

# Meeting minutes

Meeting: Metro Housing Oversight  
Committee Meeting 7

Date/time: Wednesday, August 7, 2019

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

Purpose: Review two Local Implementation Strategies (LISs), provide time for committee to continue discussions on ongoing oversight duties.

---

## Attendees

Manuel Castaneda, Dr. Steven Holt, Mitch Hornicker, Mesha Jones, Ed McNamara, Bandana Shrestha, Melissa Earlbbaum, Andrew Tull

## Absent

Serena Cruz, Jenny Lee, Steve Rudman, Shannon Singleton, Tia Vonil

## Metro

Emily Lieb, Eryn Kehe, Jes Larson, Laura Dawson Bodner, Ashley McCarron, Valeria Vidal, Megan Gibb, Patrick McLaughlin, Jonathan Williams

## Facilitators

Allison Brown, Hannah Mills

## Next meeting

Wednesday, September 4, 9:00 a.m. – 11:15 a.m.  
Metro, 600 NE Grand Avenue, Portland, Council chamber

## Welcome and Agenda

Emily Lieb, Metro, welcomed the Committee and provided updates on the following:

- The updated Committee schedule for 2019
- Metro Council review of the Washington County and Beaverton's submitted strategies

Emily explained that Co-Chair Shannon Singleton would be stepping down from her position. Jes Larson, Metro, continued noting that Metro Council felt it was not the right time to bring on a new member, and that Jenny Lee graciously accepted the request to fill Shannon's role.

The Committee unanimously approved the meeting minutes from the last meeting.

## Public Comment

Allison Brown, facilitator with JLA Public Involvement, opened the floor for public comment. Diane Linn of Proud Ground and representative from the Alliance for Homeownership submitted the following summarized comment along with a letter which was included in the Committee's meeting packet.

*Homeownership should be considered as a part of this process. The goal of equity calls for stabilization of families, and providing opportunities for homeownership can help reach that goal. Embedding homeownership into these strategies and plans is an important step.*

# Meeting minutes

## **Follow-Up from Last Meeting**

Allison asked the Committee if they were prepared to review the revised language from Washington County's strategy regarding screening criteria. Following a brief discussion, the Committee agreed to vote on the new language. Andrew Tull moved to approve the new language, Ed McNamara seconded the motion. The Committee unanimously voted to approve the updated language from Washington County.

## **LIS Review**

Allison explained that the Committee has three decision-making options for the LISs. The options include recommendation for approval, recommendation for approval with consideration, and returning the strategy to the jurisdiction for further review and refinement.

## ***Strategy 1: Clackamas County***

Allison reviewed the questions submitted by the Committee that Clackamas County would be answering during their presentation, and asked if the members would like to include any additional questions. Jill Smith and Stephen McMurtrey, staff with Clackamas County, briefly answered the questions put forth by the Committee. Questions and answers are summarized below.

- Do you foresee a substantial increase in the amount of affordable housing units within the three projects referenced (Hillside, Clackamas Heights, and Oregon City View Manor)? Is the bond the most appropriate way to finance these projects?
  - *We anticipate a substantial increase in units. Some of the units will be torn down and rebuilt, but they are not eligible for bond resources.*
- Are there plans to budget residential connection services and allocate full time resources to residents at all proposed projects?
  - *We expect that any project will have resident services within them. There may be more robust services provided at some more than others. Additionally, we found that a lot of the folks that need affordable housing overlap with those using the other services we provide.*
- What contingencies are built into the financial projections to ensure that Clackamas can meet the production goal for projects developed over the next five to seven years?
  - *Our financial modeling anticipates increased cost, and some contingency is built into that.*
- If property tax exemption is only available to Housing Authority of Clackamas County (HACC) projects, would it be more cost-effective to have HACC develop all 812 units?
  - *It's a question of capacity. There may be opportunity to co-develop some of the units, and we're reaching out to jurisdictions to identify those opportunities.*
- Does Clackamas County have a financial model showing how it would be using 80% MFI to cross subsidize lower income units and how much subsidy the 80% MFI units would produce? Does this assume using Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) income averaging?
  - *The financial model looks at the possibility of income averaging. An 80% MFI and cash flow can stabilize a project. All projects should be using the LIHTC. We*

# Meeting minutes

*will be encouraging developers to use the LIHTC and working with them on feasibility.*

- Is there a goal for providing two to three bedroom units for each project?
  - *We have a goal and we anticipate that every project will have some unit mix to achieve our goal.*
- Is there a way to strengthen the language in the LIS regarding the criteria for selecting developers?
  - *We reviewed our language and think we could strengthen that in the RFPs. There are criteria in the NOFA process.*
- How many members are on the Clackamas County Housing Advisory Board (HAB)? How is it structured? Is there a charter? How will it engage communities that may be hesitant to provide feedback directly?
  - *The HAB is a chartered board. We are seeking up to nine members based on a specific set of criteria. It's the responsibility of the HACC and our partners to perform direct engagement with communities and bring that feedback to help guide the HAB.*
- How many people in affordable housing are able-bodied and looking for work?
  - *We can try and get those numbers.*
- How will you be marketing to communities of color?
  - *We have contracted with Unite Oregon to do the outreach and specifically target communities of color. We may expand as needed, and it is a part of the RFP process. The goal is to exceed the population by race.*

## **Strategy 2: Metro**

Allison reviewed the questions submitted by the Committee that Metro would be answering during their presentation, and asked if the members would like to include any additional questions. Pat McLaughlin and Megan Gibb staff with Metro, briefly answered the questions put forth by the Committee. Questions and answers are summarized below.

