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The Portland State University (PSU) Planning Workshop is the culmination of the Masters in Urban and Regional Planning (MURP) program. The goal of the workshop is for students to synthesize the knowledge and experience gained from the program into a useful planning project that addresses a relevant regional issue. This project is performed in conjunction with a client, in this case, the Portland Community Land Trust Interim Board.
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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Portland Community Land Trust (PCLT) is a newly formed nonprofit organization implementing a community-based model for providing affordable housing in the city of Portland, Oregon. In the initial research for this project it became evident that the PCLT needed an outreach strategy in order to become a successful community-based organization. Students enrolled in the 1999-2000 Master's of Urban and Regional Planning Workshop at Portland State University spent six months developing the following outreach strategy under the direction of the PCLT Interim Board.

In the process of community research and analysis, the most substantial discoveries made were in the nature of the process of outreach itself, the significance and meaning of community organizing, and the implications these issues have had on developing this document. Communicating this learning process and emphasizing the importance of maintaining a constantly evolving outreach strategy for the PCLT are the primary goals of this report.

The work of community organizing and outreach is a continual process of engagement and dialogue. It is most effective when an organization is willing to learn and adapt to the ever-changing conditions of the world. The focus of community development work is on building and maintaining relationships, something difficult to neatly package into a program applicable to any community. An understanding of how specific communities and organizations in Portland work is included in this report to expedite the PCLT's ability to tap into existing community organizing and housing advocacy networks.

Specific findings and recommendations in this report fall under four general categories:

- **Know your Community.** This section discusses the importance of understanding the needs and values of communities and provides specific suggestions for achieving this goal.

- **Use Appropriate Media for the Message.** Relaying information in ways that a community can relate and respond to on its own terms is vital to educating the public about the PCLT.

- **Develop Community Connections** Strong partnerships at all levels of a community are important to the success of both outreach efforts and the organization as a whole. The PCLT needs to have formal and informal relationships with individual community members, neighborhoods, existing non-profits, government bureaus and those in the private sector such as banks, lenders, and developers.

- **Establish and Preserve Community Based Decision-Making.** Maintaining a community-based focus ensures that the PCLT is acting on behalf of those it serves as well as preserving a grassroots focus for future generations.
INTRODUCTION

A community land trust (CLT) exists in one form as a housing model that separates the cost of improvements (the buildings) from the land, and places control of the land with the community through a community-based non-profit corporation. This approach leverages affordable housing investments into long-term assets for the community. Recognizing these advantages, housing advocates and other agencies in Portland have formed The Portland Community Land Trust (PCLT).

The purpose of creating an outreach strategy for the PCLT is to offer direction and stability for future outreach efforts. This will ensure that limited resources are efficiently used to educate and engage the community in shaping the goals and objectives of the organization. The overarching finding of this report is that the success of the PCLT will correspond directly with its community organizing effort. To that end, this document outlines community-organizing strategies as a mechanism to ensure that community needs are addressed in the creation and preservation of affordable housing opportunities. Community organizing will create leadership, goals and actions that are community driven. In conjunction, this document provides the PCLT with a basic outreach structure to continue future organizing efforts. Ensuring community stewardship over the goals and activities of the organization will create a sustainable organization able to provide affordable housing far into the future.

Affordable Housing in Portland

Portland enjoyed stable housing availability and reasonable job growth up until the recession of the mid-1980's. As the move from a natural resource economy to a more diversified export based economy took place (City of Portland, 2000), Portland real estate began experiencing boom times. Over the past decade, the Portland housing market has become one of the twenty-five least affordable housing markets in the nation (National Association of Home Builders, 1999). While weekly wages in the city have remained stagnant, rents and housing prices have increased by as much as 138% in some neighborhoods since 1990 (City of Portland, 1999). At the same time, federal support for local housing programs has significantly decreased (New York Times Magazine, 1996). This has created an imbalance and, some charge, a crisis in housing affordability for low to moderate-income households in the City.

Definitions

For the purpose of this document it is necessary to define the following terms:

**Community** broadly refers to a group of individuals that share a commonality. They may or may not share the same needs, preferences, shared geographic area, and values. In the best sense of the word, a community can be a group of individuals that come together to create specific goals based on a shared vision. The Community refers to a group that is, or will be affected by the PCLT.

**Membership** specifically refers to those involved in the PCLT who have officially joined the organization. They may or may not be leaseholders, staff, or board members.
Definition of Community Land Trust

A community land trust (CLT) is primarily a home ownership program but is not limited in terms of housing structure type, development scale, or resident status as a homeowner or renter. A CLT is a community-based, nonprofit organization with charitable status under IRS Code 501 (c)(3). Once established, the trust acquires or is deeded land and buildings and retains ownership of the land in perpetuity for the benefit of the community. The CLT can then sell the houses to low and moderate income families, housing cooperatives, community organizations, nonprofit corporations, and/or for-profit corporations and charge a nominal lease fee for the land (Portland Bureau of Housing and Community Development, 1999).

The Portland Community Land Trust

The Portland Community Land Trust (PCLT) will develop a comprehensive citywide program that addresses the specific needs of the community to achieve long-term affordable housing. Partnerships to develop and capture housing and land opportunities in Portland will be an important part of the PCLT’s efforts. Through the use and retention of private and public subsidies, the PCLT will create long-term solutions to providing stable, diverse and affordable housing opportunities.
Percy Winters
Portland Community Land Trust Interim Board Member

My family and I have been looking to buy a home for a while now. We had been renting the same house for about nine years and I just always thought we'd stay there. But when my landlord gave us a three-month notice it really shocked me. We struggled to find a good rental home that could accommodate a large size family and this made me think that maybe we should be homeowners.

I tried going to different programs that help with home buying, doing everything from taking home buying classes to signing up for pre-qualification, but they never worked out. It seems like either the mortgage payments were too high, they wanted an almost perfect credit rating, or they required a down payment that we didn't have at the time. We also had trouble qualifying, either we made too much money or too little. And they don't always tell you about the hidden costs or income limits. Also a lot of programs put you on a long waiting list and don't give you a choice about the house. You have to take what they offer. It was really frustrating. For a while I just gave up.

And I worry that there are other people out there like me that are frustrated and want to give up too.

When our new landlord sold the house without telling me, I just came home one day and there was a sign on the lawn, the kids were crying and upset wondering where we would move to next, it really shocked me into trying to buy a home again.

My wife and I have been saving for a down payment and have worked hard on getting everything we need to buy a home that works for our family and our budget.

When I found out about the Portland Community Land Trust, I smiled because I realized that without the cost of the land, we could afford to buy a house that works for our needs. I immediately became interested.

I joined the PCLT because they will offer homes that people can actually afford. I like that you own the house – that you have a sense of respect and pride that this is mine and I can make improvements to it, that there are no issues like you would get with a landlord.

I also joined the PCLT because I don't want someone telling me what kind of program they are going to have without asking the community and individuals what they need.

The CLT model opens up new avenues to people. The limited equity isn't an issue for me because what is important is how much of my income I spend on housing, not how much money I expect to get out of it. Once you have cut down the amount of money that people spend on housing and offer them a chance for stability it can help them establish credit and can give them a foot in the door. A lot of people just need the opportunity.
METHODOLOGY

The findings and recommendations in this document come from interviews, surveys, literature and professional documents, and demographic and housing data. The purpose of defining this methodology is to assist the PCLT in working with future members and the community to create their own needs assessments and strategies based on rational methods and accessible information. Specific information on methodology and findings related to qualitative and quantitative data in Portland can be found in Appendix A.

Qualitative data
Qualitative data analysis looks at fluid and subjective forms of information such as opinions and experiences by groups and individuals, and then organizes this information to look for patterns and meaning. The majority of the data used in this report was acquired through interviews conducted with 21 Portland experts from housing and outreach related fields and 8 community land trusts across the country. The PCLT Interim Board and others related to the organization were surveyed to find out their experiences, attitudes, and knowledge about effective outreach strategies. The purpose of the interviews and surveys was to gain insight into how organizations and CLTs deal with the issue of outreach, community organizing and marketing. Most interviews in Portland were done in person; interviews with the CLTs were conducted over the phone. Board surveys were conducted by e-mail. As the interview and survey process progressed, interview summaries and surveys were compiled and examined as a whole to gain a richer understanding of outreach strategies which would be potentially useful to the Portland Community Land Trust. (A list of interviews can be found in Appendix D.) In order to bring the entire PSU workshop group to a shared understanding of outreach, members attended a community organizing training led by Philip Wong, a neighborhood planner at Southeast Uplift, a Portland area neighborhood coalition office.

