

Date: March 31, 2018

To: Seattle City Council

From: Steve Walker, Director; Emily Alvarado, Policy Manager; Maureen Kostyack, Strategic Advisor

CC: Brenda Anibarro and Erika Pablo, Office for Civil Rights

Subject: Resolution 31754: Affirmative Marketing and Community Resident Preference Policies

This memo responds to Council Resolution 31754, which requests that the Office of Housing (OH) provide recommendations that would provide neighborhood stability and, in particular, to review community resident preference programs in other comparable cities and submit recommendations to Council by March 31, 2018. The memo provides a status report on research and policy development that is still underway, in coordination with the Office for Civil Rights, including community input and engagement. OH will be available to report to City Council in six months about our recommendation regarding a potential community resident preference policy, after continued and focused community engagement, policy and legal research, and other efforts as described in more detail below.

OH has provided several recent City Council presentations that broadly cover our activities related to neighborhood stability and anti-displacement (see summary below). Therefore, this memo focuses on the specific Council request to investigate ways that OH-funded housing developments may be able to give preference to residents of the neighborhood in which the housing is located.

Council Resolution 31754, Section 14, states:

The Council requests that the Office of Housing, in collaboration with community partners and other City departments, prepare and submit recommendations to Council by March 31, 2018 for best practices, financial tools, as well as potential changes to the Seattle Housing Levy Administrative and Financial Plan and sub sections 23.58B.040.B and 23.58C.040.B of the Land Use Code. Council seeks recommendations that would provide neighborhood stability, as evidenced by people returning or being able to stay in the neighborhood, such as options for giving preference to qualified applicants for OH-supported housing who have been long-time residents of the neighborhood in which the housing is located, informed by a review of preference programs implemented in comparable settings, such as San Francisco, California, and Portland, Oregon.

The 2017 City of Seattle and Seattle Housing Authority Joint [Assessment of Fair Housing \(AFH\)](#) submitted to HUD, recommits Seattle to affirmatively furthering fair housing by addressing both segregation and displacement. It acknowledged that Seattle still reflects historic patterns of racial and ethnic segregation with predominately white households living in the north of Seattle and concentrations of people of color in the south of Seattle. It also detailed trends of displacement, including the distinct loss of Black population in and around the Central District and in much of Southeast Seattle. Input in the community engagement for the AFH affirmed that community sees how historic redlining and mortgage practices

shaped the racial character of neighborhoods and how economic pressures now displace residents from their longstanding communities.

[Seattle 2035 Growth and Equity Analysis](#) analyzed impacts on displacement and opportunity related to Seattle's Growth Strategy, providing analysis of some of the ways that the growth strategies could affect the city's marginalized populations. Specifically, it mapped displacement risk, focusing on both physical (direct) and economic and cultural (indirect) displacement that affects marginalized populations. By combining data on vulnerability, amenities, development potential, and rents, the displacement risk index identifies areas where displacement of marginalized populations may be more likely.

Addressing displacement is priority for City housing funding programs. The Council-adopted OH Funding Policies set objectives for the Rental Housing Program, including: *Contribute to the City's equitable development goals through the development and preservation of affordable housing in low-income neighborhoods where underserved groups have historic ties, including neighborhoods where low-income individuals and families are at high risk of displacement.* Significant concerns about displacement were expressed during City Council's deliberations on the 2016 Seattle Housing Levy renewal.

There is strong community concern about displacement of communities of color and low-income households, and consistent advocacy for the City to strengthen strategies that provide an opportunity for people to stay in their communities, help sustain longstanding local cultural anchors, and also to address past harms. This support has been well-documented in the city plans and policies referenced above.

