

# Engagement Report

## Oregon Housing Needs Analysis Focus Groups

### Introduction and Process

#### Project Background

Under direction from the State Legislature, the Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS) Department and the Department of Land Conservation and Development (DLCD) are developing a framework to implement an Oregon Housing Needs Analysis (OHNA) program. The OHNA builds on the Regional Housing Needs Analysis work conducted after the passage of House Bill 2003 (2019) and will culminate in a recommendations report to the Legislature in advance of the 2023 session advising on how the state could implement an OHNA into state and local planning programs.

The purpose of focus group engagement was to continue the engagement process that began with the implementation of House Bills 2001 and 2003 (2019), with the goal of ensuring that further legislative actions will lead to increased housing production, increased publicly supported affordable housing production, and improved equity in housing outcomes.

Previous engagement efforts highlighted the need to deliver more adequate and affordable housing to communities across the state. The goal of this engagement process is to ensure that these legislative recommendations are implementable, productive, and more responsive to the entirety of Oregon's housing need than the existing housing planning process.

Additional information on the project is available in the [framework report](#).

#### Focus Group Engagement Process

In coordination with DLCD, Kearns & West (K&W) engaged participants in a series of six focus groups between March and May 2022. K&W focused on engagement with groups outside of the legislative structure including land use planning and housing policy staff at local governments, market and affordable housing developers, continuums of care and other community-based organizations, and housing and equity advocates. It was essential to identify participants that were representative of various regions throughout the state and that worked with different communities to ensure that diverse perspectives were included in public policy conversations.

#### Discussion Topics

Focus group engagement focused on key questions to inform policy approaches that advance racial equity and affordable, fair, and equitable housing outcomes.

The discussions focused on the following topics. See Appendix A for a complete list of questions and focus group participants.

### March 30, 2022 | Housing and Planning Housing Focus Group

- What state, regional, and local government are, can, and should be doing to address unmet housing needs
- Accountability measures to fulfill housing responsibilities
- Support, investments, resources needed to better plan for and develop housing
- Partnership opportunities

### April 6 and April 8, 2022 | Market and Affordable Housing Focus Groups

- What state, regional, and local government are, can, and should be doing to address unmet housing needs
- Facilitating a supply of development-ready land served by adequate infrastructure
- Regulatory reform and incentives to support affordability
- Housing location and connecting people to opportunity

### April 26 and April 29, 2022 | Continuums of Care and Community-Based Organizations Focus Groups

- Barriers to affordable housing
- Role of state and local governments in addressing housing issues
- Investments that support access to housing
- State and local policies to improve housing issues
- Ongoing engagement opportunities

### May 4, 2022 | Housing and Equity Focus Group

- What housing justice and creating equitable and inclusive communities looks like
- Policies or practices that are working
- Risks of working towards more market and affordable housing and mitigation measures
- Role of state and local government in addressing housing issues and accountability measures
- Investments that support access to housing

## Focus Group Findings

### Summary of Key Themes

#### Connecting Housing to Opportunity

Access to services – Focus group participants recognized the importance of using a holistic approach to plan for affordable housing. Locating housing near transportation, jobs, and other services provides the stability and resources needed to find and keep a job. A variety of other supports and services are needed, including social services, healthcare, housing navigators, and flexible funds. Participants shared the many ways funding can be used to help people find and keep housing, including car repairs, laundry, and childcare.

A continuum of housing – Participants shared the importance of treating housing as a continuum from homelessness and shelter to renting and home ownership. Creative solutions and partnerships are needed to address housing shortages and connect people to different types of housing and shelter.

Considering barriers – Participants shared the importance of recognizing past harms, lowering barriers to housing, and considering who is disproportionately benefiting from regulatory and land use decisions. Having access to accessible and affordable housing that is in good condition and located near services

needs to be a human right. Focus group participants shared that housing availability is particularly challenging for specific groups including communities living in locations with low vacancy rates, people with physical disabilities, and communities with extremely low-incomes or no incomes. Participants highlighted the need to shift from affordable housing systems with strict requirements to systems that are easy to access and understand.