Quantitative data
Quantitative data analysis looks at statistics, numbers, and financial information to find patterns and meaning. Examination of local housing reports and U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey provided the necessary quantitative data. Data analysis focused on income, housing costs, and comparisons of rentals versus home ownership rates. Overlaying these variables geographically illustrate the spatial relationships between income, housing costs and ownership throughout the city of Portland provided an insight into Portland neighborhoods experiencing problems of housing affordability.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

A community land trust is based on the word "community." In order to be successful, the community must support, protect, participate in and sustain the CLT. To build this kind of support, the PCLT must organize the community around the CLT model. Expert interviews with other CLTs across the country, local housing and community advocates, other housing professionals, and the Interim Board of the PCLT reaffirmed the message: the PCLT needs to educate, engage and identify leaders from the community in order to become a widely supported provider of affordable housing. The information gathered identifies and details four main strategies for the PCLT:

- Know your community.
- Use appropriate media for the message.
- Develop community connections.
- Preserve community-based decision-making

Know Your Community

"It is important to do your homework... know your demographics and housing market. Know your neighborhood and community. Know their concerns, needs, and issues. Do research on housing need and preference. The need analysis is critical to outreach and marketing."

-Steve Crowell, Sabin Community Land Trust

Understanding your audience is paramount to outreach

Understanding cultural and community values is the first step in the process of gaining the community's trust and building relationships. Without this key step, information from the PCLT may be misunderstood and become distorted or ignored. People may have legitimate concerns regarding the land trust model and it is important to address these concerns up front, with honesty. The PCLT must actively research community issues and relate these to current and future affordable housing needs. The PCLT must do this while continuing to consider stakeholders' perceptions. Using real life examples when presenting the CLT model may reassure community members unfamiliar with this approach to providing affordable housing.

Approach the community without preconceived assessments

According to the Institute for Community Economics (ICE, 1982), different individuals bring different attitudes, commitments, needs and concerns to an organization. It is important not to force the community into accepting a predetermined model. An organization concerned with developing affordable housing options must start "where the world is" and not be presumptuous as to what attitudes people may hold. Approaching a community with thorough and relevant knowledge, without assuming that the facts and figures gathered are entirely indicative of the population, allows for a true two-way dialogue that doesn't leave the community feeling pandered to. Empathy towards local residents will help establish trust in the CLT. Using their ideas to build the organization's mission will establish the CLT's place in the community. The experience of the Burlington CLT in Vermont has been that support for the issues will grow exponentially as the community becomes more aware of the housing struggles that individuals face.
Using Data to Support a CLT

Knowing the community begins with understanding the reasons why a CLT might be a good working model for addressing land ownership issues. Understanding how to gather information, use data sources and make rational decisions based on fact is an important component for bringing community members into the process. A community is more likely to understand and support a program they see as directly addressing problems they have identified.

The idea behind a community land trust is that it serves a community’s need to preserve land for its own interest. A community may need a CLT because the housing market is depressed and absentee ownership is causing homes to become uninhabitable – like that in Roxbury, Massachusetts. It may need a CLT because housing price increases have outpaced wage increases, as is the case in Portland, Oregon. Rural communities may want to start a CLT to preserve farmland.

Besides knowing the community, what other issues should a CLT know about in order to support its efforts? Once the community is involved, just what kind of information will they need to make rational decisions? Some of the following may help community members begin the process of information gathering and data analysis:

Important questions to ask about a community:

- What do people earn?
- What does housing cost?
- Where are the geographic areas where people pay more of their income on housing than they should have to?
- Where does sub-standard housing exist?
- How many people in the community have to pay more than 30% of their income on housing?

In Portland, the PCLT needed to determine who would be best served by a community land trust and where they live. In this report, data was gathered to answer “what do people earn?” and “where do people who spend more than 30% of their income on housing live?” Now that these questions have been broadly dimensioned, the PCLT can move on to researching specific populations that may be best served by the CLT model. They may want to explore demographic data regarding age, race and ethnicity, immigrant status, and head of household status. As the community learns more about the need for affordable housing, the PCLT can target its efforts to better serve them.

For a detailed analysis of the housing needs in Portland see Appendix A.
Engage the community in research to provide ownership of the results
Generally the community will perceive that housing affordability problems exist but will be able to provide only anecdotal evidence. At the outset, the community should be engaged in the process of gathering the empirical evidence needed to support their assertions. The data they discover within the process will be compelling to the community if they come to trust the data through their own involvement with its analysis. This is not to say the community should be handed the data and told to make sense of it. Rather, the community process should determine what data is needed, from where it should be sought and what analysis needs to be done. Technical guidance should be provided by members or staff selected in part for their expertise. This establishes a baseline to start thinking about issues affecting neighborhoods and the prevailing demographic characteristics.

Know your community
specific recommendations:
• Organize with facts. A diverse group should be assembled to do relevant research. This will help establish a baseline to start thinking about which issues most affect a neighborhood and the prevailing demographics in specific areas.
• Have neighborhood constituents present community issues to the PCLT Board.
• Create a database of contacts.
• Acknowledge the validity of peoples’ concerns with the CLT model and be able to explain the benefits to them and their community.
• Be honest and up-front. Do not avoid difficult questions. Being honest builds trust.

MARKETING, OUTREACH, ORGANIZING
While these three terms are often confused, they have very different meanings. For the purpose of this project and in relation to CLTs, the terms are clarified below:

Marketing is a one-way information transfer. It is concerned with the selling of the CLT model and its current projects.

Outreach is a two-way information transfer between the community and the PCLT Board. It aims at understanding the needs and values of the community and working toward community support.

Organizing gives power to community members. It allows them to manage the process and ultimately be able to respond to the needs they identify collectively.
Phillip Wong
Neighborhood Planner, Southeast uplift

Phillip Wong, Neighborhood Planner for Southeast Uplift Neighborhood Coalition Office, spends his days working with neighborhoods and their concerns. Armed with a master's degree in Public Policy, Phillip went to work for the public sector but soon became disenchanted with his inability to connect with people on a personal level. Phillip first saw that collective action could bring about change when he organized a bike to work day in the city. Hundreds of people stormed downtown on their bikes showing solidarity for bike commuters. He was amazed and excited about the possibilities of community organizing.

The power of relationship building lies in its ability to promote long-term meaningful change. Most programs offer band-aids for problems. Relationships build leadership, which in turn brings about a profound change in the power structure. Phillip also notes that relationships are important in linking the "have's" with the "have-nots."

Phillip believes that the City and the community are confusing public involvement and community organizing. Real community organizing often yields very different results than public involvement. When meaningful interaction is introduced, the focus of power and the benchmarks for success change. Yet, it is through this process that potential leaders are identified and their participation cultivated.

Phillip sees a continual barrier shaped by the comfort with, and drive to preserve the existing power structure in this nation. He tries daily to expose the public to broader issues and to help them understand the concerns of others. He continually battles with the notion that renters are a minority in the City of Portland, and the perception that they are a detriment to a neighborhood.
Use Appropriate Messages and Media

"Get the CLT story out there as often as possible in as many forums as is appropriate."
Trell Anderson, Bureau of Housing and Community Development

Choose different mediums for different purposes
CLTs need to use communication methods credible to the community. The means of communication must be accessible to potential residents and within their comfort zone. Recognize that there is no single best method for outreach. The medium and the way the message is communicated depends on the audience, the purpose of the message, and what the PCLT is trying to achieve. Using appropriate mediums and making sure each one used is in agreement and reflects the overall mission of the organization, creates consistency and memorable “brand-recognition” of the PCLT. Strategic outreach planning and a consistent message illustrate that selling homes, membership development, project development, and organizational vision require different messages underlying the same goals.

