

Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee

The role of Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee is to advise City of Eugene staff on: the development of goals and programs related to the use of Affordable Housing Trust Fund resources, the allocation of Affordable Housing Trust Fund resources, and review of specific project proposals to be supported by the Affordable Housing Trust Fund resources.

Agenda

March 3, 2021, 1:00 – 2:30

Zoom: <https://eugene-or-gov.zoom.us/j/97217826595> | Passcode: AHTF2021

Phone: 971-247-1195 | Meeting ID: 972 1782 6595

I.	Welcome and Introductions	Information	5 minutes
II.	Public Comment	Information	10 minutes
III.	Minutes Approval (December 16, 2020)	Action	5 minutes
IV.	Draft Committee Charter	Discussion	45 minutes
V.	Request for Proposals Update	Discussion	20 minutes
VI.	Next Steps	Discussion	5 minutes

Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee Members :

Sarah Pishioneri (Co-Chair) · Scott Rogers (Co-Chair) · John Barofsky · Dane Butler · Paula Farquhar-Stout · Isaac Judd · Pete Knox · Kaarin Knudson · Carmel Snyder

Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee Staff:

Josh Berman, City of Eugene • 541-682-5475 • JBerman@eugene-or.gov

Ellen Meyi-Galloway, City of Eugene • 541-682-5532 • EMeyi-Galloway@eugene-or.gov

This meeting is open to the public and is wheel-chair accessible. American Sign Language or Spanish interpretation can be provided with 48-hour notice prior to the meeting. For the hearing impaired, assistive listening devices are available with 48 hours' prior notice. The agenda and all background materials can be provided in alternative formats or Spanish with 48-hour notice prior to the meeting. To arrange for any of these services please contact Josh Berman at JBerman@eugene-or.gov or 541-682-5475.

El lugar de la reunión es accesible para personas con discapacidad. A las personas sordas o con dificultades auditivas les ofrecemos intérpretes o sistemas FM de asistencia auditiva con 48 horas de anticipación. También se ofrecen intérpretes de español con 48 horas de anticipación. Materiales en formatos alternativos están disponibles a solicitud. Para disponer de estos servicios o para mayor información, comuníquese con el personal de Josh Berman, 541-682-5475

For information about minutes, agendas, or materials, please contact Josh Berman at JBerman@eugene-or.gov or 541-682-5475. Mail inquiries can be directed to City of Eugene Planning and Development Department, 99 W. 10th, Eugene, OR 97401.

NAME OF MEETING: City of Eugene Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee

DATE OF MEETING: December 16, 2020

TO: Josh Berman

RECORDED BY: Lydia Dysart

ROUTING INFORMATION

(01/04/2021 lld)
(Date and initials)

DRAFT

Draft Minutes
Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee
Wednesday, December 16, 2020 – 1:00 pm – 2:30 pm
Conference Call via GoToMeeting

Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee Members

Members

John Barofsky, Dane Butler, Paula Farquhar-Stout, Isaac Judd, Pete Knox, Kaarin Knudson, Sarah Pishioneri; co-chair, Scott Rogers; co-chair, Carmel Snyder.

City of Eugene Staff

Josh Berman, City of Eugene
Ellen Meyi-Galloway, City of Eugene

PRESENT

Sarah Pishioneri
John Barofksy
Pete Knox
Dane Butler
Josh Berman

Paula Farquhar-Stout
Isaac Judd
Kaarin Knudson
Ellen Meyi-Galloway

Others:

Avery, Candice King, Penny Gradey.

ABSENT

Scott Rogers, Carmel Snyder.

I. Welcome and Introductions

Ms. Pishoneri opened the Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee (AHTF AC) meeting at 1:04 p.m. Everyone present introduced themselves.

II. Public Comment

Avery Temple, a BIPOC queer resident of Eugene, advocated for allocating funding to support BIPOC community owned land trust projects. They stated that it was vital to the community and would instill long term care for people. Avery shared that it would also create equity for people of color. They said that this was a bare minimum ask and should be prioritized in a very white City like Eugene. Avery hoped that they would consider what they proposed.

Candice King, a Housing Liaison at Homes for Good, thanked the Committee for their hard work and dedication. She thought that they had thoughtful and well-rounded discussions about housing in Eugene. Ms. King stated that BIPOC individuals in the community had struggled with acquiring, purchasing, maintaining, and being in housing. She encouraged the Committee to give money annually to develop projects focused on ownership, co-operative community housing, and opportunities for BIPOC individuals to own and operate in housing. Ms. King had provided a list of those in support of this idea. She stated that they wanted 25% of the remaining \$300,000 and 17% of the allocation annually, which would be adjusted along with the population, to go towards creating these BIPOC development projects. Ms. King hoped that they would make this recommendation to City Council.