Unique needs – Participants stressed the importance of recognizing the unique needs of communities and individuals. In discussions about opportunity, participants noted that individuals may prefer to stay in existing neighborhoods where they have community support rather than moving to an area that is considered “high opportunity”. Participants recommended local governments and the state engage individuals about their housing preferences and design flexible policies to encourage a range of choices.

## Tools and Policies

Using tools and incentives to prioritize affordable housing – Participants shared a variety of tools local jurisdictions use to deliver affordable housing including incentives, taxes, community development block grants (CDBGs), affordable housing requirements, housing bonds, and public-private partnerships. Participants shared the need for creative solutions to leverage opportunities in existing markets. Many local jurisdictions have had success working with developers to understand where flexibility is needed and incentivizing the production of affordable housing by waiving System Development Charges (SDCs), providing subsidies and land donations, waiving commercial ground floor requirements, and utilizing tax deductions.

Participants also discussed creating infrastructure or transportation bonuses at the state level that could be awarded for shortening permitting review timelines, using model codes, or providing less than 80% area median income (AMI) requirements for developers. Participants noted the challenge of incentives not working if a city is not committed to diversifying housing options.

Codes matter – Participants noted several examples where codes create barriers to delivering housing. Open space, Planned Unit Developments (PUDs), and infrastructure requirements often add unnecessary expense to projects and may reduce the development of affordable and middle housing. As housing products are diversified, codes need to be flexible and updated to align with changing needs.

Importance of data – Participants shared that additional data collection is needed to provide jurisdictions with the information they need to make informed planning and policy decisions. This includes more accurately tracking affordability, collecting information on housing stock that is available for people with disabilities, and collecting information on housing habitability to help governments provide housing according to need. In addition, participants noted the need to distribute information on homeownership programs to improve access to opportunity, pathways to ownership, and security of tenure.

## State Accountability

Balancing state involvement – Participants acknowledged the importance of having state mandated housing requirements to provide planners with support to pass policies for issues that are difficult to address at the local level. This needs to be balanced with implementation flexibility that allows local governments to respond to local conditions and concerns.

Taking responsibility – Participants noted that the state and public have a role in holding cities accountable for providing housing and meeting State Goal 10. Participants discussed a variety of roles for local governments including funding subsidized affordable housing and regulating market-rate housing.

### Addressing Barriers

Barriers to accessing housing – Participants shared the many barriers that communities face in accessing housing including screening requirements and documents for applications, extensive waitlists, limited information in other languages, and housing availability, habitability and affordability. Participants recommended setting limits on screening requirements, creating resources to help people find housing, and providing information in multiple languages to community leaders.

Meeting rural housing needs – Participants highlighted housing challenges unique to many rural areas, including barriers for farmworker and immigrant populations, poor-quality housing, and a lack of affordable housing and land due to wildfire. Legal presence requirements to access federal housing creates a burden on undocumented immigrant populations and many are left with limited, poor-quality affordable housing options. Participants noted that new affordable housing is difficult to produce in rural areas, especially in those impacted by wildfire, due to competition with market rate developers and long wait times for tax credits. Participants also noted the unique challenges for farm and forest workers with limited transportation options to access jobs and services.

### Land Supply

Developers need shovel ready land – Participants consistently identified the availability of developable land as a major constraint. 20-year projections do not always accurately prepare jurisdictions to meet future housing needs. Having 20 years of “shovel ready” land available will help decrease the time and resources required before developers can break ground and produce housing. Participants also discussed the value of urban growth boundaries (UGBs) in addressing land supply, noting a need to streamline the process and increase the size of expansions to reduce costs.

Converting existing land – Participants expressed interest in using underutilized land located near infrastructure for new housing. This could include commercially zoned land, surface parking lots, vacant lots, and other underutilized areas.

### Community Engagement and Education

Community representation – Participants highlighted the importance of creating pathways for marginalized and underrepresented communities to be involved in government by increasing pay for elected official positions to ensure governments are representative of and responsive to the communities they serve.

