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Purpose Statement

This Affordable Housing Development Strategy aims to provide creative, practical, and implementable solutions based on community realities and best practices that will create more units of affordable housing in unincorporated, urban Washington County.

The Affordable Housing Development Strategy includes:

1. **Themes identified from public outreach** with local leaders, expert interviews, developers, residents of affordable housing and community members;

2. **Policy recommendations** that promote the development of affordable housing in opportunities areas and throughout Washington County;

3. **An assessment of existing vacant land in Washington County;** and

4. **An estimate of the potential number of new housing units that could be developed** on existing vacant parcels in focus areas of Washington County.
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Background

Washington County’s 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan Housing Market Analysis Needs Assessment indicates that households annually earning 50% of Median Family Income (MFI) or less face the greatest affordable housing gap. Both renters and homeowners in this income bracket are severely housing cost burdened, often spending over 50% of their income on housing costs. The Consolidated Plan estimates a need for 14,000 housing units affordable to low and very-low income households to meet current affordable housing demand. Washington County is one of many jurisdictions that needs to take action to address its affordable housing gap.

Open Doors Housing Solutions, a group of Masters in Urban and Regional Planning candidates at Portland State University, worked with Washington County employees in the Housing Authority and Land Use & Transportation Department to develop an initial policy and development strategy to combat this housing crisis and provide recommendations to address the shortage of 14,000 affordable housing units.

Process

To develop an effective affordable housing strategy, the process and approach focused on Washington County’s existing conditions (Place), communities (People) and current best practices (Practice) for building affordable housing. Our work in each of these areas took place concurrently, with research in one area informing the others.

Themes

From speaking with community members, local leaders, developers, affordable housing residents, analysing the existing conditions of Washington County, and researching current practices, five themes emerged:

Complete Communities - Complete communities are both diverse and stable. They represent the desire to have choice in where you live and the type of housing you occupy. People of all income levels should have access to quality housing, transportation options, schools, and quality-of-life amenities.

Education - Education refers to increasing access to information and resources for developers, County employees, and residents involved in affordable housing so that they can efficiently navigate systems for funding, permitting and application processes.

Flexibility/Adaptability - This theme represents the desire for streamlined review processes, flexibility for zoning and design standards and the ability to adapt over time as conditions in the economy and demographics change.
**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

**Funding** - Funding emerged as a limiting factor to potential affordable housing development in Washington County. Non-profit and for-profit developers of affordable housing identified numerous challenges, including onerous permitting timelines and requirements and a lack of financing opportunities.

**Partnerships** - Partnerships with other agencies, developers, and community members will be necessary in order to build more affordable housing in Washington County.

**Types of Recommendations**

The 30 specific recommendations in this report are split into four categories, based on where they could provide assistance in the affordable housing crisis. These recommendations are intended to be a group of tools to work in conjunction with each other. A single action will not solve the affordable housing problem, but several actions taken together could create the right program for Washington County to successfully meet the demand for affordable housing units.

**Policy Recommendation Categories:**
1. Funding
2. Process Improvements
3. Partnerships/Land Banking
4. Land Use and Development

**Opportunity Areas/Implementation**

The 30 recommendations are intended to be broadly applicable throughout Washington County, but this report also identifies five opportunity areas where some of these recommendations could be piloted. The five opportunity areas were chosen because they are in unincorporated, urban Washington County and in close proximity to amenities (such as public transportation, grocery stores, medical services, and much more).

**Opportunity Areas:**
1. Aloha
2. Bethany
3. Cedar Mill/West Haven-Sylvan
4. Metzger/Garden Home-Whitford
5. South County Industrial Area

Each opportunity area includes a list of land use recommendations based on the amenities and needs of that specific community (e.g. proximity to transit, medical services, grocery stores, etc.).

**Next Steps**

We hope this strategy will guide the Land Use and Transportation Department of Washington County and the Housing Authority towards appropriate next steps to take in addressing this affordable housing crisis. These recommendations may serve as starting points for the further analysis and assessment necessary to implement the right blend of incentives and financial programs to best meet Washington County’s needs.
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EXISTING CONDITIONS
**EXISTING CONDITIONS**

### A HOUSING CRISIS

Many cities across the United States are experiencing rising housing costs and declining vacancy rates, resulting in a shortage of housing affordable to lower-income households. This is occurring in Washington County, Oregon as well as the greater Portland Metropolitan Region, and has had a disproportionately negative effect on the region’s most financially vulnerable residents. The gap between incomes of the highest-wage residents and the lowest wage residents has increased in Washington County.

Washington County’s 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan Housing Market Analysis Needs Assessment indicates that households earning 50% Median Family Income (MFI) or less face the greatest affordable housing gap. Both renters and homeowners in this income bracket are severely cost burdened, often spending over 50% of their income on housing costs. The Consolidated Plan estimates a need for 14,000 housing units affordable to low and very-low income households to meet current affordable housing demand. Washington County needs to take strategic action to address its affordable housing gap.

---

**In Washington County...**

- **The Median Household Income Increased by 23.5%**
  *However.*
- **The Poverty Rate Increased by 76%**
  *Between 2000-2012*
- **Average monthly housing costs for rents: $961**

Source: Washington County’s 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan

---

- **“Social security income only provides enough income that [I] can only budget $500 for housing.”**
  - Senior Resident of Washington County

---

**Top Three Hardest Expenses to Meet each Month:**

- **Rent**
- **Groceries**
- **Utilities**

*Pollled from 145 Washington County Residents of various incomes*
Housing is considered affordable when housing costs are no more than 30% of a household's gross income.

**Housing costs include:**
- Rent or mortgage payments (including insurance and taxes)
- Basic utilities (water, sewer, garbage, electricity and gas)

70% of households pay more than 30% of their income* on housing

39% of households pay more than 50% of their income* on housing

* Gross income

Source: 2015-2020 Washington County Consolidated Plan

“In my experience when I looked for housing, I was denied because of family income. Even though in 10 years, I have never missed a rent payment.”

- Washington County Resident

**DEMOGRAPHIC SHIFTS**

The urban, unincorporated area of Washington County was home to 188,148 residents in 2010, making it effectively the second largest city in Oregon. (2035 Forecast of Population by City and County, Metro). The urban unincorporated area of Washington County was the fastest growing area in the Metro region from 2010-2015 (Annual Population Forecasts, PSU Population Research Center). This trend is expected to continue, as Metro forecasts the population to grow to 245,766 residents by 2035. (Table 1.)

**Table 1. Average Annual Growth Rate**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Washington County (Inside UGB)</td>
<td>2.77%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1.90%</td>
<td>2.42%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
<td>2.12%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>1.22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>4.29%</td>
<td>1.89%</td>
<td>1.26%</td>
<td>1.21%</td>
<td>1.50%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>1.79%</td>
<td>1.73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portland Metro Region</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>1.36%</td>
<td>0.96%</td>
<td>0.98%</td>
<td>1.23%</td>
<td>1.43%</td>
<td>1.61%</td>
<td>1.46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources: Metro 2035 Population Forecast/ PSU Population Research Center Certified Population Estimates/Washington County Transportation System Plan 2035
**Regulated Affordable Housing:**
Housing that is made affordable through public subsidies and/or agreements or statutory regulations that restrict or limit resident income levels and/or rents. Regulated affordable housing generally provides housing for households that otherwise could not afford adequate housing at market rates.

**Market Affordable Housing:**
Housing that is available in the open market without public subsidies. Market-rate housing may be low-cost or subsidized by a private agency, but does not include any public subsidy and is not subject to any statutory regulations restricting resident income levels or rents.

**Filtering:**
The gradual decrease in housing values for units as they depreciate over time (e.g. an apartment in a 10-year-old building will probably have a lower rent than a brand-new unit). Generally, filtering does not result in major reductions in value unless the housing also deteriorates in quality. Filtering is most likely to be a source of housing for households at higher income levels (80% MFI and up), but is unlikely to result in safe and decent housing units for lower-income households.

---

**Existing Conditions**

**Definitions**

**Extremely low income**
0% to 30% of MFI = $0 to $17,650
(Affordable Monthly Housing Cost = $441)

**Very low income**
30% to 50% of MFI = $17,651 to $29,400
(Affordable Monthly Housing Cost = $735)

**Low income**
50% to 80% of MFI = $29,401 to $47,050
(Affordable Monthly Housing Cost = $1,176)

**Moderate income**
80% to 120% of MFI = $47,051 to $70,944
(Affordable Monthly Housing Cost = $1,774)

(100% of MFI is $59,120)

Source: HUD Calculations: Portland-Vancouver-Hillsboro, OR-WA MSA
A substantial body of work exists that has examined the challenges surrounding affordable housing development in Washington County. The Open Doors Affordable Housing Development Strategy should be considered within the larger regional planning framework. Plans and strategies must be coordinated and mutually supportive in order to meet the current need for an additional 14,000 units of affordable housing identified in the 2015-2020 Washington County Consolidated Plan.

**Figure 2. Plan Pyramid**
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PROCESS AND APPROACH

To develop a meaningful affordable housing strategy our process and approach focused on Washington County’s existing conditions (Place), communities (People) and the current best Practices for building affordable housing. Our work in each of these areas took place concurrently, with research in one area informing another.

The Place provides the foundation of our work. The existing conditions in Washington County including community plans, spatial and demographic data were examined to create a vacant land inventory. Using GIS (Geographic Information Systems), opportunity areas were designated to focus future development efforts and inform our community development outreach strategy. The analysis we focused on unincorporated, urban Washington County.

The community outreach focused on the People of Washington County to better understand perspectives and experiences of those living in affordable housing and the surrounding community. It was important to hear from the developers building housing as well. In order to learn from these different groups, focus groups were facilitated with individuals currently living in, or on the wait list for, affordable housing. Additional focus groups were conducted with market rate and non-profit developers to learn about opportunities and barriers to producing affordable housing. Community members at Parent Teacher Organization meetings and other events contributed their thoughts and potential concerns regarding affordable housing.

Current Practices in affordable housing also guided the strategy. Subject matter experts were interviewed and contributed additional research into existing case studies and best practices. Subject matter experts from Portland State University, professionals working for affordable housing development organizations, local community outreach experts and other individuals with project-specific knowledge were interviewed. A complete stakeholder contact list is included in Appendix I. Selected case studies and best practices were researched and provide examples of implemented policy recommendations.
Figure 3. Project Framework

**Place**
- Existing Conditions
- Site Selection
- Local Policy
- Data

**People**
- Affordable Housing Residents
- Community Members
- Local Leaders
- Developers

**Practice**
- Expert Interviews
- Best Practices
- Case Studies

**Affordable Development Strategy for Washington County**
THemes

Distinct themes emerged throughout the public involvement process. These themes illustrate common concerns surrounding housing affordability and shed light on institutional gaps that perpetuate the current lack of a sufficient housing supply. Uncovering these themes from developers, residents of affordable housing and the local community informed many of the Policy Recommendations (Pages 30-31). To illustrate the connection between themes and policies, each theme has been assigned a unique identifier (symbol) included next to the policy recommendations it helped to inform and within the public involvement summaries in Appendix A.

Complete Communities

Complete communities are both diverse and stable. They represent the desire to have choice in where you live and the type of housing you occupy. People of all income levels should have access to quality housing, transportation options, schools, and quality-of-life amenities. This vision preserves neighborhood character and identity, and cultivates a sense of place. These communities promote diversity in socioeconomic status, race and ethnicity, age and occupation. Complete communities allow seniors to age in place, minimize the distance people travel to work and can help stimulate a vibrant local economy.

Education

Education refers to increasing access to information and resources for all of those (developers, employees, and residents) involved in affordable housing so that they can efficiently navigate systems for funding, permitting and application processes. Providing information to city officials on the challenges developers face in building affordable housing will help create a focused strategy to streamline permitting timelines and minimize the resources developers must dedicate toward the application process. Education for developers about opportunities for development incentives and how to navigate Washington County’s permitting process is necessary to allocate time and resources most efficiently. Decision-making processes should be transparent, and the status of proposals and funding opportunities should be advertised equitably. Low-income households and affordable housing residents lack up-to-date information and resources to find affordable housing. They may also have difficulty navigating the application for project-based housing assistance and other regulated affordable housing units. Local leaders and community members could benefit from education to alleviate common concerns about development (Appendix D), and gain a better understanding of how affordable housing development can benefit their neighborhoods.
**Themes**

**Flexibility/Adaptability**
This theme represents the desire for streamlined review processes, flexibility for zoning and design standards and the ability to adapt over time as conditions in the local economy and demographics change. Flexibility in zoning could allow developers to create additional types of smaller housing compatible with the surrounding neighborhood and address the needs of seniors and other populations who desire affordable housing that is smaller and easier to manage. Creating standards that increase the power of the County to define the character of neighborhoods and value development that is compatible with the neighborhood and existing plans and visions for future neighborhood development. Policies should be adaptable and revisited over time as economic and demographic conditions change. Adaptable policies will help prevent sprawl and protect rural areas, provide affordable housing while keeping neighborhood character, responsibly manage infrastructure, and increase the tax base to fund vital County services.

**Funding**
Funding emerged as a limiting factor to potential affordable housing development in Washington County. Non-profit and for-profit developers of affordable housing identified numerous challenges, including onerous permitting timelines and requirements and a lack of financing opportunities. The challenge of following a development schedule when trying to access and compete for 10 or more funding sources per project results in an increased cost burden for affordable housing developers in the County and further disadvantages affordable housing relative to market-rate developments. (See pages 28-29 for Barriers to Affordable Housing Development.)

**Partnerships/Collaboration**
Partnerships with other agencies, developers, and community members will be necessary in order to build more affordable housing in Washington County. There were a wide range of possible partners identified by developers as possible sites of affordable housing, including schools, churches and other faith-based organizations, and TriMet-owned land. Schools can be ideal locations for affordable housing because they offer a wide range of benefits to low-income households. Churches and other faith-based organizations have approached developers in the past with interest in expanding their community service by providing affordable housing on excess land. Partnering with TriMet for transit-oriented development presents a unique opportunity to provide affordable housing close to public transit. These partnerships create opportunities to build complete communities by making housing available at a range of incomes in high opportunity areas.
The regional and town centers designated in Metro’s 2040 Growth Plan are intended to include a variety of neighborhood resources and amenities. The Metro Growth Plan encourages housing of all types, for all levels of income, in and around these centers. Low and moderate-income families do not differ from other families in their desire for housing with access to basic amenities and advantages. Accordingly, developers should site affordable housing to maximize economic and social opportunities for its residents as well as to allow for quality-of-life amenities, including access to good schools, safe streets and parks, and public transportation options (Bach et al., 2007).

In order to identify opportunity areas with the potential for additional affordable housing development for this strategy, a ¾ mile buffer around regional and town centers was used to capture vacant lots. The ¾ mile buffer was chosen as a conservative estimate for the distance an average person can walk in less than 15 minutes, which is consistent with the 20-minute neighborhood model and has been used as a standard walkability metric in adjacent Portland communities. In cases where there appeared to be viable, large lots outside the ¾ mile buffer, the opportunity area buffer was hand digitized to capture these ancillary parcels. Clusters of vacant lots were visually confirmed to identify areas within urban, unincorporated Washington County which contained the greatest amount of existing resources and vacant land.

This process resulted in a total of five “opportunity areas” within which we have focused our vacant land inventory, opportunity mapping analysis and zoning recommendations. The findings are presented in the Opportunity Mapping section. The opportunity areas have been loosely delineated around census designated places (CDPs) where possible and are as follows: Aloha, Bethany, Cedar Mill/ West Haven-Sylvan, Metzger/ Garden Home-Whitford and the South County Industrial Area (not defined by a CDP). Metro’s Buildable Land Inventory (BLI) dataset contains sophisticated calculations and the best available data regarding land use in Washington County and was used for the vacant land inventory and analysis. Detailed methods for the GIS analysis are provided in the Appendix H.
If built out to the maximum allowable density under current zoning, the opportunity areas could only meet about 24% of the current demand for new affordable housing units. (Table 2.)

Table 2. Vacant Lots ¹ in Washington County Opportunity Areas ²

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Vacant Lot Acreage</th>
<th># of Potential Buildable Units</th>
<th>Percent of Need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloha</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>517</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>1531</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Mill/West-Haven/Sylvan</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>842</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger/Garden Home-Whitford</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Industrial Area</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total Percent of the 14,000 Units Needed³ 24%

¹Excludes Tax Exempt Lots
²Identified Urban, Unincorporated Opportunity Areas
³According to the 2015-2020 Washington County Consolidated Plan
If built out to the maximum allowable density under current land use designations, vacant land in the opportunity areas could only meet about 24% of the demand for new affordable housing units (Table 2.) An additional 57 acres of vacant land were identified by examining tax exempt lots not currently included in the BLI, which increases this percentage slightly (Table 3.) The BLI excludes certain vacant parcels are not suitable for residential or employment development. These parcels include uses like utility easements, parks, churches and schools. Properties owned by tax-exempt entities with city, State, Federal and Native American organizations are also removed from the BLI (see Appendix 2 Methodology for Determining in the 2014 Urban Growth Report’s BLI). However, because publicly-owned land can present good opportunities for affordable development partnerships, they have been included in the vacant land inventory for this project.

Table 3. Total Acres of Unconstrained Tax Exempt Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax Exempt Lots</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloha</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Mill/West-Haven/Sylvan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger/Garden Home/Whitford</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Industrial Area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>57</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Oregon Statewide Planning Goal 10

To provide for the housing needs of citizens of the state. Buildable lands for residential use shall be inventoried and plans shall encourage the availability of adequate numbers of needed housing units at price ranges and rent levels which are commensurate with the financial capabilities of Oregon households and allow for flexibility of housing location, type and density.

AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPMENT: FINDINGS

Market-rate housing developments charge rents at high enough levels to allow developers to finance the costs of development with only one or two funding sources, and are subject only to the state and local laws and development codes in construction and management of a property. Affordable housing developments charge lower rents and generate less rental revenue. As a result, affordable projects cannot finance sufficient debt to cover project costs, leaving a gap for which it is necessary to seek out other funding sources. (Figure 3.) These funding sources often have additional layers of regulations and reporting requirements that increase project costs and may delay completion of the project.

Affordable housing supports complete communities by providing housing for families and individuals of all ages and income levels, but there are significant barriers to developing housing that is affordable for extremely low and very low income populations. For these populations, which include working families and aging seniors, the market cannot provide housing they are able to afford, and additional resources and incentives are needed to create stable housing for these community members.
As an example, the above Tools Spectrum outlines existing funding tools from federal, state, and local sources that can help develop housing for lower income populations. All funding recommendations and the corresponding segment of Median Family Income (MFI) of households that would typically be served by these projects are listed.

1There is a Federal LIHTC administered by the State and an Oregon Tax Credit program.

2TIF is usually generated by the Urban Renewal Areas, which are typically established in cities but can be established in urban unincorporated County areas.
Developers seeking to provide affordable housing must layer multiple funding sources to bring rents to affordable levels. This strategy is necessary in order to serve populations with extremely low and very low incomes, and affordable housing developed by non-profits will often have at least ten separate funding sources, including Low-Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) and other federal and state sources of equity. The challenge of finding, managing, and organizing these various funding sources is just one of many reasons the housing market does not provide sufficient housing for low-income populations.

**Figure 6. Funding Source Discrepancies**

**Market Funding Sources**
- 25% Equity Investors/Developer Equity
- 10% Gap Financing
- 55-65% Long Term Loan
- 0-10% Forgivable Debt/Grants

**Affordable Housing Funding Sources**
- 0.7% Deferred Developer Fee
- 2.1% Sponsor Loan
- 5.7% Grants/Foundation/Incentive Sources
- 10.3% Washington County HOME Loan
- 17.0% NOAH Permanent Loan with OAHTC (State Credits)
- 2.1% Oregon Housing and Community Services Grants
- 62.1% 9% LIHTC Investor Equity

Example based on REACH CDC’s Orchards at Orenco Phase I

THE CHALLENGES OF FUNDING FOR NON-PROFIT AFFORDABLE HOUSING DEVELOPERS

In addition to providing funding recommendations, this Strategy provides recommendations to address challenges to development caused by delays and obstructions in the process of planning for and developing affordable housing. For many developers, this process can stretch over 4 years, during which time the developer must pay taxes, maintenance, and other carrying costs on the property, significantly increasing the overall cost of the project.

