

## HB 2003 Advisory Committee – First Convening – Discussion Notes

Date: Tuesday, April 21, 2020

Location: Zoom

Meeting recording and slides available: <https://www.oregon.gov/ohcs/Pages/rhna.aspx>

### Approaches to Understanding Unmet Housing Need Across Demographics/ Results of Statewide Equity Analysis

- HB 2003 was born out of an interest in addressing residential segregation by race and income and looking at equitable distribution. Even though not called out sufficiently and explicitly, **the legislative intent was about the role of the state to provide housing at all levels of need especially considering local patterns of geographic segregation.**

### Underproduction

- Regarding the shortage, when discussed **gap analysis at city level, is that also part of the underproduction analysis?** How do those merge together if at all?
- **How does overcrowding and those doubling up on homes get computed into the methodology in thinking about demand?** If just based on population projections and new households, maybe the doubling up that exists now doesn't matter as much.
- I wonder if there's a way to **check overcrowding using McKinney Vento data** for families that are doubled up in the school system. PIT Count data for homelessness, but **McKinney Vento data is the best data we have on doubled up.**
- Do the **second/vacation homes include short-term rentals?**

### Currently Homeless – Dataset

- There are **Annual Homelessness Assessment Reports** that all Continuums have for the shelter count itself. They count every shelter contact they have and they're supposed to have an **unduplicated list of everyone in shelter.** That means **you would only have to mess around with the unsheltered count in applying the multiplier.**
- It's hard to walk away from a real number and rely on adjustments. What is the magnitude of error we can absorb and have it not be a big deal? **At what point do we tradeoff spending a lot of time focusing on better analysis when it's a drop in the bucket in terms of overall expenditure?**

### Portland Metro RHNA x Income x Housing Type

- It's a reality check for all of us in terms of how much **increase in public support we would need to provide for the less than 80 AMI.** It may be useful to put in context the number of units that currently exist in each of those categories with state support to compare.
- Should have a **policy conversation about what an equitable distribution of PSH means.**

## Discussion Questions

*What seems to work well and should be continued into development of the OR method? What does not seem to work well and should be changed or dropped from development of the OR method?*

- It seems the answer to the **large number of units needed at below market rate rents** that may be difficult for local governments to meet, is **not to try to reduce the numbers to something that's manageable, but acknowledge that it's a huge problem** and that you may not have the tools to completely address that problem. To account for historic underproduction, **consider whether a city should have more required housing going forward than their "fair share" due to underproduction in the past.** Also, a city should **do its own HNA and HPS to address internal inequities.**
- Supportive of accounting for second and vacation homes with factor of 1.14. Regarding unit types, it's a good idea to **account for second homes and missing middle housing together** since HB 2001 is directing us to make sure we allow missing middle wherever we allow SF homes.
- It makes sense to look at a region larger than Deschutes County because of anecdotal evidence of how far people drive to go to work, for day-to-day shopping, etc. **If it makes more sense to have a bigger region, then it's probably worth doing.**
- Suggest not only thinking of **underproduction of housing by jurisdiction in urban areas, but specifically underproduction of subsidized affordable housing in resource rich areas.** To use population growth as indicator of where future demand will be is **reiterating patterns of segregation that already exist as a result of exclusionary measures** certain jurisdictions have taken.
- **It's not particularly effective or useful to break down housing units into SF vs. MF—** we just need to know the number of units. It should be driven by what people want on the ground. **If we want unit type included, then our localities need to be surveying and giving education and real trade-off options to residents.** It would also be good to see housing quality captured here. It's not just about how many units we have, but **how many safe, effectively housed units we have.** Lastly, housing filtering is a contentious topic that shouldn't be immediately accepted without work and thought.
- **What happens to those who are cost burdened?** What happens in terms of them affording a unit they need? Agree with **addressing difficulty of knowing what constitutes a housing market in terms of region during allocation.**
- When we think of housing as a more regional commodity as opposed to a city level issue, we might think of ways to **address tradeoffs in terms of transportation and housing cost.** People are making decisions and are willing to pay more in housing because they are lowering transportation costs and that's not necessarily something that's been built in here overall.
- **Unit type is super important to an on-the-ground implementer** as it's inherently tied to affordable product. During implementation, we will get in a position where this is not only a **conversation of allowing certain types of product and expanding the use, but also about restricting development of certain types of products.** The market is not delivering the need. It's taking care of itself and delivering on highest and best use and those who will

pay. In the end, this will be intervention in the market and **addressing a need the market is not stepping up for.**

- A granular focus on unit type is appreciated. The neighborhoods within **communities that are more prosperous and have better outcomes for lower income children is an interesting lens** to help us think through whether we're planning on creating enough units that can accommodate both families and lower income families. On the other side of it, there could be other **communities where you may not need more family facing units, but more units for workers** who need access to certain job centers.