

Dear Representatives,

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on HB2001. I know our housing shortage is critical and I support sensible efforts to address it. However, I urge you **NOT** to support HB001 in its current form. My main concerns relate not as much to "what goes where", but rather to "what is torn down where" to accommodate growth. Each community is different in terms of age and types of housing, infrastructure available as well as location of amenities such as schools, parks, groceries, etc. And each community should have a say in how best to add housing. Remember our "needed housing" goal calls on us to make all types of housing available at a range of prices in each of our communities.

HB2001 can easily lead to demolition of sound housing and higher housing prices, which only exacerbates the problem. Studies of this sort of "upzoning" in Chicago and elsewhere show it **drives up housing prices**, as lower-price housing is replaced with new luxury housing. Vulnerable communities, those most in need of housing, are displaced as their housing is demolished and "priced out" of the new development. The current version of the bill lacks safeguards to keep this from happening.

HB2001 will damage our environment in those communities with high housing demand. The demolition of buildings means a staggering amount of embodied energy is thrown away. Every time we raze an older house and replace it with a new one – even an efficient new building – it takes **an average of 50 years to recover** the climate change impacts related to the demolition. That doesn't even include the trees cut down and the **toxic dust** from demolitions. It is critical for our climate change goals that wherever possible we increase density either in proximity to existing services or, perhaps more important, in areas where it makes sense to add transit and other services once the density to support them exists. All this needs to occur with a careful eye on infrastructure impacts and takes planning at the local level to create synergies and take advantage of opportunities in order to create "wins" for more of the population.

I don't like to tell you what I don't like without offering alternatives. Instead of a mass rezoning, could you create benchmarks for communities to pursue, e.g., a number of lots based on population that are zoned for higher density with a case made that they will encourage development due to location, infrastructure concerns, etc.

I also have concerns about some of the details of the bill such as the collection of SDC waivers only after occupancy occurs. This needs to change. And I'm concerned about plans to evaluate the impacts of any approach taken. It is too easy to pass a bold plan and never look back or fail to tease out the unanticipated consequences, both positive and negative. Please don't do that again.

Thank you.  
Linda Nettekoven  
2018 SE Ladd Ave  
Portland, OR 97214