Other main challenges for non-profit developers occur in the ‘Pre-Development’ and ‘Apply for HOME’ and ‘CDBG Funding’ stages. Pre-Development, which includes gaining site control and developing a plan for the site, can be an expensive process, and many non-profit developers are not able to utilize their own funds for this process and encounter further delays seeking funding assistance. This delay can mean the loss of a potential site for affordable housing, as a landowner may choose to sell quickly to a for-profit market rate developer rather than wait for a non-profit affordable housing developer to organize financing to purchase the site. As an example of how our recommendations strive to address these challenges, we recommend creating funding sources or a land banking process to assist with Pre-Development and allow non-profit developers to create more affordable housing.

Figure 7. Predevelopment Timeline for Affordable Housing Development

Years 1-2
- Pre-Development
- Apply for Project-Based Vouchers
- Apply for HOME and CDBG Funding (Gap Financing)

Years 3-4
- Apply for LIHTC, GHAP and State Financing (Equity)
- Apply for Construction Permits
- Apply for Construction Loan and Begin Construction
- Begin Occupancy and Apply for Permanent Loan
These 30 policies represent the comprehensive list of policy recommendations for implementation by Washington County. Each policy is informed by what the project team heard throughout the planning process from experts, including developers and local leaders. The policies were vetted by research and extensive discussions with Washington County planning staff to ensure feasibility and maximum efficacy.

**Priority recommendation based on feasibility and anticipated efficacy.**
## Summary of Policy Recommendations

### FUNDING POLICY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F1</td>
<td>Permit Excise Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F2</td>
<td>Subsidizing Permit Fees and SDCs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F3</td>
<td>Predevelopment Funding/Gap Funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F4</td>
<td>Revolving Loan Fund for Equitable Transit Oriented Development (TOD)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Revolving Loan Fund for Rehabilitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Homebuyer Opportunity Limited Tax Exemption (HOLTE) and Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption (MULTE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Tax Increment Financing (TIF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>Impact Fees for Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Linkage Fees for Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Nonprofit-Owned Housing Tax Exemption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F11</td>
<td>Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) Fund Community Land Trust (CLT)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### PARTNERSHIPS & LAND BANKING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Partnerships - Workforce Housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Partnerships - Parcel Acquisition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Partnerships - TriMet Redevelopment Options</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Public Acquisition of Existing Rental Buildings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>Partnerships - TriMet Transit Oriented Development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Public Land for Affordable Housing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

FINDINGS:
WHY IS THIS STRATEGY NEEDED?

Current need for 14,000 Affordable Housing Units
Development trends are currently producing
Only 113 New Affordable Units Per Year

POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS:
HOW CAN WASHINGTON COUNTY COMBAT THE HOUSING CRISIS?

30 Policy Recommendations
to increase the supply of Affordable Housing in
Washington County.

OPPORTUNITY MAPPING:
WHERE CAN POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS BE IMPLEMENTED?

ALOHA
BETHANY
CEDAR MILL/WEST HAVEN-SYLVAN
METZGER/GARDEN HOME-WHITFORD
SOUTH COUNTY INDUSTRIAL AREA

APPENDICES:
HOW WAS THIS STRATEGY DEVELOPED?

Supportive Documents
Project findings and how they inform the recommendations.

1 Washington County’s 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan
How to Use This Document...

**STEP 1** Each policy recommendation is color coded and numbered within one of the following categories:

- **Z** ZONING
- **P** PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS
- **F** FUNDING
- **L** PARTNERSHIPS & LAND BANKING

**STEP 2** Theme icons demonstrate link between outreach findings and policy recommendations.

**THEME ICONS**

- COMPLETE COMMUNITIES
- EDUCATION
- FLEXIBILITY/ADAPTABLE
- FUNDING
- PARTNERSHIPS

**STEP 3** Each Policy Recommendation includes suggested Washington County Department(s) to implement strategy.

**A1 Example Policy Recommendation**

- **Z** Description of policy recommendation and its intended effect.

**Washington County Dept.**

List of Washington County Department(s) that should implement this policy.

**Related Case Studies**

List of examples where this policy has been successfully implemented. See Appendix C for details.

**STEP 4** The Housing Symbol indicates if the policy promotes Regulated Affordable Housing or serves to increase the supply of housing in general.

**HOUSING SYMBOLS**

- **AH** Policy increases supply of housing units affordable to households between 0-80% MFI.
- **H** Policy increases diversity in housing stock, residents of all income levels could benefit from a general increase in housing supply.

Figure 8. How to Use This Document
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS - ZONING AND DEVELOPMENT

In many communities in Washington County, the Community Development Code (CDC, similar to the zoning code in other jurisdictions) has not been updated in decades. As a result, many housing types that could include affordable units would be prohibitively expensive for developers to build. Additionally, community plans, which describe implementation of the CDC should be reviewed and updated. Updating the code in select areas could allow developers to produce a wider variety of housing types and units. These new housing units could provide more affordable housing, while preserving the feel of existing neighborhoods. These new housing units may offer a greater range of choices to households, from family or senior-oriented developments to small pocket neighborhoods with greater accessibility for residents with mobility challenges.

Z1 Flexible/Updated Parking Standards

- Reduction in requirements for parking for multifamily developments. Washington County could allow affordable housing units to exercise discretionary reduction of parking requirements if an applicant can demonstrate that less parking is needed (e.g. in TOD districts).

Z2 Incentive Zoning

- Density Bonus - FAR: Increased Floor Area Ratios (FAR) awarded in downtown zones or CBD based on the inclusion of tiered requirements. Affordable housing could be part of the requirement in a tier or multiple tiers to receive the incentive.
- Density Bonus - Smaller Housing: Incentivize a variety of housing for all income levels through allowances of smaller housing (e.g. rowhouses, duplexes, cottage housing) in R-5, R-6 land use districts. For example, allow cottage housing and reduce development application requirements for rowhouses and cottage housing to be Type I. This could be applied as an overlay zone or as a bonus option in R-5 or R-6.

HOUSING SYMBOLS

AH Policy increases supply of housing units affordable to households between 0-80% MFI.
H Policy increases diversity in housing stock, residents of all income levels could benefit from a general increase in housing supply.

Note: See Appendix C for All Related Case Study Details.
## Policy Recommendations - Land Use and Development

### Z3 Upzoning/Increasing Minimum Density Requirements

- Increase minimum density for residential and mixed-use developments on select lots near town and city centers, and low density areas to allow for more intense development tools (e.g. incentive zoning) to push for affordability.

**Washington County Dept.**
- Land Use and Transportation
- Housing Authority
- Office of Community Development

### Z5 Small Unit Land Use District

- Implement Land Use District regulations requiring a minimum number of smaller sized units (e.g. micro units, accessory dwelling units (ADUs) for new development).

**Washington County Dept.**
- Land Use and Transportation
- Housing Authority
- Office of Community Development

### Z4 Senate Bill 1533 - Inclusionary Zoning

- Allows certain cities and counties to adopt land use regulations or functional plan provisions, or impose conditions for approval of permits, that effectively establish sales or rental price, or require designation for sale or rent as affordable housing, for up to 20 percent of multifamily structure in exchange for one or more developer incentives. **Many of the proposed zoning recommendations could be used as incentives for required inclusionary zoning.** The incentives can be made into a package that makes it worthwhile for developers to build affordable units along with market-rate units.

**Washington County Dept.**
- Land Use and Transportation
- Housing Authority
- Office of Community Development

### Z6 Land Use District Flexibility

- Create flexibility in the development code to allow for more variety of housing types in residential districts. A variety of housing types could include duplexes, townhouses, or smaller housing in general. This allows for housing at a variety of income levels.
  - Moving attached unit types to Type I or Type II (R-5 and R-6 districts) development processes.
  - Reduction of Minimum lot sizes in residential zones.
  - Consider expanding zero lot line development provisions.

**Washington County Dept.**
- Land Use and Transportation
- Housing Authority
- Office of Community Development

**Related Case Studies**

- **Town of Barnstable, MA:** A suburban community’s Inclusionary Zoning Case Study
- **Smart Growth & Conventional Suburban Development:** An infrastructure case study completed for the EPA
### Example Land Use District Flexibility

### Housing Variety

**SIDE-BY-SIDE DUPLEX DESIGN IN THE R-5 ZONE**

A side-by-side duplex is a great example of creating housing variety in the R-5 zone. It meets the minimum lot size requirements and is an efficient use of space to create two dwelling units, a yard space, and off-street parking spots.

### Hurdles to Current Development

This type of development is currently a Type III process in the R-5 zone, which creates more cost for developers. Duplexes are allowed on approved duplex lots, but those were created for existing duplexes during the 1984 Comprehensive Plan update. These lot allowances could be expanded throughout the county or created in specific lots fit for duplexes in R-5 or R-6 land use districts.

### Example Specifications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT SIZE</th>
<th>Width</th>
<th>110 ft.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>130 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Area</td>
<td>6,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Minimum Lot Size</td>
<td>3,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING</td>
<td>Building size</td>
<td>1,024 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>2 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Unit size</td>
<td>612 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SETBACKS</td>
<td>Front</td>
<td>30 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Side</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current Minimum</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARKING</td>
<td>Parking ratio</td>
<td>2 per unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DENSITY</td>
<td>Gross density</td>
<td>10.3 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Current density</td>
<td>5 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Example of a side-by-side duplex**
Source: dutchesscounty.com

![Example of a side-by-side duplex](Image)
Example Land Use District Flexibility
Housing Variety

BUNGALOW COURT EXAMPLE IN R-6

Bungalow Court developments are another dense and more affordable option within the R-6 land use district. Parking is built within the development with a parking ratio of 1.8 per unit.

HURDLES TO CURRENT DEVELOPMENT
This type of development is only allowed in the North Bethany Plan District, limiting it’s potential in other land use districts, such as R-6 or R-9. Permit fees have also hindered developers to build smaller units. However, the ability to build eight smaller units versus one or two could incentivize more development of this type of housing.

EXAMPLE SPECIFICATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOT SIZE</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Width</td>
<td>110 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>160 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>17,600 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Lot Size</td>
<td>3,500 sq. ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>BUILDING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of units</td>
<td>8 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unit size</td>
<td>840 sq.ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SETBACKS</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Front</td>
<td>10 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Side</td>
<td>6 ft.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current Minimum</td>
<td>15 ft.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PARKING</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parking ratio</td>
<td>1.8 per unit</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DENSITY</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gross density</td>
<td>15.8 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current density</td>
<td>6 DU/Acre</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**Z7 Residential-Only Developments in TOD**

Allow residential-only developments in Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) land use districts that currently do not permit this. This could be coupled with requirements for affordable housing through density bonuses, an overlay zone, or a requirement to build smaller unit housing if residential-only is allowed.

Washington County Dept.
Land Use and Transportation
Housing Authority
Office of Community Development

**Z8 Form-Based Zoning Code**

Use form-based zoning for the Washington County land use districts to allow for a broader range of uses and housing types. This could be tested in a pilot study within one of the opportunity areas. To learn more about form-based zoning, see the case study in Appendix C.

Washington County Dept.
Land Use and Transportation
Housing Authority
Office of Community Development

Related Case Studies
The City of Cincinnati Form-Based Code Study
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS - PROCESS IMPROVEMENTS

Developer focus groups and expert interviews highlighted the difficulty of navigating the development application process in Washington County and the additional costs that can result from timeline delays. In order to encourage the development of affordable housing, the recommendations in this section address the stated concerns of developers and seek to mitigate any potential delays in the development process, making it possible for developers to lower their costs and offer housing to lower income populations than would not otherwise have been possible. Many of these recommendations are closely tied to the Education theme, as affordable housing development can be an incredibly complex process.

**P1 Affordable Housing Task Force**

Convene a task force or work group to recommend policies and actions to support affordable housing development. The task force should be comprised of multiple Washington County Departments and could include developers and local leaders. Alternatively, the task force could involve a more formal role for the existing Community Housing Advocates (CHA) group.

**Related Case Studies**

- **Pittsburgh Affordable Housing Task Force**
- **Washington County Dept.**
- **All Relevant Departments**
- **Related Case Studies**
  - Pittsburgh Affordable Housing Task Force

**P2 Streamlined Approval Process**

Jurisdictions can provide fast-track permitting and review process to incentivize projects that include a certain level of affordability or meet other affordable housing criteria.

**Related Case Studies**

- **City of Bend, OR Expedited Review and Permitting Program for Affordable Housing**

**Housing Symbols**

- **AH** Policy increases supply of housing units affordable to households between 0-80% MFI.
- **H** Policy increases diversity in housing stock, residents of all income levels could benefit from a general increase in housing supply.

Note: See Appendix C for All Related Case Study Details.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

P3 Concurrent Review Process Between City and County for Plat Approval

Coordinate with cities in Washington County to implement a system of concurrent review of all plat approval requests from affordable housing developers.

Washington County Dept.
Land Use and Transportation
Housing Authority
Office of Community Development

P4 Point Person for Permitting

Allocate staff time or hire additional staff to help for-profit and non-profit developers navigate the permitting process, types of incentives, and other resources for affordable housing development.

Washington County Dept.
Land Use and Transportation
Housing Authority
Office of Community Development

P5 Point Person for Affordable Housing Assistance

Create a point of contact for individuals navigating the assistance program application process.

Washington County Dept.
Related Case Studies
Housing Authority
Luke-Dorf Housing Navigator
Office of Community Development
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS - FUNDING

Many different federal, local, and private funding sources are needed to develop affordable housing for extremely low and very low income households. Based on our interviews with housing experts and local officials, the following recommendations can be successfully implemented in Washington County. Each of these funding recommendations can help create housing affordable to all income levels in the Opportunity Areas (Figure 9, page 45). Additionally, these recommendations address the lack of homeownership opportunities for low income populations and put forward tools to develop more affordable homes for sale to working families, offering greater choice in housing for residents without significant financial assets and creating more opportunities to build wealth.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>HOUSING SYMBOLS</strong></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AH</td>
<td>AH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Policy increases supply of housing units affordable to households between 0-80% MFI.</td>
<td>Policy increases diversity in housing stock, residents of all income levels could benefit from a general increase in housing supply.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F1 Permit Excise Tax**

A low tax on all county permits (residential, commercial, industrial, etc.) to generate a funding source that could be used to offset development costs (e.g. small grants or SDC payments) for affordable housing development.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington County Dept.</th>
<th>Related Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Transportation Assessment and Taxation</td>
<td>City of Bend Permit Excise Tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>Metro CET Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Board of Commissioners</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**F2 Subsidizing Permit Fees and SDCs**

Use general fund or other funding sources (such as revenues from a permit excise tax) to cover permitting costs for affordable housing developments. Also an option to use permit or construction excise taxes to fund SDC waivers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Washington County Dept.</th>
<th>Related Case Studies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use and Transportation Housing Authority</td>
<td>Metro CET Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office of Community Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: See Appendix C for All Related Case Study Details.
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

F3 Pre-Development Funding/Gap Funding

Funding provided to ease the upfront capital cost burden of affordable housing construction through a Construction Excise Tax, voter-approved levy, or other funding allocation.

Washington County Dept.

Land Use and Transportation Housing Authority*
Office of Community Development*

*In partnership with the Community Housing Fund

Related Case Studies

Portland Housing Bureau’s “Equity Gap Contribution” Program for Affordable-Related Development

F4 Revolving Loan Fund for Equitable Transit-Oriented Development (TOD)

A self-replenishing pool of money that applies interest and principal from existing loans to a fund through which new loans are issued; can layer public, private, and philanthropic investments, with public sector providing “top loss” and commercial lenders providing senior debt.

Washington County Dept.

Land Use and Transportation Housing Authority*
Office of Community Development*

*In partnership with the Community Housing Fund

Related Case Studies

Bay Area Transit Oriented Affordable Housing (TOAH) Fund

F5 Revolving Loan Fund for Rehabilitation

Financing for apartment building rehabilitation, potentially linked to state tax credits for energy efficiency or seismic upgrades; could be tied to affordability restrictions.

Washington County Dept.

Land Use and Transportation Housing Authority
Office of Community Development

In partnership with the Community Housing Fund

Related Case Studies

Louisville Affordable Housing Trust Fund (LAHTF) Revolving Loan Fund

F6 Homebuyer Opportunity Limited Tax Exemption (HOLTE) and Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption (MULTE)

Waives property tax on structural improvements to the home or multiple-unit development for ten years if program requirements are met. Program requirements include income and home price restrictions. Property taxes on the underlying property are still applicable during this time.

Washington County Dept.

Land Use and Transportation Housing Authority
Office of Community Development

In partnership with the Community Housing Fund

Related Case Studies

Homebuyer Opportunity Limited Tax Exemption (HOLTE) Program and Multiple Unit Limited Tax Exemption (MULTE) program in Portland
### Policy Recommendations - Funding

#### F7 Tax Increment Financing (TIF)
- **Description**: Value capture strategy (through future tax increases) that utilizes public financing for development, redevelopment, and other community improvements, which can be channeled into affordable housing.
- **Related Case Studies**:
  - Washington County Dept. Office of Community Development Housing Authority
  - Portland 30% TIF Program

#### F9 Linkage Fees for Affordable Housing
- **Description**: A fee paid by developers to receive incentives provided by the County, which are normally reserved for affordable housing, which would go into a fund to support affordable housing development rather than building affordable housing on site.
- **Related Case Studies**:
  - Washington County Dept. Housing Authority/ Land Use and Transportation
  - City of Seattle Incentive Zoning Program

#### F8 Impact Fees for Affordable Housing
- **Description**: Fees based on an assessment of the extent to which the development of new market-rate housing or commercial development generates additional demand for affordable housing. Requires a nexus study.
- **Related Case Studies**:
  - Washington County Dept. Housing Authority/ Land Use and Transportation
  - City of Boston Developer Impact Fee Program for Neighborhood Housing Trust and Neighborhood Jobs Trust

#### F10 Nonprofit-Owned Housing Tax Exemption
- **Description**: Property tax exemptions for qualifying affordable housing development.
- **Related Case Studies**:
  - Washington County Dept. Housing Authority Land Use and Transportation Assessment and Taxation
  - Currently in place in Beaverton, Hillsboro, Tigard and Portland
F11  Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) Fund Community Land Trust (CLT)

**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

Model demonstrates how a proposed Washington County Agency can provide an affordable homeownership option utilizing Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) funding in partnership with a Community Land Trust (CLT).

Washington County agency identifies a need for a number of housing units. The Oregon Department of Land Conservation and Development assesses the need and approves the Washington County CDFI funded agency to acquire the land to accommodate the number of housing units needed.

CDFI then sells the entire property at a discounted rate to one market rate developer with the condition that 10-20% of the units will be given to a CLT.

The market rate developer builds and finishes the construction of all housing units needed.

10-20% of the completed units, finished and interspersed throughout the development are returned to the Washington County Agency. The County sells these units to a CLT. The CLT owns the land, while the structure is sold at an affordable rate to qualified buyers creating an affordable homeownership option and wealth building mechanism.

*NOTE: Using this approach, development can also accommodate mixed uses, though this model illustrates residential-only development.*

Note: Proud Ground (an existing CLT) has some properties in Washington County.
**Policy Recommendations - Funding Tools Spectrum**

### Supported Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0%</th>
<th>30%</th>
<th>50%</th>
<th>Market Environment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>F1</strong></td>
<td><strong>F2</strong></td>
<td><strong>F3</strong></td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Federal Programs (HOME, CDBG, etc...)</strong></td>
<td><strong>General Fund</strong></td>
<td><strong>Housing Bonds</strong></td>
<td><strong>Market Environment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F4</strong></td>
<td><strong>F5</strong></td>
<td><strong>F6</strong></td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC)</strong></td>
<td><strong>Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Funded Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Public Private Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Regulatory Approaches</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Community Land Trusts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Land Trusts</strong></td>
<td><strong>Non-Profit Funded Projects</strong></td>
<td><strong>Inclusionary Zoning</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Incentive-Based Approaches</strong></td>
<td><strong>Incentive-Based Approaches</strong></td>
<td><strong>Transfer of Development Rights</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F7</strong></td>
<td><strong>F8</strong></td>
<td><strong>F9</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pre-Development Funding/Gap Funding</strong></td>
<td><strong>Impact Fees for Affordable Housing</strong></td>
<td><strong>Linkage Fees for Affordable Housing</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>F10</strong></td>
<td><strong>F11</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonprofit-Owned Housing Tax Exemption</strong></td>
<td><strong>Community Development Financial Institutions (CDFIs) Fund Community Land Trust (CLT)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 9.** Housing Affordability Funding Tools Spectrum with Funding Policy Recommendations
POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS - PARTNERSHIPS AND LAND BANKING

Forming partnerships to create or rehabilitate affordable housing increases resources and reduces risk to create new options for communities in need of affordable housing. The partnership opportunities listed here are designed to create complete communities and to site affordable housing developments close to the amenities that residents need most including good schools, access to public transit, and local parks to enjoy just like all residents. Developing partnerships is one of the best available methods to make certain that affordable housing developments and their residents can succeed in becoming an established and vital part of a community.

