



Community Development Corporations and Smart Growth: Putting Policy Into Practice

**Fellowship Program for Emerging Leaders
in Community and Economic Development**
October 2000

Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation



NEIGHBORHOOD REINVESTMENT CORPORATION

Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation was established by an Act of Congress in 1978 (Public Law 95-557). A primary objective of the Corporation is to increase the capacity of local community-based organizations to revitalize their communities, particularly by expanding and improving housing opportunities.

These local organizations, known as NeighborWorks[®] organizations, are independent, resident-led, nonprofit partnerships that include business leaders and government officials. All together they make up the NeighborWorks[®] network.

JOINT CENTER FOR HOUSING STUDIES OF HARVARD UNIVERSITY

The Joint Center for Housing Studies analyzes the ways in which housing policy and practices are shaped by economic and demographic trends and provides leaders in government, business and the non-profit sector with knowledge and tools for formulating effective policies and strategies.

Established in 1959, the Joint Center is a collaborative unit affiliated with the Harvard Design School and the Kennedy School of Government. The Center's programs of research, education and public outreach inform debate on critical housing issues and illuminate the role of housing in shaping communities. The Policy Advisory Board, a diverse group of business leaders in the housing sector, provides support and guidance for the Center and its activities. The Joint Center also receives input from its Faculty Committee, which draws on the expertise of a university-wide group of scholars.

This paper was written under the support of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation's Emerging Leaders in Community and Economic Development Fellowship, which provides opportunities for highly qualified professional students at Harvard University to research and publish applied analytical projects of interest to the community development field.

Any opinions expressed are those of the author and not those of the Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University or of any of the persons or organizations providing support to the Joint Center for Housing Studies, including the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. The findings and conclusions of this report are solely the responsibility of the author.

This analysis was performed with the support of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. The Corporation has full rights to use and distribute this document.

Copyright © 2000 Sarah Karlinsky

ABOUT THE AUTHOR

A graduate of Columbia University, Sarah Karlinsky spent two years teaching middle school in Baltimore City as part of Teach For America (a national corps of recent college graduates committed to teaching in school systems experiencing chronic teacher shortages). Currently Ms. Karlinsky is pursuing a master's degree in Public Policy and Urban Planning at the John F. Kennedy School of Government at Harvard University.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY.....	1
INTRODUCTION: THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE REGION.....	4
THE PROBLEM: REGIONAL DECONCENTRATION OF POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT AND THE CONCENTRATION OF POVERTY.....	7
HOUSING PRODUCTION AND POPULATION GROWTH.....	7
THE MOVEMENT OF JOBS.....	8
THE CONCENTRATION OF POVERTY.....	8
WHAT THESE TRENDS MEAN FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.....	9
THE INTERSECTION BETWEEN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SMART GROWTH: WHY THE RELATIONSHIP MAKES SENSE.....	11
NEW POSSIBILITIES LEAD TO NEW RESOURCES.....	13
TABLE I. CDCs AND THE SMART GROWTH AGENDA: COMMON CONCERNS AND POTENTIAL SOLUTIONS.....	14
COALITION-BUILDING AND ADVOCACY.....	15
COORDINATION, COMMITMENT, AND TRUST.....	17
TABLE II. POTENTIAL SMART GROWTH ALLIES FOR CDCs: COALITION-BUILDING AND ADVOCACY.....	19
WINDOWS OF OPPORTUNITY.....	20
BARRIERS TO INVOLVEMENT: CAPACITY.....	21
BARRIERS TO INVOLVEMENT: POWER.....	22
COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: LEADING THE WAY BY EXAMPLE.....	23
TABLE III. SMART GROWTH EXAMPLES FOR CDCs TO CONSIDER WHEN EVALUATING ACTIVITIES.....	25
NEW KENSINGTON COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION, PHILADELPHIA, PENNSYLVANIA.....	26
THE UNITY COUNCIL, OAKLAND, CALIFORNIA.....	28
GWINNETT HOUSING RESOURCE PARTNERSHIP, NORCROSS, GEORGIA.....	29
RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH.....	32
CONCLUSION.....	34
APPENDIX I: METROPOLITAN POPULATION GROWTH 1970-1998.....	35
APPENDIX II: DECONCENTRATION OF JOBS, 1980-1990.....	36
APPENDIX III: PERCENT POVERTY RATE, CITY VERSUS SUBURBS.....	37
APPENDIX IV: MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF THE COALITION FOR A LIVABLE FUTURE (CLF).....	38
APPENDIX V: CONTACT INFORMATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS INTERVIEWED.....	39
SOURCES.....	40

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Sprawling development patterns have had a direct impact on the neighborhoods that community development corporations (CDCs) seek to serve. While CDCs continue to work arduously to improve conditions for members of their communities, they are often swimming against a formidable tide that is pulling economic, social and political resources toward the fringes of their metropolitan areas. CDCs are not the only organizations concerned with the effects of job and population deconcentration on older parts of a region. Smart Growth advocates, also, seek to combat such patterns. They promote regional land-use planning, development around existing infrastructure, mixed-use and mixed-income development throughout the region, and investment in older-city and inner-suburban neighborhoods. The Smart Growth agenda has gained significant attention and political momentum in recent years. The rising importance of the Smart Growth agenda in shaping state and regional policy provides significant opportunities for CDCs to increase their impact, both from the more-focused perspective of production and organizational programming, as well as from the broader perspective of advocacy. In addition, CDCs have much to offer advocates of the Smart Growth agenda, particularly from the ways in which CDC development provides examples of Smart Growth production, from which Smart Growth advocates might learn.

This paper will identify the opportunities for CDCs to participate in the Smart Growth movement, and strategies they might employ to do so. This report seeks to explore one facet of how CDCs might facilitate the rebirth of cities, by examining the potential relationship between community development and Smart Growth. To this end, this report:

1. details the major regional demographic trends negatively impacting the neighborhoods CDCs seek to serve;
2. provides a rationale for CDC involvement in the Smart Growth movement, while acknowledging the potential barriers to such involvement;
3. highlights the manner in which CDCs might participate in the Smart Growth movement, from building coalitions in order to promote a community-based agenda on a regional level, to the incorporation of Smart Growth ideas and design features in community development work; and

4. provides suggestions for future research aimed at strengthening the ties between community development and Smart Growth work.

Regional Trends

Three major regional demographic trends define the context in which CDCs operate: housing production and population growth, job movement, and poverty concentration. Understanding the ins and outs of these trends on a regional level will aid CDCs both in the process of strategic planning for their organizations and also in the targeting of their advocacy activities.

Common Concerns

CDCs share their concern about the impact of regional trends on urban areas with Smart Growth advocates. The Smart Growth agenda addresses the problems engendered by sprawling development patterns on a regional level, whereas CDCs, for a series of historic and organizational reasons, have tended to focus on specific neighborhoods. There are many overlaps in the goals and aims of the Smart Growth agenda and community-development work, as well as some points of contention between them. Given that the overlaps are so clear, and that Smart Growth advocates and CDCs have much to offer each other, the potential for new partnerships, coalitions and educational opportunities abound. Moreover, additional resources either have been or are in the process of being made available to pursue Smart Growth strategies.

Coalition-Building and Advocacy

CDCs can potentially affect regional-development patterns through the formation of coalitions. What are the common characteristics of successful coalitions between CDCs and Smart Growth advocates? First, successful coalitions demand coordination among participants, a strong commitment to common values, and shared trust among members. Secondly, successful coalitions focus on windows of opportunity in a larger policy world, to affect the outcome of a certain decision, to rally for the defeat of a common enemy, or to participate in an ongoing discussion at the policy table. Finally, potential causes for failure must also be evaluated, such as issues of capacity and power.

Community Development and Smart Growth Production: Leading the Way by Example

While coalition-building and advocacy are strategies by which CDCs might access the larger policy discussion around Smart Growth, their bread and butter remains housing and commercial and real-estate development. As the Smart Growth agenda continues to gain momentum, and the ties between older urban neighborhoods and the health of a region as a whole become more explicit, some CDCs potentially have an important role to play. They can be exemplars of Smart Growth development characterized by mixed-income, mixed-use development close to public-transportation nodes in relatively dense parts of the region.

An exploration of the relationship between community development and Smart Growth provides a glimpse into the way grassroots, community-based interests and regionally focused advocacy complement each other. Many CDCs have much to add to the Smart Growth debate, bringing to the table an understanding of neighborhoods and experience with Smart Growth production. The Smart Growth agenda offers CDCs a venue to address the large-scale problems of population and job deconcentration by partnering with a wide range of regional stakeholders. By operating in conjunction, CDCs and Smart Growth advocates possess the potential to alter regional dynamics in ways that facilitate the rebirth of cities, not just their rebuilding.

INTRODUCTION: THE NEIGHBORHOOD AND THE REGION

The Atlanta metropolitan area has witnessed massive growth in the past three decades, along virtually every dimension. Adding 29.5 percent to its housing stock in the years 1990 to 1998,¹ 61,046 permits were issued for the production of privately owned housing units in 1999 alone.² Population increased from 1,762,626 in 1970 to 3,746,059 in 1998, representing a total increase of 112.4 percent. Population increases have mirrored employment opportunity. The number of jobs rose by approximately 500,000 in the years between 1980 and 1990.³ Atlanta is, in short, booming.

But how is Atlanta booming? Is growth uniform throughout the region? Slice the numbers to compare city growth to the growth enjoyed by the suburbs and a very different picture emerges. In the years 1970 to 1998, population in the city of Atlanta actually decreased by 18.8 percent, while population in the surrounding suburbs exploded by a mind-boggling 163.9 percent. While the number of jobs grew for both city and suburbs in the years 1980 to 1990, the rate of growth for suburban areas was far faster. In 1980, suburban jobs outweighed city jobs by 29.9 percent; in 1990 that ratio had increased to 49.1 percent, representing a difference of 19.2 percent. And what do these employment and population trends signify for those who lack the financial means to ride the tide? The poverty rate for the city of Atlanta was estimated at 33.6 percent in 1995, more than three times the poverty rate of 9.4 percent for suburban areas. Compare this 33.6 percent rate in 1995 with the 1969 poverty rate of 19.8 percent. Look at the numbers together and the trend becomes clear: The *city* of Atlanta is not booming; its suburbs are.

