

HB 2003 Advisory Committee – Third Convening – Discussion and Zoom Chat Notes

Date: Monday, June 22, 2020

Location: Zoom

RHNA and HPS: Defining Need → Addressing Need and Reflection/Evaluation

- How is the proposed RHNA **impacting choices**? How is it **suggesting strategies**?
- HNAs include current and past needs since they're looking at ALL needs at that point in time. **Need to better understand how the RHNA helps or adds to the work of the HNAs.**
- Mention focusing growth outside of UGBs. How does that analysis account for the **Urban Reserves and Rural Reserves** that are used in the Portland Metro region? Are Urban Reserves being counted as "**outside**" or "**inside**" of the Metro UGB?
- **Many of the areas "outside UGBs" will be in UGBs within 20 years, so how are those areas accounted for?** If the RHNA doesn't take these areas into account, for example Urban Reserves in Portland Metro, is the assumption those units will be built in those UGBs?
- In light of the extension of a similar (but not the same) housing analysis for cities under 25,000 in 2019 by the current ORS 197.296(10), does it make sense to have **uniform HNA standards that would be useful whether or not the RHNA survives?**
- Need to understand that **housing of the past isn't necessarily relevant to the future.** One can't solve a problem with the same thinking that created it.
- What **impacts of COVID-19** might undermine this project's data and statistics?
- Without knowing what the enforcement mechanisms associated with the HPS will be, **there's probability that jurisdictions that have historically been exclusionary in land use decision-making may not have pressures to change.** There will be a fiscal impact in closing the gap between market rate and lower income levels. **Without any enforcement mechanisms in HPS, might be back here in a few years.** There's a circular nature of the analysis vs. political and policy realities at jurisdictional level.
- Where is the research showing how **rapidly increasing prices for houses** is part and parcel to this problem?

People Experiencing Homelessness Not Observed in PIT or Census Data

- Does **McKinney Vento** include households experiencing homelessness with **children who aren't in K-12**? So 0-5 years old?
- **All data sources are an undercount, so no need to worry about potential double counting** because nothing will pick-up youth who have aged out of K-12, who have dropped out, or doubled up adults without children.
- What is the percentage mix of **homeless with kids vs. single without kids**?
- What is the **age breakdown** of homelessness? Percentages for different age groups?
- What **percentage of homeless are people of color** in OR?

Preliminary RHNA Unit Totals by Region

- Are Redmond and Prineville considered as housing for Deschutes?

Unit Income Targets by Component – Underproduction vs. Future Need

- The **underproduction data is GREAT!** And more accurately reflects need.
- Does "future housing need" include **current shortage/deficit**?

Version 2 Example: Methodology Changes/Changing Inputs to Local Allocation Impacts Number of Units

- Thought OHCS had been **leaning towards following allocation into 30-50% and 50-80%** from look at homeless population in terms of income distribution. **Why not doing that and instead putting everyone in 0-30%?**
- **Concern with talking about 10-12% not in 0-30%, what does that mean for places that have a lot of housing units?** 12% for a region that doesn't have a lot of people, that wiggle room may not matter as much, but it could be quite a big difference in another place.
- There are **additional data sources** that could be pulled into the mix to get a better sense of the number of households at different income levels. There are a lot of **folks in 30-50% range who experience homelessness**. Easier to house because they have some income.
- Consider how this is framed and how it's talked about. **It's important the story isn't that everyone experiencing homelessness falls into the same category**—it's proven that's not the case, just don't have the right data sources. Want to be sure not telling story of homelessness that isn't accurate to what people are experiencing on the ground.
- Since the count of homeless households is an undercount, wouldn't allocating all units for formerly homeless households to 0-30% still be appropriate? **The lowest income homeless households will be the ones most likely to be missed in the counts.**
- Referencing Home Forward data on voucher holders (folks who tend to fall in 0-30% range). About 16% of all voucher holders in Multnomah County live in middle family housing and the number of folks in single family homes has been going down. **Against putting all units for folks in 0-30% and 30-50% range in multifamily category.**
- The question of where allocation goes in terms of single family, missing middle, or multifamily is a **question of values, policy, and community choice, not allocation**. If based on current market conditions or currently where people live, extrapolating inequities. Instead, **should be asking people what the housing type is they actually want to live in.**
- Flip the convention of putting all in multifamily. **Put all in single family and middle housing**. Look critically at data sources. Not as much a fact as an observation of wisdom produced by society because of how things have been structured. Continuing past practices is as much of an arbitrary decision as completely revolutionizing how things are done.
- For the current underproduction, **adding the homeless data is to get to numbers, but not different units**. The idea multifamily would be selected over single family is even more arbitrary based on the fact that they aren't different types of human beings.
- How many different **types or alternatives are being looked at regarding different costs of housing?** Is there awareness of how current codes and requirements contribute to making housing unaffordable?
- Why are there only two housing types listed: "Single Family +Missing Middle" and "Multifamily"? **Missing middle also includes cottage clusters and townhomes**. These are not the same as single family detached.
- **Wouldn't the undercounted BIPOC who are homeless and undercounted be likely to be in the lowest income bracket?** BIPOC homeless folks are often the worst off in terms of income too, because of compounded racial and historic equity issues. **Income bracket**

shouldn't be inflexibly tied to housing type—those units would need to be affordable to 0-30% income households, regardless of housing type.

