

Table of contents

Agenda	Page 2
Metro respects civil rightss	Page 3
Written public comment	Page 4 - 5
AHBOC meeting summary march 3, 2025	Page 6 - 12
AHBOC meeting summary march 17, 2025	Page 13 - 19
Metro housing bond 2024 annual report	Page 20 - 102
Memo: AHB interest earnings	Page 103 - 105
Materials received during the meeting	Page 106
Interest earnings memo feedback from committee member	Page 107 - 108
04.16.2025 meeting powerpoint	Page 109 - 161
Housing communications report march 2024	Page 162 - 164



Metro

600 NE Grand Ave.
Portland, OR 97232-2736

Agenda

Meeting: Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: Wednesday, April 16, 2025
Time: 3:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Place: Hybrid Meeting: Metro Council Chambers / ([Zoom link](#))
Purpose: Staff presentation and committee discussion of regional trends and key findings for the 2024 annual report.
ADA: For questions about accessibility or accommodations for person with disabilities, or to request a translator, interpreter, or other communication aids, please contact Sandi Saunders at housing@oregonmetro.gov

3:00 p.m.	Welcome and Introductions
3:10 p.m.	Public comment
3:15 p.m.	Conflict of Interest
3:20 p.m.	Metro staff presentation and committee discussion: Regional trends and key findings for annual report
4:00 p.m.	Interest Earnings Conversation
4:30 p.m.	Break
4:40 p.m.	Committee discussion: Formulate preliminary findings and recommendations to inform the Committee's annual report to Metro Council
5:25 p.m.	Next steps
5:30 p.m.	Adjourn

Metro respects civil rights

Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and related statutes that ban discrimination. If any person believes they have been discriminated against regarding the receipt of benefits or services because of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability, they have the right to file a complaint with Metro. For information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a discrimination complaint form, visit www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1536. Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1700 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 5 business days before the meeting. All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at www.trimet.org.

Thông báo về sự Metro không kỳ thị của

Metro tôn trọng dân quyền. Muốn biết thêm thông tin về chương trình dân quyền của Metro, hoặc muốn lấy đơn khiếu nại về sự kỳ thị, xin xem trong www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Nếu quý vị cần thông dịch viên ra dấu bằng tay, trợ giúp về tiếp xúc hay ngôn ngữ, xin gọi số 503-797-1700 (từ 8 giờ sáng đến 5 giờ chiều vào những ngày thường) trước buổi họp 5 ngày làm việc.

Повідомлення Metro про заборону дискримінації

Metro з повагою ставиться до громадянських прав. Для отримання інформації про програму Metro із захисту громадянських прав або форми скарги про дискримінацію відвідайте сайт www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. або Якщо вам потрібен перекладач на зборах, для задоволення вашого запиту зателефонуйте за номером 503-797-1700 з 8.00 до 17.00 у робочі дні за п'ять робочих днів до зборів.

Metro 的不歧视公告

尊重民權。欲瞭解Metro民權計畫的詳情，或獲取歧視投訴表，請瀏覽網站 www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights。如果您需要口譯方可參加公共會議，請在會議召開前5個營業日撥打503-797-1700（工作日上午8點至下午5點），以便我們滿足您的要求。

Ogeysiiska takooris la'aanta ee Metro

Metro waxay ixtiraamtaa xuquuqda madaniga. Si aad u heshid macluumaad ku saabsan barnaamijka xuquuqda madaniga ee Metro, ama aad u heshid warqadda ka cabashada takoorista, booqo www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Haddii aad u baahan tahay turjubaan si aad uga qaybqaadatid kullanka dadweynaha, wac 503-797-1700 (8 galka hore illaa 5 galka dambe maalmaha shaqada) shan maalmaha shaqo ka hor kullanka si loo tixgaliyo codsashadaada.

Metro의 차별 금지 관련 통지서

Metro의 시민권 프로그램에 대한 정보 또는 차별 항의서 양식을 얻으려면, 또는 차별에 대한 불만을 신고 할 수 www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. 당신의 언어 지원이 필요한 경우, 회의에 앞서 5 영업일 (오후 5시 주중에 오전 8시) 503-797-1700를 호출합니다.

Metro의差別禁止通知

Metroでは公民権を尊重しています。Metroの公民権プログラムに関する情報について、または差別苦情フォームを入手するには、www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights。までお電話ください。公開会議で言語通訳を必要とされる方は、Metroがご要請に対応できるよう、公開会議の5営業日前までに503-797-1700（平日午前8時～午後5時）までお電話ください。

សេចក្តីជូនដំណឹងអំពីការមិនរើសអើងរបស់ Metro

ការគោរពសិទ្ធិពលរដ្ឋរបស់ ។ សំរាប់ព័ត៌មានអំពីកម្មវិធីសិទ្ធិពលរដ្ឋរបស់ Metro ឬដើម្បីទទួលបានកម្មប្រតិបត្តិការរើសអើងសម្រាប់ទស្សនាគោលដៅ www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights។ បើលោកអ្នកត្រូវការអ្នកបកប្រែភាសានៅពេលអង្គប្រជុំសាធារណៈ សូមទូរស័ព្ទមកលេខ 503-797-1700 (ម៉ោង 8 ព្រឹកដល់ម៉ោង 5 ល្ងាច ថ្ងៃធ្វើការ) ប្រាំពីរថ្ងៃ ថ្ងៃធ្វើការ មុនថ្ងៃប្រជុំដើម្បីអាចឲ្យគេសម្រួលតាមសំណើរបស់លោកអ្នក ។

إشعار بعدم التمييز من Metro

تحتزم Metro الحقوق المدنية. للمزيد من المعلومات حول برنامج Metro للحقوق المدنية أو لإيداع شكوى ضد التمييز، يُرجى زيارة الموقع الإلكتروني www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. إن كنت بحاجة إلى مساعدة في اللغة، يجب عليك الاتصال مقدماً برقم الهاتف 503-797-1700 (من الساعة 8 صباحاً حتى الساعة 5 مساءً، أيام الاثنين إلى الجمعة) قبل خمسة (5) أيام عمل من موعد الاجتماع.

Paunawa ng Metro sa kawalan ng diskriminasyon

Iginagalang ng Metro ang mga karapatang sibil. Para sa impormasyon tungkol sa programa ng Metro sa mga karapatang sibil, o upang makakuha ng porma ng reklamo sa diskriminasyon, bisitahin ang www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Kung kailangan ninyo ng interpreter ng wika sa isang pampublikong pulong, tumawag sa 503-797-1700 (8 a.m. hanggang 5 p.m. Lunes hanggang Biyernes) lima araw ng trabaho bago ang pulong upang mapagbigyan ang inyong kahilingan.

Notificación de no discriminación de Metro

Metro respeta los derechos civiles. Para obtener información sobre el programa de derechos civiles de Metro o para obtener un formulario de reclamo por discriminación, ingrese a www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Si necesita asistencia con el idioma, llame al 503-797-1700 (de 8:00 a. m. a 5:00 p. m. los días de semana) 5 días laborales antes de la asamblea.

Уведомление о недопущении дискриминации от Metro

Metro уважает гражданские права. Узнать о программе Metro по соблюдению гражданских прав и получить форму жалобы о дискриминации можно на веб-сайте www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Если вам нужен переводчик на общественном собрании, оставьте свой запрос, позвонив по номеру 503-797-1700 в рабочие дни с 8:00 до 17:00 и за пять рабочих дней до даты собрания.

Avizul Metro privind nediscriminarea

Metro respectă drepturile civile. Pentru informații cu privire la programul Metro pentru drepturi civile sau pentru a obține un formular de reclamație împotriva discriminării, vizitați www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Dacă aveți nevoie de un interpret de limbă la o ședință publică, sunați la 503-797-1700 (între orele 8 și 5, în timpul zilelor lucrătoare) cu cinci zile lucrătoare înainte de ședință, pentru a putea să vă răspunde în mod favorabil la cerere.

Metro txoj kev ntxub ntxaug daim ntawv ceeb toom

Metro tributes cai. Rau cov lus qhia txog Metro txoj cai kev pab, los yog kom sau ib daim ntawv tsis txaus siab, mus saib www.oregonmetro.gov/civilrights. Yog hais tias koj xav tau lus kev pab, hu rau 503-797-1700 (8 teev sawv ntxov txog 5 teev tsaus ntuj weekdays) 5 hnub ua hauj lwm ua ntej ntawm lub rooj sib tham.

Public comment for the Affordable Housing Bond Oversight Committee meeting on Wednesday, April 16, 2025:

To Whom It May Concern,

I don't know if my concerns below, as a resident of a LIHTC property, is an appropriate topic to share at your upcoming meeting.

I am a resident at Mercy Housing Greenbrae Apartments in Marylhurst, a property that is a recipient of housing bonds. I've spoken to the Mayor of Lake Oswego about the high level of mental health and substance abuse treatment needs for the residents here. I speak from career experience as a past Master of Social Work in the behavioral health field.

Greenbrae is a 100 unit apartment - 60 units house 60% AMI residents, 40 units house 30% AMI and residents from other referrals. Several sources have confirmed for me that those 30% AMI and referral residents are the cause for a majority of the Lake Oswego Police Department visits we experience here. Since the beginning of move-ins to this new building (May of 2024), I do not remember a week when the police were not here. I am not suggesting that the 30% and referred residents are the only problem, as we had one family of the 60% AMI group evicted for violence toward other residents. I am stating a fact that some residents (about 10 families) do not seem to have adequate support services to help them adjust to their permanent housing.

I believe, and it has been confirmed, that most of the chaos here is due to the lack of coordinated care or a continuum of care. I have wondered if no one follows these more challenged individuals and families into affordable housing. If not, they seem to be losing their housing within months of arriving here. 5 were evicted last month.

I listened to some of three of your past advisory committee meetings on Vimeo and found this kind of topic not discussed in any detail. There seemed to be some suggestion that new projects had their "challenges." Perhaps I needed to listen to entire jurisdiction reports, but those reports I did listen to seemed to discuss the quality of the construction, future plans to build more properties, or how to best apportion the funds.

I can say that mixing populations of 60% and 30% AMI does not create safe communities. That Tax Credits benefit developers and throw residents into chaos, especially if management is ineffective in reigning in lease violators. Perhaps Mercy Housing has been exceptionally inept at being able to create an atmosphere of safety. Time will tell. But my understanding from the literature, and now my experience as a resident, tells me that mental health care is woefully absent in Oregon, and the cause of a lot of suffering.

I was astonished, when at one of your advisory committee meetings, that anyone or any entity would suggest that properties would be 100% of 30% AMI and referrals. To me this kind of property would be called a residential rehabilitation or treatment center, one in need of A LOT of behavioral health services, and require that residents wanting to keep their housing would need to attend mandatory treatment. Does Oregon even want to provide that kind of support?

From my experience, and because of the lack of coordinated care (and mental health services in Oregon in general) I would never recommend bond-funded affordable housing to anyone. I am exploring my options to leave.

Please let me know where my experience can best be heard, if anywhere. I do not want to waste my or your time if this is not an appropriate topic for your committee.

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: Monday, March 3, 2025
Time: 3:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)
Purpose: Discuss implementation progress with three jurisdictions and Metro Site Acquisition Program (SAP).

Attendees

Co-chair Jeffrey Petrillo (he/him), Karen Shawcross (she/her), Co-chair Andrea Sanchez (she/her), Jesse Neilson (he/him), Katherine Rozsa (she/her), Brady Penner (she/her), Noah Goldman (he/him), James Lee (he/him), Theo Hathaway Saner (he/him), Ann Leenstra (she/her), Clayton Woullard (he/they), Maritza Kritz (she/her)

Absent members

Sushmita Poddar (she/her), Jay Tomlinson (they/them)

Metro staff

Emily Lieb (she/her), Alison Wicks (she/her), Sandi Saunders (she/her), Jimmy Oporta (he/him), Mercedes Evangelista (she/her)

Facilitator

Madeline Kane, Kearns & West (she/her)

Note: The meeting was recorded via Zoom; therefore, this meeting summary will remain at a high-level overview. Please review the recording and archived meeting packet for details and presentation slides.

Welcome and Introductions

Emily Lieb, Metro, provided opening remarks and shared excitement for the first set of jurisdiction presentations. She acknowledged that there are news items regarding Supportive Housing Services (SHS) spending and budget deficits, and that Metro staff will bring updates on this issue to the Committee.

Madeline Kane, Kearns & West, introduced herself and facilitated introductions between Committee members.

Maritza Kritz and Clayton Woullard introduced themselves as new members.

Madeline reviewed the meeting agenda and meeting logistics.

Decision: Co-chair Andrea Sanchez, Co-chair Jeffery Petrillo, Theo Hathaway Saner, Ann Leenstra, Karen Shawcross, Katherine Rozsa, Jesse Neilson, Noah Goldman, Brandy Penner, Maritza, and Clayton approved the February Meeting Summary. There were no abstentions or edits.

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Conflict of Interest Declaration

Co-chair Sanchez declared that she works at Housing Development Center, which has clients that receive Metro Bond funds.

Noah declared he places individuals into Bond-funded properties as part of his work.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Presentation Overview

Alison Wicks, Metro, reviewed the Bond's guiding principles of leading with racial equity, creating opportunity for those in need, creating opportunity throughout the region, and ensuring long-term benefits and good use of public dollars.

Co-chair Sanchez reminded the Committee that developing recommendations is a core component of their work and their job today is to listen to details and themes that they would want to bring forward to Metro Council.

Annual Progress Report: Portland Housing Bureau (PHB)

Helmi Hisserich, PHB, shared that Portland needs about 2,000 new 0-60% area median income (AMI) housing units every year. She shared that PHB has exceeded all its goals with funding commitments to date, with 2,098 homes in the pipeline. She noted that PHB was able to leverage over a billion in funds to exceed its goals. She reviewed a map sharing the location of the 26 projects underway.

Danell Norby, PHB, shared that eight projects are complete, seven of which include Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) units, and that nine projects are currently under construction.

Tanya Wolfersperger, PHB, shared that nine projects are in pre-development, three of which are homeownership projects. She shared that they are operating under the assumption that federal funds will be allocated as they have already been approved by Congress but are closely tracking federal updates. She noted they anticipate federal approval processes to slow down, which could impact financial closing schedules, and that three projects are seeking resources to be fully funded. She provided an overview of the Broadway Corridor and Legin Common projects.

Danell provided an overview of the Cesar acquisition, which is comprised of 47 PSH units, and noted that acquisitions deploy units quickly at a lower cost. She provided an overview of the Dr. Darrell Millner Building which has a preference policy for households that have been impacted by N/NE Portland gentrification. She noted this project and the Beacon project both experienced longer lease-up timelines, as 60% AMI rents are close to market rate.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Brandy:** How are you able to exceed your goals?
 - **PHB response, Danell:** By leveraging over a billion dollars in other funding sources. The goals were created based on the expected subsidy per unit.

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Question, Theo:** Can you expand on some of the lease-up challenges and any solutions or strategies to address the challenges? Are there other solutions besides looking at different levels of AMI?
 - **PHB response, Danell:** Anecdotally, we are hearing that lease-up is taking longer than projected and multiple extensions on construction loans are being taken. Each project has a different reason, but part of it is that 60% AMI is out of reach for individuals or close to market rate. We have not identified specific solutions yet but are working with partners to find bottlenecks.
- **Question, Karen:** What is the estimated delay in the lease-up that will affect financing? You do not have to answer now but share the answer once you have it.
- **Question James:** Are lease-up delays associated with the N/NE preference policy? Are there processes for organizations that serve those populations to develop in those areas?
 - **PHB response, Helmi:** Urban renewal displaced many Black neighborhoods in N/NE Portland, and the preference policy was adopted 10 years ago. The policy gives preference to families displaced due to eminent domain or who decided to move because of changes. The homeownership program has worked well, but there has been a slow uptake on the rental lease-up as 60% of AMI rent is too high. Potential solutions would be to exempt the development from the preference policy, modify the vouchers, or deepen the subsidy. We are focused on prioritizing those on the policy waitlist and working with developers as they have to meet their occupancy quickly. To clarify, the policy is race neutral and focused on those that have been displaced. We are working to try and do proactive matching between the waitlist and developments.
- **Comment, Noah:** Please be mindful of lease pressures to ensure they do not fall on PSH tenants as that can be counterproductive.

Annual Progress Report: Home Forward

Amanda Saul, Home Forward, shared that Home Forward is the Housing Authority of Multnomah County and reviewed the unit goals. She noted they were below their goals due to land use challenges for the Troutdale project. She reviewed the Dekum Courts project, which has a total of 187 units, and used a construction phased approach which allowed tenants in the existing apartments to stay housed while the updated units were built. She shared that for the additional units for new families, a waitlist was created through a community organizing marketing approach and a lottery system was used to select who received a unit.

Amanda shared that the Troutdale project is under construction after an 18-month delay due to land use processes and negotiation. The City wanted fewer units and additional parking. The negotiated agreement reduced the number of units from 96 to 85 and added a public parking lot. She noted that the delay caused a budget overrun of \$10 million, and that Home Forward received additional grants to support the funding gap and is seeking additional grants.

Amanda reflected on challenges of working in smaller jurisdictions and recommended Metro consider a sliding scale for per unit funding allocation based on unit sizes, AMI restrictions, and uses.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Question, Co-chair Petrillo:** Was the original Dekum Court project a Low-Income Housing Preservation and Resident Homeownership Act of 1990 (LIHPRHA) project? Are there any concerns about Section 8 funding cuts?
 - **Home Forward response, Amanda:** I believe it was. There have been no cuts to the Home Forward budget.
- **Comment, Karen:** It is great to see Troutdale break ground, and thank you for the advice regarding the sliding scale funding allocations.
- **Question, Katherine:** Can you share any insights on working with public communities?
 - **Home Forward response, Amanda:** Completing an affordable housing and rent burdened communities needs assessment for Troutdale was critical. The City had an interest in jobs and the assessment helped them understand that this housing would fulfill the needs of those who are residents of Troutdale.
- **Question, Noah:** If Dekum Court was public housing, and then was converted to LIHPRHA, is that a net negative?
 - **Home Forward response, Amanda:** Dekum originally had 40 units of public housing on five acres. We abolished the buildings but kept those 40 units as public housing. We then used Low-Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) and Bond funds to build the remainder of the 300 units.

Annual Progress Report: Gresham

Hawie Petros, Gresham, reviewed the City's affordable housing goals. Gresham met their target of very affordable homes and exceeded their family-sized home goals. She highlighted the Terracina Vista project and noted this project experienced some delays due to supply shortages. She reviewed the Oak Row project, which is the first affordable homeownership project in Gresham. She shared that there were some legal troubles with Oak Row as Metro did not provide a legal document template and it took one year to create a document. She shared that a lesson learned would be to have a kick-off meeting with attorneys present for any future homeownership projects, and that they can use the template they created for Oak Row for future projects. She reviewed the statuses of the six projects and noted that Civic Drive is in pre-development and is applying for state funding.

Committee members had the following questions:

- **Question, Karen:** I saw in the report the suggestion for demographic data collection training to be given to property managers, and I hope the Committee can keep that in mind so all reports can be aligned.
 - **Gresham response, Hawie:** Yes, that was a lesson learned from the first two projects, but I believe Metro now has a standardized document with instructions.
- **Question, Noah:** Was the Wynne Watts Commons rental assistance aligned with the Metro Bond funding from the beginning of the project?
 - **Gresham response, Hawie:** Yes, the goal was always to have units for those with intellectual disability disorders.

Annual Progress Report: Metro Site Acquisition Program (SAP)

Patrick McLaughlin, Metro SAP, shared that Metro SAP receives 10% of Bond funds to purchase land for new affordable housing development, which is proportioned among the jurisdictions. He noted they do not have targets to meet as they support jurisdictions in meeting their targets. He

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

shared they have purchased seven properties, one in each jurisdiction except for the remainder of Multnomah County, whose funds went to Home Forward to purchase land.

Patrick reviewed the Glisan Landing project, which includes a preschool, and shared that the preschool had to be apart from the housing building due to commercial prevailing wage requirements. He highlighted the Elmonica Station project, which experienced a delay as the county required a shared access point for the project and an adjacent market rate project.

Andrea Pastor, Metro SAP, highlighted that the Dolores project had 30 deeply affordable projects and ten PSH units. She shared that they were able to increase density on this project with Oregon Senate Bill 8 provisions and had a 17-member advisory committee to identify site priorities within Washington County.

Patrick concluded that Metro SAP can acquire land relatively quickly compared to other processes.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Karen:** Did Jamii Court receive their United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) funds in January?
 - **Metro SAP response, Patrick:** Jamii Court has not heard about their HUD funds yet.
- **Question, James:** Can you talk about site selection considerations? It seems like these resources could be useful in areas that have less resources. It seems like you are looking at areas that are in a Qualified Census Tract (QCT) and Difficult Development Areas (DDA).
 - **Metro SAP response, Patrick:** We did outreach and engagement for the entirety of the Bond and preferred sites. We heard that proximity to transit, schools, parks, and grocery stores were priorities, so that is what we look for, along with flat one-acre parcels and areas that are scarce in affordable housing. We also get tax credits for developing in QCTs and DDAs.
 - **Comment, Co-chair Sanchez:** The QCT and DDA change annually, so as a developer you may buy a property one year in a QCT and by the time you applied for the tax credit, it can no longer be in the area.
- **Question, Noah:** Who retains ownership of land in the long term?
 - **Metro SAP response, Patrick:** Metro transfers ownership to the development entity that owns the building.
- **Comment, Co-chair Petrillo:** Metro SAP can help facilitate developers to build affordable housing in higher income areas like Washington County.

Panel Q&A with Jurisdictions

Madeline facilitated Q&A between the Committee and the presenters from each jurisdiction.

- **Question, Karen:** How have delays in lease-up impacted financing? How many projects are impacted and by how much?
- **Question, Co-chair Sanchez:** To expand on that, how are lease-up delays impacting developers and what solutions are there?
 - **PHB response, Danell:** The additional months of waiting for lease-up incurs additional interest charges. Constructing financing has been used to cover the gap. A more significant delay can impact the low-income tax credit, which can lead to a reduction in equity. We can look into the data and share any widespread findings.

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Home Forward response, Amanda:** I would add that we are seeing the slowest lease-up in units that are studios and one bedrooms for 60% AMI as those are close to market rate. If given the choice between an apartment that has income restrictions or a market rate unit, most would choose the market rate as there are fewer requirements and less paperwork. However, as the units get bigger, they start to split from the market rate and lease up is quicker.
- **Question, Clayton:** What is the funding split for projects between Metro, state, and federal funding? If there is a federal funding freeze, could the state legislature propose filling the gap? With projects that have SHS, are there provisions to address burnout among case managers? How do you make sure those folks stay housed and receive quality services?
 - **PHB response, Helmi:** The federal related concerns are related to funding freezes, policy shifts, and staffing. There may be a 50% cut in HUD staff which would slow down processing. There are concerns around diversity, equity, and inclusion policy shifts, but funding has been appropriated through Congress, and we expect to have current fiscal year funding. There are still uncertainties which make it hard to determine impacts. We are meeting with local partners and keeping lines of communication open.
 - **Metro response, Emily:** Metro will bring a portfolio analysis of funding which looks at each project in April. In terms of burnout, that is a frequent topic of discussion with the SHS Oversight Committee. Bond funds are focused on capital costs and do not gather service information.
- **Question, Brandy:** Can Home Forward speak more about its approach to community organizing and how the lottery system for lease-up is equitable?
 - **Home Forward response, Amanda:** We work with service partners to reach out to neighbors and nonprofits to support our targeted marketing approach. The lottery system helps reduce barriers. Instead of first come, first serve, which can impact those who have to be at work or have other commitments, the lottery can allow people to apply over a wider range of time.
- **Question, Noah:** Is it possible to reduce the 60% AMI market units to a lower percentage of AMI?
 - **PHB response, Danell:** This fall we had a rapid acquisition request for proposals that prioritized 50% AMI or below, which has been awarded.
 - **PHB response, Helmi:** It is traditional to finance 30-60% AMI projects as that size supports private debts and expected rent income. It is hard to adjust the AMI downward once a loan is received.
 - **Comment, James:** This also applies our guiding principles of ensuring affordability, creating benefits, and managing to market.
- **Question, James:** Are jurisdictions looking at market rates and adjusting targets to ensure that rent benefits the community?
 - **Home Forward response, Amanda:** The investor typically ensures that rents are 10% below market. I have never experienced lease-up challenges like we are currently facing. Like Helmi said, rents are locked in once loans are received. The question is, can we lower rents to make them more marketable, which can be difficult to predict.
- **Question, Co-chair Petrillo:** Do the jurisdictions know in general what percentage of projects are funded by the Bond? New members may assume the Bond funds the entirety of the project.

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Home Forward response, Amanda:** In general, the rule of thumb is about 33% of local funding, state funding, and debt. That target has moved so there is less debt in general as operating costs and interest rates have increased.
- **Metro response, Alison:** Looking at the 2023 Annual Report, Bond funds generally cover 21% of projects.
- **PHB response, Danell:** I would agree that Bond funds generally cover 20-30% of the project costs.

Committee Discussion and Reflections

The Committee did not have time for this agenda item and agreed to move it to a later meeting.

Closing and Next Steps

Co-chair Sanchez thanked the jurisdictions for presenting and for sharing lessons learned and recommendations for the Committee to consider.

Madeline shared that next steps include:

- PHB to share how the estimated delay in lease ups affects financing.
- Next meeting: March 17, 2025, 3:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:30 p.m.

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Meeting: Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting
Date: Monday, March 17, 2025
Time: 3:00 p.m. to 5:30 p.m.
Place: Virtual meeting (Zoom)
Purpose: Discuss implementation progress with four jurisdictions.

Attendees

Co-chair Andrea Sanchez (she/her), Co-chair Jeff Petrillo (he/him), Karen Shawcross (she/her), Katherine Rozsa (she/her), Brady Penner (she/her), Noah Goldman (he/him), Theo Hathaway Saner (he/him), Ann Leenstra (she/her), Jay Tomlinson (they/them), Sushmita Poddar (she/her), Ex-Officio Councilor Nolan (they/them), Clayton Woullard (he/they)

Absent members

Jesse Neilson (he/him), James Lee (he/him), Maritza Kritz (she/her)

Metro staff

Patricia Rojas (she/her), Alison Wicks (she/her), Sandi Saunders (she/her), Jimmy Oporta (he/him)

Facilitator

Madeline Kane, Kearns & West (she/her)

Note: The meeting was recorded via Zoom; therefore, this meeting summary will remain at a high-level overview. Please review the recording and archived meeting packet for details and presentation slides.

Welcome and Introductions

Madeline introduced herself, reviewed the meeting agenda and objectives, facilitated introductions between Committee members.

Metro Councilor Nolan introduced themselves and thanked Committee members for bringing their expertise to the table.

Patricia Rojas, Metro, introduced herself and shared her professional and lived experience in the housing sector.

Conflict of Interest Declaration

Co-chair Sanchez declared that she works at Housing Development Center, which has clients that receive Metro Bond funds.

Noah declared he places individuals into Bond-funded properties as part of his work.

Public Comment

No public comment was received.

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

Annual Progress Report: Clackamas County

Devin Ellin, Clackamas County, reviewed the county's Bond fund allocations and noted that almost \$700 million was levered in other funding sources. She noted that 1,209 units are in the pipeline, which will exceed all production targets, and that there is a Bond project in every city except for West Linn.

Devin provided overviews of the Mercy GreenBrae and Las Flores projects, both of which include permanent supportive housing (PSH) units and good Certification Office for Business Inclusion and Diversity (COBID) contracting outcomes. The Mercy GreenBrae project implemented low-barrier lease-up strategies, and the Las Flores project will include a transit welcome center and foodbank. Devin shared that Shortstack Milwaukie is the jurisdiction's first homeownership property which includes 15 units.

