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## MARKET SロFTENS

Overall average rents per unit type－Portland：

Craig McConachie，C§R Real Estate Services，Company，Apartment Report Committee

The Portland apartment market is moving towards the late stages of the investment／ development cycle．Homeownership rates are increasing，the population growth rate is slowing，vacancy rates are up，rent growth rates are declining and apartment construction has slowed．Indications are the market will get softer，before it gets better．With approximately 10,000 units still under construction and a predicted absorption rate of five to six thousand units this year，the Portland MSA will be oversupplied with new units in the near term．Occupancy for Class C product should remain moderately strong， with a majority of the increased vacancy effecting Class A product．The good news regarding absorption is that the projects that were entitled pre－IZ and their subsequent construction will soon be completed，and a more sustainable rate of building will commence．
Some investors are nervous about the Portland market due to the increasing restrictions being placed on owners．With the passage of statewide rent restrictions and draconian ordinances being considered in the City of Portland，the interest in investing and owning multifamily buildings is being hindered． The number of for sale transactions in the Portland MSA last quarter was 72 and overall CAP rates have increased slightly to $5.5 \%$ ． The median price per unit in 4Q18 was $\$ 175,000$ and the median price per square foot was $\$ 228$ ．

## Portland／Vancouver

VACANCY：
The Portland／Vancouver vacancy factor increased by 55 basis points from our Fall report，and currently stands at 4．95\％．

Troutdale／Fairview and Lake Oswego have the lowest vacancy factors of $3.4 \%$ ．Except for Aloha and St．John＇s，all other areas are over $4 \%$ ．The highest vacancies are found in Northwest Portland at $7.9 \%$ ，followed by Downtown Portland at $6.5 \%$ ．Both of these areas are being strongly impacted by new product in lease－up．Two－bedroom，townhouse units have the best occupancy of all unit types，with average vacancy of $4 \%$ ．Studio units have the highest vacancy of $5.9 \%$ ．This survey excludes new projects in the lease－up phase that haven＇t reached stability，unless they are over one year old or over $85 \%$ occupied．

## RENT RATES：

Overall rent rates have continued their upward trajectory；however，our report includes an increased number of new projects that push the average rates higher．Rent increases have averaged $4 \%$ since our Fall survey，but it＇s important to note that the surveyed rent rates do not represent＂effective＂ rent rates．Concessions，which are becoming more prevalent，are not factored into the surveyed rates，and may account for $8 \%$ or more in rent discounts．Only three of the twenty surveyed areas experienced declining rents．Most notably，Downtown Portland experienced a 3\％decrease．Both St．John＇s and Outer SE saw strong rent growth．St． John＇s was $11 \%$ ，and Outer SE was 7\％．
Average rent per sq．ft．for all areas combined is $\$ 1.68$ ．The Downtown core area has the highest rates at $\$ 2.40$ ，with NW Portland coming in second at $\$ 2.23$ ，and SW Portland third with $\$ 1.92$ ．Outer NE Portland and Troutdale／Fairview continue to have the lowest rates，at $\$ 1.29$ and $\$ 1.36$ respectively．
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## PロRTLAND METRロ AREA

| MபLTNロMAH ᄃロபNTY | WASHINGTロN CロபNTY |
| :---: | :---: |
| （5）DOWNTOWN PORTLAND | （3）ALOHA |
| （1）NW PORTLAND | （4）BEAVERTON |
| （13）INNER \＆CENTRAL SE（PTLD） | （2）HILLSBORO｜NORTH OF HWY 26 |
| （17）INNER \＆CENTRAL NE（PTLD） | （7）TIGARD｜TUALATIN｜SHERWOOD |
| （18）NORTH PORTLAND｜ST．JOHNS |  |
| （6）SW PORTLAND | CLARK CロபNTY |
| （14）OUTER SE（PORTLAND） | （19）WEST VANCOUVER |
| （16）OUTER NE（PORTLAND） | （20）EAST VANCOUVER |
| （15）TROUTDALE｜FAIRVIEW |  |
| WOOD VILLAGE｜GRESHAM |  |
| ᄃLACKAMAS ᄃロபNTY |  |
| （12）CLACKAMAS |  |
| （8）LAKE OSWEGO｜WEST LINN |  |
| （11）MILWAUKIE |  |
| （10）OREGON CITY｜GLADSTONE |  |
| （9）WILSONVILLE \｜CANBY |  |


$\qquad$

## MARKET CONDITIONS：

Over $9 \%$ of all properties are offering rental incentives，with aggressive deals being offered in Class A projects in lease－up phase．Incentives are most aggressive in Downtown，close－in SW and Aloha．The average number of days that a unit will stay vacant for the entire Metro area is 34．Aloha and Clackamas are experiencing over two months average vacant days between tenants．Both of these areas are historically slow to re－tenant．The Inner and Central SE and NE Portland areas have the quickest turnover time of 14 to 16 days．

## Other Areas

The Salem market has softened and has a current vacancy rate of $4.6 \%$ ，but rents have increased slightly to $\$ 1.28$ psf．Vacancies in three－bedroom units are particularly high at $6.5 \%$ ．Bend／Redmond indicates a vacancy factor that has more than doubled to over $7 \%$ ， rents declined by $3 \%$ and the turnover time has increased to 36 days． The surveyed unit count decreased in that area，which may account for the abrupt changes．Eugene／Springfield has the highest percentage of properties offering concessions at $22 \%$ and the vacancy has increased to $4.6 \%$ ． U of O students can find some deals if they shop around．

## Operating Expenses

This issue debuts a new and revised format for our operating expense report．Our expense numbers have been provided by the Co－Star Group．The Co－Star report analyzes expenses on a per square foot basis and unlike our previous reports，includes capital expenditures．There are two charts，a＂ 3 －Star＂and a＂ $1 \& 2$ Star＂． The 3－Star equates to what would typically be considered a Class B property and the $1 \& 2$ Star a Class C．Class A properties are averaging
$30 \%$ to $60 \%$ higher than the 3－Star properties but are not reflected on these reports．We hope that because Co－Star has access to a much larger data base than we can pull from our membership，these expense numbers will be more accurate and reflective of local operating costs．

