

Oregon Housing and Community Services

Special Needs and Affordable Housing Needs Assessment

Purpose

The Needs Assessment identifies gaps between the housing needs of specific Oregon populations and the existing special needs and affordable housing inventory available for each of those populations. The assessment will help Oregon Housing and Community Services Consolidated Funding Cycle establish funding priorities. The goal: to understand the housing circumstances of local communities and target limited housing resources to groups that face the greatest housing shortage.

Not a market study

This assessment seeks to prioritize the housing needs of specific populations in relation to each other. It does not seek to analyze local real estate market conditions. The assessment does not evaluate whether a proposed development can succeed nor if a project will appeal to its target resident.

Implementation

This needs assessment will evolve over time. As more timely and accurate information becomes available, the department will refine the assessment. The first version established a structure for the assessment, this is the 2010 update.

Questions / Comments

Natasha Detweiler, Research Analyst
Oregon Housing and Community Services
725 Summer Street NE, Suite B
Salem OR 97301-1266
Natasha.Detweiler@state.or.us
971.673.7183

Contents

Population type and source summary	2
Data sources and methods overview.....	3
Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory.....	10
Process/Stakeholders	13

Population type and source summary

For **special needs / affordable housing** groups, the assessment looks at need in each county for the following populations:

- Alcohol and drug recovery
- Chronically homeless
- Domestic violence victims
- Elderly
- Farmworkers
- Frail elderly
- HIV/AIDS
- Homeless
- People with a presence of a physical disability
- People with the presence of a chronic mental illness
- Released offenders

For workforce affordable housing groups the assessment looks at the county level and cities that are included in the updated American Community Survey datasets.

Data sources for 2010 CFC Needs Assessment

Population	Data Source
Affordable/Special Needs Housing Inventory	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • OHCS properties (DISH, LIPS, APM) • Oregon Housing Authorities • Rural Development Authority • Metro – Affordable Housing Inventory for Portland Metropolitan Area
Alcohol and Drug Recovery	FY 2008-09 client data from DHS
Chronically Homeless	OHCS One Night Shelter Count
Domestic Violence Victims	2006-8 DHS domestic violence program data
Elderly	Census 2000, 2006-8 American Community Survey
Farmworkers	2007 Agricultural Census
Frail Elderly/Disabled	2009 Department of Human Services Report
HIV/AIDS	2009 Department of Human Services Count
Homeless	OHCS One Night Homeless Count
People with the presence of a chronic mental illness	2009 Department of Human Services AMH Reporting System
People with the presence of a developmental disability	2008 Department of Human Services Report
People with the presence of a physical disability	2009 Department of Human Services Report
Released Offenders	2000-09 Data from Department of Justice
Workforce/Family	Census 2000, 2006-8 American Community Survey

Data sources and methods overview

Special needs

For most groups – except workforce housing – the OHCS needs assessment reflects population and housing inventory at the county level.

The assessment relies on county information due to data limitations and the dynamics of special needs housing. Data on special needs groups is largely not available beyond a county boundary; in general the market from which special needs housing draws residents goes beyond that of a small city, instead drawing residents from across a county.

OHCS found a reliable population count for each special needs housing population from outside sources such as the Census and the Oregon Department of Human Services. Housing unit counts for each needs group come from the department’s own affordable housing inventory. The agency calculated the proportion of need using these two numbers.

Workforce

OHCS generated its workforce housing needs assessment at the city level rather than the county. The department could find reliable data at the city level. More importantly, effective workforce housing is both affordable to the workforce and close to jobs, necessitating a local perspective.

Some considerations and limitations

While a person may belong to a special needs group, that person may not need affordable housing. As a result, the assessment inflates housing needs for all groups except people experiencing homelessness.

This assessment also reflects a certain amount of inevitable duplication for both population and unit counts. For example, a frail elderly person will also appear in the count of elderly persons. Similarly, a unit designated as frail elderly will also appear in the count of units designated as serving an elderly population. In addition, a person can fall into multiple special needs housing groups, and a person with a special need can live in housing without services designed for their need group. As a result, summing all of these populations will generate an inflated number due to these duplications.

The following pages provide a detailed summary of the data values, sources, definitions, explanations, used to assessment the housing needs of special population. The OHCS Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory Methodology follows.