Community-driven processes and engagement – Participants consistently noted the need for processes to be community-driven and data-informed. Participants shared the importance of building honest, authentic relationships with the community, listening to what communities need and responding to such needs. Participants also recommended providing stipends and compensation for participation in committees, focus groups, and oversight bodies.

Communicating value – Participants shared difficulties effectively communicating the value of housing capacity analyses (HCAs), housing production strategies (HPSs), and the OHNA to elected officials and the public. Planners require sufficient information, educational materials, and guidance documents to effectively communicate the value of housing requirements with stakeholders, partners, and the public.

Continued engagement – Focus group participants expressed appreciation for the opportunity to engage in housing discussions and highlighted the need for ongoing engagement at different levels.

## Funding and Capacity Needs

Spending funds effectively – Participants felt that funds for subsidized housing are not always spent effectively. To address this, jurisdictions need to hire knowledgeable staff to lead the production of subsidized housing, offer trainings to existing staff to improve competencies, and utilize public-private partnerships.

Streamlining processes – Participants noted that processes for applying and receiving local, state, and federal funding for development are inefficient and create challenges to providing housing. Funding applications require substantial resources, time, and staff capacity and there are long wait periods to receive funding. Focus group members advocated for shifting away from an annual competitive funding model and establishing a more streamlined process.

Financial and technical support – Jurisdictions, especially those under 10,000 people, require additional funding and technical assistance to meet state deadlines and requirements. Flexible grant funds and technical assistance in the form of toolkits, templates, geospatial data, shared staffing resources, and guidance addressing unanticipated challenges is especially valuable.

Building capacity and investment for infrastructure – Focus group members consistently noted that providing adequate infrastructure to support housing development is an ongoing challenge and a critical component of affordable housing production. Investing in infrastructure will require both financial resources from the state as well as creative solutions and partnerships, including with market rate and affordable developers, to reduce costs and connect affordable housing to services.

Embracing new types of construction – Participants identified barriers to the construction including high costs, lack of funding, and zoning and code restrictions. They expressed that acquiring existing housing and converting it to affordable housing is too costly, and not supported by the current market without government subsidies. There is a need to embrace new types of construction by removing funding and zoning barriers to meet affordable housing needs.

Partnership opportunities – Participants identified the need to partner at the local, regional, and state level to identify creative solutions to housing challenges. Working in partnership creates opportunities to share data and approaches, distribute resources, and more effectively address regulatory issues. Focus group participants also stressed the need for local jurisdictions to partner with private and affordable housing developers to ensure that funds are spent effectively, projects run smoothly, and housing is produced more quickly.

## Recommendations

- 1) Improving coordination between agencies. Coordination is needed between agencies that help produce housing and agencies that provide supportive housing services to ensure that

individuals have successful housing outcomes. This may include improving the flexibility of housing grants to allow for supportive services, sharing data, building staff capacity, and coordinating the distribution of materials in different languages about how and where to access housing.

