

League of Oregon Cities and our 241 member cities stand in opposition to HB 2258-1.

Oregon is facing a housing crisis, with a need to build over 100,000 homes to meet Oregonian's needs. Cities agree that we need to address our housing shortage and addressing the underlying issues in housing underproduction, like lack of infrastructure funding and market economics.

Due to the reasonable and necessary safety restrictions this measure places depending on the jurisdiction this many apply to a number of lots, a few lots, or almost none. HB 2258-1 will not generate large scale housing production and will only serve to undermine local control and remove local governments' abilities to tailor housing production to meet their local communities' needs.

Oregon is a vast and diverse state, local governments tailor their local codes and zoning to their communities needs and concerns. Some communities need to address wind and flooding in their building codes, while others may need to think more about wildfire, some many have an aging population and they may need to think about aging in place, others may need more homes for growing families or young professionals. A home that works well for one region may be unsafe or unfit community needs in another. This bill creates a one-size fits all model for housing that doesn't work.

Many of our cities have independently adopted a similar strategy at the local level, making building plans available that suit the needs and environmental concerns of their communities, and follow a similar process to what is outlined in this bill. A compromise would be to make the creation of programs like those easier, create a flexible, locally driven system that allows for collaboration between the manufactured housing producers, builders and developers, and cities to create local programs that reach the same end goal, but with the individual needs of our communities in mind.

Oregon needs more housing, we need bills that significantly move the needle and work with our communities, HB 2258 is not one of them.

We urge a "NO" vote on HB 2258-1.