

Co-Chair Senator James Manning Jr.
Co-Chair Representative David Gomberg

Members of:

Joint Subcommittee on Transportation and Economic Development

Re: HB2001 A, State Over-ride of detached single-family home local zoning

I oppose HB 2001 A, because it is **unbalanced** in its approach to housing affordability, **and what's more increases the cost of housing unnecessarily** by layering on new laws cities are required to satisfy; the cost of which must be passed on either through increased taxes for city planning and enforcement or fees.

- 1) **Unbalanced. HB 2001 should override the Urban "Growth" Boundary but instead leaves it intact,** such that developers continue to bid up the price of land in urban areas. (Developers normally multiply land cost by a factor of 4 in pricing the home(s) constructed on the property.) **Speaker Kotek, co-sponsor of this bill, acknowledges in introducing this bill that HB 2001 may not go far enough as it excludes easing Urban Growth Boundaries.**

Urban Growth Boundaries such as the one administered by Portland's Metro regional government are not growing as intended, commensurate with population growth. Since the late 1970s, Metro's Urban Growth **Boundary is only ten percent larger despite regional population growth of over 78%**, per studies by a real estate economist for Portland State University. One prominent planner researched the price of land outside the urban growth boundary and found it to be ten times *less* expensive.

There's no practical growth in our Urban "Growth" Boundary (Metro's), nor the road network to open it.

Build Out too, not just with infill!

- 2) **HB 2001 (A) Layers on new regulations, causing cities to undertake costly new planning exercises and public input processes plus enforcements.**

Somebody ends up paying for all this planning, and it is most probably homeowning and renting residents. Once, more planning routinely delivers surpluses of things people don't want so much and creates shortages of things people do want. Look at the City of Portland currently it is looking like it is building to a glut of 5 story apartment complexes, and this encouraged by City and regional planners.

Economic Development would be greatly enhanced if HB 2001 were to ease the Urban Growth Boundary. Some industry – for instance, an Intel – is land intensive and therefore is located at the edges of urban areas. The Urban Growth Boundary needs to ease so as allow employees of these industries to live within an easy auto ride to their job sites. Instead, **what we have now without commensurate expansion in the Urban Growth Boundary is folks driving cross town, even in many cases east of the Willamette or north of the Columbia, to access these land intensive industry jobs particular to Washington county for instance - causing congestion.**

Sincerely,

Robert Clark

Retired Senior Economist, retired from the Oregon Public Utility Commission
Resident of Milwaukie, Oregon