**Spokane Neighborhoods Community Assembly**  
“Provide a vehicle to empower Neighborhood Councils’ participation in government”

**Meeting Agenda for November 6, 2015**

4:00-6:25 p.m. – COUNCIL BRIEFING CENTER, Basement, City Hall

**Proposed Agenda Subject to Change**
Please bring the following items:
*Community Assembly Minutes: October 2015*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGENDA ITEM</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Page No.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Introductions</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>3 min-4:00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Agenda ( incl. Core Values and Purpose)</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>2 min-4:03</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approve/Amend Minutes</td>
<td>Facilitator</td>
<td>5 min-4:05</td>
<td>Approve</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**OPEN FORUM**

Reports/Updates/Announcements
Please Sign Up to Speak!
5 min-4:10

**LEGISLATIVE AGENDA**

Mayor’s Office
- Budget
  - Jonathan Mallahan
  - 30 min-4:15
  - Oral Report/Q&A

City Council
- Update
  - City Council
  - 10 min-4:45
  - Oral Report

Admin
- Subcommittee Goals 2016, December Celebration, Special Awards
  - Jay Cousins
  - 30 min-4:55
  - Oral & Written Report

Retreat
- 2016 Retreat Date, Format, Facilitator
  - Committee Members
  - 10 min-5:25
  - Oral Report

CA/CD
- Proposed Sidewalk Program
  - Roland Lamarche
  - 15 min-5:35
  - Oral & Written Report

PeTT
- Update
  - Paul Kropp
  - 10 min-5:50
  - Oral & Written Report

Nominations
- Candidates List
  - Andy Hoye
  - 10 min-6:00
  - Oral Report

Liaison
- Update
  - Colleen Gardner
  - 5 min-6:10
  - Oral & Written Report

Budget
- Update
  - Kathryn Alexander
  - 10 min-6:15
  - Oral Report

**PRESENTATIONS/SPECIAL ISSUES**

**OTHER WRITTEN REPORTS**

- Design Review Board Liaison
  - Colleen Gardner
  - Written Report
  - 21

- Plan Commission Liaison
  - Greg Francis
  - Written Report
  - 23

- Building Stronger Neighborhoods
  - E.J. Iannelli
  - Written Report
  - 26

- Land Use
  - Patricia Hansen
  - Written Report
  - 27

- Public Safety
  - Julie Banks
  - Written Report
  - 29

- Jeanette Harras Memorial
  - Julie Banks
  - Picture
  - 41

* IF YOU CAN’T MAKE THE MEETING, PLEASE SEND YOUR ALTERNATE!!!! *
UPCOMING IMPORTANT MEETING DATES

- **November 17:** Pedestrian, Transportation & Traffic (PeTT), West Central Comm. Ctr, 1603 N Belt, 6pm
- **November 19:** Land Use, West Central Community Center, 1603 N Belt, 5pm
- **November 23:** Building Stronger Neighborhoods, Sinto Senior Center, 1124 W Sinto, 12pm
- **November 24:** CA Administrative Committee (agenda item requests due. Please submit all written material to be included in packets two days prior to CA meeting date), ONS Office, 6th Floor, City Hall, 4:45pm
  - **December 1:** Public Safety, YMCA Corporate Office, 1126 N Monroe, 3:30pm
  - **December 1:** CA/CD, West Central Community Center, 1603 N Belt, 5:30pm
  - **December 4:** Community Assembly, Council Briefing Center, City Hall, 4pm

MEETING TIMETABLE PROTOCOL

In response to a growing concern for time constraints the Administrative Committee has agreed upon the following meeting guidelines as a means of adhering to the Agenda Timetable:

1. When a presenter has one minute left in the time allotted the facilitator will raise a yellow pennant and indicate a verbal notice.
   a. Should any Neighborhood Representative wish to extend the time of the presentation or comment/question period they may immediately “Move to extend the time by (1) to (5) minutes”.
   b. An immediate call will be made for a show of hands in support of the extension of time. If a majority of 50% plus 1 is presented the time will be reset by the amount of time requested.
   c. Extensions will be limited to (2) two or until a request fails to show a majority approval. After (2) two extensions, 1) if a motion is on the table, the facilitator will call for a vote on the open motion to either a) approve or not approve, or b) to table the discussion; 2) if there is no motion on the table, a request may be made to either (1) reschedule presenter to a later meeting, or (2) ask presenter to stay and finish at the end of the agenda.

2. When the allotted time has expired, a red pennant and verbal notice will be issued.

Administrative Committee

COMMUNITY ASSEMBLY LIAISONS & REPS (Draft)

Citizens Transportation Advisory Board (PeTT): Jim Bakke, 466-4285, jfbakke@q.com
Community, Housing, & Human Services Board: Fran Papenleur, 326-2502, fran_papenleur@waeb.uscourts.gov
Design Review Board: Colleen Gardner, 535-5052, chiefgarryparknc@gmail.com
Plan Commission: Greg Francis, gfrancis1965@yahoo.com
Plan Commission Transportation Advisory Committee (PeTT): Kathy Miotke, 467-2760, zaromiotke@yahoo.com and Charles Hansen (alternate), 487-8462, charles_hansen@prodigy.net
Urban Forestry: Carol Bryan, 466-1390, cbrryan16@comcast.net

November 6, 2015 Community Assembly Meeting Agenda
a. CA Rules of Order:
   i. To speak at a meeting, a person must be recognized by the facilitator only one person can be recognized at a time. Each speaker has one minute. When all who wish to speak have been allowed their time, the rotation may begin again.
   ii. When a proposal for action is made, open discussion will occur before a motion is formed by the group.
   iii. As part of the final time extension request, the Facilitator will request a show of hands by the representatives at the table to indicate which of the following actions the group wants to take.
      1. End discussion and move into forming the motion and voting.
      2. Further Discussion
      3. Table discussion with direction
         a. Request time to continue discussion at next CA meeting.
         b. Request additional information from staff or CA Committee
         c. Send back to CA Committee for additional work

Diagram:

- Proposal for Action → Open Discussion → Facilitator Show of Hands for One of the Following Actions
  - 1. End Discussion Form Motion/Vote
  - 2. Further Discussion
  - 3. Table With Direction To...
    a. A. Continue at Next CA
    b. B. Additional Info from Staff or Comm
    c. C. Back to Comm for Addtl. Work
  - Motions From the Floor Are Not Allowed
    - As Part of the Final Extension
Community Assembly Core Values and Purpose

**CORE PURPOSE:**
Provide a vehicle to empower neighborhood councils’ participation in government.

**BHAG:**
Become an equal partner in local government.
(This will be further expounded upon in the Vivid Description. What does this mean to you?)

**CORE VALUES:**
- **Common Good:** Working towards mutual solutions based on diverse and unique perspectives.
- **Alignment:** Bringing together the independent neighborhood councils to act collectively.
- **Initiative:** Being proactive in taking timely, practical action.
- **Balance of Power:** Being a transparent, representative body giving power to citizens' voices.

**VIVID DESCRIPTION:**
The Community Assembly fulfills its purpose, achieves its goals, and stays true to its core values by its members engaging each other and the community with honest communication and having transparent actions in all of its dealings. Community Assembly representatives are knowledgeable and committed to serving their neighborhood and their city as liaisons and leaders.

The Community Assembly initiates and is actively involved early and often in the conception, adoption and implementation of local policy changes and projects. The administration and elected officials bring ideas to the Community Assembly in the forming stages for vetting, input and participation. The Community Assembly is a valuable partner to these officials and neighborhoods in creating quality policy & legislation for the common good.

The Community Assembly stimulates participation in civic life among our residents. Citizens that run for political office will believe in the importance of partnering with the Community Assembly and neighborhood councils. Those candidates’ active participation and history with neighborhoods contributes to their success, enhancing successful partnerships between the Community Assembly and local government.
Community Assembly Minutes
October 2nd, 2015

Meeting minutes from September 2015 CA were approved. Agenda was approved as is.

1. Open Forum:
   a. Collen Gardner, Chief Garry Park Neighborhood
      i. October 24th - 2nd annual pizza feed fundraiser $6 per person for all you can eat pizza and drinks and door prizes will be available at Casano’s. All are welcome!
   b. Andy Hoye, Southgate Neighborhood
      i. Southgate Neighborhood is hosting a District 2 Candidate Forum on October 14th at ESD 101 on Regal.

2. City Council:
   a. Ben Stuckart, City Council President
      i. Neighborhood notification passed a few weeks ago, 45 days before notification, only one organization was against the standing. The code gives the neighborhood councils standing which means that the neighborhood can’t be challenged.
      ii. Met with Southgate neighborhood and there is land across the street the council has said that unless the neighborhood is happy they will not move forward with the city property development.
      iii. City Council is sending a budget letter requesting an addition $15,000 for the neighborhood councils to be included in the budget.

