

Chair and members of House Committee on Housing and Human Services

I have reviewed the recently posted amendments to HB 2001. They add townhouses to the mix, reduce requirements for cities between 10,000 and 25,000 to duplexes only, give cities and counties more time to comply and add extension provisions, but with additional hurdles, new CC & Rs cannot be enforced to block middle housing, and add more money for technical assistance.

None of these amendments deal with the basic problems of HB 2001.

None of these amendments deal with the major issues of affordability, demolitions of existing affordable housing, or displacement of the most vulnerable in our cities, overburdened renters and communities of color.

None of these amendments deal with the issues raised by the recent Oregonian article on the manipulation of data by Portland Planning staffers.

HB 2001, as amended, continues to have or exacerbate the following problems.

HB 2001 removes opportunities for ownership by establishing multi-family units as a highest and best use of each parcel in what are now single family zones with a mixture of owners and renters. Such multi-units are characteristically owned by non-resident landlords or investors.

HB 2001 violates the intent and purpose of Oregon's Land use planning law. Cities are currently required in their Comprehensive Plans and zoning codes to provide for a 20 year supply of a variety of housing types and densities that meet community needs and use financial incentives to stimulate rehabilitation, not demolition, of existing housing.

"Housing takes many forms, and should be built to serve people at a variety of incomes levels. A housing supply that meets community needs is one that offers people a range of different places to live, different community densities to choose from, and does not overburden the financial resources of any group living there." **Oregon Housing Goal 10.**

"Plans should take into account the effects of utilizing financial incentives and resources to (a) stimulate the rehabilitation of substandard housing without regard to the financial capacity of the owner so long as benefits accrue to the occupants; and (b) bring into compliance with codes adopted to assure safe and sanitary housing the dwellings of

individuals who cannot on their own afford to meet such codes.” **Oregon Housing Goal 10.**

Presuming that state agencies (LCDC) and local governments are failing to enforce laws mandating a variety of housing types, is this justification to override and thus violate the intent, process, and procedures of those laws?

HB 2001 overrides civic engagement requirements under **Goal 1 Citizen Involvement** by short-circuiting the public process for determining community needs and removing local discretion in providing a variety of housing densities.

HB 2001 is a Trojan Horse for developer/interests posing as a solution for a housing “crisis”. That crisis is one of affordability and the result of numerous market forces. It is not the result of zoning regulations, at least not in Portland. The affordability gap will not be resolved by eliminating single family zoning.

HB 2001 will, however, result in displacement of residents of every income especially the poor and disadvantaged. HB 2001 fails to consider the negative environmental, financial, and social impacts on existing residents and violates the spirit and letter of Oregon’s proud history of sensible land use planning.

HB2001 may result in some needed if rarely affordable housing. On the other hand it may be the greatest land grab for housing investors in Oregon’s history. It will not support transit, address climate change, mitigate social injustice. It will be legally and socially disruptive. Ending single family zoning and confusing it with multi-family middle housing is a formula for increased demolitions, displacement, and speculative redevelopment.

The big question is who benefits from the passage of HB 2001. Follow the money, per the four part series from the Oregonian.

As a thoughtful legislator please oppose this misguided and irresponsible approach to land use planning.

Respectfully, Dean Gisvold
2225 NE 15th Ave.
Portland, OR 97212

dpg/a private/ICA/RIP/2019 Opp March HB 2001

Dean P. Gisvold | Attorney at Law | Senior Partner

M^cEWEN GISVOLD LLP - EST. 1886

1600 Standard Plaza, 1100 SW Sixth Avenue, Portland, Oregon 97204

Direct: 503-412-3548 | Office: 503-226-7321 | Fax: 503-243-2687

Email: deang@mcewengisvold.com

Website: <http://www.mcewengisvold.com>

**This message may contain confidential communications and/or privileged information.
If you have received it in error, please delete it and notify the sender.**