



# OREGON STATE HOUSING COUNCIL

**COUNCIL MEMBERS:**  
Aubre L. Dickson, Chair  
Mayra Arreola  
Tammy Baney  
Michael C. Fieldman  
Zee D. Koza  
Marissa Madrigal  
Adolph "Val" Valfre, Jr.

September 11, 2015  
**Public Meeting Minutes**

## Call to Order and Roll Call

Chair Aubre Dickson called the State Housing Council meeting to order at 9:07 a.m. and asked for a roll call.

| HOUSING COUNCIL ATTENDANCE  |                                |
|---|--------------------------------|
| <u>Present</u>  | <u>Not Present</u>             |
| Aubre Dickson, Chair<br>Tammy Baney<br>Marissa Madrigal<br>Zee Koza<br>Val Valfre | Mayra Arreola<br>Mike Fieldman |

## Public Comment

Chair Dickson opened the meeting to anyone wishing to provide public comment.

Josh McCulloch: Mr. McCulloch provided comment to the Council regarding their recent decision to approve funding for The Oaks housing project in Eugene. McCulloch advised Council members that he has been a member of the Churchill community for 16 years and has children in athletic programs in the area and expressed his disappointment with their decision to approve funding for a housing development project for criminals, specifically sex offenders, so close to so many children. He stated that there is already a high level of crime in the area and he fears with this sort of project crime will greatly increase. It is his hope that the next time the location is better thought out.

Mary McCulloch: Ms. McCulloch provided comment to the Council regarding their recent decision to approve funding for The Oaks housing project. McCulloch explained that the region already has high incidence of crime, she has been a resident of the community near the housing project for 11 years, and her family personally experienced a violent crime when her daughter was threatened during a home invasion 14 years ago. McCulloch insisted that the city purchase back the land designated for this project to build a library or children’s center instead.

On behalf of the Council, Chair Dickson expressed condolences to McCulloch for what she and her daughter have endured. He assured McCulloch that the Council takes issues related to neighborhood safety very seriously. Chair Dickson noted that this facility is not simply housing, but housing with services, including probation officers on site. Chair Dickson noted reentry housing projects that incorporate critical resident oversight and rehabilitation services often report less crime than market-rate housing in the same area.



---

Dickson explained that all projects go through rigorous internal and external evaluation processes before funding awards are recommended and are brought forward to the Council for approval. This project was thoroughly vetted and the Council remains confident in their decision to approve funding.

### **Draft Meeting Minutes for Approval - July 17, 2015**

Chair Dickson requested any comments or revisions to the draft July 17, 2015 meeting minutes. There were no edits or comments.

**Motion:** Val Valfre moved and Zee Koza seconded that the Housing Council approve the July 17, 2015 meeting minutes. **Vote:** In a roll call vote the motion passed without dissent.

### **Single Family Residential Loan Program Consent Calendar**

Kim Freeman, OHCS Single Family Section Manager presented three single family residential loans requiring Council approval. Freeman noted that monthly mortgage payment information associated with each loan has been added to the briefing materials in response to Chair Dickson's request in May. There was a question from Council members about the financial stability of the recipient families, and staff was asked to provide more detail about the process used for pre-approving recipients. Freeman answered that all recipients are processed by approved lenders and the loans are underwritten by the lender in accordance with national and industry guidelines and standards. Freeman noted that most first-time homebuyers have gone through homebuyer education, offered by Housing Centers throughout the state. Director Van Vliet requested an overview of the Single Family programs at a future Council meeting.

**Motion:** Tammy Baney moved and Val Valfre seconded, that the Council approve all three loans in Jackson County, Multnomah County, and Deschutes County. **Vote:** In a roll call vote the motion passed without dissent.

### **Meyer Memorial Trust Cost Efficiencies Workgroup Draft Report**

Michael Parkhurst, Affordable Housing Initiative Program Officer, Meyer Memorial Trust (MMT); Gina Leon, US Bank; and Jill Sherman, Gerding Edlen Development, provided the Council with an overview of the Cost Efficiencies Workgroups and their initial findings.