3. Retreat Committee
   a. Jay Cousins, Emerson Garfield Neighborhood
      i. Proposed survey for neighborhood councils that have similar questions to what was provided to the CA. The challenge is to get the members of the neighborhood councils to fill out the survey.
         1. ACTION BY CA: Send out to the survey to members of your neighborhood council.
      ii. Retreat members will be going out to give presentations at the neighborhood councils on the community assembly and about the document they created on how the community assembly works, likely starting soon.
      iii. Hours that the meeting will be held will change in January
         1. Proposed start time is 5:30pm on the first Thursday.
         2. Motion: Starting January 2016 meeting will begin at 5:30pm.
            a. Vote: in favor 16, not in favor 0, abstain 0
      3. Retreat for next year: February 2016
         a. Discussion Items for Retreat:
            i. Chairs need to have reports in writing completed for 2015 with the new goals for 2016.
            ii. Topic Ideas: Fundraising and Community Development (increase membership/outreach) strategies for neighborhood councils, budget discussion

4. Administrative Committee
   a. Joint CA/CC Report
      i. Main topic was the keeping alive the concern regarding landscaping in city projects. The utilities department is taking great strides to improve the issue regarding on CSO.
ii. Affordable Housing Topic Introduction
   1. Gonzaga Law Student Report on affordable housing
      a. Recommendations are found in the packet on page
      b. Made a recommendation to city council to do a study session on the
         recommendations which will be done on November 19th.
      c. CHHS Board will be reviewing the proposals

b. Establish a Nominations Committee
   i. Formed for positions on the administrative committee
   ii. Need 3 interested members to be on the administrative committee
      1. Replace every member
      2. How many really need to be voted for versus those that need to be replaced at least two
         people
   iii. The nominations are in November and elect at the December meeting and the administrative
        committee takes over the first admin committee in December.
   iv. Sandy Gill (North Hill), Barbara-Anne Bonner (Logan), Andy Hoye (Southgate)
      1. Andy Hoye will be chair

5. Neighborhood Services
   a. Heather Trautman, Director of Office of Neighborhood Services & Code Enforcement
   b. Full Presentation can be found [here](#).
   1. Upcoming Events
      a. Brochure Training for Neighborhood Councils: Monday, October 26th and Thursday October
         29th, 6:00-7:30pm, City of Spokane Training Room on 6th floor, please RSVP to
         jcaro@spokanecity.org.
      b. New Events are added to the Google Calendar found on the ONS website by clicking
         "Meetings and Calendar" on the homepage.
   2. What’s New?
      a. SMC 17F.070 Existing Building and Conservation Code-modifies “Abandoned building”
         ordinance to trigger registration, monitoring and caretaking for properties going through the
         foreclosure process
         i. Plan Commission Workshop: October 14th
         ii. Plan Commission Hearing: November 11th
      b. Abandoned Homes – [report found here](#).
         i. Speak at Neighborhood Council Meetings: Vacant and abandoned property
            1. Hear about what ONS/Code is doing about these homes
            2. How to report vacant, abandoned or substandard homes
            3. What strategies may be used on a local and state level?
            ii. Contact Heather Trautman at 625-6854 or htrautman@spokanecity.org if you would
                like to learn more at your neighborhood council meeting
      c. Other Ordinance Updates
         i. SMC 17C.310 Animal Keeping—restore restrictions for animal noise (other than dogs)
            for continuous or distressful noise.
         ii. SMC 10.16 Junk Vehicle: clarify the process from notice of violation of civil infraction
            for failure to voluntarily remove a junk vehicle.
      d. Neighborhood Notification
         i. Working on transition with City Departments to provide direct notification.
ii. Include resources for projects and applications:
   1. Provide links to information: predevelopment notes, applications, permits
   3. On this page you can search under the Building or Planning tabs to find information on permits as well as predevelopment meeting and notes.

3. 2015 Program Application Schedule
   a. 2015 Proposed Program Application Dates
      i. January 5th to March 2nd: Traffic Calming Applications
      ii. January 5th to March 16th: Mobile Speed Feedback
      iii. February 18th to June 1st: Clean-Up Application
      iv. March 1st to July 31st: Greening Grant-Forest Spokane
      v. June 1st to August 31st & November 25th: CDBG Applications

4. CDBG Program
   a. 2015 Application Status
      i. Next Steps
         1. Project Design Underway
         2. Project Construction Beginning

5. Forest Spokane
   a. Fall Residential Tree Program Event:
      i. Registration Deadline: October 7th
      ii. Vouchers Issued: October 9th
      iii. Tree pick-up dates: October 17th-24th Homefires; October 24th Spokane Conservation District

6. Pedestrian Traffic and Transportation Committee
   a. Paul Kropp, Southgate neighborhood & PeTT Chair
      i. Plan Commission Report on the Pedestrian Plan Update
         1. Found here in the packet
         2. Created a selection matrix to create priority projects
      ii. Additional Materials provided at meeting
         1. SRTC Horizon 2040 Implementation Toolkit
         2. WSDOT Corridor Sketch Initiative
      iii. Citizen Transportation Advisory Board Report, Jim Bakke (North Indian Trail)
         1. Transportation Benefit district was set up with the tab money to create priority
            a. As of last month the CTAB is also in charge of reviewing expenditures for the street maintenance fund
               i. Including crack and gap sealing, chip seal, grind and overlay
               ii. Project list has both CTAB and TBD projects to make the priorities
            b. Process is to coordinate buckets of money so there are no gaps, what mechanism does the streets people with making decisions.
            c. Send the link to the maintenance and 6 year street plan-prospective projects-Jim has the information but wants to be sure to let the neighborhoods know that they can change year to year depending on outside factors.

7. Liaison Committee
a. Colleen Gardner, Chief Garry Park Neighborhood
   i. No application for the CHHS Liaison
   ii. Move to reappoint Fran Papenleur for CHHS Liaison for the CHHS Board
      1. Vote: in favor unanimous
   iii. October 23rd Liaison Committee goals being discussed and tasks completed in 2015.
   iv. Letter to Mayor will be forwarded on Monday for approval

8. Public Safety Committee
   a. Julie Banks, Rockwood Neighborhood
      i. Report in packet found here
   ii. Stakeholder group continues to meet on a monthly basis
   iii. Listening to presentations from a variety of organizations related to rental housing issues
      1. Learning from entities on what they see on conditions and issues related to rental housing.
   iv. Data that has been compiled from the city regarding where the density exists in the City
   v. Continue to hear presentations through February.
   vi. October meeting will be a break to come together and ask questions and get answers
   vii. Process is to identify issues and what resources there are to address that issue, than find that gaps between the issues and existing resources.
   viii. They will come back to the CA with a recommendation for any unmet gaps.

9. Budget Committee
   a. Kathryn Alexander, Bemiss
      i. Met with Ben Stuckart to ask for the $15,000 for grant money for the neighborhoods the committee is made up of Tim Finneran, Andrew Hoye, Arielle Anderson and Kathryn
      ii. $500 per neighborhood would be available, money comes with city constraints
      iii. $5,000 is the only given the $15,000 is only an ask right now and has not be secured.
      iv. 1st and 3 Tuesday of the month at 5:00pm at City Hall
      v. Looking at doing an ongoing application period until October of each year.

10. Spokane Public Library
    a. Caris O’Malley, Innovations and Outcomes Director
       i. Services and Facilities Study
          1. Bring the library up to date and plan for the future, looking at the way that people interact and access data at the library.
          2. Looking out what do they need to do to address the data consumption patterns and for the future even though they don’t know what the future holds.
          3. Library has brought in an architecture firm consultant to look at the buildings and layout to adapt to people’s needs now and into the future.
             a. Group4 is looking at ways that they can be a people centric library instead of a stuff centric library create places for community interaction. Carson Block, information technology person and Michelle Dorman, deputy director of Houston library
          4. How do councils and the individual neighborhoods address this November 10th have a stakeholder summit-formal invitation to represent the community assembly 2:30 to 5:00pm at the Lincoln Center.
          5. December stakeholder follow-up on recommendations
6. Community Assembly can contact Caris O’Malley to look at the list of who the stakeholders are at the meeting.

