

**Response to Questions - Hillside Park RFEI**

**Q1. In the preferred Site Plan, the Phase 1 development builds 5 buildings, with 191 1BRs and 83 2BRs. Was consideration given to the family sizes in the existing buildings located on Phase 2 land with any intention of building replacement units in Phase 1 sized to meet the needs of families likely needing 3BR and 4BR units? Who could move from their existing housing on Phase 2 land into units built as part of Phase 1? Or, be able to bring back (some of those who would like to return), clients living in replacement housing off-site? I did not find any designation of the BR sizes in the existing Hillside Park development of single family and duplex structures that will be demolished.**

*A1. Consideration will be given to all current residents of Hillside Park, who will be given the first right to return into one (or more) of the Phase I buildings. HUD requires that replacement units of like bedroom size be provided for any units demolished for residents displaced during construction of the new buildings. The existing unit mix at Hillside Park consists of 25 one-bedroom units and 75 two-bedroom units.*

**Q2. Buildings A1 and A2 and E1 are all designated 1BR units. And also appear in a column on Exhibit 1 under “Market”. Is this correct to assume that these 1BRs in buildings along street frontage are to all be 1BRs and rented to market tenants, with no income restrictions?**

*A2. The bedroom distribution and allocation is based on the approved master plan. While the intent of the master plan was to prioritize smaller bedroom sizes for the “market units” included in A1, A2, and E1; this is not a requirement. There is no requirement for market rate units within the development and the expectation is that respondents propose with a distribution and structure that is justified and feasible. Conversely, if market units are proposed, they should be limited*

**Q3. Referring to p. 3 of the Exhibit 7-LIS for Metro Affordable Housing Bonds- Is there an error in the 2nd Table on this page perhaps? Looking at the total need for new affordable housing forecast for next 20 years—Milwaukie—it totals to 316 for units between 0 -80% AMI. Should the total in the last column be 697 units needed?**

*A3. Yes, that is an error. The total for the Milwaukie bands should total 697 units*

City*	Extremely Low Income (<30% MFI Need)	Very Low Income (30-50% MFI Need)	Low Income (50-80% MFI Need)	Total affordable rental housing need between 0-80% MFI
Gladstone	62	72	51	185
Happy Valley	473	548	1,025	2,046
Lake Oswego	198	167	198	563
Milwaukie	256	167	274	<del>316</del> 697
Oregon City	441	353	599	1,393
West Linn	98	164	102	364
Wilsonville	333	592	347	1,272

*Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. U.S. Census Bureau, 2012-2016 ACS Table 19001.*

*\*The data provided is still in DRAFT form and will be updated once finalized.*

**Q4. Page 4 of the LIS specifies that 50% of the units produced with benefit of Metro Affordable Housing Bonds have to be 2 bedrooms and larger. When I turn to your colorful Exhibit 1, Building Data, I count 198 of the 500 that would be newly built.**

**Q4a. Does that requirement apply to this proposed project, such that the 198 of 500 new units, is short the 50% requirement for new projects utilizing Metro Bonds that are 2BRs and larger?**

*A4a. The 50% requirement (406 total) applies to projects across the HACC portfolio and includes Hillside Park as well as additional projects and therefore the existing unit configuration is acceptable.*

**Q4b. Or, have you deleted the Market units you designate in your Exhibit 1 Table, that is, 170 units from the 500, for a total of 330 units and 198 2BR+ favorably exceeds the 50% requirement?**

*A4b. Please see the answer to question 'a' above*

**Q4c. With the Metro bonds amount of \$116,188,094 to support 812 units, I figured that per unit, you are willing to fund from Metro bonds, \$143,088 per unit, up to \$35 million dedicated to Hillside, Phases 1 and 2. Would that per unit amount apply? Such that \$35 million would help the capital costs for about 243 units. Is that HACC's metric for the \$35 million, part of building at least 234 units of the 500? Or is your Metro Bond funding allowed to be less specifically targeted to # of units and part of the capital stack to build "no less than" some number of units?**

*A4c. In general, that is correct. It is unlikely to award metro funds at a higher per unit cost. Yes, the assumption is that if a developer would like to access metro funds then a minimum of 240-250 units would need to meet metro qualifications.*

**Q5. The Metro Bond parameters indicate that the bond proceeds cannot be used for units that have existing affordability requirements. Would that, then, apply to the 100 of 500 new units proposed in the Master Plan that are designated "replacement units"? Since those would mirror, likely, the 50% or 30% AMI restrictions true of the units being demolished?**

*A5. Metro's Work Plan states that "Bond Measure funds may be used to pay for qualified capital costs associated with the following: Construction of new affordable housing as part of the redevelopment of a residential property with existing public affordability restrictions, as long as the redevelopment results in a substantial net increase in the total number of affordable homes."*

**Q6. Does the housing authority have any funds available to help pay for the streets and other public infrastructure shown on the concept plan for the site?**

*A6. The Authority does not currently anticipate contributing sources to the infrastructure.*

**Q7. Will the housing authority entertain proposals that adjust or reduce the number of units shown on the concept plan?**

*A7. Proposers are welcome to include alternative concept plans with varying unit configurations and distributions. That being said, if the overall units vary greatly from the approved master plan, it is unlikely the City would approve the variance.*

**Q8. During the planning process, what kind of feedback was received from community stakeholders about the types of uses are desired for the commercial space shown on the plan?**