The Historic District Development Corporation (HDDC) is nestled in the heart of Atlanta's Martin Luther King Jr. Historic District, not a few blocks away from the house where King was born and the Ebenezer Baptist Church where he preached. The construction of Highway 75 through the heart of the African-

¹ State of the Nations' Housing, 2000, page 29, derived from Census Bureau Construction Reports C-40, and 1990 Decennial Census. The author notes that "estimates understate actual growth because they exclude manufactured housing placements."

² www.census.gov/const/C40/Table3/tb3u1999.txt.

³ Source, State of the Nation's Cities Database, as drawn from Census data.

American business district in the mid-1960s heralded the beginning of a “precipitous decline”⁴ in the neighborhoods adjacent to the highway, including the Historic District itself. At the same time as this precipitous decline was occurring, the Atlanta metropolitan region as a whole enjoyed population growth to the tune of 26.6 percent and 32.5 percent for the 1970s and 1980s respectively, a sure sign of the need for additional units of housing.⁵ Yet “[b]efore HDDC began building new, infill housing, there had not been a new house built in the Martin Luther King Jr. Historic District in over 50 years.”⁶

As the HDDC annual report states, “HDDC is the leading nonprofit, community-based builder of affordable and moderate-income housing in downtown Atlanta. HDDC has built or is in the process of completing nearly 60 new, single-family homes. It has rescued some 35 structures from advanced stages of dilapidation, and rehabilitated them into quality housing for low-income families indigenous to the Martin Luther King Jr. Historic District.”⁷ Mtaminika Youngblood, the executive director of HDDC, discusses the need to distinguish between “cities being rebuilt and cities being reborn.”⁸ And her organization, through its exacting attention to historical detail as well as its emphasis on community, seeks to aid in the rebirth of a special area. The completion of 60 well-constructed units developed on a block-by-block basis is a laudable accomplishment to this end.

Slice the numbers now, this time to reveal a regional picture. For those committed to community development, this may well be the unkindest cut of all. The fact still remains that 61,046 new permits for housing construction were issued in the Atlanta metropolitan region in 1999. In the face of regional private production capacity 1,000 times that of the leading nonprofit producer of affordable and moderate-income housing, how do CDCs work to facilitate the rebirth of their neighborhoods and cities?⁹

⁴ HDDC Annual Report, 1998.

⁵ State of the Cities Database, www.huduser.org.

⁶ HDDC Annual Report, 1998, page 1.

⁷ HDDC Annual Report, page 1.

⁸ Interview, July 26, 2000.

⁹ The work of David Rusk suggests that, while the work of CDCs is noble and often heroic, there is little evidence that CDCs can do much to affect population and employment shifts in the neighborhoods in which they work. He writes, “In effect, CDCs are expected to help a crowd of poor people run up a down escalator, an escalator that is

This Report

This report seeks to explore one facet of how CDCs might facilitate the rebirth of cities by examining the potential relationship between community development and Smart Growth. To this end, this report:

1. Details the major regional demographic trends negatively impacting the neighborhoods CDCs seek to serve.
2. Provides a rationale for CDC involvement in the Smart Growth movement, while acknowledging the potential barriers to such involvement.
3. Highlights the manner in which CDCs might participate in the Smart Growth movement, from the building of coalitions in order to promote a community-based agenda on a regional level, to the incorporation of Smart Growth ideas and design features in community development work.
4. Provides suggestions for future research aimed at strengthening the ties between community development and Smart Growth work.

engineered to come down faster and faster than more poor people can run up.” Rusk contends that he does “not mean to criticize CDCs themselves.” His “exasperation stems from the way the CDC paradigm allows powerful government institutions to shirk once again their responsibility to confront racial and economic segregation.” (Rusk, David, *Inside Game, Outside Game*, Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, 1999, page 18.) It is the viewpoint of this author that while the work of CDCs may in many instances constitute “running up a down escalator” there are a variety of steps CDCs and supporters of CDCs might take in order to begin to re-engineer the escalator itself, or at the very least place a series of hassling phone calls to the engineer. These strategies might involve connecting CDCs to a larger regional movement, such as Smart Growth. Indeed, Rusk’s three main policy proscriptions — regional land-use planning, regional fair-share affordable housing, and regional revenue sharing — are all in alignment with the goals of the Smart Growth movement. However, Rusk’s comment on the manner in which the CDC paradigm enables powerful institutions to fail to take responsibility for their actions (or in-actions) is well taken.

THE PROBLEM: REGIONAL DECONCENTRATION OF POPULATION AND EMPLOYMENT AND THE CONCENTRATION OF POVERTY

Three major trends affect the neighborhoods in which CDCs operate: housing production and population growth, job movement, and poverty concentration. Understanding the ins and outs of these trends will aid CDCs both in the process of strategic planning for their organizations and also in targeting their advocacy activities.

Housing Production and Population Growth

While not all cities have lost population over the past 30 years, most have failed to gain population to the same degree as suburban locations (see Appendix I).¹⁰ The city of Cincinnati lost 25.7 percent of its population between 1970 and 1998, while its suburban population increased 29.8 percent. Burlington, Vermont's, population grew by 0.5 percent in the same period, while its suburbs blossomed by 62.4 percent. Even New York City failed to keep pace with the growth of its suburbs, losing 6 percent of its population between 1970 and 1998, relative to 8-percent growth in its suburbs (though this loss mostly reflects the city's whopping 10.4-percent population loss of the 1970s).¹¹

This suburban population growth is reflective of growth patterns that favor expansion at the low-density metropolitan fringe over development in higher-density areas of a region.¹² "Between 1990 and 1997, new construction added 15 percent to the housing stock of low-density metropolitan counties, compared with only 5 percent in high-density core areas."¹³ The fact that population moving toward the fringe of metropolitan areas means that many older or "inner-ring" suburbs are left vulnerable to the same type of disinvestment currently facing urban areas. This trend presents a potential opportunity to build CDC

¹⁰ State of the Cities Database, www.huduser.org. Note: some cities appear to gain population in higher percentages relative to the surrounding suburbs. This could in part be due to a reclassification of what constitutes "city," due to annexation or what David Rusk refers to as "elasticity" in *Cities Without Suburbs*. The notable exception to this trend is Charlotte, North Carolina, as can be seen in Appendix I.

¹¹ All the above statistics are taken from the State of the Cities Dataset.

¹² McArdle, Nancy, "Outward Bound: The Decentralization of Population and Employment," Joint Center for Housing Studies Working Paper W99-5, July 1999.

¹³ State of the Nation's Housing, 2000, page 8.

capacity in some of these inner-ring suburbs, and perhaps also to forge new political alliances around common concerns.

The Movement of Jobs

Housing development and population growth at the periphery of a region is mirrored by job growth in the same fringe areas. “From 1990 to 1997, job growth in the lower-density fringe of metro areas was 19 percent compared with only 4 percent in the high-density core. It is noteworthy that job growth in low- and medium-density areas is not confined to construction and retail, but has occurred across all sectors.”¹⁴

Appendix II details the changes in the percentage of jobs located in the city versus the percentage of jobs located in the suburbs for the decade 1980 to 1990.¹⁵ Each of the 10 cities listed shows declines in the percentage of urban jobs relative to suburban jobs throughout the decade. Data on Salt Lake City, for example, show that while the city held the larger percentage of jobs in 1980 (46.5 percent to the surrounding suburban counties’ 43.4 percent), by 1990 these percentages had more or less reversed themselves. The city then held 38.4 percent of area jobs relative to the suburbs’ 46.2 percent. These trends are particularly important as CDCs seek to both tie residents to larger, regional structures of opportunity and also consider economic development possibilities in their own neighborhoods.

The Concentration of Poverty

The movement of people and jobs further and further away from the metropolitan center has a very real impact on the neighborhoods CDCs serve, particularly with regard to the concentration of poverty. As Appendix III shows, cities tend to house a greater percentage of the region’s poor than do the suburbs. This is due in part to the concentration of affordable housing in cities and the dearth of affordable housing in suburban locations, especially in booming outer-ring suburbs.

¹⁴ State of the Nation’s Housing, 2000, page 7. Tabulations of the Bureau of Economic Analysis, REIS database.

¹⁵ State of the Cities Database, www.huduser.org.

The work of Paul Jargowsky and others shows that in addition to being home to a greater percentage of a region's poor, cities are also home to large concentrations of poverty. By examining census-tract data in the period 1970 to 1990, Jargowsky demonstrated that both the number of tracts characterized by a poverty level of 40 percent or higher and the percentage of total poor living in those tracts had increased dramatically.¹⁶ Furthermore, poor people of color were far more likely to live in a high-poverty census tract than poor whites.¹⁷

The concentration of poverty in city centers can be read, at least in part, as the result of the out-migration of people of means from urban areas. The relationship between domestic out-migration and the concentration of poverty in cities has been noted by numerous scholars and academics.¹⁸ This trend toward concentrated wealth at suburban fringes and concentrated poverty in city center is further exacerbated by the fact that the majority of out-migrants are of higher-income. "Between 1997 and 1999, on net more than a half-million households with incomes of \$60,000 or more left these cities for suburban or non-metro areas. While accounting for only 24 percent of households in the nation's larger cities, affluent families made up over 40 percent of the 1.2 million net out-migrants."¹⁹

What These Trends Mean for Community Development

Regional population, employment and poverty trends affect different sub-metro markets differently, dependent largely on where that sub-market sits relative to the real-estate market as a whole. If the urban market is quite tight (i.e., demand exceeds supply) as a function of a regional population explosion (such as is the case in the Bay Area), then CDCs in neighborhoods poised for transition will most likely be

¹⁶ Jargowsky, Paul. *Poverty and Place*, New York, Russell Sage Foundation, 1997, Table B-1, pages 222-232.

¹⁷ Ibid, Table B-2, pages 233-242.

