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Executive Summary

The Eugene-Springfield 2010 Consolidated Plan presents a strategic vision for housing and community development for the period beginning in July 2010 and ending in June 2015. The goals, strategies, and activities outlined in the Consolidated Plan are based on priorities identified through an analysis of community needs and an extensive community outreach process.

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield must complete and adopt a Consolidated Plan every five years in order to receive Community Development Block Grant (CDBG), HOME Investment Partnership Program (HOME), and other HUD grants. The purpose of CDBG and HOME is to advance the following statutory objectives principally for extremely low-income, low-income, and moderate-income residents:

- Provide decent, safe, and affordable housing (CDBG)
- Create suitable living environments (CDBG)
- Expand economic opportunities (CDBG)
- Expand the supply of decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing (HOME)

In addition, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield must complete a Consolidated Plan One Year Action Plan (Action Plan) for each fiscal year within the five-year period. The Action Plan describes the Cities’ annual allocation process and specific uses of HOME and CDBG funds during a specific fiscal year. The first Action Plan, for fiscal year 2010-2011, is completed and submitted to HUD along with the 2010 Consolidated Plan.

Consultation and Citizen Participation

Staff from the Cities of Eugene and Springfield employed a multi-faceted approach to engaging community members and other stakeholders in the development of the Consolidated Plan. Staff from the Lane County Human Services Commission and the Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County also provided input into the citizen involvement process. As a part of this process, a needs survey was conducted for public and private agencies that provide assisted housing, fair housing, health services, and social services. Representatives from human service agencies, local school districts, parks providers, utilities, police departments, legal aid services, and libraries were also consulted in the development of the Plan. These consultations were on-going and occurred at several stages of the Plan’s development. In addition, staff met with area housing and community development advisory committees on several occasions and conducted community surveys, stakeholder focus group meetings, general public meetings, and public hearings over the course of the Plan’s development.

Community Profile and Needs

The Consolidated Plan relies upon an analysis of qualitative and quantitative data in order to identify housing, homelessness, and community development needs and trends. This picture of need is the basis of the proposed objectives and outcomes for the 2010 Consolidated Plan. In addition to the US Census data which provides the foundation for development of the document, the Cities of Eugene and
Springfield utilized several alternative sources for needs data. These sources included the 2009 United Way survey, the Oregon Housing and Community Services Special Needs and Affordable Housing Needs Assessment, Northwest Federation of Community Organizations: 2008 Jobs Gap, and others. A complete list of data sources utilized in the Plan is included in Appendix C.

In summation, the local economy has declined, resulting in fewer job opportunities and less income for area households. As a result, there is a significant increase in the number of households who cannot meet the basic needs for food, shelter, medical care, and transportation. In addition, there are a growing number of seniors, persons with disabilities, and others who are unable to work. These factors, combined with a relatively tight housing market, have resulted in a large number of households with moderate or severe housing cost burdens. A review of noteworthy trends is provided below.

**Population Growth**
While the overall population of Eugene and Springfield continues to grow modestly at an annual projected population growth rate of slightly less than 1%, there are noteworthy changes in resident characteristics. The total population of Eugene and Springfield was 215,185 in 2009.

**Age Distribution**
The population of Eugene and Springfield is aging. Persons 45 years and older made up 36.4% of the total population in 2007, compared to 32.8% in 2000. Longer life expectancies account for a significant portion of this shift.

**Racial and Ethnic Composition**
Eugene and Springfield are becoming more racially and ethnically diverse. In 2007, the population was 83.5% White and 16.5% Hispanic/Latino and/or minority. Between 2000 and 2007, the Hispanic/Latino population increased over 40%, while the non-Hispanic/Latino minority population increased nearly 20%. Local school district data suggests that the minority and Hispanic/Latino population may be closer to 23% of the total population.

**Household Composition**
While family households still make up the largest percentage of households (55%) in both jurisdictions, there has been a significant increase in single person households (up 17.4%) between 2000 and 2007. Springfield also experienced a notable increase in the number of elderly households (up 17.4%) during the same period.

**Income and Poverty**
The Lane County Median Family Income in 2009 was $57,200. Lane County’s average wage is only 88% of the Oregon statewide average wage and less than 80% of the US average annual wage. Poverty rates in the cities of Eugene and Springfield have climbed over the past 40 years, rising from 10.9% of the total population in 1969 to 19.3% in 2007. In 2007, Eugene had a poverty rate of 19.7% while Springfield’s rate was 18.5%. According to the 2009 United Way of Lane County Community
Assessment, 18% of all households surveyed are between 100-200% of the federal poverty guideline, making them ineligible for many services but leaving them without adequate income to meet their families’ basic needs. For the 2009-2010 school year, 50% of students in the three school districts serving the cities of Eugene and Springfield were enrolled in free and reduced-price meals programs.

Persons with Disabilities
In 2007, a total of 31,700 people over the age of 5 had some disability, corresponding to almost 17% of the population over the age of 5. This figure is similar to the percentage of the population statewide with disabilities. Of those with disabilities in the cities of Eugene and Springfield, 31% are sensory, 56% physical, 44% mental, 17% self-care, 29% go-outside-home, and 34% employment. Persons may report more than one disability.

Persons experiencing Homelessness
The 2009 One-Night Homeless Count identified 2,232 homeless persons in 1,743 households. Of the total, 60% of the homeless households (993) were unsheltered; the remainder was housed in emergency shelters, transitional shelters, or motels. Twenty-two percent (22%) of homeless persons were identified as being chronically homeless, representing a 9% increase since 2008. Preliminary results of the 2010 One-Night Homeless Count indicate a sharp increase in the number of homeless people counted (up 48%) as well as a doubling of unsheltered individuals.

Persons with Special Needs who are not Homeless
Limited data exists specific to non-homeless special needs populations in the cities of Eugene and Springfield. Countywide estimates available from the State of Oregon suggest that there are approximately 500 released offenders, 300 people living with HIV/AIDS, 150 victims of domestic violence, and upwards of 6,000 persons with drug and/or alcohol addiction living in Lane County who may have special needs for housing and supportive services.

Employment and Economy
Unemployment rates in Lane County rose sharply in 2008 and 2009. In March 2009, the Lane County unemployment rate reached 13.5%, the highest rate since 1983. The latest economic downturn has seen continuing declines in manufacturing, a trend spanning more than 30 years. In 2007, relatively high-paying employment in the manufacturing sector constituted only 13% of all jobs in Lane County; that number has dropped even further as a result of the current recession. At the same time, the retail-service sector, an economic sector that pays significantly lower wages than manufacturing wages, has grown rapidly. In 2007, 61% of all jobs in Lane County paid less than the average wage for Lane County ($34,328).

According to the 2009 Lane County United Way Community Assessment, 30% of all respondents reported someone in their household not being able to find work; this measure of the difficulty of finding employment is higher than in any previous Community Assessment.
Housing Units and Tenure
Together, Eugene and Springfield contain more than 90,400 housing units. The balance between unit types has remained relatively stable since 1990, with single-family units accounting for 62% of the total, multi-family units for 32%, and the remainder in mobile/manufactured homes. The data also indicates that the majority of units available to renters are two-bedroom units; only 11% of all units have three bedrooms that might be available to large rental households. About 53% of the 90,400 housing units in the two cities are owner-occupied, while 47% are renter-occupied. The rate of homeownership in Springfield is 55% compared to 52% in Eugene.

Public and Assisted Housing
The Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County (HACSA) serves as the housing authority for the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County. HACSA owns, manages, and maintains 1,363 units of low-income housing in Lane County, of which 708 are public housing units. HACSA also administers the HUD Section 8 Housing Programs and manages the Low-Income Weatherization Program. As of December 2009, over 3,000 Lane County families are on HACSA’s combined housing waiting list. Over half of the families on the waiting list have children, 35% are disabled, and 7% are elderly. Nearly 20% are Hispanic/Latino and/or a minority. The average waiting time is approximately 18 months.

A variety of assisted housing developments are currently available and serving low-income persons in the Cities of Eugene and Springfield. There are a total of 4087 assisted housing units in 119 developments in both Cities including projects subsidized with Section 8, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, or other project-based subsidies. Eugene has a total of 3,288 units in 87 developments and Springfield has 838 units in 32 developments.

A total of 1136 units in 25 developments are subsidized through Section 8 or Section 202 contracts with HUD. These units make up 28% of all assisted housing units in Eugene and Springfield. All contracts are scheduled to expire between 2010 and 2015, however many developments are associated with nonprofit affordable housing organizations that will seek renewal of contracts.

Housing Costs and Availability
Housing costs in the Eugene-Springfield area have risen sharply over the past 20 years, forcing many households to pay more for housing than is affordable. The cost of housing is generally considered to be affordable when it equals no more than 30% of household income, including utility costs; households paying more than 30% of household income are considered to have a ‘housing cost burden.’ In the cities of Eugene and Springfield, more than one-quarter (26.1%) of all homeowners and nearly half (47%) of all renters have a housing cost burden. Vacancy rates in the area have remained relatively low but rose to 4.2% for apartment units and as high as 10% - 12% for single family homes in fall 2009.

Housing Conditions and Lead Based Paint
Within the cities of Eugene and Springfield, two-thirds of the housing stock was built before 1980 and may be in need of building rehabilitation to bring units up to modern standards. Given the age of the
housing stock, it is estimated that approximately 15,236 housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield may pose a lead-based paint hazard to residents.

Despite the age of the housing stock, the physical condition of housing in the Eugene-Springfield area is generally good, as there are relatively few housing units in the area that are considered substandard according to HUD (i.e. lacking complete plumbing facilities, heat source, or kitchen and/or in need of exterior repairs, such as roof, siding, or foundation) relative to the number of all housing units. Although there is no data available to determine how many of the substandard units are occupied by low-income households, it can be surmised that a substantial percentage of the occupants are low-income, either because, as owners, they lack resources to maintain their homes’ critical structural elements or because, as renters, they cannot afford a unit that is in standard condition.

**Goals, Objectives, Strategies, and Outcomes**

The assessment of needs and Consolidated Plan process has led to an emphasis on goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes to meet the basic needs of low- and moderate-income households, including social services, housing, and jobs over the next five years. The goals, objectives, and strategies listed on the following pages will guide the implementation of the Consolidated Plan for the years 2010 through 2015.

**Affordable Housing Objectives**

Affordable housing goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes are intended to address HUD program objectives to provide decent, safe, and affordable housing; create suitable living environments; and promote economic opportunities within the community. A total of five affordable housing goals are included in the Consolidated Plan:

1) **Increase the supply of affordable housing** The housing affordability challenges and overall vacancy show that it is necessary to continue to add units to the stock of affordable housing. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield use a combination of HOME and CDBG funds for land and development subsidies for new construction of affordable housing.

2) **Conserve and improve existing affordable owner and renter housing stock** In addition to adding units, continued efforts are necessary to preserve existing rental and ownership housing for low-income persons. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield use a combination of HOME and CDBG funds for this purpose. The City of Eugene operates a Housing Revolving Loan Pool with CDBG funds for rental rehabilitation and owner rehabilitation loans. Both Cities use funds to provide assistance for minor home repairs and accessibility improvements.

3) **Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become and remain homeowners** Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield operate downpayment assistance programs to help low-income persons become homeowners. The assistance received by each household is modest but plays a critical role in enabling them to become homeowners. In addition, the units vacated by households receiving homebuyer assistance become available to other renters. As part of efforts to affirmatively further fair housing, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield work together to enhance homeownership opportunities persons of minority race and ethnicity.
4) **Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become and remain renters** – The City of Springfield provides rental assistance to low-income persons to enable them to become or remain renters.

5) **Remove barriers to affordable and supportive housing** – Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield seek opportunities to affirmatively further fair housing and also raise awareness of the housing needs of low- and moderate-income persons, so these needs may be considered in the development of related policies and regulations.

### Community Development Objectives

Community development goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes are intended to satisfy HUD program objectives by providing human services; creating jobs; improving access to public facilities; and furthering neighborhood revitalization, planning, and community-building activities. A total of four community development goals are included in the Consolidated Plan:

1) **Support a human services delivery system that helps low- and moderate-income persons achieve dignity, well-being, and self-sufficiency** The Cities of Eugene and Springfield collaborate with Lane County to fund human service providers. This collaborative funding model uses available federal, state, and local funds to efficiently support local agencies. The Human Services Commission is the intergovernmental body that guides the use of funds and oversees the activities of agencies receiving funds. In addition, both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield provide capital grants for public facilities operated primarily by nonprofit service providers. In accordance with CDBG regulations, facilities that are designed for use in providing temporary shelter for persons having special needs are also considered to be public facilities and are included in the public facilities category.

2) **Provide economic development and diversification through the creation of jobs** The Cities of Eugene and Springfield will use CDBG funds to undertake economic development activities resulting in job creation for low- and moderate income households. The City of Eugene’s Business Development Fund will continue to provide loans to local businesses resulting in job creation or retention. This Fund operates primarily with program income from previous business loans. The City of Springfield recently initiated a similar program to provide loans to local businesses and will continue to provide such loans during the Plan period. Both Eugene and Springfield expect to continue support of microenterprise training for low- and moderate-income persons as a public service.

3) **Improve accessibility to public facilities** Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield expect to make some capital improvements to remove barriers to accessibility in public buildings and infrastructure in accordance with CDBG regulations. The City of Eugene has identified a continued need for reconstruction and installation of curb ramps in existing sidewalks, retrofits of existing traffic signals to include Accessible Pedestrian Devices, and barrier removal in city facilities. Given the overall prioritization of needs, both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield expect to make modest investments in this area.

4) **Make strategic investments to improve low-income neighborhoods and other areas exhibiting conditions of slums and blight** Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield will consider strategic investments in capital improvement projects serving eligible areas. Such projects may include park improvements, public infrastructure, and other facilities.
## 2010 Affordable Housing Strategic Plan

### Goal #1: Expand opportunities for permanent affordable housing for low-income persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1-A</td>
<td>Increase the supply of affordable housing</td>
<td><strong>1-A-1</strong> Maintain and enhance programs that provide financial and other support for the continued production of new affordable housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1-A-2</strong> Assist CHDOs to build operational capacity and provide technical and other assistance to facilitate construction of additional housing units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1-A-3</strong> Continue use of CDBG funds in Eugene: to landbank sites for future affordable housing developments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1-A-4</strong> Maintain locally-funded programs to mitigate development costs through tax exemptions and system development fee waivers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-B</td>
<td>Conserve and improve existing affordable owner and renter housing stock</td>
<td><strong>1-B-1</strong> Continue and enhance rehabilitation, weatherization, home repair, and accessibility efforts. Programs to include:  - Low- or no-interest loan (dependent upon income) program to pay costs of rehabilitation for low- and very low-income households  - Minor home repair, accessibility, and weatherization grant programs for low- and very low-income households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-C</td>
<td>Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become and remain homeowners</td>
<td><strong>1-C-1</strong> Maintain and enhance programs for first time homebuyers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1-C-2</strong> Specifically encourage greater minority homeownership through outreach and education of lender and realtor community regarding needs and potential of minority homeowners and existing programs to assist potential homeowners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-D</td>
<td>Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become and remain renters</td>
<td><strong>1-D-1</strong> Reduce rent burdens of extremely-low and low-income tenants through rental assistance programs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-E</td>
<td>Remove barriers to affordable and supportive housing</td>
<td><strong>1-E-1</strong> Continue to support programs that assure housing opportunities are provided without discrimination</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1-E-2</strong> Raise awareness of housing needs of low- and moderate-income persons through participation and collaboration on land use and zoning studies to ensure consideration of the needs of those income groups</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2010 Community Development Strategic Plan

### Goal #2: Expand access to public services, economic opportunities, and suitable living environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2-A</td>
<td>2-A-1 Collaborate to fund public services through the Human Services Commission</td>
<td>15% of entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-A-2 Provide funding for capital improvements to facilities owned by non-profits including acquisition, rehabilitation, weatherization, and accessibility improvements.</td>
<td>EUGENE: 15 facilities, SPRINGFIELD: 5 facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-B</td>
<td>2-B-1 Provide below-market financing to local businesses creating or retaining jobs available to low- and moderate-income persons</td>
<td>EUGENE: 50 loans, EUGENE: 200 jobs, SPRINGFIELD: 2 loans, SPRINGFIELD: 5 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-B-2 Provide below-market financing through Eugene’s Emerging Business Loan Pool program to local businesses creating or retaining jobs available to low- and moderate-income persons</td>
<td>EUGENE: 25% of loan volume in dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-B-3 Fund micro-enterprise development</td>
<td>EUGENE: 300 trainees, SPRINGFIELD: 50 trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-C</td>
<td>2-C-1 Remove architectural barriers from City-owned buildings and publically-maintained infrastructure</td>
<td>EUGENE: 12 facility improvements, EUGENE: 50 curb ramps, EUGENE: 25 Accessible Pedestrian Devices, SPRINGFIELD: 4 public improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-D</td>
<td>2-D-1 Fund capital improvements in eligible areas such as infrastructure, street and sidewalk improvements, and parkland acquisition and improvements</td>
<td>EUGENE: 3 projects, SPRINGFIELD: 2 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2-D-2 Provide financing for the elimination of slums and blight, including acquisition, clearance, rehabilitation, and historic preservation activities</td>
<td>1 project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Introduction and Overview

Chapter Summary: This chapter discusses the purpose of the Consolidated Plan, describes how it is organized, identifies the data sources used in preparing the plan, describes the process used to develop the plan, and summarizes the institutional structure for carrying out the plan.

Background and Purpose

The development of a Consolidated Plan is a comprehensive and collaborative process intended to establish a vision and direction for federally-funded community development efforts in the Cities of Eugene and Springfield. The Consolidated Plan establishes goals and identifies a range of community development activities related to housing, economic development and social services to be carried out over the five year period beginning on July 1, 2010. The planning process, prescribed by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) describes and prioritizes both general and specific community needs, identifies strategies to address those needs, and outlines activities that will be undertaken with funding provided by HUD.

The Consolidated Plan must be completed by communities that receive formula allocations of Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds, HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) funds, Housing Opportunities for Persons with AIDS (HOPWA) funds, and Emergency Shelter Grant (ESG) funds. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield do not currently receive HOPWA or ESG funds. The five-year plan is augmented each year with the One Year Action Plan (Action Plan) and the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).

The last five-year Consolidated Plan was created in 2005. This Plan is in effect now and will remain in effect until June 30, 2010. The Plan applies to both Eugene and Springfield. Both communities must complete a Consolidated Plan jointly because the Cities of Eugene and Springfield receive HOME funds as a Consortium. Both cities also collaborate with Lane County because they administer funding related to basic social services and homelessness through the Intergovernmental Human Services Commission.

HUD evaluates the Plan as it relates to three goals: decent housing; a suitable living environment; and expanded economic opportunities. There are four major parts of the Consolidated Plan including:

- Housing, homeless, community, and economic development needs assessment;
- Housing market analysis;
- Long-term objectives/priorities and strategies to meet priority needs in four categories: homelessness; special needs populations; housing; and community development;
- Development of measurable goals called performance measures.

While the Consolidated Plan is a requirement of HUD, the Plan primarily serves as a tool to guide the use of federal funds, in the most effective and coordinated manner possible, for local jurisdictions that receive those funds. The Plan provides an overall framework for all jurisdictions while allowing for variations in individual approaches to implementation. The Action Plan may vary from year to year as long as the activities remain within the overall scope of the Consolidated Plan.
The purpose of CDBG is to enable participating jurisdictions to carry out a wide range of community development activities related to each community’s particular needs. All activities funded with CDBG must meet one of three national objectives: 1) benefit low- or moderate-income persons; 2) prevent or eliminate slums and blight; or 3) meet an urgent need that poses an immediate threat to the community. At least 70% of CDBG funds must be used to benefit low- or moderate-income persons. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield receive separate allocations of CDBG funds. Congress determines the overall CDBG budget each year, and these funds are distributed by formula to participating jurisdictions. During the previous Consolidated Plan period, the City of Eugene received annual funding amounts between $1,366,201 and $1,579,152, and the City of Springfield received annual funding amounts between $604,981 and $700,547.

The purpose of HOME is to expand the supply of decent, safe, sanitary, and affordable housing for low-income and very low-income households. Funds may be used for the development or rehabilitation of housing, homebuyer down payment assistance, tenant-based rental assistance, and operating support for Community Housing Development Organizations. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield have joined together to form the Eugene-Springfield HOME Consortium. The City of Eugene serves as the lead entity for the Consortium. Congress determines the budget for overall HOME each year, and these funds are distributed by formula to participating jurisdictions. During the previous Consolidated Plan period, the Eugene-Springfield HOME Consortium has received annual funding amounts between $1,404,399 and $1,564,202.

**Organization of Consolidated Plan**

This Plan includes the following chapters and appendices:

**Consultation and Citizen Participation**

This chapter includes the Citizen Involvement Plan that guided the preparation of the 2010 Consolidated Plan and that will be used to guide subsequent actions related to the Plan, describes efforts to consult with applicable public and private agencies in the preparation of the Plan, and discusses the citizen involvement activities employed in developing the Plan.

**Community Profile**

This chapter includes basic geographic information about the Eugene-Springfield area and demographic information about its residents, including data about population levels and growth, income, poverty, and racial/ethnic composition.

**Housing**

This chapter includes a housing market analysis that identifies significant characteristics of the housing market in terms of supply, demand, condition, and the cost of housing. It provides information on overall housing needs, public and assisted housing needs, as well as the needs of specific populations, and it estimates the number of housing units with known or potential lead-based paint hazards.
Homelessness
This chapter summarizes the nature and extent of homelessness in the cities of Eugene and Springfield, provides an inventory of facilities and services that serve the homeless, identifies local homelessness prevention priorities, and identifies strategies to address the needs of the homeless and potentially homeless in the community.

Special Needs
To the extent that the information was available, this chapter discusses the number of persons, in various vulnerable populations, who are not homeless but may require housing or supportive services and describes facilities and services that serve those populations.

Anti-Poverty
This chapter describes local goals, programs, and policies for reducing the number of poverty level families and identifies the extent to which the anti-poverty strategies will help reduce the number of poverty level families.

Community Development
This chapter summarizes the needs associated with public services, economic development, accessibility improvements in public facilities, and improvements to low-income neighborhoods, central business districts, and other areas exhibiting conditions of slums and blight.

Strategic Plan
This chapter provides a context for and describes the priority housing and community development needs, outlines the objectives of the Plan and the strategies that will be implemented to achieve these objectives, as well as proposed outcomes. It also includes an evaluation of past performance and describes how Plan activities will be monitored.

HUD Tables
This section contains the primary tables required by HUD for the completion of the Plan.

Appendix
The Appendix contains miscellaneous items in compliance with HUD requirements for the Plan, including a summary of comments received at public hearings, HUD Certifications, supplemental information on regulatory barriers, a copy of the Fair Housing Plan, and a glossary.

Consolidated Plan Tables
This section contains all data tables used in the development of the plan.
Data Sources

In preparing the Plan, the most reliable and up-to-date information and data sources for the Cities of Eugene and Springfield were used. However, in several instances data was not available at the city level; in those cases, data was either drawn from Lane County as a whole or an older data source was used. In compiling data for the Plan, care was taken to use data that can be compared over time. Care was also taken to identify data that was developed using methodologies and collection techniques that changed between data collection periods.

Primary data sources used in the Plan are from HUD and the U.S. Census Bureau. The HUD data includes special tabulation data created by the U.S. Census, including Comprehensive Housing Affordability Strategy data (CHAS), Low and Moderate Income Summary Data and data through the State of the Cities Data System (SOCDS). These primary data sources were supplemented by other city, county, and state resources. Specific data sources are referenced within the text and charts of the plan and are also listed with the tables in Appendix C. Due to the timing of the release of 2009 CHAS data and deadlines for submittal of this plan, only one 2009 CHAS data table was used in the plan; that table is Table 33 Lead Based Paint Hazard.

Census data includes information from the Decennial Censuses, such as 1990 and 2000, and the newer American Community Surveys, which are referred to as ACS throughout the Plan. ACS data was collected for 2005-2007 and 2006-2008. The ACS data is collected over three years and represents a three-year estimate. It is acknowledged that this data may not be fully comprehensive of the population, but it can provide a reliable overall ‘snapshot’ of the population. For ease of reading, data from the 2005-2007 ACS is referred to as 2007 data in the Plan and data from the 2006-2008 ACS is referred to as 2008 data. Since a majority of the data compilation and analysis for the Plan was completed prior to the release of the 2008 data, the 2008 data was only used when 2007 data did not include complete information for both cities, due to the sample size not being large enough or other factors in Census data collection.

There are multiple geographic areas referenced in this document due to data being used from different sources. The main geographic areas discussed are: Cities of Eugene and Springfield, which represents a summation of data from both cities; Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA), which includes data for all of Lane County; Lane County; the City of Eugene; and the City of Springfield.

Managing the Process

The Community Development Division in the City of Eugene’s Planning and Development Department is the lead agency responsible for preparing the Eugene-Springfield Consolidated Plan. The City of Eugene initiated the development of the 2010 Consolidated Plan in January 2009.

A staff team, including representatives from the lead agency, as well as representatives from the Community Revitalization and Planning Division in the City of Springfield’s Development Services Department, coordinated the development of the Consolidated Plan. Staff from the Lane County Human Services Department and Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County provided input on the process to develop the Consolidated Plan and assisted in the writing of the Plan. Development of the
Plan also included consultation with public and non-profit agencies that provide housing and social services, as well as elected and appointed officials in the City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and Lane County, as described in the Consultation and Citizen Participation chapter.

The following timeline depicts the process used to develop the Plan:

![Timeline Diagram]

**Institutional Structure**

Staff from the Cities of Eugene and Springfield takes the lead in implementing and administering HOME and CDBG programs. As such, they assure the eligibility of proposed projects, compliance with applicable federal regulations, assist in periodic accountability reviews, and provide guidance to public agencies and non-profit organizations in implementing the City’s Consolidated Plan.

