

February 12, 2019
1720 SE 44th Ave.
Portland, OR 97215

To: Human Services and Housing Committee Members
Re: Supplemental Testimony on HB2001 for February 11, 2019 Public Hearing Continuation

Dear Human Services and Housing Committee Members:

I provided written testimony to you dated February 11, 2019, and am adding this as Supplemental Testimony.

As I submitted to you on February 11, I respectfully request that you **table action** on HB2001 pending modifications to this bill, and, that HB2003 be permitted to go ahead of HB2001 in legislative review. My supplemental testimony is as follows.

- 1. HB2001 is only a piecemeal approach to solving the housing problem. That is, it only deals with one aspect of housing needs and affordability and most of that is based on speculation. What should happen is a revisit to Goal 10 and make cities do the housing needs assessments properly for all types of housing, not just in low density areas. Putting this back into the context of a comprehensive plan update means infrastructure, transportation, and appropriate implementation measures will be considered in a public forum (i.e. Goal 1 compliance). HB2001 does not look at the comprehensive impacts of its mandate nor consider public involvement.**
- 2. Portland's Residential Infill Project, which HB2001 is based on, is flawed.** Please read the commentary, "Infill will not benefit ordinary folks" from the February 12 edition of the Portland Tribune: <https://portlandtribune.com/pt/10-opinion/419562-321509-my-view-infill-project-will-not-benefit-ordinary-folks?noredirect=1#noredirect>. The author very clearly points out serious problems to the Residential Infill Project which are also applicable to HB2001.
- 3. HB2001 will create tremendous financial burdens on cities but provides no funding in support.** HB2001 would trigger the need for comprehensive and zoning plan updates and necessitate changes in permitting, create increases in property values with subsequent property tax increases, require capital improvement and TSP plan updates and infrastructure projects, etc. Where is the money going to come from for all of this? Since I doubt HB2001 includes a financial package from the state like what happened with all of the federal planning assistance grants of years ago, this means local jurisdictions and special districts will be on the hook. New taxes? New development fees. And a lot of that will be passed on to the developers and home owners with an unaffordable end result.
- 4. HB2001 doesn't go far enough to allow housing innovations.** How about allowing tiny homes to locate on their own lots and not just in "cottage clusters." How about allowing innovative designs in tiny homes including those fabricated from former shipping containers (seen in the news of late). How about allowing placement of tiny home trailers to retain their wheels for easier location/relocation. How about not including anything more dense than triplexes into single family housing areas as Minneapolis did. And please allow cities the ability to apply location standards so that, for example, smaller homes are not overpowered by larger and bulkier structures.

5. **Density mandates in single family housing areas will be harmful to the natural and human environments.** More density means more structures and less landscaping/fewer trees. More density also creates new stormwater problems due to reductions in permeable soil area. There will be more cars, less parking, more noise, more garbage, more rodents, less privacy, more pressure on limited parks, more street maintenance problems, etc., etc., etc. Solving housing needs and affordability isn't as simple as HB2001 implies. It could create a planning nightmare if all the relative issues are not addressed in a comprehensive manner.

6. **Compromise is needed.** HB2001 needs compromise if it is pushed forward or it will create more problems than it portends to address.

In conclusion, please table this bill pending further study and modifications, and, please push HB2003 ahead as it tends to deal better with the problem at hand. Thanks for your consideration.

Sincere regards,

David Krogh, AICP

cc: Speaker Tina Kotek,
Damian Syrnyk, OAPA Legislative and Policy Committee Chair