L1 Partnerships - Workforce Housing

Partner with major employers to study/determine if there is sufficient housing stock for employees to live reasonably close by. If there is a gap, encourage employer to provide funding for employee housing (all employees, not just high-earning).

Washington County Dept.
- Housing Authority
- Community Housing Fund
- Land Use and Transportation
- Office of Community Development

Related Case Studies
- Employee Home Loan Program
- University of Portland
- Managing Affordable Housing
- Near Transit: Case Studies from Atlanta, Denver, Seattle and Washington, D.C., Minneapolis Green Line Funders Collaborative

Housing Symbols

AH Policy increases supply of housing units affordable to households between 0-80% MFI.

H Policy increases diversity in housing stock, residents of all income levels could benefit from a general increase in housing supply.

Note: See Appendix C for All Related Case Study Details.

L2 Partnerships - Parcel Acquisition

Partner with government agencies or services providers to acquire parcels adjacent to County managed transportation projects.

Washington County Dept.
- Housing Authority
- Community Housing Fund
- Land Use and Transportation
- Office of Community Development
### Policy Recommendations - Partnerships and Land Banking

#### L3 Partnerships - TriMet Redevelopment Options

Partner with TriMet to redevelop underutilized lots (i.e. add housing above existing open air park and ride lots) for affordable housing development.

**Washington County Dept.**

**Related Case Studies**

- Preserving Affordable Housing Near Transit: Case Studies from Atlanta, Denver, Seattle and Washington, D.C., Minneapolis Green Line
- Funders Collaborative

#### L4 Public Acquisition of Existing Rental Buildings

Purchase existing apartment buildings and work with a non-profit affordable housing developer to manage them, with tiered rental restrictions and "strings attached" improvement funds. Funding for this effort could be procured via grants like Metro’s Equitable Housing Planning and Development Grant.

**Washington County Dept.**

**Related Case Studies**

- San Francisco Mayor’s Office Small Sites Program

*Possibly in partnership with the Community Housing Fund

#### L5 Partnerships - TriMet Transit Oriented Development

Partner with TriMet and other transit oriented development partners, specifically for the Southwest Service Expansion to incorporate affordable housing units and mixed retail, and acquire land to preserve existing affordable housing along new routes.

**Washington County Dept.**

**Related Case Studies**

- Case Studies from L2

#### L6 Public Land for Affordable Housing

Local governments or other public agencies (transit agencies, school districts, and utilities) may make surplus public land available for affordable housing development. Revise the existing County property disposal process to prioritize affordable housing development on properties that allow residential development (including mixed-use development, rather than just on residential-use only properties). Explore options to increase involvement from affordable housing nonprofit developers in this process.

**Washington County Dept.**

**Related Case Studies**

- The ULI Public Land & Affordable Housing Report
FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

L7 Affordability Restrictions Linked to Retrofit/Rehab Funds

- Incorporate affordability requirements into the eligibility terms of retrofit/rehabilitation funds.

Washington County Dept. Related Case Studies

- Housing Authority
- *Housing Services
- *Office of Community Development

Related Case Studies

- Arlington County, VA Affordable Housing Authority
- *Housing Services Office of Community Development (AHIF)

*Possibly in partnership with the Community Housing Fund

---

Figure 10. Employee Home Loan Program University of Portland

Through the Employee Home Loan Program the University of Portland aims to assist employees in their first home purchase in North Portland neighborhoods. The program is meant to help recruit and retain employees, as well as assist them in creating healthier lifestyles.

Home Loan assistance is limited to one home purchase per employee and the loan cannot be transferred to a new property.

Program Purpose and Goals

- Help recruit and retain employees.
- Assist employees in acquiring a home in north Portland neighborhoods.
- Strengthen neighborhoods and stimulate economic growth and stability in the north peninsula area.
- Assist in meeting state and city clean air mandates to decrease commuting and parking on campus and encourage alternate transportation options.
- Assist in meeting University Transportation Demand Management Plan (TDMP) goals for improved air quality, reduced parking requirements and healthier lifestyles for employees.
- Positively reinforce the University’s commitment to sustainable environmental practices and efforts to reduce our carbon footprint.
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Opportunity Areas

Opportunity areas were selected based on the presence of community resources and amenities that provide ideal locations to focus additional affordable housing development within unincorporated Washington County. According to Reconnecting America,

“Our communities need basic elements to support economic opportunity and health for all people, regardless of income level, cultural background or political persuasion. ... These elements include a quality education, access to good jobs, an affordable roof over our heads, access to affordable healthy food and health services, the ability to enjoy artistic, spiritual and cultural amenities, access to recreation and parks, meaningful civic engagement, and affordable transportation choices that get us where we need to go.” (www.reconnectingamerica.org)

The opportunity areas represent specific geographic locations, within which affordable development initiatives in Washington County should be prioritized.

To characterize the unique features within each of the opportunity areas as defined on page 20, the following sections present three sets of information within each area:

1. Overview of existing resources;
2. Current land use designations with targeted land use recommendations to increase supply of housing affordable to lower-income households; and
3. Analysis of redevelopment and infill development potential.

The maps in each section illustrate the geographic presence of such features within each area and, where noted, could serve as a roadmap to locate future affordable development units.

The current land use designations and proposed land use district adjustments have been included to highlight opportunities where the land use recommendations identified in the Policy Recommendations could be implemented to increase the amount of housing affordable to lower-income households.

In order to keep residents of affordable housing in high opportunity areas and maximize the land use potential of existing developed areas, redevelopment and infill should be considered to create new affordable housing units. Using GIS analysis of the BLI, building values were divided by total land value to create a Land Value Index of redevelopment potential. A Land Value Index of less than 0.75 indicates that a parcel has a building that is worth much less than the land, and these parcels may be attractive for redevelopment.
Map 3.

Opportunity Areas

- Aloha
- Bethany
- Cedar Mill/West Haven - Sylvan
- Metzger/Garden Home - Whitford
- South County Industrial Area

Legend:
- Opportunity Areas
- Urban Growth Boundary
- Washington County
EXISTING CONDITIONS

OPPORTUNITY AREA 1: ALOHA

Total geographic area: 3,485 acres

Located in the north central area of urban Washington County, the Aloha CDP is the largest of the opportunity areas, comprising a total of 3,485 acres.

Aloha is a very resource-rich area, making it a potentially good location for additional housing supply. Aloha contains over 20 schools serving a range of age groups and is well-served by transit, being bound to the north by the MAX Blue Line and bisected by three bus lines, the 52, 57 and 88 (Map 5.) Although there are no hospitals or community centers, Aloha contains at least 8 grocery stores, though many are clustered along busy Tualatin Valley Highway. Another distinguishing feature of this area is its relative abundance of affordable housing compared to the other focus areas.

Aloha contains 1,647 units of regulated affordable housing units, more than all the other focus areas combined. Existing affordable units range from multi-family complexes to detached single-family housing units dispersed across the area. Aloha contains two Qualified Census Tracts (317.05 and 316.13) and the poverty rate is 12.5%, the highest poverty rate of the five opportunity areas. Aloha also has the highest populations of households that rent (38% in 2014).

1 Data from the 2015 Metro Affordable Housing Inventory database.
With current land use designations, Aloha could meet 4% of the total demand for affordable housing in Washington County (14,000 units as identified by the 2015-2020 Consolidated Plan).

Data Sources: Metro RLIS, Metro 2015 regional Affordable Housing Inventory database, TriMet (provided by Tom Mills) and geocoding based on internet search (grocery stores).
ALOHA LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS

There are five areas within Aloha which could be useful for pilot or test projects to employ land use designation adjustments and/or overlay zones. The recommendations below are presented in no particular order and are intended to serve as options for Washington County to consider as part of a concerted effort to develop more affordable housing.

- The areas targeted for proposed land use district adjustments can be loosely subdivided into two categories: 1) clusters of multiple transit-oriented land use districts, and 2) clusters of high density and mixed use land use districts.

- Under current land use designations, the area along Tualatin Valley Highway and in the southeast portion of Aloha include a patchwork of commercial business districts, R25+, R-24, office commercial and neighborhood commercial uses. Due to the clustering of multiple designations with similarly high densities, this is a prime area to implement an overlay zone with form-based code (Policy Recommendation Z8). This could allow for a greater variety of uses, namely greater opportunity for housing, interspersed with commercial, office and retail use.

- The three sections of transit-oriented designations in the north provide an opportunity to implement a transit-oriented overlay in which housing could be emphasized by allowing low, mid and high-rise apartments as Type I uses where they are currently allowed as Type II uses.

- In addition to the specific areas identified for land use district adjustments in Map 6, a density overlay could be considered in the low density R-5 areas which border higher density R-15 or R-24 uses. Implementing a density overlay in these areas could serve as a buffer to gradually transition between density gradients, therefore allowing for a more fluid and gradual shift in urban form within the community.

- Density overlays like those described above could include voluntary incentives for developments that include housing affordable to lower-income households (e.g. 50-80% MFI), to encourage affordable housing in those areas.

ALOHA REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Another important option to increase the housing supply is redevelopment and infill within existing built-out areas. Significant redevelopment potential exists within the proposed land use district adjustment areas, and about 26% of the lots in Aloha are below 0.74 in Land Value Index.
Proposed Land Use District Adjustment

Current Land Use Districts

IND
INST
CBD
NC
OC
GC
R-25+
R-24
R-15
R-9
R-6
R-5
TO:BUS
TO:R18-24
TO:R24-40
TO:R9-12
EXISTING CONDITIONS

OPPORTUNITY AREA 2: BETHANY

Total Geographic Area: 2,006 acres

Bethany has the second highest number of households at 7,529 and has the largest acreage of open space and parks (385 acres). Bethany has one of the highest median family incomes ($122,865) in the County and one of the lower poverty rates (4.10%).

Bethany Quickfacts

Demographics
Number of Households: 7,529
Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units: 340
Median Family Income: $122,865
Poverty Rate: 4.1%
Percent of Population Renting: 17%
Media Rent: $1,240
Median Monthly Housing Costs: $1,709

Resources/Amenities
Schools: 6
Community Center: 1
Grocery Stores: 1
Hospitals: 1
Transit: 3 Bus Lines (47, 67 and 52)
Acres of Parks/Open Space: 385

Map 8.

Data Sources: Metro RLIS, Metro 2015 regional Affordable Housing Inventory database, TriMet (provided by Tom Mills) and geocoding based on internet search (grocery stores).
BETHANY LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS

Currently, the zoning in Bethany is predominantly single-family oriented with roughly 50% of the area devoted to R-5 and R-6 land use districts. The cluster of high density residential, commercial business district and neighborhood commercial uses along Bethany Boulevard presents an opportunity to implement a high-density form-based code overlay. Additionally, increasing density in single-family land use districts could help create more housing supply.

• The geographic center of the focus area contains four distinct land use designations (Map 9). Implementing a form-based overlay zone in this area could allow for a greater mix of uses and increased granularity at ground level, thus encouraging a richer pedestrian and vehicular experience.

• If this area transitioned to a form based code, there could be greater opportunity for multifamily housing to commingle with single family and commercial uses.

• There is only a small portion of land devoted to R-5 land use, which presents an opportunity to implement a “low hanging fruit” approach to increase density and stimulate additional housing development. This area could be adjusted to R-6 or could serve as a test project to implement a density overlay for conditional uses such as ADUs or tiny homes.

• Although there is substantial housing stock located throughout the area, density overlays or “up-zoning” in lower density land use districts could make it easier for homeowners to add ADUs or to redevelop their properties to accommodate dwelling units at higher densities.

FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

BETHANY REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Redevelopment potential is lower in Bethany than in the other identified opportunity areas. Most of the developed lots have high building values and, only about 9% of the lots falling below 0.74 in Land Value Index.
Bethany Land Use Recommendations

RELATED POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

Map 9.

Proposed Land Use District Adjustment

Current Land Use Districts

- INST NB
- INST
- CBD
- NCC NB
- NCMU NB
- OC
- R-25+ NB
- R-24 NB
- R-24
- R-15 NB
- R-15
- R-9 NB
- R-9
- R-6 NB
- R-6
- R-5
- R-5
EXISTING CONDITIONS

OPPORTUNITY AREA 3:
CEDAR MILL-WEST HAVEN/SYLVAN

Total geographic area: 1,303 acres

CEDAR MILL

Cedar Mill has the second highest median family income ($125,469) and poverty rate (7.10%) next to the South County Industrial Area and Metzger respectively. Cedar Mill offers a variety of services, amenities and is served moderately well by transit. TriMet’s 2013 West Service Enhancement Plan calls for increased frequency on bus lines 20 and 62.

WEST HAVEN/SYLVAN

West Haven-Sylvan’s 3,712 households have one of the higher median family incomes and the lowest poverty rate at 2.40%. This area is rich with amenities including St. Vincent’s hospital and seven different schools providing K-12 and University-level education.

Cedar Mill Quickfacts

Demographics
- Number of Households: 5,932
- Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units: 608
- Median Family Income: $125,469
- Poverty Rate: 7.1%
- Percent of Population Renting: 16%
- Median Rent: $925
- Median Monthly Housing Costs: $1,580

Resources/Amenities
- Schools: 6
- Grocery Stores: 2
- Community Center: 0
- Hospitals: 0
- Transit: 3 Bus Lines (50, 48 and 62)
- Acres of Parks/Open Space: 118

Cedar Mill/Sylvan Opportunity Areas

- Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units
- Community Centers
- Grocery Stores
- Schools
- Hospitals
- Bus Line
- Proposed Bus Service Expansion

Map 11.

Data Sources: Metro RLIS, Metro 2015 regional Affordable Housing Inventory database, TriMet (provided by Tom Mills) and geocoding based on internet search (grocery stores).
CEDAR MILL-WEST HAVEN/SYLVAN
LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS

Although Cedar Mill and West Haven-Sylvan have been grouped geographically as one opportunity area, it is important to consider the individual character of the two communities when determining which land use designation adjustments are most appropriate.

- A distinguishing feature in both Cedar Mill and West Haven-Sylvan are the presence of clustered (three or more) transit-oriented (TO) designations.

- The areas targeted for land use district adjustments in Map 12 could include a transit-oriented overlay to allow for residential-only development, a use currently excluded from TO: RC land use districts. Additionally, residential uses (including low, mid and high-rise apartments) could be allowed as Type I uses where they are currently allowed as Type II uses.

- Small unit developments could be added to the Type I residential uses in transit-oriented land use districts to accommodate smaller households who may desire less square footage (seniors, millennials and others). This approach could succeed if implemented as part of the partnership strategy to utilize small lots adjacent to TriMet transit infrastructure (Policy Recommendations L2, L3 and L5).

- These adjustments could help increase housing in highly desirable areas located near transit, a high priority for residents seeking affordable housing options who lack access to a vehicle.

- As with the approach recommended for Bethany, a transitional density overlay in low-density areas adjacent to higher density areas should be applied, particularly where there is a “jump” in densities (i.e. a R-5 area adjacent to a R-9 or R-15 area). This could also be a useful strategy to employ along the bus lines (See Map 11) in order to co-locate housing and transit.

- As described in the Aloha section, these density overlays could include voluntary incentives for developments that include housing affordable to lower-income households (e.g. 50-80%MFI) to encourage affordable housing in those areas.

West Haven/Sylvan Quickfacts

Demographics
Number of Households: 3,712
Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units: 0
Median Family Income: $97,179
Poverty Rate: 2.4%
Percent of Population Renting: 35%
Median Rent: $1,146
Median Monthly Housing Costs: $1,323

Resources/Amenities
Schools: 7
Community Center: 1
Grocery Stores: 1
Hospitals: 1
Transit: 2 MAX Lines (Blue and Red), 2 Bus Lines (50 and 20)
Acres of Parks/Open Space: 133 Acres

CEDAR MILL-WEST HAVEN/SYLVAN REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL

Cedar Mill has a diverse mix of new and older developments. Redevelopment potential exists within the proposed zoning changes. Approximately 33% of the lots falling below 0.74 in Land Value Index.
OPPORTUNITY AREA 4: METZGER/GARDEN HOME-WHITFORD

Map 13.

Total geographic area: 1,237 acres

The Metzger portion of the opportunity area includes the portion south of Olson Road (Map 14), and has the fewest number of households (1,637) and the second highest poverty rate at 10.20%. This area currently has 127 existing affordable housing units and one grocery store.

Garden Home-Whitford constitutes the portion of the opportunity area north of Olson Road with some spillover southeast of Olson Road and is slightly larger than Metzger with 2,791 households, and 7.90% of people living in poverty. Garden Home has few amenities, but moderate transportation service.

TriMet’s Southwest Service Enhancement plan has several transit service improvements planned for this entire opportunity area. Improvements include increased trips for bus lines 1 and 45, extending service for line 56, and adding a new bus line service to Metzger and Allen Boulevard (Line 78) and new frequent service along Hall/Greenburg to better serve job centers such as Washington Square, downtown Beaverton and Tigard.

Metzger Quickfacts

Demographics
- Number of Households: 1,637
- Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units: 127
- Median Family Income: $75,642
- Poverty Rate: 10.2%
- Percent of Population Renting: 36%
- Median Rent: $999
- Median Monthly Housing Costs: $1,338

Resources/Amenities
- Schools: 2
- Grocery Stores: 1
- Community Center: 0
- Hospitals: 0
- Transit: 2 Bus Lines (43 and 45)
- Acres of Parks/Open Space: 13

Map 14.

**Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units**
- ● 1-25
- ● 25-50
- ● 50-250
- ● 250-500
- ● 500+
- ○ Grocery Stores
- ○ Schools
- ⬅️ Light Rail (MAX) Line
- ← Bus Line
- ⇀️ Proposed Bus Service Expansion

**Data Sources:** Metro RLIS, Metro 2015 regional Affordable Housing Inventory database, TriMet (provided by Tom Mills) and geocoding based on internet search (grocery stores).
**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**METZGER/GARDEN HOME-WHITFORD LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS**

The Metzger/ Garden Home-Whitford area is characterized by primarily low-density (R-5) land use with clusters of institutional, high-density, transit oriented and neighborhood and office commercial uses located within a small geography.

- There are three areas of R-15 and two areas of R-24 situated adjacent to the R-5 use in the northwest portion of the opportunity area. As recommended for portions of Bethany and the Cedar Mill/West Haven-Sylvan areas, this area could provide an opportunity to include a transitional density overlay to buffer lower density from higher density areas. Again, the potential to use density as an incentive to affordable housing developments for lower-income (e.g. 50%-80% MFI) households could be implemented here.

- Due to the presence of older housing stock in Metzger and Garden Home-Whitford (average building age is 47 years\(^1\)), small unit developments such as Tiny Homes as part of the Type I or II process in low density (R-5) land use districts should be allowed.

\(^1\) RLIS Taxlot data

• The TO: RC land use district could benefit from an overlay or land use district adjustment to accommodate residential-only development.

• In the area with multiple high density, commercial and transit-oriented uses in the southwest portion of the opportunity area, a transit overlay could allow for small unit developments as described in the Cedar Mill/ West Haven-Sylvan example.

### Garden Home-Whitford Quickfacts

#### Demographics
- Number of Households: 2,791
- Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units: 0
- Median Family Income: $81,494
- Poverty Rate: 7.9%
- Percent of Population Renting: 29%
- Median Rent: $1,082
- Median Monthly Housing Costs: $1,184

#### Resources/Amenities
- Schools: 3
- Community Center: 0
- Grocery Stores: 0
- Hospitals: 0
- Transit: 4 Bus Lines (56, 43, 45 and 92)
- Acres of Parks/Open Space: 67

*Source: Metro RLIS, U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2014 5-Year Estimates and internet search (for grocery stores).*
**RELATED POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS**

- There are planned service enhancements for the existing transit lines along Olson Road and Hall Boulevard (Map 14). The transit-oriented land use designations should be expanded northeast along Olson Road and south along Hall Boulevard to capture additional affordable housing uses in these areas and, where expanded, should enable more housing along transit by allowing residential-only use.

