

LCDC Affordable Housing Work Group, 01/12/09

1. Pilot project options

- a. Rindy #1a: Simplified UGB amendment process for site all or partly dedicated to affordable housing. Includes swapping land for changing uses.
- b. Rindy #1b: Simplified UGB amendment process for site all or partly dedicated to affordable housing; site must be in designated urban reserve (? too limiting?).
- c. Other?
- d. LCDC/DLCD to develop Goal 10 further, as requirement for doing #1a or #1b; possible ideas to pursue (some easy/near term; others later)
 - i. Extend the Metropolitan Housing Rule (OAR 660, Division 007) mix and density requirements to rest of the state
 - ii. Goal 10: Strengthen its enforcement or expand its scope
 - iii. Metro Functional Plan, Title 7: Strengthen its enforcement or expand its scope
 - iv. Winterrowd statutory and rule amendments to ORS 197.296, ORS 197.298 and OAR 660, Division 24
 - v. Require minimum density in medium density designated residential land to prevent it from being used for single family development (Winterrowd variations for cities w/ excess MDR; Medinger ideas?)
 - vi. Address phasing of developments, where developer “promises” to produce the required density in a later phase, but may not do so
 - vii. Doug Parker’s Goal 10 Safe Harbor
 - viii. UGB expansion for residential land must include a specified amount or percentage of land dedicated to affordable housing
 - ix. Audit existing local codes for impediments
 - A. Check list: Accessory units allowed, minimum density targets, SDC waiver, etc.
 - B. Clear and objective standards – or make directly applicable (impact on citizen involvement)
 - C. Amount of MDR
 - D. Location of MDR near services
 - x. Waive transportation SDC in transit corridors; other carrots for in-fill
 - xi. Require local gov’ts to allow accessory units in SFR zones
 - xii. Condition UGB expansion permission of city doing some of these
 - xiii. Mary Kyle/Chandler’s list of noncontroversial ideas

- xiv. Technical assistance team from DLCDC and OHCS to help local gov'ts review codes for housing impediments
- xv. California Housing Element Plan, other states: Fair share/regional planning, identify available AH sites, least cost housing/lowered building standards, mandatory IZ in urban renewal areas, density bonuses, trading of AH obligations, housing appeal boards (w/ reverse burden of proof for AH projects; allow corrections w/out remand; limit to vli?); AH projects allowed to bypass local gov't approval and go directly to state, attorney fees for denial of needed housing

2. Proposed criteria for determining nature of pilot project

- a. Does it actually produce affordable housing (for people at all income levels and including new manufactured home parks)? Includes infrastructure cost.
 - i. Alternatively stated: Does it encourage the private sector enough to make this idea happen? (Doug Parker: Does the program provide adequate incentives, clarity, and real measures of success to engage the housing marketplace to participate in the program?)
- b. What is its impact on cities? Does it work for them?
- c. What is its impact on rural resource lands?
- d. Is it replicable in cities of all sizes?
- e. Can we get group consensus on it? Is it politically acceptable?
- f. Is it legal?
- g. Does it include both public and private ownership approaches?
- h. Energy and transportation impacts?
- i. Can we ensure affordability long term and minimize burden of monitoring (rentals and homeowner units; re latter, equity recapture; address speculators)
- j. Require showing of affordable housing need
- k. What does AH mean (rentals at 60 percent or at 80 percent of AMI or below; homeowner units at 100 percent AMI or below)