

From: [Eben Fodor](#)
To: [Exhibits HAGLU](#)
Subject: Testimony Opposing HB 2003
Date: Wednesday, February 27, 2019 5:52:38 PM

Dear House Committee on Agriculture and Land Use,

HB 2003 is another terrible bill by Rep Tina Kotek, who seems to have been talking to nobody but developers since taking office. It seems odd that this isn't with the Housing Committee, like the other terrible bill by Tina Kotek, HB 2001. Maybe she is hope the public won't notice this one.

As a professional planner in Oregon for past 27 years, I know it is true that cities could do a better job of analyzing housing needs. However, this bill seems to have a hidden developer agenda in Section 4 by forcing the cities' hands toward density increases, gutting regulation, and increasing subsidies (see highlighted excerpt below).

SECTION 4.

(1) Within 12 months of determining its estimated housing need under section 3 (2) of this 2019 Act, a metropolitan service district, or a city described in section 3 (1) of this 2019 Act, must adopt a housing strategy. A housing strategy is a list of actions, measures and policies the metropolitan service district or city plans to undertake that are calculated to demonstrably lead to greater residential development of needed housing at rates necessary to meet the estimated housing need.

(2) In establishing and undertaking actions, measures and policies under subsection (1) of this section, the metropolitan service district or city shall ensure that land zoned for needed housing is in locations appropriate for needed housing and is zoned at density ranges that are likely to be achieved by the housing market using the analysis conducted under section 1 of this 2019 Act. Actions, measures or policies may include:

(a) Increases in the permitted density on existing residential land;

(b) Financial or other incentives for developing needed housing and higher density housing;

(c) Provisions permitting additional density beyond that generally allowed in the zoning district in exchange for amenities and features provided by the developer;

(d) Removal or easing of approval standards or procedures;

(e) Minimum density ranges; (f) Redevelopment and infill strategies;

(g) Authorization of housing types not previously allowed by the plan or regulations;

(h) Adoption of an average residential density standard;

(i) Rezoning or redesignation of nonresidential land; or

(j) Plans for obtaining or using federal, state and regional subsidies and financing to support needed housing.

Also, I don't see that the bill has defined what "affordable" means. Maybe it's

somewhere else in ORS, but a rather critical element. This seems to lack a market analysis (demand survey), which would tell us what people actually want, and therefore would actually buy.

Other than these problems, the bill seems like a great way to thank developers for their generous contributions to your campaigns!

Eben Fodor
Eugene, OR