

Portland State University

**PDXScholar**

---

Master of Urban and Regional Planning  
Workshop Projects

Nohad A. Toulan School of Urban Studies and  
Planning

---

6-8-2016

## Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan

Kaitlin Berger

*Portland State University*

Anna Dearman

*Portland State University*

Beth Gilden

*Portland State University*

Karen Guillén-Chapman

*Portland State University*

Jasmine Rucker

*Portland State University*

Follow this and additional works at: [https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp\\_murp](https://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_murp)



Part of the [Urban Studies Commons](#), and the [Urban Studies and Planning Commons](#)

**Let us know how access to this document benefits you.**

---

### Recommended Citation

Berger, Kaitlin; Dearman, Anna; Gilden, Beth; Guillén-Chapman, Karen; and Rucker, Jasmine, "Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan" (2016). Master of Urban and Regional Planning Workshop Projects. Paper 133. [http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp\\_murp/133](http://pdxscholar.library.pdx.edu/usp_murp/133)

This Report is brought to you for free and open access. It has been accepted for inclusion in Master of Urban and Regional Planning Workshop Projects by an authorized administrator of PDXScholar. Please contact us if we can make this document more accessible: [pdxscholar@pdx.edu](mailto:pdxscholar@pdx.edu).

# PATHWAY 1000 COMMUNITY HOUSING PLAN







## KEY PLANNING TEAM

---

**Kaitlin Berger: Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Analyst**

Kaitlin specializes in economic and environmental planning at PSU. She leads our GIS analysis and supports our community engagement strategy.

**Anna Dearman: Land Use Analyst**

Anna specializes in transportation planning at PSU and leads our site development opportunity analysis, supporting our GIS analysis.

**Beth Gilden: Project Manager**

Beth specializes in land use planning and has a certificate in real estate development at PSU. She leads our document design and production and supports the overall project and its products.

**Karen Guillén-Chapman: Data Analyst**

Karen specializes in environmental planning at PSU and leads our quantitative and qualitative data collection and analysis, in addition to supporting our document design and layout.

**Jasmine Rucker: Community Engagement Manager**

Jasmine specializes in community development and environmental planning at PSU. She leads our community outreach strategy and client communications.

**June 8, 2016**

# ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

---

## **Portland State University**

### **Nohad A. Toulan School of Urban Studies & Planning**

Marisa Zapata, Faculty Advisor

Ethan Seltzer, Faculty Advisor

Susan Hartnett, Advisor

Lisa Bates, Faculty Advisor

### **Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives (PCRI)**

Maxine Fitzpatrick, Executive Director

Whitney Shaw, Administrative Assistant

Andrea Debnam, Resident Services Manager

Travis Phillips, Director of Housing and Development

Debi Christensen, Senior Portfolio Manager

## **Community Partners**

Leslie Goodlow, Portland Housing Bureau

Matthew Tschabold, Portland Housing Bureau

Uma Krishnan, City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Nan Stark, City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Kevin Martin, City of Portland Bureau of Planning and Sustainability

Joy Davis, PAALF People's Plan

## **Community Experts**

Lakeitha Elliott, Self Enhancement, Inc.

John Washington, Flossin Media

Fawn Aberson, Flossin Media

Kimberly Porter, Black Parent Initiative

Charles McGee, Black Parent Initiative

Andre Ashley, Native Portlander

LaVerne Bagley Brown, Long-Time Portland Resident

Rev. T. Allen Bethel, Maranatha Church

Ken Doswell, N/NE Business Association

# CONTENTS

---

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

1 INTRODUCTION P. 1

2 HOUSING TYPES P. 9

3 FINDING 1000 UNITS P. 15

29 MODEL DEVELOPMENTS P. 29

45 EXECUTING THE VISION P. 45

TECHNICAL REPORT/APPENDIX

Housing prices in the City of Portland have risen dramatically in recent years. Over the past five years, average rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Portland has increased 35%, reaching \$1,472 per month, with overall average rent increasing 8–9% in 2015 alone. Housing affordability has become a critical issue for many Portland residents, but low income communities and communities of color in Northeast Portland have been especially hard hit as the market increase in housing costs exacerbate the dual pressures of gentrification and displacement these communities have already been facing.

The City of Portland has recognized the need for investment in affordable housing, as well as the need to rectify past damages that City policies have had on the African American community in Northeast Portland. The Portland Housing Bureau has recently allocated 20 million dollars to develop affordable housing within the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area in N/NE Portland, some of which will go towards housing specifically for those who have been displaced by past City actions. A few new affordable housing developments are already underway at the time of this report, but the city is currently in search of other sites for affordable housing development within the Northeast Portland area.

Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives (PCRI) has embarked on a mission to address the displacement of 10,000 residents over the past ten years through their Pathway 1000 initiative. Pathway 1000 aims to create 1,000 new affordable units for rent and homeownership over the next ten years. The following Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan outlines a pathway forward to accomplishing this endeavour of 1,000 new affordable units in N/NE Portland.

### **What is in the Plan**

The Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan sets out a strategy for providing affordable and stable homes as part of the Pathway 1000 initiative. The plan focuses mainly on housing development, but the recommendations also reflect a larger vision for the N/NE neighborhoods as an income inclusive, racially diverse, and welcoming community that celebrates its history as the center of African American culture in Portland.

### 1 INTRODUCTION

The introduction provides the necessary background to understand the unique history of African Americans in Portland and their connection to N/NE Portland neighborhoods specifically. It also affirms the great need for affordable housing and homeownership programs for the African American community.

### 2 HOUSING TYPES

Chapter two explores the housing preferences and values of the community and recommends that PCRI focus on “missing middle” housing types and infill development that is affordable, fits into the existing neighborhood, and reflects community preferences and values.

### 3 FINDING 1000 UNITS

Chapter three identifies the space for 1,000 new units in the study area of N/NE Portland, analyzing the potential within PCRI’s current real estate portfolio and identifying development capacity. This chapter also examines publicly-owned land and land owned by potential partners in the study in order to identify places and strategies for closing the gap to 1,000 units.

### 4 MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

Chapter four connects the proposed housing types with available sites within PCRI’s current ownership and provides examples of six different development scenarios. These “model” developments are intended to help PCRI create innovative approaches to maximizing capacity on similar sites.

### 5 EXECUTING THE VISION

Success for Pathway 1000 will require coordination with other organizations, whether it be the City of Portland which will help provide financial assistance to potential homeowners, or the private organizations which will provide stable jobs along with the new affordable housing. This chapter outlines what is required for PCRI to implement the future Pathway 1000 plan and achieve their goals for a thriving, welcoming community in N/NE Portland.





# 1 INTRODUCTION

---

## INTRODUCTION

---

### HISTORICAL CONTEXT

North and Northeast Portland, also known as the Albina District, is the historic center for the Black community in Portland. It is also an area that has experienced extensive displacement due to previous urban renewal practices and recent gentrification. Public works projects like the Interstate 5 Freeway, the Memorial Coliseum, and the expansion of Emanuel Hospital demolished thousands of homes from the 1950s to the 1970s. These actions, coupled with discriminatory lending practices and redlining, left many African American families in Portland unable to secure housing.

Action was finally taken when, in the fall of 1990, journalists from the *Oregonian* exposed these practices and the resulting tragedies (Lane & Mayes, 1990). One brokerage firm, Dominion Capital, Inc., was convicted of racketeering and fraud, but hundreds of families were still living in the firm's homes. Neighborhood and government leaders, and even the victimized families themselves, worked to create a solution. Together, they decided to form a non-profit organization that would acquire the endangered homes, help families secure conventional mortgages to buy their homes back, and retain the unsold properties as long-term affordable rentals—and Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives (PCRI) has been serving families in N/NE Portland ever since (PCRI, 2016).

### PORTLAND COMMUNITY REINVESTMENT INITIATIVES

For 20 years PCRI has reinvested in Portland's neighborhoods, preserving local diversity and providing tools to help low income families achieve stability and self-sufficiency. With over 800 units of affordable housing, PCRI's unique mix of single family homes, small multiplexes and apartments represents one of the last stable opportunities for low income households to remain in their vibrant N/NE Portland neighborhoods. PCRI's homes and apartments are woven into the fabric of these neighborhoods and are a model for eliminating concentrations of poverty in Portland.



*Aerial of NE Portland neighborhood (City of Portland Archives)*

“...the part of Portland famous for its livability—for charming shops and easy transit, walkable streets and abundant bike paths—increasingly belongs to affluent whites.”

—N. Hannah-Jones

## INTRODUCTION

---

### CURRENT CONDITIONS

The past two decades have seen major changes in demographics across Portland, but particularly in the Albina District. In 2000, for example, ten census tracts in Albina were majority Black; in 2010, there were none—after nearly 10,000 people of color (mostly Black) moved out (Hanna-Jones 2011). While significant disinvestment and poverty once plagued N/NE Portland, recent investments to improve the neighborhood and changes in the real estate market have made this area one of the most desirable places to live in the city.

Earlier in 2016, Portland Mayor Charlie Hales declared a housing state of emergency. There are insufficient housing options for low income residents, and homelessness is on the rise—and no one has felt these effects more acutely than Portland’s communities of color, particularly Portland’s Black community. According to the 2015 Multnomah Homeless count, Black or African American residents make up 24% of the homeless population, compared to just 7% of the general population, up from 20% in 2013 (Kristina Smock Consulting 2013, 2015).

A recent report from the Coalition of Communities of Color reported that 43% of Black households renting are paying over 50% of their income on housing, compared to 25% for White households. And 28% of Black households that own their homes are paying over 50% of their income on housing, compared to 12% of White households. This same report shows that fewer than one-third of African American households own their homes, compared to about 60% of white households in Multnomah County. And the data trends show that Black homeownership is on the decline: in 2000, Black homeownership in Multnomah County was over 37%, but as of the 2010 census, it was only 31% (Bates, Curry-Stevens 2014).



*Dawson Park on N Williams Avenue (Portland Parks)*

**“This is gentrification: fundamentally changing the character of neighborhoods as those with economic means and racial privilege outbuy existing residents. Unlike the days of bulldozers and red lines on black maps, it can be difficult to identify the actors on the scene.”**

**-Lisa Bates, PSU**

## INTRODUCTION

---

### PATHWAY 1000

The Pathway 1000 initiative is PCRI's response to the extensive housing inequality and displacement that has occurred in N/NE Portland neighborhoods since the 1990s. This initiative aims to "build and create at least 1,000 homes, many of which will be available to purchase" (PCRI, 2016). The aim is unique in its focus on mostly homeownership opportunities, as well as its preference policy for individuals who have been displaced to exercise their "right to return" to their former neighborhoods in N/NE Portland. Pathway 1000 sets an ambitious goal to create 1,000 new affordable housing units over the next ten years, with approximately 80% being available for purchase, as well as providing affordable commercial spaces for displaced businesses to return to.

### KEY PLANNING

Key Planning is a consulting team of graduate students from the Portland State University Master of Urban & Regional Planning program (MURP). In the winter of 2016, PCRI received a grant from Metro Regional Government to create an implementation plan for the Pathway 1000 initiative; through this grant, they identified tasks that could be completed with the Key Planning student team. From January–June 2016, the team set out to create a community-driven plan for PCRI to accomplish the housing goals of Pathway 1000. Key Planning has worked for six months to help lay the ground work for Pathway 1000, and the result is this Community Housing Plan that will set the stage for the first phase work on the comprehensive Pathway 1000 initiative.

### THE COMMUNITY HOUSING PLAN


The Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan focuses on development feasibility and site suitability in order to accomplish creating 1,000 new affordable housing units in N/NE Portland over the next ten years. To develop the plan, Key Planning has implemented a multi-pronged community engagement strategy, soliciting recommendations and feedback from local residents about housing and neighborhood preferences to inform the development recommendations in this document. This plan focuses mainly on housing development, but the recommendations also reflect a larger vision for the N/NE neighborhoods as an income inclusive, racially diverse, and welcoming community that celebrates its history as the center of African American culture in Portland.



*PCRI's 6th & Ainsworth townhouses (PCRI)*

# INTRODUCTION

## CHANGING DEMOGRAPHICS: % AFRICAN-AMERICAN POPULATION



Percent African American Population by Census Tract in N/NE Portland

IN THE EARLY 2000S AFRICAN AMERICANS WERE **TWICE AS LIKELY** TO RECEIVE SUBPRIME LOANS

AFRICAN AMERICAN HOMEOWNERS WHO PURCHASED A HOME IN THE 2000S WERE **50% MORE LIKELY** TO LOSE THEIR HOMES THAN WHITES IN A SIMILAR SITUATION

AVERAGE MEDIAN INCOME FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN FAMILIES IN PORTLAND: **\$27,923**

AVERAGE HOME PRICES IN N/NE PORTLAND: **\$330,000-\$390,000**

MONTHLY HOUSING COST CONSIDERED AFFORDABLE FOR BLACK FAMILIES: **\$698**

AVERAGE COST OF HOUSING IN N/NE PORTLAND: **\$1,495-\$1,767**

THE AVERAGE BLACK HOUSEHOLD **CAN'T AFFORD TO PURCHASE A HOME** IN ANY PORTLAND NEIGHBORHOOD.