Table 1: Specific ways to convey the message

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signs on lawns of CLT homes</th>
<th>Home repair conventions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Housing Information Centers</td>
<td>Large and visible flyers in the downtown core</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street fairs and farmers markets</td>
<td>Leadership training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CLT discussion symposiums, forums and discussions</td>
<td>Flyers to realtors and lending institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Hot lines</td>
<td>Internet e-mail list-serves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Press releases, media events</td>
<td>Community meetings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ads on buses, in movie theaters, on radio, etc</td>
<td>CLT Videos such as Homes and Hands Community Land Trust in Action</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visit faith based organizations</td>
<td>Websites</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canvassing and one-on-one informal talks</td>
<td>Ads in community papers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Use appropriate medium and message
Specific Recommendations:
• Do not rely on just one type of medium.
• Tailor your medium and your message to your specific audience.
• Always use clear and easily readable language, when necessary, use bi-lingual literature and translators.
• Make newcomers welcome, an inviting and fun atmosphere will assist with message delivery.
• Make follow-ups to initial contacts purposeful by requesting help with specific tasks such as volunteer help, feedback, or ideas on ways to reach others.
• Give partnering organizations consistent information and updates.
• Use a consistent logo for memorable “brand recognition” of the CLT.
• Give plenty of notice on upcoming events. Individual invitations and follow-up calls work. well.
Develop Community Connections

"Involve them from the beginning. Resentment comes from people telling other people this is what we are doing in your community. Partnership comes from saying this is what we are doing in our community."

Percy Winters, Portland Community Land Trust Interim Board

Building friendships
Strong partnerships at all levels of a community are important to the success of both outreach efforts and the organization as a whole. The PCLT needs to have both formal and informal relationships with individual community members, neighborhoods, existing non-profits, government bureaus, and those in the private sector such as banks, lenders, and developers. Membership must be open to individuals who share the same values as the CLT, as well as those directly affected by the issue of affordable housing. Acceptance of the CLT model and specific CLT projects within the community is dependent on involving its members throughout the entire process. Creating necessary community connections allows the CLT to become grounded in the community so that when obstacles arise, the CLT has a fully developed network from which to gather support.

Work within the system
A risk of burnout and resentment exists in situations where participants involved in the creation of a CLT attempt to achieve the practically or politically impossible. A CLT should begin working within the system of housing organizations, for example city and county housing bureaus and community development corporations, to coordinate their efforts with programs already in place. Once the organization is established, defined and recognized by the different “layers of power” within a community, the resulting mutual trust established allows efforts for change to begin.

Use existing networks
A community land trust is likely to have limited resources, especially in the early stages. Tapping into existing housing networks is the first step in effective outreach. Rather than initiate contact with the CLT, community residents may ask known and trusted housing providers about the CLT. These individuals will be familiar with a broad range of housing needs and programs as well as effective methods to connect with potential beneficiaries. It is imperative that local housing providers support the CLT and are able to accurately explain it to their constituents.

Involve the community in the planning process.
Recognizing the real world knowledge possessed by residents allows for the creation of a powerful and comprehensive strategy for creating affordable housing while garnering essential community support. Area residents and officials are more willing to accept and embrace ideas of change when they are allowed to participate in this process. Community members should not only receive helpful information from the CLT; they should also be trained to relate the information to others.
Develop Community Connections
Specific Recommendations

• Partner with community groups and those already doing outreach and organizing.
• Maintain visibility with local community organizations such as local coalitions, neighborhood associations, community development corporations, and tenant advocacy groups to create strong networks and support systems.
• Partner with organizations providing home-buyer classes, anti-displacement services, and individual counseling on home owner and finance issues.
• Make community connections in geographic areas around projects.
• Visit faith-based organizations to convey the CLT message.
• Identify formal and informal community leaders.
• Maintain diversity in outreach efforts among organizers and the target audience. Volunteers tend to be self-selecting, this limits participation and runs the risk of “preaching to the choir.”
• Hold community-planning forums as early as possible when developing neighborhood projects.
• Only have open houses/information workshops when something tangible can be offered, such as an activity to participate in or a volunteer job to do (i.e., stuff envelopes).
Build Friendships Before Building Houses

The Laconia CLT

From its inception, the Laconia Community Land Trust has been grounded in the community of Laconia, New Hampshire. A group of high profile community members shared the idea with a diverse group of individuals at their local church. Community buy-in and support was quick to follow as interested residents realized the advantages of the land trust model as an effective response to Laconia’s affordable housing crisis. Eventually the volunteers hired Linda Harvey as the CLT’s first paid employee creating what would be referred to as the Laconia Experiment, due to the unprecedented background of its Executive Director.

Although Laconia had the benefit of established CLTs in New Hampshire to draw experience and lessons from, it’s board intentionally made one distinct alteration. Other New Hampshire CLTs had traditionally hired real estate developers as their executive directors. Linda Harvey had no background in structural development. Possessing a Master’s degree in social work with an emphasis on community organizing, Linda had worked for 15 years creating housing programs for community mental health centers.

Linda began her work as executive director with a folding chair and a $10,000 grant, and has since helped create an $8 million housing organization. Linda’s approach through community organizing resulted in her spending the first two years as the executive director creating connections between the CLT and the community. She is emphatic about bringing constituents into the process so that those who benefit from the CLT are able to help shape its vision. Her community based philosophy has been rewarded by the success of the Laconia CLT. The Laconia CLT is so highly supported by Laconia’s residents, sellers even bring their homes to the CLT to purchase before advertising them with traditional real estate agents.

Linda stresses the need for all participants to consciously celebrate success. At each ribbon cutting ceremony, new residents are asked to address the group attending. Having those who benefit from the CLT share their stories involves residents through the entire process, and sometimes doesn’t leave a dry eye in the house.

“Linda began her work as executive director with a folding chair and a $10,000 grant, and has since helped create an $8 million housing organization.”
Establish and Preserve Community-Based Decision Making

"The goal of community organizing is to broaden the base of support and spread the "join with us" message..."
-Si Kahn (1983)

The health and long-term success of the PCLT will depend on the sustained support and involvement of community members. Without a community-based approach, the PCLT runs the risk of offering a housing program that does not address the needs and concerns of the public. Direct community involvement decreases the possibility for neighborhood backlash and loss of interest in the community land trust.

A group of dedicated individuals have made the PCLT a reality in Portland. In order to increase direct community support and involvement in the organization, the PCLT must educate and involve its target audience at every level, including long range planning, internal day-to-day operations, education and outreach, and project development. Furthermore, the PCLT must create a mechanism that develops leadership and organizing skills among its board and members.

**Turning community into power by creating one-on-one relationships**

The importance of community organizing is that it allows individuals to identify their common issues and relate them in conjunction with others, illustrating that unified multiple voices are more powerful than a lone voice. In the case of a CLT's approach to affordable housing, power is created through collective decision-making and action. The idea behind organizing is to not only create recognition of the community land trust but to, more importantly, educate the community and empower affected individuals around their shared need, the need for a wider range of affordable housing opportunities. One way to create this shared power is by first bringing people together through one-on-one relationships where they can explore and realize the concerns they have in common with their community. These one-on-one relationships build the networks of support that get people to attend meetings, volunteer for the organization, accept jobs and responsibilities and empower direct action.
The Association of Community Organizations for Reform Now (ACORN) Housing Corporation of Illinois

From 1986-1996 a community land trust was one component of the ACORN Housing Cooperative, an Illinois affordable housing program. From the beginning, the land trust faced some considerable challenges, the most apparent being a high level of distrust and lack of understanding of the CLT model among community residents. Although ACORN was trying to help low-income families, many African Americans viewed the land trust as an unfair form of home ownership. These community members saw the CLT model as a form of "share-cropping." This continues the perception that many housing programs do not allow people of limited means the same equity allotted to white middle and high income homeowners. During the period in which ACORN’s CLT operated, Chicago was considered a city with relatively affordable housing, creating a challenge to encourage people to live in CLT homes in perceived “run down” neighborhoods when cheap properties could be purchased in “better” neighborhoods.

