



**CITY OF SILVERTON – AFFORDABLE HOUSING TASK FORCE  
MEETING**

Silverton Community Center  
421 S. Water Street

**Tuesday, May 28, 2019 – 8:30 a.m.**

**AGENDA**

- I. Call to Order, Pledge of Allegiance and Roll Call**
- II. Approval of Minutes** – Minutes from the meeting held on Tuesday, April 30, 2019
- III. Public Comment** – Items not on this Agenda
- IV. Discussion/Action**
  - 4.1 Continue to discuss zoning standards and how they could facilitate affordable housing**
- V. Adjournment**

*A copy of the packet and materials is available for review Monday through Friday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm in the City Manager's Office at the Silverton City Hall, located at 306 South Water Street. All documents will be available on our website at [www.silverton.or.us](http://www.silverton.or.us).*

*AMERICANS WITH DISABILITIES ACT (A.D.A.): The City of Silverton intends to comply with the A.D.A. The meeting location is accessible to individuals needing special accommodations such as a sign language interpreter, headphones, or other special accommodations for the hearing impaired. To participate, please contact the City Clerk at 503-874-2216 at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.*

1 CITY OF SILVERTON  
2 **AFFORDABLE HOUSING TASK FORCE MINUTES**

3 **Silverton Community Center – Council Chambers – 421 South Water St.**

4  
5 **April 30, 2019, 8:30 a.m.**

6  
7 **I. CALL TO ORDER**

8  
9 Chairman Kyle Palmer called the meeting to order at 8:30 a.m.

10  
11

Present	Absent	
X		Kyle Palmer
X		Dana Smith
X		Jason Freilinger
X		Sarah DeSantis ( <i>arrived at 8:46 am</i> )
X		Harry Douglass
X		Kari Johnsen
X		Bonnie Logan
	Excused	Laurie Chadwick
X		Sarah White ( <i>arrived at 8:32 a.m.</i> )
X		David Goldblatt
X		Gene Oster
X		Terry Caster
X		Molly Ainsley ( <i>arrived at 8:44 a.m.</i> )

12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27 Staff Present:

28 Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu and Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk, Angela  
29 Speier

30  
31 **II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

32 Member Freilinger moved to approve the minutes from the April 9, 2019 meeting as presented. Member  
33 Caster seconded the motion. The motion passed 9-0 with Chairman Palmer abstaining.

34  
35 **III. PUBLIC COMMENT** – None received.

36  
37 **IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION**

38  
39 **4.1 Continuum of Care Presentation – Jan Calvin, Program Coordinator, Mid-Willamette Valley  
40 Council of Governments (MWVCOG)**

41 Jan Calvin explained why the MWVCOG is involved in the Continuum of Care (CoC). They got involved  
42 almost two years ago because of the Mid-Willamette Valley Homeless Initiative being formed with Marion  
43 and Polk Counties and the cities of Salem and Keizer. Through this Initiative a strategic plan was formed  
44 and the participants agreed to move forward on certain issues requiring one staff position to serve as the  
45 coordinator in order to move the strategic plan forward. Being it was a regional issue they approached the  
46 MWVCOG and they agreed to host the position with funding coming from the Initiative. The position was  
47 hired with three major issues on their work plan. The first was to create a money map to assess the  
48 amount of federal dollars coming into the region related to housing and homelessness, it was discovered  
49 that the region brings in \$107 million dollars annually and of that \$1 million is from the Continuum of Care.  
50 A resource map was also created, mapping 550 different agencies, organizations, and programs that deal  
51 with housing and homelessness. The third work plan item was to address if there should be a different  
52 approach to the CoC which is HUD mandated. The first step in creating a new design for the CoC is to  
53 ascertain if that is the will of the jurisdictions in the region.

1 Ms. Calvin explained that HUD has mandated the CoC since 1994 and that CoC's are required to submit  
2 a single, comprehensive application for federal financial support under the McKinney-Vento Homeless  
3 Assistance Act. HUD's intent was to stimulate community-wide planning. The CoC has two main  
4 purposes: 1) to develop multi-year strategic planning for homeless programs and services and; 2) prepare  
5 a competitive grant application. Ms. Calvin explained how federal funding is allocated and the structure of  
6 CoC's. A CoC can be a city, county, region (at least two counties), or a balance of state. Currently in  
7 Oregon there are five single county structures, one regional, and the balance of state includes 28  
8 counties. Marion, Polk, and Yamhill counties are currently part of the balance of state. She reviewed the  
9 advantages and disadvantages of the balance of state approach. In 2011, Marion and Polk counties did  
10 have a regional CoC that was managed by the Mid-Willamette Valley Community Action Agency. HUD  
11 formed new rules in 2011 and the Community Action Agency was not equipped to handle them at the  
12 time and they decided to join the balance of state continuum of care or the Regional Oregon Continuum  
13 of Care (ROCC). She explained the ROCC is administered by Community Action Partnership of Oregon  
14 (CAPO) and has two designated staff.