Parkhurst provided Council members with some background on MMT's Affordable Housing Initiative, which is five-year initiative organized around three goal areas encompassing eight funding strategies intended to build on previous investments to strengthen the long-term health and sustainability of Oregon's existing affordable housing.

MMT convened a Cost Efficiencies Workgroup in October of 2014 with the following goals in mind:

1. Clear explanation of the factors that drive the cost of affordable housing,
2. Recommendations for policy changes, and
3. To advise MMT on potential Pilot/Demonstration projects to explore new approaches to lower-cost development.

The 16-member workgroup included architects, consultants, nonprofit developers, and lenders.

The final workgroup report is expected to be released on October 1, 2015.

**The presentation may be found on the State Housing Council website under the September 11, 2015 meeting handouts and presentations or by clicking [here](#).**

---

## Questions and Discussion

Marissa Madrigal expressed her appreciation for the thoughtfulness and the attention to detail that went into this work. Val Valfre also recognized the thoughtfulness that went into selecting the workgroup. Valfre was also pleased to see the degree to which the draft report captured difficulties and challenges still needing to be addressed.

Tammy Baney asked if next steps have been articulated with regard to implementing the recommendations. Director Van Vliet responded that she hopes to cover next steps related to implementation as part of the 2016 Qualified Allocation Plan process update and discussion later in the meeting.

Van Vliet assured Parkhurst and the Council that the Department recognizes the workgroup's recommendations to OHCS, specifically (see slides 26-27 of the [PowerPoint](#)) and that the recommendations align with the work of the transition plan project and agency redesign. Van Vliet went on to address Parkhurst's reference to a need for a culture change at OHCS; the Department agrees and work is currently underway to shift from a regulatory to a collaborative, problem-solving focus, and balancing the fiduciary duty of the agency to be good stewards of public dollars with the need to make those dollars stretch as far as they can.

Jill Sherman, Gerding Edlen Development, provided one last comment for consideration regarding developer fees associated with affordable housing deals. She acknowledged that developer fees are often high, and that high developer fees are a contributing factor in the cost of affordable housing, Sherman encourages the Department to look at the fee in a broader context before implementing new restrictions. She further cautioned the Department to guard against unintended consequences (e.g. negatively impacting non-profit developers). Chair Dickson suggested that there may be a way to determine reasonable developer fees based on the cost of a project and the cost to operate.

## CSBG State Plan Application Overview

Claire Seguin, OHCS Assistant Director for Housing Stabilization provided Council members with a brief overview of the Community Services Block Grant (CSBG) program. OHCS receives an allocation of approximately \$5 million per year, 90 percent of that allocation is passed through to Community Action Agencies (CAAs). OHCS partners with the Community Action Partnership of Oregon (CAPO) to provide training, technical, and communications assistance. The remaining ten percent is split between administration and discretionary funding sources.

The Department has convened an ad hoc CSBG workgroup to work through several program and policy changes to the CSBG program. Due to all of the changes taking place, the agency has decided to implement a one-year state plan rather than the traditional two-year plan; over the course of the year staff will:

- Evaluate, in more detail, all of the implications of program changes; and
- Develop an effective, systems- approach to deploying CSBG funds, which includes identified outcome measures and alignment opportunities to maximize leveraging of public funds.

CSBG funds are utilized to support local services related to employment, education, income-management, housing, emergency services, nutrition linkages, self-sufficiency, and health programs; these wide variety of CSBG-funded programs generate a lot of success stories.

Madrigal informed Council that the Stability Initiative is the CSBG program in Multnomah County and Action for Prosperity is their CAA partner. These programs are a combination of work for training,

---

housing assistance, and benefits coordination. Madrigal shared three success stories with the Council to highlight the important work of the CSBG program.

