



# MEETING MINUTES

## HOUSING ADVISORY COMMITTEE OF WASHINGTON COUNTY

January 20, 2023 - 12:00 p.m.

Virtual Meeting Via Zoom

<u>COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT</u>	<u>STAFF PRESENT</u>
Sid Scott	Liz Morris
Carine Arendes	Will Seals
Sheila Greenlaw-Fink	Jacob Boyett
Narendar Sahgal	Katherine Galian
Nina Sparr	Andrew Crampton
Eric Schmidt	Leslie Gong
John Epstein	Amy Metler
Dave Bachman	Melissa Sonsalla
Nina Stafford	Komi Kalevor
Alma Flores	Josh Crites
Melinda Bell	Jes Larson
	Jacquilyn Saito
<u>ABSENT</u>	
Renee Brouse	<u>GUESTS</u>
	Martha McLennan
	<u>HABOD MEMBERS PRESENT</u>

**I. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER – 12:21 p.m.** A quorum was present.

**II. DISCUSSION – ORAL COMMUNICATIONS and MEMBER UPDATES**

No member updates at this time

**III. ACTION – APPROVAL OF MINUTES @ 12:58 p.m.**

Approve the November 17, 2022 meeting minutes of the Housing Advisory Committee.

Motion: Eric Schmidt

Second: Sid Scott

Vote: All in favor



**IV. RESOLUTIONS / ACTION ITEMS**

**A. Elections – 2023 HAC Chair and Vice Chair**

Executive Director, Komi Kalevor, opened the floor to call for nominations to the positions of Housing Authority Committee Chair and Vice-Chair.

Action: Appoint Alma Flores and Renee Brouse as the Housing Advisory Committee 2023 Chair and Vice-Chair, respectively.

Motion: Eric Schmidt

Second: Sid Scott

\*No other candidate nominations were brought forward by committee members.\*

Vote: All in favor, one abstain

**B. 2023 Housing Advisory Committee Meeting Schedule**

Executive Director, Komi Kalevor, introduced the new Development Manager for the Housing Services Department, Andrew Crampton, and explained that information voted on in this meeting needed to maintain confidential until being presented to the Board of County Commissioners on Tuesday, January 24<sup>th</sup>, 2023. Before beginning on the presentation, Andrew Crampton asked that any present committee members announce any potential conflict of interests in the agenda item. Alma Flores announced that REACH CDC had submitted an application for the Metro Affordable Housing Bond NOFA and would recuse herself of voting on any matters of approval on the agenda item.

Beginning the presentation, Andrew introduced himself to the committee alongside Martha McLennan, the consultant brought on by the Housing Authority to assist on work for the NOFA. Background information on the NOFA stated that Washington County was allocated approximately \$118 million in Metro Affordable Housing Bond Funds; the bulk of these funds were awarded to ten projects in a 2020 NOFA and achieved many of the Metro and Washington County Framework goals. In the Fall of 2022 Washington County identified approximately \$13 million in Bond Funds remaining that could still be allocated, and so a NOFA was released on August 26<sup>th</sup>, with an application due date of October 21<sup>st</sup>, calling for the completion of the Metro framework goals and identified preferences for:

1. A higher percentage of 30% units;
2. A higher percentage of 2+ bedroom units, with a special focus on 3 and 4 bedroom units;
3. Inclusion of permanent supportive housing units

Five (5) applications were received by the October 21<sup>st</sup> deadline, with three (3) projects being from non-profits and two (2) projects led by for-profit developers with non-profit partners. Of the five (5) projects, four (4) planned to use Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC), ranged from 63 to 90 units, and requested Metro Bond funds anywhere from 49.5 million to \$13 million. One (1) project application submitted was for a smaller special needs project requesting \$2.4 million for a 16 unit Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) project located above a service center. All of the submitted projects requested between \$144,000 and \$150,000 per unit of Bond funds; with three (3) of the projects being located in Tigard, and the remaining two projects being located in Tualatin.