1. Background – Anti-Displacement Strategies to Promote Neighborhood Stability

The exploration of a community resident preference policy -- intended to help low-income residents return to or stay in their neighborhood -- must consider the context of the City residential anti-displacement and stabilization strategies that are in place. Anti-displacement is central to the Office of Housing's work. OH deploys a range of strategies designed to prevent and mitigate displacement and help longtime residents remain in their neighborhoods. These strategies include:

- Funding the development and preservation of affordable housing, including in high displacement risk neighborhoods, and including developments that provide ground floor spaces for cultural, community and commercial anchors
- Funding of new Rental Rehabilitation Financing
- Sustainable homeownership tools, including Home Repair Program loans and grants
- Strategic acquisition of property for affordable housing
- Community input and engagement:
 - *Community Driven Outcomes in Affordable Housing Development.* This all-day workshop on February 27th was designed to bring together community-based organizations, housing organizations, neighborhood groups interested in community outcomes and anti-displacement. Its purpose was to foster communication, provide information, and hear community input. The workshop featured local and national case studies as well as

in depth discussions of key issues. Several city departments assisted with planning and presenting the workshop, which was attended by about 80 people. The workshop presentation by OH and OCR on affirmative marketing and resident preference is attached. All workshop materials are posted on OH's website.

2. Affirmative Marketing – Requirements and Best Practices

Affirmative Marketing refers to outreach to potential housing residents, beyond standard advertising, to let them know that affordable housing opportunities are available. The purpose of affirmative marketing is to provide equal access to housing choices regardless of race, national origin, familial status, disability, and other protected class status. Affirmative marketing is mandated by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) for all federally funded housing as an essential step to further fair housing. OH has extended this requirement to all City-funded housing.

Affirmative marketing has helped to provide neighborhood residents with access to new affordable housing developments in a number of Seattle projects. To that end, ensuring effective affirmative marketing policies are in place is foundational; it is the basis for who knows about and applies for City-supported affordable housing.

- i. **City Affordable Housing Incentive Programs:** Early this year, OH released new requirements for affirmative marketing for housing that is participating in incentive programs, including the Multifamily Tax Exemption Program, Incentive Zoning, and Mandatory Housing Affordability. Under the [Affirmative Marketing](#) policy, two weeks prior to generalized advertising for the initial lease up of the property, the owner must: 1) contact the Seattle Housing Authority so that information about available units will be communicated to voucher holders, and 2) contact three community-based organizations to inform them of the available units. In addition, the policy requires that property owners annually share their leasing information with community-based organizations. Lastly, the policy requires that the properties offer a voluntary demographic survey to residents so that OH can gain important data on households benefiting from the program.

This Affirmative Marketing policy for was developed after implementation of a Racial Equity toolkit, a survey to 100 community-based organizations, and meetings with community groups facilitated by the Department of Neighborhood's Community Liaisons. Key lessons learned from the engagement include: many community organizations serving low-income communities of color felt that housing information was shared by word of mouth in their communities, so an online database would not be the best tool to help underserved and marginalized communities know about available housing. OH will closely monitor implementation of this policy.

- ii. **City-Funded Affordable Housing:** OH requires affirmative marketing for all City-funded housing. A housing owner must include a description of affirmative marketing efforts in its Management Plan for each project, which is approved by OH prior to initial leasing. This must include actions to provide information and otherwise attract eligible applicants from

all racial, ethnic and gender groups in the area, including persons who are otherwise unlikely to apply for housing at their property. Owners meet these requirements, in part, by contacting organizations serving disadvantage groups to let them know of housing opportunities and how their community members or clients can apply. Owners must report annually to OH on their efforts and results.

In the coming months, OH will develop a guidance for affirmative marketing for funded housing based on national and local best practices. This work will build on outreach to community organizations conducted for the incentive program requirements described above. It will involve input from community organizations and housing providers, as well as research on national best practices. The purpose of this work will be to provide information and improve practices and, over time, to examine the impact of affirmative marketing on the diversity of applications received.

