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## Overview/ AT Gentrification

**Haffner ’16 of the Guardian** explains that gentrification is inevitable, in fact, **Gonzalez ’16 explains** that zoning restrictions that uniquely exist in the neg world accelerate and create all of the problems that my opponents are talking about. Understand that in either world rich people are going to want to move to a more popular neighborhood. The only difference is in our world there is actually supply for rich people to move into.

Jeanne Haffner,1-16-2016, Is gentrification inevitable – and inevitably bad?, Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/cities/2016/jan/16/gentrification-inevitable-bad-urban-change,//ZS>

Whatever one thinks of his subsequent political career, Sanders’ efforts in Burlington remind us that the impact of – and concerns over – urban gentrification are nothing new. These days, however, gentrification is perhaps the most widely used term in any discussion about contemporary cities, and invariably carries with it sinister implications of deep social division and exclusion. Rather like a law of nature or scientific fact, t**he gentrification process is now considered inevitable,** and inevitably bad. How did we come to think about it in this way – and what are the consequences of this perception for our cities?

Gonzalez ,xx-xx-xxxx, How Zoning Regulations May Be Accelerating Gentrification, [FKD], <http://www.genfkd.org/how-zoning-regulations-may-be-accelerating-gentrification,//ZS>

Regardless of your opinion on gentrification, **one thing is becoming clearer – strict land-use regulations, including housing and zoning requirements,** can **accelerate the proc**ess. When there is a sudden increase in demand in an area, **housing developers need to be able to quickly respond by building more housing units. Some zoning limits delay, or block, development which distorts the market and limits the number of units. "When paired with rising demand pressure, laws such as these are a recipe for disaster.**" When paired with rising demand pressure, laws such as these are a recipe for disaster. They restrict supply and cause prices to rise artificially. If supply were allowed to operate freely, prices would not rise so drastically. **When restrictions are imposed on how many housing units can be built**, or how tall they can built, **this significantly limits the ability for markets to adjust to fluctuations in demand**. It holds back the young workers looking to move to a new city for a new job and **it ties the hands of housing developers who want to build more. Most importantly, it accelerates the very process the policies are meant to alleviate – the destruction of local communities due to rising costs of living.**

<https://www.nytimes.com/2018/07/27/us/politics/hud-affordable-housing-crisis.html//ZS>

And the crisis didn’t begin under Mr. Trump’s presidency.  **Median national rents rose by 32 percent** in constant dollars **from 2001 to 2015, while wages remained flat,** according to the Pew Charitable Trusts. **The pace has picked up over the last few years,** buoyed by an improving economy.  **The rent increases are hitting poor and elderly people, African-Americans and low-income wage earners the hardest.** A survey by the National Low Income Housing Coalition found that **a worker earning** the state **minimum wage could afford a market-rate one-bedroom apartment in only 22 of the country’s 3,000 counties.**

## AT Labor Shortage

1. **Turn-** we are the only ones who can possibly solve, **Breech ’17 of City Metric** explains that because rent control, and current zoning restrictions prevent companies and cities from being able to attract workers, meaning when more projects are taken on that increases that incentive to recruit, and fill the current labor shortage
2. **Delink- Davidson ’18 of USA Today** reports how construction companies are increasingly turning to robots to respond to this lack of workforce. These robots are expected to cut the time it would take to build a house by half compared to a full work crew and are net much more efficient and affordable than humans**.**
3. **Delink- Rurak ’18** explains that there are 55 million people between the ages of 18 and 65 who are not working, and there are also 11.5 million people looking to start working immediately.
4. **Delink- BMU** explains that this is literally a myth created by the construction industry in order to increase visa quotas and get a large supply of cheap foreign labor in order to increase profits.

Cara Smith,12-31-2018, Construction workers on the rise in Austin — big time, Austin Business Journal, <https://www.bizjournals.com/austin/news/2018/12/31/austin-has-10-more-construction-workers-than-a.html,//ZS>

**Austin has 10% more construction workers than a year ago**

Anthony Breach,10-18-2017, Here’s why rent control might make the housing crisis worse, No Publication, <https://www.citymetric.com/politics/here-s-why-rent-control-might-make-housing-crisis-worse-3412,//ZS>

As such, rent controlled luxury apartments in elite neighbourhoods in Manhattan have been rented out for decades at less than £100 a month, but average one-bed apartments without rent control in working class parts of Brooklyn cost upwards of £1,300 a month. Rent control in Stockholm sees locals wait decades for new rent-controlled flats. And Berlin’s experience of rent control has not achieved their stated goal of stopping gentrification and has caused some rents to spike as landlords respond to the new incentives. All **the international evidence shows that rent controls divide renters into the privileged and the outsiders. Those already in rented flats when controls are introduced do well, but the city’s young people and migrants from the rest of the country and abroad are penalised as they need the new homes that are not being built. The shortage of housing then makes it harder for cities to attract the workers and firms they need to be successful.** Expensive cities like Cambridge have to manage the costs of growth by building more housing and using the new tax revenues to fund more infrastructure in the key locations that have lots of jobs and opportunities. Rent controls will make this more difficult and worsen the inequality of growth within successful cities. Labour is also promising a big expansion of social housing, and it could be argued that this would balance out any negative effects of introducing rent control on the private housebuilding industry. This is unlikely. London needs roughly 50,000 homes a year, and is currently building 20,000, mostly privately. Even at the peak of municipal social housing in the 1960s London Boroughs were not building

Paul Davidson,6-25-2018, With construction workers scarce, homebuilders turn to robots, software, USA TODAY, <https://www.usatoday.com/story/money/2018/06/25/builders-coping-construction-worker-shortage-making-houses-factories-robots/704109002/,//ZS>  
A new generation of prefabricated housing that bears little resemblance to the modular homes of old is among several **technologies homebuilders are embracing to cope with the worker shortage. They’re also starting to deploy bricklaying robots and software programs that allow them to avoid miscommunication and delays.** “We’re at a tipping point where it’s finally just gotten too expensive to build the old-fashioned way,” says Margaret Whelan, CEO of Whelan Advisory and an investment banker for the home building industry. The industry is due for a fresh approach. While U.S. productivity, or output per labor hour, rose an average 1.76 percent a year from 1995 to 2015, productivity in construction declined an average 1.04 percent during that period, according to an Evercore analysis of government and McKinsey Global Institute figures. Contractors are vulnerable to weather, human error and the missteps that result when dozens of unrelated subcontractors join forces to cobble together a home. The factory-based builders aren’t producing the kind of modular houses that have been around for decades – three-dimensional chunks of finished home pieces that are shipped to building sites in limited varieties. The new manufacturers, who serve as suppliers to traditional builders, make flat panels and can churn out any blueprint the builder requests. At Blueprint Robotics, about 30 software engineers and architects convert builders’ plans into programs that computerized machines follow. **The machines, robots essentially, cut wood to length, form holes and grooves for electric sockets and wiring, nail the wall studs together at precise intervals and then add bigger holes for windows and doors, along with a particle-board-like sheathing. Tasks that could take traditional workers an hour or more are completed in minutes. The factory crackles with the familiar sound of sawing, hammering and drilling, but it’s mostly machines making them. About 35 workers in blue sport shirts are scattered throughout the 200,000-square-foot plant to assist rather than toil, starting up machines and loading panels. Machines tilt walls upright and move them on a conveyor to stations where workers briskly add wiring, pipes and windows. A robot shoots insulation into the spaces between studs**. A similar process cranks out floors. A walk through the factory is like watching a house being built horizontally, with wood facades lined up in neat rows at the end. At the construction site, it takes about a week for a crane and seven Blueprint workers to lift the panels into place and bind the frame together so the homebuilder can complete the house. The homebuilder then takes over, finishing the house the usual way by adding features such as drywall, kitchen counters and carpet.

Michelle Hartman,9-21-2017, Why are so many potential workers sitting on the sidelines in this economy?, No Publication, <https://www.marketplace.org/2017/09/21/economy/why-are-so-many-potential-workers-sitting-sidelines-economy,//ZS>

The headline unemployment rate we report every month from the Labor Department has been consistently low. According to **economists we’re at or near what’s considered full employment.Employers have a record number of job openings, about 6 million right now, and say they can’t find workers to fill them, especially in fields like manufacturing and construction. Meanwhile, about 8.5 million people are either looking for work, or say they want to work but have given up looking. There are more working age people sitting on the sidelines, not actively looking for a job, than there were before the Great Recession. There are also more long-term unemployed, and underemployed people who have part-time jobs and want full-time ones.** So what gives? In some cases, workers are mismatched to the jobs employers want to fill — there’s a growing skills gap in the labor market. People who have not had a job for months or years may have a hard time getting hired, as employers don’t tend to want to hire people who have gone through long stretches of unemployment. And employers are also offering more part-time jobs, often with unreliable or inconsistent hours, that are unappealing to workers. Finally, more than half of the men aged 25 to 54 who aren’t working or even looking for work say they’re disabled.

Tom Rurak,12-28-2018, Constant Reports of a Worker Shortage That Isn't, No Publication, <https://www.numbersusa.com/blog/constant-reports-worker-shortage-isnt,//ZS>

In economics, the term “shortage” refers to a situation wherein the demand for a good or service exceeds the supply. The situation wherein the supply of a good or service exceeds demand is a “surplus.” If there were a labor shortage in the United States, wages would be skyrocketing, and many employers would immediately go out of business being unable to operate without a sufficient workforce. There is dispute over the relative health of the U.S. economy, the competency of the Fed, and what has caused turbulence in the stock market over the last few months. There are differing views on what are the best economic policies for the United States to pursue**. It is ludicrous to claim that there is a labor shortage in America. A labor shortage means a lack of available workers, not an abundance of available workers employers prefer not to hire. The fact is there is an oversupply of workers in the United States. About 55 million people between the ages of 18 and 65 are not working. According to the Bureau of Labor Statistics October 2018 survey, almost 11.5 million people wanted to start work immediately.** The unemployment rate for those without a college degree is much higher than the national average, as are the rate of those without a college degree who have dropped out the labor market altogether. Yet, Miller quotes uncritically Peter Quigley, executive vice president at Kelly Services staffing company claiming there is an “acute shortage” of blue-collar workers. And, of course, Miller also mentions immigration as a way to alleviate this problem.