7. Suggestions made from the group included:
   a. Library hours for additional uses, look at doing staggering the hours with the different libraries, there is a misconception that people are willing to travel to other library outside of their neighborhood.
   b. Comments were echoed regarding the need to keep in mind the growing aging population, keep the services going and new ideas with the senior population-looking at the changes over time as well as keeping in mind those with disability when designing the new library system.

ii. The library is looking for two members to participate to represent the CA group and neighborhoods at the November 10th have a stakeholder summit-formal invitation to represent the community assembly the event will be held from 2:30 to 5:00pm at the Lincoln Center.

iii. Caris is requesting suggested names for stakeholder group with a deadline for suggestion in the next few weeks.

iv. Suggestion for redistribution of feedback on stakeholder members: comalley@spokanelibrary.org

---

**In attendance:**
- Audubon/Downriver
- Chief Garry Park
- East Central
- Lincoln Heights
- North Hill
- Rockwood
- West Central
- Northwest
- Bemiss
- Comstock
- Emerson Garfield
- Minnehaha
- Riverside
- Southgate
- Logan
- Whitman

**Not in attendance:**
- Cliff Cannon
- Balboa/SIT
- Grandview/Thorpe
- Nevada/Lidgerwood
- West Hills
- Latah/Hangman
- Peaceful Valley
- Five Mile Prairie
- Manitou/Cannon Hill
- North Indian Trail
- Browne’s Addition
- Hillyard
CA Administrative Committee Meeting
October 27, 2015
5:00-5:30 p.m.
City Hall, ONS

Present:
Fran Papenleur (Audubon-Downriver)
Jay Cousins (Emerson-Garfield)
Kathryn Alexander (Bemiss)
Seth Knutson (Cliff-Cannon)

Absent:
Gary Pollard (Riverside)

Others Present:
Heather Trautman, City Staff/ONS
Rod Minarik, City Staff/ONS

CC:
Karen Stratton, City Council Liaison

I. Today’s Agenda/Items to address:
   ➢ Draft Agenda for November 6th Community Assembly meeting
   ➢ New Business

II. November CA Agenda - Topics, speakers and/or reports were reviewed.
   A. Mayor Condon – Budget Presentation (30 minutes)
   B. City Council – (10 minutes)
   C. CA Admin Committee – Jay (30 minutes)
      Committees’ Goals 2016, December celebration, Special Awards
   D. Retreat Committee – Kathryn - 2016 retreat date, format, facilitator (10 minutes)
   E. PeTT – Paul Kropp- Update (10 minutes)
   F. CA/CD Committee – Roland LaMarche – Proposed Sidewalk Program (15 minutes)
   G. Nominations – Andy Hoye (10 minutes)
   H. Liaison Committee – Colleen Gardner (5 minutes)
   I. CA Budget – Kathryn – follow up (10 minutes)

III. Follow Up/Additions
Public Safety, Land Use do not have oral reports at this time.

IV. December Agenda – ONS Programs Year-End Review

There being no other pressing business, meeting was adjourned at 5 pm. Next CA Admin Committee meeting will be Tuesday, November 24, 4:45 p.m. City Hall/ONS.
MEETING SUMMARY
Community Development Committee
Community Assembly
Tuesday, October 6, 2015 – 5:30 to 7:00 p.m.
Northeast Community Center – South Classroom


NEIGHBORHOODS PRESENT: North Hill, Bemiss, Audubon-Downriver, Whitman, West Central,

NEIGHBORHOODS ABSENT: Balboa, Five Mile, North Indian Trail, Manito, Rockwood, Grandview/Thorpe, West Hills, Latah/Hangman Valley, Comstock, Chief Garry Park, Southgate, Minnehaha, Lincoln Heights, Cliff/Cannon, Emerson Garfield, Hillyard, Riverside, Browne’s Addition, Peaceful Valley, East Central, Nevada-Lidgerwood, Logan

STAFF PRESENT: George Dahl

WELCOME/INTRODUCTIONS: Roland called the meeting to order at 5:37 p.m.

REVIEW AND APPROVE JUNE 2ND AND SEPTEMBER 1ST MEETING MINUTES: Minutes were reviewed and approved as presented to the Committee (no changes).

COMMUNITY ASSEMBLY REPORT: Fran provided the Committee with an update of the CHHS Board and CA. The CHHS Board received over 79 applications totaling more than $15,705,000.00 in requests. Fran also mentioned that the CHHS Board will have 3 vacancies at the end of October/November. Interested parties can find more information on the City website… (https://my.spokanecity.org/bcc/boards/community-housing-and-human-services-board/).

The Community Assembly is working with the City on a Pedestrian Priority Zone plan. More information can be found on the City website… (https://static.spokanecity.org/documents/projects/pedestrianplan/spokane-pedestrian-plan-draft-2015-08-19.pdf). The CA voted to amend their existing meeting schedule, starting in January 2016. Meetings will be held the first Thursday of each month from 5:30 to 7:30pm.

CD SIDEWALK PROGRAM PROPOSAL: The Committee discussed further the potential of revising our existing neighborhood CDBG sidewalk program patterned after the City of Lock Haven (http://lockhavenpa.gov/residents/sidewalks/). Discussion was around ways to open the program to exclusively low and moderate income individuals. George mentioned the possibility of providing assistance to low/mod individuals in the form of low interest rate loans and grants for extremely low income individuals. The program would be open all low/mod individuals throughout the City of Spokane with a priority placed on right of way violations, disabled and elderly. This proposal would require individuals to submit applications to the City for review and eligibility determination. Neighborhoods would no longer canvas the neighborhood looking for (sidewalk) locations to repair with CDBG.

Roland will present the concept at the November 6th Community Assembly meeting. George will be in attendance to provide additional support where needed. George agreed to request time on the November CA meeting. Roland and
George will meet prior to the November meeting to discuss the presentation. George and Roland will review the presentation during the November 3rd CA/CD Committee meeting.

**2017 PROJECT MENU DEVELOPMENT:** The final 15 minutes were spent discussing ways to improve the Neighborhood Project Menu. There was a consensus that neighborhoods need greater education about what the service provider agencies needs are and how they can effectively allocate CDBG funds to these agencies. George suggested the possibility of hosting an all agency forum that neighborhoods could attend. The Committee was supportive of making this type of meeting happen. George agreed to develop a draft agenda for discussion at the November 3rd CA/CD Committee meeting. The Committee would like to schedule the all agency forum for January 2016. This meeting would take the place of the regularly scheduled CA/CD Committee meeting. George will work on developing a list of agencies to attend this forum.

**OTHER:** The Committee requested information on the neighborhood applications received and total funds allocated. The request included a separation of the application types (menu, new and sidewalk applications).

**NEXT MEETING:** Tuesday, November 3rd from 5:30 to 7:00pm at the Northeast Community Center, Founders Room.
City of Spokane Neighborhood Sidewalk Program
Proposed Residential Program for Residential Housing

How is the Program Funded?
• Funding from Neighborhood CDBG
  • Funds will come off the total
    • Total Neighborhood Allocation is $700,000
    • CA/CD Committee voted to fund program with $50,000
      ($130,000 in 2016)
    • Remaining $550,000 will be allocated to neighborhoods for capital projects using allocation methodology developed in 2014/15
• City is evaluating the possible use of other funding sources
  • Approximately 40k
    • Reserved for notices of violation
    • Code Enforcement

Goals of the Program
• Repair dangerous sidewalks
• Repair right of way violations
• Open to all LMI within the City
  • Eligibility will be determined by income
  • No longer determining eligibility by Block Group
• Residents apply to the City
• Neighborhoods no longer collect locations for repair

Access to the Program
• Application
  • Completed by homeowner
  • Period of application between July and November (2016)
  • Submitted to the City for review
    • Eligibility
    • Follow-up within 30 days
    • Priority will be given to right of way violations, disabled, elderly and lowest income

Who Qualifies?
• Open to residential home owners
  • Must meet HUD’s LMI threshold
    • <80% AMI
    • <$36,050 (one person household)
• Priority given to right of way violations, disabled, elderly and lowest income
• Sidewalk must meet ADA/hazard criteria
  • Half inch lift or half inch separation
  • Any condition that substantially impedes pedestrian mobility

Application
• Content of Application
  • Basic contact information (name, address, etc.)
  • Income verification (most recent tax return)
  • Photo of sidewalk
  • Open right of way violation
  • Description of needed repair
    • Length & width
    • Other conditions (driveway, tree, fence, etc.)
Grants with Cost Share

- Percent of the total cost
  - Applicant pays a percentage of the construction costs
  - Sliding cost to homeowner depending on the overall construction costs

Financial Assistance Limits

- Limits
  - Cap the funds per residence ($3,000.00)
  - Exceptions for corner lots & other special considerations
  - Sidewalk pour must meet City standard
  - No color, stamp, washed aggregate, etc.
  - Tree removal allowed, but limited to % of total construction costs
    - % of cost share will be the same as sidewalks
    - Must be authorized by Urban Forestry

