



## Eugene Intergovernmental Relations

March 5, 2025

Chair Pham  
Senate Committee on Housing and Development  
900 Court Se. NE  
Salem, OR 97301

**RE: Eugene Opposes SB 49 and -1 amendment.**

The City of Eugene opposes SB 49 and the -1 amendment, as written these policies move Oregon backwards in our coordinated and cooperative effort to build critical housing units while maintaining community standards. Specifically, Eugene opposes SB 49 -1 regarding:

- The removal of minimum densities, which exist to demonstrate that cities are using urbanizing residential lands efficiently. Mandatory minimum densities are a core part of Eugene's Housing Production Strategies and meeting the goals that are laid out in the Oregon Housing Needs Analysis. Climate Friendly Areas designations, required by the state, will also require minimum densities. "Developed residential lands" is not defined and it is unclear how minimum densities would be removed from only those lands.
- Adopting a document that was to be developed as a model, not a required ordinance, and never intended to be required under SB 1564 (2024) serves no purpose. The intent of SB 1564 is clear both in statute and on the legislative record - the intent of this statute is to develop model ordinances that a city could, but is not required, adopt so as to lessen administrative burden in cases where cities do not at that time have capacity but may want to go back at a later date and adopt a more tailored ordinance. This section only serves to remove the local ability to tailor local codes and ordinances to local needs. Additionally, LCDC does not have to adopt model ordinances under SB 1564 until January 1, 2026, which would be the same effective date as this bill, which creates an unworkable timeline.
- The proposed amendments would require all cities in Oregon that choose to use inclusionary zoning to provide financial incentives and conduct analyses that are beyond their means and expertise. This would make inclusionary zoning administratively burdensome for cities to enact such policies. There is no guidance on what constitutes an economic analysis or whether it would inform a city's decision to adopt or maintain an inclusionary zoning program.
- Changing Council Authorities - Section 4(2)(b), instead of mandating this, we suggest supporting educational efforts, such as HB 3174 (2023) Sect 4: which created a statewide education program on Oregon's land use system and local government's and advisory bodies' roles and responsibilities within it. As written, SB49 Section 4 only weakens local control by creating another state mandate pre-empting local authority.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment and Eugene asks that you Oppose SB 49 and the -1. Let's focus on tangible policy and funding efforts that have meaningful results in housing units built.

Respectfully,

*submitted electronically*

Ethan Nelson, Intergovernmental Relations Manager