

From: [Travis Phillips](#)
To: [Sen Frederick](#)
Cc: [Sen Courtney](#); [Sen Burdick](#); [Sen Golden](#); [Sen Manning](#); [Rep Kotek](#); [Rep Gomberg](#); [Sen Hansell](#); [Rep Prusak](#); [Rep Evans](#); [Rep Leif](#); [Rep Post](#); [JWMTR Exhibits](#)
Subject: Support for HB2001--without -22 amendments
Date: Wednesday, June 12, 2019 10:21:19 AM
Attachments: [image001.png](#)

Senators Frederick and Courtney -

As a developer of affordable rental housing for some of the most marginalized residents of our state, **I'm writing to oppose the counterproductive -22 amendment to Speaker Kotek's very important House Bill 2001A.**

I'm driven to do this work to help ensure all of our neighbors, especially struggling or marginalized people, can find housing they can afford. Sen. Taylor's proposal may seem to advance this goal, but most affordable housing professionals will tell you that it does not. Instead, it would eliminate most of the benefits of the bill, especially in high-amenity neighborhoods with good access to schools, parks and jobs, while also throwing up significant obstacles to affordable-housing developers.

Don't get me wrong: A completely unregulated private housing market would also be a bad solution. The government must act in defense and support of vulnerable Oregonians. But allowing middle housing only for the small minority of low-income households who receive public subsidies would not be an effective way to do this (as you and I both know, the number of low-income residents grossly outnumber any subsidy that is available).

In nonprofit housing development, our enemies are time, cost and uncertainty. All of these loom larger with every regulatory hoop we have to navigate. At Catholic Charities, and before that at PCRI, I use standard development code whenever possible to develop affordable homes rather than constraining our project by opting into more restrictive versions. That is routinely the best way to deliver the most homes most quickly for the communities we serve.

Just as importantly, Oregon's housing need is far too great for us in the nonprofit development sector to solve alone. Even with increased public funding, which we very much need, nonprofit developers cannot solve the problem. The overwhelming majority of Oregonians, even low-income Oregonians, are housed by the private sector. We need the private sector to continue housing middle class and working class households so that every dollar of subsidy can go to those in more desperate need--and to fight back against the impacts of generations of racist housing discrimination. HB 2001A, as recommended and carefully crafted by Speaker Kotek and others, allows middle housing for middle-income Oregonians. It also gives affordable housing developers more tools to serve lower-income Oregonians more efficiently.

Under HB 2001, cities retain great leverage to incentivize below-market housing, for example by allowing size bonuses for below-market homes. This is the approach proposed for Portland's local zoning reform, which I provided significant feedback on, and which is almost fully consistent with the current text of HB 2001A. Like HB 2001, that reform has drawn strong support from the affordable housing community.

Please don't weaken this bill's many benefits with the addition of -22 amendment. Instead, maintain the bill as currently proposed to help retain the flexibility that affordable

housing developers (and others who help advance our goals) need in order to serve our communities.

Regards,

Travis Phillips

(PS: Thank you as well for your support of HB2508. This will make incredible strides to help us serve refugees who have made Oregon their new home.)

Travis Phillips

Director of Community Development & Housing

Catholic Charities of Oregon

Clark Family Center

2740 SE Powell Boulevard

Portland, OR 97202

503-688-2650 (direct)

503.231.4327 (fax)

tphillips@ccoregon.org