

Submitter: Andrew Butz

On Behalf Of:

Committee: Senate Committee On Housing and Development

Measure: SB1051

We Oregonians need more housing for families with incomes below or at the area median. To stop SB 1051 and the urban sprawl it proposes, instead let's focus on tools proven to quickly produce more housing that's well-located near schools, stores, transit, and parks – allowing more diverse and affordable housing in every neighborhood, expedited processes for housing development, and funding for infrastructure, all inside UGBs.

SB 1051 undermines cities' sensible planning tool of urban reserves by allowing premature UGB expansion.

Urban reserves are predetermined areas where a UGB will expand if and when there's a demonstrated need for additional urban land. They are outside a UGB and are not a guarantee of a UGB expansion. Urban reserves allow cities to do long-range infrastructure, financial, and land use planning for a city's future.

This bill would undermine those public efforts, such as by local governments around the Portland metro UGB and cities of the Rogue Valley.

And SB 1051 also undermines the urban reserve provisions in HB 2001, just passed by the House by a large and bipartisan margin.

The provisions of the Oregon Housing Needs Analysis (OHNA) in this year's HB 2001 provide an easier path for all cities to designate urban reserves and use them when a UGB expansion is needed. I support that.

SB 1051 is not needed, as the current land use process to expand UGBs works quickly.

From 2016 to 2021, Oregon's cities approved 35 UGB expansions – almost all of them completed at the city level, in well under a year, with no appeal (only two were appealed). If cities face a need for any type of housing, the current, comprehensive process works; there is no need to bypass the law.

SB 1051 risks distracting cities from more effective, comprehensive housing solutions, to instead drive UGB expansions by individual private landowners, not a public process -- overriding the will of the community.

Cities under 3,500 in population could expand into an urban reserve for any use. The bill is essentially a free pass for smaller cities to expand their UGBs by up to 200 acres for any use – industrial, commercial, or housing – with no affordability requirements, just upon the request of a landowner, without showing need. This undermines sensible urban planning, threatens farm land, enables sprawl, and will

not lead to housing for people with middle and lower incomes.

For these reasons above, I oppose SB 1051.

Thanks for considering my comment.