BMU,5-23-2014, Home builders pretend there's a labor shortage Can't imagine why..., No Publication, <http://www.michiganbuildingtrades.org/newspaper/home-builders-pretend-theres-a-labor-shortage-cant-imagine-why,//ZS>

It’s five o’clock somewhere. And maybe there’s a construction worker shortage, too, somewhere. But it’s not significant in the U.S., and it’s not very widespread. That’s the word from the Economic Policy Institute, which issued a report on May 5 titled, “No sign of labor shortages in construction: **there are seven unemployed construction workers for every job opening**.” From the report: “The National Association of Home Builders (NAHB) wants you to believe their members face a serious shortage of construction workers, even though construction employment is more than 1.7 million jobs below its pre-recession peak, and unemployed construction workers outnumber job openings in construction by well over seven-to-one. “More and more news stories, even in respected sources like NPR and the Wall Street Journal, repeat the builders’ talking points and toss around wage figures with very limited resemblance to reality,” the EPI said. So **why would the home builders want to perpetuate the myth of a construction worker shortage? “Their chief motivation behind this effort,” says a statement from North America’s Building Trades Unions, “is their collective desire to see a new, expanded and virtually unlimited foreign guest worker program for the construction industry. By convincing lawmakers that there simply are not enough American workers to fill job openings in construction, these associations believe that Congress will be amenable to expanding the foreign guest worker program – known as the H2b visa program – so that construction employers would have virtually unlimited access to an imported labor force.” The** Economic Policy Institute’s Ross Eisenbrey and Heidi Shierholz write that “the best way to identify a tight labor market, let alone a market beset by actual labor shortages, is to examine wages.” They cited a Wall Street Journal article describing a frenzied search for skilled labor, causing pay to soar “to boom-time levels and beyond.” But “boom-time” levels of pay are in the eye of the beholder. “While it’s true that construction wages have risen over the past two years,” Eisenbrey and Shierholz write, “they’ve risen from such a deep depression that they are still well below the levels of 2009. In fact, the real hourly wages of residential building workers are still 4.2 percent below 2009, a loss significantly deeper than that of the overall private sector workforce, whose wages are 0.9 percent below 2009.” North America’s Building Trades Unions **said expanding guest worker visas “would enable contractors to continue to keep labor costs stagnant (as they have been for the last 40 years in the U.S. construction industry) by utilizing low-cost, easily exploitable foreign imported labor.”**

## AT Subsidized Housing

### General

1. **Nonunique-** Subsidized housing is going down in the status quo **Guarnieri ’18 of Newsweek** found that that Trump’s budget slashed Housing and Urban Development funding by $8.8 Billion, and rental assistance by 11.2%.
2. **Link Turn-** Market rate housing is the best way to solve for the declining subsidies in the status quo, **Goldberg ’18 of Politico** explains that MRH can increase tax revenue for the government to use and spend more on subsidized housing.
3. **Link Turn- Reconnecting America** explains that market rate housing can reduce the subsidies cost and increase the construction quality of affordable units.

Grace Guarnieri,2-12-2018, Trump's budget proposal slashes Housing Department funds by $8.8 billion, could strain low-income households, Newsweek, <https://www.newsweek.com/trump-budget-slashes-housing-funding-803892,//ZS>  
**President Donald Trump's recently released Fiscal Year 2019 Budget proposal included major cuts to the Department of Housing. The budget would slash department funding by about $8.8 billion, or 18 percent of 2017's enacted levels**. The administration will ask Housing and Urban Development-assisted households to "shoulder" more of their housing costs. The proposal also calls for the elimination of the federal community development block grant, which provides funds to communities to repair infrastructure, build affordable housing and create jobs. The administration said the grant fails to demonstrate a significant impact. Ben Carson, secretary of the agency known as HUD, took to Twitter to support the proposed cuts, writing, "The proposed budget is focused on moving more people toward self-sufficiency through reforming rental assistance programs and moving aging public housing to more sustainable platforms." In a statement, Carson added: "I am confident HUD will deliver on its core programs, assist our most vulnerable populations, and make significant enhancements to our programs where needed." Despite Carson's confidence in HUD and the budget, housing and social safety net advocates expressed harsh criticisms about the president's proposed budget. "Despite the Admin’s purported interest in improving resident’s self-sufficiency, Sec Carson doesn’t propose increased $ for one HUD program designed to do just that - the Family Self Sufficiency program. Instead, expect rent hikes and work requirements," Diane Yentel, president and CEO of the National Low Income Housing Coalition, tweeted on Monday. **The budget also proposed cutting rental assistance funds by 11.2 percent** "to address the increasing and unsustainable Federal costs of rental assistance." Recipients of housing assistance are currently asked to devote 30 percent of their adjusted income towards housing costs and are typically considered "cost burdened" if 30 percent or more of their paycheck goes towards housing.

Reconnecting America ,8-21-2009, No Publication, <http://www.reconnectingamerica.org/assets/Uploads/091030ra201mixedhousefinal.pdf,//ZS>  
The socio-economic diversity that mixed-income housing provides for also enhances community stability and sustainability, and ensures that low-income households are not isolated in concentrations of poverty. Just as important, we are beginning to understand that the mixing and mingling of people from diverse backgrounds and experiences promotes innovation by increasing the opportunities for people to share and combine ideas from different perspectives and traditions. Mixedincome housing also helps stretch the limited resources available to address the affordable housing shortage. **The inclusion of market-rate units can reduce the subsidies required to build the affordable units, and help ensure there will be high-quality design and construction. These are just some of the reasons that housing policy in the U.S. has increasingly focused on mixed-income housing.** The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development’s HOPE VI program devoted $4.5 billion over 10 years to demolish and redevelop distressed public housing projects as mixed-income developments, helping to demonstrate its viability and benefits (www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/hope6). But while providing for a mix of incomes in communities in general is good, providing for a mix of incomes in walkable neighborhoods near transit is even better – for all of the reasons shown in the illustration to the right: Most importantly, in addition to the savings realized because housing is affordably priced, families living near transit can also own fewer cars – or no cars – and drive them less, which means significant savings on transportation costs. However, we must act now to ensure that the housing built in these locations provides for a mix of incomes or a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity will be lost. Changing demographics and concern about traffic has boosted demand for housing near transit and the supply is not keeping up with the increased demand. Because of this, and because developing in these locations is more time-consuming, difficult and expensive, most new housing is being built for the high end of the market, and many of the low-income residents who already live in these locations are being forced out. The first half of this book makes the case for the importance of locating mixed-income housing near transit in order to increase affordability, and explain why the increased demand for housing in walkable neighborhoods near transit is making this so difficult.

Sally Goldenberg,11-19-2018, Mayor hints at plans for more market-rate development on unused NYCHA land, Politico PRO, <https://www.politico.com/states/new-york/albany/story/2018/11/19/mayor-hints-at-plans-for-more-market-rate-development-on-unused-nycha-land-704679,//ZS>  
De Blasio indicated a desire for more development on the vacant lots adjoining some of the housing authority’s 2,418 buildings, many of which are infested with vermin and plagued by broken boilers and elevators. In total, the agency needs $32 billion over five years to make necessary repairs. “We need development to achieve the most we can for the residents of the immediate areas. So what you will see is … much greater focus on any new development benefiting the surrounding houses in the maximum way,” de Blasio said at the 1,088-unit Betances Houses complex in the Bronx Monday. "We’re going to get our hands on everything we can,” he added. The plan is for a 70-30 split of market-rate to rent-regulated housing in private developments on public land, according to several sources who have been briefed, but would only speak on background. **Market-rate housing would yield more revenue for the housing authority than apartments for lower-income tenants, which the city subsidizes.**

### AT Housing Vouchers Solve

##### **Delink-** Don’t subsidize houses that haven’t been built yet. **Miller** **of the Brookings Institute** writes that for every 100 low-income renters in the nation, there are only 39 units that are available: the problem is accessibility not affordability. Put infrastructure first to create housing projects because otherwise there’s no impact.

##### **Turn- Olsen** **of the University of Virginia** quantifies that housing assistance has a substantial disincentive effect on the poor; it leads to lower labor earnings because people won’t work if the government is paying their rent. He writes that recipients of vouchers lose $3,600 of income every year. **Lazere of the Fiscal Policy Institute** continues that after vouchers were expanded, the gap between the rich and the poor in Washington DC grew by 1.8 times.

##### **Terminal Defense**- Housing assistance has no solvency, and this for three reasons.

##### First, **Semuels** **of the Atlantic** writes that outdated voucher pricing isn’t enough to overcome the rising costs of rent or homeownership.

##### Second, **Semuels** reports that tenants favor real cash over government IOUs, and thus refuse to accept Section 8 housing assistance if there are other renters out there who can offer their actual income.

##### Third, **DeLuca** of UChicago writes that the poor are often reluctant to leave their neighborhoods out of the fear that new communities would not prove receptive to poor residents.

##### Even if people do end up moving, a **Wisconsin State Government** reportfinds that 75% of households that receive homeless prevention aid do not enter a housing program within two years, and 70% of adults who do end up getting houses can only maintain stable homeownership for 18 months.

##### **Turn- Turner** of the Urban Institute finds that government housing aid leads to increases in rent. This is because landlords exploit voucher recipients by squeezing more money out of their pockets. Proprietors raise rent to not only cover voucher money, but disposable income as well. **Lucas Waldron** of the Oakland City Council writes that numerous counties, voucher usage increased rents by 14.1%, hurting people on and off the program.

**Miller**, Brian, and Rebecca Swartz. "Welfare Reform and Housing." **The Brookings Institution**. CCF Brief, 01 Mar. 2002. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <http://www.brookings.edu/research/papers/2002/03/housing-swartz>.

To track the needs of poor families, every two years HUD publishes a report on renters without housing assistance who live in substandard housing or who pay more than half of their income in rent. This "worst case" housing report is a good proxy for the housing problems of current and former welfare recipients. Unlike studies that include households from all income levels, the worst casereport limits the analysis to households with incomes under 50 percent of AMI defined as "very low-income" (table 1). In 1999, the latest year available, 4.9 million households had worst case housing needs. The story in the worst case housing report is a straightforward one: in much of the country, there are more very low-income households than there are affordable housing units available to them. This shortfall affects renters with incomes less than 30 percent of AMI ("extremely low-income") the hardest. The shortfall in the number of units affordable to these households is made worse by the fact that almost half of units affordable to the poorest households are rented by households with higher incomes. As a result, **for every one hundred extremely low-income renters in the nation, there are only thirty-nine units that are both affordable and available.** The housing shortage particularly impacts renters in the western part of the U.S., where only twenty-five units are available and affordable for every one hundred extremely low-income renters. **Over the past eight years, the number of affordable rental units nationwide has declined**. These decreases in the housing stock result primarily from rent increases that have pushed existing units out of the affordable range, rather than from demolition or other physical changes. Such rent increases are not universal. Rent increases were less than general inflation in twelve of the twenty-six largest metropolitan areas between 1997 and 2000. But affordability has reached very serious proportions in some housing markets such as San Francisco and Boston. To make matters worse, several factors may lead to a greater shortage of affordable housing in the future, these include rapidly increasing land costs, an aging stock, and a host of expiring federal arrangements, among them many properties that received federal subsidies in exchange for offering low-rent apartments that will reach the end of their 15-year affordability periods.

