

**From:** [Dean P. Gisvold](#)  
**To:** [JWMTR Exhibits](#)  
**Subject:** HB 2001 A Opposition  
**Date:** Saturday, June 8, 2019 2:36:11 PM

---

Chair and members of Joint Ways and Means Committee, June 8, 2019  
Subcommittee on Transportation and Economic Development  
Re: Opposition to HB 2001, A

The basic question you should be asking is who is HB 2001 for.

This is the question the dissenters on the Portland Planning and Sustainability Commission asked about Portland RIP (the proto type for HB 2001) before they voted NO on sending RIP to the Portland City Council.

The answers to this fundamental question are:

HB 2001 is not for low income folks, actually no one earning below 100% MFI will benefit.  
HB 2001 is not for communities of color.  
HB 2001 is not for renters.  
HB 2001 is not for those who need affordable housing with supportive services.  
HB 2001 is not for those who need any level of affordable housing.  
HB 2001 will not prevent demolitions of existing affordable housing.  
HB 2001 will not prevent the displacement of those most vulnerable among us.

HB 2001 will greatly benefit developers, flippers, homebuilders, and investors-these are the people who have been lobbying for this legislation.

This one size fits all approach will not work and is not needed. Cities are hard at work on these problems. With bond monies and programs, the City of Portland, Multnomah County, and Metro are causing the construction of significant numbers of affordable housing with supportive services to meet the real housing crisis, not the one invented by the homebuilders.

Oregon cities can and are providing specific solutions to these problem, and do not need the state to tell them how to do it. Portland has two buildings that will provide housing for people with historical ties to the predominantly black neighborhoods that were targeted for urban renewal in the 1960's.

Oregon cities can and will pursue other policies that preserve the existing stock of affordable housing, minimize global warming impacts, and retain and expand use of existing homes, such as, weatherization of low income housing, supporting more ADUs, funding programs that support home ownership and access to existing housing by people of lower income and people of color, vigorous enforcement of Fair Housing laws and making inclusionary zoning programs part of the solution. BTW guess who is now arguing against inclusionary zoning programs-the homebuilders and up with growth supporters.

The State should get out of the way and let Oregon cities solve these issues. If some cities are not doing what they should, then the State should enforce existing laws.

There is no need for more legislation, especially one that is NOT for the common good. Please do not support HB 2001 A.

Dean and Susan Gisvold, NE Portland residents and volunteers for 52 years.