Populations

Alcohol and Drug Recovery	4
Domestic Violence	4
Farmworkers	5
Elderly	6
Frail Elderly	6
HIV/AIDS	6
Homeless / Chronically Homeless	7
People with the presence of a developmental disability	7
People with the presence of a physical disability	7
People with the presence of a chronic mental illness	8
Released Offenders	8
Workforce / Family Affordable Housing	9

Alcohol and Drug Recovery

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units for people in alcohol and drug rehabilitation to the total population in Alcohol and Drug Treatment.

Definition: The total population for the ADR group comes from an unduplicated count of clients receiving substance abuse treatment by county for the Fiscal Years 2008-2009.

Sources: Special query from DHS research staff for OHCS.

Rationale: OHCS relies on the unduplicated county count of those receiving substance abuse treatment through DHS as the most uniformly collected and updated information for this factor.

Change from prior method: Previously OHCS had used the 2005 DHS ADR and Mental Health Housing Study from DHS, which had not been updated. In consult with DHS research and program staff it was determined that the updated case load information would be more accurate than depending on the outdated information from this survey.

The data do not identify the number of people in Alcohol and Drug treatment who also need affordable housing.

Assumptions. The needs assessment assumes that similar proportion of the ADR population can obtain housing through the private market as through subsidized units. The assessment uses the total number of people in Alcohol and Drug treatment through the state as a proxy for the state's affordable Alcohol and Drug treatment housing need.

Domestic Violence

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units for adult victims of domestic violence to the three-year average number of (2006-8) adult victims of domestic violence.

Definition: Number of adults affected by domestic violence as reported by community agencies statewide

Data Source: DHS Domestic Violence Statistics reported to OHCS, reported by service agencies for 2006, 2007, and 2008, and Portland State University Population Research Center's 2009 Population Estimate to allocate populations from agencies that serve multiple counties.

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year.

Explanation: The department uses the number of adults affected by domestic violence as a proxy for a household measure since domestic violence counts are captured individually instead of by household. This does not take into consideration that some minors receiving domestic violence supportive services could constitute a household.

Farmworkers

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units for farmworkers to the total number of farmworkers (seasonal and full-time, excluding migrant farmworkers).

Definitions: Farmworkers who work full time (more than 150 days) and seasonally (less than 150 days). The Agricultural Census identifies farms that use migrant farm labor, but the population count used does not include estimates of the migrant population. A **farm** is considered to be “any place from which \$1,000 or more of agricultural products were produced and sold, or normally would have been sold, during the census year.”

Data Sources: [2007 USDA Agricultural Census](#), and the 2010 OHCS State Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory

Rationale: OHCS initially looked at three sources of farmworker information: the Oregon Employment Department’s Covered Employment and Wages, the 2002 USDA Agricultural Census data, and a 2002 [farm worker enumeration study](#) conducted by Alice Larson.

Each of the data sources has limitations. For example, the Employment Department data report only farmworkers covered by unemployment insurance. Because 82 percent of (32,000) Oregon farms are too small to be subject to unemployment insurance requirements, the Employment Department does not report the majority of the state’s farms / farmworkers. The two remaining sources use differing methodology and categorize the farmworker population in different ways. The Agricultural Census identified “full-time” farmworkers and “seasonal” farmworkers. The data from the 2002 Agricultural Census for “Seasonal” farmworkers (total: 95,506) was found to be roughly comparable to the “Migrant and Seasonal” farmworker data from the enumeration study (total: 99,923). In addition to “full-time” and “seasonal” farmworkers, the enumeration sought to identify the “migrant” farmworker population. “Migrant” farmworkers differ from “seasonal” only in that they travel for their seasonal farm employment, often necessitating the use of temporary shelters.

Additional information and definitions at the [OHCS Farmworker Information Center](#).

During the initial design of this analysis, OHCS considered each of these resources as it sought to identify a reliable resource for farmworker data for the CFC needs analysis. OHCS decided to rely on the defensible and standardized 2002 Agricultural Census data because unlike the enumeration study, which had limited information on several counties, it presented uniform information from all areas statewide. Using this source has also allowed for the update to the 2007 data, which is the most current of available farmworker data.

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year.

Assumptions: The number of farmworker units in the Affordable and Special Needs Housing inventory reflects the housing built specifically for farmworkers. The needs assessment uses the total number of farmworkers as an indicator of farmworker housing based on the following assumptions:

- the private market will meet a similar proportion of need within each county, and
- affordable housing developments will serve a similar percentage of farmworkers from county to county.

Elderly

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units for people age 65 and older to the number of people age 65 and older with incomes between 0 and 60 percent of median county income.

Definition: Seniors age 65 and older and earning between 0 and 60 percent of median county income.