The review process for these applications began with an initial review conducted by Washington County staff for completeness and compliance to application instructions. After the initial review, an outside consultant conducted a financial feasibility review of the applications before moving them to the review committee. The review committee was convened with four (4) members who were volunteers or Washington County staff with affordable housing expertise, meeting to discuss any questions or shared perceptions on the submitted project applications. Committee members completed individual ratings of each application, with an overall average for each project then being tabulated from the scores, based on a scoring criteria totaling 100 points, with a break down as follows:

- **Financial Feasibility & Cost Reasonableness** – 20 points
- **Location** – 15 points
- **Target Population & Project Attributes** – 20 points
- **Advancing Racial Equity** – 20 points
- **Developer Experience & Capacity** – 15 points
- **Readiness to Proceed** – 10 points

The unanimously highest rated project by the review committee members was the Woodland Hearth project submitted by Community Partners for Affordable Housing. The project requested \$9.45 million Bond funds for 63 units located in Tigard; with 40 units being family sized (24 being 3 & 4 bedroom units), 24 units at 30% Average Median Income (AMI), 22 PSH units, and 16 units with PBA. The unanimously second highest rated project by the review committee members was the Dartmouth Crossing 2 project submitted by REACH Community Development. The project requested \$12.9 million Bond funds for 86 units located in Tigard; with 43 family sized units (2 & 3 bedrooms), 16 units at 30% AMI, 16 PSH units, and 16 units with PBA. The remaining projects submitted included: Hawks Landing (Related Development) in Tualatin requesting \$13 million in Bond funds for 90 units, 72<sup>nd</sup> Avenue Apartments (Stewardship Development) in Tualatin requesting \$10.6 million for 72 units, and an unnamed project from Just Compassion in Tigard requesting \$2.4 million in Bond funds for 16 units.

After reviewing all of the applications and convening to discuss the results, the review committee felt that two projects best fit the intentions of the Metro and Washington County Framework goals. Andrew Crampton explained that the intent moving forward is to propose awards to the two (2) highest scoring applications; with \$5 million Metro Housing funds and \$4.2 million in Supportive Housing Services (SHS) funds being awarded for the Woodland Hearth project, and \$7.8 million in Metro Housing funds and \$5 million in SHS funds being awarded to the Dartmouth Crossing 2 project. After explaining the intention moving forward, Andrew opened the floor for any Housing Advisory Committee member questions/comments on the subject.

**John Epstein asked if the SHS fund allocation process could be expanded on.**

Jes Larson explained that the procurement team received feedback that as long as the scoring process clearly indicated which projects were the two top scoring overall, there was no problem concern about adding addition funding than more than what was initially intended. It was explained that if capital opportunity for PSH, only funded by SHS funds, the procurement process would have needed to be started all over; whereas by blending the two resources and utilizing this NOFA process it met the procurement process for the SHS capital funds, so long as the funds were used only towards PSH units.



Martha McLennan added that a number of the applicants did indicate that they would seek SHS funding, but were unclear on the rules of the use of SHS funding (how much per unit, how much could be capital, how much could be rent assistance, etc.).

**Narendar Sahgal asked if, moving forward, there would be separate application for proposals for SHS vs Metro Bond funding?**

Jes Larson stated that there will be separate applications, because the SHS funds can support a lot of things that the Metro Housing funds cannot support. This was an unusual opportunity to consider, and there might be other opportunities in the future to put out a request for applications, but because the resources were available, and the procurement process was already underway it seemed like a great opportunity to leverage all the work that had gone into the process already.

**John Epstein asked why the procurement process for the two different funding sources did not require the same procurement process.**

Komi Kalevor, Josh Crites, and Jes Larson explained that applicants spend a lot of resources responding to the NOFA request, and after confirming with the County's procurement department that as long as the additional funding was clear in its expenditure we could layer on the additional funding to support and additional project. The Procurement Department additionally stated that as long as a fair and transparent process was used to make the decision on which projects should be awarded, there is not a problem with adding additional funding to expand initial request. The intent to fund two projects, as opposed to one, is to in part to ensure that all of the Metro Affordable Housing Bond funds were used, rather than potentially spending \$10 million of the funds and leaving \$3 million unused.

Andrew Crampton explained the process of the recommendation moving forward to the Board of County Commissioners and Metro, with the intent for both projects being that they finish financial closing by the beginning of next year. He added that regular updates and reports on the process of the projects will be brought forward to the HAC.

Action: Approve Recommendation of the Metro Bond 2022 NOFA for Approval from the Washington County Board of Commissioners.

Motion: John Epstein

Second: Carine Arendes

Vote: All in favor, one recusal

**V. ONGOING BUSINESS**

**A. 2023/2024 Housing Services Department Budget Planning**

There was not enough time in the meeting to accommodate this agenda item. The item will be moved to the February meeting.



**VI. ADJOURNMENT**

Meeting adjourned at 1:00 p.m.

Komi Kalevor  
Secretary/Executive Director