

**From:** [Christopher Eykamp](#)  
**To:** [JWMTR Exhibits](#)  
**Subject:** Please oppose HB 2001A  
**Date:** Tuesday, June 11, 2019 12:23:22 PM

---

Dear Committee Members,

I am writing because I strongly oppose HB 2001A -- it is the wrong solution to the wrong problem. The housing crisis facing us is one of affordability; housing for upper end of the market is doing quite well, (prices in Portland have even been falling recently), and this bill will simply encourage more construction in this, the most profitable segment of the market. What we need are policies to provide housing for people with lower incomes: 80%, 50%, even 30% MFI. Mandating upzoning will do nothing to help this less glamorous part of the market: by encouraging the redevelopment of less expensive properties, this bill may actually make market conditions worse for everyone who cannot afford upper-end housing.

My inner Portland neighborhood offers a bit of a preview of HB 2001A -- most parcels are zoned for twice the density than what is currently built; with Portland's ADU rules, up to 4 units can replace a single typical house. I have been watching my neighborhood become less diverse as older rental properties are replaced by new construction that is universally unaffordable to most current residents, most especially those renters being displaced. Ironically, density, when measured in terms of people, not structures, is not always increasing -- around the corner from me, a house being shared by 5 people was replaced by 2 new houses each occupied by a single resident, and 2 Airbnb units providing short term rentals to tourists. Those new houses sold for \$900K each. The neighborhood lost an attractive house and a mature tree. We also lost rental property, density, affordability, and diversity. Nothing in HB 2001A would mitigate these losses.

While I generally feel that zoning and housing issues are a local affair, there are things you could do at the state level to help:

1. Oregon already mandates that urban areas provide 20 years of buildable land within the Urban Growth Boundary. Similarly mandate a certain number of affordable units be constructed each year, and let cities figure out how to meet that quota (perhaps by changing their zoning, reducing fees, or requiring it as part of other construction).
2. Regulate short term rentals to ensure they are not occupying housing that could provide viable long-term rental opportunities, an issue that affects many municipalities around Oregon.
3. Levy a tax on real-estate transactions and use that to provide funds for developing new affordable units.
4. Limit the size of new houses, which would help keep the prices of new construction lower.
5. Look for ways to make shared-rentals more attractive; these often provide the cheapest housing and the greatest density, with no need for new construction, but are ignored by most policymakers.

As a property owner, HB 2001A would likely add significant value to my property. However, I think the unintended consequences of this bill will be severe enough that I would prefer to forgo that gain in order to preserve my neighborhood. I love it here, and hope we will continue to have areas of relative affordability so that my children will be able to move here if

they choose. I believe that if HB 2001A passes, that will be much less likely.

Thank you for considering my views,

Chris Eykamp  
2101 SE Tibbetts  
Portland, OR 97202