Housing Planning Reform Working Group Meeting #2
December 9, 2021; 1:00pm – 3:00pm

By Zoom Web Conference

MEETING CONTEXT AND OUTCOME

Project Purpose – The Oregon Legislature has directed the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) to prepare recommendations for the adoption and implementation of a modernized housing planning system, addressing affordable and market-rate housing production, into state and local planning programs.

Working Group Role – The project team will be engaging with stakeholders statewide to solicit feedback on what a modernized housing planning system should look like. The role of the working group is to advise and ground truth to ensure resultant legislative recommendations are implementable.

Intended Meeting Outcome – In this exploratory phase, the project team is defining the parameters of legislative recommendations and the major issues that will need to be addressed. To this end, the working group will be providing feedback and insights on the major issues for the project team to consider in the development of a "problem statement" and ensure the team will be asking the right questions. When the working group re-convenes in April, we will review feedback solicited during the engagement process and begin to weigh policy options.

PROPOSED AGENDA

Working Group Meeting		
Time	**Topic**	**Who**
1:00 – 1:10 pm	**Welcome, Opening Remarks, and Review Intended Outcome and Agenda**	• *DLCD Staff*
1:10 – 1:15 pm	**Introduce Facilitator – Deb Meihoff | Communitas Planning** • Set virtual "name tents" with organization	• *DLCD Staff* • *Deb Meihoff*

Working Group Meeting		
Time	**Topic**	**Who**
1:15 – 1:25 pm	**Project Update** • *Project Schedule* o *Exploratory Phase (December)* o *Interim Report* o *Engagement* • *Reminder: Project Goal and Working Group Role*	• *DLCD Staff* • *Deb Meihoff*
1:25 – 2:55 pm	**Major Issues Discussion** • *Survey Overview* • *Engagement Overview* • *Major Issues and "Problem Statement" Discussion* o *Are there critical issues missing from the implementation issues list?* o *Are there issues on that list that should be addressed in another process or at another time?* o *What issues will be most important for the project team to focus on to ensure this process is successful?*	• *Deb Meihoff (Facilitation)* • *DLCD Staff* • *Working Group Members*
2:55 – 3:00 pm	**Next Steps and Wrap Up**	• *DLCD Staff*

DLCD

RHNA Working Group - Meeting 1
October 28, 2021
Question and Answer Written Response
(Published November 05, 2021)

Staff and Working Group Members

Sean Edging, DLCD
Ethan Stuckmayer, DLCD
Samuel Garcia, DLCD
Emma Land, DLCD
Megan Bolton, OHCS
Lorelei Juntunen, ECONorthwest
Al Johnson, retired Land Use Attorney
Allan Lazo, Fair Housing Council of Oregon

Ariel Nelson, League of Oregon Cities
Carla Paladino, City of Medford
Cristina Palacios, Unite Oregon
Dwight Jefferson, City of Portland
Jill Rolfe, Coos County
Jeremy Rogers, Oregon Realtors
Mallorie Roberts, AOC
Mary Kyle McCurdy, 1000 Friends of Oregon

Mary Phillips, City of Gresham
Michael Szporluk, Disability Rights of Oregon
Miranda Bateschell, City of Wilsonville
Nick Snead, City of Madras
Taylor Smiley Wolfe, Home Forward
Ted Reid, Metro

Key Insights

Data Landscape and Policy Direction – Members noted that in spite of the issues regarding the data landscape that affects any statewide housing analysis, it doesn't change the need to address housing issues through changes to policy. Addressing gaps via qualitative methods, including engagement, will be important for addressing the full scope of need, especially where data is incomplete.

Implementation of Goal 10 – While the core text of Goal 10 remains appropriate at the high level, the historic implementation of Goal 10 has overemphasized planning for unit type, mix, and density as well as the capacity of land, while ignoring many other dimensions of housing need, especially for communities that have been historically underserved by government. It will be important that this work result in planning processes that more comprehensively address these dimensions of need.

