Appendix F

Housing Needs Questionnaire and Results

Non-Housing Needs Questionnaire

Stakeholder Meeting Summaries
MEMORANDUM

DATE: February 5, 2004

TO: Housing or Social Service Providers, Advocates and Stakeholders

FROM: Peggy Scheer, Program Manager  Matt Hastie
       Office of Community Development  Cogan Owens Cogan

RE: Washington County Consolidated Plan Housing Needs Assessment Survey

The Washington County Office of Community Development is in the process of updating its Consolidated Plan for 2005-2010. This plan describes and provides guidance for meeting housing and non-housing needs for Washington County and its incorporated cities. It also guides allocation of funding from the federal Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME programs.

As part of the process of identifying future housing needs for low-income households, the homeless and those with special needs, we are distributing the attached questionnaire to a variety of groups and individuals who help meet these needs or provide associated programs and services to these populations. We hope you can take the time to complete this questionnaire. Also, please feel free to distribute copies to other Boards, Committees or groups you know of that also play a role in meeting these needs. The responses will be very helpful in supplementing other data and analysis of housing and homeless needs, as well as the results of stakeholder group and public meetings on this topic.

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN THE QUESTIONNAIRE

NO LATER THAN Friday, February 27, 2004.

Questionnaires can be completed and returned in one of two ways:

1. Write or type responses on a paper copy of the questionnaire and mail or fax to:
   Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC   c/o Pam Pickens
   813 SW Alder Street, Suite 320
   Portland, Oregon  97205-3111
   Fax: 503-225-0224

2. Send an edited electronic file to ppickens@coganowens.com or coc@coganowens.com. If you did not receive this questionnaire via e-mail, you may obtain an electronic copy via the County’s Web site (www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg, click on “Planning”).
A reply of receipt of the electronic submittal will be returned to you. If you do not receive a reply of receipt, please call Pam Pickens at 503-225-0192. You may be advised to resend the questionnaire.

Because we are distributing this questionnaire through a variety of means, you may receive more than one copy. If so, we apologize for any duplication. You only need to complete and return one copy. However, we encourage you to give any extra copies you may receive to others who also may have an interest in completing the questionnaire.

Non-housing needs will be addressed through a separate questionnaire and needs assessment process, also linked to the County’s Consolidated Planning process. Inquiries about both processes can be directed to Pam Pickens at 503-225-0192 (ppickens@coganowens.com) or Jennie Proctor at 503-846-8663 (jennie_proctor@co.washington.or.us). Thank you for your valuable assistance in this effort.
Washington County Consolidated Planning Process

HOUSING NEEDS SURVEY

1. What will be the most urgent housing needs for our low- and moderate-income residents over the next five years? For this exercise, imagine you have a budget of $100 to spend on creating and/or preserving housing units. Please indicate how many dollars you would spend on each activity.

$______ 1. Create new rental housing units for low-income households.
$______ 2. Purchase and/or preserve existing housing for low-income households.
$______ 3. Increase affordable home ownership opportunities.
$______ 4. Provide down payment assistance for first-time home buyers.
$______ 5. Acquire land for future low-income housing development.
$______ 6. Rehabilitate low-income rental housing units.
$______ 7. Provide rehabilitation assistance to low-income homeowners.
$______ 8. Provide emergency repair financial assistance for homeowners.
$______ 9. Make accessibility and/or weatherization improvements for renters and homeowners with disabilities.
$______ 10. Support programs to allow transition from subsidized to non-subsidized housing.
$______ 11. Reduce affordable housing development costs through reductions or waivers of planning or systems development charges or regulatory requirements.
$______ 12. Other (please describe) ______________________________
$100.00 TOTAL

2. What of the following groups do you think are in most need of assistance for affordable housing units. Please rank the groups from 1 to 8, where 1 = highest relative need and 8 = lowest relative need. Please use each ranking only once.

_____ Low-income households with children
_____ Low-income seniors
_____ Victims of domestic violence
_____ Persons with disabilities or other special needs (excluding homeless)
_____ Persons with substance abuse or dependency issues
_____ Low-income or homeless youth
_____ Farm workers
_____ Low-income single adults (excluding categories above)

Website: www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg, click on Planning
3. What will be the most urgent needs for homeless persons over the next five years? For this exercise, you have a budget of $100 to spend on activities to assist the homeless. Please indicate how many dollars you would spend on each activity.

$____ 1. Homeless prevention services (eviction and foreclosure intervention, etc.).
$____ 2. Emergency shelter space.
$____ 3. Transitional housing with services for treatment (stay between 6-24 months).
$____ 4. Permanent housing and permanent supportive housing.
$____ 5. Homeless support services (transportation vouchers, service centers, etc.)
$____ 6. Homeless assistance (security deposit assistance, rental assistance, etc.).
$____ 7. Other (please describe.)

$100.00 TOTAL

4. Use the space below to list other low- and moderate-income housing priorities, needs, or underserved populations that you see increasing in Washington County over the next five years.

Website: [www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg](http://www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg), click on Planning
5. What affordable housing and housing services does your organization currently provide? (please fill in table below and/or attach additional information, as needed)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of facility or program</th>
<th>Type of housing or service</th>
<th># Units or clients served</th>
<th>Approximate Location (city or portion of County)</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. With what type of organization are you affiliated? (please check one item)

___ Non-profit housing provider  ___ Faith-based organization  ___ Other non-profit organization

___ For-profit developer  ___ Local government elected official  ___ Local government staff

___ Local business

Contact Information (optional)

Name

Organization/Affiliation  Title/Position

Address  City  State  Zip

Phone  Fax  E-mail

Please complete and return by **February 27** to:

Pam Pickens
Cogan Owens Cogan
813 SW Alder Street, Suite 320
Portland, OR 97205

e-mail: ppickens@coganowens.com; fax: 503-225-0224

Website: [www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg](http://www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg), click on Planning
BACKGROUND

As part of the process of updating the Washington County’s Consolidated Plan, Washington County Office of Community Development staff and Cogan Owens Cogan prepared and distributed a brief questionnaire to solicit information about housing needs and priorities in the County. Approximately 200 questionnaires were distributed via mail, e-mail and at a Housing Forum sponsored by the Vision Action Network of Washington County. In addition, questionnaire recipients were encouraged to share and distribute copies to others with an interest in housing issues.

Questionnaire respondents were asked to comment on the following:

- Relative priorities for funding different types of activities or programs aimed at creating and preserving housing to meet the needs of low and moderate income households.
- Relative needs among different types of households or populations.
- Relative priorities for funding different types of programs or activities to address needs of the homeless.
- Other low and moderate-income housing needs and underserved populations.
- Housing services or facilities provided by respondents or their organizations.

As of March 1, 2004, 66 individuals representing non-profit housing providers, faith-based organizations, other non-profit groups, for-profit developers, local government staff and officials, local business owners and other citizens completed and returned questionnaires. Following is a brief summary of key findings and results by question.
OVERALL FINDINGS AND OBSERVATIONS

- Respondents represented a variety of organizations. However, the bulk of respondents are affiliated with faith based organizations, non-profit housing providers or other non-profit groups (combined total of 60% of all respondents). Only one for-profit developer and one local government elected official responded.

- Overall, top priorities, in order of importance, for creating and/or preserving affordable housing units included creating new low income rental units, purchasing or preserving existing units for low income residents, and buying land for development of new low income units.

- Overall, groups identified with the greatest (three highest) relative housing need included low-income families with children, persons with disabilities or other special housing needs, and low-income seniors.

- Overall, the top three priorities for programs to address the needs of the homeless included, in order of importance, emergency shelter space, permanent housing and supportive services, and transitional housing or services.

Following is a more detailed summary of results by topic.

RESULTS BY TOPIC

AFFILIATION OF RESPONDENTS

Respondents represented a variety of groups, though a majority are affiliated with some type of nonprofit organization. Local government staff account for the next largest category, while for-profit developers and local government elected officials account for the smallest number of respondents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit housing providers</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Faith-based organization</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other non-profit organization</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>37.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>For profit developer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government staff</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local government elected official</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government staff</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local business</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private citizen or undefined</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Affiliation of respondents

- Other non-profit organization: 37%
- Non-profit housing providers: 15%
- Faith-based organization: 8%
- Local government staff: 17%
- Local government elected official: 2%
- Local business: 6%
- State government staff: 2%
- For profit developer: 2%
- Private citizen or undefined: 9%
- Other non-profit organization: 37%

**Question #1 - Priorities/Spending for Creating and/or Preserving Housing Units to Meet the Most Urgent Needs of Low and Moderate-Income Residents Over the Next Five Years:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Average amount spent (out of $100)</th>
<th>Overall ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Create new low-income rental units</td>
<td>$18.53</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and/or preserve existing housing for low-income households</td>
<td>$16.78</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for future low-income housing development</td>
<td>$9.20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate low-income rental housing units.</td>
<td>$9.13</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase affordable home ownership</td>
<td>$8.61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce affordable housing development costs</td>
<td>$7.39</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide down payment assistance for first-time home buyers</td>
<td>$6.88</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other*</td>
<td>$6.06</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support programs to allow transition from subsidized to non-subsidized housing</td>
<td>$4.88</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make accessibility and/or weatherization improvements</td>
<td>$4.46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide emergency repair financial assistance for homeowners</td>
<td>$4.16</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide rehabilitation assistance to low-income homeowners</td>
<td>$3.93</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Other (14 respondents, spent $10 to $50 on the following items)
  - Rental assistance to preserve housing.
  - Mixed income housing along light rail lines.
• Home Maintenance classes for low income to help them maintain and budget for repairs
• Fund/promote co-location of affordable housing with services for low income, e.g., senior housing with health clinics, family (including farm worker) housing with childcare centers, senior housing with health clinics, etc.
• Mixed income
• Provide rental subsidies for families below 50% AMI (there are many units available, but even 50-60% AMI rents often exceed the affordability threshold for low-income households)
• Homeless shelter for singles; tax abatement (5 for shelter, 15 for abatement)
• 10 housing for single homeless, 10 for pre-development funds
• Actively work to secure a new, regional source of funding for affordable housing
• Rental or mortgage assistance
• Create low-income housing for seniors
• Singles shelter/emergency shelter
• Create more transitional housing
• Work on establishing a real estate transfer fee
• MAX Light Rail Station based housing