The Cities support several advisory committees that provide guidance and evaluation for the CDBG and HOME programs. In addition, the Lane County Human Services Commission and Lane County Housing and Community Services Agency provide advice and oversight necessary for implementing the Plan. The Eugene-Springfield area also has a strong network of community-based non-profit organizations that provide a wide range of high-quality housing and human services for area residents in need, as well as engage in neighborhood stabilization and economic development activities. An assessment of the strengths and gaps in the housing, community development, and human service delivery system can be found in the Appendix.

**Intergovernmental Housing Policy Board**

Eugene and Springfield implement housing programs funded through HOME with the guidance of the intergovernmental Housing Policy Board (HPB). The HPB is responsible for facilitating the development of permanent affordable housing. In that capacity, the HPB makes recommendations regarding the overall allocation of HOME funds among program areas to the Eugene City Council and Springfield City Council. In addition, the HPB makes recommendations regarding the award of land and HOME funds for specific projects in Eugene. The HPB also makes recommendations for the use of other local funds, such as system development charge waivers, to support affordable housing projects. The HPB also serves as a forum for other housing-related issues, including local policies affecting the availability and affordability of housing.
The HPB, which meets monthly, is comprised of elected officials and community members, including a Eugene City Councilor, a Springfield City Councilor, a Lane County Commissioner, and at-large members, of whom some are low-income housing advocates and low-income residents. At-large members are appointed by the elected officials and may serve up to three, two-year terms.

**Eugene Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee**

This committee advises Eugene staff on the Consolidated Plan and annual allocation of CDBG funds for programs and specific projects. The Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee (CDBG-AC) meets approximately six times annually to review current programs and to make funding recommendations. It also conducts a public hearing and proposes amendments to the Consolidated Plan, as necessary. The CDBG-AC is comprised of five special interest pool members, two voter pool members, one neighborhood pool member, and one member is selected by and represents the Human Rights Commission. Members are appointed by the Planning and Development Director and may serve up to three, two-year terms.

**Springfield Community Development Advisory Committee**

This committee advises the Springfield City Council on the Consolidated Plan and annual allocation of CDBG and HOME funds. Due to the relatively small amount of CDBG and HOME funds allocated, Springfield allocates all funds through one process. The Community Development Advisory Committee (CDAC) holds several public meetings annually to review current programs and funding requests and to make funding recommendations for housing and community development activities. The CDAC is comprised of a City Councilor, a Planning Commissioner, and six at-large residents. Members are appointed by the City Council and may serve up to two, four-year terms.

**Lane County Human Services Commission**

The Lane County Human Services Commission (HSC) is an intergovernmental organization that operates on behalf of Lane County and the Cities of Eugene and Springfield. The HSC is the regional policy board for human services activities in Lane County. Lane County is the lead agency for the implementation of a Continuum of Care Plan that identifies human services, supportive housing, and community development needs, and establishes goals, priorities, policies, and strategies for addressing those needs. Elected officials and appointed representatives from the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County comprise the HSC.

**Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County**

The Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County (HACSA) is charged with Lane County’s housing and related community services policies and programs. In this capacity, it serves as the housing authority for the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County. HACSA owns, manages, and maintains public housing units for low-income households. HACSA also administers the HUD Section 8 housing programs and manages the Low-Income Weatherization Program. The five Lane County Commissioners and two resident commissioners have jurisdiction over HACSA and serve as the Housing Authority Board.
Consultation and Citizen Participation

Chapter Summary: This chapter includes the Citizen Involvement Plan that guided the preparation of the 2010 Consolidated Plan and that will be used to guide subsequent actions related to the Plan; describes efforts to consult with applicable public and private agencies in the preparation of the Plan; and discusses the citizen involvement activities employed in developing the Plan.

Citizen Participation Plan

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield encourage active participation in preparation of the Consolidated Plan by all residents who are affected by Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership (HOME) funds. This section outlines local responsibilities to provide opportunities for resident involvement. Policies and procedures outlined below were followed in the preparation of this Plan and will continue to be used for any future amendments to this document.

The Citizen Participation Plan is a general guidance document. A more detailed explanation of the specific resident involvement activities used in the development and review of the 2010 – 2015 Consolidated Plan, as well as those who were consulted and participated in the process to develop and review the Plan, follows the Citizen Participation Plan.

Encouraging Citizen Participation

Resident involvement is a critical component of the 2010 Consolidated Plan, the One Year Action Plan (Action Plan) and Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). The planning processes for these activities are designed to stimulate interaction between community residents, agency staff, advisory committee members, and elected officials regarding housing, homelessness, and community development issues. The process for development of the Consolidated Plan included both small- and large-scale public involvement activities to inform the identification of needs and objectives for use of CDBG and HOME funds. The process for development of annual Action Plans and CAPERs during the Consolidated Plan period will also include multiple opportunities for discussion in public forums and resident comments.

The Cities have and will encourage participation by low- and moderate-income persons throughout the community. Emphasis will be placed on reaching out to minority populations, non-English speaking persons, and persons with disabilities in the preparation of the Plan. The Cities will also notify and seek the participation of local and regional institutions and other organizations, including businesses, developers, community and faith-based organizations in the development and implementation of the Plan.

The Cities have and will continue to encourage tenants of assisted housing developments and of the metropolitan area housing authority, the Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County (HACSA), to participate in the development and implementation of the Plan. The Cities will provide timely information on all aspects of the planning process to HACSA so that agency staff can make the information available at their facilities.
Access to Information and Records
The Cities make vital information that pertains to this Plan available to citizens, public agencies and other interested parties on an annual basis. The information to be made available includes: the amount of assistance the Cities expect to receive, including specific grant funds; available unspent prior year’s funds and related program income; and the range of activities to be undertaken, including the estimated amount of CDBG and other funds that will be expended on low- and moderate-income persons.

The Consolidated Plan, Action Plan, CAPER, and amendments to these documents are available for review during business hours, on an on-going basis, at the City of Eugene Planning and Development Department, 99 West 10th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon and at the City of Springfield Development Services Department located in Springfield City Hall, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon. Citizens and citizen groups have access to City records for at least five years through the standard public disclosure process. All documents are also available on the web at:

- City of Eugene website - http://www.eugene-or.gov/development.

Anti-Displacement and Relocation Plan
The City of Eugene and the Eugene-Springfield HOME Consortium have a Residential Displacement and Relocation Assistance Policy that complies with federal regulations. The policy applies to displacement of residents caused by activities directly funded by the CDBG and HOME programs and outlines steps to be taken by both jurisdictions to minimize displacement. A description of the policy can be found in the Appendix of the Consolidated Plan.

Notice of Draft Plan Availability
A notice that the draft Consolidated Plan is available for review was advertised two times in the Register Guard, a regional newspaper with a circulation of more than 83,000; and the Eugene Weekly, a regional weekly news and entertainment publication with a circulation of 40,000. Notice and the complete text of the draft Consolidated Plan was also posted on the Cities’ websites along with other information detailing the comment time period and comment submittal requirements. The draft Consolidated Plan was also be placed in the following locations for 30 days prior to the final public hearing:

- Eugene Public Library
- Springfield Public Library
- Eugene Planning and Development Department
- Springfield Development Services Department
- Lane County Senior and Disabled Services
- Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County

Drafts of Action Plans and CAPERs will also be made available for review during the Consolidated Plan period. A notice of the draft Action Plan and CAPER will be advertised in the Register Guard. The notification will include a summary of the Action Plan or CAPER. Notice and the complete text of each
Draft Action Plan and CAPER will be posted on the Cities’ websites along with other information detailing the comment time period and comment submittal requirements. The draft Action Plan and CAPER will also be made available in hard copy for review at City of Eugene Planning and Development Department and Springfield Development Services Department. Draft Action Plans will be made available for review for a 30-day comment period prior to submission of the final document to HUD. Draft CAPERs will be made available for a 15-day public comment period prior to submission of the final document to HUD.

Citizen Response Time Frame
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield provide interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the Plan, or on any amendments to the Plan, as defined by this Citizen Participation Plan. The Cities will consider any comments or views of interested parties received in writing or orally, at any of the public hearings, or during the specified public comment review period, and will address those comments in the preparation of the final documents. The Cities will include any written or oral comments in the final Consolidated Plan and Action Plan submitted to HUD.

Notice of Meetings
Meetings are announced through mailings to interested parties, through postings on City websites, and in the Register Guard and Eugene Weekly. All public hearings are advertised in the non-legal section of the Register Guard 14 days prior to the hearing.

Public Hearings
A minimum of two public hearings are held over the course of the process to develop the Consolidated Plan to obtain citizen views and to respond to proposals and questions. Each hearing is held at a different stage of the Plan’s development. The hearings address housing and community development needs, development of proposed activities, and review of program performance. At least one of these meetings is held prior to the proposed Consolidated Plan publication.

Each spring, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield allocate HOME and CDBG funds for the next fiscal year through development and submission of the Eugene-Springfield Action Plan. The public hearing for use of Eugene HOME funds is held by the Intergovernmental Housing Policy Board. The public hearing for use of Eugene CDBG funds is held by the Eugene CDBG Advisory Committee. The combined public hearing for use of Springfield CDBG and HOME funds is held by the Springfield Community Development Advisory Committee.

Access to Meetings
Public meetings are held at times convenient to potential and actual beneficiaries in locations that meet Americans with Disabilities Act accessibility standards. With 48 hours’ notice prior to any public meeting, the Cities can provide the following services: an interpreter and audio equipment for the hearing impaired; a reader to review printed materials with the sight impaired; and a foreign language interpreter for non-English speaking residents. Arrangements for these services can be made by contacting the City of Eugene or the City of Springfield City Manager’s Office.
Substantial Plan Amendments

Citizens will be notified and will have the opportunity to review all substantial amendments to the Consolidated Plan or the Action Plan. A notice of a substantial amendment to the Plan will be published in the Register Guard 14 days before the amendment is released to the public for a 30-day review and comment period. The draft amendment will be released simultaneously by the Cities and will be available for viewing at the City of Eugene Planning and Development Department, 99 W 10th Avenue, Eugene, Oregon and the City of Springfield Development Services Department, Springfield City Hall, 225 Fifth Street, Springfield, Oregon. The appropriate citizen advisory committee, depending on the program area, will conduct a public hearing on the proposed action and will make a recommendation to the applicable City Council. The City Council will take final action on the proposed amendment.

Substantial changes to the Consolidated Plan are defined as:

- Changes in the Citizen Participation Plan;
- Changes in allocation priorities or in the method of distribution of the funds;
- Changes in the use of CDBG or HOME funds from one eligible activity to another;
- Changes in the purpose, location, scope, or beneficiaries of a particular project or increase in budget by more than 30%; or
- Initiation of an activity, using funds from any program covered by the Consolidated Plan (including program income), not previously described in the Action Plan.

Performance Report

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield will provide interested parties with a reasonable opportunity to comment on the annual CAPER which describes performance related to Consolidated Plan activities. The CAPER will be available for review and comment for 15 days prior to submission to HUD. Notice of performance report availability will be provided in the non-legal section of the Register Guard. All written and oral comments received during the 15-day comment period will be considered in preparing the final performance report, which will include a summary of comments.

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance is provided by City staff for each particular program area. In addition, Lane County Health and Human Services staff work with local service providers who receive funding through the Human Services Commission.

In Springfield, the Development Services Department provides assistance relating to housing and public facilities, including housing rehabilitation and down payment assistance. Department staff also provides assistance to developers of affordable housing developments on an on-going basis. The City’s Public Works Department staff work with neighbors to identify capital improvement needs.

In Eugene, the Planning and Development Department provides assistance relating to the CDBG business development and housing rehabilitation loan programs, as well as affordable housing projects on an on-going basis. The City’s Neighborhood Program staff and Public Works and Parks Division planners work with neighbors to identify capital improvement needs, and the Facilities Division and
Human Rights staff work with the Human Rights Commission Accessibility Committee on barrier removal projects.

Response to Written Complaints/Grievances
The Cities will provide timely and substantive written responses to written complaints from residents regarding the CDBG and HOME programs. Written responses to written complaints will be provided within 15 working days, where practical.

Consultation of Public and Private Agencies
The Eugene-Springfield staff team that coordinated the development of the 2010 Consolidated Plan used the Citizen Participation Plan above as a guide for engaging community members and other stakeholders in the process to develop the Consolidated Plan.

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield consulted with other public and private agencies that provide assisted housing, fair housing, health services, and social services (including those focusing on services to children, elderly persons, persons with disabilities, persons with HIV/AIDS and their families, and homeless persons) to inform the development of the Plan. These consultations were on-going and occurred in several stages of the Plan’s development.

Staff to the Lane County Human Services Commission, the agency that coordinates human services, anti-poverty programs, and homeless services in Lane County in collaboration with non-profit organizations and public human service and housing agencies, provided input on the citizen involvement process, assisted in writing the Anti-Poverty and Homelessness chapters of the Plan, and reviewed the draft Plan.

Staff from the Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County, Lane County’s housing authority, likewise provided input into the citizen participation process, assisted in writing the Public Housing section of the Plan, and reviewed the Draft Plan.

In addition, staff consulted with the Eugene and Springfield City Councils, as well as several advisory groups, including the City of Eugene Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee, the City of Springfield Community Development Advisory Committee, the City of Eugene Human Rights Commission and Human Rights Commission Accessibility Committee, and the intergovernmental Housing Policy Board. Representatives from local school districts, parks providers, utilities, police departments, legal aid services, and libraries were also consulted in the development of the Plan.

Consolidated Plan staff also consulted with community health staff at the Lane County Health Department and the environmental toxicology staff at the Oregon Department of Human Services on the subject of lead-based paint hazards and incidences of lead poisoning. Findings of this consultation are summarized in the Lead-Based Paint section in the Housing chapter.
Citizen Involvement Activities

In accordance with the Citizen Participation Plan, a number of citizen involvement opportunities were developed to engage persons representing a wide variety of interests in the development of the Consolidated Plan. These activities included surveys, interest group meetings, public meetings, and public hearings.

Surveys

The needs analysis component of the Consolidated Plan drew upon information collected through the following surveys.

Service Provider Survey

In April 2009, an electronic survey was sent to 44 local affordable housing and social service agencies in Lane County to help identify the housing and related supportive service needs of low- and moderate-income residents. During the eight weeks the survey was left open, a total of 27 different agencies responded, resulting in a response rate of 61%. A majority of respondents represent social service agencies, and the primary target populations served by all respondents are families, persons with disabilities, homeless persons, and single persons.

Community Survey

In May 2009, an electronic survey was posted on the City of Eugene Public Library website, the City of Springfield Public Library website, the City of Eugene Community Development website, and the City of Springfield Housing Programs and Community Development website to engage community residents in identifying housing and community development needs related to low- and moderate-income residents. The survey was also offered to library patrons prior to logging in to all computers at both libraries. The electronic survey was left open for a period of five weeks, and a total of 210 responses were received during that time.

The electronic version of the survey was made available to the attendees of Public Meeting #1, as well as a ‘dot-survey’ version that enabled participants to indicate their responses to the survey questions posted on the wall using colorful, stick-on labels (dots). Twenty-one (21) people attended the public meeting and participated in the dot-survey.

A ‘bean-survey’ version was offered to the patrons of the Springfield Farmers’ Market on June 19, 2009 and Lane County Farmers’ Market on July 14, 2009, wherein participants indicated their responses to the survey questions by depositing beans into mason jars. A total of 228 people participated in the surveys at the farmers’ markets.

United Way Survey

In 2009, United Way of Lane County conducted its seventh community assessment to identify household experiences related to financial capacity to meet basic needs, awareness of and access to community-based human services, and whether specific conditions exist within households that might require the need for specialized services (medical, legal, mental health, etc.). The community assessment was conducted using a random sample of Lane County Residents; 1,200 telephone surveys were completed by an independent survey research firm.
The United Way Community Needs Assessment is intended to help develop a deeper understanding of the issues affecting individuals and households throughout Lane County in order to inform decision-making, such as the Consolidated Plan’s prioritization of activities to address housing and community needs. Data from the United Way survey was included in the needs analysis component of the Consolidated Plan. In addition, staff from the Cities of Eugene and Springfield attended the United Way Community Leaders presentation of the Community Assessment.

**Interest Group Meetings**

The needs analysis component of the Consolidated Plan also drew upon information gleaned through the following interest group meetings.

**Advisory Groups**

Work sessions were held in March and April 2009 to brief Eugene’s Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee, Springfield’s Community Development Advisory Committee, and the intergovernmental Housing Policy Board on the Consolidated Plan process. Work sessions were also held in October 2009 with each committee to review the initial data analysis regarding emerging trends, review the activities conducted in the past to address housing and community development needs, and discuss the activities that should be prioritized to meet the needs during 2010-2015.

**Human Rights Commission**

On May 11, 2009, the Human Rights Commission and its Accessibility Committee were invited to participate in a facilitated discussion regarding the specific accessibility needs of disabled individuals in as they relate to housing, access to social services, and economic development/jobs.

**Indirect Service Providers**

Representatives of 13 departments and agencies that provide services that are considered ‘indirect’ to housing were invited to participate in a facilitated discussion on June 30, 2009 regarding the needs of the low- and moderate-income individuals and households with whom they work, what services should be prioritized to meet those needs, and the impact of those needs on the services their organizations provide. The organizations invited included: Eugene 4J School District; Bethel School District; Springfield School District; Eugene Police Department; Springfield Police Department; Eugene Public Library; Springfield Public Library; Eugene Water and Electric Board; Springfield Utility Board; Eugene Parks and Open Space Division; Willamalane Park and Recreation District; Lane County Legal Aid; and Lane County Human Services Commission. Eight (8) agencies sent representatives to attend the meeting.

**Public Meetings**

Two public meetings were held as part of the Consolidated Plan process to obtain input in preparation of the Draft Plan and to solicit feedback once the Draft Plan was published.

**Public Meeting #1**

On June 3, 2009, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield jointly held a public meeting from 4:30pm to 7pm at the Eugene Public Library to introduce the public to the project, to provide current information on demographics, housing market trends, and economic indicators that might influence the public’s perception about how HUD funds might best be utilized, and to provide a forum for discussion and
comments regarding housing and community development needs and the Consolidated Plan process. The meeting was advertised in the Register Guard and the Eugene Weekly, and invitations were mailed to a range of stakeholders on the project’s ‘interested parties list’, including community and leaders, elected officials, agency directors, advisory committee members, residents, and policy makers. Twenty-one (21) people attended the meeting.

Public Meeting #2
A second joint public meeting was held on February 14, 2010 from 4 pm to 6 pm in Springfield City Hall to share information from the draft Consolidated Plan with the public and seek their feedback on the activities proposed as priorities to address the community’s needs. The meeting was advertised in the Register Guard and the Eugene Weekly, and invitations were sent to the stakeholders on the project’s interested parties list, as described above. Approximately 30 people attended the meeting.

Public Hearings
As stipulated in the Citizen Participation Plan, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield each held the required public hearings prior to and following the development of the Consolidated Plan. The first public hearing occurred early in the process to gather information on needs. The second set of hearings occurred following the release of the Draft Consolidated Plan.

Public Hearings on Needs
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield each held a public hearing at the beginning of the Consolidated Plan process to brief the applicable decision-makers on the project and citizen involvement activities, to review the data trends emerging from such activities, and to obtain additional input from the public regarding the community’s housing and community development needs. The City of Eugene held its first public hearing at the July 21, 2009 Community Development Block Grant Advisory Committee Meeting. The City of Springfield held its first public hearing at the September 21, 2009 City Council meeting.

Public Hearings on Draft Consolidated Plan
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield will each hold a public hearing at their respective City Council meetings in April 2010, following a 30-day public comment period on the draft Consolidated Plan. The purpose of the final public hearing is to provide an opportunity for the public to comment on the plan prior to final action on the adoption of the plan being taken by each Council. A summary of the written comments and testimony from these public hearings is included as Appendix N.
Community Profile

Chapter Summary: This chapter includes basic geographic information about the Eugene-Springfield area and demographic information about its residents, including data about population levels and growth, income, poverty, and racial/ethnic composition.

The cities of Eugene and Springfield are located in Lane County, which is in the Willamette Valley of western Oregon. Eugene lies to the west and Springfield to the east of Interstate 5, as shown in Figure 1. The Cities currently share a common urban growth boundary (UGB) but will be adopting separate UGBs during the Plan period in accordance with Oregon House Bill 3337. As of September 1, 2009, the UGB of the Cities of Eugene and Springfield contained approximately 76 square miles.

Figure 1 Eugene-Springfield Metropolitan Area 2009
Population Growth

The cities of Eugene and Springfield make up the second largest metropolitan area in the state, serving as the center of the region’s commerce, industry, higher education, and government. Eugene is the largest city in Lane County and the second largest city in Oregon with a 2009 population of 157,100. Springfield is the second largest city in the Lane County and ranks ninth in the state with a 2009 population of 58,085. The total population of the cities of Eugene and Springfield has doubled in size since 1970, growing from 105,900 to 215,185 in 2009. Figure 2 depicts population trends by decade.

Figure 2 Population Trends, 1970 to 2009 – Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County

Between 1970 and 2007, the average annual growth rates of Eugene (1.8%) and Springfield (2.1%) were higher than that of Lane County (1.7%), were similar to the State of Oregon (2.1%), but outpaced the growth rate of the United States as a whole (1.3%). (See Table 2) Within the past decade, the growth rate has slowed somewhat. Between 2000 and 2008, the average annual growth rate for Eugene declined to 1.4%, for Springfield to 1.2%, and for the State of Oregon to 1.35%, although each of these continued to exceed the average annual US growth rate (0.97%), as depicted in Figure 3. Lane County Coordinated Population Projections, adopted June 17, 2009, indicate an annual population growth rate of 0.9% between 2000 and 2035 for the area within Eugene and Springfield’s UGBs,
resulting in a total projected population of 303,887 by 2035. Lane County’s Population is expected to grow to 435,615 by 2035.

**Figure 3 Average Annual Growth Rates, 2000 to 2008**

Data sources: US Census Bureau; Portland State University 2008 Certified Population Estimates; Data compiled by Lane Council of Governments

**Age Distribution**

The majority of the population in the cities of Eugene and Springfield consists of individuals 25 to 44 years of age, comprising 28.8% of the total population, and individuals 45 to 64, comprising 23.8% of the population. Together, these two age groups make up more than half (52.6%) of the total population.

Generally, Census data indicates an overall aging trend since 2000 affecting, specifically, that segment of the population aged 45 years and older, as depicted in Figure 4. In 2000, persons 45 and older made up 32.8% of the total population; in 2007, this group made up 36.4% of the population. Census data also indicates that the largest percentage change in any age group is that of the 85 and older group, with a 57.2% increase from 2000 to 2007, although, numerically, the 85 and older group is fairly small, representing only 2.7% of the total population.
Persons with Disabilities

A significant percentage of the population in the cities of Eugene and Springfield has disabilities. 2007 Census data suggests that a total of 31,700 people aged 5 and over live with disabilities. That number corresponds to 16.7% of the population over the age of 5, which is similar to the percentage of the population statewide with disabilities (16.5%). Of those with disabilities in the cities of Eugene and Springfield, 31% are sensory, 56% physical, 44% mental, 17% self-care, 29% go-outside-home, and 34% employment, as defined in Appendix D (individuals may identify more than one disability) (See Tables 4a and 4b).

Racial and Ethnic Composition

Overall, racial and ethnic diversity in the region has increased since 2000. The minority and Hispanic/Latino population in the cities of Eugene and Springfield experienced growth as depicted in Figure 5, but remains a relatively small percentage of the total population. In 2007, Black/African Americans comprised only 1.2% of total population, American Indian/Alaskan Native 1.8%, Native
Hawaiian/Pacific Islander 0.1%, and Asians just 4.1% of the total population. Collectively, the Hispanic/Latino and minority populations totaled 34,067 people.

**Figure 5 Racial and Ethnic Composition, 2000 to 2007 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield**

In 2007, the minority and Hispanic/Latino populations made up 16.5% of the total population in the cities of Eugene and Springfield, representing an increase of 28% since 2000. (See Table 5) Of the 16.5%, 7.1% were Hispanic/Latino. While these populations have increased, the White non-Hispanic/Latino population decreased 2.6% (from 86.1% to 83.5% of the total population) during the same period. The Hispanic/Latino population has grown over 40% since 2000 in the cities of Eugene and Springfield, whereas the non-Hispanic/Latino minority population has grown nearly 20%. By comparison, the total population of the cities of Eugene and Springfield grew 8% from 2000 to 2007.

While the cities of Eugene and Springfield have experienced an increase in Black/African American (+34%), American Indian/Alaskan Native (+101%), and Asian (+70%) populations between 2000 and 2007, both have also seen a decrease in Native Hawaiian/Pacific Islander populations (-45%), and persons of two or more races (-19%).

Although local school district boundaries do not align exactly with jurisdictional boundaries, data from the school districts can be helpful in describing population demographics. For instance, data for the 2009-2010 school year indicates that the Hispanic/Latino and minority populations in the cities of
Eugene and Springfield may be higher than the Census data suggests. The cities of Eugene and Springfield are served by the Springfield School District, the Eugene 4J School District (4J), and the Bethel School District, serving northwest Eugene. Students identifying themselves as Hispanic/Latino and/or minority comprise 23.26% of total enrolled students in the three districts combined (21.31% in Bethel, 22.33% in 4J, and 26.13% in Springfield). Of this, approximately 14% overall are Hispanic/Latino (9.5% in 4J, 13.29% in Bethel, and 19.86% in Springfield).