Ultimately, Chicago’s abundant supply of affordable housing on the traditional market helped undermine ACORN’s goals. In addition, ACORN did not purchase these homes during this affordable period, thus making it more expensive and difficult to purchase property in times of increasing prices, the time in which there is a greater need for affordable housing.

In spite of ACORN’s CLT disappointment, current Chicago ACORN director Marty Shalloo still believes that a CLT is the best way to legally protect long term housing affordability.

The ACORN example is representative of the problems which arise when an organization does not fully understand and address sensitive community concerns. It also illustrates the need to determine whether or not the CLT home-ownership model is an appropriate model to address a community’s housing affordability issues. Despite good intentions and available funding to address housing and neighborhood stability concerns, education and community support are crucial to the success of a CLT.

"In spite of ACORN’s CLT disappointment, current Chicago ACORN director Marty Shalloo still believes that a CLT is the best way to legally protect long term housing affordability."
Building a powerful membership base
Membership involvement is needed to create and sustain a strong and stable CLT. New people can bring in fresh ideas, skills, and energy into a CLT while established members offer stability and education. Linda Harvey of the Laconia CLT noted the crucial need for membership in the success of a CLT. Her advice for newly formed CLTs is to focus on raising friends before attempting to raise funds. Members are the driving force of any organization and active recruitment is imperative.

Recognize the process not just the product
Everyone involved with the organization is in some capacity doing outreach. Members need to be actively engaged in a well-defined process in which participation is encouraged. The process by which people have voiced their concerns and understandings needs to be documented and recognized in order to create long-term stability and an historical understanding of the organization. Documenting the process educates new members and the community and helps them arrive collectively at the meanings and definitions upon which a plan of action should be based. The degree of open discussion determines the extent to which people's understandings broaden and translate into effective leadership and action.

Seek internal and external feedback
The PCLT needs to constantly encourage honest feedback from both within and outside the organization in order to stay relevant and useful. The needs, powers, assets and challenges within a community constantly undergo change. Strategies that work to empower and strengthen the PCLT today may not necessarily work tomorrow. The PCLT should maintain on-going mechanisms for feedback by holding public forums, administering regular member surveys, organizing focus groups and holding informal one-on-one or small group discussions to communicate the current state of the PCLT and learn changing community needs and concerns.

Develop an internal communication plan
An internal communication plan should specify those who are responsible for carrying out specific outreach and organizing activities. Facilitated training and retreats for staff, the Board, and other core members should be viewed as a way to refresh strategies and review the organization's mission and outreach efforts. Such events can be a chance to evaluate successes and failures and institute new strategies in light of past performance. As suggested by Portland area consultant Marjory Hamann, facilitated training adds the advantage of allowing an independent party to mediate and maybe even initiate ideas that may help bring a diverse board to consensus over politicized issues.

Compromise
Compromise is key to working within a group and with other organizations. Active listening and flexibility are important components of compromise. Since every group has strengths and weaknesses, groups need to understand the qualities of the people they are working with. If an organization is starting from scratch, compromising will move the organization further along from where it started. Acknowledge that occasionally people involved in a specific project may need to step aside so that others with more experience or skills can get the job done right.
Housing Alternatives Within the CLT Model

As the PCLT evolves as an organization, some alternative housing options may be useful to present to members as a way to respond to an ever-changing community. This may also assist in successful outreach efforts by illustrating that the PCLT can provide housing for many different needs, preferences, and lifestyles.

One strength of the CLT model is its flexibility to support a wide variety of housing types. Several development options work with the CLT land ownership model. This report mainly focuses on the development of single-family homes, however the CLT model can also support other housing types such as, but not limited to, multi-family housing projects, accessory dwelling units, cooperatives, and Single Resident Occupancy (SRO) housing.

Accessory Dwelling Units
Accessory dwelling units provide a housing alternative useful for single person households. Such an approach provides housing diversity with minimal disruption, aids in the maintenance of existing housing, and creates a source of affordable housing for low income residents (Seltzer and Perry 1995: 3). Accessory dwelling units offer an opportunity to add value to existing housing and may provide an income stream to the owner while at the same time proving needed affordable housing options.

An accessory dwelling arrangement may also be useful in providing housing to elderly residents and/or relatives who may need to live in proximity of relatives for care giving or other assistance. An opportunity exists for land trusts to implement this design, educating public and private realms on the feasibility and opportunities offered by accessory units and their ability to address fundamental shifts in demography and lifestyles.

Housing Cooperatives
Housing Cooperatives, though not widely documented in the United States, offer another opportunity for providing CLT housing. A cooperative offers residents control over their housing through cooperative ownership of the property and a democratic decision making process. By emphasizing the utility of housing in meeting needs such as shelter, security and community, a cooperative stresses the use value of housing over the exchange or investment value.

Single Room Occupancy Units (SROs)
In Burlington, Vermont, the Burlington Community Land Trust has successfully developed single room occupancy (SRO) units for single low-income women. Despite early neighborhood opposition, the project was successfully sited after bringing neighbors into the planning process to establish appropriate site plan, staffing plan and house rules (Peterson 1996: 10).
Moving from single to multiple issues
As part of a long-term strategy, many organizations move from a single-issue to multiple issues in order to maintain and increase support. Examining evolving needs of the community and addressing them is an important element of successful community land trusts. A well-developed program eventually possesses the capacity to expand and address more than the single issue it began with. The Community Land Cooperative of Cincinnati, after developing a successful housing program, has since increased its efforts to provide such services as counseling, home-maintenance training, and student volunteer programs.

It is also important for CLTs to recognize that organizational growth can generate conflict among its members. One possible solution to this potential problem is to develop chapter or block clubs that keep the CLT’s meeting sizes small and give more opportunity for members to voice their concerns. Residents and non-resident members will better understand decisions in which they’ve been involved.

Establish and Preserve Community Based Decision-Making
Specific Recommendations:

- Create an internal communication plan within the organization to guide in streamlining tasks, roles, and responsibilities.
- Begin to address multiple issues once the organization is established by coordinating support services with existing organizations.
- Face to face communication is the way a strong organization is built, new people bring fresh ideas into the process.
- Focus on a process that encourages participation on a variety of levels where people’s individual understandings and needs are documented.
- Institute regular retreats and facilitated training to revisit existing strategies and to review the organization’s mission and outreach efforts.
- Create feedback mechanisms including open forums, member surveys, and focus groups to discuss the current state of the organization.
- Develop chapter or block clubs that encourage smaller sized PCLT meetings, giving more opportunity for members to voice their concerns.
The Institute for Community Economics Community Land Trust Handbook (1982) describes an example of successful community organizing through the Community Land Cooperative of Cincinnati’s (CLCC) ability to organize community members around a specific issue – the displacement of current and former residents of Cincinnati’s West End.

The program’s first effort involved securing housing for a long-time West End resident and her nine children who were scheduled to be evicted from their home. The resident, Vivian Maxwell, had approached her Reverend, explaining her dire situation. Her resourcefulness allowed her to have already located a potential home and she requested Rev. MacCrackin’s assistance in financing the purchase. Fortunately for Mrs. Maxwell, she and the Rev. MacCrackin would not have to operate alone.

One year prior, the West End Alliance of Churches and Ministries had been formed. Equally fortunate was the presence of Chuck Matthei, then director of the Institute for Community Economics. Reverend MacCrackin convened a meeting of the West End Alliance of Churches which both Mrs. Maxwell and Chuck attended. Chuck explained the CLT model to the meeting participants and after a few additional meetings the newly formed CLCC purchased the home Mrs. Maxwell had found.

Not long afterwards the CLCC acquired a second property and continues to address the displacement of low-income residents of Cincinnati’s West End through innovative uses of the CLT model. Mrs. Maxwell’s story illustrates the benefits of building one-on-one relationships around a common cause and the relation to building an effective and powerful organization.