Similarities and differences among types of respondents
• Most groups identified the same top two priorities as the group as a whole except as noted below
• Local business representatives are relatively more supportive of home ownership options - ranked increasing affordable home ownership and assistance for first time homebuyers #1 and #2, respectively.
• Faith-based groups and other non-profits ranked rehabilitation of rental units #3, compared to overall ranking of #4.
• Non-profit housing developers ranked reducing affordable housing development costs #3, compared to #6 overall
• Private citizen/non-affiliated respondents ranked the following items #1, #2 and #3 respectively: purchase and/or preserve existing units for low-income housing; acquire land for low-income housing development; and reduce affordable housing development costs.
**QUESTION #2. RELATIVE NEED OF SPECIFIC POPULATIONS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Affiliation</th>
<th>Average Ranking</th>
<th>Relative ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income households with children</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities or other special needs</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(excluding homeless)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income seniors</td>
<td>3.52</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of domestic violence</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income or homeless youth</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with substance abuse or dependency issues</td>
<td>5.61</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income single adults</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: Lowest value = highest relative need*

Similarities and differences among types of respondents included the following:

- Most groups identified low-income households with children as having the greatest relative need except as noted below. There was more variation in the responses among different groups, in comparison to the results for question #1.

- Local business representatives ranked persons with disabilities, low-income households with children, and victims of domestic violence #1, #2 and #3, respectively.

- Faith-based groups ranked farmworkers #2, compared to an overall ranking of #5; they ranked victims of domestic violence higher and low-income seniors lower than the group as a whole.

- The top three rankings by non-profit housing developers were the same as for the group as a whole, though their #4 and #5 rankings were reversed, in comparison to the overall rankings.

- Private citizen/non-affiliated respondents ranked the following items #1, #2 and #3 respectively: persons with disabilities or other special needs; low-income households with children; and low-income seniors.
QUESTION #3 - PRIORITIES/SPENDING FOR HOMELESS ASSISTANCE PROGRAMS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program/need</th>
<th>Average amount spent (out of $100)</th>
<th>Overall ranking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter space</td>
<td>$22.34</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent housing and supportive services</td>
<td>$21.60</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing services or treatment</td>
<td>$18.49</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless prevention services</td>
<td>$13.81</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless assistance (security deposit assistance, rental assistance, etc.)</td>
<td>$12.70</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless support services (transportation vouchers, service centers, etc.)</td>
<td>$9.37</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other – seven (7) respondents spent $5 to $30 on the following:</td>
<td>$1.69</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Employment enhancement training (work skills, hygiene advice, resume writing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Access to affordable health care, especially for chronic health problems.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Drug treatment, mental health treatment.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• De-criminalization of homelessness. Work to stop police from arresting people for trying to sleep.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Training on how to find jobs and training on gaining work skills</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Youth and mentally ill.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Establishment of real estate transfer fee.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similarities and differences among types of respondents included the following:

- Responses to this question showed the most variation among respondents’ top three rankings in comparison to questions #1 and #2, though most groups ranked emergency shelters as a top funding priority.
- Local business representatives ranked transitional housing #2, followed by homeless prevention services and permanent housing, which tied for #3.
- Faith-based groups ranked transitional housing with services as their #1 priority; they ranked permanent housing and emergency shelter space #2 and #3 respectively but with almost identical average scores.
- Local government staff ranked transitional housing #2 and permanent housing #3.
- The top three rankings by non-profit housing developers were permanent housing and support services, prevention services, and emergency shelter space, respectively.
- Other non-profit groups ranked permanent housing and services, emergency shelter space, and transitional housing #1, #2 and #3, respectively.
• Private citizen/unaffiliated respondents’ top three rankings matched those of the group as a whole.

QUESTION #4 – OTHER LOW AND MODERATE-INCOME HOUSING PRIORITIES OR UNDERSERVED POPULATIONS.

A variety of needs, populations and trends were identified. The following were mentioned most frequently. A complete listing of comments is available upon request. Numbers in parentheses refer to the number of times each topic was mentioned.

Underserved populations (mentioned more than once)

• Low-income seniors (6)
• Drug and alcohol abuse affected individuals (6)
• Very low income single mothers or single parents with children (5)
• Immigrant populations (5)
• Families unable to purchase a home, including large families (5)
• Persons with mental health issues (5)
• Lowest income groups (4)
• Adults with developmental disabilities (4)
• Victims of domestic abuse (4)
• Farmworkers (3)
• At-risk youth (3)
• Mobile home occupants (3)
• First-time homebuyers (3)
• Ex-offenders (3)
• Homeless singles (2)

Program needs or strategies (mentioned more than once)

• Rental assistance (4)
• Homeless shelter space (2)
Date: January 12, 2004
To: City and County Officials, Nonprofit Organizations, and Interested Parties
From: Washington County Office of Community Development (OCD) and Cogan Owens Cogan, Consultant to OCD
Re: Request for Information to Identify Non-Housing Community Development Needs

Your assistance is needed to identify non-housing community development needs, as the first step in preparing the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan for Washington County. The plan will describe community needs, outline objectives, list activities that may be eligible for CDBG funding and provide criteria for selecting projects.

For your convenience, two public workshops will be held on:

**Tuesday, January 20, 2004** from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. at the PCC Hillsboro Education Center, 102 SE Washington, Room 109.

**Thursday, January 22, 2004** from 2:00 – 4:00 p.m. at the PCC Hillsboro Education Center, 102 SE Washington Room 109.

(Topics covered on both days will be the same)

The workshop is your opportunity to ask any questions you may have about the Needs Questionnaire or the consolidated planning process. The meeting room is accessible to persons with disabilities. Assisted listening devices are available for persons with impaired hearing and can be scheduled for this workshop by calling (503) 846-8814 or (503) 846-4598 no later than 5:00 p.m. Friday, January 16, 2004 or Monday, January 19, 2004 (respective to each meeting date).

Future project applications must be based on the needs listed in the 2005-2010 Consolidated Plan. Therefore, your response to this questionnaire is a key element in the identification of non-housing community needs and possible methods of meeting those needs. **It is very important to note that you will be projecting needs for the five-year time period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2010.**

Questionnaires will be distributed at the workshops or will be available on line after January 16, 2004 (www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg, Click on Planning). Questionnaires are due **Tuesday, February 10, 2004** and must be returned to the consultant at the following address:

Pam Pickens
Cogan Owens Cogan LLC
813 SW Alder Street, Suite 320
Portland, OR 97205-3111

If you should have any questions, call Pam Pickens at 503-225-0192.
A. DESCRIPTION OF THE PROGRAM
The Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program is established by Federal law and administered by the Federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Every year, HUD allocates and distributes funds for the program to “entitlement” communities throughout the United States. Washington County has been an entitlement community for almost 25 years.

Entitlement communities are responsible for making actual CDBG awards within the terms of the Federal guidelines. Funds may be used for a wide range of projects, provided they are directed towards one of the three national objectives of the program, listed below, and the proposed activities meet federal eligibility criteria.

This CDBG Needs Assessment process addresses NON-HOUSING needs only, except for shelters, group homes, and residential treatment facilities. Housing needs will be handled through a separate questionnaire and needs assessment process, also linked to the County’s Consolidated Planning process. Inquiries about the housing needs process should be directed to Jennie Proctor at 503-846-8663.

Historically, the Washington County CDBG program has operated on a three-year cycle. However, it recently has transitioned to a five-year planning cycle linked with the County’s Consolidated Plan, which covers non-housing and housing needs. Completion of the attached Needs Questionnaire is a crucial first step if your organization is to effectively compete for CDBG funds in the 2005-2010 cycle. Needs should include all of those anticipated in this five-year period. In addition, starting this year the County will solicit CDBG applications for specific projects on an annual basis. This represents a substantial change from previous years.

If you have any concerns or questions, please do not hesitate to contact the individual listed at the conclusion of this Guide.

B. PROGRAM ELIGIBILITY DEFINITIONS
While federal legislation and regulations establish rules that all CDBG funded activities must meet, the Washington County CDBG Program sets its own program and funding priorities. All program activities must meet one or more of the following three national objectives.

1. Benefit low and moderate income persons
The federal government requires entitlement communities demonstrate that at least 70 percent of each year’s funding be used to address the first national objective by providing benefit to low
and moderate income persons. In Washington County, virtually all of the activities funded have been directed towards this objective.

Low to moderate income persons are defined as those living in households earning less than 80% of area median income. For an activity to meet this objective, the project must:

- Serve an area where 51% or more of the residents are low and moderate income;
- Serve a population group that is 51% or more low and moderate income; or
- Serve a target population (or limited clientele group) as identified by HUD. These groups are: abused children, elderly persons, battered spouses, homeless persons, adults meeting the Bureau of Census’ definition of severely disabled persons, illiterate adults, persons living with AIDS, and migrant farm workers.