¹⁸ Including, first and foremost, William Julius Wilson in *The Truly Disadvantaged*, 1987. Wilson's work was based predominantly on data gathered for the city of Chicago. Jargowsky's work affirmed Wilson's work on a national level. Anthony Downs of the Brookings Institution, by way of contrast, has called into question the direct correlation between sprawl and the concentration of poverty. He writes, "...when I have tried to verify these linkages (between suburban sprawl and the concentration of poverty) empirically for 162 large metropolitan areas, most of the 10 traits of sprawl exhibit no statistically significant relationship to measures of urban decline. Even so, I believe the core-area concentration of minority poverty built into the American metropolitan development process aggravates urban decline. But that relationship may be inherent in all forms of American peripheral suburban growth, not just suburban sprawl, or it may be based on just a few of sprawl's basic traits." Downs, Anthony, "The Big Picture: How America's cities are growing," *The Brookings Review*, Washington, DC, Fall 1998.

concerned about displacement in addition to being concerned about attracting investment. Similarly, if the urban and regional markets are both relatively soft (as the result of moderate population growth), CDCs should be concerned with attracting investment and stabilizing the neighborhood in order to stem population loss.²⁰

The deconcentration of jobs is another serious issue for CDCs to consider. Given that CDCs serve majority low- to moderate-income communities in urban neighborhoods, while the majority of available jobs are located in the outlying suburbs (suburbs which are often inaccessible by public transportation),²¹ it makes sense for CDCs to think carefully about the manner in which the residents of their neighborhoods might better access opportunities throughout the region. Tying residents to a larger regional structure of opportunity is also a means of combating concentrated poverty²² and thus tying anti-poverty work to the work of neighborhood revitalization.

¹⁹ State of the Nation's Housing, 2000, pages 8-9.

²⁰ I am here indebted to my conversations with Charles Buki of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation regarding regional and neighborhood dynamics. For a further discussion of the ways in which market conditions define appropriate housing strategies, please see Goetze, Ray and Colton, Kent, *The Dynamics of Cities: A Fresh Approach to Understanding Housing and Neighborhood Change*.

²¹ Jargowsky, *Poverty and Place*.

²² Wilson, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, Jargowsky, *Poverty and Place*.

THE INTERSECTION BETWEEN COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT AND SMART GROWTH: WHY THE RELATIONSHIP MAKES SENSE

Smart Growth has taken the national mainstream dialogue by storm. Search the Internet for “sprawl” and 131,600 sites appear. Search for “smart growth” and an additional 3,460,000 sites appear.²³ As a voting issue, sprawl has taken a place in the canon alongside crime, taxes, education and the economy.²⁴ In the 1998 election year, of 240 sprawl-related ballot measures, 70 percent were approved.²⁵ Although 1999 was not an election year, another 140 measures were decided by voters. Of these 140, 77 percent were approved. Fully half the nation’s governors have identified sprawl as a priority. And the Democratic nominee for President, Al Gore, has made Smart Growth one of the hallmarks of his vice presidency.

What is Smart Growth? Smart Growth can be defined as “an effort, through the use of public and private subsidies, to create a supportive environment for refocusing a share of regional growth within central cities and inner suburbs. At the same time, a share of growth is taken away from the rural and undeveloped portions of the metropolitan area.”²⁶

Smart Growth focuses on the following actives and objectives:

- Regional land-use planning;
- Mixed-use development throughout a region;
- Mixed-income development throughout a region;
- Development around mass-transit nodes;
- Utilizing existing infrastructure; and
- Preserving greenspace.

²³ Using the “Google” search engine. August 23, 2000. A search for “taxes” recovered a whopping 3,460,000 sites.

²⁴ Lowry, Joan, “Growth Is a Sprawling Voter Issue,” Scripps Howard News Service.

²⁵ Ibid.

²⁶ Burchell, Robert W., Listokin, David and Galley, Catherine C., “Smart Growth: More than a Ghost of Urban Policy Past, Less than a Bold New Horizon,” 1999, Fannie Mae Foundation.

In light of changing regional demographics, what does the rising importance of the Smart Growth agenda mean for CDCs?

1. The rise of Smart Growth as an important political agenda represents the first opportunity in many years to address the issue of regional development patterns and the ramifications of regional deconcentration of jobs and employment in a holistic, far-reaching way.
2. Community development and Smart Growth philosophically intersect at the point of neighborhood revitalization (see Table I). CDCs care passionately about the health of neighborhoods and about the health of the people who live in them. Smart Growth advocates care passionately about the health of regions and about the health of the people who live in them.
3. There exists a certain degree of skepticism from CDCs regarding their role in the Smart Growth movement. This skepticism has resulted from:
 - a. capacity limitations, making it difficult for CDCs to become heavily involved in policy work.;
 - b. potential conflicts of interest between the goal of greenspace preservation and the goal of affordable-housing production. Moreover, some community advocates may see regionalism as a means to diffuse hard-won urban political power, particularly if the political faultlines have been defined along racial lines; and
 - c. the idea that Smart Growth is just the latest flavor of liberal public policy, and its time, too, shall pass.
4. However, the fact remains that CDCs lack the capacity to alter regional dynamics on their own. They will continue, in the words of David Rusk, to try to run up the down escalator.
5. CDCs can begin to participate in the regional discussion by identifying windows of opportunity to participate in the debate and by forming coalitions with a series of Smart Growth stakeholders. They can provide examples of Smart Growth programming and production in the neighborhoods in which they work.
6. Smart Growth advocates lose an important perspective when CDCs are not at the table, particularly regarding affordable housing issues.

Smart Growth provides opportunities for CDCs to participate in policy-shaping discussions around regional issues, to partner with new organizations, while drawing upon the strong community-development tradition of advocacy. Efforts to promote what PolicyLink (a progressive, Bay Area-based think tank) describes as community-based regionalism derive “from a common understanding that the future of low-income communities is tied to broader regional social, political and economic factors; and that improving the well-being of low-income neighborhoods requires understanding the regional context and taking action beyond a neighborhood or community level.”²⁷

²⁷ PolicyLink, *Community Based Initiatives Promoting Regional Equity*, page 5.

New Possibilities Lead to New Resources

As federal, state and local governments and foundations have become increasingly aware of the importance of pursuing Smart Growth strategies, resources have become available to support regional measures. A sample of Smart Growth-related resources that could potentially benefit CDCs include:

- **Federal Government: Innovative Community Partnership Grants**

A new Environmental Protection Agency program, innovative community partnership grants, is designed to provide funding for projects seeking to promote environmental responsibility and economic revitalization.²⁸

- **State Government: Maryland's Smart Growth Program**

Under the leadership of Governor Glendening, Maryland has developed a number of Smart Growth initiatives designed to strengthen existing neighborhoods. The neighborhoods initiative includes a Live-Near-Where-You-Work program, a neighborhood-partnership program (promoting private investment in neighborhood-revitalization activities), and a Smart Growth/smart-ideas initiative (providing 4-percent interest rates for home mortgages in some neighborhoods).²⁹

- **Foundation Funding: The Funders Network for Smart Growth**

A number of foundations are beginning to focus a portion of their activities towards facilitating Smart Growth programs both at the regional and neighborhood levels. The Funders Network for Smart Growth “informs and strengthens funders’ individual and collective abilities to support and connect organizations working to improve the quality of life, create better economies, build livable communities and protect and preserve natural resources.”³⁰ The Funders Network includes a number of foundations and institutions such as the Americana Foundation, Bank of America, The Community Foundation for Greater Atlanta Inc., The Enterprise Foundation, Ford, Fannie Mae, The Gund Foundation, Local Initiatives Support Corporation and the David and Lucille Packard Foundation.

²⁸ www.livablecommunities.gov/toolsandresources/ic_protection.htm.

²⁹ Maryland Office of Planning, “Smart Growth and Neighborhood Conversation.”

³⁰ www.fundersnetwork.org

The emphasis on Smart Growth affords CDCs interesting opportunities to receive additional funds for the work they currently do or to broaden their mission to include a more regional focus.

TABLE I. CDCs and the Smart Growth Agenda: Common Concerns and Potential Solutions

Common Cause of Concern	Potential Smart-Growth Solution	Potential Pitfalls
Concentration of poverty	Provision of affordable housing throughout region, not just in urban areas already characterized by high levels of affordable housing. Redirection of resources back into city leading to greater mixture of incomes.	If affordable housing is not component of Smart Growth agenda, taking land off the table could make “medicine” of gentrification worse than “disease” of concentrated poverty.
Population out-migration leading to destabilization of neighborhoods	Regional cooperation creates less need for suburban areas to compete with one another for residents, and thus slows sprawl. Slower growth mechanisms could potentially redirect people and resources back into urban areas.	If regional cooperation is not a component of Smart Growth, NIMBY-ism in suburban areas in the name of Smart Growth could exacerbate problems of affordability by further driving up housing costs. Success could also lead to diffusion of hard-won political power.
Difficulty accessing job opportunities in suburban parts of region	Different transportation modes are encouraged, making it easier for low-income individuals without automobiles to access job opportunities in other parts of the region.	Doesn’t address core problem of job decentralization coupled with lack of jobs in urban areas for those without high-tech skills. Could potentially exacerbate sprawl.
Lack of job opportunities in urban areas	Redevelopment of brownfields is encouraged. Mixed-use development leads to creation of job opportunities more evenly throughout region.	Development could potentially create limited opportunity for low-income residents of urban areas.
Lack of safe space for recreation	Promote the creation and preservation of greenspaces throughout the region. High use (as result of higher densities) potentially results in greater levels of safety.	If not coupled with higher-density production, taking land off development table potentially jeopardizes affordability.
Low tax base from which to draw in order to fund municipal services	Some components of the Smart Growth agenda include regional tax base-sharing initiatives. Redirection of resources back to urban centers increases the tax base. “Self-fulfilling” cycle of investment: Better-funded schools attract investment, which lends itself to better-funded schools, etc.	Potential problem with low-income homeowners being priced out of homes on basis of rise in property values.

COALITION-BUILDING AND ADVOCACY

What are the examples of the “New Politics” defined by cooperation between community development interests and Smart Growth advocates? No better example of successful regional cooperation exists than that evinced by the metropolitan region of Portland, Oregon. In 1973, under pressures from farming and environmental interests,³¹ the Oregon state legislature voted to adopt Senate Bill 100. Senate Bill 100 codified a series of requirements for local governments, including the encouragement of:

1. urban development within Urban Growth Boundaries (UGB);
2. the availability of affordable housing for all income groups;
3. the promotion of a variety of residential densities and housing types;
4. the preservation of the existing housing stock; and
5. continued economic growth, particularly for unemployed and disadvantaged persons.