## Our Contributors

Whitney Rhoades and Danalee Corso，with Marcus and Millichap examine the overall Portland market and the effect our public policy is having on investors from a broker＇s perspective．They note that out－of－state and local investors are＂voicing concerns regarding the public persecution of rental housing providers＂．Despite these concerns they see continued high demand for investing in apartments and point to the fact that Portland ranks fifth nationally in the major markets for long－term appreciation．
Josh Lehner，State Economist from the Oregon Office of Economic Analysis，provides an interesting analysis about job polarization，wages and migration．He points out that the slowing in population growth is more pronounced than expected．＂Within the Portland region， the working age population growth slowed the most in Multnomah County while the suburbs saw the steady growth．＂ Josh also weighs in on the possible effects of Senate Bill 608 （Rent stabilization／No－cause evictions）and the concerns that his office has on the impact the legislation will have on the market．

This survey represents a total of 63,662 units from 906 properties． All of the articles have been reprinted without editing the content， in order to present unbiased opinions．We＇d like to thank all of the management companies and property owners who have submitted information．Their participation is critical in insuring the accuracy of our data and the continued success of this report．
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AVERA도 NUMBER ロF DAYS VACANT－PロRTLAND／VANEロUVER


SURVEY RESULTS—SPRING 2 ロ19
PロRTLAND／VANEロUVER METRロ AREA

| AREA NAME | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# OF } \\ & \text { PROP } \end{aligned}$ | DATA | ALL | FALL 18 REPORT | CHANGE | STUDIO | $\begin{aligned} & 1 \text { BED } \\ & 1 \text { BATH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { BED } \\ & 1 \text { BATH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { BED } \\ & 2 \text { ВАТН } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { BED } \\ & \text { TWNHS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \text { BED } \\ 1 \text { BATH } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \text { BED } \\ & 2 \text { BATH } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| DOWNTOWN PORTLAND （5） | 31 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 6.46 | 6.09 | 0.06 | 4.26 | 5.86 | 10.59 | 13.1 | 12.5 | 0 | 25 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 2.4 | 2.47 | －0．03 | 2.65 | 2.31 | 2.16 | 2.09 | 1.79 | 1.75 | 2.21 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1153 | 1566 | 1723 | 2268 | 2254 | 1665 | 2640 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 2027 | 2085 |  | 751 | 922 | 85 | 252 | 8 | 1 | 8 |
| NW PORTLAND （1） | 66 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 7.88 | 6.33 | 0.24 | 7.34 | 7.96 | 6.61 | 8.05 | 6.12 | 6.06 | 11.06 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 2.23 | 2.11 | 0.06 | 2.69 | 2.37 | 1.83 | 1.87 | 1.63 | 1.43 | 1.58 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1344 | 1647 | 1585 | 1932 | 1584 | 1376 | 2010 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 5840 | 7048 |  | 1063 | 2677 | 348 | 1453 | 49 | 33 | 217 |
| INNER \＆CENTRAL SE （PORTLAND） （13） | 138 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 5.4 | 4.06 | 0.33 | 3.68 | 5.59 | 4.79 | 9.18 | 8.99 | 0 | 3.23 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.9 | 1.87 | 0.02 | 2.73 | 1.96 | 1.49 | 1.86 | 1.44 | 1.21 | 1.7 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1170 | 1268 | 1263 | 2090 | 1369 | 1373 | 1821 |
|  |  |  | 3538 | 3648 |  | 489 | 1627 | 960 | 196 | 189 | 46 | 31 |
| INNER \＆CENTRAL NE （PORTLAND） （17） | 101 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.13 | 4.87 | －0．15 | 8.61 | 5.92 | 3.66 | 0.54 | 4.5 | 0 | 2.33 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.88 | 1.87 | 0.01 | 2.89 | 1.86 | 1.62 | 1.77 | 1.53 | 1.29 | 1.61 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1132 | 1189 | 1324 | 1821 | 1521 | 1469 | 1881 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 3753 | 3287 |  | 395 | 1435 | 547 | 1114 | 200 | 19 | 43 |
| N PORTLAND｜ST JOHNS （18） | 23 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 3.9 | 3.64 | 0.07 | 4.05 | 5.13 | 2.61 | 3.16 | 1.72 | 0 | 0 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.86 | 1.67 | 0.11 | 2.36 | 1.88 | 1.46 | 1.84 | 1.4 | 1.28 | 1.56 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1164 | 1357 | 1167 | 2270 | 1114 | 1234 | 1395 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 1153 | 686 |  | 247 | 448 | 230 | 158 | 58 | 11 | 1 |