**Olsen**, Egdar O., Catherine Tyler, and Paul E. Carrillo. "The Effects of Different Types of Housing Assistance on Earnings and Employment." **University of Virginia**, Department of Economics. A Journal of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. Office of Policy Development and Research, 2005. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <https://www.huduser.gov/periodicals/cityscpe/vol8num2/ch8.pdf>.

This study overcomes some of the shortcomings of previous studies. First, it is based on an enormous random sample of housing assistance recipients throughout the country as well as data on a random sample of unsubsidized households. The administrative data from which the assisted sample is selected contains information on all renters who received HUD assistance between 1995 and 2002. Second, since the assisted sample comes from administrative data, the type of housing assistance received is correctly identified. Third, the study uses longitudinal data to account for immutable, unobserved household characteristics that are determinants of market labor supply and correlated with program participation. In addition, this study provides the first estimate of the effect of an important initiative within subsidized housing intended to promote self-sufficiency, namely, the FSS program. The results indicate that all types of housing assistance have substantial disincentive effects on market work; that is, they lead to lower labor earnings than in the absence of housing assistance. **Our most conservative estimates indicate that recipients in private subsidized projects earn $4,011 less per year, public housing tenants earn $3,894 less, and voucher recipients earn $3,584 less.** Estimates of the difference between the disincentive effects of different types of housing assistance on market work based entirely on administrative data indicate that the work disincentive effects of housing assistance are somewhat smaller for tenant-based housing vouchers than for either type of project-based assistance. They indicate that, in the first year of program participation, households with tenant-based assistance have a $419 smaller reduction in their annual earnings than similar households in private subsidized projects and a $277 smaller reduction than public housing tenants.

No Author. "Clark County 10-Year Homeless Plan: Homeless Plan Strategies." **Wisconsin State Government**. American Community Survey, Apr. 2012. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <https://www.clark.wa.gov/sites/default/files/CC10YearPlanStrategies.pdf>.

1. 70% of those who receive rental assistance maintain stable housing for 18 months. 2. 70% of chronically homeless single adults who receive rental assistance maintain stable housing for 18 months. 3**. 75% of households who receive homeless prevention funds do not enter into a homeless housing program within two years. 4**. Sustain and increase homeless prevention programs at 2009 (pre-ARRA) levels. 5. Number of newly homeless is 10% lower than the previous year.

**Lazere**, Ed. "Income Inequality Grew Dramatically in DC Over The Past Two Decades." **DC Fiscal Policy Institute**. CBPP, 25 Jan. 2006. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <http://www.dcfpi.org/income-inequality-grew-dramatically-in-dc-over-the-past-two-decades>.

The study, Pulling Apart: A State-by-State Analysis of Income Trends, was prepared by the Washington, DC-based Center on Budget and Policy Priorities and the Economic Policy Institute.[1] The study is based on Census Bureau **data that have been adjusted to account** for inflation, the impact of federal taxes, and the cash value of food stamps, subsidized school lunches, and **housing vouchers.** Income from capital gains is also included. The study compares combined data from 2001-2003 with data from the early 1980s and early 1990s, time periods chosen because they stand as comparable low points of their respective business cycles. Its findings include: Income among DC’s poorest families remained virtually unchanged between the early 1980s and the early 2000s. During that time, the average income of the bottom fifth of DC families rose just three percent, from $12,300 to $12,700. (Both figures are adjusted for inflation to equal 2002 dollars.)[2] The average income of the middle fifth of families increased from $32,100 to $41,900, an increase of 31 percent. **The average income of the richest fifth of families increased by more than $70,000** between the early 1980s and the early 2000s, from $87,300 to $157,700. This is an increase of 81 percent over the past two decades. As a result, the income gaps between DC’s high-income and low-income families widened significantly, as did the gap between wealthy and middle-income families. In the early 2000s, the richest 20 percent of District families had **incomes 12.4 times as large as the average income of the poorest 20 percent. This is up from a ratio of 7.1 in the early 1980s**.

**Turner**, Margery. "Housing and Economic Mobility." Urban Institute. **Urban Institute**, 13 Apr. 2015. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <http://www.urban.org/debates/housing-and-economic-mobility>.

I'd like to offer an additional perspective. Millennials are creating substantial pressure on rental housing supply, increasing rents and further reducing rental affordability. Paying more of their income for rent means they have less to save and may be forced into unfortunate choices about where and how to live. Older millennials who may be credit-worthy still can't get mortgages, blocking their access to the economic stability and mobility that can come from homeownership and further crowding the rental market. Federal housing policy that addresses these fundamentals of housing supply and demand through support for homeownership and rental housing finance therefore would directly and indirectly support economic stability and mobility. **Balancing the demand for rental with new supply would also slow rent increases**, which are quickly depleting the limited budget for tenant-based housing assistance.

**Semuels**, Alana. "How Housing Policy Is Failing America's Poor." **The Atlantic**. Atlantic Media Company, 24 June 2015. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <http://www.theatlantic.com/business/archive/2015/06/section-8-is-failing/396650/>.

One study in Austin found that there were plenty of apartments around the city that voucher-holders could afford. But only a small portion of those apartments would rent to voucher-holders. The report, by the Austin Tenant’s Council, found that 78,217 units in the Austin metro area—about 56 percent of those surveyed—had rents within the Fair Market Rent limits. But only 8,590 of those units accepted vouchers and did not have minimum income requirements for tenants. Most were located on the east side of Austin, in high-poverty areas with underperforming schools and high crime rates. (The survey only looked at apartment complexes with at least 50 units.)

**Waldron**, Lucas. "Despite Housing Subsidies, a Majority of Alameda County Recipients Are without Section 8 Housing." Oakland North. **Oakland City Council**, 16 Oct. 2015. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <https://oaklandnorth.net/2015/10/16/hud-housing-subsidies-were-miscalculated-majority-of-alameda-county-recipients-without-housing/>.

In a request for HUD to reevaluate the subsidy reduction, the Housing Authority of the County of Alameda (HACA) said the federal agency calculated the adjustments using two-year-old data that does not account for rapidly rising rents across the East Bay. Using the old data, HUD calculated that the rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Alameda County has decreased by 1.45 percent for fiscal year 2016. But county **officials said up-to-date data shows the average rent in Alameda County actually increased by 14.1 percent from 2014 to 2015.** They report that the average monthly rent for a two-bedroom apartment in Alameda County is really $2,172. When a woman in McKinney, Texas, told Tatiana Rhodes and her friends to “go back to your Section 8 homes” at a public pool earlier this month, she inadvertently spoke volumes about the failure of a program that was designed to help America’s poor. But the fair market rent cut-off point often consigns voucher-holders to impoverished neighborhoods. This is in part because of how that number is calculated: HUD draws the line at the 40th percentile of rents for “typical” units occupied by “recent movers” in an entire metropolitan area, which includes far-flung suburbs with long commutes and, as a result, makes the Fair Market Rent relatively low. In New York City, for example, the Fair Market Rent for a one-bedroom is $1,249, a price that would relegate voucher-holders to the neighborhood of Brownsville in Brooklyn, one of the most dangerous places in the city, and where the most public housing is located. Technically, voucher holders can live anywhere in a region that meets the price restrictions. But the tendency is for people to stay in neighborhoods that are familiar to them, though a few areas have created robust mobility-counseling programs to try and mitigate this. Additionally, as Eva Rosen has detailed, landlords in low-income areas aggressively recruit voucher-holders, as the vouchers are a much more reliable source of rent than other low-income tenants have available. The failings of Section 8 go far beyond flaws in how the program was designed to how the the states have implemented it. People can argue all they want about the merits of subsidized housing, but given that Section 8 exists, it would seem advantageous for states and municipalities to take advantage of federal funds to help families find better housing. **But many states seem especially determined to keep voucher-holders in areas of concentrated poverty.** “The whole idea of Section 8 in the beginning was that it was going to allow people to get out of the ghetto,” said Mike Daniel, a lawyer for the Inclusive Communities Project, told me. (Daniel has sued HUD over the way it is carrying out the program in Dallas.) “But there’s tremendous political pressure on housing authorities and HUD to not let it become an instrument of desegregation.” **For example, in much of the country, landlords can refuse to take Section 8 vouchers, even if the voucher covers the rent.** And, unlike the landlords in poor neighborhoods in Eva Rosen’s study, many landlords of buildings in nicer neighborhoods will do anything to keep voucher-holders out. The result is that Section 8 traps families in the poorest neighborhoods.

**Haveman**, Robert. "Do Housing Vouchers Work?" John Bascom Emeritus Professor of Economics and Public Affairs at **University of Wisconsin**-Madison. Journal of Urban Economics and the Journal of Housing Economics, 2013. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <http://inequality.stanford.edu/\_media/pdf/pathways/spring\_2013/Pathways\_Spring\_2013\_Haveman.pdf>.

The results of our research speak to the ongoing policy debate over tenant- versus project-based housing subsidies. By analyzing the labor market and other behavioral effects of voucher receipt in detail, this article provides some insight into important features of the primary tenant-based housing assistance program in the United States. What have we learned? It's clear that the Section 8 program has many welfare-enhancing effects: It promotes mobility that allows voucher recipients to live in neighborhoods with a lower poverty rate, a lower unemployment rate, and better housing. These outcomes, all of which are central to the objectives of the Section 8 program, are delivered more or less as intended. There are, however, also perverse incentives under the Section 8 program that lead recipients to reduce earnings, especially in the short-run. **Because the voucher program requires participants to contribute 30 percent of their income toward rent, they are subjected, in effect, to a 30 percent tax on their earnings that creates a negative incentive to work.** This result illustrates the need for policymakers to design housing subsidy programs—both tenant-based and project-based—in a manner that minimizes the adverse incentives for socially desirable behaviors.