**METZGER/GARDEN HOME REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**

This area is primarily composed of older housing stock and has the second highest redevelopment potential with 67% of the lots below 0.74 in Land Value Index. Redevelopment potential exists within the proposed land use district adjustment areas.
The South County Industrial Area has the most vacant space and the fewest amenities. There are 2,600 households living in this area with 2.49% below the poverty line. This area is currently planned to accommodate employment development and therefore would also benefit from residential development to provide workforce housing options.

TriMet’s 2015 Southwest Service Enhancement Plan includes a new bus line to enhance transit service in this area. The planned line will connect Tigard Transit Center, Downtown Tigard, Downtown King City, the Tualatin Industrial Area, and the future Basalt Creek neighborhood via Tigard Transit Center, Commercial, Main, Pacific Highway, 124th Avenue, and roadways to be developed in the future Basalt Creek area.

**South County Industrial Area Quickfacts**

**Demographics**
- Number of Households: 2,600
- Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units: 0
- Median Family Income: $127,172
- Poverty Rate: 2.5%
- Percent of Population Renting: 18%
- Median Rent: $1,367
- Median Monthly Housing Costs: Data Not Available

**Resources/Amenities**
- Schools (Including within 500ft Buffer): 0
- Community Center: 0
- Grocery Stores: 0
- Hospitals: 0
- Transit: 1 MAX (WES - Westside Express Service)
- Acres of Parks/Open Space: 0

*Source: Metro RLIS, U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2014 5-Year Estimates and internet search (for grocery stores).*

1 South County Industrial Area is the only focus area which does not correspond to a Census Designated Place (CDP) and therefore the demographic data is compiled from the cumulative census block groups within the area.
South County Industrial Area Opportunity Areas

Map 17.

Proposed Bus Service Expansion

- Bus Line
- Light Rail (WES) Line

Data Sources: Metro RLIS, Metro 2015 regional Affordable Housing Inventory database, TriMet (provided by Tom Mills) and geocoding based on internet search (grocery stores).
**FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS**

**SOUTH COUNTY INDUSTRIAL AREA LAND USE RECOMMENDATIONS**

Currently, the entirety of the South County Industrial Area is devoted to future development uses of moderate to high density. Recent planning initiatives have resulted in impending land use changes in this portion of the county. Most of the southeast portion of the opportunity area is captured in the Basalt Creek Concept Plan proposed by the cities of Wilsonville and Tualatin and the southeast portion of the opportunity area is targeted for the Coffee Creek Urban Renewal District proposed by Wilsonville (Map 18). The Basalt Creek Concept Plan would include annexation of this area by the cities of Tualatin and Wilsonville. The Basalt Creek Concept Plan outlines a proposal for the area which includes pockets of residential neighborhood, neighborhood commercial, light industrial, employment areas and more as outlined in the complete concept plan (See more at http://www.basaltcreek.com). Washington County has a unique opportunity for involvement in this area given the formative planning currently taking place, and our primary recommendation is that Washington County begin land banking for affordable housing in the South County Industrial Area.

The area of proposed land use district adjustments highlighted in Map 18 provides a geography within which to concentrate land acquisition for affordable housing initiatives. The northwestern portion of the Basalt Creek plan area is currently anticipated to contain residential neighborhoods and would work well for Washington County to expand residential opportunities to the northwest by implementing land use district adjustments for single and multi-family uses. Single family, lower density use could be allowed on the periphery of the proposed adjustment area, with higher densities, or perhaps a small community business district located towards the center. As illustrated in Map 17, planned transit expansion provides a corridor along which to procure landholdings for future transit oriented and mixed use development. Given the early development phases and proposed employment uses in this portion of the county, a “complete community” concept should be prioritized here. Housing should be developed in conjunction with other community areas and this can be achieved through strategic planning of targeted employment housing as well as a range of housing options in general. This will ensure that as the area develops and more individuals come to the area for work, they will also be able to engage as stable residential members of the community.

**SOUTH COUNTY INDUSTRIAL AREA REDEVELOPMENT POTENTIAL**

This area has the highest redevelopment and development potential of all five opportunity areas, with roughly 82% of the lots below 0.74 in Land Value Index.
South County Industrial Area Land Use Recommendations

RELATED POLICY RECOMMENDATIONS

L3 L6 L7

Proposed Land Use District Adjustment

Current Land Use Districts

- Basalt Creek Plan Area
- Proposed Coffee Creek Urban Renewal District
- FD-10
- FD-20

Map 18.
## FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

### Table 4.
**Opportunity Areas: Quick Facts Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Acreage</th>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Resources/Amenities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Aloha</td>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>Cedar Mill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Acreage</strong></td>
<td>3,485</td>
<td>2,006</td>
<td>1,303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Demographics</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Households</td>
<td>17,239</td>
<td>7,529</td>
<td>5,932</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Regulated Affordable Housing Units</td>
<td>1,647</td>
<td>340</td>
<td>608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Family Income</td>
<td>$66,010</td>
<td>$122,865</td>
<td>$125,649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty Rate</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Population Renting</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Rent</td>
<td>$1,113</td>
<td>$1,240</td>
<td>$925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median Monthly Housing Costs</td>
<td>$1,315</td>
<td>$1,709</td>
<td>$1,580</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Resources/Amenities</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery Stores</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospitals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: Max</td>
<td>1 (blue)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transit: Bus Lines</td>
<td>3 (88/57/52)</td>
<td>3 (47/67/52)</td>
<td>3 (50/48/62)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acres of Parks/Open Space</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>385</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Metro RLIS, U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2014 5-Year Estimates and internet search (for grocery stores).*

*South County Industrial Area is the only focus area which does not correspond to a Census Designated Place (CDP) and therefore the demographic data is compiled from the cumulative census block groups within the area.*
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Public Involvement

Overview
This planning effort included a robust public involvement program. The guiding pillar for community engagement is the need to obtain multiple perspectives within the community, including subject matter experts, residents of affordable housing or those on the wait list and members of the broader Washington County community. The engagement strategy was divided into five parts:

- Developer Focus Groups
- Resident Focus Groups
- Community Engagement
- Housing Preference Survey
- Stakeholder Expert Interviews
- Elected Officials
Developer Focus Groups

Open Doors Housing Solutions (ODHS) discussed affordable housing issues with many developers throughout the project. Developer outreach consisted of two Focus Groups with six market-rate and non-profit developers attending each. ODHS also interviewed a number of developers directly to better understand the specific interests and concerns that developers have regarding development of affordable housing in Washington County.

The Developer Focus Group discussions included the following topics:

1. Site criteria that is most important for land acquisition and site selection for development of affordable housing in Washington County.

2. Development code barriers that prevent the development of affordable housing in unincorporated, urban Washington County.

3. Incentives, beyond just financial, that would prove most innovative and effective in promoting the development of affordable housing in Washington County.

4. Partnerships and service levels that would be most valuable to developers, when considering working on an affordable development project.

Land Acquisition

Developers express interest in having a list of publicly owned, developable land. They suggest the County create a surplus land program that would allocate County-owned lots or other tax exempt lots to ensure they are developed with affordable housing. Site control is a major barrier, especially to non-profit developers. In cases where Washington County has the opportunity to acquire vacant and redevelopable lots, the County may make the land available to developers of affordable housing after the land has been appropriately zoned. This may make projects more feasible, as the expense of holding the land while waiting for zone changes can prevent a project from ever getting started. Developers are also concerned about the time and expense of rezoning or using conditional zoning in the County.
Site Criteria

Developers repeatedly mentioned the issue of infrastructure. The more service ready a site can be, the better. The biggest constraint on development in Washington County is not the Urban Growth Boundary, but the lack of infrastructure. Proximity to transit, medical services, basic amenities and schools surfaced as some of the most important factors in choosing development sites for affordable housing. In fact, to successfully compete for 9% LIHTC funding, the most common source currently used for the development of affordable housing to households at and below 60% MFI, development must be located in areas with transit opportunity, high walk scores and in Qualified Census Tracts.

Parking requirements are a major burden when developers are heavily constrained by the high cost of development and limited funding options (See pages 28-29). Washington County’s parking requirements are currently under review, but all of the developers, with the exception of Habitat for Humanity, consider the County’s high parking requirements a constraint for development of affordable housing and development in general.

The most desirable parcel size for development of affordable housing varies among developers. Washington County should consider that there is demand for a variety of property sizes when allocating land for affordable housing options. Most developers are looking for lots between two and six acres, including REACH Community Development Corporation and Community Partners for Affordable Housing. Pedcor Companies, a large national developer prefers larger parcels of ten or more acres. There is also interest in properties as small as ½ acre. Both Habitat for Humanity and Proud Ground expressed interest in affordable homeownership development options on smaller parcels.

Barriers and Incentives

Some of the major barriers the developers face in the development of affordable housing in Washington County include time, political will, outdated code and the application process.

Developers indicate that the permit process takes nearly twice as long in Washington County than in Multnomah and Clark Counties. Delays can significantly increase project timelines, adding as much as 1-2 years (especially for regulated affordable housing development, which is constrained by annual funding cycles). Coordinating the timelines of permitting at the local level with state and national funding cycles is challenging and often the necessary deadlines do not align. An expedited process at the County level would signal to developers that Washington County is capable and interested in supporting affordable housing development. Developers also recommended streamlining the application process for HOME, CDBG, and other County funding sources to better align with state priorities. Developers want to have a point person within Washington County's staff to oversee the entire permitting process, with electeds and local leaders to champion the process.

Developers are skeptical that there is political will for the development of affordable housing in Washington County. There has been a perception of uncertainty in the County, and the developers would like reliable County support for affordable development, especially in cases where developers face NIMBY (Not In My Back Yard) resistance to affordable housing. The developers we spoke with recommend the County provide a fast track for affordable housing to help meet the significant need for housing affordable to lower-income households in the region.
Implementing policy to prioritize creation of affordable housing is necessary to incentivize its development within Washington County. Specific policies the developers would like the County to implement include: tax exemptions, tax abatements, system development charge (SDCs) reductions (especially for TODs), density transfers, inclusionary zoning and Community Benefit Agreements.

Developers recommended that the County hold informational networking events to promote the County’s interests in supporting development of affordable housing. Developers would also like the County to better (or more broadly) advertise Request for Qualifications and Request for Proposals opportunities.

Developers have experienced difficulties with projects in Washington County as a result of the outdated code, not only around parking requirements but also regarding landscaping requirements and allowance for transit-oriented and mixed-use development. They would like the code be updated to reflect the communities’ need and allow for greater flexibility based on the context of the site and proposed development.

Another major concern is the need to maintain a complex schedule of applications for funding with a variety of agencies, and the lack of consistency between the application criteria and schedule of Washington County funding sources and State criteria and schedules.
Primary Themes from the Developer Focus Groups

**Education**
Developers recommend the Washington County Staff point person receive training in real estate and economic development to be able to better understand and respond to developer questions and concerns. The point person should serve to provide expertise to developers regarding specific issues relevant to Washington County. Developers are also interested in having a simple list of incentives that Washington County provides available to reference. Other elements of education that are requested include informational networking events, better advertised RFP/RFQ opportunities and a list of developable, publicly-owned land.

**Partnerships/Collaboration**
Building relationships across sectors is an important way in which the County can support the development of affordable housing including employer assisted housing, advocating for partnerships with service providers, land banking opportunities and community benefit agreements.

Developers identified many opportunities for partnerships and collaborative efforts that could promote affordable housing development in Washington County. Employer assisted housing is an option to supplement workforce housing in the County with local employers providing some kind of housing development incentives or employee assistance to support their lower income staff and promote the option to live nearer to work. (Figure 10, page 48) The opportunity to partner with TriMet or Metro to develop otherwise underutilized properties would create another opportunity to provide sites for affordable housing. Coordinate with school district and faith-based institutions for land banking and acquisition opportunities, as these entities often have excess land and value social contributions to helping those in need of affordable housing. School districts could also set aside land to provide housing options for teachers. Beaverton has done some land banking through partnerships on a case-by-case basis and could provide a starting framework for Washington County. The County could play a role in supporting partnerships between developers and service providers to meet the needs of residents and the surrounding community. Community Benefit Agreements have proven to be successful programs to integrate affordable housing in a manner that benefits everyone in the community.

**Funding**
A tax exemption program is strongly recommended. Implementing a program that would include tiered affordable unit requirements would provide an equitable distribution of affordable housing while allowing developers cost effective options to build.

Successfully competing for 9% LIHTC requires that development be located in high opportunity areas without concentrating poverty. Non-profits must struggle to align timing of funding applications and awards for local and state funding. One major concern of determining how long to hold land before funding will be secured. Most regulated affordable development includes multiple funding sources, which must be applied for and awarded individually. These constraints and funding timelines mean that non-profit development often takes much longer than market-rate development that only relies on one or two funding sources that are not competitively awarded.
It may reduce administrative burdens if applications for existing and/or future County funding to support affordable housing used similar applications/application criteria as State funding sources. Developers also noted that local, State, and Federal programs aimed at serving populations that require supportive services often do not include funding for those services. Developers recommend that County programs that support affordable housing also include funding for supportive services for residents.

The County should provide developers with information about available affordable housing funds to help streamline the process. Developers also requested greater SDC reductions, especially for Transit Oriented Developments. Tax abatements are another option that would serve to alleviate some of the extensive cost barriers that developers face when developing affordable housing.

**Flexibility/Adaptability**

Developers expressed a need for greater flexibility and adaptability in order to develop a sufficient supply of housing to meet the needs of Washington County residents. There are challenges with zoning and code that prevent developers from acting swiftly. More flexible community development code could help developers create new housing more quickly. Form based zoning can allow for greater flexibility in use, while maintaining important design standards. Form based code may easily be applied to street improvements and tree code.

Reducing code restrictions in general may promote expedited development. In combination with an educated and knowledgeable Washington County Staff Point Person, flexible code could reduce development delays and increase the supply of quality housing.

Parking requirements should include flexibility and focus on type of development and population served. Parking requirements could be adjusted to meet specific community needs, for example, allowing lower parking ratios for senior housing.

Allowing flexibility is a major theme among developers. They would like jurisdictions to explicitly state what is wanted and what type and be flexible in all the details. Ultimately allowing for flexibility with standards. Allow for developers to balance certain requirements and standards such as parking, landscaping and balconies with consideration to the proximity of proposed development to existing amenities. Allow mixed use zoning and provide opportunities for additional residential density as the market demands with form based zoning. Do not require expensive design elements, such as decks, when a large common shared space is readily available, and perhaps more desirable within the community.

**Complete Communities**

Developers recognize that not all residents are interested in the same options in their housing unit or neighborhood. Create access to services dependent on who is being served (i.e. elderly - health services, families – schools, workforce housing – transit). Allow a wider range of housing types to increase affordability. (See page 93 for more about Baby Boomers and housing choice.)
To address the question “Who is not being served?,” focus groups were organized with current residents of affordable housing developments to discuss their needs and how these needs were or were not being met by existing affordable housing developments and programs. The discussion with participants targeted several issues: first, to understand their preferences for the physical developments in which they live.

The most important theme to emerge from the resident focus groups was Choice: residents wanted to have a choice of where to live and what type of community to join. Because of the severe shortage of housing options affordable to low-income populations in Washington County, many residents expressed that they felt they had to take the first option available for affordable housing just to avoid becoming homeless. The practical effect of this is that families and individuals may be living in units that exacerbate the physical and mental challenges they face, whether from the noise of a highway or the noise of children in neighboring apartments.
Resident Focus Group Summary

Residents from different developments expressed very different desires regarding community composition, with some residents enjoying a mixed-age development and others finding that this type of development aggravated anxiety and other mental health challenges. This perspective should be considered by developers as they plan new developments—community gardens and other active spaces were widely celebrated, but should be designed to meet the needs of expected residents. For example, a senior complex could include a quiet space, while a development serving families may include a playground. Regardless of family structure, most participants identified a need for one or two-bedroom units, but the reasons were variable. Some residents did express a desire for two-bedroom units because of occasional visitors or in-home nurses.

Transportation was another area where choice was paramount. While many residents have a car and expressed that they were not likely to forego this in the near future, they also often utilize public transit and indicated that this was a preferred mode of transportation because of the lower cost. Other residents commented that public transit, whether bus services or light rail, allowed them to travel to and from work and that it was critical for their livelihood. Additionally, almost all residents were happy to have somewhere, whether a park or other open space, library or community center, to which they could easily walk.

After rent, utilities was the most difficult monthly payment to meet for most residents. At Orchards at Orenco, the energy-efficient Passive House design, results in low utility bills for households in the Orchards; these residents identified other needs, such as medical payments for current and previous conditions, as being some of their most difficult to meet expenses. ‘Medical and Social Services’ was identified as one of the most important neighborhood amenities for these residents, but they spoke of challenges in accessing certain services because of their level of income and health insurance coverage. As a result of these factors, many residents needed to travel to medical and social services they could access, but were willing to do so to maintain continuity of care.

Parks and open spaces, as well as good schools, were identified by many residents as important anchors for the community. Many of the focus group participants had moved 3-4 times in the past five years, making it very important for them to find neighborhood features that could provide additional stability for the community and opportunities for them to get involved with the larger community. Participants discussed how involved they were with their children’s or grandchildren’s education, or the community groups with which they volunteered. This stability was incredibly important to residents of all ages, and may have a significant impact on health and educational outcomes.
Community Engagement

Community engagement included additional outreach in Cedar Mill/West Haven-Sylvan, Garden Home-Whitford and Metzger. The team decided to focus on targeted outreach in Cedar Mill and Metzger for several reasons; first, these communities did not have recent community outreach around affordability like other opportunity areas in the vicinity, namely Aloha. Cedar Mill was identified as having particularly well established community resources including moderate transit service, ample open space and multiple schools, therefore it was assumed to be a reasonable potential area to focus housing affordability initiatives. Metzger was selected because it has some of the lowest vacancy rates out of all of the opportunity areas; the team knew early on that a likely strategy for this area would be to recommend that the County procure landholdings quickly to prevent further land losses and establish a footprint for affordable units in the area.

The community engagement included the following events:

- Sunset Parent Teacher Organization
- Sunset Latino Parent Night
- Metzger Parent Support Organization
- Metzger Latino Parent Night
- Cedar Mill Futurepalooza

Parent Support Organization/ Parent Teacher Organization Presentations

Parent Support and Parent Teacher Organization meetings are an established framework in Washington County public schools, within which information could be effectively presented and community feedback received. The goal of these events was to better understand the perspectives of residents of opportunity areas, specifically attitudes toward affordable housing developments and their residents. ODHS representatives attended the Parent Teacher Organization meeting at Sunset High School on April 11th and the Parent Support Organization meeting at Metzger Elementary School on April 12th. At these meetings, the ODHS team presented our research, conducted dot polling and solicited feedback from residents via comment cards and guided discussion.
Primary Themes from the Community Engagement

Complete Communities
Respondents expressed concerns about long-term stability and housing accessibility for working families, young graduates and others who were unlikely to afford housing in their community. When asked what concerns, if any, the participants had about affordable housing, one respondent wrote: “That additional resources are available. That affordable housing options are timely and plentiful. That individuals will have an advocate to help them navigate process.”

Some are concerned about additional pressure which could be put on schools that are “already bursting at the seams.” Others mentioned the importance of updating transportation infrastructure in combination with increasing housing stock.

Education
Many participants were surprised to learn how costly housing was in their own communities. Several respondents expressed concerns related to the length of wait lists for affordable housing and the need for individuals to have access to resources and information about affordable housing options. One respondent even suggested the option to use schools as a conduit for disseminating information about housing options/assistance.

Latino Parent Night Presentations
The Latino Parent Night presentations were conducted in a similar forum to the Parent Support Organization and Parent Teacher Organization events but with a distinctly cultural nexus. The intention of these events was to gain unique insights into the views and experiences of Latino community members in the Opportunity Areas. The same methods above were employed at the Latino Parent Night events and the team used an interpreter and translated materials to collect feedback. ODHS representatives attended two Latino Parent Night events: the first was conducted at Sunset High School on April 20th and the second was conducted at Metzger Elementary on April 27th.
Primary Themes from the Latino Parent Night Events:

**Complete Communities**
Many community members discussed the challenges of obtaining quality housing. Several respondents mentioned that they can only afford housing which is in disrepair, older or ill-kept because nicer options are unaffordable. In general, there is a lot of concern over housing quality and increasing rent.