### **Questions and Discussion**

Tammy Baney asked a question regarding the fact sheet presented, specifically if the percentage of Oregonians shown as both “served” and “in poverty” on the handout was an accurate reflection of the need in the community. She noted that she hoped federal partners could be made aware that the progress being made and accomplishments might actually not be nearly enough.

Chair Dickson asked if there is any news on how much of an allocation OHCS is expecting for next year’s budget, and Seguin replied that the Budget has not yet been released for CSBG. Chair Dickson asked what Council members can do to help advocate and support the need to make State and Federal agencies aware that while the CSBG has been successful, and that there needs to be much more assistance. Seguin answered that she will meet with National CSBG workgroup to determine the best way for the Council to engage.

Val Valfre showed appreciation for the stories that were shared and the outstanding work that has been done. He also mentioned the great work that the Community Warehouse has done with providing necessities to veterans.

### **Legislatively Adopted Budget Overview**

Caleb Yant, OHCS’ Chief Financial Officer discussed the Department’s Legislatively Adopted Budget and OHCS’ updated approach to forward allocating resources.

*The Summary of 2015-17 Legislatively Adopted Budget can be found on page 24 of the meeting packet by clicking [here](#).*

### **Questions and Discussion**

Tammy Baney asked how the agency captured limited duration (LD) positions and if there was a standard practice for how to utilize LD positions? Yant responded that several individuals were limited duration, most of whom were part of the Oregon Homeownership Stabilization Initiative. This federally funded program is winding down, so the number is being continuously reduced. All other OHCS positions are regular staff positions. Yant noted that OHCS only utilizes LD positions to staff programs that are temporary.

Chair Dickson asked that someone explain the CASA program. CASA, or Court Appointed Special Advocates, is for children involved in the child welfare system. CASA members are volunteers; they serve as case managers and the eyes and ears for the court, acting on behalf of the best interests of the child. Director Van Vliet informed the Council that CASA is a part of Oregon Volunteers, which was added to OHCS for administrative reasons many years ago. CASA and Oregon Volunteers both have separate boards appointed by the governor. The Legislature has asked that OHCS and Oregon Volunteers report in February 2016 with a plan for a permanent home for Oregon Volunteers.

Marissa Madrigal asked what the percentage of the “cut” positions noted in the budget slide was eliminated versus which ones were transitioned elsewhere. Yant answered that a large portion of that was the Oregon Homeownership Stabilization Initiative. There were 37 limited duration positions that went down to 10 in the 15-17 budget. The other significant portion represents administrative staff reductions within Central Services. Those reductions were made primarily through attrition.

---

## **Forward Allocation Framework Update**

Caleb Yant, OHCS Chief Financial Officer updated the Council on the Department's progress since the initial forward-allocation conversation in March, during which the Council approved a substantially larger amount for multifamily funding awards than had been approved in previous years. The department has begun to commit anticipated future receipts of ongoing revenue sources such as the document recording fee, rather than wait for revenue to be received prior to making the funding available.

By tracking the funding streams, the reports outline the performance and availability of all funds. They provide the Department with visibility and accountability regarding what each funding stream is being used to pay for, ensure accountability for the spend down rate of each funding stream, and ensure staff members across the agency understand available and committed cash balances.

Tracking and projections of program expenses are reports that provide transparency and predictability to the true cost of running each program regardless of the source of funding used to pay for the costs. The true costs consist of expenses directly charged to a program or any shared cost that is allocated to a program. These reports track any subsidization received in programs and the type of funding used to provide the subsidization. They also forecast future costs, anticipated subsidization, and specify the funding that will be used to provide the needed subsidization.

## **Questions and Discussion**

Tammy Baney stated that in term of reserves, dollars are a direct service and those services need to get to the ground as soon as possible. She asked if it can be explained how some of the funding streams have restrictions in terms of what the reserves seem to be?

Yant replied that some money goes out the door that comes back in through repayments or through some other avenue, and as a result are very flexible dollars. Director Van Vliet explained also that there are times when a project has unanticipated costs. It's important to hold back enough funds in the event that there are issues that arise. The system, under Caleb's leadership, in which the program managers can have real time information to understand clearly what's happening, is very important to running things smoothly.