Andrew Crampton, Clackamas County, provided an overview of the Hillside Park project which is being implemented in two phases and is a repositioning project. He shared that phase one is currently under construction and will result in 275 units. He shared that the site is 13.7 acres and was the location of the oldest public housing property in Oregon which was demolished for repositioning. He noted that the public housing residents received tenant protection vouchers, relocation assistance, and lease-up priority for phase one.

Andrew shared that We All Rise was consulted for community outreach, and key themes heard from engagement efforts include mobility assistance and accessibility, functional and safe community spaces, and natural disaster preparedness. He noted that building on a large scale is very efficient and allows for ordering and storing materials so the project will come in under budget. He shared that phase two of the project will include Latino culturally specific services including afterschool care, and that the buildings will include three- and four-bedroom units. He noted that there is a \$3 million funding gap, and the project would be a great candidate to receive Bond interest-earning support.

Gloria LaFleur, Clackamas County, provided an overview of the El Nido and Park Place projects. El Nido is shovel-ready and has a \$1.5 million funding gap due to delays. She noted that the contractor Hacienda is working closely with Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS) to explore gap funding options. Park Place is a repositioning project that will utilize cottage cluster zoning.

Devin reflected that the Bond has been successful in implementing its guiding principles and Metro has been a good collaborator. She shared that opportunities for improvement include additional program administration funding, acquisition and predevelopment funding opportunities, and marketing and promoting Bond program success to the public.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Karen Shawcross:** Congratulations! I appreciate the photographs in the report and the example of equitable lease-ups for priority populations. I agree that the Bond has been successful and needs to be publicly shared. Will Canadian lumber tariffs impact your construction budgets, especially for Hillside Park?
 - **Clackamas County response, Devin:** Our contractors feel confident that they have materials purchased and stored to complete the projects with the contingency available. For projects in construction, I feel confident, but for projects in pre-

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

development, I am worried. We are trying to build in contingency but are limited by OHCS funding.

- **Question, Co-chair Andrea Sanchez:** Can you describe the co-developer model and how that is working to build El Centro?
 - **Clackamas County response, Devin:** They are sharing developer fees, and prioritizing the El Centro communities as part of the lease-up process.
- **Question, Noah Goldman:** Have the number of publicly subsidized units changed with the two public housing redevelopments?
 - **Clackamas County response, Devin:** Hillside Park demolished 54 units of public housing and included 140 project-based rental assistance in the repositioning. Park Place demolished 99 units, and 112 new units will have rental assistance.
- **Question, Co-chair Jeff Petrillo:** Does the reduction in housing units reduce the subsidy for the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)? Who is the developer for Shortstack? What is the current cost per unit for the Lake Oswego project?
 - **Clackamas County response, Devin:** We get an allocation annually from HUD for operations and capital funds. The funds are converted to a Section 8 rental assistance subsidy which has a small admin fee. It changes the metrics at the housing authority level but does not impact residents. Shortstack Developer Anna McKay partnered with Proud Ground for this project. It costs \$563,000 per unit.
- **Question, Sushmita Poddar:** I have heard comments from community members that there is not enough soundproofing between the floors of units. Have you all received this feedback before?
 - **Clackamas County response, Devin:** I have not heard any comments from the new building residents, but this is a great question for our developer as part of a post-construction questionnaire. We are prioritizing soundproofing in our new buildings as we have heard that there was not enough soundproofing at previous public housing units.
 - **Clackamas County response, Andrew:** Hillside Park Building C had additional soundproofing added that exceeds new standard requirements.

Annual Progress Report: Washington County

Lisa Varon, Washington County, reviewed the status of the 12 Bond projects and shared that there have been some cost increases for projects under construction. She highlighted that Washington County will exceed its production goal targets, and noted that through Metro's Site Acquisition Program, the Aloha 209 project is in planning and will include PSH units. She noted that a PSH project in Forest Grove will feature 60 units of PSH pending Metro Concept Endorsement.

Melissa Dailey, Washington County, reviewed the 2024 milestones, highlighting that Cedar Rising completed its lease-up and had its grand opening in June. She shared that Woodland Hearth experienced some permitting delays and cost increases and OHCS funds were used to bridge the finance gaps. She noted that the Altura and Opal projects also experienced cost increases and additional funding sources were identified to bridge those finance gaps.

Jill Chen, Washington County, shared that lessons learned include that providing security for PSH units is very expensive, projects need a critical number of units, and PSH set-asides can be challenging to integrate into the coordinated entry system. She noted that insurance costs are experiencing high increases and that there is state legislation to address this issue. She highlighted

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

that COBID contractors have shared that additional capacity is needed and that Metro could help facilitate assistance to COBID contractors as a regional collaborator.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Brandy Penner:** Thank you, your team was great to work with and I appreciate the highlighted challenges.
- **Question, Co-chair Petrillo:** Is the insurance operation that allows nonprofits to apply not working? I would like to see areas north of Highway 26, Cedar Hills, and North Bethany receive affordable housing.
 - **Washington County response, Jill:** The insurance market as a whole has taken a beating and so has the affordable housing insurance with the high-risk rating with the populations we serve. We have been working to preserve the Bethany Meadows project.
- **Question, Karen:** Congratulations! I appreciate the lesson learned that projects under 50 units are not sustainable. For the two projects under construction, will tariffs impact construction costs or is there enough contingency?
 - **Washington County response, Lisa:** We do have contingency and we are keeping an eye on material costs. For the Aloha 209 project, we will proceed with significant partnerships between the architect and construction teams to have an accurate projected cost.
- **Question, Sushmita:** What is being done regarding soundproofing for the units? Are the targeted production numbers being revised for the need in the county as cost increases? When talking about 60-80% Area Median Income (AMI), can we state the number to make it easier for community members listening in to understand? Our affordable housing stock does not meet the needs of those who make \$15 an hour or \$32,000 annually. The voucher and housing support systems are inadequate.
 - **Washington County response, Jill:** HUD releases the AMI numbers each year. For 2024, the 80% AMI for a household of four for the entire Portland Metropolitan Area is \$94,400. Washington County has the highest rent rates in the metro area. Our commitments stay the same regardless of costs. When costs increase, we look to find additional funding sources.
- **Question, Noah:** Could Washington County Housing Authority apply for an exemption to the AMI figures through the Moving to Work program?
 - **Washington County response, Jill:** The need for more vouchers would still exist. We need more vouchers.

Annual Progress Report: City of Beaverton

Javier Mena, City of Beaverton, reviewed Beaverton's Bond portfolio and shared that the city is on track to exceed its production target goals. He highlighted the Mary Ann Project, which houses a significant number of youth community members. He shared that South Cooper Mountain was recently annexed into the city and is developing rapidly and will have two Bond projects, including Amity Orchards. Amity Orchards has three family-sized buildings, and infrastructure including a street had to be created which led to a funding gap filled by the state.

Javier highlighted the Elmonica project and noted there was a challenging land use and permitting process including transportation issues, but construction began in December 2024. He reviewed the Meadowlark project which is strategically located within the city and will include a public-use

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

ground floor. He noted that they expected to receive \$3 million in federal funding, which will no longer happen, but the city remains committed to the project and will work through funding challenges commercially.

Javier shared that lessons learned include working with developers that have experience with PSH, challenges with leasing up studios and one bedrooms which are at market rate, and that contractors are at capacity.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Comment, Karen:** Thank you for not giving on Elmonica and pre-leasing Amity Orchard, I hope that is an example that can be replicated.
- **Question, Co-chair Sanchez:** Can you expand more on the lesson learned for developer experience with PSH?
 - **Beaverton response, Jaiver:** It is important to know what the population needs and connect housing to services and providers. It makes partners more comfortable.

Annual Progress Report: City of Hillsboro

Chirs Hartye, City of Hillsboro, shared that Hillsboro does not own or operate affordable housing, their role is to gap financing and be catalysts for development. He provided an overview of the Nueva Esperanza and Dolores projects. The City contributed six acres to Nueva Esperanza and the project was a great partnership between Bienestar and the Housing Development Center. He noted that there were supply chain issues during the project, but the development team identified creative solutions. He shared that Dolores experienced tax credit pricing challenges and that the project used regional long-term rental assistance (RLRA) vouchers.

Chris highlighted the city's partnership with TriMet for the Willow Creek Park and Ride project which is currently going through the RFP process. RFP bidders will need to meet the minimum of developing 110 units, 33 of which will be deeply affordable. He noted that these three projects will exceed Hillsboro's target production goals.

Chris shared that lessons learned include that land is getting harder to acquire in Hillsboro and that having publicly owned sites is critical. He emphasized the importance of leading with racial equity and selecting culturally specific developers. He reflected that costs are increasing and resources are becoming more competitive, especially at the state level. He noted the need for continued coordination amongst jurisdictions and thanked Metro for being a convener.

Committee members had the following questions and comments:

- **Question, Co-chair Sanchez:** I noticed that market fluctuations are resulting in fewer units. As you consider the Willow Creek project, should we be prepared that the minimum of 110 units may not be met?
 - **Hillsboro response, Chris:** We are anticipating Willow Creek to have a gap between \$5-10 million. Our hope is for the developer to not propose fewer units, but to partner with the developer to identify ways to fill the cost gap.
- **Question, Noah:** Can you further explain the tax credit pricing issue?
 - **Hillsboro response, Chris:** Fewer banks in the marketplace want to invest in low-income housing tax credits, which brings tax credit pricing down.
 - **Response, Co-chair Sanchez:** It is basic supply and demand. If there is a need for large corporations and banks to receive tax credits to reduce their liability, it will

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

increase. As the demand for reduced tax liability decreases, there is less demand to purchase the low-income tax credits.

Panel Q&A with Jurisdictions and Committee Discussion

Madeline facilitated a Q&A between the Committee and the presenters from each jurisdiction.

- **Question, Jay Tomlinson:** How is non-car transportation prioritized for these sites? Are jurisdictions working with TriMet to build bus stops near sites or are sites being selected near already existing transportation lines?
 - **Clackamas County response, Devin:** We do not have a lot of Max service. We have the Wilsonville transit center and bus lines. We try to incentivize public transit and bike travel by providing bike storage and reduced transit fares.
 - **Beaverton response, Javier:** We wanted to maximize publicly owned properties, and the challenge with South Cooper Mountain is there is no transportation. We hope that the bus line will extend to the site soon, but other projects are located on key transportation paths.
 - **Washington County response, Jill:** We are similar to Clackamas County, we are not high density, but we generally try to find opportunities that are close to the Max line or rapid bus line. A key component of PSH projects is to be close to the main transportation lines.
- **Question, Theo Hathaway Saner:** How does Metro allocate Bond interest earnings?
 - **Metro response, Alison Wicks:** There have been two instances where Metro dispersed earnings to jurisdictions. Metro allocated funds to provide air conditioning in all units in response to the 2021 heat dome and dedicated some funds in 2024 for PSH projects. We will bring this topic up at a future meeting to discuss the next steps for allocating the newly accrued interest earnings.
 - **Beaverton response, Jaiver:** The interest earnings could support a Cooper Mountain complementary project.
 - **Washington County response, Jill:** This would be an interesting discussion in terms of priorities for the Committee for what you are looking for in particular, such as more units.
- **Comment, Karen:** Congratulations to all. The lessons learned were helpful to hear. I hope that Metro will reconvene the jurisdictions in the hope that there will be another Bond. I heard lessons learned on studios and one bedrooms, soundproofing, PSH experienced developers, and pre-leasing. I think Metro's convener role should bring together jurisdictions to discuss best practices and hear what works and what does not.
 - **Washington County comment, Melissa:** To clarify, we see fast take-ups for studios and one bedrooms at 30% AMI.
- **Comment, Sushmita:** I want to uplift Jay's comment. Washington and Clackamas counties have relatively fewer community-based organizations and public transit. Are we going to invest in transportation or development? If the development is not near transit, tenants are forced to drive and pay driver's insurance, which is not affordable. I request Committee members to put pressure on TriMet to work with jurisdictions to ensure public transit is increased.
 - **Clackamas County response, Andrew:** I would add that counties and cities are collaborating with TriMet when doing transit investments.

Housing Bond Oversight Committee Meeting Summary

- **Question, Noah:** Given the issue of 60% AMI units, in the future could entire complexes be 30% AMI units? Perhaps in 2019, 60% AMI was needed, but now it seems more deeply affordable units are needed.
 - **Washington County response, Jill:** The cost has gone haywire. It costs \$700,000 per unit, which is the equivalent of a market-rate single-family home. We collectively need to streamline and improve processes in land use, management, and construction. Populations in affordable housing buildings have high needs. Projects that are all 30% AMI units are not fiscally viable.
- **Comment, Co-chair Sanchez:** At our previous meeting, Home Forward recommended considering subsidy caps based on AMI served. Entire projects of 30% AMI will need a significant increase in subsidy. The policy question is what our strategic goal is and how do we build affordable housing accordingly.
- **Question, Noah:** Would some of these high costs be remedied by public housing options?
 - **Washington County response, Jill:** It would not be remedied. Without HUD support the housing authority operates at a loss.
 - **Clackamas County response, Devin:** Public housing has been underfunded by HUD. There is an aging stock which is challenging to maintain at a quality level.



Closing and Next Steps

Madeline thanked the jurisdictions for presenting and the Committee members for their participation. She shared that the next steps include:

- Next meeting: April 16, 2025, 3:00 – 5:30 p.m.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 5:45 p.m.



2024 annual report
May 2025

Metro affordable housing bond program

Draft 04.09.25 for Housing Bond Oversight
Committee and partner jurisdiction review

oregonmetro.gov/housing

Metro respects civil rights

Metro fully complies with Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 that requires that no person be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be otherwise subjected to discrimination on the basis of race, color or national origin under any program or activity for which Metro receives federal financial assistance.

Metro fully complies with Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act and Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act that requires that no otherwise qualified individual with a disability be excluded from the participation in, be denied the benefits of, or be subjected to discrimination solely by reason of their disability under any program or activity for which Metro receives federal financial assistance.

If any person believes they have been discriminated against regarding the receipt of benefits or services because of race, color, national origin, sex, age or disability, they have the right to file a complaint with Metro. For information on Metro's civil rights program, or to obtain a discrimination complaint form, visit oregonmetro.gov/civilrights or call 503-797-1536.

Metro provides services or accommodations upon request to persons with disabilities and people who need an interpreter at public meetings. If you need a sign language interpreter, communication aid or language assistance, call 503-797-1700 or TDD/TTY 503-797-1804 (8 a.m. to 5 p.m. weekdays) 5 business days before the meeting. All Metro meetings are wheelchair accessible. For up-to-date public transportation information, visit TriMet's website at trimet.org.

Cover page images (clockwise from top left): Rockwood Village, Nueva Esperanza, The Opal, Cedar Rising, Good Shepherd Village and Dr. Darrell Millner Building.

Memo

Date: May 21, 2025
To: Metro Council
From: Metro Housing Bond Community Oversight Committee
Subject: 2024 Annual Report

A report to the Metro Council and the community from the Metro Housing Bond Community Oversight Committee

We are pleased to present the 2024 annual report for the Metro affordable housing bond, covering the period from January 1, 2024 through December 31, 2024.

The Metro Housing Bond Community Oversight Committee has reviewed progress reports from the bond’s implementation partner agencies, as well as an analysis of regional progress and performance presented by Metro staff. The committee also reviews quarterly progress and expenditure reports on an ongoing basis to monitor and evaluate progress toward production and policy goals outlined in the Metro Council’s adopted policy framework for the bond.

The bond framework established a goal of creating at least 3,900 new homes as well as policy expectations for advancing racial equity throughout the implementation process. Through the work of Metro’s jurisdictional partners, affordable housing developers, community-based nonprofits, contractors, and construction and trades workers, the bond is delivering on these promises. Metro and its partners are on track to build 1,700 more homes than expected, bringing 5,600 affordable homes to the region. These new affordable homes will help tackle the region’s housing shortage and stabilize communities so that all people can thrive.

KEY HIGHLIGHTS


In its fifth year of implementation, the bond program outpaced its housing production targets while continuing to make significant progress in advancing regional goals to increase equitable access to housing.

Production progress

As of December 2024, there were 60 bond-funded projects underway that will provide 4,989 new affordable homes. These homes represent 128% of the bond’s total unit production target of 3,900 affordable homes.

- **Total units:** The 4,989 affordable homes (which are collectively referred to as the “bond portfolio” throughout the report) include 2,221 units that have completed construction, 1,764 units under construction and 1,004 units in pre-construction.

Regional progress toward production goals



- **Deeply affordable units:** 1,773 of these homes will be affordable to households with incomes at or below 30% of area median income, representing 111% of the program’s production goal for deeply affordable homes.
- **Family-size units:** 2,545 of these homes will have two or more bedrooms, representing 131% of the program’s production goal for family-size homes.

Plans are in place that will commit all remaining bond funds by 2026 with final projects expected to break ground by 2027. **The program is projected to achieve 144% of its original production target once all funds are expended**, supporting the creation of an estimated 5,600 affordable homes that will provide housing for 10,600 to 18,000 people across the region.


By December 2024, 3,877 people had moved into their new homes in 21 bond-funded projects located in Beaverton, Cornelius, Forest Grove, Gladstone, Gresham, Happy Valley, Hillsboro, Lake Oswego, Oregon City, Portland and Tigard.

Addressing disparities and advancing racial equity

Metro and its implementation partners are making ongoing progress in moving forward the bond program’s goals of addressing disparities, increasing equitable access to housing and advancing racial equity:

- **Addressing disparities through project location:** The locations of the bond portfolio’s homes expand access to housing options in a diversity of areas throughout the region: 35% of units are located in areas that have historically lacked affordable housing, 56% are located in areas where communities at risk of displacement live today and 44% are located in areas historically inaccessible to communities of color. This not only improves access to affordable housing in communities across greater Portland and provides residents with greater choice about where to live, it also helps connect people to schools, jobs and other opportunities while preventing displacement in changing neighborhoods.

Affordable housing bond project locations



- **Advancing economic opportunity through construction:** Bond-funded projects represented 13% of regional multifamily housing construction in 2022-23. These projects have supported an average of 2,283 direct jobs in the construction sector annually – jobs that pay an average of \$93,676 per year in wages and benefits. To ensure equitable access to the economic opportunities provided by bond investments, the program aims to direct construction contracts to underrepresented firms. The bond’s development projects are on track to meet or exceed the regional goal of at least 20% of construction contract funding going to state certified minority- or women-owned and/or emerging small businesses (MWESB). By December 2024, 22 projects had reached completion with a combined \$165.7 million in contracts paid to MWESB firms, representing 29.1% of total construction costs.
- **Promoting equitable access through marketing and lease-up:** All bond projects are required to develop plans for affirmatively marketing housing opportunities and reducing lease-up barriers to ensure equitable access to bond-funded units. Outcomes from projects that have completed lease-up suggest that these affirmative marketing and lease-up strategies are working, with a higher percentage of people of color housed in bond-funded units than the percentage of households that are people of color in the surrounding neighborhoods and the region as a whole.
- **Advancing housing stability through services:** On-site services can support households with low incomes to remain stably housed. Across the 60 projects in the portfolio, 93% include formal partnerships with culturally responsive or culturally specific organizations to provide resident services and other programming. In

addition, 50% of projects will provide ongoing case management for households in permanent supportive housing units intended for people exiting long-term homelessness; 63% of these projects are leveraging funding from Metro's supportive housing services fund.

- **Promoting community engagement:** Implementation partners and developers are expected to conduct outreach and organize engagement opportunities to involve the community in providing input on project design, services and other priorities. In 2024 more than 522 people participated in community engagement opportunities to inform planning for 17 projects. Their input helped to inform project design, unit amenities, outdoor spaces and on-site services.

Addressing emerging opportunities and challenges

In June 2024, the oversight committee presented recommendations to Metro Council designed to optimize the impact of housing bond resources and set up the region to continue to address pressing regional housing needs. Key policy and program efforts undertaken in response to the recommendations include:

- **Funding coordination and alignment:** Metro has continued to work with funding and development partners to support bond projects facing financial barriers, including providing amendments to final approvals as needed to allocate additional bond funds to fill gaps in projects. Metro also continued to coordinate with Oregon Housing and Community Services and jurisdictional partners on funding processes and alignment. Metro's previous allocation of affordable housing bond interest earnings to fund housing for people exiting homelessness supported 67 permanent supportive housing units that were added to the portfolio in 2024.
- **Affordable housing operations:** In spring and summer of 2024, Metro worked with partners to conduct interviews, listening sessions and research to inform a report on affordable housing investment opportunities, including exploration of barriers to production related to the escalation of affordable housing operating costs. The Tri-County Planning Body, which develops regional strategies to support implementation of Metro's supportive housing services fund, sponsored an assessment of mission-driven property management practices in the region to inform priorities for regional action. In 2025, Metro initiated an asset management and monitoring assessment to better understand best practices, needs and possible gaps to support long-term stewardship of bond-funded assets, and to identify lessons learned and considerations for future funding.
- **Plan for the future:** Metro has focused the past year on multiple interrelated efforts aimed at ensuring the region is able to meet its affordable housing needs into the future. In 2024, Metro conducted an analysis of regional housing investment opportunities and needs that supported the Metro chief operating officer's recommendation for future funding options as well as subsequent Metro Council conversations about funding strategies and reforms. Metro also launched work to

create the region’s first Regional Housing Coordination Strategy, a state-mandated plan to coordinate and support local housing strategies to further fair housing and the development of diverse housing types that are high quality, accessible and affordable with access to economic opportunities, services and amenities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

[The Housing Bond Oversight Committee will develop the recommendations at its April and May meetings.]

Thank you,

Jeffrey Petrillo (Co-chair)
Andrea Sanchez (Co-chair)
Noah Goldman
Maritza Kritz
James Lee
Ann Leenstra
Jesse Neilson
Brady Penner
Sushmita Poddar
Katherine Rozsa
Theo Hathaway Saner
Karen Shawcross
Jay Tomlinson
Clayton Woullard

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction	1
Background	2
2024 policy efforts	8
Unit production progress	11
Advancing racial equity through project location	20
Advancing economic opportunity through construction	25
Advancing equitable access to housing	29
Advancing housing stability	38
Community engagement to shape project outcomes	43
Efficient use of funds	45
Sustainability and climate resilience	50
Looking ahead	52
Exhibits	54
• Exhibit A: Summary of affordable housing bond portfolio through December 2024	54
• Exhibit B: Maps and detailed summary of location metrics for affordable housing bond projects	55
• Exhibit C: Summary of contracting goals and preliminary outcomes, workforce tracking commitments and prevailing wage requirements	63
• Exhibit D: Occupancy data for projects that completed lease-up	65
• Exhibit E: Summary of leveraged capital funding sources	69
• Exhibit F: Summary of ongoing funding for long-term rental assistance and wraparound services	71
• Exhibit G: Affordable housing bond financial report through December 2024	73
• Exhibit H: Oversight committee 2024 recommendations to the Metro Council	74

INTRODUCTION

Greater Portland does not have enough affordable housing to meet everyone's needs. Metro's 2024 Urban Growth Report estimates that the region will need to build a total of 27,000 homes to meet the region's current housing needs. This includes 8,700 homes for people experiencing homelessness, 4,200 homes that are affordable to households with extremely low incomes and 5,300 homes affordable to households with very low incomes. An additional 150,000 homes will be needed over the next 20 years to keep up with future growth, and almost two-thirds of that future housing will need to be affordable for households with low incomes.

The region's affordable housing shortage puts many of our neighbors at risk of housing instability and homelessness. Populations with additional barriers to housing have been hit particularly hard. These groups include people of color, immigrants and refugees, veterans, people with disabilities, older adults and families.

On November 6, 2018, voters took action to address the region's housing crisis, passing the nation's first regional affordable housing bond. The voter-approved bond was designed to generate \$652.8 million in funding, with the goal of building 3,900 affordable homes to house about 12,000 people. Since voter approval, Metro and a wide range of partners have worked together to deliver the results sought by voters.

This report provides an update on implementation progress for the Metro affordable housing bond. The report summarizes bond implementation through December 2024, building upon and aggregating information provided in progress reports from seven local implementing partner jurisdictions plus Metro's site acquisition program. The report includes:

- A summary of local and regional progress toward unit production targets, funding commitments and expenditures
- Analysis of progress to advance racial equity through geographic distribution of investments, commitments for equitable contracting and hiring, low-barrier leasing, affirmative marketing and strategies to provide ongoing services to meet the needs of residents
- Activities and outcomes for community engagement to ensure that feedback from communities of color and other priority groups meaningfully shapes project outcomes to meet their needs
- Financial analysis of the current portfolio to analyze efficient use of subsidy and alignment with leveraged funds to maximize the benefits of these investments

BACKGROUND

When Metro Council referred the 2018 bond to voters, it adopted an implementation framework developed through months of engagement with partners and community members. The framework continues to guide implementation today.

Core values

The framework includes four core values:

1. **Lead with racial equity.** Ensure that racial equity considerations guide and are integrated throughout all aspects of implementation, including community engagement, project location, inclusive workforce, tenant marketing and screening, and resident and/or supportive services strategies.
2. **Create opportunity for those in need.** Ensure that program investments serve people currently left behind in the region's housing market, especially communities of color, families with children and multiple generations, people with disabilities, seniors, veterans, households experiencing or at risk of homelessness and households at risk of displacement.
3. **Create opportunity throughout the region.** Ensure that investments are distributed across the region to: (a) expand affordable housing options in neighborhoods that have not historically included sufficient supply of affordable homes, (b) increase access to transportation, employment, education, nutrition, parks and natural areas, and (c) help prevent displacement in changing neighborhoods where communities of color live today.
4. **Ensure long-term benefits and good use of public dollars.** Provide for community oversight to ensure transparency and accountability in program activities and outcomes. Ensure financially sound investments in affordable, high-quality homes. Allow flexibility and efficiency to respond to local needs and opportunities, and to create immediate affordable housing opportunities for those in need.

Leading with racial equity

Because people of color have been and continue to be among those most harmed by housing discrimination and lack of access to safe, stable, affordable homes, the Metro Council directed the housing bond program to lead with racial equity in all aspects of the program. Explicitly focusing policies and investments to benefit communities of color can reduce racial disparities while benefiting the whole community.

The housing bond program partially addresses these barriers through its ambitious goals for family-size and deeply affordable homes. The program also prioritizes racial equity throughout implementation – from community engagement that informs projects, to the geographic distribution of investments, to creating economic opportunity with the

development of affordable housing, to strategies for reducing barriers to access and promoting culturally responsive services to meet the needs of future residents.

Implementation partner jurisdictions

Metro works to deliver the housing bond program in close partnership with seven local implementation partners: the cities of Beaverton, Gresham, Hillsboro and Portland; Clackamas and Washington counties; and Home Forward, as the implementation partner for east Multnomah County. In recognition of the unique knowledge, experience and opportunities in communities across the region, each partner has developed its own implementation strategy to meet local needs while serving the bond's regional goals. Jurisdictions are responsible for administering funds to invest in property acquisition and eligible development projects. Some projects are being developed and operated by public housing authorities, but the majority are public-private partnerships with third-party affordable housing developers, owners and property managers.

Metro is responsible for providing oversight and accountability, including reviewing each proposed investment at concept and final stages to ensure alignment with program requirements and contribution to the production outcomes promised to voters. In addition, Metro directly invests housing bond funds through its site acquisition program, which strategically acquires and invests in the development of promising sites for affordable housing in collaboration with local implementation partners.

Work plan and local implementation strategies

In 2019, the Metro Council adopted a housing bond work plan to provide operational guidance for program administration activities including roles and responsibilities, funding allocation and eligibility criteria, and processes for funding approvals. In accordance with requirements set forth in the work plan, each implementing partner created a local implementation strategy informed by community engagement. Each strategy includes a development plan to achieve the local share of unit production goals and commitments for advancing racial equity and ensuring community engagement input informs projects.