Sources: 2000 Census tables P53 and P55, 2006-8 American Community Survey data for those counties with data provided tables B19013 and B19037, and the 2010 OHCS State Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory.

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year.

Explanation: Most affordable rental housing programs serving the elderly target those with incomes between 0 and 60 percent of area/county median income. By calculating the proportion of the elderly population living with units from the Affordable Housing inventory, the scale of the elderly housing gap is identified. This does not mean that all people over 65 in this income range would be in need of affordable housing, nor does it mean that elderly projects using this groups priority assignment need to use the specific age of 65 as its tenant criteria.

Frail Elderly

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units designated as assisted living facilities or residential care facilities to the number of individuals age 65 and older with physical disabilities.

Definition: Clients of the Department of Human Services age 65 or older with disabilities who: receive In-Home care; are in adult foster care, residential care, assisted living, or a nursing facility; or are personal care clients

Sources: [2009 DHS Client data book for Seniors/Physically Disabled](#), published June 2009, and the 2010 OHCS State Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year.

Rationale: These data values identify the number of seniors (age 65 and older) who received assistance through in-home, residential, or personal care. Because a person must be low-income and have few assets to qualify for assistance, this count provides a good indication of the need for affordable housing.

HIV/AIDS

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units for people with HIV/AIDS to the total number of diagnosed HIV/AIDS cases

Definition: Number of people reported for each county with HIV / AIDS

Data Source: [Department of Human Services HIV/AIDS Reporting System](#) – extracted 10/1/2009, data on status from 6/30/2009, and the 2010 OHCS State Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year.

Rationale: While the data does not describe financial capacity to pay for housing, it is information that is uniformly gathered statewide.

Homeless / Chronically Homeless

Data Value: Total number households (sheltered and turned away) plus affordable homeless housing units, total number of chronically homeless households (sheltered and turned away) plus affordable homeless housing units in ratio with Number of Affordable Housing Units/Beds with a Homeless population allocation

Definition: OHCS defines **homeless households** as those households counted during the one-night count. **Chronically homeless** households have been continuously homeless for a period of a year or more or had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years as well as having a physical or mental disability.

Homelessness is a Policy Priority #1

Sources: 2009 OHCS One-night homeless count, and the 2010 OHCS State Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory.

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year.

Rationale: To identify a total homeless population, OHCS added to the number of affordable homeless housing units or beds to those homeless households identified during the one-night shelter count.

People with the presence of a developmental disability

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units for people with developmental disabilities to the number of people with developmental disabilities.

Definition: Number of adults and children with developmental disabilities identified by DHS in case management.

Sources: [2008 DHS Client data book](#), and the 2010 OHCS State Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year.

Rationale: People identified as Department of Human Services clients with developmental disabilities are likely to qualify for housing allocated to serve people with developmental disabilities. This serves as a proxy for affordable housing needs among this group.

People with the presence of a physical disability

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units for people with physical disabilities to the number of people under age 65 with a physical disability.

Definition: People under age 65 with disabilities who receive In-Home care; are in adult foster care, residential care, assisted living, or a nursing facility; or are personal care clients

Sources: [2009 DHS Client data book for Seniors/Physically Disabled](#), and the 2010 OHCS State Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year.

Rationale: These data values identify the number of people under 65 who receive assistance through in-home, residential, or personal care. Because a person must be low-income and have few assets to qualify for assistance, this count provides a good indication of the need for affordable housing.

People with the presence of a chronic mental illness

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable units for people with chronic mental illness to the number of people with chronic mental illness discharged to counties by Community Mental Health Programs.

Definition: The total count of mental health discharges in CPMS by county. It represents an unduplicated count of the adults and children discharged by the Community Mental Health Programs from 2007-2009 calendar years. The three-year average is used.

Sources: 2009 [AMH Online Reporting System](#) Data queried on 2/2/2010, and represented as based on data available through 12/2009.

Rationale: The assessment uses the total number of people discharged from Community Mental Health Programs as a proxy to indicate the relative scale of need for affordable CMI housing. It does not identify how many people with chronic mental illness also need affordable housing.

Change from prior method: Previously OHCS had used the 2005 DHS ADR and Mental Health Housing Study from DHS, which had not been updated. In consult with DHS research and program staff it was determined that the updated case load information would be more accurate than depending on the outdated information from this survey.

Assumptions: The needs assessment assumes that an analogous proportion of the CMI population can obtain housing through the private market, as need subsidized units. It is additionally notable that this count is for those served in community, not private, mental health programs.