| SW PORTLAND <br> （6） | 44 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.97 | 5.74 | －0．13 | 6.64 | 4.35 | 5.14 | 5.87 | 0 | 2.44 | 6.56 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.92 | 1.93 | －0．01 | 2.63 | 2 | 1.54 | 1.82 | 1.3 | 1.16 | 1.52 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1240 | 1391 | 1264 | 2054 | 1478 | 1251 | 1806 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 2734 | 2909 |  | 301 | 1380 | 467 | 392 | 31 | 41 | 122 |
| OUTER SE（PORTLAND）(14) | 25 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.27 | 4.76 | －0．1 | 5.1 | 4.55 | 4.18 | 3.52 | 3.77 | 0 | 6.28 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.51 | 1.41 | 0.07 | 2.17 | 1.78 | 1.34 | 1.27 | 1.47 | 1.14 | 1.39 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 902 | 1132 | 1111 | 1236 | 1554 | 1066 | 1653 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 2390 | 2205 |  | 157 | 703 | 478 | 682 | 159 | 20 | 191 |
| OUTER NE（PORTLAND） （16） | 19 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 5.56 | 3.91 | 0.42 | 0 | 4.29 | 6.98 | 3.3 | 17.31 | 14.29 | 1.79 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.29 | 1.28 | 0.01 | 1.57 | 1.41 | 1.23 | 1.19 | 1.11 | 1.11 | 1.28 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 865 | 1010 | 1092 | 1172 | 1216 | 1426 | 1350 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 1296 | 1737 |  | 6 | 490 | 473 | 212 | 52 | 7 | 56 |
| TROUTDALE｜FAIRVIEW <br> WOOD VILLAGE \｜GRESHAM （15） | 29 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 3.4 | 2.87 | $0.18$ | 5.32 | 6.09 | 2 | 3.73 | 3.06 | － | 0.61 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.36 | 1.32 | $0.03$ | 2.15 | 1.61 | 1.27 | 1.23 | 1.4 | － | 1.19 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 917 | 1015 | 1166 | 1213 | 1433 | － | 1547 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 2144 | 2717 |  | 94 | 361 | 600 | 697 | 229 | 0 | 163 |
| CLACKAMAS <br> （12） | 6 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.05 | 4.64 | －0．13 | 3.85 | 4.63 | 2.47 | 4.72 | 3.13 | － | 4.27 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.44 | 1.43 | 0.01 | 1.84 | 1.63 | 1.39 | 1.35 | 1.27 | － | 1.35 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 854 | 1047 | 1188 | 1283 | 1219 | － | 1526 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 1037 | 1465 |  | 26 | 259 | 243 | 360 | 32 | 0 | 117 |
| LAKE OSWEGO｜WEST LINN （8） | 13 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 3.36 | 3.75 | －0．1 | 0 | 4.2 | 2.45 | 4.06 | 2.86 | － | 0 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.6 | 1.56 | 0.03 | 2.68 | 1.7 | 1.43 | 1.55 | 1.41 | － | 1.45 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 992 | 1207 | 1274 | 1577 | 1418 | － | 1672 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 744 | 1680 |  | 28 | 262 | 163 | 197 | 70 | 0 | 24 |
| MILWAUKIE(11) | 19 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.16 | 3.03 | 0.37 | 3.6 | 4.79 | 4.43 | 2.09 | 3.53 | 0 | 3.57 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.5 | 1.51 | －0．01 | 2.06 | 1.59 | 1.39 | 1.47 | 1.14 | 1.28 | 1.35 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 883 | 1047 | 1167 | 1382 | 1117 | 1296 | 1527 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 1779 | 1882 |  | 111 | 647 | 655 | 191 | 85 | 6 | 84 |
| OREGON CITY｜GLADSTONE （10） | 7 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ |  | 4.34 | $0.12$ | 10 | 3.33 | 2.91 | 6.72 | 1.72 | 0 | 8.33 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.39 | 1.33 | 0.05 | 2.25 | 1.61 | 1.34 | 1.33 | 1.22 | 1.16 | 1.22 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1100 | 1041 | 1134 | 1363 | 1035 | 1104 | 1688 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 803 | 1013 |  | 20 | 180 | 172 | 238 | 58 | 27 | 108 |
| WILSONVILLE｜CANBY <br> （9） | 16 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 5.76 | 3.66 | 0.57 | 14.29 | 5.68 | 4.6 | 5.62 | 7.45 | 0 | 8.06 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.46 | 1.43 | 0.02 | 1.95 | 1.67 | 1.39 | 1.43 | 1.22 | 0.67 | 1.35 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1100 | 1198 | 1226 | 1424 | 1399 | 751 | 1562 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 2710 | 2512 |  | 7 | 669 | 718 | 836 | 94 | 14 | 372 |
| ALOHA <br> （3） | 34 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 3.66 | 4.03 | －0．09 | 9.8 | 3.9 | 3.73 | 3.34 | 1.27 | 2.04 | 4.33 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.5 | 1.48 | 0.01 | 2.18 | 1.72 | 1.42 | 1.41 | 1.38 | 1.44 | 1.37 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1023 | 1167 | 1251 | 1394 | 1687 | 1406 | 1586 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 6446 | 7365 |  | 51 | 1820 | 1234 | 2247 | 237 | 49 | 808 |