Areas of Racial and Ethnic Concentration

An ‘area of racial concentration’ is defined as an area where the percentage of persons of racial minority and/or Hispanic/Latino ethnicity is at least ten percentage points higher than the percentage of persons in the category as a whole. As previously stated, the cities of Eugene and Springfield had a combined Hispanic/Latino and minority population of 16.5% in 2007. However, at the time of writing this Plan, Census Bureau data for 2007 was not available for mapping purposes, so the Hispanic/Latino and minority percentage of 13.9% from 2000 was used. This percentage defined the threshold at which a disproportionate concentration existed and was calculated at 23.9%. There were numerous Census 2000 blocks and block groups in the cities of Eugene and Springfield where the percentage of Hispanics/Latinos and minorities was greater than 23.9%, as depicted in Map 1. In 2000, there were 122 Census blocks where over 23.9% of the population identified with a racial minority and/or Hispanic/Latino ethnicity, and of those, eight Census blocks had populations with over 50% Hispanics/Latinos and minorities. There were seven Census block groups identified as having racial minority and Hispanic population concentrations.

As mentioned above, local school district data suggests that the combined Hispanic and/or race minority population may be higher than Census data indicates. Taking the Hispanic/Latino and/or minority population percentages in Bethel, 4J, and Springfield School Districts of 21.31%, 22.33%, and 26.13%, respectively, the threshold at which a disproportionate concentration would exist in each of these districts would be 31.3%, 32.33%, and 36.13%, respectively. Within the Bethel School District, Danebo and Fairfield Elementary Schools would be considered to have a disproportionate concentration of Hispanic and/or minority students. In the 4J School District, Cesar Chavez, River Road, and Yujin Gakuen Elementary Schools, Arts and Technology Middle School, and North Eugene High School fall within this category. In the Springfield School District, a disproportionate concentration of Hispanic and/or minority students exits in the Guy Lee, Maple, and Moffit Elementary Schools and Hamlin Middle School.
Map 1: Areas of Racial and Ethnic Concentration

Data query: Census 2000 blocks and Block Groups queried to isolate areas with over 50 people.
Data for Census 2000 blocks is for the incorporated Cities of Eugene and Springfield.
Block Group Data is extracted from the Census Bureau web site based on geography for Lane County.

Data classification:
Data classification based on calculating 10 percentage points higher than the base percentage for the Cities of Eugene and Springfield population with Racial Minority and Hispanic Ethnicity combined which is 13.9%. With the additional 10% to identify areas of concentration, the classification break used is 23.9%.
This data is based on the combination of the cities of Eugene and Springfield.
1/13/09

Census 2000 Blocks: Percent of the Population with Hispanic Ethnicity and/or Racial Minority
- 23.91% - 49.99%
- 50% - 75.32%

Census 2000 Block Groups: Percent of the Population with Hispanic Ethnicity and/or Racial Minority
- 25.51% - 30.89%
Household Composition

Family households make up the largest percentage of all households (55%) in both jurisdictions. In Eugene, 52% of all households are family households; the percentage is higher in Springfield where 62% of all households are family households (See Table 6).

Single person households now make up 33% of all households in both jurisdictions. Since 2000, the number of single person households in the cities of Eugene and Springfield have increased at a higher rate than all other household types; this household type grew by 17% while non-family households as a whole increased by 13.7% between 2000 and 2007. The rate of growth for single person households in Springfield was greater (27.7%) than in Eugene (14.4%).

While there was modest growth in elderly households during the period for the cities of Eugene and Springfield (3.4%), Springfield’s rate of growth in elderly households was more significant (17.4%) than Eugene’s (-0.7%).

Average household size has been in decline both nationally and locally due to lower birth rates, increased divorce rates, higher survival rates, and delayed marriages. The previously described trends regarding age distribution and household types has a direct effect on average household size. Significant increases in populations 50 and over translates to smaller households. Census data indicates average household size for Eugene is 2.24 while the average household size for Springfield is 2.46. Each city’s household size has continued to decrease since 1960. This trend may continue in the cities of Eugene and Springfield due to the growing population of those aged 45 and over and the proportionally smaller population of those under the age of 24.

Within Eugene, the average household size of owner-occupied units is 2.46 persons while the average size of renter households is 2.01 persons. Within Springfield, the average household size of owner-occupied units is larger than Eugene with an average of 2.58 persons per household, while the average size of renter households is 2.3 persons per household.

Projections show that a larger share of future population will be comprised of smaller, older, and less affluent households. This will alter the housing market demand in many ways over the next 20 years. Married couples with children will not dominate the market as in the past. Singles, childless couples, divorcees, those with disabilities, and single parents will be a much larger proportion of the market than in the past. To meet the needs of these households, more affordable choices in housing types will be needed than currently exist.

Education

In the Eugene-Springfield area, the number of people with an advanced education is increasing. There has been a significant increase in the number of people over age 25 with more than a ninth grade education. In both cities, the percentage of the population that has graduated from high school is over 80%. In Springfield, 15.8% of the population has an advanced degree (bachelor’s degree or higher); in Eugene, 41% have an advanced degree. Overall, the metro area educational levels are increasing, as more people are staying in school or finishing school.
Eugene is home to the University of Oregon, Lane Community College and Northwest Christian University. More than 27,500 people in the community (13% of the total population) were enrolled in college or graduate school in 2007.

**Economy and Wages**

The latest economic downturn has seen continuing declines in manufacturing, a trend spanning more than 30 years. According to Lane Workforce Partnership’s State of the Workforce Report 2007-2008, in 1980, 20% of workers in Lane County were employed in manufacturing, an employment sector that pays above-average wages. Wood products and transportation equipment manufacturing have consistently been the largest manufacturing subsectors in Lane County. However, during the 1979 to 1982 period, lumber and wood products dropped 3,800 jobs. The decline in this primary industry rippled through the local economy and led to large reductions in other sectors. By 1990, manufacturing employment had dropped to 15%. In the early 1990s, a second period of rising unemployment occurred in the wood products industry. During the 1989 to 1993 period, wood products lost 3,500 jobs. By 2007, manufacturing employment had dropped again to 13% of all jobs.

In the current era, Lane County's economy is experiencing a severe downturn as part of a national recession. As a result, construction activity has severely stalled and employment in the wood products industry is down 12% over the past year. Overall, durable goods manufacturing employment in Lane County has declined 24% during the past year. The 2008 closure of Hynix Semiconductor Manufacturing, one of Lane County’s largest private employers, resulted in the loss of 1,400 jobs, ranking among Oregon’s biggest layoffs this decade. The closure has had a ripple effect in the local economy, as many suppliers reduced labor in response to the closure. The other major blow to the local labor market has been the decline in the Recreational Vehicle (RV) manufacturing sector, which peaked at 5,000 jobs in the recent past. The current national recession has dramatically slowed RV production, resulting in a 46% decline in RV manufacturing employment. Additionally, many local suppliers to the RV industry have been hit hard as the industry has faltered.

As manufacturing jobs have eroded and local population growth has continued, the retail/service sector of the local economy has grown rapidly. In the 1990’s, 77% of all new jobs were in the service/retail industries. The challenge inherent in this economic outlook is focused on wage income. As the local economy moves more toward growth in lower wage retail/service jobs, individuals and households have greater financial difficulties and the overall economic vitality of the community is diminished. According to Lane Workforce Partnership, one quarter of the jobs in Lane County in 2007 were in occupations that averaged less than $25,000 per year, while 61% were in jobs that paid less than $34,328 - the 2007 average wage for Lane County. In 2007, the average wage for Lane County was only 88% of the Oregon statewide average wage, and only 79% of the US average annual wage. Most of the predominant occupations in Lane County paid less than the average wage in that year. Of the top ten fastest growing jobs in Lane County, nine pay significantly below the Lane County average wage.
Unemployment

Since 1990, Lane County unemployment rates have typically hovered in the 5% to 8% range, generally responding to economic trends at the national level. This trend has continued in recent years – until the current recession as depicted in Figure 6. March 2009 presented a 13.5% rate of unemployment in Lane County. According to Lane County Labor Trends published by the Oregon Employment Department, this unadjusted rate is the highest since February 1983 and the highest March rate since 1958, when the Oregon Employment Department first started publishing county unemployment rates. The number of unemployed Oregonians more than doubled over a 12-month period from March 2008 to March 2009 (115,629 to 256,404). More recent unemployment data suggests the trend has reversed; the February 2010 unemployment rate declined to 11.4%.

Figure 6 Unemployment Rates, 2000 to 2010 - Lane County

The sudden and dramatic increase in national, state and regional unemployment has had a major impact on economic and family well-being of local residents. High unemployment rates have forced skilled laborers out of work and sometimes into jobs where their skills are under-utilized. Unemployment has increased the need of residents in the Eugene-Springfield area for basic necessities, including food, affordable housing, and health care. The 2009 Lane County United Way Community Assessment provides a snapshot of social and economic indicators that shows increasing stress on families and individuals directly related to the economic health of the community. The Community Assessment found that 30% of all respondents reported someone in their household not being able to find work – a finding

Data source: http://www.QualityInfo.org; Unadjusted data.
unmatched in any previous Community Assessment since United Way began conducting them in 1992. Thirty percent (30%) of respondents also reported difficulty in affording housing – again, the highest rate ever reported in any previous Community Assessment. One out of five households (21%) reported receiving some sort of public assistance in the previous 12 months. Of those households, 60% reported experiencing financial difficulty in affording gas and maintenance for personal automobiles, medical insurance, medical and dentist visits and clothing.

**Poverty**

The US Census Bureau establishes the income limits annually to determine which households are living in poverty. These limits are based on the Consumer Price Index to reflect cost of living and are adjusted by family size and composition. Originally, the Social Security Administration created the poverty definition in 1964 for food programs; it is this program that provides the foundation for the current guidelines used in determining poverty levels.

According to *The 2008 Job Gap*, a study published by the Northwest Federation for Community Organizations, focusing on economic inequality in the Northwest, the federal poverty thresholds established more than 40 years ago that were based simply on food expenditures are outdated and do not fully reflect the true cost of living. Since the 1960’s, the cost of housing, gasoline, utilities, health care and child care expenses have increased much faster than the cost of food, resulting in federal poverty measures that substantially underestimate the basic needs of Oregonians and other Northwest families. This study further indicates that many families with incomes above the federal poverty threshold still lack sufficient resources to meet their basic needs.

Poverty rates in the cities of Eugene and Springfield have climbed over the past 40 years, rising from 10.9% of the total population in 1969 to 19.3% in 2007, as depicted in Figure 7. The poverty rate in Eugene is slightly higher than in Springfield. Eugene has an overall poverty rate of 19.7%, while Springfield’s rate is 18.5%. The poverty rate in both cities has increased since 2000, Eugene’s by 3.7% and Springfield’s by 0.6%. 
Racial Minorities and Hispanic Populations in Poverty

Within the cities of Eugene and Springfield, the incidence of poverty among racial minorities and Hispanic populations is generally higher than in the White population.

In Eugene, American Indians and Alaskan Natives experience the highest rate of poverty at 48% (1,015 people), followed by Other Race at 36% (1,436 people), Hispanic/Latino at 33% (3,078 people), Asians at 28% (2,052 people), Two more More Races at 25% (1,250 people) and Black or African American at 17% (346 people). Collectively, more than 5,500 people in the identified minority groups experience a disproportionate level of poverty (See Table 10).

In Springfield, the Hispanic/Latino community, has a poverty rate of 28.7% (1,380 people), followed by Two or More Races at 27.3% (397 people), Other Race at 24.3% (634 people) and American Indians and Alaskan Natives at 6.4% (90 people). Census data on poverty is not available for most racial or ethnic groups in Springfield due to the small sample size, but from the information that is available, it can be determined that disproportionate levels of poverty are in evidence only within the Hispanic population.
Incidence of Poverty by Household Type

In Eugene, 20% of all households live in poverty. Of the 12,386 Eugene households in poverty, 74% are non-family households and 26% are family households, as depicted in Figure 8. Of those family households living in poverty in Eugene, 34% are married couples with children and 58% are families with a female head of household. The large number of non-family poverty households may be due, in part, to the large population of college students living in Eugene (16% of the Eugene population).

In Springfield, 18% of all households live in poverty. Of the 3,978 Springfield households in poverty, 48% are non-family households; 52% are family households as depicted in Figure 8. Of those family households in Springfield, 28% are married couples with families and 14% are families with a female head of household.

Figure 9 Incidence of Poverty 2007 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield

Data sources: U.S. Census Bureau, ACS 2005-07, Table C17017; Select Social Characteristics

Other Indicators of Poverty

School district data regarding participation in the Department of Agriculture’s free and reduced price meals programs provides additional information regarding the incidence of poverty in the cities of Eugene and Springfield. Students are eligible for these programs based on family income in relation to the Federal poverty guidelines. The threshold for the free meals programs is calculated by multiplying the
Federal poverty income limit by 1.30, and the threshold for the reduced price meals programs is calculated by multiplying the Federal poverty income limit by 1.85. As stated in the Racial and Ethnic Composition section above, the cities of Eugene and Springfield are served by three school districts, Bethel, 4J, and Springfield. For the 2009-2010 school year, 37.47% of students in the 4J School District, 55% of students in the Bethel School District, and 57% of students in the Springfield School District were enrolled in free and reduced price meals programs.

According to the 2009 United Way of Lane County Community Assessment, 18% of all households surveyed are between 100-200% of the federal poverty guideline, making them ineligible for many services but leaving them without adequate income to meet their families’ basic needs per the Lane County self-sufficiency standard.

**Median Income**

The Area Median Income (AMI) is another way to assess the incomes and relatives needs of persons in a particular community. The US Census Bureau establishes an AMI for local geographic areas. The AMI is adjusted by household size. By definition, one half of households will have an income greater than the AMI and one half will have less than the AMI. In Lane County, the 2009 MFI for a family of four was $57,200 (same as AMI).

HUD has established definitions for low, very low, and extremely low income households as percentages of the MFI. HUD defines extremely low-income households as those at or below 30% of an area’s MFI, which for a family of four in Lane County would be $17,150. Low-income households are those earning between 31% and 50% of the area’s MFI ($28,600 for a family of four), and moderate-income households are those earning between 51% and 80% of the area’s MFI ($45,750 for a family of four).

In 2000, 33,908 moderate-, low-, and extremely low-income households resided in the cities of Eugene and Springfield, as depicted in Figure 9. In 2000, this was approximately 43% of the total households of both cities.

Maps 2 and 3 identify the census tracts or block groups within the Cities of Eugene and Springfield composed of a majority of persons (51% or more) with incomes below Moderate Income threshold established by HUD. In the year 2000, the low- and moderate-income population in the eligible area represented about 22% of the total population in both cities.
Figure 9 Extremely Low-Income, Low-Income and Moderate-Income Households, 2000 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield

Data sources: HUD CHAS Census 2000 Data
Chapter Summary: This chapter includes a housing market analysis that identifies significant characteristics of the housing market in terms of supply, demand, condition, and the cost of housing. It provides information on overall housing needs, public and assisted housing needs, as well as the needs of specific populations, and it estimates the number of housing units with known or potential lead-based paint hazards.

General Housing Market Characteristics

In 2007, there were 90,427 total housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield, approximately three-quarters of which (74%) were located in Eugene. The total number of housing units in the two cities represented 61% of the total housing stock in Lane County at that time, as depicted in Figure 10.

Figure 10 Total Number of Housing Units, 2000 and 2007 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County

Data sources: US Census Bureau, Census 2000, SF1, AT-H1, General Housing Characteristics, ACS 2005-2007, Select Housing Characteristics
Census data indicates that the number of housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield is not increasing at the same rate as population or household growth. Between 1990 and 2007, the population in the cities of Eugene and Springfield grew from 157,352 to 212,625, representing an overall increase of 35.1%. During the same period, the number of households grew 33% from 63,721 to 84,839, and the number of housing units grew from 66,112 to 90,427, representing an increase of 26.9%.

The current recession and difficulties with the housing market have resulted in a steep decline in building permit activity in both Eugene and Springfield. While the number of residential permits issued in the cities of Eugene and Springfield remained stable for a number of years, a local decline in building permit activity began in 2006 and continued throughout 2009 as depicted in Figure 11. The number of residential building permits issued by the Cities of Eugene and Springfield has declined by more than 80% since 2005.

Figure 11 New Residential Units, 2000 to 2009 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield

Data source: HUD SOCDS Permits Database; 2009 data is preliminary and is through November 2009.
Housing Unit Types

The balance between unit types in the cities of Eugene and Springfield has remained relatively stable since 1990. In 1990, single family units accounted for 62.1% of the total, multi-family units for 31.6%, and mobile homes in parks for 6.3%. By 2007, the mix had shifted slightly, with single family units accounting for 62.2% of the total, multi-family units for 32.2%, and mobile/manufactured homes for 5.4%, as depicted in Figure 12.

Figure 12 Total Housing Units by Type, 2007 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield

Figure 13 provides information on the number of units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield that have zero or one bedroom, two bedrooms, or three plus bedrooms, and owner-renter status for each category. The data indicates that in 2007, the majority of units available to renters have two bedrooms (21.6%); only 10.7% of total units have three bedrooms available to large rental households.

Housing Occupancy & Tenure

Overall vacancy rates for all housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield have risen slightly over the past 20 years. According to Census data, the vacancy rate for all housing types in Eugene and Springfield was 3.6% in 1990, increased to 5.2% in 2000, and rose again to 6.2% by 2007. However, the vacancy rate in the cities of Eugene and Springfield in 2007 was substantially lower than the State of
Oregon (9.5%) and the U.S as a whole (10%). The City of Springfield’s rate was even lower than the average of the two cities at 4.7%.

Figure 13 Housing Units by Number of Bedrooms and Tenancy, 2007 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield

Census data suggests that vacancy rates in the cities of Eugene and Springfield for owner-occupied housing are consistently lower than that for renter-occupied units. Owner-occupied rates have remained relatively stable in both Eugene and Springfield over the past 20 years. On the other hand, rental unit vacancy rates in Eugene have fluctuated during this period, ranging from a low of 3.5% in 1990, rising to 6.6% in 2000, and dropping to 4.9% in 2007. Springfield rental vacancy rates have been more stable than Eugene’s rates over that period. (See Table 15)

It is important to note, however, that vacancy rates are captured at a specific point in time; local vacancy rates for each city or each occupancy type may have reached higher or lower than those captured by Census data and may have fluctuated up and down many times between Census years. For instance, the Portland, Oregon-based Metro Multifamily Housing Association calculated a rental vacancy rate in the cities of Eugene and Springfield of 4.2% in fall 2009, which was lower than other Oregon cities; Portland and Salem reported a 5.9% vacancy rate and Bend topped 10% at that time. While the vacancy rate for apartments was fairly low in fall 2009, rentals of single-family homes were reported to be around 10% to 12% as families lost jobs during the economic downturn and reined in costs. It is likely that the relatively low vacancy rates in the cities of Eugene and Springfield for apartments compared to other Oregon metropolitan areas is due, in part, to the high and growing population of college students in the area.
Of the total occupied housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield, 44,654 (52.6%) were owner-occupied and 40,185 (47.4%) were renter-occupied in 2007. In Eugene, 51.8% of the total occupied units are owner-occupied and 48.2% are renter-occupied. The percentage increase from 2000 in both owner-occupied (7.6%) and renter-occupied (7.5%) units was consistent with the overall increase (7.5%) in total occupied units for Eugene. The percentage of owner-occupied versus the percentage of renter-occupied units in Eugene has changed subtly over the past 20 years. (See Table 16)

In Springfield, the ratio of owner- to renter-occupied housing in 2007 was higher than in Eugene, as depicted in Figure 14. Of the 22,353 occupied units, 55% were owner-occupied while 45% were occupied by renters. This change can be at least partly attributable to policies that the City Council and Mayor put in place in the early 1990s. At that time, 51% of the housing units in Springfield were occupied by renters. The Springfield Mayor and Council made increasing homeownership in Springfield a high priority, and enacted programs and policies to promote homeownership. Between 2000 and 2007, Springfield experienced an increase of owner-occupied housing exceeding that of Eugene’s, with an increase of 11.6%. In contrast, Springfield only had a 5.9% increase in renter-occupied housing in the same period. Homeownership remains a priority for Springfield, although the Council has displayed strong support for the development of affordable rental housing for populations with special needs, such as the elderly and persons with disabilities.
Housing Age and Condition

The age of a community’s housing stock is typically an indicator of the need for building rehabilitation to bring units up to modern standards. Residential buildings over 25 years old are most likely to need rehabilitation. In the cities of Eugene and Springfield, two-thirds (66%) of the housing stock was built before 1980, with the older housing being nearly equally distributed between the cities of Eugene (65.2%) and Springfield (67%). (See Table 17) The median year-built of Eugene’s housing stock is 1975 while the median year-built of Springfield’s housing stock is 1973. As depicted in Map 4 the older housing stock in both cities generally tends to be located in the central core of the cities. Data related to housing condition in the area indicates that problems related to housing age are less frequent than might be found in communities with a higher proportion of much older housing stock.

For the purposes of this Plan, housing units fall into one of three condition classifications: standard, substandard but suitable for rehabilitation, and substandard but not suitable for rehabilitation, as defined in Appendix D. 2007 Census data indicates that there are relatively few housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield that are substandard relative to the number of total occupied housing units. For instance, of the total occupied housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield (84,839), only 0.1% lacked complete plumbing facilities, 0.7% lacked complete kitchen facilities, and 0.7% had no identified heating source. Since the same housing unit that lacks complete plumbing facilities may also lack a heating source or complete kitchen facilities, the actual number of housing units considered to be substandard may, in fact, be even lower (See Table 18).

Although there is no data available to determine how many of the substandard units are occupied by low- and moderate-income households, it can be surmised that a substantial percentage of the occupants are low or moderate income, either because, as owners, they lack resources to maintain their homes’ critical structural elements, or because, as renters, they cannot afford a unit that is in standard condition.
Map 4 Location of Older Housing Stock, 2000, Cities of Eugene and Springfield

Census 2000 Block Groups with housing built before 1980 as a percentage of total housing units

- City of Eugene and City of Springfield UGIs
- Census 2000 Block Groups
- Housing built before 1980 as a percentage of total housing units

Legend:
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- 90.1% - 100%

Data: U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census, Table H14
Map: City of Eugene, April 2010
Lead-Based Paint

Lead-based paint was frequently used in residential applications until it was banned in 1978. Thus, many homes built prior to 1978 may contain lead-based paint. Lead is a highly toxic metal that may cause a range of health problems. Exposure to lead-based paint hazards may result in serious, irreversible health consequences, and can be especially damaging to children. When lead is absorbed into the body, it can cause damage to the brain and other vital organs, such as kidneys, nerves, and blood. Lead poisoning can also cause reduced IQ levels, reading and learning disabilities, decreased attention span, seizures, hyperactivity and aggressive behavior, and, in extreme cases, death. Some symptoms of lead poisoning may include headaches, stomachaches, nausea, tiredness, and irritability.

The age of a housing unit is a leading indicator of the presence of a lead hazard. The 2002 National Survey of Lead and Allergens in Housing, Analysis of Lead Hazards, written by Clickner et.al., found that 67% of housing units built before 1940 had significant lead-based paint hazards. The hazard declined to 51% for houses built between 1940 and 1959; 10% for houses built between 1960 and 1979; and to just 1% for houses built after 1979.

Information on the number of housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield that were built prior to 1978 is not available in Census data, but information is available for the number of units built prior to 1980. In the cities of Eugene and Springfield, approximately 61% (56,000) of the total housing units were built prior to 1980 and may contain lead-based paint. Based on the Clickner findings, approximately 15,236 homes pose potential lead-based paint hazards in the cities of Eugene and Springfield. According to 2009 CHAS data, a total of 11,140 housing units built before 1980 in all of Lane County were inhabited by one or more children age 6 or younger in 2007.

Overcrowding

The condition of overcrowding is based on the number of people per habitable room in a housing unit (not including bathrooms, storerooms, etc.). A housing unit is considered to be overcrowded when there is more than one person per habitable room. According to 2007 Census data, the overcrowded conditions in the housing market in the cities of Eugene and Springfield are quite low. Within the cities of Eugene and Springfield, only 1.9% of all housing units were overcrowded in 2007 (2.4% of rental units and 1.6% of owner-occupied units). The 2007 rate represents a decline of 46% from the year 2000 when the overcrowding rate was 3.9% overall. The overall rate of overcrowding is similar to that of Lane County (1.9%) but is below the statewide figure of 2.5.

The condition of overcrowding, when viewed by race and ethnicity, presents a slightly different picture. As noted above, only 1.9% of all housing within the cities of Eugene and Springfield was considered overcrowded in 2007. However, 2008 data indicates that 5% of housing units occupied by minorities and more than 9% of housing units occupied by Hispanics/Latinos in the cities of Eugene and Springfield were overcrowded.
Housing Affordability

In the 1980’s, housing prices in the cities of Eugene and Springfield plummeted, caused in part by the collapse of the timber industry in the Pacific Northwest. However, since the 1990’s, housing costs have rapidly increased while incomes have increased at a much slower rate. Between 1970 and 2007, median family income in the cities of Eugene and Springfield grew by only 2%, as depicted in Figure 15, while median gross rent grew by 20% and median home values increased by 145% (See Table 22).

Figure 15 Median Family Income, 1970 to 2007 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield

![Median Family Income Chart]

The cost of housing is generally considered to be affordable when it equals no more than 30% of household income, including expenditures for utilities. This definition applies both to owners, for whom housing costs include mortgage, principle and interest, property taxes, and insurance, and to renters, for whom housing costs include rent and utilities.
In its 2009 publication, *Out of Reach*, the National Low-Income Housing Coalition outlines the relationship between Fair Market Rents (FMR), set by HUD based on actual area housing costs, and the income required to afford that housing.

