL THE TIF SET ASIDE CHANGE HOW PDC FUNDS HOUSNG IN NEIGHBORHOODS?

No. PDC has had affordable housing programs for over 40 years. PDC will continue to fund the same type of projects and programs it is known for, including high-quality rental housing construction and rehabilitation, home repair programs, new affordable homeownership construction and homebuyer assistance. PDC's investments in housing will continue to be guided by the adopted urban renewal plans and housing strategies which were developed with community input, as well as citywide housing priorities.

HOW MUCH FUNDING IS AVAILABLE FOR THE TIF SET ASIDE? HOW MUCH HOUSING WILL RESULT?

There is approximately $120 million forecast for affordable housing funding for the next five years (through 2011), which could result in approximately 1,200 to 4,000 new and rehabilitated affordable housing units (both rental apartments and owner-occupied homes).**

The TIF Set Aside has resulted in an increase of approximately 100 percent of TIF dollars for extremely low-income rental housing, and homeownership programs will see a 300 percent increase in funding from past years. Much of the funding for affordable rental housing will focus on rehabilitating and preserving existing low-income apartments.

*Under this policy, affordable housing is rental housing affordable to households earning 60 percent MFI and below ($40,750/year for a family of four or $28,500/year for a single person), or ownership (for-sale) housing for households earning 80 percent MFI and below ($38,000/year for a single person). In the case of families with children, affordable ownership housing is for families earning up to 100 percent MFI ($66,800/year for a family of four). See the **Affordable Housing Fact Sheet** for more information.

**Subject to change.

FOR MORE INFORMATION:

see the PDC TIF Set Aside webpage at www.pdc.us/TIFSetAside.

Investing in Portland's Future

PDC
PORTLAND DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

222 NW Fifth Avenue, Portland, OR 97209
tel: 503.823.3200 • fax: 503.823.3368

Portland Housing Bureau

Solving the unmet housing needs of the people of Portland.

Phone: 503-823-2375 fax: 503-823-2387 421 SW 6th Avenue, Suite 500, Portland, OR 97204
More Contact Info (http://portlandoregon.gov/phb/article/433750)

History of TIF Set-Aside Policy

On April 26, 2006, through Resolution No. 36404, the City Council expressed an interest in considering a policy "to dedicate a percentage of Tax Increment Financing (TIF) revenues from all Urban Renewal Districts citywide to an affordable housing set aside fund, or to create another mechanism to ensure predictable and adequate funding and prioritization of housing for individuals and families earning 80% Median Family Income (MFI) or less."

Council also "request[ed] the Portland Development Commission work in partnership with the Bureau of Housing and Community Development, the Office of Management and Finance, the Housing and Community Development Commission, and Affordable Housing Now and other interested stakeholders to develop and present to Council by September 1, 2006 either an implementation plan to create such a set aside fund or other options."

The PDC Commission directed staff to create and implement a broad and inclusive public participation effort, consistent with PDC's Public Participation Policy, which reflects perspectives from individuals and groups, including Urban Renewal Advisory Committees, involved in all aspects of tax increment financing, and other stakeholders who would benefit or would be impacted by a specific set or automatic allocation of urban renewal resources for affordable housing.

Tax Increment Expenditure Data Report

A Technical Advisory Committee was established to review PDC's historic information on affordable housing expenditures in the existing URA's as well as developing projections regarding future expenditures. The committee consisted of members representing the following: Mayor, Commissioner Sten, Bureau of Housing and Community Development, Office of Management and Finance, the Housing Development Center, Community Development Network and PDC.

The Technical Advisory Committee was charged with assisting with the Data Report on Historical and Forecasted Urban Renewal Expenditures. Their work was completed during the month of July 2006. Both the PDC Board and the City Council were briefed on their work in August.