15  
16 Ms. Calvin reviewed the reasons why the regional approach is being pursued; including, an increase in  
17 homelessness, a growing public awareness, currently there is not one designated entity doing  
18 coordinated planning with many programs providing services, capacity and performance issues with  
19 Continuum of Care, and resource reductions to Marion and Polk County over the past eight years. Ms.  
20 Calvin introduced Jimmy Jones, Executive Director of the Community Action Agency in Salem. He  
21 explained that his specialty is the design and construction of coordinated entry systems for the homeless  
22 population in the ROCC region. He explained the difficulty of statewide coordination due to the  
23 geographical make-up of the state. CoC's are funded on a competitive basis nation-wide and the ROCC  
24 has not been very competitive, because it lacks in the area of data management and performance.

25  
26 Ms. Calvin explained that the ROCC ranks ninth in the nation's CoC with the largest number of homeless  
27 people and tenth in the number of chronically homeless individuals. She reviewed the funding history  
28 prior to the joining the ROCC and after joining. Since 2012, the funding allocation for Marion and Polk  
29 counties has decreased and is down to about 21 percent of the ROCC total allocation. The region has not  
30 only declined in total real dollar, but has also as a percentage in the State's overall grant allocation. Mr.  
31 Jones reviewed the CoC dollars per person based on the point-in-time count and the ROCC received  
32 \$548.99 per person, whereas the individual county CoC's in Oregon received a much higher amount.  
33 Lane County is getting nearly \$2,400 per person from HUD to deal with homelessness in their community.

34  
35 Ms. Calvin reviewed four policy questions with the Task Force.

36  
37 Policy Question #1: Should the region establish its own CoC?

38 Ms. Calvin reviewed the reasons already established, including: money, planning, coordination, and  
39 autonomy. Mr. Jones explained that if nothing changes with the way things are funded now, that  
40 homelessness will continue to get worse. He sees this as a public health issue with the government being  
41 primarily responsible and needing to hold the providers accountable. This will lead to better resource  
42 outcomes. He also explained why creating a substructure within the ROCC would not be possible.

43  
44 Policy Question #2: What organizational structure is recommended for a new CoC?

45 Should the region be Marion and Polk counties or should Yamhill also be included. The proposal is to  
46 have a coordinated unified funding agency; it could be the MWVCOG or some other entity. The federal  
47 dollars would go to the coordinated funding agency for disbursement. She reviewed the board  
48 requirements and explained that the CoC would have to prove the capacity with no conflict of interest.  
49 Currently there is a conflict of interest, because the providers are voting on who receives the program  
50 dollars. In other county CoC's this conflict does not occur. She reviewed the planning requirements. Mr.  
51 Jones reviewed the coordinated entry which ensures that all people experiencing a housing crisis have  
52 fair and equal access and are quickly identified, assessed, referred, and connected to housing and  
53 assistance, based on their strengths and needs. By using the coordinated entry approach agencies are  
54 ensuring that they are using resources in the smartest most efficient way. He explained how in the past  
55 agencies were spending money on the wrong clients and that the chronically homeless population needs  
56 to be served first. Those include individuals that will never be able to rehouse on their own due to

1 substance abuse and mental health needs. These are the individuals who are most costly to  
2 communities. The coordinated entry is used to get information about every person in the homeless  
3 community and they are assessed based on a vulnerability index and their demographics. Mr. Jones  
4 responded to a question about housing availability in the region and indicated that his agency has housed  
5 1,100 individuals in the last 20 months in 600 different units. He said that the voucher system does not  
6 work with the chronically homeless population. Ms. Calvin reviewed the accountability requirements for  
7 forming a CoC. Another requirement will be to select a lead organization to manage the CoC and the  
8 formats for that were reviewed as well as the staffing needs. The MWVCOG is also working to identify  
9 collaborative partnerships in the region.

10  
11 Policy Question #3: What changes would need to occur?

12 Ms. Calvin explained that the strategic planning would be different and would create a “go to” organization  
13 for the region with a focus on local issues within a regional context. She described how CoC’s operate in  
14 Lane and Clackamas County.