In addition, Senate Bill 100 included environmental clauses pertaining the preservation of open space, the protection and conservation of wildlife and their habitats, and the protection of air and water quality.³²

Throughout Oregon, these local efforts are typically coordinated at the county-jurisdiction level. The exception to this rule is Portland, home of Metro, the nation’s only elected regional government. What makes Metro particularly distinctive is that the authority of its bark rests on the power of its bite. In addition to fulfilling its responsibility for regional land-use planning, Metro has also been charged with creating a 50-year growth plan, including the Metro Region 2040 Growth Concept and the Regional Framework Plan.

How have CDCs and other Smart Growth advocates come together to influence policy decisions made by Metro? The Coalition for a Livable Future (CLF) was formed approximately six years ago to affect the direction of the Growth Concept, the Regional Framework Plan and the future of growth in the Portland Metropolitan Region. Comprised of “land-use, affordable-housing, conservation, transit, social justice, and inner-city development advocates,” CLF put together a “detailed set of proposed amendments to the Metro Region 2040 Growth Concept.”³³ Of the proposed amendments, a number were included in the plan. Among them: “a formal recognition that affordable housing is an issue of regional concern; fair-

³¹ Rusk, David, *Inside Game, Outside Game*, Washington D.C., Brookings Institution Press, 1999, page 157.

³² *Ibid*, page 157.

share housing mandates for each local-jurisdiction; policies that support inclusionary zoning; provisions to address affordable-housing needs when reviewing the region's urban-growth boundary; creation of the Affordable Housing Technical Advisory Group as a formalized process of addressing affordable-housing issues over the medium- to long-term; and a commitment by Metro to monitor the region's economic vitality."³⁴

CLF has been successful for a number of reasons. First, "the coalition's broad representation uniquely positions it to influence public policy." A cursory look at the member-organizations of CLF confirms its diverse nature. CLF includes the American Institute of Architects, Portland Chapter; Community Alliance of Tenants Community Development Network; Hillsdale Neighborhood Association; Housing Partners Inc.; Jobs With Justice; the Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission; the Willamette Pedestrian Coalition; and the Bicycle Transportation Alliance (See Appendix IV). Second, the development of a long-range regional growth plan under the auspices of a regional government has presented a concrete opportunity for CLF to advocate for its collective interests. Third, the manner in which the coalition is organized lends itself to active participation in regional policy: CLF is broken down by topic into working groups, such as the Regional Affordable Housing Advocates (RAHA), which "consists of individuals interested in the housing crisis facing the Portland region," the Economic Vitality Working Group, and the Urban Design Working Group.³⁵ These working groups hash out questions and policy recommendations and then meet with each another to ensure that their questions and policy recommendations do not overlap. Comments are then presented to Metro committees. In addition, some members of the CLF also sit on the Metro committees.³⁶

What is the nature of CDC participation in CLF? CDCs are represented in CLF both independently and through a coalition of Portland CDCs, called the Community Development Network. "CDCs perform the

³³ www.clfuture.com.

³⁴ PolicyLink, "Community Based Initiatives Promoting Regional Equity: Profiles of Innovative Programs from Across the Country," pages 18-19.

³⁵ www.clfuture.com. Note: This list is not exhaustive.

role of affordable-housing advocacy³⁷ within the coalition by participating in the working groups focused on affordable-housing issues. CLF helps CDCs deal with the strains on capacity engendered by such participation, by engaging in joint grant-writing projects. As a result of this funding, CDC staff are freed to participate in the larger policy discussion and engage in critical policy research.

What broader lessons might be drawn from the relationship between CDCs, CLF and Portland's Metro government? First, successful coalitions demand coordination among parties, a strong commitment to common values, and trust among members of the coalition. Secondly, successful coalitions focus on windows of opportunity in the larger policy world: to affect the outcome of a certain decision, to rally for the defeat of a common enemy, or to participate in an ongoing discussion at the policy table. Finally, potential causes for failure must also be evaluated, such as issues of capacity and power.

Coordination, Commitment, and Trust

Ronald Ferguson, editor of *Urban Problems and Community Development*, deals directly with the issue of coalition-building and community development in the final chapter of that text. He notes that "trust is a factor at every stage of alliance development. Several dimensions of trust are worth distinguishing. Each becomes increasingly resolved, toward more trust or less, as alliance members work together, testing and learning about one another."³⁸ He describes four trust questions, which guide the formation of alliances and center on "motives, competence, dependability, and collegiality." The first is "[c]an I trust that my allies have motives compatible with mine, so that an alliance is likely to serve, not undermine, the interests I represent?"³⁹

This question is particularly instructive for an analysis of coalition formation between CDCs and Smart Growth advocates. One scholar has suggested that CDCs tend to build allies in a "most-comfortable" to

³⁶ Phone interview with Teresa Huntsinger, Assistant Coordinator of CLF, August 23, 2000.

³⁷ Phone interview with Teresa Huntsinger, see footnote 37.

³⁸ Ferguson, Ronald F. and Dickens, William T., *Urban Problems and Community Development*. Brookings Institution Press, Washington, DC, page 592.

³⁹ Ibid.

“least-comfortable” continuum⁴⁰ (see Table II). This continuum begins with coalitions with other CDCs and community-based organizations, state trade associations (such as MACDC in Massachusetts) and local intermediaries (such as ANDP in Atlanta).⁴¹ Secondary relationships may be formed with funding institutions, both nationally and locally.⁴² Smart Growth affords CDCs an opportunity to build new alliances as well. As with CLF, CDCs can form potentially powerful contacts with groups, such as environmentalists and historic preservationists, with an eye on achieving common goals. Additionally CDCs can look to organizations doing similar work in suburban areas in order to build regional coalitions. Examples in the Boston area include Jewish Housing for the Elderly, Newton Community Housing Foundation, and the Metro Boston Housing Partnership.⁴³

⁴⁰ Phone interview with Jim Stockard, Curator of the Loeb Fellowship, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University.

⁴¹ ANDP’s Smart Growth Equity Summit, held in April 4, 2000, is an example of a local intermediary tackling Smart Growth.

⁴² “Fundlers’ Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities,” Translation Paper Number One, December 1999. An example of a funder becoming involved in coalition-building is The Greater Cincinnati Foundation, which has provided funding for the Metropolitan Growth Alliance (MGA). MGA has “set out to be a catalyst in uniting the 13-county, tri-state area into a more-cohesive metro center.” The Metropolitan Growth Alliance seeks to bring together “people who should be talking to one another” about regional issues, such as business interests, environmentalists and community activists, drawing from the position that “in terms of revitalization of urban core, CDCs are absolutely key.” Source: Phone interview with Jan Rubens, Program Associate for the Metropolitan Growth Alliance, August 23, 2000.

⁴³ Phone interview, Jim Stockard, Curator of the Loeb Fellowship, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University.

Table II. Potential Smart Growth Allies for CDCs: Coalition-Building and Advocacy
(Most-Comfortable to Least-Comfortable Continuum)

Potential Ally	Points of Commonality	Points of Contention
Other CDCs and CBOs	Similar mission, organizational structure, history of collaboration, shared network.	Turf wars over resources.
Local, Statewide and National Intermediaries and Trade Organizations	Shared focus on community development interests. History of supportive relationship, point of contact for larger networks.	Different vantage point may lead to desire to focus on different solutions.
Labor Interests	Shared focus on needs of low- to moderate-income individuals. Affordable-housing issues.	Focus on interest of union members may run contrary to other community-based interests, needs of region.
Faith-Based Organizations	Shared focus on community development interests. Common community-based perspective.	Faith-based organizations may not necessarily be focused on issues.
Foundations and Philanthropic Institutions	Shared interest in community development. May provide necessary capital to allow CDCs to broaden mission.	Additional funding stream has potential to alter mission of organization, steer away from core competency.
Nonprofit Affordable Housing Producers in Suburbs	Similar organizational mission, potential to cross jurisdictional boundaries in order to work for common goal of regional affordable housing.	Lack of historic collaboration.
Local Government Agencies	Complementary interests (housing and economic development in locality, redirection of resources back to older parts of region).	Difficulty in working with complex bureaucracy in order to effect change. Potential difference in goals.
Environmental Groups	Potential complementary interests (preservation of green-space, sustainable neighborhoods, focus on mass transit over auto transit).	Potential conflict of interest if taking land off the table for development leads to a reduction in affordable housing.
Historic Preservationists	Potentially complementary interests (preservation and reinvestment in older parts of the region, including areas where CDCs operate).	Potential conflict of interest if historic preservation efforts are undertaken without regard to affordability considerations.
Business Interests	Potentially complementary interests (regional economic health, investment in neighborhoods with untapped market potential).	Dependent on whether community interests are at heart.

Windows of Opportunity

The success of coalitions between CDCs and Smart Growth advocates centers around the opening of windows of opportunity in the policy debate. CLF's success stems in part from the initial opportunity to affect regional growth patterns through Metro's 2040 Regional Growth Plan. While the political environment in Portland is particularly conducive to activism around regional issues, other examples exist as well. Windows of opportunity might open around the creation of a new public entity with broad regional powers (such as the Georgia Regional Transportation Authority), or the advancement of legislation with potential impact on the regional production of affordable housing (such as the Community Preservation Act). (See highlighted sections on GRTA, CPA below.) Allying around a new opportunity or against a new enemy provides "single-issue motivators" (or a succession of single-issue motivators) around which CDCs and Smart Growth advocates alike can organize.⁴⁴ In this way the intersection between Smart Growth and community-development advocacy becomes focused on action and not simply another point around which CDCs must play the "meet-and-greet" game.⁴⁵

The Georgia Regional Transportation Authority Atlanta, Georgia

Due to the Atlanta's failure to comply with federal air-quality standards, the federal government cut off transportation funding for the development of new highways in the 13-county region. The Georgia Regional Transportation Authority was created in response to the federal government's decision, largely to facilitate regional cooperation around growth issues, particularly as they pertain to transportation development. Unlike the Atlanta Regional Council (ARC), GRTA enjoys relatively broad authority. GRTA board approval is not only required for regional land-transportation plans, but also for "major developments that affect the transportation system"⁴⁶ in the Metro Atlanta region.

Currently only one CDC is represented on GRTA's policy board.⁴⁷ However, given that GRTA approval is required for major developments affecting the transportation system, the potential for redirecting resources back to older parts of the region abounds.

⁴⁴ This idea was raised during a meeting of the Community Revitalization and Business Planning Practice Group, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, July 11, 2000.

⁴⁵ Many executive directors expressed concern that "advocacy" efforts would devolve into elaborate displays of lip service, involving nothing more than attendance at yet another series of meetings.