Community Oversight Committee

Independent community oversight is a hallmark of accountability to voters and the community. The Metro Council appointed an Affordable Housing Bond Community Oversight Committee in January 2019 to provide independent and transparent oversight of implementation, including evaluating local implementation strategies for consistency with program goals and guiding principles, monitoring investment outcomes and providing an annual report to the Metro Council.

Throughout 2019, the committee reviewed and recommended local partners' implementation strategies for approval by Metro Council. During this time, the committee also identified considerations for ongoing monitoring and evaluation. In 2020, the

committee monitored early implementation. Beginning in 2021, the committee submitted annual reports to Metro Council. In the most recent annual report, released in 2024, the committee made recommendations related to funding coordination and alignment, affordable housing operations and planning for the future (see *Exhibit H*).

Funding requirements and intergovernmental agreements

The Metro Council approved local implementation strategies as part of intergovernmental agreements with each implementation partner describing the terms and conditions for using bond funds for eligible investments and program administration.

Intergovernmental agreements include these provisions:

- All projects selected for bond funding must demonstrate contribution to unit production targets and consistency with approved local implementation strategies as confirmed through Metro staff review at the concept endorsement and final approval stages.
- All funded projects will have a regulatory agreement ensuring long-term affordability and monitoring obligations for a term of at least 60 years (or 30 years for existing buildings that are purchased and rehabilitated for use as affordable housing and are more than 10 years old).
- Implementing jurisdictions will submit annual progress reports to Metro, to support the oversight committee’s annual progress review.
- Metro will disburse administrative funding to implementation partners annually based on a schedule established in the intergovernmental agreement. One exception is City of Portland, which will have its administrative share included in project funding, to be reimbursed to the City through a “project delivery fee.”
- Implementing jurisdictions will submit annual end-of-fiscal-year reports to Metro summarizing direct project expenditures and program administrative expenditures, the latter of which is subject to the 5% administrative cap included in the housing bond measure.

The oversight committee completed its review and recommendation of local implementation strategies between July 2019 and February 2020, and Metro Council approved strategies as part of intergovernmental agreements. Six intergovernmental agreements were executed between November 2019 and August 2020. The intergovernmental agreement for Home Forward was approved in March 2021 due to the relatively small funding allocation in Multnomah County outside the cities of Portland and Gresham.

Funding allocation

The housing bond framework called for funding to be allocated region-wide based on assessed value of property in each of the three counties and set a 5% cap on administrative funding across the program.

As of December 2024, the housing bond work plan allocated \$678,254,782 for investments in property acquisition and development, to be allocated as follows:

- Ten percent of original project allocation (\$62,016,000) allocated for investment through Metro’s site acquisition program, which purchases regionally significant sites and supports their development in coordination with local implementing jurisdictions.
- All remaining funds (\$616,238,782) allocated to support local implementation, with distribution on the basis of share of assessed property value to achieve a proportionate distribution of investments across the region (45% in Multnomah County, 34% in Washington County and 21% in Clackamas County).

This includes additional funding generated through bond sale premiums and interest earnings, which has been allocated toward investments in air conditioning, permanent supportive housing, and additional project and administration costs in alignment with Metro Council direction. Current funding availability and adjusted allocations are shown in *Exhibit G*.

The bond measure included an administrative funding cap of 5% of total bond proceeds. Including interest earnings through December 2024, \$35,697,620 is available for administrative costs. Of these funds, \$19,409,319 is directed to Metro’s regional oversight and accountability functions, and \$12,803,823 is allocated for the administrative costs of implementing partners and Metro’s site acquisition program.¹ The remaining \$3,484,478 within the 5% cap is reserved for future allocation.

The administrative activities for the bond program are expected to span fiscal years 2019-2029. Averaged over that 11-year period, the program has a total of \$3,245,238 per year in administrative funding for all implementation and oversight activities of Metro and its local implementation partners combined. This funding is insufficient to cover the full administrative costs of implementation, a challenge which has led to capacity gaps and the need for Metro and its jurisdictional partners to secure supplemental administrative funding from other sources.

Targets and metrics

From 2019 through 2020, Metro engaged implementation partners, stakeholders, practitioners and the community oversight committee to further define metrics for evaluating progress toward goals and targets in the measure.

The implementation framework established the following goals for the program:

- Create 3,900 affordable homes.

¹ Portland does not receive an allocation for administrative costs as Portland uses a Program Delivery Fee, not paid for by Metro's affordable housing bond, to cover administrative expenses.

- Reserve 1,600 homes for people with extremely low incomes (30% or less of area median income)
- Build half of the homes with two or more bedrooms – big enough to accommodate families
- Up to 10% of homes may be moderately affordable for people with below average incomes (61-80% of area median income)
- Distribute investments across the region to create 21% of homes in Clackamas County, 34% in Washington County and 45% in Multnomah County.
- No more than 5% of total funding may be spent on program administration activities.
- At least 20% of construction contracts for each project should be awarded to state certified minority- or women-owned and emerging small business firms (MWESB), and jurisdictions should demonstrate progress toward increasing equitable contracting outcomes over time.

Metro defined additional metrics to further operationalize the values and goals in the framework and support program evaluation. These metrics relate to the following areas:

- Community engagement outcomes, including demographics of participants and how feedback changed processes and projects
- Location outcomes related to access, fair housing and community stabilization
- Outreach to MWESB/COBID (Certification Office for Business Inclusion and Diversity) certified firms
- Construction workforce diversity
- Affirmative marketing activities and outcomes (e.g., referral sources)
- Screening and lease-up outcomes (e.g., application denials)
- People served and resident diversity
- Efficient use of subsidy

Many metrics will not be reported until after projects reach completion (e.g., contracting/workforce outcomes) and lease-up (e.g., marketing/lease-up outcomes, resident demographics). The first post-completion outcomes were reported in December 2022.

Metro supportive housing services fund

In May 2020, voters in greater Portland approved a new regional tax to fund supportive housing services, an unprecedented effort to direct funding toward investments in rental assistance and supportive services for people experiencing or at risk of homelessness. The supportive housing services fund, or SHS, aims to connect at least 5,000 households experiencing prolonged homelessness with permanent supportive housing and stabilize at least 10,000 households experiencing short-term homelessness or at risk of

homelessness in permanent housing. Implementation is guided by a commitment to lead with racial equity, with community-informed strategies, goals and outcome metrics.

The SHS fund presents an opportunity to integrate rental assistance and supportive services funding with the bond program's capital investments to maximize the ability of both programs to serve households experiencing or at risk of homelessness, with a particular focus on providing permanent supportive housing, or PSH. Integration of SHS funding with bond investments also enables the bond program to further advance its racial equity commitments.

2024 POLICY EFFORTS

In June 2024, the oversight committee presented recommendations to the Metro Council designed to optimize the impact of housing bond resources and set up the region to continue to address pressing regional housing needs. The committee's recommendations focused on funding coordination and alignment, affordable housing operations and planning for the future (see *Exhibit H*). Key policy and program efforts undertaken in 2024 that respond to the recommendations are summarized below.

Funding coordination and alignment

- **Filling funding gaps:** Metro has continued to work with funding and development partners to ensure that bond projects have flexibility and support to navigate funding gaps due to unprecedented cost escalation and private activity bond constraints. Metro worked with jurisdictional partners and helped development teams meet their financial closing deadlines by issuing additional bond funding to projects needing to fill financing gaps that could not be filled through other strategies.
- **Coordination with funding partners:** Metro continued to coordinate with Oregon Housing and Community Services, or OHCS, and jurisdictional partners on funding processes and alignment. This included participation in regular meetings with OHCS Technical Advisors and in the OHCS engagement processes for the Oregon Centralized Application and Qualified Allocation Plan, as well as ongoing coordination around policies and strategies related to permanent supportive housing and regional housing data. Metro staff also interviewed OHCS staff and bond implementation partners to inform an analysis of investment opportunities and lessons learned from the bond. These strategies are helping to support stronger coordination and alignment between Metro and OHCS, and there are opportunities to continue to expand this coordination in the future.
- **Permanent supportive housing funding:** In 2022, Metro dedicated \$20 million in affordable housing bond interest earnings to fund capital investments in permanent supportive housing pilot projects. In 2024, two projects with PSH pilot project funding reached milestones. The Vuela, in Clackamas County, started construction, and the Cesar, a market rate multifamily building in Portland, was acquired for conversion into PSH units. These two projects have added 67 PSH units to the bond portfolio. All 67 units will also be supported with SHS-funded rent assistance and services.

Affordable housing operations

- **Operating costs:** Metro conducted dozens of technical interviews aimed at understanding industry needs and trends and co-hosted a listening session with Housing Oregon and the Housing Development Center, or HDC, focused on the escalation of affordable housing operating costs. Participants in the listening session included affordable housing operators, property managers and service providers, as well as funders and policy experts. HDC also collected, analyzed and shared operating

cost data from a wide range of properties in the Metro area. The results of these engagements and industry trend research informed a report and presentation to the oversight committee about key findings.

- **Property management:** To support its regional landlord recruitment goal, the Tri-County Planning Body, or TCPB, recommended a focused assessment of mission-driven property management practices in the region. Consulting firm Focus Strategies is currently conducting a landscape analysis and researching best practices, as well as engaging stakeholders and experts to define mission-driven property management, identify barriers and opportunities to implementation, and recommend priorities for regional action. The results should be available later this year and will inform future regional strategies and considerations.
- **Asset management:** Metro has launched an asset management and monitoring assessment to better understand best practices, needs and possible gaps to strengthen long-term stewardship of bond-funded assets. HDC, which has deep expertise in this area, will assist Metro with this work by analyzing existing regulatory agreements and reporting structures and assessing the characteristics of the bond portfolio that may inform risks and opportunities for long-term stability. A report on HDC's preliminary findings is expected to be available later this year.

Plan for the future

Over the past year, Metro has led multiple interrelated efforts aimed at securing a future for the region where housing is affordable, available and better integrated with systems such as SHS-funded homelessness response and supportive housing services systems. Key efforts have included:

- **Evaluation of housing investment opportunities:** Metro conducted an analysis of regional housing investment opportunities and needs, including an assessment of investments that will best serve those with the deepest need, such as households experiencing homelessness. The findings from this analysis have underpinned Metro's housing department work this year, supporting the Metro chief operating officer's recommendation for future housing funding as well as subsequent Metro Council conversations about strategies to extend and reform regional funding to address homelessness and housing instability.
- **Regional housing coordination strategy:** In 2025, Metro will complete its first Regional Housing Coordination Strategy, or RHCS, through a collaborative effort of the planning, development and research and housing departments within Metro. Under the state's new Oregon Housing Needs Analysis framework, local jurisdictions with populations over 10,000 are required to create housing production strategies every six years, and Metro is required to produce a strategy to support coordination across these local planning efforts, with the first strategy required to be complete by December 2025. The strategies in Metro's RHCS will be informed through coordination with partners to determine the needs of jurisdictions, housing developers and providers, with a focus on identifying opportunities for Metro to best

support local strategies through coordination of local efforts and regional resources and strategies to fill gaps best addressed at a regional scale. The RHCS will include measures, policies or coordinating actions to promote: (a) the development and maintenance of diverse housing types that are high quality, physically accessible and affordable; (b) housing with access to economic opportunities, services and amenities; and (c) actions that affirmatively further fair housing.

UNIT PRODUCTION PROGRESS

The housing bond program is on track to exceed the goal of creating 3,900 affordable homes, including 1,950 family-size homes and 1,600 homes regulated for affordability to households making 30% of area median income or below.

As of December 2024, the program had committed funding to 60 projects representing 4,989 new affordable homes, including:

- 26 projects (2,221 units) that have completed construction
- 20 projects (1,764 units) that are under construction
- 14 projects (1,004 units) that are in pre-construction

Of these homes:

- 2,545 will have two or more bedrooms, representing 131% of the program's production goal of 1,950 family-size homes.
- 1,773 will be affordable to households with incomes at or below 30% of area median income, or AMI, representing 111% of the program's production goal of 1,600 deeply affordable homes.²



The 4,989 homes in the current portfolio will provide affordable housing for an estimated 9,500 to 16,000 people (detailed occupancy estimates are available in *Exhibit A*).

By December 2024, 3,877 of these people had moved into their new homes in the first 21 projects to complete lease-up, located across the region in Beaverton, Cornelius, Forest Grove, Gladstone, Gresham, Happy Valley, Hillsboro, Lake Oswego, Oregon City, Portland and Tigard.

The current portfolio's 4,989 affordable homes represent 128% of the bond program's total production target. Figure 4.1 shows regional progress toward production goals relative to funding committed. About 83% of total bond resources have been encumbered to fund the 4,989 homes already in progress. Plans are in place that will commit all remaining bond resources to projects by the end of 2026.

² In the Portland metropolitan area, 30% of area median income in 2024 was an annual income of \$24,780 for a household with one person and \$35,400 for a household with four people.

Figure 4.1 Regional progress toward production goals relative to funding committed



Trends in production costs

While the program is on track to exceed its unit production goals, **changes in the funding and financial landscape present challenges that have reduced the rate of units produced relative to resources committed.**

The production goals for the affordable housing bond were established based on modeling that reflected conditions and projections in 2018. Favorable tax credit pricing and low interest rates, as well as swift action by implementing partners, enabled the program to exceed expectations in early phases of implementation. Staff expected that market cost escalation would impact costs and subsidy needs throughout the course of the implementation timeframe, but the past four years have brought unprecedented cost escalation due to broader economic factors impacting the cost and availability of materials and labor. Ongoing impacts of the COVID-19 pandemic have created a construction cost premium for wood-framed projects with slab-on-grade foundations that is estimated at 8%-12% above that which would have occurred with standard, pre-COVID construction cost escalation. Inflation and interest rate increases since early 2022 have further impacted costs, with the Portland Housing Bureau reporting an average 1% increase in construction “hard” costs per month for projects in its pipeline.

In addition, the state of Oregon has faced funding constraints in recent years as a result of oversubscription of private activity bonds, necessary for financing 4% low-income housing tax credits, which represent the largest source of leveraged funding across the portfolio. Limitations in tax credit availability create uncertainty across the state's affordable housing development pipeline and contribute to funding delays, resulting in higher cumulative cost escalation.

These challenges have contributed to significant increases in production costs for bond-funded housing. Across the bond portfolio, the weighted average per unit total project cost was \$460,949 in 2024 compared with \$355,432 in 2020. Analysis of more recent projects in the portfolio indicates that project costs are trending toward a weighted average of \$555,871 per unit.

Due to these increases, many projects are requiring higher Metro bond subsidy amounts. The weighted average per unit Metro bond subsidy was \$109,777 in 2024 compared with \$98,236 in 2020. Excluding outliers (such as projects using Metro bond subsidy to fill a small gap and projects relying on unusually high levels of bond funding), the weighted average in 2024 was \$110,071 across the portfolio, but for more recent projects the average was \$154,630 per unit.

Local production progress

As of December 2024, five of the seven implementing jurisdictions had already met or exceeded their local share of the bond's production goal:

- **Beaverton** achieved 172% of its unit goal, 145% of its goal for deeply affordable units and 129% of its goal for family-size units, with 99% of funding committed.
- **Clackamas County** achieved 119% of its unit goal, 123% of its goal for deeply affordable units and 138% of its goal for family-size units, with 83% of funding committed.
- **Gresham** achieved 201% of its unit goal, 100% of its goal for deeply affordable units and 232% of its goal for family-size units, with 99.96% of funding committed.
- **Portland** achieved 142% of its unit goal, 114% of its goal for deeply affordable units and 135% of its goal for family-size units, with 98% of funding committed.
- **Washington County** achieved 107% of its unit goal, 103% of its goal for deeply affordable units and 108% of its goal for family-size units, with 97% of funding committed.


Hillsboro achieved 76% of its unit goal, 77% of its goal for deeply affordable units and 106% of its goal for family-size units, with 62% of funding committed. A funding solicitation is planned for 2025 to select a final project that will enable Hillsboro to meet and exceed its housing production targets.

Home Forward achieved 77% of its unit goal for east Multnomah County, 78% of its goal for deeply affordable units and 78% of its goal for family-size units, with 100% of funding

committed. It will not be able to add more units because it is using bond funding for a single project that had to be scaled back in response to challenges with parking requirements and land use approvals. However, any shortfall will be offset by the units produced by other jurisdictions.

Implementation partners are on track to exceed the bond’s overall unit production goals, with funding committed to 4,989 units, representing 128% of the regional goal. Each jurisdiction’s progress toward meeting its local share of the bond’s total production goal is shown in Figure 4.2.


Figure 4.2 Local progress toward total unit production goals



Implementation partners are on track to exceed overall targets for deeply affordable units, with funding committed to 1,773 units that will serve households with incomes at or below 30% AMI (111% of the regional goal for deeply affordable units). Each jurisdiction’s progress toward meeting its local share of the bond’s total goal for deeply affordable units is shown in Figure 4.3.

Deeply affordable units require additional subsidy because their rental income is lower and their operating expenses can be higher, creating operating funding gaps and limiting projects’ ability to carry debt. Of the portfolio’s deeply affordable units, 64% have commitments of project-based long-term rental assistance to reduce operating funding gaps.

Figure 4.3 Local progress toward 30% AMI unit production goals



Implementation partners are also on track to exceed the overall goal for homes with two or more bedrooms, with funding committed to 2,545 family-size units in the portfolio (131% of the target for family-size homes). Of the family-size homes in the portfolio, 29% are regulated for affordability at 30% AMI or below and 35% are larger unit sizes with three or more bedrooms. Each jurisdiction’s progress toward meeting its local share of the bond’s total goal for family-size units is shown in Figure 4.4.

Figure 4.4 Local progress toward family-size production goals



The bond program limits the number of homes provided for households making 61%- 80% AMI to 10% of overall units. To date, 140 bond-funded units representing 2.8% of the current portfolio are affordable to households making 61%-80% AMI. This includes 22 units in Amity Orchards, 42 units in Vuela and 76 units in the portfolio’s six homeownership projects. Flexibility to allow these more moderately affordable units in bond-funded developments was an intentional policy choice intended to support cross-subsidization of deeply affordable units. This is particularly important given that many of the bond portfolio’s deeply affordable (30% AMI or below) units do not include long-term rental assistance.

Metro site acquisition program

Metro’s site acquisition program, or SAP, manages implementation of 10% of total bond funds toward investments in property acquisition as well as development of sites already controlled by Metro. Development is facilitated through joint solicitations with implementing jurisdictions, and properties are transferred from Metro to a long-term owner prior to development. The site acquisition program aims to proportionately invest funds in implementing jurisdictions to contribute toward local production goals; funds remaining after acquisition support the development of the site. In most cases, projects developed on Metro-acquired properties require additional development funding from an implementing jurisdiction’s bond allocation.

As of December 2024, the program had reserved 100% of SAP funds for sites in all seven implementing jurisdictions. The SAP acquires property in areas with strong access to amenities important to households with low incomes such as transit, grocery stores, parks and elementary schools, and in areas with limited existing regulated affordable housing. The program prioritizes deep stakeholder engagement to set priorities for the development of its sites. By acquiring and competitively offering high-quality development sites, the SAP brings regulated affordable housing to communities where affordable housing developers have not been able to secure property and is able to attract proposals from a wide range of developers, not just those that control properties within the implementing jurisdiction.

Figure 4.5 Site acquisition program resources reserved per jurisdiction

Jurisdiction	Total SAP allocation	SAP funds reserved:			Percent reserved	Notes
		For due diligence and site acquisition	For development of Metro owned sites	Total reserved		
Beaverton	\$3,460,066	\$0	\$3,460,066	\$3,460,066	100%	All funds invested in previous Metro TOD program property purchased at Elmonica Station; developer: REACH CDC; construction start: December 2024; completion anticipated June 2026
Clackamas	\$12,909,788	\$2,626,621	\$10,283,167	\$12,909,788	100%	Metro SAP program acquired Boone's Ferry Road site in Lake Oswego's Lake Grove neighborhood; developer: Hacienda

						CDC; construction start: June 2025; completion anticipated November 2026
Gresham	\$2,972,999	\$18,744	\$2,954,255	\$2,972,999	100%	All funds committed to previous Metro TOD program property purchased at northeast portion of Gresham Civic Station; developer: Home Forward; construction start: October 2025
Hillsboro	\$4,517,453	\$2,767,453	\$1,750,000	\$4,506,502	100%	Metro SAP program acquired Walker Road site in Hillsboro's Tanasbourne neighborhood; developer: Hacienda CDC; construction start: August 2024; completion anticipated April 2026
Home Forward	\$1,764,347	\$0	\$1,764,347	\$1,764,347	100%	Site in Troutdale acquired and developed by Home Forward; construction start: July 2024; completion anticipated December 2025
Portland	\$23,450,731	\$16,118,725	\$7,332,006	\$23,450,731	100%	All funds committed to development of two sites: Glisan Landing (TOD-purchased site); developer: Related NW; completion anticipated February 2025. Barbur Portland Value Inn (SAP-funded acquisition); developer: Community Partners for Affordable Housing in partnership with HAKI Community Organization and Urban League; construction start: spring 2025
Washington	\$12,940,615	\$3,217,708	\$9,722,907	\$12,940,615	100%	Metro purchased property at 209th and TV Highway in Aloha-Reedville; developer: Housing Authority of Washington County; construction start: fall 2026
Totals	\$62,015,999	\$24,749,251	\$37,266,748	\$62,005,048	100%	

Affordable homeownership

The bond portfolio includes six developments that will offer affordable homeownership to 159 households. The projects use a community land trust model in partnership with Proud Ground and Habitat for Humanity. This shared equity model provides permanent affordability that will benefit multiple generations of future owners. Bond funding for the six projects is \$19.4 million, or 3.7% of the total bond funding across the portfolio. The projects will expand access to homeownership, particularly for communities of color who have been intentionally excluded from opportunities to build intergenerational wealth due to racist policies like redlining and restrictive covenants.

Strategic acquisition

In 2024, the Portland Housing Bureau leveraged bond funding to take advantage of favorable market conditions in the multifamily housing sector. In partnership with Home Forward, Portland allocated \$6.7 million in bond funding to purchase the Cesar Apartments, part of an innovative strategy to acquire market rate buildings for affordable housing at a lower cost and shorter timeline than new construction would permit. Once

minimal renovations are complete on the two-year-old building, the Cesar will offer 47 units of permanent supportive housing for individuals exiting chronic homelessness.

Portland also selected two additional projects to be considered for Metro bond funding through a special solicitation focused on rapid acquisition opportunities. Both projects will convert existing market rate buildings into affordable housing, creating 125 additional affordable homes.

Pipeline forecasting

Implementation partners are actively working on final funding solicitations and plans to commit remaining funds. All remaining funds are expected to be committed by 2026 with final projects currently expected to break ground by 2027.

Figure 4.6 shows the anticipated timeline for Metro’s disbursement of remaining funds to partner jurisdictions and completion of remaining units. Metro expects to disburse approximately \$136 million in 2025, with final disbursements of approximately \$105 million in 2026. Jurisdictions will then disburse the funds to developers according to locally determined schedules for each project. Projects typically take 39 to 47 months from solicitation and pre-development through construction and lease-up. Most remaining units are expected to be complete by 2028 with the final units reaching completion in 2029.

Figure 4.6 Forecasted timeline for remaining disbursements and unit completion





Figure 4.7 shows expected outcomes when accounting for all remaining funds. **The bond program is projected to achieve 144% of its original production target once all funds are expended, with an estimated total production of 5,600 units that will provide housing for 10,600 to 18,000 people.** This includes an estimated 2,000 deeply affordable units (125% of the original goal) and 2,700 family-size units (138% of the original goal). These projections are based on conservative assumptions about cost escalation and delays due to private activity bond availability.

Figure 4.7 Forecasted production outcomes



ADVANCING RACIAL EQUITY THROUGH PROJECT LOCATION

Metro’s bond work plan required local implementation partners to develop a project location strategy that considers geographic distribution of housing investments, access to opportunity, strategies to address racial segregation, and strategies to prevent displacement and stabilize communities.

Metro analyzes project locations to assess how they are distributed and how they support goals for advancing access to opportunity and racial equity. Each implementing jurisdiction’s progress report provides additional detail on access to transportation, employment, education, nutrition, parks and natural areas for specific project locations.

Figure 5.1 analyzes the projects added to the bond portfolio in 2024 based on the location-based characteristics that Metro is tracking. The table also summarizes the percentages of the total eligible units in the portfolio that meet each location-based metric. (See *Exhibit B* for a detailed table that includes all 60 projects in the portfolio.) Each metric is described after Figure 5.1, including how it supports the program’s core values and how it has been measured for this analysis.


Figure 5.1 Summary of project location metrics

Projects added in 2024	Eligible units	County	Areas where communities at risk of displacement live today	Areas historically inaccessible to communities of color	Areas with limited regulated affordable housing	Areas with access to transit	Walkable areas
Gooseberry Trails	52	Mult.	X		X	X	X
Broadway Corridor	230	Mult.		X		X	X
Cesar	47	Mult.		X	X	X	X
73rd and Foster	64	Mult.	X			X	
Legin Commons	124	Mult.		X	X	X	X
The Jade	40	Mult.	X			X	X
Myrtlewood Way	20	Mult.	X			X	X
Civic Drive	59	Mult.	X			X	X
Total bond portfolio units	4,989		56%	44%	35%	75%	77%

Geographic distribution

The housing bond framework allocates funding to achieve the following distribution of new homes across the region: 45% in Multnomah County, 34% in Washington County and 21% in Clackamas County. This distribution formula was based on the assessed value of property within the portion of each county located in Metro’s jurisdictional boundary, and the percentages also tie closely to population distribution. Local implementation strategies include goals for distributing investments across each partner jurisdiction in locations that advance fair housing choices, stabilize communities vulnerable to displacement and expand access to transit, food, jobs and amenities.

Figure 5.2 Affordable housing bond project locations




Larger versions of the maps in this section are available in *Exhibit B*.

Advancing fair housing access and reducing segregation

The geographic distribution of affordable homes in the bond portfolio demonstrates strong outcomes for advancing regional fair housing access and reducing segregation. This goal is measured by analyzing the percentage of bond-funded homes located in areas where (a) the population has a lower proportion of people of color than the region and (b) the rate of affordable housing units is lower than the average rate for the region.


Of the total affordable homes in the current bond portfolio, 44% are in areas historically inaccessible to communities of color, defined as areas where the percentage of people of color is less than or equal to the regional average (based on recent American Community Survey estimates).

Figure 5.3 Projects located in areas that have been inaccessible to communities of color



Of the total affordable homes in the current portfolio, 35% are in areas with limited existing affordable housing, defined as areas where the percentage of regulated affordable housing units (out of all units within a one-mile radius) is lower than the average rate for the region.

Figure 5.4 Project locations relative to existing regulated affordable housing




Preventing displacement and stabilizing communities

In addition to supporting investments in places that have historically lacked affordable homes, the housing bond framework also includes a goal of supporting investments in places that stabilize communities at higher risk of displacement. This is measured by identifying which projects are located in areas where the population has a high proportion of people of color and/or people with limited English proficiency (people age five or older who speak English less than “very well”), based on recent American Community Survey estimates. **Of the total affordable homes in the current portfolio, 56% are in areas with higher proportions than the region of people of color and/or people with limited English proficiency.**

Because there are limitations in American Community Survey estimates, the analysis also identifies areas where the percentage of people of color and/or people with limited English proficiency exceeds the regional average by more than the margin of error. These represent areas where there is more certainty of concentrations of communities of color and people with limited English proficiency: census tracts with up to 61% people of color and up to 27% people with limited English proficiency, compared to regional averages of

32% people of color and 7% people with limited English proficiency. See the detailed table in *Exhibit B* for more information.

