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Glossary of Terms

- **Chronically homeless**: An individual adult or persons in households with children where one of the adults has a disabling condition and has been either continuously homeless for a year or more or has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years that total to at least 12 months.

- **Disabling condition**: A diagnosable substance abuse disorder, a serious mental illness, developmental disability, or chronic physical illness or disability, including the co-occurrence of two or more of these conditions.

- **Doubled up**: Individuals or families who are temporarily sharing the housing of others due to loss of housing, economic hardship, or a similar reason. This includes people who lack a regular or fixed housing situation and are forced to stay with a series of friends or extended family members (often referred to as “couch surfing”).

- **Emergency shelter**: A facility with the primary purpose of providing temporary shelter for people experiencing homelessness and which does not require occupants to sign leases or occupancy agreements. The typical stay is up to 90 days or until specific goals are accomplished by the client.

- **Point-in-time count of homelessness (PIT)**: A count of sheltered and unsheltered homeless persons in a given geographic area on a single night. The federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requires an annual PIT of the sheltered homeless population and a bi-annual PIT of the unsheltered homeless population. Douglas County typically conducts a combined count of both populations every January.

- **Permanent supportive housing (PSH)**: A combination of non-time-limited affordable housing with ongoing wraparound service supports that are flexible, tenant-driven, and voluntary. Services can include tenancy supports, connections to behavioral and primary health care, medication management, counseling, peer support, etc.

- **Rapid re-housing**: Immediate, short-term assistance designed to help people to quickly exit homelessness and return to permanent housing. Services are tailored to the unique needs of each household and typically include a combination of housing identification, rent and move-in assistance, and connections to community-based resources.

- **Rent-restricted affordable housing**: Housing that is made affordable through public subsidies or regulations that define the income levels of eligible residents and the rents that can be charged. Also referred to as “income-restricted” or “regulated” affordable housing, this type of housing is generally intended for households that otherwise could not afford housing in the private market.

- **Sheltered homeless**: An individual or family living in a supervised publicly or privately operated shelter designated to provide temporary living arrangements for people experiencing homelessness (including congregate shelters, transitional housing, and hotels and motels paid for by charitable organizations or by federal, state, or local government programs for low-income individuals).

- **Transitional housing**: A program that provides temporary housing and specialized services for a period typically up to 24 months as a bridge to facilitate the movement of people experiencing homelessness to permanent housing.

- **Unsheltered homeless**: An individual or family with a primary nighttime residence that is a public or private place not designed for or ordinarily used as a regular sleeping accommodation for human beings, including the street, a vehicle, park, wood, abandoned building, bus or train station, or camping ground.
Executive Summary

The City of Roseburg commissioned a study of the city’s homeless population as part of a broader Housing Needs Analysis. The study included interviews with stakeholders and service providers, an analysis of data from Roseburg’s January 2019 point-in-time count of homelessness, an examination of other supplementary data, and a scan of national best practices. This report provides an overview of Roseburg’s homeless population, an assessment of the city’s existing homelessness strategies, and a menu of potential policy options.

Homelessness in Roseburg

Sheltered and Unsheltered

Roseburg’s point-in-time count of homelessness identified 260 people in 204 households who were unsheltered or in emergency shelters or transitional housing on the night of January 30, 2019:

- **Living situation:** 46% were unsheltered, 38% were in emergency shelter, and 14% were in transitional housing on the night of the count (living situation for the remaining 2% is unknown).
- **Household composition:** 11% of the households are families with children, 89% are adult-only households, and 1% are unaccompanied youth under age 18.
- **Gender:** 44% identify as female, 52% as male, and 0% as transgender (gender for the remaining 4% is unknown).
- **Race and ethnicity:** 8% identify as American Indian or Alaska Native, 2% as Asian, 5% as Black or African American, 4% as Hispanic, 4% as Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 83% as White.
- **Age:** 16% are children under age 18, 5% are young adults ages 18-24, 52% are adults ages 25-49, 20% are older adults ages 50-65, and 6% are seniors over age 65.
- **Monthly income:** 48% of the households didn’t report any monthly income. Among those with an income, the most common sources are government benefits, employment, and retirement.
- **Disabling conditions:** 74% of the households have at least one member with a disabling condition. The most common conditions are mental health, chronic health, and physical disabilities.
- **Chronic homelessness:** 30% of the individuals meet the federal definition for chronic homelessness.
- **Veterans:** 12% of the adults are U.S. military veterans.
- **Domestic violence:** 29% of the individuals are victims of domestic violence.
- **Released offenders:** 11% of the individuals are released offenders.
- **Connection to Roseburg:** 61% of the households have lived in Roseburg for more than two years; 30% arrived within the last two years and were homeless when they came to Roseburg.
- **Reasons for homelessness:** Point-in-time count respondents identified “couldn’t afford rent” (36%) and “unemployed” (26%) as the most common reasons for their homelessness.
- **Service needs:** Point-in-time count respondents identified “help finding housing” (62%) and “help paying for housing” (56%) as their most common service needs.

Doubled Up

While comprehensive data aren’t available on the number of people who are doubled up in Roseburg, the available data indicate that far more people are doubled up than those who are literally homeless.
For example, on the night of the point-in-time count, more than ten times as many homeless students were doubled up than were sleeping on the streets or in shelters or transitional housing.

**At Risk of Homelessness**
Many Roseburg households are at risk of losing their housing and becoming homeless. The population at greatest risk includes 1,897 households with annual incomes below $20,000 who are paying more than 30% of their income on housing costs.

**Existing Services**
Roseburg nonprofits, public agencies, and the faith community offer a range of shelter, housing, and services to assist people experiencing homelessness in the community. Current services include:

- **Emergency shelter:** 76 beds for men, 104 beds for women and children, 100 severe weather warming center beds, and 10 rooms for victims of domestic violence.
- **Transitional housing:** 98 beds for men, 27 beds for women and children, 64 beds for men or women, and approximately 20 beds for unaccompanied youth.
- **Rent-restricted affordable housing:** 871 units.
- **Permanent supportive housing:** 49 beds.
- **Housing vouchers:** 486 vouchers currently deployed in Roseburg.
- **Social services:** Mental health, addiction, medical care, food boxes, meals, clothing, outreach, services for victims of domestic violence, life skills, housing placement, etc.

**Service Needs and Gaps**
Roseburg’s existing services and resources are insufficient to meet the needs of the city’s current homeless population and the many households who are at risk of homelessness. The biggest needs and gaps include:

- **Lack of affordable housing:** Roseburg has a significant shortage of affordable housing, with only 29 affordable units available in Douglas County for every 100 families with extremely low incomes.
- **Barriers in accessing housing:** Low-income renters often struggle to access the available housing due to high move-in costs and screening barriers such as poor credit history and prior evictions.
- **Sub-standard housing:** In Roseburg’s tight housing market, the units that are available to low-income renters are often of sub-standard quality and in some cases pose health and safety risks.
- **Insufficient housing services:** Roseburg doesn’t have sufficient services and resources to help households transition effectively from homelessness to permanent housing.
- **Limited mental health services:** Roseburg doesn’t have enough mental health resources to meet the needs, and not everyone who needs help is willing or able to get it.
- **Transportation challenges:** Lack of transportation limits people’s housing and employment options and creates barriers in navigating available services.
- **Shelter limitations:** Roseburg’s available shelter beds do not align with national best practice guidelines, which include minimizing barriers or pre-conditions for accessing shelter and serving as a bridge to voluntary services and permanent housing.
• **Limited outreach capacity**: Roseburg’s street outreach capacity is limited, making it difficult for many people to access the types of services and supports they need in order to address their homelessness.

• **Insufficient drop-in services**: Roseburg lacks sufficient access to services such as showers, mail, internet, lockers, and laundry that are necessary to help people secure employment and housing.

**Barriers to Addressing the Needs**

Stakeholders identified a number of barriers that make it difficult to effectively address homelessness in Roseburg:

• **Community perceptions**: Homelessness is a source of considerable community tension in Roseburg due to the high visibility of a subset of the homeless population whose behavior negatively impacts the surrounding community. Frustration over the actions of a small portion of the city’s overall homeless population makes it difficult to pursue constructive solutions for the issue as a whole.

• **Lack of coordination**: The city lacks a cohesive plan or collective impact framework for addressing homelessness. There are several different groups working on the issue, but there is no overarching plan based on data and best practices.

• **Lack of resources**: Local service providers lack sufficient resources to meet the needs, and the City has limited general fund revenue it can contribute. State and federal resources are limited and often highly competitive.

• **Criminal justice response**: Frequent interactions with the criminal justice system in response to behaviors associated with unsheltered homelessness can generate distrust and in some instances may create additional barriers for people trying to stabilize their lives and get into housing.

• **Barriers to development**: Roseburg’s economic challenges have made it difficult to attract housing development. Land use issues also create challenges in implementing some housing development strategies.