⁴⁶ www.grta.org.

⁴⁷ Interview with Mtaminika Youngblood.

**The Community Preservation Act
Boston, Massachusetts**

The CPA represents an example of legislation around which affordable-housing, open-space preservation and historic-preservation interests have mobilized. The CPA would allow communities to create a dedicated funding source for open space, historic preservation and affordable housing with 10 percent set aside for each use. The CPA would be funded via a surcharge of up to 3 percent of the real-property tax levy. There would also be a fund established to match (at a certain rate) the funds raised by municipalities that adopt the CPA. Money for the fund would come from an additional \$20 fee on all recorded documents at the registry of deeds, and every entry, filing and registration with the Land Court. The fee is expected to generate approximately \$30 million annually.”⁴⁸

Numerous housing-advocacy groups have heavily supported this bill, including the Citizens’ Housing and Planning Association (CHAPA), MAHA , and the Massachusetts Association of Community Development Corporation.⁴⁹ Their support comes in part because they are concerned about preserving the affordable-housing aspect of the bill. “If we’re not at the table, this (CPA legislation) will be a complete loser for us.”⁵⁰ Community development support is, therefore, critical for maintaining the equity component of Smart Growth legislation.

Barriers to Involvement: Capacity

The largest barrier from an organizational perspective to CDC involvement in Smart Growth policy work is that of limited CDC organizational capacity. CDCs have expressed this in a number of ways. Sandy Salzman of New Kensington CDC in Philadelphia states: “We would love to partner with other CDCs to do some political work, but we have no time to do this.” While André Reynolds of Neighborhood Housing Services of Cleveland would “love to touch the issue” of sprawl and Smart Growth, he feels there is “only so much you can do well.” Time spent on policy issues may be seen as an “extra” within the context of the organization. While CDCs currently devote time to policy issues, they do so often in an effort to garner more resources for their organization and/or as a labor of love, aligned with the goals of the organization but tangential to its successful functioning. There may be creative ways of getting around the issue of capacity. As stated previously, CLF in Portland was able to work around the capacity barrier by grant-writing designed to provide CDC staff with the flexibility to participate in larger policy discussions.

⁴⁸ Sharon Anderson, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, 2000.

⁴⁹ Phone interview with Chris Norris, CHAPA, July 18, 2000.

⁵⁰ Phone interview with Joe Kreisberg, MACDC, August 7, 2000.

As Bruce Katz of the Brookings Institution notes, CDCs at the regional table are those who “have been doing the deals for years: the mature CDCs.”⁵¹ This sentiment has been echoed by others in the community-development field. When asked what the common characteristics were of CDCs with the potential to affect the regional dialogue, one executive director responded: “one, size; two, already politically active; three, tied to statewide advocacy organizations; four, well-established; five, managed by good planners.”⁵² These characteristics describe CDCs possessing long-standing relationships with other members of the nonprofit, development and political communities that make them likely candidates for inclusion in the discussion. Large, well established CDCs and CBOs, such as Bridge in the Bay Area, Self-Help in North Carolina, and the Reinvestment Fund in the Delaware Valley, are particularly well positioned to grapple with the dual roles of bricks-and-mortar development and advocacy.

Barriers to Involvement: Power

Given that Smart Growth advocates are tailoring their policy message to the state and/or national level, CDCs are almost always not the first stakeholders to which they turn when seeking to create powerful coalitions. Cities themselves often lack the political power necessary to influence regional dynamics (this political trend is only exacerbated by urban population loss to suburban and ex-urban areas), and must look to form broad-based coalitions in order to alter policy at the state level. As Bruce Katz states, “The threshold question [regarding the relationship of CDCs to larger policy questions such as Smart Growth] is: Do CDCs matter?” This, he asserts, is “a pure question about power.” Other scholars have acknowledged the importance of thinking critically about the dynamics of power within a regional context,⁵³ but have noted that relatively little systematic research has been conducted on the deconcentration of political power relative to the amount of existing research on the demographic shifts in employment and population. Writes Margaret Weir, “We know much less about what determines the way low-income communities fit into regional configurations of power (relative to what we know about regional demographics); indeed we have no frameworks for conceptualizing how power and cross-boundary linkages are organized in different regions.”⁵⁴ For this reason, examples of successful coalitions between CDCs and Smart Growth advocates, such as CLF, are so important for gaining a clearer understanding of how such cross-boundary linkages might be formed.

⁵¹ Phone interview with Bruce Katz, August 4, 2000.

⁵² Interview with Michael Gabriel, June 23, 2000.

⁵³ See *Urban Problems and Community Development*, pages 587-589.

⁵⁴ Weir, Margaret from *Urban Problems and Community Development*.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT: LEADING THE WAY BY EXAMPLE

While coalition-building and advocacy are strategies by which CDCs might access the larger policy discussion around Smart Growth, their bread and butter remains housing and commercial real-estate development. As the Smart Growth agenda continues to gain momentum, and the ties between older urban neighborhoods and the health of a region as a whole become more explicit, some CDCs potentially have an important role to play. They can be exemplars of “Smart Growth” development, characterized by mixed-income, mixed-use development close to public-transportation nodes in relatively dense parts of the region. CDCs bring a number of competitive advantages to the table as potential implementers of Smart Growth in neighborhoods, including:

- Experience doing infill development in areas where the regulations governing such development may be arcane;
- Flexibility in the types of projects they chose to pursue, as well as how they chose to pursue these projects; and
- Flexibility in whom they chose to partner with in order to pursue projects, even if such partnerships cross jurisdictional lines.

Large, mature CDCs and other community-development groups are already playing to some of these competitive advantages and providing examples of Smart Growth production with regional repercussions.

Bridge Housing Corporation of San Francisco, for example, is currently heralded “as a model for implementing the most cutting-edge Smart Growth strategies,” a tactic that is considered by most planning experts to be the key to successfully addressing California’s current and future challenges. For this reason, Bridging the Gap⁵⁵ has been endorsed by U.S. Sen. Dianne Feinstein, California Treasurer Philip Angelides, and Oakland Mayor Jerry Brown, as well as business and community leaders.”⁵⁶

Bridging the Gap seeks to act as “a positive spiral effect – more quality and affordable housing for workers close to jobs, stable neighborhoods and a better-trained and -qualified work force.”⁵⁷

⁵⁵ Bridge’s recently unveiled large-scale mixed-use development program.

⁵⁶ “Bridge Housing Unveils \$20-Million Program To Rebuild California Communities,” April 24, 2000, as cited from <http://bridgehousing.com/misc/rebuild.html>.

While Bridge serves as an example of Smart Growth implementation, the work of some CDCs may actually detract from Smart Growth aims. Bruce Katz of the Brookings Institution states, “On the production side, CDCs need to think about what they do. Is it contributing to sprawl by creating push factors?” He cautions that CDCs “need to worry about whether [their] own activity is somehow undermining the city’s vitality.” Jeremy Nowak, executive director of the Reinvestment Fund, echoes this notion when he writes that “neighborhood-development strategies can reinforce the segregation of the poor by building housing in the worst employment markets.”⁵⁸

How might CDCs incorporate Smart Growth into the work they do? What are some issues CDCs should be keeping in mind as they seek to both provide affordable housing and also strengthen and revitalize neighborhoods? As Table III (next page) demonstrates, there are a number ways in which CDCs might consider Smart Growth. In thinking about the needs of a neighborhood comprehensively, CDCs might consider the ways in which different organizational activities complement and strengthen each other, such as housing production combined with commercial development in close proximity to an existing public-transportation node; or commercial development, designed to attract business investment, combined with workforce development, geared towards enabling residents to benefit from business location; or the creation and maintenance of green space in neighborhoods as a “pull factor,” designed to stabilize population in a declining neighborhood.⁵⁹

While Bridge serves as a large-scale, nationally recognized example of Smart Growth production, numerous other examples exist as well. They include the New Kensington Community Development Corporation of Philadelphia, for its preservation and promotion of green space as a revitalization strategy;

⁵⁷ Carol Galante, executive director of Bridge, as quoted in “Bridge Housing Unveils \$20-Million Program To Rebuild California Communities,” <http://www.bridgehousing.com>.

⁵⁸ Nowak, Jeremy, “Neighborhood Initiative and the Regional Economy,” *Economic Development Quarterly*, vol. 11, no.1.

⁵⁹ I am again indebted to my conversations with Charles Buki for my understanding of “push” and “pull” factors as a means of analyzing neighborhood dynamics.

Table III. Smart Growth Examples for CDCs To Consider When Evaluating Activities

CDC Activity ⁶⁰	Smart Growth Example
<p>Housing Development Including: Rehabilitation New Construction Management of Units Home-ownership Counseling Home Repair Home-Purchase Loans/Grants Home-Rehab Loans/Grants</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mixed-income development that creates pull factors for future investment in neighborhoods suffering from disinvestment • Provision of affordable housing in suburban locations in order to link low-income individuals to job opportunities • Housing development in combination with access to services, amenities and transportation options that cross regional boundaries
<p>Commercial Real Estate Development Including: Retail/Office Rehab Retail/Office New Construction Retail/Office Area Improvements</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Commercial real-estate development in conjunction with housing development • Development around existing modes of public transportation • Development geared towards providing job opportunities in neighborhood
<p>Business Enterprise Development Including: Technical Assistance/Counseling Business Ownership</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economic development propelling further investment in neighborhood • Economic development tied to housing and workforce development in neighborhood, also tied to economic drivers in the region
<p>Job Training /Placement Including: Workforce Development</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Partnerships with local high school, colleges, universities in order to help residents gain access to skills necessary to compete in regional economy • Addressing transportation issues of neighborhood residents seeking to access employment in other parts of the region
<p>Planning Research Including: Strategic Planning Garnering Feedback from Neighborhood</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Taking regional employment opportunities into account • Partnering/thinking with other groups and organizations to provide mixture of services that increases total impact on an area • Considering expanding activities to address total neighborhood concerns (converting vacant lots to gardens, etc.) and making neighborhoods competitive with suburbs
<p>Advocacy For Affordable Housing For Increased Resources For Neighborhood Interests</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Engaging regional partners around neighborhood issues • Advocating for affordable housing throughout region, “fair-share” policies, etc. (see section on coalition-building above)

The Unity Council of Oakland, California, for its development around an existing mass-transportation node; and Gwinnett County Research Partnership of Norcross, Georgia, a NeighborWorks[®]

organization, for its provision of affordable-housing services in suburban Atlanta (each is highlighted below). It should be noted that many other CDCs incorporate aspects of Smart Growth into the work they do. At the time of writing, the National Neighborhood Coalition (NNC) was preparing to release the results of its “Neighborhoods, Regions and Smart Growth Project,” which, in part, detail the work of CDCs and other grassroots organizations in addressing the impacts of sprawl.⁶¹ This project should add significantly to the existing literature on the intersection between CDCs and Smart Growth.