- Using **local variables will need to be balanced**. Many jurisdictions have used “local variables” to argue that they “really” need detached single family homes for high-income households—which clearly cannot be true.

Allocating Underproduction: Equitable Distribution of Housing by Income

What is an equitable distribution of PSH? What do you think it means?

- Consider whether **PSH could also mean policies** such as protecting naturally occurring affordable housing or anti-displacement policies.
- When there are investment pressures that cause displacement, **naturally occurring affordable units are lost** when publicly subsidized units are put in.
- For OAH, could easily **calculate what share of a city's total housing stock is publicly subsidized compared to what's needed in the region**. Is that going to be included in the report? Need clear information on **what jurisdictions in state are or are not meeting their fair share obligation** of publicly supported housing.
- Examine **existing distribution** and look at current subsidized units and vouchers.
- In thinking about future distribution, look at **where money is being spent on PSH now** in different communities.
- It makes sense to look at income distribution, but have to do a racial analysis as well. **If race isn't included in an equity analysis, one of the biggest components of the distribution of equitable housing is being left out**. This has to be called an **income equity analysis**.

Broader Equity Issues in Housing Planning System/Incorporating Equity into RHNA/ Equity in Larger Planning System

How can RHNA best support incorporation of non-income based need in the larger system so we're not asking RHNA to do it all? If RHNA isn't picked up by the legislature, don't want to see the end of incorporating equity in housing system. Also want to make sure the RHNA is doing the best job it can to support integration into the larger system.

- Urge and support **adding a racial equity analysis** to income analysis for the RHNA.
- The overlay of an income analysis and race analysis becomes powerful. The base analysis has to be done to answer **how closely linked race and income issues are** in a particular area. Without that, planners will continue to focus on income. Need to set up the discussion **to address barriers, institutional issues, racist real estate market, etc.** That level of analysis is critical to set the stage for the policies that people will want and need to make.
- **There doesn't have to be a full equitable distribution by race because not every person of color wants to live outside of strong network of people of color**, so wouldn't want to regulate that. Don't have to be too prescriptive, use lighter language. It's about colored children being able to go to choice schools even when income numbers might not be there.
- Do an income analysis and race analysis **for regions the data exists and acknowledge the desire to do it in other places, but can't due to data quality issues**. In Portland and Metro region, it's maybe feasible, but outside of that, it will be challenging.

- If RHNA took the lead to provide racial analysis and transparency about what is good and reliable data in what regions as a companion piece or to further detail this conversation on housing unit type, that would show great leadership. This would be important for pointing out the gaps of **statewide disaggregated data that is desperately needed** and provide a framework for local housing folks to collect this data.
- Don't need data to confirm that disparities by race exist in housing. **Need to do a racial equity analysis as part of RHNA and identify how to get the data necessary to do so.**
- While thinking of racial analysis and what it might look like, sounds like considering income and race intersection within different cities and counties. **Is the RHNA going in the direction of looking at income groups by race or overall distribution?** Useful to have conversation about what that looks like and what is possible based on the data.
- The RHNA does not take into account Urban Reserves and other areas outside of UGBs that may be part of UGBs within 20 years. It ignores options for equitable distribution of future housing outside UGBs. **Acknowledge units outside UGBs as an equity issue.**

At statewide and regional level, for examination of household income distribution across various demographics, what additions to this would be useful in the RHNA? Should we do this for cities the data is available and see how far that gets us? Even if that leaves us only with big cities?

- Useful from state and regional perspective, but **to get at inequities and distribution within a region, have to go down to city level.** Only feasible in Portland area data wise. Or, could include in report and acknowledge bad data.
- It's worth seeing what the data tells us about race by city where it can actually be done. There's something to be said about **conducting the analysis where it can be done** and doing the best that can be done with what's available.
- Go down to the **smallest city that can be looked at based on margins of error.** For this analysis, don't think counties will help us much. Possibly **looking at cities over 25,000** could be an option which goes in line with other state's guidance. When looking at intersection of race and income, margins of error get wonky and it's difficult to dig in to some of those categories. Consider a cut-off point and **look at above 80% and below 80% instead of looking at all of them.** From a policy perspective, that could be constructive moving forward. If the state is thinking about doing this, **tying to existing requirements for cities over 25,000 could be a useful framework.**
- When the report includes the allocation of publicly supported housing by city within a region based on definition of "equitable distribution," could the **analysis help tell the story of how this definition does, or does not affirmatively further fair housing by race?**
- What is the **data plan of doing an equitable distribution around race?** What data is there and what limitations exist?
- If possible to get **income distribution by race for cities where margin of error isn't terrible**, that would be a useful thing to report. Know that won't be possible statewide. This information can **make the case for better data down the road.**
- Only looking at **regional or county level doesn't get to issues of disparity by city** which is the area in which implementation will matter.