**Policy Options**

The report ends with a menu of policy options for consideration as part of the Housing Needs Analysis decision-making process. These include:

• **Improve planning and coordination**: Develop a strategic homelessness plan; foster a more coordinated homeless services system; form a citywide coordinating board to oversee the city’s homelessness efforts; strengthen partnerships between the City and the community.

• **Increase the supply of affordable housing**: Use regulatory tools, financial tools, development tools, and planning tools to increase the stock of affordable housing; explore the creation of a dedicated local revenue source for affordable housing.

• **Increase housing access**: Engage landlords as partners; create a landlord guarantee fund to incentivize landlords to rent to people experiencing homelessness; educate landlords about fair housing laws; create a flexible funding pool to assist households with move-in costs.

• **Improve housing quality**: Conduct proactive housing inspections to identify and address threats to health and safety; provide financial support to preserve the habitability of existing affordable units.

• **Expand targeted housing strategies**: Partner with service providers to expand rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing programs.
• **Strengthen mental health resources:** Secure a sustainable funding source for the Crisis Intervention Team; develop a local triage center; provide enhanced mental health training to first responders.

• **Expand transportation options:** Work with partners to explore targeted expansion of UTrans service; partner with service providers to offer individualized transportation to support service navigation.

• **Increase access to emergency shelter:** Partner with service providers to support the creation of shelter that meets federal guidelines; create safe sleep options for people who are unsheltered; work with service providers to explore alternatives to congregate shelters.

• **Increase outreach capacity:** Partner with service providers to increase the number of outreach workers in the city; incorporate outreach practices into existing positions.

• **Create a full-service drop-in center:** Partner with service providers to fund and site a full-service drop-in center; explore the creation of a navigation center with co-located services.

• **Manage the impact of homelessness:** Support siting and sustainable funding for a sobering center; provide day storage options; create a street ambassador program; improve sanitation strategies.

• **Modify law enforcement strategies:** Strengthen partnerships and communication between law enforcement and service providers; implement a citation dismissal program; pursue alternative justice system strategies such as community courts.

• **Public education:** Use social media and public meetings to help the public to better understand Roseburg’s homeless population, dispel negative stereotypes, and share the City’s strategies.
Introduction

The City of Roseburg is in the process of developing an updated Housing Needs Analysis (HNA). The 2019 HNA will provide a detailed look at the city’s housing market, growth forecast, socio-economic trends, and buildable lands. The HNA findings will be used to inform the development of policies and strategies to meet Roseburg’s future housing needs. In conjunction with this process, the City allocated additional grant funding to commission an analysis of the city’s homeless population.

This report provides an overview of homelessness in Roseburg, an assessment of the city’s existing homelessness strategies, and a menu of potential policy options. Data sources for the report include:

- One-on-one interviews with 25 Roseburg service providers and stakeholders
- Data from the January 2019 point-in-time count of homelessness
- Service data and needs assessments provided by local agencies and organizations
- Data from external sources including the American Community Survey and Oregon Housing and Community Services
- A review of the literature on national best practices

Appendix A lists the local service providers and stakeholders who were interviewed and provided data for the report.

The report begins with an analysis of Roseburg’s homeless population, followed by an overview of the city’s existing services for people experiencing homelessness. It identifies the biggest gaps in the city’s available tools as well as the barriers that have made it more difficult to address homelessness in Roseburg. The final section of the report offers a menu of policy options for the City and its partners to consider as part of the HNA decision-making process.
Homelessness in Roseburg

Point-in-time counts of homelessness provide the most comprehensive source of information on the number and characteristics of the homeless population in a given area. Jurisdictions are required to conduct point-in-time counts every January by the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). HUD’s definition of homelessness for the point-in-time count (PIT) is limited to people who are unsheltered (e.g. sleeping outside, in a vehicle, a tent, or other place not intended for human habitation) and people sleeping in emergency shelters or transitional housing for the homeless on the night of the count. People who are sharing the housing of others due to the loss of housing or economic hardship (commonly referred to as “doubled up”) are not part of HUD’s definition of homelessness for the PIT, but they represent a significant portion of the individuals and families experiencing housing insecurity.

This section of the report provides a comprehensive overview of the sheltered and unsheltered homeless population in Roseburg based on the city’s 2019 PIT. It also offers an initial analysis of the city’s doubled up population based on the limited available data as well as an estimate of the number of currently housed Roseburg households who are at greatest risk of becoming homeless.

Sheltered and Unsheltered

Total Numbers
The most recent point-in-time count of homelessness identified 204 households comprised of 260 individuals who met HUD’s definition of homelessness and were sleeping in Roseburg on the night of January 30, 2019.

Living Situation
Of the 260 individuals who were counted:
- 46% were unsheltered
- 38% were in emergency shelter
- 14% were in transitional housing

Living situation for the remaining 2% is unknown.

Household Composition
Of the 204 households that were counted:
- 89% were adult-only households
- 11% were households with children
- 1% were unaccompanied youth under age 18

---

Point-in-Time Count Data Limitations

- It is virtually impossible to identify every person experiencing homelessness on a given night. For this reason, point-in-time counts of homelessness almost always underrepresent the actual number of people experiencing homelessness in a community.
- Many more people experience homelessness over the course of a year than on a single night. Point-in-time counts tend to overrepresent people who have been homeless a long time and underrepresent those whose homelessness is shorter in duration.
- Counts that occur on a single night do not provide a complete picture of a community’s experience with homelessness over the course of the year, including seasonal or episodic variations in patterns of homelessness.
- HUD requires PITs to take place in late January based on the rationale that it is easier to conduct a count when shelter use peaks due to weather. In communities with limited shelter capacity, winter weather can make outreach more difficult and campers harder to find.
- Roseburg’s PIT relies primarily on an event-and location-based methodology, which is an efficient way to capture information on a sizable portion of the homeless population but is likely to miss people who are trying to stay under the radar or unwilling to participate.
Gender
Males are over-represented in Roseburg’s homeless population. The table below compares the gender composition of Roseburg’s homeless population with the city’s population as a whole:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Homeless population</th>
<th>General population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transgender</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>n/a²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender unknown</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Race and Ethnicity
Most populations of color are over-represented in Roseburg’s homeless population. The table below compares the race and ethnicity of Roseburg’s homeless population with Roseburg’s population as a whole:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race/ethnicity</th>
<th>Homeless population</th>
<th>General population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>American Indian or Alaska Native</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>83%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age
About half of Roseburg’s homeless population is between the ages of 25 and 49, a quarter is age 50 and over, and a quarter is age 24 and younger. Compared with Roseburg’s population as a whole, the homeless population has a smaller percentage of seniors and a higher percentage of adults between the ages of 25 and 49:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Homeless population</th>
<th>General population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Over age 65</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 50-65</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 25-49</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age 18-24</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;Age 18</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 American Community Survey (ACS) 2013-17 5-year estimates.
2 ACS gender data are limited to male and female. The PIT survey included a transgender option, but no Roseburg respondents selected that option.
3 PIT respondents were asked to select all applicable races and ethnicities. For that reason, the percentages add up to more than 100. For comparability, the ACS data used in the table are “race alone or in combination with one or more other races” and “Hispanic or Latino (of any race).”
4 ACS 2013-17 5-year estimates.
5 Date of birth information was not available for 2% of the individuals counted in the PIT. The percentages in this table are out of the remaining 98% of respondents.
6 ACS 2013-17 5-year estimates.
Monthly Income
The PIT survey asked respondents about their approximate monthly household income in an average month and their sources of income. Eighty-one percent of households answered those questions. Of those households:

- 48% didn’t report any monthly income
- 32% receive government income benefits (e.g. Supplemental Security Income, Social Security Disability Insurance, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, etc.)
- 7% have employment income
- 7% receive retirement income (e.g. Social Security, pension, etc.)
- 6% get income from other sources (e.g. odd jobs, canning, etc.)
- 2% get money from family or friends
- 1% receive unemployment insurance

Among the households with some income, the monthly income amounts ranged from a low of $20 to a high of $2,000 (for a family of five).

- Mean (average) monthly income was $756
- Median (midpoint amount) was $770
- Mode (most frequent amount) was $300

Oregon Health Plan
The PIT survey asked respondents if they are on the Oregon Health Plan (OHP). Eighty-one percent of households answered the question. Of those households, 72% said they are on OHP. The percentage was higher for families with children, 86% of whom are on OHP.

Disabling Conditions
In 74% of PIT households, at least one household member has a disabling condition. In 73% of households, the head of household has a disabling condition.

Respondents were asked to identify the specific type(s) of disabling conditions they experience. Many reported more than one disabling condition. Out of all respondents:

- 38% have a mental health condition
- 35% have a chronic health condition
- 32% have a physical disability
- 21% have both alcohol and drug conditions
- 21% have an alcohol condition
- 19% have a developmental disability
- 17% have a drug condition
**Chronic Homelessness**

HUD defines chronic homelessness as an individual adult or persons in households with children where one of the adults has a disabling condition and has been either continuously homeless for a year or more or has had at least four episodes of homelessness in the past three years that total to at least 12 months. To count as chronically homeless for the PIT, a person has to currently be either unsheltered or in emergency shelter.