- 2) Building public-private partnerships. Partnerships are needed between local jurisdictions and market and affordable housing developers to better understand tools and resources needed to produce homes and meet housing needs. Partnerships help ensure processes move forward smoothly and efficiently.
- 3) Focusing on Equitable Processes and Outcomes. Recognizing past harms and working with priority groups to reduce barriers and design community-driven processes is critical to improving Oregon’s housing system. Ongoing meaningful and compensated engagement is needed with marginalized and underrepresented groups including those with low or no-incomes, people experiencing houselessness, people with disabilities, domestic violence survivors, farm and forest workers, immigrants and refugees, and other priority populations to understand and respond to their unique housing needs.
- 4) State support is needed for all jurisdictions, especially those under 10,000 people, including:
  - Guidance on appropriate incentives for affordable housing development
  - Statewide data sets, including geospatial data, to support decision-making at the local level
  - Communications materials to illustrate the value of HCAs, HPSs, and the OHNA to elected officials and the public
  - Flexible funding to support local implementation of state mandates
  - Technical assistance to meet state deadlines and requirements including toolkits, templates, shared staffing resources, and guidance addressing unanticipated challenges
  - Bonuses for improving permitting processes, using model codes, and more
  - Mandates that allow for flexible, outcomes-based implementation at the local level
  - Instilling urgency at every level of public sector
- 5) Increasing the supply of shovel-ready land. State and local governments should be coordinating and investing to increase the supply of land that ready for development. This includes streamlining state (e.g. UGB adjustments) and local (e.g. annexation, zone change, subdivision) review processes to reduce the time required to prepare land for development. It also includes making investments in infrastructure and site preparation necessary to support housing development. Shovel-ready land needs to be planned for in advance to ensure there is a steady supply of land for future development.
- 6) Opportunities for underutilized land. The state can encourage local jurisdictions to identify underutilized land that may be suitable for housing, including commercial land, surface parking lots, brownfields, and vacant lots. These areas are often served by infrastructure and may be a cost-effective way to increase the production of housing. Local jurisdictions will need to determine if the sites are appropriate for development and determine the appropriate policy changes and site preparation needed to support future development.

- 7) Streamlining state funding for affordable housing. State affordable housing applications require substantial resources, time, and capacity from affordable housing developers. There are often long wait times following the application process and coordination of multiple funding streams can take years. Shifting away from an annual competitive funding model to a more streamlined model, and or aligning/timing different funding applications may increase efficiencies for affordable housing developers. There is a need for funding that allows for creative housing projects such as new types of housing or converting existing structures into affordable housing. Any incentives or funding sources resulting from this process should emphasize flexibility in its use, while simultaneously ensuring adequate oversight to ensure it is used appropriately.

*Housing-related issues beyond the direct scope of the OHNA:*

Considering houseless populations and the provision on shelter. While houselessness and shelter were outside of the OHNA scope, additional conversations are needed to coordinate and improve outcomes for houseless populations. Recommendations should highlight the need for follow-up work at the state level and coordination with the Interagency Council on Homelessness

Increasing equitable representation in government. It is important to create pathways for marginalized and underrepresented communities to be involved in government to better meet their needs. Recommendations should highlight the need for follow-up work on state and local processes to increase equitable representation, especially for communities that have been historically underrepresented, including communities of color, people with disabilities, and federal and state protected classes.

Reducing barriers in accessing housing with pro-tenant policies. Screening and income requirements, poor housing quality, lack of reasonable accommodations enforcement, and navigating eviction courts creates barriers for communities to access and maintain housing. Statewide policies that provide more options, especially to renters and households at risk of displacement, are needed to reduce these barriers.

Connecting housing to climate planning. Coordinating statewide housing and climate processes may improve efficiencies over time and ensure the production of housing that is long-lasting and resilient to climate change. Housing-related recommendations should work in tandem with climate policy to build more housing in climate-friendly areas and increase the resilience of communities against future risks, such as wildfire and flooding.

## Appendices

### A. Focus Group Participants

#### Housing and Planning Focus Group

Agency	Geography
Association of Oregon Counties/County Planners Association	Statewide
League of Oregon Cities	Statewide
City of Beaverton	Portland metropolitan area
City of Eugene	Southwest
City of Gresham	Portland metropolitan area
City of Hood River	Northeast

City of Madras	Northeast
City of Medford	Northeast
City of Portland	Portland metropolitan area
City of Wilsonville	Portland metropolitan area
Morrow County	Northeast
Rogue Valley Council	Southwest
Oregon Chapter of American Planning Association (OAPA) – Legislative and Policy Affairs Committee	Statewide

