

From: Michael Johnson
To: Sen.LewFrederick@state.or.us
Cc: Sen.FredGirod@state.or.us; [Sen Taylor](#); Rep.SalEsquivel@state.or.us; rep.kenhelm@state.or.us; [Rep Lewis](#); [Rep Power](#); [JWMNR Exhibits](#)
Subject: HB 2007
Date: Wednesday, June 21, 2017 8:07:02 PM

"Dear Committee members,

I am contacting you today as a member and supporter of the group Stop Demolishing Portland.

Like many grassroots activist groups, people initially come to us when they encounter a problem that is related to our-issues. They feel frustrated when they cannot get assistance from their elected officials - when they feel you disregard the citizenry's concerns about what they see happening around them, that's when they come to us.

You don't need to do-polling regarding your votes on HB 2007 - I'm reporting to you that the level of anger and outrage over it is *unprecedented*.

it's an incredible over-reach by State government, removing the Cities' & Counties' right to self-determination. The intent of Oregon's "Home Rule" is so local citizens are provided with local Councils/Commissions where they may become involved in local decision-making - or simply to go and be-heard, when they wish to have a say on a local issue or proposed plan. It's incredibly-offensive that you would even consider removing our right to this participation.

You are also laying another unfunded mandate at the Cities'/Counties' feet, with this bill. Taking-on more employees, to fulfill your mandated time-limits - at a time when all Oregon public agencies are already feeling the strain of PERS - is an undue burden. The State has declared a hiring-freeze for your agencies, yet you expect local governments to find funding for this mandate-?

Numerous Cities have stated they oppose HB 2007.

Lake Oswego dislikes the loss of local control over development decisions, plus the added staffing/processing burden. Oregon City is concerned about losing control over decisions regarding their historic structures & neighborhoods.

Corvallis feels it won't help renters or lead to increased home-ownership. The Legislative Director in Representative Rayfield's office had passed along this 'feedback' to the Corvallis Mayor, from the Speaker's office, about HB 2007;

"... regarding the 100 day time line, this component of the bill only pertains to developments where at least 50% of the development's units are at least 60% or less of the median family income. In speaking with the Speaker's office, these circumstances are rare and very few of the developments in Oregon would fall into this category, so it is unlikely to place too substantial of a burden on local governments."

[https://archives.corvallisoregon.gov/public/0/edoc/893407/CLC%2006.09.2017%20Packet%20\(3.42%20MB\).pdf](https://archives.corvallisoregon.gov/public/0/edoc/893407/CLC%2006.09.2017%20Packet%20(3.42%20MB).pdf)

So, even the House Speaker - the Co-sponsor of the bill - admits that "very few" developments will result in any substantial-amounts of "affordable" housing.

Additionally, you have now bumped "affordable" up to 120% MFI.

60% was offensive enough, that helps NO ONE who is truly low-income or is dependent on Social Security. At 60-120%, all you're doing is subsidizing housing for workers whose wages are not in-keeping with the rising cost of living here.

Is that your intent, to create the Walmart business-model for businesses here, providing taxpayer subsidized housing for the vast-majority of workers-? Where does that end, and where are Oregon's Senior/disabled/working-class folks to live, if this plan is fulfilled-??

To many of those angry-Oregonians I had mentioned above - this feels like an intentional displacement of the poorest Oregonians. Constantly referring to this bill as an "affordable housing" bill is not fooling anyone.

Also what we're hearing-about from the citizenry is the shocking lack of public process, regarding this bill. The testimony at a previous hearing, which was dominated by the developer interests, was unacceptable. And to

then hear Speaker Kotek state during her remarks at the end of the hearing that if we disagree with this bill, then we are racists/elitists/NIMBYS (or, simply too ignorant to understand it) was one of the most offensive things I've heard from a State elected, especially one who is a "Democrat".
We urge you to distance-yourselves from her offensive remarks.

And of course, for us - it's about the demolitions, and what that means for our communities.

There's now increasingly-disturbing research and reporting on lead-exposure.

The EPA states that there is NO safe amount of lead-exposure for children, yet structures that are covered in layers of lead paint continue to be smashed, scooped-up & hauled to landfills. We have photo documentation, collected throughout this city over the last several years, showing clouds of dust containing lead, asbestos and other toxins floating into yards, homes, schoolyards, etc.

Don't tell us there's measures to prevent it - it's not happening, the few laws that are in-place are frequently not enforced.

If your goal is to have affordable housing available - how does demolishing a small Portland bungalow, and replacing it with 2 market-rate houses, achieve that goal, exactly-?

Yes, that's an increase in "density" on that property. But this only benefits the developers, when a small/older house is replaced with a couple of McMansions. We certainly understand that the City/County's motivation may be largely to boost revenue & collect fees, but the sheer-negligence in how this is already affecting existing Portlanders is certainly fueling the anger about seeing it throughout the state, if this bill passes.

And please explain how this bill gets even one-person off the streets and into permanent housing.

I shouldn't have to remind you about our over-loaded infrastructure, especially in the Portland area.

There's nothing in this bill to remedy that, and it appears you may not be securing transportation funding this session.

Traffic & parking are a huge-part of the discussion in our group, and as you should also know, history shows that being stuck in traffic is one-thing that unites all voters and causes them to let their electeds know how unhappy they are with your infrastructure/traffic management.

And in Portland, we have sewers that now overflow during even moderately-heavy rains, we have 100-year-old water pipes bursting around town, and the long-term water supply is in-question with the already-rapid population growth that has occurred.

Shouldn't a top-consideration of the Natural Resources Subcommittee be to end massive sewage spills into our rivers, not cause an increase in them?

And what about long-term planning for a stable water-supply?

And also for your committee to consider - our trees.

They provide cooling in our warming climate, they scrub our air for us, they provide food & habitat for our wildlife. They anchor slopes where erosion would otherwise occur.

And they are being cut-down at an *alarming* rate.

Besides the environmental reasons for our concern, Oregonians love and place a high-value on our trees. This is another source of much-anger from our members, and a major source of concern from opponents of this bill.

We absolutely agree with organizations such as the Architectural Heritage Center, the McCulloch Foundation, National Trust for Historic Preservation and others who oppose the bill based-on their specific set of issues, which are frequently in-line with our own. You'll have ample opportunity to learn more about those tomorrow from these passionate & dedicated folks.

I would also add that nothing in this doe's anything to get people off the streets. On the contrary it doe's everything to put them on the streets and the living proof of that is on the streets of Portland and many communities across the state of Oregon. As the saying goes "If there was a profit in Homelessness, it wouldn't exist".

In conclusion - we see nothing positive in this bill, and are calling for it to be killed.

The only support I've seen for it has been from those who would profit from less-regulations and increased development.

We actively support candidates for elected office who share our views on our key-issues, and we will be ensuring that our members are updated & reminded of the progress and outcome of this bill, both now and in future election cycles.

We hope that we can count on you to do the right-thing, for all Oregonians, and vote *No* on HB 2007.

Sincerely,

Michael A Johnson

Portland Oregon