- HUD has determined that the 2009 ‘housing wage’ for Lane County was $14.77 per hour, resulting in a yearly income of $30,720. This is the amount a full time (40 hour per week) worker would have to earn to afford a two-bedroom apartment at the area’s FMR of $768.
- In Lane County, the 2009 estimated mean (average) wage for a renter was $10.74 an hour. In order to afford the FMR for a two-bedroom apartment at this wage, a renter must work 44 hours per week, 52 week per year.
- At the 2009 Lane County mean wage, a renter would only be able to afford an apartment costing no more than $558 per month (at 30% of monthly income), barely enough to rent an efficiency apartment (no bedroom) in this market at the FMR of $500.
- A person earning the Oregon minimum wage ($8.40 per hour) would have to work 70 hours a week for the two-bedroom unit to be affordable (See Table 23).

As mentioned in the Community Profile chapter, the Lane County Median Family Income (MFI) in 2009 for a family of four was $57,200. For extremely low-, low-, and moderate-income households earning less than 80% MFI, it is very difficult to find any affordable housing. For instance, for a four-person low-income household earning 31% to 50% MFI ($28,600), affordable monthly housing costs would be $715, well below the $768 FMR for a two-bedroom apartment. (See Table 24)

Persons with disabilities who rely on Federal Supplemental Security Income (SSI) for support are among those with the lowest levels of household income. According to the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, in 2009, the SSI program provided just $674 per month to individuals. The 2009 FMR for a one-bedroom unit in Lane County $607, so it would take 91% of an individual’s SSI income to rent a one-bedroom apartment in the cities of Eugene and Springfield at that time.

**Housing Cost Burden**

As stated previously, the cost of housing is generally considered to be affordable when it equals no more than 30% of household income, including expenditures for utilities. Households putting more than 30% of their income towards housing costs are considered to have a “housing cost burden,” and households putting more than 50% of their income towards housing costs are considered to have a “severe housing cost burden”.

According to 2000 data, nearly 50% of renter households and over 25% of owner households in the cities of Eugene and Springfield experienced a housing cost burden. While only 2.4% of owners reported a severe housing cost burden, more than 25% of renters were experiencing a severe housing cost burden at that time. It is likely that those figures are much higher today, due to the widening gap between incomes and housing costs, particularly given current economic conditions. (See Tables 25 and 26)

Housing cost burdens are especially prevalent among low- and extremely low-income renter households (earning at or below 50% MFI). For those income cohorts, over 80% of households in 2000 experienced a housing cost burden. Nearly 80% of extremely low-income owner households experienced a housing cost burden in 2000, as well.
Housing Problems

Housing problems, as defined by HUD, include housing units without complete kitchen or plumbing facilities, and/or overcrowding, and/or housing costs greater than 30% of a household’s income. In 2000, 45% of renters and 26% of owners in Lane County reported one of these housing problems. In 2007, the percentage of owners reporting one of these housing problems grew to 31%, and the percentage of renters reporting one of these problems rose to 47%. The percentage of households reporting two or more problems decreased from 2000 to 2007 for both renters and owners. In 2007, these percentages were 2.4% and 0.5%, respectively. (See Table 27) The data verifies a trend first reported in the 2000 Consolidated Plan and restated in the 2005 Plan that renter households are more likely than owner households to have a housing problem related to housing affordability and/or housing habitability.

In 2000, approximately 34,000 households in the cities of Eugene and Springfield were considered to be low- and moderate-income (under 80% MFI). Nearly one-third (30%) were homeowners and the remainder were renters, as depicted in Figure 16.

Figure 16 Tenancy Type by Income Range, 2000 - Cities of Eugene and Springfield

![Graph showing tenancy type by income range for 2000 in Eugene and Springfield](image)

Given the gap between incomes and housing costs in Lane County, low- and moderate-income households are more likely to experience housing cost burdens or to live in unsuitable or overcrowded...
conditions, and are at risk of homelessness. People in these income categories find it increasingly difficult to afford other necessities, such as child care, medical insurance or basic health care, or food.

At income levels below 50% MFI, the extent of housing problems for renters is severe. In 2000, 83% of low-income renter households had housing problems while nearly 82% of extremely low-income renter households had housing problems. Most acutely burdened were large renter households with five or more related individuals; 97% of extremely low-income renter households and 90% of low-income renter households in this category reported housing problems in 2000 (See Table 29).

While overcrowding is not a factor for all renter households, the problem becomes more significant as household size increases. Overcrowding persisted with large renter households, even when the cost burden was alleviated. For example, only 6% of large renter households with incomes above 80% MFI had a housing cost burden, yet 47% are shown with housing problems. The difference is mostly attributable to overcrowding.

As with renter households, the percentage of owner households with housing problems increased significantly as income decreased. Nearly 81% of extremely low-income owner households had housing problems compared to 68.1% of low-income owner households and 53.5% of moderate-income owner households. Large owner households reported the highest percentages of housing problems; 88% of large owner households earning less than 80% MFI reported housing problems in 2000. Large owner households also reported the highest incidence of overcrowding and/or lack of complete kitchen or bath facilities, with nearly 20% of large moderate-income owner households falling within this category.

2000 Census data reveals disproportionately high incidences of housing problems among racial and ethnic minorities in the cities of Eugene and Springfield. Disproportionate housing problems are defined as existing when the percentage of households identifying with a particular race or ethnicity is reported at a rate 10% or greater than the population as a whole, which, in 2000, was 37.2%. Disproportionate housing problems are evident for households identifying as Hispanic/Latino (54%), Black/African American (55%), Pacific Islanders (61%), and Native American (51%), as depicted in Figure 17 (See Table 30).
Public Housing

Created by the Lane County Board of Commissioners in 1949 and reorganized in 1980 and 2002, the Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County (HACSA) is charged with Lane County’s housing and related community services policies and programs. In this capacity, it serves as the housing authority for the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County. As HACSA’s governing Board, the five Lane County Commissioners and two resident commissioners review and approve the business and policies of the agency.

HACSA and the Cities of Eugene and Springfield have established good working relationships. Along with Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County, HACSA stays connected to the intergovernmental Housing Policy Board (HPB), which sets housing policy for the local area and allocates funds from a variety of sources. Since 1992, HACSA has developed or acquired 12 low-income housing developments (551 units) in Eugene using local and Federal funds awarded through the local HPB competitive allocations process.

HACSA owns, manages, and maintains 1,363 units of low-income housing in Lane County, of which 708 are public housing units. (See Table 31) None of HACSA’s units are scheduled to be lost from the...
assisted inventory during the next five years. HACSA also administers the HUD Section 8 Housing Programs and manages the Low-Income Weatherization Program.

Public Housing and Section 8 Programs

HACSA owns, manages, and maintains 708 public housing units throughout Lane County. Of those, 372 are designated elderly/disabled, and the remaining are family units. In addition, HACSA owns and manages a 25-unit project-based Section 8 complex, two HUD multi-family complexes (132 units), and a 90-unit affordable housing complex. Of the 708 public housing units, 494 units (70%) are located in the cities of Eugene and Springfield.

HACSA also operates the Section 8 Voucher Program, serving approximately 2,600 low-income households throughout Lane County. The program allows clients to choose any unit that meets the program requirements within Lane County. Tenants pay a portion of the rent, based on their income, and HACSA provides a rental assistance payment directly to private landlords participating in the program.

HACSA consistently exceeds HUD’s Federal targeting requirements for providing assistance to families at or below 30% of Lane County’s MFI. In 2009, 71% of new admissions to public housing were considered extremely low income (at or below 30% MFI), 22% were low income (31%-50% MFI), and 7% were moderate income (51%-80% MFI). The Section 8 admissions statistics similarly indicate that HACSA is exceeding its targets for providing assistance to extremely low-income families (76% were considered extremely low income, 20% low income, and 4% moderate income).

As of December 2009, over 3,000 Lane County families were on HACSA’s combined housing waiting list. Over half of the families on the waiting list had children, 35% were disabled, and 7% were elderly. Nearly 20% were Hispanic/Latino and/or a minority. The amount of time a family has to wait for a unit varies by program type and family size. Currently, the waiting time for a one-bedroom unit is two years, for a two-bedroom unit, 16 to 18 months, and for a one-bedroom unit, one year. The average waiting time is approximately 18 months.

Condition of Public Housing Units

The public housing units in the cities of Eugene and Springfield are in good physical condition. The condition of the units is evaluated under HUD’s Public Housing Assessment System, and because HACSA has always received a score of 90 or above, HUD considers HACSA to be a high performer.

HACSA recently contracted with an inspection firm to conduct a new Physical Needs Assessment that includes a detailed survey of all public housing units to pinpoint deficiencies and plan for corrections. While HACSA is still analyzing the data from this assessment, HACSA has included a number of the immediate needs into its rolling Five-Year Capital Fund Program (CPF) Plan for the modernization of public housing units. In March 2009, HACSA was awarded $1.6 million of additional capital improvement funds under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (ARRA). Projects to be completing using ARRA funds and through the CPF include: painting; energy conservation improvements; parking lot repaving; elevator upgrades; unit improvements; and sidewalk, sewer line, and roof replacements.
Because of the additional funding HACSA received under the ARRA grant and the HACSA Weatherization Department’s willingness to complete energy upgrades on multi-family public housing properties, many items originally listed in the Five-Year Plan were moved forward, and others identified in the recently completed public housing capital needs assessment were added to the Five-Year Plan. HACSA is also in the process of applying for additional modernization funding under the ARRA Capital Fund Recovery Competition Grants.

**Assisted Housing**

A variety of assisted housing developments are currently available and serving low-income persons in the Cities of Eugene and Springfield. There are a total of 4087 assisted housing units in 119 developments in both Cities including projects subsidized with Section 8, Low-Income Housing Tax Credits, or other project-based subsidies. Eugene has a total of 3,288 units in 87 developments and Springfield has 838 units in 32 developments. The spreadsheets in the Appendix R provide detailed information on each development including number of units, location, and population served.

A total of 1136 units in 25 developments are subsidized through Section 8 or Section 202 contracts with HUD. These units make up 28% of all assisted housing units in Eugene and Springfield. All contracts are scheduled to expire between 2010 and 2015, however many developments are associated with nonprofit affordable housing organizations that will seek renewal of contracts.

**Barriers to Affordable Housing**

As part of the Consolidated Plan, HUD requires an analysis of regulatory barriers that may impede the development of a range of housing types to meet community needs. Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield use the Questionnaire for HUD’s Initiative on Removal of Regulatory Barriers as one tool for identifying potential regulatory barriers. Both Cities also address regulatory barriers to affordable and supportive housing on an on-going basis through participation and collaboration on land use and zoning studies to ensure consideration of the needs of low- and moderate-income residents.

**City of Eugene**

The City of Eugene’s Questionnaire can be found in Appendix E-1 of this Plan. In addition, the City of Eugene has included a detailed response to each item on the Questionnaire, also included in the Appendix. The City of Eugene’s responses to the Questionnaire indicate that there are two areas where the City of Eugene could work towards further reducing barriers to affordable housing: modifying infrastructure standards and/or authorizing the use of new infrastructure technologies to significantly reduce the cost of housing; and providing expedited or ‘fast track’ permitting and approvals for all affordable housing developments.

The City of Eugene has worked to established mechanisms for involvement of the Housing Policy Board (HPB) and its staff in policy discussions to address barriers to affordable housing. For instance, HPB and/or staff have and/or continue to participate on citizen and technical advisory committees for the Minor Code Amendment Process, the Infill Compatibility Standards and Opportunity Siting project, and
the Eugene Comprehensive Lands Assessment, as discussed in detail in the Five-Year Strategic Plan chapter.

City of Springfield

The City of Springfield’s Questionnaire can be found in Appendix F-1 of this Plan, along with a detailed response to each item on the Questionnaire. The City of Springfield’s responses to the Questionnaire suggest that there are three areas in which the City of Springfield could work towards continuing to reduce barriers to affordable housing, including: explicit parking requirement waivers for affordable housing developments; fast track permitting for affordable housing developments; and as-of-right density bonuses.

In addition to the topics indicated on the Questionnaire, the City of Springfield has identified other areas in which the City can better support affordable housing development through its policies and regulations. From August 2008 to February 2009, staff from the City’s Planning Division reviewed the City’s development regulations to identify impediments to affordable housing over which the City has control to eliminate or mitigate. The purpose of the review was to identify areas where the City’s development code needs revisions to improve consistency and clarity, as well as to identify areas where code revisions are needed to adjust requirements or restrictions that may inadvertently limit the range and diversity of housing developed within Springfield.

As part of the development code review process, City staff interviewed a range of local affordable housing developers and service providers with distinct missions and client bases. Interviews with staff and Board members from these organizations, in addition to their private development consultants, where applicable, were held during August and September 2008. The information gleaned from these one-on-one sessions was summarized in a report of findings and recommendations in February 2009.

The summary report recommended changes to the Springfield Development Code in an effort to reduce impediments to affordable housing development in the following areas: bicycle parking; vehicle parking; solar setbacks; stormwater management; transportation infrastructure and emergency access; multi-unit design standards; and mixed-use development standards. The local affordable housing providers also identified a relative lack of community support, and specifically financial support, as a principal barrier to affordable housing development Springfield. Areas identified in the report where the City could better support affordable housing development include: system development charges; permit review timelines and fees; property taxes; land; and visibility on the state and local level. The City has and/or continues to address these issues as part of on-going land use and zoning studies, as discussed in detail in the Five-Year Strategic Plan chapter.
Homelessness

Chapter Summary: This chapter summarizes the nature and extent of homelessness in Eugene and Springfield, provides an inventory of facilities and services that serve homeless individuals, identifies local homeless and homeless prevention priorities, and identifies strategies to address the needs of the homeless and potentially homeless in the community.

Homelessness Population and Facilities

Homelessness remains a significant challenge for the Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County. The three jurisdictions work collaboratively to assess the extent and nature of homelessness. One mechanism for assessing the extent of homelessness in Lane County is the One-Night Homeless Counts that are conducted annually. HUD Table 1A provides an indication of the number of homeless persons living in Lane County in 2009. The information was drawn from the One Night Homeless Count (Count) conducted on January 28, 2009 through a combination of outreach to areas homeless people are known to congregate in or live, and the Homeless Management Information System Point in Time service reports.

The 2009 Count suggests that 1,743 households (2,232 persons) were homeless in Lane County at that time, the vast majority of which live in the cities of Eugene and Springfield. Of the total homeless households identified in the 2009 count, 40% were living in temporary shelter, including emergency shelters, transitional housing, and motels, and 60% were unsheltered, either because they were turned away due to a lack of shelter availability or they were otherwise unable to access shelter. Approximately one-third of homeless households with children were without any shelter while two-thirds of homeless individuals and homeless households without children were not sheltered.

The results from the 2009 Count indicate an overall increase in the number of homeless persons of 35% and a 60% increase in the number of unsheltered individuals from 2008 to 2009. The 2009 Count was more comprehensive than the 2008 Count in documenting unsheltered homeless in that all persons were interviewed and 16 new data collection sites were added. Therefore, the significant increase in the unsheltered population was based, not only on the dramatic economic changes in the County, but also the counting process. The data suggests that the number of chronically homeless, as defined by HUD, decreased by 22%. However, the County identified an error in its 2008 counting process, and thus the chronically homeless population actually increased by 9% to 498 in 2009.

HUD Table 1A also summarizes the Continuum of Care Housing Gap Analysis. Currently, emergency shelters, including safe havens, in Lane County provide beds for 442 individuals and 130 persons in families with children; 12 are under development. There are 50 transitional housing beds for individuals, 321 for persons in families with children, and ten are currently under development. There are 158 beds in permanent supportive housing for chronically homeless individuals and 43 for chronically homeless persons in families with children; 4 beds in this category are under development. The Continuum of Care Housing Gap Analysis indicates that there is an unmet need of 339 emergency shelter beds, 345 transitional housing beds, and 783 permanent supportive housing beds for individuals and a need of 842 transitional beds and 149 permanent supportive housing beds for persons in families with children. The shelter counts for 2009 represent a decrease from 2008. However, this is due, in part, to the fact
that in the past a treatment center was counted as having eligible beds and the County is no longer including those beds in the inventory. The decrease also reflects double-counting errors for safe haven beds and permanent supportive housing beds that were corrected in 2009.

In late January 2010, the Lane County Human Services Commission conducted the annual One-Night Homeless Count. While the final conclusions of the Count have not yet been published, preliminary results indicate that the number of homeless people in the community has increased significantly over the past year. The 2010 count identified 3,971 homeless people, an increase of 48% overall and an increase of 101% in the number of unsheltered individuals from 2009 to 2010. The 2010 count also identified a total of 628 homeless people in rural areas (up 232%), 607 homeless families (up 156%), 317 veterans (up 90%) and 1,215 chronically homeless individuals (up 87%).

Racial and Ethnic Groups
During the 2009 Count where racial and ethnic characteristics could be collected, approximately 16.5% were Hispanic/Latino and/or a minority and 8.3% were listed as having unknown race/ethnicity. Of those who identified themselves as Hispanic/Latino and/or a minority, 4.6% were Asian, 18.7% were Black or African American, 49.9% were Hispanic/Latino, 24.1% were American Indian or Alaska Native, and 2.7% were Native Hawaiian or Pacific Islander.

Singles with Special Needs and/or Chronic Mental Illness
The Lane County Continuum of Care strategic planning process and the gaps analysis find single chronically homeless men and women to be a high priority need locally. Both emergency housing and permanent housing with supportive services are needed. Connection to mainstream benefits for people who are homeless and chronically mentally and/or challenged with substance abuse issues is also needed.

As noted in the Continuum’s gaps analysis, chronically homeless individuals fall within the subset of persons who present a complex set of multi-problem challenges for Lane County service providers, such as persons with psychiatric and substance abuse issues. These populations frequently exhibit a pattern of being disconnected from conventional community life. Many have limited support systems, reflected in most being adults and youth with weak family connections. Many have past experiences with mainstream services that did not effectively address their needs or prevent them from falling into homelessness. These characteristics contribute to the long or repetitive patterns of homelessness they exhibit. They also reflect why re-engaging a chronically homeless person with treatments can be challenging. In addition to these issues, extreme poverty, poor job skills, lack of education, and negative childhood experiences are common features of chronic homelessness.

Currently, limited support services exist in Lane County for homeless singles with mental illness and co-occurring substance abuse problems and other special needs. The problems have been compounded by the recent closures of State hospitals, which have limited shelter options available to adults with mental illness. The foster care system in Lane County has been significantly overtaxed because of the shortage of suitable living alternatives. The Eugene Mission, the only major homeless shelter facility for singles (with no professional counseling available, no staff trained in crisis intervention, and no mental health para-professionals or professionals), has served this vulnerable population throughout the years. The 24-
bed Royal Avenue Shelter, with 12 permanent housing beds for homeless singles with psychiatric disorders and 12 crisis/respite beds, is intended as an alternative to psychiatric hospitalization for homeless mentally ill persons who need extra support, assistance, and medication monitoring. Because of a shortage of transitional and assisted housing units, as well as delays in obtaining Supplemental Security Income payments, there is often a bottleneck at this facility.

Supportive services for single homeless individuals are not adequate, and this group has the least amount of public assistance available to them. A majority of this population are males who have few skills and multiple problems. St. Vincent DePaul’s Eugene Service Station provides access services to approximately 150 homeless singles each day, and the Shankle Safe Haven Day Access Center serves 12 homeless singles with psychiatric disorders and provides permanent housing to an additional 12 singles. White Bird Clinic provides outreach services to over 400 chronically homeless individuals annually by site visits and street outreach to 20 agencies and community sites on a regular schedule.

A 15-bed facility that offered culturally and linguistically appropriate shelter for single Latino males closed its doors recently. It is particularly difficult for Latinos in this area to obtain shelter, employment, and services because of language and cultural barriers.

Youth

Homeless and at-risk youth who are living on the streets are at risk of exploitation, typically fear authorities, are physically and emotionally needy, and often abuse substances to escape the daily pain of survival. At-risk, homeless, and runaway youth are particularly vulnerable to chronic physical and mental health problems, including bronchitis, pneumonia, foot and leg ailments, impetigo, sexually-transmitted diseases, lice, scabies, depression, and other mental health conditions.

Service providers identify approximately 2,500 runaway, homeless youth and young adults, or at-risk youth in the age range of 11-21 living in Lane County. Some of these youth have homes but are unsupervised on the street. Others do not have homes and are living on their own as part of the homeless street population.

As of January 2010, the Eugene 4J School District had already served 186 homeless students in the early months of the 2009 to 2010 school year. The 4J School District has found that a majority of these students are ‘doubled up,’ meaning there are multiple families living at the same address. About a quarter of the identified students are living in shelters, and the next two most common situations are students staying in hotel/motels and RV’s or cars. The Bethel School District, which serves northwest Eugene, has identified approximately 100 students during the same time period. The Bethel School District has found that for the last 12 years they have consistently identified between 175 to 200 homeless students each year, and they have indicated that such numbers in reality undercount the actual number of homeless students. The Springfield School District had identified a total of 279 homeless students thus far in the 2009 to 2010 school year, and as of January 2010 the District has identified 10 families who are at risk of homelessness. The Springfield School District serves an average of 400 to 600 homeless students annually.
The reasons youth fall into these circumstances vary greatly; however, some information and patterns have emerged that give us indicators that can lead to homelessness if there is no intervention. The youth population can be described as follows:

**Time-out Youth**
Time-out-youth are those residing at home with parents or surrogates but are at risk of being asked to leave home. Families usually are in a crisis at the time of intervention, and emergency shelter is needed for respite to avoid escalated tension or violence in the home. A diagnosed mental illness, violence in the home, trauma and neglect from parent and drug and alcohol abuse are all factors contributing to the exit from home.

**Homeless and Pushed Out Youth**
These are youth who have no home to return to, or their parents refuse or are unable to care for them.

**Runaway Youth**
These are youth who have left home without parental consent. Parents may be willing to have the youth home and are making attempts to reconcile. A majority of runaways return home and achieve some stability; however, some youth return home for short periods of time and then leave again, staying with peers and young adults who house them for short periods of time. Many return to social service agencies for shelter and further services.

**Families**
Permanent housing, both supportive and basic affordable, is one of the community’s greatest needs. Many homeless households in this community do not need intensive services to stabilize, and their need for housing is not reflected on the gaps chart. Growing numbers of non-chronically homeless families are simply in need of affordable housing. While permanent housing is a high priority, there is still a need for some emergency shelter.

In September 2009, ShelterCare, the non-profit agency that manages the community’s centralized waiting list for homeless families, had 155 individuals in 47 households who were placed on a waiting list. There were already 34 individuals in 10 households still calling for services from July and August 2009. In mid-October 2009, 108 individuals in 32 households were awaiting services. Some of these families reported being situationally homeless due to losing their housing as a result of economic dislocation, catastrophic medical expenses, domestic violence, or divorce. People who are situationally homeless have had one event or a series of events which has cost them their housing, and they have become part of the community’s homeless statistics. Some families have lost housing through the slow process of eroding wages and escalating housing and utility costs.

The 2009 Count indicated that 157 households with children were sheltered and 80 households with children were unsheltered at that time. (See HUD Table 1-A) Others, along with their family members, are turned away from shelter because of inadequate emergency shelter capacity. No child comes away from the experience without physical or psychological difficulties. The emotional traumas, prevalence of physical illnesses, and developmental delays experienced by homeless children have only recently begun to be documented.
If transitional housing options were more available to the homeless families who could benefit from such programs, the overall emergency services system that provides shelter services would improve greatly. The same is true of adding more affordable housing to the permanent stock. There is a tremendous need for transitional and permanent supportive housing for homeless families.

On any given night, according to the gap analysis, there is an immediate unmet gap for 991 units for homeless families and 1,467 units for singles and couples. (See HUD Table 1-A) The need for continuing supportive housing programs is imperative to break the bottleneck that currently exists within the current emergency shelter system. The impediments caused by an inadequate inventory of transitional and permanent affordable housing units limit the ability to appropriately respond to homelessness in Lane County. Community planning groups identified the problems associated with this unmet need as relating directly to the lack of affordable housing and transitional and permanent housing available for emergency participants after stabilization.

### Homelessness Prevention Strategies

Historically, the continuum of homeless services in Lane County focused on emergency and transitional shelters as a way to alleviate the immediate crisis. Over time, with unemployment rates increasing, coupled with an inadequate affordable housing stock, the emergency/transitional housing system has been overtaxed and cannot adequately meet the needs through these shelter programs.

Lane County’s Continuum of Care has placed an increased emphasis on addressing the needs of people who are chronically homeless by providing more permanent housing programs for people who are homeless with a disabling condition. The County has also learned that preventing homelessness at the front end is less costly and more effective. By identifying and helping singles and families who are risk of homelessness retain their housing, with short term rental assistance and case management support, housing stability is maintained.

For households who are already homeless, rapid re-housing or the “housing first model” is the best strategy. This approach focuses on providing homeless people with housing quickly and then providing services as needed. The housing first strategy is housing-based rather than shelter-based and has an immediate and primary emphasis on helping individuals and families quickly access and sustain permanent housing. The key is to offer multiple services along with housing assistance to ensure housing stability and individual well-being; these services are short-term, limited, or longer term, depending on household needs.

ShelterCare, one of Lane County’s family shelter providers, is in a unique position to act as the clearinghouse for a larger coalition of family homelessness prevention services locally. ShelterCare’s partnerships with other local providers and its control of a centralized waiting list allow the agency to connect to a large pool of prospective participants.

Sheltercare maintains the largest number of emergency shelter units for families with children in the area and maintains the waiting list for shelter units operated by both ShelterCare and Catholic Community Services. In addition, ShelterCare works closely with St. Vincent de Paul’s First Place Family Center, which provides day services and night shelter to homeless families with children. ShelterCare also maintains a close relationship with the Eugene Mission’s Women and Children’s Shelter. Additionally,
ShelterCare’s Family Housing Program has contractual arrangements with the domestic violence shelter managed by Womenspace.