"At the very outset of the organization we’re succeeding in trusting one another; we’re succeeding in saying we want to do such and such and then going ahead and getting it done. This sounds very simple, but it is a very significant step for us, and for most folks trying to organize around a specific issue". – Rev. Bruce Hinkley, CLCC
OUTREACH CHALLENGES

There are many barriers to successful outreach and organizing efforts. This is especially true for new organizations, organizations that work with lower income residents, and organizations that are geographically and demographically diverse. The PCLT currently fits all of these descriptions. It is also introducing a new and somewhat unknown affordable housing model to the Portland community, presenting the additional challenge of educating people about the CLTs while trying to reach them. The barriers listed below are not a comprehensive list. They serve as a beginning point at which to begin discussing how an outreach strategy may or may not serve the public it is trying to reach.

Some barriers to effective outreach are

• Using technical language, acronyms, or “jargon.”
• Talking above the audience, not with the audience.
• Location of meetings and/or office.
• Meeting days and times.
• Distrust of outsiders and unknown organizations.
• Distrust of government and institutions.
• Not relating the goals of an organization to the personal needs and issues of an audience.
• Poverty (i.e. working two jobs and having no additional time for meetings).
• Lack of transportation to meetings.
• Individual feelings of being powerlessness or of being alone and not part of a community.
• Foreign language and cultural differences.
• Lack of access to childcare.
• Self-oppression (a feeling that one isn’t knowledgeable or deserving enough to have an opinion).
• Apathy or distrust in the system (lack of political will).

The weakness of traditional methods

Traditional outreach methods do not always address these barriers. While each is an important and useful component in outreach, it is imperative to understand where they are weak. Hotlines, mail-in surveys, public hearings and workshops can all be effective tools, but the ways in which they are conducted may exclude many people. They are often self-selecting; only people that are already aware of and interested in the organization will utilize them. These tools are passive; in essence the organization is waiting for people to come to them. To combat this, the PCLT needs to go where the people are. It must find out where and how the community congregates and communicates. It is important to include outreach methods that step outside of the norm and provide opportunities to build stronger relationships between stakeholders in addition to providing information.
Ways to overcome barriers

- Make sure to use clear and accessible language. Have community members read through information before it gets distributed to look for jargon, acronyms, and hard to understand technical language.
- Have meetings at easy to reach locations that are on transit lines.
- Provide childcare services at meetings.
- Work through distrust of organizations, the government, institutions, and outsiders by informal one-on-one or small group contact first.
CONCLUSIONS

Community organizing is a fluid process. The resulting outcome is not always immediately apparent because relationships and trust take time to build. Through the efforts to prepare an outreach strategy for the PCLT, it became apparent that workshop group members were actually participating in the initial steps of relationship building by developing contacts and gauging the support and interest of Portland's community of housing and outreach experts. Overall, the community members and professionals interviewed expressed enthusiastic support and thoughtful suggestions for the PCLT. In addition, the workshop group members found a willingness of other national CLTs to provide informational assistance.

Individuals interviewed repeatedly suggested others who they felt would provide valuable insight to the PCLT, resulting in this document's inclusion of a list of future interviews. This will allow the PCLT to continue the process of relationship building among interested constituents. This list is not comprehensive, it only reflects those individuals specifically mentioned.

Another important source of information will be those groups whose input is needed to appropriately scope the PCLT but have yet to be directly contacted. These groups include, but are not limited to, immigrant communities, elderly populations, and those with special needs. It was not within scope of this report to include their perspectives, however they should be included in further dialogues about the PCLT. Considering all facets of the community will be essential to the success of the PCLT. For it is within these networks and groups that individuals dedicated to the CLT model will emerge to carry the organization and the vision forward.

"Never doubt that a small group of dedicated individuals can change the world. Indeed, it's the only thing that ever has."

--Margaret Mead
STUDENT REFLECTIONS

Perhaps the single most important finding of this document is woven into the process by which it was created. As we collected information from experts in the field, and managed data to illustrate the possibilities of applying the CLT model in Portland, our own debate over the meaning of outreach emerged. This process dispelled a number of assumptions each of us brought to the initial drafting of our contract and original work plan. We realized that documenting the process would be beneficial to the PCLT and other organizations that are developing outreach strategies.

Communicative Planning

Communicative planning is active communication with stakeholders in the community during the planning process. Communicative planning is both listening to others and documenting the course of action so that others may learn from it. By far, the greatest rewards derived from this project were from our interviews and our communication with individuals. Interaction among ourselves and with members of the PCLT board spurred new ideas and helped reformulate the group’s perspective on outreach. In effect, we were implementing our plan while we were taking part in the planning process.

We realized an important tool for building consensus was working through diverse perspectives rather than ignoring the difficulties they presented towards making progress. This closely mirrors real life organizing efforts. As we sifted through interviews we found similarities but also differences. As themes emerged, we began to find that as a group our ability to listen to one another, challenge each other’s biases, and collectively bargain for common understandings were the greatest tools of analysis. Technical documentation and data analysis helped in giving a backdrop to broader themes, but the process itself and a conscious effort to reflect on this process became the core of our methodology and communicative planning efforts.

Communicative planning and purposeful action that is publicly documented often stimulates dialogue and debate from which future action may be refined. If attended to, the careful translation and transaction of community interests can become the basis for future action and help gain popular support for the organization.

Rethinking the Original Workplan

One assumption we began with was that an analysis of who would benefit from the CLT model would neatly correspond with a group of easily identifiable people who would have an interest in CLT housing. This brought to question our initial goal of creating a standing outreach document. We came to realize the idea of creating an “outreach strategy” that could be pulled out and used whenever the PCLT needed to find community members was a fallacy. It was in direct opposition to the CLT ideal of letting a community create for itself sustainable means to provide affordable housing through it own efforts.

We discovered that if the PCLT is to represent collective interests, organizing and outreach needs to be the result of a community process. We as students cannot provide the board with the nuance, participation and commitment that ultimately drives a community-based campaign. What we do offer is a strategy to involve others who can generate a collective vision of what the PCLT can strive to become.
APPENDIX A: QUANTITATIVE DATA

Quantitative Data - The Portland Context

This analysis dimensions the affordable housing crisis in Portland and provides a context within which the PCLT can determine how to best utilize its resources. By spatially examining where people are spending over 30% of their income on housing, specific areas in Portland amenable to the CLT model of ownership were revealed. These areas may be where the PCLT would find community organizing opportunities around the affordable housing issue. The PCLT will have further opportunities to identify populations within these broad areas that will be best served by the CLT model.

This appendix is also provided to give a specific example of how members of a CLT can use demographic, housing, and spatial data to best determine where its efforts should be focused.

Portland’s Housing and Wage Connection

Though the Northwest is experiencing increased job growth and flush economic times, the jobs being created do not always provide living wages. At a minimum, living wage means that someone working full-time should never fall below the poverty line. A living wage should provide enough money for decent housing, utilities, food and savings.

According to the NW Policy Center:

- In Multnomah County the hourly living wage for a single adult is calculated to be $10.36 per hour; $18.75 per hour for a family of four.
- The state’s minimum wage is less than 60% of the living wage for a single adult and less than 35% of the living wage for a family of four.
- 44% percent of all jobs in the economy pay less that $10.07 per hour.
- 77% of jobs in the economy pay less than $16.36, the living wage for a family.

Recent and Extreme Increases in Housing Costs

As the same time that Portland transitioned its economy from a natural resource economy to a more diversified export based economy (City of Portland, 2000), real estate began experiencing boom times. As demand for housing rapidly increased, so did prices. Metro, Portland’s regional government, predicts Portland’s population will continue to grow, providing even more impetus to expanding the region’s available affordable housing tools.

The following information is from the December, 1999 Realtor’s Market Listing Service (RMLS) and the Halstead Report on Gentrification:

- The Portland metropolitan area average home sales price in December 1999 was $191,200
- The median sales price for November 1999 was $163,000.
- In a recent report on gentrification, Leah Halstead found that “between 1990 and 1996, the average house price in [Multnomah] county rose from $61,110 to $125,00, an increase of 102%”
- A corresponding increase in rents was not found, (an increase of only 35% during the same time period) though the inner eastside did experience higher than average increases when measured on a gross rent per bedroom basis.
What is Affordable and Available in Portland?
Monthly housing cost is considered not affordable when it requires more than 30% of a household’s income. This guideline is set by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and includes rent or mortgage, taxes (if applicable), and utilities; it is often referred to as the “cost burden” of housing.

