

Dear Committee Members,

The condition of this bill as a *piece* of legislation - something that purports to be a law - is appalling. Staff does not even know how the distances are measured, it is so over-broad as to be nonsense, and has literally no empirical support for how its provisions are supposed to address the central rationale of the bill.

As a teacher, I would give that student a fail and feel a little insulted they even turned in something so poorly conceived and executed. I would add the comment "does not demonstrate a firm grasp of course content." In this case SB 10 "does not demonstrate a firm grasp of planning, economics, culture, democracy, and State Planning Goal 1."

In fact, this is so over the top and poorly conceived it almost seems created as a diversion for the state's other proposed intrusions into cities' autonomy (SB 2001, SB 8, etc) or to make them look reasonable by comparison. Does this show respect? Is it a good use of your time?

The proper course of action is to bin it.

On "substance," what research that has been done (submitted by other's here so I won't repeat it) indicates that this sort of transit based upzoning leads to higher prices, gentrification, and displacement of poor and minority renters while enriching a few developers and providing housing for people who already have plenty of choices. **Building more housing does not make other housing more affordable.** The author does not include support of this central contention because none exists. I was a member of the Eugene Housing Tools and Strategies Working Group and the housing economist the city hired stated the so-called "filter effect" has no empirical basis. It has not shown to have worked anywhere, ever. You can't base a law on supposition, especially one that impacts hundreds of thousands if not millions of people.

We do not have a housing crisis, we have an *affordable* housing crisis and a lagging wage and wealth inequity crisis that SB 10 won't just **not** solve, but will make **worse**.

In Eugene my neighborhood is 65% renters and is one of the most dense in the city filled with everything from 100+ year old homes to plexes of all sizes, ADUs, apartment buildings, you name it. We are central, downtown, have BRT and major transportation corridors on all sides, so would be 100% under SB 10. Much of housing rental stock is "marginal" and so more affordable. Anything new brought into this neighborhood would be much more expensive and completely un-affordable to anyone near the median income here. To wit:

The average income of a Eugene resident is \$26,313 a year, so 30% for housing is \$650 a month

The median household income of a Eugene resident is \$42,715 a year., so 30% for housing is \$1075

One bedroom apartments in Eugene rent for \$996 a month on average and two bedroom apartment rents average \$1278.

You can't buy a house in this neighborhood for less than \$300K. Exactly how is a developer supposed to buy, demo, and build and then afford to rent at anywhere near what are already an un-affordable average? How are my renters supposed to replace their \$500 a month rooms in shared house? How can someone here afford to to buy a \$400k townhouse?

Moreover, how is this not just a 21st century version of 1960s urban renewal? One might ask (1) who benefits financially and (2) do the authors or members of your committee live somewhere that would come under SB 10?

As a matter of equity, my neighborhood was in serious decline, riven by drugs and crime, and so had affordable homes that people with limited means could buy. They took pride, organized, and built up this neighborhood. Others bought up a few homes and rented them out. They created special area zones to guide development by protecting neighbors and providing innovative opportunities for infill, such as alley facing lots that also made alleys safer. Others followed, loving the mature street canopies (kiss these trees goodbye under SB10) and that they could walk and bike to everywhere. We put up with and then worked to address crime, homelessness, and crumbling infrastructure. The people here did what state and city leaders wanted and resuscitated the urban core. Now many of these pioneers are on fixed incomes and how does Salem thank them? Now that the urban core is livable and trendy, SB 10 (and HB 2001) propose to turn it over to developers to gentrify, to destroy the trees and historic homes, and run low income and medium renters out and leave homeowners with the choice of cashing out (and going where?) or enduring hyper dense housing for urban professionals looming over their yards. How anyone can claim this will help our housing issues with a straight face is beyond me.

This is not just a map grid, it's a diverse community and culture, its people's lives, how did we get to the point of believing that middle class homeowners are the evil force behind the lack of affordable housing? Our neighborhood is vibrant, socially stable, and welcoming. Is that not worth anything?

Finally, there is the issue of State Planning Goal 1. The bedrock of planning and democratic process in Oregon. It calls for meaningful participation in all phases of the planning process. How is anyone supposed to meaningfully participate when decisions are dictated by Salem? State Planning Goal 1 relies on local decision making and democratic process at the neighborhood association level.

Look, cities have not done as much as they could or should on increasing affordable housing stock, but considering the land and construction costs, demands for urban growth boundaries, lagging wages, and general disinterest of developers in this segment this would mean subsidy and that is expensive. Middle and working class homeowners are not selfish ogres - we have family and friends who struggle with housing. What our neighborhood process illustrates is that if you sit down with people you can work out some great ways to increase housing.

Has democratic process become too much of a burden for the legislature? Why so much stick and no carrot? Eugene is working on developing our transportation corridors, it is right there in Envision Eugene, how about some resources to help it happen?

Our neighborhood association has been advocating for affordable housing at a vacant shovel ready site for years as well as building on property facing our transit corridors that is currently low rise commercial and in one case derelict. There is NO developer interest in this prime land. How about helping us do what works and what is right for our communities? Not all cities or neighborhoods are the same and that is exactly how SB 10 treats us. I can tell you, if this bill passes, there is no way are going to advocate for any development - why would we potentially instigate our own demise?

So please, reject this bill outright and give us resources to create actual affordable housing.

Sincerely,

Ted M. Coopman, Chair.
971 W. Broadway, Eugene
206-214-8625

--

Jefferson Westside Neighbors
Executive Board
Eugene, OR
www.jwneugene.org