

**Testimony of Randy Tucker, Legislative Affairs Manager  
In Support of House Bill 2001  
Transportation and Economic Development Subcommittee  
June 12, 2019**



Metro is the regional government for the greater Portland metropolitan area, tasked by Oregon statute with preparing population and growth forecasts for the region every six years, and making decisions about how and where the region will grow. Our region has a strong track record of supporting the core purposes of Oregon’s statewide planning system – protecting farms and forests and providing additional room for growth when needed.

In recent years, we have worked with our partners to improve how we do this work. We have supported local efforts to make the most of existing land, adopted a 50-year plan for urban and rural reserves, required concept planning to ensure that UGB expansions will result in needed housing, and made continuous improvements to our technical analyses that support growth management decisions. In its most recent growth management decision in 2018, the Metro Council added four well-planned areas to the UGB as proposed by four cities in the region.

The Metro Council strongly supports the goal of HB 2001 to increase the availability of “middle housing.” In fact, in its recent decision to expand the UGB, the Council included conditions of approval requiring the four cities responsible for planning the areas added to the boundary to allow the same types of housing that will be allowed under HB 2001. We also recommended early on that HB 2001 be broadened to apply to more of the area within our UGB, including unincorporated areas that house hundreds of thousands of residents. That change is reflected in the bill before you today.

There are two caveats to our support. First, we have concerns regarding Sections 5 and 6 of the bill. These sections, which were not part of the original bill and are not required to achieve the bill’s underlying purpose, make significant changes to Metro’s methodology for forecasting population growth and future housing needs. This language will undermine our efforts to accurately project future housing need and appears to be aimed at requiring Metro to make unnecessary expansions of the region’s urban growth boundary.

The main amendment before you today includes some technical changes to Sections 5 and 6 that make them more workable on the ground. While we continue to disagree with the inclusion of these sections, we appreciate the assistance of the Speaker’s office in facilitating these improvements.

Second, language added to ORS 197.296 on page 4, line 16 of the A-Engrossed bill requires us to analyze

**existing and projected** housing need by type and density range ... to determine the number of units and amount of land needed for each needed housing type for the next 20 years.

The term “existing need” is undefined and its addition to this subsection is inconsistent with the purpose of the statute, which is solely to estimate future need in 20 years. If this language requires anything analogous to the calculation of future need currently required by this statute, it could constitute an expensive unfunded mandate, while doing nothing to inform the 20-year land supply decision governed by this statute. We urge you to remove the reference to “existing need.”

Once again, the Metro Council strongly supports the rest of HB 2001. Thank you for your consideration.