## INTRODUCTION

### EXCLUSION AND REDLINING

1859: African Americans are excluded from living in Oregon via the state constitution.

Real estate code of ethics prevents real estate agents from selling to African Americans due to possible negative effects on real estate values.



Activist sign remembers history of Albina as a redlined neighborhood (Signonpdx)



Vanport Flood (Oregon Historical Society)

In the early 1940s the community of Vanport was built to house manufacturing workers. Around 40% of the residents were African American. The housing was poor quality, and in 1948 a flood left a significant number of residents homeless. Many of the displaced found home in Albina.

### ALBINA, THE HEART OF BLACK COMMUNITY IN PORTLAND

Between 1940–1946 the number of African Americans in Oregon increased from 1,800 to 15,000.

Albina was a majority Black and prosperous community. N Williams Avenue was referred to as “Black Broadway.” It was the center of African American culture in Portland, where jazz music could be heard 24 hours a day.

### URBAN RENEWAL, EMINENT DOMAIN, DISINVESTMENT

In 1956 4/5 of community members in Albina were black. Memorial Coliseum took 450 homes. 1-5 Freeway cut through Albina and took 1100 homes.



Protestors at Emanuel Hospital (Oregon Historical Society)

Expansion of Emanuel Hospital: homeowners were given \$15,000, renters were given \$4,000 and 90 days to move.

Albina became a place of vacant homes and illicit substances, and many residents became victims of predatory and fraudulent lenders. Many of those who had the means fled the area.



N Williams Avenue in the 1950s (Oregon Historical Society)



N Williams Avenue in the 1970s (Oregon Historical Society)

## INTRODUCTION

Revitalization of Albina began as a grassroots community movement. Due to past disinvestment and the types of new investment in the community, the local population was unable to take advantage of revitalization efforts.

**“We fought like mad people to keep crime out of here. Had we not fought, I don’t know what this area would’ve eventually been. But the newcomers haven’t given us credit for it. I envisioned cleaning up the neighborhood, making the neighborhood livable for all of us.... In the past, Blacks and Whites worked very strongly together. We were one. This thing that happened in the last ten years has been most disappointing, most uncomfortable. It’s like the revitalization of racism.”**

—Charles Ford, Boise resident since 1951 (Gibson)

In 1999 African Americans owned 36% fewer homes than previously, and Whites owned 43% more.

In 2015, *Governing Magazine* names Portland as the most gentrified city in America.

## GENTRIFICATION AND DISPLACEMENT

## A NEW VISION FOR N/NE PORTLAND

In 2014, tension over gentrification comes to a head when the Portland Development Commission announces a plan to sell a keystone property at the corner of MLK and Alberta for 80% of market value to a California developer to build a Trader Joes. Activists successfully stop the deal.



Activists at the Trader Joe's site (Oregonian)

In January of 2015, the Portland City Council adopts the N/NE housing strategy, which includes funds for affordable housing in N/NE Portland from the Portland Development Commission TIF fund and a “preference policy” that works to bring back residents who have been unwillingly displaced.

In 2014 the Portland African American Leadership Forum (PAALF) launches the People’s Plan in response to African Americans being largely left out of the status quo in city planning.



PCRI's Grant Warehouse development (PCRI)

PCRI begins work on the Pathway 1000 initiative to create 1,000 new units of affordable housing in N/NE Portland that will primarily serve those who have been displaced.





## 2 HOUSING TYPES

---

### KEY POINTS

- People prefer single family homes; however, preferences can be unpacked so that characteristics of single family home living can be achieved through other more affordable and homeownership options.
- Portland's new zoning updates are more amenable to "missing middle" housing models.

### RECOMMENDED ACTIONS

- Use a diversity of housing types to achieve the benefits of single family homes while providing affordable homeownership opportunities.

## HOUSING TYPES

---

### UNPACKING HOUSING TYPES

Individuals have often been surveyed about their preferred housing types; unfortunately, these surveys generally oversimplify the landscape of housing options to just a choice between a single family detached home or an apartment. The landscape of housing options is much more diverse, and we see this in both national and local trends.

In our survey of the PCRI community and in surveys conducted by the Portland Housing Bureau and Metro, individuals overwhelmingly prefer single family homes. Our goal was to understand what characteristics of a single family home were important to people and to align those benefits and features with housing types that are more feasible for Pathway 1000.

“Missing middle” has emerged as a term to describe homes that are neither standalone single family structures nor large multifamily apartment buildings. The missing middle concept breaks housing types up into far more categories of options. Examples of this housing type are listed on the facing page. This more complex view of housing options is also being considered locally.

In Portland, Mayor Hales has created an advisory committee to consider how to increase density in single family, residentially-zoned neighborhoods without disrupting neighborhood character, and many of options they are considering would include allowing for these housing types. Missing middle housing types are now generally allowed in single family residential zones such as the R2.5 and R5 zones, and the city is creating more flexibility for these housing types via the 2035 Comprehensive Plan update, including zoning changes.

Missing middle housing types and those being considered by the Portland Residential Infill Committee are ideal for PCRI because they align with the goals of Pathway 1000. They allow for housing to integrate into the existing neighborhood character, they can provide an affordable option for homeownership, and they can be built densely without sacrificing the benefits of single family home living.

“New development should maintain the architecture of the neighborhood.”

–Participant at Pathway 1000 Community Forum

## HOUSING TYPES

### MISSING MIDDLE HOUSING IN PORTLAND

#### DUPLEX



While most prefer single family homes, attached homes were the second choice for PCRI constituents.

#### COTTAGE CLUSTER



PCRI constituents worried about relying on neighbors to landscape and keep up communal space. Successful cottage clusters rely on a strong community and shared responsibilities.

#### TOWNHOUSE



Townhouses were favorably received with PCRI constituents, but they reacted negatively to same-ness and wanted a chance to express their personal taste through paint and landscaping.

#### STACKED FLAT



Stacked flats raised concern among PCRI constituents for their accessibility (requirement to climb stairs) and noise issues. All designs should consider universal access, and a good building envelope and insulation can create a quiet environment while also increasing energy efficiency.

#### ACCESSORY DWELLING UNIT



Many PCRI constituents responded positively to ADUs for their ability to allow for multigenerational living with a variety of affordable housing options.

*Left to right: N San Rafael Street, Portland (Ian Pollet, Creative Commons), Hastings Green Courtyard Condos, Portland (oregonlive), NE Portland Townhomes (redfin), ADU in Cully (Hammer and Hand), Stacked Flats in NW Portland (source unknown).*

## HOUSING TYPES

### HOUSING PREFERENCES AND VALUES

We unpacked housing types and categorized housing features in the following way:

- **Structure and Type:** Is it an apartment building, a single family home, duplex etc? Additionally, what is the architecture style; is it built out of wood or brick, etc.?
- **Space:** How big is it, and how is the space divided? How many bedrooms and bathrooms, and how is the outdoor space used?
- **Tenure:** Is it owned or rented? If owned, is it a condo, co-op, or other alternative ownership situation?
- **Quality:** How long are the materials that the home is built with meant to last? Is it energy efficient and durable?
- **Neighborhood:** Where is it located? What amenities are nearby, and how does the relative uses and architecture of nearby buildings relate to the home? (Beamish, 2001)

To the right is a summary of what we learned through our research and community engagement efforts about these characteristics and how they should be considered/applied as part of Pathway 1000.

### HOUSING PREFERENCES OF PCRI CONSTITUENTS


Structure and Type	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Individuals prefer single family homes</li> <li>• We recommend a diversity of housing structures and types</li> <li>• More information about how to select an ideal structure and type can be found in chapter four</li> </ul>
Space	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many individuals find it difficult to find housing with more space or more bedrooms in their price range</li> <li>• More than half of those we surveyed require at least one parking space</li> <li>• When considering outdoor space, almost half reported wanting a place to grow plants, and one-third wanted space for children to play</li> </ul>
Tenure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Housing stability holds the same importance as affordability for some individuals</li> <li>• Individuals associate homeownership with single family homes</li> <li>• Building homeownership and generational wealth is important to Portland's Black community and for preventing displacement</li> <li>• PCRI should offer a variety of housing types as options for homeownership</li> <li>• PCRI should also consider "alternative tenure models" including co-ops and condos</li> </ul>
Quality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Durability is essential; affordable home maintenance and upkeep is an important part of housing retention</li> </ul>
Neighborhood	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• N/NE Portland is important to PCRI constituents both as a community center and due to their family history</li> <li>• More insights into neighborhood and locating housing can be found in chapter three</li> </ul>
Expenditures	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Affordability is the primary barrier to finding housing for PCRI constituents</li> </ul>

### VALUES OF PCRI CONSTITUENTS

Safety: The home is safe and secure



Location: Proximity to neighborhood amenities, work, and social life



Efficiency: Requires less energy, water, etc. for everyday tasks



Durability: Requires less upkeep and maintenance; materials last longer over time




Promotes/Supports Health: The home has good air and water quality and provides access to physical activity and necessary health services



Adaptability: A place that can change with you and your family's needs over time



Privacy: The home provides privacy from sound and view of others



Beauty/Aesthetics: The home looks and feels the way you want it to



We asked PCRI constituents what they value most in their housing. These values should guide the design of housing for Pathway 1000.



## 3 FINDING 1000 UNITS

---

### KEY POINTS

- N/NE Portland is ideal for affordable housing due to its proximity to transit corridors, historically Black communities, and other neighborhood amenities.
- 329 additional units can be developed through infill on PCRI's properties.
- In order to reach the goal of 1,000 units, PCRI will have to:
  - Acquire public land
  - Partner with other organizations
  - Participate in the private market
- Key Planning found 109 sites owned by public and partners agencies that could be suitable for housing development in inner NE Portland, and these sites can house over 2,500 units.

### RECOMMENDED ACTION

- PCRI should prioritize development of the sites listed in Table 2 at the end of this chapter.



## FINDING 1000 UNITS

### FINDING SITES FOR 1,000 UNITS

This section of the Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan is designed to help PCRI identify where to site 1,000 housing units in N/NE Portland.

The first section shows the best locations for housing based on community feedback.

The second section examines PCRI's properties and highlights the sites that have opportunity for infill development.

The third section examines properties owned by public agencies and nonprofits in N/NE Portland, to show where PCRI can acquire additional land for 1,000 housing units.

This chapter concludes with recommendations for sites that PCRI should prioritize in the implementation of the Pathway 1000 initiative.

### THE STUDY AREA

The N/NE Investment Plan Study Area was developed as part of the N/NE housing strategy (See Map 1). The study area contains the majority of the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area as well as surrounding inner NE Portland neighborhoods. The neighborhoods in this area have experienced the most extensive gentrification and displacement of the African American community. Since the N/NE Investment Plan Study Area was chosen to be the focus for the implementation of the N/NE housing strategy, Key Planning focused its land use analysis on this same area.

### FINDING LOCATIONS FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING


For the Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan, we examined potential sites for affordable housing development in N/NE Portland. Key Planning looked at all PCRI-owned properties, as well as other properties within the study area that could be ideal sites for affordable housing. Based on the feedback from the N/NE housing strategy, Key Planning developed criteria for ideal locations of affordable housing. The criteria considered included:

- Proximity to public transit, particularly access to multiple and frequent transit lines
- Access to healthy food and local grocery stores
- Access to green space
- Access to childcare
- Proximity to other amenities such as schools, libraries, community centers, and job training centers

The map on the facing page shows the ideal locations for affordable housing based on proximity to the services and amenities community members expressed concern for during the N/NE housing strategy community forums. Areas with a score of five were deemed the most accessible, with a score of one as least accessible. The areas identified as most accessible are within a half-mile walk to the majority of the public transit, amenities, and services listed above. As the map shows, nearly all of NE Portland received a score of three or more, meaning that some necessary services, amenities, and transit are within a short walking distance. Nearly all of the N/NE Investment Plan Study Area is shown to be highly accessible for affordable housing, with the Williams, Mississippi, and Interstate corridors receiving the highest overall scores. This information helped to inform Key Planning's land use recommendations for affordable housing development.

# FINDING 1000 UNITS

## MAP 1: STUDY AREA & SUITABILITY FOR AFFORDABLE HOUSING BASED ON PROXIMITY TO TRANSIT & AMENITIES



### DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY IN PCRI PROPERTIES

Key Planning analyzed all 284 PCRI-owned properties to assess where development potential might exist, and found that PCRI could potentially reach nearly one-third of its 1,000 unit goal just through infill on the properties they currently own.