### HUD LOW AND MODERATE INCOME STANDARDS
**EFFECTIVE February 2003**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size of Household</th>
<th>Moderate Income Household: 80% of Median</th>
<th>Low Income Household: 50% of Median</th>
<th>Extremely Low Income Household: 30% of Median</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$36,850</td>
<td>$23,050</td>
<td>$13,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>$42,100</td>
<td>$26,300</td>
<td>$15,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>$47,400</td>
<td>$29,600</td>
<td>$17,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>$52,650</td>
<td>$32,900</td>
<td>$19,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>$56,850</td>
<td>$35,550</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>$61,050</td>
<td>$38,150</td>
<td>$22,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>$65,250</td>
<td>$40,800</td>
<td>$24,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>$69,500</td>
<td>$43,450</td>
<td>$26,050</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)

2. **Aid in the prevention or elimination of slums and blight.**
   To meet this national objective, the activity must be designed to address the conditions causing the slums and blight. The Washington County CDBG Program uses the following definition of slums and blight: at least 30% of the structures are unsafe and public infrastructure is insufficient to meet current or projected needs. Unsafe structures are in violation of the standards of building, fire, health, or safety codes, or a threat to life, health or safety. This objective has rarely been used in Washington County to qualify CDBG projects. Addressing blighted conditions to remove health and safety conditions on a spot basis is also allowed; for example, bringing an historic structure up to safety standards.

3. **Urgent Community Need.**
   To qualify under this third national objective, it must be demonstrated that the proposed project will address a serious and immediate threat to the community health or welfare, which is of recent origin, or became urgent within the past 18 months; and other financial resources are not available. In Washington County, this objective has only been applied once or twice in the history of the local program.
C. PROGRAM CATEGORIES
The federal government has listed the following Program Categories for CDBG funding; Public Facilities, Infrastructure, Public Service, Anti-Crime Programs, Youth Programs and Senior Programs. The attached Needs Questionnaire includes a chart listing these categories and the subcategories within each.

In all cases, the population to be served must be primarily low and moderate income and/or one of the target groups identified by HUD and listed on page 2. Again, please note that the Washington County CDBG Program and the Needs Questionnaire address only non-housing needs.

Activities that are NOT eligible for CDBG funding under Federal guidelines include:

- Buildings used for the general conduct of government
- General government expenses
- Political activities
- Purchase of equipment
- Operating and maintenance expenses
- Income payments and
- New housing construction.

In addition, the following activities are NOT eligible for CDBG funding under Washington County Program policies:

- General planning
- Economic development

D. INSTRUCTIONS FOR COMPLETING THE NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE

Please identify only one Need per form. One questionnaire is provided in this packet; make as many additional copies of the form as you require.

PART A  RESPONDENT
The contact person(s) listed should be those responsible for preparing or authorizing the Needs Questionnaire. These are the people we will contact if any points in your completed questionnaire must be clarified.

PART B:  PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION
This brief program description will be used to create a table listing all identified Needs in Washington County. Please note that this Questionnaire includes only non-housing Needs, with the exception of shelters, group homes and residential treatment facilities.

PART C:  FOCUSED NEED ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS
Population served. The actual area that will benefit from a project is considered to be the “service area”. In some cases, this CDBG service area may be county-wide. For other CDBG eligible activities, a specific geographic area may be served and could be expressed
as a city or specific part of the unincorporated area in the County. Alternatively, a need may serve clients who are either part of a limited clientele group or if a majority (51%) meet the low and moderate income test. The number of people served, approximate cost, percentage of cost expected to be covered by CDBG funds, and other funding sources also should be identified in this section.

PART D: DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF NEED
Documentation is important. Please attach additional information or list references that will support your statement of Need and provide enough detail to allow the reference sources to be easily obtained.

For example, if your identified Need involves the acquisition, construction, or reconstruction of a public facility or describes a public entity’s need for infrastructure improvements, you should indicate the specific area to be served, if not identified specifically in Part C. Also, if not already identified in section C, a Needs statement that describes the Need for initially providing a public or human service, or an expansion of an existing service, should also define the low and moderate income beneficiaries to be served, where they will be served, and whether those clients will be located in a defined “service area” or serve a targeted clientele.

Most importantly, you should show that the facility or infrastructure Need you cite is to be located in a logically defined “service area” and 51% of the residents or users of that improvement are, clearly, at low to moderate-income levels.

If you have any questions, please call:

Pam Pickens
Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC
503-225-0192
ppickens@coganowens.com

PLEASE COMPLETE AND RETURN THE NEEDS QUESTIONNAIRE
NO LATER THAN Tuesday, February 10, 2004.

Questionnaires can be completed and returned in one of two ways:

1. Write or type responses on the attached questionnaire (one Need per questionnaire) as needed, and mail or fax to:

Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC
813 SW Alder Street, Suite 320
Portland, Oregon 97205-3111
Fax: 503-225-0224
2. Obtain an electronic copy of the questionnaire via the County’s Web site (www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg, click on “Planning”), edit the file (provided in Microsoft Word format), and e-mail to ppickens@coganowens.com or coc@coganowens.com.

A reply of receipt of the electronic submittal will be returned to you. If you do not receive a reply of receipt, please call Pam Pickens at 503-225-0192. You may be advised to resend the questionnaire.
YEAR 2005 - 2010
NEEDS ASSESSMENT QUESTIONNAIRE

Welcome to Washington County’s Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) Program. Completion of this Needs Assessment Questionnaire is the first step in a process that will categorize your identified Need in anticipation of potentially competing for a Block Grant award in the years 2005-2010. PLEASE IDENTIFY ONLY ONE NEED PER FORM. Make as many copies of this form as you require. If you did not receive the CDBG Program Guide, which explains the process, goals and requirements of the Program, please contact one of the individuals listed at the end of this questionnaire and they will send you a copy. Or, you can find the questionnaire at the County’s website (www.co.washington.or.us/cdbg, click on Planning).

PART A: RESPONDENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Agency/Jurisdiction:</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Department/Division (as applicable):</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mailing Address:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City and Zip Code:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Contact Name(s) & Title(s)

1. ____________________________________________________________
   Phone: __________________ e-mail: __________________ Fax:__________________________

2. ____________________________________________________________
   Phone: __________________ e-mail: __________________ Fax:__________________________

PART B: PROGRAM IDENTIFICATION

B.1. Please provide a brief title or description of your identified Need in one or two sentences. This may be expressed as a generalized concept or in very specific terms.
B.2. The six primary program categories and subcategories are listed below. Please select the one subcategory you feel most appropriately includes your identified Need.

PUBLIC FACILITY NEEDS
- Neighborhood Facilities
- Parks & Recreation Facilities
- Health Facilities
- Parking Facilities
- Solid Waste Disposal Improvements
- Asbestos Removal
- Non-Residential Historic Preservation
- Other Public Facilities Needs

PUBLIC SERVICE NEEDS
- Handicapped Services
- Transportation Services
- Substance Abuse
- Employment Training
- Health Services
- Other Public Service Needs

ANTI-CRIME PROGRAMS
- Crime Awareness
- Other Anti-Crime Programs

INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS
- Water Improvements
- Sewer Improvements
- Sidewalk Improvements
- Street Improvements
- Flood Drain Improvements
- Other Infrastructure Needs

YOUTH PROGRAMS
- Youth Centers
- Childcare Centers
- Youth Services
- Childcare Services
- Other Youth Programs

SENIOR PROGRAMS
- Senior Centers
- Senior Services
- Other Senior Programs

PART C: FOCUSED NEED ASSESSMENT QUESTIONS

C.1. Identify the geographic or service area within which your Need occurs:
- County-wide
- City (name): ____________________________________________________________
- Unincorporated portion of County (non County-wide)
  - East
  - West
  - North
  - South

C.2. If your Need involves benefit to a target population or limited clientele, rather than low and moderate income individuals in general, please identify the group below. If you check more than one box, please be sure that your detailed Need Description in Part D explains why.

- Abused children,
- Elderly persons,
- Battered spouses,
- Homeless persons,
- Illiterate adults,
___ Persons living with AIDS, and
___ Adults meeting the Bureau of Census’ definition of severely disabled persons,
___ Migrant farm workers.

C.3. Please estimate the number of people in the designated geographic or service area (C.1.) who are subject to the Need you have identified. Provide estimates for each of the groups you identified previously (C.2.). Any overlap should be clarified in your Need Description (Part D).

C.4. Depending on the nature of the Need or specific project you have identified, it would be helpful to have your estimate of the costs involved. Please indicate whether your rough estimate of cost is one-time or potentially reoccurring, and why.

Total Estimated Cost $____________________

______One time cost
______Recurring cost (please explain)______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________

C.5. To what extent do you anticipate that CDBG funds will have to be used to meet the costs of addressing your identified Need? If possible, please express this as a percentage of total cost. What other funding sources are available/anticipated to help meet the costs?

_____ (%) of total cost of need met by CDBG funds

Other potential funding sources

PART D: DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF NEED

D.1. Please provide details of your identified Need. The Need usually will be expressed as a general concept (i.e. “provide shelter and job training for the homeless”), but can be more specific (i.e. construct a 32 bed homeless shelter in western Washington County”). Please review your answers to the questions in Part C. If available, provide more detailed information about the nature of the need on the following page. Such information may be helpful in determining eligibility under the federal criteria listed in the accompanying instructions, estimating the cost of meeting the need, or categorizing the need (see question B.2).
Supplemental information could include reason(s) for the Need; characteristics of the Need; specific resources required (staff, buildings, land, materials, etc.); cost assumptions; and/or how the Need could be satisfied through the CDBG Program.

(D.1 continued)

D.2. If there are additional sources of information (reports, statistics, etc.) that will assist in documenting your Need, please identify them below or attach them to your submitted form. For references, please provide enough detail so that the documentation may be obtained easily.
ANY QUESTIONS? We recognize that with a program as diverse as this one, it may be difficult to provide answers to all of the questions posed in this form. Do NOT assume that your inability to answer a question will disqualify you from submitting a Needs Questionnaire. Instead, give us a call.

Pam Pickens  
Cogan Owens Cogan  
503-225-0192

Please return this form NO LATER THAN Tuesday, February 10, 2004 to:

Pam Pickens  
Cogan Owens Cogan, LLC  
813 SW Alder Street, Suite 320  
Portland, Oregon  97205-3111  
503-225-0224 (fax)  
ppickens@coganowens.com
The following is a summary of the first Washington County 2005 – 2010 Consolidated Plan Update stakeholder meeting.

