

MINUTES

Homes for Good Housing Agency

BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS



Location of the meeting:

Board of County Commissioners Conference Room, Public Service Building, 125 East 8th Avenue, Eugene, OR, 97401

Phone: 541.682.2506

The meeting location is wheelchair-accessible. Anyone needing special accommodations (deaf, people with hearing loss, language translation, chemical sensitivity needs, and large print copies of agenda), please make your request at least 48 hours prior to the meeting.

Wednesday, June 19th, 2019

(1:30 p.m.) Board of County Commissioners Conference Room, Public Service Building, 125 East 8th Avenue, Eugene, OR, 97401

1. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Sara Pendersen

Pat Reilly

Joshua Kielas

Jaqueline McClure

Julie Hulme

Above is a list of those who bore public testimony, a recording of public comment is available upon request by emailing jshaw@homesforgood.org. Written testimony that was submitted can be found in APPENDIX A.

2. COMMISSIONERS RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENT AND/OR OTHER ISSUES AND REMONSTRANCE

Jay Bozievich: I would like to express my disappointment that people feel there was no public process. When Eugene developed and adopted the masterplan there was significant public process, and it was at that time that the greenway goals were addressed, not in the individual development of a single parcel. Unless you want to change that masterplan and ask for re-zoning, that is when you would have to re-address that greenway goal. But that parcel was zoned medium density residential and passed through the entire process of appeals and everything else and met the standard to be part of the masterplan for Eugene, in a very public process. We share the same values of protecting the greenway, and the masterplan process addresses that, and pre-dates my elected time in office. So, I wanted to say there was a very public process to zone that land as medium density residential. There has also been a very public process where this board

has adopted masterplans and have adopted 5-year plans that we have to submit to HUD. Those plans stated that we were going to get rid of some properties, so we could purchase or develop other properties, and identified some of the surplus, and was done very openly and publicly. The land was put on the market publicly, and there was nothing that excluded anyone from purchasing it, and we don't have the ability to choose who purchases it, we did not pick who purchased it. In fact, we would probably be putting the organization at liability and at risk if we denied someone from purchasing it, there is the Fair Housing Act which makes it illegal to deny people from submitting contracts. So, there was a public process to set the zoning of the property, there was a public process to set the masterplans for this organization, and the land was sold publicly. At this point we are under contract, and I don't believe we have the ability to enter into a dispute resolution process.

Pete Sorensen: I am really happy that we had the opportunity for public comment today. We heard a little bit about the work that Mr. Reilly and other River Road residents are putting into the issue of affordable housing on River Road. Thanks for handing out your leaflets Mr. Reilly for what's going on in this development. Sometimes when we have these conversations about low income housing, people are mad at us because we are trying to get affordable or low-income housing places. We had quite an ongoing dispute with the neighbors for the Oaks at 14th when we were working with people who were just being released from prison and jail, and that was very controversial. But what I'm interested in is always looking forward. In any given facet of life we are going to make mistakes, we are going to wish we did things differently, and I don't want to go backwards to look at those mistakes, but I also want to recognize that we have a dispute, and we have people who are angry at the agency, and we have a buyer who I think will not want to buy where they are not wanted, and you are right Commissioner: we have a contract, and contracts can either be enforced, they can be modified or they can be canceled, or changed, and that process for doing that, such as the extension of the contract, and if we wanted to, to cut down on the opposition and anger and see if there can be an agreement, that is what mediation is all about: seeing if we can get people to come to an agreement, that seems to be a good thing. I think at the appropriate time, which will probably be the next item on the agenda, that we move the discussion of the Lombard street property to the top of the line so that the people who have come here for public comment can see the discussion.

I was taking notes and one person said we should have mediation for all, one person said we should cancel the contract, one person said we should have mediation between Evergreen and Homes for Good, now to me, those are all different things. I would like to see a discussion when we get to that item, and to move that item up so that people who are here for public comment can see that.

Pat Farr: Thank you, not much to say, but that the majority of the former board is still the majority of this board. We are a seven member board, only a few members have changed. We are not a board of the Lane County Commissioners, nor do we make decisions as Lane County Commissioners. Thank you.

