

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

421 South Water Street and Zoom Web Conference Platform

November 21, 2023, 6:31 p.m.

I. CALL TO ORDER, PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE AND ROLL CALL

Chair Freilinger called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m. The task force members and staff were present both in person and through the virtual meeting platform Zoom, consistent with House Bill 2560.

Present	Excused	
X		Jason Freilinger {Chairman}
X		Dana Smith
X		Karyssa Dow
X		Laurie Chadwick
X		Sarah White
X		Gene Oster
	X	Barbara Rivoli
X		Hilary Dumitrescu
	X	Rebecca Delmar
		Ray Teasley
	X	Clay Flowers {Planning Commission Rep.}

Staff Present:

Community Development Director, Jason Gottgetreu.

II. APPROVAL OF MINUTES:

Member Smith moved to approve the minutes from the October 17, 2023, meeting, Member Dumitrescu seconded the motion, and it passed unanimously.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT: There were no comments.

IV. DISCUSSION/ACTION:

4.1 Affordable Housing Development – Westfield Site RFP Discussion: City of Hood River RFP Example Review.

Director Gottgetreu relayed the Request For Qualifications (RFQ) was sent to thirteen affordable housing developers in October. Director Gottgetreu summarized the RFQ and submittal requirements and stated the deadline for response is December 12, 2023; this will result in discussion for the upcoming December AHTF meeting. Director Gottgetreu stated the upcoming processes and schedules after the RFQ and moved forward with the Request For Proposals (RFP) phase of the project.

Member Smith requested clarification on the process for reviewing the RFQs for the December meeting.

1
2 Director Gottgetreu provided the process for the RFQ submittal.
3

4 Director Gottgetreu continued to provide the committee with the process for the RFQ; they then
5 moved on to iterate detailed schematics for the Request For Proposals (RFP). The conceptual
6 design submittal for the RFP was given to ensure the committee understood the next steps of the
7 development process.
8

9 Member White and Member Smith discussed requiring an abundance of conceptual drawings to
10 ensure cohesive development. Potential frivolity from such was considered, if not accepted by
11 the public; fidelity to original design would not be obtainable if the public was unaccepting.
12

13 Director Gottgetreu stated the typical process for a design review with a RFQ and presentation to
14 the Planning Commission.
15

16 Member White spoke about past projects with design review and stated they would like to see a
17 broad spectrum of options.
18

19 Director Gottgetreu offered strategy to obtain a developer that meets preferred architectural
20 design.
21

22 Member Oster stated they believe it important to focus on how a developer will utilize the
23 property in contrast to aesthetic design taking on precedent.
24

25 Director Gottgetreu proceeded with presenting the Committee with alternatives for the
26 interworking's of the program for the site. This included, but was not limited to, preferred
27 number of units, unit types, affordability, and amenities. The conceptual financial analysis (Pro
28 Forma) of the RFP was relayed including request for identification of proposed sources of local,
29 State, Federal or public funding. Moving on, Director Gottgetreu went over the deal structure
30 and finance portion of the RFP.
31

32 Member Oster and Director Gottgetreu discussed the financial portion of the RFP and how
33 developers may relay their potential to obtain funding. The competitive nature of the RFP was
34 then considered with process to ensure the developer received funding and had a contingency
35 plan for funding.
36

37 Member Smith stated they believe the decision-making process will be pertinent on the track
38 record of a developer obtaining funding and having contingency funding options from previous
39 projects.
40

41 The Committee and Director Gottgetreu discussed contingency funding and general funding
42 options for developers. They then went over additional requirements to include in the RFP. The
43 Committee considered the possibility of Marion County Housing Authority [MCHA]
44 involvement in the RFP.
45

1 Director Gottgetreu continued with the RFP presentation displaying the conceptual timeline
2 portion of the document with potential requisites.
3
4 Member Smith and Member Dumitrescu lightly discussed the potential time constraint for
5 developers from fund receipt to final development.
6
7 The recommended public outreach and engagement process was then elucidated by Director
8 Gottgetreu. They displayed the environmental energy and sustainability provision with the caveat
9 of whether the provision was a necessity.
10
11 The Committee discussed the potential for requiring environmental energy and sustainability and
12 whether it would assist in additional grant funding or be a financial burden.
13
14 The presentation progressed to whether the developer had any concerns, generally, Director
15 Gottgetreu stated, this would be related to infrastructure and System Development Charges
16 [SDCs].
17
18 Member Smith inquired about the wetland assessment for the Westfield property.
19
20 Director Gottgetreu relayed the assessment was in progress.
21
22 A potential process schedule for the RFP was displayed with a conceptual timeline of six to eight
23 weeks from release to proposal acceptance.
24
25 The Committee and Director Gottgetreu discussed additional items to add to the RFP.
26
27 **REPORTS AND COMMUNICATIONS:**
28 The next meeting will be December 19, 2023.
29
30 Member Smith relayed Square One Villages would be holding an open house, they offered
31 information about the event.
32
33 Director Gottgetreu informed the Committee of questions he had received from developers
34 regarding the RFQ and development.
35
36 **V. ADJOURNMENT:**
37 The meeting adjourned at **7:26pm**
38 /s/ Cleone Cantu, Planning and Permit Assistant.