Figure 5.5 Projects located in areas where communities of color live today



Access to transit and amenities

Of the total eligible units in the portfolio, 75% are within either a quarter mile of a frequent service bus stop or a half mile of a MAX station, and 77% are rated with a Walkscore of 50 (“somewhat walkable”) or better. The detailed table in *Exhibit B* provides the Walkscore and the distance to the nearest frequent service bus stop or light rail station for each project location.

Many of the projects also have access to a range of amenities including grocery stores, natural areas, schools and jobs. Each implementing jurisdiction’s progress report provides additional detail on nearby amenities.

ADVANCING ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITY THROUGH CONSTRUCTION

Economic impact

Metro affordable housing bond investments have had a significant impact on the local economy. Across the region, bond-funded units represented 13% of multifamily housing construction in 2022-23. Bond-funded projects have also supported an average of 2,283 direct jobs in the construction sector annually. These are living wage jobs, paying an average of \$93,676 per year in wages and benefits. Bond investments have also supported jobs in related industries such as insurance, finance, architecture and engineering.

Equitable contracting progress

To ensure equitable access to the economic opportunities provided by bond investments, the program aims to direct construction contracts to underrepresented firms. All implementing partners established a minimum goal of awarding 20% of project contracts to minority- or women- owned and/or emerging small businesses (MWESB) certified by the state Certification Office for Business Inclusion and Diversity (COBID), and the City of Portland committed to a goal of 30% COBID participation. Some projects have set higher aspirational goals exceeding the jurisdictional minimum.

Metro requires that projects report on contracting outcomes within six months of certificate of occupancy. As of December 2024, 22 projects had reached this milestone and submitted contracting outcomes data. Across the 22 projects, **COBID certified firms were paid a combined \$165.7 million in contracts, representing 29.1% of total construction costs for those projects.** With these contracts, firms can grow their businesses and create high-paying local jobs, while providing opportunities for workers to learn new skills and further their careers.


Figure 6.1 Summary of equitable contracting goals and outcomes for completed projects

Jurisdiction	Project	Construction costs	COBID contract dollars paid	COBID goal		COBID outcome	
				Hard costs	Soft costs	Hard costs	Soft costs
Beaverton	Mary Ann	\$14,389,822	\$3,921,179	20%	20%	27.5%	22.6%
Clackamas County	Tukwila Springs	\$11,208,808	\$2,476,081	20%	20%	21.1%	75.0%
	Fuller Road Station	\$32,689,095	\$6,465,376	20%	20%	19.8%	15.0%
	Good Shepherd Village	\$43,975,764	\$14,733,637	30%	20%	33.8%	28.4%
	Mercy Greenbrae	\$32,676,644	\$10,246,357	30%	30%	32.5%	18.7%
	Las Flores	\$49,863,699	\$18,068,304	20%	20%	34.0%	68.4%
Gresham	Wynne Watts Commons	\$32,577,823	\$8,286,752	20%		25.4%	
	Rockwood Village	\$39,460,973	\$9,172,867	20%		21.9%	
Hillsboro	Nueva Esperanza	\$38,844,840	\$13,744,050	29%	NA	35.0%	NA
Portland	Findley Commons	\$5,006,088	\$1,318,505	24%	20%	19.7%	58.4%
	Hattie Redmond	\$14,746,765	\$6,311,027	30%	20%	44.0%	28.9%
	Powellhurst Place	\$19,533,905	\$5,908,902	30%	20%	27.2%	70.7%
	Waterleaf	\$55,404,104	\$15,986,811	30%	20%	29.4%	21.6%
Washington County	Viewfinder	\$22,635,382	\$4,964,925	20%	20%	21.8%	26.0%
	Valfre at Avenida 26	\$9,047,142	\$2,990,573	20%	NA	33.1%	NA

Jurisdiction	Project	Construction costs	COBID contract dollars paid	COBID goal		COBID outcome	
				Hard costs	Soft costs	Hard costs	Soft costs
	Heartwood Commons	\$3,919,523	\$989,251	20%	20%	21.6%	76.3%
	Terrace Glen	\$31,186,415	\$9,718,240	20%	NA	31.2%	NA
	Alongside Senior Hsg	\$18,726,604	\$4,323,170	20%	20%	22.9%	25.0%
	Cedar Rising	\$21,575,339	\$5,377,819	20%	NA	24.9%	NA
	Altura (Goldcrest)	\$24,268,836	\$7,809,158	20%	NA	38.8%	NA
	Opal Apartments	\$13,620,849	\$2,686,706	20%	NA	19.7%	NA
	Plaza Los Amigos	\$32,577,462	\$10,171,974	20%	NA	31.2%	NA
Totals		\$567,935,882	\$165,671,664	29.1% of total construction dollars paid to COBID firms			

Of the \$165.7 million in construction dollars paid to COBID certified firms, 53% went to minority-owned businesses (MBE), 32% went to women-owned businesses (WBE), 13% went to emerging small businesses (ESB) and 3% went to service-disabled veteran-owned businesses (SDVBE). In Figure 6.2, businesses that fell into multiple categories are reported based on the following hierarchy: MBE, WBE, SDVBE and ESB.


Figure 6.2 Payments to COBID certified firms by firm type



Veteran-owned businesses that don't fall under any of the other categories made up 0.2%. All other veteran-owned businesses (3%) are included in the percentages for other categories.

Among the minority-owned businesses, 54% were Latine/Hispanic, 22% were Black/African American, 4% were Native American and 12% were Asian Pacific. (The remaining 7% did not provide race/ethnicity data.)

Figure 6.3 Minority-owned businesses by race/ethnicity



Workforce diversity progress

While equitable contracting goals measure participation by smaller firms and those owned by women and people of color, workforce diversity goals aim to track the diversity of workers involved in the construction process. Efforts to support construction workforce diversity are limited in jurisdictions without a history of setting goals or tracking workforce diversity. Currently, no projects located outside Multnomah County have established project-specific goals for workforce diversity. All implementation strategies included, at a minimum, a commitment to explore opportunities to support workforce diversity, and several jurisdictions stated an intention to consider tracking and reporting on workforce diversity if they determined this to be feasible based on contractor and jurisdiction capacity. Additionally, some jurisdictions have taken steps to invest in their own capacity to support tracking through implementing new software. Currently, 41 of 60 projects (68%) have committed to report on workforce diversity outcomes. This data will help to establish a baseline on which future workforce diversity goals could be established.

Metro has developed reporting metrics and templates to support consistent tracking for projects and jurisdictions that are able to report on workforce diversity. Figure 6.4 summarizes the outcomes for the projects that completed construction by December 2024 and reported on workforce diversity. Some projects that are not yet complete provided preliminary workforce data in their local progress reports.

Figure 6.4 Summary of workforce outcomes for completed projects

Jurisdiction	Project	Workforce outcomes <i>% of labor hours worked by:</i>		
		Apprentices	POC	Women
Beaverton	Mary Ann	12%	38%	2%
Clackamas County	Fuller Road Station	13%	100%	3%
	Good Shepherd Village	12%	93%	2%
	Las Flores	7%	100%	7%
	Tukwila Springs	30%	38%	21%
Portland	Waterleaf	23%	46%	11%
	Findley Commons	18%	42%	<1%
	Hattie Redmond	21%	56%	8%
Washington County	Viewfinder	18%	42%	3%
	Alongside Senior Housing	12%	45%	4%
	Plaza Los Amigos	9%	55%	3%
	Cedar Rising	6%	64%	0%

Across the 12 projects that completed construction by December 2024 and reported on workforce diversity outcomes, 38%-100% of labor hours were worked by people of color (POC), 6%-30% of labor hours were worked by apprentices, and 0%-21% of labor hours were worked by women.

The workforce participation outcomes are particularly notable for Clackamas County's Fuller Road Station, Good Shepherd Village and Las Flores projects, which reported 93%-100% of labor hours worked by people of color. Strategies that supported these outcomes included extensive outreach and networking to connect with MWESB firms, advertisement of employment opportunities through community groups and local newspapers, fostering opportunities for smaller businesses to participate in projects through subcontracting, allowing on-the-job training, and offering support and guidance to potential contractors and suppliers in the bidding process and with meeting contract requirements.

Of the completed projects tracking workforce participation, only the Portland projects had established workforce diversity goals. The goals for Findley Commons and Hattie Redmond were 20% of labor hours worked by apprentices, 18% by people of color and 9% by women. The goals for Waterleaf were 20% of labor hours worked by apprentices, 29% by people of color and 13% by women. All three projects exceeded their workforce goals for people of color, and all but Findley Commons exceeded the goal for apprentices. None of the projects met the goals for women, which is consistent with the relatively low percentages of labor hours worked by women across most of the completed projects.

While the Beaverton, Clackamas County and Washington County projects did not establish workforce diversity goals, they committed to tracking workforce participation in order to understand workforce activity and create a baseline on which future workforce diversity goals could be established.

More work is needed to ensure that affordable housing investments can tackle broader workforce equity issues within the construction industry, including increased participation by women. This will require upstream investments to create a pipeline of diverse workers.

A project-by-project breakdown of COBID goals, workforce tracking commitments and prevailing wage requirements is provided in *Exhibit C*.

ADVANCING EQUITABLE ACCESS TO HOUSING

The housing bond is guided by a commitment to advance equitable access to housing for communities of color and other populations with disproportionate barriers to housing. Jurisdictions are working to advance equitable access through the use of affirmative marketing and low barrier screening and by designating units to serve specific populations. Leasing outcomes for projects that have reached full occupancy demonstrate the impact of these strategies in expanding access to housing for priority communities.

Serving priority communities

The housing bond framework identified the following priority communities to be served by program investments:

- People of color
- Families with children and multiple generations
- Seniors and older adults
- Veterans
- Households experiencing or at risk of homelessness
- Households experiencing or at risk of displacement
- People with disabilities

The bond portfolio includes buildings with different mixes of unit sizes intended to serve a variety of household sizes and configurations. Additionally, many units are restricted for households with extremely low incomes and/or households experiencing homelessness, including a subset of units designated as permanent supportive housing for individuals and families living with a disability who have experienced prolonged homelessness.

Figure 7.1 provides information on the projects and units designated to serve each of the bond's priority populations and the outcomes through December 2024 for the metrics that are being used to track the program's effectiveness in serving each priority population.

Figure 7.1 Designated units/projects and outcome metrics for serving priority populations

Priority population	Designated units/projects	Outcomes for projects that completed lease up by December 2024
People of color	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> All projects committed to low-barrier screening and affirmative marketing to ensure access for people of color 54 projects include partnerships with culturally specific organizations 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 59% of occupants are people of color
Families with children	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 51 projects include family-size units 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 44% of occupants are children under age 18
Seniors and older adults	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8 projects have units designated for seniors or older adults 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 8% of occupants are age 62 or older
Veterans	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 projects have units designated for veterans 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 2% of occupants are veterans
Households experiencing or at risk of homelessness	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 1,773 units are restricted for households with extremely low incomes (30% AMI) 1,135 of the 30% AMI units have project-based rental assistance 831 units are designated as permanent supportive housing 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 20% of units provide permanent supportive housing for households experiencing or at risk of homelessness
Households experiencing or at risk of displacement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 6 projects are participating in the City of Portland’s N/NE Preference Policy 35 projects are located in areas where communities at risk of displacement live today 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 31 households have been placed through the N/NE Preference Policy 62% of occupants live in areas where communities at risk of displacement live today
People with disabilities	<p>For projects that provided data on physical accessibility features:³</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> 22% of units are ground floor units 6% of units are ADA (Type A) units 76% of projects have universal design 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> 13% of occupants are living with a disability 70 households requesting an accessible unit were matched with an accessible unit

Strategies for affirmative marketing and low-barrier screening

All of the partner jurisdictions’ local implementation strategies incorporated commitments to affirmative marketing and low-barrier screening. Affirmative marketing approaches include working with property management companies to ensure materials and services are accessible to people with limited English proficiency via translation and interpretation in multiple languages, as well as strategies to market units through partnerships with community-based organizations that can leverage informal channels and word of mouth.

Across the 60 bond-funded projects, 98% report partnerships with community-based organizations to support their affirmative marketing strategies (one project in pre-construction has not yet identified affirmative marketing partners). These partners include social service agencies, homeless services agencies, community centers, education

³ Data on ground floor and ADA units was provided for 70% of units; data on universal design was provided for 62% of projects.

organizations, employment and training providers, membership organizations, leadership development organizations, homeownership support organizations, health centers and behavioral health providers.

Among the projects that report partnerships with community-based organizations, 92% include partnerships with culturally specific organizations. These partners include organizations serving a wide range of populations, such as Native American Rehabilitation Association, Native American Youth and Family Center, Urban League of Portland, Self Enhancement, African American Alliance for Homeownership, El Programa Hispano Católico, Centro Cultural, Latino Network, Hacienda CDC, Bienestar, HAKI Community Organization, Somali Empowerment Circle, Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon, Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization, Asian Health and Service Center, Unite Oregon and more.

The following examples illustrate how bond-funded projects engage with partners to implement affirmative marketing:

- Las Flores is a 171-unit development in Oregon City that includes units set aside for agricultural workers and their families with support from the Agricultural Workforce Housing Tax Credit. As part of the project's marketing, the project team worked closely with local farms, farmers markets, community-based organizations like the Farmworker Housing Development Center and other service providers in Clackamas County who serve the agricultural worker community. Regular contact with these groups helped ensure that marketing efforts effectively reached the farmworker community.
- Cedar Rising is an 82-unit project in Aloha. Based on research showing that half of Black, Korean, Latine, Native American and Slavic renters in Washington County spend more than 30% of their income on housing, the project's marketing targeted these groups. Ads placed in the Portland Chinese Times, Asian Reporter, Portland Observer and El Latino ran multiple times throughout the application period. Marketing information was translated into several languages, and oral interpretation was provided via a contract with a live interpretation service which provided telephone interpretation in over 100 languages.
- Mercy Greenbrae is a 100-unit community in Lake Oswego with 40 permanent supportive housing units and 60 units serving households at 60% AMI or below. To support lease-up of the permanent supportive housing units, the project sponsor developed referral agreements with several organizations including Clackamas Women's Services, The Father's Heart, Clackamas County Social Services, Northwest Housing Alternatives, Lake Oswego School District and Catholic Charities of Oregon. Marketing for the remaining units included in-person meetings with local business owners, engagement with a large retirement community adjacent to the property and online marketing.

In addition to affirmative marketing, bond-funded projects work to reduce barriers to lease-up to promote more equitable access to housing. This includes implementing

screening practices specifically designed to promote accessibility for households with low incomes and adverse credit, rental or legal histories. It also includes working proactively to make the application process more transparent and accessible.

The following examples illustrate some of the ways that sponsors are reducing leasing barriers for bond-funded projects:

- Plaza Los Amigos is a 113-unit project in Cornelius sponsored by REACH CDC and Bienestar. Screening criteria were adjusted for the project to reduce barriers, such as eliminating credit as a screening factor and limiting criminal background screening to only use major crimes as a basis for denial. The project does not charge an application fee, and Bienestar and Centro Cultural help applicants with first month's rent and/or security deposits.
- Plambeck Gardens is a 116-unit development in Tualatin sponsored by Community Partners for Affordable Housing. The screening criteria for the project are designed to reduce barriers related to credit, rental history and legal history. Only convictions that involve crimes against people and could impact the safety of other residents are a basis for denial. All denied applicants have access to a hearing, and CPAH will review the appeals of denials to ensure reasonable accommodation is a priority for denials that are related to a disability.
- Amity Orchards is a 135-unit, three-building development in Beaverton serving families and seniors. As the project prepared to begin leasing up its first completed building, project sponsor Wishcamper Development contracted with Unite Oregon to organize two community events where a representative from the leasing company clarified requirements and reviewed the application process. Outreach materials for the events were provided in seven languages, and language interpretation during the events was available in Spanish, Somali, French and Dari. By breaking down the application process into clear steps, addressing common misperceptions and translating complex terms into simple language, the events aimed to make the process more accessible and less intimidating to potential applicants.

Leasing outcomes

Bond-funded projects are required to submit a leasing outcome report once they reach at least 95% occupancy. The report collects data on applications received, applicant screening results (including denials and appeals), permanent supportive housing unit placements, placements in accessible units and affirmative marketing outcomes. As of December 2024, 21 projects had reached at least 95% occupancy and submitted leasing outcome reports. Leasing data for the first 10 projects was included in previous annual reports. The tables in this section highlight the 11 projects that completed lease-up during 2024 along with summary data for all 21 projects. Project-specific data for all 21 projects is available in *Exhibit D*.

Figure 7.2 Projects reaching at least 95% occupancy in 2024 and submitting occupancy outcome data

Project	Location	Eligible units	30% AMI units	2+ BR units	PSH units
Alongside Senior Housing	Tigard	57	23	0	4
Altura (Goldcrest)	Beaverton	74	14	45	0
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	Portland	63	17	48	0
Good Shepherd Village	Happy Valley	142	58	79	58
Las Flores	Oregon City	171	70	129	17
Mercy Greenbrae	Lake Oswego	100	40	83	40
Nueva Esperanza	Hillsboro	149	60	105	0
Opal Apartments	Portland	54	28	9	0
Plaza Los Amigos	Cornelius	112	26	72	0
Powellhurst Place	Portland	64	12	45	12
Terrace Glen	Tigard	144	51	74	3
	Totals	1,130	399	689	134

Unit availability relative to applications

The volume of applications across the properties that leased up in 2024 demonstrates that the need for affordable units is greater than the number of units available. Figure 7.3 shows the number of applications received compared with the number of units available across the projects, broken out by unit size. The number of applications received far outpaced unit availability, and these data do not include the prospective applicants who remained on waitlists and were not able to apply for a unit.

Figure 7.3 Availability of units relative to applications for properties that leased up in 2024

	Studios	1 BR units	2 BR units	3 BR units	Total
Total units available	51	396	467	216	1,130
Total rental applications received	82	1,205	1,028	884	3,199
Total percentage of applicants housed	62%	33%	45%	24%	35%

The discrepancy between applications and available units highlights both the important role of the bond in alleviating the region’s severe shortage of affordable housing and the continuing need for affordable units. In total, only 35% of applicants were able to be housed in the available units. The percentages ranged by unit size, with the lowest percentage of applicants housed in three-bedroom units and the highest percentage housed in studios. Additional analysis of regional need by household size may support future leasing outcome data analysis.

Demographics of building occupants

The leasing outcome reports also collect information on the demographics of the initial building occupants, including race and ethnicity, disability status, age, veteran status, household size and household composition. It is important to note that demographic characterizations of diverse, multifaceted and intersectional communities are often difficult to get right. For Metro's demographic collection and reporting purposes, efforts have been made to align with existing data and reporting sources specific to the affordable housing industry and emerging best practices in reporting on priority communities.

Across the 21 projects reporting leasing outcomes, data on race and ethnicity was provided for 69% of occupants, data on disability status was provided for 83% of occupants and data on age was provided for 100% of occupants. This section provides an analysis of the available data while recognizing that some of the data is incomplete.

For each demographic category, the data for occupants of bond-funded units is compared with data at the neighborhood and regional levels. The data sources for the comparisons are based on American Community Survey data. The neighborhood comparison data points were created using a one-mile buffer around each site and include the demographics for all residents of the surrounding neighborhood and for households with incomes below \$75,000.⁴

Metro recognizes the importance of analyzing intersectionality across demographic data categories and providing fully disaggregated data when reporting on demographics. However, because occupancy data are submitted to Metro in aggregate form, not as individual tenant-level records, analysis of intersectionality is not feasible. Inconsistencies in data reporting categories across the projects as well as sample size limitations also create barriers to accurately reporting on fully disaggregated demographic data. For these reasons, data on race and ethnicity are analyzed for people of color as a whole but not for individual races/ethnicities.

Race and ethnicity

Figure 7.4 shows the percentage of total occupants of bond-funded units who provided race and ethnicity data followed by the percentage of those occupants who identified as people of color (POC), defined as all races and ethnicities except white non-Hispanic. The table compares these percentages with the percentage of people of color households overall and people of color households with incomes less than \$75,000 in the surrounding neighborhood and the region.

⁴ \$75,000 was selected for this analysis because it is the household income break in the American Community Survey data that is closest to 60% AMI for a family of four (\$70,800).

Figure 7.4 Occupancy outcome data: race and ethnicity

Projects leased up in 2024	# of occupants in bond-funded units	% of occupants who provided race/ethnicity data	% POC of occupants who provided data	Demographic data for surrounding neighborhood	
				% of households that are POC	% of households with incomes <\$75,000 that are POC
Alongside Senior Housing	64	97%	16%	24%	25%
Altura (Goldcrest)	187	9%	44%	30%	37%
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	49	92%	87%	28%	42%
Good Shepherd Village	299	97%	53%	30%	35%
Las Flores	433	27%	40%	12%	17%
Mercy Greenbrae	249	86%	19%	15%	19%
Nueva Esperanza	356	90%	95%	40%	35%
Opal Apartments	58	72%	17%	32%	29%
Plaza Los Amigos	310	96%	90%	42%	43%
Powellhurst Place	117	100%	77%	39%	45%
Terrace Glen	312	100%	64%	23%	27%
Total for projects leased up in 2024	2,434	75%	64%	30%	35%
Total for all 21 leased up projects	3,877	69%	59%	30%	35%
Region				28%	32%

Overall, 59% of occupants of bond-funded units are people of color, compared with a regional rate of 28% (32% for households with incomes less than \$75,000) and a rate of 30% in the surrounding neighborhoods (35% for households with incomes less than \$75,000). Eight of the 11 projects that leased up in 2024 have a higher percentage of households of color than their surrounding neighborhoods and the regional rate.

Disability status

Figure 7.5 shows the percentage of occupants of bond-funded units who provided disability status, followed by the percentage of those occupants who are living with a disability. These data are compared with the percentage of the population living with a disability in the surrounding neighborhood and the region.

Figure 7.5 Occupancy outcome data: disability status

Projects leased up in 2024	# of occupants in bond-funded units	% of occupants who provided disability status	% living with a disability of occupants who provided data	% living with a disability in surrounding neighborhood
Alongside Senior Housing	64	98%	41%	14%
Altura (Goldcrest)	187	100%	3%	6%
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	49	100%	6%	13%
Good Shepherd Village	299	100%	17%	8%
Las Flores	433	100%	3%	14%
Mercy Greenbrae	249	100%	2%	13%
Nueva Esperanza	356	99%	7%	10%
Opal Apartments	58	10%	100%*	10%
Plaza Los Amigos	310	100%	7%	15%
Powellhurst Place	117	99%	25%	16%
Terrace Glen	312	93%	14%	13%
Total for projects leased up in 2024	2,434	97%	10%	12%
Total for all 21 leased up projects	3,877	83%	13%	14%
Region				13%

**100% of Opal occupants who provided data on disability status have a disability, but only 10% of the building's occupants provided data on disability status.*

Overall, 13% of occupants of bond-funded units are living with a disability, compared with a regional rate of 13% and a rate of 14% for the surrounding neighborhoods. Across the projects that leased up in 2024, the percentage of occupants living with a disability ranges from 3% to 41%. Four of the 11 projects have disability rates that are higher than the regional rate and the rate for the surrounding neighborhood.

Age

Figure 7.6 shows the percentage of occupants of bond-funded units who are children under age five, youth ages five to 17, and seniors ages 62 and older. These data are compared with age demographics for the surrounding neighborhood and the region.

Figure 7.6 Occupancy outcome data: age

Projects leased up in 2024	Occupants of bond-funded units			Demographic data for surrounding neighborhood		
	% under age 5	% age 5-17	% age 62 or over	% under age 5	% age 5-17	% age 62 or over
Alongside Senior Housing	0%	0%	98%	4%	16%	21%
Altura (Goldcrest)	18%	15%	3%	5%	19%	14%
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	14%	29%	12%	4%	10%	13%
Good Shepherd Village	11%	28%	10%	5%	20%	20%
Las Flores	19%	30%	4%	5%	17%	20%
Mercy Greenbrae	16%	33%	6%	5%	15%	29%
Nueva Esperanza	15%	29%	4%	4%	14%	14%
Opal Apartments	0%	0%	100%	5%	20%	16%
Plaza Los Amigos	15%	29%	5%	4%	20%	19%
Powellhurst Place	19%	15%	5%	6%	17%	19%
Terrace Glen	16%	23%	4%	4%	13%	19%
Total for projects leased up in 2024	15%	26%	10%	5%	16%	18%
Total for all 21 leased up projects	16%	28%	8%	5%	14%	18%
Region				5%	15%	19%

Overall, 16% of occupants of bond-funded units are children under age five and 28% are youth ages five to 17, both of which are significantly higher than the regional rate and the rate for the surrounding neighborhoods. Only 8% of occupants are ages 62 or over, compared with a regional rate of 19% and a rate of 18% in the surrounding neighborhoods. Across the projects that leased up in 2024, the percentages of children are highest in the projects with a significant portion of family-size units, while the percentages of older adults are highest in the two senior housing projects, Alongside and Opal Apartments.

ADVANCING HOUSING STABILITY

Metro's bond framework established expectations that affordable housing projects offer connections to services to support residents' housing stability. All bond-funded projects are expected to provide access to resident services, which are on-site services that support community building and the stability of the housing community while connecting residents to other on- and off-site programming and resources. Some homes, including those designated as permanent supportive housing, also provide individual residents with one-on-one case management and tailored wraparound services to meet their needs.

Culturally responsive service partnerships

All services provided in bond-funded projects are expected to be culturally responsive. Culturally responsive services are respectful of, and relevant to, the beliefs, practices, culture and linguistic needs of diverse resident populations and communities. Connections to services provided by culturally specific organizations are also prioritized. Culturally specific organizations are nonprofits that serve a particular community of color, where the majority of staff and members/clients are from the community being served, the organization has a track record of successful community engagement and involvement with the community being served, and the organizational environment is culturally-focused and identified as such by members.

Of the 60 projects in the bond portfolio, 93% have established partnerships with organizations that will provide culturally responsive and/or culturally specific resident services, case management, wraparound services or other programming. (The remaining projects have not finalized service partnerships yet.) For 72% of the projects, these partners include culturally specific organizations such as Hacienda CDC, Latino Network, Bienestar, Centro Cultural, El Programa Hispano Católico, Adelante Mujeres, Native American Rehabilitation Association, Native American Youth and Family Center, Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization, Asian Pacific American Network of Oregon, Islamic Social Services of Oregon, Somali American Council of Oregon, Afghan Community Center, Black Parent Initiative, National Association of Black Veterans, Urban League and Self Enhancement.

The following examples illustrate how bond-funded projects are incorporating partnerships with culturally responsive and/or culturally specific service providers to support housing stability:

- Aldea at Glisan Landing in Portland is a 96-unit family-focused project targeting people of color, immigrant and refugee households, and intergenerational families. Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization, or IRCO, will provide resident services including enrichment activities, after school programs, job training and ESL classes. Other on-site amenities for residents include a multicultural children's reading room, art studio, teen lounge, computer lab and fitness room. IRCO will also operate a multicultural preschool in an adjacent building.

- Jamii Court in Portland will provide 98 apartments for community members of color who are at risk of housing instability and displacement, families who are formerly homeless, and intergenerational families who want to live near or with each other. HAKI Community Organization, Community Partners for Affordable Housing and Portland Community College will provide resident services, higher education support, eviction prevention, housing stabilization, community building and youth programs. Urban League will provide additional culturally specific supportive services for the permanent supportive housing units in the project.
- Terrace Glen in Tigard is a 144-unit community for individuals and families that includes permanent supportive housing units for homeless young adults. EngAGE Northwest has an office on site that provides regular programming for the residents focused on economic stability, promoting healthy lifestyles and enriched art programs for seniors and multigenerational households. HomePlate Youth Services provides case management and wraparound supports for the permanent supportive housing units. IRCO provides services for immigrants and refugees and conducts occasional events.
- Las Flores in Oregon City is a 171-unit development for agricultural workers, immigrants and families. Hacienda's Youth and Family Services provides culturally responsive resident services designed to bridge the gap between property management and residents, reduce barriers to stable housing and increase the social capital of the community. Hacienda also provides residents with access to legal services, financial education, workforce development, safety and workers' rights trainings for farmworkers and their families, and assistance with school engagement and enrollment.

