



4940 NE 8th Ave. Portland, OR 97211
ph. 503.208.4391

October 25, 2016

I'm Beverly Logan, a leader with Metropolitan Alliance for Common Good (MACG), a broad-based community organization of faith, labor, community non-profit and health-care education member institutions and the thousands of households they include in the Metro Region, mostly across Portland's many neighborhoods.

MACG is not a housing organization. We engaged in the housing issue last year in response to hearing the increasing struggles faced by vast numbers within our membership. I and other members of MACG's Housing Action Team have followed the work of the IZ panel of experts since our work early this year to help pass the state legislation lifting the ban on Inclusionary Zoning in Oregon.

We appreciate the work of the housing and planning bureaus and the members of the IZ panel of experts in thinking through the complexities of inclusionary zoning, especially those who've spoken for the needs of the community. Thank you for the chance to speak to you today. We've had a steep learning curve, trying to keep up with the IZ expert panel discussions. Yet we know enough to testify confidently today on our recommendations for your bureau at this stage in the process: **Push forward with as aggressive an IZ policy as options allow, in service to the tremendous needs and reality of our city, rather than the desires and fears of certain developers. To the extent that bar is lowered by the LOCUS proposal, please reject it.**

Information presented at the most recent panel meeting showed that goals of the proposed policy are in fact doable. While some developers have offered strong support for IZ, others seem bound up by the unspoken rules of entitlement for the most privileged.

Those who have prospered from investment of our public dollars in transforming their properties into high value developments, should expect to contribute back to our community to help solve this crisis and ensure that all classes and races of people will be properly included among the members of ALL of Portland's neighborhoods, with their own opportunities to prosper. This social contract applies to all of us who benefit from society, but there is a special obligation on developers for housing, given the heavy role they played in creating the crisis shortage of affordable housing, through their lobbyists, banning anyone in Oregon from using IZ for seventeen years.

We should expect all bureaus of government to hold all actors accountable to democratically determined rules, not privilege those with more power to bypass or fashion the rules themselves in their own interest. Yet we saw that happen at the state level—the developer community had its way with the IZ legislation, first through its ban, then again recently in imposing excessive limits on communities when the ban was finally lifted.

Now that we have some prospect of including housing—affordable to moderate incomes—in all large developments, we hear arguments for inertia:

- We hear, “*There isn’t enough certainty to go forward at this time with as robust an IZ policy as the law allows.*” Nonsense. No one is exempt from uncertainty, and yet we must press ahead. There will always be uncertainty for developers, for many reasons beyond IZ. Our city and our people are in crisis and it is worsening. That is certain. The disruption and suffering are certain. The resulting strain on public services is certain.

If developers need more certainty, you can *create certainty* here in one of America's hottest markets by helping to pass strong IZ policy now.

- It’s implied that “*we should conduct business as usual according to the failed supply and demand calculations of trickle-down economics.*” Well we can’t solve a problem with the same thinking that created it; the housing crisis can’t be solved with unchecked construction of high end units or by failing to rigorously build housing affordable to those below not just 80% but below 60% of area median income.
- We heard, “*Developers have to maintain the current rate of return for their projects to be viable and attract financial investors.*” Again, Nonsense. This reveals a sense of entitlement, unshaken by the housing emergency so jarring to everyone else. ‘Highly profitable’ is NOT the definition of ‘viable.’

That said, we don’t doubt that developers are pressured by investors—in fact, this is one of the factors that drove the need to establish IZ, to get government to check the market dynamics on behalf of our people. With an aggressive and firm IZ policy, developers and investors will have the certainty they claim to need—if the law says you will *always* have to include units affordable at certain thresholds, they can get on with their business, rather than waiting to see if they can get an extra fraction of a percent or so on their projects later.

If the first bench of investors aren’t interested, surely a bit of effort will discover others behind them who will welcome the ROIs projected within meaningful IZ. Many foreign investors need a safe place to invest their money, and Portland real estate is desirable. The deluge of money wreaking havoc on cities isn’t just feared, but already observed around the world. Against that force, it’s imperative you help rebalance the playing field here in Portland, so our diverse communities can have some chance of surviving and thriving inside the city limits. The investors and developers will sort themselves out.

Finally, it’s unfortunate that a sense of entitlement among some developers appears stronger than their sense of responsibility for the community that has prospered them, or responsibility for the ban their lobbyists put in place, which tied the hands of all communities in addressing—much less preventing—the housing crisis we suffer today.

Push forward now in approving as aggressive an IZ policy as the law allows.

WE need certainty that the city is doing everything it can to resolve this crisis.

WE need the city to ensure a reasonable return on OUR investment as a community.