Seventy-seven people in 63 households met HUD’s definition of chronically homeless, representing 30% of Roseburg’s homeless population:

- 58% are male; 38% are female (gender is unknown for 4%)
- 90% are adults; 10% are children
- 77% were unsheltered and 22% were in emergency shelter on the night of the count
- 11% are veterans
- 18% are released offenders
- 80% are on the Oregon Health Plan
- 19% receive government income benefits

**Veterans**

Twenty-six people counted in the 2019 PIT are U.S. military veterans, representing 12% of all the adults counted. This is lower than Roseburg’s overall percentage of veterans; according to the American Community Survey, 15% of Roseburg’s adult population is veterans.7

Of the veterans counted in the PIT:

- 96% are male; 4% are female
- 27% are chronically homeless
- 85% have a disabling condition
- 46% were unsheltered, 38% were in transitional housing, and 15% were in emergency shelter on the night of the count
- 52% are on the Oregon Health Plan
- 31% receive government income benefits; 26% receive retirement income

**Families with Children**

There were 23 families with 41 children under age 18 identified in the PIT. Of these households:

- 91% are female-headed households
- 57% of the heads of household have a disabling condition
- 57% of the heads of household are victims of domestic violence
- 59% were in emergency shelter, 23% were unsheltered, and 18% were in transitional housing on the night of the count

---

7ACS 2013-17 5-year estimates.
• 61% receive government income benefits; 9% have employment income
• 86% are on the Oregon Health Plan

Families with children are typically underrepresented in point-in-time counts. Unsheltered families are more likely to be sleeping in vehicles, which can make it difficult to identify and interview them. Parents may be unwilling to talk to PIT volunteers because of parents’ fears that they will lose custody of their children. Families with children are also more likely to be doubled up.

**Domestic Violence**
Seventy-six people, representing 29% of the people counted in the PIT, identified as victims of domestic violence. Those 76 people were in 61 households with a total of 85 people, most of whom are likely affected by the domestic violence even if they themselves are not direct victims. These figures may be an undercount due to the way the question is worded on the PIT survey and the reluctance of some respondents to share personal information.
• 79% of the individuals affected by domestic violence are in adult-only households; 21% are in households with children
• 24% of the affected individuals are children
• 41% of the households have family members who are currently fleeing domestic violence
• 77% of the adults in the affected households are female and 18% are male (gender is unknown for 5%)
• 77% of the households have at least one household member with a disabling condition
• 22% of the affected individuals are chronically homeless
• 54% of the individuals were in emergency shelter, 24% were in transitional housing, and 20% were unsheltered on the night of the count
• 41% of the households receive government income benefits; 8% have employment income

**Released Offenders**
Twenty-eight people representing 11% of Roseburg’s homeless population self-identified as released offenders. The PIT survey did not collect information on how recently they had been released or any details about the nature of their convictions, so it isn’t possible to know the extent to which this background has contributed to their current homelessness. It is also possible that this number is an undercount since it is based on voluntary self-reports.

Of the 28 people who identified as released offenders:
• 55% are male; 45% are female
• 93% are in adult-only households and 7% are in households with children
• 82% were unsheltered and 18% were in emergency shelter on the night of the count
• 86% have a disabling condition
• 50% are chronically homeless

Response rates for other PIT questions were too low for this subgroup to provide accurate data on Oregon Health Plan participation, income sources, etc.
Connection to Roseburg
The PIT survey asked a series of questions to better understand respondents’ connections to Roseburg. Key take-aways from their responses include:

- 61% of households have lived in Roseburg for more than two years
- 30% of households came to Roseburg within the last two years and were homeless when they arrived
- 26% of households who were homeless when they arrived in Roseburg came from Douglas County; an additional 34% came from southern Oregon or another part of Oregon

The tables below show the responses to each of the PIT survey questions related to this issue. The percentages are out of the 80% of respondents who answered the questions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long have you lived in Roseburg?</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 3 months</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months – 1 year</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-2 years</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 2 years</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Were you homeless when you came to Roseburg?</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (from Roseburg originally)</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If you were homeless when you came here, where did you move from?</th>
<th>% of households who were homeless when they came here</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Douglas County</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Oregon</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Another part of Oregon</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A different state</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

To put these data in context, 64% of all adult residents of Douglas County are not originally from Oregon.⁸

Among the 82 households who reported that they were homeless when they came to Roseburg:

- 40% have lived in Roseburg for more than two years; 19% have lived in Roseburg for less than three months
- 50% were in emergency shelter, 33% were unsheltered, and 16% were in transitional housing on the night of the count
- 83% are adult-only households; 13% are households with children; 4% are unaccompanied youth
- 50% have no reported monthly income; 39% receive government income benefits; 5% receive retirement income; 4% have employment income
- 71% are on the Oregon Health Plan

---

• 74% have a head of household with a disabling condition
• 44% have a head of household who is a victim of domestic violence

**Reasons for Homelessness**
The PIT survey asked respondents to identify the reasons for their homelessness. The question was multiple choice, and respondents could select as many options as were applicable. The table below shows the percentage of households who selected each answer choice (excluding the answer choices that received less than 2% of responses).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reasons for homelessness</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t afford rent</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kicked out by family/friends</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other reason*</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Domestic violence</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evicted by landlord</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/alcohol at home</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor rental history</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal history</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental or emotional disorder</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug/alcohol (self)</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeless by choice</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medical problem</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Credit</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The most common “other” reason was the death of a partner, spouse or family member. The second most common reason was separation, divorce or the end of a relationship.

**Service Needs**
The PIT survey asked respondents “What types of services do you need but aren’t able to access?” The question was multiple choice, and respondents could select as many options as were applicable. The table below shows the percentage of households who selected each answer choice out of the 81% of respondents who answered the question.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service needs</th>
<th>% of households</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Help finding housing</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help paying for housing</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transitional housing</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelter</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment-related services</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A place to access mail, showers, computers, and resource referral</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help accessing social security, food stamps, OHP or other benefits</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A (I don’t need additional services)</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other services*</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mental health services</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health care/medical care</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substance abuse treatment</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
*The most common “other service” was transportation. Common responses also included laundry, help getting identification, dental services, senior and disabled services, and clothing.

**Doubled Up**

Households who are sharing the housing of others for economic reasons are commonly referred to as “doubled up.” Not all people who are doubled up consider themselves homeless, but being doubled up is a sign of housing insecurity and is often a stepping stone to literal homelessness. In the course of a year, the estimated odds of a doubled up person ending up on the streets or in a shelter are one in ten. People who are doubled up often live with households who are also unstably housed, contributing to overcrowding and a greater risk of homelessness among those households.

Comprehensive data don’t exist on Roseburg’s doubled up population. This section draws upon the available data to create a ballpark estimate of the size of the city’s doubled up population and its characteristics.

**Estimates of Doubled Up Population**

There are no effective methodologies for accurately enumerating the number of people who are doubled up in a given area. Roseburg’s January 2019 PIT included interviews with 129 people who were doubled up, but the interviews were based on a convenience sample of people accessing certain types of services and do not represent a comprehensive count of the city’s doubled up population.

National studies indicate that the doubled up population is far larger than the population that meets HUD’s definition of homelessness for the PIT. For example, a study by the National Alliance to End Homelessness estimated that if the doubled up population was included in the PIT, it would increase the size of the nation’s homeless population by a factor of five.

Unlike HUD, the Department of Education and Department of Human Services (DHS) include the doubled up population in their definitions of homelessness. Data from those agencies are helpful in creating an order-of-magnitude estimate of Roseburg’s doubled up population:

- **Department of Education Data:** On the day of the 2019 point-in-time count, the Roseburg School District and Head Start program counted 107 homeless students. Eighty-three percent of the students were doubled up and 7% were in emergency shelter. Living situations for the remaining 10% are unknown. Proportionally, there were more than 10 times as many doubled up students in Roseburg on the night of the count than students who met HUD’s definition of homelessness.

---

11 Homeless student numbers only include students attending the district’s public schools who identify themselves to school staff as homeless. For this reason, the numbers are almost certainly an undercount. Many students, particularly those who are doubled up, may not consider themselves homeless or may be unwilling to share their situation with school staff.
**Department of Human Services Data:** On the day of the 2019 point-in-time count, the DHS database of SNAP (food stamp) recipients included 857 households living within the Roseburg zip codes who identified as homeless.\(^{12}\) This includes households who were sheltered, unsheltered, and doubled up (the database doesn’t distinguish between them). If all of the sheltered and unsheltered households counted in the PIT were included in this figure, there would be 2.3 times as many doubled up SNAP recipients as those who met HUD’s definition of homelessness. Since it is very unlikely that all of Roseburg’s doubled up households are receiving SNAP, or that all the sheltered and unsheltered households counted in the PIT are in the DHS database, this calculation most likely under-estimates the size of the doubled up population.

These estimates suggest that Roseburg’s doubled up population is at least 2.3 times the size of its unsheltered and sheltered population, and it may be closer to five to ten times the size.

