

From: [Gary Miniszewski](mailto:Gary.Miniszewski)
To: [Exhibit SB10](#)
Subject: opposition to SB10 as amended
Date: Sunday, March 31, 2019 10:03:55 AM

My name is Gary Miniszewski and I live at 8343 SW 57th Ave. Portland, OR. I have been a land use planner in this state for 30 years. I have reviewed the latest amendment to SB10 and I think the amendments have not changed the major intent of SB10. As such, I oppose this bill as amended for the following reasons.

SB10 literally throws Land Planning Goal 1 out the window. Citizen involvement is virtually nil when dealing with state legislation. And since SB10 creates a mandate, Oregon Cities, and citizens at the local level, will have no say once the mandate comes down to their cities/counties to implement. This housing mandate for minimum residential densities along transit corridors seems to be another knee jerk reaction, like HB 2001, to the "affordable housing crisis".

This bill ignores the fact that all Oregon Cities have addressed Housing Goal 10, which requires that they identify adequate land to accommodate various forms of housing for increased population for a 20 year horizon. Also, this bill ignores the fact that Oregon Cities, like Gresham, have been following sound land planning principles regarding transit corridors for decades now. As an example, the city of Gresham established corridor zone districts adjacent to the Max light Rail line in the late 1980s. These transit corridor districts require housing densities of 20 to 24 units an acre. Cities in Oregon should determine the appropriate density and location of multiple family housing along transit corridors, not be given specific State housing density mandates. This kind of proscriptive legislation undermines SB 100, which required Cities and Counties to develop their own land use plans, based on sound planning principles provided by each of the Statewide Land Planning Goals, i.e Goal 10 (Housing) and Goal 12 (Transportation).

It seems that every public official in this state has just woke up and is suddenly panicked about the "affordable housing crisis", thinking that the planning process in local jurisdictions is somehow inadequate. It isn't. Land planning does not control the housing development market. Goal 10 only requires that adequate lands suitable for residential development be identified. Land planning cannot directly provide for built, affordable housing stock. This "affordable housing crisis" has been in the making for decades and the Great Recession of 2008 exacerbated it. New housing wasn't being built for 3 to 4 years after 2008. Housing affordability is a national, systemic economic problem. More and more persons cannot afford adequate housing (and other basic needs) because their wages are not staying up with housing costs.

It is only recently that Portland, Portland Metro and the State of Oregon have recognized the need to more directly address this problem. Portland is just now trying to establish inclusionary zoning to provide for affordable housing; the State of Oregon, Portland, and Portland Metro are just now realizing the fact that construction of affordable housing needs to be publicly subsidized. Lets try and rely on tools like those, that directly and honestly address the housing problem - over time. Lets not make hasty State mandates requiring specific residential densities along urban transit corridors to address the need for more housing. The Cities and Counties of Oregon are much better equipped than the State of Oregon to establish appropriate housing density limits along their various forms of transit corridors.

cc: Sen.ShemiaFagan@oregonlegislature.gov
Sen.DallasHeard@oregonlegislature.gov
Sen.JeffGolden@oregonlegislature.gov
Sen.TimKnopp@oregonlegislature.gov
Sen.LaurieMonnesAnderson@oregonlegislature.gov
Sen.ginnyburdick@oregonlegislature.gov