Val Valfre asked if there is a matrix for the Council to see that will show whether or not the predictability is prudent and to see if in the next year there will be cut backs because the agency has been too generous in predicting revenue. Yant responded that the agency is being fairly conservative in its projections, and will be tracking the accuracy of the projections.

## **2016 QAP Process Update and Discussion**

Julie Cody, Assistant Director of Housing Finance and Mark Shelburne from Novogradac and Company LLP presented regarding the 2016 QAP. Novogradac is working with OHCS to compare our Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) program with ten other states. Novogradac is also helping put together the draft for the 2016 Qualified Allocation Plan (QAP).

Agency staff is working hard to meet the aggressive timeline adopted to update the 2016 NOFA and QAP. The Department has held three stakeholder roundtables thus far, including with lenders and investors, 4% LIHTC stakeholders, and participating jurisdictions. The meeting for 9% LIHTC stakeholders will be on the 18<sup>th</sup> of September.

The QAP will be presented during the October State Housing Council meeting with a recommendation that the document be released for a 30-day public comment period at that time.

Cody responded to several points from the Meyer Memorial Trust presentation. OHCS has received

---

feedback about the number of NOFA offerings released per year, including the suggestion that we offer multiple LIHTC offerings in one year. Currently, with one round of LIHTC funding, the agency is able to fund ten or eleven projects per year. In order to do more than one LIHTC NOFA offering per year, the agency would put out a very small offering, and would have to reserve funding for another round. From Cody's point of view, having 30 projects coming after half the money and then trying once again doesn't make much sense. Currently, if the agency were to receive credits back in any given year, the additional credits could be utilized. However, considering the work it takes to issue a NOFA, awarding only five projects doesn't seem to be a good solution.

Regarding cost containment, in 2014 a measurement was added that looked back five years at the cost of the different projects in each region. If the project was outside the cost parameters, the applicant had to provide an explanation of additional cost drivers. The agency is eager to see the final recommendations from the Meyer Memorial Trust report.

**The QAP Policy Questions PowerPoint is available on the State Housing Council website under September 11, 2015 meeting handouts and presentations or by clicking [here](#).**

### **Local Priorities - Letter of Support**

**Stakeholder Input:** Competing priority letters are problematic; the current process may disadvantage rural/smaller communities; local priority letters may be used to discourage affordable housing in some communities.

### **Question for Council Input**

Should OHCS continue the practice of Local Priority Letters as it currently stands, or should there be a different way to ensure that projects with scarce federal dollars awarded by local jurisdictions receive preference in some other way? Or should the concept of local priorities be removed from the NOFA process?

### **Discussion**

Local priority letters were added to the NOFA to align OHCS funding with local planning efforts. Currently, the process can result in multiple number one priorities in the same local area. Director Van Vliet explained that multiple applications come from different communities within one county. She believes it would be helpful and in public interest to know if local communities have a preference. It would be beneficial to have a mechanism to ask local communities how they would advise the agency if more than one application is received from an area.

Tammy Baney believes it is the responsibility of the county to convene to discuss multiple applications without it becoming a "popularity contest." The discussion would need to be based on what the true needs are and what will be addressed. She appreciates that there has been a process to engage with local elected officials to ensure they are aware of local needs. Chair Dickson agreed with Baney that elected officials awareness is a high priority.

It was explained that in Washington County, it is a consortium of many cities that are involved in making the decision of the prioritization of their interests. Baney added that both urban and rural areas don't have enough money to meet the great need they have for more affordable housing. Conversations within a community need to take place to determine the main priorities and decide what is best for the population.

Mark Shelburne of Novogradac agreed that it makes sense within a jurisdiction to ask certain decision makers which application is a better fit for the community needs. He did caution that complaints could

---

be made from developers that are on the losing end of the process. Director Van Vliet stated there will always be those who have issues with a decision due to them simply having not received funding.