Parameters of the Process – Working Group members agree that establishing clear parameters of the process and resultant legislative recommendations is critical at this stage of work. Members discussed the merits of highly detailed versus broad statutory language in both achieving the desired outcomes and improving the likelihood of adoption and implementation. DLCD staff will follow up with members to solicit greater clarity on the project goal and process parameters.

RHNA Working Group Survey

Key Insight Summary

Project Goal Statement

The Scope of the Goal Statement – Working group members generally agreed that the working project goal statement was "on the right track" but disagreed on the extent of issues this process should seek to address. In general, responses fell on the following spectrum:

1. "The scope is too broad" – DLCD was directed by the Legislature to prepare recommendations on the implementation of a regional housing needs analysis. If this project is intended to address only housing need methodologies and land use, then the scope of issues identified in the goal statement is too broad and cannot be reasonably achieved in the timeframe of this process. The goal would be more achievable and successful if it focused on the implementation of the methodology and its implications for land use planning in cities and counties.
2. "The scope is too narrow" – The current framework has systematically failed to comprehensively address various dimensions of housing need, especially needs that have been historically un- or under-addressed. This process should completely overhaul how government entities plan for and respond to housing need. This goal statement should touch on other topic areas, including public facilities, the role of private developers, addressing "NIMBYism", etc.

Achieving Fair Housing Outcomes – Similarly, members held a spectrum of views on the role and extent to which fair housing is addressed by the implementation of a RHNA:

1. "Fair housing is not enough" – Instead of referencing fair and equitable housing outcomes, the goal statement should more explicitly outline the needs of federal and state protected classes that we are trying to serve. We should emphasize that we are focusing on production to meet the need for BIPOC communities.
2. "Fair housing is impracticable to address through land use" – While advancing fair housing is important, it is not clear that the RHNA and local land use implementation can meaningfully address it with the tools at local governments' disposal. It would be more productive to focus on factors important for fair housing outcomes and more closely relate to land use policy, including affordability and local/regional capacity.

Major Issues

While each of the major issues are critical for improving housing outcomes, a few issues emerged as warranting particular attention from the project team, including:

1. Establishing realistic and productive accountability mechanisms (11 out of 18)
2. Addressing underproduction and affordability (9 out of 18)
3. Responding to un- and under-addressed dimensions of need (8 out of 18)
4. Clearly articulating responsibilities of state, regional, and local gov't (7 out of 18)
5. Directing state agencies to orient investments and resources (7 out of 18)

This does not necessarily mean that these are the most critical issues to address but may have implications for how the project team should frame the problem statement. We will discuss this in greater detail in the next meeting.

Messaging

Working group members had a variety of suggestions on messaging and building political support, including:

Fulfilling Goal 10 – This process should emphasize that the intent is the fulfillment, and not the extension, of existing, long-standing requirements of Goal 10, including the principles of equity, balance, and efficiency expressed in the statewide land use goals.

Outcome-Based Messaging – The message should make clear that the legislative recommendations from this process will address a problem or set of problems that cannot be addressed within the current paradigm. This should include developing stories from various regions and local governments that illustrate the unique problems they face and the need for action.

Focus on Collaboration – "We are in this together" is the defining motto of this theme. Messaging should ensure that partnership and collaboration are defining themes of this process and should be inclusive and transparent for community members throughout the state.

Key RHNA Implementation Questions

The following questions were identified as part of the summary and assessment reports prepared by OHCS and DLCD and are organized into major topic areas. In preparation for the working group meeting, we ask that you review the questions below and consider the following discussion questions:

1. Are there critical issues missing from the implementation issues list?

2. Are there issues on that list that should be addressed in another process or at another time?

3. What issues will be most important for the project team to focus on to ensure this process is successful?

The purpose of this discussion is to establish a foundation for the parameters or "skeleton" of issues that the legislative recommendations will address. This list of issues will need to be updated and refined through the RHNA process, as will the spectrum of policy options available to address each issue. We will work with you and other stakeholders to understand the appropriateness and importance of these issues.