In Portland, the housing burden is greatest for those earning 0-30% of the median household income. The city is 9,571 units short of adequate housing for people in this income category. Residents in this income category are forced to spend much more than 30% of their income on housing, often in housing priced for residents in the 30-50% median household income category. This places a heavier housing burden on those who can least afford it.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of Units for Low-Income Renter Households, 1997</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Using Multnomah County 1997 Level Median Household Income Information from US Census Bureau American Community Survey ($34,559)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0 - 30% of Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 - 50% of Median</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 - 80% of Median</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table 3-13 Consolidated Plan Housing Market Analysis DRAFT, 2/8/00

What does the gap between wages and housing prices look like? The following table shows the amount of money an individual or family would be able to afford for housing given different income scenarios. Since the average sales price of a home for Portland is currently over $150,000, home ownership opportunities for the individuals and families shown here would be extremely limited.
## What is Affordable Housing in Portland?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Hourly Wage</th>
<th>What is Affordable?</th>
<th>Annual Income</th>
<th>Hourly Wage</th>
<th>What is Affordable?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>30% of Median Income</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$11,000/yr.</td>
<td>$6.61/hr.</td>
<td>$275/month</td>
<td>$15,700/yr.</td>
<td>$7.55/hr.</td>
<td>$393/month</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three-fourths time fast food worker, service station attendant, or child care worker.  
*This person can afford a house worth $29,290*  
Head preschool teacher, janitor, or laborer with 3 children.  
*This family can afford a house worth $41,806*  

| **50% of Median Income** |               |                     |               |             |                     |
| $18,350/yr.   | $8.82/hr.   | $459/month          | $26,200/yr.   | $12.60/hr.  | $655/month          |

Landscape maintenance worker, data entry, home health aide, nurse’s aide, hairdresser, receptionist, or forest conservation worker.  
*This person can afford a house worth $48,862*  
Human resource assistant, dental assistant, maintenance worker, or pharmacy assistant with 3 children; or a fast food worker and a service station attendant with 2 children.  
*This family can afford a house worth $69,765*  

| **80% of Median Income** |               |                     |               |             |                     |
| $29,350/yr.   | $14.11/hr. | $734/month          | $41,900/yr.   | $20.14/hr.  | $1,048/month        |

Accounting assistant, broadcast technician, computer operator, emergency medical technician, licensed practical nurse, or truck driver.  
*This person can afford a house worth $78,153*  
First year accountant, registered nurse, or social worker with 3 children; or a teacher’s aide and a bank teller with 2 children.  
*This family can afford a house worth $111,571*  

| **100% of Median Income** |               |                     |               |             |                     |
| $36,700/yr.   | $17.64/hr. | $918/month          | $52,400/yr.   | $25.19     | $1,310/month        |

Computer programmer, corrections officer, carpenter or vocational teacher.  
*This person can afford a house worth $97,725*  
Electrical engineer or health services manager with 3 children; or a machinist and a retail store manager with 2 children.  
*This family can afford a house worth $133,197*
Notes from preceding table:
1. Housing is considered to be affordable when total housing expenses including all utilities cost no more than 30% of total household income. This standard is the same whether a household earns $10,000 a year or $100,000 a year, and whether the occupants are owners or renters.
2. Fair market rent in the Portland Metropolitan Area for a 1-bedroom apartment is $523; for a 2-bedroom apartment is $645; for a 3-bedroom apartment is $897; and a 4-bedroom apartment is $974 as of October 1998.
3. The median area family income for a family of 4 persons is $52,400/year in Portland as of January 1999.
4. Nearly 45% of Oregonians work in the service or retail fields. Those in services earn approximately 56.5% of MFI for a family of four, those in retail, only 37.4%.
5. Hourly wage assumes 40 hours/week, 52 weeks/year. Under Four Person Household, listings for 3 children assume one working adult and listings for 2 children assume 2 working adults.
6. Source: US Department of Housing and Urban Development
This does not include down payment, closing costs, monthly utilities, and other debt burdens. This does assume a 1% annual property tax, .5% insurance rate, and an 8.25% annual interest rate on a 30 year mortgage. Information regarding the amount of housing that people can afford was calculate from Hugh's Mortgage and Financial Calculator: http://www.interest.com/hugh/calc/howmuch.cgi

Using Census Data and Geographic Information Systems
Data from the U.S. Census Bureau 1996 American Community Survey was examined to identify the gaps in affordable housing in Portland. Variables were extracted at the census tract level for analysis and include median household income, home ownership rates, housing cost burden to renters, and mortgage as percent of monthly household income for homeowners at. Data from the ACS by census track was then attached to Geographic Information Systems (GIS) maps in order to pinpoint where the “gaps” in affordable housing are located in Portland. The U.S. Census Bureau 1996 American Community Survey was used to find population and housing statistics. This is the most current information appropriate for this study that the U.S. Census Bureau provides in-depth.

According to the U.S. Census Bureau, ACS Data is derived from sample data. This means that the standard errors and confidence intervals associated with the data have not yet been calculated. The data from the 1996 ACS is not strictly comparable to the 1990 census but provides more up to date information. The aim of the ACS data is to broadly dimension the affordable housing gaps and suggest geographic areas of interest the PCLT may want to focus on in targeting housing needs, project developments, and community involvement efforts.

Map 1: Portland's Cost Burden of Rent with Median Household Income
This map illustrates the median household income distribution with an overlay of the cost burden to renters in the City of Portland in 1996.

Median Family Income
Significant Findings
- On the Eastside of the Willamette River, the lowest median family incomes are in the outer southeast neighborhoods of Lents and Foster-Powell, the inner southeast neighborhood of Buckman, the neighborhoods along the northeast corridor of Martin Luther-King Jr. Blvd. and a section of the North Portland neighborhood of Cully. None of these areas has a median household income over $19,719. (See Map 1.)
- The highest median household income is on the westside of the Willamette River along the
"viewsheld" of the West Hills ($43,560 to $101,995). The exception is an area in the Northwest section where there are many transient renters ($19,720 - $30,162) and the downtown core where Portland's Single Resident Occupancy housing is concentrated ($8,423 - $19,719).

- There is generally an evenly distributed median household income on the east side of the Willamette River, with a few localized areas that contain both higher and lower than average median incomes.
- Northeast Portland, especially the residential neighborhoods of Alameda, Irvington, Grant Park, Rose City and Laurelhurst have a higher than average median incomes ranging from $43,560 to $63,410.

Map 1.

Cost Burden to Renters

Significant Findings

Map 1 also shows that there are geographic areas in Portland where the cost burden for renters is above the 33% income guideline, a burden felt by a greater number of renters than homeowners.

- The rent burden is 33% or more for renters in 29 census tracts. There are no census tracts where the burden to homeowners is in the 33 - 50% range, however there are 13 census tracts where the monthly cost burden of housing is 50 - 64.7%.
- Renters with high housing cost burdens are distributed throughout east Portland. The Elliot, Boise, and Lloyd District neighborhoods have housing costs over 50% for renters, an indication of gentrification and displacement of current residents (Halstead, 1999).
- Areas where the cost burden is 33 – 50% for renters include 18 census tracts throughout North/Northeast Portland and seven census tracts in southeast Portland. The median household income of the seven Southeast census tracts with 33 – 50% housing costs is $30,163 to $43,559.

**Areas for Opportunity**

If the PCLT chooses to geographically concentrate its efforts the areas outlined above may provide the most opportunity for finding people within the 80 – 100% median family income scenario. Census tracts within the Cully, Concordia and Alameda neighborhoods may also afford these same opportunities. If the PCLT should choose to focus on families in the 50 – 80% median income range, Parkrose, Parkrose Heights, Woodlawn, Piedmont, parts of Kenton, King and Boise neighborhoods all have high levels of renters paying 33 – 50% of their monthly income on rent.
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APPENDIX C: ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHY

The annotated bibliography below provides more information on other housing related documents that concern Portland. These documents provide a base of understanding and are a jumping off point in the process of community data creation.