For each of PCRI's properties, Key Planning compared what currently exists on the site to what is allowed by the current zoning code for that area. If a property contains less housing units than what is allowed in its zone, the site is determined to be underutilized or to have "development capacity." The properties discussed in this section could be developed or redeveloped to help PCRI reach its goal of 1,000 new affordable units in N/NE Portland.

Once sites with development capacity were identified, Key Planning created development scenarios for PCRI that reflect community input and minimize negative impact on surrounding neighborhoods. The criteria considered were:

- **Housing Type:** What type of housing could fit on this property given the zoning? What types of housing could best meet the needs and preferences of community members?
- **Neighborhood Compatibility:** Would the style and structure of the house fit into the surrounding neighborhood?
- **Land Value vs. Building Value:** If the land value of a site is considerably more than the building value, this site was determined to be a higher priority for development.
- **Displacement of Current Residents:** Demolition scenarios provide the opportunity for maximization of density, but at the risk of displacing the residents of the currently underutilized sites. Key Planning highlights these opportunities with careful consideration of this impact.

**“The young families we work with need more stable housing options near services for their families.”**  
–Kimberly Porter, Black Parent Initiative

## FINDING 1000 UNITS

---


PCRI owns five vacant properties, and 16 that have opportunity for infill or redevelopment. If PCRI chose to redevelop all of these properties to their maximum allowed density, it could result in an additional 329 units. Table 2 shows all of the properties that development potential; this table includes information that will help assess PCRI's decision making process, such as zoning, property size, land and building value, maximum allowed units, and development scenarios.

- **Ratio Land/Building Value:** shows the ratio of 2015 assessed land value to building value. The properties with a ratio of 1.00 or higher have a high land value relative to the current structure, indicating that these sites could be worth redevelopment to higher density.
- **Development Capacity:** shows how many additional residential units could be placed on the property, in addition to what structures currently exist on the site, based on the zoning code for that area. In most cases, the site would require removal or demolition of the current building in order to reach maximum development capacity on that site.
- **Least Impact Scenario:** shows how PCRI could maximize density on these properties without modifying the current residence.
- **Recommended Highest Density Scenario:** shows the maximum units allowed on the property if PCRI chooses to develop/redevelop the property. The majority of the high density scenarios would require demolition of the current structure on the property.

### PCRI PROPERTIES INCLUDE:

- 5 VACANT PROPERTIES
- 16 UNDERUTILIZED LOTS
- 329 POTENTIAL UNITS

MAP 2: PCRI PROPERTIES WITH DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY



# FINDING 1000 UNITS

## TABLE 1: PCRI PROPERTIES WITH DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY

	Address	Current Zoning	Proposed Zoning	Lot Size (Acres)	Ratio Land/Bldg. Value	Least Impact Scenario	Highest Density Scenario
<b>1</b>	<b>1134 WI/NE Ainsworth Street</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>Vacant</b>	<b>SF home &amp; ADU on vacant lot and adjacent lot</b>	<b>Upzone, lot consolidation, 4 unit rowhouse*</b>
2	1313 NE Killingsworth Street	R1	R1	0.11	0.76	Flag lot	4 unit rowhouse/stacked flat
<b>3</b>	<b>1415 N Winchell Street</b>	<b>RH</b>	<b>RH</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>1.55</b>	<b>Flag lot</b>	<b>34 unit MF*</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>1531 N Blandena Street</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>CM3</b>	<b>0.12</b>	<b>1.75</b>	<b>Flag lot</b>	<b>28 unit MF*</b>
5	1700 WI/NE Alberta Street	CS	CM1	0.15	Vacant	None; current use as parking lot	5 unit rowhouse
<b>6</b>	<b>1732 NE Alberta Street</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>CM1</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>1.01</b>	<b>None; lot currently in use for business &amp; parking lot</b>	<b>6 unit MU/MF*</b>
7	3170 W/N Arlington Place	R5	R5	0.06	Vacant	None with current zoning	Upzone, lot consolidation, demo existing unit, and 2 unit rowhouse*
8	3610 N Mississippi Avenue	EX	CM3	0.06	0.81	Potential ADU	13 unit MF*
<b>9</b>	<b>4066 NE Grand Avenue</b>	<b>RH</b>	<b>RH</b>	<b>0.23</b>	<b>1.40</b>	<b>None; current use as parking lot</b>	<b>45 unit MF*</b>
10	432 NE Russett Street	CG	CE	0.11	1.02	Flag lot	15 unit MF*
<b>11</b>	<b>4608 NE Garfield Avenue</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>CM3</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>1.32</b>	<b>ADU on east portion of lot where garage is</b>	<b>27 unit MF*</b>
12	5029–5031 WI/ NE 7th Avenue	R1	R1	0.09	1.41	None	3 unit rowhouse*
<b>13</b>	<b>5125 NE Campaign Street</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>R5</b>	<b>0.22</b>	<b>Vacant</b>	<b>Flag lot</b>	<b>Flag lot</b>
<b>14</b>	<b>5254 S/N Williams Avenue</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>R1</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>Vacant</b>	<b>Duplex</b>	<b>Fourplex</b>
<b>15</b>	<b>5403 N Mississippi Avenue</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>CS</b>	<b>0.11</b>	<b>0.75</b>	<b>Partition lot/stacked flat</b>	<b>23 unit MF*</b>
16	6329 NE MLK Boulevard	R1	CM2	0.40	1.66	Remain PCRI office location	52 unit MF*
17	7027 NE Grand Avenue	R1	R1	0.15	1.07	ADU where garage is currently located	3 unit MF*
18	725 N Lombard Street	CG/R2	CM2	0.11	0.97	ADU	7 unit MF*
<b>19</b>	<b>8240 N Interstate Avenue</b>	<b>EX</b>	<b>CM3</b>	<b>0.10</b>	<b>1.31</b>	<b>None</b>	<b>15 unit MF*</b>
20	9131 N Lombard Street (not on map)	R1	R1	0.13	0.60	ADU	29 unit MF*
21	916 N Mason Street	CS	CM2	0.04	1.16	None	9 unit MF*

**Bold text** designates priority development sites

Total: 17 Units

**Total: 329 Units**

\*requires demolition

### DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY ON PUBLIC LAND

In order to reach the goal of 1,000 new housing units, PCRI will have to look beyond the properties they currently own. One option to consider is acquiring public land. Key Planning examined all publicly-owned properties within the study area and found the following results:

- There are 146 publicly owned properties that have some development capacity and are in zones that allow residential use outright.
- Of these 146 properties, 114 sites are vacant.
- Key Planning identified 84 publicly-owned sites that could be suitable for development (Properties were considered non-suitable if they were immediately adjacent to highways or train tracks, or if they are currently in use as parks.).
- These 84 sites could result in additional 2,225 housing units, if acquired and developed to maximum capacity.

Key Planning compared these public sites to the site suitability analysis to find properties that would be the best choices to acquire for affordable housing development. Five publicly-owned sites were identified as being located in prime spots for affordable housing; these sites alone could result in 478 housing units. Key Planning recommends these five sites be prioritized for acquisition and development (More detailed information on these sites is contained in the technical report site suitability section.).

### PUBLIC AGENCIES WITH VACANT PROPERTY IN THE STUDY AREA

- Home Forward
- Metro
- Multnomah County
- Portland Housing Bureau
- Portland Development Commission
- State of Oregon
- City of Portland

### PRIORITY PUBLICLY-OWNED SITES

- 6431–6435 NE MLK Boulevard
- 84 N Weidler Street
- NE Holladay & 1st (NE corner)
- NE Holladay & MLK Boulevard (NW corner)
- NE Saratoga & 27th Avenue

## FINDING 1000 UNITS

---

### POTENTIAL PARTNER ORGANIZATIONS

On the pathway to 1,000 new housing units, PCRI should also consider partnering with nonprofits. Key Planning examined all nonprofits that own property within the study area to find potential partners that PCRI could work with to develop housing. Using the same method of analysis as was used for public properties, Key Planning found:

- There are 36 properties owned by nonprofit potential partners within the study area that are in zones that allow residential use outright.
- Of these 36 properties, 23 sites are vacant.
- Key Planning identified 25 sites that could be suitable for development (Properties were considered non-suitable if they were immediately adjacent to highways or train tracks, or if they are currently in use as parks.).
- These 25 sites could result in additional 349 housing units, if acquired and developed to maximum capacity.

Key Planning compared these nonprofit sites to the site suitability analysis to find properties that would be the best choices to acquire for affordable housing development. Four nonprofit-owned sites were identified as being located in prime spots for affordable housing; these sites alone could result in 74 housing units. Key Planning recommends these four sites be prioritized for acquisition and development.

### NONPROFIT AGENCIES WITH VACANT PROPERTY IN THE STUDY AREA

- Proud Ground
- Urban League of Portland
- Salvation Army
- Habitat for Humanity
- King Dishman Affordable Housing
- Metanoia Peace Community
- Our United Villages
- People of Praise
- Transition Projects

### PRIORITY PARTNER-OWNED SITES

- 7654 N Delaware Avenue
- NE Dekum & 6th (SE corner)
- NE Emerson & N Williams Ave. (SW corner)
- NE Killingsworth & N Williams Ave. (NE corner)



### TYING IT ALL TOGETHER: PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT SITES

Key Planning found 19 sites in PCRI's portfolio, on publicly-owned land, and on land owned by potential partners that are ideal for housing development and should be considered for priority development.

Table 2 shows all 19 priority development sites that Key Planning recommends. This list of properties includes vacant and underutilized PCRI-owned properties, as well as vacant properties owned by potential partners. This table shows the types of housing that could be constructed to reach maximum allowable density and the maximum number of units that could be produced.

PCRI properties were identified as priority sites if they were vacant, or if the current structure had a low land/building ratio and a large development capacity.

Partner properties were placed on the priority site list if they were:

- Vacant
- Large enough to construct a residence on
- Located in areas appropriate for residential development (not abutting highways or train tracks)
- Had good access to transit, amenities, and services (scored a 4 or 5 on the site suitability analysis)
- Located in acceptable residential zones (R, CM, CS, RH, CG, EX, & CX)

If PCRI develops their priority sites to maximum capacity, and works with partners to develop affordable housing on the other priority sites, 740 new affordable housing units could be developed. These sites, in combination with the housing developments that are already in the pipeline as part of the Pathway 100 initiative, such as Grant Warehouse or PCRI's recently developed townhomes, would add up to over 820 housing units.

In order to reach the 1,000 unit goal, PCRI could consider denser redevelopment of some of their other properties, look for infill opportunities in occupied partner properties, or look for opportunities in the private housing market.

### CRITERIA FOR PRIORITIZATION

VACANCY STATUS

SIZE

LOCATION

ACCESSIBILITY

ZONING

TABLE 2: PRIORITY DEVELOPMENT SITES

Address	Owner	Type of Housing	# of Tax Lots	# of Units
1134 WI/NE Ainsworth Street	PCRI	Rowhouse	2	4
1415 N Winchell Street	PCRI	MF	1	34
1531 N Blandena Street	PCRI	MF	1	28
1732 NE Alberta Street	PCRI	MF	1	6
4066 NE Grand Avenue	PCRI	MF	1	45
4608 NE Garfield Avenue	PCRI	MF	1	27
5125 NE Campaign Street	PCRI	SF (flag lot)	1	2
5254 S/N Williams Avenue	PCRI	Fourplex	1	4
5403 N Mississippi Avenue	PCRI	MF	1	23
6431–6435 NE MLK Boulevard	PHB	MF	3	104
7654 N Delaware Avenue	People of Praise	Rowhouse	1	4
8240 Interstate Avenuer	PCRI	MF	1	15
84 N Weidler Steet	PDC	MF	1	98
NE Dekum & 6th (SE corner)	Habitat for Humanity	MF	1	6
NE Emerson & Williams (SW cor.)	Salvation Army	MF	7	30
NE Holladay & 1st (NE corner)	PDC	MF	1	200
NE Holladay & MLK Blvd. (NW cor.)	PDC	MF	3	71
NE Killingsworth & Williams (NE c.)	Salvation Army	MF	1	34
NE Saratoga & 27th Avenue	Home Forward	SF (flag lot)	5	5
		Total:		740

## FINDING 1000 UNITS

---

### FILLING THE GAP TO 1000

If PCRI were to develop all of the recommended priority sites from Table 2, this would produce a maximum of 740 potential new units of affordable housing in the target areas. An obvious gap to 1,000 remains.