**Characteristics of Doubled Up Population**

During the 2019 PIT, volunteers interviewed 129 people in 57 households who were doubled up in Roseburg on the night of the count. While this information does not provide a comprehensive picture of Roseburg’s doubled up households, it does offer insights into the characteristics of a portion of the city’s doubled up population.

Key findings from the PIT survey’s doubled up respondents include:

- **Household composition:** 49% are households with children and 51% are adult-only households.
- **Gender:** 54% are female, 41% are male, and 0% are transgender (gender is unknown for the remaining 5%).
- **Race and ethnicity:** 9% are American Indian or Alaskan Native, 0% are Asian, 7% are Black or African American, 14% are Hispanic, 0% are Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander, and 68% are White (race and ethnicity aren’t known for 1%).
- **Age:** 48% are children under age 18, 10% are young adults ages 18-24, 32% are adults ages 24-29, 6% are age 50-65, and 5% are over age 65.
- **Monthly income:** 25% didn’t report any monthly income. Among those that did report a monthly income, the average income amount is $839. The most common income sources are government benefits and employment.
- **Oregon Health Plan:** 63% are on the Oregon Health Plan.
- **Disabling conditions:** 61% have a head of household with a disabling condition. The most common disabling conditions are chronic health conditions, mental health issues, and physical disabilities.
- **Veterans:** 5% of the adults are veterans.
- **Domestic violence:** 21% of the heads of household are victims of domestic violence, and 14% are currently fleeing.
- **Released offenders:** 7% self-identify as released offenders.
- **Connection to Roseburg:** 70% have lived in Roseburg for more than two years, and 74% are either from Roseburg originally or had housing when they arrived. Of the 26% who were homeless when they came to Roseburg, 70% moved from southern Oregon or another part of Oregon.

---

\(^{12}\) Data provided by Roseburg Department of Human Services, 2019.
**Reasons for homelessness**: The most common causes of homelessness are “couldn’t afford rent” (61%), “unemployed” (39%), and “poor rental history” (26%).

**Service needs**: The most common service needs are “help paying for housing” (75%) and “help finding housing” (73%).

### At Risk of Homelessness

A variety of factors can influence a household’s likelihood of becoming homeless, but the biggest risk factor is the inability to afford housing. Housing is generally considered affordable if a household spends no more than 30% of its income on housing costs. Households paying more than 30% of their income on housing are considered to be “cost burdened” because they often do not have enough income left over to pay for other essential needs, such as medical care, food, and transportation.

Housing cost-burdened households are more financially precarious than those that spend a smaller percentage of their income on housing. They typically have limited savings and are unable to build a financial cushion. The risks of homelessness are greatest for cost-burdened households with the lowest incomes. Any crisis, from an unexpected car repair to a death in the family can put these households at risk of homelessness.

In Roseburg, 3,379 households are paying more than 30% of their income on housing. Those at greatest risk of homelessness are the 1,897 households with annual incomes below $20,000 and the 794 households with incomes of $20,000-$34,000 that are paying more than 30% of their income on housing.

Recent national research shows that communities where the average renter household spends more than 30% of its income on rent are particularly vulnerable to increases in homelessness. In today’s housing market, 54% of Roseburg renter households are paying 30% or more of their income on rent, and 29% are paying more than 50% of their income on rent.

These data suggest that without significant interventions, Roseburg is likely to see increased rates of homelessness, with its lowest-income, housing cost-burdened households at greatest risk.

---

17 ACS 2013-17 5-year estimates.
19 ACS 2013-17 5-year estimates.
Existing Services and Resources

Roseburg nonprofits, public agencies, and the faith community offer a range of shelter, housing, and services to assist people experiencing homelessness in the community. This section summarizes the existing resources related to homelessness that are currently available in Roseburg.

Emergency Shelter

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Beds</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Rescue Mission</td>
<td>76 beds</td>
<td>Men ages 18 and older</td>
<td>The Mission is a Christian organization that provides faith-based shelter and services. Participants must attend chapel, be clean and sober, and follow program rules.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 additional beds for men in the New Life Program</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Samaritan Inn</td>
<td>104 beds</td>
<td>Women ages 18 and older with or without children (girls of any age; boys up to 14)</td>
<td>Also run by the Mission with the same guidelines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Dream Center Warming Center</td>
<td>100 beds</td>
<td>No limitations</td>
<td>Low-barrier warming center open during severe weather to anyone in need.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battered Person’s Advocacy</td>
<td>Approximately 10 rooms</td>
<td>Victims of domestic violence, sexual assault, stalking, and others</td>
<td>Emergency safe shelter provided in several locations as needed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Transitional Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Terrace (UCAN)</td>
<td>7 beds for men 5 beds for women</td>
<td>Men and women</td>
<td>Maximum transitional housing stay is 2 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oxford House</td>
<td>39 beds for men 6 beds for women and children</td>
<td>Men, women, and children seeking clean and sober housing</td>
<td>Houses are democratically run. Average stay is one year, but there is no maximum time limit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Rescue Mission</td>
<td>40 single room occupancy (SRO) units for men</td>
<td>Men who have spent 30 days at the Mission, graduates of the Mission’s New Life Program, and others</td>
<td>The Mission is a Christian organization that provides faith-based housing and services. Rooms can be rented for an indefinite period of time.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Information on emergency shelter and transitional housing is based on service provider interviews and websites as well as the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC) Housing Subcommittee’s Transitional Housing List.

This list includes beds that were not counted in the PIT because they do not meet HUD’s definition of transitional housing for the PIT, which requires a maximum time limit of 24 months.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>TrueNorth Star Ministries</td>
<td>12 beds for men</td>
<td>Male RSAT graduates, Drug Court clients, and others</td>
<td>TrueNorth Star Ministries is a Christian organization that provides faith-based housing and services. Average stay is 6-8 months; maximum stay is 2 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Knoll Apartments</td>
<td>64 SRO and studio units for men and women</td>
<td>Adult men and women in transition, with preference given to veterans</td>
<td>Alcohol and drug free environment. Residents sign a 6-month lease that can be renewed up to 3 times, for a maximum stay of 2 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casa de Belen</td>
<td>Approximately 20 beds for youth</td>
<td>Unaccompanied youth ages 12-17</td>
<td>Provides a stable environment for youth to stay in school, learn life skills, and develop a sustainable transition plan.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven</td>
<td>8 beds for women 8 beds for children</td>
<td>Pregnant and parenting women age 18 and over and their children</td>
<td>Residents receive education, parenting classes, life skills, and connections to community resources. Typical stay is for a year after child’s birth.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Rent-Restricted Affordable Rental Housing**[^22]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Affordable Units</th>
<th>Target Population(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brookside Court Apartments</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Camas Ridge</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cecil House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview South</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ex/Released Offenders, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crestview Terrace</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ex/Released Offenders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>David’s House</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Physical Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Deer Creek Village (under development)</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>Veterans, Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diamond Court</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Family, Physical Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eagle Landing</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>Homeless, Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esperanza Circle</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Apartments</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>Family, Homeless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Homes</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meadow Creek Retirement Community</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^22]: Information in this section is based on service provider interviews as well as Oregon Housing and Community Services’ “Affordable Housing Oregon Inventory” and “Affordable Rental Housing Projects” lists.
### Affordable Units and Target Population(s)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property</th>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Target Population(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Neu Place</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Developmental Disabilities, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newton Creek Manor MHP</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>Elderly, Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oak Grove Retirement Center</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Orchard Knoll</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Veterans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oregon</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkside Village</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Princeton Court Apartments</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rice House</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Elderly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rose Villa</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Project</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Developmental Disabilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rosewood Park Homes</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schaeffer House</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunset Apartments</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium Terrace</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine Street Court I</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vine Street Court II</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Family</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westview Commons</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Housing Vouchers

In addition to owning public and affordable housing units which are included in the list above, the Housing Authority of Douglas County (HADCO) also administers federal housing vouchers available to low-income households. Under the voucher programs, HADCO pays a portion of the rent directly to a landlord on behalf of the participant. The average time on the waiting list is typically two years but is currently closer to one year.

HADCO administers 751 Housing Choice Vouchers and 111 VASH Vouchers for a total of 762 vouchers in Douglas County. Currently, 64% of the voucher holders (486) are living in Roseburg.