PロRTLAND／VANCIUVER METRG AREA

| AREA NAME | $\begin{aligned} & \text { \# OF } \\ & \text { PROP } \end{aligned}$ | DATA | ALL | FALL 18 REPORT | CHANGE | STUDIO | $\begin{gathered} 1 \text { BED } \\ 1 \text { BATH } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { BED } \\ & 1 \text { BATH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { BED } \\ & 2 \text { BATH } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 2 \text { BED } \\ & \text { TWNHS } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 3 \text { BED } \\ 1 \text { BATH } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3 \text { BED } \\ & 2 \text { BATH } \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| beaverton <br> （4） | 40 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.7 | 3.54 | 0.33 | 11.11 | 5.12 | 3.72 | 4.47 | 3.81 | 9.57 | 4.1 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.49 | 1.43 | 0.04 | 1.97 | 1.69 | 1.36 | 1.45 | 1.38 | 1.16 | 1.34 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 993 | 1150 | 1211 | 1423 | 1397 | 1222 | 1640 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 3088 | 4181 |  | 72 | 996 | 1022 | 604 | 105 | 94 | 195 |
| HILLSBORO｜N OF HWY 26 （2） | 12 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.46 | 3.56 | 0.25 | 7.04 | 5.12 | 4.21 | 3.61 | 33.33 | 0 | 1.23 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.6 | 1.46 | 0.1 | 2.1 | 1.69 | 1.44 | 1.52 | 1.22 | 1.18 | 1.35 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 1200 | 1289 | 1161 | 1582 | 1200 | 1350 | 1581 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 1098 | 1602 |  | 71 | 469 | 95 | 360 | 6 | 16 | 81 |
| TIGARD｜TUALATIN SHERWOOD <br> （7） | 40 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.8 | 4.17 | 0.15 | 10.87 | 3.79 | 4.88 | 5.07 | 3.88 | 7.27 | 6.97 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.51 | 1.49 | 0.01 | 2.38 | 1.69 | 1.42 | 1.43 | 1.36 | 1.3 | 1.35 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 899 | 1122 | 1177 | 1414 | 1494 | 1310 | 1658 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 4399 | 5323 |  | 46 | 1478 | 1107 | 1084 | 232 | 165 | 287 |
| WEST VANCOUVER <br> （19） | 27 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 5.38 | 3.72 | 0.45 | 5.26 | 5.93 | 4.73 | 6.33 | 1.35 | 6.25 | 6.85 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.38 | 1.34 | 0.03 | 2.03 | 1.6 | 1.27 | 1.26 | 1.18 | 1.65 | 1.05 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 919 | 1120 | 1050 | 1361 | 1236 | 1400 | 1341 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 2380 | 3079 |  | 57 | 793 | 529 | 616 | 223 | 16 | 146 |
| EAST VANCOUVER(20) | 19 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.01 | 4.26 | －0．06 | 1.22 | 6.12 | 3.7 | 3.97 | 1.25 | － | 2.87 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ | 1.36 | 1.33 | 0.02 | 1.98 | 1.51 | 1.34 | 1.28 | 1.21 | － | 1.27 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 943 | 1042 | 1167 | 1291 | 1231 | － | 1450 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 2717 | 2630 |  | 82 | 621 | 649 | 856 | 160 | 0 | 349 |
| TOTAL AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ |  |  | 4.95 | 4.4 | 0.13 | 5.89 | 5.41 | 4.28 | 4.66 | 3.95 | 4.78 | 5.32 |
| TOTAL AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ |  |  | 1.68 | 1.62 | 0.04 | 2.56 | 1.87 | 1.42 | 1.5 | 1.35 | 1.25 | 1.35 |
| TOTAL AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  |  |  | 1170 | 1268 | 1214 | 1530 | 1408 | 1286 | 1610 |
| TOTAL SUM OF PROPERTIES SURVEYED |  |  | 709 | 762 |  | 208 | 590 | 464 | 227 | 100 | 71 | 156 |
| TOTAL SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED |  |  | 52076 | 59054 |  | 4074 | 18237 | 10775 | 12745 | 2277 | 565 | 3403 |

VACANCY RATE SINCE FALL 2ロ14－PロRTLAND／VANCロUVER METRロ AREA


| ロTHER AREAS |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SALEM \＆VICINITY | 112 |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & 4.11 \\ & 1.21 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.12 \\ & 0.06 \end{aligned}$ | 2.56 | 6.07 | 4.58 | 3.83 | 4.68 | 6.45 | 2.97 |
|  |  | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ | 4.621.28 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ |  |  |  | 1.72 | 1.46 | 1.21 | 1.26 | 1.1 | 1.36 | 1.19 |
|  |  | AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  | 750 | 884 | 999 | 1229 | 1109 | 1228 | 1379 |
|  |  | SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 6279 | 8355 |  | 156 | 1400 | 2448 | 1359 | 385 | 93 | 438 |
| EUGENE \｜SPRINGFIELD | 79 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | $\begin{aligned} & 4.59 \\ & 1.37 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 3.23 \\ & 1.31 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 0.42 \\ & 0.05 \end{aligned}$ | 3.25 | 4.45 |  | 6.35 | 4.17 | 4.76 | 7.97 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 | 1.52 | 3.43 1.2 | 1.33 | 1.2 | 1.22 | 1.2 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | 716 | 991 | 956 | 1396 | 1239 | 1222 | 1412 |
|  |  |  | 4875 | 5139 |  | 369 | 1347 | 1486 | 787 | 480 | 42 | 364 |
| BEND｜REDMOND | 5 | AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED | 7.62 | 2.99 | $\begin{aligned} & 1.55 \\ & -0.03 \end{aligned}$ | － | 3.95 | 8.77 | 13.58 | 12.5 | － | 13.04 |
|  |  |  | 1.55 | 1.6 |  | － | 1.77 | 1.22 | 1.54 | 0.95 | － | 0.95 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  | － | 1295 | 1080 | 1561 | 953 | － | 1164 |
|  |  |  | 420 | 803 |  | 0 | 228 | 57 | 81 | 8 | 0 | 46 |
| TOTAL AVG MARKET VACANCY RATE \％ |  |  | 4.72 | 3.73 | 0.27 | 3.05 | 5.18 | 4.21 | 5.07 | 4.47 | 5.93 | 5.66 |
| TOTAL AVG RENT PER SQ FOOT \＄ |  |  | 1.33 | 1.27 | 0.05 | 1.92 | 1.51 | 1.21 | 1.3 | 1.15 | 1.31 | 1.18 |
| TOTAL AVG RENT PER UNIT TYPE \＄ |  |  |  |  |  | 727 | 964 | 984 | 1300 | 1179 | 1226 | 1382 |
| TOTAL SUM OF PROPERTIES SURVEYED |  |  | 196 | 222 |  | 33 | 115 | 115 | 58 | 26 | 34 | 45 |
| TOTAL SUM OF UNITS SURVEYED |  |  | 11574 | 14297 |  | 525 | 2975 | 3991 | 2227 | 873 | 135 | 848 |

Surveys received from $\operatorname{Sec} 42, \operatorname{Sec} 8$ and other subsidized affordable housing programs are not included in the current survey data．