Office of Housing Next Steps:

- Research national best practices; survey and convene local organizations to identify local best practices
- Circulate draft and finalize OH Guidance for City-funded housing
- Monitor outcomes of Incentive Program Affirmative Marketing Requirements

3. Community Resident Preference – Case Studies

Community Resident Preference refers to policies that give a preference to certain applicants to housing at the time of initial leasing. If carefully constructed, such policies can be part of a jurisdiction's anti-displacement strategies.

Community Resident Preference policies do not generally guarantee that an applicant eligible for the preference will be able to reside in a particular housing development. Depending on the number and type of preferences used, the policy will create a smaller pool of eligible applicants for units subject to the preference. A lottery is still commonly used to create a ranked list of applicants.

To conform with Fair Housing, any preference policy must meet the requirements of HUD's 2015 Rule on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing. This rule advances the original objective of the Fair Housing Act to reduce segregation, and increase choice and opportunity, for members of protected classes. It created a legal test for disparate impact, including a requirement that policies be designed to limit/minimize discriminatory impact on members of protected classes. For example, a policy that gives preference to residents of a neighborhood that has a high proportion of a particular racial group may be seen to discriminate against members of other protected classes. OH is working closely with the Office for Civil Rights to research policy options and engage the community to address any concerns raised about potential discriminatory impacts of preference policies.

In recent years, community-based affordable housing developers in Seattle have explored or implemented various approaches to provide preference to certain applicants, to address and prevent displacement. One development provided a preference for applicants from certain zip codes reflecting communities with a high risk of displacement. Absent clear government guidance, this approach has been met with hesitance by property management companies.

Case Studies

Several cities across the country have implemented Community Resident Preference policies at the urging of community members to help address past harms of segregation caused by government policy and practice and to address present impacts of displacement. While the policies vary in design and implementation, they share an underlying purpose. Vicki Been, the former Department of Housing Preservation and Development Commissioner for the City of New York [explained](#) that New York "is intended to ensure that local residents, many of whom have deep roots in the community and have persevered through years of unfavorable living conditions, are able to remain in their neighborhoods as those neighborhoods are revitalized" in part through development. In Portland, Oregon, policy was instituted [explicitly](#) to mitigate marginalizing or displacing community members, particularly because Portland's urban renewal explicitly marginalized and displaced historic residents of North and Northeast Portland. In San Francisco, Mayor Edwin Lee [acknowledged](#) that their policy was "important progress in our efforts to halt the displacement of residents at greatest risk of being forced out of the city they know and love," said. "This will thwart the out-migration of African-American and Latino communities who have been deeply impacted by the challenging housing market."

These three cities – New York City, Portland and San Francisco -- provide examples of community resident preference as an anti-displacement strategy. Additional information about each city is attached to this memo.

New York City Community Preference Policy

New York's high housing costs led the City to develop anti-displacement preference policies over 30 years ago. The policy has been changed over the years and challenged successfully in court in certain circumstances. The current challenge in federal district court is being watched nationally.

- In effect since 1980s
- Applies to all funded projects citywide
- 50% of units set-aside for preference during initial lease up only
- Preference for neighborhood residents
- Applicant selected via lottery

San Francisco Neighborhood Preference Policy

San Francisco's policy gives preference residents living immediately near the project location or in the same City district. The policy applies to projects not using HUD funding. HUD opposed application of this policy to a HUD-funded senior project in the Western Addition district, finding that it could limit equal access to housing and perpetuate segregation, inconsistent with the Civil Rights Related Program Requirement of HUD.

- In effect in 2016
- Previously applied to all funded projects; Now applies unless project is receiving HUD funding
- 40% of units set-aside for preference during initial lease up or initial sale only
- Eligible applicants: reside in same Supervisorial District or within ½ mile of project
- Applicants selected via lottery

San Francisco Anti-Displacement Preference Policy

San Francisco negotiated with HUD to develop this policy to replace Neighborhood Preference. The approved policy provides priority access to a portion of units in a development to households living in census tracts that have been identified as having the greatest risk of displacement.

