From:	Ann Reiner
To:	Sen Taylor; Sen.LewFrederick@state.or.us; Rep.BradWitt@state.or.us; Sen.FredGirod@state.or.us; Rep.SalEsquivel@state.or.us; Rep Power; rep.kenhelm@state.or.us; Rep Lewis; JWMNR Exhibits
Subject:	Re: HB 2007
Date:	Wednesday, June 21, 2017 8:13:27 PM

I'm apologize that I didn't personalize this nor sign my name and address. I feel strongly about this issue for many reasons.

I am a 23 year resident of Portland. It is just in the last few years where it is plain to see builders are taking advantage of the current situation. From my perspective, they do not build affordable housing - they build structures that fill the lot, shoot up to the sky, and then charge astronomical prices that I'm not sure who can afford. I don't care if these structures increase my house price. The point is they are considering the good of many with their approach. They are catering to the affluent, wealthy, and their own bottom line. I hear them talk that "it's what the customer wants," but missing from their response is identification of the customer. It infuriates me that they act like they are serving the good of the community. This falls into the idea of what we hear about Washington DC. THIS IS NOT NORMAL.

I would hope that all of you would take into account the good of all, not just the wealthy. It is true Portland needs affordable housing, but not more housing for those who have many resources already.

Thank you for your consideration. Ann Reiner, voter in every election since 1994.
Oregon Senate - District 23
Oregon House of Representatives - District 46

On Wed, Jun 21, 2017 at 7:57 PM, Ann Reiner <annofpdx@gmail.com> wrote:

> Dear _____,
>
> If you share our goal of creating **more affordable housing**, increasing **density without demolition**, and **conserving the historic character** of our older neighborhoods, you must adopt Restore Oregon's amendments to FIX HB 2007:
>
> 1. Focus incentives on the creation of **affordable** housing, not market-rate housing.
> 2. Stop tear downs of good modest-priced homes, unless they're being replaced with multiple affordable units.
> 3. Enable the internal conversion of existing houses into as many as four units without triggering the cost-prohibitive commercial building code. This adds density while retaining character.
> 4. Leave in place baseline protections for new historic districts, while providing incentives for ADUs, internal conversations, and compatible infill.
>
> **As it stands, HB 2007 is based on FALSE PREMISES:**
> 1. That simply building more housing – even if it's at high market rates – will have the trickle-down effect of creating more affordability.
>
> - There is NO EVIDENCE this has worked in other cities. One need only look at San Francisco and Vancouver.
>
> 2. That we have a shortage of market rate housing in Portland and other major metro areas.
>
> - Market rate housing is doing fine – there's even an over-supply at the higher end.
> - We do not have enough AFFORDABLE housing. Building more high-end homes will not help that
>
> 3. That there is insufficient buildable land inside the UGB.
>
> - Nope. The central city is already dense, but outer neighborhoods have lots of opportunities for development and deserve investment.
>
> 4. That designation of historic districts is being used as a mechanism for blocking density and affordable housing.
>
> - Historic designation does NOT prohibit accessory dwelling units (ADUs) or infill development. Some historic districts require design review for compatibility. Recently revised Goal 5 rules provide that

the only automatic protection for new historic districts is demolition review.
- Historic districts comprise just 1% - 3% of residential zoning. They are not the problem and provide significant community benefits worthy of good stewardship.

There are positive aspects to HB 2007 such as streamlining review, establishing clear and objective standards for affordable housing design, and allowing religious institutions to create affordable housing on their property.

But to avoid doing more harm than good, we urge you to either **adopt our proposed amendments as a package, or VOTE NO on this bill.**

Thank you for giving this your full consideration,