Permanent supportive housing

The policy framework for the affordable housing bond included a commitment to serve households experiencing homelessness. For households with disabilities experiencing prolonged homelessness, permanent supportive housing, which pairs a housing unit with long-term rental assistance and wraparound services, is the nationally recognized solution.

Because resources for PSH rental assistance and supportive services were limited when the housing bond measure passed in 2018, Metro's framework included unit goals for deeply affordable (30% AMI) units but did not establish regional unit goals for PSH. Two implementing jurisdictions set local PSH unit goals, both of which have already been met:

- Portland set a goal of 300 PSH units that would be supported with capital investments through the Metro bond. As of December 2024, Portland had exceeded that goal with 393 Metro bond-funded PSH units open or in the pipeline.
- Washington County's local implementation strategy for the Metro bond included a goal of at least 100 PSH units. As of December 2024, Washington County had exceeded that goal with 127 Metro bond-funded PSH units open or in the pipeline.

While other implementing jurisdictions did not establish formal PSH unit goals, the regional portfolio includes PSH units distributed across the region, in alignment with the goal of serving households experiencing homelessness. **As of December 2024, partners reported a total of 831 PSH units in 30 projects across the bond-funded portfolio.** This includes six projects that are entirely PSH (Beacon at Glisan Landing, the Cesar, Findley Commons, Hattie Redmond, Heartwood Commons and Tukwila Springs) and an additional 24 projects that include a subset of PSH units. Half of the projects in the bond-funded portfolio include PSH, and PSH units make up 17% of total bond-funded units.

In 2022, Metro dedicated \$20 million in unallocated affordable housing bond interest earnings to provide capital funding for permanent supportive housing pilot projects. This funding has supported 67 of the portfolio's PSH units.

Units designated as PSH offer deep affordability along with ongoing case management and wraparound services to support housing stability. Voters' approval of the Metro supportive housing services measure in 2020 has created opportunities to increase PSH production by matching bond-funded units with SHS-funded regional long-term rent assistance, case management and wraparound services. Across the 831 PSH units in the portfolio, 27% are using SHS funding for rental assistance and 62% are using SHS funding for services. Several additional projects are likely to use SHS funding for PSH units, with the details finalized closer to completion of construction.

Examples of bond projects that are leveraging SHS-funded services and rent assistance to support PSH include:

- El Nido (Lake Oswego): a 55-unit property with 10 designated PSH units supported with project-based regional long-term rent assistance and SHS-funded behavioral health services provided by New Narrative.
- Vuela (Wilsonville): a 120-unit development with 20 designated PSH units supported with project-based regional long-term rent assistance and SHS-funded wraparound services provided by Latino Network.
- Powellhurst Place (Portland): a 65-unit project with 12 designated PSH units supported with SHS-funded services provided by Native American Rehabilitation Association of the Northwest.
- Meridian Park (Portland): a 65-unit property that is 100% PSH with SHS-funded recovery-oriented services provided by Central City Concern.
- Plambeck Gardens (Tualatin): a 116-unit project with 16 designated PSH units, eight of which are supported with SHS-funded services provided by Community Action.
- Heartwood Commons (Aloha): a 54-unit property that is 100% PSH with all units supported by regional long-term rent assistance and SHS-funded services provided by Community Partners for Affordable Housing and Sequoia Mental Health.
- The Dolores (Hillsboro): a 66-unit complex with 12 PSH units supported with regional long-term rent assistance and SHS-funded services provided by New Narrative.

Figure 8.1 summarizes PSH units across the bond portfolio as of December 2024 based on information provided in partners' annual progress reports and post-completion reporting. For some projects, PSH unit commitments and other details are still being finalized.

Metro worked with partners in 2024 to ensure greater clarity and consistency in the definition of PSH for reporting. All units defined as PSH serve people with disabilities and extremely low incomes who have long or multiple histories of homelessness and other significant barriers to housing stability. PSH provides permanent housing, rent assistance and intensive yet voluntary services, with no time limits.

Figure 8.1 Distribution, target population and service partners for permanent supportive housing

Jurisdiction	Project	Eligible units	PSH units	PSH target population	Service partners	Status
Beaverton	Meadowlark	104	30	Seniors 55+	Native American Rehabilitation Association, Bienestar	Pre-construction
Clackamas	Fuller Road Station	99	25	Families and individuals, foster youth exiting or having exited the system, Asian, Latine	Clackamas Women's Services, Cornerstone Community Housing, DevNW	Complete
	Good Shepherd Village	142	58	Individuals and families, including 15 units for veterans, Asian, Latine	Catholic Charities of Oregon, APANO, El Programa Hispano Católico, Familias en Acción, Do Good Multnomah	Complete
	Las Flores	171	17	Individuals and families	Northwest Housing Alternatives	Complete
	Tukwila Springs	48	48	Individuals, older adults age 50+	Native American Rehabilitation Association	Complete
	Mercy Greenbrae	100	40	Families	Mercy Housing NW	Complete
	Hillside Park A & B	143	13	Families	Impact NW, Community Vision, Unite Oregon	Construction
	Hillside Park C	78	8	Families	Impact NW, Housing Authority of Clackamas County Service Team	Construction
	El Nido	54	10	Families, Latine	New Narrative	Pre-construction
	Vuela	120	20	Families, Latine	Latino Network	Construction
Gresham	Wynne Watts Commons	147	30	Individuals with intellectual and developmental disabilities	Integration with the State's K Plan which provides services to those living independently, Albertina Kerr	Complete
Hillsboro	The Dolores	66	12	Individuals and families	New Narrative	Construction
Portland	73 rd and Foster	64	22	People exiting homelessness, people with disabilities	REACH CDC	Pre-construction
	Broadway Corridor	230	35	People exiting homelessness, people of color	Urban League	Pre-construction
	Cesar	47	47	People exiting homelessness, young adults exiting foster care	To be determined	Complete

Jurisdiction	Project	Eligible units	PSH units	PSH target population	Service partners	Status
	Hattie Redmond	60	60	People of color, people displaced from Albina neighborhood	Urban League, Home Forward	Complete
	Findley Commons	35	35	Veterans	Veterans Administration, Do Good Multnomah	Complete
	Waterleaf	176	20	Veterans	Veterans Administration	Complete
	Beacon at Glisan Landing	41	41	Seniors, survivors of domestic violence and sexual assault	Catholic Charities	Complete
	Meridian Gardens	85	65	People in substance use disorder treatment, people experiencing chronic homelessness	Central City Concern	Complete
	Tistilal Village	24	16	Native American families	Native American Rehabilitation Association, Native American Youth and Family Center	Construction
	Jamii Court	98	15	Formerly homeless families, intergenerational families, people of color at risk of displacement, with disabilities	Urban League, Community Partners for Affordable Housing, HAKI Community Organization	Pre-construction
	Powellhurst Place	64	12	People exiting homelessness, people of color	Northwest Housing Alternatives, Native American Rehabilitation Association	Complete
	Garden Park Estates	54	25	People exiting homelessness	Innovative Housing, Inc.	Construction
Washington	Heartwood Commons	54	54	Individuals	Community Partners for Affordable Housing, Sequoia Mental Health	Complete
	Plambeck Gardens	116	16	Individuals and families	Centro Cultural/ Worksystems, Community Action, Lifeworks NW	Construction
	Terrace Glen	144	3	Youth	HomePlate Youth Services, Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization	Complete
	Alongside Senior Housing	57	4	Veterans, seniors	Veterans Administration	Complete
	Viewfinder	81	28	Individuals and families, veterans	Project Homeless Connect, Cornerstone Community Housing, Veterans Administration	Complete
	Woodland Hearth	63	22	Individuals and families	HAKI Community Organization, Native American Youth and Family Center, Community Action	Construction
	Total PSH units		831			

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT TO SHAPE PROJECT OUTCOMES

Metro's bond work plan requires jurisdictional partners to conduct community engagement to inform implementation planning. To remedy decades of disinvestment and displacement, engagement activities are expected to focus on reaching communities of color and other priority populations, including people with low incomes, seniors, people with disabilities, immigrants and refugees, existing tenants in acquired buildings, and people who have experienced or are experiencing housing instability or homelessness. Each jurisdiction reports on this community engagement, including participant demographic information, descriptions of outreach and activities, themes from engagement and how feedback informed implementation.

In 2024, community engagement was conducted for 17 projects across the seven implementing jurisdictions and Metro's site acquisition program. A total of 29 specific engagement opportunities were organized for the 17 projects, with more than 522 participants. (Data on participant numbers was only collected for 19 of the 29 engagement opportunities.)

Engagement of communities of color and other priority populations

Demographic data was reported for 122 participants in eight of the 29 engagement opportunities. Among those participants:

- 43% were people of color
- 68% were people with low incomes
- 64% were immigrants and refugees
- 33% had lived experience of homelessness

Participant information was not tracked consistently for other priority populations. Reports from the engagement opportunities where other demographic information was collected show additional participation by older adults, existing tenants in the building and people with limited English proficiency.

How engagement input informed projects

Partner jurisdictions' reports demonstrate how input gathered during community engagement was incorporated into project planning. For example:

- Metro's site acquisition program and the Housing Authority of Washington County contracted with Unite Oregon to facilitate a project advisory committee to provide input into priorities for development of a site in Aloha at 209th Avenue. A 17-person advisory committee met six times and discussed a wide variety of project elements, such as support services, architectural design, shared indoor and outdoor spaces, in-unit amenities, management practices and more. The group developed a comprehensive statement of community values that was incorporated into the request for proposals soliciting design teams for the site.

- Park Place Redevelopment is a Clackamas County project submitted for Metro concept endorsement that would redevelop Clackamas Heights, an aging public housing project. To ensure resident insights informed planning for the project, the Housing Authority of Clackamas County formed a community advisory committee made up of current public housing residents. The committee has actively collaborated with the housing authority and design team to provide feedback on the redevelopment plans. Feedback that informed project design included the importance of providing in-unit washer and dryer hookups, locating amenities near family-size units, and providing a variety of outdoor and indoor amenity options.
- Abbey Lot Townhomes is an affordable homeownership project that will create eight three-bedroom homes for displaced families looking to return to Portland’s historically Black North/Northeast neighborhoods under the N/NE Preference Policy. In a community meeting sponsored by co-developer Self Enhancement Inc. and facilitated by the Gordly Burch Center for Black Leadership and Civic Engagement, participants provided input on various amenity and design ideas. Feedback that was integrated into the project’s design included a preference for the inclusion of a dedicated parking space for each unit, fewer shared outdoor spaces and larger patios for each unit.
- Amity Orchards is a 135-unit project in Beaverton serving families and seniors. To better understand the needs of future tenants, Unite Oregon facilitated two focus groups on resident services. Themes from participants’ input included the importance of having resident services staff that are reflective of the tenants, dedicated community spaces, and opportunities for tenant voice and leadership. In response, hiring is underway for a Spanish-speaking resident services staff position, the project has incorporated individual study areas and meeting spaces, and Unite Oregon will help to coordinate tenant leadership development once the project is fully leased up.

EFFICIENT USE OF FUNDS

Good use of public funds is a core guiding principle of the affordable housing bond for Metro and its partners. In 2024, the average per-unit investment of Metro bond subsidy was \$109,777, which is considerably lower than the average of \$143,000 per unit in Metro bond subsidy available to achieve the goals. This reflects a variety of factors, including some projects that are only utilizing Metro bond funds to fill a small gap. In general, it is anticipated that higher Metro bond subsidy levels will be needed for remaining projects due to significant cost escalation and anticipated delays due to emerging constraints in the availability of private activity bonds, which are necessary to finance 4% low-income housing tax credits.

This section highlights key findings related to development costs and capital and operating funding sources. *Exhibit A* provides a summary of the portfolio projects, including configuration, size, unit mix, cost and Metro bond subsidy. *Exhibit E* provides additional details regarding capital financing sources, and *Exhibit F* provides a summary of ongoing rental assistance and services funding attached to Metro bond units.

Development costs

The Metro affordable housing bond portfolio includes 60 properties that range in size from 10,200 to 245,705 square feet, with an average size of 88,861 square feet. The properties range from one to 21 buildings, with an average of three buildings. The number of units in each property ranges from eight to 230, with an average of 93.

The housing development industry recognizes two general categories of cost: *hard costs*, which are focused on construction itself, and *soft costs*, which include a variety of project development, permitting and financing costs. Compared to market rate housing, affordable housing is widely recognized to have higher per-unit soft costs, due to the need to combine various public and private funding sources and greater regulatory and compliance requirements.

In general, the housing bond portfolio's development costs align with similar affordable housing trends in the region and nationally. Development costs across the portfolio span a wide range and are influenced by a variety of factors including project size, unit configurations and construction type. The bond program's priority focus on family-size units contributes to higher average hard costs per unit. For this reason, cost per square foot and cost per bedroom are important metrics. Similarly, the program's priority focus on advancing racial equity was established with an understanding that prioritizing equitable contracting and workforce diversity may mean additional development costs. A number of other factors impact costs including prevailing wage requirements, parking requirements and more.

Figure 9.1 Average total project costs

Metric	Weighted average
Total project cost per unit	\$460,949
Total project cost per bedroom	\$265,249
Total project cost per square foot	\$480.37

Development costs have escalated across the affordable housing industry over the past four years due to broader economic factors impacting the cost of materials and labor. Supply chain issues and labor shortages along with inflation and interest rate increases have significantly increased construction costs. The impact of these increases is evident in the construction costs for bond projects approved after 2021. The average cost of construction per square foot for new construction projects financed with 4% low-income housing tax credits was \$306 for bond projects approved in 2021 or earlier and \$388 for projects approved after 2021. The full impact of the cost increases is masked by wide variations in other factors that affect construction costs across the portfolio, such as construction type, prevailing wage requirements, on- and off-site construction requirements, and the availability or absence of building fee exemptions and/or systems development charge waivers.

Alignment with other subsidy sources


The affordable housing bond program was structured to provide flexible gap funding that can be layered with other capital sources to achieve desired outcomes. While the production goals were modeled assuming the leverage of 4% low-income housing tax credits and modest bank debt, the program requirements are intentionally flexible to allow for a range of models.

The current affordable housing bond portfolio represents \$2.56 billion in investments, of which approximately 20.4%, or \$521 million, is Metro affordable housing bond funding and \$2.04 billion is leveraged from other sources.

Figure 9.2 provides a high-level breakdown of funding sources; Figure 9.3 provides more detail.⁵

⁵ Sponsor contributions in Figure 9.2 and 9.3 do not include the value of deferred developer fees and contributed cash developer fees. The additional value of those sponsor contributions is \$155,334,981. *Exhibit E* provides comprehensive data on sponsor contributions, including all developer fees.

Figure 9.2 Project funding sources




Low-income housing tax credits (LIHTC) represent the most substantive leveraged funding source in bond projects. Of the 54 rental projects in the portfolio, 50 are utilizing LIHTC. Of these, six projects (Mary Ann, Tistilal Village, Garden Park, Meridian Gardens, Troutdale Apartments and 73rd & Foster) are financed using highly competitive 9% LIHTCs. The remaining 44 projects are utilizing or plan to utilize 4% LIHTCs.

Unlike 9% LIHTCs, 4% LIHTCs are not subject to an annual cap but are based on federal requirements for utilization of private activity bonds, or PABs, which are dependent on a federal allocation to states. Historically, PABs were undersubscribed in Oregon. However, in 2021, Oregon Housing and Community Services announced a pause on reviewing 4% LIHTC applications due to oversubscription of PABs. Combined with construction cost escalation, this poses a significant challenge for the bond program and the statewide affordable housing pipeline. Metro is working with implementation partners and OHCS to develop a coordinated strategy to ensure that projects with local funding commitments and deeply affordable units are prioritized and don't face delays in accessing PABs.

Four rental projects – the Cesar, Findley Commons, Heartwood Commons and the Jade – are being financed without tax credits. The Cesar, Heartwood Commons and Findley Commons are all 100% PSH projects. The Cesar is a strategic conversion of a two-year-old market rate building. Heartwood Commons is a motel acquisition rehab sponsored by Washington County, which wanted to keep costs as low as possible. At 35 units, Findley Commons is too small to effectively utilize LIHTC funding. The Jade did not need a reservation of LIHTCs because the project secured a General Housing Account Program loan from OHCS.

After LIHTC, other funding sources include Metro housing bond funds, permanent loans, sponsor contributions and state and local grants and loans. Figure 9.3 shows a breakdown of total leveraged funding by source. *Exhibit E* provides additional details on the financing mix for each project.

Figure 9.3 Capital funding sources



Operating costs and subsidy

The affordable housing bond program includes ambitious goals for deeply affordable units, defined as those affordable to households making less than 30% of the area median income. In 2024, this was an annual income of \$24,780 for a household with one person and \$35,400 for a household of four. Providing deeply affordable units requires additional subsidy. Rental income from these units is lower and their operating expenses can be higher, creating operating funding gaps and limiting projects' ability to carry debt. Lender and/or tax credit investors may also require the capitalization of reserves to mitigate the risk that operating expenses may not be able to be adequately funded from projects' operating revenue.

Across the housing bond portfolio, 1,773 units are designated to serve households with extremely low incomes (30% AMI or below). A total of 1,170 units include project-based rental assistance, funded through a combination of federal and local sources, including Metro's supportive housing services fund.

Additionally, buildings serving households with extremely low incomes often require investment in ongoing services that are beyond the scope of traditional real estate related operating expenses and require external operating funding to be financially feasible. Across the buildings serving households with extremely low incomes, **831 units are designated as permanent supportive housing and include additional funding commitments to provide wraparound services.**

Exhibit F provides a summary of the total units, 30% AMI units and units with project-based rental assistance and ongoing services funding.

Local affordable housing policy tools and incentives

Affordable housing development can be supported or hindered by local jurisdictions' policies and regulations. In 2020 and 2022, Metro staff surveyed all 24 cities in the region to identify incentives and policies in place that support affordable housing development. In 2024, Metro asked jurisdictional partners to share examples of policies and incentives that have supported their bond projects. One of the examples highlighted by multiple jurisdictions was support with system development charges through deferrals, exemptions and financing. For example, Gresham allows for a deferral of system development charges until certificate of occupancy as well as financing for those charges over a period of 10 years for qualifying projects. Oak Row and Myrtlewood Way are projects that have benefitted from this incentive.

Some bond projects have also encountered barriers or delays due to zoning and permitting challenges in local jurisdictions. For example, in Hillsboro, unless development occurs in certain downtown or transit station planning areas, density allowances within typical medium-and high-density multifamily zones can constrain affordable housing development. The property for Nueva Esperanza needed to be rezoned to allow for residential development, and density bonuses stemming from Oregon Senate Bill 8 needed to be applied to both the Dolores and Willow Creek sites to achieve adequate and appropriately sized housing developments. Hillsboro is now conducting a community development code audit where these types of issues are being identified and addressed to alleviate constraints and promote increased housing production.

Administrative costs

The Metro affordable housing bond framework includes a cap of 5% of bond proceeds for administrative costs. While only a small portion of the overall budget, these costs are vital to delivering on bond outcomes through effective and efficient implementation of the work plan. They include expenses related to financial and legal administration and oversight, monitoring and evaluation, oversight committee engagement, communications and policy development.

While most of the administrative funding was allocated to implementing partners and Metro via the initial work plan, Metro Council action in March 2023 allocated an additional \$12,706,638 in administrative funding within the 5% funding cap. Any administrative costs over the 5% cap stipulated in the bond measure must be funded with non-bond funding sources.

As of December 2024, \$24,058,650 in administrative funding had been expended or disbursed to partners and Metro; this is 67% of the administrative funding budgeted in the work plan. Details of administrative expenditures can be found in *Exhibit G*.

SUSTAINABILITY AND CLIMATE RESILIENCE

In the Portland region, as in many places around the globe, events in recent years have made the effects of climate change clear. With issues such as prolonged wildfires and extreme heat, the building industry will need to adapt to new climate-related challenges. These challenges are much bigger than a single funding program can address and will require ongoing work to support policy and funding alignment.

While Metro has not developed sustainability related metrics or requirements for bond-funded projects, the program tracks information reported by partners on each project's sustainability features. In addition, Metro has provided policy guidance and funding to encourage development partners to incorporate in-unit cooling strategies into bond-funded buildings.

Cooling strategies

Metro issued a policy statement in September 2021 strongly encouraging implementing jurisdictions to work with development partners to incorporate cooling strategies for projects, including in-unit air conditioning, to ensure safety and livability for residents. Metro also allocated \$8 million in unprogrammed affordable housing bond interest earnings/premiums to support additional investments in cooling.

The projects added to the bond portfolio since the guidance was issued all include in-unit air conditioning, and jurisdictions incorporated the requirement into funding solicitations for future projects. A few projects that were already near completion when the guidance was issued will not be able to incorporate in-unit air conditioning but will offer other cooling options.

Sustainability strategies

The affordable housing bond reduces energy use and greenhouse gas emissions by funding new homes in multifamily affordable housing buildings. If these units were not available, many residents would likely live in older, less dense housing. According to data from the Energy Information Administration's Residential Energy Consumption Survey, the average multifamily housing unit consumes roughly one-third of the energy and produces one-third the greenhouse gas emissions of a typical single-family unit.

Jurisdictional partners' annual progress reports demonstrate a strong commitment to additional energy efficiency and sustainability measures across the portfolio. Many projects pursue Earth Advantage certification and commonly achieve the silver, gold or platinum levels. About two-thirds of projects also participate in Oregon Housing and Community Services' Multifamily Energy Program, which provides financial incentives to affordable housing projects for energy efficiency measures aimed at reducing electricity consumption.

The following examples illustrate the range of sustainability strategies incorporated throughout the bond portfolio:

- Clackamas County's El Nido housing development is aiming to achieve Earth Advantage Gold Certification or higher. Plans include 100% electric systems, energy efficient mini-split heat pump heating and cooling, electric vehicle charging stations, and a solar system estimated to offset two-thirds of the building's total electrical needs. All electric utilities will be paid for by the owner.
- Located in the Jade District of Southeast Portland, the Jade Apartments aims to advance a key goal of the Jade District's "Greening the Jade" project which seeks to increase affordable housing and improve infrastructure and environmental features of the neighborhood. The Jade Apartments development team plans to include a solar array, net-zero ready designation, green building materials, 50-year roofs and a high-efficiency HVAC system as part of the project's commitment to sustainability.
- The Portland Housing Bureau's Green Building Policy aims to increase sustainability in buildings through third-party certification programs such as LEED, Earth Advantage and Green Communities. The policy aligns with the Portland Clean Energy Community Benefits Fund (PCEF) goals allowing Metro Bond projects to utilize PCEF awards for energy efficiency measures. Projects with PCEF awards include PCC Killingsworth, Tistilal Village, 73rd & Foster, Strong Site, Hollywood HUB, Legin Commons, the Jade, M. Carter Commons, Barbur, Jamii Court and Broadway Corridor.
- Shortstack Milwaukie, a cottage cluster homeownership project near downtown Milwaukie, leverages recent state legislation and local zoning code updates that create opportunities to increase residential density for infill sites. The 15-home project features mass timber panel construction, which makes use of sustainable materials that have a lower carbon footprint than concrete or steel. The homes will be all electric including heat pump heating and cooling. The development team is pursuing participation in the Energy Trust of Oregon's Path to Net Zero program.

LOOKING AHEAD

The affordable housing bond program has exceeded its unit production targets while making significant progress in advancing regional goals to increase equitable access to housing. As the program prepares to allocate the remaining bond funds, Metro is committed to working with its partners to strengthen the long-term impact of these investments. The oversight committee has proposed recommendations to support the ongoing success of the bond-funded portfolio while positioning the region to continue to address critical housing needs. Metro housing staff will work in collaboration with the oversight committee, jurisdictional partners and other stakeholders to move forward these recommendations over the upcoming year.

[PLACEHOLDER: This section will summarize Metro's plans to follow up on the committee's 2025 recommendations.]

Acknowledgements


Metro staff: Melissa Arnold, Nui Bezaire, Clint Chiavarini, Mercedes Evangelista, Lauren Everett, Jane Marie Ford, Liam Frost, Joe Gordon, Emily Lieb, Patrick McLaughlin, Margot Monti, Jimmy Oporta, Andrea Pastor, Patricia Rojas, RJ Stangland, David Stein, Alison Wicks.

Consultants: Kris Smock, John Warner.

