



1

# Metro Affordable Housing Planning: Problems, Missed Opportunities, Next Steps

Presented At The Other Side of the River:  
Using Land Use Planning to Create a Regional Fair Share of Housing

**TOM CUSACK,**  
**OREGON HOUSING BLOG**  
[WWW.OREGONHOUSING.BLOGSPOT.COM](http://WWW.OREGONHOUSING.BLOGSPOT.COM)

# Contact Information

2

**Email:**

**[housepdx@gmail.com](mailto:housepdx@gmail.com)**

**Oregon Housing Blog:**

**<http://www.oregonhousing.blogspot.com>**

# Needed Housing, Goal 10

3

## ORS 197.295 (3)

*“**Government assisted housing**” means housing that is financed in whole or part by either a federal or state housing agency or a housing authority as defined in ORS 456.005, or housing that is occupied by a tenant or tenants who benefit from rent supplements or **housing vouchers** provided by either a federal or state housing agency or a local housing authority.*

# Scope of HUD Vouchers, Portland Metro

4

- Portland Metro 3 Counties, Est. **12,000 vouchers**, \$7 M per month. (+1,800 vouchers, \$940k per month in Vancouver/Clark County)

HA Name	Clackamas County	Multnomah	Washington	3 County Total
Vouchers	1,441	7,864	2,662	11,967
Monthly HAP	\$ 837,359	\$4,570,928	\$ 1,532,116	\$ 6,940,403

# Need for Gov't Assisted, Including Vouchers

5

- Since Vouchers are by far the largest source of government assisted housing in Metro, (except MID tax deduction), for the eligible population (<50% MFI and <30% MFI) there should be a **substantial** focus on
  - The *locality specific* need for additional vouchers to cover difference between market rents and renter incomes and the cost for these vouchers.
  - The reduction in otherwise affordable unit supply because of occupancy of these units by higher income households.
  - The count of *income restricted units* that remain **available** to households at these income levels.
  - The *locations* where vouchers are in use, including project based vouchers.

# Brief History

6

- 1999: State Preemptive Anti Inclusionary Zoning Law Adopted
- 2001: Metro Adopted Ordinance Establishing Voluntary LOCAL 5 year affordable housing targets in FUNCTIONAL Plan [3.07.720]. Included local **reporting requirement** and identified annual gap of \$97 million to fund affordable housing production, 5 year goal of 9,047 units <50% MFI AND within that, 6,419 units for incomes below 30% MFI.
- PROBLEM: Local Governments “should” adopt targets; virtually NO follow up on reporting of progress.

# Comment on 2001 Plan Voluntary Goals

7

*Ed Sullivan (2002), a Portland land-use attorney, said that Metro's plan is weak because "it estimated the need on a market-based approach, and what was left out of the equation was the lower end—people who really can't afford housing."*

*Further, Sullivan said, from the start "it didn't set a very high bar. It only looked at 10 percent of the need." Sullivan also noted that the plan's emphasis on **voluntary compliance made unclear enforcement and requirements for local governments.***

*HUD Report on Regional Approaches to Affordable Housing*

# Brief History (Con't)

8

- **2007:** Metro adopted FUNCTIONAL PLAN changes [3.07.740] that required LOCAL reporting of changes in Affordable Housing Supply every two years, including preservation of affordable housing. INCLUDES requirements for reports on affordable housing in Centers.
- Existing voluntary housing affordable housing goals also remain in FUNCTIONAL PLAN
  - Problem: No reporting follow up; too much flex in counting. Incentives not clear/weak. Metro not original source of supply data, no one willing to do without Metro commitment to use data.
  - **2007** Metro suspends reporting requirements



# Recent History, 2010-2011

9

- **2010-2011: Metro projects huge increase in affordability problem, policy response inadequate:**
  - Investment in Centers/"Infrastructure"-if 71% of these projected units are in Portland how does that promote *regional* choice?
  - Whose the mayor of a "sub region"?
  - No recognition of affordability/availability problem/vouchers.
  - NO new LOCAL /Functional Plan goals, REGIONAL goal now in **Framework** plan, Chapter 1, Land Use:
    - ✦ **Reduce** the percentage of the region's households that are cost-burdened, meaning those households paying more than 50 percent of their incomes on housing and transportation.

# Recent History, 2010-2011 (Con't)

10

- One Off H+T Index: good that it **focused on renters**, but problems
  - ✦ Includes income sources like food stamps in definition of income.
  - ✦ Standard set at 50%, higher than national H+T standard of 45%
  - ✦ Data NOT available for download, even on *Portland Pulse*.

## *Bottom Line:*

1. ***What's the Local incentive?***
2. ***What happens if not achieved?***
3. ***Claim victory if gas prices decreased?***
4. ***Going to ever get+PUBLISH existing required reports?***
5. ***How come no recognition of success of Project Based Vouchers in Multnomah? Little analysis of local "government assisted"/voucher need?***

# Consistent Problems

11

- All prior plans, little substantive attention to Fair Housing /Minority Issues, Government Assisted Need.
- Council history and MPAC structure make local housing goals with teeth seem highly unlikely.
- Metro process causes burnout.
- Portland happy [and should be recognized] for **out producing** it's fair share of affordable housing. [*Next Page*]. Portland “rocks” on use of project based vouchers, one of few tools that has been employed.

