



HOUSING PRIORITIES BY DEPARTMENT
January 2019

RESPONSIBILITY	DEPARTMENT PRIORITIES	HOW TO ACHIEVE THIS
Economic Development	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Access, ownership and asset building opportunities for our resident workforce. 2. Life-cycle housing programs that facilitate opportunities for young worker singles and families, mid-life upgrades and retirees to find, afford, and turn-over desirable housing. 3. Increase the number and mix of available units. 4. Work-force housing that is attainable to the local workforce, not built for and absorbed by Portland-bound commuters. 5. Policy and incentives for industrial-scale manufacturers like Freres, Modern Building Systems, and innovative builders to help with housing production. 6. Linkages for large employers like the school system and hospitals to provide work-force housing solutions. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Need land supply, infrastructure, creative financing tools, and local zoning and other governance work. 2. Create efficiencies along the value chain. For Freres, that means access to timber. They all will need workforce, so that means CTE training and livable (eg water, sewer, broadband) communities (eg canyon, Donald, Hubbard, Gervais, Jefferson). 3. Will need to provide usable information to the communities, incentives to both communities and businesses, and help for everyone involved do the regulatory work. 4. Avoid being trapped by the lower-end affordable housing conversations; it is important but will tend toward too narrow of a focus. We will need to avoid being trapped by the existing financing tools which are aimed at affordable housing. The missing middle housing doesn't have programs - we need to create some tools with partners. 5. Explore public and private land banking to maintain work-force housing options.
Health and Human Services	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Long-term sustainability for master leases to support individuals who are unable to obtain leases on their own. 2. Property owners/managers who are willing to give housing opportunities to individuals with poor rental histories (i.e. evictions/criminal history) 3. More availability for rental subsidies until individuals are able to receive housing vouchers AND a rental subsidy program for families with children with complex needs (behavioral health and I/DD) 4. Integration with employment readiness programs that support individuals to achieve true independence from systems. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreements with property owners./managers that give individuals with housing barriers equal access to available units, based on our ability to adequately support both the tenants and property owners. 2. Increased funding for rental subsidies with expanded eligibility criteria. 3. Development of employment programs that use a "Housing First" model. 4. Access to flex funds for move-in costs/fees.



HOUSING PRIORITIES BY DEPARTMENT
January 2019

<p align="center">Marion County Housing Authority</p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Expand traditional Project-Based Voucher program in order to supplement affordable housing development in rural Marion County and increase affordable housing options. Project base some VASH vouchers to expand options for homeless veterans. Build affordable housing in “the Canyon” for working-families. We hope that the community would be mixed-finance and serve households with varying incomes. Build affordable (possibly subsidized) housing in low-poverty, opportunity neighborhoods for families, seniors and/or persons with disabilities. 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> Work with MCHA board to set priorities. With HUD approval, issue an RFP to solicit landlords interested in using Project-Based Vouchers at their properties. Work with stakeholders to identify property, funding, and development partnerships. 																			
<p align="center">Sheriff’s Office</p>	<table border="1"> <thead> <tr> <th colspan="3" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">Transitional Housing</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #c0c0c0;">Model 1</th> <th style="background-color: #c0c0c0;">Model 2</th> <th style="background-color: #c0c0c0;">Model 3</th> </tr> <tr> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">All case types, all risk levels</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">All case types, high/med risk</th> <th style="background-color: #e0e0e0;">PPS only, high/med risk</th> </tr> </thead> <tbody> <tr> <td align="center"> 320 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 50 (gap)/ month </td> <td align="center"> 288 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 18 (Gap)/ month </td> <td align="center"> 238 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 32 extra beds/month </td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center"> 50 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$18,500.00 </td> <td align="center"> 18 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$6,660.00 </td> <td align="center"> 0 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$0.00 </td> </tr> <tr> <td align="center" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;"> Overall funding gap: \$18,500.00 </td> <td align="center" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;"> Overall funding gap: \$6,660.00 </td> <td align="center" style="background-color: #e0e0e0;"> Overall funding gap: \$0.00 </td> </tr> </tbody> </table> <p>NOTE 1: In 2017, 1,253 clients were scheduled to go through intake. Of those clients, 320 (26%) were identified as homeless. From January - October 2018, 1,062 clients were scheduled to go through intake. Of those clients 247 (24%) were identified as homeless.</p> <p>NOTE 2: Intake-1145 unit codes someone as homeless if the client is transient, couch hopping, or living in a</p>			Transitional Housing			Model 1	Model 2	Model 3	All case types, all risk levels	All case types, high/med risk	PPS only, high/med risk	320 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 50 (gap)/ month	288 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 18 (Gap)/ month	238 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 32 extra beds/month	50 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$18,500.00	18 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$6,660.00	0 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$0.00	Overall funding gap: \$18,500.00	Overall funding gap: \$6,660.00	Overall funding gap: \$0.00
Transitional Housing																					
Model 1	Model 2	Model 3																			
All case types, all risk levels	All case types, high/med risk	PPS only, high/med risk																			
320 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 50 (gap)/ month	288 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 18 (Gap)/ month	238 (2017 “need”) - 270 (capacity) = 32 extra beds/month																			
50 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$18,500.00	18 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$6,660.00	0 (additional beds needed) X \$370.00 (average cost) = \$0.00																			
Overall funding gap: \$18,500.00	Overall funding gap: \$6,660.00	Overall funding gap: \$0.00																			



HOUSING PRIORITIES BY DEPARTMENT
January 2019

shelter/transition house and is not paying their own rent (i.e., P&P is subsidizing, client is receiving rental assistance through ATR, etc.).

NOTE 3: All models assume bed availability at transitional housing. However, due to some clients staying in housing for extended periods, there are not always beds available. The majority of CC clients are not referred for subsidized housing by the intake unit- a 10% random sample of the homeless clients identified by intake shows that 65% of these clients are referred to shelter housing (UGM/Simonka) by intake staff.

- Includes all housing options from our 2015 survey as well as New Options, Shelly’s House and Oxford House; but does not include Greer St (while we can subsidize there, residents must be in good standing in another UGM program and referred by UGM staff, so not included in total).
- The biggest increase in capacity from 2015 is the inclusion of Oxford House (141 beds).
- Model 3 is comparable to the 2015 survey. Although this model reflects no gap in beds (which may be a little misleading) as all models assume bed availability at our transitional housing options. However, due to some clients staying in housing for extended periods, there are not always beds available. As of 11/9/2018, across all of the Oxford houses (141 beds), there were only 2 vacancies.
- Model 2 is most representative of a true need; we are short about 18 transitional beds/month.
- This does not include the ongoing issue we have with people eligible for MC Housing vouchers but need/wish to stay within the Salem UGB.

Vendors Receiving Subsidy in 2017 & 2018	# of Beds	%
Reformation Outreach Ministries	1	0.3%
Salvation Army	1	0.3%
Grace House	7	2.3%
Shelly’s House	24	7.8%
New Options	33	10.8%
Oxford (all houses)	39	12.7%
Bridges to Change	43	14.1%
Restoration House	158	51.6%