Cost Share Thresholds

- AMI Split
  - <30% 100% grant
  - 31-40% 95% covered by grant, 5% is homeowner responsibility
  - 41-50% 90% covered by grant, 10% is homeowner responsibility
  - 51-60% 85% covered by grant, 15% is homeowner responsibility
  - 61-70% 80% covered by grant, 20% is homeowner responsibility
  - 71-80% 75% covered by grant, 25% is homeowner responsibility
  - 81-90% 70% covered by grant, 30% is homeowner responsibility
  - 91-100% 65% covered by grant, 35% is homeowner responsibility

Cost Share Examples

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Address</th>
<th>Cost ($)</th>
<th>100%</th>
<th>95%</th>
<th>85%</th>
<th>75%</th>
<th>65%</th>
<th>50%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wellesley Ave</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>88.25</td>
<td>108.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Augusta Ave</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>88.25</td>
<td>108.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit Blvd</td>
<td>995</td>
<td>9.75</td>
<td>29.25</td>
<td>48.75</td>
<td>68.25</td>
<td>88.25</td>
<td>108.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wabash Ave</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>540.00</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grace Ave</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>540.00</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Main St</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>540.00</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25th Ave</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>540.00</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hatch St</td>
<td>1,200</td>
<td>60.00</td>
<td>180.00</td>
<td>360.00</td>
<td>540.00</td>
<td>720.00</td>
<td>900.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Timeline (PY2016)

- Applications
  - July – Nov. 2016
- Specs & Plans (City Engineering)
  - Jan. – Feb. 2017
- Construction Bidding
  - March 2017
- Construction Period
  - May – Aug. 2017

Next Steps

- Neighborhood Reps take back to Councils for discussion.
  - Revisit program at Dec. 4th CA meeting
  - Possible vote

For more information please contact George Dahl (gdahl@spokanecity.org) with the Community, Housing and Human Services Department.
October 27, 2015
West Central Community Center – 1603 N. Belt Street
6:00 – 7:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER AND INTRODUCTIONS: 6:05 PM
Michael Harves  Browne’s Addition
Patricia Hansen  Cliff Cannon
Elaine Thorne  Comstock
Harrison Baldwin  East Central
Jim Bakke  North Indian Trail
Paul Kropp  Southgate
Charles Hansen  Whitman
Greg Francis  Community Assembly Liaison
Rod Minarik  ONS

CURRENT AGENDA: REVIEW & APPROVAL
September agenda was reviewed and approved by unanimous vote.
Motion  Michael Harves
Second  Charles Hansen

LAST MONTH’S MINUTES: REVIEW & APPROVAL
August meeting minutes were reviewed and approved by unanimous vote.
Motion  Michael Harves
Second  Charles Hansen

OLD BUSINESS
1. No Old Business

NEW BUSINESS
1. Introduction to Performance Measures for Street Investments
   – Paul Kropp
   a. Goals & objectives are to “Measure what we value”
   b. Discussed “outcome measures” for the $50 million received, over four years.
      Encouraged members to experience on-line tool with potential investments and
      potential outcomes. (Performance.srtc.org)

2. Introduction to CTAB, Advisory Group to the City’s Transportation Benefit District
   – Jim Bakke
   a. Discussed Impact Fee Ordinance to address problems resulting from reduced budget.
   b. Road maintenance is being addressed by the Transportation Benefit District (TBD)
      i. Car tab fees up to $20 do not require a vote
   c. Recent legislative action combined the TBD with Council meeting business.
   d. 2017 Sunset Clause creates three Council options: Dissolve the TBD, Renew the TBD, or Incorporate it into the new structure.
   e. Legislature recently increased tab fees to $40 without a required vote.
   f. Evaluations of road conditions: Arterials every 2 years, Residential every four years.

3. Committee discussed potential meeting topics for 2016.
   a. Sprague Avenue street developments
   b. Maple Street Bridge and speed limits
   c. Visioning for the North Spokane Corridor

NEXT MEETING & AGENDA
1. November 17
2. Guest Speaker, Mark Serbousek, Director of Streets

ADJOURNED: 7:25 PM
For Immediate Release
September 28, 2015

Contact: Staci Lehman
Public Information and Education Coordinator, (509) 343-6387

New Web Tool Let’s YOU Make the Hard Choices on How to Spend Transportation Money

If it was your job to decide how money is spent on local transportation projects and programs, what areas would be most important for you to invest money in? The Spokane Regional Transportation Council (SRTC) is launching an online survey tool that demonstrates the difficult financial tradeoffs that must be made to maintain and improve our transportation system.

SRTC is the government agency responsible for transportation planning for the area covered by Spokane County. New federal and state regulations require Metropolitan Planning Organizations like SRTC to create and track performance measures and targets to ensure the transportation system is developing as planned. This is being done through a project called the Horizon 2040 Implementation Toolkit.

Horizon 2040 is the region’s long-term transportation plan that guides how our transportation system will grow between today and the year 2040. The Horizon 2040 Implementation Toolkit will identify measures and targets that can be measured using available data that relate to Horizon 2040’s Guiding Principles.

The new web tool will help you understand how investments and outcomes are related and also allows you to identify priorities of the region that will help develop those targets. There is a link to it on the home page of the SRTC website at www.srtc.org. The tool allows users to choose an estimated level at which they would like to fund categories such as roadway preservation and management, congestion management, bicycle and pedestrian improvements, transit improvements and transportation safety.

As you allocate money to each category, graphics show just how far that amount would go. For instance, for roadway preservation, the amount of lane miles repaired changes as you change the funding for that category. For bicycle and pedestrian improvements, the percentage of people commuting by bike or walking increases or decreases as you add or subtract money. Screen shots on the following page give an idea what you will see when using the web tool.

Just like in real life, the hard part is not blowing your budget. The $50 million available for distribution on the web tool is based on the approximate amount of money projected to be invested in the local transportation system by SRTC over the next five years. Once you have made your budgeting decisions, you can compare your results to others who have used the web tool and learn about the next steps in the performance measurements development process.

For more information on Horizon 2040 and the Horizon 2040 Implementation Toolkit, click the links. Please give the web tool a try. It will be available online for approximately one month.
SRTC assures nondiscrimination in accordance with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964, and Civil Rights Restoration Act of 1987 (P.O. 100.259) and the Americans with Disabilities Act. A person with a disability may request a reasonable accommodation by contacting the SRTC office by telephone at (509) 343-6370 or by email at contact.srtc@srtc.org at least 48 hours in advance. Persons who are deaf or hard of hearing may contact (509) 343-6387 through the Washington Relay Service at 7-1-1.

How Should we Invest our Transportation Funding?

Where Would You Invest?

So now for the tough choices.

How will you balance funding between these areas? The slider bars below represent SRTC’s 5-year budget allocations in key investment areas. The starting budget settings indicate how SRTC currently invests money from key federal programs in these areas.

Click on the orange circles and move them to the right to choose the amount of funding you would allocate to each focus area. Click on the question marks to learn more.

Roadway Preservation and Maintenance

Congestion Management

Transportation Safety

Transit Improvements

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements

Your Budget

Performance

Roadway Preservation and Maintenance

Congestion Management = Number of intersection improvement projects completed

Transportation Safety = Number of safety projects completed

Transit Improvements = Percent change in transit trips

Bicycle and Pedestrian Improvements = Percent of workers commuting by bike or walking

Submit
Liaison Committee
Minutes
10/23/2013
Colleen Gardner/Chair

- The committee reviewed the goals for 2015 and agreed that they have been met
- The committee will redefine the Mission Statement, additionally they set the goals for 2016
- Colleen will announce at the Nov. Ca meeting that she is stepping down from the committee due to neighborhood commitments.
- Committee reviewed the Liaison Binder and will continue with the work to keep up-to-date
- Goals/Mission statement for 2016 will be presented at the Nov. CA meeting

Liaison Committee Goals 2015

- CA appointments of Boards/Commissions/Committee, without Mayor approval for non-voting positions (carry over for 2013) The committee agreed the issue that generated this matter no longer exist therefore no need to pursue.
  - Follow up with evaluation process for 2015: completed

- Provide the Community Assembly with a list of recommended actions designed to better support the CA liaisons Completed per the Liaison binder available at ONS
City of Spokane
Community Assembly

Liaison Subcommittee

Proposed Goals for 2016
DRAFT 10/26/2015 = ver. 2

• Prepare a revision to the subcommittee’s goal/mission statement to reflect current practice for ratification by the Community Assembly and incorporation into the committee’s policy and procedures document.