Regional Needs

Clark, Barbara, Auditor, City of Portland, Blackmer, Gary, Auditor, Multnomah County, Housing: Clarify Priorities, Consolidate Efforts, Add Accountability (A Joint City of Portland/County Audit of the Local Housing Delivery System, 1997
This audit recommends that City and County officials designate a single county-wide consortium to establish housing and community development goals and priorities which allocate funds to operating agencies and evaluate and report on performance.

Displacement

Coalition For A Livable Future, Displacement: The Dismantling of a Community, 1996
This document looks at the effects of displacement in Portland. Displacement is the forced movement of people out of their neighborhood because of rising costs of housing, both home ownership and rental. Displacement is a threat to the stability of Portland neighborhoods and a significant concern for both residents and community leaders. The study highlights who is affected by displacement and what that has meant to them. The study indicates that though displacement is happening all around Portland, the northeast and the southeast are hardest hit.

Gentrification

Halstead, Leah, Gentrification in Portland (Portland, State University, 1999)
The purpose of the Halstead Report is to determine whether gentrification of inner city neighborhoods is resulting in the involuntary displacement of minority and low-income residents from these neighborhoods into areas with less rapidly increasing housing costs such as the neighborhoods to the east and north. The author documents changes in housing costs, income, and poverty levels among the census tracts in Multnomah County as evidence for a gentrification. The Sunnyside neighborhood was highlighted as an area that is currently experiencing the signs of gentrification. She also discussed the difficulty of defining gentrification and the problems that are associated with it.

Changing Demographics

Hough, George, Lycan, Richard; Portland's Changing Demographics 1970-1996 (Center For Population Research and Census, Portland State University)
This paper gives a clear picture of Portland’s demographics from 1970-1996 using tables and data. While Portland’s population declined between 1970 and 1980 due to the economic recession, the population of Portland has increased significantly since 1980. Coinciding with the national trend, there are less families with children and less two parent families. Housing prices, as well as the percent of homeownership declined in the late 80's. Since 1990, both indicators have risen sharply.
CLT Model


This document lays out the issues involved in resident selection for CLTs. The Institute for Community Economics urges newly formed CLTs to use this document only as a guide, knowing that each CLT and the structures that are already in place for a specific community should be utilized as well.

Institute for Community Economics, *Profiles of Community Land Trusts*, 1993

This document consists of reprinted articles from The Institute for Community Economics. The fourteen organizations portrayed in these articles reflect the diverse circumstances addressed by today’s CLT’s. Some CLT’s included are the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, the Burlington Vermont CLT, and the North Carolina Community Land Trust.

Poverty

Multnomah County Department of Community and Family Services, Office of Community Action and Development *Poverty in Multnomah County: A Descriptive Report*, 1996

This report provides a general description of poverty in Multnomah County, including the extent and location of those in poverty, the characteristics of the poor and homeless and the factors affecting poverty locally. The intent of the report is to provide background data that will be useful to the Department of Community and Family Services Office for community action and development, funders, and other partners, providers, and others planning, grant writing, community education, and community organizing and advocacy purposes.

The findings are as follows:

- Countywide, the highest number of people in poverty are living in the outer-east, followed by the Southeast, Northeast and North.
- The service districts with the highest percentages of people in poverty are Downtown Portland, North and Northeast.
- Female-headed families are over represented among the poor and homeless populations of the county.
- African-Americans, Hispanics and Native Americans are over represented among the poor and homeless in the county.
- 14% of all children in the county are poor, and children constitute at least 29% of those who are homeless in the county.
- Real wages (adjusted for inflation) have stagnated, and neither minimum wage jobs alone nor income assistance benefits pull people out of poverty.
- Unemployment is higher for people of color.
- Low income people face not only rents that have outpaced inflation, but low vacancy rates as well.
- About half of those who request emergency food assistance in the county are members of families, 40% are with disabilities, and one-third are working poor.
Wage-Housing Connections

Northwest Policy Center and Northwest Federation of Community Organizations  
*Northwest Job Gap Study: Searching For Work that Pays, Oregon, 1999*  
For more information please go to: [http://weber.u.washington.edu/~npcweb/](http://weber.u.washington.edu/~npcweb/)

The Northwest Job Gap Study explores the gap between the number of living wage jobs being created in the Northwest and the number of people needing living wage jobs. This document provides data detailing that the affordable housing problem has just as much to do with low wages as with inflated housing prices. The key findings, based on 1996 data are:

- The living wage for a single adult is $10.17 an hour.
- The living wage for a single adult with two children is $16.36. About half of all job openings (47 percent) pay less than $10.07 an hour. About 77% pay less than $16.36 an hour.
- For each job opening that pays at least the $10.07 an hour, there are on average six other job seekers.
- For each job opening that pays at least $16.36, there are on average 14 job seekers.

Economic Trends


- The Portland region’s rate of economic expansion has slowed somewhat in response to the economic recession of the major Asian trading partners. Recent indicators point to some rebound among the major Asian economies.
- The economy remains in a positive growth pattern with indications of real wage growth reflecting a tight labor market in several sectors of the regional economy.
- The expansion of the California economy during the last five years has eased some of the population growth pressure in the metropolitan area and in other sections of the state.
- Housing prices continue to rise, but at a slower rate than in previous years, and a volatile apartment market shows signs of overbuilding in specific sub-markets of the region.
- The urban areas of Oregon continue to reflect a general mood of economic confidence (with a discernable level of caution) as we near the end of a century and a millennium.
- Despite the overall positive outlook, the general income gap between the poorest members of our population and those prospering continues to grow. Most of the resources addressed by the Consolidated Plan (federal housing and community development funding and state, local, and private dollars) focus on the needs of these populations who have benefited less during this sustained period of economic expansion.


**Costs of Housing Development**

White, William; Bole, Robert; Sheehan, Brett, *Affordable Housing Cost Study: An Analysis of Housing Development Cost in Portland, 1997*

This document answers questions regarding how affordable housing is financed and built. Its purpose is to respond to a critical need for objective cost information about different types of housing which are being developed in the Portland region. Some of the findings are:

The cost of developing housing, when measured per person or per square foot, is lowest for single-family residences. The cost is slightly higher for town-homes, or small plexes, and increased significantly for multi-family and mixed use developments. CDC’s produce less expensive single-family homes than private developers, while multi-family units cost are the same for private developers and CDC’s. Housing costs rise dramatically as the housing height and density increases. Projects funded by federal tax credits, bonds, or a combination of the two result in higher soft costs than projects funded by the Portland Development Commission or private lenders.
## APPENDIX D: LIST OF INTERVIEWS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portland Community Design</th>
<th>Juneau Housing Trust</th>
<th>1-14-00</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Suzanne Zuniga</td>
<td>Betsy Longenbaugh</td>
<td>1-14-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Mutual</td>
<td>ACORN Housing Cooperative of Illinois</td>
<td>1-5-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brian Stewart &amp; Scott Karn</td>
<td>Marty Shaloo</td>
<td>1-5-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Host Community Development Corp.</td>
<td>Burlington Community Land Trust</td>
<td>1-13-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denis O'Neil</td>
<td>Ellen Rubenstein</td>
<td>1-13-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-11-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Alliance of Tenants</td>
<td>Sabin CDC</td>
<td>2-2-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dana Brown</td>
<td>Steve Crowell</td>
<td>2-2-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innovative Housing Inc.</td>
<td>Fannie Mae</td>
<td>2-14-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ralph Austin</td>
<td>Sue Krake</td>
<td>2-14-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-9-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Partnership Fund</td>
<td>Portland Comm. Reinvestment Initiative</td>
<td>2-18-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim Burnett</td>
<td>Maxine Fitzpatrick</td>
<td>2-18-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-8-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon</td>
<td>Enterprise Foundation</td>
<td>2-3-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lowen Berman</td>
<td>Mike Andrews</td>
<td>2-3-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-7-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Housing Center</td>
<td>Wilcox Elementary School</td>
<td>2-2-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peg Malloy</td>
<td>Debi Bradway</td>
<td>2-2-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-3-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Development Commission</td>
<td>Habitat for Humanity</td>
<td>2-9-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don Graves-Highsmith</td>
<td>Sara Breckenridge</td>
<td>2-9-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-2-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coalition for a Livable Future</td>
<td>Southeast Uplift</td>
<td>2-24-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joey Lyons</td>
<td>Phillip Wong</td>
<td>2-24-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-31-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjory Hamann Consulting</td>
<td>Marathon Property Management</td>
<td>2-11-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjory Hamann</td>
<td>Joe Bradway</td>
<td>2-11-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-25-00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Land Cooperative of Cincinnati</td>
<td>City Commissioner Erik Sten's Office</td>
<td>2-25-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Hastings</td>
<td>Bob Durston</td>
<td>2-25-00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-19-00</td>
<td>Portland, Oregon</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau of Environmental Services</td>
<td>Laconia Area Community Land Trust:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Johnston Creek Watershed Council
Maggie Skendarian
1-19-00
2-25-00