Documentation is an access related challenge. Most rental applications require a social security number, which can prevent some Latino people from applying. Additionally, access to transportation is a concern in the community. Many residents do not have a driver’s license and therefore rely heavily on transit.

Many community members love living close to the schools. They appreciate how the schools contribute to a sense of community character, they are well-landscaped green areas and add a sense of “calmness” to the neighborhood.

**Education**
Education is very important to these respondents - several noted that they would continue to deal with rent increases in order to remain in a good school district.

Many people are concerned about a lack of sidewalk connectivity, which is a hindrance to walkability around the neighborhood. The would like the sidewalks improved, to increase the character of the community.

At Metzger Elementary, in particular, a common interest is prioritization of community resources including community centers and sports infrastructure. Some residents are concerned about the challenge of transporting their children to sporting events as their community has no soccer fields. Several individuals would like to know the status of a proposed community center.
Futurepalooza

“Futurepalooza” was an event hosted by residents of the Cedar Mill neighborhood and members of the Terra Linda CUE (Conservation, Us and the Environment). During the event, speakers also presented from Metro, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation, Washington County Waste and Recycling, Willamette Water Supply, and Washington County Citizen Participation Groups. ODHS set up a table to solicit feedback from attendees.

Presentation topics included:

- Increased density and future growth
- Recycling and waste reduction
- Community participation

The event also included staffed information tables where participants could learn more about other topics and engage in further discussions. The Open Doors Housing Team brought an infographic to display the average housing costs for those in the 0%-120% range, as well as the Median Family Income (MFI) and other data for areas in Washington County. Community responses include:

- Surprise to see Cedar Mill had such a high MFI.
- Housing affordability did not currently affect these residents personally. Many had lived in their neighborhood for 20+ years.
- Attendees participated in a dot poll indicating two neighborhood amenities were most important. The results from that dot poll can be found in the “Dot Polling Section.” (Appendix G)

“Wow! My grandkids can’t even afford to live here!”

- Cedar Mill Resident
Dot Polling

To better understand community preferences for neighborhood amenities across a wide range of stakeholder groups, ODHS implemented a sticker voting tool throughout our community engagement process. The most important neighborhood amenities across all stakeholder groups are ‘Good Schools’ and ‘Neighborhood Feels Safe,’ which is consistent with research literature and previous engagement activities in Washington County. Every group polled exhibits slightly different concerns, and we are also able to identify general trends among focus group participants, parents of school-age children, and Latino parents.

For residents of affordable housing developments and community members searching for housing assistance, having ‘Medical and Social Services’ accessible in their community was most important, particularly as many of our focus group participants represented an older population with significant physical and mobility challenges. Second to ‘Medical and Social Services’ was ‘Parks and Open Spaces.’ The least important neighborhood amenities to this population (a question we did not ask to other groups) were ‘Good Schools’ and ‘Playgrounds,’ and few of our participants had school-age children.

The parents and children who participated in Latino Parent Nights at Sunset High School and Metzger Elementary School demonstrated deep concern for the educational opportunities of their children. ‘Good Schools’ was by far the most important neighborhood amenity, followed by ‘Neighborhood Feels Safe’ and ‘Parks and Open Spaces.’ These results matched almost exactly with those expressed by parents at other Parent Support Organization meetings, and were reinforced by stories from the parents of choosing to move to specific areas to give their children the chance to attend particular schools. Many of these families were paying a significant portion of their income toward housing costs, but were willing to do so to live near schools that provided educational opportunities and important neighborhood infrastructure through safe outdoor spaces.
Affordable Housing Preference Survey

Open Doors Housing created a survey in both Spanish and English aimed at getting answers from those on the Washington County wait list for affordable housing and residents who already live in regulated affordable housing. In the end we received 145 completed responses. A summary of the responses can be seen in Appendix G, as well as, a quantitative analysis of the open ended questions in the survey. Based on the responses we received, we can see where their comments related and gave us insight on our five themes.

Primary Themes from the Affordable Housing Preference Survey:

Complete Communities

Based on our definition of complete communities for this strategy, affordable housing residents and those on the wait list emphasized their desire to live in complete communities. The top three most important neighborhood amenities to the respondents was that their neighborhood feels safe, sidewalks exist throughout the neighborhood, and good public transportation. All of these three neighborhood amenities relate to the idea of a complete community where they are able to easily walk through their community and feel safe and get to places they need to go without the use of a car.

Education

In the survey, one of our questions asked about the barriers to finding affordable housing. In the responses, we found that lack of knowledge around the resources available for those looking for affordable housing, like a need for housing assistance programs, and a few mentioned resources for home ownership. Many of these survey respondents were already in regulated affordable housing or already were on the wait list, which meant that they were able to find or locate some of the affordable housing resources. However, from narratives we received from those looking for affordable housing from the Beaverton Library it was clear that easily accessing the right information to get assistance in housing was significantly missing. Many had no idea where to go and what could be offered.

How many parking spaces are currently needed for Washington County affordable housing residents?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2 spaces</th>
<th>1 space</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Housing Preference Survey Results
Stakeholder Expert Interviews

A significant portion of the public involvement initiative involved interviews with subject matter experts. The housing issue is so dynamic in Washington County that the team needed to go beyond literature reviews to obtain anecdotal and experience-based knowledge from subject matter experts ranging from PSU faculty and prominent architects of affordable housing to affordable housing developers and community leaders. We used a network-based approach in which we identified a small pool of contacts in coordination with the Washington County Housing Authority and began conducting informational interviews. The discussions which developed in the informational interviews resulted in additional leads in which interviewers recommended additional experts to contact. Additional recommended contacts were suggested as feedback during a preliminary presentation to the Washington County Housing Advisory Committee. A complete list of stakeholders is included as Appendix I.

Elected Officials

To realize the long term goal of providing high quality housing options for all residents, local leadership is necessary to move new initiatives forward. Elected officials must fully understand the need to create affordable housing and make policy decisions that will alleviate the housing crisis. The ODHS team interviewed all five of the Washington County Commissioners, Greg Malinowski, Dick Schouten, Andy Duyck, Bob Terry and Roy Rogers. The purpose of the interviews were to discuss the housing crisis, project strategy, preliminary findings and potential policy recommendations. The commissioners provided feedback on policies and offered their thoughts on which policies could be most effective in their jurisdictions. Key findings from this Strategy were presented June 3, 2016 to the Joint Board and Housing Authority Board of Directors Work Session.
Adapting our cities for the needs of older adults needs to be a priority. Trends show that Baby Boomers are interested in downsizing, moving out their larger two-story homes while still "aging in place." Some indicated an interest in developing cottage clusters to create a safe environment with a sense of community that allows the option to travel without concern for their homestead. Cottage clusters generally have shared costs of common areas, through a Home Owners Association, which is paid into monthly to provide basic maintenance and repair. Some residents of Washington County mentioned an interest in quality modular housing (i.e. http://www.ideabox.us/#home) with the option to own a smaller (1,000 square feet or less) without stairs. Other important features include: energy efficiency, storage space and extra bedroom for visitors (adult children/grandchildren) or to be used as an office space.

**See pages 34-35 for corresponding Policy Recommendations:**

**Sources**


Housing affordability is an issue that extends far beyond keeping a roof overhead, because adequate and affordable housing affects every aspect of local communities. The Fair Housing Council of Oregon recommends approaching housing as an additional category of infrastructure as necessary to a community as roads, water, and electricity (See fhco.org for more). In accordance with Oregon’s Statewide Planning Goal 10 (See page 26), Washington County has an opportunity to reassess how to provide housing that meets the needs of all price ranges and rent levels represented by the county’s residents.

Development of affordable housing in its current form represents a significant transfer of federal funds toward local jurisdictions. This transfer spurs local construction and creates jobs, both for construction and for property management and maintenance, a significant investment in the local economy without a large corresponding cost to local taxpayers (Table 5.)

A workforce needs housing, and Washington County has a surplus of housing affordable to households who earn 80% or more of Washington County median income. But income across the county is highly variable, with median incomes ranging from $65,000 to $125,000 per year. Investing in affordable housing not only creates jobs, but can create complete communities—where families and individuals of all income levels can find housing that meets their needs. Affordable housing provides stability to communities, which is particularly important for children and their educational outcomes (Galvez & Luna, 2014). As the number of students facing homelessness has reached a new high in this past school year, a trend unlikely to improve as housing grows more expensive, it is incredibly important for the County to take steps toward providing housing stability for families (Table 6.)

### Table 5.
#### Economic Impact of Housing Assistance Payments for the Charlotte Housing Authority (CHA), Fiscal Year 2014

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jobs Supported</th>
<th>Employee Income</th>
<th>Gross Domestic Product</th>
<th>Output</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Effects</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>$5,695,103</td>
<td>$32,471,111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indirect Effects</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>$3,371,792</td>
<td>$6,461,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Induced Effects</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>$1,679,461</td>
<td>$2,951,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Effect</strong></td>
<td><strong>388</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,746,356</strong></td>
<td><strong>$41,884,292</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Direct Effects result from expenditures to conduct CHA activities; Indirect Effects are measured by purchases of goods and services by suppliers to CHA as a result of CHA’s activities; and Induced Effects are a measure of the purchases of goods and services as a result of wages paid by CHA.

*Source: Economic Impacts of the Charlotte Housing Authority (2009-2014), 2015*
Finally, using affordable housing as an economic development tool is an efficient use of taxpayer dollars. Currently, the limiting factor identified by developers for new development is not a shortage of land, but a shortage of infrastructure. Though tools are in place to finance infrastructure construction through charges on development, developers have an incentive to build in areas where costs are lower. Facilitating development in areas with established infrastructure reduces development and infrastructure costs and embodies the County’s reputation for fiscal responsibility. It can also reduce commute distances and times, increasing productivity for local businesses as employees can spend more time at work and less time stuck in traffic (Schrank and Lomax, 2005).

Developing in areas with established infrastructure also offers opportunities to partner with TriMet to coordinate development in conjunction with existing and proposed expansions of public transit. Transit-oriented development reduces congestion and air pollution, contributing to the quality of life of all County residents, and meets the needs of low-income and aging populations who are more likely to rely on public transportation options (Urban Land Institute, 2006).

Transit-oriented development provides additional opportunities for mixed-use development. This style of development can provide several benefits for Washington County and its residents. First, many residents in the Baby Boomer generation are retiring and are looking to move to locations with access to urban amenities through walkable streets and proximity to transit. For many seniors relying on fixed incomes, affordable housing is particularly important and represents their best opportunity to continue to stay involved with, and contributing to, the larger community. Mixed-use developments are able to provide seniors and retirees the urban amenities and walkability they desire, allow developers to include affordable units in an attractive development, and build the tax base of the County at the same time (Minicozzi, 2012).

Table 6.
Students Facing Homelessness
(By District 2014 - 2015 School Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hillsboro</td>
<td>386</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Banks</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forest Grove</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tigard-Tualatin</td>
<td>188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaverton</td>
<td>1380</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sherwood</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gaston</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>2148</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: [http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcements.aspx?ID=13280&TypeID=5](http://www.ode.state.or.us/news/announcements/announcements.aspx?ID=13280&TypeID=5)

Table 7.
Preferred Mode of Travel for
Residents in Need of Affordable Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Car</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Rail (MAX)</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Housing Preference Survey
### APPENDIX C: CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy Recommendation</th>
<th>Case Study Name</th>
<th>Case Study Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Z1</td>
<td>Flexible/updated parking standards for multifamily development</td>
<td>Chicago Metropolitan Planning Agency and Washington County's Right Sizing the Parking Code. Additional resources from the Victoria Transport Policy Institute</td>
<td>The <strong>Chicago Metropolitan Agency</strong> for Planning's 2012 Report on Parking Strategies to Support Livable Communities affirmed that &quot;requiring large amounts of parking in residential developments makes housing more expensive, irrespective of actual resident demand, as the cost of parking is built into the cost of each unit.&quot; Washington County's Right Sizing the Parking Code suggests shared parking options for work sites and multi-family residential buildings. &quot;Shifting from reserved to shared parking for employment typically reduces requirements by 10-30%. Shared parking among multiple destinations typically reduces requirements by an additional 10-30%&quot;. This strategy would be particularly applicable in areas of mixed commercial and multifamily land use. <strong>The Victoria Transport Policy Institute</strong> recommends the following options for parking management strategies to reduce parking requirements: Shared parking, unbundling of parking from the development itself, location efficient development, carsharing, car free planning, overflow parking and transportation management associations. Source: Rightsizing the Parking Code: Technical Memorandum #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z2</td>
<td>Incentive Zoning</td>
<td>Seattle - Incentive Zoning in Seattle: Enhancing Livability and Housing Affordability: Seattle - Background Report for Affordable Housing and Incentive Zoning Update Options</td>
<td>Seattle's Incentive Zoning program was created in 2001. It offered developers to build affordable housing through a few avenues: 1. Density Bonus - where developers could build higher or earn more FAR to offset the cost of building some affordable units in that bonus area. 2. A &quot;fee-in-lieu&quot; option, also known as a linkage fee, where a developer could pay a fee that goes towards a fund for building affordable housing rather than building affordable units on site. Overall, usage rates varied dramatically by zone, land use (commercial or residential), and time of application. Most developers have elected to make a cash payment 'in lieu' of performance. These bonus contributions totaled $31.6 million through 2013. A total of $27.2 million in bonus contributions have been committed to affordable rental projects corresponding to 1,570 units. Of this total: More than $23 million has been committed to a total of 20 new construction and acquisition/rehabilitation rental projects totaling 1,361 housing units. These units were primarily 1-bedroom or smaller units, with over 60% serving households under 30% or under 50% of MFI. An additional $2 million was committed to several rehabilitation projects including 209 units, and $2 million more was committed to a project still in development. All together the program has created 714 affordable units since 2001 (56 onsite production units, 42 homeownership units, and cash in lieu payments equivalent to 616 rental units).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z3</td>
<td>Upzoning/Increasing Minimum Density Requirements in Centers</td>
<td>See Z6: Smart Growth &amp; Conventional Suburban Development: An Infrastructure Case Study Completed for the EPA</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Policy Recommendation</td>
<td>Case Study Name</td>
<td>Case Study Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Z6       | Land Use District Flexibility | Town of Barnstable, MA: A suburban community's Inclusionary Zoning Case Study | Town of Barnstable, MA Case Study: Barnstable is located on Cape Cod 53 miles east of Fall River and 69 miles southeast of Boston. Barnstable faces the distinct challenge of increasing the number of affordable units while encouraging more sustainable development of market rate housing. Barnstable first implemented an inclusionary zoning bylaw in 2001 as a part of an Affordable Housing Plan, which seeks to produce 1,000 units of affordable housing in ten years time. The following goals, incentives, and techniques are specified in the Barnstable Plan:  
- 10 percent of all housing units in the town must be affordable to residents at or below 80% of area median income (AMI)  
- Incentives for developments that are 100% affordable include (1) waived density requirements and (2) reduced minimum lot sizes.  
- A subdivision that creates 10 or more lots or a multiple unit development that creates 10 or more units is required to dedicate 10 percent of the units to affordable housing.  
- Alternatives to on-site construction of affordable housing include (1) fee-in-lieu of payments of money or land, or (2) construction or rehabilitation of housing off-site.  
- The control period for the affordable units is 40 years with the town having right of first refusal to purchase the dwelling unit should a qualified purchaser, beyond the initial purchaser, not be found.  
**Critical Elements to the Program’s Success:**  
- Vision - Inclusionary zoning policy was created as part of an overall affordable housing plan for the town.  
- Capacity - The Town created positions and dedicated staff to work toward increasing affordable housing stock. Key positions included a director of the Office of Community and Economic Development, Community Development Coordinator, Special Projects Coordinator, and a part-time Housing Development Coordinator.  
- Local Agency Support - The Town of Barnstable worked with the local Community Housing Development Office (CHODO), Housing Assistance Corporation, and the Office of Community and Economic Development in order to draft the Affordable Housing Plan.  
- Innovative Solutions - To encourage affordable housing development, preserve existing housing stock, and control growth, Barnstable introduced an Accessory Affordable Housing/Amnesty program that brings existing non-conforming dwelling units and new accessory units into compliance if used for affordable housing. |
| Z4       | Inclusionary Zoning | | |
| Z5       | Small Unit Land District | | See Z6: Smart Growth & Conventional Suburban Development: An Infrastructure Case Study |
### APPENDIX C: CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy Recommendation</th>
<th>Case Study Name</th>
<th>Case Study Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z5</strong></td>
<td>Small Unit Land District</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Z6: Smart Growth &amp; Conventional Suburban Development: An Infrastructure Case Study Completed for the EPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z6</strong></td>
<td>Land Use District Flexibility</td>
<td>Smart Growth &amp; Conventional Suburban Development: An infrastructure case study completed for the EPA</td>
<td>Since World War II and especially in the last 25 years, Conventional Suburban Development (CSD) was the path of least resistance for the majority of builders. Zoning codes favored CSD, the market was understood, the risks were clear, and the planning, design, and permitting process had been repeated time and time again. However, the development climate has now changed. Developers and builders are looking for ways to cut costs. Municipalities face a steadily growing burden of infrastructure maintenance costs. Energy efficiency is a high priority as the supply of oil and other natural resources are dwindling. Countering the effects of climate change has become a priority worldwide. At the same time, demand for urban, walkable communities is steadily increasing, and supply has not kept up: market studies show a demand gap of one-third. Given these realities, there has been increasing interest in Traditional Neighborhood Development (TND) as an alternative to CSD. When comparing CSD scenarios to alternative TND designs, the study found that infrastructure costs for the TND scenarios were consistently less than CSD. Reductions in infrastructure costs due to TND development patterns ranged from 32 to 47%, with the extent of TND cost savings based principally on density. TND scenarios designed according to Smart Growth and New Urbanist principles with smaller lot sizes, compact urban form, a variety of multifamily housing types, and a mix of land uses results in infrastructure systems that serve more development in proportion to their cost to construct. In comparison, typical lower density CSD alternatives require far-reaching infrastructure systems to serve lower-density development, with higher costs to build. The case studies showed a clear reduction in infrastructure cost for scenarios with higher density.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z8</strong></td>
<td>Form-Based Zoning Code</td>
<td>The City of Cincinnati Form-Based Code Study</td>
<td>The City of Cincinnati undertook a form-based code study to determine how this zoning tool could be incorporated into the new Land Development Code. The study took several years and the development of the Cincinnati Form-Based Code itself took another several years. The Code is a tool that neighborhoods and/or developers can voluntarily choose to implement in the compact walkable areas as defined by Plan Cincinnati. The Cincinnati Form-Based Code was approved by the City Planning Commission in March 2013 and by City Council in May 2013. The first four neighborhoods to implement this new zoning tool include Madisonville (October 2013), College Hill (November 2013), Walnut Hills (January 2014), and Westwood (February 2014). <a href="http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/planning/planning-projects-studies/form-based-code/">http://www.cincinnati-oh.gov/planning/planning-projects-studies/form-based-code/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Policy Recommendation</td>
<td>Case Study Name</td>
<td>Case Study Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P1</td>
<td>Affordable Housing Task Force</td>
<td>Pittsburgh Affordable Housing Task Force</td>
<td>The task force was co-chaired by City Councilman R. Daniel Lavelle and City Planning Director Ray Gastil. The cornerstone of the task force’s recommendation is a $10 million Pittsburgh Housing Trust Fund that could potentially help finance more than 680 affordable units annually. The report also recommends inclusionary housing policies; preserving existing deed-restricted affordable housing; and protection of existing homeowners and tenants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P2</td>
<td>Streamlined Approval Process</td>
<td>City of Bend, OR Expedited Review and Permitting Program for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>In Bend, any residential or mixed use development that receives local, state, or federal affordable housing funding is eligible for 2-week approval (for simple projects) or 6 weeks for projects that require a public hearing. Source: <a href="http://bendoregon.gov/index.aspx?page=99">http://bendoregon.gov/index.aspx?page=99</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P5</td>
<td>Point Person for Affordable Housing Assistance</td>
<td>Luke-Dorf Housing Navigator</td>
<td>The Luke-Dorf Housing Navigator works with landlords and assists chronically homeless Shelter Plus Care (SPC) clients in obtaining housing. Since September 2015, 11 chronically homeless individuals have been housed from several different service provider agencies.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 8. Case Studies**
### APPENDIX C: CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy Recommendation</th>
<th>Case Study Name</th>
<th>Case Study Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>F5</td>
<td>Revolving Loan Fund for Rehabilitation</td>
<td>Louisville Affordable Housing Trust Fund (LAHTF) Revolving Loan Fund</td>
<td>The LAHTF was created by Metro Council in 2008 as the way for Louisville to invest additional local public funds to address the affordable housing shortage for working families whose wages are not enough to live in Metro Louisville; for people on fixed incomes like seniors and people with serious disabilities; for young families starting out; and for veterans. Short-term loan funds are available for the purpose of rehabilitating vacant and/or abandoned property into affordable homes for people with low incomes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F6</td>
<td>Multiple-Unit Limited Tax Exemption (MULTE) Homebuyer Limited Tax Exemption (HOLTE)</td>
<td>Homebuyer Opportunity Limited Tax Exemption (HOLTE) Program and Multiple Unit Limited Tax Exemption (MULTE) program in Portland</td>
<td><strong>Multiple Unit Limited Tax Exemption (MULTE) Program:</strong> A ten-year property tax exemption on residential structures, including common areas and associated parking, as well as commercial portions providing an approved public benefit. For eligibility: 10+ unit projects within designated high-transit areas and at least 20% of units must be affordable to households earning 60% MFI or below (up to 80% MFI where market rents exceed 120% MFI levels) - affordable units should reflect total mix of unit sizes in the project overall. <strong>Homebuyer Opportunity Limited Tax Exemption (HOLTE) Program:</strong> A single-unit homes receive a ten-year property tax exemption on structural improvements to the home as long as the property and owner remain eligible per program requirements. Property owners are still responsible for payment of the taxes on the assessed value of the land during the exemption period. The property is reassessed when the exemption is either terminated for noncompliance or expires after the ten years, and owners begin paying full property taxes. The exemption period cannot be extended.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F7</td>
<td>Tax Increment Financing (TIF)</td>
<td>Portland 30% TIF Program</td>
<td>Created in 2006, the set-aside policy has generated more than $152 million in direct investment in housing affordable to low-income and workforce residents in its first five years. It maintains 30% of investment in Urban Renewal Areas as the minimum level of expenditure on affordable housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Policy Recommendation</td>
<td>Case Study Name</td>
<td>Case Study Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F8</td>
<td>Impact Fees for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>City of Boston Developer Impact Fee program for Neighborhood Housing Trust and Neighborhood Jobs Trust</td>
<td>Boston’s development impact fees benefit two local organizations: The Neighborhood Housing Trust and the Neighborhood Jobs Trust. The program requires that all new large-scale commercial real estate developments which exceed 100,000 square feet and require zoning relief make either a cash payment or directly create housing or a job-training program. Cash payments are received by both the Neighborhood Housing Trust and the Neighborhood Jobs Trust for distribution and the The City of Boston’s Jobs and Community Services (JCS) Office manages the disbursement of the funds. For commercial development in the area defined as “neighborhood,” housing payments are made over a seven year period beginning with the earlier of either the issuance of an occupancy permit or two years from issuance of a building permit; for commercial development in the area defined as “downtown,” payments are made over a seven-year period, beginning upon issuance of the building permit. Jobs payments are made over a two-year period, the first due at issuance of the building permit, regardless of the location of the development. Development Impact Project agreements serve as contracts by which the developer and the Boston Redevelopment Authority (BRA) confirm the payment of linkage fees. Source: <a href="http://housingtrustfundproject.org/boston-linkage-fee-for-large-scale-developments-produces-jobs-and-housing/">http://housingtrustfundproject.org/boston-linkage-fee-for-large-scale-developments-produces-jobs-and-housing/</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F9</td>
<td>Linkage Fees for Affordable Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td>See Z2: Seattle Incentive Zoning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F10</td>
<td>Nonprofit-Owned Housing Tax Exemption</td>
<td>Currently in place in Beaverton, Hillsboro, Tigard and Portland</td>
<td>The City of Beaverton’s Affordable Housing Tax Exemption Program was adopted in August 2013 and is an economic development tool enabled through ORS307.540-548 that allows nonprofit developers that provide rental housing to low-income households to receive an exemption of up to 100 percent of the property tax for an unlimited timeline. The City of Tigard exemption is allowed under their City Code,Chapter 3.50 Non-Profit Corporation Low Income Housing. The City of Portland adopted the program through Code Chapter 3.101. The tax exemption program benefits low-income renters by alleviating the property tax burden on those agencies providing these housing opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# APPENDIX C: CASE STUDIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Policy Recommendation</th>
<th>Case Study Name</th>
<th>Case Study Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Partnerships and Land Banking</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>Partnerships - Workforce Housing</td>
<td>Employee Home Loan Program University of Portland</td>
<td>Through the Employee Home Loan Program the University of Portland aims to assist employees in their first home purchase in North Portland neighborhoods. The program is meant to help recruit and retain employees, as well as assist them in creating healthier lifestyles. Home Loan assistance is limited to one home purchase per employee and the loan cannot be transferred to a new property. Source: <a href="http://www.up.edu/hr/default.aspx?cid=12551&amp;pid=6980">http://www.up.edu/hr/default.aspx?cid=12551&amp;amp;pid=6980</a></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>Partnerships - Parcel Acquisition</td>
<td>Preserving Affordable Housing Near Transit: Case Studies from Atlanta, Denver, Seattle and Washington, D.C., Minneapolis Green Line Funders Collaborative</td>
<td>Transit investments will increase property values in many areas, creating community development opportunities and challenges. By taking action to create or preserve diverse housing options near transit, community leaders, CDCs and developers can ensure that people of all incomes are able to enjoy the benefits of these investments – improved access to jobs, schools and services; greater mobility; and reduced transportation costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>Partnerships - Trimet Redevelopment Options</td>
<td>See L2: Preserving Affordable Housing Near Transit: Case Studies from Atlanta, Denver, Seattle and Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>Public Acquisition of Existing Rental Buildings</td>
<td>San Francisco Mayor's Office Small Sites Program</td>
<td>The program funds the availability for acquisition and rehabilitation financing for the multi-family rental buildings of 5-25 units through the new Small Sites Program. This funding will help stabilize buildings that are occupied by low to moderate income tenants throughout San Francisco that are particularly susceptible to evictions and rising rents. An initial $3 million is being made available with additional funding expected to be released during the program’s first year. The focus of the program is properties whose existing tenants are low-income, with an average building Area Median Income (AMI) of 80 percent. This is intended to be a zero disruption program, and no residents, regardless of income, will be displaced due to the building’s participation in the Small Sites Program. Small Sites Program buildings will carry long-term affordability restrictions, increasing the City’s supply of affordable housing and ensuring that rental units are affordable for future generations of San Francisco residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L5</td>
<td>Partnerships - Trimet Transit Oriented Development</td>
<td>See L2: Preserving Affordable Housing Near Transit: Case Studies from Atlanta, Denver, Seattle and Washington, D.C.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L6</td>
<td>Public Land for Affordable Housing</td>
<td>The ULI Public Land &amp; Affordable Housing Report</td>
<td>The ULI Public Land &amp; Affordable Housing report analyzes land costs, presents case studies of public land projects in the Washington, D.C. region, analyzes promising public land policies, and provides regional recommendations for public land policies. Strong interest among nonprofit developers of affordable housing. PDC has done this in URAs. Surplus park and school land has been used in Portland. Urban Land Institute's &quot;Public Land &amp; Affordable Housing in the Washington, D.C. Area&quot; has a number of useful case studies for particular developments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L7</td>
<td>Affordability Restrictions Linked to Retrofit/Rehab Funds</td>
<td>Arlington County, VA Affordable Housing Investment Fund (AHIF)</td>
<td>Revolving loan fund provides incentives for developers through low-interest loans for new construction, acquisition and rehabilitation of affordable housing. Since 2000, the County has originated more than $200 million in loans for affordable units.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Common Concerns About Affordable Housing