However, we know from some of the available data that N/NE Portland neighborhoods have a residential capacity of multiple thousands of new units. So how is PCRI going to lead the way in developing these as part of the Pathway 1000 initiative? We propose two options with regard to participating in the private market, which PCRI has expressed a willingness to do:

1. Purchase land at market rate. Take advantage of financing incentives, apply for financing assistance, partner with other agencies—truly participate in the private market to purchase residential and commercial properties that may be vacant and/or underutilized for redevelopment as affordable housing.
2. Partner with local agencies to land bank properties. Metro has recently pioneered this strategy locally with regard to housing in its purchase of the abandoned furniture store at SE 82nd Avenue and SE Division Street in Portland’s Jade District, another diverse neighborhood on the city’s east side. Rather than stand by and allow a private developer with deep pockets to purchase the site for potentially less affordable redevelopment opportunities, Metro used Transit-Oriented Development (TOD) funding, a key component of the agency’s new equitable housing strategy, to purchase the site ultimately for redevelopment as affordable housing, and to be leased and operated as a community center in the interim. As Metro has partnered with local community-based organizations on this initiative, so could Metro or other public agencies partner with PCRI to land bank vulnerable properties in N/NE to be preserved for redevelopment as affordable housing.

### METRO’S LAND BANKING INITIATIVE



*Metro’s new land banking initiative at SE 82nd & Division (Metro)*

This page intentionally left blank.



# 4

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

---

### KEY POINTS

- PCRI can provide additional housing opportunities through creative, lower-impact approaches such as adding ADUs to existing or proposed single family dwelling sites. These units can provide rental housing and, perhaps eventually, even income opportunities for the property's homeowner.
- Affordable housing units created through Pathway 1000 should be developed in response to zoning allowances, neighborhood characteristics, and the needs and preferences of future tenants.

### RECOMMENDED ACTION

- Apply the development considerations in the following model sites to properties with similar zoning and neighborhood characteristics.

This page intentionally left blank.

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

---

### DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY WITHIN PCRI PROPERTIES

This chapter examines six of the PCRI properties we identified as priority development sites and proposes models for recommended housing types. The majority of our recommendations focus on “missing middle” housing that provides a balance in terms of density between single family and multifamily developments. We include a more detailed discussion of our reasons for focusing on missing middle developments in chapter two of this plan.

Though our proposed models focus on missing middle housing, we also provide recommendations for a single family home and an apartment building. We know that PCRI will serve some families who need—and will be able to own—a single family home, whereas renting an apartment will be a better option for some PCRI residents. Our purpose in proposing this variety of housing models is to provide details on which type of development makes sense on what type of site, and for whom. The following models are developed in response to both the land use characteristics of the individual site and neighborhood and to the needs and preferences we identified through our community engagement activities.

### MODEL SITES

- ① CAMPAIGN ST. FLAG LOT
- ② N WILLIAMS FOURPLEX
- ③ KILLINGSWORTH TOWNHOUSES
- ④ GRAND COTTAGE CLUSTER
- ⑤ ALBERTA MICRO-MIXED USE
- ⑥ GARFIELD APARTMENTS



## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### MODEL 1: CAMPAIGN ST. FLAG LOT



Google Street View



House adjacent to the east

Source of all photos on this page: Google Earth

### SITE SUMMARY

#### 5125 NE Campaign Street

The Campaign Street site is 9,520 square feet in size and zoned single family. The lot is located in the Cully neighborhood, which has somewhat fewer amenities than the primary N/NE study area, but Cully is located within an established single family neighborhood relatively close-in to the city center. This site is well-suited well for families that desire outdoor space and privacy for young children and gardening, etc., and who may rely on a personal vehicle for transportation.



#### Development Capacity:

Lot size: 9,520 SF

2 units: 2 Single Family Homes (with ADUs?)



#### Zoning:

Single-Family Residential, Lower Density (R5)



#### Suitability:

Good single family neighborhood but far from transit



#### Nearby:

Rigler School, Cully Boulevard commercial & transportation corridor

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT: FLAG LOT

Though in general we recommend minimizing single family development as part of Pathway 1000, the Campaign Street site provides an opportunity for more dense single family development on a subdivided flag lot (potentially with ADUs).

Flag lots can be created through a simple lot subdivision process, with a single family home developed on each resulting lot. Because the single family homes would likely be sold rather than rented, this model is ideal for PCRI residents with relatively higher incomes and may be better for larger families who need more space than that available in an apartment or other smaller unit.



#### Key Takeaways

- Maintains single family look and feel of existing neighborhoods but adds needed density
- Large lots can be subdivided to provide space for two single family homes
- Ideal for homeownership for larger families with relatively higher incomes
- Optional ADUs available to rent, potentially as income for homebuyer or for multigenerational living



Nearby flag lot development (Google Earth)



Nearby flag lot development (Google Earth)



ADU (homesweetpdx)

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### MODEL 2: N WILLIAMS FOURPLEX



Google Street View



Plex adjacent to the north

Source of all photos on this page: Google Earth

#### SITE SUMMARY

##### 5254 N Williams Avenue

The N Williams site is located on a vibrant commercial corridor, making it ideal for somewhat denser development—and for residents who rely on easy access to transportation and other neighborhood amenities and services. The site is large for its zoning designation of multidwelling residential, and it is surrounded by existing plex developments on both the north and south sides.



##### Development Capacity:

Lot size: 4,700 SF  
4 units (MF)



##### Zoning:

Multi-Dwelling Residential, Medium Density (R1)



##### Suitability:

Very suitable; good access to transportation, parks, and services



##### Nearby:

Jefferson High School, Peninsula Park, N Williams commercial corridor

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT: FOURPLEX

The N Williams Fourplex model represents an opportunity for PCRI to provide “missing middle” housing for residents who need perhaps less space per unit but greater access to transportation alternatives and nearby amenities and services. The proposed plex development could be provided as either an attached “fourplex” structure, with the existing lot subdivided into four, or as two attached duplexes, with the existing lot subdivided into two. Both options could be available for homeownership through either a condo or co-operative structure.

Because the plex units would likely be smaller in size than traditional single family detached structures, this model may be more appropriate for smaller families or residents with relatively lower incomes.



*Nearby plex development (Google Earth)*



*Attached duplex (loopnet)*



*Duplex with backyard (loopnet)*



#### Key Takeaways

- Take advantage of higher-density zoning allowances to subdivide and maximize unit capacity on larger sites
- Smaller size should correspond to smaller pricetag, benefitting residents who need and can only afford smaller spaces and may rely on accessibility to transit, etc.

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### MODEL 3: KILLINGSWORTH TOWNHOUSES



Google Street View



Attached development nearby to the west  
Source of all photos on this page: Google Earth

#### SITE SUMMARY

##### 1313 NE Killingsworth Street

The Killingsworth Street site is strategically located on a thriving historically Black commercial corridor between MLK Boulevard and Alberta Street, with good access to transportation options and neighborhood amenities such as Alberta Park. The location and zoning for this site make it more appropriate for denser multifamily development, such as the attached housing models that have already been constructed in the vicinity.



##### Development Capacity:

Lot size: 4,980 SF  
4 units (SF/MF)



##### Zoning:

Multi-Dwelling Residential, Medium Density (R1)



##### Suitability:

Extremely suitable; walkable, great access to transportation, commercial & employment opportunities, etc.



##### Nearby:

Alberta Street commercial & transportation corridor, Alberta Park, Sabin Elementary School

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT: KILLINGSWORTH TOWNHOUSES

The Killingsworth Street site is well-suited for multifamily attached development, such as the recommended townhouses. In order to construct the townhouses, the lot would be subdivided into multiple lots, with each resulting unit attached to the adjacent unit on one or two sides. Alternatively, narrower rowhouses could be constructed along the frontage on Killingsworth—though these may have the appearance of “skinny houses,” which we learned from our community engagement activities were not the most desirable housing model.

Noise and privacy concerns in the vicinity of the nearby commercial area could be abated by providing well-insulated (and also energy efficient) homes. The townhouse model provides a great option for a wide variety of family types and income levels, as townhouses can easily be rented or owned through traditional or condo/co-op structures.



*PCRI proposed townhouses (PCRI)*



*Townhouse development (travisstanley)*



*Townhouses with garages (rmlsweb)*



#### Key Takeaways

- Townhouses provide a good transition from traditional single family neighborhoods to denser corridors and can be configured in multiple ways
- A great example of “missing middle” housing, townhouses are appropriate for a variety of families and incomes

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### MODEL 4: GRAND COTTAGE CLUSTER



Google Street View



Small-scale multifamily nearby to the south  
Source of all photos on this page: Google Earth

#### SITE SUMMARY

##### 7027 NE Grand Avenue

The Grand Avenue site is located close to the Dekum Triangle commercial area and Woodlawn Park, with a variety of transportation options available. The large size and open shape of this site makes it appropriate for dense single family development to be provided in a “cottage cluster” model. Similar medium-density multifamily development is already present in the immediate vicinity of the site.



##### Development Capacity:

Lot size: 6,705 SF  
5 units (SF/MF)



##### Zoning:

Multi-Dwelling Residential, Medium Density (R1)



##### Suitability:

Very suitable; good access to transportation & commercial opportunities, etc.



##### Nearby:

Peninsula Park, Woodlawn City Park, Dekum Triangle commercial area

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT: COTTAGE CLUSTER

Cottage cluster development provides a great opportunity for incorporating single family structures into denser, more communal models. The Grand site could be subdivided into four lots, three of which could have single family homes (and potentially ADUs) and one of which could have a duplex, for a total of five new units where only one unit existed before.

The varied structure of this models also provides a great opportunity for co-locating residents of various family sizes—even multigenerational families or communities—and income levels in a diverse setting, which we learned from our community engagement activities is highly desired by potential PCRI residents.



*Cottage cluster development (redfin)*



*Cottage cluster development (squarespace)*



*Cottage cluster development (tinyhouse)*



#### Key Takeaways

- For those residents desiring diverse, communal living spaces, cottage cluster developments provide both community and privacy, with some of the same outdoor amenities as single family development
- Density can be achieved by diversifying housing types on a single site



## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### MODEL 5: ALBERTA MICRO-MIXED USE



Google Street View



Community Cycling Center

Source of all photos on this page: Google Earth

#### SITE SUMMARY

##### 1732 NE Alberta Street

The Alberta site is located in the heart of the historically Black Alberta commercial corridor, on the same block as the Community Cycling Center. The commercial zoning of this site and nearby land uses suggest that it may be appropriate to provide ground floor retail or other commercial opportunities as part of the redevelopment of this site. Additionally, this site is highly accessible for public transit, neighborhood amenities, and other services that some PCRI residents may rely on.



##### Development Capacity:

Lot size: 5,000 SF  
6 units (SF/MF)



##### Zoning:

Commercial Storefront (CS)



##### Suitability:

Very suitable; great access to transit, commercial retail/employment opportunities, etc.



##### Nearby:

Alberta & Killingsworth commercial corridors, Alberta City Park

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT: MICRO-MIXED USE

The “micro”-mixed use model proposed for this site could take a variety of shapes, but we recommend a medium-density stacked flat development with commercial retail space for lease on the ground floor.

With creative and efficient use of indoor and outdoor spaces, the micro-mixed use model could be appropriate for either rental or ownership opportunities through a condo/co-op structure, though the smaller spaces and multiple floors may be better for smaller families or younger single residents who may still rely on nearby transportation options and services available with limited access to a personal vehicle, etc. This smaller model may also be more appropriate for residents with relatively lower incomes.



#### Key Takeaways

- Smaller units provide housing opportunities for smaller, potentially single family households with relatively lower incomes who need higher access to walkable services
- Stacked flat developments also provide an opportunity to be creative with the use of space to provide highly affordable units



(Nobius Properties)



(chatterbox)



(Boulder Housing)

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### MODEL 6: GARFIELD APARTMENTS



Google Street View



MLK multifamily development

Source of all photos on this page: Google Earth

#### SITE SUMMARY

##### 4608 NE Garfield Avenue

The Garfield site is actually being rezoned through the Portland 2035 Comprehensive Plan Update from residential to commercial zoning—which still allows for residential development but encourages density. This proposed zoning change, along with the site’s location near the accessible, historically Black MLK corridor, provides a great opportunity for PCRI to maximize the development capacity of this site with a higher-density multifamily model such as already exists nearby.



##### Development Capacity:

Lot size: 5,000 SF  
27 units (MF)



##### Proposed Zoning:

Central Employment (EX)



##### Suitability:

Very suitable; great access to transit, commercial retail/employment opportunities, etc.



##### Nearby:

MLK & Alberta commercial corridors,  
King School Park

## MODEL DEVELOPMENTS

### RECOMMENDED DEVELOPMENT: APARTMENTS

Similar to existing multifamily development nearby, the Garfield Apartments model represents an opportunity to provide as many housing units as possible in a highly accessible, desirable area for PCRI residents to locate in. Despite the relatively significant change in land use from a single family home to a larger multifamily development on this site, the highest and best use of this property can only be achieved by adding density.

Smaller apartment units could provide the best housing option for those residents with the lowest relative incomes, including singles and aging residents who need ground floor units with high neighborhood accessibility. Alternatively, the units could be sold in a condo or co-op structure.