**Attending**

**Stakeholders:** Henry Alvarez, Washington County Department of Housing Services; Karina Benitez, Columbia Funding Group; Terry Brown, Homestreet, Inc.; Vince Chiotti, Oregon Housing and Community Services; Dennis Erickson, Washington County Community Corrections; Sheila Greenlaw-Fink, Community Partners for Affordable Housing; Carol Gakin, Citizen; Jeff Hill, Aging and Veterans Services; Kristin Kane, Cascade AIDS Project; Doug Longhurst, Housing Development Corporation; Deborah Miller, Realty Trust; Kris Moore, Interfaith Hospitality Network; Sam Park, Oregon Korean Community Center; Michael Parkhurst, City of Beaverton Mayor’s Office; Duane Roberts, City of Tigard Planning; Barbara Smith, Washington Mutual; Becky Smith, Community Action; Chance Wooley, Washington County Mental Health.

**Consultant Staff:** Matt Hastie and Pam Pickens, Cogan Owens Cogan, COC; Ramsay Weit.

**Washington County Staff:** Jennie Proctor, Community Development Program Coordinator; Peggy Scheer, Program Manager; Bill Haack, Housing Services Specialist.

**Guests:** Mike Sheehan, Fisher, Sheehan & Colton.
Introductions

Matt Hastie opened the meeting by introducing himself and members of the consulting team Pam Pickens, Cogan Owens Cogan and Ramsay Weit. Additional team members not in attendance include Kurt Wehbring, Sextant Consultants and Sumner Sharpe.

The purpose of this project is to update the existing Washington County Consolidated Plan. Stakeholders will assist in identifying housing needs, objectives and strategies for the Washington County 2005 – 2010 Consolidated Plan. Four stakeholder meetings are scheduled.

Next, Matt reviewed the agenda and asked participants to introduce themselves and identify any groups with which they are affiliated.

Project Overview

Matt provided a Power Point presentation to describe the process for updating the Consolidated Plan. The objectives of the project are to meet HUD requirements for a consolidated plan; coordinate with other jurisdictions on all plan elements; involve stakeholders and members of the public; create a more seamless, user-friendly document; and focus on implementation and results. The role of HPAS and PAB review progress at key points; review draft work products; provide guidance on key decisions; and conduct public hearing/meetings. The project runs from January 2004 to May 2005. The stakeholder involvement process is concentrated in February – April, 2004, although input is encouraged throughout the process. Upcoming steps include technical analysis and review by the stakeholder group.

Stakeholder Roles and Responsibilities

Matt reviewed stakeholder roles and responsibilities. He explained that meeting participants will assist Washington County Office of Community Development staff and consultants in identifying five-year housing needs and priorities, as well as policies and strategies to meet and monitor them. Project staff and consultants will support stakeholders in these efforts throughout this project. Ultimately the County’s Housing Programs Advisory Subcommittee and Policy Advisory Board will review stakeholder recommendations for incorporation in the Consolidated Plan. Specific responsibilities will include: review and comment on the work of the consultants and staff; review the materials before each meeting; inform other interested parties about future opportunities for involvement and comment; be a liaison to constituent groups; and participate actively in meetings and discussions.
Ramsay said this project is an ongoing process. If stakeholders have any particular ideas about funding, needs, etc. they should contact the consulting team between meetings, if needed.

Stakeholders asked to review Consolidated Plan elements and then asked whether Portland State University (PSU) data would be incorporated into the Plan update. Plan elements include:

- Executive Summary/Introduction
- Implementing Plans
- Housing Affordability Strategy
- Community Development Block Grant Plan
- Goals and Policies
- Community Profile
- Housing and Homeless Needs Assessment

The PSU project summarized U.S. Census Data related to housing in Washington County broken down by jurisdiction. Some of the data will be useful, but one of the Plan’s requirements is to identify concentrations of population by low-income and ethnicity by Census Tract, which the PSU project did not do.

**Review of Previously Identified Needs, Objectives, Priorities**

Matt asked the group to review the *Comparison of Identified Needs* handout, which compares identified housing needs in the Washington County 2000 – 2005 Consolidated Plan and the Vision West Issue Paper, 2002. He asked the group to identify any categories that are not already listed. Additional categories recommended include:

- Homeless
- Single people with disabilities
- Permanent housing for people with disabilities

Other comments from stakeholders include:

- Programs should target 30% of median income and below for affordable housing projects. Currently, this is a gap.
- First time homebuyer and affordable unit categories should be separate.
- Drug and alcohol issues should be included as a separate category.
- This process should be used to identify gaps in the planning process. The end result should be that each identified issue can move along a continuum.

Next, Matt asked what types of information should be included in the Plan to help stakeholders make better decisions now and in the future? Suggestions include:

- Geographic distribution of special needs populations
- Relationships between income, age and ethnicity
- Compilation of reliable data sources
- Housing condition and needs. For example, do seniors need housing and what condition is their current housing? The U.S. Census identifies if there is overcrowding, but not the size of house needed to alleviate overcrowding.

**Next Steps**

At the next meeting, consultants and staff will provide quantitative and qualitative information about the extent of housing needs for specific groups, including a preliminary summary of the housing needs survey. During the meeting we will prioritize housing needs and strategies. The next meeting will take place on Friday, March 12, 1:30 – 3:30 pm at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park, 15655 SW Millikan Blvd.
Stakeholder Meeting #2

March 12, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
Nature Park Interpretive Center
Beaver Den Room
15655 SW Millikan Blvd.
Beaverton, OR

Notes
The following is a summary of the second Washington County 2005 – 2010 Consolidated Plan Update stakeholder meeting.

Attending
Stakeholders: Susan Wilson, Washington County Department of Housing Services; Terry Brown, Homestreet, Inc.; Vince Chiotti, Oregon Housing and Community Services; Dennis Erickson, Washington County Community Corrections; Sheila Greenlaw-Fink, Community Partners for Affordable Housing; Phil Hedrick, Cascade Housing Group; Jeff Hill, Aging and Veterans Services; Adele Hughes, Hillsboro Chamber; Kristin Kane, Cascade AIDS Project; Doug Longhurst, Housing Development Corporation; Kris Moore, Interfaith Hospitality Network; Amber Ontiveros, Tri-Met; Michael Parkhurst, City of Beaverton Mayor's Office; Debbie Raber, City of Hillsboro; Duane Roberts, City of Tigard Planning; Patrick Rogers, Community Action; Howard Roll, The Bridge Project; Chance Wooley, Washington County Mental Health.

Consultant Staff: Matt Hastie and Damian Pitt, Cogan Owens Cogan, COC; Ramsay Weit.

Washington County Staff: Jennie Proctor, Community Development Program Coordinator; Peggy Scheer, Program Manager; Bill Haack, Housing Services Specialist.

Guests: Mike Sheehan, Fisher, Sheehan & Colton.
Introductions

Matt Hastie opened the meeting by introducing himself and consulting team members Damian Pitt, Cogan Owens Cogan (filling in for Pam Pickens) and Ramsay Weit.

Matt reviewed the agenda and objectives for the meeting. One goal is to have the stakeholders talk and become actively engaged in this and future stakeholder group meetings. Therefore, Matt asked the participants to talk briefly with their neighbors around the conference table about the work that they do to meet housing needs in Washington County. The stakeholders talked with each other for approximately five minutes, after which time several volunteers shared the information they had learned.

Project Overview

Matt reviewed a flowchart outlining the stakeholders’ role in the preparation of the 2005 – 2010 Consolidated Plan Update. Generally, the stakeholders group provides advice to County staff and the project consultant team as they draft the Housing Needs and Special Needs sections of the plan. The purpose of the first two stakeholder meetings is to identify, describe, and prioritize the housing related needs of renters, owners, and people with special needs in Washington County. In the first meeting the stakeholders discussed the types of data that would be helpful for identifying needs and priorities. The objectives of the second meeting are to present the information that the consultants have gathered so far, gather the stakeholders’ responses to this information, and determine what else is needed. We also will discuss the particular needs of certain populations and go through a prioritization process exercise to determine the most pressing needs and issues.

After this meeting, the consultant staff will draft a list of goals, building off of those found in the previous Consolidated Plan and other plans from the County and other relevant organizations. In the third meeting stakeholders will help refine the goals and identify and prioritize strategies for achieving them. The final stakeholders meeting will be used to discuss performance measures or goals to be used in judging the success of the goals and strategies to address housing needs. Performance measures were not covered in the 2000 plan, but this is something that HUD is more concerned with now. The results of all four meetings will be incorporated in the Consolidated Plan and will be reviewed and approved by the County’s Housing Programs Advisory Subcommittee (HPAS), Policy Advisory Board (PAB), the Washington County Board of Commissioners, and finally HUD.

Matt asked if the stakeholders had any further questions about the process, and they did not.
Review of Preliminary Questionnaire Results

Matt reviewed the results of the housing needs questionnaire that was distributed to the stakeholders and other interested parties between the first and second meetings. The consultant team sent out 200 of these surveys, and 66 were returned by the February 27 deadline. The stakeholders’ comments on the questionnaire follow, with responses from Matt included in brackets:

Comments on Question 1, Priorities/ Spending for Creating and/or Preserving Housing Units to Meet the Most Urgent Needs of Low and Moderate-Income Residents over the Next Five Years:

- It may have been better to refine this question and ask about the priorities for different regions within the County.
  [We did not address that in the questionnaire, although the need for this type of information was discussed in the first stakeholder group meeting. We have gathered some quantitative data that will show what we know about the needs so far, some of which is broken down by region].
- “Other” should have been ranked last, since the items included under “Other” were probably not mentioned as often as any of the listed options.
- It might help to group the items by broader categories, such as renters’ vs. homeowners’ issues.

Comments on Question 2, Relative Needs of Specific Populations

- The respondents' background and work likely influenced their perceptions of the relative needs of specific populations.
- A respondent’s geographic base also could influence his or her perceptions of the relative importance of some issues, such as farmworker housing.
- HUD’s recent study on worst-case housing needs validates the results from the questionnaire.