• Adopt other revisions to the policy and procedures document as may be appropriate to reflect current practice and to provide clear direction for committee activities.

• Establish a consistent format for the information on file for all liaison and representative positions to ensure accurate and complete information is available in the Neighborhood Services office and on the Community Assembly’s web page.
Design Review Board

October 14, 2015
Meeting Minutes

Meeting called to order at 5:30 PM

Attendance

- Board Members Present: Chris Batten, Chair; Craig Andersen, Vice-Chair; Colleen Gardner; Jeff Logan; Austin Dickey
- Board Members Not Present: Jacqui Halvorson, David Buescher, Steven Meek
- Staff Present: Julie Neff, Planning and Development
- Applicants Present: Mike Keenan, Greg Forsyth - Spokane Public Schools; Melissa McFadgen, Steve McNutt, Michael Cole - NAC Architecture
- Citizens Present: N/A.

Briefing Session:
1. Chair Comments - Mayor’s Urban Design Awards discussed
2. Staff Comments - Nothing on October 28 agenda, meeting cancelled
3. August 12, 2015 and September 23, 2015 meeting minutes approved

Board Workshop
1. Salk Middle School Phase II:
   - Staff report: Julie Neff
   - Applicant Report: Greg Forsyth - Spokane Public Schools; Melissa McFadgen, Steve McNutt, Michael Cole - NAC Architecture
   - Public Comment: N.A.
   - Questions asked and answered

Motion
The Design Review Board recommends approval of the project as presented at the October 14, 2015 Recommendation Meeting.

Board Business
1. Old or New Business
2. Administrative Design Review
   Discussion on number of applicant requests, what projects qualify, and whether the full board would prefer to weigh in. General agreement that using the admin. process to streamline is desirable, but should the chair wish to consult with any other member on an application, it will be forwarded to the full board. Discussion that it is desirable for administrative staff reports to be brief.
3. DRB Rules of Procedure
   - Proposed updates as outlined in 10_14_2015 Draft Summary of Updates.doc (on file) were approved by the board. The October 14, 2015 DRB Rules of Procedure will replace the December 14, 2011 version.

Meeting Adjourned at 6:21pm

Next Design Review Board meeting is scheduled for November 11, 2015

Note: Minutes summarized by staff. An audiotape of the meeting is on file - Design Review Board Urban Design, City of Spokane.
The review on Oct. 14 was the recommendation meeting for the 2nd phase of Salk Middle school.

The DRB recommend, by a unanimous vote to approve as presented as they felt the applicant had met all the conditions of the collaborative workshop.

There are not reviews scheduled for the month of Nov.
Plan Commission Liaison Report
November 6, 2015
Greg Francis

Hearings

**Wireless Communication Facilities Hearing** – There was a Plan Commission hearing on 10/14/15 to review and adopt the proposed changes to the “Wireless Communication Facilities” (SMC 17C.355A, et al) and “Eligible Facilities Modifications” (SMC 17C.356) ordinances, both of them relating to placement and design of cell tower facilities within the city. The key changes to the ordinances are focused on trying to keep cell towers away from residential zones and, if they are in a residential zone, requiring specific designs to reduce their visibility. The city has constraints on what they can require due to federal regulations as well as attempting to balance the needs of improved wireless services while reducing the visible impact of the towers. The changes are a compromise between numerous parties. There was a fair amount of testimony at the hearing, both by the wireless providers and residents. Patricia Hansen from Cliff/Cannon asked for two specific revisions that had been in earlier drafts: neighborhood notification language and provisions for preservation of historic structures. The Plan Commission considered both revisions but ultimately chose to approve the draft revisions as written with a final vote of 8-0. However, city staff worked with neighborhood representatives and other stakeholders following the Plan Commission hearing and made modifications to the proposed ordinance that designates historic structures and districts as the least preferred location for cell towers and to place further requirements on wireless providers to demonstrate how exceptions will resolve significant gaps of coverage when a tower is proposed in or near a residential zone.

At the 11/2/15 City Council meeting, the ordinance was passed by a vote of 7-0 with the modifications outlined above. There were also a lot of accolades, especially to Patricia Hansen, who put a lot of effort and personal time into this ordinance.

Workshops

**City Six-Year Capital Program** – Over the past two Plan Commission meetings, various city departments have presented on elements of their six-year capital expense projects (a capital expense is any project over $60,000). Some of the projects presented included putting in the infrastructure for wireless in public parks, opening of a temporary fire station along Highway 195 with plans for a permanent fire station at Cheney-Spokane Rd by 2020, various park and other recreational area improvements, improvements to the waste management fleet with compressed natural gas, and CSO tank installation.

**Foreclosure Property Registry** – An update to the abandoned property ordinance is in progress that is intended to close some loopholes that lenders are using to avoid the existing ordinance. One of the key changes is that the process is triggered when an official foreclosure notice is issued versus waiting until the property is “abandoned.”

**Spokane Housing Ventures Annexation** – This is a proposed annexation of county land on the south hill between 53rd and 55th and Regal and the Palouse Highway, which is a
mixture of apartment buildings, single residential land, a storage unit facility, and some undeveloped commercial property. The key discussion point is whether to zone the undeveloped commercial property as general commercial (GC) or centers and corridors (CC). This is being guided by the anticipated long-range annexation of county land further to the south, including the commercial area around 57th and Regal, which is anticipated to be a business district center.

**Plat Extensions** – City staff are proposing a number of code cleanup modifications with one of the most significant being plat extensions. Plat extensions are for construction projects that are in progress but not yet completed (e.g., a multi-phase housing development). State law allows for five to ten year plat agreements with cities having the ability to extend beyond that. The proposed change is to change from a single one-year extension to unlimited three-years extensions as long as the developer meets certain criteria such as progress being made and the project being consistent with the comprehensive plan. There has been some opposition to the idea of unlimited extensions.

**Electric Fence Ordinance** – A revision to the fence ordinance is being considered that would allow for electric fences to be installed in certain zones as a security measure with the draft ordinance including both light and heavy industrial areas as well as general commercial zones. The ordinance requires that a border fence be installed outside of the electric fence with signs indicating that the second fence is energized and there are additional requirements near residential zones and schools. The Plan Commission expressed concern that inclusion of general commercial is too permissive so some of suggested that general commercial zones should require a conditional-use permit.

**City Council actions on previous Plan Commission hearings**

**Rezoning Proposals** – Three rezoning requests came to the Plan Commission at their 9/23/15 hearing as part of the annual update to the comprehensive plan. The three locations are Market and Cleveland, Maple and Wellesley, and just east of Perry Street between 10th and 11th avenues. The Plan Commission unanimously recommended approval of all three rezoning requests even with a substantial amount of written comments submitted by local residents against the proposed Perry Street change.

The City Council passed the Market/Cleveland and Maple/Wellesley rezoning requests unanimously. After local resident testimony against the Perry Street rezoning at the 10/26/15 city council meeting, several city council members worked with the applicant and residents near the proposed Perry Street rezoning location to restrict the proposed area to be used only for parking or residential development to help address local neighborhood concerns. The Perry Street rezoning passed 6-1 with these modifications.

**Manufactured Home Park Text Amendment** – Also part of the comprehensive plan annual update, this proposed amendment would add the text “Designate appropriate areas for the preservation of mobile and manufactured home parks” to the Land Use chapter (chapter three) of the city’s comprehensive plan. This proposal was submitted to address concerns about the availability of affordable housing. The Plan Commission voted 5-1 to
recommend not adopting this amendment with a recommendation that a more comprehensive review of affordable housing was required.

The City Council passed this text amendment by a vote of 5-2 at their 11/2/15 session.

**Pedestrian Master Plan** – The pedestrian master plan was recommended by the Plan Commission for approval by a vote of 6-0. The City Council approved the plan at their 11/2/15 session by a vote of 7-0.

**Grandview/Thorpe Neighborhood Plan** – The city council accepted the plan as written at their 11/2/15 session by a vote to 7-0. The Plan Commission had reviewed and endorsed the plan back in July.

**Other Plan Commission Items**

**Planning Director Hiring Process** – The position of Planning Director has closed with more than thirty applications submitted (not yet screened for qualifications). Interviews are tentatively to be conducted in November. The CA Liaison to the Plan Commission will be involved in the interview process with the tentative interview date being 11/19/15. Any suggestions for questions to ask the applicants can be sent to gfrancis1965@yahoo.com.
Community Assembly Building Stronger Neighborhoods Committee
October 26th, 2015 Meeting Summary

Voting Members Present: E.J. Iannelli (Emerson-Garfield), Dixie Zahniser (Manito/Cannon Hill), Seth Knutson (Cliff/Cannon), Karen Carlberg (West Hills)

Others Present: None

Staff Present: Jackie Caro (ONS)

Meeting Summary: Need to approve September meetings at November meeting.