Penny Grady, a Social Worker at White Bird Clinic, gave support for the letter Ms. King talked about. The letter was able to get 95 signatures in the matter of five days. They stated that it was the City's responsibility to allocate money to BIPOC projects. Housing options were limited, and they should be open to new and interesting housing styles.

III. Minutes Approval (November 18, 2020)

MOTION: Mr. Barofsky moved, seconded by Ms. Knudson, to approve the November 18, 2020 AHTF AC meeting minutes. The motion passed unanimously.

IV. Committee Response

Ms. Knudson was excited to read the materials that Ms. King provided and speak more later about the idea. She thanked everyone who spoke to them. It was always helpful for them to hear from the community. Ms. Knudson encouraged them all to continue to speak in the community, and in front of City Council, the Mayor, and the Planning Commission. She emphasized that this was an important conversation to have and work towards.

Ms. Pishoneri was excited to see those ideas brought forward. She thought it would be a great opportunity for the City to put money where they always talked about putting it.

V. Request for Proposals Criteria

Ms. Meyi-Galloway said that they would continue their discussion of their request for proposal (RFP) criteria. The RFP was scheduled to be released in January. She had created a draft criteria for them to look through. Ms. Meyi-Galloway said that it would be difficult to incorporate the proposal that community members brought up if they wanted to stay on schedule.

Ms. Meyi-Galloway shared that the draft RFP criteria used the same format as the other funding sources in the City. The six topics would address issues important to the City to make sure that funding went towards realistic projects that would create affordable housing, help priority needs population groups, and

be an asset to the neighborhood it was in. She said that they would go through the draft and make sure that it agreed with what the Committee had talked about.

The first section was focused on concept and design. Proposals were required to present a well-developed design that was suitable for the targeted population(s) and project location, comply with the applicable City Code, increase the existing number of units through new construction, adaptive re-use, or rehabilitation, and demonstrated readiness to acquire and/or start construction within 12 months from the date of award. The Committee preferred that proposals demonstrate a significant innovation or benefit through the project design and/or compatibility with surrounding uses and demonstrate use of cost-effective green building measures.

Mr. Judd wondered if it was reasonable to have projects start construction in the first year. Ms. Knudson replied that that requirement was talking about whether applicants already owned the property they wanted to build on or not.

Mr. Barofsky noted that they had a robust set of criteria which was very similar to other RFPs that the City did. He was concerned with it and hoped that they could modify the RFP moving forward. Since they had leeway with their funding, he wanted to have their allocation open to a diverse set of projects. Mr. Barofsky knew that this was their first year and they had a smaller allocation than they thought, so it made sense, but hoped to see different criteria in following years. Ms. Pishoneri agreed and said she wanted to see flexibility and creativity moving forward.

Ms. Farquhar-Stout had spent the last couple months speaking to people who lived in shelters. They needed projects to be put together fast, even if they were small. Also, there were people waiting to reunite as families. An example of this would be kids in CFD custody because the parents could not find housing. She emphasized their need to be creative in this process.

Ms. Meyi-Galloway stated that one issue with the criteria was that they had to have projects that would be affordable for over a 20-year period. This meant that on the application the developer needed to be able to answer questions on how they would provide that. The City was trying to protect the money they were allocating and make sure it was going to projects that would be built and last a long time. She stated that they could look at different housing types year to year, but some things could not be changed.

Ms. Pishoneri wondered if they could add something about community land trust to their preferred criteria in the first section. Ms. Meyi-Galloway said that over the last couple months of discussion they had decided on focusing on rental housing. Ms. Pishoneri was not thinking specifically of home ownership, but projects that were set up like co-ops where people rented. She said that projects like that would give people equity. Ms. Meyi-Galloway told her that they could put "innovation in rental housing models, such as co-ops" in their preferred criteria. Ms. Farquhar-Stout thought that was a good idea since gaining equity was an important part of getting out of poverty. Ms. Knudson was interested in seeing innovation in housing, but the conversations they had had over the last few months indicated that they should focus on renting. She liked the idea of opening their RFP to more diverse projects the following year. Ms. Knudson thought it was good to keep a smaller focused criteria list since it was their first year and they only had \$300,000. Mr. Barofsky agreed and hoped that they could flush out the projects mentioned in more detail over the year.