(rdcpix)



(GRES)



(cloudfront)



#### Key Takeaways

- Apartment models represent the densest development possible with the highest unit yield
- Denser multifamily models are appropriate for locating as many residents as possible in accessible areas
- Multifamily models also represent one of the most affordable housing types



# 5 EXECUTING THE VISION

---

## KEY POINTS

- The African American community has a great need for housing programs that address current housing disparities.
- We need a holistic approach that considers economic and community development to realize racial equity in housing and create stable communities.
- HUD's 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule provides a clear policy mandate and uniting touchpoint for addressing racial equity in housing.

## RECOMMENDED ACTION

- Moving forward will require many organizations working together for a common goal.

## EXECUTING THE VISION

### INTRODUCTION TO EXECUTING THE VISION

Good housing provides stability, comfort, shelter, health, and wellbeing as well as opportunity, access, and a sense of belonging—a place — in the community. Housing is the foundation for community development. The role housing plays in creating a thriving, sustainable, equitable community cannot be overstated. Still, housing is one component in uplifting Portland’s Black community.

Our recommendations for pursuing the Pathway 1000 initiative and instituting our Community Housing Plan extend beyond site and demographic analysis and housing development scenarios. We offer these further recommendations with the hopes that PCRI will choose to devote both time and resources to the pursuit of comprehensive community development. These recommendations are put forth with recognition of PCRI’s leadership role in the Portland community. They are presented here with the intention that PCRI will adopt these recommendations in order to expand their capacity to play a leadership role in the Portland community, the state of Oregon, and the region.

This section of recommendations includes a focus on:

- Creating a coalition and forming strategic partnerships
- Policy advocacy
- Cultural change for community cohesion



*Community members ready to weigh in at the Key Planning Pathway 1000 Community Forum*

### COLLECTIVE IMPACT

PCRI will not be able to achieve the goals of Pathway 1000 alone. They will need to partner with government agencies, other landowners, developers, and community-based organizations. These partnerships are necessary not only to secure land and funds for the homeownership goals of Pathway 1000, but also to create a stable and integrated community. Key Planning recommends that PCRI work within the Collective Impact model to create a coalition of agencies and individuals working to further their mission of creating stable housing and a strong welcoming community for African Americans in N/NE Portland.

Creating affordable housing has been a hot topic in Portland over the last couple of years, but we repeatedly heard from community members and experts that it isn't enough to just provide a subsidy for a home. Individuals also need job opportunities, access to education, community connection, social integration, and more to be able to keep their homes over time and feel at home in their community. PCRI can only focus on their expertise, providing housing, within the gamut of services and activities that are needed to achieve the larger Pathway 1000 vision. We also heard from community members that there is competition among African American-serving organizations and housing providers for resources. The Collective Impact model offers a way for organizations to work together towards their common goals. Collective Impact not only integrates the actions of social sector networks (community-based organizations), but also includes policymakers and funders who are dedicated to the larger mission.

### FIVE ELEMENTS REQUIRED FOR COLLECTIVE IMPACT

*As articulated by the John Kania and Mark Kramer who first described the model*

- ① All participants have a common agenda for change, including a shared understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed-upon actions.
- ② Collecting data and measuring results consistently across all the participants ensures shared measurement for alignment and accountability.
- ③ A plan of action outlines and coordinates mutually reinforcing activities for each participant.
- ④ Open and continuous communication is needed across the many players to build trust, assure mutual objectives, and create common motivation.
- ⑤ A backbone organization(s) with staff and a specific set of skills is needed to serve the entire initiative and coordinate participating organization and agencies.



### **Partner with other African American Focused Community-Based Organizations**

Forming a coalition of affordable housing organizations with an articulated mission, vision, and values under the umbrella of Pathway 1000 is one means of leveraging relationships through Collective Impact. An equally important set of relationships to pursue and maintain is the relationship between PCRI and other African American-serving organizations in the city of Portland, the state of Oregon, and the region.

One way this could be achieved is by co-hosting a summit for African American-serving organizations, during which PCRI details the goals of the Pathway 1000 initiative and highlights some of the ways in which these goals align with the missions of participating organizations. Possible co-hosts and sponsors include PAALF, the NAACP Portland Branch, the Black United Fund of Oregon, Policylink, and the Urban League of Portland.

Important invitees include representatives from Africa House, African Community Youth Organization, African American Chamber of Commerce of Oregon, African American Health Coalition, Inc., Black Parent Initiative, the Center for Intercultural Organizing, Coalition of Communities of Color, the Commission on Black Affairs Oregon Advocacy Commissions Office, Immigrant and Refugee Community Organization, Self Enhancement, Inc., POIC, and the United Way of the Columbia Willamette.

These organizations should be convened with the explicit purpose of supporting and advancing the Pathway 1000 initiative; analyzing organizational and political obstacles to Black empowerment and advancement in the city, state, and region; and seizing this moment as an opportunity to affirm and leverage working relationships in the face of political obstacles.

Addressing the housing crisis will only be achieved through cooperation and coordination between government actors, nimble community-based organizations, and their eager stakeholders. Good housing is the foundation for community development, but providing access to housing is only once piece of the puzzle. For African Americans in Portland to achieve the same homeownership levels as others and break free from a housing crisis will require an integrated set of services for this particular community.

**“Too often we only talk about low-income housing... You can’t provide ‘less than’ housing without other supports.”**  
**–Ken Boswell, N/NE Business Association**

## EXECUTING THE VISION

---

### **Continued Community Engagement**

Sustained community engagement will be integral to carrying out the Pathway 1000 initiative and creating an equitable, racially diverse, and income integrated community in N/NE Portland. Community members should be provided with opportunities to engage with the process at multiple levels, ranging from staying informed on the progress of the initiative to helping to guide current and future development. This entails creating a direct marketing campaign for the initiative and establishing a steering committee for the initiative made up of community stakeholders.

We recommend convening a steering committee made up of PCRI residents, who participate in both the rental and homeownership programs, housing advocates, and stakeholders from the Portland Black community. Introduce them to the Tracking Toolbox (2010), developed by the Partnership for Working Families. The Tracking Toolbox is designed to help community groups and organizers understand the basics of the development process so they can engage with it to influence development outcomes. It maps out the involved actors and typical steps most large projects go through, offering suggestions on ways for community groups to keep track of development projects.

By convening a steering committee and empowering participants with oversight capabilities, PCRI will be engaging the community in an impactful way. Serving on the Pathway 1000 Steering Committee will allow participants an opportunity to hold PCRI and government and community-based partners accountable while ensuring that stakeholder concerns are given voice and attention throughout the development process.

### **Cultivate Community Ownership**

The successful implementation of a plan requires significant community buy-in. This goes beyond community acceptance, entailing community trust, value, and willful participation. One way of creating trust and value for the community are avenues for interaction with those guiding the process and the process itself.

We recommend building in opportunities for new participants in the homeownership program to express individual agency during the construction of their new home. These opportunities

**“Use people in the development process—get them involved, not just the loudest but the best voices in the room.”**  
**–Fawn Aberson, Flossin Media**

can range from participating in the construction process to offering input on the small but important details of their future home.

With particular attention to participant safety and comfort, these opportunities to cultivate community pride and ownership can take many forms. This may look like program participants being invited to the site during the laying of the foundation of the home. It may also entail asking participants their preferred color of the front door of their new home, cabinetry preferences, or how the outdoor space can be arranged based on its future use.

### **Workforce Training Partnerships**

With investments in construction and renovations for new affordable housing units comes contracting and job opportunities. These investments can be directed to benefit the local economy and provide opportunities for minority-owned businesses, as well as workforce development opportunities for local residents. Partnering with local organizations in the community can help connect residents to these job opportunities and provide necessary training and assistance. Portland has a network of organizations PCRI can use to leverage this potential economic impact among communities of color. A few of these organizations are listed below:

- National Association of Minority Contractors—Oregon
- Portland Community College
- WorkSource Oregon
- SE Works, Inc.
- Metropolitan Contractors Improvement Partnership
- Women in Trades
- Oregon Association of Minority Entrepreneurs
- Portland Business Alliance, Partners in Diversity

### **Community Organizing & Raising Awareness about Land Use Processes**

Concerted and intentional outreach to communities of color is necessary for under-represented residents of Portland to get involved in policy creation, prioritization of public funds, and ensuring that public investments meet real community needs—particularly as these funds pertain to the built environment and public works projects.

**“Housing needs to be done in partnership with workforce development; getting into an affordable housing unit isn’t sustainable if you don’t have a stable job that allows you to cover your monthly housing cost.”  
–Charles McGee, Black Parent Initiative**

## EXECUTING THE VISION

---

Community organizing groups and nonprofits like PAALF and the Urban League are uniquely positioned to advocate for housing funds in partnership with culturally-specific CDCs like PCRI. Likewise, they can work to educate their constituents to be their own advocates for land use decisions.

### **Gaining Support from the Public Sector**

Dedication to the African American community in Portland makes the work of PCRI and the Pathway 1000 initiative unique. PCRI offers hope to all Portlanders that their city can be a place that accepts, welcomes, and works to build equity for African Americans. In a city that once embraced redlining, saying you can only live here, the Pathway 1000 initiative says we want you to live here. This will be a new message, and it is important that it comes not only from PCRI, a trusted ally of African Americans, but also from government institutions, current residents in the N/NE community, and other community-based organizations who otherwise are not focused specifically on racial equity. The success of the Pathway 1000 initiative requires both financial and organizational assistance from Portland's public institutions and, more broadly, for the dominant culture to recognize past actions that have disadvantaged Black Portlanders, while at the same time taking actions to correct the resulting inequities.

Establishing equitable and productive partnerships with local government is key to the success of Pathway 1000 initiative. Specific roles for different government partners, however, may need to be defined and negotiated. As recommended in City of Portland Gentrification and Displacement Study (Bates, 2016) these roles and functions might be distributed in different ways as determined by bureaus to best match their spheres of activity. In order to address the range of factors related to gentrification and the policies and investments that respond to it, it would be most effective to:

- Clarify and coordinate bureau roles
- Analyze how land use and growth interact in a housing strategy
- Monitor neighborhood change
- Create subsidy and incentive programs that maximize public resources

It becomes possible to hold government partners accountable once their roles and functions have been explicitly named. As a community partner and implementer of the city's N/NE housing strategy, it is appropriate for PCRI to expect this level of coordination and cooperation from their government partners.

**“We need to get African Americans to serve on neighborhood associations, particularly on the land use committee.”**  
**–Ken Boswell**

**“The government is going to have to help this process. People don't even realize they are a part of the problem.”**  
**–John Washington, Flossin Media**

### REALIZING RACIAL EQUITY IN HOUSING

Portland Community Reinvestment Initiatives has embarked on a bold initiative to mitigate and reverse gentrification that has disproportionately impacted the African American community that for generations resided in N/NE Portland. Over ten years, 10,000 African American families were pushed out of the neighborhoods they called home due to the push-pull forces of an unfettered economy and past poor decisions of a city government blind to their dilemma.

If the N/NE housing strategy is any indication, the political culture in Portland is shifting. Gentrification and concerns over access to affordable housing dominate all conversations on urban issues, from the mayor's office to the local media outlets. However, one key component coloring the issues often remains left unnamed: how to approach race and institutional racism in housing policy. Refusing to name the unnamed will cause our city to stumble on its road to achieving racial equity.

#### **New Opportunities under the HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing Rule**

In the past, there have been significant barriers that discouraged or prevented policymakers and non-governmental organizations from aligning with a housing initiative inextricably linked to race. Prominent among those barriers was the colorblind approach traditionally pursued by both federal and local housing authorities. As a result, the provision of essential services and assistance has become an “end of the pipeline” intervention. Such interventions are directed at the economically disadvantaged, with little recognition for how race and cultural history may have contributed to racial inequity. This mode of operating denies the unique history that African Americans have faced in Portland and does not acknowledge that there are racialized disparities in income and assets, homeownership, employment, and access to publicly-provided services and amenities between African American and White Portlanders.

This reality is rapidly changing, and new opportunities are opening up under the 2015 HUD Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) rule.

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has released a final rule to equip communities that receive HUD funding with the data and tools that will help them to meet long-standing fair housing obligations in their use of HUD funds. The AFFH rule



*Tony Hopson of PAALF speaks at the press conference against the city's plan for a vacant NE Portland block in 2014. (Portland Tribune)*

## EXECUTING THE VISION

---

requires municipalities that receive federal housing funds to use new agency-provided tools to demonstrate going forward that their housing policies do not promote racial segregation or racial inequities.

Under the long-awaited AFFH rule, HUD will provide maps and data on historic segregation that cities will need to use to assess their progress in reducing disparities, increasing housing choices, and promoting inclusivity. The AFFH rule change follows the Supreme Court's recent ruling on the Fair Housing Act, which upheld the use of disparate impact claims, or the recognition that certain policies may be deemed discriminatory based not on intentions, but on the resulting negative impact on a minority group.

HUD intends for data to illustrate the reality of economic and racial segregation in America, the result of policies with disproportionately negative effects on poor communities and communities of color. In development since 2013, the rule actually implements a provision of the Fair Housing Act of 1968 that has, until now, gone largely unenforced.