**DeLuca**, Stefanie. "Segregating With the Best Intentions." University of Chicago. **University of Chicago**, May 2013. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <https://urban.uchicago.edu/page/segregating-best-intentions>.

The HCV program is the largest housing program under the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and subsidizes more than 2.2 million households in the country. The HCV program, formerly known as Section 8, is aimed at providing rent subsidies to low-income families, assisting them in leasing a private market unit with the aim of providing an opportunity to move to diverse neighborhoods. However, in practice, the program has been ineffective in desegregating housing [because]. In the study, the authors discuss several reasons that voucher holders **remain in poor, segregated communities [thanks to]: limited housing search resources, a reluctance to leave their current neighborhoods, [and racist] landlord practices**, and several others. **Furthermore, the authors find that the voucher program itself does not incentivize housing authorities to promote neighborhood mobility.** The aims of housing organizations significantly vary from those of the families that they are meant to assist. A small city, Mobile, Alabama became the research site for the study, where the residential locations of Black voucher holders are similar to those of voucher holders in many other cities. They found key challenges related to housing policy itself, including: Unpredictable and, as authors describe it, “seemingly never-ending” waitlists for housing vouchers prevent adequate planning

**Lawrence**, Keith, Stacey Sutton, and Anne Kubisch. "Structural Racism and Community Building." The Aspen Institute Roundtable On Community Change. **The Aspen Institute**, June 2004. Web. 17 Apr. 2016. <http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/rcc/aspen\_structural\_racism2.pdf>.

The backdrop of white privilege, national values, and contemporary culture is the context within which our major institutions, or opportunity areas—such as health care, education, the labor market, the criminal justice system, or the media—operate today. While we expect the **policies and practices of public and private institutions** to be race neutral, they **are inevitably influenced by this racialized context and, therefore, contribute to the production of racially disparate outcomes.** If background forces go unrecognized and unexamined, racial disparities such as those typically seen in the labor market and criminal justice systems are understood simply as unintended consequences of “neutral” or, by and large, “fair” industry policies and practices. Sorting and stereotyping reinforce this, as they work to legitimize, or at least explain, the inequitable outcomes in employment, housing, health care, education, and other opportunity areas.

**Sard**, Barbara, and Will Fischer. "Chart Book: Federal Housing Spending Is Poorly Matched to Need." **Center for Budget and Policy Priorities**. Senior Advisor on Rental Assistance for the HUD, 18 Dec. 2013. Web. 24 Apr. 2016. <http://www.cbpp.org/research/chart-book-federal-housing-spending-is-poorly-matched-to-need?fa=view&id=4067>.

Federal housing expenditures favor higher-income households. The bulk of homeownership expenditures go to the top fifth of households by income, who typically could afford to purchase a home without subsidies. According to estimates by the congressional Joint Committee on Taxation, more than three-fourths of the value of the mortgage interest and property tax deductions goes to households with incomes of more than $100,000, and close to a third goes to families with incomes above $200,000. Overall, more than half of federal housing spending for which income data are available benefits households with incomes above $100,000. The 5 million households with incomes of $200,000 or more receive a larger share of such spending than the more than 20 million households with incomes of $20,000 or less, even though lower-income families are far more likely to struggle to afford housing. In 2010, **the most recent year for which complete data are available, households with incomes of $200,000 or more received an average benefit** of $7,014 — **more than four times the average benefit of** $1,471 received by **households with incomes below $20,000.** It is difficult to see the policy purpose served by providing such large benefits to higher-income households, who in most cases could afford to purchase a home without subsidies.

### AT Tradeoff

1. **Link turn- Been ’18 of NYU** gives several reasons this would never happen.
   1. Where land is limited in supply, it is generally not the case that the proposed where market-rate housing is proposed would otherwise be used for affordable housing… probably too costly to support affordable housing because of OTHER competing interests for the land (businesses, schools, etc.)
   2. Affordable Housing is not provided in larger quantities because the lack of land and inadequate funding to pay for construction, financing, and operation costs
   3. Mandatory affordable housing programs can ensure that developments using land for market-rate housing also includes affordable housing. The weighing is simple, 100% certainty that there is a greater number of affordable housing units in the AFF world in the world of market rate housing, but because of other structural issues, the government funded affordable housing fails (look at point B)
   4. Even if their argument is true, land can be used more intensely (building vertically)
   5. The limits on land makes housing different than most goods, but the difference is one of degree: the supply of housing can and does increase even in constrained markets, and prices almost always fall in response.

Vicki Been ,8-20-2018, No Publication, <http://furmancenter.org/files/Supply_Skepticism_-_Final.pdf,//ZS>

Some argue that the normal rules of supply and demand don’t apply to housing because housing is tied to a specific plot of land, and unlike other inputs into the production of housing that may be in plentiful supply, the supply of land is limited in many jurisdictions by existing development and by geographical constraints like coasts or mountains (Angotti & Morse, 2016). Indeed, critics argue that because land is inherently limited, the development of market rate housing consumes scarce land that could otherwise be used for affordable housing. 4 The argument often is accompanied by demands that high percentages (such as 50 percent or more) of all housing developed on private sites should be restricted as affordable housing (Durkin, 2016). Whereas **land is limited in supply, it is not necessarily the case that the land where market-rate housing (or a mixture of market rate and affordable housing) is proposed would otherwise be used entirely for affordable housing. The land might continue to be too costly to support affordable housing, even if the land could not be used for housing for higher income households, because there are other uses competing for the land**. Also, the **reasons affordable housing is not provided in larger quantities go far beyond the lack of land and include the inadequacy of funding to pay for construction, financing costs and operating costs. Further, programs like mandatory affordable housing can ensure that developments using land for market-rate housing also include some affordable housing, although no inclusionary program imposes requirements as high as 50 percent of the units** (Thadden & Wang, 2017). M**ore fundamentally, although it is surely true that land is constrained, especially in certain markets (Saiz 2010), land can be used more intensively to allow for more housing. The limits on the land with which housing is bundled make housing different from many goods, but the difference is one of degree: the supply of housing can and does increase even in constrained markets, and prices should generally fall in response** (see the review by DiPasquale, 1999; Mayer & Somerville, 2000).

## AT MRH Increases Displacement

1. **Alt Causality-** we are the only ones that address the issue of affordability, as **Walker ’16 of Gizmodo** found that the root cause of increasing housing prices is due to a shortage.
2. **Terminal Defense- Shoag ’19 of Harvard** explains that most studies that indicate that MRH increases displacement are wrong, this is true for two reasons.
   1. **Filtering down- Walker ’16 of Gizmodo** found that only 10% of americans live in apartments built in the last decade, which is critical as **Shoag** found that a substantial portion of low-income housing supply comes from a ‘filtering down’ of old properties.
   2. **Increased Construction- Shoag** concludes that market rate housing creates fewer zoning restrictions, it increases the amount of construction which can subsequently decrease the price for all. In fact, **Hertz ’16 of the City Observer** quantifies that market rate construction decreases displacement by up to 46%.
3. **Turn-** Doing nothing is worse, **Yglesias ‘15 of Vox** explains that absent market rate housing, rich people are forced to buy properties and replace them, which exacerbates displacement.
4. **Turn-** in an empirical analysis **Bachrach ’17 of UCLA** found that there were 13% more units built than were demolished, it gets better, as **Bachrach** concludes that there were 6 times as many affordable units after market rate construction.
5. **We Control the internal link into solving-** **Thratch ’18** explains that in the status quo gentrification created the national housing crisis in which 43% of Americans aren’t earning enough to cover the combined costs of housing, food, and transportation.

Alissa Walker,3-7-2016, How Building Expensive New Housing Actually Helps Create More Affordable Cities, Gizmodo, <https://gizmodo.com/how-building-expensive-new-housing-actually-helps-creat-1763423240,//ZS>

Although there are many contributing factors to what makes rents or housing prices specifically (and often artificially) high, **all of these issues come down to a shortage of housing stock**. This wasn’t a problem for many years as **cities built plenty of new places to live**. But **now, increased demand is driving housing prices up:** There are more people who want to live there than there are housing units available. And there hasn’t been enough new housing built over the last few years—decades, even—to “trickle down” to these new residents. Over at the Washington Post, Emily Badger explains this process very well: In tight markets, poor and middle­-class households are forced to compete with one another for scarce homes. So new market-rate housing eases that competition, even if the poor are not the ones living in it. Over time, new housing also filters down to the more affordable supply, because housing becomes less desirable as it ages. That means the luxury housing being built today will contribute to the middle-class supply 30 years from now; it means today’s middle-class housing was luxury housing 30 years ago.

Daniel Shoag, Harvard University, "Removing Barriers to Accessing High-Productivity Places", January 2019, https://www.brookings.edu/wpcontent/uploads/2019/01/Shoag\_PP\_web\_20190128.pdf//ZS

Though straightforward to an economist, many people do not share this intuition. There is a strongly held view that **new market-rate housing may crowd out affordable housing or existing residents. The evidence for this is scant, though, and studiesthat investigate the matter generally find the opposite effect** (Uhler 2016). In fact, Rosenthal (2014) has shown **that a substantial portion of low-income housing supply comes from a filtering down of market-rate properties. As homes age, they are sold or rented to people who are on a lowerrung of the income distribution.** Rosenthal shows that, **on average, 10-year-old apartments are rented to people making just 70 percent of the income of the original tenant and 50-year-old apartments are rented to people making just 30 percent.** Moreover, Rosenthal shows that filtering occurs most slowly in regions like New England and the Pacific states, where housing regulations tend to be most restrictive. While filtering works too slowly to be a panacea, **more market-rate construction can push down prices across the spectrum**. It is of course important that the new development actually increase the number of housing units.

Miriam Zuk, UC Berkeley. “Housing Production, Filtering and Displacement: Untangling the Relationships.” May, 2016. <http://www.urbandisplacement.org/sites/default/files/images/udp_research_brief_052316.pdf//ZS>

Debate over the relative importance of subsidized and market-rate housing production in alleviating the current housing crisis continues to preoccupy policymakers, developers, and advocates. This research brief adds to the discussion by providing a nuanced analysis of the relationship between housing production, affordability, and displacement in the San Francisco Bay Area**, finding that:** • At the regional level**, both market-rate and subsidized housing reduce displacement pressures,** but subsidized housing has over double the impact of market-rate units. • Market-rate production is associated with higher housing cost burden for low-income households, but lower median rents in subsequent decades. • At the local, block group level in San Francisco, neither market-rate nor subsidized housing production has the protective power they do at the regional scale, likely due to the extreme mismatch between demand and supply. Although more detailed analysis is needed to clarify the complex relationship between development, affordability, and displacement at the local scale, this research implies the importance of not only increasing production of subsidized and market-rate housing in California’s coastal communities, but also investing in the preservation of housing affordability and stabilizing vulnerable communities.

