To whom it may concern--

Thank you for reading.

My name is Paul Runge, I'll be a student at Portland State University this fall, and I am writing in support of HB 2001.

As you know, Oregon has a housing shortage that has put upward pressure on rents and home prices. The private market hasn't adequately responded to this shortage due to factors that limit expansion of the housing supply. One key factor is that Oregon's cities zone massive swathes of their land for single-family use. Single-family zoning is so proliferate that state intervention is now a reasonable way to help Oregon's housing market get unstuck.

On a personal level, I have well over a dozen friends living around the country, many of whom grew up in Oregon, who worry about being able to move there later in life due to the price of renting or buying a home. By allowing more housing and housing types, HB 2001 would help ensure that such people, many of them native Oregonians, can actually afford to live in the place they long called home. Oregon, specifically Portland, has a history of attracting valuable, high-human-capital talent, too. You can read about that <u>here</u>. HB 2001 assists with that attraction by combating over-inflation of rents and home prices.

There are many practical, non-personal reasons to support HB 2001. The bill returns property rights to property owners, giving them new opportunities to house aging relatives or simply create a new revenue stream for themselves. The multi-unit dwellings the bill legalizes are often the cheapest types of multi-unit buildings for developers, large and small, to build, since they don't require much steel and concrete. The multi-unit dwellings the bill legalizes are powerful, scalable tools in combating climate change by allowing us share infrastructure, create homes with smaller square footages leading to lower energy demand, and by concentrating demand for services, facilitating the long-term development of the attractive, walkable, car-optional neighborhoods so many of us want to live in. The multi-unit dwellings the bill legalizes were legal for years before being banned in a well documented effort to keep poor and non-white populations out of certain neighborhoods.

Many common arguments against the bill are easily undermined, too. For example, detractors often argue the bill threatens their neighborhoods character. First off, the bill doesn't mandate any night-and-day change in character, it simply allows changes to occur over time. No person, no matter how rich, should be exempt from changes inherent to cities. Second, the multi-unit dwellings the bill legalizes are already a part of cities' urban fabrics. Ironically, many of the leafy, historic neighborhoods whose homeowners are mobilizing against HB 2001 already have such housing options on their blocks.

Detractors will argue that the bill doesn't help those most in need. While it is true that this bill is not sufficient to guarantee housing to the poorest among us, detractors are incorrect to say this legislation wouldn't help those most in need. Even if new units built due to this legalization are too expensive to directly serve the most vulnerable or impoverished renters,

such units' construction will relieve pressure on the rentals that actually do serve those vulnerable and impoverished renters. This process is called filtering and is well documented. Recently, this <u>paper revealed</u> how upwardly mobile tenants that moved into new high-price apartments had often left their city's most affordable neighborhoods, opening space for poorer renters. Detractors might also argue that this legislation might hurt people of color through displacement. Those detractors would do well to look at the many diverse, progressive organizations supporting HB 2001 and refresh themselves on the racist origins of single family zoning.

Thank you for considering this perspective and for supporting HB 2001.

Paul Runge