ShelterCare’s waiting list matches homeless families with children with temporary housing facilities and services offered through the local emergency shelters. When a family contacts the centralized waiting list for shelter, staff conducts a brief interview to assist in determining the family’s current situation and needs. The screening identifies whether the caller will benefit from services and programs through ShelterCare and/or other social service providers. Callers are directed to programs that will best address their current situation. For example, if a caller is in his/her own dwelling and able to remain in his/her own home with a small amount of rental assistance and short-term case management, ShelterCare staff refers the family to the ShelterCare Homeless Prevention Program. ShelterCare also offers long-term case management through its Family Transitional Program. The transitional program provides up to two years of in-depth case management services addressing barriers that have affected the family’s ability to remain in stable housing in the past.

City of Eugene and Lane County Human Services Commission both receive funding through the Homeless Prevention and Rapid Re-Housing Program (HPRP) created as part of the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act of 2009 (ARRA). The City of Eugene has been notified that it will receive $567,404 while Lane County expects to receive $874,654. Available funds will be used for case management and financial assistance to help households who are homeless or at risk of homelessness find and maintain appropriate housing.

Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield have worked collaboratively with Lane County to develop the Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness. It should be noted that the Ten-Year Plan inherently addresses the issues of shorter term homeless or situational homelessness, as well. Below is a chart depicting the Ten-Year Plan.
## Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Action Steps</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1. Create new Permanent Housing (PH) beds for chronically homeless persons. | Expand Lane County’s Continuum of Care (CoC) PH bed capacity.  
  a. Provide additional housing units for chronically homeless veterans with mental health and/or substance abuse problems.  
  b. Increase supply of permanent affordable housing for singles, families, and youth who are homeless. |
| 2. Increase percentage of homeless persons staying in PH over 6 months to 71%. | Work with permanent housing providers on retention of participants through increased wraparound services.                                                                                   |
| 3. Increase percentage of homeless persons moving from Transitional Housing to PH to 61%. | Work with all jurisdictions (cities and county) and the Intergovernmental Housing Policy Board to increase permanent housing inventory.                                  |
| 4. Increase percentage of homeless persons becoming employed by 11%.  | Collaborate with other agencies within the Lane County CoC to increase employment opportunities.  
  a. Partner with St. Vincent de Paul to increase employment services to homeless individuals.  
  b. Partner with Lane Workforce Partnership to increase support services for job search and retention.  
  c. Partner with Veterans’ Services of Lane County to increase job support services for homeless veterans. |
| 5. Ensure that the CoC has a functional Homeless Management Information System (HMIS). | Train 40 service providers to enter data into HMIS so that accurate data is available to better count the number of unduplicated homeless persons and the frequency, depth, and breadth of homelessness. This collection tool will help us: track the outcomes and service improvements for homeless people who access the system; and plan more effectively to serve people who are homeless. |
| 6. Coordinate regional efforts to end homelessness in Lane County by the year 2016. | a. Implement Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness in Lane County.  
  b. Present plan to the City of Eugene, City of Springfield, Lane County, and other local intergovernmental partners.  
  c. Educate Human Services Commission, Community Action Advisory Committee, City Councils, Board of County Commissioners.  
  d. Educate Human Services Network, United Way, civic organizations, and the community at-large. |
| 7. Improve continuum of homeless services. | a. Increase grants from existing sources, seek new funding streams, and explore restructuring of existing resources.  
  b. Work with providers within local CoC to identify gaps in services.  
  c. Work with providers within local CoC to reduce and/or remove barriers to homeless services.  
  e. Collaborate with the State of Oregon Department of Mental Health to pursue funding opportunities for special populations. |
| 8. Increase permanent affordable housing in Lane County. | a. Identify local funding to supplement federal funds.  
  b. Identify methods to add low-income housing in communities outside of the metropolitan area.  
  c. Acquire property for future housing development. |
| 9. Discharge vulnerable homeless populations into permanent housing. | a. Implement a structure to coordinate discharge planning among publicly funded institutions and other system(s) of care (e.g., local hospitals).  
  b. Review agreements on a comprehensive discharge planning. |
| 10. Increase services to homeless youth to prepare them for independent living. | a. Increase the number of Housing First units with strong wraparound supportive services (such as substance abuse treatment, mental health counseling, youth mentoring, job shadowing, etc).  
  b. Increase outreach activity to engage youth to access housing services. |
Barriers to Eliminating Homelessness

Many obstacles stand in the way of meeting the critical needs of the homeless population. Homelessness results from a complex set of circumstances that require people to choose between food, shelter, health care, and other basic needs. Finding solutions to homelessness requires a concerted effort on a number of fronts, including living wages, adequate support for those who cannot work, affordable housing, and access to health care. Following are the major obstacles to meeting the under-served needs of the homeless:

Poverty and Homelessness

Poverty and homelessness are inextricably linked. People living in poverty are often unable to pay for their basic needs and must make difficult choices that affect their ability to keep and maintain stable housing. Factors that account for increased poverty include the high unemployment rate, housing foreclosures, and the low housing vacancy rate locally, the erosion of good paying jobs, and declining value and availability of public assistance.

High Unemployment Rates and Low-Wage Jobs

Oregon’s unemployment rate topped the 2001 recession in March 2009 at 14%, matching the worst since the early 1980s timber recession. High unemployment rates contribute to higher rates of homelessness in the community. The connection between impoverished workers and homelessness can be observed in homeless shelters, many of which house a significant number of full-time wage earners. Unemployment, underemployment, and wages not keeping pace with the cost of living are all contributors to the problem. Insufficient funds for housing often create insurmountable barriers to pay a security deposit and first and last month’s rent. Inadequate income and lack of a sufficient supply of affordable housing lead to homelessness.

Lack of Affordable Housing

Lack of available affordable housing and the limited scale of housing assistance programs are major contributors to the current housing crisis and to homelessness. Housing assistance can make a difference between housing stability, precarious housing situations, and no housing at all. The demand for housing with support services vastly outweighs the supply, creating long waiting lists for housing, forcing families to double up, or become involved in the emergency shelter system. Consequently, there is less shelter space available, forcing many to resort to living in precarious and unsafe situations, including the streets.

Lack of Housing Resources for Special Populations

A lack of permanent housing resources for disabled persons being released from corrections and other public institutions greatly contributes to homelessness in Lane County. People with criminal convictions face considerable discrimination from landlords as they attempt to rent housing. There is inadequate funding for targeted case management programs to provide outreach to disabled and dually-disabled homeless persons. Persons with mental health or substance abuse issues, physical disabilities, or HIV/AIDS are more vulnerable and have additional challenges accessing needed services and finding permanent stable housing.
Limited Federal, State, and Local Government Resources

The Federal government has reduced its role in human services, placing more emphasis on local responses. Changes in Federal policies that relate to the Federal budget, welfare reform, food stamps, and Supplemental Security Income will increase demands for local services in the future. The State government shift from mental health services to managed care places burdens on cities and counties. These jurisdictions are hampered by lack of funding to provide for adequate resources for these groups. Local governments have not been able to assist in filling the gaps created by the Federal and State government. Voters in Oregon have passed measures that make it extremely difficult to raise new revenue through taxes.

Decline in Public Assistance

There has been a decline in the value and availability of public assistance. Until its repeal in August 1996, Aid to Families with Dependent Children was the largest cash assistance program for poor families with children. It was replaced by the Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF) program. Current TANF benefits and food stamps combined are below the poverty level in every state. The median TANF benefit for a family of three is approximately one-third the poverty level, and contrary to popular belief, welfare does not provide relief from poverty. Although welfare rolls have decreased since the new legislation was passed, this only means that fewer people are receiving benefits under this program. Early findings suggest that these families are moving from welfare to work, but many remain in poverty because of low wages and the burden of expenses imposed by child care expenses.

Unique Challenges for Homeless Youth

According to the National Alliance to End Homelessness, the same factors that contribute to adult homelessness, such as poverty, lack of affordable housing, low education levels, unemployment, mental health, and substance abuse, can lead to homelessness among youth. Beyond these factors, youth homelessness is largely a reflection of family breakdown. In addition, there continues to be a lack of services for youth aging out of foster care, and/or residential treatment facilities. Many youth have limited employment skills and find landlords unwilling to rent to youth. Homelessness is not an uncommon occurrence for youth leaving the child welfare system.

Data Collection for Planning

Accurate data for community members and elected officials is essential in efforts to evaluate programs and distribute resources efficiently. Public education about the depth and breadth of the problem in essential if resources are to be prioritized effectively. Lane County’s Homeless Management Information System (HMIS) continues to work on ways to more comprehensively collect data for these purposes.

Other Contributing Factors

Other factors that push people towards homelessness include lack of affordable health care, lack of supportive services for chronically homeless people with disabilities, and domestic violence. Domestic violence is an immediate cause of homelessness for many women and is the most frequently stated cause
of homelessness for families. In 2008, the National Alliance to End Homelessness found that 13% of homeless families named domestic violence as their primary reason for leaving their last residence.

**Homelessness Prevention Priorities**

From September 2008 through June 2010, Lane County’s Human Services Commission (HSC) developed the area’s Human Services and Housing Plan. The Human Services and Housing Plan identifies human services needs and gaps in Lane County. It also helps prioritize the distribution of operating funds for human service programs offered by community-based non-profit and public agencies, on behalf of Lane County and the Cities of Eugene and Springfield, beginning in fiscal year 2010-2011.

At the time of the writing of the Consolidated Plan, the Human Services Plan was still under development and not yet at the final stage of approval. In October 2009, preliminary data and planning efforts suggested that homelessness and housing issues rank in the first two tiers of prioritization of local resources on a three-tier outcome grid. The draft report described Priority Outcome One (Tier 1) as ‘Meeting Community Basic Needs,’ which includes emergency housing and related services. Priority Outcome Two (Tier 2) was described as ‘Increasing Self Reliance,’ which encompasses a funding priority for housing and supportive services.

In developing the Human Services and Housing Plan, the HSC used a community engagement process for planning and communicating human needs by soliciting input from many organizations and civic groups that represent thousands of county residents. The community engagement strategy encouraged community action to support HSC and its service provider partners, including a community awareness campaign on human service needs and opportunities. The Plan was developed with broad stakeholder input through a series of focus groups and community forums with a variety of sectors – human services, education, healthcare, business, faith communities, and neighborhoods – participating in development of the Plan and the policies that it articulates. The HSC also engaged youth, families, seniors, disabled individuals, homeless singles, and the Latino community in obtaining data for the Plan.

A Planning Committee comprised of public and private human service funder staff, HSC members, county and city staff, service providers, and members of advisory boards, met monthly throughout the planning process to: develop the vision, principles, scope, and outcomes for the Plan; assist staff and consultants in organizing the design of the planning process; confirm the results from the public consultation; and frame key questions and help to finalize recommendations included in the Plan. A technical team, comprised of inter-jurisdictional and cross-departmental staff, provided operational oversight and technical expertise in the development of the Plan. Senior HSC management and the full HSC were also engaged in the process to review the draft plan for policy and funding implications and recommend approval of the Plan by the applicable jurisdictions.

Because human needs are complex and inter-related, alignment of HSC activities with other funders/partners as part of the Plan will create the greatest positive impact. A core assumption of the Plan is that activities supported by local government must be carefully aligned with other efforts targeting the same or similar populations. In its planning and coordination of human services, the HSC is connected with other jurisdictions, funders, and planning groups. A number of these groups also
conduct human services planning, and these plans have been reviewed to understand trends, priorities, and the areas of responsibility of other entities. For instance, the data review for the Human Services and Housing Plan included a review of the Lane County Ten Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness and the Final Report from the Blue Ribbon Committee on Homelessness.

The Plan includes strategies to address community trends impacting community wellness. Some of the trends affecting the context in which human services are delivered, and the delivery themselves, are long-term environmental changes that are continuing and in some cases deepening. The recommendations of the Plan incorporate 18 key outcome areas and cover services for all stages of the human life cycle – infancy, childhood, adolescence, and adulthood. Populations include children, youth, families, singles, seniors, veterans, persons with disabilities, persons living with HIV/AIDS, homeless, immigrants, offenders and ex-offenders, and victims of domestic violence and sexual abuse.

While the HSC provides a wide range of services, it focuses efforts in four key areas for local investment in services. The Plan thus includes community goals, desired outcomes, key indicators, and suggested strategies for four key service areas that correspond to four overarching strategies to: build strong children, youth, adults and families; empower people to be self-reliant; help people in crisis and reduce abuse, poverty, and homelessness; and build community capacity and enhance infrastructure for coordinated access to housing and primary and behavioral health (mental health & substance abuse) services for people served by allied human services. The Plan also builds a strong evaluation component into the activities identified to identify, measure, and report the impact of local investment of funds over time and whether the investments have achieved their goals.

**Early-Intervention and Prevention**

People should receive the support they need to be successful in school and to be prepared for self-sufficiency and success in life. To do this, the HSC works to increase the resilience of children, youth and families; decrease risk factors for substance abuse, violence and other harmful involvement; increase protective factors; prepare them for learning and positive involvement in the community; or strengthen their families as their primary supports.

Services in this outcome area include, but are not limited to: An array of family development services; childhood development; positive youth development; senior independent living planning; individual and family counseling; parenting education and skill development; prevention and intervention from abuse, neglect, exploitation and/or institutional placement; substance abuse prevention and treatment; and health care and education.

**Self-Reliance**

Adults, youth, seniors, and persons with disabilities should be able to effectively access and use transportation, employment services, housing and supportive living services, financial and nutritional services, legal counseling, education services, and specialized services for persons with disabilities, seniors, and adults. The HSC is committed to ensuring that access and support are available that allow its residents to progress in attaining self-sufficiency, or when appropriate, to have other positive and meaningful involvement in the community.
Services in this outcome area include, but are not limited to: an array of support and development services for youth, adults, seniors, and for persons with disabilities, including independent living skills and support, transitional housing, financial education and counseling, life management skills, and employability skill training and wellness activities.

**Basic Needs**

Every resident of the Lane County should have access to food, shelter, medical, and other basic necessities of life. Support should be provided to people in crisis when the urgency of their needs requires that they be met. The Lane County Ten-Year Plan to End Chronic Homelessness suggests that city and county resources should be developed to meet needs that are not being met by others and should focus on increasing comprehensive approaches to helping individuals and families reduce their reliance on subsidized services.

Services in this outcome area include, but are not limited to: an array of food assistance, emergency housing and rental assistance, energy assistance, prescription assistance, and case management.

**Coordinated Care**

This service area calls for implementing collaborative strategies to reduce repeated involvement in the emergency medical and criminal justice systems, and increase stability and self-sufficiency of multi-problem community members and families by developing and expanding the capacity of supportive housing networks that use housing first strategies and provide integrated support, treatment, and employment services.

Services in this outcome area include, but are not limited to: an array of coordinated case management, treatment, employment, training and permanent supportive housing services.
Special Needs

Chapter Summary: To the extent that the information is available, this chapter discusses the number of persons, in various populations, who are not homeless but may require housing or supportive services and describes facilities and services that serve those populations.

Special Needs Population

Limited reliable data exists to determine the number of individuals in various special needs subpopulations within the cities of Eugene and Springfield. The primary sources of data include the 2008 Oregon Housing and Community Services (OHCS) Special Needs and Affordable Housing Needs Assessment (Needs Assessment), and the 2010 Needs Analysis Priorities for Special Needs Populations, which estimate the number of persons in various subpopulations within Lane County that may have special needs for housing and supportive services. In 2009, the population in the cities of Eugene and Springfield accounted for approximately 60% of the total Lane County population. Typically, approximately 70% of the population in the cities of Eugene and Springfield reside in Eugene with the remaining 30% residing in Springfield.

The OHCS Needs Assessment was compiled using databases from multiple agencies. It should be noted that one person may be counted in multiple subpopulations. In addition, it is difficult to ensure non-duplicative counts with homeless persons since the data sources for the subpopulations are varied and, in some instances, duplicative.

Released Offenders

OHCS data suggests that nearly 500 released offenders living in Lane County are in need of housing and supportive services. For many of these former inmates, the question of where they will live is a critical one, and has important consequences for the community. Returning to their former living situation may expose them to the environment that caused them to be incarcerated. In addition, many leave the prison system without a job or reasonable prospects of a job, no recent rental history, limited credit, and no money for deposits. As a result, it is extremely difficult for members of this population to find and pay for rental housing in the private market.

A 2000 article published by the National Institute of Justice, When Prisoners Return to the Community: Political, Economic and Social Consequences, predicted that when an ex-offender was released to the street with little or no preparation, "a number of unfortunate collateral consequences are likely, including increases in child abuse, family violence, the spread of infectious diseases, homelessness and community disorganization". Transitional housing, combined with other services, such as drug treatment and job training, provide a ‘safe haven’ for this very difficult to house population and provide greater opportunities for success upon their re-entrance into the community.

Persons with HIV/AIDS

OHCS data indicates that approximately 300 people living with HIV/AIDS in Lane County are in need of housing and supportive services. With the advent of new medications, the average life expectancy for
people newly diagnosed with HIV is now 24 years. As long-time survivors deal with the ongoing financial impact of HIV/AIDS, housing and support services become critical to their ability to meet basic needs, such as shelter and food. Clients with evictions, limited income, or criminal history require additional assistance in moving from temporary or transitional housing to permanent housing.

Access to medical care is a top priority for this subpopulation in the cities of Eugene and Springfield. In both statewide and local client surveys, people living with HIV/AIDS have repeatedly stated the need for assistance with care coordination. This need includes information and referral to medical assistance programs and social services, advocacy, and insurance coordination. This subpopulation has also expressed a need for financial assistance, such as transportation to medical appointments, housing costs, food, and medication costs. Dental care has also been identified in client satisfaction surveys as one of the top unmet needs of people living with HIV/AIDS in the cities of Eugene and Springfield.

Victims of Domestic Violence

OHCS data identifies close to 150 victims of domestic violence (individuals or single adults with children) in Lane County in need of housing and supportive services. Women fleeing from domestic abuse, many with children, often have special shelter and housing needs. Foremost can be a need for security, including assurances that their identity and whereabouts will not be disclosed. While most shelters include such safeguards, permanent housing is likely to be more public and accessible. Recognizing this, permanent housing for this extremely vulnerable population needs to be developed with security and anonymity as primary considerations, along with affordability. Group living situations may provide the support and security that is needed, but these are usually transitory and do not provide permanent solutions to this subpopulation’s special housing needs.

While it may not be advisable to develop housing complexes exclusively for this population (this in itself will be revealing for the tenants), it is necessary to consider this population when developing affordable housing, especially when public funds are used. Site security measures and management policies that protect the identity of tenants are as important as affordability and need to be incorporated into the design and implementation of such housing.

Persons with Alcohol and/or Drug Addiction

OHCS data suggests that nearly 6,000 persons with drug and/or alcohol addictions living in Lane County are in need of housing and supportive services. Behavioral problems related to their addiction often prevent this subpopulation from successfully obtaining and maintaining permanent housing. Specialized drug/alcohol free transitional housing (group homes, halfway houses) with supportive drug counseling and therapy services is a high priority need for this population. Individuals able to transition out of supportive housing will need permanent housing options that will help them as they continue on the road to recovery. Of primary importance is to have affordable housing options that are drug and alcohol free. This may have to be program-enriched housing in order to be able to effectively enforce drug and alcohol free policies. Unlike housing for victims of domestic violence, recovering addicts may best be served by living in a strictly controlled environment, among peers with similar addiction issues, and with ready access to supportive services. Therefore, dedicated drug/alcohol free multi-family and/or
single-room occupancy housing developed in conjunction with service agencies will likely provide the best opportunities for success for this difficult to house population.

**Persons with Disabilities**

The OHCS Needs Assessment indicates that more than 7,300 persons living with a disability in Lane County are in need of housing and supportive services. The data suggests that two-thirds (66%) of this subpopulation is chronically mentally ill while the remainder has developmental disabilities (23%) or physical disabilities (11%), each of whom have different housing needs. For instance, while for people with mental or developmental disabilities, finding and remaining in housing with the necessary supportive services is a high need, for those with physical disabilities, affordability can be one of the greatest impediments to accessing and maintaining permanent housing.

A 2002 year-long project produced by National Public Radio, Housing First, reported that people with mental illness leaving acute or chronic care facilities without adequate provisions for their housing or support tend to end up sliding into homeless shelters or the criminal justice system. A housing model that works to stem this trend is supportive housing wherein the provision of housing is linked to social services, including mental health care. The report cited research conducted by the Berkeley University’s Goldman School of Public Policy that pointed out the public benefits of providing supportive housing for people with mental illness. Before moving in, the participants in the Berkley study had made frequent use of emergency rooms and hospitals, costing thousands of dollars per person annually. Once the study participants were placed in supportive housing, the study found a 58% decrease in emergency room visits, a corresponding drop in hospital stays, and virtual elimination of their use of residential mental health facilities.

Arguably the greatest impediment to housing for persons with physical disabilities is affordability. A 2000 Census survey found that 28% of persons 25 to 64 years old with severe physical disabilities fell far below the federal poverty line, nearly four times the rate for people of the same age who were not disabled at that time. It is important to consider this when developing housing for persons with physical disabilities, as units that meet the various accessibility requirements tend to be more costly to build and maintain than standard units. Design requirements, such as elevators and ramps, door widths and turnarounds, kitchen and bathroom configurations, and wheelchair-compatible hard surfaces add to construction costs. The limited supply of suitable building sites (level, close to public transit) further add to the cost of development. Affordable handicap-accessible housing is extremely difficult to build without substantial public subsidy to offset development costs and/or rental costs.

An important and growing subset of the disabled community is veterans. Of the more than 9000 men and women currently serving in the Oregon National Guard, approximately 1,250 are residents of Lane County. Each year, 150 to 200 National Guard veterans are released from regular active duty and return to their homes in Lane County.

Many veterans have diverse and difficult issues following their military service. Such issues undermine their ability to maintain housing. Veterans experience mental and physical disabilities, post traumatic stress, traumatic brain injury, and, in some cases, isolation from family and/or the broader community. Healthcare is not always an affordable option, and as a result, many begin to self medicate with drugs and alcohol.
The regional Veterans Administration medical facility is located in Roseburg, Oregon, 70 miles south of Eugene and Springfield. The Roseburg VA Health Care Catchment includes Lane County as well as large segments of southern Oregon and northern California. Approximately 53% of the military veterans who live within the Roseburg Catchment are residents of Lane County. Lane County veterans who require specialty care and hospital services must travel to Roseburg to access those services.

**Elderly and Frail Elderly**

The OHCS Needs Assessment identifies around 11,000 elderly and 1,600 frail elderly persons living in Lane County in need of housing and supportive services. However, this does not necessarily signify that all of these persons need housing units specifically designated for this subpopulation as many elderly and frail elderly persons living in Lane County are able to live in their own homes, rent units on the private market, or live in general purpose subsidized affordable housing developments that have not been designated for a particular subpopulation.

**Existing Facilities and Services**

The 2008 OHCS Needs Assessment provides some data regarding the number of affordable units available to serve the non-homeless special needs population. However, as with the special needs population numbers, the data regarding existing housing and facilities is not all inclusive. It is also important to note that some of the people in these subpopulations can live independently or semi-independently in housing on the private market, given housing suitable for their needs and with necessary supportive services. Where possible, additional information from local service providers has been provided.

**Released Offenders**

Although the OHCS data shows that no affordable housing units exist in Lane County to serve released offenders, Sponsors, Inc. provides re-entry services to ex-offenders in Lane County. Sponsors provides housing, case management, assistance with employment and schooling, and practical support to approximately 300 men and women annually, who account for about 35% of the ex-offenders released to Lane County.

Sponsors has several programs targeted at the Lane County male ex-offender population. Services in the basic program include case management for each participant, transitional housing, assistance in obtaining employment and permanent housing upon completion of the program, and assistance in obtaining identification and whatever clothing and tools are required for employment. Two residential programs for males provide a total of 45 beds, both in Eugene. In addition, there are 14 Honors Program beds for males who have successfully completed the basic program and express interest in remaining in a less-structured environment for up to one year.

The women’s transition program in Eugene offers transitional housing for up to 19 women, some of whom may have a child living with them. There are 14 beds in the basic program and five beds in the women’s Honors Program. Priority is given to women being released from prison. The program offers structure and support to address the complex issues facing the residents, including substance abuse,
domestic violence, loss of children, and trauma. The average length of residential program participation is approximately three months, a month longer than the men’s program to allow for lower wage-earning capacity among women.

The Sponsors sex offender program houses 15 offenders, and Sponsors also owns a 28-unit quad in Eugene designated as alcohol and drug free-housing under Oregon law. The quad is available to men (16 units) and women (12 units) who have successfully completed Sponsor’s basic program or who have been referred by their parole officer. The goal of this housing is to provide tenants with clean, safe, and affordable housing, as well as an opportunity to rebuild their credit and rental histories.

In May 2009, Sponsors broke ground on a new development in Eugene that includes a housing and program services complex, consolidating housing for ex-offenders from two scattered and aging rented buildings and increasing Sponsors’ capacity by 21 beds of transitional housing. The 44-unit facility will house approximately 72 men and include a warehouse to store donations, food, and sundry goods.

While the OHCS analysis identifies a need for housing for released offenders, that analysis did not take into account existing units and units under construction for that population. Based on information gathered from local service providers regarding the actual number of affordable housing units available for released offenders, a Priority Need Level of “medium” has been established and documented in Table 1B for this population rather than the ranking determined by OHCS.

Persons with HIV/AIDS

The OHCS Needs Assessment similarly indicates that there are no affordable housing units to serve persons with HIV/AIDS in Lane County. However, HIV Alliance provides a broad range of supportive services to increase access to and engagement in HIV care, including: health and psycho-social assessments; linkage to medical care, health insurance, and prescription drugs; dental, nutritional, mental health, and substance abuse services; transportation assistance; and emergency housing and utility assistance.

The Oregon Department of Human Services, HIV Care and Treatment Program, provides housing services through the Oregon Housing Opportunities in Partnership (OHOP) program. The services provided to non-homeless clients include: comprehensive housing needs assessment; direct provision of utility assistance; and direct provision of permanent supportive housing through rental assistance.