MOTION: Ms. Pishoneri moved, seconded by Ms. Farquhar-Stout, to add the language "innovation in rental housing models, such as co-op rental models or equity share rental" to the preferred criteria the Project Concept and Design section of the RFP.

Ms. Knudson said that they could add it but just wanted to include more examples of what innovation projects meant. Ms. Pishoneri clarified that this was just what they wanted to see and proposals that came to them did not have to include them. Ms. Knudson hoped that the way the proposal was outlined it would produce innovative projects. Mr. Barofsky said that they could put it in preferred criteria which would allow them to give it more points when scoring. He was concerned that they had not flushed that idea out enough to be scored. Ms. Pishoneri withdrew her motion.

The second section was focused on site feasibility. Ms. Meyi-Galloway emphasized that applicant had to have site control or an option to purchase at the time of the application. Proposals were required to demonstrate that the designated project site was suitable for affordable housing and the targeted population(s), was free of adverse environmental conditions that could be mitigated (examples of ineligible sites included, was not limited to, sites with toxic contaminations, proximity to above-ground storage of explosive materials, and designated wetlands) if the site had an environmental condition such as noise proximity, buildings older than 45 years, or land in the 100 year flood plain, it must be possible to mitigate the condition through reasonable measures. The applicant was also required to have appropriate zoning for the type of development proposed and demonstrate consistency with the City's Housing Dispersal Policy. The Committee preferred that the proposal was located near schools, parks, commercial areas, public transportation, services, and jobs, and did not displace any households from their homes.

Mr. Barofsky had an issue with saying they would pay for dispersals, but that they would give more points during scoring if they did not displace people. Mr. Barofsky was in favor of displacing one home if it added more units to the City. He wanted to remove section B "do not displace any households from their homes" because he felt that it was already covered in another part of the proposal. Mr. Barofsky did not want a project being scored lower than others just because it displaced people.

MOTION: Mr. Barofsky moved, seconded by Mr. Judd, to remove "do not displace any households from their homes" from their preferred proposal criteria under the Site Feasibility section of the RFP.

VOTE: The motion passed – 5:1. Ms. Pishoneri voted nay.

Ms. Pishoneri said that displacing was about more than just money. Ms. Meyi-Galloway said that they could have a general statement saying that the City encouraged projects to not displace people and could not score based on that. Ms. Knudson said that their goal in getting rid of the section was not to encourage displacement but to not have it be a scoring criteria.

MOTION: Ms. Knudson moved, seconded by Mr. Barofsky, to add "a preference for projects that minimized onsite parking requirements" to their preferred proposal criteria under the Site Feasibility section of the RFP.

VOTE: The motion passed – 6:0.

The third section focused on targeted populations and services. Proposals were required to target households earning no more than 100% of the area median income (AMI) and include at least 5% of units for people with mobility challenges (such as a wheelchair) and sensory challenges (such as blindness or deafness), rounding up, and one unit as a minimum. The Committee preferred if proposals targeted at least one of the following income levels: households with extremely low incomes (30% AMI or less), households with moderate incomes (60% AMI – 80% AMI), or designated mix of income levels, targeting units at various AMI levels. They also preferred proposals to designate some units for a high

priority special needs population as identified in the 2020 Consolidated Plan, demonstrated a significant innovation or benefit through serving a population that was uniquely needy and significantly undeserved, and worked with a service provider to provide services to the designated special needs population.

MOTION: Ms. Pishoneri moved, seconded by Mr. Barofsky, to add BIPOC to their underserved population list in preferred proposal criteria under the Target Population and Services section of the RFP.

VOTE: The motion passed – 6:0.

Ms. Meyi-Galloway stated that she would make the adjustments based on that motions that passed and then send out the new draft RFP. The Committee would need to give feedback on that version via email for them to stay on track.

MOTION: Mr. Barofsky moved, seconded by Ms. Knudson, to accept the RFP as amended.

Ms. Pishoneri wanted to vote on adding language about innovation or non-traditional forms of rentals in the preferred section under the Project Concept and Design section of the RFP. Ms. Knudson made an amendment to include innovative models of rental housing and management. Mr. Barofsky thought that idea was not flushed out enough for him to approve. He had been on the Planning Commission and thought that that idea had holes in it and needed to be flushed out more. Ms. Pishoneri withdrew her motion.