Washington County residents have a wide range of perspectives on affordable housing, but some of them are based on inaccurate information. Below is a list of some of the most common concerns about affordable housing developments and their residents, and we hope to offer a concise explanation as to why, “Well managed housing that fits the scale of the neighborhood seldom produces [these] negative impacts…” (Tighe, 2010).

Adverse Effects on Property Values
A substantial body of research, dating to the 1970’s, has demonstrated that affordable housing development does not decrease the value of surrounding properties or increase the time that homes spend on the market. However, it is important to develop affordable housing in ways that mesh with the surrounding community, so ODHS encourages neighbors to reach out to local developers to share their perspectives on development styles that could match surrounding housing in appearance.

Crime Rate
There is no evidence of an increase in crime resulting from the introduction of affordable housing into a neighborhood. In fact, much of the affordable housing now being developed in inner cities and older neighborhoods replaces broken down and crime-ridden buildings and can serve to reduce the neighborhood crime rate.

Source --Urban Institute, The Impacts of Supportive Housing on Neighborhoods and Neighbors (April 2000).

Crime and Safety
A common concern about affordable housing is that the development could increase crime in the area, particularly because of stereotypes about low-income families and individuals being more likely to engage in criminal activities. Research has concluded that crime rates are no higher in proximity to affordable housing, group homes, and emergency shelters. Our interviews with residents of affordable housing affirmed the research data: residents watched out for each other’s safety, reported any illegal activity, and actively contributed to improving the safety of their communities.
Traffic
Multi-family developments tend to be located closer to public transit than new single-family developments, and developers of affordable housing strive to locate their developments near medical and social services vital to residents who may be older or have a disability. Locating affordable housing developments near these vital services and transit will also reduce the distance most residents will have to travel to work, cutting down on congestion across the County.

Home Values
Single-family home values in the neighborhood of [affordable housing projects] are not adversely affected by their proximity to those projects. Indeed, in some cases, home values are actually higher the nearer the home is to [such a project].

Source: Paul M. Cummings and John D. Landis, Relationships between Affordable Housing Developments and Neighboring Property Values, (Univ. of California at Berkeley, Sept. 1993)

Transit-Oriented Development
Ohlone-Chynoweth Commons: San Jose, California
The Santa Clara Valley Transit Authority and Eden Housing have constructed affordable housing on the parking lot of an existing transit stop. The development provides much-needed affordable housing to the community as well as maximizes the public investment in the transit system by providing convenient transit access to a group that needs it the most, ensuring built-in ridership. The construction include 194 multi-family rental units reserved for families making between 30 and 60 percent of the area’s median income, as well as 4,400 square feet of retail, a 4,000 square foot community center, and over 360 parking spaces.

Schools and Education
Many community members we spoke to were concerned about crowded classrooms in our region’s schools, as school construction has not kept pace with our population growth. While a valid concern, most multi-family developments actually have fewer children per household than do single-family homes (Housing Alliance of Pennsylvania, 2004).

To learn more, check out Solving America’s Shortage of Homes Working Families Can Afford: Fifteen Success Stories, pages 56-61.
APPENDIX E: COMMUNITY OUTREACH TOOLKIT

COMMUNITY OUTREACH AROUND AFFORDABLE HOUSING TOOLKIT

This toolkit is reserved for assisting staff of Washington County in community outreach around the topic of affordable housing. In particular, it provides information that would be best suited for community members who are concerned about affordable housing developments in their neighborhoods or community. Some community members may not be aware of the need for affordable housing and why it is important to provide them in their communities. This information could also assist non-profit affordable housing developers that are working in partnership with the County to build more affordable housing developments. The County would be able to outreach to the community the non-profit developers are building in to promote the benefits of these new developments.

WHAT'S IN THIS TOOLKIT?

1. **Common Concerns Flyer**
   This flyer is aimed at “debunking” some common concerns community members could have around affordable housing, such as property values, crime, and traffic. This would be a great handout for community events and having on hand in general.

2. **Housing Affordability in Washington County Flyer**
   This flyer was used as a large poster and as a handout at community events, when speaking with parents at schools, and for a broader general audience. Many community members don’t know exactly who is in the 0-80% Median Family Income (MFI) range and what housing costs they can afford. When comparing those numbers to what exists in Washington County currently, it is a great opportunity for the community members to fully understand the housing crisis that exists.

3. **Community Preference Survey Dot Poll Poster**
   This poster can be used to understand neighborhood preferences from various communities. In practice, participants were given two stickers to pick their top two most important amenities. Not only did this showcase their preferences, but can help the County and affordable housing developers tailor their developments towards what the community already finds important.
COMMON CONCERNS ABOUT AFFORDABLE HOUSING

ADVERSE EFFECTS ON PROPERTY VALUES
A substantial body of research, dating to the 1970’s, has demonstrated that affordable housing development does not decrease the value of surrounding properties or increase the time that homes spend on the market. However, it is important to develop affordable housing in ways that mesh with the surrounding community, so we encourage neighbors to reach out to local developers to share their perspectives on development styles that could match surrounding housing in appearance.

Source: Paul M. Cummings and John D. Landis, Relationships between Affordable Housing Developments and Neighboring Property Values, (Univ. of California at Berkeley, Sept. 1993).

HOME VALUES
Single-family home values in the neighborhood of [affordable housing projects] are not adversely affected by their proximity to those projects. Indeed, in some cases, home values are actually higher the nearer the home is to [such a project].

Source: Paul M. Cummings and John D. Landis, Relationships between Affordable Housing Developments and Neighboring Property Values, (Univ. of California at Berkeley, Sept. 1993).

CRIME RATE
There is no evidence of an increase in crime resulting from the introduction of affordable housing into a neighborhood. In fact, much of the affordable housing now being developed in inner cities and older neighborhoods replaces broken down and crime-ridden buildings and can serve to reduce the neighborhood crime rate.

Source –Urban Institute, The Impacts of Supportive Housing on Neighborhoods and Neighbors (April 2000).

CRIME AND SAFETY
A common concern about affordable housing is that the development could increase crime in the area, particularly because of stereotypes about low-income families and individuals being more likely to engage in criminal activities. Research has concluded that crime rates are no higher in proximity to affordable housing, group homes, and emergency shelters. Interviews with residents of affordable housing affirmed the research data: residents watched out for each other’s safety, reported any illegal activity, and actively contributed to improving their communities.

Source: Paul M. Cummings and John D. Landis, Relationships between Affordable Housing Developments and Neighboring Property Values, (Univ. of California at Berkeley, Sept. 1993).
### Housing Affordability in Washington County

#### 0-30% Area Median Income
- **Annual Household Salary (three-person household):** $0-$20,000
- **Affordable Monthly Housing Costs:** $0-$500

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Security Income</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full-time Minimum Wage Worker</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>$24,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Teacher</td>
<td>$32,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Full-time Minimum Wage Workers</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$43,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
<td>$59,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Electrician</td>
<td>$72,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurse</td>
<td>$85,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 30-60% Area Median Income
- **Annual Household Salary (three-person household):** $20,000-$40,000
- **Affordable Monthly Housing Costs:** $500-$1000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>$24,760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Teacher</td>
<td>$32,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Full-time Minimum Wage Workers</td>
<td>$38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>$41,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$43,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
<td>$59,430</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>$72,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$85,450</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 60-80% Area Median Income
- **Annual Household Salary (three-person household):** $40,000-$53,000
- **Affordable Monthly Housing Costs:** $1000-$1300

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>$35,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Teacher</td>
<td>$39,220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Full-time Minimum Wage Workers</td>
<td>$43,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>$47,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$51,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
<td>$60,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>$78,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$92,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 80-100% Area Median Income
- **Annual Household Salary (three-person household):** $53,000-$66,000
- **Affordable Monthly Housing Costs:** $1300-$1650

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>$45,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Teacher</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Full-time Minimum Wage Workers</td>
<td>$53,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>$57,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$61,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
<td>$70,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>$88,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$102,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 100-120% Area Median Income
- **Annual Household Salary (three-person household):** $66,000-$79,000
- **Affordable Monthly Housing Costs:** $1650-$2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occupation</th>
<th>Median Family Income</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cashier</td>
<td>$51,680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preschool Teacher</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two Full-time Minimum Wage Workers</td>
<td>$58,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>$62,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$66,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Teacher</td>
<td>$75,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welder</td>
<td>$93,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carpenter</td>
<td>$107,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Data from U.S. Census Bureau American Community Survey, 2014 5-year Estimates
Figure 12. Community Preference Survey Dot Poll Poster
Public Involvement:
Challenges and Lessons Learned

A focus group can be conducted to test the categories used in a dot poll prior to its use in a broader community engagement strategy. Dot polling was most successful when it was used as an introductory tool at community engagement events. If the dot poll was set up inside it was easier for people to miss it or overlook the opportunity to participate, but when set up right outside the entrance to the event people were much more likely to notice and engage with the tool.

A limitation to the outreach strategy was the limited interaction with different ethnic and minority groups in Washington County. Although we made a point to incorporate the Latino Parent Night events and Spanish language surveys into our outreach efforts, there are many groups in Washington County which were not represented in the broader outreach.

Similarly, due to time and resource constraints, we were unable to engage as many residents of different ages and income levels as we would have liked. Future research efforts would benefit from reaching out to senior citizens; we heard multiple times during resident focus groups that seniors are quickly slipping through the cracks in achieving affordable housing. Fixed incomes paired with rent increases create fear of being pushed out of livable situations.

Additionally, competition for affordable units has become so high that individuals with less time to devote to the process (preparing paperwork for applications, following up on application submittals and even physically standing in line to fill out application materials) cannot compete with individuals who have more time to devote to navigating the process. It would be useful to reach out to individuals working multiple jobs, single parents, and others to identify any unique barriers they experience in securing affordable housing.

Lastly, the recognizing schools as a resource to disseminate information was an important lesson. A lot of information about affordable housing resources is communicated via word of mouth and we heard that it would be helpful to utilize schools (and other community organizations like churches) to formally distribute information about housing resources.
Dot Polling Methodology and Implementation

To dig deeper into preferences for community amenities from different segments of the community, we employed a dot polling system that we implemented at each community outreach event. As participants entered the event, we provided two stickers to each person and asked them to identify the two most important neighborhood amenities to them.

Changes were made after the first focus group to better reflect comments made by focus group participants about the community amenities most important to them, and continued these categories throughout the rest of our community engagement strategy. During the focus groups, we utilized the dot polling as a point of discussion to better understand the preferences of affordable housing residents for community amenities. In these events, we added an additional layer of participation relative to other engagement events by providing participants two additional stickers of a different color and asking them to identify the two least important neighborhood amenities.

To analyze the results of the dot polling, the results of each event were aggregated in a table and were evaluated by the total number of votes for each category, the average votes for each category across all events, and the average votes for each category across all events in which that category received votes.
Figure 13.
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Most Important Neighborhood Amenities
Average Dot Poll Response per Event
Comment Cards Responses

Affordable Housing Resident Focus Group: The Barcelona at Beaverton

Question:
Q1) If you would like to share additional information or believe there are more important ideas that we did not discuss today, please let us know.

Response 1:
A1) I think that pet friendly environments are important. However, owners need to clean up their pet droppings. In Hillsboro (where I live) I can't walk down the sidewalk without fear of stepping into dog do.

Response 2:
A1) Is there some rational to scattering housing around the county rather than sentering it into a com[unreadable] community with stores, schools, transit, community senter, etc?

Response 3:
A1) More input by- more people! (no food at meeting) (NO kids)

Affordable Housing Resident Focus Group: Orenco Station

Question:
Q1) If you would like to share additional information or believe there are more important ideas that we did not discuss today, please let us know.

Response 1:
A1) May be have a more focused group of single parents in housing through Washington County.

Response 2:
A1) I feel the focus group was very encouraging, I believe more low income housing is needed for seniors, and more groups like today are needed.

Response 3:
A1) The Orchards at Orenco is a very well run complex. I would like assigned parking here. The major change for me would be greater flexibility so that I could qualify for a 2-bedroom as much as I have my grandsons and other family stay with me.

Sunset High School Parent Teacher Organization Presentation:
No comment cards were collected from the Sunset High School PTO event.
Questions:
Q1) As your community is expected to grow, what is your vision for the future of housing in your neighborhood?
Q2) If you have concerns about affordable housing, what are they?