A minimum of five supportive housing units have been identified by local service providers as those that currently house persons with HIV/AIDS and are receiving services provided by OHOP. These units are scattered throughout the cities of Eugene and Springfield within established affordable housing developments.

As with released offenders, while the OHCS analysis identifies a need for housing for persons with HIV/AIDS, that analysis did not take into account existing units for that population or the fact that persons with HIV/AIDS can live independently or semi-independently in housing on the private market, given housing suitable for their needs and with necessary supportive services. Based on information gathered from local service providers regarding the actual number of affordable housing units available for persons with HIV/AIDS and the relatively low number of persons in the community with HIV/AIDS, a
Priority Need Level of “medium” has been established and documented in Table 1B for this population rather than the ranking determined by OHCS.

Victims of Domestic Violence

The OHCS Needs Assessment also suggests that no affordable housing units exist in Lane County for victims of domestic violence. Yet, Womenspace, Inc. provides an emergency shelter that can serve up to 25 women and children who are victims of domestic violence. Another 20 affordable housing units have been identified by local housing/service providers that contract with Womenspace as units dedicated to or rented by victims of domestic violence. Units tend to be two-bedroom or larger and in locations that provide a sense of safety for victims.

Persons with Alcohol and/or Drug Addiction

The OHCS Needs Assessment identifies 34 affordable housing units for persons with alcohol and/or drug addiction. Recently completed rehabilitation projects in Eugene have added 28 more units of affordable housing for veterans recovering from an alcohol and/or drug addiction. Data from local service providers also reflects approximately 17 other persons in recovery that reside in affordable housing (some of which are dedicated for this subpopulation) and receive case management in addition to the units identified in the OHCS Needs Assessment.

Persons with Disabilities

The OHCS Needs Assessment found that nearly 500 affordable housing units exist in Lane County to serve persons with disabilities, approximately one-third each serving the chronically mentally ill, those with developmental disabilities, and those with physical disabilities.

There are several models in the area that have proven to be successful in providing affordable housing to persons with mental disabilities. The first is group home living, which provides private bedrooms to up to five individuals in a single family home. Onsite managers, live-in or drop-in caregivers, and access to supportive services are a commonality among group homes for this population. Special design considerations and arrangements are made specific to each client’s needs. Group homes have the advantage of being able to be disbursed throughout the community and blend into the surrounding neighborhood. Group homes developed and managed by Alvord-Taylor, Inc. are good examples of this type of housing.

A second type of facility serving persons with disabilities are multi-family developments built or converted to meet the specific needs of the intended population. These facilities tend to serve high-functioning individuals who can live independently but benefit from the support of other disabled persons, as well as from management and policies tailored to their needs. Mainstream Housing and Housing and Community Services of Lane County have been successful in developing this type of housing. The HUD Section 811 program has also been utilized to provide housing with supportive services for this population. Examples of 811 projects are the Uhlhorn Apartments, Laurel Grove Apartments, and River Kourt. Local developers have identified a need for more independent living opportunities.
The third model for serving persons with disabilities is transitional housing or halfway housing for those individuals that require more initial oversight. Housing of this type is primarily used by those individuals with treatable mental illnesses such as schizophrenia and bi-polar disease. People in this type of housing receive on-going treatment and supervision as they work toward stability and more permanent housing. ShelterCare provides housing of this type.

St. Vincent de Paul, a local housing and service provider, has developed three apartment complexes to house homeless veterans with a dual diagnosis of mental illness and addiction. The total number of affordable housing units currently available for this specific population has now grown to 35.

**Elderly and Frail Elderly**

The OHCS Needs Assessment located over 2,000 affordable housing units serving the elderly and frail elderly in Lane County. However, elderly and frail elderly persons living in Eugene and Springfield have a range of housing needs and live in a variety of housing types. Many continue to live in their own homes or rent units within the private market or live in general purpose subsidized affordable housing developments that have not been designated for a particular population. In addition, there are multiple subsidized housing developments in Eugene and Springfield targeted to this population. Examples of such housing development, created through the HUD Section 202 program, include Ya-Po-Ah Terrace, Aster Apartments, and Olive Plaza.
Anti-Poverty

Chapter Summary: This chapter describes local goals, programs, and policies for reducing the number of poverty level families, and identifies the extent to which the anti-poverty strategies will help reduce the number of poverty level families.

Over the last 37 years, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield have worked collaboratively with Lane County to reduce poverty throughout the county by way of the Human Services Commission (HSC). This collaborative model efficiently distributes limited funds to agencies serving Eugene, Springfield, and other areas of Lane County. The HSC was established in 1972 to serve as the bridge between public agencies and private, non-profit community-based organizations to strengthen the community by ‘closing the front door to poverty’ by helping the region’s neediest residents achieve stability, improved health, greater independence, and a higher quality of life. The HSC is comprised of seven members, including elected and appointed officials from Lane County, Eugene, and Springfield.

The HSC is managed by the Human Services Division within Lane County’s Department of Health and Human Services. The Human Services Division is designated as the Federal- and State-funded anti-poverty and homeless agency for Lane County, and as such, ensures financial and program accountability and manages the service contracts the HSC has with community-based organizations.

The HSC also allocates funds ($14 million in Fiscal Year 2009) from the regional Human Services Fund, which is financed by Lane County, Eugene, Springfield, and other State and Federal sources. Funds are allocated to non-profit and public human service providers in Lane County’s Human Service Network through a bi-annual bidding process. The Community Action Advisory Council assists the HSC with planning and recommending program allocations based on priority needs.

The HSC is the lead agency for implementing the Continuum of Care Plan for activities aimed at ameliorating poverty and homelessness in Lane County. The Continuum of Care Plan is a road map for providing an integrated community safety-net delivery system to low-income households. The plan identifies human services, supportive housing, and health care needs, and it establishes goals, priorities, and strategies for addressing those needs. The plan identifies how funds included in the plan will be spent, taking into account various regulations governing grant funding, to meet locally identified needs for low-income and homeless persons.
Poverty Reduction Goals

The HSC is governed by both national and local goals for reducing poverty. These goals fall within the general categories of meeting basic community needs, increasing the self-reliance of individuals, improving the health and well-being of households, strengthening children and families, and building a safer community. HSC, as the Community Action Agency for Lane County, adopts the Community Services Block Grant National Goals of:

- Low-income people become more self-sufficient;
- The conditions in which low-income people live are improved;
- Low-income people own a stake in their community;
- Partnerships among supporters and providers of services to low-income people are achieved;
- Agencies increase their capacity to achieve results; and
- Low-income people, especially vulnerable populations, achieve their potential by strengthening family and other supportive environments.

Anti-Poverty Policies

The HSC guides policy and funding decisions, and it identifies and approves funding priorities and grants to service providers throughout Lane County. The Community Action Advisory Council supports the HSC with planning and recommending program allocations. The HSC has developed the following policies to guide its decision making process:

- End the cycle of poverty;
- Create good health and ongoing wellness;
- Prevent or end homelessness;
- Assist low-income residents to make their housing energy efficient;
- Provide educational and training opportunities;
- Secure employment and an adequate income;
- Treat substance abuse and mental illness;
- Prevent unintended teen pregnancy;
- Prevent juvenile delinquency; and
- Stop child abuse and neglect.

Poverty Reduction Programs

Since 1972, the HSC has effectively focused its efforts to make the greatest impact with limited public funds. In Fiscal Year 2008, the HSC supported 65 local programs that, together, provide an integrated community safety-net delivery system of human services, supportive housing services, and health care services to at-risk youth, families, and individuals. The individuals and households served include: individuals who have been impacted by domestic violence and sexual assault; at-risk youth, homeless and runaway youth, and teen parents; low-income singles and families; homeless singles, youth, and families; farm workers; ex-offenders; individuals with physical and psychiatric disabilities; veterans; seniors; and people with limited English language proficiency.
The HSC funds a range of human service programs that allow its non-profit partners to meet the needs of the community when and where it exists. Ninety-four percent (94%) of the HSC’s financial support goes directly to helping people in crisis and preventing homelessness. In calendar year 2008, the programs funded by the HSC helped 73,806 individuals in 58,114 households receive assistance to improve their lives. Sixty-six percent (66%) of the households currently participating in funded programs live in poverty or extreme poverty with a household income at or below the Federal Poverty Level.

Housing Assistance and Human Services
The HSC wholly or partially funds numerous human and housing services and programs in Lane County. A complete list of agencies and programs served between July 1, 2007 and June 30, 2008, including the number of households served by each and a summary of the program purpose and outcomes, can be found in Appendix J.

Energy and Conservation
The HSC also supports programs that provide energy assistance, energy conservation education, financial assistance, and home weatherization to low-income households to lower their utility cost burden and energy usage, reduce arrearages on their accounts, and prevent shut offs. These programs are as follows:

- **LIEAP - Low Income Energy Assistance Program**: this program provides financial assistance to low-income households (below 60% of area median income) for utility bills. The program is seasonal, and winter services are available as early as funding allows.
- **REACH - Residential Energy Assistance Challenge**: in conjunction with the Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County, this program offers help to low-income renters and homeowners (including mobile homes) who purchase power from participating utility companies in weatherization audit and weatherization measures, energy conservation education, case management, and limited bill paying assistance for people needing weatherization.
- **ECCP/EWEB - Customer Care Plus**: this program provides energy education and a kit of energy saving devices to EWEB customers with incomes below 60% of area median income. ECCP also includes bill assistance, weatherization, case management and referral to other community resources.
- **Weatherization Program**: this program, provided by the Housing and Community Services Agency of Lane County, assesses homes for weatherization needs, installs insulation and windows, and seals heating ducts to income-qualified renters and home owners (including mobile homes).

Veterans
The Veterans Administration (VA) office serves the approximate 38,000 veterans, their dependents, and survivors in Lane County, which amounts to 80,000 to 100,000 potential recipients of VA benefits. Some of the duties of this office are to:

- Advocate for veterans, their dependents, and survivors;
- Assist veterans filing service-connected disability claims;
- Assist veterans filing non-service connected disability claims;
• Assist veterans and their dependents recover lost or forgotten military records;
• Assist veterans applying for enrollment in VA Health Care;
• Assist veterans and their dependents applying for VA education benefits;
• Assist widows and widowers with filing for Surviving Spouse Benefits;
• Provide outreach appointments to house-bound veterans and widows throughout Lane County; and
• Provide outreach to Florence, Cottage Grove, and Oakridge.

Impact of Anti-Poverty Strategies

Poverty is an income issue related to living wage jobs and the economic health of communities, the region, and the nation. Broad economic strategies and job creation programs are the primary responsibility of the Federal and State governments. The HSC is limited in the direct effect that it can have on the rate of poverty in Lane County.

The HSC’s goals and objectives primarily have an indirect effect on jobs and poverty. Most of the HSC’s programs help to relieve economic burdens on households, such as the housing cost burden, and help to support them to become more stable and potentially more equipped to find jobs or higher-paying jobs; however, these programs do not affect poverty without an adequate number of living wage jobs in the area. The HSC communicates with, consults, and plans with community partners and a host of other public and private agencies that engage in work to help households move out of poverty and, in some cases, to create jobs that will alleviate poverty.

The HSC considers the following strategies as being effective in reducing poverty:

• Affordable housing units may decrease the rental cost burden on households and help stabilize them;
• Improved housing stock may make deteriorated areas more viable for economic development and new jobs;
• Repair programs for home owners allow households to secure financing to fix their home through non-amortizing loans so that the household does not have to expend limited income on costly monthly loan payments;
• First-time homebuyer programs allow low- to moderate-income households gain equity in a home and begin to create some wealth;
• Responsible lending educational work and remedies help keep households from being stripped of the investment or equity in their home, or losing their home;
• Homelessness prevention programs help keep households from being propelled into homelessness and losing their job and stability;
• Shelters, transitional housing, and related services help households get back on their feet, and, in many cases, stay employed, if homelessness occurs;
• Permanent supportive housing helps formerly homeless households with a disability to become stable and perhaps secure a job in the future;
• Improving the ability of health and human service agencies to serve low- and moderate-income residents helps households take care of emergency and crisis needs, as well as plan for longer term needs for greater stability and the ability to move out of poverty;
• Improving public infrastructure makes communities healthier and safer and, in some cases, more viable for economic activities that can increase local jobs;
• Neighborhood revitalization strategies help make high poverty, deteriorated neighborhoods attractive for new investments, and create new jobs and economic opportunities.
• Assisting small and/or economically disadvantaged businesses in predominantly low- to moderate-income communities with improvements to their commercial property may help revive deteriorated commercial areas and retain or increase jobs.
• Assisting low- to moderate-income persons in obtaining job skills and employment services helps households find work or secure a better-paying job.

The HSC focuses its strategies to reduce poverty in four primary areas:

**Family Development**
Increase the ability of low-wage workers to be stable and self-reliant through an integrated range of family development services designed to address emergency situations as well as long-term goals for self-sufficiency.

According to the 2007 U.S. Census American Community Survey, 15.9% of Lane County’s population (54,630 people) are living in poverty, the emergency basic needs of which only 46.1% (25,203 people) were addressed through the Lane County Human Service Network, and only 3,477 received self-sufficiency case management.

**Child and Youth Development**
Ensure that families with young children and youth are able to access the services and supports they need to promote healthy children, youth and family development and wellbeing, school-readiness, and a pathway to a healthy journey. Expand primary prevention activities to form healthy habits early in life, focusing on preventing problems before they occur. Develop youth to become self-reliant adults who are a positive asset to our communities through an integrated approach to services.

According to the 2007 U.S. Census American Community Survey, 16% of related children under 18 were below the poverty level. Nine percent of all families and 29% of families with a female householder and no husband present had incomes below the poverty level. Of the 7,478 families below poverty, the HSC was only able to serve 566 with children and youth development services. The HSC currently only has a capacity to serve to serve 643 at-risk and homeless youth.

**Housing and Support Services**
Expand the continuum of coordinated housing and services to prevent and eventually end homelessness. Move more previously homeless individuals and families off the streets and other unstable living situations to live in stable, supportive housing with increased housing, employment, and economic stability.

Out of those below poverty, only 2,988 people were served through supportive housing programs, and 2,747 were housed in emergency shelters. Only 296 households are served with homeless prevention self-sufficiency services.
Integration of Services

Expand options for integration of housing, social services, behavioral health, and medical services to stabilize those who traditionally have rapidly moved in and out of stability.

According to the Federal SAMHSA Mental Health Information Center, 39% of homeless people have some form of mental health problem and 20%-25% have a serious mental illness. Further, 38% report using alcohol while 26% report using drugs. HSC would like to expand integrated serves to the adult at-risk and homeless population, as well.

Coordination of Programs & Services

The HSC is the lead entity for the Lane County Continuum of Care planning process. The HSC is the inter-jurisdictional body that reviews and makes health and human services and supportive housing policy recommendations to Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County, in collaboration with the Intergovernmental Housing Policy Board.

The HSC has been the manager of the overall Continuum of Care Plan process since 1994. The HSC is an administrative division of the Lane County Department of Health & Human Services. The HSC provides health, housing, and human services through partnerships with local governments and public, private nonprofit, and private community-based organizations, schools, utilities, and hospitals. The HSC coordinates the Lane County regional continuum of care, in collaboration with non-profit and public human service and housing organizations. The HSC’s coordinated care model finances and delivers an integrated community safety-net delivery system of social services, supportive housing, and healthcare services for low-income, uninsured, and under insured people. In an effort to address homelessness on a regional basis, the Lane County Continuum of Care Plan covers a consortium of contiguous jurisdictions located within Lane County, Oregon.

Under the leadership of the HSC, the Lane County Continuum of Care Plan is a well-coordinated, unduplicated regional collaborative process that identifies human services, supportive housing, and community development needs and establishes goals, priorities, policies, and strategies for addressing those needs. Planning for and implementing the Continuum of Care occurs within a strategic framework and takes into account local housing, social service, and economic conditions that encompass Lane County communities. The HSC exists to ensure coordination and to minimize duplication of effort and administrative costs. The HSC promotes the efficient and flexible use of funding by pooling flexible Federal block grants and state and local funds with sensitivity to community differences, needs, and resources.

The HSC administrative staff ensures coordination of planning of other Federal resources through their responsibility for the development and administration of the consortia plan for HUD’s CDBG, HOME, and ESG programs, as well as CSBG, LIHEAP, Health Care for the Homeless and Community Health Center, Homeless Youth, and Veterans programs.

The HSC is the lead agency for the State of Oregon’s homeless programs in Lane County, ensuring coordination of those programs with federally- and locally-funded activities. The HSC administers State-funded homeless, low-income housing, human service, primary dental, and behavioral health care
services in Lane County. The Department of Human Services’ (DHS) Lane County branch coordinates Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Food Stamps, and the Oregon Health Plan (Medicaid) programs and works in conjunction with the HSC to coordinate these services effectively in conjunction with local non-profits. DHS and Lane County ensure coordination of the Continuum of Care planning with these assistance programs.

An example of this coordination is a joint-funded project through HSC and TANF to assist homeless teen parents. Another example is that HSC-funded non-profit agencies that provide housing services work with agencies that build and manage affordable housing projects to prioritize referrals from homeless agency program participants or incorporating special populations they serve in designing new affordable housing developments.
Community Development

Chapter Summary: This chapter summarizes community development needs identified in the cities of Eugene and Springfield including public services, public facilities, public infrastructure, economic development, and other community development needs.

The community development needs of Eugene and Springfield are guided by the overall community trends in poverty, unemployment, incidence of homeless, and other indicators. HUD requires a statement of need according to particular categories of eligible activities. As a result, the following chapter is organized according to the categories of need established by HUD for non-housing uses of CDBG funds.

It is important to note that the needs described below are limited to those that can be addressed through CDBG-eligible activities and also have the ability to meet a CDBG national objective. As a result, the analysis focuses on the need of low- and moderate-income persons, which is the primary national objective of CDBG.

Public Services

A limited portion of CDBG funds may be used to address a variety of public services that benefit low- and moderate-income persons. The need for these services is well-established in the Homelessness and Anti-Poverty chapters of the Consolidated Plan. Additional evidence of public service needs come from the 2009 Community Assessment conducted by United Way of Lane County. This study presents a snapshot of community need based on a random phone survey of 1,200 households residing in Lane County. This survey has been conducted seven times since 1992.

In summation, the 2009 Community Assessment finds that more households are reporting financial hardships affording basic services and goods than in any other previous survey. Among households surveyed, 30% or more indicated difficulty finding work and lack of money for medical insurance and expenses, food, housing, transportation, and clothing. Over 50% of households with children reported financial hardships affording food, utilities, clothing, and housing. Figure 18 provides a breakdown financial hardship and compares the results of the 2009 survey with four previous surveys. The study also finds that these economic challenges have resulted in a two-fold increase in the need for services related to mental/emotional needs, domestic violence, and parenting.

In response to these conditions, there is an expanded need for basic services for Eugene and Springfield residents. Needed services include food distribution, case management and counseling for homeless individuals and families, medical services for homeless persons, and family supports. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield and Lane County work collaboratively to address anti-poverty and homelessness issues. The use of CDBG funds and other resources are guided by the intergovernmental Human Services Commission, composed of elected officials and appointed members from these jurisdictions. This collaborative arrangement results in better funding and service coordination among jurisdictions and participating agencies.
Public Facilities

The term ‘public facilities’ is broadly defined by HUD to include all improvements and facilities that are either publicly owned or that are traditionally provided by the government, or owned by a nonprofit and operated so as to be open to the general public. Such facilities do not include permanent housing but do include various types of residential facilities, such as emergency shelter or special needs facilities.

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield have identified needs related to two areas under the umbrella of Public Facilities: 1) nonprofit facilities serving low- and moderate-income persons; and 2) barrier removal in government buildings.
Nonprofit Facilities Serving Low- and Moderate-Income Persons

Nonprofit facilities serving low- and moderate-income persons house a wide variety of services and uses. While Public Facilities does not include permanent affordable housing, regulations specify that facilities designed for use in providing shelter for persons having special needs are considered to be public facilities. Such shelters would include convalescent homes, medical facilities, shelters for victims of domestic violence, emergency shelters, transitional housing, and halfway houses.

Typically, such facilities demonstrate that the majority of persons served have low and moderate incomes by collecting income information or limiting services to exclusively benefit a clientele who are generally presumed by HUD to be low- or moderate-income persons. Currently, the following groups are presumed by HUD to be made up of principally of low- or moderate-income persons: abused children, elderly persons, battered spouses, homeless persons, severely disabled persons, illiterate adults, persons living with AIDS, and migrant farm workers.

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield rely upon a network of nonprofit organizations to provide basic human services for low- and moderate-income persons. The vast majority of services require appropriate capital facilities, whether the service is food distribution, emergency housing, medical services, substance abuse counseling, or other services. In many cases the adequacy and condition of the capital facilities can significantly limit the nonprofit’s ability to provide appropriate services. Many local nonprofit agencies serve both jurisdictions and also receive funding through Human Services Commission.

The need for services provided by nonprofit organizations is described in the Public Services section in this chapter, as well as other chapters. Additional indications of need for nonprofit facilities include:

- As shown on HUD Table 1A – Homeless and Special Needs populations, there is an unmet need for emergency and transitional housing for both individuals and families with children. Specifically, there is a need for 339 emergency shelter beds and 345 transitional shelter beds for individuals. For families with children, there is a need for 842 transitional shelter beds. These forms of shelter are needed by persons who are chronically or situationally homeless, have serious mental illness or substance abuse problems, veterans, living with HIV/AIDS, victims of domestic violence, or unaccompanied youth.
- Staff conducted an informal survey of local nonprofit organizations to assess the need for rehabilitation of existing facilities or new facilities to respond to community needs. Local agencies participating included Catholic Community Services, Head Start, Looking Glass, ShelterCare, St. Vincent de Paul Society, Sponsors, Inc., and Willamette Family Treatment Services. All agencies indicated needs for repair of existing facilities or expansion to meet growing need for services. Critical needs for existing facilities include roof replacements, foundation work, and accessibility improvements.
- The level of assistance requested in the previous Consolidated Plan period was significant. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield assisted over 20 nonprofit capital facilities over the past five years. Examples of projects assisted include a new food distribution facility for Catholic Community Services, installation of an elevator for Full Access Brokerage, and acquisition of a new facility for Womenspace.

Requests for CDBG funds for nonprofit capital facilities are solicited through the CDBG allocation process conducted separately by Eugene and Springfield. Through each process, the need for the
particular facility improvement is evaluated against the needs identified in the Consolidated Plan and other requests for use of CDBG funds.

**Removal of Architectural Barriers in Government Buildings**

CDBG funds may be used to remove architectural barriers in existing facilities that restrict the access of elderly or severely disabled persons. While use of CDBG is usually prohibited in buildings used for the general conduct of government, the regulations make an exception for removal of architectural barriers. Such buildings may include city halls, administrative buildings, office buildings, or other facilities in which the legislative, judicial or general administrative affairs of government are conducted. Ineligible buildings include jails, prisons, police stations, and fire stations. Given that such facilities are accessed by the public at large, the nature of the improvement must specifically benefit elderly and disabled persons.

**City of Eugene**

The need for accessibility improvements in City of Eugene facilities were most recently assessed in the 2008 Facility Accessibility Evaluation Report. This report identifies deficiencies and areas of non-conformance as outlined in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) of 1990 and the Architectural Barriers Act of 1968. The elements evaluated were identified as creating a physical barrier to accessibility and included elements of buildings used by the public, as well as infrastructure such as streets, curbs, sidewalks and stairs. A phased ‘Transition Plan’ concept was initiated in the early 1990’s to document priority projects, guided by public input from the Human Rights Accessibility Committee (HRAC) of the Human Rights Commission. Eugene has incrementally addressed physical accessibility issues over the last 18 years through capital improvement projects, as well as with CDBG funding for qualifying projects. Although many of the major deficiencies and barriers to accessibility in public facilities and infrastructure have been addressed, there is still a need to continue to remove barriers to accessibility in Eugene.

Eugene is now in the Phase 7 ADA Transition Plan, which outlines current projects needed based on the most recent 2008 Facility Accessibility Evaluation report. The HRAC’s priorities for recommendations included in the Phase 7 ADA Transition Plan are those projects with the highest public use and greatest public benefit. They also requested that safety concerns for people with disabilities be addressed in public facilities. Priority projects identified for next five years include: 1) upgrades to fire alarm systems at branch libraries and swimming pools; and 2) installation of accessible parking at public parks. Other needs include modifications to non-accessible bathroom facilities in two community centers, walkways and ramp improvements at three community centers, and installation of a wheelchair lift at one community center. Requests for CDBG funds for removal of architectural barriers in government buildings are considered on a case-by-case basis through Eugene’s annual CDBG allocation process.

**City of Springfield**

Springfield has not identified specific needs for accessibility improvements in City-owned facilities. Use of CBDG funds for such improvements are considered when requested by users and evaluated through its annual CDBG/HOME allocation process.
Public Infrastructure

Public infrastructure improvements are eligible CDBG activities under certain conditions. Such activities must benefit low- and moderate-income persons and/or address conditions of slums and blight and/or an urgent need. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield considered needs related to two areas under the umbrella of Public Infrastructure: 1) barrier removal in public infrastructure; 2) public infrastructure needs in low-income neighborhoods; and 3) public infrastructure related to the development of affordable housing.

Removal of Architectural Barriers in Public Infrastructure

CDBG funds may be used to remove architectural barriers in public infrastructure that restrict the access of elderly or severely disabled persons. CDBG-eligible improvements include installation of curb ramps, accessible pedestrian devices, and other projects meeting barrier removal requirements. Such improvements are assumed to benefit elderly and disabled persons due to the nature of the improvement.

