

To the Senate Committee on Housing,

Hi! My name is Bradley Bondy, and I'm writing in strong support of this bill. Building more densely around transit is an easy way to lower our green house gas emissions, and slow suburban sprawl. That said, I do have a few suggestions that I hope the committee will consider rolling into the bill before it moves it forward.

1) Expand the affected area to include unincorporated areas within Metro's Urban Growth Boundary

I live in unincorporated Clackamas County, within a 20 minute walk of the Clackamas Town Center transit center. This Transit Center is the southern terminus of the MAX Green Line, and also the focal point of 11 bus lines. It's practically begging for more density, however Clackamas County hasn't updated it's zoning code to allow such development to happen. Clackamas county also failed to allow more density near it's 2 other MAX stations and it's two major frequent service bus corridors (McLaughlin and 82nd Ave). So I ask that the committee update the bill's language so that it also applies to unincorporated areas within Metro's Urban Growth Boundary.

2) Determine area by walking distance rather than as the crow flies

Along I-205 there are a few MAX stations that lack easy access to the other side of the freeway. This creates some situations where some land would allow dense development, while being outside of a reasonable walking distance of a station. These include include the Gateway, Fuller Rd, Clackamas Town Center, and Parkrose MAX stations. This could be solved by switching from circular buffers as the bill currently uses to walking network buffers for determining affected areas (or by building 4 pedestrian bridges).

3) Regional centers within Metro's district should allow even more than this bill calls for

Metro has defined 8 areas within it's district as Regional Centers as part of it's "2040 growth concepts plan". These are all major transit hubs and are envisioned as second only to central Portland in terms of housing and job density, and so I suggest that this bill requires cities and counties to allow even higher densities near frequent transit within regional centers. I also feel I should mention that I rent an apartment within the Clackamas Regional Center.

Below are some densities that I feel would be appropriate for regional centers. These numbers are drawn from some buildings in Portland's Pearl District.

- (a) 300 residential units per acre if within one-quarter mile of a light rail station.
- (b) 150 residential units per acre if within one-half mile of a light rail station.
- (c) 150 residential units per acre if within one-quarter mile of a priority transportation corridor.
- (d) 75 residential units per acre if within one-half mile of a priority transportation corridor.

4) Include an anti-displacement strategy in the bill

Similar bills in California and Washington exempt current rental housing from the requirements, however I don't think this is a great anti displacement strategy. One issue is that the state doesn't have a database of rental housing, making it nearly impossible to map this out. The second challenge is that if a city is rezoning an area to be in compliance with this bill, most would just rezone the entire area rather than go lot by lot and figure out if it's a rental or not.

Perhaps the bill could include a "Right to Return" policy, that requires a comparable unit of the same rent be offered to the tenant after construction is complete. And have along side it a requirement that the developer pay the tenants moving expenses. I believe such a policy would be very effective.

Thanks!

Bradley Bondy

Milwaukie, OR 97222