Chair Dickson advised that at the end of the day when it comes to determining points, it is how the funds are allocated and the impact of the amount of points that are allocated for certain preferences. The biggest concern is if a project is significantly uplifted in one category and brings the score down for others.

Cody also noted that during the process of providing feedback to sponsors whose projects were not funded, the agency did hear that local jurisdictions are looking for more information and direction, and as a result, letters of support may not be written by local jurisdictions without experience or capacity. Council members questioned whether a more regional government like a county government would be a more effective place to have these conversations.

It was asked what would happen if more than one letter was received from a consortium and from a city, but projects were ranked differently. Cody replied that if a letter from the county or consortium was received as well as a letter from a city where both parties were number one priorities but different projects then they would both receive full points. One project isn't given an advantage over the other.

### **HOME Funding Preference**

Stakeholders have suggested that instead of, or in addition to, a local priority letter OHCS should provide a preference to projects that have an award of participating jurisdiction (PJ) funds, similar to the points given to projects in the balance of state that request HOME funds. Julie Cody presented this question to the Council for their input.

### **Discussion**

Julie Cody believes that both local funding and participating jurisdictions should be looked at together due to different ways in which there are consortiums in a number of non-metro and metro regions. The question is whether this would be a place where preference or points could be given to projects leveraging tax credits with locally controlled funds.

### **Preferences - Qualified Census Tract (QCT) / Low Poverty Census Tract**

Stakeholders have commented that the 4 points available for projects located in a QCT or Low Poverty Census Tract disadvantages rural Oregon, given that rural communities lack either type of census tract. Julie Cody noted that this has played a larger role than previous years in determining projects that were funded. The Council was asked whether OHCS should look at different ways to preference opportunity areas and/or QCTs that are within specific revitalization plans, and should the number of points currently awarded be revised.

### **Discussion**

Chair Dickson asked that staff revisit this scoring component.

### **Preferences – Other Federal Preferences**

Stakeholders have asked OHCS to reconsider points given to two federal preferences that are rarely utilized. The Council should consider whether there are other ways that OHCS could utilize the federal preferences within its selection criteria.

### **Discussion**

Julie Cody explained that there is a cap on the number of tax credits that are put into the competitive process on a per-project basis. Right now, the cap is \$890,000 tax credits a year for ten years. This currently builds approximately 48 to 50 units, which may not be the most efficient size of projects. Research shows that 70 to 80 units would be an appropriate target of units built, which would

---

require an increase to the cap. The trade-off would be that fewer projects would be funded. It was asked whether there would be an adverse impact on rural areas. It was noted that the impact on rural areas would be negligible because it will not necessarily change the scale of those projects. This issue affects metro area projects where there is a higher cost for land and a greater need for services.

Councilor Madrigal noted that given the state of the housing crisis in Oregon, the Council should consider prioritizing the development of more units, and work to mitigate the impact on rural areas. Shelburne pointed out that when there is a limited resource such as tax credits, all decisions have trade-offs. He noted that one thing to consider is that in this case, eight projects would likely end up funded, rather than ten, which we can currently fund with the cap.

### **Basis Boost**

Stakeholders requested that OHCS offer a pre-application process to help applicants understand whether or not they would qualify for a basis boost. The Council is asked for their input on how OHCS could provide more certainty of whether or not a project qualifies for a basis boost, and how a basis boost would be seen in relation to increasing or eliminating 9% LIHTC per project cap.

### **Discussion**

Julie Cody explained that the state has the ability to do a basis boost inside the QAP. There are areas which have a high cost to develop that are allowed the basis boost. They receive credits up to 130% of what the costs are, instead of 100%. There are other ways for the state to be able to use other policy directives to do this. One of the issues that stakeholders noted is that the criteria wasn't clear enough to know whether they've met the requirements, and as a result would apply for a project assuming they would receive a basis boost. The Department is considering a prequalification process for the basis boost.