***New Kensington Community Development Corporation, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania
Preservation and Promotion of Urban Green Space as a Revitalization Strategy***

One of the newest members of the NeighborWorks[®] network, The New Kensington CDC (NKCDC) in Northeast Philadelphia serves the two predominantly working-class neighborhoods of New Kensington and Fishtown. As the result of an extensive planning process completed in 1995, the staff of New Kensington found that neighborhood residents were particularly concerned about vacant land, trash and the physical condition of the neighborhood. Reports one staff member, “People were sending their friends on weird routes to come visit so as to avoid having their friends see the trash-strewn lots.”⁶² In response to neighborhood concerns about vacant lots, NKCDC established an open-space management program. Key strategies of the open-space management program include:

- stabilizing large vacant lots,
- conveying sideyards to adjacent homeowners,
- creating community gardens,
- creating a community-garden center, and
- investing in a hydroponic farm.⁶³

⁶⁰ List derived in part from Vidal, Avis, *Rebuilding Communities: A National Study of Urban Community Development Corporations*, New York, Community Development Research Center, New School for Social Research, 1992.

⁶¹ NNC writes, “Numerous community-based organizations are already addressing the environmental, economic, and social impacts of sprawl...NNC has collected an impressive database of these organizations that will be featured in a series of informative reports highlighting their work.” www.neighborhoodcoalition.org.

⁶² Lisa Calvino, director of development and public relations for NKCDC, interview, July 11, 2000.

⁶³ “New Kensington CDC Fact Sheet,” printed pamphlet.

Actually acquiring the vacant properties in order to convert them to sideyards, or even stabilize them by removing trash and planting trees, proved to be a significant challenge. Ultimately NKCDC pressed the city to turn the neighborhood into an urban-renewal domain. The city was highly skeptical of NKCDC being able to rouse community support for such a measure, particularly in light of the contentious nature of urban-renewal projects in the past (such as the construction of I-95 along the eastern side of the neighborhood). However, “people’s awareness of land-use was heightened” and the creation of an urban-renewal domain became the means by which vacant lots were recovered for community use.⁶⁴

As a result of NKCDC’s efforts “more than 350 parcels have been cleaned and greened, 156 lots have been brought into the sideyard program, and 15 trash-strewn vacant lots have been transformed into community gardens.”⁶⁵ A key partnership with the Pennsylvania Horticultural Society’s Philadelphia Green program has facilitated the process of transforming the vacant lots; in addition, the program donated some plants to NKCDC’s Community Garden Center, where neighborhood residents may purchase plants for a small fee.

What Makes It Smart Growth?

The strategies employed by New Kensington CDC are clearly Smart Growth strategies. They have led to the protection of green space in urban areas and also created a “pull factor” that in turn has stabilized the neighborhood. The organization offers anecdotal evidence of success. Prior to the implementation of the program, New Kensington CDC had a very difficult time selling the houses it built or rehabilitated. As of the time of the interview, of the 10 properties the CDC is in process of developing, six have already been sold. As executive director Sandy Salzman reports, “[n]ow we’re able to sell properties for \$50,000 where we couldn’t sell them for \$30,000.”⁶⁶ Furthermore, the open-space program has created an impression among residents that the neighborhood is on the upswing, or, at the very least, not on the downswing.

⁶⁴ Interview, Lisa Calvino and Sandy Salzman, July 11, 2000.

⁶⁵ “New Kensington Community Garden Center, A Brief History,” printed pamphlet.

⁶⁶ Interview, Sandy Salzman, July 11, 2000.

“People are now saying that they’ll ‘wait and see’” what happens in the New Kensington/Fishtown area instead of moving to nearby suburbs.⁶⁷

***The Unity Council, Oakland, California
Transportation and Comprehensive Development***

The Unity Council,⁶⁸ formerly the Spanish Speaking Unity Council, is “one of Fruitvale’s oldest community-based institutions,” and has sought to provide comprehensive services to the residents of its neighborhood. When Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART) proposed to turn a 10-acre lot around an Oakland BART station into a 500-car parking garage, the Unity Council created an alternative plan for development centered around the notion of a “Transit Village.” The Transit Village is inspired in part from the results of a study conducted by the University-Oakland Metropolitan forum,⁶⁹ and the idea took form through a series of community-design charrettes involving local residents and merchants. The community chose to focus development efforts on the incorporation of more housing and services, including those which served the needs of young families and the elderly.⁷⁰

The Transit Village is in part designed to attract visitors (and investment) to the area directly around the station (“we want to give people a sense that they could hang out,” says executive director Arabella Martinez⁷¹), and in part to connect the station to a nearby commercial corridor (formerly East 14th Street, now International Boulevard). The Unity Council invested additional resources in supporting a façade-improvement plan geared towards helping businesses attract customers on International Boulevard. The Transit Village will include a state-of-the-art child-development and health-care facility, a senior center, a library, a community police station, family and senior housing, and new and renovated office space.

⁶⁷ Interview, Lisa Calvino, July 11, 2000.

⁶⁸ The Unity Council is a member of the NeighborWorks® network.

⁶⁹ A collaboration between the University of California, Berkeley, and the city of Oakland.

⁷⁰ Web site of the city of Seattle’s Strategic Planning Office, Transit-Oriented Development Case Studies, www.cityofseattle.net/planning/todstudy.

⁷¹ Phone interview, August 3, 2000.

The creation of the Transit Village is particularly exciting as an example of a CDC engaging a wide range of partners and actors including BART, the Metropolitan Transportation Commission, La Clinica de la Raza, the city of Oakland, the Department of Transportation, the EPA, merchants and residents of the area, and 16 community groups.

What Makes It Smart Growth?

The Fruitvale Transit Plaza has structured its development around existing transportation nodes, including the BART station and the AC Transit buses connecting the station to other portions of the East Bay. The Fruitvale Transit Plaza is designed to connect commuters with the weakened commercial corridor along International Boulevard in order to revitalize the neighborhood as a whole. The integration of social services, housing, and commercial development provides a point of economic strength upon which the rest of the area might build.

***Gwinnett Housing Resource Partnership, Norcross, Georgia
Affordable Housing Services in the Suburbs***

Gwinnett Housing Resource Partnership (GHRP), a member of the NeighborWorks[®] network, defines its mission as being to “[p]rovide quality affordable housing to low- and moderate-income people (including the homeless); help strengthen family and community; and promote fair housing and nondiscriminatory practices.” GHRP estimates it served 95,000 people in 1999 through its various programs, including:

- Emergency Shelter;
- Homelessness Prevention Assistance;
- Supportive Transitional Housing with Case Management;
- Home-Stretch Down-Payment Assistance;
- Individual Development Accounts (IDAs) for Home Ownership;
- Homebuyer Education and Counseling;
- Spanish Homebuyer Education; and
- Housing Counseling (homeless, rental, mortgage-default prevention, reverse mortgages).

GHRP also has active relationships with a number of organizations to whom it refers clients. These organizations are clustered into seven main categories: emergency and transitional housing; permanent

housing, financial assistance (rent, utilities, deposits) and referrals; health services; basic necessities; legal and fair-housing assistance; and employment and job training.⁷² While GHRP might refer a client to Gwinnett Technical Institute for job-training needs, other organizations might refer individuals back to GHRP for housing services.

Part of what makes GHRP unique is the political savvy of its executive director, Marina Sampanes Peed. Peed has done an excellent job of “putting a different face on who needs affordable housing,” in order to garner necessary resources and support for her efforts. One of her educational tools includes a sample profile of “A Typical ‘Affordable-Housing’ Customer” by the name of “Wirka Z. Buthoff.” The “customer” is a “single parent with a school-age child and a toddler. Parent works full-time; toddler in day care; school-age child is in “latch-key” environment. Divorced with consumer debt from marriage, limited family/emotional support. Parent has two-year degree from vocational school.” The “customer,” with whom most suburban dwellers can sympathize, is in need of affordable-housing services.

What Makes It Smart Growth?

GHRP’s capacity to provide affordable-housing services in suburban Atlanta is bolstered by its numerous partnerships with organizations located both in Gwinnett County as well as in other parts of the region. They include the Gwinnett Economic Opportunity Authority (EOA), the Gwinnett Coalition for Health and Human Services, the Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership (ANDP), the Enterprise Foundation and Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation. GHRP is an example of an organization playing an increasingly important role in the context of Smart Growth — that of a suburban nonprofit housing producer and advocate with ties to comparable urban organizations and political savvy in dealing with local suburban governments.

NKCDC, The Unity Council and GHRP provide brief portraits of the ways in which CDCs are currently engaging with new partners and new ideas that provide concrete examples of Smart Growth in a variety

⁷² “Gwinnett Housing Resource Partnership Inter Agency Relationships,” pamphlet, October 2000

of contexts. While square footage of housing and commercial space developed by such organizations may be low compared to for-profit entities, NKCDC, The Unity Council and GHRP all have much to contribute to a dialogue around regional issues. They can speak from experience about the roles their organizations play in promoting regional health.

RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Many aspects of the intersection between Smart Growth and community development have yet to be explored. While some organizations have begun to identify examples of CDCs working in concert with Smart Growth advocates in order to effect change (most notably PolicyLink and the National Neighborhood Coalition), little systematic research is currently available on the topic. A number of important research questions require additional exploration, including:

- **What types of funding mechanisms might be drawn upon to finance Smart Growth production by CDCs and CBOs?**

One of the main barriers preventing CDCs from adopting the Smart Growth agenda from both organizational and policy perspectives is the lack of funding available for such efforts. Research that both identifies current sources of funding for Smart Growth development projects as well as describes ways in which funding streams might be made more flexible and thus to allow CDCs to pursue more wide-ranging efforts would be extremely helpful.