Michelle Thurston: I would like to point out that when this sale happened, I was not part of this board either. So that makes three of us that are new who did not know what was going on. But, that being said, my second day as a new commissioner, a lot of you came to the meeting and expressed your concern over the sale of this property, and quite frankly I had heard of the

sale but didn't know much about it. So, over the last year I have done an exorbitant amount of research, asking questions, looking up things, and trying to decipher what I heard from the community and what Homes for Good had to say, and doing that I have come up with my thought. You are right, the area is a beautiful area, it is gorgeous, but my role as a Homes for Good Commissioner is to do what is right for Homes for Good, and the people who will utilize those services. In my opinion, selling that property was the right thing to do because the ability to use that property as public housing, to get the tax exempt status, the cost, the location, the fact that it is in the flood-plane (and I know that that has been addressed, but still that is a costly thing) and every time we have to shell out money for a legal battle, or surveys, that is money that is being taken away. That is someone who is not being housed. So in the future we have to look at facts, like: we could have built tiny homes on the property like someone suggested, maybe 5 or 6. But then again, we are looking at a community that doesn't want things built there, and just a few units, where we could use this money to build a large complex, or at least built more units to house more people. So as hard as it is to say, we have to look at: what can we do for the least amount of money for the greatest amount of good for a community and house the people who need homes. In my opinion, this is how this is done. Is it a beautiful area? Absolutely, but the way the zoning is happening, this is how it goes now. This is what the community chose years ago. We are following those rules, exactly as they are laid out. As Commissioner Bozievich said, nothing was done behind the back, no slide of hand or lack of communication. Everyone can find the steps that Homes for Good took to sell this property, and now we need this money to build more housing. I do appreciate everyone coming, and I have listened, and I have heard what you have to say. I would like to say that I am not an elected official, I have been a resident in the Homes for Good programs for over twenty years, and I know what it's like to need affordable housing. I would like to point out that when we are in this room, the Lane County Commissioners are not Lane County Commissioners, they are board members who have to what is the best for Homes for Good, and it seems like most people when they come in here are not addressing them as board members, they are addressing them as Lane County Commissioners. I just wanted to point out that there is a distinction between the Lane County Commissioners, and the Homes for Good Board of Commissioners.

Joe Berney: I came into this in January, during the years in which Commissioner Bozievich mentioned, that the public process was taking place. I want to apologize that I was not part of that. I was traveling back and forth to southern California building literally hundreds of millions of dollars of solar, energy efficiency, energy storage and microgrids, commercial industrial retrofits because of my interest in clean energy. I don't know what options are, and are not available for this board, and I rely on Jacob and staff to tell us that. But I do want to say this: if there is the ability to have a dispute resolution process, I for one would be for that. Were I involved earlier on, sir, I would have asked the exact same questions that you asked. But I don't know if there is the time for that or not at this point. I for one will ensure that all of the citizen input of items discussed are applied, or I at least as one person will vote that they be applied, to further Homes for Good activities.

Heather Buch: Thank you. When it comes to an ADR, in my experiences with contracts and such, my first hunch is that it's not going to fly. With ADRs we have to have interest on both sides, and we have a buyer who really wants this property, I don't think they would have lasted this long if they didn't. So, I don't know if that would work, although I am in the same boat as

Commissioner Sorenson, that when we talk about the future, I think It might be the right time to talk about how we can facilitate this better in the future, and how we can involve the community more so that this doesn't happen again.

Joe Berney: I also think that people have brought up a good point, and it might not be applicable at this point, but that is: who does Homes for Good sell to and what is that process? And if it is a public process and we can't intervene, I get that, but I also know that this particular developer has a pretty bad rep in the community and it does make for bad optics.

Jay Bozievich: I don't disagree with what you said, but it is one of those things that we would be in a world of legal liability if we turn down an offer without good reason.

Michelle Thurston: Or pick and choose who we sell to.

Jay Bozievich: Right

Patt Farr: Just on the note of the developer: I have had bad experiences with Evergreen, mainly, however, on their response to Eugene code, and requirements by the city of Eugene. So actually, to villainize Everygreen might not be completely accurate, but Eugene code requires less parking to in order to encourage people to use more transit instead of personal vehicles. I have spent many years working on bringing more affordable housing and supportive housing, and it is high on my list, and if I had my County Commissioner hat on, I would put it as 1a on the issues for the county, but also the city of Eugene requires certain things like dense infill based upon zero expansion of the urban growth boundary, and that's absolutely going to happen, and that's an issue with the city of Eugene.