### **Affordability Period**

OHCS is considering making changes to the 60 year affordability period. OHCS is interested in a way to participate in discussions about the future of the project, although the Department would like to structure the period such that there is an ability to make changes to the terms and affordability of the units at certain points. OHCS also recognizes that the useful life of most apartment projects is 30 years, and after that projects need substantial recapitalization. Rent levels set in the beginning may not be financially feasible for 60 years, so there should be an opportunity to review those at year 30. In the case of OAHTCs, the subsidy is only available for 20 years and therefore the requirement to pass through savings to the tenant in the form of lower rents should not be required after year 20.

The Council is being asked whether OHCS should modify its Affordability Periods on its various programs.

### **Social Equity**

#### **Stakeholder Feedback**

Julie Cody described elements within the current scoring criteria that touch on social equity. OHCS is working on ways to directly address social equity in the application process (i.e. asking applicants to be more descriptive of their marketing plans to ensure those plans are considering the demographics of a particular project location).

Natasha Detweiler provided information to the Council about how OHCS is using the practices employed by other states to help Oregon build a more robust approach to social equity during the

---

application process. OHCS will use the information from these other states to assist in the creation of the criteria and scoring for applications for projects in Oregon.

### Discussion

Director Van Vliet recognized that there is a lot of interest to be more aggressive when scoring for social equity. Through marketing outreach, OHCS believe they can drive social equity in an intentional way. The Director suggested using both place-based and people-based strategies to consider and formulate feedback.

Zee Koza asked staff for more information on people-based approaches (i.e. health outcomes, educational outcomes, and socioeconomic outcomes) in addition to census tract data. The use of this additional data may shed light on racial and ethnic disparities as well.

Tammy Baney asked if there have been any lessons learned or ideas of ways other states have addressed this.

Mark Shelburne stated that the Council would benefit from further defining exactly what you mean by social equity and what you are going to look for. The people-based aspect is pretty clear. The basic concept is marketing to those who are the less likely to apply based on their protected categories. The only question is how often does that type of marketing happen, and what forms does it take. The place-based questions are intensely complex and varied, so just using the phrase social equity, raises about a hundred issues/questions.

OHCS is committed to bring the topic of Social Equity back to the Council for further discussion.

### **Resident Services**

#### Stakeholder Feedback

OHCS has received a large amount of feedback on the topic of Resident Services. Some of the key themes from the feedback are:

Rural projects not scoring as well as urban projects, due in part to the lack of robust service providers in the rural areas of Oregon. This may lead to a diminished ability to compete with larger communities.

Some key questions OHCS may want to consider: What outcomes are we trying to achieve by requiring resident services? Can desired outcomes be clearer in their application so developers know if a project is going to score well?

What about allowing for above-the-line operating expenditures to be used for services? If above-the-line operating expenditures are not allowed it may be why we see a number of projects that offer more referral-based services versus actually providing the services on site.

Are there certain target populations that we want certain services for? OHCS Staff want to get more thoughts from the Council on resident services. What services should be offered? How should the services be delivered? Please let the OHCS staff know what your thoughts are about resident services.

### Discussion

*Chair Dickson* - resident services depend on the target population. Most projects have a clear need for resident services, and it could be good for OHCS to reconsider how services are incorporated into the deal-structuring. From the side of the "funder" Chair Dickson would like to see resident services above-the-line especially if it is an important part of the development. He expressed concern for projects where resident services are a vital component but not included in the above-the-line operating budget.

---

Chair Dickson is also concerned with the method of utilizing memorandums of understanding (MOUs) with the partners which are not examined by the Council. The Chair wants to take a closer look at how services are funded to determine service sustainability. How is the service provider funding resident services? Are resident services simply a one-year commitment? These variables should be factored into any decision made by the Council.

We know that in Portland, the cost of moderate housing is climbing. Housing projects should not be discounted just because they don't have a glamorous social service component. Chair Dickson suggests looking at the details of the deal to determine if resident services are vital to any given project. If the answer is yes, then making sure funds are available is vital. Having the knowledge of the funding model for resident services for any given project would be useful information to have.