Comments on Question 3, Priorities/ Spending for Homeless Assistance Programs

- The top three priorities from Question 3 reflect those from Question 1.
- We should look at national trends. For example, shelters and transitional housing are becoming less of a priority than permanent housing.
- The Housing and Supportive Services network also identified these as the top three issues.
That group is working on the continuum of care strategy, which is one of the processes that will be integrated into the Consolidated Plan report.

- We should attempt to group some of these categories together.

For Question 4, Other Low and Moderate-Income Housing Priorities or Underserved Populations, Matt observed that the questionnaire responses reflected a continuing emphasis on the special needs populations from Question 2. He asked if the stakeholders were aware of any other emerging trends that should be considered. Their responses were as follows:

- There will be less federal money for these services in the near future. For example, the Bush administration’s proposed budget includes a $23 billion reduction in Section 8 funding.

- Larger families that are renters are another underserved population. For example, in Beaverton there are a lot of 1- and 2-bedroom rental units but very few 3- and 4-bedroom rentals.

- Some organizations now make a strategic decision to plan their work based on what is more likely to be funded. The priorities in the Consolidated Plan should also take into consideration what is more likely to be funded.

- It’s cheaper to house people than put them in shelters, even though that isn’t reflected in the questionnaire results. Money is better spent preventing homelessness rather than reacting to it. People often don’t understand this because they can see the people who are homeless and need a place to sleep, but can’t see and understand the needs of people who are living in apartments or homes and are in danger of losing them. At the same time, that does not mean there isn’t a need for shelters.

- The Housing First rental assistance model being pushed in Multnomah County has been found to be more effective than the traditional “step-system” of emergency to transitional to permanent housing.

- There has been a big push to bundle housing and services, such as required participation in counseling or other services that goes along with the housing. These requirements make transitional housing more expensive. We should reduce the number of steps one has to go through to get into permanent housing.

- Transitions to Housing has been a model that has been successful in Multnomah County, and that should be an example that we consider.

Review of Preliminary Assessment of Housing Needs

Damian Pitt of Cogan Owens Cogan presented the results of the consultant team’s preliminary assessment of housing needs for low-income and special
needs populations in Washington County, which had been summarized in a table distributed to the stakeholders group. Damian mentioned that some of the information in the table, such as income status, has not yet been found and may not be available for every category of special needs resident. For example, there is no information readily available from the US Census or other sources regarding the income levels of people who have mental or physical disabilities. In other cases the information may not be useful for the purposes of the Consolidated Plan. For example, the US Census identifies the total number of residents who are elderly or have any form of disability, but it doesn’t identify how many of those are frail or otherwise in need of housing assistance. Damian also mentioned that the table did not include much information on the gaps between service locations and needs, and that the consultant team was trying to gather more information in that area.

The stakeholders' comments on the questionnaire follow, with responses from the County and the consultant team included in brackets:

- Do the population numbers represent households or individuals?
  
  [The data for income ranges (first three items in the table) represent households; all others represent individuals]

- Is there any overlap between the various population groups shown in the table rows?
  
  [Yes]

- Why does the table list facilities for seniors that aren't necessarily affordable? You should include only those that accept Medicaid.
  
  [We need to consider all seniors as a special needs population]

- One of our goals should be to disperse or reduce concentrations of low-income housing. We need to know more about where housing for low-income households and special needs populations is located. We should be able to identify concentrations of assisted or low-income housing if the locations of all publicly funded housing units are geocoded.

- Are housing facilities built with private activity bonds included in the public or assisted housing inventory?
  
  [They are included if they are found in the inventories of HUD and DHS-assisted units.]

- We need to clarify whether housing that is available to the 0-30% and 30-50% income groups is actually affordable to them.

- There are significant populations of farmworkers living in the Beaverton and Tigard areas.
- CAO is going to do street counts of homeless people in the County, including going out to the woods to identify people who aren't seeking services.
- Homeless shelter counts underestimate the total need. Turnaway counts are more important than number of people using beds in shelters.
- We should try to identify the number of accessible units out there.
- We can get more info about mental health and DHS units accessible to people with disabilities.

Identify Priorities

Matt led a discussion of Table 2a, one of the required elements of the Consolidated Plan, which will identify the County’s priority housing needs. He asked the stakeholders to review the priority needs identified in the previous Consolidated Plan and determine whether the priorities need to be changed for the updated Plan. Comments included the following:

- The questionnaire results do not reflect the priorities from the old table 2a.
- It might be helpful to see if the priorities from the previous plan have been addressed.
- Why are owners in the 50-80% income category given a high priority, when renters in that category are considered a medium priority.
- Home ownership is the American dream, and should not be a low priority.
- Home ownership rates are much higher for whites vs. minorities. There will be racial and ethnic implications to the decisions about who gets assistance, as Hispanics are concentrated in lower income groups.
- Rehab programs help homeowners stay in their homes, which saves space in low-income rental units for others who may need them.
- Change the priority for the 51-80% income owner group from high to medium.

Matt asked if the rest of the stakeholders agreed to this final suggestion. After some discussion, the group decided to table the question until the next meeting, so more information can be gathered on the availability of units that are affordable to the various income groups.

Matt then led the stakeholders through a dot prioritization process to identify their top priorities among the following three categories: Housing Needs by Housing and Program Type; Housing Needs for Specific Populations; and Homeless
Needs. The results of this process are included in the tables attached to this summary.

**Next Steps**

At the next meeting the participants will review the results of the dot process and continue the discussion of prioritization of needs. The consultants will present additional information about housing availability and needs. Participants will review and refine housing goals as a large group, then engage in small group discussions on strategies to address the priority needs. The next meeting will take place on Thursday, April 8, 1:30 – 3:30 pm at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park, 15655 SW Millikan Blvd.
## Housing and Homeless Needs Prioritization

### HOUSING NEEDS BY HOUSING AND PROGRAM TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and/or preserve existing housing for low-income households</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new low-income rental units</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate low-income rental housing units.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for future low-income housing development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support programs to allow transition from subsidized to non-subsidized housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase affordable home ownership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce affordable housing development costs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide rehabilitation assistance to low-income homeowners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide down payment assistance for first-time home buyers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make accessibility and/or weatherization improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide emergency repair financial assistance for homeowners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Housing and Homeless Needs Prioritization

### HOUSING NEEDS FOR SPECIFIC POPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities or other special needs (excluding homeless)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income households with children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income seniors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with substance abuse or dependency issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income single adults</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income or homeless youth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-offenders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Housing and Homeless Needs Prioritization

#### HOMELESS NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent housing and supportive services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless prevention services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter space</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless assistance (security deposit assistance, rental assistance, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless support services (transportation vouchers, service centers, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing services or treatment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Stakeholder Meeting #3

April 8, 1:30 – 3:30 p.m.
Tualatin Hills Park & Recreation District
Nature Park Interpretive Center
Beaver Den Room
15655 SW Millikan Blvd.
Beaverton, OR

Notes
The following is a summary of the third Washington County 2005 – 2010 Consolidated Plan Update stakeholder meeting.

Attending
Stakeholders: Susan Wilson, Washington County Department of Housing Services; Terry Brown, Homestreet, Inc.; Vince Chiotti, Oregon Housing and Community Services; Dennis Erickson, Washington County Community Corrections; Phil Hedrick, Cascade Housing Group; Jeff Hill, Aging and Veterans Services; Adele Hughes, Hillsboro Chamber; Ellen Johnson, Oregon Legal Services; Kristin Kane, Cascade AIDS Project; Doug Longhurst, Housing Development Corporation; Kris Moore, Interfaith Hospitality Network; Michael Parkhurst, City of Beaverton Mayor’s Office; Debbie Raber, City of Hillsboro; Duane Roberts, City of Tigard Planning; Patrick Rogers, Community Action; Howard Roll, The Bridge Project; Barbara Smith, Washington Mutual; Becky Smith, Community Action; Chance Wooley, Washington County Mental Health.

Consultant Staff: Matt Hastie and Damian Pitt, Cogan Owens Cogan, COC; Ramsay Weit.

Washington County Staff: Jennie Proctor, Community Development Program Coordinator; Peggy Scheer, Program Manager; Bill Haack, Housing Services Specialist.

Guests: Mike Sheehan, Fisher, Sheehan & Colton; Pavel Goberman.
Introductions

Matt Hastie opened the meeting by introducing himself and consulting team members Damian Pitt, Cogan Owens Cogan and Ramsay Weit.

Matt asked the stakeholder group members to introduce themselves, then reviewed the meeting agenda. He added one item to the agenda, to review the new information and data that the consultant team had gathered since the last stakeholders meeting. The stakeholder group had no further questions about the agenda.

Information and Data Update

Since the last stakeholder group meeting, the consultant team has filled in new information for Table 2a, which is a HUD-mandated component of the final consolidated plan. This table identifies the number of households within the applicable jurisdiction that have any sort of “housing problem,” such as cost burden, substandard housing, or other barriers to adequate housing. The table divides the population by homeowners and four categories of renters (elderly renters, large families, small families, and other renters), as well as by income categories (0-30% Median Family Income, 31-50%, and 51-80%). The information on the number of households with housing problems comes from HUD’s Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy (CHAS) tables, which are available on the HUD website. These numbers are based on the 2000 US Census, and the consultants updated the data for the years 2005 and 2010 based on the state’s expected population growth rates for Washington County. Table 2a also includes the estimated cost of the improvements needed to meet the identified future needs. These figures are based on HUD’s Total Development Costs for developing new units or rehabilitating existing units in the Portland metropolitan region.

Matt explained that the consultant team had prepared a separate table showing housing need numbers for homeowners according to the Table 2a categories used for renters (elderly, small families, large families, and other). These numbers are based on the same data and assumptions used in filling out Table 2a.