### Permanent Supportive Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>PSH Beds</th>
<th>Target Population(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grandview Homes</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Households with children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Oregon Leasing and Support II</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Households without children</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trillium Terrace</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Households with children</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

23 Information in this section is based on direct communication with HADCO.

24 Information in this section is based on the 2018 Roseburg Housing Inventory Count. Grandview Homes and Trillium Terrace are also listed in the Rent-Restricted Affordable Housing section.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Homelessness-Related Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adapt</td>
<td>Drug and alcohol treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Battered Persons’ Advocacy</td>
<td>Services for victims of domestic violence and sexual assault</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compass Behavioral Health</td>
<td>Mental health treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cow Creek Tribe</td>
<td>Medical and mental health, food pantry, emergency assistance, safe house, self-sufficiency, workforce development, educational assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FISH</td>
<td>Food pantry</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foundation Fellowship</td>
<td>Food pantry, meals, clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Dream Center</td>
<td>Outreach, food boxes, clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Rescue Mission Day Center</td>
<td>Meals, showers, laundry, clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Rescue Mission New Life Program</td>
<td>Work training, bible classes, life skills classes, addiction recovery classes, personal counseling, goal setting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg School District Homeless &amp; Runaway Youth Services</td>
<td>Transportation, school supplies, clothing, hygiene products, connections to other community services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roseburg Veterans Affairs Medical Center</td>
<td>Primary care, hospital services, mental health services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safe Haven Maternity Home</td>
<td>Meals, life skills, parenting skills, financial skills, educational skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salvation Army</td>
<td>Food pantry, rent assistance, furniture, household items, clothing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South River Community Health Center</td>
<td>Behavioral health and general medicine, jail in-reach for health insurance enrollment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Community Action Network (UCAN)</td>
<td>Outreach, food pantry, clothing, health insurance enrollment, UTrans, housing placement assistance, move-in help, rent assistance, information and referral, goal setting, action planning</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umpqua Community Health Center</td>
<td>Primary medical, dental, and behavioral health services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

25 Information in this section is based on service provider interviews and websites, and Douglas Education Service District’s “2017-18 Douglas County Resource Directory”.
Service Needs and Gaps

Roseburg’s existing services and resources are insufficient to meet the needs of the city’s current homeless population and the many households who are at risk of homelessness. This section summarizes the greatest needs and gaps in services related to homelessness in Roseburg based on input from local service providers and stakeholders, an analysis of the city’s existing services, and a review of national best practices.

Lack of Affordable Housing
Stakeholders identified affordable housing as the most significant need for those experiencing and at risk of homelessness in Roseburg. The city lacks sufficient housing at all income levels, with the greatest impact on low-income households. For every 100 families with extremely low incomes (defined as less than 30% of median family income), there are only 29 affordable units available in Douglas County.\(^{26}\) The county has a shortage of 2,102 units for those households, 2,065 units for households at 50% of median family income, and 1,692 units for households at 80% of median family income.\(^{27}\) In 2017-18, 49% of Douglas County Housing Choice Voucher holders were unable to find housing within the allowable rental limits, forcing them to turn back their vouchers.\(^{28}\)

A rent survey conducted by HADCO in December 2018 found average rents in Roseburg of $634 for a studio, $806 for one bedroom, $1,105 for two bedrooms, and $1,675 for three bedrooms.\(^{29}\) At those rates, a household would need one full-time worker earning $21.26 an hour or two full-time workers earning minimum wage to afford a two-bedroom unit.\(^{30}\)

The need for affordable housing is demonstrated by data on service requests to 211, the region’s human services hotline. In FY 2017-18, service requests related to housing were the most common type of call to 211 in Douglas County. The most common requests were for rent payment assistance and low-income/subsidized rental housing. Of the 508 callers requesting housing help, 84% had incomes under the federal poverty level and 36% said they were currently experiencing homelessness.\(^{31}\)

Barriers in Accessing Housing
In addition to the lack of affordable units, low-income renters often struggle to access housing due to barriers such as low credit scores, lack of rental history, prior evictions or criminal backgrounds. Steep competition for every available unit means landlords tend to reject applicants with any blemishes on their records. Some landlords violate fair housing guidelines by refusing to accept applicants with rent subsidies or by denying reasonable accommodations for those with disabilities. Some landlords also set the move-in costs at such high levels that even if a household can afford the monthly rent they often can’t afford the initial up-front costs.

Sub-standard Housing
In Roseburg’s tight housing market, the units that are available to low-income renters are often of sub-standard quality and in some cases pose significant health and safety risks. In a 2017 focus group with

\(^{27}\) Oregon Housing and Community Services, “Statewide Housing Plan,” 2018.
\(^{28}\) Data provided by HADCO, 2018.
\(^{29}\) Data provided by HADCO, 2019.
\(^{31}\) Data provided by 211info, 2018.
low-income Roseburg residents sponsored by Oregon Housing and Community Services, participants identified concerns with lack of heat, poor housing conditions, overcrowding, and problems with maintenance and housing safety.\(^{32}\) Eighteen percent of households in Douglas County experience severe housing quality issues including homes that are severely overcrowded, severely cost burdened, lacking complete kitchen facilities or lacking complete plumbing facilities.\(^{33}\) Some households opt to live in recreational vehicles because they can’t afford other housing, but the vehicles are often in disrepair and not appropriate as a living accommodation.

**Insufficient Housing Services**

While the shortage of decent affordable housing is a key driver of homelessness in Roseburg, helping people to end their homelessness often requires targeted housing services that are tailored to meet each household’s specific circumstances and needs. The strategies that have been shown to be most effective in national studies are rapid re-housing and permanent supportive housing (PSH), but Roseburg has very limited access to either of these approaches. According to the 2018 Housing Inventory Count (HIC) provided to HUD, Roseburg has 49 beds of PSH and no rapid re-housing. In contrast, Roseburg tallied 93 transitional housing beds in the 2018 HIC, even though transitional housing is an approach which has been shown in national studies to be more costly and less effective for all but a few specific populations.\(^{34}\)

- **Rapid re-housing:** Rapid re-housing focuses on getting households placed quickly into permanent housing through a tailored approach that includes immediate problem-solving, short-term financial assistance, and connections to services when appropriate. It is the most effective solution to homelessness for people who do not need permanent supports in order to remain successfully housed. Rapid re-housing interventions are tailored to each household’s specific situation and may include flexible financial assistance, housing search assistance, support in overcoming tenant screening barriers, rent and move-in assistance, and connections to community resources. The PIT data suggest that a significant portion of Roseburg’s homeless population could be effectively served through rapid re-housing strategies.

- **Permanent supportive housing (PSH):** PSH combines non time-limited affordable housing assistance with ongoing wraparound service supports. It is a proven solution for ending the homelessness of people who are living with chronic disabling conditions and have experienced long or repeated episodes of homelessness. The services in supportive housing are flexible, tenant-driven, and voluntary, and can include tenancy supports, connections to behavioral health and primary health care, medication management, counseling, and peer support. PSH should be prioritized for the 30% of Roseburg’s homeless population that is chronically homeless.

- **Transitional housing:** Transitional housing provides temporary housing (usually up to two years) with specialized services for specific segments of the homeless population. It is intended to bridge the gap from homelessness to permanent housing by providing structured supports in congregate facilities or scattered-site units. The majority of people experiencing homelessness do not require stays in transitional housing prior to successfully moving into permanent housing. National experts

---

\(^{32}\) Oregon Housing and Community Services, “Phase 1 Outreach Summary Report,” 2018.


have been pushing jurisdictions to shift away from the transitional housing model as research increasingly has shown it to be more expensive and less effective than other approaches. For a few specific sub-populations, however, transitional housing still may be the most appropriate intervention. Stakeholders cited several specific sub-sets of Roseburg’s homeless population who would benefit from transitional housing, particularly people exiting incarceration and unaccompanied youth. The PIT data suggest these sub-populations represent less than 10% of Roseburg’s overall homeless population.

**Limited Mental Health Services**

After housing, many stakeholders identified mental health services as the most significant service gap for addressing homelessness. Thirty-eight percent of all PIT respondents and 61% of chronically homeless PIT respondents self-identified as having a mental health condition. However, like many Oregon communities, the Roseburg area doesn’t have sufficient mental health resources or treatment facilities to meet its population’s mental health needs. People seeking help often don’t know how to access services and aren’t able to get the services they need in a timely manner. Another challenge is that not everyone who needs help is willing to get it, making it difficult to stabilize people in crisis who are unwilling to seek treatment voluntarily.

**Transportation Challenges**

Many stakeholders identified transportation as one of the biggest barriers affecting people’s ability to exit homelessness. Lack of transportation limits people’s options for housing, education, and employment, and makes it difficult to access available services. Navigating services and resources can be extremely difficult for people due to transportation barriers. UTrans is a critical resource, but it is inadequate to meet the needs. The routes are too limited and infrequent, and it requires a level of resources, pre-planning, and time that isn’t always realistic for people living in crisis.

**Shelter Limitations**

Emergency shelter is not a solution to homelessness, but it can help people meet basic survival needs while connecting them to services. National best practices emphasize that for shelters to operate effectively, they should meet the following criteria:

- **Immediate and low-barrier access:** Eliminate barriers that may prevent people from accessing shelter such as sobriety or faith-based activity requirements; do not require family members and partners to separate from one another in order to access shelter; provide a welcoming and safe living environment that promotes dignity and respect for every person needing services.

- **Connections to services and housing:** Serve as an entry point for people to access services and resources on a voluntary basis, guided by each participant’s own goals and priorities. Provide targeted services and financial supports to help people transition out of shelter into permanent housing as quickly as possible.