- Will Site Acquisition Program (SAP) funding only be used for sites that Metro acquires and then offers for development?
  - *SAP funds will only be used for acquiring land that can be developed. We will also use SAP funds for gap funding on sites that Metro already owns in order to leverage all available resources.*
- How much of the SAP is estimated for land and how much for additional gap funding?
  - *It will depend on the sites and their location. Some jurisdictions want more for acquisition, and some want more for gap funding.*
- Are the site prioritization criteria listed on page 12 of equal rank and priority?
  - *Yes, they were not intended to be listed based on priority, but three of those points are meant to address racial equity considerations.*
- How do the SAP priorities relate to the technical criteria?
  - *The priorities are regional in nature. These are the types of properties we want to purchase. The technical criteria look at whether the sites will serve the needs.*
- How does the SAP implement anti-displacement policies?
  - *The SAP addresses anti-displacement through land acquisition – purchasing land in areas currently experiencing displacement, with anticipated displacement, or that have already been displaced.*



600 NE Grand Ave.  
Portland, OR 97232-2736

# Meeting minutes

- If a project achieves priorities two through six on page 12, could this result in asking people of color to once again move from their current locations to enjoy the benefits of these investments?
  - *It's our goal to help people stay in their communities and also to provide opportunities in locations that have not historically had affordable housing opportunities.*
- What are the difficulties and challenges associated with acquiring sites that meet Metro's priorities? Are any priorities inconsistent with each other? Will these priorities vary by jurisdiction?
  - *The priorities are not necessarily inconsistent with each other. For example, Metro owns a property in Beaverton that will be used for bond-funded housing that meets all the criteria. Staff do not expect every property to meet all criteria and expect properties to address some criteria better than others. These priorities will vary by jurisdiction depending on the strategic focus of their LIS.*

## **Considerations and Recommendations**

Following each question-answer session, the Committee was given time to discuss and determine their recommendation.

### *Voting Results*

For the Clackamas County's LIS, Ed McNamara moved to recommend Metro Council approval, subject to the County's revision of language related to public solicitation processes described on Pg. 8, as discussed by the committee. The motion was seconded by Dr. Steven Holt. The Committee unanimously voted to approve recommending the LIS to Metro Council with considerations (listed below).

For Metro's SAP implementation strategy, Ed McNamara moved to recommend Metro Council approval, subject to Metro SAP's revision of language related to prioritization of racial equity regarding site acquisition criteria on Pg. 12, as discussed by the committee. The motion was seconded by Andrew Tull. The Committee unanimously voted to approve recommending the implementation strategy to Metro Council with considerations (listed below).

### *Considerations*

The Committee identified the following considerations specific to Clackamas County's ongoing implementation and monitoring of outcomes:

- The County should further define strategies and outcomes that will be measured to demonstrate the advancement of racial equity, including low-barrier screening criteria, affirmative marketing, universal design, voucher prioritization, wraparound services, and contract and workforce diversity.

# Meeting minutes

The Committee identified the following considerations specific to Metro's SAP ongoing implementation and monitoring of outcomes:

- Metro's Site Acquisition Program should acknowledge that all developments will have units dedicated to serving households with incomes at 0-30% AMI, and that dedicated income streams are critical to provide ongoing supportive services to these households. Metro's Site Acquisition Program should commit to working with partners to identify ways to provide these services.

The Committee requested an early response from Clackamas County and Metro's SAP regarding the considerations above and ongoing updates as part of the jurisdictions' annual LIS progress reports.

In addition to the above listed considerations, Committee members offered the following considerations for all jurisdictions participating in implementation of the Housing Bond. These considerations may be further refined as the Committee discusses Local Implementation Strategies from other jurisdictions in coming months:

- Use language that acknowledges intersectionality of populations; avoid differentiating between homelessness, disabling conditions including physical and mental health, and addiction.
- Identify screening criteria not relevant to likelihood of successful tenancy that should not be considered.
- Additional resources need to be identified to successfully serve tenants who need permanent supportive housing.
- Measuring outcomes regarding workforce equity should include all workers, not solely apprentices.
- Many minority owned businesses need additional support to successfully participate in the COBID certification program.
- Consider sustainability/durability and life cycle costs, and incorporate findings from the 2015 Meyer Memorial Trust study on cost efficiencies in affordable housing in evaluating project costs.

## **Committee Business**

Due to time constraints and the number of Committee members absent from the meeting, the Committee Business discussion will take place at the September 4<sup>th</sup> meeting.

## **Next Steps and Close**

Emily briefly recapped the discussion and recommendations and explained that Metro staff would be working with the co-chairs to check in on the revisions before submitting them to Metro Council. Jes explained that the Committee would only be reviewing one LIS at the next meeting, allowing more time for the Committee Business portion of the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned.