

# Housing Affordability and Homelessness Task Force



## Meeting #9 Summary

March 27, 2019 | 6:00 – 8:30 p.m.  
Development Services Building, Auditorium  
150 Beaver Creek Road, Oregon City, OR

### Attendees:

#### Name

Anna Geller  
Cole Merkel  
Graham Phalen  
Roseann Johnson  
Katrina Holland (on phone)  
Nate Ember  
Yelena Voxnyuk  
Ken Fisher  
Nancy Ide  
Patty Jay  
Dave Carboneau

#### Affiliation

Geller Silvis  
Street Roots  
Clackamas County Sheriff's Office  
Home Builders Association of Metro Portland  
Community Alliance of Tenants  
Built Architecture, Community + Design  
NW Housing Alternatives  
Clackamas County Business Alliance  
City of Oregon City Representative  
Clackamas County Citizen Representative  
Home First Development

#### County staff

Abby Ahern  
Jill Smith  
Julie Larsen  
Martha Fritzie  
Vahid Brown

#### Facilitators

Alice Sherring, EnviroIssues  
Mari Valencia, EnviroIssues

*Apologies – Alma Flores, Bart Berquist, Chris Scherer, Dan Chandler, Ellen Burns, Jane Leo, Jennifer Hughes, Jerald Johnson, Kari Lyons, Larry Didway, Nina Carlson, Rob Hawthorne, Ruth Adkins, Shelly Mead, Shelly Yoder, Wilda Parks*

## Welcome and housekeeping

Alice Sherring, facilitator, welcomed Task Force members to the meeting. Ms. Sherring reviewed the meeting agenda and noted last-minute changes due to unforeseen circumstances and late changes to speaker availability. Ms. Sherring explained the information sharing (funding opportunities) agenda item will now be pushed to the following task force meeting.

Ms. Jill Smith, Director of Housing Services for Clackamas County, would also be representing the County in this evening's meeting on behalf of Dan Chandler. She noted that the Task Force would focus the bulk of the meeting on refining draft recommendations for the Housing Services and Planning, Zoning and Development topic areas.

Ms. Sherring led group introductions. She then asked if any edits were needed to the meeting #8 summary. No edits were noted, and the summary will be considered final.

## Opening remarks and task force updates

Ms. Sherring invited opening remarks from County Staff:

- Jill Smith, Clackamas County, said she was happy to be back then gave praise to Dan Chandler, Vahid Brown, Clackamas County, Wilda Parks, Clackamas County Economic Development, and Nate Ember, Built Architecture, Community + Design, for a successful presentation on the Shelter of the Streets (SOS) Task Force Recommendations before the Board of County Commissioners (BCC) on March 12.
- Ms. Smith invited Mr. Brown and Mr. Ember to share some highlights from the BCC meeting:
  - Mr. Ember said the session went over well. He said commissioners asked good questions and were interested in the conversations the task force is having.
  - Mr. Brown said the SOS Recommendations were generally supported by commissioners; however the Commissioners were really interested in knowing about the implementation and costs associated with the recommendations. Mr. Brown said he let Commissioners know that Mr. Chandler and himself will be putting some thought on the implementation and funding needs.
    - Nancy Ide, City of Oregon City Representative, asked if there was video footage of the public hearing available. *Ms. Sherring said she would send out the audio file and the presentation slides to task force members.*
- Ms. Smith invited Ms. Ahern, Clackamas County, to share an updated related to the County's Continuum of Care program.
  - Ms. Ahern explained the Continuum of Care (CoC) is a system of programs to support people experiencing homelessness and noted the topics from her last two presentations before the task force fall under the CoC program. She said that roughly 370 communities submit application for CoC funding annually. Applications are scored and awarded based on scoring. The County submitted their application last September and was awarded \$2.7 million for 2019-2020, a 12 percent increase from last year (\$282,000). The County scored 190 of 200 points receiving the highest score across the nation; median score was 160. Ms. Ahern explained the score was based the County's successful homelessness programs, the national model CHA system, and coordination and planning to constantly improve equity, access, services and efficiency.

- Ms. Smith invited Katrina Holland, Community Alliance of Tenants, to share her thoughts on the recently approved tenant protection senate bill (SB 608).
  - Ms. Holland said the passing of SB 608 is a significant step forward for Oregon related to tenant protections but still has a long way to go. She explained the bill eliminates no-cause eviction standards after the first year of occupancy and adds new landlord-based for-cause reasons to evict a tenant including: sale to a person who will move in, landlord or family member move-in, significant repair or renovation of the unit, and removal of the unit from residential use. If a landlord uses any of the four landlord-based reasons, they must provide the tenant with 90-day notice and relocation expenses in the amount of one month's rent. Ms. Holland did note exceptions: small landlords (four or fewer units) do not have to pay relocation expenses and landlords who live on the same property as their tenant (owner occupied, 2 units or less) may still use a no-cause eviction at any time. Though there is still more work to be done, Ms. Holland said SB 608 sets a precedent for landlord-tenant protections.
  - Patty Jay, Clackamas County Citizen Representative, said she testified at the hearing which was motivated by personal experience with no-cause evictions. She offered thanks Ms. Holland and everyone else that helped pass the bill as it sends a strong message of safety and protection.
  - Anna Geller, Geller Silvis, explained the bill also includes a clause about annual rent increases. Landlords may increase rent by no more than seven percent plus consumer price index in a 12-month period, however, new construction projects with a certificate of occupancy issuance of 15 years ago are exempt. Ms. Geller asked Ms. Holland to share her thoughts on this clause noting that there have been thousands of units built in the last 15 years that will be exempt. Ms. Sherring intervened by stating this topic will be discussed in detail in the next task force meeting.
- Ms. Smith shared a final update. She recently had a meeting with Gladstone staff and sadly learned the city is seeing a high loss of children in their schools due to eviction and rising rents for families in the community. Ms. Smith said she and her staff are having initial conversations around rent assistance programs.
- Mr. Brown shared an update. He said the warming activities finished for this season, noting a 111 percent increase in sheltering. He said the increase was not a result of increased capacity rather a need for more sheltering given the increase in colder weather this winter compared to previous winters. Mr. Brown also shared that the *Tri-County Equitable Housing Strategy to Expand Supportive Housing for People Experiencing Chronic Homelessness* was completed last month and is available for public review. Ms. Sherring will share this report with task force members via email.

Ms. Sherring invited updates from Task Force members:

- Ms. Geller said she attended the presentation by Bill Pickle. She said his work focuses on housing people experiencing chronic homelessness. Ms. Geller said he offered a message that resonated with her. She said he believes said more housing units will not solve our housing issues rather creative solutions such as funding, building relationships with landlords, or supportive services in housing complexes will. Ms. Sherring will share Mr. Pickle's presentation with task force members via email.

## Recommendation Finalization: Planning, Zoning, and Development

Ms. Sherring explained County staff synthesized the Task Force's action planning contributions around Planning, Zoning and Development into a draft goal and set of draft recommendations and sub-recommendations. Ms. Sherring walked through the draft goal and set of recommendations line by line to refine recommendations with task force members. An updated version of recommendations is appended to this meeting summary.

Ms. Sherring invited the Task Force members to review the recommendations to finalize these for the Board of County Commissioner review:

- Ms. Jay asked why 2022 was referred to in the goal?
  - Mr. Brown said that year came from an existing goal stated in Performance Clackamas, so changes to the proposed goal would be modifying this.
  - Ms. Smith said 300-500 units by 2022 would be more realistic for the Housing Authority alone.
  - Mr. Ember stated that he recalled from past discussion the goal considered pure growth projections in the County and therefore weren't sure about this number.
  - Ms. Fritzie said the County is working on the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA) and this work will be completed by June 30. This may be a good resource for further defining this goal. Otherwise the Task Force can look at Metro's information and timeframe. Ms. Fritzie stated that 2.5 years is pretty quick for a timeframe for development of housing.
  - Ms. Geller agreed, stating that it takes at least 2 years to develop affordable housing. Additionally, you have to raise money from State and Federal levels, and it can easily take 2 years. The target date will need to be revised.
  - Ms. Smith pointed out that Metro money does not cover all the need in the County.
  - Mr. Brown reminded the Task Force that the language came from the Performance Clackamas document. A quarter of the units will be done by spring and/or within the next year. Mr. Brown added that that it may be worth while to look at Metro's 7-year timeline.
  - Ms. Johnson indicated that she spoke to Beth Goodman and went through the jurisdictions within the County. She said some are opting-in and out or doing it slightly different. She wondered if all HNAs can be combined and put in strategies to get those cities opting out to participate. Ms. Johnson suggested that the goal year may need to be pushed out due to opportunity zones that will take at least 10 years to develop.

Ms. Sherring asked the group to reflect on the needs for this goal. She asked if this needed to be a long-term goal or alternatively, keep a nearer term focus in accordance with the Task Force charge for this stage of work.

- Ms. Smith said opportunity zones are one of many tools, stating that they met with Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS) to discuss funding sources for affordable housing development. There is potential new funding the County will need to consider applying to beyond what the bond will help. Even then, the County will need more time and based on the need of 6,000 units of affordable housing needed.

- Mr. Brown said it makes sense to extend the timeline. It's important for the year to align with a timeline for planning work.
- Ms. Sherring asked what year would that alignment be in?
  - Ms. Fritzie said that while Performance Clackamas is a shorter-term plan. She said the recommendations also seemed like a short-term plan and the 7-year timeline from metro is considered short term. If this lines up with Metro, then it fits the timeline. The intent with HNA is to create a broad, cross-jurisdiction view.
  - Ms. Johnson said she agreed with 2026, as this aligned with opportunity zones as well as Metro. This is the date where investors and funding will be available.
  - Ms. Geller asked if there is more than one opportunity zone in the County?
  - Ms. Smith said there is but was unfamiliar with the exact number.
  - Ms. Jay stated that from a citizen view, it's important to the community that there is short-term goals, due to the potential perception that the County is doing the work and not waiting another 7-years.
  - Ms. Smith said that managing for results is what is Performance Clackamas County report is about. She thinks that it must be realistic, but report on units developed, predeveloped, in construction and built. The County will tell the whole story. Ms. Smith stated that the bond will give the County opportunity for development through partners. There will be 300 new units by 2022 developed by HACC alone and more beyond that.
- Ms. Sherring surmised that it sounded like the Task Force believe that 2026 would be an appropriate year for this goal to align to. She then asked the County to confirm the numbers for the development of affordable housing, based on the 6,000-deficit need, what HAAC has planned, other projects in the pipeline.
- Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force members supported the suggested edits to the overarching goal?
  - All Task Force members supported.

Ms. Sherring referred the Task Force to the Draft Recommendations in Tier One.

- In reviewing Recommendation A, the task force discussion included:
  - Mr. Ember stated that Recommendation A should include all multi and single-family zones
  - Ms. Geller stated that to some degree we have to say what is meant by affordable housing as some BCC members are interested in mixed income housing and maybe this language should be added.
  - Ms. Johnson said she uses the term housing affordability because it includes all incomes, housing type and choice. It's important to define affordable housing.
  - Ms. Geller said that anyone can go to state and get 100 tax credits to build 200 units. Is that truly community revitalize. Density bonuses are important.
  - Ms. Fritzie said affordable generally means 60% of the area median income or less. This is part of the Housing Package that will be considered and there may be different bonuses for different incomes and units. She said that affordable doesn't have exact income level. It's more about catering to different levels.
  - Ms. Smith said affordable housing to lowest income folks is 60% and below medium family income, even 80% and below. She indicated that she would not understand why the County or government would be involved in providing high density bonus if

we aren't challenging those to develop affordable housing to serve the most vulnerable.

- Mr. Ember said it's complex math that has not been fully addressed. One could argue land might not meet housing goals due to zoning.
  - Ms. Geller said 60% medium family income used to be market rate, and one thing she took away from the presentation by Bill Pickle is to be bold. We need to buck up and meet all needs.
  - Ms. Fritize acknowledged Mr. Ember's comment and said some of this data will be in the HNA, but the planners review and consider the data in implementation of the recommendation.
  - Ms. Geller stated that maybe a tiered density bonus system may be more appropriate.
  - Ms. Sherring asked if this was instead of "enhanced" and the group agreed.
  - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edits described?
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation B, the task force discussion included:
    - Mr. Merkel said it should say "code currently allows"
    - Ms. Ide asked if the commercial zoning districts are in areas with adequate services including transportation, amenities, services, etc?
    - Ms. Fritzie said they were and added that the word "Remove" should say "Increase"
    - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edits described?
    - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation C:
    - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
    - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation D
    - Ms. Ide asked her invited guests if this section is what they are interested in, as they are interested to be involved in process to find land for RVs.
    - Ms. Sherring requested that during the break-out Mr. Brown would be available to meet Ms. Ide's guests and can talk about their interests.
    - Mr. Ember said he was wondering if this recommendation was specific enough about housing people in their backyard or only looking at whole land use.
    - Ms. Sherring asked Mr. Ember if with the Tier Two recommendations that point was covered?
    - Ms. Fritzie asked what Shelter off the Streets housing included?
    - Mr. Brown noted that the language should be amended to say "SOS programs" because it isn't housing it's a program to allow tents to be placed in camping spots, tiny homes and pod villages.
    - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edit described?
    - All Task Force members supported this recommendation

Ms. Sherring referred the Task Force to the Draft Recommendations in Tier Two.

- In reviewing Recommendation E:
  - Ms. Johnson explained cottage cluster housing is housing that is mixed of housing on lots (i.e. one parcel with many units with interior open space, it's flexible).
  - Mr. Carboneau asked if duplexes were included in this?
  - Ms. Johnson said no, as duplexes were not typically considered as part of the missing middle.
  - Ms. Fritzie said that one of the zoning districts has allowance in zoning code but, this development has never been built. She said would need to make code amendments to allow this, and was not sure what was meant by realistic?
  - Ms. Sherring stated that she recalled the past discussion was focused on flexibility of options and suggested that the word "realistic" be removed. Task Force members agreed.
  - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edit described?
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation F
  - Ms. Ide stated that this would not only save processing times, but also expense.
  - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edit described?
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation G:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation
- In reviewing Recommendation H:
  - Ms. Fritzie said the recommendation ties into more opportunity for different types of housing for "missing middle" such as lived working units.
  - Ms. Geller said she can think of a lot of live-work that would not be desirable to encourage, such as an unsavory business that terrifies neighbors.
  - Ms. Johnson asked if code right now prohibits co-housing?
  - Ms. Fritzie said it fits under multi-family housing and would be in locations with relative density.
  - Ms. Voxnyuk asked for more clarity on live-work units.
  - Ms. Fritzie said a mixed unit may be a business on the first floor and home on top level. Live/work is already allowable in mixed use zones. It's a specific market type that works in specific market areas. She says that live/work units could be affordable because people can live where they work to save money.
  - Ms. Jay asked Ms. Fritzie to explain co-housing.
  - Ms. Fritzie said this where you have multi-family housing, and maybe with a shared kitchen or with large shared common facilities. From a zoning that is multi-family co-housing and it is already allowed.

- Mr. Ember says it could mean anything but the essence is more co-living with neighbors to use such as shared amenities, parking, etc.
  - Ms. Johnson recalled an example in Seattle, and the micro-units fall under co-housing and the need to encourage different choices.
  - Ms. Sherring asked if removing the word “allow” and replacing this with “Explore additional opportunities for co-housing, micro-units and live work units for a variety of housing choices” and replace “live/work unit” with “mixed use building”. She also suggested addressing Ms. Geller’s concern at the end of the recommendation by including the edit “building codes and other uses that considers appropriate compatible uses.”
  - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edits described?
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation H:
    - Mr. Carboneau said the underlying zones this recommendation is tricky, due to conditional uses, and this should be considered
    - Ms. Fritzie said it is currently allowed at school owned properties and the recommendation should note that this needs to be developed consistently with the density of the underlying zone.
    - Mr. Fisher asked this was referring to both private and public schools?
    - Ms. Geller said that churches and schools have opportunities for land to advance housing development by permitting the conditional uses.
    - Mr. Carboneau said that the bonding restrictions also make this difficult.
    - Ms. Sherring asked if appropriate edits would include adding: “school-owned properties” replacing “allowed” with “developed at the density” and replace “and opportunities” with “by considering appropriate permitting solutions for conditional uses”
    - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edits described?
    - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.

Ms. Sherring referred the Task Force to the Draft Recommendation 6 and noted the carry over items for future Task Force discussion.

- In reviewing Recommendation 6:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.

Ms. Sherring invited Task Force applause for refining recommendations for Planning, Zoning and Development!

## **Tenant Protections: Focus Area Recommendation Development**

Ms. Sherring noted the advancements at the State level and asked if Task Force members that in the interest of time, would they be willing for County staff to work offline between meetings to develop the tenant protections recommendations from the Task Force discussion to date, and bring a draft



set of recommendations back to the next meeting that addressed the gaps between the State Bill and the Task Force’s discussion on this Focus area. The Task Force agreed.

## **Recommendation Refinement: Housing Services (Transition and Stability Services)**

Ms. Sherring explained that County staff synthesized the Task Force’s action planning contributions around Housing Services into a draft goal, set of draft recommendations and sub-recommendations. Ms. Sherring invited Ms. Ahern to join the Task Force members for this discussion. Ms. Sherring and Ms. Ahern reviewed the draft goal each recommendation, line-by-line to refine recommendations with Task Force members. An updated version of proposed changes is appended to this meeting summary.

Ms. Ahern said the recommendations came from conversations from past large group and small group action planning and recommendation development sessions. Ms. Ahern stated the goal. She said the Task Force hadn’t previously talked through a goal and she invited discussion.

- In reviewing the draft goal:
  - Ms. Voxnyuk asked for more clearly defining the “next 2 years” and specifying from which date she also asked for how homelessness was being defined here.
  - Ms. Ahern said HUD has four definitions of homelessness: people who are living in a place not meant for human habitation, people who are losing their primary nighttime residence, families with children or unaccompanied youth who are unstably housed and people fleeing domestic violence. This uses the literally homeless definition and the State adds those at risk of homelessness.
  - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this goal with the edit to add the year timeline described?
  - All Task Force members supported this goal.

Ms. Sherring referred the Task Force to the Draft Recommendations in Tier One.

- In reviewing Recommendation A:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation B:
  - Ms. Holland noted the importance of this recommendation.
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation C:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation D:
  - Ms. Jay asked how “low income” was defined here

- Ms. Ahern stated she would add a definition of “low income” and homelessness as defined by HUD to this recommendation document for clarity.
  - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edits described?
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation E:
    - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
    - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.

Ms. Sherring referred the Task Force to the Draft Recommendations in Tier Two.

- In reviewing the Tier Two preamble:
  - Ms. Ahern noted that the equity lens should be noted here and will also be its own recommendation similar to PZD recommendation.
  - Ms. Ahern also referred to the inclusion of “for migrants” in the preamble.
  - Ms. Sherring asked if the Task Force was willing to support this recommendation with the edits described?
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation A:
  - Ms. Holland asked that that in the evaluation process be defined for developers to understand this recommendation and ensure this was carried out in implementation Ms. Geller noted the need for this to be contingent on service provision
  - Ms. Sherring held discussion on this item and suggested the Ms. Adhern and Ms. Smith revise this recommendation offline to consider the percentage, service piece, RFP evaluation piece, and refine this recommendation.
  - Task Force members agreed this was an appropriate way forward.
- In reviewing Recommendation B:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation C:
  - Mr. Merkel outlined the relationship between this recommendation and recommendation A and asked that when the County team review A, the consider C.
  - Task Force members agreed this was an appropriate way forward.
- In reviewing Recommendation D:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
- In reviewing Recommendation E:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.

- In reviewing Recommendation F:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
  
- In reviewing Recommendation G:
  - No edits were suggested by the Task Force.
  - All Task Force members supported this recommendation.
  
- Mr. Fisher noted the need to review all recommendations and update numbering throughout for consistency and clarity.
  - Ms. Sherring agreed and noted this as an item to progress offline.

Ms. Sherring invited Task Force applause for the group's efforts in refining recommendations for Housing Services.

### **Next steps and closing remarks**

Ms. Sherring reviewed the outcomes of the meeting and the following action items:

- County staff to confirm appropriate number for affordable housing units in the Planning, Zoning and Development recommendation to align with the new goal year of 2026.
- County staff will circulate the results of this meeting's recommendation finalization for the Planning, Zoning and Development topic area via email.
- County will circulate the results of this meeting's recommendation refinement for the Housing Services topic area via email.
- County staff will develop draft recommendations for the Tenant Protections topic area.
- Ms. Sherring will circulate audio file and the presentation slides from the SOS recommendations presentation before the BCC to task force members via email.
- Ms. Sherring will circulate the *Tri-County Equitable Housing Strategy to Expand Supportive Housing for People Experiencing Chronic Homelessness* report completed in February via email.
- Ms. Sherring will circulate Bill Pickle's presentation with task force members via email.
- Ms. Sherring will review all recommendations and update numbering throughout for consistency and clarity.

Ms. Sherring said at the next meeting there will be a funding presentation then alignment with tools for the recommendations developed by the task force. She asked Task Force members to complete a meeting evaluation form and, on the back, write down any organizations they feel aren't currently represented in the Task Force but should be, thanked members for their time and contributions and adjourned the meeting.