3. AJUSTMENTS TO THE ADGENDA

Jacob Fox: I like Pete's idea of moving the River Road discussion to the top of the agenda, but what we have encountered over the last six months, is that because of the public comment taking up so much time it has really disrupted the Board and staff's ability to present and deliberate on other items. So, we have about 55 minutes, and frankly a little more than 55 minutes left on the agenda. So I guess if you would like to move it to the top, we have a number of guests here to help present materials, and I think they can all be here until three, but I need to ask just for business reasons that we keep the discussion to 20 minutes or less, if the Board chooses to move this discussion.

Pete Sorenson: I would like to make the request to move item 6.G: DISCUSSION—River Road, Lombard Street Property Sale to the top of the agenda. I have no objection to setting a timer to keep the discussion at 20 minutes.

Char Reavis: Ok, if there are no other objections, we will move it to the top of the list but limit it to exactly 20 minutes.

4. COMMISSIONERS' BUSINESS

Patt Farr is participating via phone and may lose cell phone reception.

5. EMERGENCY BUSINESS

6. ADMINISTRATION

A. Approval of Minutes: 05/22/2019

Motion: **Michelle Thurston**

Second: **Heather Buch**

Minute approved as written unanimously 7/0

G. DISCUSSION—River Road, Lombard Street Property Sale. (Estimated 20 minutes) (Jacob Fox, Executive Director) (Ross Williamson, Legal Counsel)

Jacob Fox: In your board packet is a summary of materials that have been previously presented to the Board. We understand the neighbor's opposition to the project, I don't argue with that opposition, I think that that is their right as humans and members of this community. In your packet is a brief memo, a timeline of significant events, and a Q&A. We put this together because we wanted people to be able to see how this played out, and because there was a lot of misinformation being circulated by some members of the neighborhood. I'm not saying that people misrepresented the information in a devious way, but buying and selling property, and the world of affordable housing is a complex ecosystem, and we just wanted to make this fact sheet so that we could be clear and transparent.

Jay pointed out the amount of energy that has been brought to this board, and the accusations that I have misrepresented information or haven't been transparent to the Board does feel bad to me, it doesn't make me feel good as a person who has integrity and ethics and has always been truthful as an employee in every organization that I have worked for. But again, that is my job to deal with controversial issues, and we have been shouted down in many neighborhoods and been told that they don't want low income people in their backyards. What I would say, out of respect for the neighbors is that I appreciate the fact that you guys haven't communicated that. But for me the fact that so much energy has been spent giving public testimony and organizing people to oppose this sale to this board, and frankly very little, if any, energy engaging with the city of Eugene to enhance greenway protection and change the code that underlays the land-use options for this properties and other properties throughout Eugene, also just feels out of balance and weird to me. Frankly, I will say I lived in Portland for twenty years, and I had apartment communities built up right next to my house, and I had neighbors looking right into my backyard, and it doesn't feel good, and that happened all over Portland, and with the way the population is changing that's going to happen in Eugene.

Interjection from Audience: Not necessarily

Jacob Fox: Infill is going to happen in Eugene unless citizens work with elected officials, and planning bodies to make changes.

So with that, my engagement with Ross, and a handful of other attorneys indicates to me that us trying to get out of this contract would be a breach of a purchase and sale agreement, we would be litigated against, it is highly likely we would lose, almost certainly that we would lose, and we would end up being told by a judge to sell the property based on the terms of the contract that we breached. I haven't felt much wiggle room, and I haven't felt I could bring the Board options, because that is the nature of the legally binding purchase and sale agreement that I believe we are in, based on lots of discussions with lots of different lawyers.

Ross Williamson: Ross tells of the times that he came before the board and talked to them in executive session about this matter last year, and his colleague Rebecca coming in March of this year.

The end result is as Jacob has just told you, and there is no change to that advice.

Michelle Thurston: What would be the cost approximately be if Homes for Good breaches the contract, gets brought to court, and is sued by the other side?

Ross Williamson: Our estimate is that a legal battle would be about \$100,000 and that is primarily because we believe we would not win.

Michelle Thurston: And that would be taken away from what we receive for the property itself.

Ross Williamson: You would have to find that money somewhere, yes.

Pete Sorenson: A lot of times contracts provide that the side that breaches the contract pays the other sides attorney fees, is that a provision that is written into this contract?