Roseburg has two year-round shelters for the general population – one for men and one for women and children, both run by the Roseburg Rescue Mission. While those shelters provide a valuable service to hundreds of people each year, they do not meet the above criteria. The Rescue Mission requires shelter participants to attend chapel services, be clean and sober, and follow the requirements placed on them.

---

by a case worker. The Mission imposes bans on people who have broken the rules or have not adhered to behavioral expectations. The demographic guidelines for the two shelters require families and couples to separate, and there are no shelter options for single fathers with children or mothers with boys over the age of 14.

Roseburg needs additional shelter options that meet the best practice guidelines. The Dream Center warming center offers low-barrier shelter during severe weather, but it is only open a few weeks a year and doesn’t have the capacity to provide robust connections to services or permanent housing.

**Limited Outreach Capacity**

Many people experiencing homelessness are disengaged from service systems and may be reluctant to seek assistance. Addressing their homelessness requires proactive outreach, relationship building, and engagement. Effective outreach strategies incorporate:

- Regular canvassing of streets, parks, trails, and other places where people may be sleeping.
- Engaging with people one-on-one for as long as it takes to build credibility and trust.
- Identifying people’s goals, needs, strengths, and challenges, and working with them to facilitate the development of an action plan.
- Providing one-on-one support to help people problem solve and address barriers.
- Connecting people with appropriate services and helping them to navigate the service system.
- Supporting people in transitioning into permanent housing, and continuing to maintain a relationship once they are in housing to promote long-term stability.

Roseburg’s existing outreach capacity is limited to one outreach worker at UCAN plus a few volunteers doing outreach through the Dream Center’s Under the Bridge ministry. Expanding the number of outreach workers would significantly increase the city’s capacity to effectively engage people living on the streets and connect them to housing.

**Insufficient Drop-in Services**

Many stakeholders identified the need for a full-service drop-in center as one of the key gaps in Roseburg’s homeless services system. Drop-in centers provide access to showers, mail service, laundry, lockers, and the internet, all of which are essential in enabling people to seek employment and services so that they can end their homelessness. Employers won’t hire someone who doesn’t have a mailing address and a predictable option for staying clean. People also need a mailing address in order to communicate with service providers and receive government benefits. A drop-in center also provides a centralized location where people can get information about available services and connections to resources. In some cases, drop-in centers are staffed by social workers who can assess people’s needs and connect them to services. In other cases, multiple homeless service providers co-locate in a single center to offer seamless connections to wraparound services.

Roseburg doesn’t have a full-service drop-in center. The Rescue Mission offers a day room with limited access to restrooms, showers, and laundry that is open to people who meet the same screening rules and behavioral guidelines as the shelter, but it doesn’t meet the full need.

---

**Need for Stabilization Supports**

In addition to housing and basic services, many people experiencing homelessness need additional supports to stabilize their lives and achieve greater independence. Some stakeholders identified the need for increased access to stabilization supports as one of Roseburg’s key service gaps. Specific supports they identified included:

- Housing retention – tenancy skills, problem solving, landlord mediation, etc.
- Life skills training – budgeting, finances, independent living, etc.
- Education – GED, community college, technical education, etc.
- Employment – job skills training, job readiness, job placement, etc.
- Benefits acquisition – SSI/SSDI, SNAP, TANF, veterans’ benefits, etc.
Barriers to Addressing the Needs

Stakeholders identified a number of barriers that make it more difficult to effectively address Roseburg’s homelessness crisis. This section summarizes the barriers that were identified most frequently.

Community Perceptions of Homelessness in Roseburg
Homelessness is a source of considerable community tension in Roseburg due to the impact of a subset of the city’s homeless population that has a highly visible presence. Many have mental health and/or substance use issues, and their behavior can be disorderly and destructive. Even though they represent a small portion of the individuals and families experiencing homelessness in Roseburg, many members of the community equate the issue of homelessness with this group. This results in the common perception that homelessness is a lifestyle choice, that people experiencing homelessness aren’t interested in resolving their homelessness, and that any help that is offered will simply create more problems.

Due to this perception, much of the City’s approach to homelessness focuses on trying to mitigate its impact on the community rather than trying to help people to end their homelessness. Efforts by community organizations to address people’s needs often run into neighborhood opposition, making it difficult to site service facilities or provide services in the locations where people need them.

Lack of Coordination
The city lacks a cohesive plan or collective impact framework for addressing homelessness, in part due to the lack of resources to implement shared strategies. There are several groups trying to advance work on the issue, but the coordination between the existing efforts could be stronger, and additional resources are needed to advance shared priorities. In light of the resource limitations, the strategies that the City currently prioritizes are often opportunistic rather than based on a comprehensive assessment of data and best practices.

National best practices emphasize the importance of creating integrated homeless service systems that provide the right mix of interventions to match the specific needs. A key part of this approach is the use of a coordinated entry system that uses standardized assessment tools to facilitate access to appropriate services. Roseburg’s service providers collaborate in various ways, but Roseburg does not have an integrated system of services. The current coordinated entry system only involves two service providers, and there is no overarching, data-based strategy for allocating services or ensuring the right services are available to meet local needs.

Stakeholders emphasized the need for stronger coordination and planning, but with different opinions about which entity should take the lead. Some suggested the City should play that role; others said one of the existing groups such as the Homeless Transitions Action Group (HTAG) or the Local Public Safety Coordinating Council (LPSCC) Housing Subcommittee should lead the effort; others argued it would be most effective to have a neutral third party like the United Way or Ford Family Foundation facilitate the process.
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Lack of Resources and Capacity
Local service providers lack sufficient financial resources to meet the full spectrum of homelessness-related needs, and they often struggle to recruit and retain qualified staff. State and federal resources are limited, and the process of applying for them is often highly competitive.

The roots of Roseburg’s homelessness crisis are not local, and the problem can’t be solved entirely by local government. Nonetheless, local governments by necessity must play a role in helping to address homelessness in their jurisdictions. Roseburg’s capacity to address the issue is constrained by insufficient City resources and a limited tax base. The resources the City does direct toward homelessness focus on mitigating its impacts rather than addressing the needs. For example, in 2017-18, the City spent $8,686 on homeless camp clean-ups and $5,268 to abate homeless/transient activity in derelict buildings. These costs reflect billable activities only and do not include staff time or other costs for the City’s administration of these programs.

Criminal Justice Response to Homelessness
People experiencing unsheltered homelessness often have frequent interactions with the criminal justice system because many of the behaviors associated with sleeping outside violate the law. For example, camping within Roseburg is prohibited because it can result in hazardous and unsafe conditions that require significant clean up. Prior to a 2018 decision by the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals, camping was treated as a misdemeanor in Roseburg. In response to the court decision, camping is now a violation, but people are still cited to appear in court and pay a fine of $250.

The table below shows the number of Roseburg Police cases over a recent 12 month period for behaviors that may be associated with homelessness, and the percentage of the cases in which the person cited did not have a permanent address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of case</th>
<th># of cases</th>
<th>% with no permanent address</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prohibited camping</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offensive littering</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urinating in public</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drinking in public</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal trespass</td>
<td>323</td>
<td>88%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The rights of people experiencing homelessness must be balanced with the rights of the community to clean and safe public spaces. These tensions can often be difficult for local governments to navigate, as cities have a responsibility to maintain public spaces, enforce laws, and respond to the concerns of community members. However, research shows that punitive approaches to homelessness can exacerbate existing problems while adding to jurisdictions’ costs. Having citations and unpaid fines can create additional barriers for people to obtain employment and housing, making it even more difficult to

---

38 Data provided by City of Roseburg Community Development Department and Roseburg Police Department. Clean up data is for the period of August 2017-October 2018; derelict building data is for January-December 2018. The billable activities resulting from the City’s homeless camp clean-up and derelict building programs can be highly variable, so these costs are not necessarily typical of the annual costs.
40 Data provided by Roseburg Police Department for December 2017-December 2018.
escape homelessness. The criminal justice response to homelessness also creates a climate of fear and distrust which makes it less likely that people will seek help to address their problems.

In addition to citations for behaviors associated with homelessness, the City of Roseburg conducts sweeps of homeless encampments. ORS 203.079 requires law enforcement officials to post a 24-hour notice prior to a camp sweep and to notify the designated social service agency so that it can arrange for outreach workers to visit the site to help connect people with services. According to some stakeholders, Roseburg police have not consistently followed those guidelines in the past. However, the City of Roseburg has made recent efforts to ensure that the proper procedures are followed and that the rights of campers affected by the sweeps are upheld. Unfortunately, the sweeps force the impacted individuals to move from one place to another, which in some instances further destabilizes their lives and makes it harder to access services. Sweeps also frequently result in the loss or destruction of personal property, creating additional barriers to stabilization.