EXHIBIT A. SUMMARY OF AFFORDABLE HOUSING BOND PORTFOLIO THROUGH DECEMBER 2024

Jurisdiction	Project Name	Type	Units				≤30% AMI		2+ Bedroom		Total Bdrms	Occupancy Estimates			Total Net Project Cost	Cost Efficiency (Total Project)			Metro Affordable Housing Bond			
			Affordable	Total	Eligible	PBV	No.	% Tot	No.	% Tot		High	Low	Avg		Per Sq Ft	Per Unit	Per Bdrm	Acquisition	Development		
																				Total	Per Unit	Per Bdrm
Beaverton	Amity Orchards	Rental	164	164	135	0	17	12.6%	79	58.5%	258	448	234	341	\$74,012,211	\$301.22	\$451,294	\$286,869	\$0	\$9,000,000	\$66,667	\$40,179
	Elmonica Station	Rental	81	81	81	8	33	40.7%	33	40.7%	129	234	144	189	\$50,891,533	\$554.14	\$628,291	\$394,508	\$3,460,066	\$8,888,934	\$109,740	\$68,906
	Mary Ann	Rental	54	54	54	8	11	20.4%	29	53.7%	86	172	89	131	\$21,867,324	\$315.96	\$404,950	\$254,271	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$55,556	\$34,884
	Meadowlark	Rental	104	104	104	19	68	65.4%	0	0.0%	104	200	104	152	\$47,080,608	\$467.60	\$452,698	\$452,698	\$0	\$10,500,000	\$100,962	\$100,962
Clackamas	El Nido (Lake Grove)	Rental	54	55	54	10	20	37.0%	28	51.9%	88	172	90	131	\$28,386,744	\$623.12	\$516,123	\$322,577	\$10,000,000	\$0	\$185,185	\$116,279
	Fuller Road Station	Rental	99	100	99	25	30	30.3%	82	82.8%	203	402	221	312	\$45,645,146	\$353.67	\$456,451	\$224,853	\$0	\$8,570,000	\$86,566	\$42,637
	Good Shepherd Village	Rental	142	143	142	20	58	40.8%	79	55.6%	243	469	261	365	\$55,192,053	\$497.80	\$385,958	\$227,128	\$0	\$18,330,000	\$129,085	\$76,058
	Hillside Park A & B	Rental	175	175	143	40	40	28.0%	14	9.8%	216	283	169	226	\$76,454,461	\$521.07	\$436,883	\$353,956	\$0	\$23,509,307	\$164,401	\$144,229
	Hillside Park C	Rental	100	100	78	78	68	87.2%	53	67.9%	175	259	131	195	\$59,315,388	\$556.22	\$593,154	\$338,945	\$0	\$18,190,692	\$233,214	\$138,860
	Las Flores	Rental	171	171	171	53	70	40.9%	129	75.4%	384	768	468	618	\$60,180,855	\$413.55	\$351,935	\$156,721	\$0	\$15,903,000	\$93,000	\$41,414
	Mercy Greenbrae	Rental	100	100	100	40	40	40.0%	83	83.0%	205	410	227	319	\$39,980,085	\$492.61	\$399,801	\$195,025	\$0	\$3,000,000	\$30,000	\$14,634
	Shortstack Milwaukie	Owner	15	15	15	0	0	0.0%	15	100.0%	30	60	30	45	\$7,554,605	\$524.63	\$503,640	\$251,820	\$0	\$700,000	\$46,667	\$23,333
	Tukwila Springs	Rental	48	48	48	48	48	100.0%	0	0.0%	48	48	48	48	\$21,233,701	\$816.68	\$442,369	\$442,369	\$0	\$5,548,542	\$115,595	\$115,595
Vuela	Rental	120	121	120	0	35	29.2%	79	65.8%	212	418	223	321	\$53,624,933	\$435.55	\$443,181	\$252,948	\$0	\$8,000,000	\$66,667	\$37,915	
Gresham	Civic Drive	Rental	59	59	59	59	0	0.0%	59	100.0%	170	340	222	281	\$42,700,309	\$473.49	\$723,734	\$251,178	\$2,950,000	\$2,100,000	\$85,593	\$29,706
	Myrtlewood Way	Owner	20	20	20	0	0	0.0%	20	100.0%	69	138	98	118	\$11,777,132	\$433.92	\$588,857	\$170,683	\$0	\$3,800,000	\$190,000	\$55,072
	Oak Row at Rockwood	Owner	11	11	11	0	0	0.0%	11	100.0%	22	44	22	33	\$4,180,476	\$321.25	\$380,043	\$190,022	\$0	\$2,200,000	\$200,000	\$100,000
	Rockwood Village	Rental	224	224	47	0	47	100.0%	39	83.0%	518	234	148	191	\$60,524,159	\$253.83	\$270,197	\$116,842	\$0	\$5,237,814	\$111,443	\$44,768
	Terracina Vista	Rental	91	92	91	0	0	0.0%	56	61.5%	188	372	225	299	\$41,404,746	\$435.32	\$450,052	\$220,238	\$0	\$5,200,000	\$27,473	\$13,441
Wynne Watts Commons	Rental	147	147	147	30	30	20.4%	31	21.1%	186	348	194	271	\$43,268,985	\$448.38	\$294,347	\$232,629	\$0	\$11,292,447	\$76,819	\$60,712	
Hillsboro	The Dolores	Rental	66	67	66	8	30	45.5%	46	69.7%	146	288	176	232	\$40,530,788	\$521.49	\$604,937	\$277,608	\$4,506,407	\$8,750,000	\$200,855	\$92,058
	Nueva Esperanza	Rental	149	150	149	8	60	40.3%	105	70.5%	310	616	362	489	\$52,545,844	\$337.25	\$350,306	\$169,503	\$0	\$16,940,731	\$113,696	\$55,002
Multnomah	Troutdale Apartments	Rental	85	85	85	25	36	42.4%	43	50.6%	140	269	152	211	\$51,398,288	\$741.39	\$604,686	\$367,131	\$1,764,347	\$15,970,323	\$208,643	\$126,676
Portland	73 Foster	Rental	64	64	64	0	22	34.4%	29	45.3%	108	199	123	161	\$29,970,677	\$526.59	\$468,292	\$277,506	\$0	\$3,032,340	\$47,380	\$28,077
	Abbey Townhomes	Owner	8	8	8	0	0	0.0%	8	100.0%	24	48	32	40	\$5,084,152	\$498.45	\$635,519	\$211,840	\$0	\$1,200,000	\$150,000	\$50,000
	Albina One	Rental	94	94	94	19	32	34.0%	55	58.5%	171	342	193	268	\$62,110,015	\$681.33	\$660,745	\$363,216	\$0	\$14,424,597	\$153,453	\$84,354
	Aldea at Gilsan Landing	Rental	96	96	96	15	15	15.6%	63	65.6%	180	351	201	276	\$53,784,392	\$518.30	\$560,254	\$298,802	\$11,500,000	\$3,685,679	\$38,392	\$20,476
	Barbur	Rental	149	150	149	19	32	21.5%	102	68.5%	277	550	299	425	\$71,756,131	\$518.56	\$478,374	\$259,047	\$0	\$18,559,384	\$124,560	\$67,489
	Beacon at Gilsan Landing	Rental	41	41	41	41	41	100.0%	0	0.0%	41	41	41	41	\$20,040,816	\$428.74	\$488,800	\$488,800	\$0	\$5,822,000	\$142,000	\$142,000
	Broadway Corridor	Rental	230	230	230	50	50	21.7%	62	27.0%	305	533	318	426	\$132,021,194	\$651.10	\$574,005	\$432,856	\$0	\$40,250,000	\$175,000	\$131,967
	Carey Boulevard	Owner	53	53	53	0	0	0.0%	53	100.0%	168	336	230	283	\$22,522,267	\$324.38	\$424,948	\$134,061	\$0	\$6,087,267	\$114,854	\$36,234
	Cesar	Rental	47	47	47	0	47	100.0%	4	8.5%	51	74	51	63	\$14,902,784	\$626.27	\$317,081	\$292,211	\$0	\$6,671,717	\$141,951	\$130,818
	Dekum	Rental	187	187	147	27	61	41.5%	78	53.1%	360	454	285	370	\$80,636,436	\$537.31	\$431,211	\$223,990	\$0	\$21,170,882	\$144,020	\$83,023
	Dr. Darrell Millner Building	Rental	63	63	63	0	17	27.0%	48	76.2%	136	272	161	217	\$30,648,469	\$555.02	\$486,484	\$225,356	\$0	\$9,216,838	\$146,299	\$67,771
	Findley Commons	Rental	35	35	35	20	0	0.0%	0	0.0%	35	55	35	45	\$6,667,137	\$507.01	\$190,490	\$190,490	\$0	\$1,945,175	\$55,576	\$55,576
	Garden Park	Rental	117	117	54	25	25	46.3%	40	74.1%	227	192	106	149	\$54,855,892	\$509.01	\$468,854	\$241,656	\$0	\$2,239,308	\$41,469	\$22,393
	Gooseberry Trails	Owner	52	52	52	0	0	0.0%	52	100.0%	179	358	254	306	\$30,392,840	\$450.26	\$584,478	\$169,792	\$0	\$5,451,773	\$104,842	\$30,457
	Hattie Redmond	Rental	60	60	60	60	60	100.0%	0	0.0%	60	60	60	60	\$22,876,252	\$664.66	\$381,271	\$381,271	\$0	\$4,411,737	\$73,529	\$73,529
	Hollywood Hub	Rental	222	224	73	23	39	53.4%	24	32.9%	385	185	117	151	\$135,294,885	\$582.90	\$603,995	\$351,415	\$0	\$10,256,344	\$140,498	\$95,854
	Jamii Court	Rental	98	98	98	39	39	39.8%	58	59.2%	182	347	208	278	\$51,179,267	\$539.81	\$522,237	\$281,205	\$7,336,006	\$6,155,974	\$137,673	\$74,132
	Legin Commons	Rental	124	124	124	20	20	16.1%	63	50.8%	203	373	219	296	\$56,197,778	\$509.19	\$453,208	\$276,836	\$0	\$1,674,627	\$13,505	\$8,249
	M Carter Commons	Rental	62	63	62	11	21	33.9%	0	0.0%	63	118	62	90	\$34,778,406	\$696.52	\$552,038	\$552,038	\$0	\$8,131,806	\$131,158	\$131,158
	Meridian Gardens	Rental	85	85	85	65	70	82.4%	0	0.0%	85	85	85	85	\$28,971,832	\$748.90	\$340,845	\$340,845	\$0	\$13,365,160	\$157,237	\$157,237
PCC Killingsworth	Rental	84	84	84	28	28	33.3%	60	71.4%	159	300	174	237	\$47,542,254	\$568.86	\$565,979	\$299,008	\$0	\$2,538,237	\$30,217	\$15,964	
Powellhurst Place	Rental	64	65	64	12	12	18.8%	45	70.3%	111	218	109	164	\$25,498,001	\$436.98	\$392,277	\$229,712	\$0	\$4,091,048	\$63,923	\$37,533	
Strong Site	Rental	75	75	75	0	11	14.7%	54	72.0%	151	302	173	238	\$40,479,913	\$551.97	\$539,732	\$268,079	\$0	\$3,150,000	\$42,000	\$20,861	
The Jade	Rental	40	40	40	0	5	12.5%	26	65.0%	81	162	96	129	\$21,851,586	\$473.37	\$546,290	\$269,773	\$0	\$4,431,054	\$110,776	\$54,704	
Tistital Village	Rental	57	58	24	24	24	100.0%	22	91.7%	101	110	64	87	\$36,102,021	\$577.98	\$622,449	\$357,446	\$0	\$4,632,538	\$193,022	\$84,228	
Waterleaf	Rental	176	178	176	20	17	9.7%	48	27.3%	246	423	260	342	\$78,224,388	\$417.33	\$439,463	\$317,985	\$0	\$9,299,219	\$100,961	\$7,972	
Washington	Alongside Senior Housing	Rental	57	58	57	23	23	40.4%	0	0.0%	58	114	57	86	\$23,075,155	\$483.97	\$397,848	\$397,848	\$0	\$6,323,691	\$110,942	\$110,942
	Altura (Goldcrest)	Rental	74	75	74	0	14	18.9%	45	60.8%	128	250	131	191	\$39,546,233	\$501.63	\$527,283	\$308,955	\$0	\$12,000,000	\$162,162	\$96,000
	Cedar Rising	Rental	81	82	81	0	33	40.7%	50	61.7%	138	265	141	203	\$33,031,515	\$548.11	\$4					

EXHIBIT B. MAPS AND DETAILED SUMMARY OF LOCATION METRICS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING BOND PROJECTS



Which projects are in areas historically inaccessible to communities of color?

Complete


- 1 The Valfre at Avenida 26 (36 units)
- 2 Plaza Los Amigos (112 units)
- 3 Nueva Esperanza (149 units)
- 4 Heartwood Commons (54 units)
- 7 Altura (Goldcrest) (74 units)
- 8 Cedar Rising (81 units)
- 10 Mary Ann (54 units)
- 11 Opal Apartments (54 units)
- 15 Terrace Glen (144 units)
- 16 Alongside Senior Housing (57 units)
- 18 Viewfinder (81 units)
- 25 Dr. Darrell Millner Building (63 units)
- 27 Hattie Redmond (60 units)
- 29 Waterleaf (176 units)
- 33 Mercy Greenbrae (100 units)
- 38 Cesar (47 units)
- 41 Findley Commons (35 units)
- 43 Tukwila Springs (48 units)
- 44 Beacon at Gilsan Landing (41 units)
- 47 Las Flores (171 units)
- 48 Fuller Rd Station Family Housing (99 units)
- 50 Meridian Gardens (85 units)
- 51 Powellhurst Place (64 units)
- 53 Wynne Watts Commons (147 units)
- 54 Good Shepherd Village (142 units)
- 57 Rockwood Village (47 units)

Pre-construction

- 12 Meadowlark (104 units)
- 19 Carey Boulevard (53 units)
- 20 El Nido (Lake Grove) (54 units)
- 21 Jamii Court (98 units)
- 23 Gooseberry Trails (52 units)
- 24 Barbur Apartments (149 units)
- 26 M Carter Commons (62 units)
- 28 Broadway Corridor (230 units)
- 32 Abbey Site (8 units)
- 42 73rd and Foster (64 units)
- 49 The Jade (40 units)
- 56 Myrtlewood Way (20 units)
- 58 Oak Row at Rockwood (11 units)
- 59 Civic Drive (59 units)

In Construction

- 5 The Dolores (66 units)
- 6 Amity Orchards (135 units)
- 9 Elmonica Station (81 units)
- 13 Vuela (120 units)
- 14 Plambeck Gardens (116 units)
- 17 Woodland Hearth (63 units)
- 22 Tistilal Village (24 units)
- 30 Albina One (94 units)
- 31 Strong Site (75 units)
- 34 Dekum Court (147 units)
- 35 Hillside Park A & B (143 units)
- 36 Hillside Park C (78 units)
- 37 Shortstack Milwaukie (15 units)
- 39 Hollywood Hub (73 units)
- 40 PCC Killingsworth (84 units)
- 45 Aldea at Gilsan Landing (96 units)
- 46 Legin Commons (124 units)
- 52 Garden Park Estates (54 units)
- 55 Terracina Vista (91 units)
- 60 Troutdale Apartments (85 units)



Communities of color by tract

Percent people of color compared to regional rate (31.6%)

- < regional rate by more than the margin of error
- <= regional rate
- > regional rate

Source: American Community

Which projects are in areas with limited regulated affordable housing?

Complete


- 1 The Valfre at Avenida 26 (36 units)
- 2 Plaza Los Amigos (112 units)
- 3 Nueva Esperanza (149 units)
- 4 Heartwood Commons (54 units)
- 7 Altura (Goldcrest) (74 units)
- 8 Cedar Rising (81 units)
- 10 Mary Ann (54 units)
- 11 Opal Apartments (54 units)
- 15 Terrace Glen (144 units)
- 16 Alongside Senior Housing (57 units)
- 18 Viewfinder (81 units)
- 25 Dr. Darrell Millner Building (63 units)
- 27 Hattie Redmond (60 units)
- 29 Waterleaf (176 units)
- 33 Mercy Greenbrae (100 units)
- 38 Cesar (47 units)
- 41 Findley Commons (35 units)
- 43 Tukwila Springs (48 units)
- 44 Beacon at Gilsan Landing (41 units)
- 47 Las Flores (171 units)
- 48 Fuller Rd Station Family Housing (99 units)
- 50 Meridian Gardens (85 units)
- 51 Powellhurst Place (64 units)
- 53 Wynne Watts Commons (147 units)
- 54 Good Shepherd Village (142 units)
- 57 Rockwood Village (47 units)

Pre-construction

- 12 Meadowlark (104 units)
- 19 Carey Boulevard (53 units)
- 20 El Nido (Lake Grove) (54 units)
- 21 Jamii Court (98 units)
- 23 Gooseberry Trails (52 units)
- 24 Barbur Apartments (149 units)
- 26 M Carter Commons (62 units)
- 28 Broadway Corridor (230 units)
- 32 Abbey Site (8 units)
- 42 73rd and Foster (64 units)
- 49 The Jade (40 units)
- 56 Myrtlewood Way (20 units)
- 58 Oak Row at Rockwood (11 units)
- 59 Civic Drive (59 units)

In Construction

- 5 The Dolores (66 units)
- 6 Amity Orchards (135 units)
- 9 Elmonica Station (81 units)
- 13 Vuela (120 units)
- 14 Plambeck Gardens (116 units)
- 17 Woodland Hearth (63 units)
- 22 Tistilal Village (24 units)
- 30 Albina One (94 units)
- 31 Strong Site (75 units)
- 34 Dekum Court (147 units)
- 35 Hillside Park A & B (143 units)
- 36 Hillside Park C (78 units)
- 37 Shortstack Milwaukie (15 units)
- 39 Hollywood Hub (73 units)
- 40 PCC Killingsworth (84 units)
- 45 Aldea at Gilsan Landing (96 units)
- 46 Legin Commons (124 units)
- 52 Garden Park Estates (54 units)
- 55 Terracina Vista (91 units)
- 60 Troutdale Apartments (85 units)



Regulated affordable housing
 Percent regulated affordable housing units (out of all units) within a 1-mile radius, compared to the regional rate of 5.1 percent regulated affordable units

- 0 percent
- < regional rate
- > regional rate
- no housing units

Sources: Metro's Affordable Housing Inventory (2020), Housing (2024)

Which projects are in areas where communities of color live today?

Complete


- 1 The Valfre at Avenida 26 (36 units)
- 2 Plaza Los Amigos (112 units)
- 3 Nueva Esperanza (149 units)
- 4 Heartwood Commons (54 units)
- 7 Altura (Goldcrest) (74 units)
- 8 Cedar Rising (81 units)
- 10 Mary Ann (54 units)
- 11 Opal Apartments (54 units)
- 15 Terrace Glen (144 units)
- 16 Alongside Senior Housing (57 units)
- 18 Viewfinder (81 units)
- 25 Dr. Darrell Millner Building (63 units)
- 27 Hattie Redmond (60 units)
- 29 Waterleaf (176 units)
- 33 Mercy Greenbrae (100 units)
- 38 Cesar (47 units)
- 41 Findley Commons (35 units)
- 43 Tukwila Springs (48 units)
- 44 Beacon at Gilsan Landing (41 units)
- 47 Las Flores (171 units)
- 48 Fuller Rd Station Family Housing (99 units)
- 50 Meridian Gardens (85 units)
- 51 Powellhurst Place (64 units)
- 53 Wynne Watts Commons (147 units)
- 54 Good Shepherd Village (142 units)
- 57 Rockwood Village (47 units)

Pre-construction

- 12 Meadowlark (104 units)
- 19 Carey Boulevard (53 units)
- 20 El Nido (Lake Grove) (54 units)
- 21 Jamii Court (98 units)
- 23 Gooseberry Trails (52 units)
- 24 Barbur Apartments (149 units)
- 26 M Carter Commons (62 units)
- 28 Broadway Corridor (230 units)
- 32 Abbey Site (8 units)
- 42 73rd and Foster (64 units)
- 49 The Jade (40 units)
- 56 Myrtlewood Way (20 units)
- 58 Oak Row at Rockwood (11 units)
- 59 Civic Drive (59 units)


In Construction

- 5 The Dolores (66 units)
- 6 Amity Orchards (135 units)
- 9 Elmonica Station (81 units)
- 13 Vuela (120 units)
- 14 Plambeck Gardens (116 units)
- 17 Woodland Hearth (63 units)
- 22 Tistilal Village (24 units)
- 30 Albina One (94 units)
- 31 Strong Site (75 units)
- 34 Dekum Court (147 units)
- 35 Hillside Park A & B (143 units)
- 36 Hillside Park C (78 units)
- 37 Shortstack Milwaukie (15 units)
- 39 Hollywood Hub (73 units)
- 40 PCC Killingsworth (84 units)
- 45 Aldea at Gilsan Landing (96 units)
- 46 Legin Commons (124 units)
- 52 Garden Park Estates (54 units)
- 55 Terracina Vista (91 units)
- 60 Troutdale Apartments (85 units)



Communities of color by tract

Darkest shades: > regional rate by more than the margin of error
Middle shades: > regional rate
Lightest shades: < regional rate



Source: American Community Survey

Summary of Project Location Metrics

Project	Eligible units	County	Areas where communities at risk of displacement live today	Areas historically inaccessible to communities of color	Areas with limited regulated affordable housing	Areas with access to transit	Walkable areas
The Valfre at Avenida 26	36	Wash.		X			X
Plaza Los Amigos	112	Wash.	X		X	X	X
Nueva Esperanza	149	Wash.	X		X	X	
Heartwood Commons	54	Wash.	X			X	X
The Dolores	66	Wash.	X			X	X
Amity Orchards	135	Wash.	X				
Altura (Goldcrest)	74	Wash.		X	X		
Cedar Rising	81	Wash.	X			X	X
Elmonica Station	81	Wash.	X			X	X
Mary Ann	54	Wash.	X		X	X	X
Opal Apartments	54	Wash.	X			X	X
Meadowlark	104	Wash.	X		X	X	X
Vuela	120	Clack.		X			
Plambeck Gardens	116	Wash.		X			
Terrace Glen	144	Wash.	X		X	X	X
Alongside Senior Housing	57	Wash.		X		X	X
Woodland Hearth	63	Wash.		X		X	X
Viewfinder	81	Wash.	X				X
Carey Boulevard	53	Mult.	X		X	X	X
El Nido (Lake Grove)	54	Clack.	X		X		X
Jamii Court	98	Mult.	X		X	X	X
Tistilal Village	24	Mult.	X			X	X
Gooseberry Trails	52	Mult.	X		X	X	X
Barbur Apartments	149	Mult.	X		X	X	
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	63	Mult.		X		X	X
M Carter Commons	62	Mult.		X		X	X
Hattie Redmond	60	Mult.		X		X	X
Broadway Corridor	230	Mult.		X		X	X
Waterleaf	176	Mult.		X		X	X
Albina One	94	Mult.		X		X	X
Strong Site	75	Mult.	X				
Abbey Site	8	Mult.	X			X	X
Mercy Greenbrae	100	Clack.		X	X		X
Dekum Court	147	Mult.	X		X	X	X
Hillside Park A & B	143	Clack.		X		X	X
Hillside Park C	78	Clack.		X		X	X
Shortstack Milwaukie	15	Clack.		X			X

Project	Eligible units	County	Areas where communities at risk of displacement live today	Areas historically inaccessible to communities of color	Areas with limited regulated affordable housing	Areas with access to transit	Walkable areas
Cesar	47	Mult.		X	X	X	X
Hollywood Hub	73	Mult.		X		X	
PCC Killingsworth	84	Mult.	X		X	X	X
Findley Commons	35	Mult.		X	X	X	X
73rd and Foster	64	Mult.	X			X	
Tukwila Springs	48	Clack.		X	X		X
Beacon at Glisan Landing	41	Mult.		X		X	X
Aldea at Glisan Landing	96	Mult.		X		X	
Legin Commons	124	Mult.		X	X	X	X
Las Flores	171	Clack.		X			X
Fuller Rd Station	99	Clack.	X			X	
The Jade	40	Mult.	X			X	X
Meridian Gardens	85	Mult.	X			X	X
Powellhurst Place	64	Mult.	X			X	X
Garden Park Estates	54	Mult.	X			X	X
Wynne Watts Commons	147	Mult.	X			X	X
Good Shepherd Village	142	Clack.	X		X		X
Terracina Vista	91	Mult.	X			X	X
Myrtlewood Way	20	Mult.	X			X	X
Rockwood Village	47	Mult.	X			X	X
Oak Row at Rockwood	11	Mult.	X			X	X
Civic Drive	59	Mult.	X			X	X
Troutdale Apartments	85	Mult.		X			X
Percent of total units			56%	44%	35%	75%	77%

Detailed Table of Location Metrics

Detailed Table of Location Metrics			How are the projects distributed around the region? (see Figure 5.2)				Which projects are in areas where communities of color live today? (see Figure 5.3 and notes A, B and C below)					Which projects are in areas historically inaccessible to communities of color? (see Figure 5.4 and notes A, B and C below)		Which projects are in areas with limited regulated affordable housing? (see Figure 5.5 and notes A and D below)		How is the physical access near each project? (see notes F and F below)		
Map ID	Project name	Eligible units	County	POC	LEP	POC-LEP	People of color (vs. regional rate of 31.6%)		Combined POC and LEP, vs. regional rates	People with limited English proficiency (vs. regional rate of 6.8%)		People of color (vs. regional rate of 31.6%)		Affordable housing share (vs. regional rate of 5.1%)	Access to transit (miles to nearest stop/station)			
							Estimate	MOE		POC / LEP	Estimate	MOE	Estimate		MOE	MAX ¼ mi	FS Bus ¼ mi	Walkscore
1	The Valfre at Avenida 26	36	Washington	low	low	lowlow	24%	+13%	< / <	3%	+2%	24%	+13%	6.8%	5.9	0.5	58	
2	Plaza Los Amigos	112	Washington	high	high	highhigh	54%	+8%	> / >	16%	+7%	54%	+8%	5.2%	2.8	0.2	58	
3	Nueva Esperanza	149	Washington	high	low	highlow	50%	+8%	> / ≤	5%	+4%	50%	+8%	5.0%	0.4	0.4	42	
4	Heartwood Commons	54	Washington	med	med	medmed	36%	+12%	> / ≥	10%	+4%	36%	+12%	6.0%	1.5	0.1	68	
5	The Dolores	66	Washington	high	med	highmed	50%	+8%	> / ≥	8%	+5%	50%	+8%	11.7%	0.8	0.2	69	
6	Amity Orchards	135	Washington	high	med	highmed	41%	+9%	> / ≥	8%	+5%	41%	+9%	6.3%	5.1	3.8	2	
7	Altura (Goldcrest)	74	Washington	low	low	lowlow	28%	+12%	< / ≤	4%	+3%	28%	+12%	4.7%	4.8	3.4	16	
8	Cedar Rising	81	Washington	high	high	highhigh	48%	+12%	> / >	16%	+5%	48%	+12%	7.8%	1.1	0.1	78	
9	Elmonica Station	81	Washington	med	med	medmed	37%	+15%	> / ≥	9%	+7%	37%	+15%	11.4%	0.2	0.2	60	
10	Mary Ann	54	Washington	high	high	highhigh	58%	+12%	> / >	18%	+10%	58%	+12%	3.4%	0.3	0.1	97	
11	Opal Apartments	54	Washington	med	med	medmed	39%	+9%	> / ≥	9%	+7%	39%	+9%	10.7%	1.7	0.1	87	
12	Meadowmark	104	Washington	high	high	highhigh	41%	+9%	> / >	17%	+10%	41%	+9%	3.6%	0.5	0.0	95	
13	Vuela	120	Clackamas	low	low	lowlow	24%	+11%	< / ≤	5%	+3%	24%	+11%	10.8%	10.8	4.5	27	
14	Plambeck Gardens	116	Washington	low	low	lowlow	24%	+12%	< / ≤	3%	+2%	24%	+12%	5.7%	8.8	1.9	14	
15	Terrace Glen	144	Washington	med	low	medlow	41%	+12%	> / ≤	6%	+5%	41%	+12%	4.7%	3.1	0.1	70	
16	Alongside Senior Housing	57	Washington	low	low	lowlow	24%	+8%	< / ≤	3%	+3%	24%	+8%	9.0%	5.0	0.2	57	
17	Woodland Hearth	63	Washington	low	low	lowlow	24%	+11%	< / ≤	2%	+1%	24%	+11%	12.8%	4.2	0.2	65	
18	Viewfinder	81	Washington	med	med	medmed	32%	+14%	> / ≥	7%	+7%	32%	+14%	14.6%	4.5	0.3	60	
19	Carey Boulevard	53	Multnomah	med	low	medlow	35%	+9%	> / ≤	2%	+1%	35%	+9%	3.3%	2.4	0.2	74	
20	El Nido (Lake Grove)	54	Clackamas	med	low	medlow	35%	+8%	> / ≤	3%	+2%	35%	+8%	1.5%	4.9	1.1	68	
21	Jamil Court	98	Multnomah	med	low	medlow	34%	+11%	> / ≤	6%	+3%	34%	+11%	0.3%	4.2	0.1	68	
22	Tistital Village	24	Multnomah	high	med	highmed	58%	+6%	> / ≥	9%	+3%	58%	+6%	14.3%	1.8	0.1	83	
23	Gooseberry Trails	52	Multnomah	med	low	medlow	35%	+10%	> / ≤	3%	+2%	35%	+10%	3.1%	2.3	0.2	76	
24	Barbur Apartments	149	Multnomah	med	low	medlow	35%	+10%	> / ≤	3%	+2%	35%	+10%	3.7%	2.8	0.0	2	
25	Dr. Darrell Millner Building	63	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	23%	+12%	< / ≤	1%	+1%	23%	+12%	9.8%	0.2	0.2	58	
26	M Carter Commons	62	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	28%	+10%	< / ≤	3%	+3%	28%	+10%	13.9%	0.0	0.0	89	
27	Hattie Redmond	60	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	27%	+11%	< / ≤	3%	+2%	27%	+11%	8.1%	0.0	0.0	89	
28	Broadway Corridor	230	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	15%	+18%	< / ≤	1%	+2%	15%	+18%	22.1%	0.1	0.1	87	
29	Waterleaf	176	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	25%	+12%	< / ≤	6%	+4%	25%	+12%	18.2%	0.3	0.2	88	
30	Albina One	94	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	28%	+9%	< / ≤	4%	+3%	28%	+9%	21.3%	0.4	0.1	87	
31	Strong Site	75	Multnomah	med	low	medlow	34%	+8%	> / ≤	4%	+4%	34%	+8%	13.0%	0.8	0.3	23	
32	Abbey Site	8	Multnomah	med	low	medlow	34%	+8%	> / ≤	4%	+4%	34%	+8%	12.6%	0.9	0.1	58	
33	Mercy Greenbrae	100	Clackamas	low	low	lowlow	22%	+11%	< / ≤	3%	+2%	22%	+11%	2.8%	2.3	1.2	59	
34	Dekum Court	147	Multnomah	med	low	medlow	34%	+11%	> / ≤	3%	+2%	34%	+11%	4.7%	2.0	0.1	59	
35	Hillside Park A & B	143	Clackamas	low	low	lowlow	24%	+10%	< / ≤	1%	+1%	24%	+10%	8.8%	0.7	0.1	61	
36	Hillside Park C	78	Clackamas	low	low	lowlow	24%	+10%	< / ≤	1%	+1%	24%	+10%	8.8%	0.7	0.1	95	
37	Shortstack Milwaukie	15	Clackamas	low	low	lowlow	24%	+10%	< / ≤	1%	+1%	24%	+10%	8.4%	1.0	0.3	79	
38	Cesar	47	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	24%	+16%	< / ≤	1%	+2%	24%	+16%	1.5%	1.5	0.0	90	
39	Hollywood Hub	73	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	25%	+12%	< / ≤	3%	+2%	25%	+12%	8.3%	0.0	0.0	39	
40	PCC Killingsworth	84	Multnomah	high	med	highmed	56%	+6%	> / ≥	11%	+9%	56%	+6%	4.1%	2.1	0.1	86	
41	Findley Commons	35	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	21%	+14%	< / ≤	3%	+2%	21%	+14%	1.2%	2.0	0.1	87	
42	73rd and Foster	64	Multnomah	med	high	medhigh	37%	+9%	> / >	11%	+4%	37%	+9%	7.9%	1.1	0.1	39	
43	Tukwila Springs	48	Clackamas	low	low	lowlow	20%	+12%	< / ≤	4%	+2%	20%	+12%	1.2%	3.1	1.3	69	

