

**From:** [Dean P. Gisvold](#)  
**To:** [Exhibits HAGLU](#)  
**Subject:** HB 2003 Testimony in Opposition  
**Date:** Monday, March 4, 2019 12:15:30 PM

---

## House Committee on Agriculture and Land Use

HB 2003 is a 30 page bill that only a land use attorney can fully understand, and I am not a land use attorney. Here are my comments.

1. I do not understand why such a top down piece of legislation is really needed. From what I know of the current land use system, it seems that much of the work contemplated by 2003 is already required. I have seen no evidence of failure to comply by cities, counties and Metro. Thus, my first question is why is 2003 needed.
2. If cities and counties and Metro need more information on affordability levels, why not say so. From my experience in affordable housing, all housing affordable to very low income requires significant public subsidies and supportive housing programs. I am not aware of any private developers who will touch these project. I would say that very low income should go up to 60%.
3. Given the current housing market, the categories from 60% to 120% will require some form of public subsidy. I do not see any discussion of this matter and how it will be achieved.
4. A re worked 2003 that is cleaner and clearer about what it is trying to achieve in terms of new information might be useful, but this needs to happen before HB 2001 is contemplated for passage. 2001 sounds like it already has the answer, which it doesn't, and 2003 is in search of a problem. It would be nice to know if there is a problem, and what are the options that might succeed before 2001 is considered for adoption.
5. Will 2003 rely on market rate developers for implementation-it sounds like it to me, which is another problem. HB 2001 and HB 2003 favor market rate developers, a dream come true.
6. Why is the current needed housing definition being deleted and a new one being adopted. Again, what is the problem with the current definition, it appears to cover all the bases, except, perhaps, the levels of affordability. The new definition is hard to understand, and is ambiguous in part.
7. I am opposed to the burden shifting in sections 19 and 20. Not needed.
8. I am opposed to the changes in how attorney's fees are to be awarded. Has the same problem as a similar provision inn 2001.
9. I am opposed to the restrictions on height and density issues in sections 19 and 20. Not needed. Let local government solve these issues if they are issues.
10. I am opposed to the restrictions imposed on cities and counties regarding systems development charges. Let local government deal with these matters.

11. Finally, the timelines imposed on various bodies do not seem well thought out.

I am opposed to this legislation. It needs work.

Dean Gisvold 2225 NE 15<sup>th</sup> Portland Oregon 97212