The County provided information, included in the stakeholders’ agenda packets, about the distribution of the County’s Housing Rehabilitation Program funds by income, special needs populations, and racial/ethnic categories.

The consultant team also made some changes to the Preliminary Analysis of Housing Needs, which had been distributed at the second stakeholders meeting. These changes included:

- Corrected the “percent of total” figures for the number of households in each income category.
• Updated the information on Section 8 vouchers distributed by DHS.

• Added information on the Washington County Shelter + Care program.

• Reduced the number of housing units listed for elderly residential care facilities, nursing facilities, assisted living facilities, and adult foster homes. Listed only the units that accept Medicaid, which are assumed to be the only ones affordable to low-income elderly residents.

• Added information, provided by DHS, on the number of rental units with accessible features.

• Changed the number of housing units provided by DHS for each income category to more accurately reflect the number of units that are affordable to members of each income category. The consultant team is working with DHS to replace these numbers, which are based on the maximum income limits for each housing development, with numbers based on the actual incomes of the residents or rents at the various DHS housing facilities.

A stakeholder group member asked if more information could be added to the rental units with accessible features portion of the table about the number of units that are restricted to people with certain specific conditions. Matt responded that this information will be added if it is available.

The consultants also gave the stakeholder group members a table that shows the geographic distribution within the County of HUD affordable housing, DHS assisted housing, and DHS public housing units. The table includes the number of units in each jurisdiction plus the jurisdictions’ percent of the total. Matt described how the distribution of these units compares to the jurisdictions’ respective percentages of the total incorporated county population. For example, Beaverton has 22% of the units and 33% of the population. Matt noted that the locations are based on street addresses, and some of the housing developments may not necessarily be within the city limits. Susan Wilson mentioned that some of the facilities listed for Beaverton are technically in Aloha. Others listed for Portland are actually in unincorporated Washington County. There is a concentration of low-income housing units in that area, due to two very large facilities. The consultant team also has gathered information about the census tracts where low-income or minority households are concentrated.

Chance Wooley of Washington County Mental Health said that his office estimates there are 8,500 people in Washington County with severe mental illness, and there are 73 housing beds in County specifically targeted for those people.

Another stakeholder asked about whether the “4% tax credit properties” are included in the Preliminary Analysis of Housing Needs. Susan Wilson answered that some are included and others are not. Damian Pitt stated that the units included in the Preliminary Analysis table are those listed in DHS’s Affordable
Housing Portfolio. Only “family” units are listed for their respective income categories, and those units targeted to farmworkers or other specific sub-populations are included elsewhere in the table.

A stakeholder group member mentioned that there are now a lot of market-rate properties that are affordable to the 51-80% of MFI population. Including those in the needs analysis will show that the greater need is in the 0-30% and 31-50% groups.

Susan Wilson mentioned that there are a lot of complicating factors when determining the number of units that are affordable to various income categories, including the fact that the rents in some housing complexes are below the maximum level allowed, making them affordable to a greater number of residents than would otherwise be assumed.

**Complete Priority Exercise**

Matt reviewed the preliminary results of the Housing and Homeless Needs Prioritization exercise, which listed the needs in three categories -- Housing and Program Type, Specific Populations, and Homeless Needs – and ranked them in descending order of importance as identified in the “dot exercise” from the previous stakeholder meeting. He then asked the stakeholder group to divide the needs into High, Medium, and Low priorities. He explained that the stakeholders will provide one set of input and advice on the priorities, but the group’s recommendation is subject to change as the draft Consolidated Plan goes through the review and approval process with the County’s Housing Programs Advisory Subcommittee (HPAS), Policy Advisory Board (PAB), and Board of Commissioners. Some of the stakeholder group’s comments regarding this prioritization are included below:

- **Can we identify priorities by income level?**
- **We also must address the lack of units available to large families.**
- **We have to come up with a low-income number that we agree with.**

Matt explained that priorities can be identified by income level, and that HUD defines “low-income” in different ways for different programs. He recommended that the group consider “low-income” to be families with an income of 50% MFI or lower. Participants agreed that this would be an acceptable level for the purpose of the prioritization discussion.

A discussion ensued on the identification of High, Medium, and Low priorities for the three categories of housing and homeless needs. The results of these prioritizations are shown in Appendix A.

Susan Wilson mentioned that the needs that are considered a High priority are those that probably will be funded. Matt said that whatever is identified as a High priority in the final plan, not necessarily what the stakeholder group suggests, will
be more likely to get funded. However, this does not necessarily mean that items given a medium priority have no chance of being funded.

The prioritization discussion for Housing Needs for Specific Populations revolved around whether "Low-income seniors" should be a high or medium priority. The point was made that “frail elderly” would fall into the top category, “Persons with disabilities or other special needs.” Therefore the group decided to make Low-income seniors a Medium priority, with the understanding that frail elderly will be accommodated under the disabilities and special needs category.

Matt then reviewed the categories for HUD Table 2A, discussing the rationale behind the prioritizations from the 2000 Consolidated Plan. The previous plan ranked everything high or medium, in an attempt to make sure that all needs would have a chance of being funded. Matt asked how the stakeholders wanted to approach this question, and whether they wanted to give anything a low prioritization. In the ensuing discussion arguments were made to assign all 0-30% MFI renter categories a High priority, all 31-50% as Moderate, and all 51-80% as Low. Other stakeholders argued that the 31-50% category should also be a high priority.

Susan Wilson agreed that the greatest need is in the 0-30% category is greatest need, but made the point that these projects are difficult to build without a full 100% subsidy. She said that therefore there might not be any other funding left over for 31-50% units if they are not considered a High priority.

After some discussion it was decided to give all 0-30% renter categories a High priority, with Moderate priorities for all 31-50% renter categories, and Low priorities for all 51-80% renters, although this decision did not have the support of the entire group. For the owner categories on table 2A it was suggested that 0-30% owners should be a Low priority, 31-50% High, and 51-80% Medium. Others suggested that 0-30% should be a High priority. It was agreed that rehabilitation of homes owned by residents in the 0-30% income bracket would be a high priority, but new home ownership programs for this income bracket would be a Low priority, primarily because new home ownership opportunities are financially out of reach for households in the 0-30% income range. These results are shown in Appendix B.

**Housing Goals and Strategies**

Between the second and third stakeholder group meetings County staff met with the consultant team to draft a list of nine housing goals and accompanying strategies. The first six were included in the stakeholder meeting packet. Matt read draft goals seven through nine, which were not complete at the time of the mailing.

Matt asked if any goals should be removed from the list. Some stakeholders suggested removing Goal 4 because it is a Fair Housing issue. Others
suggested to instead combine Goal 4 with Goal 8, or to state Goal 4 differently without using the terms “ethnic and racial minority.” Ultimately the stakeholders agreed to add “including ethnically diverse neighborhoods and communities” to the end of the existing Goal 4 and to retain Goal 8 as a separate item.

Other modifications approved by the stakeholders were to:

- Change Goal 8 to refer to “households” rather than “individuals.”
- Add a new Goal 10: “Maximize production of units for households in 0-30% of median family income bracket.”
- Add a new Goal 11: “Promote development of high quality, durable, sustainable housing.”

Due to a lack of time remaining for the meeting, Matt removed the small group reports from the agenda and offered instead to compile results of small group discussions between this meeting and the next one and e-mail or mail out to participants an updated set of goals and strategies.

Matt explained that the strategies assigned to each goal came from the year 2000 Consolidated Plan, ideas from the Vision Action Network process, and other ideas suggested by the consultants and County staff. He then divided the stakeholders into three small groups to discuss the strategies. Each group was asked to review three of the goals and decide if any strategies should be modified, removed, or added to the list. After finalizing the list of strategies the stakeholders were to identify their top three, in order of importance, for each goal. One of the groups was only able to complete two goals, and the goals added by the stakeholders were not discussed. The results of this exercise are included in Appendix C.

**Next Steps**

At the next meeting participants will:

- Break into small groups to finish reviewing and identifying housing strategies and priorities for Goals 4, 10, and 11.
- Identify any additional recommended strategies for all the goals.
- Review and discuss information from the consultants related to performance measures.
- Discuss future involvement of stakeholder group participants and next steps in the process.

The next meeting will take place on Thursday, April 29, 1:30 – 4:30 pm at the Tualatin Hills Nature Park, 15655 SW Millikan Blvd.
Appendix A

Results of Housing and Homeless Needs Prioritization

HOUSING NEEDS BY HOUSING AND PROGRAM TYPE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase and/or preserve existing housing for low-income households</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create new low-income rental units</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rehabilitate low-income rental housing units.</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acquire land for future low-income housing development</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support programs to allow transition from subsidized to non-subsidized housing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase affordable home ownership</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce affordable housing development costs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide rehabilitation assistance to low-income homeowners</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide down payment assistance for first-time home buyers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make accessibility and/or weatherization improvements</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide emergency repair financial assistance for homeowners</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Results of Housing and Homeless Needs Prioritization

HOUSING NEEDS FOR SPECIFIC POPULATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Persons with disabilities or other special needs (excluding homeless)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income households with children</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income seniors</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farm workers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Persons with substance abuse or dependency issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low income single adults</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Victims of domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-income or homeless youth</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ex-offenders</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Results of Housing and Homeless Needs Prioritization

#### HOMELESS NEEDS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Dots</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Permanent housing and supportive services</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless prevention services</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency shelter space</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless assistance (security deposit assistance, rental assistance, etc.)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Medium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless support services (transportation vouchers, service centers, etc.)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing services or treatment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>Low</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix B. Results of Table 2A Prioritization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of MFI</th>
<th>Need Level</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Estimated $(2010)*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small Related</td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-50%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-80%</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>2,925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large Related</td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-50%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1,164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-80%</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1,421</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elderly</td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>1,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-50%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-80%</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1,533</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All Other</td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>2,884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-50%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>3,230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-80%</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>3,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>0-30%</td>
<td>L / H**</td>
<td>3,191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31-50%</td>
<td>H</td>
<td>3,621</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>51-80%</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>7,521</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on HUD's 2003 Total Development Cost (TDC) limits for the Portland Metropolitan area. “Two-bedroom walkup unit” costs ($130,463 per unit) are used for the "small related," "elderly," and "all other" categories. “Three-bedroom walkup unit” costs ($173,297 per unit) are used for the "large related" category. Homeowner assistance is calculated at $15,000 per unit.