*A8. The mixed-use buildings will provide the opportunity to add some small, neighborhood focused commercial uses to the site that will enhance the area. The community expressed interest in uses such as a health clinic, a coffee shop, and other small business interests that might support the neighborhood residents.*

**Q9. Is the City planning any major streetscape improvements along 32nd Avenue?**

*A9. Mitigation is not triggered by the development at any of the study street intersections. At the southern accessway of the site, a left turn pocket is required to mitigate impacts for vehicles access the site from northbound 32nd Ave. The additional ridership generated by the site will require improving adjacent bus stops. Two existing TriMet bus stops are located on 32nd Ave; one just north of the intersection with the existing Hillside Ct (stop #7342), and the second just north of the intersection with future Meek Street (stop #7349). Based on consultations with TriMet designers these two stops will be combined into a single bus stop located between SE Dwyer and SE Meek Sts and enhanced as part of the development. The new combined stop will include a raised curb/bus platform to facilitate bus loading and a new 4 ft by 8 ft transit shelter. Pedestrian access to the stop will also be improved with a new crosswalk and with ADA ramps on both sides of 32nd Ave, and new refuge islands in the center of the street to calm traffic and prevent cars from pulling around the stopped bus. The new bus stop will be sized for future growth by allowing room for a larger shelter (4 ft by 12 ft) and a trash can in the future. The consolidation of the bus stops is anticipated to occur as part of Phase 2 of the development when the bulk of the 32nd Ave frontage improvements will be constructed. No additional right-of-way dedications should be required to facilitate the new combined stop.*

**Q10. Can you please provide the demographic information on the current resident of the public housing site?**

*A10. See demographic data on page 5.*

**Q11. Does the above RFEI have an estimated value, ideal construction start date, and end date at this time?**

*A11. No, the RFEI does not have an estimated value or ideal construction start date and end date. Time is of the essence, however, all Metro Bond funded projects must have begun construction by 2026 at the very latest.*

**Q12. Has funding for horizontal infrastructure been identified?**

*A12. No, that is the purpose of the RFEI.*

**Q13. Will streets and utilities be public up to the property lines?**

*A13. Yes, streets and shared utilities are publicly owned and the lots define right of way up to the property line of the lot.*

**Q14. Who will provide maintenance?**

*A14. Since the streets and Right of Way are publicly owned, the City of Milwaukie would maintain the streets and landscape maintenance up to the property line.*

**Q15. Is there flexibility to make the internal streets private?**

*A15. No – public funding is provided to the capital improvements of the property and it will remain public. A developer may elect to create private streets within their lot, but this would likely be limited to a drive aisle, etc. and would likely be very inefficient in the context of the newly-created public streets.*

**Q16. Will dedications/widenings be required on SE 32nd Ave?**

*A16. Yes, Per the Traffic Impact Study review, a left-turn lane is required for north bound SE 32nd Avenue at Meek Street as mitigation for expected trip increases. This left-turn pocket must be constructed prior to (or concurrently with) that phase of development which creates greater than 325 residential units. Note, right of way is taken from the northbound side of 32<sup>nd</sup> Ave to create the left turn lane.*

**Q17. Will upgrades to water, sewer, and storm drain facilities serving the site be required to improve condition or capacity?**

*A17. No upgrades are required for offsite / downstream water, sanitary or storm systems. Studies were done during the master planning phase and confirmed with city staff that there are available capacities for the proposed master plan development.*

**Q18. Will undergrounding of overhead utilities on SE 32nd Ave be required?**

*A18. Unknown at this stage.*

**Q19. Are covers and divider pages included in page count?**

*A19. No.*

**Q20. What can you share about the composition of the selection committee?**

*A20. The selection committee will likely include members of the Clackamas County Housing Authority, other local Housing Authorities, local governments, consultants, and other members to be identified.*

**Q21. DSCR is listed at 1.2 in the RFEI but as 1.25 in Exhibit 1: Development Assumptions. Which is the correct number?**

*A21. You may assume 1.20*

**Q22. Metro bond funds are listed at \$36MM in the RFEI and \$35MM in Exhibit 1. Which is the correct number?**

*A22. \$36MM in Metro bonds have been set aside for this project*

**Tenant Statistical Reporting**  
**PH - Tenant Stats - Standard Summary Rpt**  
Hillside Park

**Summary Statistics**

	<b>Count</b>	<b>PCT</b>	<b>Avg Age</b>
Male:	14	14.8936%	67.36
Female:	80	85.1064%	58.15
Elderly:	45	47.8723%	73.60
Non-Elderly:	49	52.1277%	46.59
Disabled:	62	65.9574%	59.82
Non-Disabled:	32	34.0426%	58.94
FSS:	3	3.1915%	38.67
WTW:	0	0.0000%	0.00
<b>Race Codes:</b>			
W - White:	83	88.2979%	
B - Black/African American:	8	8.5106%	
N - American Indian/Alaska Native:	3	3.1915%	
A - Asian:	0	0.0000%	
P - Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander:	0	0.0000%	
O - Other:	0	0.0000%	
D - Declined:	1	1.0638%	
<b>Ethnicity:</b>			
Hispanic or Latino:	6	6.3830%	50.83
Not Hispanic or Latino:	88	93.6170%	60.11
Declined:	0	0.0000%	0.00
<b>Part-time Student:</b>			
	0		
# of households:	94		
Families w Children:	18		
Total Nr Children: (Y-only)	29		
# in Family:	166		