# 3 County LIHTC Awards, 2000-2011

12

## 3 County Portland Metro LIHTC Allocations, 2000-2011

Year	Clackamas	Multnomah	Washington	Total	Clackamas	Multnomah	Washington
12 Years	689	<b>6,332</b>	1,673	<b>8,694</b>	8%	<b>73%</b>	19%
AVG	57	<b>528</b>	139	<b>725</b>	8%	<b>73%</b>	19%

- Multnomah Received 73% of all LIHTC Awards
- City of Portland received **6,025 Units; 69% of All Units in these Counties**

# Metro Cities, Growth in Renters 2000-2010

13

- **ALSO**, In Metro Cities From 2000-2010,
- City of Portland Accounted for
  - **38%** of **All** Household Growth
  - **49%** of all **Renter** HH Growth
- Metro cities increase in renter households was **GREATER** than increase in owner occupied households; absolute numerical increase about the same:
  - **18.4 vs. 13.6%**
  - **37,000 each increase**

# Moving Beyond the Past: Opportunities/Next Steps

14

1. Outcome of Metro's HUD Sustainable Communities Planning grant application **will determine** IF there is , and/or scope of:
  - Regional Analysis of Impediments
  - Regional mobility counseling for voucher holders
  - Opportunity Maps (3 Metro Counties have projects in place or underway, Metro as repository of data?).
2. Revise H+T (HUD attempting national data standardization) and publish to the public Metro CT data and formulas used.

# Opportunities/Next Steps /(Con't)

4. I'd suggest focus on *local* plans, especially centers.
  - *However, Lake Oswego Foothills Framework 452 page plan document not encouraging, **Zero** mention of “affordable housing”, except 2 mentions in citizen comments. “Senior housing” planned for 543 units, but **NO** family/workforce/government assisted housing.*
  - *Also discouraging, Metro May 2011 “State of Centers” Report does not mention rental housing anywhere in **114 page** report. [Related posts [HERE](#) and [HERE](#)].*

# Opportunities/Next Steps /(Con't)

16

## 4. Opportunity Map Issues

- Need COMMON elements and weighting.
- Data and map layers need to be publically available, not in a *black box*.
- Need to be linked to written housing location policies.
- Linked to QAP within Metro region?
- When does opportunity mapping become *redlining*?
- Use of smaller area voucher payment standards can help BUT trade off is that fewer families could be served.



# Opportunities/Next Steps /(Con't)

17

5. Revisit Inclusionary Zoning for *rental* housing
6. Revisit creation of a unified Federal **Housing** advocacy, similar to unified Metro transportation advocacy.
7. Affordable housing supply database and local progress reports toward voluntary goals still **NOT publically available**. Need incentives to cause local governments to **WANT** to report.
8. **MORE focus on housing needs of renters.**

# Resource Materials/Active Links

1. [2001 Metro Ordinance](#) (Includes Findings of Fact/COL)
2. [2007 Metro Ordinance](#) (Includes Findings of Fact/COL)
3. [2011 Metro Ordinance](#) (Includes Findings of Fact/COL)
4. [Metro Code, 3.07 Urban Growth Management Functional Plan](#)
5. [Metro Framework Plan](#) (Chapter 1 has H+T goal).
6. [HUD Report, Regional Approaches to Affordable Housing](#) (Includes only Portland Metro Section, link on cover page is to full report).
7. My [December 29, 2009 Comments](#) to Metro Council

# Resource Materials/Active Links (Con't)

8. [\*\*Metro HUD Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Full Application\*\*](#), FTP Site:LARGE [99 MB] file includes all Exhibits].
9. [\*\*Oct 6, 2011 Metro Draft UGB Expansion Ordinance, 11-1264\*\*](#), (Look for October 20, 2011 version with Findings of Fact, COL).
10. [\*\*Portland Pulse, Housing and Communities\*\*](#)
11. [\*\*Draft OHCS LIHTC 2012 Qualified Allocation Plan\*\*](#), October 21<sup>st</sup> public hearing, written comments due NLT November 4<sup>th</sup>.

## Resource Materials/Active Links (Con't)

12. [Lake Oswego Foothills District Framework Plan Draft.](#)
13. [Metro “Centers” Report,](#) May 2011.
14. [New York City Subsidized Housing Information Project](#) (With location of 171,000 units)
15. [Preserve Oregon Housing](#) (Database of Oregon HUD subsidized AND some other housing types, including RD and LIHTC).

## Resource Materials/Active Links (Con't)

15. Oregon Housing Blog:

<http://www.oregonhousing.blogspot.com>

(Keyword search “Metro”; and “[Metro Housing Watch](#)” link in right pane is to select video of prior Metro Council Meetings and other materials)

16. THIS PRESENTATION

<http://www.housepdx.com/presentations/housing/apaoctober2011.ppt> OR

<http://www.housepdx.com/pdfs/housing/apaoctober2011.pdf>