### Market and Affordable Housing Developers Focus Groups

Organization	Focus	Geography
Oregon Property Owners Association	Real estate	Statewide
Portland Planning Commission	Market housing	Portland metropolitan area
Hayden Homes	Market housing	Central Oregon
Homes for Good	Affordable housing	Southwest Oregon
DevNW	Affordable housing	Portland metropolitan area, Southwest Oregon, Central Oregon, Coast
Pahlisch Homes	Market housing	Central Oregon
Stone Bridge Homes NW	Market housing	Portland metropolitan area, Central Oregon
Oregon Homebuilders Association	Market housing	Statewide
Central Oregon Realtors	Real estate	Central Oregon
Oregon Association of Realtors	Real estate	Statewide
Network of Oregon Affordable Housing	Affordable housing	Statewide
Innovative Housing	Affordable housing	Portland metropolitan area

### Continuums of Care and Community-Based Organizations

Organization	Focus	Geography
Access Center for Community Resilience	Housing case management	Southern Oregon
Community Alliance of Tenants	Low-income renters	Statewide
Daytime Drop-in Centers	Houseless communities	
Disability Rights Consultant	People with disabilities	
Disability Rights Oregon	People with disabilities	Statewide
Native American Youth and Family Center (NAYA)	Native American community	Portland metropolitan area
Oregon Community Foundation	Philanthropy	Statewide
Project Access Now	Low-income communities	Portland metropolitan area
Springfield-Eugene Tenant Association	Renters	Southwest Oregon
Unete, Center for Farmworker Advocacy	Farmworkers	Southern Oregon
Unite Oregon	BIPOC, Immigrants and refugees	Portland metropolitan area, Southern Oregon



Hope and Safety	Domestic violence survivors	Central Oregon
Self Enhancement, Inc.	Black/African American Community	Portland metropolitan area
Neighbor Impact	Low-income communities	Central Oregon
JOIN	Houseless communities	Portland metropolitan area
Housing Land Advocates	Housing advocacy	Statewide

### Housing and Equity Focus Group

Organization	Focus	Geography
1000 Friends of Oregon	Land use planning	Portland metropolitan area, Southern Oregon, Southwest Oregon
Central City Concern	Houseless communities	Portland metropolitan area
Fair Housing Council of Oregon	Civil rights	Statewide
Housing Alliance Homelessness Subcommittee/ NW Pilot Project	Houseless/low-income communities	Statewide
Housing Alliance/Neighborhood Partnerships	Housing advocacy	Statewide
Housing Oregon	Housing advocacy	Statewide
Latinos Unidos por Siempre	Youth	Central Oregon
Partnership for Safety and Justice	Public safety	Portland metropolitan area

## B. Focus Group Questions

### Housing and Planning Focus Group

1. What are governments at different levels doing that's working to improve unmet housing need? What is the primary issue for different levels of government?
2. What are effective ways to ensure those government agencies fulfill those responsibilities? Including funding, incentives, and enforcement mechanisms.
3. What supports or adjustments to housing capacity analyses and housing production strategies would help your community better plan for and support housing development?
4. How is this issue different for larger versus smaller cities?
5. Infrastructure planning and finance are cited as significant barriers to housing development. Are there specific types of investments you think would help support housing development?
6. The implementation of the RHNA will require continued capacity building and partnership with local governments to implement legislative direction. In this past biennium, we received a historic investment of \$3.5 million in funding to support housing planning efforts by local governments. What kind of resources do you expect local governments to need in both the near- and long-term to support implementation?
7. How can local jurisdictions best partner at a regional level?
8. What else should the project team consider as it develops recommendations?

## Market and Affordable Housing Developers

1. Based on your interactions with state, regional, and local governments, what are they doing that is working to facilitate housing production and affordability? What could they be doing better?
2. How can we better facilitate a supply of development-ready land in cities?
  - a. What do you see as the relationship between infrastructure and housing construction?
  - b. Are there specific types of investments you think would help support housing development?
  - c. To what extent is access to financing for different types of housing a barrier to construction?
  - d. How can cities better incentivize infill development?
3. What types of regulatory reform and incentives would encourage developers to build housing that is more affordable to households with lower incomes?
  - a. In what ways do current local planning processes and codes support or inhibit smaller and/or less expensive housing?
  - b. In what ways do current local planning processes and codes support or inhibit family-sized (3br+) rental units?
4. How should housing be located in a manner to connect people to opportunity? What challenges would you expect in trying to achieve this?
5. What else should the project team consider as it develops recommendations?