Released Offenders

Data Value: A ratio of the number of affordable housing units for released offenders to the three-year average (2007-9) number of released offenders by county.

Definition: Offenders released into the county in which they offended.

Data Source: Department of Justice, direct reporting to OHCS of releases into each Oregon county by year for 2000 through 2009, and the 2010 OHCS State Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year

Explanation: Does not currently include information on what percentage of the released offender population are in need of affordable housing. It is often the case that offenders return to live with family where they would not need housing assistance.

Workforce / Family Affordable Housing

Data Value: Rent burden for households earning 30 to 60 percent of county median income in comparison to the state value.

Definitions: The CFC defines **workforce population** as renter households earning between 30 and 60 percent of county median income. **Rent burden** occurs when a household spends more than 30 percent of household income on gross rent. **Workforce Index** is a comparison of the percent of rent burdened workforce in a particular city or county to the statewide rent burdened workforce.

Data Sources: 2000 Census tables P53 and H73, 2008 & 2006-8 American Community Survey tables B19013 and C25074

Change from prior method: No source or method change. Updated source data year

Rationale: OHCS set the low end of the earnings range at 30 percent of area median income. A household working at minimum wage earns approximately 30 percent of area median income. Therefore, the needs assessment captures the lowest paid workers – a portion of the workforce population most likely to benefit from CFC funding.

The housing or rent burden variable is currently the standard measure used in the research and analysis of workforce housing issues.

The rate of housing burden reflects a household's ability to live in a particular area because a high burden rate means the area lacks in housing that would be affordable to this population group.

City data were included where available from the American Community Survey (in addition to county) as the primary market area for workforce housing.

Affordable and Special Needs Housing Inventory

Purpose

The department used data from many sources (see below) to build a special needs and affordable housing inventory for Oregon. This inventory provides unit counts for the consolidated funding cycle's special needs population groups. The department identified affordable housing gaps by population groups by comparing this unit counts to population data.

Sources

OHCS Housing Databases

- Multi-Family Project Database (DISH)
- Loan Information Processing System (LIPS)
- Asset and Property Management's Project Tracking System (PROMIS)
- Housing and Development Software (HDS)
- Online Inventory Document

Oregon Housing Authorities

- Clatsop County Housing Authority
- Coos-Curry Housing Authority
- Housing Works (Bend area)
- Jackson County Housing Authority
- Josephine Housing Council
- Klamath County
- Lane County Housing Authority
- Lincoln County Housing Authority
- Linn-Benton Housing Authority
- Malheur County Housing Authority
- Marion County Housing Authority
- Mid Columbia Housing Authority
- North East Oregon
- North West Oregon
- West Valley
- City of Salem
- Umatilla County Housing

Rural Development Authority

US Dept of Housing and Urban Development

METRO Affordable Housing Inventory

Housing Development Centers – Streamlining Project Inventory ** new in 2010 **

Methods

OHCS queried all of its databases to identify properties. The department then merged the results using project name, address, project number fields to identify duplicate entries.

Inventory Data Variables:

- Project Name
- Project Number / Unique Identifier
- Project Address (Street, County, City)
- Total Unit Count
- Affordable (Subsidized/Regulated) Unit Count
- Population Served

Populations Served:

- HOM (homeless)
- ELD (elderly)
- ADR (alcohol and drug recovery)
- PD (people with physical disabilities)
- CMI (people with a chronic mental illness)
- HIV (people with HIV / AIDS)
- DD (people with a developmental disability)
- FW (farmworkers)
- EO (released offenders)
- DV (domestic violence victims)
- FAM (family / general population)
- NATV (Native American)
- ALF (Assisted Living Facility)
- RCF (Residential Care Facility)

OHCS Property Databases

At OHCS, the DISH database is the most inclusive resource for property information, capturing most project information from the time of project inception. DISH reflects all projects that submit an application for funding whether the project received funding or not. Therefore, the data query specified funded projects.

After the department approves a project for development and the project is developed, the department transfers responsibility for ongoing project oversight to the Asset and Property Management Division which maintains project information in the Promis (through September 2007) and HDS.

Alternatively, those projects not requiring asset management services through OHCS remain in both DISH and LIPS (the Loan Information Processing System).

Properties managed by other agencies

Community Integration Projects represent an important exception to OHCS long-term project oversight practices. After the 1999 closure of Fairview State Training Center, the state established CIP to support the development of alternate housing options for people with developmental disabilities. Fairview had housed up to 3,000 people with developmental disabilities.