We look forward to the discussion to hear your perspectives and priorities to help DLCD frame the parameters of this process.

Achieving More Affordable, Fair, and Equitable Housing Outcomes

1. What responsibilities do local, regional, and state governments have to address housing needs for historically underserved communities, including communities of color, people with disabilities, and people experiencing homelessness?
2. What is the state's role in achieving a system of shared responsibility and accountability in addressing patterns of residential segregation by race and income and access to housing for other marginalized populations?
3. How do we educate and build capacity in local, regional, and state governments to work towards more affordable, fair, and equitable housing outcomes and a more complete implementation of fair housing law?
4. How can we improve our understanding of tribal housing need, which is dispersed across many geographic areas, and develop an implementation and funding framework that meets these needs in collaboration with Oregon tribes?

Administration of a RHNA

1. Which state or regional agency or agencies should be responsible for preparing and implementing a RHNA?
2. What kind of changes in inherent or delegated authority would agencies need to coordinate state resources, planning efforts, incentives, and enforcement mechanisms?
3. What's the optimal frequency for completing the RHNA? How does this best align with the update cycles for Housing Production Strategies (HPS), the Housing Needs Analysis (HNA), the Metro Regional Framework Plan?
4. What is the appropriate timing and process for periodically amending the RHNA methodology?

Region-Specific Issues

1. How would a RHNA, and any additional changes in the state land use and housing delivery system, function with Metro's structure and charter for land use and transportation planning in a manner that ensures local accountability?
2. What is the appropriate relationship between the Metro and satellite cities outside of the Metro boundary?

3. What data resources are necessary to delineate RHNA boundaries that best reflect the economic, housing, and social dynamics of regions around the state?
4. What adjustments to the methodology can be made to develop regions that better reflect the Central Oregon and Southern Oregon Coast regional housing markets and regulatory structures?
5. How should local jurisdictions be empowered to address specific contextual local needs, such as a large student populations or markets with a significant percentage of second homes?

Defining a System of Shared Responsibility

1. How should the allocation of housing need to local cities and counties be structured to best reflect a shared responsibility among all jurisdictions in a region and address existing patterns of racial and economic segregation?
2. How do historic actions and policies affect the responsibility of a local government to redress housing inequity today?
3. How do future trends, such as climate change and economic development, affect anticipated housing need and distribution over the RHNA planning horizon?
4. How should cities and counties locally plan for housing type, mix, quantity, and characteristics?
5. What are the responsibilities of counties in planning for housing in urban, unincorporated areas, including how they approach economic development planning through Goal 9?
6. How should cities under 10,000, who are not required to complete a regular, localized HNA nor HPS, participate?

Establishing Realistic and Productive Accountability

1. How will Oregon establish a regulatory system that holds cities accountable, while recognizing that local governments are not generally in the business of actually building housing, and that market cycles greatly influence production? What incentive and enforcement tools are appropriate and possible?
2. Given new local housing production strategies and the possibility of changes to Goal 10, what other kinds of administrative or regulatory structures may be needed to enable an implementation system that meets the housing needs of all Oregonians?
3. What should be the expectations for local, regional, and state entities in addressing the housing need identified in the RHNA?
4. With the RHNA serving as a data source for local housing production targets, how will state and local governments track progress toward those targets and create accountability structures that focus on total unit production as well as the production of publicly supported housing?

Directing and Coordinating Resources

1. How will state agencies partner with local and federal funders to generate the resources necessary to make progress toward this need? Through the combination of funding for new construction and other kinds of tenant supports? How can other (non-OHCS, non-DLCD) state funds be directed toward accomplishing the stated intent of the HB 2003 legislation?
2. How much revenue is needed and over what time period? How should that revenue be directed toward tenant supports versus new construction?
3. Infrastructure, especially in smaller and more rural communities, is one of the largest barriers to the provision of more affordable housing options. How should existing and new infrastructure finance and investment be structured to support more affordable housing options?