

## HB 2003 Stakeholder Engagement – Discussion Notes

Date: Tuesday, April 24, 2020

Location: Zoom

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

### Data Sources and Limitations

- Interested in whether there are **any special populations in the translation from population to household type, including students?**

### Underproduction

- In Corvallis, there is a huge commute in and a lot of people believe it's because of a housing shortage. **Under this current model, the shortage or pent up demand isn't showing up.** It **effects surrounding cities** where people are living because they can't live here (in Corvallis). It seems like we have the housing cost burden that we're counting even though they're housed. This would be a similar category of **people who don't have housing, but they're not in the geographic boundaries, so they don't show up in the data.**

### Unit Types

- It **makes a lot of sense to batch duplexes with SFD.** Concern with 3 and 4 plexes is that we don't know what the final recommendation is going to be and we certainly don't know how cities are going to apply them. **It seems a bit premature to batch 3 and 4 plexes with SFD rather than keeping them in a separate bucket or keeping them with MF.** There's a lot more correlation between SFD and duplexes, but we don't know if there's going to be the same symbiosis for 3 and 4 plexes.
- **Concern with consolidating other categories into missing middle.** To leave the more detailed breakdown could be **confusing to suddenly lump everything into missing middle** when we're not even fully sure how we're defining missing middle. At some point in time, it might make sense to consolidate into that category, but doing so now creates the potential for misunderstanding and confusion.
- If **cottage clusters** are defined in HB 2001 as 4+ units, **how are they being allocated to avoid duplication?** Which bucket are they going to go in? How is missing middle housing as defined in HB 2001 being accounted for?
- It feels **important to distinguish between MF and SF.** If we can be more specific, that will help us get more affordable types.
- It would be helpful to have **information on physically accessible units.** It's not so much a unit type that's separate from other unit types, but a unit type that spans the types already identified. This serves as a way to **incorporate fair housing and other kinds of issues that deal with equity** into this overall framework. Could have **targets for accessibility and accessible units that span the SF/MF divide.**
- The use of **unit types are very important to get to question of how dense we need to be in regions across the state.** How do we do this in such a way that it allows flexibility to regional and local areas and at the same time is accurate and not confusing? **The difference between SF, SFA, and MF is fairly global and understandable.** Changing that at this point would cause more confusion than it would be helpful.

- Keeping the **expanded number of housing types** available would be **well served for jurisdictions to get data in forms they are familiar with** and more data rather than less.
- Discuss what it looks like to **assign housing types without buildable land inventory**.

### **Equity**

- It seems like **there's enough data at the levels you are working at to at least identify equity issues**. And at the same time, while we're creating this methodology, it's an opportunity to **also create a tracking or reporting tool that is then passed off to implementing jurisdictions** to be used towards addressing inequities, racial inequities, and racial housing components.
- Now that all of the background has been established, we can **make it a priority to start with the equity conversation** instead of finishing with it.