Ross Williamson: Yes, I do believe it is, and that is the reason for the high number. The cost to my office to defend the litigation would probably not be \$100,000 but if it proceeds to the end, and you have to pay our fees and the other sides fees, that's where the numbers gets big.

Pete Sorenson: What are some of the factors of Evergreen not wanting to move forward? Is the 400-day extension an indication of Evergreen wanting to move forward? Or is it them saying we need a lot more time, we might not want to do this? Could that be the opening for mediation?

Ross Williamson: Putting myself in their shoes, I believe that their opinion would be that they have spent a lot of money on attorneys, and experts, and professionals to get this property developed. And what that extension was, is to go through the land-use process, which they are still going through and are defending litigation right now on that process. So, they are obviously spending money to put this project forward, and so I see no reason for them to back out.

Michelle Thurston: And that's the LUBA?

Ross Williamson: Right, they are actually before the Court of Appeals right now.

Pete Sorenson: Do you anticipate another extension?

Ross Williamson: I have no way of knowing that, but it seems that they are wanting to resolve the litigation before closing. So, I would expect that would be the case.

Pete Sorenson: Are they eligible for another extension?

Ross Williamson: I believe they are.

Pete Sorenson: So, they can get another 400 days on top of what we have already agreed to?

Ross Williamson: And again, as soon as they resolve those issues I think they will be ready to close. So, the variable right now I think we have is the land-use approval for the development. Once that is settled, I don't see any more roadblocks to them closing.

Jacob Fox: The way the purchase and sale agreement is written, the time in which they have to buy the property tolls until the appeal is concluded. So, after the appeals process in the Court of Appeals is concluded, and if it is favorable to the buyer, they have 30 days to purchase the property. There is one possible next step: the opponents of the project could propose the Oregon Supreme Court takes the case, but as I understand it the Oregon Supreme Court doesn't take land-use cases often. So, if the Oregon Supreme Court did take it, the purchase and sale agreement would continue to toll until that process is complete.

Pete Sorenson: Lastly, do you have an idea of whether mediation would be appropriate in this case?

Ross Williamson: To be honest, I don't see how it would work, mediation is a voluntary process, Evergreen has no reason to enter into a voluntary process right now.

Michelle Thurston: When the contract was originally done, was the extension put in the original contract, or was it added later?

Ross Williamson: The allowance for an extension was in the original contract.

Michelle Thurston: So, this wasn't something that just came by, and we are going to extend this, but it was in the original verbiage and wasn't added in later.

Ross Williamson: Right, they knew they had a land-use process in front of them, and they built in that opportunity to fulfill the land-use process before closing. So that was built in.

Pete Sorenson: Another question: in terms of the opportunities for the public to challenge this, one is the land-use, but what are some of the other options can be reasonably foreseen with these types of disputes?

Ross Williamson: Other than the Land-Use Appeal process, I don't know of another legal forum for the complaints.

B. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR REPORT (estimated 5 minutes)

Jacob Fox: I think the thing that I on the front of my mind, and important to the Board is the development of the Homes for Good diversity, equity, and inclusion initiative. This is a process of looking at our intimate systems with an "equity lens" and the Lane County Commissioners have done a lot of great work under the county umbrella in terms of business systems. The example that I like to use, and we haven't done this analysis yet, but one of the things that we will be doing is looking at the demographics and race of people who are receiving eviction notices and analyzing whether there is a disparity or not. Are we issuing eviction notices to people with disabilities on a more frequent basis? Are we issuing eviction notices to communities of color more often than we are to Caucasian folks who live in our housing? I am very committed to this work. Char and Michelle actually interviewed with our consultants yesterday, and there will be other opportunities for the Board to engage. As this initiative takes shape I will be keeping the Board up to speed and at some point this fall there will be some sort of more formal engagement with the board to help us think about how to run a more equitable organization.

Char Reavis: For people who have severe and consistent health illness or issues, will that be considered in the assessment of evictions?

Jacob Fox: Yes, it will. Wakan is not here, but we will be looking at our eviction process.

C. ORDER 19-19-06-01H— In the Matter of Approving the Submission of the PHA 2020-2025 Five-Year Plan and FY2020 Annual Plan (Estimated 15 minutes) (Alli Swartz, Real Estate Specialist) (Melanie Church, Property Management Analyst)

Melanie Church: Explains the process that Homes for Good has taken in evaluating, modifying, and taking input for their guiding documents. The next step is a board order to allow the submission to HUD.