VOTE: The motion passed – 6:0. Ms. Pishoneri was in the middle on this motion.

VI. Select Evaluation Committee

Mr. Berman asked who was interested in being on the Evaluation Committee with a max of five people. Mr. Judd, Mr. Knox, Ms. Knudson, and Ms. Pishoneri volunteered. Mr. Barofsky inquired into what the timeline would look like. Ms. Meyi-Galloway replied that they would get proposals in March and then they would be evaluated by the April AHTF AC meeting. Mr. Barofsky thought that they should reach out to Mr. Rogers and Ms. Snyder to see if they wanted to be a part of the Evaluation Committee.

VII. Adjournment

Ms. Pishoneri adjourned the AHTF AC meeting at 2:37 p.m.

(Minutes recorded by Lydia Dysart)



MEMORANDUM

Date: February 26, 2021

To: Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee

From: Community Development Staff

Subject: Committee Charter Update

Background

In 2019, City Council passed Ordinance 20609, in which Section 3.748 Section 5 calls for the City to convene a newly formed Community Advisory Committee to make recommendations regarding the allocation of construction excise tax revenue. The Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee (AHTF-AC) fulfills this section of the code.

It is standard process for public committees advising city staff and City Council to have a charter. Charters are meant to guide the work of the committee, set expectations of committee members and provide overall structure to ensure committee longevity. The charter is not a legally binding document and can change based on committee request, staffing needs or council direction.

Charter Update

City staff have been working to develop a charter that reflects the responsibilities of the committee as well as expectations of individual members. At the 3/3/2021 AHTF-AC meeting, staff will present draft sections of the charter related to committee membership and chair selections along with specific questions for committee consideration (Attachment A). A yellow highlight has been used to call out specific areas in the draft charter that are unclear or could use additional committee feedback.

Committee members can offer feedback on the draft sections and advise staff on any additional items that members would like to see in the charter. Staff will also provide an update on the overall scope of the committee and expected meeting ongoing meeting schedule (Attachment B). Following this meeting, the Committee will reconvene on 3/17/2021, where staff will present the committee with the full draft charter to review.

Action Requested

None, information only

Attachments

- A. Selections of the draft AHTF-AC Charter
- B. Draft AHTF-AC Meeting Schedule

Attachment A

Membership Selection Process

Committee membership will:

- Generally, strive to represent the richness of the community's perspectives, neighborhoods and technical expertise
- Seek a balanced mix of constituent representatives recruited by City Staff selected by the City of Eugene Planning and Development Director including:
 - Three at-large neighborhood representatives;
 - Three members from the private sector, such as business owner, homebuilder and realtor; and
 - Three housing and population advocates, such as housing consumer, member of the Human Rights Commission and housing advocates
- Terms not to exceed 2-years, with an optional 2-year renewal. Some members may have 3-year terms initially to create a staggered rotation of new members later.
- When a committee member leaves before their term is finished a replacement will be recruited to complete the term.

Questions to consider:

Are the terms too long or too short?

Is it appropriate for committee members to serve multiple terms? If yes, then how many?

Decision Making Process

Committee members will aim to come to recommendations on consensus. When there is a disagreement during group deliberations in which a majority of members are in support of a specific proposal, the objector/objectors are responsible for proposing an alternative solution that can achieve consensus. Members need not be unanimously enthusiastic for a proposal to be adopted, if all members find the outcome of the proposal acceptable.

Potential addition: Should consensus not be possible, recommendations will be decided based on a majority vote. In such cases, those in the minority will have the opportunity to write a summary of the minority position and include it with the Panel's recommendation that goes to the City Manager.

Question to consider:

The last time we met about decision making, the committee opted to use a consensus model. The potential addition is language from another city charter. Is the committee interested in adding this provision?

Co-Chairs

Roles and Responsibilities

1. The Co-Chairs shall serve for one (1) year. The election of Co-Chairs will be held at the AHTF Advisory Committee's first meeting of the calendar year. If a Co-chair cannot serve a full term, the Advisory Committee shall, at the meeting in which the resignation is received, elect a new Co-Chair to complete the unexpired term. If both Co-Chairs vacate their respective positions prior to the end of their terms, elections must be held at the following meeting to fill both offices.
2. Committee members may not be elected as Chair for more than two (2) successive terms.