Daniel Hertz, 9-2-2016, "Report: Market-rate housing construction is a weapon against displacement," City Observatory, http://cityobservatory.org/report-market-rate-housing-construction-is-a-weapon-against-displacement///ZS

We’ve known for a long time that housing shortages are a major driver of high housing prices—and that, as a result, places that prevent new construction also tend to have big affordability problems. But now, for the first time that we’re aware of,researchers have taken the next step to showing directly that places like that prevent new construction end up inducing more displacement of their low-income residents. That finding comes from California’s Legislative Analyst’s Office, which just released a new report on the state’s ever-growing affordability crisis. Using a broad definition of displacement—any decline of a neighborhood’s low-income population relative to its total population—the LAO shows that, even controlling for other demographic factors, Bay Area communities with the greatest expansion of market-rate housing also see the least low-income displacement. **The effect is strong: changing from a low-construction neighborhood to a high-construction neighborhood was associated with a decline in the probability of displacement from 46 percent to 26 percent.**

Matthew Yglesias@Mattyglesiasmatt@Vox,5-11-2015, Everything you need to know about the affordable housing debate, Vox, <https://www.vox.com/2014/4/10/18076868/affordable-housing-explained,//ZS>

This is unlikely. If you were to only build one building, you might well want to make it a high-priced, high-margin luxury project. But there are only so many millionaires in the country. As the number of projects increases, developers need to reach further down the market to reach a larger base of customers. Think about car companies. Most auto firms do try to sell high-margin luxury vehicles. But they also make plenty of ordinary vehicles for middle-class car buyers, because there are only so many rich people to sell cars to. If you forced Toyota to only build a handful of cars per year, they would probably try to make them Lexuses rather than Corollas. But in an unconstrained market, Corollas predominate. **What's more, even luxury projects help address housing scarcity**. **In a marketplace with no new luxury projects, rich people** don't forget that they enjoy fancy houses in appealing neighborhoods. **They simply snap up older properties and renovate them (or house-flippers do it), thus blocking the process of filtering and taking middle-class residences off the market.**

Eve Bachrach,5-6-2017, Is Los Angeles destroying its affordable housing stock to build luxury apartments? UCLA Lewis Center for Regional Policy Studies, <https://www.lewis.ucla.edu/luxury-apartments/,//ZS>

In our analysis of **104 new multifamily developments, we found that more than 13 times as many units were constructed across the city than were demolished** (see Table 1). We also found that 22 percent of the new units were affordable — income-restricted and/or permanent supportive housing for formerly homeless people. **There were 460 such units, which is more than six times greater than the number of multifamily units lost to demolitions.** This is important because older multifamily units are the sort of naturally-occurring affordable housing that most concerns activists. This is good news — according to our findings, new housing development is mostly replacing single-family housing, creating many more units than it is demolishing and even producing many more strictly affordable units than what is demolished. Yet there are other factors to consider. The distribution of new units across the city matters, as does the match between unit and neighborhood types. Moreover, not all affordable units are alike. Some new developments are permanent supportive housing for homeless people, some are for seniors, and other have rents pegged to different percentages of the county’s median income. While we are building more affordable units than we are demolishing, that does not mean that the 74 households in our sample who moved out of those demolished multifamily units are able to afford what replaces it. New affordable housing construction can benefit the city as a whole at the expense of individual households. New multifamily construction is more common in (but not exclusive to) the denser or more central parts of the city, such as South LA and Hollywood. In the San Fernando Valley, which is about half as dense as South LA,[2], [3] our sample had 18 new multifamily developments. While this is a relatively small number considering the Valley is roughly half of Los Angeles’s square footage, these developments tended to be larger than those built in South LA. Very little of this activity was on the Westside of Los Angeles.

**Table 1: Units lost and gained in a random sample of developments from 2014-2016****[[1]](https://www.lewis.ucla.edu/luxury-apartments/" \l "_ftn1)**

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Housing Units Demolished** | **Housing Units Constructed** |
| 152 | 2061 |

|  |  |
| --- | --- |
| **Multifamily Units Demolished** | **Affordable Units Constructed** |
| 74 | 460 |

<https://www.washingtonpost.com/news/wonk/wp/2018/05/25/the-alarming-statistics-that-show-the-u-s-economy-isnt-as-good-as-it-seems/?noredirect=on&utm_term=.26e7a280fdd2//ZS>

The U.S. economy has a problem. The usual economic bench marks look really good: America in 2018 is enjoying faster growth, low unemployment, record numbers of job openings and a stock market near an all-time high. Yet an alarming number of Americans are still struggling to get by. In the past week, two reports — a new Federal Reserve survey of more than 12,200 Americans about their finances and a new United Way report on financial hardship — reveal just how unstable life remains for a large number of people. Here's a rundown of the key findings: **Forty-three percent of households can't afford the basics to live, meaning they aren't earning enough to cover the combined costs of housing, food, child care, health care, transportation and a cellphone, according to the United Way study.** Researchers looked at the data by county to adjust for lower costs in some parts of the country.

Black Enterprise,11-2-2018, Gentrification, 'Negro Removal,' and a Housing Crisis, <https://www.blackenterprise.com/gentrification-black-communities/,//ZS>

Gentrification involves the transformation of under-invested, predominately poor communities from low value to high value**. During this transformation, long-time residents and businesses are displaced; unable to afford higher rents, mortgages, and property taxes.** For some, gentrification is a process of renovating deteriorated urban neighborhoods through the influx of more affluent residents. To others, **gentrification magnifies the racial divide as it shifts a neighborhood’s racial composition as white residents move in and minorities are moved out.** According to a 2015 Governing survey, **gentrification accelerated in several cities with nearly 20% of neighborhoods with lower incomes and home values experiencing gentrification since 2000.** That’s compared to only 9% during the 1990s. It is inspiring to see the leadership on the panel committed to finding solutions,” said Bass. “We need to build more coalitions of government, community, and academics to address this critical community issue.” **“We studied the issue [and] we realized rapid displacement was happening in every big city across the country**. I wanted to convene this discussion because **this is a national crisis and we need a national discussion to identify concrete solutions,**” stated Harris-Dawson. Solutions like Destination Crenshaw, the first outdoor project of its kind in Los Angeles, using an iconic city street name to provide the context for public artwork and design, **will formally establish and** memorialize an African American neighborhood **and set the tone for community revitalization**.

## AT Rent Control is Better

1. **Turn- Barthold ’18 of the IGM Forum** found that 95% of economists believe that rent control does nothing to combat poverty, or provide affordable housing. The warrant behind this far outweighs, as **Walker ’18 of Gizmodo** found that the root cause of the lack of affordable housing is the shortage, fortunately affirming alleviates that.
2. **Turn- Mirsa ’18 of City Lab** explains that rent control incentivizes landlords to knock down property for the poor and build new construction, rent control areas were 10% more likely to become gentrified.
3. **Turn** - **Beyer ’15 of Forbes** ‘finds that America’s rent-controlled cities are its least affordable, indicating that rent control actually makes housing more expensive.
4. **Turn** – **Edwards ‘15 of the Business Insider** explains that rent control actually drives up the price of most rents by restricting the supply of new units onto the market.
   1. Ultimately, the **NBER** ‘18 concludes that rent control is on net worse for the poor and low-income residents.
5. **Turn- APM ’17** reports that market rate housing would “expanding the supply of subsidized income-based affordable units.” when there are cheaper houses on the market it would be harder to discriminate.
6. **Turn- The Business Insider** explains that “Rent control actually drives up the price of most rents by restricting the supply of new units onto the market. While some renters may get a bargain, most people never get access to rent-controlled flats.”

Corbin Barthold,8-20-2018, Wake Up, California Millennials: Rent Control Is A Generational Con Game, Forbes, <https://www.forbes.com/sites/wlf/2018/08/20/wake-up-california-millennials-rent-control-is-a-generational-con-game/#6e267387397b,//ZS>

In 2012 the **IGM Forum polled some economists about rent control. Each economist was asked to agree or disagree that rent control promotes affordable housing, and to state the degree of confidence, on a scale of 1 to 10, he invested in his response. Weighted for confidence, 95 percent of the economists disagreed, four percent felt unsure,** and one percent agreed. Support for rent control received one vote, with a confidence of 3. Nobel laureate Angus Deaton, a dedicated analyst of the causes of poverty, voted “strongly disagree,” confidence 9. Richard Thaler, another Nobel Prize winner, likened rent control to geocentrism. In 1995 California barred cities from imposing rent control on houses or new apartments. This November Californians will vote on Proposition 10, a repeal of that ban. California’s ruling party asked its executive board whether to endorse the measure. Ninety-five percent said yes. The economists voted on what works, the party leaders on what feels good. Like any price control, a rent cap crops supply. Investors aren’t stupid. They will not build rent-controlled housing if they can obtain a higher return doing something else. Landlords aren’t stupid either. If renting becomes less profitable, some of them will sell their units, as condominiums, to the well-heeled.

Alissa Walker,3-7-2016, How Building Expensive New Housing Actually Helps Create More Affordable Cities, Gizmodo, <https://gizmodo.com/how-building-expensive-new-housing-actually-helps-creat-1763423240,//ZS>

Although there are many contributing factors to what makes rents or housing prices specifically (and often artificially) high, **all of these issues come down to a shortage of housing stock**. This wasn’t a problem for many years as **cities built plenty of new places to live**. But **now, increased demand is driving housing prices up:** There are more people who want to live there than there are housing units available. And there hasn’t been enough new housing built over the last few years—decades, even—to “trickle down” to these new residents. Over at the Washington Post, Emily Badger explains this process very well: In tight markets, poor and middle­-class households are forced to compete with one another for scarce homes. So new market-rate housing eases that competition, even if the poor are not the ones living in it. Over time, new housing also filters down to the more affordable supply, because housing becomes less desirable as it ages. That means the luxury housing being built today will contribute to the middle-class supply 30 years from now; it means today’s middle-class housing was luxury housing 30 years ago.

