

The basic problem with HB 2001 is that it would allow over 90% of Portland's and other cities' houses to be replaced with three story, 4,000 square-foot quadplexes. See John Liu's 2/12/19 letter to the Portland Tribune, Who is RIP for? Not for ordinary Portlanders. The Bill does not address 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. Lacking any analysis of the potentially far reaching impacts of this bill, we look to the predicted impacts of the parallel initiative in Portland, the Residential Infill Plan.

HB 2001, like the RIP being considered by the city of Portland, is a massive rezoning bill that primarily benefits for-profit developers, builders and investors and contributes to city development fees. Both would preempt city planning, ignore Comprehensive Plans, neighborhood context and environments, increase global warming and provide no affordable housing.

Both will encourage the demolition of the smaller, affordable and habitable homes that should be preserved and made more energy efficient, in Portland through the use of the Clean Energy Fund. As that campaign stated: "Of the 249,000 single family and multiple family housing units in Portland 213,000 are in need of energy efficiency upgrading." At least 50% of grant-funded energy efficiency/renewable energy projects "should specifically benefit low-income residents and communities of color."

The Johnson Economics report commissioned by the city in November 2018 makes it clear that the Residential Infill Project will not produce affordable housing, average-priced housing, or family-size housing. As with RIP, HB 2001 will result in the demolition of thousands of existing homes. The first to go will be less-expensive rentals occupied by lower income families. These families will be displaced as has already occurred in North and East Portland. See <https://portlandtribune.com/pt/10-opinion/419562-321509-my-view-infill-project-will-not-benefit-ordinary-folks>.

City planners admit that the RIP will likely displace renters in neighborhoods with a higher share of low income and people of color, without college degrees, Lents, Brentwood-Darlington, Montavilla, and other inner ring neighborhoods such as St. Johns, Portsmouth, Concordia, and Cully. Class, economic differences mark debate over infill plan, Portland Tribune, 2/28/19. HB 2001 would have a similar effect.

Johnson Economics report concluded that most redevelopment will be investor-owned rental quadplex apartments: in the report's words, "largely rental product." There will be little room for home buyers, let alone nonprofit developers: "Ownership residential solutions under the proposed new codes would be expected to be limited." This Bill would have a similar effect.

Johnson's analysis also shows RIP redevelopment will produce rental apartments that are both small and expensive. According to this city-commissioned report, these rental quadplex units will be around 730 square feet at a typical rent of \$1,823 per month. According to the Portland Housing Bureau, the average rent for existing one-bedroom apartments in Portland is \$1,379 per

month. RIP quadplex apartments will be 35 percent more expensive than current average rents. According to the Housing Bureau, the affordable rent level for a one-bedroom apartment in Portland, for a family making 60 percent of the median family income, is \$840 per month. For a family making 80 percent of median family income, affordable rent is \$1,120 per month.

The way to make affordable housing available to the working-class and people of color in Portland and elsewhere while minimizing global warming impacts is to allow cities to preserve existing housing with energy efficiency upgrades and expand use of existing homes by supporting the addition of ADUs and internal renovations under residential codes to larger older homes to accommodate multiple families. In Portland's adopted 2035 Comprehensive Plan, the approved map shows the location of the 20-year supply of vacant and underutilized land zoned for residential use. In addition every residential corner lot is zoned for 2 houses, every midblock lot may include an 800SF ADU, density overlays are applied to substantial areas of the city. In excess of 41,000 lots zoned for denser housing in Portland are available excluding ADUs. These entitlements are largely unused.

In his Nov. 16, 2016 statement to the City Council on RIP, former PSU Professor Lutzenhiser found that "renovation of existing dwellings (rather than demolishing them), and adding ADUs to those and additional sites, would achieve the same density as demolition" – with duplex and ADU replacement — "at about 15 percent of the total cost to the households involved."

Moreover, the bill ignores the existence of National Historic Districts, such as Laurelhurst and Irvington, where ADUs are allowed. The Portland Historic Landmarks Commission prefers renovating existing buildings over building new ones. The most sustainable building is the one that already exists. This is essential for fighting climate change. 4-30-19 Portland Tribune.

The demolition of 1,000s of smaller, older, affordable housing for newly built duplexes, triplexes and quadplexes will unnecessarily increase global warming. Putting aside the loss of mature CO2 absorbing trees on lots cleared, the continued demolition of buildings across Oregon amounts to a staggering amount of [embodied energy](#) that is literally being thrown away. Every time we raze an older house and replace it with a new, even more energy efficient one, it takes an average of 50 years to recover the climate change impacts related to its demolition. See January 28, 2014 article entitled "The Impact of Oregon's Increasing Demolition Trend" by [Brandon Spencer-Hartle](#) on the [restoreoregon.org](#) website.

Professor Lutzenhiser also found: "Our demolition and new construction carbon emissions estimate is in the neighborhood of 47,000 pounds of CO2 emitted in the demo-construction process. The estimate for a major energy retrofit of an existing house is about 1,500 pounds (about 1/30th as much), and building a new ADU is estimated to produce around 12,000 pounds of CO2."

If you really care about the access of the displaced working class and people of color to our neighborhoods, you should allow cities to provide specific solutions to this problem, not ones that aggravate the problem and add to global warming. For example, dozens of longtime Portlanders whose families were displaced by city sponsored urban renewal in North and NE Portland began moving into the Beatrice Morrow Cannady building in November 2018. The

City's preference policy provides housing for people with historical ties to the predominantly black neighborhoods that were targeted for urban renewal in the 1960's. The 80 two plus bedroom apartments are being rented to families making no more than 60% of the area median income, \$49,000 for a family of 4 in 2018. 11-23-18 Oregonian.

A 61 unit apartment building with mostly 2 or 3 bedrooms will soon occupy a site on North Williams. 40 units will be reserved for households earning 30% of the area median family income, (\$24,420 for a family of 4), 20 for those making 60%. 5-2-19 Portland Tribune.

The State should allow cities to pursue other policies that preserve our neighborhoods, minimize global warming impacts, and retain and expand use of existing homes, such as, weatherization of low income housing, paying for ADUs that must be rented to low income families for 10 years, only waiving ADU development fees if units are rented under long term leases to households below median income, funding programs that support home ownership and access to existing housing by people of lower income and people of color (including land trust home ownership programs), vigorous enforcement of Fair Housing laws and lower income housing requirements in projects larger than 10 units.

Paul and Nikki Majkut 4130 NE 18th Avenue Portland OR

May 22, 2019