- **How might CDCs draw upon existing legislation to pursue Smart Growth aims?**

Much Smart Growth legislation already appears on the books that CDCs could potentially use to greater advantage. A recent NCCED paper on the manner in which CDCs might draw upon existing legislation regarding the clean-up of brownfields is an example of research linking changes in legislation to the pursuit of Smart Growth aims by CDCs. A need exists for research that identifies the ways in which CDCs might draw upon existing legislation to promote Smart Growth ends.

- **How might CDCs position themselves to deal with some of the unintended consequences of Smart Growth legislation?**

The Smart Growth agenda has the potential to affect the dynamics of population and job growth in a region. These effects are largely positive: the redirection of resources back into older parts of the region, population growth in cities as well as in suburban locations at higher densities, and the stabilization of mixed-income communities throughout the region. While some research has been

done on the effects of gentrification and displacement on neighborhoods,⁷³ it has focused on ways in which CDCs might preserve affordable housing for long-term residents in neighborhoods transitioning from soft to hot. An additional need exists for research on the ways in which CDCs might deal with the potential “community clashes” on social and political levels between existing residents and those seeking to invest in older neighborhoods.⁷⁴

⁷³See work by PolicyLink and ANDP.

⁷⁴ See Elijah Anderson’s *Streetwise*, 1990, for an excellent portrayal of the ways in which communities clash around contested urban space. The role that CDCs might potentially play in mitigating such a clash has been left largely unexplored by the existing literature.

CONCLUSION

An exploration of the relationship between community development and Smart Growth provides a glimpse into the way grassroots, community-based interests and regionally focused advocacy complement one another. Some CDCs have much to add to the Smart Growth debate, bringing to the table an understanding of neighborhoods and experience with Smart Growth production. The potential abounds for more CDCs to enter into the debate. The Smart Growth agenda not only offers CDCs an opportunity to reassess the work they do, it also supplies a venue to address the large-scale problems of population and job deconcentration by partnering with a wide range of regional stakeholders. By operating in conjunction with one another, CDCs and Smart Growth advocates together possess the potential to alter regional dynamics in ways that facilitate the rebirth of cities, not simply their rebuilding.

APPENDIX I: METROPOLITAN POPULATION GROWTH 1970-1998⁷⁵

Metropolitan Area	1970-1980	1980-1990	1990-1998	1970-1998
Atlanta, Georgia				
City	-14.5%	-7.3%	2.5%	-18.8%
Suburbs	42.8%	41.9%	30.3%	163.9%
Baltimore, Maryland				
City	-13.1%	-6.5%	-12.3%	-28.7%
Suburbs	19.7%	16.8%	11.9%	56.4%
Burlington, Vermont				
City	-2.4%	3.8%	-1.7%	0.5%
Suburbs	22.9%	17.8%	12.2%	62.4%
Cincinnati, Ohio				
City	-14.8%	-5.6%	-7.6%	-25.7%
Suburbs	9.6%	7.4%	10.3%	29.8%
Denver, Colorado				
City	-4.3%	-5.0%	6.7%	-3.0%
Suburbs	58.9%	23.4%	24.6%	144.3%
New York, New York				
City	-10.4%	3.5%	1.3%	-6.0%
Suburbs	2.3%	1.7%	4.0%	8.1%
Oakland, California				
City	-6.2%	9.7%	-1.7%	1.2%
Suburbs	16.0%	22.0%	15.3%	63.2%
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania				
City	-13.4%	-6.1%	-9.4%	-26.3%
Suburbs	6.4%	8.0%	5.5%	21.2%
Portland, Oregon				
City	-4.1%	19.4%	15.2%	32.0%
Suburbs	41.4%	11.6%	20.3%	89.9%
Providence, Rhode Island				
City	-12.50%	2.50%	-6.10%	-15.80%
Suburbs	9.30%	8.80%	1.20%	20.40%
Rochester, New York				
City	-18.4%	-4.2%	-6.4%	-26.8%
Suburbs	9.0%	5.3%	4.1%	19.5%
Salt Lake City, Utah				
City	-7.3%	-1.9%	9.0%	-0.8%
Suburbs	56.4%	24.4%	21.0%	135.5%

⁷⁵ *Source: SOCDs 1970, 1980, and 1990 Decennial Census, 1998 Federal State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau. Please note that population estimates from census to census do not take into account the fact that the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) definitions for regions change from census to census.

APPENDIX II: DECONCENTRATION OF JOBS, 1980-1990⁷⁶
PERCENT OF TOTAL REGIONAL JOBS, CITY VERSUS SUBURBS

	% of Total Jobs Located in City	% of Total Jobs Located in Suburbs	Suburban – City
Atlanta, Georgia			
1980	35.0%	64.9%	29.9%
1990	25.4%	74.5%	49.1%
Increase in % Suburban			19.2%
Baltimore, Maryland			
1980	46.2%	51.1%	4.9%
1990	34.9%	62.3%	27.4%
Increase in % Suburban			22.5%
Burlington, Vermont			
1980	44.1%	55.9%	11.8%
1990	33.8%	66.2%	32.4%
Increase in % Suburban			20.6%
Cincinnati, Ohio			
1980	44.2%	55.8%	11.6%
1990	37.6%	62.4%	24.8%
Increase in % Suburban			13.2%
Denver, Colorado			
1980	54.6%	45.4%	-9.2%
1990	43.9%	56.0%	12.1%
Increase in % Suburban			21.3%
Oakland, California			
1980	25.6%	62.0%	36.4%
1990	18.4%	69.6%	51.2%
Increase in % Suburban			14.8%
Philadelphia, Penn.			
1980	39.1%	58.9%	19.8%
1990	33.8%	64.5%	30.7%
Increase in % Suburban			10.9%
Portland, Oregon			
1980	50.1%	45.2%	-4.9%
1990	43.6%	47.9%	4.3%
Increase in % Suburban			9.2%
Providence, Rhode Island			
1980	29.4%	24.1%	-5.3%
1990	23.0%	44.7%	21.7%
Increase in % Suburban			27.0%
Rochester, New York			
1980	45.5%	54.5%	9.0%
1990	37.9%	62.1%	24.2%
Increase in % Suburban			15.2%
Salt Lake City, Utah			
1980	46.5%	43.4%	-3.1%
1990	38.4%	46.2%	7.8%
Increase in % Suburban			10.9%

⁷⁶ Source: SOCDs 1970, 1980, and 1990 Decennial Census, 1998 Federal State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau. Please note that population estimates from census to census do not take into account the fact that the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) definitions for regions change from census to census.

APPENDIX III: PERCENT POVERTY RATE, CITY VERSUS SUBURBS⁷⁷

	Poverty Rate (Percent)				
	1969	1979	1989	1993 (Est.)	1995 (Est.)
Atlanta, Georgia					
City	19.8%	27.5%	27.3%	35.6%	33.6%
Suburbs	10.1%	9.1%	7.6%	10.3%	9.4%
MSA	12.8%	12.5%	10.1%	13.4%	12.1%
Baltimore, Maryland					
City	18.0%	22.9%	21.9%	25.7%	24.0%
Suburbs	5.6%	5.5%	4.7%	6.3%	5.4%
MSA	11.1%	11.9%	10.1%	12.0%	10.6%
Burlington, Vermont					
City	11.8%	16.2%	19.3%	20.9%	17.6%
Suburbs	8.3%	8.8%	5.5%	6.7%	5.6%
MSA	9.5%	10.7%	8.8%	10.2%	8.5%
Cincinnati, Ohio					
City	17.1%	19.7%	24.3%	26.7%	21.9%
Suburbs	7.7%	7.3%	7.7%	8.7%	7.2%
MSA	10.7%	10.5%	11.6%	12.8%	10.4%
Denver, Colorado					
City	13.5%	13.7%	17.1%	18.0%	17.0%
Suburbs	5.9%	5.4%	6.8%	7.7%	6.4%
MSA	9.4%	8.2%	9.7%	10.5%	9.2%
Oakland, California					
City	16.2%	18.5%	18.8%	22.4%	21.1%
Suburbs	6.8%	6.8%	6.6%	8.0%	7.1%
MSA	9.9%	9.9%	9.3%	11.0%	9.9%
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania					
City	15.1%	20.6%	20.3%	26.5%	23.8%
Suburbs	5.8%	6.4%	4.9%	6.7%	6.0%
MSA	9.8%	12.0%	10.4%	13.6%	11.9%
Portland, Oregon					
City	12.6%	13.0%	14.5%	15.9%	14.5%
Suburbs	8.0%	7.2%	7.6%	8.9%	7.8%
MSA	9.7%	9.0%	9.9%	11.2%	9.9%
Providence, Rhode Island					
City	18.0%	20.4%	23.0%	29.5%	27.9%
Suburbs	7.7%	7.0%	6.0%	7.8%	7.2%
MSA	10.3%	10.1%	9.5%	12.4%	11.5%
Rochester, New York					
City	12.0%	17.5%	23.5%	27.3%	28.3%
Suburbs	5.3%	6.3%	5.8%	6.9%	6.8%
MSA	7.2%	8.9%	9.6%	11.2%	11.2%
Salt Lake City, Utah					
City	13.9%	14.2%	16.4%	16.4%	15.2%
Suburbs	6.8%	6.3%	7.3%	7.6%	6.5%
MSA	9.4%	8.4%	9.4%	9.9%	8.6%

⁷⁷ Source: SOCDs 1970, 1980, and 1990 Decennial Census, 1998 Federal State Cooperative Program for Population Estimates, U.S. Census Bureau. Please note that population estimates from census to census do not take into account the fact that the Metropolitan Statistical Area (MSA) definitions for regions change from census to census.