- In effect in 2016
- Applies to certain funded projects in low-income neighborhoods with high displacement risk, as defined by a research analysis conducted by University of California Berkeley.
- 40% of units set-aside for preference during lease up or initial sale only
- Eligible applicants: reside in one of six city neighborhoods that have been identified as having the greatest risk of displacement
- Applicants selected via lottery

Portland, Oregon, Affordable Housing Preference Policy, N/NE Neighborhood

Portland's policy is designed to give preference to marginalized families with historic roots in North

and Northeast Portland, neighborhoods affected by Urban Renewal. The policy was developed as part of the North/Northeast Neighborhood Housing Plan, which also provides funds for housing development. The preference is for families currently in the community as well as those who have already been displaced. The policy gives first priority to households displaced by the Portland's seizure of their property by eminent domain for Urban Renewal activities.

- In effect in 2015
- Applies to funded projects in areas of concentrated Urban Renewal activity in N/NE Portland
- 40% of units set-aside for preference during initial lease up or sale only
- Top priority given to households who owned property in North/Northeast Portland that was taken by city government, and to their descendants; preference also given for current or former residents, with a point system.

4. Community Resident Preference – Research and Policy Development

Cities across the country, particularly those facing displacement of low-income communities of color, are considering community resident preference policies. Recent litigation and HUD actions are bringing the issue into more public discussion. National housing and civil rights organizations are examining pros, cons and potential approaches. Examples can be seen in policy papers at [New York University's Furman Center](#) for Real Estate & Urban Policy.

Earlier this year, HUD suspended its review of already-submitted local Assessments of Fair Housing (AFH) and put future AFHs on hold to allow time for a Department review of AFH requirements and fair housing policy. Therefore, it is difficult to predict future positions of HUD's fair housing enforcement division on community resident preference policies. (Note: Seattle's AFH was already approved by HUD and the City must still implement all HUD requirements.)

In consultation with national experts, including former HUD Fair Housing officials, several preliminary directions can be taken from recent experience. In designing a community resident preference policy, policymakers should consider:

- Demographic data on geographic areas:
 - The extent to which policies are informed by reliable demographic data that clearly shows implications of a preference policy for various racial and ethnic groups and other protected classes.
 - How the scope, scale, and design of geographic boundaries forming the basis of preference policy might promote integration or segregation for current and future populations.
- Data demonstrating displacement:
 - Whether a policy is justified by data that clearly documents the effects of displacement on various racial and ethnic groups and other protected classes.
- Multiple preference points:

- Whether there is a point system that allows for several criteria to form the basis for applicant selection and preference.
- The extent to which preference policy applies to a portion of, rather than the entirety of, the building.
- The distinction between a preference policy which determines a household’s placement in a lottery, as opposed to their overall eligibility to apply for a development.
- Fund sources:
 - Whether a development utilizing a preference policy includes federal funds.
 - Whether various affordable housing fund sources trigger specific marketing, wait list, lottery, or other applicant selection process.

Community resident preference policies have been discussed for many years at the High Cost Cities Housing Forum convened by Enterprise Community Partners, of which OH is a member. There is potential that national convenings will be organized on this topic in the coming year, with likely involvement of the Urban Institute, Enterprise Community Partners, and philanthropic organizations. These convenings may help to hone in on best practices for design of community resident preference policies, such as those identified above.

Office of Housing Next Steps in Collaboration with Office for Civil Rights:

- Further research on existing preference policies: data used to define displacement risk and establish preference areas, lottery systems, evaluation/monitoring
- Track litigation and any HUD actions
- Track and participate in any convenings of cities, community organizations, and fair housing organizations from around the country
- Explore sufficiency and applicability of local data (including underlying indicators in the Growth with Equity Analysis and Tenant Relocation Assistance data) to serve as justification for and design of a potential community resident preference policy in Seattle