Michelle Thurston: Did you have any significant questions, adjustments, or comments on the plan?

Melanie Church: We did not.

Char Reavis: I just wanted to express my appreciation again of the staff bringing these to the RAB and getting input and feedback on them.

Michelle Thurston: Also expresses her appreciation.

Jay Bozievich: Points out the public notice of the plan.

Melanie Church and Michelle Thurston: Discuss the various public notices that were given for the plan including the posting in the Register Guard, the affidavit that goes with it, the public hearing, etc.

Jay Bozievich: Following up: does this plan include the disposing of any property?

Jacob Fox: I'm thinking about the sale of the scattered sites, and I don't think those are talked about in this plan, I think they have been talked about in previous plans.

Steve Ochs: They have been talked about in previous plans, and there will be a board order for a significant amendment for RAD phase 2 in an upcoming board meeting. There will be a public hearing for that probably in the August meeting, and it will be on the disposal of the remaining 100 units of the scattered sites.

Jay Bozievich: I just wanted to point out that there was public notice, and there was a public hearing, and that the plan was available for inspection and comment. I just wanted to point out that there is nothing secretive about what we are doing.

Motion: **Heather Buch**

Second: **Michelle Thurston**

This motion has passed 6/0 with Pat Farr being excused

D. ORDER 19-19-06-02H— In the Matter of Authorizing Execution of Ground Lease with Lane County for the Bus Barn Property in Eugene, Oregon. (Steve Ochs, Real Estate Development Director) (Estimated 5 minutes)

Steve Ochs: Explains about the need for the Bus Barn lease and the relationship to the MD Commons project. He talks about the RFP process of getting the land, and potential long-term plans ideas for the property.

Jacob Fox: Talks about the day care that is currently on the property who Homes for Good will continue to let use the space, and other opportunities for the land.

Jay Bozievich: I have a question for Ross: So, since five of us on this board are Lane County Commissioners, and Lane County is on both sides of the lease, is there a conflict of interest for us voting on this?

Ross Williamson: Ethics laws worry about you and your capacity as a business owner, so since Lane County is not a business, it isn't a conflict of interest.

Motion: **Heather Buch**

Second: **Michelle Thurston**

This motion has passed 6/0 with Pat Farr being excused

E. ORDER 19-19-06-03H— In the Matter of Authorizing the Execution and Delivery of a Financing Agreement and Note in the Principal Amount Not to Exceed \$9,200,000 to Refinance the 2017 Loan and Finance the Renovation, Improvement and Equipping of the Admin Building; Designating an Authorized Representative and Special Counsel; and Related Matters. (Estimated 20 minutes) (Nora Cronin, Project Developer)

Jacob Fox: Introduces some of the architects from PIVOT architecture, and John Brown the real-estate broker, who came to the meeting to answer any questions. Jacob expresses his excitement for the project.

A lot has changed since I started with the organization in 2013. I would say we were really disinvested in our employees. We had a culture of not sending them to trainings, our fleet was in disrepair, many buildings had envelope issues, and one of the administrative buildings is almost uninhabitable. Jacob expresses that because of the growing complexity of the organization they figured out about four years ago that we need to get under one roof. Getting under one roof will help eliminate redundancies: two buildings means two front desks, extra administrative support, two alarm systems, etc.

Jacob talks about trauma considerations, and trauma informed design.

Jacob talks about the reality of mass-shooting, and the shooter scare situation that occurred at the Day Island office this past month. Jacob also talks about seismic and other emergency event precautions the new building will address.

Nora Cronin: Talks about the loan and financing that was decided on. She talks about the tax-exempt portion of the loan. Not all of the loan can be tax exempt because Kaiser will be leasing the ground floor, and they are not a public entity or nonprofit, and can't benefit from a tax-exempt loan. Homes for Good took the square footage of what Kaiser is renting, which is 15%,

so that portion will get a higher interest rate, but the other 85% of the purchasing cost, and all of the cost of the construction will be at the lower loan interest-rate.

Jacob Fox: Talks about potential visions for the property, and potentially building affordable housing over what is now a parking lot.