Detailed Table of Location Metrics

How are the projects distributed around the region? (see Figure 5.2)			Which projects are in areas where communities of color live today? (see Figure 5.3 and notes A, B and C below)				Which projects are in areas historically inaccessible to communities of color? (see Figure 5.4 and notes A, B and C below)				Which projects are in areas with limited regulated affordable housing? (see Figure 5.5 and notes A and D below)		How is the physical access near each project? (see notes E and F below)				
Map ID	Project name	Eligible units	County	POC	LEP	POC-LEP	People of color (vs. regional rate of 31.6%)		Combined POC and LEP, vs. regional rates	People with limited English proficiency (vs. regional rate of 6.8%)		People of color (vs. regional rate of 31.6%)		Affordable housing share (vs. regional rate of 5.1%)	Access to transit (miles to nearest stop/station)		Walkscore
							Estimate	MOE		Estimate	MOE	Estimate	MOE		MAX ¼ mi	FS Bus ¼ mi	
44	Beacon at Glisan Landing	41	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	10%	+30%	< / <	1%	+2%	10%	+30%	9.1%	0.7	0.2	73
45	Aldea at Glisan Landing	96	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	10%	+30%	< / <	1%	+2%	10%	+30%	9.1%	0.7	0.2	44
46	Legin Commons	124	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	22%	+8%	< / <	3%	+2%	22%	+8%	4.9%	0.8	0.1	51
47	Las Flores	171	Clackamas	low	low	lowlow	17%	+11%	< / <	3%	+2%	17%	+11%	16.4%	7.0	0.7	64
48	Fuller Rd Station Family Housing	99	Clackamas	med	med	medmed	34%	+12%	> / >	12%	+5%	34%	+12%	6.6%	0.1	0.1	32
49	The Jade	40	Multnomah	high	high	highhigh	54%	+9%	> / >	22%	+7%	54%	+9%	6.0%	0.3	0.3	70
50	Meridian Gardens	85	Multnomah	med	high	medhigh	42%	+12%	> / >	26%	+9%	42%	+12%	8.9%	1.0	0.0	79
51	Powellhurst Place	64	Multnomah	high	high	highhigh	45%	+11%	> / >	16%	+6%	45%	+11%	6.1%	1.4	0.0	85
52	Garden Park Estates	54	Multnomah	high	high	highhigh	48%	+7%	> / >	18%	+6%	48%	+7%	7.9%	1.7	0.1	60
53	Wynne Watts Commons	147	Multnomah	high	high	highhigh	45%	+12%	> / >	27%	+15%	45%	+12%	10.9%	0.4	0.2	94
54	Good Shepherd Village	142	Clackamas	med	med	medmed	36%	+7%	> / >	8%	+3%	36%	+7%	3.0%	3.7	3.7	82
55	Terracina Vista	91	Multnomah	high	high	highhigh	61%	+9%	> / >	27%	+10%	61%	+9%	10.6%	0.2	0.1	75
56	Myrtlewood Way	20	Multnomah	high	high	highhigh	61%	+9%	> / >	27%	+10%	61%	+9%	10.7%	0.3	0.3	82
57	Rockwood Village	47	Multnomah	med	high	medhigh	44%	+13%	> / >	20%	+10%	44%	+13%	9.6%	0.3	0.1	71
58	Oak Row at Rockwood	11	Multnomah	high	high	highhigh	54%	+9%	> / >	15%	+8%	54%	+9%	9.9%	0.2	0.1	81
59	Civic Drive	59	Multnomah	med	med	medmed	32%	+10%	> / >	9%	+4%	32%	+10%	6.4%	0.1	0.1	99
60	Troutdale Apartments	85	Multnomah	low	low	lowlow	25%	+12%	< / <	4%	+3%	25%	+12%	9.8%	2.9	1.5	97

Percent of Total Eligible Units

19% Clackamas
51% Multnomah
29% Washington

25% > regional	29% > regional	20% > regional	6% < regional	0% none	27% FS Bus and MAX	46% score ≥ 70
31% ≥ regional	27% ≥ regional	18% ≥ regional	38% ≤ regional	35% < regional	48% FS bus or MAX	31% score 50-69
44% ≤ regional	44% ≤ regional	63% ≤ regional	56% ≥ regional	65% > regional	25% neither	23% score < 50

> or ≥ region for either POC or LEP

Abbreviations: FS = frequent service; LEP = limited English proficiency; MOE = margin of error; POC = people of color.

Notes on data sources and assumptions

- A Regional rates are calculated based on Metro’s jurisdictional boundary.
- B People of color and people with limited English proficiency (people age 5 and older who speak English less than “very well”) use the American Community Survey 2017-2021 5-year estimate, by tract.
- C The darkest cell shading for people of color or people with limited English proficiency means greater (or less) than the regional rate by more than the MOE. Middle shades are greater (or less) than the regional rate but within the MOE.
- D Affordable housing share is based on Metro’s inventories of affordable housing (2023), multifamily housing (2023), and single-family housing (2023).
- E Access to transit is calculated based on linear distance (“as the crow flies”), using Metro’s data on existing transit (RLIS).
- F Walkscore is calculated at <https://www.walkscore.com>. A score of 50-69 is “somewhat walkable” and a score of 70+ is “very walkable” or “walker’s paradise”

EXHIBIT C. SUMMARY OF CONTRACTING GOALS AND PRELIMINARY OUTCOMES, WORKFORCE TRACKING COMMITMENTS AND PREVAILING WAGE REQUIREMENTS

Jurisdiction	Project	COBID Goal		COBID Progress		Workforce tracking?	Prevailing wage
		Hard costs	Soft costs	Hard costs	Soft costs		
Beaverton	Mary Ann	20%	20%	28%	23%	Y	
	Amity Orchards	20%	20%			Y	
	Elmonica Station	30%	30%			Y	Davis Bacon
	Meadowlark	30%	30%			Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
Clackamas	Fuller Road Station	20%	20%	20%	15%	Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Good Shepherd Village	30%	20%	34%	28%	Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Hillside Park Buildings A & B	20%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon
	Hillside Park Building C	20%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon
	El Nido (Lake Grove)	25%	25%			Y	
	Las Flores	20%	20%	34%	68%	Y	Davis Bacon
	Mercy Greenbrae	30%	30%	33%	19%	Y	
	Shortstack Milwaukie	30%	30%			N	
	Tukwila Springs	20%	20%	22%	75%	Y	Davis Bacon
	Vuela	35%	30%			N	BOLI
Gresham	Civic Drive	30%				Y	BOLI
	Myrtlewood Way	20%				N	
	Oak Row at Rockwood	20%				N	
	Rockwood Village	20%		22%		N	
	Terracina Vista	30%	20%			Y	
	Wynne Watts Commons	20%		25%		N	
Hillsboro	Nueva Esperanza	29%	NA	35%	NA	N	
	The Dolores	20%	20%			Y	
Home Forward	Troutdale	28%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon
Portland	73rd and Foster	30%	20%			Y	
	Abbey Site	30%	20%			Y	
	Albina One	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Aldea at Glisan Landing	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon
	Barbur	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon
	Beacon at Glisan Landing	30%	20%		70%	Y	
	Broadway Corridor	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Carey Boulevard	30%	20%			Y	
	The Cesar	NA	NA			N	
	Dekum	24%	20%			Y	
	Dr. Darrell Millner Building	30%	20%			Y	BOLI
	Findley Commons	24%	20%	20%	58%	Y	Davis Bacon
	Garden Park Estate	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon
Gooseberry Trails	30%	20%				Davis Bacon	

Jurisdiction	Project	COBID Goal		COBID Progress		Workforce tracking?	Prevailing wage
		Hard costs	Soft costs	Hard costs	Soft costs		
	Hattie Redmond	30%	20%	44%	29%	Y	
	Hollywood Hub	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Jamii Court	30%	20%				Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Legin Commons	30%	20%			Y	
	M. Carter Commons	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Meridian Gardens	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon
	PCC Killingsworth	30%	20%			Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Powellhurst Place	30%	20%		71%	Y	
	Strong Site	30%	20%			Y	
	The Jade	30%	30%				
	Tistilal Village	30%	20%			Y	
	Waterleaf	30%	20%	29%	22%	Y	Davis Bacon/BOLI
	Washington	Alongside Senior Housing	20%	20%	23%	25%	Y
Cedar Rising (Aloha Family)		20%	NA	25%	NA	N	
Altura (Goldcrest)		20%	NA	39%	NA	N	
Heartwood Commons		20%	20%	22%	76%	N	BOLI
Opal Apartments		20%	NA	20%	NA	N	Davis Bacon
Plambeck Gardens		20%	20%			N	
Plaza Los Amigos		20%	NA	31%	NA	Y	Davis Bacon
Terrace Glen		20%	NA	31%	NA	N	
The Valfre at Avenida 26		20%	NA	33%	NA	N	
Viewfinder		20%	20%	22%	26%	Y	Davis Bacon
Woodland Hearth		30%	20%			N	BOLI

EXHIBIT D: OCCUPANCY DATA FOR PROJECTS THAT COMPLETED LEASE-UP

Projects reaching at least 95% occupancy and submitting occupancy outcome data

Project	Location	Eligible units	30% AMI units	2+ BR units	PSH units
Alongside Senior Housing	Tigard	57	23	0	4
Altura (Goldcrest)	Beaverton	74	14	45	0
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	Portland	63	17	48	0
Good Shepherd Village	Happy Valley	142	58	79	58
Las Flores	Oregon City	171	70	129	17
Mercy Greenbrae	Lake Oswego	100	40	83	40
Nueva Esperanza	Hillsboro	149	60	105	0
Opal Apartments	Portland	54	28	9	0
Plaza Los Amigos	Cornelius	112	26	72	0
Powellhurst Place	Portland	64	12	45	12
Terrace Glen	Tigard	144	51	74	3
The Valfre	Forest Grove	36	8	30	0
Rockwood Village	Gresham	47	47	39	0
Mary Ann	Beaverton	54	11	29	0
Tukwila Springs	Gladstone	48	48	0	48
Viewfinder	Tigard	81	34	56	28
Findley Commons	Portland	35	0	0	35
Hattie Redmond	Portland	60	60	0	60
Fuller Road Station	Happy Valley	99	30	82	25
Waterleaf	Portland	176	17	48	20
Wynne Watts Commons	Gresham	147	30	31	30
Totals		1,913	684	1,004	380

Occupancy outcome data: race and ethnicity

Project	# of occupants in bond-funded units	% of occupants who provided race/ethnicity data	% POC of occupants who provided data	Demographic data for surrounding neighborhood	
				% of households that are POC	% of households with incomes <\$75,000 that are POC
Alongside Senior Housing	64	97%	16%	24%	25%
Altura (Goldcrest)	187	9%	44%	30%	37%
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	49	92%	87%	28%	42%
Good Shepherd Village	299	97%	53%	30%	35%
Las Flores	433	27%	40%	12%	17%
Mercy Greenbrae	249	86%	19%	15%	19%
Nueva Esperanza	356	90%	95%	40%	35%
Opal Apartments	58	72%	17%	32%	29%
Plaza Los Amigos	310	96%	90%	42%	43%
Powellhurst Place	117	100%	77%	39%	45%
Terrace Glen	312	100%	64%	23%	27%
Findley Commons	35	94%	12%	20%	26%
Fuller Rd Station	274	31%	14%	29%	32%
Hattie Redmond	60	100%	100%	25%	37%
Mary Ann	117	46%	26%	40%	43%
Rockwood Village	141	22%	65%	41%	41%
The Valfre at Avenida 26	92	100%	79%	23%	23%
Tukwila Springs	48	77%	41%	19%	18%
Viewfinder	189	33%	35%	23%	29%
Waterleaf	271	71%	54%	27%	36%
Wynne Watts Commons	216	86%	44%	40%	40%
Total	3,877	69%	59%	30%	35%
Region				28%	32%

Occupancy outcome data: disability status

Project	# of occupants in bond-funded units	% of occupants who provided disability status	% living with a disability of occupants who provided data	% living with a disability in surrounding neighborhood
Alongside Senior Housing	64	98%	41%	14%
Altura (Goldcrest)	187	100%	3%	6%
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	49	100%	6%	13%
Good Shepherd Village	299	100%	17%	8%
Las Flores	433	100%	3%	14%
Mercy Greenbrae	249	100%	2%	13%
Nueva Esperanza	356	99%	7%	10%
Opal Apartments	58	10%	100%	10%
Plaza Los Amigos	310	100%	7%	15%
Powellhurst Place	117	99%	25%	16%
Terrace Glen	312	93%	14%	13%
Findley Commons	35	100%	34%	13%
Fuller Rd Station	274	2%	100%	17%
Hattie Redmond	60	100%	30%	9%
Mary Ann	117	15%	100%	15%
Rockwood Village	141	33%	11%	17%
The Valfre at Avenida 26	92	92%	11%	15%
Tukwila Springs	48	100%	69%	17%
Viewfinder	189	43%	2%	12%
Waterleaf	271	100%	16%	18%
Wynne Watts Commons	216	92%	28%	17%
Total	3,877	83%	13%	14%
Region				13%

Occupancy outcome data: age

Project	Occupants of bond-funded units			Demographic data for surrounding neighborhood		
	% under age 5	% age 5-17	% age 62 or over	% under age 5	% age 5-17	% age 62 or over
Alongside Senior Housing	0%	0%	98%	4%	16%	21%
Altura (Goldcrest)	18%	15%	3%	5%	19%	14%
Dr. Darrell Millner Building	14%	29%	12%	4%	10%	13%
Good Shepherd Village	11%	28%	10%	5%	20%	20%
Las Flores	19%	30%	4%	5%	17%	20%
Mercy Greenbrae	16%	33%	6%	5%	15%	29%
Nueva Esperanza	15%	29%	4%	4%	14%	14%
Opal Apartments	0%	0%	100%	5%	20%	16%
Plaza Los Amigos	15%	29%	5%	4%	20%	19%
Powellhurst Place	19%	15%	5%	6%	17%	19%
Terrace Glen	16%	23%	4%	4%	13%	19%
Findley Commons	0%	0%	37%	4%	12%	15%
Fuller Rd Station	24%	33%	2%	5%	13%	20%
Hattie Redmond	0%	0%	35%	5%	11%	14%
Mary Ann	19%	39%	6%	6%	13%	18%
Rockwood Village	23%	55%	6%	7%	17%	15%
The Valfre at Avenida 26	18%	51%	1%	6%	19%	15%
Tukwila Springs	0%	0%	35%	3%	12%	25%
Viewfinder	21%	50%	4%	6%	14%	21%
Waterleaf	12%	25%	0%	2%	4%	20%
Wynne Watts Commons	13%	26%	1%	8%	16%	17%
Total	16%	28%	8%	5%	14%	18%
Region				5%	15%	19%

EXHIBIT E. SUMMARY OF LEVERAGED CAPITAL FUNDING SOURCES

Jurisdiction	Project	LIHTC equity	Grants	Permanent loan	Metro housing bond	Sponsor contribution	Other
Beaverton	Amity Orchards	\$28,705,076	\$12,192,290	\$22,869,594	\$9,000,000	\$5,542,431	\$1,245,251
	Elmonica Station	\$21,329,179	\$12,899,657	\$4,313,698	\$8,888,934	\$825,652	\$3,460,066
	Mary Ann	\$11,998,800	\$3,668,524	\$3,200,000	\$3,000,000	\$0	\$0
	Meadowlark	\$22,680,608	\$4,700,000	\$8,000,000	\$10,500,000	\$3,450,005	\$1,200,000
Clackamas	Fuller Road Sta.	\$20,273,666	\$1,782,381	\$15,019,000	\$8,570,000	\$1,699,604	\$0
	Good Shepherd	\$19,623,281	\$3,666,495	\$12,622,277	\$18,330,000	\$5,606,979	\$950,000
	Hillside Park A & B	\$26,052,376	\$9,755,778	\$17,137,000	\$23,509,307	\$5,694,141	\$0
	Hillside Park C	\$18,711,696	\$8,250,000	\$14,163,000	\$18,190,692	\$4,985,000	\$0
	El Nido (Lake Grove)	\$12,333,775	\$1,174,476	\$4,665,000	\$0	\$1,484,773	\$10,000,000
	Las Flores	\$20,567,572	\$1,010,283	\$22,700,000	\$15,903,000	\$1,941,657	\$0
	Mercy Greenbrae	\$18,480,347	\$4,380,000	\$12,418,738	\$3,000,000	\$2,518,786	\$1,700,000
	Shortstack Milwaukie	NA	\$3,295,000	NA	\$700,000	\$62,487	\$3,559,605
	Tukwila Springs	\$6,415,003	\$2,400,000	\$4,700,000	\$5,548,542	\$2,564,651	\$400,000
	Vuela	\$23,861,341	\$1,763,492	\$20,000,000	\$8,000,000	\$4,115,047	\$0
	Gresham	Civic Drive	\$21,407,915	\$3,700,000	\$12,542,394	\$2,100,000	\$2,800,000
Myrtlewood Way		NA	\$3,648,000	NA	\$3,800,000	\$417,502	\$3,911,630
Oak Row		NA	\$0	NA	\$2,200,000	\$36,000	\$1,944,476
Rockwood Village		\$23,936,345	\$4,350,000	\$27,000,000	\$5,237,814	\$5,503,886	\$0
Terracina Vista		\$17,250,147	\$8,706,000	\$12,345,000	\$2,500,000	\$2,297,852	\$0
Wynne Watts Commons		\$18,447,678	\$200,000	\$10,000,000	\$11,292,447	\$5,391,000	\$0
Hillsboro	The Dolores	\$16,618,750	\$2,974,731	\$7,080,900	\$8,750,000	\$4,607,530	\$4,506,407
	Nueva Esperanza	\$23,556,000	\$443,625	\$11,605,488	\$16,940,731	\$1,360,000	\$0
Home Forward	Troutdale	\$19,059,951	\$7,180,150	\$3,682,785	\$15,970,323	\$3,126,143	\$3,540,847
Portland	73rd and Foster	\$20,798,000	\$2,307,467	\$3,832,770	\$3,032,340	\$625,100	\$0
	Abbey Townhomes	NA	\$1,600,000	NA	\$1,200,000	\$84,152	\$2,200,000
	Albina One	\$28,311,935	\$6,864,008	\$9,807,000	\$14,424,597	\$6,903,322	\$1,970,000
	Aldea at Glisan Landing	\$19,914,540	\$8,684,073	\$10,000,000	\$3,685,679	\$4,000,100	\$11,500,000
	Barbur	\$29,828,075	\$12,468,672	\$10,900,000	\$18,559,384	\$5,040,000	\$0
	Beacon at Glisan Lndg	\$6,575,517	\$5,293,199	\$2,350,000	\$5,822,000	\$1,142,865	\$0
	Broadway Corridor	\$55,766,747	\$25,577,644	\$10,426,804	\$40,250,000	\$12,600,000	\$0
	Carey Boulevard	NA	\$3,325,000	NA	\$6,087,267	\$745,575	\$13,110,000
	Cesar	\$0	\$8,231,067	\$0	\$6,671,717	\$359,457	\$0
	Dekum	\$34,304,795	\$0	\$16,850,000	\$21,170,882	\$10,575,759	\$0
	Dr. Darrell Millner Bldg	\$14,720,747	\$150,000	\$6,560,884	\$9,216,838	\$1,574,406	\$0
	Findley Commons	\$0	\$4,221,962	\$500,000	\$1,945,175	\$300,000	\$0
	Garden Park	\$30,112,757	\$3,176,386	\$8,497,602	\$2,239,308	\$5,744,044	\$7,379,258
	Gooseberry Trails	NA	\$12,002,297	NA	\$5,451,773	\$4,186,492	\$10,538,770
	Hattie Redmond	\$9,640,093	\$8,788,906	\$0	\$4,411,737	\$1,120,341	\$0
	Hollywood Hub	\$61,967,829	\$18,760,210	\$22,784,942	\$10,256,344	\$14,621,395	\$21,525,560
	Jamii Court	\$24,834,241	\$3,256,210	\$8,250,000	\$6,155,974	\$5,465,132	\$8,682,842
	Legin Commons	\$23,413,472	\$18,855,128	\$10,829,924	\$1,674,627	\$2,812,017	\$1,324,627
	M Carter Commons	\$14,823,884	\$4,555,616	\$3,767,000	\$8,131,806	\$3,408,330	\$3,500,000
Meridian Gardens	\$13,084,916	\$2,521,756	\$0	\$13,365,160	\$1,571,921	\$0	

Jurisdiction	Project	LIHTC equity	Grants	Permanent loan	Metro housing bond	Sponsor contribution	Other
	PCC Killingsworth	\$23,316,521	\$11,816,299	\$7,700,000	\$2,538,237	\$2,971,197	\$0
	Powellhurst Place	\$11,280,000	\$344,590	\$4,840,000	\$4,091,048	\$725,150	\$4,942,363
	Strong Site	\$18,688,807	\$3,290,906	\$7,100,000	\$3,150,000	\$2,545,505	\$8,250,000
	The Jade	\$0	\$13,206,532	\$4,214,000	\$4,431,054	\$1,553,115	\$0
	Tistilal Village	\$17,998,200	\$3,892,876	\$4,106,076	\$4,632,538	\$805,790	\$5,472,331
	Waterleaf	\$27,676,175	\$30,755,540	\$13,866,080	\$1,929,219	\$6,229,253	\$0
	Alongside Senior Hsg	\$8,893,680	\$1,968,000	\$5,790,000	\$6,323,691	\$2,664,633	\$0
Washington	Cedar Rising	\$14,368,995	\$3,524,585	\$3,950,000	\$10,230,000	\$1,087,935	\$500,000
	Altura (Goldcrest)	\$16,928,506	\$41,727	\$6,146,000	\$12,000,000	\$3,900,000	\$1,680,000
	Heartwood Commons	\$0	\$762,608	\$0	\$9,283,000	\$0	\$0
	Opal Apartments	\$7,922,852	\$1,251,012	\$6,665,699	\$6,149,000	\$1,445,377	\$0
	Plambeck Gardens	\$29,379,545	\$4,955,783	\$9,600,000	\$14,700,000	\$5,715,369	\$1,510,000
	Plaza Los Amigos	\$16,543,161	\$2,530,976	\$11,273,671	\$13,670,523	\$2,250,000	\$2,011,670
	Terrace Glen	\$23,067,941	\$500,000	\$10,200,000	\$17,484,000	\$2,925,000	\$0
	The Valfre Ave 26	\$4,135,910	\$500,000	\$4,800,000	\$3,792,088	\$375,345	\$0
	Viewfinder	\$11,451,863	\$259,548	\$8,950,000	\$11,583,000	\$706,779	\$0
	Woodland Hearth	\$14,572,633	\$10,413,392	\$8,410,000	\$9,450,000	\$6,126,938	\$0
	Totals	\$1,025,631,842	\$342,794,856	\$489,033,324	\$521,121,797	\$190,938,919	\$145,465,703

EXHIBIT F. SUMMARY OF ONGOING FUNDING FOR LONG-TERM RENTAL ASSISTANCE AND WRAPAROUND SERVICES

Jurisdiction	Project	Total affordable units	Metro bond-funded units		
			30% AMI	With project based rental assistance	With ongoing funding for wraparound services
Beaverton	Amity Orchards	135	17	0	0
	Elmonica Station	81	33	8	0
	Mary Ann	54	11	8	0
	Meadowlark	104	68	19	30
Clackamas	Fuller Road Station	99	30	25	25
	Good Shepherd	142	58	20	58
	Hillside Park A & B	143	40	40	13
	Hillside Park C	78	68	78	8
	El Nido (Lake Grove)	54	20	10	10
	Las Flores	171	70	53	17
	Mercy Greenbrae	100	40	40	40
	Shortstack Milwaukie	15	0	0	0
	Tukwila Springs	48	48	48	48
	Vuela	120	35	0	20
Gresham	Civic Drive	59	0	59	0
	Myrtlewood Way	20	0	0	0
	Oak Row	11	0	0	0
	Rockwood Village	47	47	0	0
	Terracina Vista	91	0	0	0
	Wynne Watts Commons	147	30	30	30
Hillsboro	The Dolores	66	30	8	0
	Nueva Esperanza	149	60	8	12
Home Forward	Troutdale	85	36	25	0
Portland	73rd and Foster	64	22	0	22
	Abbey Townhomes	8	0	0	0
	Albina One	94	32	19	0
	Aldea at Glisan Landing	96	15	15	0
	Barbur	149	32	19	0
	Beacon at Glisan Landing	41	41	41	41
	Broadway Corridor	230	50	50	35
	Carey Boulevard	53	0	0	0
	Cesar	47	47	0	47
	Dekum	147	61	27	0
	Dr. Darrell Millner Bldg	63	17	0	0
	Findley Commons	35	0	20	35
	Garden Park Estates	54	25	25	25
	Gooseberry Trails	52	0	0	0
	Hattie Redmond	60	60	60	60
	Hollywood Hub	73	39	23	0
	Jamii Court	98	39	39	15
	Legin Commons	124	20	20	0
	M Carter Commons	62	21	11	0

Jurisdiction	Project	Total affordable units	Metro bond-funded units		
			30% AMI	With project based rental assistance	With ongoing funding for wraparound services
	Meridian Gardens	85	70	65	65
	PCC Killingsworth	84	28	28	0
	Powellhurst Place	64	12	12	12
	Strong Site	75	11	0	0
	The Jade	40	5	0	0
	Tistilal Village	24	24	24	16
	Waterleaf	176	17	20	20
Washington	Alongside Senior Housing	57	23	23	4
	Cedar Rising	81	33	0	0
	Altura (Goldcrest)	74	14	0	0
	Heartwood Commons	54	54	54	54
	Opal Apartments	54	28	24	0
	Plambeck Gardens	116	47	8	16
	Plaza Los Amigos	112	26	16	0
	Terrace Glen	144	51	8	3
	The Valfre Ave 26	36	8	8	0
	Viewfinder	81	34	16	28
Woodland Hearth	63	26	16	22	
Total		4,989	1,773	1,170	831

EXHIBIT G. AFFORDABLE HOUSING BOND FINANCIAL REPORT THROUGH DECEMBER 2024

FINANCIAL SUMMARY

TOTAL REVENUE	\$713,952,402
TOTAL EXPENSES and DISBURSEMENTS	\$466,781,537
TOTAL COMMITTED	\$135,620,095
TOTAL FUNDING REMAINING	\$111,550,770

REVENUE

	FY 2018 - 2024	FY 2024 - 2025	TOTAL REVENUE
Bond Proceeds	\$652,800,000		\$652,800,000
Premiums on Bonds	\$2,630,335		\$2,630,335
Interest Earnings	\$50,617,834	\$7,429,233	\$58,047,067
Metro General Fund	\$0	\$475,000	\$475,000
TOTAL REVENUE:	\$706,048,169	\$7,904,233	\$713,952,402

EXPENSES

PROJECTS	Prior Years Expended or Disbursed	FY2024-25 Expended or Disbursed	Committed -- Not Yet Disbursed	TOTAL EXPENDED, DISBURSED or COMMITTED	WORK PLAN FUNDING (Amended)	% of Work Plan Funding Expended, Disbursed or Committed
Jurisdiction:						
Beaverton	\$12,000,000	\$8,888,934	\$10,500,000	\$31,388,934	\$31,587,595	99%
Clackamas County	\$69,542,235	\$32,209,307	\$0	\$101,751,542	\$122,018,094	83%
Gresham	\$19,030,261	\$2,200,000	\$5,900,000	\$27,130,261	\$27,140,995	100%
Hillsboro	\$16,940,731	\$8,750,000	\$0	\$25,690,731	\$41,240,081	62%
Home Forward (East Multnomah Co.)	\$37,004,406	\$136,800	\$0	\$37,141,206	\$37,141,206	100%
Portland	\$68,301,536	\$20,078,061	\$98,934,089	\$187,313,686	\$208,740,992	90%
Washington County	\$105,215,302	\$9,450,000	\$0	\$114,665,302	\$118,135,532	97%
Metro Site Acquisition Program	\$27,324,043	\$5,343,111	\$20,286,006	\$52,953,160	\$62,016,000	85%
Other Metro Direct Project Costs	\$266,861	\$41,299	\$0	\$308,160	\$0	N/A
PSH IGA in progress (Wash Co)					\$6,746,000	N/A
Funding to be allocated (Interest Earnings)					\$23,488,287	N/A
TOTAL:	\$355,625,375	\$87,097,512	\$135,620,095	578,342,982.10	\$ 678,254,782	85%

ADMINISTRATIVE	Prior Years Expended or Disbursed	FY2024-25 Expended or Disbursed	TOTAL EXPENDED or DISBURSED	WORK PLAN FUNDING (Amended)	% of Work Plan Funding Expended or Disbursed
Jurisdiction:					
Beaverton	\$945,835	\$0	\$945,835	\$974,615	97%
Clackamas County	\$2,353,622	\$641,376	\$2,994,998	\$3,636,371	82%
Gresham	\$598,345	\$119,538	\$717,883	\$837,421	86%
Hillsboro	\$994,779	\$138,839	\$1,133,618	\$1,272,457	89%
Home Forward (East Multnomah Co.)	\$496,973	\$0	\$496,973	\$496,973	100%
Portland ¹	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	N/A
Washington County	\$2,387,306	\$627,716	\$3,015,022	\$3,645,054	83%
Metro Site Acquisition Program ²	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,940,932	N/A
Metro Accountability and Financial Transaction Costs	\$13,469,235	\$1,285,086	\$14,754,321	\$19,409,319	76%
Funding to be allocated (Interest Earnings)				\$3,484,478	N/A
TOTAL:	\$21,246,095	\$2,812,555	\$24,058,650	\$35,697,620	67%

¹ PHB uses a Program Delivery Fee, not paid for by Metro's Affordable Housing Bond, to cover administrative expenses.