Homestead Community Land Trust
Sheldon Cooper
1-10-00

Opal Community Land Trust
Lisa Byers
1-11-00

We would like to thank:

Laurel Butman
City of Portland
Office of Finance and Administration

Tim Mackenzie
Burlington Associates

Portland Community Land Trust
Interim Board

Trell Anderson
City of Portland
Bureau of Housing and Community Development

Barbara Riegler
Portland Development Commission

Debra Howe, Connie Ozawa and Karen Gibson
Portland State University
Department of Urban Studies and Planning

A special thanks to the PCLT Interim Board student advisory committee:

Trell Anderson, Sam Chase and Percy Winters
APPENDIX E: LIST OF FUTURE NETWORK CONTACTS

Bev Stein  
Multnomah County Chair  
1120 SW Fifth Avenue, Suite 1515  
Portland, Oregon 97024-1914  
(503) 988-3277, fax (503) 988-3013

Denny West  
Housing Authority of Portland  
135 South West Ash Street  
Portland, OR 97203  
Phone: 503-802-8495  
Fax: 503-802-8489

Jerry Hudson  
Collins Foundation  
1618 SW 1st Ave  
Portland, OR 97201  
(503) 227-7171

Voiss  
Franciscan Enterprises  
1478 NE Killingsworth St  
Portland, OR 97211  
(503) 284-8642

Judy Bauman  
Executive Director Link CDC  
2215 SE Division  
Portland, OR 97202  
233-2898

Richard Harris  
Central City Concern  
2 NW Second Ave.  
Portland, OR 97209

Linly Rees  
Office of Mayor Vera Katz  
1221 SW 4th Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Phone: (503) 823-4000

Network for Oregon Affordable Housing (NOAH)  
135 SW Ash St # 600  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 223-3211

Human Solutions  
2900 SE 122nd  
Portland, OR 97236  
(503) 248-5202

Portland City Commissioners  
City Information and Referral  
City Hall  
1221 SW 4th Avenue  
Portland, Oregon 97204  
Phone: (503) 823-4000

Molly Cooley  
Neighborhood Pride Team  
7543 SE 52nd Ave.  
Portland, OR 97206  
(503) 774-4880

Nick Sauvie, Rose CDC  
7211 SE 62nd Ave.  
Portland, OR 97206  
(503) 788-9197

Marilyn Miller  
Portland Impact  
4610 SE Belmont St  
Portland, OR 97215  
(503) 248-3660

Susan Emmons  
Northwest Pilot Project  
1137 SW Broadway  
Portland, OR 97205  
(503) 227-5605

Hongsa Chanthavong  
Asian Family Center  
4424 NE Glisan St  
Portland, OR 97213  
(503) 235-9396

IRCO (International Refugee Center of Oregon)  
1336 E Burnside St  
Portland, OR 97214  
(503) 234-1541
APPENDIX F: COMMUNITY ORGANIZATIONS

A guide to some housing and advocacy resources in Portland

Association of Oregon Community Development Organizations (AOCDO)
PO Box 6188
921 SW Morrison, Suite 544
Portland OR 97205
503-223-4041
Fax: 503-223-3845
Email: mailto:aocdo@teleport.com

Central City Concern
2 NW Second Ave.
Portland OR 97209
294-1681
Fax 294-4321
Email: ccc@transport.com

Community Development Network of Multnomah County
2627 NE MLK Blvd. rm 206
Portland OR 97212
335-9884
Email:cdn@teleport.com

Community Partners for Affordable Housing
PO Box 23206
Tigard OR 97281
503-968-2724
Fax: 503-598-8923

Downtown Community Housing
7720 SW Macadam #20
Portland OR 97219
244-3435
Fax: 244-7416
Provides rental assistance.
Email: sgaassocia@aol.com

Franciscan Enterprise
4826 NE 8th Ave.
Portland OR 97211
284-8642
Fax 284-4092

Habitat for Humanity
PO Box 11527
Portland OR 97211
287-9529
Fax 284-5469
Web: http://www.pdxhabitat.org/index.html

HOST
1818 NE MLK Blvd.
Portland OR 97212
331-1752
Fax 280-2135

Housing Development Corporation of Washington County
155 N. First Avenue, Suite 170
Hillsboro, OR 97124
503-648-8814
Fax: 503-648-2882
Web: http://www.co.washington.or.us/deptmts/comm_dev/comm_dev.htm
Email: webmastr@co.washington.or.us

Housing our Families
3987 N Mississippi Ave.
Portland OR 97227
335-0947
Fax: 281-0933

Housing Development Center
2627 NE Martin Luther King Jr. Blvd.
Portland OR 97212
335-3668
Fax 335-0475
Email: hdc@teleport.com

Human Solutions Inc.
2900 SE 122nd
Portland OR 97236
248-5201
Fax 248-5202

Inner Westside CDC
PO Box 10712
Portland OR 97210-0712
503-228-5588
Fax: 274-1400
Email: IWCDC@juno.com

Innovative Housing Inc.
Jubilee Fellowship Ministries
PO Box 8122
Portland OR 97207
282-3550

LIHNAPO
Low Income Housing for Native Americans of Portland OR
PO Box 17270
Portland OR 97217
234-2947
Fax 283-0710

Link Community Development Corporation
2215 SE Division St.
Portland OR 97202-1200
503-233-2898
Fax: 503-238-6644
Email: linkcdc@aol.com

Metro CDC
5260 NE 74th Ave.,
or Office: 2545 E Burnside St, 97214
Portland OR 97218
234-3265
Fax 234-2747

NECDC
4114 N Vancouver
Portland OR 97217
282-5482
Fax 282-9152
Email: NECDC@teleport.com

Neighborhood Pride Team
7453 SE 52nd Ave.
Portland OR 97206
503-774-4880
Fax: 503-774-4832

Network Behavioral Healthcare
5415 SE Milwaukie Ave. #3
Portland OR 97202
238-0705 for housing, For other services call: 203-5132
Fax 233-2861

Northwest Housing Alternatives
2316 SE Willard
Milwaukie OR 97222
654-1007
Fax 654-1319
Email: nha@teleport.com

Portland Community Design
2014 NE MLK Blvd.
Portland OR 97212
281-8011
Fax 281-8012
Email: pcd@spiritone.com

Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives Inc.-PCRI
4829 NE Mlk Jr. Blvd.
Portland OR 97211
288-2923
Fax 288-2891
Email: pcri@pcrihome.org

Portland Housing Center
1605 NE 45th
Portland OR 97213
282-7744
Fax 282-0049

Portsmouth Community Redevelopment Corporation
9025 N Dana Ave.
Portland OR 97203
503-283-1096
Fax: 503-283-1557
Email: info@pcrc.org
Web: http://www.pcrc.org

REACH Community Development, Inc.
1135 SE Salmon St.
Portland OR 97214-3655
503-231-0682
Fax: 503-236-3429
www.reachcdc.org

ROSE CDC
7211 SE 62nd Ave.
Portland OR 97206
788-8052
Fax 788-9197
Email: rosecdc@teleport.com

Sabin CDC
2517 NE Alberta
Portland OR 97211
287-3496
Fax 287-3597

Tualatin Valley Housing Partners
PO Box 1505
Beaverton OR 97075
503-231-2987
Fax: 503-239-5750