**Barriers to Housing Development**

Roseburg’s economic climate has made it difficult to attract investment. The city has had limited construction activity in recent years and insufficient housing development. Vacant and abandoned properties have resulted in a loss of existing housing stock while deterring new investments. Land use issues such as wetlands create challenges for new housing development. Some of the city’s planning guidelines and zoning codes also limit the opportunities for affordable housing strategies such as tiny home villages and cottage clusters.
Policy Options

This section provides a menu of policy options for consideration as part of the Housing Needs Analysis decision-making process. It focuses on strategies that the City could take the lead in implementing or helping to move forward in partnership with local nonprofits, faith organizations, and other stakeholders.

Improve Planning and Coordination

- **Strategic plan:** Bring stakeholders together to develop an overarching plan based on data and best practices. The plan would create a framework for collective action by identifying shared goals and objectives, a road map for achieving each objective, and accountability measures for ensuring effective implementation.

- **Integrated system:** Work with service providers to develop a more coordinated and integrated system to address homelessness. This includes expanding the existing coordinated entry system to include more providers, sharing data and information across providers, and aligning services to maximize the impact of existing resources.

- **Coordinating board:** Create a formal coordinating board to lead the city’s collaborative efforts to address homelessness. The board would bring together government, nonprofits, faith groups, schools, philanthropy, business, community members, and people with direct experience of homelessness, and it would build upon and align the efforts of existing groups such as HTAG and LPSCC.

- **City support:** Increase City support and involvement in planning and implementation of community-based efforts. For example, engage City departments in the annual PIT planning to ensure community efforts aren’t undermined by the City’s parking enforcement and policing activities. Convene service providers and City departments on a regular basis to share information and engage in solutions-oriented discussions.

- **Discharge planning:** Partner with local criminal justice, health care, and child welfare systems to ensure that people discharged from their care have housing plans in place and are connected to appropriate community-based services prior to discharge.

Increase the Supply of Affordable Housing

Increase the stock of affordable housing by making it more financially and logistically feasible to develop a variety of affordable housing types. Work with partners to prioritize and implement a mix of strategies that will promote increased development. Potential tools include:

- **Regulatory tools:** density bonuses, expedited permitting, relaxing of design standards, reduced parking requirements, etc.

- **Financial tools:** financing or credits for system development charges (SDCs), property tax reductions or exemptions, City-funded gap financing, employer-assisted housing, etc.

- **Development tools:** land banks, land trusts, make public land or buildings available for affordable housing, make abandoned or tax-delinquent properties available for affordable housing, etc.

- **Planning tools:** modify planning guidelines and zoning codes to permit and incentivize multifamily housing, micro-units, single-room occupancy developments, tiny houses, cottage clusters, accessory dwelling units (ADUs), etc.
- **Dedicated revenue sources**: construction excise tax, tax increment financing set-aside, general obligation bond, revenue bond, linkage fees, developer impact fees, short-term rental tax, etc.

Appendix B provides more detailed descriptions of each of these tools.

**Increase Housing Access**

- **Landlord engagement**: Use a recruitment campaign to engage private market landlords as partners in committing to house people exiting homelessness.

- **Landlord guarantee fund**: Incentivize landlords to rent to people exiting homelessness by offering a guarantee fund that landlords can tap into to cover damages or unpaid rent.

- **Landlord education**: Provide trainings for local landlords about state and federal fair housing laws related to disparate impact, source-of-income discrimination, reasonable accommodations, and protected classes.

- **Housing placement support**: Make flexible funding available to nonprofits to assist households in paying for security deposits, first month’s rent, application fees, and move-in costs (potentially in the form of a revolving loan fund).

**Improve Housing Quality**

- **Rental housing inspections**: Conduct proactive inspections to protect tenants from significant threats to health and safety, with the goal of curbing the worst abuses while avoiding further loss of available housing.

- **Home repair grants and loans**: Provide grants or low-interest loans to landlords and low-income homeowners to allow them to make necessary repairs to preserve the habitability of existing affordable units. Include access to affordable financing for manufactured home repair.

**Expand Targeted Housing Services**

- **Rapid re-housing**: Work with service providers to expand rapid re-housing services to assist qualified households to quickly exit homelessness and regain stability. Prioritize rapid re-housing for households who need initial support in transitioning back into housing but can function long-term in housing without ongoing supports.

- **PSH**: Work with nonprofit housing developers and service providers to develop a coordinated application for PSH funding that aligns with the priorities identified in the Statewide Housing Plan. Facilitate planning and zoning issues, and provide City support for proposed projects. Prioritize PSH for the 30% of Roseburg’s homeless population who are chronically homeless and will likely need long-term support in order to maintain housing stability.

- **Transitional housing**: Support transitional housing projects that align with national best practices and data on local needs. Prioritize transitional housing resources for specific sub-populations that need intensive services on a shorter term basis, including people exiting corrections facilities and unaccompanied youth.
Strengthen Mental Health Resources

- **Crisis Intervention Team**: Develop a strategy to provide ongoing funding for the Crisis Intervention Team\(^{42}\) to strengthen the police department’s capacity to effectively respond to calls involving individuals with a mental illness.

- **Enhanced mental health training**: Educate law enforcement, fire departments, and paramedics about how to effectively engage with people experiencing a mental health crisis, use crisis intervention techniques and involuntary psychiatric holds, and make appropriate referrals to available services.

- **Local triage center**: Create a center where individuals experiencing mental health or substance abuse crises can receive support on a walk-in basis and where police officers and paramedics can bring people in crisis so that they can be stabilized, assessed, and receive immediate referrals to appropriate follow-up services.

Expand Transportation Options

- **UTrans expansion**: Partner with UCAN and Douglas County to explore options for a targeted expansion of UTrans routes and frequency and/or increased availability of on-demand transit services to better connect low-income residents with housing and services.

- **Individualized transportation**: Partner with service providers to equip outreach workers and case managers with access to private vehicles that can be used to transport clients as needed to facilitate service navigation and problem solving.

Increase Access to Emergency Shelter

- **Low-barrier shelter**: Partner with service providers to support the creation of low-barrier shelter options that meet federal guidelines and provide connections to permanent housing. Explore potential ways the City could be supportive, including making use of government land or buildings, addressing siting issues or providing general fund dollars.

- **Safe sleep options**: Create options for people to sleep safely and legally that will reduce their impact on public spaces while facilitating connections to services to address their homelessness. Options include: (a) permitting religious organizations and nonprofits to temporarily host vehicles on their properties; (b) identifying public areas where overnight parking will be permitted; (c) creating a City-sponsored RV park with low nightly fees; (d) allowing homeowners to host one tent or vehicle on their property. All options should include access to sanitary facilities and garbage disposal along with connections to outreach workers who can facilitate service navigation.

- **Alternative shelter options**: Work with service providers to explore alternatives to congregate shelter for specific populations to provide temporary accommodations while residents receive support in transitioning to permanent housing. Options include: (a) an organized settlement of micro-homes, huts or sleeping sheds; (b) a nonprofit sponsored mobile home park; (c) use of motel vouchers; (d) a nonprofit or City-owned motel.

---

\(^{42}\) In 2018, the City of Roseburg in partnership with Adapt/Compass was awarded a $750,000 federal grant to create a Crisis Intervention Team that will pair mental health professionals with police to co-respond to calls involving mental health issues. The grant will support the program’s launch and initial implementation, but sustainable funding will need to be identified in order to maintain the program over the long term.
Increase Outreach Capacity

• **Expand the number of outreach workers:** Partner with service providers to increase the number of trained and experienced outreach workers focused on engagement, relationship-building, individualized problem-solving, and service navigation. Pursue sources of flexible funding that outreach workers can use to support their efforts to help people address barriers and move out of homelessness.

• **Incorporate outreach practices into existing positions:** Provide training on outreach and engagement best practices for public and private sector employees who regularly come into contact with people experiencing homelessness.

Create a Drop-in Center

• **Full-service center:** Partner with service providers to fund and site a drop-in center in an easily accessible location to provide access to showers, mail, laundry, internet, lockers, and a central hub for information and connections to services.

• **Service navigation:** Explore the creation of a centralized location for existing service agencies that would facilitate streamlined access to services on a drop-in basis. In addition to co-location of services, the center could provide centralized intake and assessment, access to case workers to support service navigation, assistance with applying for benefits, and referrals to specialized services.

Manage the Impact of Homelessness

• **Sobering center:** Move forward current efforts to create a sobering center that would reduce the problems associated with public intoxication while offering a gateway to treatment and services. Provide support in addressing siting challenges and identifying sustainable funding sources.

• **Day storage program:** Create safe and accessible options for people living on the streets to store their belongings during the day.

• **Street ambassador program:** Partner with downtown businesses to fund street ambassadors to help mediate tensions between homeless campers, business owners, and customers in impacted areas of downtown.

• **Improved sanitation:** Provide portable bathrooms in high impact areas. Increase the availability of trash receptacles and increase trash pick-up service as needed. Work with downtown businesses to hire people with experience of homelessness to pick up trash and keep streets clean.

Modify Law Enforcement Strategies

• **Communication:** Facilitate better communication between law enforcement and service providers to strengthen mutual understanding and foster compromise solutions that meet public safety needs while also supporting the rights and needs of people experiencing homelessness.

