

I do not support HB2001 as it is currently written.

First, it subverts a local jurisdiction's ability to manage housing and its allocation consistent with the Planning Goals of the State of Oregon. By introducing this bill, the Oregon legislature is telling local jurisdictions that their comprehensive planning process (and the public input that went into it) can be disregarded with much less public consideration or any analysis for how these added housing opportunities will even address the perceived problem and how these policies will impact adequate facilities (schools, roads, water, sewers, etc.). To date, I have not seen one study that predicts that the bill will produce the outcome that its proponents seek, most notably income/cultural diversity, affordability, and the dream of home ownership,

Studies performed in several neighborhoods in Portland have consistently found that redeveloped single family lots will produce housing units that are approximately 150% higher in cost than the units that they replaced. The Johnson Economics study, funded by the City of Portland, found that the average new unit produced under the Residential Infill Project, which seeks higher densities in single family residential zones like HB2001, would likely result in the average rent of \$1,800/month per unit (without even taking into account the underlying land value). Within this context, HB2001 will only increase the number of demolitions, increase the number of evictions of price sensitive renters who formerly occupied existing single family homes, and increase the supply of luxury units which will not be affordable or occupied by a more diverse population. In addition, the Johnson Economics study anticipates that few of the duplexes, triplexes, and/or fourplexes contemplated by HB2001 would be owner occupied, with even fewer turned into condominiums, which means that most would be luxury rentals. Ignoring these prognostications, HB2001 places the dream of home ownership to even more distant horizon for most Oregonians.

This bill also ignores the role geography plays in value, price, and rent. Without any inclusive housing requirements, developers will be free to demolish units in higher value areas, closer to job centers thus displacing the existing population. In Portland, that will mean that African Americans will continue to be displaced from North and Northeast Portland. In just one decade the community of Woodlawn, for instance, had one of the highest rates of building permits and demolitions in its single family zoned areas. It also had one of the highest rates of displacement where the population of African Americans decreased by 900 and the population of whites increased by 800. Programs to encourage the communities of color to stay in these areas have been spectacularly unsuccessful, if not demeaning. Just imagine first being priced out of your neighborhood and then second being asked to apply to stay there. HB2001 will only make that situation worse. By pushing sensitive populations to the periphery of urban areas, to areas with more affordable rents, this bill will burden folks with increased time and cost to commute to work (whether by transit or automobile) - thus creating an added cost burden upon people who can least afford it.

Rather than precipitating the demolition of existing, inherently more affordable housing, the legislature should be contemplating benefits for existing rental unit owners and homeowners who wish to increase density on their properties in a more sustainable and equitable manner. The legislature should be investigating the benefits of internal conversions and housing rehabilitation tax credits as a way to use what the state's forests, lumberyards, and cement factories have

already produced and not fill landfills with unnecessary waste. Nearly 40 years ago, the City of Portland initiated the Albina Neighborhood Improvement Project that sought to restore the residential vitality of Albina after it had been decimated by urban renewal and highway construction. Nearly 300-400 houses were improved under that program. Why HB2001 seeks the housing clearance option over the housing rehabilitation option is puzzling.

I strongly urge the legislature to reconsider HB2001 and instead contemplate how housing rehabilitation, accessory apartments, and internal conversions would provide a much more measured and ultimately successful program that will produce inherently more affordable housing and a more diverse population.

Regards,

Kirk Ranzetta