**APPENDIX IV: MEMBER ORGANIZATIONS OF
THE COALITION FOR A LIVABLE FUTURE (CLF)**

American Institute of Architects, Portland Chapter
American Society of Landscape Architects
Association of Oregon Rail and Transit Advocates
Audubon Society of Portland
Bicycle Transportation Alliance
CITE, Creative Information Transformation Education
Citizens for Sensible Transportation
Columbia Group Sierra Club
Columbia River Inter-Tribal Fish Commission
Community Action Organization
Community Alliance of Tenants
Community Development Network
Ecumenical Ministries of Oregon
The Enterprise Foundation
Environmental Commission of the Episcopal Diocese of Oregon
Fair Housing Council of Oregon
Fans of Fanno Creek
For the Sake of the Salmon
Friends of Arnold Creek
Friends of Clark County
Friends of Goal Five
Friends of Rock, Bronson and Willow Creeks
Friends of Smith and Bybee Lakes
Friends of Trees
Friends of Tryon Creek State Park
Growing Gardens
Hillsdale Neighborhood Association
Housing Partners, Inc.
Jobs With Justice
The Justice and Peace Commission of St. Ignatius Catholic Church
Keepers of the Waters
League of Women Voters of the Columbia River Region
Livable Oregon
Multnomah County Community Action Commission
Network Behavioral HealthCare, Inc.
Northwest Housing Alternatives
1000 Friends of Oregon
Oregon Council of Trout Unlimited
Oregon Environmental Council
Oregon Food Bank
Oregon Sustainable Agriculture Land Trust
Portland Citizens for Oregon Schools
Portland Community Design
Portland Housing Center
Portland Impact
REACH Community Development Corporation
ROSE Community Development Corporation
Sisters of the Road Cafe
Sunnyside United Methodist Church
Sustainable Communities Northwest
Tualatin Riverkeepers
Tualatin Valley Housing Partners
The Urban League of Portland
The Wetlands Conservancy
Willamette Pedestrian Coalition
Woodlawn Neighborhood Association

APPENDIX V: CONTACT INFORMATION FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT CORPORATIONS INTERVIEWED

Atlanta Neighborhood Development Corporation

Hattie Dorsey, Executive Director
34 Peachtree Street, N.W., Suite 1700
Atlanta, GA 30303
(404) 522-2637

Atlanta Mutual Housing Association

Ron Walker, Executive Director
2788 De Foors Ferry Road, #15F
Atlanta, GA 30318
(404) 355-2642

Burlington Community Land Trust

Brenda Torpy, Executive Director
P.O. Box 523
179 Winooski Avenue
Burlington, VT 05042
(802) 862-6244

Cobb County Housing, Inc.

Chasmin Sokoloski, Acting Executive Director
700 Sandy Plains Road, Suite B-8
Marietta, GA 30066
(770) 429-4400

Gwinnett Housing Resource Partnership

Marina Sampanes Peed, Executive Director
3453 Holcomb Bridge Road, Suite 140
Norcross, GA 30092
(770) 448-0702

The HomeOwnership Center of Greater Cincinnati

Corinne Cahill, Executive Director
1811 Losantiville Road, Suite 220
Cincinnati, OH 45237
(513) 631-8560

Historic District Development Corporation

Mtaminika Youngblood, Executive Director
107 Howell Street
Atlanta, GA 30312
(404) 215-9095

Manna, Inc.

George Rothman, President and CEO
828 Evarts Street, NE
Washington, DC 20018
(202) 832-1845

Neighborhood Housing Services of Baltimore

Michael Braswell, Executive Director
244 North Patterson Park Avenue
Baltimore, MD 21231
(410) 327-1200

New Kensington Community Development Corporation

Sandy Salzman, Executive Director
2515 Frankford Avenue
Philadelphia, PA 19125
(215) 427-0350

Salt Lake Neighborhood Housing Services

Maria Garciaz, Executive Director
622 West 500 North Street
Salt Lake City, UT 84116
(801) 539-1590

Neighborhood Housing Services of Rochester

Karna Gerich Cestero
683 South Avenue
Rochester, NY 14620
(716) 325-4170

The Unity Council

Arabella Martinez, Executive Director
1900 Fruitvale Avenue, Suite 2A
Oakland, CA 9460

SOURCES

Printed Materials (Selected)

- Anderson, Elijah, *Streetwise*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1990.
- Burchell, Robert W, David Listokin and Catherine C. Galley, "Smarty Growth: More than a Ghost of Urban Policy Past, Less than a Bold New Horizon," Fannie Mae Foundation, 1999.
- "Connecting Neighborhood and Region for Smarter Growth." The National Neighborhood Coalition's Neighborhoods, Regions and Smart Growth Project., April 2000.
- Ferguson, Ronald F. and Dickens, William T., eds., *Urban Problems and Community Development*, Washington, D.C., 1999.
- Geotze, Rolf and Colton, Kent. "Dynamics of Cities: A Fresh Approach to Understanding Housing and Neighborhood Change," *AIP Journal*, 1980.
- Jackson, Kenneth T., *Crabgrass Frontier*, New York: Oxford University Press, 1985.
- Jargowsky, Paul A., *Poverty and Place*, New York: Russell Sage Foundation, 1997.
- Joint Center For Housing Studies, *The State of the Nation's Housing*, 1999.
- Joint Center For Housing Studies. *The State of the Nation's Housing*, 2000.
- Katz, Bruce, ed., *Reflections on Regionalism*: Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution Press, 2000.
- Lowry, Joan, "Growth Is a Sprawling Voter Issue," Scripps Howard News Service.
- Nowak, Jeremy, "Neighborhood Initiative and the Regional Economy," *Economic Development Quarterly*, vol. 11, no. 1, 1997.
- Orfield, Myron, *Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*, Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press, 1997.
- McArdle, Nancy, *Outward Bound: The Decentralization of Population and Employment*, Working Paper No. W99-5, Joint Center for Housing Studies, 1999.
- PolicyLink, "Perspectives on Regionalism: Opportunities for Community-Based Organizations to Advance Equity. A Review of Academic and Policy Literature," January 2000.
- PolicyLink, "Briefing Book: Strategies and Examples of Community Based Approaches to Equity and Smart Growth – A Working Document."
- PolicyLink, "Thinkers and Resources For Promoting Equitable Development," March 2000.
- Rusk, David, *Cities Without Suburbs*, Washington, DC: The Woodrow Wilson Center Press, 1995.
- Rusk, David, *Inside Game, Outside Game*, Washington DC: The Brookings Institution Press, 1999.

Vidal, Avis C., *Rebuilding Communities: A National Study of Urban Community Development Corporations*, New York: Community Development Research Center, 1992.

Voith, Richard, "Central City Decline: Regional or Neighborhood Solution?" *Business Review* (Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia), Sept.-Oct. 1992.

Wilson, William Julius, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1987.

Wilson, William Julius, *When Work Disappears*, New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1997.

Internet Sources

Bridge Housing Corporation: www.bridgehousing.com

City of Seattle's Strategic Planning Office, Transit Oriented Development Case Studies:
<http://www.cityofseattle.net/planning/>

Livable Communities Resource Center: www.livablecommunities.gov

National Low Income Housing Coalition: www.nlihc.org

National Neighborhood Coalition: www.neighborhoodcoalition.org

Sprawl Watch Clearinghouse: www.sprawlwatch.org

State of the Cities Dataset: webstage1.aspensys.com/socds/fastlook/fastlook_Home.htm

Urban Land Institute: www.uli.org

Maryland State Department of Planning: op.state.md.us.htm

Interviews

Kevin N. Baynes, Maryland Revitalization Center
Angela Blackwell, PolicyLink
Michael Braswell, Neighborhood Housing Services of Baltimore
Eileen Brumber, Neighborhood Housing Services of Rochester
Corinne Cahill, HomeOwnership Center of Greater Cincinnati
Lisa Calvino, New Kensington Community Development Corporation
David Conine, Salt Lake Neighborhood Housing Services
Elke Davidson, Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership
Michael Gabriel, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Tasha Harmon, Community Development Network
Teresa Huntsinger, Coalition for a Livable Future
Bob Jaquary, Gund Foundation
Bruce Katz, The Brookings Institution
Karen Kollias, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Joe Kriesberg, Massachusetts Association of Community Development Corporations
Ray Kuniansky, Atlanta Neighborhood Development Corporation
Steven Lafferty, Maryland Revitalization Center
Paul F. Malvey, New Kensington Community Development Corporation
Arabella Martinez, The Unity Council
Andrew Michael, Bay Area Council
M. von Nkosi, Atlanta Neighborhood Development Partnership
Chris Norris, Citizens' Housing and Planning Association
David Parish, Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston
Marina Sampanes Peed, Gwinnett Housing Resource Partnership
Bob Reeder, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
George Rothman, Manna Inc.
Jan Rubens, Metropolitan Growth Alliance
Sandy Salzman, New Kensington Community Development Corporation
Chasmin Sokoloski, Cobb County Housing Inc.
Jim Stockard, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University
J. Ronald Terwilliger, Urban Land Institute
Brenda Torpy, Burlington Community Land Trust
Ron Walker, Atlanta Mutual Housing Association
Mtaminika Youngblood, Historic District Development Corporation

Additional Thanks

Kathy Charles, Neighborhood Housing Services of Green Bay
Community Revitalization and Business Planning Practice Group, Neighborhood Reinvestment
Corporation
David Dangler, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Doug Dylla, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Celeste Fields, Atlanta Mutual Housing Association
Jenna Hornstock, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
Elizabeth Humphrey, Maryland State Department of Planning
Bill Lunsford, Rocky Mountain Mutual Housing Association
Richard Marshall, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University
Sylvia Martinez, Federal Housing Finance Board

Marcia Nedland, Fall Creek Consultants
The Northeastern District Office, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Madeleine Pill, Kennedy School of Government, Harvard University
Michaele Pride-Wells, Graduate School of Design, Harvard University
André L. Reynolds, Neighborhood Housing Services of Cleveland
Southern District Office, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Tyrone Spann, Foundations of East Chicago

**Collaborating Staff at the Joint Center for Housing Studies and
Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation**

Eric Belsky, Joint Center for Housing Studies
Charles Buki, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Michael Collins, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Margo Kelly, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
George Knight, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Paula Planthaber, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Donald Phoenix, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
Nicolas Retsinas, Joint Center for Housing Studies
Ken Wade, Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation

Special Thanks

This paper is informed by the invaluable input of many individuals who contributed their expertise in order to ensure its success. Without the advice and intellectual input of Eric Belsky and Nicolas Retsinas of the Joint Center for Housing, as well as Charles Buki and Michael Collins of the Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation, this paper simply would not have been possible. In particular, I would like to take this opportunity to extend a special thanks to Charles Buki who invested countless time and energy providing direction and feedback for this work. It is to his commitment to the field of Community Development that this paper is dedicated.



Neighborhood Reinvestment Corporation
1325 G Street, N.W., Suite 800
Washington, DC 20006
(202) 220-2300
www.nw.org



Joint Center for Housing Studies
Harvard University