City of Eugene

Eugene’s sidewalk system includes over 700 miles of sidewalks and pedestrian ways. Approximately 7,000 curb ramps offer access to public facilities, private businesses, transit stops, parks, and pedestrian cross walks. Of all curb ramps, 1,100 meet current ADA access ramp standards. The remaining ramps once met ADA access ramp standards, but are in need of a variety of design upgrades such as truncated domes. There are approximately 1,700 mid-block and intersection crosswalks that are without curb ramps.

Curb ramp selection criteria used by City staff takes into account several logistical factors, along with the input from various committees and citizens. The ADA requires that funding priorities be given to “walkways serving local and state government offices and facilities”. Staff prioritize curb ramp selections to those locations that serve government offices and facilities, schools, private businesses such as medical facilities, transit stops, parks, pedestrian crosswalks, corridors which create connectivity in neighborhoods, and other areas where barriers from access may exist. A main focus for selection is in areas of high pedestrian traffic including sidewalks along both arterial and collector streets. Public requests for curb ramps are evaluated and prioritized accordingly.

Installation of Accessible Pedestrian Devices (APDs) at existing signalized intersections has been identified as a need by Eugene residents. The use of APDs increases safety for visually impaired residents, as such signals provide a locating tone to assist users in locating the pedestrian push button and audible message to wait or walk across the intersection. Eugene has 158 actuated signals, and APDs have been installed on 45 of those signals. There are 113 signals remaining. Priority for installation of APDs is determined through user requests and input from the HRAC.

City of Springfield

Springfield considers funding for barrier removal in public infrastructure based on customer or user request for an improvement to meet their needs. The Public Works Department receives requests from the public at large and also from the City Council for improvements such as curb ramps and auditory signals. The request is prioritized based on projected usage, cost and fund availability, and the condition and suitability of the improvement that will be replaced (if any). More requests are received than can be
implemented, but all requests are logged and maintained by the Public Works Department. In addition, accessibility improvements may be implemented as part of a larger public improvements project. This may allow significant cost savings when compared to a stand-alone project. CDBG funds may be used to support these projects if it can be demonstrated that a project meets a national objective and is an eligible activity. If the project is eligible for CDBG assistance, Public Works staff must apply for project funding through the annual CDBG/HOME allocation process.

Public Infrastructure Improvements for Low-Income Neighborhoods
CDBG funds may be used for activities that are available to benefit all the residents of a specific geographic area which is primarily residential. In addition, the activity must meet the identified needs of low- and moderate-income persons residing in an area where at least 51% of the residents are low- or moderate-income persons. CDBG-eligible activities include public infrastructure improvements to roads, bikeways, pedestrian areas, and parks that serve these areas.

City of Eugene
Potential uses of CDBG funds benefiting low-income areas are identified through multiple mechanisms including, but not limited to, the Eugene Pedestrian and Bicycle Strategic Plan, the Eugene Parks and Open Space Plan, and by neighborhood associations. Specific needs related to bike and pedestrian facilities include infill and reconstruction of sidewalks, pedestrian and bicycle crossings, improvement and creation of bicycle lanes and bicycle boulevards, and installation of bicycle parking. Such improvements are needed in residential areas to enhance safety and accessibility. In neighborhood commercial areas, such improvements would also benefit neighborhood businesses. Specific needs related to parks include replacement of dilapidated and unsafe playground equipment, expanded play areas, improvements to paths, and replacement of site furnishing. Another specific need is removal of wading pools that are no longer compliant with health code provisions and replacement with water play elements. In addition, some residential areas do not have adequate geographic access to existing neighborhood parks, indicating a need for creation of new parks. Requests for CDBG funds for such activities are considered on a case-by-case basis through Eugene’s annual CDBG allocation process.

City of Springfield
Springfield has a history of using CDBG to improve and revitalize many neighborhoods throughout the city. Beginning with the Hamlin/Moffit neighborhood in the early 1990’s and continuing through today, the City has combined these funds with street improvement funds, Willamalane Parks and Recreation District resources, and other development funds to improve vehicular and pedestrian safety, reduce and eliminate blight, and increase recreation opportunities. Eligible projects include public infrastructure and public spaces in low-income neighborhoods. Use of CBDG funds for such improvements are considered when requested by users and evaluated through Springfield’s annual CDBG/HOME allocation process.

Public Infrastructure Related to Affordable Housing Development
The City of Eugene purchases and makes land available for the development of affordable housing. Some parcels require infrastructure improvements to serve the development such as installation of sewer, water, electricity, and transportation improvements.
Economic Development

The Joint Elected Officials, representing the City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and Lane County have established an Economic Development Task Force to develop a collaborative response to the current economic climate. The Task Force is creating a framework for a regional economic development plan to better position the region’s economy and take advantage of economic opportunities that align with the area’s assets and values. There have been significant ramifications of the current financial crisis for residents of Eugene, Springfield, and Lane County. The decline in local jobs, coupled with an increased demand for social services, is putting a strain on city, county and state programs. The decline in the availability of local jobs has put increased pressure on housing and social services. The Task Force has established the following goals:

- By 2020, create 20,000 net new jobs in the chosen economic opportunity areas.
- Reduce the local area unemployment rate to, or below, the state average.
- Increase the average annual wage to, or above, the state level.

Special Economic Development Activities

Small businesses create the majority share of the net new jobs in Eugene and Springfield. They are becoming increasingly important in manufacturing and are a primary source of the innovation that leads to employment growth. The current financial crisis has resulted in an environment where credit is being denied at an accelerating pace. Self-funding and local lending are the primary sources of small business capitalization; however, small businesses have never had a harder time getting a loan. Home equity loans, traditionally a key source for start-up small businesses, are no longer a source of liquidity because of declining real estate values and tighter lending. Without access to credit, small businesses cannot grow, cannot hire, and too often end up going out of business. CDBG funds may be used for multiple economic development activities that result in job creation for low- and moderate-income persons.

City of Eugene

The Business Development Fund (BDF) small business loan program has provided a critical source of capital for small businesses since the mid-1980s. The BDF is designed to create jobs for the community and leverage private investment. Funds are available to new and existing businesses within Eugene. Borrowers in need of greater assistance may be eligible for the Emerging Business Loan Pool (EBLP), a spin-off program for businesses that face extraordinary credit barriers, such as low-income status and female or minority owned business. By offering below-market interest rates and flexible financing terms, the BDF and EBLP programs are responsive to the needs of local businesses. Over 200 businesses have taken advantage of the program and more than 1,100 new jobs have been created. The BDF and EBLP programs have loaned over $15 million and leveraged an additional $43 million in private investment. Targeted investments in key industries, such as natural foods, bicycle manufacturing, and technology transferred from University of Oregon are helping diversify the local economy.

Eugene has historically served as the center for growth and commerce in metropolitan area. Downtown Eugene is the town center that functions as the nucleus of government, economic, cultural, and educational activity. Downtown has the largest concentration of employment in the region. The vision captured in the Downtown Plan includes expansion of downtown’s regional importance as an economic center. Dense commercial office development generates significant employment opportunities and
activity that supports retail, restaurants, cultural and entertainment activities. Use of tools and incentives to assist employers to locate and expand downtown is a fundamental economic development strategy.

**City of Springfield**

Springfield recently created a Business Development Loan (BDL) Program modeled after the Eugene program. Funding priorities include meeting a national objective, cost-reasonableness, ability to leverage other resources, viability of the business plan, and how well the activity meets other CDBG and community priorities and goals.

Springfield will make available its newly created BDL fund through its combined CDBG/HOME request for proposal process. Targeted at the small, private business, the BDL uses the LMI-Jobs national objective to determine initial project eligibility. Because Springfield’s annual CDBG allocation is relatively small, the BDL is not a high priority with the Community Development Advisory Committee or with the Council, but having BDL program policies and guidelines clearly established provides additional flexibility when considering proposals for CDBG funding.

**Microenterprise Training**

Another identified need for Eugene and Springfield is microenterprise training for low- and moderate-income persons seeking to start or sustain businesses. Due to recent changes in the economy, there is a continuing need for such services. There have been an increased number of requests for services from existing business owners seeking to stabilize their businesses and survive the economic downturn. There has also been a marked increase in the number of individuals referred for microenterprise training after being turned down for loans by local banks.

**Other Community Development Needs**

In addition to the areas previously described, eligible CDBG activities also include several other activities, including acquisition of real property, disposition, clearance and demolition, clearance of contaminated sites, and code enforcement. While the Cities of Eugene and Springfield have not identified significant needs in these areas, such activities may be undertaken as needed in response to specific opportunities or community challenges.
Strategic Plan

Chapter Summary: This chapter provides a context for and describes the priority housing and community development needs, outlines the objectives of the Plan and the strategies that will be implemented to achieve these objectives, as well as proposed outcomes. It also includes an evaluation of past performance and describes how Plan activities will be monitored.

Context for Consolidated Plan Priorities

The Eugene-Springfield 2010 Consolidated Plan was developed with consideration for several factors that influence Consolidated Plan priorities. The following factors were of primary importance in setting priorities.

- Overall HUD program objectives.
- Federal program eligibility.
- Needs identified through community consultation carried out by those with expertise in programs and services for no- to moderate-income people and special needs populations.
- Needs identified through consideration of the Housing Gaps Analysis, Special Needs, Priority Housing Needs and Non-Housing Community Development Needs Tables included in this Plan.
- Housing and community development resources available at the federal, state, and local levels and their respective use restrictions and guidelines.

Overall HUD Program Objectives

In addition to addressing the housing and community development needs that were previously identified in those sections of the Plan, this section documents the means through which the Cities of Eugene and Springfield will address the objectives established by HUD. The strategies outlined in the 2010 Consolidated Plan for the use of CDBG and HOME program funds were developed to achieve the following statutory objectives, principally for moderate-income, low-income, and extremely low-income residents.

CDBG Program Objectives

- Provide decent, safe and affordable housing
- Create suitable living environments
- Promote economic opportunities

HOME Program Objectives

- Expand the supply of decent, safe, and affordable housing

Federal Program Eligibility

HUD requires that activities funded by federal HUD grants governed by this Consolidated Plan benefit persons who are from low- to moderate-income households or who are homeless according to federal definitions. The 2009 Income Eligibility Guidelines can be found in Table 32.
Community Consultation and Needs Assessment Process

The assessment of needs, establishment of priorities, and identification of strategies in the plan was based on a comprehensive assessment of community needs through consultations with public and private agencies with expertise in programs and services for no- to moderate-income people and special needs populations, various local advisory groups and representatives from local school districts, parks providers, utilities, police departments, legal aid services, and local libraries. A list of agencies and other entities consulted in this process can be found in Appendix B. A complete discussion of the citizen involvement process used to involve the general community in identification of needs, priorities, and strategies can be found in the Consultation and Citizen Participation chapter.

Survey results from the service provider survey, community survey, United Way survey and comments from various interest groups identify a diversity of needs that correspond directly to goals, objectives and strategies included in this plan. Input from the surveys and citizen involvement process advocate increased support for renters, especially low- and extremely-low income subpopulations; the homeless; persons with disabilities; and victims of domestic violence. The surveys and comments also support construction of new, and improvement of existing affordable housing units – especially rental units, and removal of barriers to affordable and supportive housing. Summaries of surveys and interest group comments used in the development of the needs analysis component of the Consolidated Plan can be found in Appendix P.

Strategies developed to address priority housing and community development needs of extremely-low, low- and moderate-income residents are based on consideration of the Housing Gaps Analysis, Special Needs, Priority Housing Needs, and Non-Housing Community Development Needs Tables included in the HUD Tables section of this plan, as well as other community needs discussed throughout the plan. The Housing Gap Analysis data in Table 1A is based on homeless needs information provided by housing, homeless, and special needs service providers, including a one-night count of shelter units being utilized, unsheltered homeless people, and shelter units denied for lack of space. Special Needs Population data (Table 1B) displays information provided by the State of Oregon characterizing the unmet needs of special needs subpopulations. In addition, housing data provided directly by HUD, as well as data and other information provided through interviews with local providers of public, human, and economic development services were used in establishing estimates of needs, priorities, goals, and objectives identified in this chapter.

Prioritization of Needs

In consideration of the significant quantitative and qualitative data gathered through the needs assessment, it is clear that there are significant numbers of persons living in poverty in Eugene and Springfield. Their needs are basic – food, shelter, employment, and access to social services. In the cities of Eugene and Springfield, programs that support these service areas are chronically underfunded; Consolidated Plan funds cannot comprehensively address all of the community needs that have been identified. The need for housing, human, and economic development services is evident throughout both cities; those needs are not isolated to any one neighborhood or geographic area. Accordingly, the
strategies, objectives and actions identified in this plan will be applied broadly to meet overall program goals and to address the most critical needs.

Affordable Housing Needs
The need for quality affordable housing is pervasive among households earning less than 50% of the area’s median family income. In 2000, over 80% of both very low-income renter and owner households had a housing problem. Qualitative data from service providers and the 2009 United Way Community Assessment indicates this need has increased dramatically due to shifts in the economy. A detailed analysis shows extreme need among a few low-income populations. HUD Table 1A shows a need for 2,458 emergency, transitional, and permanent supportive beds for homeless persons. HUD Table 1B shows particularly high needs among persons with severe mental illness, persons with drug addictions, victims of domestic violence, and persons with developmental disabilities. HUD Table 2A shows the greatest need among small and large related households earning less than 50% of the area’s median family income. In addition, low vacancy rates show there are simply not enough housing units to meet needs even if all households could afford the rents.

Community Development Needs
In consideration of the overall economic distress, the most significant community development needs are for public services to meet basic human needs, public facilities related to provision of public services, and economic development activities supporting the creation of more jobs for low- and moderate-income persons (see HUD Table 2A). The 2009 United Way Community Assessment finds more households are reporting financial hardships affording basic services and goods than any previous survey. Social service agencies report a significant increase in needs for a range of services including food assistance, mental health counseling, drug treatment, and assistance for victims of domestic violence. There is also a significant need to support the public facilities, primarily owned and managed by nonprofit agencies that house these basic services. Economic development is also needed to create viable employment opportunities so households may create sustained streams of income to address their basic needs. While other community development needs are less urgent, there are still needs related to removal of architectural barriers and improvement of low-income areas.

Past Performance
In the 2005 Consolidated Plan, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield outlined their goals, objectives, and projected outcomes for permanent affordable housing and community development for the 2005 to 2010 Plan period. At the time the Draft 2010 Consolidated Plan was issued, actual outcomes for the fifth year of the five-year period were unknown. The information on actual outcomes in the tables below only accounts for four years of outcomes for Eugene and estimated five-year outcomes for Springfield. Actual outcomes for the five-year period will be included in the 2009/10 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report.
New Permanent Affordable Housing
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield made strides during 2005 to 2010 to increase the supply of permanent affordable housing by increasing the operational capacity of non-profit developers, participating in land use studies to ensure the needs of low-income residents were considered and amending land use regulations to allow for the development of more affordable housing, and providing financial support for the production of new affordable housing. The Cities also continued to contract with the Fair Housing Council of Oregon to assure housing opportunities were provided without discrimination. While the Cities also projected evaluating and/or purchasing landbank sites for future affordable housing development, both Cities fell short on this objective.

Maintaining Existing Permanent Affordable Housing
Both Cities worked to conserve and improve existing affordable owner and renter housing stock over the course of the 2005 Plan period. Eugene and Springfield met their objectives for analyzing and targeting specific neighborhoods for priority funding, and each City either maintained or expanded upon its programs to assist low-income renters and owners repair and rehab their homes. The number of home repairs far exceeded projected outcomes while participation in rehab programs fell somewhat short of projections. Eugene also implemented a Rental Housing Code program to address basic habitability standards for rental units, but Springfield did not meet its objective of considering developing a similar program in Springfield.

Homeownership Among Low-Income Households
From 2005-2010, Eugene and Springfield increased opportunities for low- and moderate-income households, especially minority households, to become and remain homeowners and renters. Both cities maintained their programs to assist first-time homebuyers, although Springfield did not assist as many homebuyers as anticipated. The Consortium exceeded its goal for providing affordable homeownership opportunities to minority households and increasing its outreach and education of the lender community regarding the needs of potential minority homeowners.

Housing Opportunities for Persons with Special Needs
The 2005 Plan included a goal for increasing the range of housing options and related services for special needs populations. During the Plan period, together the Cities provided housing assistance to special needs populations through existing specialized programs in the area, helping nearly 650 households.

Both Eugene and Springfield more than doubled the projected outcome for adding to the supply of affordable rental housing for special needs populations. Eugene also doubled its expected outcome for supporting capital improvements necessary to stabilize emergency shelter programs. Eugene also met its goal for providing accessibility improvements to tenants with disabilities while Springfield fell short of its projected outcomes in this category. Both cities fell short of their anticipated outcomes for providing accessibility improvements to homeowners who are elderly and/or disabled.
Public Services
In the area of Community Development, the Cities had a 2005 to 2010 goal of assisting the human service delivery system by contributing to the Lane County Human Services Commission (HSC) and providing funding for non-profit capital improvements. Eugene and Springfield committed the 15% of CDBG funds allowed annually to the HSC. Eugene met its projected outcomes for non-profit capital improvements while Springfield tripled its anticipated outcomes in that category.

Barrier Removal in Public Facilities
In 2005, Eugene also established a goal of improving accessibility to public facilities. The City far exceeded its projections in removing architectural barriers to City-owned facilities and installing curb ramps throughout the city.

Creating Jobs for Persons with Limited Incomes
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield made great strides in their goal of creating jobs for low- and moderate-income households. The Cities supported the training of nearly 400 micro-enterprises. While Eugene did not make progress on developing a recapitalization strategy for its Business Development Fund, the program came close to meeting its projected outcomes for jobs created and loans made, and Eugene exceeded its target for providing below-market financing through Eugene’s Emerging Business Loan Pool.

Eliminating Slums and Blight
For the 2005-2010 Plan period, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield anticipated supporting capital improvements and eliminating conditions of slums and blight in low-income neighborhoods. Both cities met or came close to meeting projected outcomes in both categories.

Effective Administration of Funds
The Cities also had a community development goal of administering Federal funds effectively and efficiently with a projected outcome of receiving a best practice award. Eugene received a National Innovations Award for its landbanking program in 2007, and Springfield met HUD’s timeliness test for three of the five years of the Plan period.

The following table lists 2005 Consolidated Plan goals and objectives and summarizes projected and actual outcomes from that plan.
## 2005 Affordable Housing Projected and Actual Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Projected Outcomes</th>
<th>Actual Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Increase the supply of affordable housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.1 Maintain and enhance programs that provide financial and other support for the continued production of new affordable housing.</td>
<td>E: 500 units</td>
<td>E: 350 units, S: 100 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Assist non-profit sponsors to build operational capacity and provide technical and other assistance to facilitate construction of additional housing units.</td>
<td>4 non-profit agencies assisted</td>
<td>4 non-profit agencies assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.3 Continue Eugene’s use of CDBG funds to purchase and landbank sites for future affordable housing developments.</td>
<td>2 sites acquired</td>
<td>0 sites acquired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.4 Springfield to consider using CDBG funds to landbank sites for future affordable housing developments.</td>
<td>1 site evaluated</td>
<td>0 sites evaluated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5 Evaluate new zoning code language for the permitting of Accessory Dwelling Units (ADU) and consider expanding to all residential zoning districts.</td>
<td>Bring to Springfield City Council in 2006, implement amendments by 2008</td>
<td>Development Code amended in 2002 to permit ADUs; no evaluation or consideration for expansion conducted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6 Work with City to amend land use regulations to allow multi-family units on some single-family lots.</td>
<td>On-going review of Springfield Development Code</td>
<td>Proposed Development Code amendment scheduled for spring 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Conserve and improve existing affordable owner and renter housing stock</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1 Continue and expand publicly-supported rehabilitation, weatherization, home repair, and accessibility efforts. Programs to include: Low- or no-interest loan (dependent upon income) program to pay costs of rehabilitation for low-income owners. Minor home repair, accessibility, and weatherization grant programs for low- and very low-income households. Create for Springfield and expand Eugene’s investor-owner rehabilitation low-interest loan or other incentive programs. Assure affordability through coupling rental assistance programs.</td>
<td>E: 50 Home Repair, E: 20 Owner Rehab, E: 280 Rental Rehab, S: 500 Home Repair, S: 25 Owner Rehab, S: 25 Rental Rehab</td>
<td>E: 107 Home Repair, E: 6 Owner Rehab, E: 175 Rental Rehab, S: 651 Home Repair, S: 12 Owner Rehab, S: 0 Rental Rehab</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Consider housing code enforcement programs to address basic habitability standards, such as structural integrity, plumbing and heating systems, and weatherproofing.</td>
<td>Eugene implementing a City Rental Housing Code Program July 2005, Springfield to update City Council on Eugene program and consider implementing similar program</td>
<td>E: Rental Housing Code implemented in 2005, S: No activity to report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Target areas with the greatest need and strategize ways to acquire, maintain, and improve affordable housing units with other neighborhood revitalization efforts.</td>
<td>Eugene to analyze and target 1 neighborhood for priority funding, Springfield to analyze 2 neighborhoods for priority funding</td>
<td>E: Outreach to 1 neighborhood, S: Outreach to 2 neighborhoods</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become homeowners and renters</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.1 Maintain and expand programs for first time homebuyers.</td>
<td>E: 150 units, S: 225 units</td>
<td>E: 175 units, S: 160 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Assist extremely low- and low-income individuals to become renters by providing security deposit assistance.</td>
<td>Evaluate option for security deposit program for the Consortium</td>
<td>No activity to report, Program terminated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.3 Reduce rent burdens of extremely low- and low-income tenants through rental assistance programs.</td>
<td>200 households</td>
<td>113 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4 Provide incentives that encourage the creative development of homeownership opportunities especially with infill or acquisition/rehab activities.</td>
<td>25 units</td>
<td>13 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Specifically encourage greater minority homeownership</td>
<td>4.1 Provide affordable homeownership opportunities to minority households.</td>
<td>10% goal for Consortium 5-year average 12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Increase outreach and education of lender community regarding needs and potential of minority homeowners and existing programs to assist potential homeowners.</td>
<td>3 activities for Consortium annually Projected outcomes exceeded in all 5 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Increase the range of housing options and related services for special needs population</td>
<td>5.1 Add to the supply of affordable rental housing through acquisition and new construction, renovation, and conversion activities.</td>
<td>E: 15 units S: 15 units E: 35 units S: 88 units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2 Support capital improvements necessary to stabilize emergency shelter programs.</td>
<td>E: 3 facilities S: 5 facilities E: 6 facilities S: 3 facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.3 Provide accessibility improvements for tenants with disabilities.</td>
<td>E: 20 served S: 25 served E: 18 served S: 4 served</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4 Provide accessibility improvements to homeowners who are elderly and/or disabled.</td>
<td>E: 130 households S: 200 households E: 13 households S: 61 households</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5 Provide other housing assistance to special needs population.</td>
<td>Provided through 11 existing housing programs 643 households assisted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Remove barriers to affordable and supportive housing</td>
<td>6.1 Continue to support programs that assure housing opportunities are provided without discrimination.</td>
<td>On-going support E: Continued contract with Fair Housing Council of Oregon (FHCO); participated in Infill Compatibility Study task team – parking reduction for special needs units adopted by Council in 2009 S: Supported Threshold Program, ABC’s of Homebuying, and continued contract with FHCO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.2 Evaluate zoning code to remove conditions in low-density zones that limit multiple family units or duplex units.</td>
<td>Bring to both City Councils in 2007, implement in 2008 E: S: Proposed Development Code amendment scheduled for spring 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## 2005 Community Development Projected and Actual Outcomes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goals</th>
<th>Objectives</th>
<th>Projected Outcomes</th>
<th>Actual Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Support a human service delivery system that helps low- and moderate-income persons achieve dignity, well-being, and self-sufficiency</td>
<td>1.1 Provide funding for capital improvements to facilities owned by non-profits including acquisition, rehabilitation, weatherization, and accessibility improvements.</td>
<td>E: 20 facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: 5 facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2 Collaborate with funding jurisdictions through the local HSC administered by Lane County.</td>
<td>Commit 15% CDBG allowable annually</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Promote economic development and diversification through the creation of jobs</td>
<td>2.1 Provide below-market financing through Eugene’s Business Development Fund loan program to local businesses creating or retaining jobs available to low- and moderate-income persons.</td>
<td>200 jobs created</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>50 loans made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2 Provide financing for activities which eliminate slums and blight.</td>
<td>E: 2 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: 2 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.3 Provide micro-enterprise development.</td>
<td>Loans and training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: 74 trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 Develop an appropriate recapitalization strategy for the Business Development Fund loan program.</td>
<td>Sustainability of fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5 Provide below-market financing through Eugene’s Emerging Business Loan Pool program to local businesses creating or retaining jobs made available to low- and moderate-income persons. This program assists emerging or high risk businesses facing extraordinary credit barriers.</td>
<td>25% of loans made</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Revitalize low-income neighborhoods by promoting a resource targeting strategy that links physical, economic, and social programs, maintains historic character, and eliminates slums and blight</td>
<td>3.1 Identify capital improvements needed in eligible neighborhoods, including infrastructure, street and sidewalk improvements, parkland acquisition and improvements.</td>
<td>E: 5 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: 5 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.2 Provide financing for the elimination of slums and blight, including acquisition, clearance, rehabilitation, and historic preservation activities.</td>
<td>E: 2 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: 4 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Improve accessibility to public facilities</td>
<td>4.1 Removal of architectural barriers in City of Eugene-owned facilities.</td>
<td>12 improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.2 Installation of curb ramps to increase accessibility in Eugene.</td>
<td>50 ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Administer Federal grants efficiently and effectively</td>
<td>5.1 Provide funding for administration costs associated with planning and administration, including the implementation of the Consolidated Plan and amendments, and the CDBG and HOME programs.</td>
<td>Receive Blue Ribbon Best Practice Award</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>S: Met timeliness test for 3 years of the 5-year period</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Evaluation/Reduction of Lead-Based Paint Hazards
In 1978, the Consumer Product Safety Commission banned the manufacture of lead-based paint for interior and exterior use on residential buildings. As noted earlier, many homes built prior to 1978 may contain lead-based paint. Poor building maintenance and remodeling can sometimes lead to exposure of lead-based paint. Peeling or chipping paint in older buildings can also be considered lead-based paint hazards. The presence of lead-based paint alone does not indicate the extent of exposure hazard. According to the Code of Federal Regulation 24 CFR Part 35, any housing rehabilitation project involving housing constructed prior to 1978, and receiving $5,000 or more of Federal funding, must be tested for lead-based paint. Projects receiving $5,000 to $25,000 in Federal funds must mitigate identified lead-based paint hazards. Lead hazard mitigation may be accomplished through the use of interim controls, as defined in the Glossary. Those projects receiving more than $25,000 in Federal assistance, as calculated in accordance with Federal regulations, must abate any identified lead-based paint hazards.

