

March 17, 2019

To: House Committee on Human Services and Housing

From: James Gorter, Southwest Portland

Re: Testimony on HB2001, -10 amendments – OPPOSED

The proposed amendment fails to address basic problems of HB2001:

- Goal 1 of Oregon's Land Use Regulations places the responsibility for urban land use planning and zoning on the cities and metropolitan service districts. HB2001 would put the state in charge. Cities and other local jurisdictions are best qualified to identify their own strategies for providing adequate housing for all.
- Goal 1 also requires public involvement in these decisions. HB2001 removes the public from the decision making process.
- HB2001 would not make housing more affordable. HB2001 mirrors Portland's proposed Residential Infill Project. The Johnson Economic Study of the RIP proposals is grievously flawed. Bare land and plex construction costs are greatly underestimated.
- HB2001 will drive the most housing challenged families out of urban areas and into more rural areas, far from jobs and services.

In regards to specific -10 amendment proposals:

- (2) Easing the requirements for 3plexes, 4plexes, clusters and townhouses in smaller cities does not solve the problems of planning, displacement, and housing costs for cities over 25,000.
- (7) The provision to award attorney's fees is bullying and intimidation at its worst. While the goal may be to reduce frivolous challenges, it will remove all but well healed developers from the process.
- Section 3 (10): Updating comprehensive plans is very expensive. Cities do not have the resources to do this on a sped up timeline. If this becomes a state requirement, costs should be fully covered by the State of Oregon.
- Section 3(2): If infrastructure improvements are required solely because of this act, such costs should be fully covered by the State of Oregon.
- Section 6: The timing for collection of system development charges should be a local decision. Within a jurisdiction, the timing should be consistent for all types of construction.

This testimony is submitted in response to Amendment -10. If amendments are added after the twenty-four hour testimony cutoff period, additional opportunity should be provided to allow public comment to be included in the hearing record.