5. Community Input and Engagement

Community input is essential to development of affirmative marketing guidance and a potential community resident preference policy guidance. OH is working with OCR to hear from community members and community based organizations about goals, priorities and concerns. This dialogue is

underway and will continue to guide policy options development. To date, community engagement has included:

- As mentioned above, affirmative marketing and resident preference were a featured topic at OH's recent workshop *Community Driven Outcomes in Affordable Housing Development*. The discussion covered Seattle's history of housing discrimination and segregation, fair housing policy objectives and requirements; and learnings from the experience of New York, San Francisco, and Portland. The community response reflected the common desire to serve the specific community that is supporting the housing development, and strong concerns about fair housing violations.
- OH presentation to Chinatown International District Community Development and Stabilization Workgroup
- Project-specific discussions as requested by affordable housing providers

Office of Housing Next Steps in Collaboration with Office for Civil Rights:

- Engage with community members and organizations to discuss goals, priorities, concerns and potential unintended consequences of resident preference; focus on engagement with communities of color and impacted communities.
- Engage with fair housing and legal organizations to explore potential risks/unintended consequences of this work.
- Consider approach to engagement with HUD.

Attachments:

1. New York City Community Preference Policy
2. City of San Francisco Lottery Preference Programs
3. City of Portland Affordable Housing Preference Policy, N/NE Neighborhood
4. Community-Driven Outcomes in Affordable Housing Development workshop: Housing Access for Local Communities session presentation

New York City; Community Preference Policy

What is the Preference Policy?

When New York City helps finance the construction or renovation of affordable housing, it requires that in half of the affordable units the property developer give a preference to income-eligible residents of the community board district where the property is built. NYC's districts are defined [here](#). The policy is intended to ensure that local residents, many of whom have deep roots in the community and have persevered through years of unfavorable living conditions, are able to remain in their neighborhoods as those neighborhoods are revitalized.

How does it work? <https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/hpd/downloads/pdf/Marketing-Guidelines.pdf> (pg. 27)

The Community Preference is mandatory. The Developer must, during initial rent-up, give an occupancy preference for fifty percent (50%) of the units to applicants who, at the time of application, are residents of the Community District in which the building is located. Applicants with community resident status must meet all other programmatic requirements of the Agency and the Developer (e.g., income qualification, credit worthiness).

If after all applications have been opened and processed the community preference cannot be filled from applicants in the logbook, the Developer must provide a letter to the Agency stating how much of the preference has been achieved. After review, the Agency may waive the remainder of this preference and authorize the Developer to proceed with the remainder of the log sequentially. If the community preference is fully achieved, any remaining community applicants will be processed from the log in the same order as other applicants.

Community Preference Policy Lawsuit:

In 2015, a federal lawsuit (Winfield v. City of New York) was filed on behalf of on behalf of three black residents New York City. Plaintiffs claim that the Community Preference Policy has a disparate impact on African-American and Latino applicants in "neighborhoods of opportunity," which they assert are predominantly white. They also claim that the Community Preference Policy perpetuates racial segregation in the city and that its promulgation and application constitutes intentional discrimination in violation of the federal Fair Housing Act, 42 U.S.C. §§ 3604.

<https://ralphlosey.files.wordpress.com/2017/12/winfield-v-city-of-new-york-tar-case.pdf>

The case is continuing to work its way through federal court. The Plaintiffs' attorneys maintain a website showing the status of this litigation: <http://www.antibiaslaw.com/orp>.

Media

<https://consumerfinancialserviceslaw.us/new-york-city-defends-its-community-preference-policy/>

<https://www.wsj.com/articles/hud-reviews-new-york-city-affordable-housing-policy-1424399380>

https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2815771

<https://citylimits.org/2016/04/27/advocates-wary-of-lawsuit-over-citys-affordable-housing-preferences/>

<http://www.nydailynews.com/opinion/perpetuating-segregated-city-article-1.3372393>

<http://furmancenter.org/research/iri/discussions/community-preferences-and-fair-housing>

City of San Francisco Lottery Preference Programs

<http://sfmohcd.org/lottery-preference-programs>

Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference FAQs [excerpt]: <http://sfmohcd.org/neighborhood-resident-housing-preference>

What is the Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference?

The Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference is designed to benefit residents living in the same neighborhood as projects containing city supported affordable housing units. The preference applies only to new residential developments going through the initial lease-up or sale process and is limited to 40% of the units in the development.

How does the Neighborhood Resident Preference help me get housing?

San Francisco's affordable housing lotteries are very competitive with many eligible applicants for each available unit. The Neighborhood Resident Housing Preference improves the chances for residents of the area around the project by ensuring that 40% of the available units are first offered to neighborhood residents. Applicants who qualify for the preference will be included in a special lottery pool from which residents will be selected for these units. Once 40% of the units are filled from the Neighborhood Preference pool any additional neighborhood residents will be included among other applicants from outside the neighborhood for consideration for the remaining units.

Eligibility for neighborhood preference does not guarantee that the holder will be eligible for a City Affordable Housing unit. All applicants will still be required to meet all other eligibility requirements of the unit (e.g. income eligibility, household size requirements, etc.).

Who is eligible for the preference?

To be eligible for the neighborhood preference, there must be at least one member of your household who, at the time of application submission, has a primary residence that is located within the same Supervisorial District as the project or within a ½ mile buffer around the location of the project.

How do I apply for the preference?

Applying for the preference is as simple as checking the Neighborhood Resident box on the Lottery Application form and providing proof of occupancy. The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development will use its Geographic Information System (GIS) to verify whether your addresses qualifies and will post a list of applicants who qualify before the lottery.

Anti-Displacement Housing Preference [excerpt] <http://sfmohcd.org/anti-displacement-housing-preference>

The Mayor's Office of Housing and Community Development has worked with the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the state of California Department of Housing and Community Development to craft an appropriate implementation program for lottery preferences. Recognizing that San Francisco must act to protect residents being priced out of the

City in the current housing environment, the Anti-Displacement Housing Preference will apply to certain new affordable housing projects. For projects where this preference applies, the preference allows up to 40% of units to be prioritized for residents who live in low-income neighborhoods undergoing extreme displacement pressure. Lottery preference will be given to households living in census tracts that have been identified as having the greatest risk of displacement. These districts are located citywide, and include census tracts in the Western Addition, Bayview, the Mission, the Richmond, Russian Hill, and South of Market neighborhoods.

Eligibility for Preference Status

To be eligible for the Anti-Displacement Housing Preference (ADHP), a Household must include at least one member who, at application submission, lives in one of the census tracts listed in the San Francisco Census Tracts with Highest Risk of Displacement document. These census tracts are also identified in the: Map of Census Tracts Eligible for Anti-Displacement Preference" and Census Tracts Eligible for Anti-Displacement Preference. MOHCD will use its Geographic Information System (GIS) to determine which applicant addresses are eligible for the preference. The list of applicants (identified by their unique 'lottery ticket' numbers) who qualify for the Anti-Displacement Housing Preference will be listed on the project posting at <http://housing.sfgov.org> one week prior to the lottery.

Media

Excerpt from NPR [story](#):

HUD originally objected to the city's initial plan to grant "neighborhood preferences" to seniors residing mainly in the Western Addition — many of them African-Americans — applying for residency in the federally financed complex. Officials argued that such preferences violated the 1968 Fair Housing Act by limiting equal access and perpetuating segregation in the historically African-American neighborhood.

...

In a Wednesday letter to Mayor Lee, Assistant Secretary for Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity Gustavo Velasquez wrote: "HUD can support an 'anti-displacement' preference for 40 percent of the units, where residents from throughout the city are eligible for the preferences and where race is not considered in the selection process."

...

In essence, HUD told San Francisco to expand the pool of residents who are eligible for the housing to other neighborhoods in addition to the mostly black Western Addition. This brings the city in line with laws that requires equal access.