## TREND REPロRT ：PロRTLAND METRロ AREA

CoStar：Search criteria—Research Status：Published；Market：Portland；PropType：Multi Family；Sale Date：1／1／2016—12／31／18；unit： 5 units and greater．





| YEAR | 1Q16 | 2Q16 | 3Q16 | 4Q16 | 1Q17 | 2Q17 | 3Q17 | 4Q17 | 1Q18 | 2Q18 | 3Q18 | 4Q18 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| \＃OF TRANS | 78 | 65 | 55 | 75 | 33 | 47 | 47 | 47 | 60 | 54 | 56 | 72 |
| TTL \＄VOLUME | \＄533，643，026 | \＄394，593，400 | \＄449，628，750 | \＄1，673，134，898 | \＄365，176，896 | \＄229，539，234 | \＄441，714，000 | \＄660，010，092 | \＄460，382，050 | \＄277，684，156 | \＄670，608，291 | \＄873，665，944 |
| TTL BLDG SF | 3，017，624 | 2，157，580 | 2，572，879 | 15，455，959 | 1，897，493 | 1，472，106 | 2，377，259 | 2，140，877 | 2，330，731 | 1，518，482 | 2，596，963 | 3，642，946 |
| TTL UNITS | 3，189 | 2，477 | 2，805 | 7，757 | 1，948 | 1，644 | 2，327 | 2，731 | 2，509 | 1，550 | 2，419 | 4，147 |
| AVG PRICE | \＄6，930，429 | \＄6，070，668 | \＄8，175，068 | \＄22，919，656 | \＄11，065，967 | \＄5，100，872 | \＄10，517，000 | \＄14，042，768 | \＄8，686，454 | \＄5，239，324 | \＄11，975，148 | \＄12，134，249 |
| AVG \＃OF SF | 38，687 | 33，194 | 47，646 | 112，017 | 59，297 | 31，321 | 50，580 | 45，551 | 38，846 | 28，120 | 46，374 | 50，596 |
| AVG \＄BLDG SF | \＄177．74 | \＄182．89 | \＄174．49 | \＄204．51 | \＄191．82 | \＄168．05 | \＄209．12 | \＄308．29 | \＄217．06 | \＄183．17 | \＄258．23 | \＄239．82 |
| MED \＄P／SF | \＄116．22 | \＄139．71 | \＄133．66 | \＄155．88 | \＄164．51 | \＄160．06 | \＄180．10 | \＄196．97 | \＄173．30 | \＄193．55 | \＄201．74 | \＄227．96 |
| AVG \＄P／UNIT | \＄165，804 | \＄159，303 | \＄159，791 | \＄215，222 | \＄186，846 | \＄147，994 | \＄203，886 | \＄238，231 | \＄193，432 | \＄173，882 | \＄274，726 | \＄209，999 |
| MED \＄P／UNIT | \＄107，843 | \＄116，667 | \＄120，733 | \＄149，125 | \＄152，199 | \＄132，500 | \＄150，532 | \＄180，000 | \＄146，454 | \＄179，808 | \＄176，714 | \＄175，000 |
| AVG \＃OF UNITS | 43 | 38 | 53 | 112 | 61 | 36 | 51 | 61 | 43 | 31 | 46 | 58 |
| ACTUAL CAP RATE | 5．56\％ | 5．51\％ | 5．59\％ | 5．22\％ | 5．38\％ | 5．62\％ | 5．60\％ | 5．29\％ | 5．27\％ | 5．21\％ | 5．35\％ | 5．50\％ |
| AVG GRM | 9.91 | 11.30 | 10.36 | 11.56 | 11.82 | 14.73 | 11.16 | 13.64 | 14.18 | 10.13 | 11.33 | 13.09 |
| AVG GIM | 9.44 | 10.73 | － | － | － | － | 9.01 | － | － | － | 9.88 | － |

## EXPANSIロN CONTINUES, BUT GROWTH SLOWS

Josh Lehner, Economist, State of Oregon, Office of Economic Analysis

The economy experienced another year of strong growth in 2018. Unemployment remains near historic lows and wage growth continues to pick up. The economy will set a new record for the length of an expansion this summer at ten years old. Thankfully the next recession is not yet seen in the data either. That said, the outlook calls for ongoing, but slowing growth this year and next. The tax cuts are fading and past interest rate hikes cool economic activity. The keys to the outlook are the increasingly dovish Federal Reserve and U.S. consumer, which should hold up due to labor market gains despite a few weak months of retail sales.

The Portland region continues its transition down to more sustainable rates of growth. Job gains last year were more than enough to match population growth and the influx of workers. That said, 2018's job growth was the slowest the region has experienced during an economic expansion in the past 40 years. The lone exception was during the Asian Financial Crisis in the late 1990s. Today's slower growth is the result of an economy bumping up against supply side constraints, like the lack of a large pool of readily available workers.


Given people mostly move to Oregon for job-related reasons, as employment growth slows, so too does migration. While the slowing in the latest population estimates is no surprise, it was a bit more pronounced than expected. The sharpest slowdowns were seen among children and seniors while the working-age population increases held up somewhat better. Within the Portland region, the working-age population growth slowed the most in Multnomah while the suburbs saw steady growth.


Looking forward, the region will continue to add residents. The primary driver will be 20 - and 30 -somethings moving from other parts of the country. Such migrants increasingly have high levels of educational attainment. This is unequivocally good for the local economy. High-wage job growth and the workers who fill these positions continue to drive economic growth and housing demand this cycle.

However, new research from MIT's David Autor furthers our understanding of job polarization, wage stagnation, and migration. A generation ago, workers of all stripes earned higher wages in large, urban areas. There was an economic incentive for individuals to move to cities. Workers responded accordingly and our metro regions have thrived.

Today, due to the decline of good-paying, middle-wage jobs, there is no longer an urban wage premium for workers without a college degree. Someone working in Pendleton earns approximately the same as someone in Portland. All of this before housing and the cost of living are taken into account.

Without a financial incentive, workers without a college degree will continue to move less frequently to big, urban areas. This reduces the relative labor supply in cities, placing more pressure on firms looking to fill low-wage jobs. Conversely this shift raises labor supply in smaller metros and rural areas, supporting stronger overall growth in these locations.

This sorting by educational attainment, job opportunities and the like is not complete. The economy is searching for a new equilibrium. For now these trends point toward young college graduates continuing to drive population growth in the Portland region, while the rest of the state sees more balanced gains.