• **Citation dismissal:** Implement a citation dismissal program to allow people with low-level infractions to participate in service or diversion programs in lieu of paying a fine.

• **Community courts:** Pursue alternative justice system strategies for people experiencing homelessness who have committed non-violent offenses to reduce criminal justice system involvement while increasing connections to other systems of care.
• **Mental health strategies:** As noted in the “Strengthen Mental Health Resources” section above, identify sustainable funding for the Crisis Intervention Team and develop a triage center.

• **Service connections:** Ensure consistent implementation of ORS 203.079 to enable outreach workers to engage with campers and connect them with services before they are displaced by camp sweeps.

**Conduct Public Education**

• **City leadership:** Use social media and public meetings to present a consistent City message about homelessness that focuses on developing coordinated strategies to help people address their needs in order to end their homelessness.

• **Information sharing:** Provide data and information to help the public to better understand Roseburg’s homeless population and dispel negative stereotypes. Share stories that will enable the public to understand the range of people experiencing homelessness in the community.

• **Staff training:** Conduct regular trainings for City staff in partnership with local service providers to strengthen understanding of Roseburg’s homeless population, existing resources available to address homelessness, and techniques for engaging people experiencing homelessness.

• **Relationship-building:** Create opportunities for community members to engage one-on-one with people experiencing homelessness to break down barriers and build greater understanding.
Appendix A: Stakeholder Input

The stakeholders listed below contributed to this report by participating in one-on-one interviews and/or providing data or information for the study. Interview and data requests were sent to additional stakeholders, but not all of the identified stakeholders were able to participate.

Interviews
Melanie Prummer, Battered Persons’ Advocacy
Kivonna Coccia, Casa De Belen
Justin Mathison, Cow Creek Tribe
Sarah Thompson, Cow Creek Tribe
Bill Clemens, Douglas County Building Official
Randy Webb, Foundation Fellowship
Janeal Kohler, Housing Authority of Douglas County
Joan-Marie Michelsen, Legal Aid Services of Oregon
Arielle Reid, NeighborWorks Umpqua
Brian Shelton-Kelley, NeighborWorks Umpqua
Brian Prawitz, Roseburg City Council
Lance Colley, Roseburg City Manager
Timothy Edmundson, Roseburg Dream Center
Christopher Hutton, Roseburg Dream Center
Randal Olsen, Rose Alternative School
Lynn Antis, Roseburg Rescue Mission
Rick Burton, Roseburg School District
Juliana Marez, Roseburg School District
Evie Kumar, Safe Haven
Kristy Church, Salvation Army
Wayne Ellsworth, South River Community Health Center
Larry Clark, UCAN
Kelly Wessels, UCAN
Kat Cooper, Umpqua Health Alliance
Bryan Trenkle, United Way

Data and Information
Beth Bambrick, 211info
Ricky Hoffman, City of Roseburg Community Development Department
Cheryl Carson, Department of Human Services
Melissa McRobbie, Douglas County Local Public Safety Coordinating Council
Janeal Kohler, Housing Authority of Douglas County
Dana Burkhart, Roseburg Police Department
Lynn Antis, Roseburg Rescue Mission
Juliana Marez, Roseburg School District
Wayne Ellsworth, South River Community Health Center
Justina Fyfe, UCAN
Kat Cooper, Umpqua Health Alliance
Appendix B: Tools to Support Affordable Housing Development

The tools listed in the Policy Options section under Increase the Supply of Affordable Housing are described in more detail below.

Regulatory Tools

- **Density bonuses**: Density bonuses provide an incentive for affordable housing development by allowing increased development capacity beyond the base zoning entitlement in exchange for affordable units. This can include increased dwelling units per acre or an increase in floor area ratio. The incentive can also be structured to provide an option for the increased density to be used on another site or achieved through payment of a fee to fund affordable housing development at another site.

- **Expedited permitting**: Jurisdictions can incentivize affordable housing development by shortening the permitting process and review timelines to allow projects to move through the development process faster. Expedited permitting can lower the costs of development by reducing the time it takes to complete a project, reducing the uncertainty in the development review process, and reducing the personnel resources required to shepherd a project through the permitting process.

- **Relaxing of design standards**: Design requirements and restrictions can increase the cost of a housing development by reducing flexibility, adding hard costs, or making it more difficult to maximize the use of available space. Jurisdictions can incentivize affordable housing by relaxing specific design standards for projects that incorporate affordable units.

- **Reduced parking requirements**: Mandatory per-unit parking requirements for multi-family projects can add significant development costs and reduce usable square footage. Reducing the parking requirements for projects with affordable units can lower construction costs and make affordable development more feasible.

Financial Tools

- **System development charges (SDC) financing or credits**: Cities can reduce the up-front costs for developers by allowing them to finance their SDC costs over time or make direct improvements to the site in lieu of paying SDCs.

- **Property tax reductions or exemptions**: Reducing or abating property taxes for new developments can enable owners to charge lower rents. Oregon’s Multi-Unit Limited Tax Exemption Program allows selected projects to receive a property tax exemption for up to ten years on structural improvements in exchange for setting aside a percentage of the units as affordable. Cities can set criteria for selecting projects through a competitive process.

- **City-funded gap financing**: A city can use general fund dollars or other designated resources to directly invest in affordable housing projects through grants or low-interest loans. Offering financing with more favorable or flexible terms than are available on the market can provide essential gap financing to make affordable housing development more feasible.

- **Employer-assisted housing**: Employers can assist employees with housing costs through rental subsidies, direct investment in the construction of rental housing, down payment assistance, etc. Cities can offer their own employer-assisted housing programs for public-sector employees, and they can also provide incentives to encourage private-sector employers to initiate their own programs such as matching funds, administrative assistance, etc.
Development Tools

- **Land banks**: Land banks make affordable development more feasible by eliminating or reducing the cost of land for the development. Land banks acquire land for affordable development through donation or disposition of public land and/or by strategically purchasing land to be used for future development. They can be administered by cities, nonprofit entities, or both through a partnership.

- **Land trusts**: Land trusts support affordable home ownership by selling housing to income-qualified buyers on land that is retained by the land trust. Because the cost of the land isn’t included in the price, the housing is more affordable.

- **Make public property available for affordable housing**: Municipalities can reduce the costs of affordable housing development by making public land or buildings available for affordable housing development. This can include surplus properties or vacant lots owned by cities, transit agencies, or other municipal districts.

- **Make private property available for affordable housing**: Municipalities can reduce the costs of affordable housing by making abandoned, chronically blighted, and tax-delinquent private properties available for affordable housing development.

Planning Tools

- **Zoning changes**: Zoning changes can encourage the development of lower-cost housing types such as multifamily housing, accessory dwelling units, micro-units, tiny houses, single-room occupancy developments, duplexes, row houses, cottage clusters, internal division of larger homes, or manufactured housing.

- **Accessory dwelling units (ADUs)**: Municipalities can incentivize ADUs by offering fast-track permitting, waiving design standards or parking requirements, or reducing the impact of ADUs on property tax assessments. ADUs can be explicitly targeted for affordable housing by linking zoning laws to affordability requirements or by providing public financing for ADU projects that are set aside for households transitioning from homelessness.

Dedicated Revenue Sources

- **Construction excise tax (CET)**: Under SB 1533, which was passed in 2016, Oregon cities and counties can adopt CETs to support affordable housing. The CET is assessed on construction permits issued by the local jurisdiction for residential, commercial, and/or industrial construction. The allocation of the revenue is specified in SB 1533 and varies depending on the type of construction, but in all cases at least 50% of the revenue must be dedicated to affordable housing.

- **Tax increment financing (TIF) set-aside**: Jurisdictions can establish urban renewal areas (URAs) to generate revenue for community improvement projects using tax increment financing. Bonds are used to fund development projects, and as property values increase, the property tax increase is used to pay off the bonds. TIF funds can be invested in low-interest loans and/or grants for capital investments including affordable housing. Cities can require a portion of TIF funding in a URA to be set aside as a funding source for affordable housing.

- **General obligation bond**: General obligation bonds must be approved by voters. Once approved, the bond revenue is available in full and can be used for affordable housing construction. The bond is repaid through taxation of the jurisdiction’s property owners.
- **Revenue bond**: Revenue bonds can be issued by a jurisdiction without a public vote to finance revenue-producing projects. The bonds are typically repaid by revenue generated from the project, but they can also be financed with general fund dollars.

- **Linkage fees and developer impact fees**: Developer impact fees are imposed by local jurisdictions on new commercial and residential development to cover the cost of providing new public services and infrastructure such as sidewalks, schools, and affordable housing. Linkage fees are charged to developers specifically to cover the cost of affordable housing based on a nexus study that shows that the development will result in an increased need for affordable housing beyond what is currently available.

- **Short-term rental tax**: Short-term rentals such as Airbnb can reduce the availability of rental housing and increase rental rates. Jurisdictions can charge short-term lodging taxes dedicated to affordable housing and services to offset the market impact.