For more than forty years, HUD funding recipients have been obligated by law to reduce barriers to fair housing. Established in the Fair Housing Act of 1968, the law directs HUD and its program participants to affirmatively further the Act's goals of promoting fair housing and equal opportunity. The final rule on AFFH aims to provide all HUD grantees with clear guidelines and the data that will help them to achieve those goals, in addition to proactively addressing historical discrimination and racial equity in their local communities.

While we implore local government officials to approach race boldly, to be explicit and to address racially-specific challenges in Portland, we acknowledge that government officials and policymakers face political pressure to shy away from talking about race and acknowledging race in their policies, particularly when it comes to housing. As government practices adapt to the new AFFH rule, community partners can seize the opportunity to contribute to furthering HUD's goals of promoting fair housing and equal opportunity by mirroring and reaffirming new policy language and helping to hold their government partners accountable to these new federal standards.

## APPENDIX

---

## CONTENTS

---

1.1 METHODS	3
1.1 METHODS	4
1.1 A) ACCESSIBILITY TO PUBLIC TRANSIT	5
1.1 B) NEIGHBORHOOD AMENITIES MAP	6
1.2 FULL DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY	7
1.2B) PCRI PROPERTIES, LAND TO BUILDING VALUE RATIO	8
1.2C) POTENTIAL PUBLIC PARTNERS PROPERTY	9
1.2D) POTENTIAL NON PROFIT PARTNERS PROPERTY	14
2.1 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS	16
2.2 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS	17
2.3 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS	18
2.4 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS	19
2.5 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS	20
2.6 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS	21
3.1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT RESULTS	22
3.2 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY PHASE I	24
3.3 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY PHASE 2	26
3.4 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY PHASE 3	27
3.5 HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD PREFERENCES SURVEY	29
REFERENCES	30

---



## 1.1 METHODS

### LAND USE ANALYSIS

Key Planning conducted a land use analysis to determine areas within our study area that had development capacity and areas that were ideal locations for affordable housing. The land use analysis consisted of several components:

- A site suitability analysis
- A development capacity analysis
- An assessment of the properties owned by PCRI
- An assessment of publicly- and privately-owned properties
- An assessment of properties owned by potential partners

The results of these studies were combined to identify PCRI lots that had potential for further development and other sites which could be considered for purchase in order to meet the goal of 1,000 new affordable units.

This section of the appendix provides a more in-depth look at our methods and results, so that PCRI can investigate aspects of the Community Housing Plan in greater detail should they desire to.

## 1.1 METHODS

### SITE SUITABILITY ANALYSIS

In order to find the most ideal locations for affordable housing based on community feedback, Key Planning conducted a GIS site suitability analysis of NE Portland. First, criteria for the site suitability analysis was determined. We considered proximity to public transit a high priority and collected data on bus stops, MAX stops, and transit centers. Second, we developed a list of amenities and services based on feedback from the N/N housing strategy as well as the Portland Housing Bureau's Opportunity Analysis. The services we determined that should be near any optimal affordable housing location include schools, libraries, community centers, parks, healthy food, healthcare, and employment training centers. We gathered GIS shapefiles from Metro's RLIS database for transit, schools, libraries, community centers, hospitals, and parks. Then we developed a list of other services that would be particularly useful for low-income families: food pantries, child care (including head start programs), affordable health care (including community health clinics), grocery stores that accept Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and Women Infant and Children (WIC) benefits, and employment services; these data were downloaded from the Coalition for a Livable Future.

We chose to look at all of N/NE Portland as the study area, extending from St. Johns on the west to I-205 on the east, bordered by I-84 to the south. Once all the data were collected and geocoded, we created two weighted suitability analyses, one for transit accessibility and one for amenities and services accessibility.

We determined that a quarter mile radius would be optimal for services used every day, such as grocery stores and food pantries, child care, and transit stops. The one exception to this was transit centers, which we gave a half-mile radius to since we assumed people would be willing to travel farther for transit centers that have a broader range of coverage across the region. For important services that would be used less frequently, we decided a half-mile radius would be optimal: libraries, community centers, parks, and employment centers. We then conducted two separate analyses, one for Transit Accessibility and one for Accessibility to Amenities and Services (See Maps 1 and 2).


---

# 1.1 A) ACCESSIBILITY TO PUBLIC TRANSIT

## PUBLIC TRANSIT ACCESSIBILITY MAP

### Transit Accessibility

This map shows the optimal areas for affordable housing development, based on proximity to public transit stops. This map was created using a weighted suitability analysis based on locations of stops for the MAX lines, frequent bus routes, infrequent bus routes, and transit centers. We gave the highest weighting to proximity to bus stops for frequent bus lines, with a 40% weighting. We gave an equal weighting of 20% to transit centers, light rail stops, and infrequent bus stops.



Esri, HERE, DeLorme, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community, Esri, HERE, DeLorme, MapmyIndia, © OpenStreetMap contributors, and the GIS user community

# 1.1 B) NEIGHBORHOOD AMENITIES MAP


## ACCESSIBILITY TO AMENITIES AND SERVICES

### Amenities Accessibility

This map shows areas identified as optimal for affordable housing development, based on proximity to amenities and services. To map affordable food sources, we combined information on food pantries and grocery stores that accept SNAP and WIC benefits. For healthcare services, we used information on locations of healthcare facilities and hospitals. Next, we created a weighted suitability analysis based on proximity to amenities and services. Those services that would be used most frequently received the highest weightings.

Weightings were assigned as follows:


- Food: 30%
- Health: 15%
- Schools: 15%
- Childcare: 15%
- Employment Centers: 10%
- Community Centers: 5%
- Parks: 5%
- Libraries: 5%



# 1.2 FULL DEVELOPMENT CAPACITY

## CITY OF PORTLAND'S BUILDABLE LAND INVENTORY

This map shows all properties within the study area that have some development capacity. While some of these properties are vacant, the majority are occupied with structures; but the zoning allows greater density than what currently exists on site. Since the areas with the greatest development capacity are along Interstate Avenue and MLK Boulevard, it could be assumed that a relatively large amount of infill development will occur along these corridors.



## 1.2B) PCRI PROPERTIES, LAND TO BUILDING VALUE RATIO

### LAND TO BUILDING VALUE RATIO FOR PCRI PROPERTIES

Address	Total Value	Land Value	Building Value	Ratio Land/ Bldg Value
1134 WI/ NE Ainsworth St	\$121,000.00	\$121,000.00	Vacant	N/A
1313 NE Killingsworth St	\$306,890.00	\$132,500.00	\$174,390.00	0.76
1415 N Winchell St	\$227,940.00	\$138,500.00	\$89,440.00	1.55
1531 N Blandena St	\$207,220.00	\$132,000.00	\$75,220.00	1.75
1700 WI/ NE Alberta St	\$88,550.00	\$88,550.00	Vacant	N/A
1732 NE Alberta St	\$251,880.00	\$126,500.00	\$125,380.00	1.01
3170 W/ N Arlington Pl	\$2,500.00	\$2,500.00	Vacant	N/A
3610 N Mississippi Ave	\$340,810.00	\$152,200.00	\$188,610.00	0.81
4066 NE Grand Ave	\$495,200.00	\$288,600.00	\$206,600.00	1.4
432 NE Russett St	\$258,400.00	\$130,500.00	\$127,900.00	1.02
4608 NE Garfield Ave	\$330,400.00	\$188,000.00	\$142,400.00	1.32
5029-5031 WI/ NE 7th Ave	\$336,220.00	\$196,730.00	\$139,490.00	1.41
5125 NE Campaign St	\$158,750.00	\$158,750.00	Vacant	N/A
5254 S/ N Williams Ave	\$175,500.00	\$175,500.00	Vacant	N/A
5403 N Mississippi Ave	\$427,840.00	\$184,000.00	\$243,840.00	0.75
6329 NE MLK Blvd	\$909,070.00	\$566,930.00	\$342,140.00	1.66
7027 NE Grand Ave	\$293,910.00	\$151,650.00	\$142,260.00	1.07
725 N Lombard St	\$273,560.00	\$135,000.00	\$138,560.00	0.97
8240 N Interstate Ave	\$220,530.00	\$125,000.00	\$95,530.00	1.31
9131 N Lombard St	\$274,670.00	\$103,400.00	\$171,270.00	0.6
916 N Mason St	\$262,710.00	\$141,130.00	\$121,580.00	1.16

## 1.2C) POTENTIAL PUBLIC PARTNERS PROPERTY

### PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTIES POTENTIALLY SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT

OWNER	ADDRESS	TAX LOT ID	VACANT	# OF POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL UNITS
EAST MULTNOMAH SOIL & WATER	5211 N/ N WILLIAMS AVE	R877303720	Yes	14
CITY OF PORTLAND	1907 NE SKIDMORE ST	R941230090	No	18
CITY OF PORTLAND	829 WI/ N RUSSELL ST	R678302700	Yes	8
CITY OF PORTLAND (BES)	N/A	R598300970	Yes	1
CITY OF PORTLAND (BES)	N/A	R598300990	Yes	4
CITY OF PORTLAND (BES)	N/A	R598301060	Yes	4
CITY OF PORTLAND (BES)	N COLUMBIA BLVD	R655227520	Yes	2
CITY OF PORTLAND (BIBS)	4906 WI/ NE 6TH AVE	R491800590	Yes	1
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	910 NE M L KING BLVD	R396200370	No	94
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	6931 NE M L KING BLVD	R658100050	No	50
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	NE COR/ 1ST & NE HOLLADAY ST	R396200960	Yes	198
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	N/A	R396200810	Yes	24
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	N/A	R396200780	Yes	42
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	N/A	R396200800	Yes	5
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	888 NE M L KING BLVD	R396200260	Yes	174
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	5125-5131 WI/ NE M L KING BLVD	R877306370	Yes	26
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	5044 S/ NE GARFIELD AVE	R877306390	Yes	26
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	5044 S/ NE GARFIELD AVE	R877306410	Yes	74
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	5029 S/ NE M L KING BLVD	R877306510	Yes	29
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	NWC/ ALBERTA & NE M L KING BLVD	R877306470	Yes	51
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	NWC/ SUMNER & NE M L KING BLVD	R877306550	Yes	147

**PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTIES POTENTIALLY  
SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT**

OWNER	ADDRESS	TAX LOT ID	VACANT	# OF POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL UNITS
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	2221 WI/ N ARGYLE ST	R598300450	Yes	132
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	3620 W/ NE M L KING BLVD	R497103530	Yes	12
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	3620 W/ NE M L KING BLVD	R497103540	Yes	12
CITY OF PORTLAND (PDC)	3620 NE M L KING BLVD	R497103550	Yes	24
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	SEC/ GRAND & NE HASSALO ST	R396200550	No	52
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	NE HOLLADAY ST	R396200580	No	23
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	3368 NE M L KING BLVD	R009604300	Yes	85
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	427 WI/ NE COOK ST	R009604290	Yes	28
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	427 NE COOK ST	R009604270	Yes	28
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	408 NE IVY ST	R009604280	Yes	28
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	NEC/ GRAND & NE HOLLADAY ST	R396200570	Yes	29
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	6445 NE M L KING BLVD	R657809000	Yes	32
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	6431-6435 NE M L KING BLVD	R657808990	Yes	18
CITY OF PORTLAND (PHB)	NE M L KING BLVD	R657808960	Yes	54
CITY OF PORTLAND (WATER BUREAU)	1823 N GOING CT	R660100680	Yes	2
HOME FORWARD	7003 WI/ NE 27TH AVE	R941141490	No	20
HOME FORWARD	9500 N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097390	No	1
HOME FORWARD	9520 N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097380	No	1
HOME FORWARD	9504 N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097400	No	1



**PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTIES POTENTIALLY  
SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT**

OWNER	ADDRESS	TAX LOT ID	VACANT	# OF POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL UNITS
HOME FORWARD	9504 N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097400	No	1
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R600090550	No	4
HOME FORWARD	4375 N TRENTON ST	R194109570	Yes	7
HOME FORWARD	4580 N TRENTON ST	R600094390	Yes	50
HOME FORWARD	SEC/ FISKE & N COLUMBIA BLVD	R600090530	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	9544 N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097410	Yes	39
HOME FORWARD	SEC/ FISKE & N COLUMBIA BLVD	R600090530	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	SEC/ DWIGHT & N WOOLSEY AVE	R600090540	Yes	8
HOME FORWARD	9536 N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097420	Yes	2
HOME FORWARD	9512 N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097430	Yes	12
HOME FORWARD	N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097440	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R600090720	Yes	3
HOME FORWARD	N JUNEAU ST	R851334880	Yes	0
HOME FORWARD	N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097450	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R600090690	Yes	3
HOME FORWARD	N JUNEAU ST	R851334880	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N WOOLSEY AVE	R600097460	Yes	2
HOME FORWARD	N NEWARK ST	R600090640	Yes	2
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R600090680	Yes	6

**PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTIES POTENTIALLY  
SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT**

OWNER	ADDRESS	TAX LOT ID	VACANT	# OF POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL UNITS
HOME FORWARD	N WOOLSEY AVE	R600090650	Yes	3
HOME FORWARD	N WOOLSEY AVE	R600090670	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N WOOLSEY AVE	R600090660	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	9214 S/ N DWIGHT AVE	R600096750	Yes	0
HOME FORWARD	9214 S/ N DWIGHT AVE	R600096750	Yes	49
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R600098310	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R600090400	Yes	3
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R201452000	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R201452020	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R201452040	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R201452060	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	N/A	R201452080	Yes	1
HOME FORWARD	5802 N MICHIGAN AVE	R893903170	No	0
METRO	320 S/ NE LLOYD BLVD	R226504660	Yes	180
MULTNOMAH COUNTY TAX TITLE	1825 S/ N WILLIAMS AVE	R245000040	Yes	0
MULTNOMAH COUNTY TAX TITLE	N/A	R655224830	Yes	1
PORTLAND CITY OF(PDC	84 NE WEIDLER ST	R244901000	Yes	98
STATE OF OREGON (DAS)	214 N RUSSELL ST	R009612610	No	104
STATE OF OREGON (DAS)	30 WI/ N WEBSTER ST	R877304570	Yes	11

PUBLICLY OWNED PROPERTIES POTENTIALLY  
SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT

OWNER	ADDRESS	TAX LOT ID	VACANT	# OF POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL UNITS
STATE OF OREGON (DAS)	30 WI/ N WEBSTER ST	R877304550	Yes	5
STATE OF OREGON (DAS)	30 WI/ N WEBSTER ST	R877304530	Yes	5
STATE OF OREGON (DAS)	30 WI/ N WEBSTER ST	R877304510	Yes	5
STATE OF OREGON (DAS)	30 WI/ N WEBSTER ST	R877304490	Yes	5
STATE OF OREGON (DAS)	N FARGO ST	R710803400	Yes	2
STATE OF OREGON (DAS)	1225 WI/ N THUNDERBIRD WAY	R746700060	Yes	27
				<b>Total Potential Units: 2225</b>

Supplemental Materials:

*Map: Partners Properties with Development Capacity.pdf*

## 1.2D) POTENTIAL NON PROFIT PARTNERS PROPERTY

### NON PROFIT PROPERTIES POTENTIALLY SUITABLE FOR DEVELOPMENT

OWNER	ADDRESS	TAX LOT ID	VACANT	# OF POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL UNITS
BETHEL AFRICAN METHODIST EPISCOPAL	802 NE JARRETT ST	R166400860	Yes	1
HABITAT FOR HUMANITY	1470 WI/ NE KILLINGSWORTH ST	R860700130	Yes	8
HABITAT FOR HUMANITY	N/A	R777120050	Yes	6
JESUIT VOLUNTEER CORPS	3922-3928 WI/ N WILLIAMS AVE	R010504840	Yes	35
JESUIT VOLUNTEER CORPS	NE FAILING ST	R010504850	Yes	9
KING-DISHMAN AFFORDABLE HSG	4942-4956 NE 6TH AVE	R491800550	No	45
METANOIA PEACE COMMUNITY	N/A	R420407730	Yes	1
PEOPLE OF PRAISE INC.	7654 WI/N DELAWARE AVE	R593500250	Yes	4
PROUD GROUND	1322 N WINCHELL ST	R267906390	No	27
PROUD GROUND	6916 N MARYLAND AVE	R332301890	No	50
PROUD GROUND	6535 N MONTANA AVE	R332300320	No	37
PROUD GROUND	8000-8004 N INTERSTATE AVE	R267905920	No	21
PROUD GROUND	7607 N EMERALD AVE	R630400600	No	4
PROUD GROUND	597 WI/ N DEKUM ST	R726901040	Yes	4
SALVATION ARMY	N EMERSON ST	R877303500	Yes	4
SALVATION ARMY	N EMERSON ST	R877303520	Yes	3

APPENDIX

---

OWNER	ADDRESS	TAX LOT ID	VACANT	# OF POTENTIAL ADDITIONAL UNITS
SALVATION ARMY	N EMERSON AVE	R877303540	Yes	3
SALVATION ARMY	SWC/ WILLIAMS & N EMERSON ST	R877303560	Yes	3
SALVATION ARMY	N ROSELAWN ST	R877303630	Yes	3
SALVATION ARMY	N ROSELAWN ST	R877303610	Yes	3
SALVATION ARMY	NWC/ WILLIAMS & N ROSELAWN ST	R877303580	Yes	11
SALVATION ARMY	NEC/ WILLIAMS & NE KILLINGSWORTH ST	R657800720	Yes	34
TRANSITION PROJECTS INC	2242 N/ N WILLIAMS AVE	R009608680	Yes	4
URBAN LEAGUE OF PORTLAND INC	741 N BEECH ST	R146805180	Yes	1
VOLUNTEERS OF AMERICA	4616 WI/ N ALBINA AVE	R163901650	Yes	26
			Total Potential Units: 349	

---

## 2.1 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS

### MODEL 1: CAMPAIGN ST. FLAG LOT ZONING & PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARIES

#### ZONING SUMMARY

Address: 5125 NE Campaign Street

Neighborhood: Cully

Zoning: R5 (Residential 5,000, Single-Family Residential, 1 Unit/5,000 Square Feet of Lot Area)

Use Allowances:

- Uses Allowed Outright: household living (traditional)
- Limited Uses (subject to dimensional constraints, etc.): live-work
- Conditional Uses (require public hearing, etc.): group living, community service
- Housing types allowed: single-family, townhouse/rowhouse, ADU, tiny house (manufactured)
- Homeownership models allowed: single-family & townhouse/rowhouse may be owned or rented, ADU may be rented

Walkscore: 54 (“Somewhat Walkable”)

Nearby: Rigler School, Cully Boulevard

#### PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARY

Standard	Pros	Cons
Housing features	Private: own indoor & outdoor space For sale: homeownership opportunity	Less dense (fewer units for fewer people) Less affordable
Neighborhood amenities	Good community engagement & resources Commercial opportunities on Cully Boulevard	Outside of target N/NE neighborhoods Not historically Black neighborhood
Community	Engaged citizens & community-based organizations	Neighborhood vulnerable to gentrification
Family	Great residential area with single family home opportunities	Fewer opportunities for adult nightlife Lack of diversity/diverse amenities

## 2.2 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS

### MODEL 2: N WILLIAMS FOURPLEX ZONING & PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARIES

#### ZONING SUMMARY

Address: 5254 N Williams Avenue

Neighborhood: Humboldt

Zoning: R1 (Residential 1,000, Multi-Dwelling Residential, 1 Unit/1,000 Square Feet of Lot Area)

#### Use Allowances

- Uses Allowed Outright: household living (traditional)
- Limited Uses (subject to dimensional constraints, etc.): live-work, daycare (could also be conditional)
- Conditional Uses (require public hearing, etc.): group living, community service
- Housing types allowed: multi-family dwelling/development, single-room-occupancy (SRO), single-family detached dwelling, townhouse/rowhouse, ADU, tiny house (manufactured)
- Homeownership models allowed: multi-family, single-family & townhouse/rowhouse may be owned or rented, ADU may be rented

Walkscore: 83 (“Very Walkable”)

Nearby: Jefferson High School, Peninsula Park, commercial retail/employment opportunities on N Williams

#### PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARY

Standard	Pros	Cons
Housing features	More affordable (smaller, attached) Flexible homeownership/rental opportunity	Less private Smaller
Neighborhood amenities	Healthy commercial corridor Multiple transportation options	Site of ongoing painful gentrification & displacement Possibly less accessible for elderly population in fast-paced, somewhat hectic environment
Community	Vibrant nightlife Engaged residential & commercial populations	Neighborhood experiencing significant gentrification, microaggressions
Family	Great, active neighborhood for raising growing family Healthy adult nightlife & opportunities for the whole family	African American community dispersed & being displaced by predominately white residents

## 2.3 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS

### MODEL 3: KILLINGSWORTH TOWNHOUSES ZONING & PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARIES

#### ZONING SUMMARY

Address: 1313 NE Killingsworth Street

Neighborhood: Vernon

Zoning: R1 (Residential 1,000, Multi-Dwelling

Residential, 1 Unit/1,000 Square Feet of Lot Area)

Use Allowances

- Uses Allowed Outright: household living (traditional)
- Limited Uses (subject to dimensional constraints, etc.): live-work, daycare (could also be conditional)
- Conditional Uses (require public hearing, etc.): group living, community service
- Housing types allowed: townhouse/rowhouse, multi-family dwelling/development, single-room-occupancy (SRO), single-family detached dwelling, ADU, tiny house (manufactured)
- Homeownership models allowed: townhouse/rowhouse, multi-family & single-family may be owned or rented, ADU may be rented

Walkscore: 90 (“Walker’s Paradise”)

Nearby: Martin Luther King Boulevard, Sabin Elementary School

#### PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARY

Standard	Pros	Cons
Housing features	Affordable homeownership/rental opportunity Good transition between single family & multifamily development	Less private Not traditional single family detached model
Neighborhood amenities	Excellent access to commercial & transportation opportunities on MLK & Alberta nearby African American community resources nearby	Somewhat commercially depressed area
Community	Historically Black neighborhood with resources intact Healthy adult nightlife	Neighborhood vulnerable to gentrification
Family	Great location for all family types, from young singles to larger families to aging singles	Less traditionally residential area; transition area from residential to commercial



## 2.4 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS

### MODEL 4: GRAND COTTAGE CLUSTER ZONING & PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARIES

#### ZONING SUMMARY

Address: 7027 NE Grand Avenue

Neighborhood: Woodlawn

Zoning: R1 (Residential 1,000, Multi-Dwelling Residential, 1 Unit/1,000 Square Feet of Lot Area)

Use Allowances

- Uses Allowed Outright: household living (traditional)
- Limited Uses (subject to dimensional constraints, etc.): live-work, daycare (could also be conditional)
- Conditional Uses (require public hearing, etc.): group living, community service
- Housing types allowed: multi-family dwelling/development, townhouse/rowhouse, single-room-occupancy (SRO), single-family detached dwelling, ADU, tiny house (manufactured)
- Homeownership models allowed: multi-family, townhouse/rowhouse & single-family may be owned or rented, ADU may be rented

Walkscore: 75 (“Very Walkable”)

Nearby: Peninsula Park, Woodlawn City Park & Dekum’s Triangle commercial retail/employment opportunities

#### PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARY

Standard	Pros	Cons
Housing features	Diverse housing types available Shared, communal spaces	Less private Potentially smaller spaces
Neighborhood amenities	Walkable yet residential in nature Great park & community center nearby	Somewhat less accessible for transportation, commercial options
Community	More traditional residential area with single family development	Less diversity Site of current gentrification
Family	Good residential area for raising family Less hectic environment for aging residents	Lack of healthy adult nightlife Lack of diverse activities for the whole family to enjoy

## 2.5 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS

### MODEL 5: ALBERTA MICRO-MIXED USE ZONING & PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARIES

#### ZONING SUMMARY

Address: 1732 NE Alberta Street

Neighborhood: Vernon

Zoning: CS (Commercial Storefront)

Use Allowances

- Uses Allowed Outright: household living (traditional), retail sales & service, office, schools, daycare
- Conditional Uses (require public hearing, etc.): group living, community service
- Housing types allowed: stacked flats, townhouse/rowhouse, multi-family dwelling/development, single-room-occupancy (SRO), single-family detached dwelling, ADU, tiny house (manufactured)
- Homeownership models allowed: condo, townhouse/rowhouse, multi-family & single-family may be owned or rented, ADU may be rented

Walkscore: 90 (“Walker’s Paradise”)

Nearby: Community Cycling Center, Alberta Street commercial corridor

#### PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARY

Standard	Pros	Cons
Housing features	Dense: more units for more people For rent (accessible for lower MFI levels)	Not single-family detached Potentially less private Not for sale (unless condo ownership model applied)
Neighborhood amenities	Multiple commercial retail/employment opportunities on Alberta Great transit accessibility & walkability Relatively resource-rich	Somewhat less affordable (commercial retail sources higher-end, less for necessities and more for luxuries)
Community	African-American history of Alberta street rich (relocation site of businesses, etc., displaced from MLK)	Very whitewashed area; site of mass displacement & subsequent gentrification
Family	Great place to raise growing family/family with children of any age Great adult nightlife	Less accessible for aging population; pace less friendly toward aging population

## 2.6 HOUSING TYPES AND DEVELOPMENT MODELS

### MODEL 6: GARFIELD APARTMENTS ZONING & PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARIES

#### ZONING SUMMARY

Address: 4608 NE Garfield Avenue

Neighborhood: King

Zoning: CM3 (Proposed; Commercial Mixed Use 3)