Response 1:
A1) I would love to see affordable housing for many of the families in our community. Nicer townhomes/condos not apartments.
A2) A concern I have is the size of our school we are already bursting at the seams. If we add affordable housing in our school neighborhood, how does the school house them?

Response 2:
A1) Having more options for purchasing a home would be a positive move. Also, access and ease to get the help that is available.
A2) Education to those who need the information. This could be distributed through the school system or mail.

Response 3:
A1) In the Metzger area I envision an area where kids can ride their bikes and have a neighborhood-like feel. In addition to affordable housing we need sidewalks. A safe place for our kids to be.
A2) My only concern is that there would be long-term stability for these potential residents. If funding stops, will they be forced to move?

Response 4:
A1) Not sure what my vision is – Washington County definitely needs options for affordable housing.
A2) Transportation needs to be addressed at the same time. Freeway congestion is spilling into neighborhood streets as people look for alternatives to getting where they need to go. Mass transit needs serious attention as housing is increased.

Response 5:
A1) I would like to see parks included in any future development.
A2) I’m concerned about how long the waiting list is for help with housing.

Response 6:
A1) Affordable housing for families. Lots of projected growth in Tigard; new schools potentially being built.
A2) That additional resources are available. That affordable housing options are timely and plentiful. That individuals will have an advocate to help them navigate process.
APPENDIX G: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT RESPONSE

Sunset High School
Latino Parent Night

Questions:
Q1) As your community is expected to grow, what is your vision for the future of housing in your neighborhood?
Q2) If you have concerns about affordable housing, what are they?
Q3) Have you had any issues finding housing that is affordable, if yes, what was your experience?

Response 1:
A1) High rent price, they are getting smaller and old
A2) Every time rent is more expensive, and the apartment is getting smaller
A3) Yes, there is managers that take too many applications, especially home owners, you spend a lot at the end.

Response 2:
A1) The community is growing, the problem is rent. Apartment prices went up a lot.
A2) (No response)
A3) Not able to get a house, because the house prices went up

Response 3:
A1) A clean and safe community
A2) Prices for services could go up.
A3) Sometimes there’s not enough income to pay

Response 4:
A1) It’s a school zone and that causes a lot of students to be around that zone
A2) Rent is going up every year but salaries are not
A3) Yes, yes I have and every time I look there’s none and I have to look and look. Sometimes they have too many requirements.

Response 5:
A1) To improve more
A2) I am new to this country
A3) Concerns about rent that keeps going up

Response 6:
A1) It will be easier to have housing for all people
A2) I don’t have any concerns
A3) Not so far

Response 7:
A1) I would love to have an opinion, but my opinions are limited
A2) My concerns for affordable housing are: housing conditions, and that in reality they are very little
A3) In my experience when I looked for housing, I was denied because of family income. Even though in 10 years I have never missed a rent payment.

Response 8:
A1) That more apartments are built, but that they have a fair price for everyone.
A2) My concern is that they are increasing housing prices way too high.
A3) Yes because of the same reason, price for housing is too much.
Response 9:
A1) I would love to buy a house but that will be in the future.
A2) My concern is that each year rent is going up for apartments and salaries are not going up much, I don’t agree with that.
A3) I had a problem with some apartments that were charging me the money that I didn’t owe. They sent me to collection and because of that reason I couldn’t get housing.

Response 10:
A1) To have more schools and residential parks
A2) To have emergency services nearby, bus systems and more public services
A3) No

Response 11:
A1) It will extend to more housing, more schools, more parks, more safety and build more health centers.
A2) Not a lot of safety
A3) No

Response 12:
A1) Improve housing, better streets, close schools, parks
A2) To have more speed bumps for cars, so streets can be respected, because of children
A3) No

Response 13:
A1) To build more condos, more jobs, information centers for youth about how to plan a family
A2) There’s a lot of requirements, like application fees, same as a deposit with rent payment
A3) Because they require a valid social security number, and the deposits are high

Response 14:
A1) Housing is more expensive
A2) That in some places they will require a social security number
A3) None

Response 15:
A1) That there’s more latinos
A2) That rent price goes up, because it’s going up a lot
A3) Yes because they require a valid social security number

Response 16:
A1) (No response)
A2) The cost of having housing is increasing. In my case I would prefer my own house, I wish it was that easy
A3) Bo, not so far. But I have heard of people who’ve had problems

Response 17:
A1) It's a good place to live close to the school
A2) No worries
A3) We don’t need anything, we planned it with enough time and things are done well, living close to a school is very beautiful

Response 18:
A1) I live in Cornellwood. I recommend it to families with children at Sunset. Especially if they play sports. (More close? Last part could not be translated)
A2) No worries
A3) No
Metzger Elementary
Latino Parent Night

Questions:

Q1) As your community is expected to grow, what is your vision for the future of housing in your neighborhood?

Q2) If you have concerns about affordable housing, what are they?

Q3) Have you had any issues finding housing that is affordable, if yes, what was your experience?

Response 1:
A1) We will need more resources and affordable housing because our families are growing.
A2) You are not able to find them as easy or as close.
A3) It’s harder and harder finding affordable housing that is in decent shape.

Response 2:
A1) Better housing, quiet and newer or remodeled apartments, especially during winter for heating expenses.
A2) Since we do not earn much to pay rent, we don’t have food (enough) for the family we worry about paying the rent.
A3) Yes, the ones that are cheaper are in bad shape and are not in good living conditions.

Response 3:
A1) Low income housing available.
A2) Housing rents are going up steadily.
A3) Not personally, but I have heard families have problems accessing affordable housing.

Response 4:
A1) Something affordable for large families - convenient with laundry facilities and accessible to public transportation and good schools.
A2) Cost
A3) Just issues with being able to rent and can't rent because of bad credit.
Thank you for your participation. If you complete this survey, you’ll be entered in a drawing to win a $100 Fred Meyer gift card!

The Housing Authority of Washington County is working with Portland State University (PSU) on a project to help encourage housing affordability. This information will help us better understand how to provide housing to meet your needs. It should only take you about 5-10 minutes to complete.

Your participation is entirely voluntary. Your choice about participating will not affect your current housing or waitlist status (or any other benefits) or your relationship with the Housing Authority or Portland State University.

All your answers will be kept confidential and the report will not include home addresses or other information that would identify you personally. The PSU students who review the surveys will not know who returned them. The Housing Authority staff may know who received the survey, but not who participated and they will not see your responses. The study will only report on how groups of people responded, not how individuals responded.

Section One: Housing Preferences
Please tell us about your housing and your housing needs:

1. **What kind of housing do you live in now?**
   - [ ] Apartment
   - [ ] Duplex/Triplex
   - [ ] Townhouse/Rowhouse
   - [ ] Single family detached house
   - [ ] Bedroom in a shared house or apartment
   - [ ] Other: ___________________________

2. **Please rank the type of housing you and your family would prefer. (1=what you like best, 5=what you like least)**
   - [ ] Apartment
   - [ ] Duplex/Triplex
   - [ ] Townhouse/Rowhouse
   - [ ] Single family detached house
   - [ ] Bedroom in a shared house or apartment
3. How many bedrooms do you and your family need to sleep in?
- None/Studio Unit
- 1 bedroom
- 2 bedrooms
- 3 bedrooms
- 4 bedrooms
- 5 bedrooms
- Prefer not to answer

4. How many parking spaces do you currently need for your car(s)?
- None
- 1 space
- 2 spaces
- 3 or more spaces
- I don’t know

5. How important are the following features to you? (Please rate the following options in order of importance to you. 1 = most important, 6 = least important)
- Private yard
- Shared outdoor space (like a courtyard or playground)
- Energy efficient appliances
- Parking spaces
- Laundry machines (either in your unit or as part of a shared space)
- Having lots of room (a big house)

6. Do you receive help with your housing costs from a program like Section 8?
- Yes
- No
- No, but I’m on a waitlist
- Prefer not to answer

7. What barriers have you encountered to finding long-term housing?

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
**Section Two: Neighborhood Character, Neighborhood Amenities.**
Please tell us what is important in your neighborhood and community.

8. For each of the following, please select how important it is for you and your family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amenities</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good public transportation (like TriMet)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shopping areas within walking distance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low transportation costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood feels safe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks throughout the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and open space nearby</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living close to your job</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to a freeway</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking distance to schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking distance to libraries and community centers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy access to medical and social services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other ____________________________</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9. Which of these expenses is the hardest for you to meet each month?
- Medical expenses
- Transportation
- Rent
- Childcare
- Elder care
- Utilities
- Home Maintenance
- Groceries
- Other:_______________________

10. How would you like to travel to work and other places? (Please check all that apply)
- Car
- Bus
- Light rail (MAX)
- Walking
- Bicycling
- Other_______________________

Section Three: Demographics
Please tell us about yourself.

11. How many times have you moved past in the 5 years?
- 0
- 1-2
- 3-4
- 5 or more

12. What is your zip code?
__________________

13. Do you identify as...
- Male
- Female
- Transgender Male
- Transgender Female
- Prefer not to answer
- Other (please describe)__________________

14. What is your race? (Please check all that apply)
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin
- White or Caucasian
- Asian or Pacific Islander
- Native American or Alaskan Native
- Other_______________________
- Prefer not to answer

15. Does anyone in your household have a physical or mental disability?
- Yes, physical disability
- Yes, mental disability
- Yes, both
- No
- Prefer not to answer
16. Include yourself, how many people live in your household?
Adults: ______________________________
Children (under the age of 18) ___________
☐ Prefer not to answer

17. Which of the following best describes your current employment status? (Check one)
☐ Employed full-time
☐ Employed part-time
☐ Retired
☐ Not employed
☐ Disabled and unable to work
☐ Other (please describe) _____________
___________________________________
☐ Prefer not to answer

18. What is your estimated household income?
☐ Less than $10,000
☐ $10,000-$25,999
☐ $26,000-$45,999
☐ $46,000-$65,999
☐ $66,000-$85,999
☐ $86,000 or more
☐ I don’t know/Prefer not to answer

Section Four: Pathways to Involvement
In this section, please provide responses about how you can stay involved in this project.

Is there anything else you would like us to know?
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________
________________________________________________________________________

Thank you so much for your time!
If you wish to be entered in the drawing for a $100 Fred Meyer gift card, please write your
name and preferred contact information below:

Name ____________________________ Contact Type/Contact Information

☐ Check this box if you would like to be contacted about future community meetings and
events to help make housing more affordable in Washington County!
## Affordable Housing Preference Survey Results (Raw Data)

### Section One: Housing Preferences

#### Please tell us about your housing and your housing needs:

1. **What kind of house do you live in now?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Duplex/Triplex</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Townhouse/Rowhouse</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single family detached house</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bedroom in a shared house or apartment</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other?</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>170</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **Please rank what type of housing you and your family would prefer.**  
(1=what you would like best, 5=what you would like least.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Apartment</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Duplex/Triplex</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Townhouse/Rowhouse</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>139</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Single family detached house</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bedroom in a shared house or apartment</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>139</strong></td>
<td><strong>138</strong></td>
<td><strong>142</strong></td>
<td><strong>-</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. **How many bedrooms do you need for you and your family to sleep in?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None/Studio unit</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Bedroom</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 Bedrooms</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 Bedrooms</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4 Bedrooms</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>5 or More Bedrooms</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>156</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Other?

- 2 sets of 2 townhouses connected together
- Regular house
- 1 level ranch home
- Manufactured home
- Condo
- Group home
- Casa movil
- Casa movil

### Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. How many parking spaces do you currently need for your cars?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 space</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2 spaces</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 or more spaces</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How important are the following housing features to you?
(Please rate the following options in order of importance to you
1=most important, 6=least important. You can only use each number once.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Private yard</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>139</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shared outdoor space (like a courtyard or a playground)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>137</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Energy efficient appliances</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Parking spaces</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>138</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Laundry machines (either in your unit or as part of a shared space)</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>142</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Having lots of room (a big house)</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>140</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>135</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Private yard</th>
<th>Shared outdoor space (like a courtyard or a playground)</th>
<th>Energy efficient appliances</th>
<th>Parking spaces</th>
<th>Laundry machines (either in your unit or as part of a shared space)</th>
<th>Having lots of room (a big house)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>3.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.71</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.74</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you receive help with your housing costs from a program like Section 8?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>No, but I'm on a waitlist</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX G: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT RESPONSE

Section Two: Neighborhood Character, Neighborhood Amenities
7. Please tell us what is important in your neighborhood and community.
For each of the following, please select how important it is for you and your family:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Not at all important</th>
<th>Moderately important</th>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Extremely important</th>
<th>Total Responses</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Good public transportation (like TriMet)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Shopping areas within walking distance</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Good schools</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>2.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Low transportation costs</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>2.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Neighborhood feels safe</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Sidewalks throughout the neighborhood</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>3.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Parks and open space nearby</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>2.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Living close to your job</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Children’s play areas</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>2.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Easy access to a freeway</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Walking distance to schools</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Walking distance to libraries and community centers</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Easy access to medical and social services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>3.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Other
- bike path on main road
- close to shopping malls
- n/a
- farmers market
  - I don't only want the neighborhood to feel safe, it needs to BE safe.
  - Quiet neighborhood
  - bike lanes and/or low speed streets
  - Decent Grocery Stores
  - price
  - kingdom halls of Jehovahs Witnesses
  - Good school for my child
  - Privacy
  - Good Accessibility and safe sidewalks at complex
  - not on very busy street
  - walking and bicycle trails.
  - Friendly neighborhood
  - outdoor private and community space
  - Trees
  - Proximity to my church
  - Affordability and garden space!
  - Safety in housing
  - Dog friendly
  - community activities
  - Utility assistance
  - Library
  - estacion de Max a poca distancia
  - Seguridad y Educacion
  - pues los servicios de la basura todo esta bien.
8. Which of these expenses is the hardest for you to meet each month?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Elder care</td>
<td></td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Home maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Childcare</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Medical expenses</td>
<td></td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Groceries</td>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td></td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Rent</td>
<td></td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analysis:
- Min Value: 1
- Max Value: 9
- Mean: 4.74
- Variance: 6.65
- Standard Deviation: 2.58
- Total Responses: 145

9. How would you like to travel to work and other places? (Please check all that apply.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Car</td>
<td></td>
<td>77%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Bus</td>
<td></td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Light Rail (MAX)</td>
<td></td>
<td>32%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Walking</td>
<td></td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Bicycling</td>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section Three: Demographics Please tell us about yourself.

10. How many times have you moved in the past 5 years?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1-2</td>
<td></td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3-4</td>
<td></td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>5 or more</td>
<td></td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>147</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistical Analysis:
- Min Value: 1
- Max Value: 4
- Mean: 1.84
- Variance: 0.73
- Standard Deviation: 0.65
- Total Responses: 147

11. What is your zip code?

Text Response
- 97229
- 97223
- 97229
- 97005
- 97123
- 97116
- 97224
- 97006
- 97140
- 97005
- 97003
- 97007
- 97124
- 97229
- 97008
- 97124
- 97229
- 97003
- 97022
- 97006
- 97123
- 97116
- 97005
- 97129
- 97007
- 97129
- 97006
- 97008
- 97124
- 97229
- 97113
- 97006
- 97003
- 97022
- 97006
- 97123
- 97113
- 97229
- 97006
- 97124
- 97124
- 97078
- 97002
- 97005
- 97078
- 97124
- 97008
- 97006
- 97223
- 97008
- 97215
- 97123
- 97006
- 97123
- 97006
- 97124
- 97003
- 97078
- 97002
- 97005
- 97078
- 97124
- 97008
- 97006
- 97223
- 97008
- 97215
- 97123
- 97006
- 97123
- 97006
- 97022
- 97006
- 97123
- 97116
- 97219
- 97116
- 97232
- 97223
- 97006
- 97229
- 97236
- 97005
- 97214
- 97123
- 97230
- 97124
- 97008
- 97006
- 97006
- 97123
- 97116
- 97124
### 12. What is your race? (Please check all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Hispanic, Latino or Spanish origin</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>White or Caucasian</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>59%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Asian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Native American or Alaskan Native</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other**
- Multi racial
- Mixed race household
- Mexicana (Blanca)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 13. Do you identify as...

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Transgender male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Transgender female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>148</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other (please describe)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>148</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 14. Does anyone in your household have a physical or mental disability?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Yes, physical disability</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Yes, mental disability</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Yes, both</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 15. Including yourself, how many people live in your household?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adults:</th>
<th>Children (18 and younger)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistic**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
16. Which of the following best describes your current employment status? (Check one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Employed full-time</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Employed part-time</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Retired</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Not employed</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Disabled and unable to work</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Other (please describe)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 147

Other (please describe)
- Internship
- I'm my daughter's caregiver. But I don't get paid.
- Stay at home mom waiting for disability case to be determined
- FT seasonally- tax preparer
- Self-employed with variable hours
- Student
- Full time employed and full time student
- Partly retired
- Two part time jobs, both at least 20 hrs/week for a total of more than 40 hrs/wk.
- Both members employed part time and school full time
- Husband works full time
- Trabajo temporal

17. What is your estimated household income?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than $10,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$10,000-$25,999</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$26,000-$45,999</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$46,000-$65,999</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$66,000-$85,999</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$86,000 or more</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I don’t know/ Prefer not to answer</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total: 143

Other (please describe)
- Income from trust, endowment or foundation.
- Income from dividends, annuities, or interest.
- Income from rental property.
- Income from investments.
- Income from royalties.
- Income from alimony or child support.
- Income from social security.
- Income from unemployment benefits.
- Income from workers compensation.
- Income from other government assistance.
- Income from VA.
- Income from other.

Statistic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>3.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>147</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Min Value</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I really appreciate the service you provide and because of you I am able to provide a safe stable environment for my child. I am concerned however how much my rent has and continues to increase. I fear we will soon have no where to stay because we simple won’t be able to afford living where we currently reside. It is near impossible to be on section 8 AND live in a decent neighborhood in a good school district.

I need help, with housing. PLEASE

no

I am so thankful that I am getting /rental assistance from Washington county

no

There needs to be better options for individuals who need to live in quiet areas with safe mobility. The unsupervised children where I live are very problematic aking over sidewalks with bikes, scooters, skateboards, remote control toys, etc.

For people with disabilities, for the poor and the working poor of which most of us belong, please work to roll back the rents. This is just too much.

It’s hard to become self sufficient because when you have a job and work your rent goes up with housing and your food stamps go down which makes it almost pointless to work because after the cost to commute and time away you basically make nothing. I also think there is not enough incentive to go to school. It seems they would encourage this and not make it effect your housing and food stamps negatively because if you get a good job you could get off of public assistance.

Clear advertising when properties are designated refugee projects or child care communities. Section 8 supervisor and worker made a mistake that got me evicted and cost me over $6000 and they refuse to pay the portion they owed for the rent, approx. $4000 plus of the total, and this is THE main reason I have difficulties getting a rental unit that’s not substandard and high cost.

I really wish the rent could be less.

new apartments that are being built whom receive government subsidy, need to out washer and dryer in each unit.

Housing authorities take photos during inspection and I feel this is a violation of my privacy. I don’t know the reasoning behind it and I have asked and I have not received a satisfying response.

humans need HOMES, not just shelter. I am on the edge of hanging it up, because it been so long since I’ve had a real home, a place I don’t have to move from because of rising rents. I don’t even have a place here to put a pot of flowers or herbs, or even to sit outside with a cup of coffee. I can’t find another place cheap enough to move to.

My Partner & I recently moved in with my father. I have grandchildren nearby who will be going to school. I support rent caps as well as governmental support for intentional/community living.

My assessment will change in a month when I have to leave my home because I will be done with school.

Government rules, regulations, and taxes are what’s preventing enough affordable housing for people.

Yes, I would make myself available and would like to stay involved.

Mary Jane G. (Orchards)

Provide online feedback

Maybe opinionating

As a single white male I found it really hard to find help.

The need for utility assistance

Help us build better apartments and lower prices

Give us more information to other informational meetings. Thank you for sharing today.

Building access: In a security building it is sometimes difficult to admit guests and for people

as part of the community that need to live in quiet areas, there is a lack of these options.

The projects need to be more consistent through the whole process.

The maintenance people always do a crappy job at fixing or replacing things in the house... I know that im on housing but that does not mean I have to live a broken down ,crappy looking house. I pay my rent and do my best to keep it clean and taken care of......Housing should want to keep there houses in good condition to.