Appointing a BSN secretary: Dixie Zahniser said she would take minutes for the meeting.

2015 Goal Review and 2016 Goal Creation:

2015 Goal Recap:

1.) BSN will focus on outreach as opportunities arise in collaboration with ONS and members of the 28 Neighborhood Councils. **Goal:** Spread the word about Neighborhood Councils to the general public by having volunteers attend neighborhood events, block parties, neighborhood parades or fairs.
   a. The BSN Committee accomplished attendance at 3 major neighborhood events in 2015 including Garland St. Fair, Emerson Garfield Farmers Market and the Lower South Hill Block Party.

2.) Continue to promote and support neighborhood events through all the means possible.
   a. The BSN Committee helped to organize the WordPress training and the Brochure Training which both help the neighborhoods get the word out about their neighborhood council.

2016 Additional Goals:

Two goals from 2015 will remain with the addition of a 3rd:

3.) Hold two trainings one on E-Newsletters and a Postcard Content/Best Practices Training

ONS updates:

Intern for Neighborhoods: Jackie reported that there was on student from Rogers who was interested, E.J. will be contacting her. Jackie is working on possible candidates through On Track. The idea is to place interns in their own neighborhoods to work with their Neighborhood Councils helping them with Social Media and website or blog creation and upkeep.

Brochure Trainings: Training are being held Monday, October 26th and Thursday, October 29th, 6:00-7:30pm in City Hall training center.

Next meeting: November 23rd, 2015, noon at the Sinto Senior Center (1124 W Sinto Ave)

Meeting adjourn at 1:00pm

Proposed Agenda Items:
Introductions
Margaret Jones – Rockwood
Greg Francis – Plan Commission Liaison
Barb Biles – Emerson Garfield
Patricia Hansen – Cliff-Cannon

Review and Approve Current Agenda
No quorum.

Review and Approve Minutes for September
No quorum.

Old Business
• Flowcharts from Planning Department – Not discussed
  o Neighborhood Notice passed September 21; effective November 4.
  o Initiate drafting flowchart with new information?
• Update on cell phone towers – Patricia Hansen/Greg Francis
  ▪ Oct 19 Council briefing, Oct 19 PCED briefing, Oct 26, 2015 hearing on emergency ordinance to adopt the final draft and end the moratorium.
• Legal is researching language on cell towers and historic structures that had previously been in place and is now missing from the final draft at PC. Megan Duvall HPO in consultation. Concerns definition of eligible property/building. PC elected not to re-add the language (4/4); possible reconsidered at Council.
• Plan Commission declined to consider add neighborhood notification language back into the ordinance draft as the Neighbor Notice had passed Sept 21 2015.

New Business
• Invited speakers Rae-Lynn Barden on cell towers and Jacqui Halvorson on Pedestrian Plan were unavailable.
• There was a question from Patricia Hansen on how the neighborhoods could be asked to comment on a vacation of city property if they did not really have information on what
might happen there. Melissa to check on comment dates and to let Cliff-Cannon liaison know about the vacation request.

- Barb Biles told LUC that Emerson-Garfield and N Hill each contributing 32K for the next two years on the N Monroe gateway project. The neighborhoods will work with city departments on leveraging N Monroe arterial and stormwater capital improvements. Greg brought up a discussion that happened at Council about CSO projects having development on top as an option, not just greenspace.
- Barb also brought up a Community Frameworks low income housing project breaking ground at Calispel&Mission West 315.
- Brief discussion of requirements of neighborhoods in the new ordinance: potential bylaw changes to provide comment, ensuring neighborhood council contacts are updated and the contacts are communicating to their council. LUC requested info/discussion at Community Assembly.

Reports:
- Plan Commission Update – Liaison, Greg Francis (Rockwood)
- Discussion of Comprehensive Plan Amendments at Plan Commission – Greg Francis
  - Mobile Home amendment recommended for denial by Plan Commission. Discussion included that allowing a new zone category might set up a future Rezone which would significantly impact private property owners rights. PC recommends researching the need for low income housing diversity in Spokane.
  - South Perry amendment was approved by PC unanimously. Finding for consistency with Comp Plan.
  - Other two amendments were not controversial and were approved. (Wellesley/Maple and Market/Cleveland)
- PeTT Committee Update – Paul Kropp (Southgate)
- Planning & Development Quarterly Updates (Planning Director)
- Building Stronger Neighborhoods (invite when needed)
- Community Development (invite when needed)

Good of the Order

Next Meeting Items:
- Melissa to let Patricia know new contact info for Manito-Cannon Hill.
- Melissa send out Bylaws to LUC for review. Bring 2015 goals for review and discussion for 2016.
- Melissa reported to LUC she has requested remaining as LUC liaison at this time. She asked for direction from LUC in connecting issues and concerns to the meetings for discussion and potential development of recommendations to take to Community Assembly for review.
- Brief discussion of whether there should there be a November or December meeting? Comments that LUC should meet in November to discuss goals and elections.

Next meeting is November 19 at 5:00 p.m. at West Central Community Center
Stakeholder Meeting Minutes

October 6th, 2015

**Introduction:** Julie Banks gave a background on where the group is in the process and where they are going and did introductions.

**Meeting Overview:** Melissa Wittstruck went over ground rules for the meeting.

**Questions & Discussion:** Heather Trautman walked the stakeholder group through the Question Matrix that was handed out to the group. There were additional questions raised as well as discussions.

- **Q:** Stated that housing quality and health conditions cannot be exclusively related to rental housing. Issue with health dept report
  - **A:** Refers to City of Spokane Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice 2014 Update report that was handed out to the group.
- **Q:** what is equivalent to public housing here in Spokane?
  - **A:** a unit that is receiving federal subsidy through HUD
- **Audience member Q:** Was this study focused more on housing health issues or lifestyle choice? (question related to Health dept response relating to health data)
  - **A:** so are these related to building health vs. personal choice
- **Q:** perhaps a tenant doesn’t see the impact of their lifestyle on a property. Perhaps property was decent at move in but truly became substandard over time.
  - **A:** look at studies provided and look for secondary impacts as it relates to housing health over time
  - **Q:** no doubt that there are environmental triggers but something to remember is that we have a very high low income population in Spokane and a high percentage of smokers for example within those populations. Interested in looking at asthma rates
- **D:** subsidized housing is not substandard because they’re inspected and held to a higher standard. Poverty linked to health is simply that poverty correlates to lower health standards in general (health, education, etc is lower)
- **D:** waiting lists to get into public housing are obviously better or there wouldn’t be waiting lists to get in. Can we get data for the total number of public and subsidized housing units available?
  - **D:** there is a high demand.
  - **D:** it’s the low income units on the open market that are at risk.
- **D:** potentially we should have the health dept come back and address these questions
- **Q:** behavioral issues- tenant behaviors that impact the quality of the housing. What is the link?
  - **A:** if you’re aware of some of the behavior issues contributing to the problem bring that to the table and we can find some speakers that can address these issues
D- responsible renters at the YWCA, also is aware of other programs. Responsible renters education is required for Section * vouchers. There are no requirements for market rate renters.

Q- Police data: was this relating to rentals exclusively? Yes, so it was impacted by density?

A- rental units; this was a comparison of calls for service based on what he saw

Q- can this be broken down to a budgetary analysis?

A- yes that presentation did include a cost analysis

Q- do regional officers collect this data as well?

A- all data collected is fed into a single input and then fed into a statewide database.

They do not collect data specific to the needs of this group

Q- Are there other reporting agencies outside of Building and Code? Where can a regular resident report poor housing?

A- Yes. For instance if someone has a housing voucher then they could report to Housing Authority. There are other methodologies

D- Housing authority properties are regularly inspected. Resident can write you a letter giving you ten days to remedy the issue and escrow your rent or vacate your lease....

D- maybe during our next phase we can do a mapping exercise

D- are tenants aware that they can do this?

D- Tenants are risking their housing by reporting this.

D- the department offers relocations assistance. This issue will be addressed during phase 2.

Audience Member Q- What is the most common code violation?

A- Solid waste is the most common complaint type

Audience Member Q- Of the 97% vacant buildings, were those classified as rentals?

A- They were classified as nothing but vacant. About 50% are “zombie properties” where ownership simply walks away. If they’re sold they will quickly rehabilitate.

Q- If someone is unhappy with the house they’re living in why not move out?

A- It costs money to move.

