



SUMMARY OF COMMENTS COLLECTED FROM STAKEHOLDER GROUPS

The following stakeholder groups and organizations provided comments on the Bond Policy Framework Plan between Aug. 18 and Sept. 25, 2017:

- A Home for Everyone (AHFE) Coordinating Board
- AHFE Housing Workgroup
- Black Parent Initiative
- Central City Concern
- Community Development Partners
- Cully Housing Action Team
- East Portland Action Plan Housing Committee
- Economic Opportunity Program Partners
- Enterprise Community Partners
- Interfaith Alliance on Poverty
- Metro
- Northeast Coalition of Neighborhoods
- Prosper Portland's Neighborhood Prosperity Initiative Districts
- Oregon Opportunity Network Portland Policy Council
- REACH Community Development Corp.
- Rosewood Initiative
- Self Enhancement Inc.
- Southeast Uplift
- Transition Projects
- Urban League of Portland
- Welcome Home Coalition

Thirty pages of comments were received. Staff conducted a preliminary review and categorized approximately 130 comments into one or more of the following categories. The categories, and some highlighted comments, are below:

1. Support for content in draft plan (14%)
 - Agreement for the Priority Communities
 - Strong support on the focus of advancing racial equity throughout the framework (prioritized communities, acquisition decisions, and services).
2. Grammar corrections or requests to clarify definitions (16%)
 - Clarify supportive housing definition
 - Clarify distinction between households facing imminent homelessness vs. displacement
3. Bond operations and/or implementation policies (51%)
 - Clear tenant eligibility and screening criteria policies are needed:
 - What is the process, how will it be implemented?
 - Low barrier –criminal histories and immigration status
 - Provide specifics on the types of tools the city can/will use to support mixed-use, mixed-income housing.
 - Clear definition and policies needed for Turn Key option
 - Policies needed regarding households with incomes over 60% AMI
4. Proposed policy changes or additions to the draft plan (19%)

(see table on following page)

4. Proposed policy changes to the draft plan

Section of Draft Plan	Comment
Priority Communities	1. Add people existing from psychiatric institutions as a Priority Community
	2. Related to PSH, plan should emphasize harm reduction housing, such as Bud Clark Commons PSH, for those with highest barriers.
	3. Make Immigrant and Refugee communities as a stand-alone Priority Community (not embedded under Communities of Color)
	4. Add persons with evictions on their records as a Priority Community
	5. Add seniors as a Priority Community
	6. Add persons with disabilities, including mental health, as a Priority Community
Location Priorities	7. As currently written, the priorities allow development anywhere in the city. If we want to ensure development in high opportunity areas, the framework should include a target or percentage to focus for housing in high opportunity areas.
	8. Flip what is currently proposed for investments in the draft plan to instead be: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building acquisitions should be prioritized in high opportunity areas (land is scarce and expensive); • Land acquisitions should be prioritized in areas at high risk of gentrification (land more available and at lower cost)
	9. Location priorities as listed are at odds with one another. Suggest weighting or ranking the various priorities so it is clear what is most important to achieve.
	10. Construction goals should be included as front and center of the analysis of each project as it is proposed, specific to the site of each proposed project.
	11. Consider weighing specific criteria more than others – e.g. weight communities facing displacement over others and maintain geographic diversity by spreading affordable housing throughout the city.
	12. Set a % of funds to acquire market rate units where low income people and Communities of Color are or may be displaced.
	Guidelines for Development
14. Add cost allowances in the framework.	
15. Set a % of funds to acquire market rate units where low income people and Communities of Color are or may be displaced.	
16. Include as a main strategy obtaining free or reduced land from properties, for example, looking to invest in areas East of 122 nd to Gresham where Communities of Color have potential for large opportunity growth.	
Guidelines for Operations	17. Articulate a priority in keeping households stabilized, particularly in cases when people may increase income while in housing, or be at or over income at time of a housing acquisition. Policies should be clear and transparent so households know what to expect and how to plan.
Guidelines for Services	18. Related to range of services for supportive housing, add “PHB will use industry experts to establish evidence based standards of practice for supported housing and will monitor expected outcomes. Expected outcomes will include indicators that measure clinical, economic and housing stability gains.”
Additional	19. The plan references in several places the importance of leveraging other resources, yet the bond funds limit those options. Clarity is needed on what the leveraging options are and whether they are viable or not.
	20. Since the bond cannot leverage Low Income Housing Tax Credits, the SAG should think in terms of how best to leverage all City funds for the largest impact. The City and SAG should outline all housing development resources available to the City and how best to expend those to produce the most units.
	21. East County is considered a low-opportunity area with a high vulnerability index. Under current location priorities, it can appear to be redlining East Portland.