TIF Set Aside Implementation Plan

A Project Advisory Group was established to review the data report from the technical advisory committee and discuss implementation options. Membership will include: Mayor, Commissioner Sten, Bureau of Housing and Community Development, Office of Management and Finance, the Housing Development Center, Community Development Network, Affordable Housing Now, Housing and Community Development Commission, Housing Authority of Portland, Portland Business Alliance, League of Women Voters, PDC and urban renewal advisory committees.

The Project Advisory Group was charged with assisting with the development of TIF Set Aside Implementation Recommendations. The Group met three times in August and September and provide input to PDC staff in the development of the Implementation Plan.
A public forum cosponsored by PDC and HCDC was held August 28th to allow for broad community input into the development of the Implementation Plan.

In October both the PDC Board of Commissioners and the City Council adopted the TIF Set-Aside Implementation Plan which established a 30% set aside in the new districts (Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area, Gateway Regional Center Urban Renewal Area, Lents Town Center Urban Renewal Area and North Macadam Urban Renewal Area) and South Park Blocks Urban Renewal Area, and includes separate percentages for Downtown Waterfront Urban Renewal Area, Oregon Convention Center Urban Renewal Area and the Central Eastside Urban Renewal Area.

TIF Set-Aside Income Guidelines

The Implementation Plan included PDC's intent to establish income guidelines that correspond to individual URA Housing Policies, current projects, per unit subsidies, and forecasted budget availability. PDC participated met with urban renewal advisory committees and stakeholder groups, as well as citywide stakeholder and advocacy group in January and February to get input on the in Preliminary Staff Recommendation for Income Guidelines.

PDC hosted a public forum on January 24, 2007, which was attended by over 60 community representatives ranging from URA representatives, neighborhood representatives, affordable housing developers and advocacy groups, homeownership advocates, community organizations and real estate professionals.

On February 28, 2007, the PDC Board of Commissioners formally adopted Income Guidelines for the TIF Set-Aside.

2011 Stakeholder Review

In early 2011, the PHB completed a thorough review of the policy. The review included a public hearing on the TIF Affordable Housing Set-Aside policy (held on August 2, and the hearing provided an opportunity for public testimony and comments on the policy and the recommendations currently under development. On November 16, 2011, the Portland City Council unanimously approved and adopted a set of recommendations that Housing Commissioner Nick Fish brought forward in order to improve the TIF 30% Set-Aside Policy. View the City Council ordinance (http://efiles.portlandoregon.gov/webdrawer/rec/4592422/view/TIF%20Set%20Aside%20Ordinance%20Packet%202011%20Policy%20Review.PDF).

DRAFT 2015 HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING CALENDAR

Meetings: 2nd & 4th Wednesday of each month

As of May 6, 2015

May	**May 4 Special Meeting** Review and vote to City Council to authorize Amended and Restated Lease with Nova Star Cruises at Ocean Gateway.
	May 13 Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of RFP for 157 Brackett Area-wide Affordable Housing TIF District discussion/Review of Affordable Housing TIF Program
	May 27
June	Executive session to discuss: Wilmot Street matter resolution; direction regarding New England Ocean House project. ~~Begin discussion related to Riverside Street area wide needed public infrastructure status and improvements.~~ Short Term Rentals - Air bnb. Review and Recommendation to City Council award of bid and Purchase and Sale Agreement for 65 Munjoy Street. City "Amethyst Lot" discussion/direction for future uses. Bayside TIF District amendment regarding sea level rise study funding. TENTATIVE: Review and recommendation to City Council regarding 84 Free Street Lease in the Spring Street Garage Lodging house as an alternative to emergency shelter
	June 10 Review and recommendation to City Council to authorize Purchase and Sale Agreements regarding property acquisitions to relocate Public Services out of Bayside.
	June 24
July	Update on City-owned lot at 98 High Street. India Street lot. Police Parking lot. Begin discussion related to Riverside Street area wide needed public infrastructure status and improvements. Waterfront TIF District geography amendment discussions, including consideration of Portland Company as TOD TIF Discussion. Riverwalk TIF District Reduction Amendment – Discussion and direction to staff. Update of Tax Acquired Properties for Development Opportunities/Coordinate with Trust for Public Land
	July 8
	July 22
August	
	August 12
	August 26