As for the housing market, the recently passed Senate Bill 608 is top of the mind. In broad terms, SB 608 has two components: restrictions on no-cause evictions, and rent stabilization. Nearly all of the public discussion centers on the latter given the longstanding rent control issues like low levels of new supply and deferred maintenance given there is less economic incentive to build or maintain properties.

Our office recently discussed the legislation with our advisors and the consensus was that the new law is likely to avoid these bad outcomes．SB 608 is not expected to restrict new housing supply given the 15 year exemption for new con－ struction and the relatively high cap for the maximum annual rent increase．These conditions will not bind for the vast ma－ jority of developers，landlords or units．As such，the likely im－ pact of the legislation will be preventing the worst displacement scenarios，ensuring somewhat more stability for tenants，and increased administrative costs for landlords．

Now，our office＇s advisors did raise two concerns．First，they are worried that the annual increase or new construction ex－ emption would be tightened over time，leading to worse housing market outcomes．Second，they wondered who would oversee tenant complaints，ensure landlord compliance and whether there would there be funding for increased landlord／tenant court cases．


Finally，as part of the legislation，our office has the reporting requirement for the maximum annual rent increase，which is defined as 7 percent plus inflation．For 2019 this equals $10.3 \%$ ．Our office now has a dedicated page on our website where one can view this information and download the data． Our office will publish the maximum annual rent increase for 2020 in September 2019．■

Josh Lehner is a Senior Economist with the State of Oregon＇s Office of Economic Analysis．He develops the quarterly Oregon Economic forecast， including outlooks for employment，income and housing．Additional responsibilities include the Oregon Index of Leading Indicators，tracking international developments in Oregon＇s export markets and forecasting revenues for the Oregon Lottery，Oregon Judicial Department and state tobacco taxes．Mr．Lebner earned a B．A．in Economics from the University of Colorado and an M．S．in Economics from Portland State University．


## Dロ Yロப ロFFER INCENTIVES？



# ANNUAL ロPERATING EXPENSES <br> Co－Star Multi－family Market Report—Portland Market 

The Co－Star report analyzes expenses on a per square foot basis and unlike our previous reports，includes capital expenditures．There are two charts，a＂ 3 －Star＂ and a＂ $1 \& 2$ Star＂．The 3－Star equates to what would typically be considered a Class B property and the 1\＆2 Star a Class C．Class A properties are averaging $30 \%$ to $60 \%$ higher than the 3 －Star properties but are not reflected on these reports．


## PロRTLAND MULTI－FAMILY

3 STAR EXPENSES PER SQUARE FロロT（ANNUAL）

|  | Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Capital Expenditures |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market／Cluster | Mgmt． | Admin． | Payroll | Water | Utilities | Maint． | Insurance | Taxes | Appliance | Structural | Other | Total |
| Portland | \＄0．49 | \＄0．56 | \＄0．68 | \＄0．62 | \＄0．78 | \＄0．99 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．26 | \＄0．18 | \＄0．45 | \＄1．15 | \＄7．36 |
| Aloha | \＄0．36 | \＄0．54 | \＄0．51 | \＄0．61 | \＄0．78 | \＄0．49 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．23 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．06 | \＄6．39 |
| Beaverton | \＄0．49 | \＄0．54 | \＄0．52 | \＄0．67 | \＄0．78 | \＄1．01 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．37 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．05 | \＄7．24 |
| Central Northeast | \＄0．51 | \＄0．55 | \＄1．08 | \＄0．68 | \＄0．79 | \＄1．10 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．41 | \＄0．18 | \＄0．49 | \＄1．13 | \＄8．12 |
| Clackamas County | \＄0．49 | \＄0．63 | \＄1．07 | \＄1．09 | \＄1．11 | \＄2．61 | \＄0．19 | \＄1．66 | \＄0．24 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．06 | \＄10．59 |
| Clark County | \＄0．51 | \＄0．54 | \＄0．35 | \＄0．42 | \＄0．65 | \＄0．55 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．04 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．39 | \＄1．38 | \＄6．20 |
| Columbia County | \＄0．49 | \＄0．63 | \＄1．07 | \＄1．09 | \＄1．11 | \＄2．61 | \＄0．19 | \＄1．66 | \＄0．24 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．06 | \＄10．59 |
| Damascus | \＄0．50 | \＄0．63 | \＄0．36 | \＄0．54 | \＄0．65 | \＄0．88 | \＄0．20 | \＄0．97 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．06 | \＄6．40 |
| Downtown Portland | \＄0．55 | \＄0．56 | \＄0．73 | \＄0．55 | \＄0．89 | \＄0．62 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．41 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．46 | \＄1．09 | \＄7．23 |
| East Portland | \＄0．49 | \＄0．63 | \＄1．07 | \＄1．08 | \＄1．11 | \＄2．59 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．65 | \＄0．24 | \＄0．49 | \＄1．12 | \＄10．67 |
| Hillsboro | \＄0．36 | \＄0．54 | \＄0．51 | \＄0．61 | \＄0．78 | \＄0．51 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．24 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．48 | \＄1．11 | \＄6．51 |
| Lake Oswego | \＄0．50 | \＄0．61 | \＄0．38 | \＄0．53 | \＄0．67 | \＄0．83 | \＄0．19 | \＄0．99 | \＄0．16 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．04 | \＄6．34 |
| North Portland | \＄0．50 | \＄0．57 | \＄1．07 | \＄0．88 | \＄0．94 | \＄1．84 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．51 | \＄0．20 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．04 | \＄9．19 |
| Northeast Portland | \＄0．51 | \＄0．56 | \＄1．10 | \＄0．69 | \＄0．80 | \＄1．10 | \＄0．21 | \＄1．42 | \＄0．18 | \＄0．57 | \＄1．25 | \＄8．39 |
| Northwest Portland | \＄0．52 | \＄0．56 | \＄0．51 | \＄0．50 | \＄0．91 | \＄0．35 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．36 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．06 | \＄6．58 |
| Oregon City | \＄0．50 | \＄0．63 | \＄0．36 | \＄0．54 | \＄0．65 | \＄0．88 | \＄0．20 | \＄0．97 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．06 | \＄6．40 |
| Outlying Washingto．．． | \＄0．50 | \＄0．65 | \＄1．08 | \＄1．10 | \＄1．12 | \＄2．63 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．67 | \＄0．25 | \＄0．63 | \＄1．33 | \＄11．16 |
| Sherwood／Tualatin | \＄0．51 | \＄0．54 | \＄1．03 | \＄0．67 | \＄0．77 | \＄1．08 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．38 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．06 | \＄7．85 |
| Southeast Portland | \＄0．51 | \＄0．54 | \＄1．08 | \＄0．71 | \＄0．81 | \＄1．20 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．42 | \＄0．18 | \＄0．46 | \＄1．08 | \＄8．19 |
| Southwest Portland | \＄0．57 | \＄0．55 | \＄0．50 | \＄0．46 | \＄0．95 | \＄0．30 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．39 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．04 | \＄6．57 |
| Tigard | \＄0．50 | \＄0．54 | \＄1．04 | \＄0．68 | \＄0．78 | \＄1．09 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．40 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．05 | \＄7．89 |
| Troutdale／Gresham | \＄0．51 | \＄0．55 | \＄1．07 | \＄0．71 | \＄0．81 | \＄1．22 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．43 | \＄0．18 | \＄0．46 | \＄1．09 | \＄8．23 |
| Vancouver | \＄0．50 | \＄0．53 | \＄0．34 | \＄0．42 | \＄0．65 | \＄0．55 | \＄0．19 | \＄1．04 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．39 | \＄1．37 | \＄6．15 |
| Wilsonville | \＄0．50 | \＄0．61 | \＄0．51 | \＄0．57 | \＄0．67 | \＄0．93 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．05 | \＄0．17 | \＄0．44 | \＄1．06 | \＄6．71 |
| Yamhill County | \＄0．49 | \＄0．62 | \＄1．07 | \＄1．08 | \＄1．09 | \＄2．53 | \＄0．20 | \＄1．63 | \＄0．23 | \＄0．51 | \＄1．15 | \＄10．60 |