## Continuums of Care and Community-Based Organizations

1. What barriers exist for your populations/clients in accessing affordable housing?
  - a. Do the communities you serve have difficulty finding housing that is accessible to transportation and jobs?
2. What roles do state and local governments have in addressing disparities created by the housing crisis? What are they currently doing that's working and where can they improve?
  - a. What do you think would be most effective in ensuring they fulfill those responsibilities?
3. What types of investments (direct or indirect) would be most beneficial in supporting access to housing for the communities you serve?
4. Are there specific state or local policies that could better support the provision of accessible housing and more inclusive communities for people with disabilities?
5. The implementation of the OHNA will require continued policy development and engagement over the next few years to implement legislative direction, including continued engagement and involvement from our CBO partners and the community members they serve. Would your organization be interested in continued engagement through implementation? If so, what venues and resources would best support your ability to participate?

6. DLCD has parallel work related to equity and climate change that will be ongoing. Would your organization or community partners be interested in participating in any of this work as well? If so, what venues and resources would best support your ability to participate?
7. What else should the project team consider as it develops recommendations?

### Equity and Advocacy Organizations

1. What does housing justice mean for the communities you serve?
2. What does housing look like in an equitable and inclusive community?
  - a. Are there policies or practices that are working to create equitable and inclusive communities?
3. How do we structure engagement and planning processes to better support the communities we serve and ensure policies are responsive to their needs?
4. What risks are there in working towards more market rate and affordable housing production and how do we avoid or mitigate them?
5. What are the responsibilities of local governments to promote housing production and work towards equitable outcomes?
  - a. What incentives, funding, and enforcement mechanisms would be effective in fulfilling these responsibilities?
  - b. How should we track progress and outcomes?
6. The Legislature directed DLCD to develop recommendations intended to increase land capacity, availability, and supply. What do you see as important issues to address and how would you suggest addressing them?

### C. Participant Interests

Issue	What's Working?	What is needed?
Houselessness		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership opportunities</li> <li>• State support to ensure local jurisdictions do not pass laws that target people experiencing houselessness, like anti-camping ordinances and proposals for massive singular homeless shelters.</li> <li>• Consideration of shelter in addition to housing</li> <li>• Exploring creative housing solutions</li> </ul>
Data		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Statewide datasets to compare results between communities and complete accurate housing needs analyses</li> <li>• Tracking equitable access and affordability rates versus affordability to help local</li> </ul>

		<p>governments better understand needs</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data is needed to better understand where physically accessible housing units are located</li> <li>• Data about affordable housing availability needs to be centralized and easy to find</li> <li>• Prioritizing data needs in funding allocations</li> <li>• Using data to make informed decisions</li> <li>• Recognizing the importance of qualitative data</li> </ul>
Community Engagement	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Direct engagement and intentional conversations with impacted communities</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Marginalized communities need to be represented in government</li> <li>• Building trust between decision-makers and communities</li> <li>• Meaningfully engaging with communities directly and compensating them for their time to better understand their needs</li> <li>• Increasing cultural competency around housing processes</li> </ul>
Accountability		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Accountability tools to ensure local governments are creating housing capacity</li> <li>• Strong state leadership and cooperation between agencies</li> </ul>
Land Readiness		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Streamlined UGB process and local processes to reduce time inputs and costs</li> <li>• Investments in infrastructure and site preparation to prepare land for development</li> <li>• Shovel ready land to address supply issues</li> <li>• Ensuring UGB expansions do not displace marginalized communities</li> </ul>
State Support	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• State mandates have been successful when changes are needed but not supported at the local level</li> <li>• Pairing mandates with technical assistance and funding to</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Future mandates need to be balanced with flexibility at the local level</li> <li>• Outcome-based structures are important</li> </ul>