Tanvi Misra,1-29-2018, Is It Time to Reform Rent Control? CityLab, https://www.citylab.com/equity/2018/01/rent-control-a-reckoning/551168/,//ZS

The dollar value of these tenants’ benefits was immense. If what they collectively gained between 1995 and 2012 were given out as a lump sum today, it would amount to $2.9 billion, the researchers calculated. That’s around $2,300 and $6,600 per person per year. But many other tenants in rent-controlled apartments stayed in their homes for far shorter periods of time than their counterparts in the control group. This is because rent control policies have an impact on landlord behavior. Landlords have many options to elude rent control by changing the status of their buildings and driving tenants out. **The researchers found that rent-controlled properties were 10 percent more likely to be converted into condos or renovated drastically, so that they’d be exempt from rent control.** Other landlords avoided the regulations by moving into the property themselves, taking advantage of California’s Ellis Act and saying they were taking the building off the rental market, or buying off the tenants. Landlords probably pursued these tactics more readily in expensive areas, where they had more to gain, according to the paper, and were more successful in cases where tenants put up less resistance.

Jim Edwards, Business Insider, 9-3-2015, No, rent control does not work — it actually benefits the rich and hurts the poor, https://www.businessinsider.com/does-rent-control-work-no-it-actually-increases-rent-prices-for-most-people-2015-9, 2-23-2019//ZS

**Rent control actually drives up the price of most rents by restricting the supply of new units onto the market. While some renters may get a bargain, most people never get access to rent-controlled flats. Once people move into a rent-controlled place, they are incentivized to never move out, because it is so cheap.** The classic rent-control lease in New York lasts indefinitely, so once someone is in, they can stay for the rest of their life. (In New York, it's commonplace inside rent controlled apartments to see cookers, radiators, and kitchen fittings that date back to the 1960s because landlords just won't replace them, and tenants won't move out.) People can even sub-let their apartments or pass them on to next-of-kin which is why personal connections in the market are so important. That removes a huge chunk of available housing from the market. Demand for new housing remains the same, but now the supply of new housing is reduced. So prices everywhere else go up. Under rent control, landlords and property owners know not to create any new housing units that fall under rent control, because they won't be able to maximise their investment. So they build as few units as possible in that category.

Scott Beyer, Forbes, 4-24-2015, How Ironic: **America's Rent-Controlled Cities Are Its Least Affordable,** https://www.forbes.com/sites/scottbeyer/2015/04/24/how-ironic-americas-rent-controlled-cities-are-its-least-affordable/, 2-22-2019, AK

**According to** [**Landlord.com**](http://www.landlord.com/rent_control_laws_by_state.htm)**, there are six cities among the nation’s 50 largest with rent control.** In New York City, [nearly half](http://www.amny.com/news/nyc-rent-stabilization-a-battle-looms-1.9796335) of units are rent controlled or stabilized, with annual increases determined by the Rent Guidelines Board. Los Angeles has almost the same number of rent-regulated units, at [880,581](http://la.curbed.com/archives/2014/09/10_quotes_to_explain_the_good_and_bad_of_la_rent_control.php). In Washington, DC, a [majority](http://www.washingtoncitypaper.com/articles/46608/losing-control-dcs-rent-control-laws-are-supposed-to-keep/) of units are rent-controlled, and the policy exists in the Bay Area cities of San Francisco, Oakland, and San Jose. In such cities, rent increases are generally tied either to inflation, or some other metric that ensures annual increases of a few percentage points. Most of these laws began in the 1970s, in response to rising housing prices. **The commonality between all these cities—despite differences in geography, demographics, and land use—is their expense.** According to a 2012 [BLS study](http://www.bls.gov/spotlight/2014/housing/pdf/housing.pdf) that calculated annual household expenditures on housing, the nation’s three costliest metro areas are DC, San Francisco (a metro area that includes Oakland and San Jose), and New York City. Los Angeles was #6.

APM ART + marketing,4-16-2017, Market-Rate Housing Isn’t a Bad Word, and We Won’t Solve the Housing Crisis Without It, <https://artplusmarketing.com/market-rate-housing-isnt-a-bad-word-and-we-won-t-solve-the-housing-crisis-without-it-ce67c06aff4d,//ZS>

These attitudes breed skepticism — and even hostility — in political leaders and advocacy organizations toward market-rate housing, and drive support for housing policy that focuses either exclusively or largely on publicly subsidized, income-based affordable housing. The problem is that as much as I and others support and work to expand subsidized, income-based affordable housing, we will never — and I truly mean never — produce enough of that housing to satisfy all, or even most, of our housing needs. These subsidized units clearly play a critical role, particularly for our lowest income residents, and we need many more of them. But, absent a housing Marshall Plan by the federal government (not gonna happen in our lifetime), we simply do not and will not have the massive resources we would need to shift to a dominant public-subsidy-based housing approach. **Which means: In addition to expanding the supply of subsidized income-based affordable units, we must increase the overall supply of housing, and that means — you guessed it — market-rate housing.** Some describe all new market-rate housing as “luxury housing,” because it’s expensive. Well, of course it’s expensive, since for decades we haven’t built enough of it. According to California’s Legislative Analyst, the state needs to produce about 180,000 units of housing a year to keep up with growth. In practice, we produce less than half that number.

Jim Edwards,9-3-2015, No, rent control does not work — it actually benefits the rich and hurts the poor, Business Insider, <https://www.businessinsider.com/does-rent-control-work-no-it-actually-increases-rent-prices-for-most-people-2015-9,//ZS>

**Rent control actually drives up the price of most rents by restricting the supply of new units onto the market. While some renters may get a bargain, most people never get access to rent-controlled flats.** Once people move into a rent-controlled place, they are incentivised to never move out, because it is so cheap. The classic rent-control lease in New York lasts indefinitely, so once someone is in, they can stay for the rest of their life. (In New York, it's commonplace inside rent controlled apartments to see cookers, radiators, and kitchen fittings that date back to the 1960s because landlords just won't replace them, and tenants won't move out.) People can even sub-let their apartments or pass them on to next-of-kin which is why personal connections in the market are so important. That removes a huge chunk of available housing from the market. Demand for new housing remains the same, but now the supply of new housing is reduced. So prices everywhere else go up.

## AT MRH Bad for the Poor

1. **Turn- Elkind ’18 of the University of Boulder** provides 3 benefits of MRH development for low income tenants in particular:
   1. **First,** MRH increases the supply of housing, reducing displacement pressures.
   2. **Second,** it acts as future low-income housing without subsides as properties age and deteriorate in attractiveness.
   3. **Third,** Increased tax revenue for local governments to spend on subsidized housing.
   4. Overall, He concludes that “opposing new market-rate housing, particularly near transit, is not a solution. In fact, it’s part of the problem.”

Ethan Elkind,2 -7-2018, New Market-Rate Housing Reduces Displacement &amp; Gentrification Pressure, ColoradoBoulevard.net, <https://www.coloradoboulevard.net/new-market-rate-housing-reduces-displacement-gentrification-pressure/,//ZS>

But the **study also indicates that new market-rate housing may have three primary benefits for low-income tenants**: **It can reduce displacement pressure overall** (although less so than new affordable units). **This housing stock eventually “filters” over the coming decades into low-income housing, as it gets older and therefore less desirable to higher-income earners. As a result, it provides an investment in the unsubsidized housing of the future (most low-income residents live in market-rate housing, not subsidized units). New market-rate development can provide local governments with the revenue they need to fund new subsidized units, via impacts fees, inclusionary zoning, or higher tax revenue.** There’s no denying that displacement is a genuine concern, and policies to promote new housing need to take that concern into account. But opposing new market-rate housing, particularly near transit, is not a solution. In fact, it’s part of the problem.

### AT Only Luxury Buildings

1. **Delink- Yglesias ’15 of Vox** explains that there would only be a limited number of luxury projects that can be built because there is only a limited number of people who can afford them. Thus, as the number of projects increases, developers will reach down the market to a larger customer base. (this happens with cars)

Matthew Yglesias@Mattyglesiasmatt@Vox,5-11-2015, Everything you need to know about the affordable housing debate, Vox, <https://www.vox.com/2014/4/10/18076868/affordable-housing-explained,//ZS>

Won't unregulated developers just produce tons of luxury housing? **This is unlikely. If you were to only build one building, you might well want to make it a high-priced, high-margin luxury project. But there are only so many millionaires in the country. As the number of projects increases, developers need to reach further down the market to reach a larger base of customers.** Think about car companies. Most auto firms do try to sell high-margin luxury vehicles. But they also make plenty of ordinary vehicles for middle-class car buyers, because there are only so many rich people to sell cars to. If you forced Toyota to only build a handful of cars per year, they would probably try to make them Lexuses rather than Corollas. But in an unconstrained market, Corollas predominate. What's more, even luxury projects help address housing scarcity. In a marketplace with no new luxury projects, rich people don't forget that they enjoy fancy houses in appealing neighborhoods. They simply snap up older properties and renovate them (or house-flippers do it), thus blocking the process of filtering and taking middle-class residences off the market.

## AT Gentrification

### AT General

1. **Nonunique- Albright ’17 of the Guardian** explains that gentrification is on the rise in urban areas, and prices have increased 400% since 2000.
2. **Link Turn-** Market rate housing is the only way to reverse this trend for 2 reasons
   1. **Supply and Demand- Bertlot ’16 of Sightline** explains that the root cause of the displacement seen in the status quo is a shortage of homes, because when there is less of a product it raises the price for the other supplies, affirming solves this.
   2. **Middle America Moves- Wagner ’17 of NYU** found that because there is a deficient supply of middle-income housing means they have no choice but to move to lower income areas, causing gentrification. More market-rate housing allows for these americans to be more evenly distributed through the city and reduce levels of gentrification.

Cliff Albright,11-10-2017, Gentrification is sweeping through America. Here are the people fighting back, Guardian, <https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/nov/10/atlanta-super-gentrification-eminent-domain,//ZS>

Kristin E. Holmes, The Philadelphia Inquirer,7-14-2018, As areas gentrify, black churches lose their base, depart, AP NEWS, <https://www.apnews.com/9254f2a17b774f8c86ff28a41ddeb571,//ZS>

PHILADELPHIA (AP) — Until a few years ago, the greatest threat to the future of the 99-year-old New Light Beulah Baptist Church in Philadelphia’s Graduate Hospital neighborhood was a thunderstorm that barreled through on a Thursday evening, ripping off part of the roof. The raging downpour in June 2010 flooded the sanctuary, rendering the church uninhabitable. Yet, the determined congregation restored its house of worship at a cost of $250,000, and a year later moved back to the corner of 17th and Bainbridge to resume its ministry. But **the vicissitudes of nature paled next to another looming threat: the pressures of gentrification on an urban pocket where housing prices have increased more than 400 percent since 2000.** With longtime black neighbors moving out and mostly younger, mostly white newcomers moving in, the community’s transition sapped the church of its membership — Sunday attendance dipped from a peak of 250 to 65 — and turned the stucco and stone edifice into an albatross.