<http://www.oregon.gov/DHS/dd/housing.shtml> (12/07))

Once funded and developed, the Department of Human Services, Seniors and People with Disabilities Community Housing Section takes on management and oversight of CIP homes. DHS keeps data related to the properties, and OHCS no longer maintains information about them.

APM replaced a database known as Promis in September of 2007 with a new database called HDS. APM maintains current and verified unit counts in HDS.

Identifying projects

OHCS created a unique identifier number for each project entered into DISH.

The department also uses other identifiers. Separate numbering systems cover loans, properties in Promis, HUD properties in HDS. This complicates the process of creating a single list of housing units. The department used project names and addresses, which are generally not standardized or permanent to update information and to identify duplicate data.

Identifying target populations

Another challenge to creating a single inventory centers on the specification of housing units for a particular population group. While DISH often captures target populations and the number of total units / affordable units, the information reflects only the first fund application through initial development. Therefore, the information cannot be considered updated or reliable. HDS and Promis usually do not include the population served and provide only one unit count. In the case of the unit count, HDS and Promis do not consistently reflect a property's total number of units, often reporting just the regulated units. Therefore, the department must combine and scour multiple data sources to build accurate information about each property.

Because OHCS databases do not provide rich information about the number of units and the targeted populations, the department turned to a number of outside sources for more information. These sources included the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development, local housing authorities, the United States Department of Agriculture Rural Development, and Metro.

For those properties without a duplicate entry in the supplemental databases, the department sought to identify the population served and the numbers of units through HDS, DISH, Promis, and LIPS. In some cases, population type reflects the intended use of the property at development, often included in the name. For example: all of the projects with CIP in the name indicated that they were developed to house people with developmental disabilities; projects with ALF in the name are assisted living facilities that house the elderly; those that are Non Congregate Group Care are Non CIP Group Care facilities whose populations were identified primarily through DISH.

Project status

Active/Inactive project status comes from multiple sources. The department flags inactive project in HDS. However, HDS accuracy is compromised when APM changes a project identifier. In such cases, a single project may appear on both the Active and Inactive project lists. The department resolved such conflicts by turning to HUD project activity reports. The department does not consistently enter project activity in DISH.

Process/Stakeholders – during Initial Analysis Development

OHCS Housing Staff: monthly meetings were held with OHCS housing staff including Bob Gillespie, Betty Markey, Vicki Massey, and Information Services’ Bill Carpenter. The group discusses issues regarding the definition of populations served through the CFC process, access to accurate data, and methods of prioritization.

CFC Technical Advisory Team: The department met monthly with CFC stakeholders statewide to address the re-working of the CFC application. From July through November the CFC needs assessment was a regular part of the agendas. The CFC TAG helped identify the special needs groups included in the assessment and data resources for those populations. The group also gave feedback on methodological presentations and assisted with the definition and parameters of the workforce population.

CFC Revision TAG Team Members

Name	Organization
Amanda Saul	Housing Development Center
Betty Tamm	Umpqua CDC
Bill Van Vliet or Joni Hartmann	NOAH
Catherine Kes	Hacienda CDC
Janet Byrd	Neighborhood Partnership Fund
Jennifer Gates	Central City Concern
Lisa Rogers	CASA of Oregon
Mark Rozgay	TimberRiver Development Inc.
Mike Andrews	Housing Authority of Portland
Monica Elgert	Enterprise
Phil Hedrick	Cascade Housing Group
Richie Weinman	City of Eugene / Planning & Dev.
Ruby Mason	Mid-Columbia Housing Authority
Sonja Hart	Eastern Oregon Alcohol Foundation
Sophia McDonald / Michael Anderson	AOCDO / CDN
Steve Fulton or Will White	Bureau of Housing
Terri Silvis	Catholic Charities
OHCS CFC Revision Staff Members	
Name	Email
Betty Markey	betty.markey@hcs.state.or.us
Bob Gillespie	bob.gillespie@hcs.state.or.us
Darcy Strahan	darcy.strahan@hcs.state.or.us
Jack Duncan	jack.duncan.@hcs.state.or.us
Karen Clearwater	karen.clearwater@hcs.state.or.us
Sarah Dornon	sarah.dornon@hcs.state.or.us
Vicki Massey	vicki.massey@hcs.state.or.us

OHCS Research Staff: The project is under the direction of Bill Carpenter. Natasha Detweiler is the primary researcher. Weekly updates and strategy sessions were held with OHCS research staff including, at various times, Bill Carpenter, Lisa Joyce, Richard Bjelland, Natasha Detweiler, Andria Howell, and Melissa Torgerson.