*Director Van Vliet* added her thoughts on resident services: The developers are responsible for resident services, but the community is providing services. Projects need to show a linkage to the services between the developer and the community service providers.

Workforce housing: The needs of this population would be very different from housing for families. The point is to make sure that people are getting their needs met, and that agencies within the state of Oregon are looking at bringing services to the clients. Resident services are not an unfunded mandate for a developer. We are asking for a coordinated effort between the developers and the community service providers to ensure the needs of the population served by a particular project are met.

This topic will be addressed again in future Council meetings to ensure all members are fully informed. OHCS will begin developing a scoring system which addresses resident services. Julie Cody will reach out to Mike Fieldman to get his feedback since he was unable to attend and has expressed a particular interest in the resident services discussion.

Chair Dickson thanked Mark Shelburne for his commitment and time spent.

Julie Cody wrapped up the discussion with an overview of the process timeline:

- The final stakeholder roundtable will be held on September 18, 2015 at OHCS.
- Staff are targeting September 23, 2015 for the best draft QAP that will be in your packet for the October meeting.

OHCS Director Van Vliet asked for any additional comments on this topic from those present in the room.

### **Additional Public Comment**

**Shelly Cullin:** Shelly Culling spoke about concerns over the local priority letters. She suggested considering treating acquisition rehab projects different than new construction projects. If an affordable project that already exists needs additional funding then they receive different points than a new project. She would like to see that resident services is not part of the competitive process but that OHCS has to approve a resident services plan after the project has been awarded funding and discussions with local partners have begun.

**Stacy Howard:** Stacey Howard is interested in the local preference for affordable housing, but is concerned that some of the conversations need facilitation. She would like to see more "Housing Integrators" return to the work that the Regional Advisors to the Department filled, and help plan projects more, and guide local planning efforts.

### **Report of the Director**

---

Director Van Vliet gave the Council an update on the LIFT program, and its subcommittees. The Policy and the Financial Structuring Subcommittees will advise OHCS and the State Housing Council regarding the \$40 million. The subcommittees met for the first time, and the goal is to complete the necessary work in four, three hour meetings. The subcommittees will then report back to the Council in February.

The Legislature also committed \$20 million for new housing for people with mental health and addictions issues. This work is being coordinated by OHCS and the Oregon Health Authority (OHA). OHA will be leading stakeholder engagement, and thinking about the client populations that are most in need of housing.

The Consolidated Plan, a five year planning document is moving forward. This fall the Council will hear about the comprehensive needs assessment and market analysis. Zee Koza and Val Valfre participate on the stakeholder committee for this work.

The Housing Council will become the Housing Stability Council on January 1, 2016. Two new members who will be appointed by the Governor will take place after the first of the year, and confirmed by the Senate in February. Director Van Vliet will attend the grand opening of a new Housing Works project, East Village 2, in Bend. The Veteran's Housing NOFA and Gap NOFA have closed and will be presented for approval Council in December.

The Single Family section has an RFA for Down Payment Assistance for first time homebuyers in the amount of \$1 million. Housing Centers and homeownership partners are eligible to compete for the RFA. Also in the Single Family section, the agency recently sold bonds to provide \$75 million dollars in new Oregon Bond loan resources. In future meetings, the Council will hear an update on other potential single family mortgage products the Department could offer.

The Council's schedule for 2016 has been released, with plans to have the May meeting in Bend, and the October meeting in La Grande.

### **Report of the Chair**

Chair Dickson appreciates the opportunity to engage in and dig deeper into these issues. He's looking forward to the LIFT Subcommittee and is excited about the work ahead. He appreciates everyone in all the hard work that has been put in.

With no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:25 p.m.



---

Aubre Dickson, Chair  
Oregon State Housing Council

12/11/2015  
Date



---

Margaret S. Van Vliet, Director  
Oregon Housing and Community Services

12/11/2015  
Date