3. The Co-Chairs shall facilitate all meetings of the Advisory Committee, consult with Staff on preparation of meeting agendas.
4. The Co-Chairs are entitled to vote on all issues
5. The Co-Chairs or the Co-Chairs' designee is the official spokesperson for the Advisory Committee on all matters of the community that concern the Committee. This includes media inquiries.
6. The Co-Chairs will work with staff to ensure that all Committee members review and approve written Committee materials. The Co-Chairs will sign all materials provided on behalf of the Committee to the City Manager.

Selection Process:

1. The officers of the Advisory Committee shall be the Co-Chairs elected by the committee from among the 9 standing members of the Committee. To be eligible for a Co-Chair nomination, a Committee member must have served on the Committee for at least one (1) year.
2. Any Committee member may nominate a candidate for the position of Co-Chair. Nominations need not be seconded.
3. A Committee member may decline nomination because of an inability to serve, but may not withdraw in favor of another member.
4. Any Committee member may move to close the nominations; a second is required. If the motion carries one of the Co-Chairs then calls for the election.
5. Committee members will be able to vote for two co-chairs. The votes of all Committee members will be recorded by staff. **The candidates who receive the most and second most votes become the new co-chairs.**

Question to consider:

Other City committees use a Chair and Co-Chair model. In this model the Chair and Co-Chair both meet with staff, but the Chair is primarily responsible for facilitating meetings unless otherwise stated.

1. Is the co-chair model serving the committee well?
2. Is there interest in moving to the Chair and Co-Chair model?

Attachment B

Committee Timing

The annual schedule will have 4 AHTF-AC meetings. The committee can schedule additional meetings as needed.

Winter/Spring

- Meeting 1 (March): Introduction to the committee. Presentation from staff on AHTF funding allocation. Committee has the option to recommend specific allocation to city staff. Process changes
- Meeting 2 (April): RFP selection

Fall

- Meeting 1: RFP criteria discussion
- Meeting 2: Staff presents draft RFP criteria to AHTF-AC for review and recommendation to city staff.



MEMORANDUM

Date: February 26, 2021

To: Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee

From: Community Development Staff

Subject: Request for Proposals Update

Background

City Council allocated \$300,000 of the FY21 Affordable Housing Trust Funds (AHTF) to be used for affordable housing development projects. The funds were to be offered through a competitive Request for Proposals (RFP) process. The Affordable Housing Trust Fund Advisory Committee (AHTF-AC) established RFP criteria in the fall of 2020. The RFP was released in January 2021 and proposals are due March 23, 2021.

RFP Update

The RFP requested Letters of Intent to Apply (LOIs) from prospective applicants by February 23. The LOIs help staff to plan for the evaluation process by determining the number of applicants. LOIs were not required. Submitting an LOI does not guarantee that the developer will submit an application. Three LOIs were received, from Cornerstone Community Housing, 11thandLincoln LLC, and SquareOne.

The Evaluation Committee for the proposals will be five members of the AHTF-AC. This year the Evaluation Committee will be the following members:

Carmel Snyder
Isaac Judd
Kaarin Knudson
Sarah Pishioneri
Scott Rogers

An orientation meeting to review scoring guidelines will be scheduled for the week after proposals are due. The Evaluation Committee meeting to score proposals will be scheduled in April. Scores will be presented to the full AHTF-AC at the April meeting. Both the Evaluation Committee meeting and the AHTF-AC meeting will have opportunities for public comment on the proposals. The AHTF-AC will make a recommendation for funding awards. City Council will consider the proposals at their May 24, 2021 meeting. City Council makes final funding decisions. Please see Attachment A for the RFP schedule at a glance.

Action Requested

None, information only

Attachments

- A. Timeline for FY21 Affordable Housing Trust Funds RFP

Attachment A
Timeline for FY21 Affordable Housing Trust Funds RFP

Month	Activities
October 2020 – December 2020	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff works with AHTF-AC to develop and finalize the RFP criteria.
January 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff provides draft RFP for AHTF-AC comment and finalizes RFP. • RFP is released to public to solicit development proposals
February 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers submit letters of intent to apply to the RFP.
March 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Developers submit project proposals in response to RFP
April 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sub-committee of AHTF-AC reviews and scores proposals. • Sub-committee presents evaluations to full AHTF-AC and determines funding recommendation.
May 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff presents proposals and AHTF-AC recommendation to City Council. • City Council makes final funding awards.
Summer 2021	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Staff works through legal agreements to provide AHTF to selected project proposal(s).