Dan Bertlot,8-10-2016, Displacement: The Gnawing Injustice at the Heart of Housing Crises, Sightline Institute, <https://www.sightline.org/2016/08/10/displacement-the-gnawing-injustice-at-the-heart-of-housing-crises/,//ZS>

But the causes and solutions? Our focus groups, like many Northwesterners, were less clear on those. This article lays out the best evidence on displacement in Seattle—the different types, rates, and causes—and assesses strategies for protecting our communities from it. Unfortunately and perhaps surprisingly, what common sense counsels on this issue—to stop demolition of old buildings and preserve them as low-rent apartments, for example—turns out to backfire in a sequence of unintended consequences. **The root cause of displacement is a shortage of homes, and the only real solution is to build lots more housing of all types, to bolster those efforts with public support for those most vulnerable, and to precisely target preservation efforts** in places justified by the protection of cultural communities or the opening of economic opportunities. Seattle and other prospering cities can ensure that working families and people of color can stay in their homes and keep fragile communities together. Displacement does have solutions, in other words. They just may not be what you think.

Nyu Wagner,11-29-2017, Gentrification: It's complicated, No Publication, <https://wagner.nyu.edu/news/story/gentrification-its-complicated,//ZS>  
“The government should not stop gentrification,” countered Dr. Freeman, saying new **market-rate housing can have broad, positive results.** But, he said, "That doesn’t mean that governments should do nothing”– and suggested a designated tax to create affordable housing and dampen displacement. Any city would be hard-pressed at the same time to halt gentrification, considering so many people are seeing cities as attractive places to live, said Freeman. Greenberg readily embraced the addition of a tax, perhaps in the form of a sales tax, to create affordable housing in cities like New York, where "hyper-investment," dislodgement, and homelessness have all grown. The problem with alternate approaches to the problem, like special tax abatement programs to require affordable units within new, market-rate housing, is that they can often end up touching off gentrification and displacement throughout the surrounding neighborhood. Even public/private partnerships in affordable housing development rarely work: "Developers demand way too much, the city capitulates, and designated affordable units are often more expensive than the people in those neighborhoods are used to paying or can pay,” he said. Dr. Freeman responded, “I agree with a lot of sentiment that Michael is expressing regarding some of the problems that happen..." and mentioned the need for government to take active steps to preserve affordable units. But, he contended, discouraging market-rate housing in lower-income areas across the board is not the wisest public policy to follow. **“People want to move into the city, it’s driving gentrification,” Freeman said. If we don't build the market-rate housing, then “where are those people going to go? They will eventually look for housing that is currently occupied by moderate-income households….It won’t necessarily stop the problem; it might indeed accelerate gentrification in some neighborhoods.”**

### Gentrification Good Turns

1. **Impact Turns**- Gentrification is actually good for **Byrne of Georgetown** explains that gentrification is on net good for the poor, this is true for 6 reasons
   1. **Infrastructure- Chapple of UC Berkeley** explains that when gentrification happens increased infrastructure is built to bring more attractive amenities, Infrastructure protects the less fortunate against the harms of gentrification in two ways.
      1. **First**, it drives down living costs. **Adler** **of the Grist Magazine** points out that developing public transit and infrastructure is key to alleviating rising prices for the poor. He goes on that the expansion of transit restrains the growth of prices, because lower costs of commuting offset higher housing prices and increase the accessibility of affordable housing projects.
      2. **Second**, it expands job markets for the poor. Better infrastructure can reduce travel time and free up previously consumed time, decreasing the spatial mismatch between the poor and job opportunities. **Kaufman** of **NYU** finds that investment in the New York subway system could reduce average commute time from 48 to 33 minutes, making 530,000 new jobs available. This is because at a certain point jobs become so far away that they aren’t worth pursuing. thus, **Gibson of Georgia State** found that every 3% increase in infrastructure would increase the wealth of Americas poorest citizens by 147% and decrease income inequality by 11%.
   2. **Increasing political heft**- **Kennedy** **of the Brookings Institute** writes that gentrification is a politically powerful concept that can be manipulated to drive resources, jobs, and construction into lower income communities in need.
   3. **Funding affordable housing- Byrne** finds that areas that attract more affluent residents are more capable of aggressively financing housing for the poor.
   4. **Improving residential stability**- **Freeman** **of Columbia University** explains that the beneficial effects of gentrification, including renewed housing investments, improved retail services and a revived tax base encourage the stability in low-income households. Thus, Freeman finds that poor households residing in gentrified areas are 24% less likely to move out or experience displacement.
   5. **Boosting capital capacity**. By increasing the monetary circulation within neighborhoods, **Hurst** of the University of Chicago reports that poor neighborhoods 1 mile away from rich one experienced 23% lower poverty rates, 11% higher incomes, and 25% higher college graduation rates. **McKinnish** of the Journal of Urban Economics corroborates that average incomes of black householders increase by 20% in gentrified neighborhoods.
   6. **Decreasing crime**- Because the opportunity costs of crime increase under gentrification, **Linke ’19 of MIT** empirically found that gentrification decreases crime by 16%.

Kaufman, Sarah M., Mitchell L. Moss, Jorge Hernandez, and Justin Tyndall. "Mobility, Economic Opportunity and New York City Neighborhoods." New York University. The Rudin Center for Transportation at the NYU Wagner School, Nov. 2015. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://wagner.nyu.edu/rudincenter/wp-content/uploads/2015/11/JobAccessNov2015.pdf>.//ZS

Although public transit provides access to jobs throughout the New York City region, there are actually substantial inequalities in mobility. By focusing on the neighborhood level, the NYU Rudin Center for Transportation has identified communities that are substantially underserved by the public transportation system. The Rudin Center ranked New York City’s 177 neighborhoods according to the number of jobs accessible from the neighborhoods by transit, within 60 minutes and completed by 9:00 a.m.on a Monday morning. The number of jobs accessible in this timeframe ranged from 42,275 (South Staten Island) to 4,839,253 (North Chelsea). Our analysis reveals substantial variation in levels of transit access across New York affect residents’ employment levels, travel modes and incomes. Most notably, the rankings result in a swoosh-shaped relationship between transit and income: the highest incomes are connected to the areas with the most access, and low transit access still provides average incomes, because residents travel by private car rather than transit. (This chart is also available in interactive form: http://bit.ly/RudinJobAccess**) The neighborhoods appearing in the middle-third of the rankings were those with the lowest household incomes: the areas with highest accessibility prefer transit or walking, and those with the fewest transit options often commute in private vehicles. The middle third has enough transit access to commute effectively, but insufficient transit options to provide significant job opportunities, leading to the city’s highest unemployment rates and lowest incomes**: These imbalances of access perpetuate issues of income inequality and traffic congestion, limiting both economic and physical mobility for many in the city. The NYU Rudin Center for Transportation offers several recommendations to mitigate access disparities, including: Maximize the efficiency of the existing transportation system. Although New York’s landscape makes it extremely difficult to build new infrastructure, the Metropolitan Transportation Authority should seek to improve upon existing resources, including unused tracks and building out simple transfers. In particular, the CityTicket should be extended to weekday usage, allowing New York City residents to ride commuter rail at a discount. In Norwood, in the Bronx, **residents’ commutes would be reduced from 48 to 33 minutes to Midtown Manhattan when using Metro-North, making 527,819 more jobs available.**

Adler, Ben. "To Create More Affordable Housing, Build More Mass Transit." Grist Magazine. Grist.org, 10 June 2015. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://grist.org/cities/to-create-more-affordable-housing-build-more-mass-transit/>.//ZS

There is, however, a public policy lesson to be learned from the pattern of gentrification: Demand follows transit. For all the talk about how artsy young people will go where the housing stock has historic character and the rents are low, the bottom line is that the vast majority of them will live where they can get to a job in a reasonable amount of time. And growing numbers of young people are eager to avoid the hassle and expense of commuting by car. That means the solution is the same both for cities struggling with high housing costs and those struggling to attract any residents at all: Build more transit. In Detroit, for example, gentrification has lead to a shortage of rental apartments in centrally located Downtown and Midtown, with the high prices and generic boxy new buildings that naturally follow, even though the city is filled with dirt-cheap detached houses from the 1920s just a few miles farther out. It’s all about the transportation. “The problem is East English Village is eight miles from Downtown or Midtown, and there isn’t a subway for people to jump on or any decent mass transit,” says Eric Dueweke, an urban planning professor at the University of Michigan who lives in Detroit, referring to an undervalued neighborhood with excellent housing stock and elegant tree-lined streets. Much has been written by pundits from center-right to center-left, including yours truly, about **how cities must allow and even incentivize the construction of new housing in transit-accessible areas in order to restrain the growth of prices.** But that is only one side of the equation. We also need to create more transit-accessible areas. In New York City, for example, every neighborhood that is less than an hour by subway from the city’s primary office district in Midtown Manhattan either has gentrified or has the specter of gentrification hanging over its head. It’s fine in theory to say that we need more housing in those neighborhoods, but New York is by far the densest city in the nation. Its current subway, school, and sewer infrastructure is already bursting at the seams. The only solution left is to create more neighborhoods that are less than an hour from Midtown by subway. New York could build new subway lines in areas that currently lack them, add more express trains on existing lines, and run trains more frequently on underserved lines. (My line, the C, only comes once every 10 minutes even at rush hour.) **The lower cost of commuting by transit than by private car helps to offset high housing prices. In other words, once you factor in the cost of transportation, building more transit means you’re essentially making the housing along the transit lines more affordable. Mass transit also works in tandem with new housing: There should be, for example, more housing within walking distance of suburban commuter rail stations outside expensive cities such as New York**. And new transit lines can spur development of new housing as they have in Downtown Los Angeles. Improved transit could also reduce a major drag on our economy. Currently, people living in the strongest job markets in the country — in particular New York, D.C., and San Francisco — are finding that their higher wages are largely going to higher housing costs.