Q- private inspections do not go into assessor data, correct?

A-Yes. Correct.

D- There is a missing link between human health and structure health.

D- We need to look at the economics of doing the things that were looking at. Education of the economics.
LONG TERM RENTAL HOUSING

GROUND RULES FOR MEETING

1. Treat each other, the organizations represented in the stakeholder group, and the stakeholders themselves with respect and consideration at all times – put any personal differences aside.
2. Work as team players and share all relevant information. Express fundamental interests rather than fixed positions. Be honest, and tactful. Avoid surprises. Encourage candid, frank discussions.
3. Ask if you do not understand.
4. Openly express any disagreement or concern you have with all stakeholder members.
5. Offer mutually beneficial solutions. Actively strive to see the other's point of view.
6. Share information discussed in the meetings with only the organizations/constituents that you may represent, and relay to the stakeholder group the opinions of these constituents as appropriate.
**GROUND RULES FOR MEETING**

7. Speak one at a time in meetings, as recognized by the facilitator.
8. Acknowledge that everyone will participate, and no one will dominate.
9. Agree that it is okay to disagree and disagree without being disagreeable.
10. Support and actively engage in the workgroup decision process.
11. Do your homework! Read and review materials provided; be familiar with discussion topics.
12. Stick to the topics on the meeting agenda; be concise and not repetitive.
13. Make every attempt to attend all meetings. In the event that a primary workgroup member is unable to attend, that member is responsible for notifying Office of Neighborhood Services about alternative arrangements.
14. Question and Answers will be held until the end of each presentation.

---

**RENTAL HOUSING: AGE OF STRUCTURE**

[Map of Rental Housing Age of Structure]
### Assessors Rating of Housing Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Owner Occupied</th>
<th>Renter Occupied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Poor</td>
<td>303</td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>664</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>4,781</td>
<td>2,647</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>13,705</td>
<td>11,148</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>698</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### SAFETY INSPECTIONS

- **Renter:**
  - A renter would be the most likely person to request a safety inspection to make corrections, or to portray living conditions.

- **Owner:**
  - 1. They have just purchased a property, failed to have a home inspection process done before the purchase, and are finding evidence of repairs or construction that concern them.
  - 2. Maybe they have lived there a while and want to convert it into a rental, or something else, and want to know what issues might need to be fixed.
  - 3. They have received a letter from Code enforcement or the Building Department about a list of conditions, have made some attempts to correct the conditions and would like a complete inspection to confirm resolution, or to identify anything that may have been missed.
  - 4. Renters have damaged areas of the dwelling or made unauthorized changes, and the owner would like a complete inspection.
Total Inspection Requests: 990
Matched to Residential Addresses: 512
Types of Non-Residential Inspections: commercial, vacant lots, etc

2010-Current: Safety Inspection Requests
- Non-Residential Inspections: 66%
- Residential Inspections: 34%

Residential Inspections
- Owner Occupied: 64% (328)
- Renter Occupied: 29% (151)
- Both (2-4 Unit): 5% (6)
### Health and Wealth


### Health Data for Renters

- **Does DCFS or DSHS have any health data for (local) renters?**
  - Heather Wallace & Peggy Slider

- **Have any comparison studies been done to show health effects in public housing or any other subsidized housing?**
  - Heather Wallace & Peggy Slider
  - The National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) did publish the following: *Is Public Housing the Cause of Poor Health or a Safety Net for the Unhealthy Poor?*. *J Urban Health*. 2010 Sep; 87(5): 827–838. Published online 2010 Jun 29. doi: 10.1007/s11524-010-0484-y. PMCID: PMC2937128. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2937128/ Abstract: “Research has shown that public housing residents have the worst health of any population in the USA. However, it is unclear what the cause of that poor health is among this population. The purpose of this paper is to investigate the association between public housing and health conditions: specifically, we ask if residents entered public housing already ill or if public housing may cause the poor health of its residents. The data used for this study come from the GSU Urban Health Initiative, which is a prospective, mixed-methods study of seven public housing communities earmarked for demolition and relocation (N = 385). We used the pre-relocation, baseline survey. We found that, while health was not the main reason residents gave for entering public housing, the majority of public housing residents entered public housing already ill. Substandard housing conditions, long tenure in public housing, and having had a worse living situation prior to entry were associated with the highest risk of poor health.”

- **Is the health data similar for adults?**
  - Heather Wallace & Peggy Slider

### Law Enforcement

- **What does law enforcement tell tenants when they have or are faced with uninhabitable living conditions?**
  - If the property is uninhabitable it is not uncommon for us to contact Spokane Fire, or Code Enforcement to respond. Beyond that we do not have a hand out of any kind to direct them to services, however we may tell them about non-profit services that may be able to help them.

- **Under what circumstances would SPD call the Fire Department?**
  - I believe that was answered above. Primarily if we believe the person is in some kind of danger, unable to take care of themselves, or living in an unfit place.

- **Do you find more repeat calls to properties that are not maintained? Does this apply to single family homes or is this just a large complex issue?**
  - It has been my experience that we go to more properties that are not maintained. My research involved multi-family locations such as apartment complexes. However it has been my patrol experience that this is common for unmanaged, not maintained residences as well. I do not have any stats for that.