² Administrative expenses in support of Metro's Site Acquisition Program are combined with Metro's total Administrative expenses and included in "Metro Accountability and Financial Transaction Costs."

METRO COSTS ANNUAL BASIS ³	FY2024-25 YTD Actuals	FY2024-25 Metro Budget	YTD % Spent
	1,415,639	3,209,375	44%

³ In addition to Metro's Administrative costs, these costs include certain Metro Direct Costs reported under the "Project" Cost table above (e.g. personnel costs for the Metro Site Acquisition Program as well as Other Metro Direct costs). These costs were not provided a Work Plan Funding allocation, and therefore must be covered by Metro's Administrative Funding allocation.

EXHIBIT H. OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE 2024 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE METRO COUNCIL (SUBMITTED JUNE 2024)

The committee commends Metro and its implementation partners on the milestones reached this year. The bond program is on track to exceed unit production goals, and considerable progress has been made on the committee's previous recommendations. This sets a firm platform for the committee to make the following recommendations to continue to optimize the impact of these resources and set up the region to continue to address pressing regional housing needs.

- **Funding coordination and alignment:** 20 projects (1,577 units) have received a commitment of Metro bond funds and are still in the pre-construction stage. These projects continue to face challenges due to unprecedented cost escalation and statewide shifts necessary to address private activity bond constraints, presenting significant risks to reaching construction start. Metro should continue to work with funding and development partners to ensure that projects have the flexibility and support they need to navigate funding gaps or other barriers. Metro should continue to coordinate with Oregon Housing and Community Services and jurisdictional partners on funding processes and alignment to provide predictability and certainty for developers, ensure that funding and underwriting standards are responsive to their needs, and prioritize deeply affordable and permanent supportive housing units.
- **Affordable housing operations:** While the bond program is exceeding its housing production goals and demonstrating strong outcomes for racial equity in construction and initial marketing, the ongoing stability of residents – and the organizations that own and operate the housing – will be the long-term measure of success for this program. Affordable housing owners and operators face new challenges navigating rising operating costs and supporting property management and operational practices that are responsive to the needs of residents. Metro should conduct an analysis and convene stakeholders to evaluate needs/gaps and identify opportunities to support property management and operational practices that will ensure long-term stewardship of the community assets created through this investment program.
- **Plan for the future:** Metro should continue working with partners and stakeholders to develop plans to ensure the region can address its affordable housing needs into the future. This includes planning for continued funding for affordable housing, coordination of local strategies to eliminate barriers to affordable housing production in alignment with State Land Use Goal 10, and planning for the intentional integration and alignment of Metro's capital and supportive housing services funds. This work is necessary to ensure that we are maximizing the impact of these combined investments in addressing our region's housing and homelessness crisis.

The Portland region should be proud that we are addressing the national issues of affordable housing and homelessness with an active approach that centers racial equity. This bond continues to be successful and will exceed the commitments made to voters. We have an opportunity to build upon this work and expand its impact. We would like to applaud Metro

and jurisdictional partner staff for their continued dedication, and we are honored to have the opportunity to provide oversight for this important program for our region.

Thank you,

Jenny Lee (Co-chair)

Steve Rudman (Co-chair)

Scott Greenfield

Ann Leenstra

Jesse Neilson

Jeffery Petrillo

Mara Romero

Katherine Rozsa

Andrea Sanchez

Karen Shawcross

Date: Friday, April 11, 2025
 To: Metro Affordable Housing Bond Oversight Committee
 From: Emily Lieb, Housing Policy Director
 Housing Department
Emily.Lieb@oregonmetro.gov
 Subject: Request for feedback on Metro Affordable Housing Bond interest earnings

Dear Oversight Committee Members:

This memo provides a brief overview of the current status, past actions, and proposed next steps related Metro Affordable Housing Bond interest earnings.

Summary of recommendation:

The preliminary staff recommendation to Metro COO Madrigal is to allocate additional Metro Affordable Housing Bond interest earnings as “Eligible Share” with a priority of addressing funding gaps for pipeline projects experiencing difficulties or at risk due to cost escalation and other factors. To allocate all interest earnings accrued as of March 2025, to all seven implementation partners using the pro rata formula established in the Council-adopted Affordable Housing Bond work plan. And to consider an alternative approach for allocating remaining interest earnings projected to accrue through the end of the bond implementation and to plan on a discussion of allocation of final remaining interest earnings beginning in the fall of 2026, for recommendation to Metro COO Madrigal and Metro Council.

Affordable Housing Bond interest earnings background

As of December 2024, the Metro Affordable Housing Bond program has accrued a total of \$26,972,765 in unallocated interest earnings, including \$23,488,287 available for Eligible Share allocation after setting aside 5% for program administration. Based on financial projections, the program is forecasting an additional \$6.1 million in interest earnings funding to accrue through the end of bond implementation anticipated at the end of FY27, ending in June 2028.

Metro Affordable Housing Bond Interest Earnings – funding availability as of Dec 2024	Unallocated interest earnings accrued as of Dec 2024*	Total unallocated interest earnings forecasted through FY27
Total interest earnings accrued as of Dec. 2024	\$26,972,765	\$33,420,944
5% for administration	\$3,484,478	\$3,806,887
Interest earnings available for Eligible Share (non-admin) allocation	\$23,488,287	\$29,614,057

**Updated interest earning estimates through March 2025 will be available in mid-April*

The Council-adopted Affordable Housing Bond work plan established a methodology for allocating bond fund according to a proportional formula based on property tax revenue generation. In addition, in Spring 2023 the work plan was updated to include a methodology for allocating admin share. Utilizing this formula, the Metro COO may approve additional interest earnings for eligible bond uses. Below is the Work Plan formula as it would apply to Eligible Share interest earnings accrued as of December 2024.

Jurisdiction	Work Plan Allocation %	Eligible Share interest earnings as December 2024*
Beaverton	5.58%	\$ 1.3M
Clackamas County	20.82%	\$ 4.9M
Gresham	4.79%	\$ 1.1M
Hillsboro	7.28%	\$ 1.7M
Home Forward	2.84%	\$ 660k
Portland	37.81%	\$ 8.8M
Washington County	20.87%	\$ 4.9M
TOTAL	100%	\$ 23M

**Updated interest earning estimates through 3/31/2025 will be available in mid-April*

Historically, COO-directed interest earning allocations have been utilized to address emerging challenges and opportunities related to bond implementation, including:

- **\$14 million proportionately allocated to seven partners in 2022 to support additional investments in in-unit cooling.** This was an action directed by the COO in response to the heat dome event in June 2021, and in conjunction with Metro policy guidance strongly encouraging jurisdictions to require in-unit cooling systems for all bond funded housing developments.
- **\$20 million was proportionately allocated to the three counties in 2023 and 2024 to support investments in additional PSH units,** with a priority for units that could be created through acquisition-based strategies or other approaches that could quickly produce additional PSH units targeted for serving individuals and families exiting chronic homelessness. These funds were allocated only to the three counties, to provide funding allocations large enough to support a project in each county and in reflection of the fact that counties administer SHS funding, a substantial source of funding to support ongoing funding needs associated with PSH. This allocation was directed by the COO based on strong feedback from the HBOC.

Under the work plan formula, funds may be allocated proportionately only to the three counties, such as in the case of the PSH pilot funds, or to all seven jurisdictions, such as in the case of additional funding for in-unit cooling upgrades.

In January and February 2025, the AHB team met with each jurisdiction as a part of the annual report process. The team asked about projects with current gaps or anticipated need for additional resources. All jurisdictions confirmed plans to commit all remaining bond funds and several expressed immediate needs for resources to fill gaps in current pipeline projects. Many jurisdictions reiterated these needs during their presentations to AHBOC in March.

- Housing Authority of Clackamas County – has identified two projects in their pipeline with financial gaps in need of additional funding.
- Gresham – has identified one project in their pipeline with potential financial gaps, and one potential new project that could benefit from funding.
- Hillsboro – has identified one pipeline project with a financial gap.
- Home Forward- has identified one project under construction with that could benefit from additional funding.

- Portland Housing Bureau – has identified multiple pipeline projects that could benefit from additional funding including projects in predevelopment, under construction, and completed but pre-stabilization/pre-perm loan conversion.
- Washinton County – has identified one pipeline project and one potential new project that could utilize additional funds.
- Beaverton – would potentially utilize funds for one new project.

Request for feedback on interest earnings recommendation:

In early April, Metro staff briefed the Metro COO Madrigal on the AHB program interest earnings. Metro COO Madrigal requested feedback from the AHBOC co-chairs and committee members before making a final decision. This will be a topic of discussion at the April 16, 2025 AHBOC meeting as a part of the AHBOC Annual Report recommendations.

The preliminary staff recommendation to Metro COO Madrigal is to allocate additional Metro Affordable Housing Bond interest earnings as “Eligible Share” with a priority of addressing funding gaps for pipeline projects experiencing difficulties or at risk due to cost escalation and other factors. To allocate all interest earnings accrued as of March 2025, to all seven implementation partners using the pro rata formula established in the Council-adopted Affordable Housing Bond work plan. And to consider an alternative approach for allocating remaining interest earnings projected to accrue through the end of the bond implementation and to plan on a discussion of allocation of final remaining interest earnings beginning in the fall of 2026, for recommendation to Metro COO Madrigal and Metro Council.

The following materials were received
during the meeting.

1. Lack of Clear Long-Term Plan for Remaining Interest Earnings

- The memo proposes allocating current interest earnings (as of March 2025) but only begins planning for remaining earnings projected through FY27.
- There's no concrete allocation strategy yet for the \$6.1 million expected to accrue after March 2025.
- This delay could risk funds sitting idle during a housing crisis or being allocated without community input.

2. Uneven Distribution & Impact Across Jurisdictions

- Funds are allocated based on a pro rata formula tied to property tax revenue—not based on urgency, population need, or homelessness rates.
- For example, Portland receives 37.81% of the interest earnings regardless of whether smaller jurisdictions may have more urgent project needs or higher per-capita housing shortages.
- There's also potential concern about jurisdictions with multiple needs (e.g., Portland or Clackamas County) receiving the same formulaic share as those with fewer or less urgent gaps.

3. Ambiguity Around “New Projects” vs. Current Pipeline

- Some jurisdictions (e.g., Gresham, Washington County, Beaverton) mention interest in using funds for potential new projects, not just existing gaps.
- This raises equity and accountability questions about whether interest earnings should prioritize completing already-approved pipeline projects first before funding new efforts.

4. Limited Transparency or Public Process

- The memo notes that Metro COO Madrigal will make the final decision, but it's unclear how much public or community input will be included beyond AHBOC feedback.
- Given the size of the interest earnings (\$23M+), broader stakeholder engagement may be warranted.

5. Rising Costs and Delayed Project Completion

- Many jurisdictions are reporting financial gaps due to cost escalation (construction, materials, etc.).
- If interest earnings are not deployed strategically and quickly, projects could stall or fail to deliver promised units, especially for vulnerable populations like seniors, veterans, or those exiting homelessness.

6. Need for Clear Guidelines on “At-Risk” Projects

- The memo uses language like “projects experiencing difficulties” or “at risk due to cost escalation” without defining what qualifies as at-risk
- A lack of criteria could lead to inconsistent or politically influenced funding decisions



Metro affordable housing bond oversight committee meeting |
April 16, 2025

Agenda

- Welcome and introductions
- Public comment
- Conflict of interest
- **Interest earnings conversation**
- Metro staff presentation and committee discussion: regional trends and key findings for 2024 annual report
- Break
- Committee discussion: formulate preliminary findings and recommendations to inform the committee's annual report to metro council.
- Next steps
- Adjourn



Annual Report Process

- March
 - Review jurisdiction progress reports
 - Jurisdiction presentations at AHBOC
- April
 - Review Draft Annual Report – feedback by April 18
 - Key Findings & Report Highlights presentation (today!)
 - Committee discussion to formulate preliminary findings and recommendations
- May 21 Meeting
 - Finalize committee findings and recommendations in letter to Metro Council
- June *Date TBD*
 - Presentation of findings and recommendations to Metro Council

Oversight Committee role

- Purpose
 - to provide program oversight on behalf of the Metro Council to ensure investments achieve regional goals and desired outcomes
 - To ensure transparency and accountability in program activities and outcomes
- Duties (among others)
 - Provide an annual report and presentation to Metro Council assessing program performance, challenges, and outcomes



Metro



Metro affordable housing bond program 2024 annual report: preliminary findings

Housing Bond Oversight Committee | April 16, 2025

Purpose of today's presentation

Share preliminary findings for the 2024 annual program report

Committee feedback and discussion of findings and recommendations to Metro Council



Guiding principles

Lead with racial equity

Create opportunity for those in need

Create opportunity throughout the region

Ensure long-term benefits and good use of public dollars

Section 1

Unit production

Residents


Geographic
distribution

Pipeline forecast



Unit production

Affordable housing production: progress underway



People housed


The 60 projects in the current portfolio will provide homes for an estimated 9,500 to 16,000 people

The first 3,877 people had moved into their new homes by December 2024




Advancing fair housing access

35% of homes are in areas with less than the regional rate of regulated affordable housing



Access to transit & amenities



75% of homes are within a quarter-mile of a frequent service bus or half-mile of MAX



77% of homes are rated with a walkscore of 50 or better

Community engagement


2024 engagement:

- 17 projects
- 29 engagement opportunities
- 522+ participants




Local Implementation Partner funding

Resources committed




Total funding committed/remaining

Affordable Housing Bond Funding - December 2024




AHB funding – April 2025

Affordable Housing Bond Funding - April 2025



Forecasted production outcomes



Questions?



Section 2

Equitable access


Equitable contracting and workforce

Permanent supportive housing




Equitable contracting outcomes

COBID-certified MWESB firms were paid \$165.7 million in contracts, representing 29.1% of total construction costs



Veteran-owned businesses that don't fall under any of the other categories made up 0.2%. All other veteran-owned businesses (3%) are included in the percentages for other categories.



Workforce diversity outcomes

Outcomes for 12 completed projects reporting on workforce diversity

Average % of labor hours worked by

People of color	Apprentices	Women
60%	15%	5%

Serving priority communities

- Communities of color
- Families with children and multiple generations
- Seniors and older adults
- Veterans
- People experiencing or at risk of homelessness
- People with disabilities
- People experiencing or at risk of displacement



Designated units

Communities of color	All projects committed to low-barrier screening and affirmative marketing to ensure access for communities of color 54 projects include partnerships with culturally specific organizations
Families with children	51 projects include family-size units
Seniors and older adults	8 projects have units designated for seniors or older adults
Veterans	6 projects have units designated for veterans
People experiencing or at risk of homelessness	1,773 units are 30% AMI 1,135 of the 30% AMI units have project-based rental assistance 831 units are designated as permanent supportive housing
People with disabilities	22% of units are ground floor units 6% of units are ADA (Type A) units 76% of projects have universal design
People experiencing or at risk of displacement	6 projects are participating in the City of Portland's N/NE Preference Policy 35 projects are in areas where communities at risk of displacement live today

Reducing barriers to access




- Affirmative marketing
- Partnerships with community-based organizations
- Partnerships with culturally specific organizations
- Low-barrier screening

Leasing outcomes


Projects that completed lease up in 2024	Studios	1 BR units	2 BR units	3 BR units	Total
Total units available	51	396	467	216	1,130
Total rental applications received	82	1,205	1,028	884	3,199
Total percentage of applicants housed	62%	33%	45%	24%	35%

Race and ethnicity

Occupants in bond-funded units




Region




A higher percentage of people of color are housed in bond-funded units than the region as a whole

Disability status

Occupants in bond-funded units



Region



The percentage of people with disabilities housed in bond-funded units is the same as the regional rate

Permanent supportive housing

Jurisdiction	Projects with PSH units	Number of PSH units
Beaverton	1	30
Clackamas	9	239
Gresham	1	30
Hillsboro	1	12
Portland	12	393
Washington	6	127
Total	30	831

The portfolio includes 831 PSH units across 30 projects

PSH units make up 17% of bond-funded units

50% of bond-funded projects contain PSH units

Questions?




Section 3

Efficient use of funds




Development costs



- \$2.56 billion in total investments
- \$521 million (20.4%) is Metro housing bond funding
- \$2.04 billion is leveraged from other sources

Capital funding sources



Metro bond investment

	Average cost		
	Per project	Per unit	Per bedroom
Total project cost	\$55,690,007	\$460,949	\$265,249
Metro bond subsidy	\$11,396,957	\$109,777	\$70,103

Development cost increases

- Construction cost increases
- Limited availability of private activity bonds
- Newer projects are requiring a higher bond subsidy per unit



Operating costs and subsidy




1,773 units are designated for 30% AMI or below

1,170 units have project-based rental assistance

831 units have funding for wraparound services

Economic impact



Bond-funded units represented 13% of the region's multifamily housing construction in 2022-23



Bond funding has supported an average of 2,283 construction sector jobs annually

Questions?



Section 4

Adapting our program to respond to challenges and opportunities



Funding coordination and alignment

- Filling funding gaps
- Coordination with funding partners
- Permanent supportive housing funding



Affordable housing operations



- Operating costs
- Property management
- Asset management

Plan for the future

- Evaluation of housing investment opportunities
- Regional housing coordination strategy



Questions?



Interest earnings update



- 2022 - \$14 million for in-unit cooling
- 2023 & 2024 - \$20M for permanent supportive housing investments
- 2025 - \$23M recommended to support projects at risk

Interest earnings

Metro affordable housing bond interest earnings	Unallocated interest earnings accrued as of Dec 2024	Total unallocated interest earnings forecasted through FY27
Total interest earnings accrued as of Dec 2024	\$26,972,765	\$33,420,944
5% for administration	\$3,484,478	\$3,806,887
Interest earnings available for Eligible Share (non-admin) allocation	\$23,488,287	\$29,614,057

Interest earnings

Jurisdiction	Work plan allocation %	Eligible Share interest earnings as of December 2024
Beaverton	5.58%	\$ 1.3M
Clackamas County	20.82%	\$ 4.9M
Gresham	4.79%	\$ 1.1M
Hillsboro	7.28%	\$ 1.7M
Home Forward	2.84%	\$ 660k
Portland	37.81%	\$ 8.8M
Washington County	20.87%	\$ 4.9M
TOTAL	100%	\$ 23M

Interest earnings

- Clackamas County – 2 pipeline projects with financial gaps: **El Nido** and **Hillside Park Redevelopment – Buildings D & E**
- Gresham – 1 pipeline project with potential gap – **Civic Drive**, 1 potential new Homeownership project
- Hillsboro – 1 new project with financial gap – **Willow Creek RFP**
- Home Forward – 1 project under construction with cost escalations – **Dekum Court**
- Portland Housing Bureau – **multiple projects in pre-development**, under construction, and pre-stabilization projects
- Washington County – 1 pipeline project – **Elm Street PSH**, 1 potential new project
- Beaverton – 1 potential new project

Interest earnings considerations and risks

- Allocating funding outside of work plan formula would involve additional discussion and time, including Metro Council approval
- Alternative approaches, such as a Metro-led competitive allocation, would require Metro Council approval and additional staff capacity to implement.
- If an allocation decision is not made by May, immediate needs will be unmet and could result in costly delays for one project

Interest earnings recommendation

- Allocate interest earnings as “Eligible Share” with a priority of addressing funding gaps for pipeline projects experiencing difficulties or at risk due to cost escalation and other factors.
- Allocate all interest earnings accrued as of March 2025, to all seven implementation partners using the pro rata formula established in the Council-adopted Affordable Housing Bond work plan.
- Consider an alternative approach for allocating remaining interest earnings projected to accrue through the end of the bond implementation and to plan on a discussion of allocation of final remaining interest earnings beginning in the fall of 2026.

Break



What we've heard so far: HBOC recommendations for 2025



- Supporting the pipeline
- Problem solving in operations
- Planning for the future

Discussion questions

Does the committee have thoughts and feedback on the themes for HBOC recommendations for 2025?

Next Steps

- Review the annual report and provide written comments by **Friday, April 18th.**
- The draft of committee findings and recommendations for the cover letter will be shared via email in advance of the May 21 AHBOC meeting.
- Present to Metro Council in June – date TBD

oregonmetro.gov





Housing Communications Monthly Report – March 2025

The Housing Department’s Communications team is working on several stories across Metro news, social media, paid community media, email marketing and earned media.

Metro News

[New shelter and resource center opens in Tigard with Metro SHS dollars](#)

Highlight: “Shelter and day center guests will have access to fresh meals, shower facilities, case management, housing navigation and behavioral health services. The center was also designed ‘to make it easy for our guests to connect with services like health care and employment support from our partner agencies,’ explained Just Compassion Executive Director Dr. Vernon Baker. Additional activities like gardening and art classes will offer enrichment and connection. The facility can also accommodate up to 50 additional people overnight as an emergency shelter in extreme weather.”

[Beaverton opens latest affordable housing community with Metro bond funds](#)

Highlight: “Altura is the latest affordable apartment community to be completed in Beaverton with Metro affordable housing bond funds. The complex is located in the newly-incorporated South Cooper Mountain area of Southwest Beaverton — a part of the city that historically has not had any income-based housing options.”

Email marketing

The [March Metro Housing newsletter](#) focused on six new bond and SHS-funded projects: three have begun construction in the last 2 months and three have celebrated opening their doors to the community.

Earned media

In March, four Metro affordable housing bond- and supportive housing services-funded projects broke ground or opened. Metro worked with our partnering jurisdictions, and in some cases the developers, to issue joint press releases and press advisories. Metro took photos for media and launched a new b-roll effort, thanks to a new contract with Parachute Strategies. B-roll footage is provided to media and will be utilized for Metro-produced videos about the bond and SHS.

Here are the March events with links to their coverage:

Hillsboro year-round shelter groundbreaking (SHS)

[KPTV](#) | [KOIN](#) | [KGW](#) | [Carpenter Media Group newspapers](#) (formerly Pamplin)

M Carter Commons groundbreaking (AHB)

[KGW*](#) | [KOIN](#) | [The Skanner](#)

Altura opening (AHB)

[KPTV](#) | [Carpenter Media](#) | [The Registry](#)



Just Compassion Shelter & Resource Center opening (SHS)

[KGW](#) | [KATU](#) | [KUNP*](#) | [Carpenter Media](#) | [KLX-FM](#)

**Some broadcast clips are no longer available through Meltwater; the platform we use to track broadcast appearances.*

Marketing and Public Education

A set of slides that highlight the affordable housing bond and supportive housing services will continue to be displayed in local independent theaters throughout the coming months.

Metro Housing Department’s “home is everything” performance display ad campaign continued through March, with 1.2 million impressions, our highest monthly reach yet, across the region. The Click Through Rate (CTR) for ads across the web was .62%, with about 6,500 clicks leading to a [landing page on the Metro website](#) that gives an overview of Housing Department work. This CTR is higher than the benchmark, which is .10%, and higher than other Metro display ad campaigns. The “home is everything” social ads appearing on Oregonlive.com continued to have a lower CTR, at .18%, which has been typical of this campaign and other campaigns.

In late March, we also launched our Search Engine Marketing (SEM) campaign through Oregonian Media Group. This campaign is wrapped into a larger Metro-wide campaign shared among departments. These ads appear as sponsored links in Google search results and direct web users to the same [landing page on the Metro website](#) that gives an overview of Housing Department work.

Social media

The communications team published social media content recently on the opening of the [Altura affordable apartments](#) in Southwest Beaverton and the [Just Compassion Shelter and Resource Center](#) in Tigard.

Up and coming

The housing communications team is working with developers and contractors to hang sets of two informational banners at several local bond-funded construction sites throughout the region. One banner will provide information about the project specific to the site, including number of units and bedrooms. The other banner will provide general bond information and display a QR code that links to the Metro housing website with a choice of five languages: English, Spanish, Simplified Chinese, Vietnamese and Russian.

The housing department will be running a series of ads on 20 TriMet bus shelters throughout the region from June through August. They will highlight the important work of the bond and SHS fund in our community.



A new Community Voices photo project will be kicking off soon with residents of the [Dr. Darrell Millner Building](#), a bond-funded community in North Portland that opened in September 2024.