

Submitter: Jon Christenson  
On Behalf Of: individual comment  
Committee: House Committee On Rules  
Measure: HB3414

Chair  
Members of the House Rules Committee  
State Capitol

I have reviewed the testimony. I support and concur with the testimony of the City Manager of Salem, and Mike Houck. The letter from the City Manager clearly states the concerns of municipal government. When Oregon enacted a coordinated comprehensive statewide land use program (Oregon Senate Bill 100) in 1973, it was an agreement between the state and local government. Local government, counties and cities, would continue to assess, and make decisions, and the State of Oregon would establish Goals and Guidelines, in a collaborative and cooperative endeavor. House Bill 3414 undercuts that longstanding agreement between state and local governance.

Not one size fits it all. Not rural areas, not smaller communities, not cities of various sizes, or resource and economic foundations or histories.

The testimony from Mr. Mike Houck explains, briefly, how HB 3414 unravels the Oregon system, damages resources and undermines generations of work, at the state and local level, and threatens the essence of what is Oregon.

Oregon is not Portland or the Portland SMA. Or a METRO.

I truly fear that a Portland model is being imposed on communities outside of the Portland SMA. Rather ruthlessly, actually.

What we are seeing at the local level are ordinances being adopted at the local level at , to accommodate state law, with virtually no substantive economic, geographical, topographical analysis or depth, integration with transportation planning, capacity or outcomes or infrastructure, or build out understanding or modeling: outcomes putting at serious risk, natural resources, livability, historic resources, and what will, in future years, be ghettos, poorly integrated housing because the haste lacked true integrative thought or understanding of carrying capacity and eventual costs.

What is taking place is, right now, in haste, years to come of mitigation, costing literally billions of public dollars to rectify errors, "someone else will be pick up the

tab."

I encourage you to moderate the repeated thrust of so-called deregulation.

Be careful not to throw the baby with the bath water,

And to look at, reassess the structure of the housing industry, fabrication, systems with the production of housing for reform and redesign and streamlining, a more sophisticated approach and economic analysis.

Dig into the market and supply systems, fabrication, look at different structures to how housing can take place, emerge: e.g., use of cooperatives, land banking, labor-industry-non-profit collaboration in construction, etc.

"Deregulation" is a easy banner. But it is not based on an understanding of production. It blames government. More easy because it is the state blaming local government. That's easy. It is a form of passing the buck.

The real solutions are much deeper. Production, critical paths and access to materials, labor, capital, technological innovation, supply systems and dependencies, contingencies, et al.

How do we produce houses, deliver housing. It is not just regulation. Look at the industrial and production systems. Look at innovation. Look at how the State of Oregon could capitalize innovation.

Thank you.

Jon Christenson