- **Is Hot Spot Policing the result of actual crimes or tip lines?**
  - Primarily Hot Spot Policing is generated from call for service and crime reports called into Crime Check. Our Crime Analysis Unit reviews this data and determines where the Hot Spots are.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime/Safety Related</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Letter of drug activity and arrest: Why can't the letter wait until a</td>
<td>You are correct that an arrest does not necessarily prove guilt. These letters are primarily issues after a search warrant is executed on a</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>person has actually been convicted and sentenced before the eviction</td>
<td>property and drugs are located in the residence. This letter is mandated by state law. It is not based on guilt or innocents.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>begins? What happened to innocent until proven guilty? An arrest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>does not necessitate guilt or even fault.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What type of crime is occurring in the North side and Downtown</td>
<td>During the presentation I showed a whole laundry list of crimes that were involved at these places, and they were not all drugs. Not</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>complexes? What about using PC's to control drug dealers?</td>
<td>even half were drugs. I am not sure the reference of PC regarding the control of drug dealers. Working drugs in a complex is harder to do</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>because it is hard to see where people are coming from</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Notice of Arrest Letters: do you advise when the prisoner has been</td>
<td>We do not notify anyone when the arrested subject is released.</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>released?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What can landlords do to be more cooperative with law enforcement?</td>
<td>a.) I would like to look at this question as being more helpful to law enforcement. More cooperative makes it sound like they are not</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>cooperating, and this is not usually the case. b.) I think the key is to maintain and manage their properties. This means managing in</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>a way so that there is minimal crime at their location. Every place has the potential to have some crime. However when law</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>enforcement responds day in and day out the owner/manager needs to take care of the problem. Management is the key. c.) Someone</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>mentioned a rental property registry. This would be a helpful tool as long as law enforcement had access so they know who to contact</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>when there is an issue. A big problem with this type of information is keeping it up to date. If it is not up to date then it has far</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>less worth. d.) If there is criminal activity occurring on their property make a report of it with specifics. Who, what, and where.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Information is very helpful to us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What address the letter of arrest sent to? How do management</td>
<td>We use tax records to determine ownership. If by chance we know who the management company is we will send one there too. The law</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>companies receive letters before it goes to the owner of record?</td>
<td>advised that we need to notify the owner. If a registry is created the management company would be great information to include along</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>with owner information.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What resources are available to first responders?</td>
<td>This is a pretty open ended question. I will say that owner information and contact numbers are at times very difficult to obtain.</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Especially when officers are on scene. There is a time factor involved, and oftentimes quick information is not readily available to us.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How can landlords work with tenant associations to decrease calls for</td>
<td>I think this is a question that needs to be addressed to the landlords and tenant association. Each have their own issues that need to</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>service?</td>
<td>be discussed and then determine how to move forward. Law enforcement should be a key component, but everyone should look at this question</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>I think education is one good option. Some people have never been taught about how to live in complexes and what expectations there can be.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Some people find that hard to believe, but it is true.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What are some tools for landlords when a tenant returns to property</td>
<td>Unless some legal documents is in play the subject has a right to his house. This is not necessarily a short easy answer. Eviction is an</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>after being removed due to arrest?</td>
<td>option depending on the circumstances. However it may be that thelandlord does not want to do this for various reasons. The bottom line</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>is that Landlord Tennant law has to be followed and in any of these cases the Landlord should consult an attorney for legal advice</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DO you find that landlords are generally cooperative with law</td>
<td>We have cooperative and uncooperative landlords. It all depends on the individual. I would say that there are far more cooperative</td>
<td>Sgt Ervin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enforcement?</td>
<td>landlords than there are uncooperative landlords.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Crime/Safety Related</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If the City knows my landlord is negligent because of an inspection</td>
<td>If the property falls within the framework of Building Official or Substandard Building then the City can become involved however there are many issues that are related to maintenance and falls under the Landlord Tenant Act and it is required that the landlord remedy if the tenant brings it to the landlord.</td>
<td>Dan Skindzer/Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>why aren't they holding him accountable now?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trautman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Could apartment complex tenants involve Code Enforcement to inspect and</td>
<td>Yes, a tenant can make complaints to Code Enforcement and the Building Department however these departments cannot act unless it rises to the level of a substandard building.</td>
<td>Dan Skindzer/Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>get help?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trautman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What resources are available for relocation due to Substandard</td>
<td>The City currently works with SNAP for relocation assistance due to a home entering the Building Official Process.</td>
<td>Dan Skindzer/Heather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings?</td>
<td></td>
<td>Trautman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Who can and how are Code complaints made?</td>
<td>Any citizen can make a code complaint via a code violation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How are Gonzaga student rental units coded?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building/Code Related</td>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the complaints how many are renter vs. owner? Only 3%</td>
<td>The 3% refers to the number of JUST active substandard cases that were rental at the time of the complaint.</td>
<td>Heather Trautman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of the 1000's of property owners, 52 complaints in one year seems low.</td>
<td>Currently there is no formal tracking system for maintenance issues that are called into the Building Department regarding rental units, the 52 complaints was derived from the call log that Dan Skindzer this did not include other inspectors call logs.</td>
<td>Dan Skindzer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many properties are Substandard by Code criteria's?</td>
<td>Code Enforcement is a complaint driven process, there is no way to know of all properties which are substandard, code enforcement only investigates those that complaint on them.</td>
<td>Heather Trautman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What resources are available for homeowners to bring structures up to Code?</td>
<td>The resources are typically through CDBG, SNAP Programs, etc.</td>
<td>Heather Trautman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we develop an agreed definition of &quot;Substandard&quot; Properties?</td>
<td>No likely the definition for &quot;substandard building&quot; varies. The City of Spokane does not have the ability to require another agency to adopt the same definition. The definition used by the City of Spokane can be found &quot;substandard or unfit building&quot; found in 17F of the Municipal Code.</td>
<td>Heather Trautman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What happens to tenants when the building they are living in is determined uninhabitable?</td>
<td>They are required to relocate through Code process. Code Enforcement provides referrals for services that provide housing such as SNAP.</td>
<td>Heather Trautman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who notifies the tenants when the building they are living in is determined uninhabitable?</td>
<td>Code Enforcement notifies the tenant if a building is determined substandard by posting on the property and sending a letter to the occupant and property owner.</td>
<td>Heather Trautman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the City assist tenants with relocation if the building is uninhabitable? If not who does?</td>
<td>Yes, the City does offer assistance, there are also other agencies that provide assistance.</td>
<td>Heather Trautman</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How many complaints about conditions come from tenants living in the unit?</td>
<td>There is no data tracked for this, the numbers presented are anecdotal and come from Dan Skindzer's personal call log.</td>
<td>Dan Skindzer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data Related</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The data doesn't track all complaints regarding rentals; data lacks possible real number of rental properties issues?</td>
<td>Currently there is no tracking mechanism within the building department for calls related to landlord/tenant maintenance issues. It has been asked to begin tracking these requests.</td>
<td>Dan Skindzer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Legal Questions</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 2 Related Questions</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SLIHC-High Risk Tenants training?</td>
<td>Hold for Phase 2-Identify existing programs, policies, ordinances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there requirements that the landlord provide relocation assistance to tenants if the building is uninhabitable and they refuse to do the repairs?</td>
<td>Hold for Phase 2-Identify existing programs, policies, ordinances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Are there regulations in place right now to ensure that my (and all) landlords provide, good clean, safe housing?</td>
<td>Hold for Phase 2-Identify existing programs, policies, ordinances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How can we educate tenants about their legal rights?</td>
<td>Hold for Phase 2-Identify existing programs, policies, ordinances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does SNAP offer education of landlord/tenant laws?</td>
<td>Hold for Phase 2-Identify existing programs, policies, ordinances</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phase 3 Related Questions</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Presenter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How will a license make my landlord/property owner do all of the influence factors discussed by Sgt. Ervin?</td>
<td>Hold for Phase 3- Explore gaps between the issues and existing solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In inverse condemnation a possible solution?</td>
<td>Hold for Phase 3- Explore gaps between the issues and existing solutions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Question</strong></td>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
<td><strong>Presenter</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would Code Enforcement oversee or take on so many additional calls (if a registration program were created)?</td>
<td>This is not relevant to the scope of the group, the group is to focus on current issues and how current programs address those issues and make recommendations based on those.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Why register all properties when Building Department &amp; Code Enforcement complaint numbers exists?</td>
<td>This is not relevant to the scope of the group, the group is to focus on current issues and how current programs address those issues and make recommendations based on those.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is there or are there has there been a housing shortage in Spokane?</td>
<td>This is not relevant to the scope of the group, the group is to focus on current issues and how current programs address those issues and make recommendations based on those.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you enforce accountability to those landlords who don’t follow the current rules?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If landlords are required to improve properties for rent what profitability is there to allow landlords to make a reasonable profit for their interests?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where would funding come from for an inspection program?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What criteria would be used to assess a property?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would homeowners be educated about their impacts if they don’t comply with a rental inspection program?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would we consider a penalty type system?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would there be new laws and regulations to enforce under a registration program?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>As a good landlord how does it benefit me to be licensed? Am I just being penalized for the conduct of bad landlords?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>License fees will be passed onto tenants in the form of higher rent. If the City fined noncompliant landlords instead of charging good landlords, wouldn’t this help keep rent prices down?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would you consider approaching (a inspection program) as partnering with good landlords to offer incentives such as recommendations to live in such places as opposed to places that cannot hold the standard and therefore are not considered partners?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is no recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would a license for landlords require a test to acquire?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is not recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What is the proposed cost of inspection? Would this cover all costs?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is not recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Who would oversee a possible rental property registry?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is not recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How would you identify who should take courses or acquire a license or would it be across the board for all landlords?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group, there is not recommendation at this time that would address this outcome.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>Answer</td>
<td>Presenter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In addition to current recommendations do you think the power imbalance would change if Spokane were to adopt a just cause eviction ordinance?</td>
<td>This is outside of the scope of the Stakeholder group,</td>
<td>Heather Wallace &amp; Peggy Slider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How does Spokane Regional Health advocate and educate?</td>
<td>Advocate means to publically recommend or support while educate is to teach or train. Employees of the Community and Family Services division at SRHD advocate by presenting the position of populations they represent to those who have the ability to impact issues affecting that population. An example of this would be talking to the Parks and Recreation Department about issues around a park that is falling into disrepair and/or is experiencing a lot of naughty or criminal behavior and starting the conversation around resolving those issues. Another example of advocacy is to contact DSHS about issues a person is facing and advocating for the state to provide the help needed. Education falls into a large variety of venues. It may be speaking at a conference, or teaching parenting classes, or talking to the Public Safety Committee about the effects poor quality housing has on health.</td>
<td>Heather Wallace &amp; Peggy Slider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Does the new schedule include speakers reported on the survey? If not, why did we do the survey?</td>
<td>We are working to identify the additional speakers when the speakers series currently scheduled is completed.</td>
<td>Heather Wallace &amp; Peggy Slider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will new members be added to the Stakeholder Group as related to the survey taken?</td>
<td>At this time the majority of stakeholders felt that the current lineup of the Stakeholder group was sufficient in representing many views.</td>
<td>Heather Wallace &amp; Peggy Slider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we have more information about the Hillyard Study</td>
<td>At this time the Northeast Community Center is Housing and Health: Suggestions for the Future is available by public records request.</td>
<td>Heather Wallace &amp; Peggy Slider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can we have more information to the lead class action suit?</td>
<td>The Lead Class Action Suit will be available</td>
<td>Heather Wallace &amp; Peggy Slider</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues</td>
<td>Agency</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Management</td>
<td>Institute of Real Estate Management</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Cost of Repeat Offenders</td>
<td>Police Department</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Education of Landlord Tenant Act</td>
<td>Health Department</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of Upkeep</td>
<td>Building Department</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No one place for tenant to receive help</td>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor/No rental contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of internal access to property</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of staff for relocation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insufficient Housing Data</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lack of tenant upkeep/no motivation</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>