	<p>support cities with different levels of resources</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Templates and guidance documents for technical work</li> <li>• Pre-selected consultants from the state for grant funds</li> <li>• Incentives for local governments to act and allocate resources</li> </ul>
Land Availability	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Government support of infill projects by providing parking, environmental reviews, and mediation</li> <li>• Portland’s Residential Infill Project</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More accurate projections are needed to plan for housing needs</li> </ul>
Protection of natural resources		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Updating wetland definitions to exclude non-significant wetlands created during the development process</li> <li>• Improvements to farmland restrictions</li> <li>• State consideration of wetland mitigation banking</li> </ul>
Effective communication		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving communication between the public and elected officials about housing and planning processes</li> <li>• Motivation from local governments to take action</li> <li>• Including legislators in conversations that require legislative action</li> <li>• Providing information on housing in different languages</li> </ul>
Infrastructure	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Partnership opportunities between local government and developers</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Improving administration of Community Development Block Grants by creating a more intentional process and prioritizing resources for housing related infrastructure</li> <li>• Strategic investments in infill and expansion areas to reduce the cost of infrastructure (Local Improvement Districts and Reimbursement Districts)</li> <li>• State guidance for infrastructure standards, including efficient designs that are broadly adaptable and usable</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Connecting climate and housing planning to align processes</li> </ul>
Affordable housing	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Public-private partnerships</li> <li>• Tax Increment Financing</li> <li>• Brownfield cleanup by local governments to create shovel-ready land</li> <li>• Incentives: land banks, density bonuses, SDC waivers, removing commercial ground floor requirements, and allowing accessory dwelling units</li> <li>• Reduced rate infrastructure loans</li> <li>• Construction excise tax</li> <li>• Community Development Block Grants</li> <li>• Affordable housing bonds</li> <li>• Rent control laws (SB608)</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Eliminating annual competition for affordable housing funding (time and resource intensive) and switching to a model that is more collaborative</li> <li>• Additional loan pools from the state for subsidized and workforce housing</li> <li>• Embracing new types of housing, like modular units, tiny homes, and RVs</li> <li>• Facilitating processes for converting existing structures into affordable housing</li> <li>• Using incentives and subsidies to build affordable housing</li> <li>• Ensuring affordable housing remains affordable long-term</li> <li>• Public sector support for the private sector to develop affordable housing</li> <li>• Providing housing for a range of income levels to reduce the gap between affordable housing and market rate housing</li> <li>• Implementing limits on income requirements to rent</li> </ul>
Code requirements		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing restrictive open space and PUD requirements that create barriers to affordable housing</li> <li>• Accelerating the approval of building permits</li> <li>• Opening up commercially zoned spaces to residential uses</li> <li>• Improving manufactured home park codes</li> <li>• Flexibility with zoning</li> <li>• Updating codes to align with changing needs</li> </ul>
Opportunity		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Working with communities to direct resources</li> <li>• Maintaining connections between work, school, and other services</li> <li>• Focusing on addressing supply across neighborhoods</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Locating housing near jobs and transportation is critical for many groups, including people with disabilities</li> <li>• Connecting social services and health care services to housing</li> <li>• Providing flexible funds that can be used for services that support stable housing, including car repairs</li> <li>• Tenant education programs</li> <li>• Acknowledge communities have different needs</li> </ul>
Rural Housing		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Increasing staff capacity at the state level for rural housing projects</li> <li>• Planning for areas impacted by fire and other natural disasters</li> <li>• Incentivizing affordable housing production and management in rural areas</li> <li>• Reducing wait times for tax credits</li> </ul>
Housing Accessibility		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reducing proof of legal presence requirements for affordable housing</li> <li>• Reducing screening requirements and providing support navigating housing applications</li> <li>• Identifying policies to incentivize development of accessible housing</li> <li>• Increasing accessibility requirements for affordable housing production</li> <li>• Funds for structural accommodations and home modifications</li> <li>• Creating an accessibility certification program</li> </ul>