** Low priority for the construction of new housing units, high priority for the rehabilitation of existing units. Priorities for the 31-50% and 51-80% income groups are as shown for both new units and rehabilitation of existing units.
Appendix C. Prioritization of Housing Goals and Strategies

Note: New strategies or additions resulting from the third stakeholders meeting are underlined. Revisions are shown with strikethrough text.

I. Increase homeownership opportunities in Washington County, with an emphasis on those households that are under-represented in homeownership, incorporate a bi-lingual capacity in implementing programs.

- Support pre/post purchase housing counseling and foreclosure prevention program/s that serve low and moderate income households in Washington County.
- Support first-time homebuyer program that assists low and moderate income households secure an affordable mortgage in Washington County. (2)
- Support first-time homebuyer program that assists low and moderate income households by providing downpayment assistance in Washington County.
- Research availability of non-County resources to expand first time homeownership opportunities.
- Use public funds to acquire land to enable self-help groups to produce homeownership options. (3)
- Establish a program directed to first-time homeownership for underrepresented populations (e.g. Latinos in Beaverton or Hillsboro). (1)
- Support and coordinate homeownership education; coordinate these programs with similar efforts by local lenders and non-profit groups.
- Identify, facilitate and obtain financial and technical resources to implement appropriate demonstration programs in the design, planning and construction of affordable homeownership units and subdivisions.

II. Reduce homelessness and provide needed services to those that are homeless or at risk of becoming homeless in Washington County.

- Support housing projects that assist homeless households transition into permanent housing. (2)
- Integrate Federal housing program resources managed within the County that lead to permanent housing for the homeless. (1)
- Support housing and social service providers activities that lead to the creation of housing options for the homeless. (3)
- Support programs that provide homeless prevention services.
- Support programs that provide emergency shelter and services for the homeless.
- Encourage the creation of a winter shelter network through links with the faith community.
- Maintain a Housing and Support Services Network as a year-round coordinating and strategic planning organization to serve the homeless.
- Increase number of shelter beds for single people.

III. Build and preserve housing units for households with special needs and difficult to serve households in Washington County

a. Elderly and Frail Elderly

- Encourage development of incentives or subsidies to projects targeting elderly and physically disabled households in rental housing projects. (Tie 1)
- Encourage the development of additional supportive housing resources for the elderly that offers an integrated array of services and are conveniently located near public transportation. (Tie 1)
- Support coordinated programs that integrate housing facility inspections and housing rehabilitation services for the elderly and persons with disabilities. (Tie 3)
- Continue to support real property tax deferral opportunities for elderly homeowners.
- Encourage and facilitate public education regarding programs to address the specific housing needs of the elderly, such as asset conversion, reverse annuity mortgages, housing rehabilitation and weatherization, and shared housing.
- Assist development partners in efforts to secure 202 grants. (Tie 3)

b. Persons with Disabilities

- Provide incentives to projects that provide more than the minimum number of fully accessible housing units. (Tie 2)
- Provide incentives to projects targeting chronically mentally ill and developmentally disabled persons in rental housing projects. (Tie 2)
- Evaluate needs and design and implement joint housing and services projects, seeking demonstration grants and other financial resources to develop innovative housing appropriate to individual population groups (e.g., the
severely disabled, the moderately disabled, persons with spinal cord injuries). (Tie 2)

**Promote best practices in building design/resident services to better serve populations with disabilities.**

- **Encourage the development of additional housing for persons with disabilities that offers an integrated array of services and are conveniently located near public transportation.** (1)
- **Assist development partners in efforts to secure 811 grants.**
- **Develop housing with built-in supportive service components for persons with disabilities, including group homes and small- to medium-sized complexes (less than 25 units), in locations with access to public transportation.** (Tie 2)
- **Continue to work closely with state treatment facilities when transitioning persons with mental or developmental disabilities from institutional to community living.**

**c. Persons with Other Special Needs**

- **Encourage development of incentives or subsidies to projects providing accessibility repairs of owner-occupied housing.** (2)
- **Encourage development of incentives or subsidies to projects that provide housing for households with a family member with HIV/AIDS complex.** (3)
- **Encourage development of incentives or subsidies to projects targeting single-parent households and that target very large households.**

**Assist development partners in their efforts to secure 202 and 811 grants.**

- **Develop housing with built-in supportive service components for special need populations, including group homes and small- to medium-sized complexes (less than 25 units), in locations with access to public transportation.** (1)
- **Integrate planning between the County Departments serving special needs populations and the housing development community so that services and rent assistance flow with the populations to be housed.**
- **Provide technical assistance to housing providers on the requirements of the federal Fair Housing Act**
- **Maximize use of state incentives.**
- **Integrate housing proposals into public safety levies (e.g. domestic violence shelters).**

**Continue to work closely with state treatment facilities when transitioning persons with mental or developmental disabilities from institutional to community living.**

- **Build stronger relationships with social services/case management providers who refer high-risk applicants for housing.**
IV. Increase housing options for ethnic and racial minority low-income households, including promoting ethnically diverse neighborhoods and communities.

- Encourage development of incentives or subsidies to projects targeting year-round farm worker households.
- Encourage development of incentives or subsidies to projects targeting seasonal and migrant farm worker households.
- Encourage development of incentives or subsidies to projects targeting African-American, Hispanic, Asian, Pacific Islander, and native American households, particularly those with low or very low incomes.
- Expand the availability of language-appropriate landlord-tenant and homeownership counseling.
- Link ethnically targeted social service organizations (e.g. Centro Cultural) with housing providers to expand potential pool of clients.
- Identify and utilize appropriate publicly owned surplus property or resources to develop farmworker housing.
- Support efforts to improve housing conditions in farm labor camps.
- Design and implement a demonstration project to develop farmworker housing projects serving families and single persons that are design-sensitive, linked to transportation and multiple services, and located within easy access to employment centers.
- Improve and expand the coordination of services including education, medical, employment, language skills, transportation, and legal services and facilitate the direct connection of appropriate services with existing and newly created housing resources.
- Expand and strengthen an effective communication network involving housing and social services providers, agricultural workers, advocacy organizations, employers, and government agencies to provide both long-range planning and emergency situational response capability to respond to the needs of the agricultural worker population.

Note: The stakeholders group has not yet reviewed the Strategies for this goal.

V. Preserve existing affordable housing stock in Washington County

- Encourage development of incentives or subsidies to support the acquisition and rehabilitation of existing affordable rental housing units, especially those projects financed under USDA Rural Development and HUD Multi-Family programs that preserve rental assistance, and the acquisition of Tax Credit and Bond financed housing units. (3)

Support housing rehabilitation programs that provide low-interest loans, deferred payment loans and grants to that assist homeowners preserve existing housing as affordable housing.

- Adopt long-term affordability requirements as condition of use of federal funds. (1)
- Identify inventory of affordable and/or expiring-use properties and collaborate with housing partners to maintain, acquire, and preserve that stock.

- Continue to provide resources to rehabilitation and weatherization programs for low and moderate income homeowners; target areas with concentrations of substandard homes. (2)

Provide housing rehabilitation assistance to larger families seeking to make additions to overcrowded housing units.

- Support rehabilitation of existing multifamily projects (non-profits and for-profits) with long-term affordability requirements.

- Address the supply of manufactured homes by exploring purchase or financing options for non-profits, including land trusts.

- Provide incentives for life-skills training for potential and existing tenants in special needs housing.

VI. Support designated Community Housing Development Organizations (CHDO) carry out the Goals of the Consolidated Plan

- Provide operating grants that support CHDO organizations. (2)

- Link intermediaries with local non-profits to promote capacity-building initiatives. (3)

- Identify and provide resources for nonprofits in organizational development, capacity building, and technical issues related to housing planning, finance, and development.

- Identify and obtain financial resources for predevelopment costs, such as preliminary design, feasibility studies, consulting fees, environmental analysis, and site control, for affordable housing.

- Dedicate the maximum allowable portion of HOME program funds for CHDO operating costs and make required CHDO set-aside amounts available for project-specific technical assistance as well as housing production.

- Where CHDOs are not meeting identified community needs, consider creating new CHDOs that would be eligible for operating grants. (1)

- Link the corporate real estate industry with nonprofits to explore available (and inexpensive) office space in empty buildings.

VII. Reduce costs and obstacles to develop affordable housing, including regulatory barriers and costs

- Support simplification and streamlining of housing regulatory requirements to reduce construction costs, simplify and shorten processing time.

- Encourage the appropriate, permitted use of duplex, attached, and/or specialized housing designs and types – particularly as infill in existing neighborhoods – through examination of regulatory requirements, leadership in design innovations, and community information and education. (3)
- Promote design modifications and variances to land use rules to promote affordable housing. (2)
- Advocate for fee subsidies to pay for SDC’s, building permits, and other fees. (1)
- Advocate for the ability to use inclusionary zoning programs in the development of affordable housing (requires change in state law).

VIII. Ensure equal access to affordable housing for all households in Washington County

- Maintain strong Fair Housing education and outreach programs targeting renters and property managers, including the following components. (1)
  - Educate managers and owners about rules relating to children that may violate the Fair Housing Act or state law.
  - Encourage proper design in apartments to accommodate normal childhood activity.
  - Educate property owners about charging premium rent to minorities.
- Encourage Fair Housing enforcement and education. (3)
- Examine the language and application of tenant screening criteria. Consider circumstances in which property owners may be willing to ease selection criteria or accept a limited cosigner. Research the idea of a central guarantee fund; consider a pilot project.
- Review policy recommendations on revising practices that may constitute impediments to Fair Housing.
- Review public transportation as an impediment to Fair Housing choice in the county with special emphasis on the disabled and families with children.
- Require all publicly funded housing to have policies on Section 8, limited English proficiency, alternative formats, reasonable accommodation, and affirmative fair housing marketing. (2)
- Require all housing to set aside 5% of units for those with physical accessibility (mobility) impairments, plus 2% for those with hearing or sight impairments.
- Tie Fair Housing requirements to funding of affordable housing.