City of Portland, Affordable Housing Preference Policy, N/NE Neighborhood

Portland Housing Bureau, N/NE Neighborhood

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/72705>

N/NE Neighborhood Housing Plan, Executive Summary, p. 4

Who has Access –

Decades of involuntary displacement have led to a community very different from the one that existed three or more decades ago. Much has been lost and some of that is due to who has (or had) access. Access is fundamentally about equity not just in North/Northeast Portland, but the city as a whole.

Start Immediately

5. Preference for Community Residents and those Displaced – People displaced or at risk of displacement from the study area will have priority access to housing developed through this initiative. Similar policies have been implemented in New York, Massachusetts, California, as well as through Home Forward here in Portland. The Bureau has been and will continue to work with the City Attorney’s office and the Office of Equity and Human Rights to develop this program’s mechanics.

6. Outreach and Engagement – Engage with owners and developers of private market developments in N/NE Portland to create knowledge and opportunity for marketing vacancies in the local neighborhood. (Similar strategies will be required for all homes created with Strategy funds.)

Next Up

7. Screening Criteria – Collaborate with community-based organizations to enhance implementation of existing effective programs like Rent Well. Also, work with owners and property managers as well as community-based organizations such as the Urban League to implement best practices for tenant screening that do not have unintended negative consequences for communities of color

for the City’s rental and homeownership opportunities in the Interstate Corridor Urban Renewal Area.

FAQs Excerpt [<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/phb/article/671059>]

What is the N/NE Preference Policy?

Recognizing that past City actions have marginalized and displaced many longtime residents of North and Northeast Portland, the Portland Housing Bureau (PHB) developed the Affordable Housing Preference Policy as a tool to prioritize impacted households for PHB housing opportunities in the area. The Preference Policy aims to address the ongoing impact of this legacy by giving priority to households with generational ties to N/NE Portland—i.e.: current and former residents of specific areas that were subject to high levels of urban renewal, and their descendants. [View maps of these areas here.](#) **Note:** The Preference Policy determines the order of applicants on waiting lists for housing, not their eligibility for housing programs.

How does it work?

Whenever PHB housing in N/NE Portland becomes available, PHB will advertise an open application round for households to apply to receive preference for those openings. This will apply to rental apartments, ownership homes, and down payment assistance for first-time homebuyers. Top priority will be given to households (and their descendants) who owned property that was taken by Portland City government—during the building of Memorial Coliseum or the expansion of Emanuel Hospital, for example.

All other applicants can receive “preference points” based on current or historic residency. Up to three points are possible based on whether your current or former address falls within one of the areas where past City plans had a destabilizing effect on long-term residents; up to three more points are possible based on the current or former address of your parent/guardian or grandparent, for a maximum total of six points possible. ([Click here to view maps of the eligible areas and their point values](#)).

PHB will sort the applicants in order of their preference points from highest to lowest, with priority status households at the top of the list, followed by six-point households, then five-point households, and so on. All applicants will be notified of their waitlist status by mail.

How do I apply?

PHB will be accepting applications between Monday, October 16, 2017 and Monday, October 30, 2017. Beginning Monday, October 16, applications will be available online and at designated application sites. Apply online [here](#), in person at a [designated application site](#), or call the helpline to request a paper application in the mail. You can find a list of application sites as well as a paper application for download on the PHB website beginning Monday, October 16. Printed applications can be dropped off at an application site or mailed to the PO Box address below (mailed applications must be postmarked by 11:59 pm on the Monday, October 30 application deadline). **Note:** application sites will only accept applications during their standard business hours on the application deadline date. **Limit one application per household.**

Media

<https://www.portlandoregon.gov/PHB/article/656409>

http://media.oregonlive.com/portland_impact/other/NNE%20Combined%20Presentation%2012%2015%202015.pdf

<https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2018/mar/01/portland-anti-gentrification-housing-scheme-right-return>