Im on unemployment seeking work

NO

keep rents in line with incomes

no

More assistance when landlords are not making repairs

The cost of our rent has risen over $600/month over the past 5 years, and in spite of paying rent on time every month since April 1998, no other landlord will consider us for a renewal due to our income/credit/family size, so we are virtually trapped in our overpriced rent with all working teens contributing paychecks while delaying college plans.

I’d like to change a status from being a tenant to a home owner. I’d like to know more information to become a home owner and the preparation to be an effective home owner... Rent is going up too fast!!!

We need a means to pay utility bills as well as affordable housing.

No

Not at this time

rent and housing market are very expensive and low income and middle class people are having a very hard time trying to make their lifes better. Higher rent/morgage make it very tuff to keep food on the tables and bills paid.

housing needs to be much cheaper, even on section 8. Paying 40% of your income in rent plus utilities that are higher than what they calculate makes rent and utilities way more than 50% of income for low income people with disabilities on SSD.

Please let educational incentives, like the rent like the Earned Income Disallowance continue until the student graduates, we have only had it for 6 months.
Think theater - professional actor with a BFA in acting
Elevator in building; internet access and cable (basic); grocery stores - walking distance
No thanks
No por el momento
Si. [illegible]. Renta Cara

19. Thank you so much for your time! If you wish to be entered in the drawing for a $100 Fred Meyer gift card, please write your name and contact information below:

All Participants remain confidential.

20. Please contact me about future community meetings and events to help make housing more affordable in Washington County.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Click here for yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Statistic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### APPENDIX G: PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT RESPONSE

#### 21. What barriers have you encountered to finding long term housing?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Text Response</th>
<th>None</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non at this time</td>
<td>Non credit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stereotypes act managers of sec 8 tenants and finding managers and apartments that work with sec 8</td>
<td>Section 8 payment standard for WA city is about 30% below market rate. Extremely low vacancy rates make it nearly impossible to find anything in the payment standard. Also, low income properties in the area allow smoking on property which no market rate places allow anymore. This is a serious barrier to housing. Additionally, for medical reasons, I need washer and dryer in unit and was unable to find ANY cheap place that had this. Discriminatory practices against section 8 people still exist and are a problem but the main problem is the lack of reality back to the sec 8 payment std for WA city which is $100 lower than clackamas and Multnomah counties. Scarcity of accessible housing is a serious problem. Many people with disabilities need private entrances rather than shared hallways due to air quality issues and pesticide or smoke or fragrance issues. Again for some reason, low income properties seem to often build with shared entrances rather than private entrances like most market rate units have. In short, just because people are poor doesn't mean they should have to endure smoke, chemical exposure, pesticides and/or vermin, etc. Please build with private entrances and washers and dryers, and have strict no smoking on property rules (inside and out). Also, make units all on ground level for people with disabilities and the elderly (and families with young children benefit as well). Stairs are not helpful. Thank you. Distance to public transportation was also a barrier for many less expensive places.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Background checks and credit history</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nothing</td>
<td>Not a lot of people will take sec 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rental Rates way too high and Section 8 is behind in costs of housing</td>
<td>None so far</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rent too high</td>
<td>I am on disability, my two daughters live with me, so cost and space are huge barriers. The rent keeps going up and I am struggling to keep up!</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places that accept section 8</td>
<td>FEELONY CONVICTION &amp; Credit History</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disability that makes it really difficult, if not impossible, to work.</td>
<td>a long wait</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expensive</td>
<td>none</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability, hate moving.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>Financial situation is 200% below the Federal Government's Poverty line. No way tp make it any better as I am permanently disabled.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lack of great paying job</td>
<td>the time it takes to get on the program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable living</td>
<td>Communication - finding places - communication needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>none</td>
<td>Too long to get voucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>units in nicer areas.</td>
<td>Social status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large deposit required; rent too high, bad/dirty rental, too far from TriMet</td>
<td>High cost to buying a house in Washington County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability within my price range</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>no barriers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent is way too expensive and it expensive to move</td>
<td>ability to walk outside</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of rent</td>
<td>The cap for one person is way too low. I have disability equipment and a service dogs needs cramped into a tiny one bedroom apt. More needs to be allowed for people with disabilities. There is no such thing as long term housing. I moved to my current location with the hope of staying 10 years. 1 year after receiving Sec 8 benefits I was targeted for move out via a no cause eviction. Tenants not on Sec 8 were offered leases. Now, every year at lease signing I go through panic attacks as I wait to be told to leave again. It is very stressful.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rent being raised and smokers moving in would make it difficult to keep living here</td>
<td>having to make a budget to cut make and save money for a home</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being able to afford the size home we need.</td>
<td>energy efficient housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None now. I have been in my apartment for 4 years. I get Section 8 support</td>
<td>Being able to find a house that fits into the price range that is allotted through section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>long waiting list</td>
<td>Income restrictions, and availability of 4+ bedrooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectations of having to make 2 or 3 times the amount of rent to qualify</td>
<td>Rent prices, application approval criteria, available units, unable to reach people that post rental listings, screening companies are unable to reach previous landlords which results in application being denied and the apartment being given to the next available applicant before the denial can be appealed, deposit requirements are way way too high, deposits not being returned by landlords no matter how good the condition, and application fees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard to find housing</td>
<td>Money issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial</td>
<td>waiting list is years. thus there is not enough affordable housing available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The housing limit regarding what types of places you can move into is very low for the housing market.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>pricing above section 8 allowance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Previously, an eviction was a barrier to securing long-term housing.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost is prohibitive</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steps into laundry room. Disabled.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No really sure how to answer this question? i have been on housing for a really long time now</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Being financially stable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None really, since there are low income units in this area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prices</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rents keep going up more and more every year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The wait, but all the time was a blessing and we are not homeless</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Issues with Screening and low vacancy rates</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>poor credit, family size, income requirements, finding location that is accessible to safe bike/walk routes and mass transit</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>no employment security and available down payments requirements...</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rising Rent cost</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finding places that fit within my family needs and my voucher funds limits. Most of the time places that meet HUD's voucher requirements are in unsafe or bad neighborhoods.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, Price Hikes, Location,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discrimination and also some landlords don't like to get involved with paperwork and housing inspections. They don't like the bureaucracy in the housing department. Also, they think people who are in section 8 are second class people and may cause trouble in the neighborhood. Some of them like the people who are looking at their house to rent, but as soon as they hear section 8, they change their mind and look at you as if you don't exist. They even insult you, sometimes. It hurts.

Rent is too expensive, and won't work with my section 8 voucher

Availability, restrictions, PRICING!

Financial and Credit

Being able to afford rent and safe money...I'm basically stuck renting forever as rent costs are too high to save for down payments.

Pricing and allowing pets

Cost

Down payments, equity losses from housing bust in 2010

Cost. I am just finishing as a student and will finally move out of my family's home when I have a full-time job.

Land use rules and permit fees

None. I've owned my own home.

Cost

Two part time jobs that don't pay enough to afford it. Only being able to find housing in my price range that is far from public transit, grocery stores, jobs, etc. Although my 2 roommates have cars, I do not have a drivers license, so transportation to my jobs/the food stamp office/to grocery stores to by food are major issues.

Cost

Affordability pure and simple, how can I afford to save enough money to have a downpayment for buying or even for another security deposit at a rental. Cost of housing, buying/renting, is just astronomical and eating up more than 50% of my monthly income

Low income

Cost

Rent increase

I need more bedrooms for extended family but only allowed 1. Have 3 grandsons 3 days a week - not majority of week...

### 22. What is your age?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>Answer</th>
<th>Response</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Under 18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>18-25</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>26-49</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>44%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>50-65</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>over 65</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Min Value</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Value</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variance</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Responses</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX H: GIS METHODOLOGY

GIS Methodology

The primary data sources for the GIS analysis conducted to inform Open Doors Housing Solution’s Affordable Development Strategy for Washington County were: Oregon Metro’s Regional Land Information System (RLIS) datasets, Metro’s 2014 Buildable Land Inventory (BLI), Metro’s 2015 regional Affordable Housing Inventory database, TriMet Service Enhancement Plan Data and Washington County tax lot Data. The 2014 Urban Growth Report Appendix 2 Methodology for Determining the Buildable Land Inventory was used to understand the BLI dataset. The methodology described herein describes the stepwise approach taken to prepare the opportunity mapping, vacant land inventory, and redevelopment analysis provided in the report.

VACANT LAND INVENTORY ASSESSMENT

Step 1: Review Existing Data and Establish Geographic Overview
- Review RLIS dataset and identify data to be used in the analysis
  - Major landmarks (rivers, highways, counties, cities, UGB, major city park)
- Review the Buildable Land Inventory (BLI) provided by Metro.
  - Understand how the data was created for vacant and redevelopable lots
- Review “Appendix 2: Methodology for determining the 2014 Urban Growth Report’s buildable land inventory” to understand the analysis which has already been performed on the BLI dataset.
  - Use Metro’s 2015 regional Affordable Housing Inventory database to create feature class to illustrate the existing regulated affordable housing units in the area.
    - Review locations and number of units for future analysis
  - Subtracted Waco cities from Waco county to obtain County-only dataset for further analysis.
  - Note: Net_Res_acreages and net_new_units used for summary stats in focus area table.

Step 2: Identify Focus Areas
- Unincorporated Washington County identified as the primary focus area within the broader county jurisdiction.
- Created a ¾ mile around regional, town or neighborhood centers as identified in Metro’s regional 2040 Growth Plan, as labeled in the BLI from Washington County.
  - Rationale: Affordable housing should be sited in resource rich areas. The 2040 Plan seeks to attain a more compact urban form, build communities rather than subdivisions, increase mixed use development and increase transportation mode choices. quote from Metro scope.
- Used visual analysis to identify areas with multiple vacant parcels (BLI dataset) located within ¾ mile buffer from regional, town or neighborhood centers and within unincorporated Washington County.
- Calculate the total acreage of vacant lots in each focus area.
- Five focus areas were established to concentrate further mapping and land use recommendations: Aloha, Bethany, Cedar Mill/ West Haven-Sylvan, Metzger/ Garden Home-Whitford, and South County Industrial Area.
Step 3: Analyze Vacant Land

Datasets: “Focus_Areas_VacRes” and “Focus_Areas_VacRes_Exempt”

- QA/QC BLI
  - Parcels in which the “VAC_DEV” field attribute were coded as “VAC” (Completely Vacant (>95% Vacant)) or “VAC2” (Other Vacant (see white paper)) were selected as the first step in identifying the vacant lots.
  - Removed vacant features where net_res_acre was less than or equal to zero.
  - Coded environmentally constrained areas as 1= intersected by Title 13, Title 3, Floodplain or 25% slopes; 0=not intersected by Title 13, Title 3, floodplain or 25% slopes
  - Compare metro’s zoning “crosswalk” to Washington’s county’s Land Use District framework to ensure similar densities were used for “Net Residential Acres” and “Net New Units”.
    - Note: See Single and Multi-family Residential Capacity calculations in Metro’s “Methodology for determining the 2014 Urban Growth Report’s buildable land inventory.”
  - Removed parcels where the unconstrained portions were developed since the 2013 BLI. The remain parcel was environmentally constrained.
  - Review vacant lots where “net_res_acre” attribute was greater than zero and compare them to the most recent aerials available to ensure that they have not been developed and to ensure the dataset wasn’t inaccurately picking up any un-developable parcels such as parks, road rights of way, etc.
    - The final dataset presenting the total vacant land for all non-exempt parcels in the five opportunity areas is “Focus_Areas_VacRes”

- In Metro’s BLI, certain tax lots were designated as “Exempt” from the vacant land analysis. For the purposes of this analysis it was determined that these lots should be added back into the dataset to present the greatest potential of vacant land available and identify areas where potential partnerships with other agencies/organizations are possible. The “exempt” lots included certain tax exempt properties, rail properties and and private streets (see Appendix 2 Methodology for Determining the 2014 Urban Growth Report’s Buildable Land Inventory). These parcels which were also classified as “Vac” or “Vac2” in the Metro BLI were brought in as a second dataset to present overall vacant land in formerly “exempt” parcels.
  - As done with the parcels greater than 0 net residential acres above, this data was cleaned by performing a QA/QC against 2015 aerial imagery to identify and remove lots which had been developed since the BLI dataset was created. This process also included a general cleaning of the dataset to identify parcels which removing:
    - Remove roads
    - Schools (where structures are shown on approximately 50% or more of the lot)
    - Churches (where structures are shown on approximately 50% or more of the lot)
  - The final dataset presenting the total vacant land for all exempt parcels in the five opportunity areas is “Focus_Areas_VacRes_Exempt”
  - Conducted final QA/QC by recalculating the total shape area and removing slivers <= 500 sq. ft.
    - This threshold used as a conservative measure and because certain uses, tiny homes for example, could be located on lots ~500 Sq. ft. and are consistent with policy recommendations.
OPPORTUNITY MAPPING
- The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s Qualified Census Tracts were consulted to determine whether any of the opportunity areas contained these census tracts.
  - Aloha contained two qualified census tracts (Tract 317.05 and Tract 316.13)
  - The following features were identified and mapped within each opportunity area:
    - Schools, including Title 1 High Schools (from RLIS)
    - Existing regulated affordable housing units
    - Existing TriMet Bus and MAX Lines
    - Planned TriMet Service Enhancement bus line routes
    - Community Centers (from RLIS)
    - Hospitals (from RLIS)
    - Note: A 500ft buffer was used for all point feature amenity clips

REDEVELOPMENT ANALYSIS
Analyze Redevelopment Potential - Dataset name “Focus_Areas_BLI_2014_ReDev”
- Metro 2014 BLI was clipped to opportunity areas was used as primary dataset
- Conducted QA/QC by recalculating the total shape area and removing slivers <= 500 sq. ft.
  - This threshold used as a conservative measure and because certain uses, tiny homes for example, could be located on lots ~500 Sq. ft. and are consistent with policy recommendations.
  - Divided building value by land value to get a redevelopable index.
  - Divided total value by GIS sqft to show value by sqft.
- Examined average age of housing stock. Created new field in the “Focus_Area_Taxlots” feature class called “Builind_Age”. Subtracted YEARBUILT from 2016.

SUMMARIZE DATA
- Calculate the total net residential acres and net new units for privately owned lots and lots owned by Development LLCs (compared to Washington County) Table 1.
- Calculate the total GIS acreage for Tax Exempt Lots Table 2.
- Quantify vacant land by owner (3 ownership designations were used): Tax exempt property owned by a Development LLC and Privately owned property
  - Owner_Cat added to Focus_Areas_VacVac2_ResAcres_Above_0. Land holding LLC = 1 Private owners = 0
- Calculate re-developable lot Land Value Index (Table 4).
### Table 9. Vacant Lots in Unincorporated Washington County Urban Opportunity Areas (Excludes Tax Exempt Lots)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vacant Lot Acreage</th>
<th>Number of Potential Buildable Units</th>
<th>Percent of need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloha</td>
<td>30.8</td>
<td>517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>93.9</td>
<td>1531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Mill/West-Haven/Sylvan</td>
<td>57.5</td>
<td>842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger/ Garden Home-Whitford</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Industrial Area</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Percent of the 14,000 Needed:** 24%

### Table 10. Total Acres of Tax Exempt Lots

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total Acres of Tax Exempt Lots</th>
<th>Acres</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloha</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Mill/West-Haven/Sylvan</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger/ Garden Home-Whitford</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Industrial Area</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 11. Total Vacant Lot Acreage by Development LLC and Private Ownership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Development LLC</th>
<th>All Other Private Ownership</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloha</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>26.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>32.6</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Mill Sylvan/West-Haven</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger/Garden Home-Whitford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>19.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Industrial Area</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 12. Redevelopable Calculations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Number of Redevelopable Lots</th>
<th>Number of Lots where the Land Value is &lt; 0.75</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aloha</td>
<td>10,464</td>
<td>2,719</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethany</td>
<td>5,308</td>
<td>496</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Mill Sylvan/West-Haven</td>
<td>4,348</td>
<td>1,427</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metzger/Garden Home-Whitford</td>
<td>2,995</td>
<td>1,992</td>
<td>67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South County Industrial Area</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>109</td>
<td>82%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX I: STAKEHOLDER CONTACT LIST

Stakeholder Contacts

Local Leaders:

- Commissioner Andy Duyck, Washington County at-large Chair
- Commissioner Bob Terry, Washington County District 4
- Commissioner Greg Malinowski, Washington County District 2
- Commissioner Dick Schouten, Washington County District 1, Vice Chair
- Commissioner Roy Rogers, Washington County District 3
- Andrew Singelakis, Director of Land Use and Transportation at Washington County
- Val Valfre, Director of Housing Authority of Washington County

Faculty and Subject Matter Experts:

- Dr. Ethan Seltzer, Professor of Urban Studies and Planning, Portland State University
- Dr. Marisa Zapata, Assistant Professor of Land Use Planning, Portland State University
- Susan Hartnett, Spectator Facilities and Development Manager, City of Portland
- Kim Armstrong, Program Coordinator, Washington County Department of Housing Services
- Erin Wardell, Senior Planner, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation
- Andree Tremoulet, Research Associate & Adjunct Assistant Professor, Urban Studies & Planning - Urban & Public Affairs at Portland State University
- Dr. Lisa Bates, Associate Professor of Urban Studies and Planning at Portland State University
- Sambo Kirkman, Associate Planner, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation
- Ben Sturtz, Housing Development Project Manager, REACH CDC
- Leigh Shrock, Home Forward
- Ramsay Weit
- Jessica Woodruff, Director of Housing Development, REACH CDC
- Mike Dahlstrom, Senior Planner, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation
- Brandon Delk, VP Development, Pedcor Investments
- Emily Lieb, Senior Project Manager, Equitable Housing, METRO
- Joy Alise Davis, Design + Culture Lab
- Cadence Moylan, City of Beaverton
- Jim Irvine, President, The Conifer Group
- Kathy Armstrong, Deputy Director, Proud Ground
- Sid Scott, Principal, Scott Edwards Architecture
- Clint Chiavarini, Senior GIS Specialist, METRO
- Tom Mills, Senior Planner, TriMet
- Victoria Garcia, Social Work Intern, Portland State University School of Social Work
- Theresa Cherniak, Principal Planner, Washington County Department of Land Use and Transportation
- Jennie Proctor, Washington County Office of Community Development
- Jeff Salvon, Associate Planner, City of Beaverton
- Rachel Loftin, Executive & Government Relations Assistant, Home Builders Association of Metro Portland
- Nancy Davis, Private Property Owner
- Deborah Imse, President, Multifamily NW
- Kristen Keipert, Holland Residential
- Maria Samayoa, Latino Parent Night Coordinator, Sunset High School
- Esme Keymolen, Latino Parent Night Coordinator, Metzger Elementary School
- Elisa Bennett, Parent Teacher Organization President, Sunset High School
- Naomi Mimnaugh, Parent Support Organization President, Metzger Elementary School
Developers Focus Groups:

- Sheila Greenlaw-Fink, Executive Director, Community Housing Fund
- Shannon Wilson, Deputy Director, Community Partners for Affordable Housing
- Roy Kim, General Managing Partner, Central Bethany Development Co.
- Ben Sturtz, Housing Development Project Manager, REACH CDC
- Ross Cornelius, Client Services Manager, Walsh Construction
- Jessica Woodruff, Director of Housing Development, REACH CDC
- John C. Miller, Principal Broker, First Home Realty
- Mark Forker, Executive Director, Willamette West Habitat for Humanity
- Sarah Zahn, Senior Project Manager, Gerding Edlen
- Jill Sherman, Partner, Gerding Edlen
- Rachael Duke, Executive Director, Community Partners for Affordable Housing (CPAH)
- Karen Perl Fox, Housing Development Manager, Community Partners for Affordable Housing (CPAH)

Contacted but No Connection:

- Dave Nielsen, Chief Executive Officer, Home Builders Association of Metro Portland
- Jim Winkler, President at Winkler Development Corporation
- Ann Blaker, Executive Director, Bienestar Oregon
- Adelante Mujeres
- Northwest Housing Alternatives
- Eli Spevak, Orange Splot LLC
- Ed McNamara, Turtle Island Development LLC
- Roy Jay, Roy Jay Enterprises LLC
- Andrew Colas, National Association of Minority Contractors of Oregon
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