Michelle Thurston: So, will all of the Homes for Good Staff, including that maintenance staff and shops behind Fairview be running out of the new building?

Jacob Fox: No, a lot of the staff at Fairview will move into the new building. At the Fairview property we have a woodshop, metal shop, and a paint booth, and that is an area that our maintenance staff uses. We have actually been putting in shops at various properties and the vision that there will be onsite maintenance shops, not necessarily at every building, but distributed geographically around the county. Then our intention will be to lease out the entire complex.

Michelle Thurston: How will that effect the community of McKenzie Village?

Jacob Fox: Jacob describes the complex of McKenzie village, and the administrative building being the central hub to the community.

The idea that the maintenance staff and property management staff for that site would probably office somewhere in the building, and be excluded from the space that we lease.

Michelle Thurston: I'm thinking specifically of the community room that McKenzie Village uses.

Jacob Fox: We would either use that community room, or build a new one in the future, residents would still have access to using that space.

Joe Berney: What is the length of the loan?

Nora Cronin: Explains the loan terms.

Joe Berney: Has anyone looked at the potential of later down the line, expanding the building up?

Nora Cronin: No, we have not gone through that exercise.

Michelle Thurston: Is it possible to do that for a historic building?

Nora Cronin: It is a historically significant building, but it is not a historic building. But the short answer is no, we haven't explored it. But it would probably be a pretty crazy to think about. Nora also explains about the environmental review that the building site had to undergo through HUD and the State Historic Preservation Office because of Homes for Good's funding.

Michelle Thurston: As a resident I am really excited about this. There has been times that I have had to go back and forth between the buildings, and I don't drive anymore, and the access to public transportation isn't very good and there are no quick routes, especially when there is bad weather. Michelle also talks about being excited about the openness of the building compared to the darkness of the current buildings, and the increase of parking.

Motion: **Heather Buch**

Second: **Michelle Thurston**

This motion has passed 6/0 with Pat Farr being excused

F. ORDER 19-19-06-04H— In the Matter of Updating the Housing Choice Voucher Administrative Plan Local Preferences (Estimated 15 minutes) (Beth Ochs, Rent Assistance Division Director)

Heather Buch: I would like to recuse myself of this vote. I would like to declare a conflict of interest. I have a business interest with a property management company. Because of tenant law, property managers must take Section 8 vouchers, and since this order is about changing section 8, I will recuse myself.

Beth Ochs: Explains the Mainstream Vouchers.

Motions: **PETE SORENSON**

Second: **JOE BERNEY**

This motion has passed 5/0 with Pat Farr being excused, and Heather Buch recusing herself.

7. OTHER BUSINESS

Adjourn

Please note this is a short excerpt of the proceedings, a full recording of the meeting is available upon request by emailing jshaw@homesforgood.org

Key Features

Affordable
Energy Efficient
Ample Green Space
Vibrant Landscaping
Community Connections
Emergency Preparedness



St. Vincent de Paul Society of Lane County, Inc. presents

River Road Affordable Housing

53 units for households at or below 50% and 30% of AMI

Fostering Community

The River Road Community Organization (RRCO) has shared extensive input throughout this process, which has informed our process and design.

We look forward to continued collaboration with the neighborhood through our four member Neighborhood Engagement Team.

By providing high performance housing centered around vibrant landscaping and open space, River Road Affordable Housing is a model for multifamily development. RRAH provides opportunities for residents to learn and grow and invites neighbors to connect.

Affordable for Populations in need

- Most units for families at or below 50% AMI
 - 1 bedroom (7): \$533
 - 2 bedroom (16): \$633
 - 3 bedroom (24): \$729
- 5 units for households at 30% AMI
 - 1 bedroom (4): \$293
 - 2 bedroom (1): \$350
- 5 units for clients of Womenspace



Innovative community building (above) is built to essential facility standards and can be immediately occupied after an emergency. It includes a gathering space, a 'flex space', kitchen, computer area, offices, and a large storage area for emergency supplies. This building will serve residents and neighborhood groups.

Energy Efficient

- Earth Advantage standards
- High performance building envelope
- Ductless mini-split heat pumps provide efficient heating & cooling
- All buildings PV ready

Promotes Multimodal Transportation

- EWEB Electric Car Sharing Pilot Program
- PeaceHealth Rides Bikeshare Station
- Ample parking



River Road Affordable Housing Stakeholders