Use Allowances (to be confirmed upon adoption of proposed zoning)

- Uses Allowed Outright: household living (traditional), retail sales & service, office, schools, daycare
- Conditional Uses (require public hearing, etc.): group living, community service
- Housing types allowed: stacked flats, townhouse/rowhouse, multi-family dwelling/development, single-room-occupancy (SRO), single-family detached dwelling, ADU, tiny house (manufactured)
- Homeownership models allowed: condo, townhouse/rowhouse, multi-family & single-family may be owned or rented, ADU may be rented

Walkscore: 87 (“Very Walkable”)

Nearby: MLK Boulevard & Alberta Street commercial & transportation corridors, King School Park

#### PREFERENCES/TRADEOFFS SUMMARY

Standard	Pros	Cons
Housing features	Dense: more units for more people For rent (accessible for lower MFI levels; more affordable)	Not single-family detached Potentially less private Not for sale (unless condo ownership model applied) Potentially smaller
Neighborhood amenities	Multiple commercial retail/employment opportunities on Alberta Great transit accessibility & walkability Relatively resource-rich	Somewhat less affordable (commercial retail sources higher-end, less for necessities and more for luxuries)
Community	African-American history of Alberta street rich (relocation site of businesses, etc., displaced from MLK)	Very whitewashed area; site of mass displacement & subsequent gentrification
Family	Great place to raise growing family/family with children of any age Great adult nightlife	Less accessible for aging population; pace less friendly toward aging population

## 3.1 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT RESULTS

### **Community Engagement**

Key Planning developed a community engagement strategy and helped to launch a community engagement campaign with two primary goals: 1) introduce the Pathway 1000 initiative to the N/NE Portland community, and 2) make sure our land use and development recommendations align with expressed community needs and preferences. This section outlines the community engagement strategy developed by Key Planning, details the work that took place on the ground, including shortcomings identified in pursuit of the strategy, and offers a summary of our findings from our community-based participatory research.

### **Results of our Community Engagement**

Through our meetings, our survey, and our interviews with community members, we have learned a lot about the principles that need to guide the Pathway 1000 initiative.

- The N/NE neighborhoods are important to Black Portlanders, and for good reason. These neighborhoods have exceptional access to services, amenities, and jobs, while they are also a place of shared history and cultural warmth for the Black community. Gentrification has made it nearly impossible for people to live in the area but has brought many investments. As a result, native Black Portlanders feel robbed of place—and have seen a diminishing of their rights to the city. After being educated by the community and getting to know their concerns, we assert that these place-based investments should be shared in by N/NE Portland’s historic Black community.
- The community wants to be involved in creating the N/NE Portland of the future—and there is a clear vision for the direction that we should be headed in. Now, it is fitting that local planning and development agencies acknowledge the depth and breadth of community based knowledge, and proactively work with these communities by sharing resources and co-developing a route forward.

We have also learned a lot about about specific neighborhood and housing priorities from communities members that currently live in affordable housing, or are currently seeking affordable housing.

---

- In terms of neighborhood priorities, we heard that people want convenient, walkable neighborhoods that are dense enough to support good public transit and feature local businesses and culturally specific services. They want to see mixed income, racially diverse neighborhoods. And, most importantly, people need to feel secure and welcome in their neighborhoods just as they are.
  - For housing priorities, we heard that people want durable and energy efficient housing. They want simplicity in their home design, with natural features, tall ceilings, and multi-functional or adaptable space inside. Many folks wanted access to private green space, and the ability to garden and grow their own food. Many folks reacted positively to the idea of living in a duplex or a cottage cluster—a nice home that shares the same lot with other families similar to their own. Importantly, people want homes that fit into the traditional character and design of the N/NE neighborhoods.
  - Housing stability and neighborhood character are just as important as affordability. People want to know their neighbors and to share experiences and build community in N/NE Portland, together. They also want to know that the history of N/NE Portland will not be lost, but will be respected and built upon by the people who live here now.
-


## 3.2 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY PHASE I

### Stakeholder Participation in the Planning Process

Involving stakeholders in the formation of the research process can build trust and help ensure that the process will produce more equitable results (Pahl-Wostl & Hare, 2004). For our purposes, local knowledge was used to develop and sort scenario alternatives, and to guide the adoption of a final set of housing and community development scenarios.

### Stakeholder Analysis Framework

Identifying and prioritizing stakeholders is a strategic, iterative process that taps into informal community structures to approach and engage marginalized communities. In identifying marginalized communities, the stakeholder analysis is based on an intersectional approach, which centers the most impacted community members in line with a community-based participatory research framework:



Key Planning engaged in strategic dialogue guided by stakeholders that have been traditionally marginalized within planning practice. This means that the basis of communication between the engagement team and marginalized communities was defined by the communities themselves and structured around their availability and needs.

The definitive stakeholders to be engaged through the bulk of our community engagement strategy were PCRI's clientele: community members that currently live in PCRI housing and those who will live in PCRI housing as participants in the Pathway 1000 initiative.

**Stakeholder Selection Imperatives**

The Community Engagement Lead focused on addressing power imbalances and inaccessibility through promoting flexibility in each stage of the process and in the structure of the process itself. The facilitation team was made responsible for initiating and maintaining contact with assigned contacts on the master contact list. Assignments were based on the specific contextual information or data required for each member of the Key Planning group. The aim was to accelerate data sharing between the Key Planning subject area lead and their key informants.

**Audience Analysis and Developing Messaging**

The Community Engagement Lead conducted a preliminary audience analysis to determine what messaging would be most effective with the primary and secondary audiences for the Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan. Primary audiences include PCRI and program participants in the Pathway 1000 initiative. Secondary audiences include government partners and study area residents. Under consideration in the case of each party was their goals, their current knowledge, their beliefs and values, and their needs and expectations. Deliberately addressing these areas helped the team to develop messages appropriate for each audience, and finally a plan that is accessible to all parties.

---

## 3.3 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY PHASE 2

### **Preliminary Engagement, Community Coordination**

Phase two of the community engagement strategy pertains to data collection, continued stakeholder identification, and community coordination. During this phase, the Community Engagement Lead and support team conducted informational interviews with key players in local government agencies, PCRI and their community partners, area nonprofits, members of the African American business community, and other key community leaders.

The purpose of these interviews was to gather information about the existing conditions in the study area, to inform potential community partners of the nature of our goals and our work, and to align efforts in identifying potential community stakeholders (individuals) that should be engaged in the upcoming community events.

Interviewees from the nonprofit sector, local business community, and faith community were asked a set of identical questions that informed our understanding of our work and our study area. The questions posed were:

1. What has gentrification meant for N/NE Portland?
  2. What would you/your constituency like to see change in N/NE Portland?
  3. In light of the right to return policy that will be instituted by the Pathway 1000 initiative, what do we need to do to welcome people back to N/NE Portland?
-



## 3.4 COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY PHASE 3

### **Community Events/Forums**

The purpose of the sequential community forums was to gather data and community feedback on what types of housing types should be prioritized in development and what elements would make these neighborhoods feel like home to participants in the Pathway 1000 initiative and those exercising their right to return, including amenities, services, and design features.

The first event oriented the audience to the project, the key player, and their goals. Participants were provided with opportunities to interact with one another, to discuss their visions and desires, and to collaborate. During this session, facilitators provided broad discussion prompts, such as: What does a home mean to you? What do you want out of your home? What do you need out of your home? What does community mean to you? What do you want/need from your community?

Participants discussed broad themes, and their answers were recorded and reported back by the facilitators. Facilitators helped to translate these desires and needs into specific housing and neighborhood features in order to package this feedback into subsequent event activities. Participants took part in a Housing Preference Activity, discussing housing types while taking an interactive live survey.

The second event offered the community engagement team the opportunity to drill down on the feedback they had received and offer details on the tradeoffs associated with housing types and different design interventions. Possibilities were constrained in this forum, and facilitators asked participants to help them prioritize specific designs. PCRI staff assisted in discussing housing models and tradeoffs. Maxine Fitzpatrick presented on the guiding principals of the Pathway 1000 initiative and explained how potential participants could apply for affordable housing through PCRI.

The final event was designed as an inclusive community event where PCRI clientele and their neighbors, as well as area community and nonprofit groups, could come together and

---

affirmatively build community. Half of this event focused on creative collaboration and joyful interaction.

Closing this event, facilitators gave a report out on the results of the community involvement data, letting the community know “what we heard.” The event was co-hosted by PAALF People’s Plan, a community-based plan for and by the Black community, allowing for a comprehensive take on strategies to uplift the Black community. Posters featured images of the top design choices that were prioritized by the community and gave room for written reactions to these housing types. Collage stations asked community members to create a “day in the life” depiction of their ideal life, home, and neighborhood. One-on-one interviews were conducted with attendees. Photo booths and music were planned for this event, in addition to a buffet. Facilitators discussed the progress of the Pathway 1000 Community Housing Plan, talked about the trajectory of Pathway 1000 initiative, and helped participants identify pathways for continued community involvement.

---

## 3.5 HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD PREFERENCES SURVEY

A community housing survey was conducted to determine preferences among community members for housing and neighborhood amenities. Our survey tool was hosted online through Qualtrics, allowing for access through desktop and mobile devices. We also used a paper copy of the survey for in-person surveying at two of the community forums held and during three days of intercept surveying at the PCRI office as residents came in to pay rent, apply for housing, and sign up for the preference policy.

The survey included questions about community members' preferences for housing features and neighborhood amenities, in addition to demographic information about participants. We had 42 respondents to the survey with:

**54%** identifying as African American

**19%** currently PCRI residents

**79%** renting their home.

Survey participants were asked to choose up to three values that were most important to them in their ideal home, and in their ideal neighborhood.

**Supplemental Materials: Full datasets from the survey and community forum activities are shown in the supplemental materials.**

Survey Tool: *Pathway1000\_Survey.pdf*

Survey Results: *Pathway1000\_SurveyReport.pdf*

From the 39 responses, the top three values chosen for their ideal home are:

**Safety:** the home is safe and secure, 54% (21 respondents)

**Location:** Proximity to neighborhood amenities, work, and social life, 44% (17 respondents)

**Efficiency:** Requires less energy, water, etc. for everyday tasks—reduced utility bills and impact on the environment, 36% (14 respondents)

And among the 41 responses, the top three values chosen for their ideal neighborhood are:

**Diversity:** the neighborhood provides an inclusive environment where people from a variety of races, with differing incomes, and from different backgrounds live, 61% (25 respondents)

**Safety:** the neighborhood is free from crime and safe for all to walk around and children to play, 59% (24 respondents)

**Community:** the neighborhood is a friendly place where neighbors know each other, 54% (22 respondents)

## REFERENCES

Bates, L. Curry-Stevens, A. & the Coalition of Communities of Color (2014). *The African American Community in Multnomah County: An Unsettling Profile*. Portland, OR: Portland State University.

Bates, L. K. (2013). Gentrification and Displacement Study: implementing an equitable inclusive development strategy in the context of gentrification.

Beamish, J., Goss, C. & Emmel, J. (2001). UL 28:1-2, 1-28, DOI:10.1080/08882746.2001.11430459

Hannah-Jones, N. (2011). "In Portland's Heart, 2010 Census Shows Diversity Dwindling." *The Oregonian*, A1. Accessed online March 10, 2016 at: [http://www.oregonlive.com/pacific-northwest-news/index.ssf/2011/04/in\\_portlands\\_heart\\_diversity\\_dwindles.html](http://www.oregonlive.com/pacific-northwest-news/index.ssf/2011/04/in_portlands_heart_diversity_dwindles.html).

Kristina Smock Consulting (2015). *2015 Point-in-Time Count of Homelessness in Portland/Multnomah County, Oregon*. Portland Housing Bureau and Multnomah County.

Kania, J., & Kramer, M. (2011). Collective impact.

Lane, D. & Mayes, S. (1990). "Bank Redlining Creates Blue Print for Slum in North, Inner NE Portland: 1990 Coverage from the *Oregonian*." Accessed online March 10, 2016 at: [http://www.oregonlive.com/portland/index.ssf/2014/08/bank\\_redlining\\_creates\\_bluepri.html](http://www.oregonlive.com/portland/index.ssf/2014/08/bank_redlining_creates_bluepri.html).

Metro (2014). Residential Preference Study. Accessed online March 2016.

Metro (2016). Opportunities and Challenges for Equitable Housing. Accessed online at <http://www.oregonmetro.gov/sites/default/files/EquitableHousingReport-20160122.pdf>.

The Tracking Toolbox. Retrieved June 07, 2016, from <http://www.forworkingfamilies.org/resources/publications/tracking-toolbox>

Portland Housing Bureau (2015). N/NE Neighborhood Housing Strategy. Accessed online at <https://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/65193>.

---