Goals, Objectives, Strategies and Outcomes
The assessment of needs and Consolidated Plan process has led to an emphasis on goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes to meet the basic needs of low- and moderate-income households, including human services, housing, and jobs over the next five years. There is a more limited emphasis on other community development objectives. The goals, objectives, and strategies listed on the following pages will guide the implementation of the Consolidated Plan for the years 2010 through 2015.

Following the tables outlining the 2010 Strategic Plan for affordable housing and community development is a description of the Housing and Community Services Agency (HACSA) of Lane County’s strategies for Public Housing, and the strategies the Cities of Eugene and Springfield employ to reduce regulatory barriers to affordable and special needs housing.

Affordable Housing Objectives
Affordable housing goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes are intended to address HUD program objectives to provide decent, safe, and affordable housing; create suitable living environments; and promote economic opportunities within the community. A total of five affordable housing goals are included in the Consolidated Plan including:

1) Increase the supply of affordable housing The housing affordability challenges and overall vacancies show that it is necessary to continue to add units to the stock of affordable housing. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield use a combination of HOME and CDBG funds for this purpose.

2) Conserve and improve existing affordable owner and renter housing stock In addition to adding units, continued efforts are necessary to preserve existing rental and ownership housing for low-income households. The Cities of Eugene and Springfield use a combination of HOME and CDBG funds for this purpose. The City of Eugene operates a Housing Revolving Loan Pool with CDBG funds for rental rehabilitation and owner rehabilitation loans. The City of Springfield also makes loans available for owner rehabs and rental rehabs for units owned by non-profit housing providers. Both Cities use funds to provide assistance for minor home repairs and accessibility improvements.
3) Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become and remain homeowners
Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield operate downpayment assistance programs to help low- and moderate-income households become homeowners. The assistance received by each household is modest but plays a critical role in enabling them to become homeowners. In addition, the units vacated by households receiving homebuyer assistance become available to other renters. As part of efforts to affirmatively further fair housing, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield work together to enhance homeownership opportunities for persons of minority race and ethnicity.

4) Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become and remain renters
The City of Springfield provides rental assistance to low-income persons to enable them to become or remain renters.

5) Remove barriers to affordable and supportive housing
Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield seek opportunities to affirmatively further fair housing and also raise awareness of the housing needs of low- and moderate-income persons, so these needs may be considered in the development of related policies and regulations.

Community Development Objectives
Community development goals, objectives, strategies, and outcomes are intended to satisfy HUD program objectives by providing human services; creating jobs; improving access to public facilities; and furthering neighborhood revitalization, planning, and community-building activities. A total of four community development goals are included in the Consolidated Plan including:

1) Support a human services delivery system that helps low- and moderate-income persons achieve dignity, well-being, and self-sufficiency
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield collaborate with Lane County to fund human service providers. This collaborative funding model uses available federal, state, and local funds to efficiently support local agencies. The Human Services Commission is the intergovernmental body that guides the use of funds and oversees the activities of agencies receiving funds. In addition, both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield provide capital grants for public facilities operated primarily by nonprofit service providers. In accordance with CDBG regulations, facilities that are designed for use in providing shelter for persons having special needs are also considered to be public facilities, but not permanent housing, are included in the public facilities category.

2) Promote economic development and diversification through the creation of jobs
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield use CDBG funds to undertake economic development activities resulting in job creation for low- and moderate-income households. The City of Eugene’s Business Development Fund will continue to provide loans to local businesses resulting in job creation or retention. This Fund operates primarily with program income from previous business loans. The City of Springfield recently initiated a similar program to provide loans to local businesses and will continue to provide such loans during the Plan period. Both Eugene and Springfield expect to continue support of microenterprise training for low- and moderate-income persons as a public service.

3) Improve accessibility to public facilities
Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield expect to make some capital improvements to remove barriers to accessibility in public buildings and infrastructure in accordance with CDBG regulations. The City of Eugene has identified a continued need for reconstruction and installation of curb ramps in existing sidewalks, retrofits of existing traffic signals to
include Accessible Pedestrian Devices, and barrier removal in City facilities. Given the overall prioritization of needs, both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield expect to make modest investments in this area.

4) Make strategic investments to improve low-income neighborhoods and other areas exhibiting conditions of slums and blight. Both the Cities of Eugene and Springfield will consider strategic investments in capital improvement projects serving eligible areas. Such projects may include park improvements, public infrastructure, and other facilities.
## 2010 Affordable Housing Strategic Plan

### Goal #1: Expand opportunities for permanent affordable housing for low-income persons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **1-A** Increase the supply of affordable housing | 1-A-1 Maintain and enhance programs that provide financial and other support for the continued production of new affordable housing | EUGENE: 500 units  
SPRINGFIELD: 100 units |
| | 1-A-2 Assist CHDOs to build operational capacity and provide technical and other assistance to facilitate construction of additional housing units | 4 non-profit sponsors |
| | 1-A-3 Continue use of CDBG funds in Eugene to landbank sites for future affordable housing developments | 2 sites purchased  
3 sites awarded for development |
| | 1-A-4 Maintain locally-funded programs to mitigate development costs through tax exemptions and system development charge waivers | On-going |
| **1-B** Conserve and improve existing affordable owner and renter housing stock | 1-B-1 Continue and enhance rehabilitation, weatherization, home repair, and accessibility efforts. Programs to include:  
• Low- or no-interest loan (dependent upon income) program to pay costs of rehabilitation for low- and very low-income households  
• Minor home repair, accessibility, and weatherization grant programs for low- and very low-income households | EUGENE: 50 home repairs  
EUGENE: 2 owner rehabs  
EUGENE: 280 rental rehabs  
SPRINGFIELD: 500 home repairs  
SPRINGFIELD: 25 owner rehabs  
SPRINGFIELD: 25 rental rehabs |
| | 1-B-2 Maintain and enhance programs for first time homebuyers | EUGENE: 100 households  
SPRINGFIELD: 150 households |
| | 1-B-3 Specifically encourage greater minority homeownership through outreach and education of lender and realtor community regarding needs and potential of minority homeowners and existing programs to assist potential homeowners | 3 events |
| **1-C** Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become and remain homeowners | 1-C-1 Maintain and enhance programs for first time homebuyers | EUGENE: 100 households  
SPRINGFIELD: 150 households |
| | 1-C-2 Specifically encourage greater minority homeownership through outreach and education of lender and realtor community regarding needs and potential of minority homeowners and existing programs to assist potential homeowners | 3 events |
| **1-D** Increase opportunities for low- and moderate-income households to become and remain renters | 1-D-1 Reduce rent burdens of extremely-low and low-income tenants through rental assistance programs | 100 households |
| **1-E** Remove barriers to affordable and supportive housing | 1-E-1 Continue to support programs that assure housing opportunities are provided without discrimination | 4 Fair Housing events |
| | 1-E-2 Raise awareness of housing needs of low- and moderate-income persons through participation and collaboration on land use and zoning studies to ensure consideration of the needs of those income groups | Maintain Housing Policy Board and seek representation of affordable housing in policy discussions |
## Goal #2: Expand access to public services, economic opportunities, and suitable living environments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Objective</th>
<th>Strategy Description</th>
<th>Projected Outcome</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-A</strong></td>
<td>Support a human services delivery system that helps low- and moderate-income persons achieve dignity, well-being, and self-sufficiency</td>
<td>15% of entitlement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-A-1</strong></td>
<td>Collaborate to fund public services through the Human Services Commission</td>
<td>EUGENE: 15 facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-A-2</strong></td>
<td>Provide funding for capital improvements to facilities owned by non-profits including acquisition, rehabilitation, weatherization, and accessibility improvements.</td>
<td>SPRINGFIELD: 5 facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-B</strong></td>
<td>Promote economic development and diversification through the creation of jobs</td>
<td>EUGENE: 50 loans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-B-1</strong></td>
<td>Provide below-market financing to local businesses creating or retaining jobs available to low- and moderate-income persons</td>
<td>SPRINGFIELD: 5 jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-B-2</strong></td>
<td>Provide below-market financing through Eugene’s Emerging Business Loan Pool program to local businesses creating or retaining jobs available to low- and moderate-income persons</td>
<td>EUGENE: 25% of loan volume in dollars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-B-3</strong></td>
<td>Fund micro-enterprise development</td>
<td>EUGENE: 300 trainees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-C</strong></td>
<td>Improve accessibility to public facilities</td>
<td>EUGENE: 12 facility improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-C-1</strong></td>
<td>Remove architectural barriers from City-owned buildings and publicly-maintained infrastructure</td>
<td>EUGENE: 50 curb ramps</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-D</strong></td>
<td>Make strategic investments to improve low income neighborhoods and other areas exhibiting conditions of slums and blight</td>
<td>EUGENE: 3 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-D-1</strong></td>
<td>Fund capital improvements in eligible areas such as infrastructure, street and sidewalk improvements, and parkland acquisition and improvements</td>
<td>SPRINGFIELD: 2 projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-D-2</strong></td>
<td>Provide financing for the elimination of slums and blight, including acquisition, clearance, rehabilitation, and historic preservation activities</td>
<td>1 project</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Public Housing

HACSA submits five-year plans and Annual Capital Fund Statements to HUD outlining all physical and management improvements for public housing units. The five-year plans are developed by HACSA staff (with resident input) and are brought before residents through a county-wide public hearing, through review by the Tenant Advisory Group (TAG), and through meetings held in all the public housing complexes.

The plan contains a resident involvement strategy with four goals:

- Provide and explain opportunities for residents and the general community to become involved in the daily operation, programs, policies, and services affecting public housing in Lane County.
- Carry out a set of activities that recognizes residents and the community-at-large as a positive resource for effective and responsible operation of public housing.
- Function as a coordinator and catalyst in developing opportunities for public housing residents aimed at increasing economic and human potential.
- Assure public housing resident involvement in all matters affecting their living environment.

The TAG is comprised of resident representatives elected from each of the public and assisted housing complexes. The TAG representatives and two resident commissioners meet monthly with HACSA staff to review and discuss public and assisted housing issues, including maintenance and occupancy issues, grant proposals, revisions of lease agreement provisions, and HACSA policies. In addition to the TAG, public housing residents assist in designing HACSA strategies, participate in on-site resident council/groups and activity committees, and take responsibility for a variety of activities, including resident meetings, resident newsletters, Neighborhood Watch, and food distribution.

Reasonable Accommodation Policy

HACSA has a comprehensive and well-publicized Policy on Reasonable Accommodation that allows public housing applicants/residents with disabilities to request reasonable accommodations that will provide them with an equal opportunity to enjoy HACSA’s housing programs.

Resident Services

In addition to encouraging and supporting residents’ involvement in the TAG and capital fund process, HACSA’s Resident Services Division works cooperatively with public housing residents to implement a variety of HUD grants and programs, resident-initiated services, and partnerships with local service providers, including, but not limited to:

- Individual Development Accounts – HACSA offers Individual Development Accounts to its Section 8 and Public Housing residents and is a member of the Valley Individual Development Accounts (VIDA) program. VIDA is a savings and match program based on the premise that people escape poverty and become financially stable through savings and investment. The program allows participants to invest funds in the purchase of an asset: homeownership; post-secondary education; adaptive equipment; technology; and specialized training. The VIDA savings match supplements the participant’s deposit at a rate of 3:1. Over the course of the program, participants complete financial education courses and training related to the participant’s savings
goals, which is the foundation of the participant’s skill-building to successfully build and maintain their assets.

- **LifeLine Financial Education** – this program, operated by O.U.R. Federal Credit Union, offers a four-week series of classes in financial management and budgeting to low-income residents who are in danger of losing their housing due to financial issues. LifeLine is a cooperative venture supported by HACSA, Lane County Law and Advocacy Center, ShelterCare, and O.U.R. Federal Credit Union, and is partially funded by United Way.

- **Second Chance Renters Rehabilitation** – this program, operated by St. Vincent de Paul, offers an eight-week series of classes, to assist low-income residents in overcoming barriers to obtaining housing. The weekly classes include topics such as presenting yourself to a landlord, how to find a rental, landlord/tenant law, credit repair and budgeting, financial planning/goal setting, and public policy and conflict resolution.

- In addition, HACSA has working relationships with nearly 30 local entities/service providers, many of which serve on the Advisory Board for HACSA’s Family Self-Sufficiency Program.

- **Other Resident Activities** – HACSA’s Resident Services Division works closely with public housing residents as a support system to foster resident-initiated activities that promote community interaction. Some of the current activities include: fundraisers, such as garage/rummage sales, craft sales, parking for the University of Oregon home football games; Monday Lunch Bunch, and bingo for seniors; regularly-scheduled community potlucks; holiday events; social events geared towards children; and supplementary food distribution through the Extra Helpings programs. Food for Lane County also operates its Summer Food Program at two HACSA Public Housing developments each summer. In addition, HACSA staff assists with the development, printing, and distribution of periodic resident newsletters for its Public Housing developments.

**Homeownership Program**
The Section 8 Homeownership Program is designed to allow eligible Section 8 participants the option of using their subsidy towards the purchase, rather than the rental, of a home. As of January 2010, HACSA has 19 families throughout Lane County who have purchased homes with their Section 8 subsidy; 17 families are still participating and receiving assistance with their mortgage. Of the families still participating, three families purchased homes in Eugene while six purchased homes in Springfield. These families have received homeownership education and counseling through the Neighborhood Economic Development Corporation’s Threshold Homeownership Education and Counseling Program and O.U.R. Federal Credit Union’s Realizing the American Dream program.

Given the lack of funds in programs that typically assist low-income families with down payment and closing costs (Homestart, VIDA, and Oregon State Bond), HACSA does not anticipate any families purchasing in Eugene or Springfield in 2010. All homes purchased through HACSA’s Section 8 Homeownership Program in 2008 and 2009 were made possible through the USDA Direct Loan program, which only funds homes outside of the urban growth boundaries for Eugene and Springfield. HACSA anticipates that three families will purchase homes in more rural areas of Lane County using the Section 8 Homeownership Program in 2010.

Through the Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) Program, 76 families (51 from Section 8 and 25 from Public Housing) have successfully achieved homeownership in Lane County. Working in cooperation with non-profit organizations, the FSS program assures that participants receive the financial and homeownership
education that will assist them in purchasing and maintaining their homes when they move off housing subsidies, as well as obtaining available down payment assistance funds for low-income households. The overall goal is for families to reach economic self-sufficiency and no longer need any subsidy.

**Low-Income Energy Services Program**

HACSA’s Energy Services Program provides comprehensive energy saving services to more than 300 Lane County households annually. The program typically receives two Federal grants, combined with funds from six local public electric utility partners, the Bonneville Power Administration, one private natural gas utility, one private electric utility, and one State-administered oil program. HACSA’s weatherization program works closely with several other community service providers in terms of direct referrals, such as Lane County’s E2C2 energy education (case management) program, the Cities of Eugene and Springfield home repair programs, as well as rural rehabilitation programs administered by St. Vincent de Paul or the US Department of Agriculture.

Participant eligibility is based upon household income at or below 200% of the Federal poverty guideline. The principal mission of the program is to help families save energy used to heat their homes. This is achieved through cost-effective investments in building shell and heating system efficiency improvements, coupled with base-load reduction (compact fluorescent lights, water conservation, Energy-star refrigerators, and renewable solar water heating), and energy education strategies. Additionally, agency energy auditors test and evaluate conditions of a client’s home regarding indoor air quality using pressure diagnostics, excess moisture, electrical safety, and other energy-related repairs, such as leaking roofs and plumbing.

In terms of program outcomes, these comprehensive energy services yield significant community benefits that help stabilize families, promote energy awareness/choices, save money and improve comfort, reduce the carbon footprint, dampen utility rate increases, and help maintain the community inventory of affordable housing.

**Strategies to Ameliorate Barriers**

The Cities of Eugene and Springfield consistently seek to address impediments to housing choice and affordability that may be the unintended consequence of unclear, unnecessary, or overly restrictive language contained in their respective land use codes and city policies. Below are the areas in which both cities are currently working to reduce impediments to and support the development of affordable housing in their respective communities.

**Buildable Lands Studies**

The 2007 Oregon Legislature passed House Bill 3337, which requires the Cities of Eugene and Springfield to inventory residential buildable land within their respective urban growth boundaries by December 31, 2009 and to determine whether sufficient buildable land exists for the coming 20 years. Oregon statute requires cities to respond to the projected need through the adoption of new policies to ensure that the needed housing density and mix can be achieved within the existing land inventories and/or by expanding the urban growth boundaries to provide more urbanizable land for housing to avoid an artificial increase in the price of land that would make housing more expensive for everyone.
The City of Springfield completed its Residential Lands Study and Housing Needs Analysis in 2009. The study, which is based on the population projections for Lane County that were adopted in 2009, forecasts the City of Springfield’s housing needs for 2010 – 2030, and the land supply required to accommodate those needs. The findings of the Springfield Residential Lands Study indicate that the City of Springfield will experience a shortage of buildable residential land over the 20-year plan period. The study also shows that almost half of the City of Springfield’s remaining vacant residential land supply is on steep slopes, which also contributes to higher construction costs and housing prices. As of October 2009, the City of Springfield is preparing draft plans and policies that will provide for a higher percentage of land designated for multi-family housing and other more affordable dwelling types and densities, in response to the Springfield Housing Needs Analysis.

The City of Eugene similarly completed its Comprehensive Land Assessment in 2009. The study includes an inventory of buildable residential land within the City of Eugene’s Urban Growth Boundary, an estimate of land needs for residential uses, and a determination of whether the City of Eugene has sufficient land within its Urban Growth Boundary to meet the estimated residential need. The preliminary findings of Eugene’s housing needs analysis indicate that the City of Eugene will experience a shortage of buildable residential land over the 20-year plan period. Following completion of the study, the City of Eugene will begin to examine policies in 2010 that may reduce this land need through provision of a higher percentage of land designated for multi-family housing or by encouraging higher-density development. Housing affordability and the provision of sufficient land for all types of needed housing will be part of this policy examination.

**Land Use Efficiency Measures**

In 2008, the City of Springfield’s Planning Division began studying land use efficiency measures as a way to accommodate projected housing and employment growth within the existing urban growth boundary. Over the years, the City of Springfield has adopted many land use efficiency measures to better accommodate housing and employment growth within its existing urban growth boundary. As part of the process to adopt Springfield’s 2030 Plan in spring 2010, the following additional land use efficiency measures will be proposed for implementation in the City of Springfield, all of which have the potential to reduce impediments to and/or encourage the development of affordable housing within the City of Springfield:

- Establish a Transit Corridor Overlay plan designation and zoning district that provides a density bonus for high-density housing developed near transit stations.
- Establish a Low-Moderate Density Residential plan designation and zoning district that allows attached housing as an outright permitted use, small lot development, and 8-15 dwelling units per acre.
- Increase allowed densities in High-Density Residential zoning districts.
- Expand opportunities for duplex dwellings in Low-Density Residential zoning districts.
- Establish a streamlined development review process for accessory dwelling units.
- Establish a streamlined development review process for multi-family developments.
- Explore concepts for reduced street width standards.
**Development Code Revisions**

Due to constrained resources at this time, the City of Springfield has not completed the development code review process described in the Impediments to Affordable Housing Development in Springfield section above. The next phase of that project will include staff research regarding best practices other communities have employed to address similar barriers to affordable housing and the development of proposed policy amendments. To ensure that suggested policy changes adequately address the concerns raised by the affordable housing providers, recommended development code and policy changes will be presented to the housing providers for input and feedback prior to being proposed to elected officials for consideration.

**Sustainability Commission**

In 2008, the Eugene City Council established the Eugene Sustainability Commission to advise the Eugene City Council on matters pertaining to community sustainability. The Eugene Sustainability Commission’s charge is broad but includes goals that may affect the development of affordable housing. Specific elements of the Eugene Sustainability Commission’s work that could influence the housing supply include: linking land use and transportation planning to sustainability practices; partnering with agencies and groups working on social equity issues; and decreasing community reliance on fossil fuels.

**Infill Compatibility Standards**

In 2007, the City of Eugene initiated a project aimed at addressing the impact of residential infill development on the community. The project, which is on-going, includes describing, categorizing, and addressing those impacts in the most effective way possible and demonstrating positive infill examples, while considering the impacts on the city’s growth pattern as a whole.

The final outcome of the project is infill compatibility standards or tools to regulate the amount, form, and appearance of new residential development in established areas, standards that may also help reduce impediments to affordable housing development. For instance, as of October 2009, the City of Eugene has drafted new parking requirements for housing developed for low-income households, seniors, and/or the disabled population. The proposal would remove a barrier to affordable housing by reducing the parking requirements for these types of developments by as much as 75%.

**Monitoring**

The City of Eugene and Springfield staff performs a number of procedures to monitor performance in relation to the objectives stated in the Consolidated Plan and to ensure compliance with Federal regulations.

**Consolidated Plan**

Performance measurements for the CDBG and HOME programs begin with the Consolidated Plan. The Consolidated Plan lists priorities and sets projected outcomes over the five-year plan period. These goals and implementation measures address housing, homelessness, and community development. In the annual OYAP, the proposed accomplishments are listed on the project sheets. Progress towards these measures is contained in the annual CAPER. Data is provided at the project level and reported annually to show progress towards the five-year objectives established in the Consolidated Plan.
Sub-Recipients
Local non-profit service providers sign contracts that set goals, scope of work, and identify the budget for use of CDBG funds. These contracts are administered by Lane County. Quarterly progress reports are submitted. At mid-year, staff from the City of Eugene, City of Springfield, and Lane County conduct a desk audit and risk assessment of each agency’s performance during the first two quarters of the fiscal year. A follow-up letter is sent to the agency identifying any issues or concerns. These issues are addressed in an on-site follow-up monitoring of selected agencies. Notes and follow-up letters are placed in the agency file.

Acquisition and Capital Improvements
For physical improvements to Eugene non-profit agency facilities, the City of Eugene directly contracts for the work, thereby not creating a formal sub-recipient relationship. The use of the funds does trigger a period of benefit; however, a Trust Deed is recorded as a lien against the property to secure the City’s interest. For grants up to $25,000, the grant is forgiven after five years. If the agency discontinues providing services in these first five years, the grant amount must be repaid in full. For grants $25,000 and over, the grant is fully forgiven after ten years. If the agency discontinues providing services in the first five years, the grant amount must be repaid in full. The grant amount is then forgiven incrementally over the next five years.

For CDBG-assisted acquisition and/or capital improvement projects, the City of Springfield ensures the period of public benefit through a contractual agreement with the project developer. The public benefit period is usually ten years, except for very small projects where the benefit period may be five years. Repayment of the grant occurs if the project fails to meet the public benefit standard set forth in the agreement and mirrors the percentage of time remaining until the expiration of the public benefit period. For instance, if 40% of the public benefit period remains, 40% of the grant must be repaid to the City. After the public benefit period expires, there are no repayment requirements except as stipulated for properties with more than $25,000 of CDBG assistance.

For properties with more than $25,000 of CDBG assistance for acquisition or improvements, if the property is sold, transferred, or otherwise disposed of for any reason by the owner within ten years from the date of project completion, the owner must reimburse the City of Springfield the amount of the current fair market value of the property, less any portion of the value attributable to expenditures of non-CDBG funds for acquisition of, and improvements to, the property. This provision may be waived at the sole discretion of the City if the proposed change of ownership continues to provide the agreed upon public benefit, and meets a CDBG national objective, and if the proposed change of ownership is approved by the CDAC and City Council.

HOME-Assisted Housing Developments
The housing developer is required to submit a summary of income certifications annually. On-site monitoring is conducted annually by City of Eugene and City of Springfield staff. Individual tenant files are reviewed for tenant income certifications, HOME lease provisions and tenant protections, initial lease period, and rent and utility levels. The City inspects rental developments assisted with HOME funds during the affordability period on a one, two, or three year cycle depending on the total number of units
in the project, not the number of HOME units. Per CFR 92.251(c) “An owner of rental housing assisted with HOME funds must maintain the housing in compliance with all applicable State and local housing quality standards and code requirements and if there are no such standards or code requirements, the housing must meeting the housing quality standards in 24 CFR 982.401.” Staff has determined the Housing Quality Standards (HQS) inspection form provided by HUD encompasses and actually exceeds the rental housing standards found in Chapter 8, section 8.425 of the City of Eugene Municipal Code.

Consortium Monitoring
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield operate under a Memorandum of Agreement that states the program responsibilities within the Consortium. The City of Eugene, as lead entity in the consortium, conducts an annual monitoring of the City of Springfield HOME activities.

Single Audit Monitoring
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield financial systems are subject to annual reviews by external auditors.

Project Management
A project manager is assigned to each Federally-funded project. The project manager reviews the project for compliance throughout the implementation of the project. The project contract includes a scope of work, timeline, and budget.

Timeliness
The Cities of Eugene and Springfield monitor expenditures throughout the fiscal year and maintain projections in order to ensure the timely expenditure of funds. By mid-year, if it is apparent that expenditures are lagging, ready-to-go projects are identified and reprogramming the funds is recommended.