Expenses are estimated using NCREIF，IREM，and CoStar data using the narrowest possible geographical definition from Zip Code to region．

PロRTLAND MULTI-FAMILY
1 \& 2 STAR EXPENSES PER SF (ANNUAL)

|  | Operating Expenses |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Capital Expenditures |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Market / Cluster | Mgmt. | Admin. | Payroll | Water | Utilities | Maint. | Insurance | Taxes | Appliance | Structural | Other | Total |
| Portland | \$0.43 | \$0.39 | \$0.60 | \$0.54 | \$0.68 | \$0.71 | \$0.18 | \$1.04 | \$0.07 | \$0.41 | \$0.96 | \$6.01 |
| Aloha | \$0.34 | \$0.47 | \$0.48 | \$0.58 | \$0.74 | \$0.46 | \$0.19 | \$1.06 | \$0.07 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$5.67 |
| Beaverton | \$0.47 | \$0.47 | \$0.47 | \$0.64 | \$0.74 | \$0.99 | \$0.19 | \$1.08 | \$0.08 | \$0.42 | \$0.87 | \$6.42 |
| Central Northeast | \$0.46 | \$0.31 | \$1.02 | \$0.61 | \$0.71 | \$0.87 | \$0.19 | \$1.10 | \$0.07 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.62 |
| Clackamas County | \$0.38 | \$0.23 | \$1.01 | \$0.78 | \$0.58 | \$0.61 | \$0.19 | \$1.05 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.17 |
| Clark County | \$0.45 | \$0.41 | \$0.21 | \$0.40 | \$0.63 | \$0.52 | \$0.14 | \$0.99 | \$0.06 | \$0.37 | \$1.31 | \$5.49 |
| Columbia County | \$0.42 | \$0.34 | \$1.03 | \$0.87 | \$0.73 | \$1.18 | \$0.19 | \$1.22 | \$0.11 | \$0.43 | \$0.91 | \$7.43 |
| Damascus | \$0.44 | \$0.43 | \$0.35 | \$0.52 | \$0.62 | \$0.84 | \$0.19 | \$0.92 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$5.65 |
| Downtown Portland | \$0.48 | \$0.41 | \$0.76 | \$0.55 | \$0.78 | \$0.60 | \$0.19 | \$1.15 | \$0.09 | \$0.42 | \$0.90 | \$6.33 |
| East Portland | \$0.37 | \$0.28 | \$0.94 | \$0.66 | \$0.66 | \$0.76 | \$0.18 | \$1.06 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.25 |
| Hillsboro | \$0.34 | \$0.47 | \$0.48 | \$0.58 | \$0.74 | \$0.48 | \$0.19 | \$1.06 | \$0.07 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$5.69 |
| Lake Oswego | \$0.44 | \$0.43 | \$0.39 | \$0.49 | \$0.67 | \$0.65 | \$0.19 | \$0.96 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$5.56 |
| North Portland | \$0.43 | \$0.27 | \$1.01 | \$0.71 | \$0.66 | \$0.73 | \$0.19 | \$1.08 | \$0.07 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.43 |
| Northeast Portland | \$0.48 | \$0.31 | \$1.02 | \$0.64 | \$0.74 | \$0.86 | \$0.19 | \$1.10 | \$0.08 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.70 |
| Northwest Portland | \$0.46 | \$0.45 | \$0.48 | \$0.44 | \$0.81 | \$0.29 | \$0.19 | \$1.11 | \$0.08 | \$0.42 | \$0.89 | \$5.62 |
| Oregon City | \$0.44 | \$0.43 | \$0.35 | \$0.52 | \$0.62 | \$0.84 | \$0.19 | \$0.92 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$5.65 |
| Outlying Washingto... | \$0.39 | \$0.24 | \$1.01 | \$0.79 | \$0.59 | \$0.65 | \$0.19 | \$1.06 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.26 |
| Sherwood/Tualatin | \$0.38 | \$0.50 | \$0.17 | \$0.60 | \$0.73 | \$0.98 | \$0.16 | \$1.18 | \$0.08 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.06 |
| Southeast Portland | \$0.48 | \$0.34 | \$1.02 | \$0.64 | \$0.74 | \$0.95 | \$0.19 | \$1.10 | \$0.07 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.81 |
| Southwest Portland | \$0.44 | \$0.43 | \$0.48 | \$0.44 | \$0.77 | \$0.28 | \$0.19 | \$1.05 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$5.42 |
| Tigard | \$0.35 | \$0.51 | \$0.16 | \$0.64 | \$0.74 | \$0.99 | \$0.19 | \$1.11 | \$0.07 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.04 |
| Troutdale/Gresham | \$0.32 | \$0.37 | \$1.00 | \$0.51 | \$0.64 | \$0.82 | \$0.17 | \$1.07 | \$0.05 | \$0.42 | \$0.87 | \$6.24 |
| Vancouver | \$0.45 | \$0.41 | \$0.21 | \$0.40 | \$0.63 | \$0.52 | \$0.14 | \$0.99 | \$0.06 | \$0.37 | \$1.31 | \$5.49 |
| Wilsonville | \$0.44 | \$0.43 | \$0.35 | \$0.52 | \$0.62 | \$0.84 | \$0.19 | \$0.92 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$5.65 |
| Yamhill County | \$0.39 | \$0.24 | \$1.01 | \$0.79 | \$0.59 | \$0.66 | \$0.19 | \$1.06 | \$0.06 | \$0.42 | \$0.86 | \$6.27 |