Kennedy, Maureen, and Paul Leonard. "Dealing With Neighborhood Change: A Primer on Gentrification and Policy Choices." The Brookings Institution Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy. PolicyLink, Apr. 2001. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://www.brookings.edu/~/media/research/files/reports/2001/4/metropolitanpolicy/gentrification.pdf>.//ZS

Fourth, the pace of change matters a great deal. Rapid gentrification brings with it many more problems than does slow but steady revitalization. Fifth, involuntary renter and commercial displacement is the most significant adverse consequence of gentrification, albeit among those hardest to affect. Strategies to minimize it should form the core of efforts to moderate gentrification. Sixth, gentrification is a politically powerful concept that **can be manipulated to drive resources, jobs and housing into lower income communities that need them**. And finally, if we can link the jobs and market demand that drive gentrification into the very communities most likely to feel its ill effects, we may accomplish a great deal.

Byrne, Peter J. "Two Cheers for Gentrification." Georgetown University Law Center. Housing Law Commons and the Urban Studies and Planning Commons, 2003. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://scholarship.law.georgetown.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1936&context=facpub>.//ZS

My contention here goes somewhat further: **gentrification is good on balance for the poor and ethnic minorities**. The most negative effect of gentrification, the reduction in affordable housing, results primarily not from gentrification itself, but from the persistent failure of government to produce or secure afford- able housing more generally. Moreover, **cities that attract more affluent residents are more able to aggressively finance affordable housing**. Thus, gentrification is entitled to "two cheers,"4 if not three, given that it enhances the political and economic positions of all, but exacerbates the harms imposed on the poor by the failures of national affordable housing policies.

Freeman, Lance, and Frank Braconi. "Housing, Planning and Economic Development in New York: Gentrification and Displacement." Professor of Planning, Columbia University. Community Preservation Corporation and Chase Manhattan Foundation, Jan.-Feb. 2002. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://www.chpcny.org/wp-content/uploads/2011/02/UP\_Gentrification\_Displacement1.pdf>.//ZS

The growth of an affluent professional class in a number of the nation’s cities during recent decades has been perceived as a mixed blessing by many social scientists, policymakers, and community activists. Most recognize t**he beneficial effects, which include renewed housing investment, improved retail services and a revived tax base**. Some even hope that the gentrification of urban neighborhoods can be managed to promote greater racial and economic integration than currently exists. But there is also a backdrop of suspicion: some see gentrification as a new type of “land grab” that will work to the disadvantage of the poor and the powerless. Our research sheds new light on the gentrification process. Although it does not prove that secondary displacement of the poor does not occur in gentrifying areas, it suggests that demographic transition is not predicated on displacement. Low-income households actually seem less likely to move from gentrifying neighborhoods than from other communities. improving housing and neighborhood conditions appear to **encourage the housing stability of low-income households to the degree that they more than offset any dislocation resulting from rising rents.** Using logit regression, a type of statistical analysis that allows a researcher to evaluate the probability of an event occurring, we analyzed renter mobility. When compared to poor households not residing in one of the seven gentrifying neighborhoods identified above, poor households residing in those neighborhoods were found to be **24 percent less likely to have moved** during the 1991-1999 period. When we use the lack of a four-year degree as our measure of disadvantage, this relationship is still evident. Households without a college degree were 15 percent less likely to have moved if they lived in a gentrifying neighborhood. Based on this analysis it appears that gentrification actually suppresses, rather than raises, the probability that a disadvantaged household will move out of its apartment.

Guerrieri, Veronica, Daniel Hartley, and Eric Hurst. "Endogenous Gentrification and Housing Price Dynamics." University of Chicago. National Bureau of Economic Research, 28 Jan. 2013. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://faculty.chicagobooth.edu/erik.hurst/research/gentrification\_jpube\_final\_publish.pdf>.//ZS

The results from estimating (21) are shown in Table 7. In response to a city-wide housing demand shock, it is the poor census tracts that are in close proximity to the rich census tracts that are much more likely to experience rising incomes, declines in the poverty rate, and rising educational attainment of residents relative to poor census tracts that are farther from the rich census tracts. Specifically, in response to a one-standard deviation instrumented income shock, poor census tracts that were 1 mile from rich neighborhoods experienced income growth that was 1.7 percentage points higher than poor neighborhoods that were 4 miles away. Given that the average census tract in our sample experienced income growth of 14.9 percent during the decade, this represents an increase in income of 11 percent for poor neighborhoods that are close to rich neighborhoods in response to a one standard deviation instrumented income shock. Likewise, **poor neighborhoods that are 1 mile from the rich neighborhoods experienced 23 percent lower increases in the poverty rate and 25 percent higher increases in the fraction of residents with a college degre**e or more relative to otherwise similar poor neighborhoods that are 4 miles from the rich neighborhoods.

McKinnish, Terra, Randall Walsh, and Kirk T. White. Journal of Urban Economics. National Center for Biotechnology Information, U.S. National Library of Medicine, 1 Mar. 2010. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC2802068/>.//ZS

The most striking finding is that **average incomes in cohorts of black householders with high school degrees increase at least 20% more in gentrifying than non-gentrifying neighborhoods**. We can- not formally test whether this is because gentrification improves the earnings of these householders, or disproportionately reduces exit of the highest earning householders in these cohorts. We do point out, however, that we do not see any evidence of displace- ment of lower-income cohorts in Table 7. We feel that this makes it less likely that this result is driven entirely by displacement of lower-income households within cohort. We emphasize, however, that we have no way to formally test how much of the increase in average cohort income is compositional as opposed to house- hold-level income growth.

Campbell, Joan. "ULI Research Roundup: The Impact of Transit on Property Values." Urban Land Institute. ULI Center, 7 Aug. 2013. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://uli.org/infrastructure-initiative/uli-research-roundup-the-impact-of-transit-on-property-values/>.//ZS

The New Real Estate Mantra: Location Near Public Transportation, released in March 2013, was a team effort among the American Public Transit Association, the National Association of Realtors, and the Center for Neighborhood Technology. The report, a **study of property values near transit, finds that housing values near transit facilities fared 41.6 percent better than homes that were farther away. Furthermore, a look at the issue of price resilience noted that properties with greater transit access had retained their property values**. Findings are presented for five study regions—Boston, Chicago, Minneapolis/St. Paul, Phoenix, and San Francisco. The 2013 Knight Frank report, Action Stations: The Impact of Crossrail on Residential Property in Central London, takes a look at the impact of Crossrail—London’s most significant transit investment project—on property values. The researchers measured price premiums in walk zones—namely, areas within a ten-minute walk from station entrances. Results showed that since 2008, when the Royal Assent approved the Crossrail project, property prices have jumped more than 30 percent. By 2018—the year the Crossrail is scheduled to open—anticipated price performance is expected to vary by station. For example, the level of regeneration around stations will have a major impact on property values. Knight Frank, at set intervals, plans to continue monitoring prices up to the opening of Crossrail and thereafter. A study of Charlotte-area single-family home prices was conducted from 1997 through 2008. The 2012 report, The Impact of a New Light Rail System on Single-Family Property Values in Charlotte, North Carolina, presented in the Journal of Transport and Land Use last year, shows results were varied among pre−station plans, planning, construction, and operating phases. Negative price impacts were reported before the train became operational. However, after the train opened the homes located near the station began seeing positive appreciation in prices.

Baum-Snow, Nathaniel. "Urban Transport Expansions, Employment Decentralization, and the Spatial Scope of Agglomeration Economies." Brown University. National Bureau of Economic Research, Feb. 2014. Web. 15 Apr. 2016. <http://www.econ.brown.edu/Faculty/Nathaniel\_Baum-Snow/baumsnow\_emp\_decent.pdf>.//ZS

This exercise indicates that the elasticity of central city total factor productivity with respect to central city employment is 0.02 to 0.06 greater than the elasticity of central city TFP with respect to suburban employment, depending on parameters used for calibration. This full range of estimates indicates that a sizeable fraction of the overall metropolitan area level agglomeration economies documented elsewhere in the literature is achieved through relatively local spillovers. Among one-digit industries not dominated by public sector workers, finance, insurance & real estate exhibits the strongest productivity advantages of density and spatial centrality while wholesale & retail trade exhibits the weakest. Despite the importance of local agglomeration spillovers for influencing firm location choices, such spillovers only explain a small part of residential location responses to new highways. Model calibrations also reveal that **each radial highway generates real income increases of up to 3.6 percent and housing cost declines of up to 1.9 percent for central city residents. Central city land rents decline by 4.3 to 12.8 percent with each radial highway. About half of the real income increases occur because new highways open up additional urban space for productive use, increasing land-labor ratios, while most of the remainder comes because of direct productivity effects of reduced intra-urban travel times**. This paper provides the first estimates of the causal effects of highways on the spatial organization of economic activity by industry within metropolitan areas. Moreover, it is the first to employ exogenous shocks to metropolitan area environments in a large set of cities to facilitate recovery of productivity spillovers that operate at local spatial scales. The use of a closed city theoretical framework facilitates the first quantification of the welfare benefits of new highways while holding metropolitan scale fixed.

Mit Researchers.,2-22-2019, New study: **Gentrification triggered 16 percent drop in city crime**, MIT Sloan, https://mitsloan.mit.edu/ideas-made-to-matter/new-study-gentrification-triggered-16-percent-drop-city-crime,//ZS

They then asked why this was. “What became so valuable about being in a neighborhood that used to have lots of rent control?” Palmer said. They found there could be many reasons. “These neighborhoods had higher turnover, buildings were fixed up, dive bars became yoga studios and coffee shops, and people value this sort of upgrading of neighborhood amenities,” Palmer said. “People also suggested that the neighborhoods got safer.” While the Cambridge Police agreed this was likely the case, no scientific research existed to corroborate the theory. Palmer, Autor, and Pathak set out to find out if it was true. It was. **They determined that crime dropped by an extra 16 percent because of the end of rent control**, saving city residents on average $10-15 million annually. Of the $2 billion total appreciation of Cambridge housing value attributable to the end of rent control, approximately 10-15 percent, or $200 million, was due to public safety improvements. When the researchers drilled down further, they found that a reduction in violent crimes, specifically, resulted in the largest economic gains. That is because “avoiding violent crime is extremely important to residents of a city,” Palmer said. An optimistic interpretation is that crime went down overall, though that was outside the scope of the study. “There is evidence in the criminology and economics literatures that sometimes, when you disrupt violent social networks, crime declines in aggregate. For example, **researchers found that when Chicago demolished certain public housing projects and former residents end up scattered, crime went down in total.” Additionally, the researchers heard anecdotally from members of the police force that some of the new city residents installed alarm systems, better deadlocks, or barred first floor windows. These increased personal security measures could have contributed to the reduction in property crimes.**