

From: [Michael Andersen](#)
To: [DLCD Housing * DLCD](#); [TEVA Celestina * DLCD](#); [CHROMAN Thea * DLCD](#); [VALENCIA-AGUILAR Mari * DLCD](#)
Cc: [Julia Metz](#); [MCCURDY Mary Kyle](#)
Subject: HAWG comment re acceleration program
Date: Wednesday, April 23, 2025 2:14:52 PM
Attachments: [Outlook-cid_6ebd5d.png](#)
[Outlook-cid_38ec0d.png](#)
[Outlook-cid_5ce464.png](#)
[Outlook-cid_69220e.png](#)

Hello! Thanks for giving me some time this morning to raise concerns this morning about any system that relies entirely on staff discretion in the content of the acceleration agreement, and therefore (a) would require constant infusions of political capital to adequately empower DLCD and (b) wouldn't offer the predictability required to give local leaders an incentive to advocate for their local plan (as opposed to advocating against a state plan).

To further underscore my recurring point about the middle housing bill, please consider Eugene. By most appearances it would have seemed, in 2019, like the sort of city that would do as little as possible to comply. It had defied the state's ADU mandate and lobbied hard against fourplexes. Elected officials there face well organized and politically powerful opposition to infill. But because of the certainty written into the middle housing bill, the city was forced to have a difficult conversation — and the code Eugene came up with turned out to be quite liberal and one of the most productive in the state, more than doubling middle housing permits in the first full year after implementation.

Of course this sequence has not turned out so well in every city. This shouldn't be our only means for achieving local policy changes. And laws and rules should keep being updated (like the middle housing bill is being updated now). But predictable consequences were the key to that success story from the prior HB2001.

This morning I corresponded by text and email with Aaron Eckhouse of CAYimby, one of their lead policy staffers on RHNA. I sent him the memo in which the meeting he was part of had been cited, and asked for his take. He said:

- 1) It's good that there are clear standards for cities' plans.*
- 2) It would be good for there to be clear consequences/default programs (because housing is not a punishment!) the state could impose for cities that fail to meet their planning requirement, or whose plans are not working. We are trying to move toward this in California.*
- 3) Having an option for a more flexible, discretionary audit in cases where the above don't work also makes sense.*

Thank you all for putting so much thought into your work on all these details. It is apparent and impressive.

Michael



Michael Andersen | cities + towns director | him or them

cell: 503-333-7824 | Zoom: 702-268-5970 | www.sightline.org



Based in Portland on traditional Chinookian & Coast Salish land.

Sightline Institute is an independent, nonprofit think tank transforming Cascadia into a global model of sustainability. [Follow](#) our leading original analysis of housing, democracy, and energy policy, [support](#) our work.