Expenses are estimated using NCREIF, IREM, and CoStar data using the narrowest possible geographical definition from Zip Code to region.


| SECTION 42 SURVEY RESULTS • SPRING 2019 |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| TTL \# OF PROPERTIES = 111 | • TTL \# OF UNITS = 7,709 |  |
|  | VACANCY | AVG. RENT |
| UNIT TYPES | RATE (\%) | PER SQ FT (\$) |
| STUDIO | 2.74 | 2.30 |
| 1 BED / 1 BATH | 1.94 | 1.31 |
| 2 BED / 1 BATH | 2.29 | 1.05 |
| 2 BED / 2 BATH | 5.08 | 1.12 |
| 2 BED / TH | 1.97 | 0.84 |
| 3 BED / 1 BATH | 1.81 | 0.95 |
| 3 BED / 2 BATH | 1.43 | 0.81 |
| TOTALS | 2.3 | 1.38 |

## NAVIGATING THE NEW PロRTLAND

Whitney Rhoades and Danalee Corso, Rhoades-Corso Group

## URM, IHZ, SB 608, OPPORTUNITY ZONES, INCREASED CONSTRUCTION COSTS, LIMITED SCREENING CRITERIA...

The landscape of Portland area apartments is continually shifting, with what seems like a new guideline or requirement every month. The increasingly frustrated owners who decide to sell and move on to a new frontier are wondering, what will all this mean for my value? Will buyers still have an appetite in this ever-changing market? In this team's humble opinion, absolutely!

The strengths of the local market remain intrinsic, appealing, and growing to keep up with and even outpace each new challenge. Oregon saw nearly 60,000 newly migrated residents in 2018 alone, with would-be locals attracted to the high paying jobs, prolific transportation system, and inherent lifestyle and livability of the city. According to our firm's national 2019 multifamily forecast*, the Portland metro area remains one of the strongest major markets for long-term appreciation (\#5 nationally), and is the least expensive cost of living among west coast cities.

Now, not everything is rosy-hued. Both local and out-of-state investors are voicing concerns regarding the public persecution of rental housing providers, the shift of control regarding rental rates into the state government's hands, and the continually pending requirements surrounding unreinforced masonry. These all pose concerns for both our present owners and those considering investment into Portland and its surrounding communities. While this has caused a longer evaluation period for investments, those investors can calculate the effect of the new risks as the strengths of the market continue to bolster their anticipation of long-term success.

As we look at current transactions as compared to one, two, three or more years ago, we see a continued appetite for apartments in the area surrounding Portland. There has been a marked hesitancy, primarily from local investors, to buy in

Portland - particularly since relocation fees were passed. This hesitancy seems due not to the actual fee so much as the perceived general attitude toward rental housing providers within the city itself. It is yet to be seen how the "leveling of the playing field" from SB 608, which created statewide rent control, will effect investors' minds of Portland vs. Everywhere Else. Investors from other states however, particularly California, which has even more stringent rent control laws in many major markets, remain bullish on Portland's prospects for long term holds. We see continued aggressiveness from investors regarding their acquisition goals. Most recently, an apartment property on offering by our team saw immediate interest from investment groups locally, from Seattle, and from multiple markets in California. Typical other recent transactions are seeing earnest money becoming nonrefundable early, lack of financing contingencies, and competitive pricing from interested investors in the interest of gaining the opportunity to win the deal.

The current headwinds facing owners in this market are many and varied, but we strongly believe the benefits outweigh the threats. The growing population is comprised mainly of the infamous Millennials and Boomers. Consequently, Portland continues to offer a population that favors renting over homeownership, and thus a stable and willing renter base. That continual demand for quality housing will dictate transactions moving forward as buyers look to take advantage of the strengths the market offers, and sellers look to take advantage of the premiums those buyers are willing to pay for the opportunity.

Summarily, despite the newfound obstacles presented by our changing landscape, Portland remains a high demand market for investors. While it might take a bit longer to get to the upside end of the rainbow, the path remains, for the time being, navigable.

Rhoades-Corso Group is a team within Marcus $\mathcal{F}$ Millichap, a leading national commercial brokerage firm. RCG focuses on private client apartment sales throughout the Portland MSA and greater Oregon and southwest Washington.

* 2008-2018 Average annualized appreciations in price per unit. Sources: Marcus \& Millichap Research Services; CoStar Group, Inc.; Real Capital Analytics
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