September	
	September 9
	September 23
October	
	October 14
	October 28
November	Note: November 11 is Veteran's Day and November 25 is the day before Thanksgiving Portland Economic Development Plan Implementation - Update
	November 11?
	November 25?
December	FYE 2015 Annual City-Wide TIF District Activity Report 2015 Calendar Year HCDC Accomplishments Report Proposed 2016 HCDC Work Plan
	December 9
	December 23

2015 HOUSING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE MEETING CALENDAR – Completed Work

January	**January 14** Review and Approval of Revisions to Guidelines for Lead Safe Housing Program Housing Study Report Update, Review and Approval of Proposed Rosa True School Housing Transaction Communication: Spring Street Garage/Bid for Broker for leasing Retail/Office Space; Portland Technology Park/RFP for Brokers ~~Executive Session: Possible Disposition of City-Owned Property at 157 Brackett and 176 Clark Streets~~
	January 28 Review and vote to recommend to City Council on award of bid and purchase and sale agreement for Cliff Island tax-acquire parcel. Review of 65 Hanover/52 Alder Street Feasibility Report and possible recommendation on RFP/Deed Options Housing Study Policy Response- Direction from HCDC ~~Review, Discussion and Possible Approval of RFP for 157 Brackett~~ Postponed to a later date.
February	**February 11** Responses to Munjoy Street RFP Review and recommendation to City Council award of bid and Purchase and Sale Agreement for 71 Hanover Street Review of Revised RFP for 65 Hanover/52 Alder Street and possible recommendation to issue Executive session: Guidance to staff on Ready Seafood Lease amendment review at Portland Ocean Terminal
	February 25 HCDC Housing Production and Affordability Forum.

<u>March</u>	**<u>March 11</u>** Review and recommendation to authorize staff to enter into Commercial Broker Agreement for sale of property at Portland Technology Park. Review and guidance to staff re: proposed IZ ordinance Review and guidance to staff re: ordinance changes to encourage and enable housing development Review and Approval of FY15-16 Affordable Housing Application Process. Housing Program Budget Recommendation to City Council. Housing Trust Fund Annual Plan Recommendation to City Council. **Executive Session**: Provide guidance to staff for property acquisitions to support relocation of Public Services out of Bayside; and, direction regarding possible tenant lease negotiations related to City-owned Spring Street Parking Garage commercial space.
	<u>March 25</u> Review and recommendation to City Council to authorize Ready Brothers Lease Amendments at Portland Ocean Terminal. **Executive Session**: Provide guidance to staff for (a) Amendments to Shucks Lobster lease at Portland Ocean Terminal; (b) proposed lease with New England Ocean Cluster House at Portland Ocean Terminal; and (c) Nova Star Cruises proposed lease amendments. Review and guidance to staff re: ordinance changes to encourage and enable housing development Review of Affordable Housing TIF Program - Postponed
<u>April</u>	**<u>April 8</u>** Loan Term Amendment – Avesta 134 Washington Avenue Project Rosa True approval of additional funding and lease terms Review and referral to Planning Board for public hearing of ordinance changes (Inclusionary Zoning and Others Items) to encourage and ensure housing development including changes to Division 30 (Affordable Housing) Review of Affordable Housing TIF Program - Postponed
	<u>April 22</u> CDBG Allocation Committee Funding Recommendations. Review of HUD 5-Year (2015-2020) Consolidated Plan and FY 15-16 HUD Annual Action Plan. Review and Comment/Recommendation to City Council if necessary: Improvement to CDBG process. Review and vote to City Council to authorize Amended and Restated Lease with Nova Star Cruises at Ocean Gateway. Executive Sessions: DPS Bayside Relocation guidance. Review and referral to Planning Board for public hearing of ordinance changes to encourage housing development