15  
16 Policy Question #4: What is the change process?

17 Ms. Calvin explained the steps in the process in order to apply for HUD funding in 2020. Documentation  
18 would need to be submitted to HUD establishing capacity as a new CoC by the end of 2019.

19  
20 Member Gene Oster asked if there is a downside if the City of Silverton decides not to participate in the  
21 Continuum of Care and if there are any costs involved with participating. The presenters explained that  
22 Marion County Board of Commission is waiting to hear feedback from the jurisdictions before moving  
23 forward. The money would still come into the CoC regardless of the decisions of the individual  
24 jurisdiction’s willingness to participate. The bigger downside is that the issue of homelessness is not  
25 going away and by participating with the rest of the region it will ensure that Silverton’s interests,  
26 concerns, and needs are being heard and concerns of rural homelessness are being weighed. Mr. Jones  
27 explained that the cost depends on who becomes the lead organization and how the staff positions are  
28 funded. Ms. Calvin explained how the current MWVCOG position is funded and it will be a choice of the  
29 jurisdictions to help fund or not.

30  
31 Member Sarah White, Executive Director of Silverton Sheltering Services explained that her organization  
32 is not seeing the benefit from the ROCC model and is supportive of moving in a regional direction,  
33 because Silverton’s voice would have a bigger impact at a smaller regional level.

34  
35 Member Dana Smith asked if some of the money received from HUD could be dedicated to more stable  
36 permanent housing solutions. Mr. Jones explained HUD funding has been targeted towards rental  
37 assistance situations, but if it becomes a point where those programs are funded adequately then more  
38 state dollars could be invested in acquiring permanent housing. This would be one way to ensure that  
39 resources are maximized. Having a better managed CoC will allow the region to attract other funding  
40 partnerships.

41  
42 Member Smith made a motion to move forward with the recommendation to withdraw from the statewide  
43 CoC and reorganize as a regional Continuum of Care. Member White seconded the motion. Member  
44 Oster asked if cities would be allowed to participate in both a regional CoC and a statewide CoC.  
45 Chairman Palmer said the City would belong to the statewide CoC until the regional CoC is formed and  
46 you cannot belong to both at the same time. Member Kari Johnsen said by participating through a smaller  
47 region Marion County will have access to more funding and there will be additional reporting standards  
48 that agencies will have to follow which will show greater due diligence in fund management. The motion  
49 passed unanimously and the recommendation will be forwarded to City Council at their May 6, 2019  
50 meeting.

51  
52 **4.2 Discuss zoning standards and how they could facilitate affordable housing**

53 Community Development Director Jason Gottgetreu reviewed the affordable housing strategies that have  
54 been discussed by the Task Force to-date. Including possible changes to the development code as it  
55 relates to ADU’s and alternative housing types such as courtyard apartments and cottage style  
56 developments.

1  
2 The next affordable housing approach Director Gottgetreu would like feedback on is a small lot form  
3 based approach with certain design standards. This would allow lots that are smaller than the minimum  
4 standard lot size in a subdivision. He reviewed the current standards for a single family lot. This approach  
5 would allow one lot to be split in half to allow for two smaller detached houses to be built on the site. It  
6 would be similar to a duplex, but they would be detached on their own separate lot. This creates more  
7 privacy and a greater sense of ownership. The setback would be three feet for a total of six feet between  
8 the structures. These setbacks would not require the construction to be fire rated. The rear yard would  
9 require a seven foot setback. The houses in this approach could be around 1,200 square feet with a one  
10 car garage. The Planning Commission viewed these as a duplex and recommended allowing them up to  
11 20 percent of a new subdivision. These would be allowed in new subdivisions only, because each  
12 dwelling unit would need their own water meter and sewer connection. Director Gottgetreu explained why  
13 this type of housing would likely not be allowed as infill development. Member Oster asked about  
14 decreasing the 7,000 foot minimum lot size. Director Gottgetreu said that is something that this Task  
15 Force could discuss in the future. He explained that system development charges (SDCs) would apply to  
16 both dwellings. The members discussed the designs and possible modifications; such as, building a  
17 carport instead of a garage and making the building footprint smaller to allow for more green space and  
18 affordability. There was consensus of the Task Force to pursue this code change.

19  
20 **ADJOURNMENT**

21  
22 Member Freilinger made a motion to adjourn the meeting and Chairman Palmer adjourned the meeting at  
23 10:02 a.m.

24  
25 Respectfully submitted by:

26  
27  
28 /s/Angela Speier, Assistant to the City Manager/City Clerk