IX. Enhance community awareness of the need for and issues associated with housing for people with low incomes and special needs

- Support community education and outreach on the economic value of affordable housing. (1)
- Encourage development of services to facilitate solutions to neighborhood issues involving residents of affordable housing.
- Provide complete and timely information to neighborhood residents and all interested parties to fully advise the public regarding proposed affordable housing development.
Emphasize education for property owners, managers, realtors, lenders and tenants.

Provide education on Fair Housing issues to social service providers, developers, builders, and architects.

Develop messages linking affordable housing and educational success/continuity. (2)

Educate/advocate with local government to adopt tools/strategies to reduce the cost of housing development (Metro RAHS). (3)

Create a housing constituency in the Washington County business community.

X. Maximize production of units for households with 0-30% of the Median Family Income.

Explore options for flexible financing terms for HOME and CDBG to increase the feasibility of projects serving those at less than 50% of median income.

Provide assistance for preparation of preliminary site plans and acquire suitable vacant land for affordable housing as sites and financial resources become available.

Select locations and properties as sites for affordable housing that provide the greatest economic benefit, in terms of cost effectiveness to develop and finance, and a location convenient to transportation, job markets, shopping, health care, and other essential services.

Note: The stakeholders group has not yet reviewed the Strategies for this goal.

XI. Promote development of high-quality, sustainable, durable housing.

Note: Strategies have not yet been identified for this goal.

XII. General / Other.

Increase state tax credit awards to Washington County by securing local match dollars.

Support the efforts to fully capitalize the Community Housing Fund.

Encourage support of the business community to invest in housing development.

Seek partnerships with national and local housing intermediaries to roll out financing or program initiatives.

Consider the use of HUD’s 108 loan guarantee program as a source of additional funds.

Partner with the faith organizations in the County to identify land for possible donation and/or joint financial ventures to develop housing.
• Encourage the development of mixed-income rental housing with units at market and below-market rents.

• Develop affordable housing that is compatible with existing development in the immediate area in terms of such physical characteristics as size, density, and type of structure and materials.

• Consider a mechanism for reducing the cumulative costs to applicant families of duplicate screening fees, while protecting the interests of property owners.

• Review factors underlying the reluctance of property owners to rent to Section 8 certificate holders.

• Encourage and expand coordination between housing and service providers through planning, project selection, and capacity building.
Notes
The following is a summary of the fourth Washington County 2005 – 2010 Consolidated Plan Update stakeholder meeting.

Attending
Stakeholders: Larry Bowen, Clean and Sober Living; Terry Brown, Homestreet, Inc.; Vince Chiotti, Oregon Housing and Community Services; Dennis Erickson, Washington County Community Corrections; Carol Gakin, Housing Authority Tenant; Phil Hedrick, Cascade Housing Group; Jeff Hill, Aging and Veterans Services; Adele Hughes, Hillsboro Chamber; Ellen Johnson, Oregon Legal Services; Doug Longhurst, Housing Development Corporation; Kris Moore, Interfaith Hospitality Network; Michael Parkhurst, City of Beaverton Mayor’s Office; Debbie Raber, City of Hillsboro; Howard Roll, The Bridge Project; Becky Smith, Community Action; Chance Wooley, Washington County Mental Health; Susan Wilson, Washington County Department of Housing Services.

Consultant Staff: Matt Hastie and Damian Pitt, Cogan Owens Cogan, COC; Ramsay Weit.

Washington County Staff: Jennie Proctor, Community Development Program Coordinator; Peggy Scheer, Program Manager; Bill Haack, Housing Services Specialist.

Guests: Mike Sheehan, Fisher, Sheehan & Colton.

Introductions
Matt Hastie began by thanking the participants for attending the final stakeholder group meeting.
He then reviewed the agenda, which included completing the housing strategies exercise from the previous meeting, discussing performance measures that could be used to evaluate the success of the Consolidated Plan, and talking about how stakeholder group members can remain involved through the duration of the Consolidated Plan process.

**Housing Strategy Exercise: Small Group Discussions**

The small group discussions focused on strategies to achieve the three goals that were not discussed at the previous meeting (goals 4, 10, and 11). These discussions took the same approach as at the previous meeting. The groups first reviewed the tentative list of strategies prepared by the project consultants and County staff to determine if any should be modified, consolidated, or removed. They then identified additional strategies to add to the list. Finally, participants selected their top three choices from the revised list.

At the end of the small group discussions, before the group began going over the full list of draft goals and strategies, a question was raised about the summary to the third stakeholder group meeting. The summary identified assistance to homeowners in the 31-50% MFI income range as a high priority (as part of the HUD-required Table 2A). A member of the stakeholder group believed that the group had considered this to be a medium priority. After some discussion it was agreed that the “high priority” label had been correct.

A question also was raised about the priority for assistance to homeowners in the 0-30% MFI category, which had been given a split prioritization (low priority for new homeownership programs, high priority for rehabilitation programs). Some participants questioned whether the new homeownership programs should be a medium or high priority, given that households in the 0-30% MFI category with access to Section 8 Housing vouchers qualify for and participate in the County Department of Housing Services homeownership assistance program. Identifying this group as a low priority in this category could possibly preclude their future participation.

Matt asked if there was any sentiment within the group for changing the priority from low to medium or high. One participant suggested that it should remain low, as any funds dedicated to these homeownership programs would be taking money away from the 0-30% MFI renter population. The group then voted, and approximately 2/3 of the participants recommended changing the priority to medium.

**Housing Strategy Exercise: Full Stakeholder Group Review**

After the small group discussions, Matt led the full stakeholder group in a review of the complete list of goals and strategies. He asked the participants for
suggestions about modifying, removing, or supplementing the draft strategies on the list. Major points discussed at this time included the following:

- Clarified the strategy under Goal III(b) to read “link objectives in the Consolidated Plan with available state funding initiatives, such as set-asides for particular special needs populations. Some of the strategies listed under Goal 7 to reduce housing development costs may contradict the objective of Goal 11, to promote high quality, durable, and environmentally friendly housing.

- The first strategy under Goal 7 is not necessary because it cannot be implemented. The regulations and permitting requirements are typically driven by state law, and cannot be changed or streamlined. A better strategy would be to help non-profits or other groups as they work through the permitting process to develop affordable housing.

- The third strategy under Goal 9 should be removed. It would stimulate controversy about developments that are legally permitted in a community. Instead, it may be appropriate to add a strategy about dealing with public opposition to specific affordable housing developments. Such a policy could include engaging the public in a conversation about the importance of affordable housing projects.

- Tax credit projects are not funded proportionally to population, because they are based on HUD's assessment of need rather than population numbers. Washington County has never been denied tax credit project money.

- Many of the strategies should use stronger verbs, such as “address,” rather than weaker verbs such as “consider,” and “encourage.”

Appendix A lists the revised strategies for the 12 goals resulting from the small-group and full-group discussions, and shows the top three priority strategies for each goal as identified in the small group discussions.

**Performance Measures**

Stakeholder group member Michael Parkhurst presented information about work being done across the metro region to develop performance measures for housing and community development purposes. Washington County, the City of Beaverton and other jurisdictions are involved in this effort. United Way is lending its experience to the process as well. This work reflects a growing national trend to address the performance of federal programs and determine what benefits are resulting from federal expenditures. It is possible that the results of these performance evaluations will eventually affect the funding of federal programs. For example, preliminary performance measure studies consider the CDBG program to be ineffective in terms of measurable outputs.
While the federal government has requested that the recipients of federal funds adopt performance measures, it has not provided guidance on how to do so. The cities and counties in the Portland metro region are in the early stages of developing certain types of performance measures. They are looking at examples from some social service groups, such as the United Way. This group has not considered housing performance measures yet, but is expected to do so by 2005-06 funding cycle. An important criterion for these local governments is that the performance measures should not increase the administrative burden on grant recipients. Some grant recipient groups are already working on how to quantify or evaluate their performance.

Michael distributed a few documents illustrating different performance measure models (the “logic model” and the “data collection model”). Matt mentioned that it would not make much sense for this group or the County to develop a separate set of performance measures now that might be inconsistent with the results of the regional performance measure process.

A participant asked if the Consolidated Plan is supposed to include specific numerical goals. The plan itself does not have to include such specific goals, but the idea is that activities resulting from the Consolidated Plan should ultimately have specific numerical output goals. A participant expressed concern about potential unintended consequences of output requirements, such as programs or service providers disregarding the needs of people who are harder to serve in order to show greater numerical outputs. Another mentioned that the real outcomes (i.e. the social impacts) of affordable housing can only be measured over time, and it is hard to measure the social benefits of affordable housing, if any, that are discernable in the short term.

**Wrap-Up**

Matt reviewed the schedule for the remainder of the Consolidated Plan project and identified the opportunities for the members of the stakeholder group to remain involved. The group members will be sent copies of the updated goals and strategies, based on the results of this meeting, and will have the opportunity to give further comments. The next step is to draft a preliminary Housing and Non-Housing needs document, which will be reviewed at a public meeting. The stakeholder group members will be informed of the date and time of the public meeting as soon as that information is available.

Matt asked if the group members had any other ideas for ways they can be kept informed and involved in the process. They did not suggest any.

Matt then thanked the group members for their time and participation, and said that their input had been very helpful and constructive. The County staff members on hand asked the group members to continue to participate in the future. The meeting adjourned at 4:15 p.m.