

MEMORANDUM

To: IMI June 11th Participants
From: Rick Sander and “Chicago committee”
Date: June 4, 2019
Re: Draft MacArthur proposal

During May, several of us – Maria, Allison, Jay, Bruce, and I – developed and discussed a general “concept memo” for what an IMI proposal to MacArthur’s “100&Change” competition might look like. We met with a MacArthur official and have reached out to many of the Chicago people and organizations that we would want to partner with if we undertook a Chicago-based initiative.

The “100&Change” proposal format is tightly structured, and the pages that follow reproduce this format, providing responses based on the concept memo and our various discussions from our March meeting forward. The encouraging aspects of all this are that (a) the general concept of our initiative, and many of its particulars, seem to fit very well into what MacArthur has in mind, and (b) we have good, substantive, and evidence-based answers to many of the questions MacArthur is implicitly asking. The difficult aspect is that the proposal format is so tightly structured that it provides limited scope for explaining our ideas, the evidence, and how our approach differs from past approaches to segregation. To provide some additional context for you, I’ve attached as an appendix the current version of our concept memo (starting on page 27).

Our assumption in pursuing thus so far has been that the initiative should not be limited to Chicago or an single metropolitan area. This is partly because we do not want to seem parochial – and because MacArthur, as a Chicago-based foundation with substantial programs already operating in Chicago too, probably doesn’t want to seem parochial either. The two most segregated, reasonably large southern metro areas are Memphis and Birmingham; both areas, though large, are small enough relative to Chicago that our initiative would be able to devote most of its resources to Chicago, and thereby make a real impact in both areas. Although among us we already have some contacts in both Memphis and Birmingham, it will be a significant challenge to develop a network in either place at all comparable to that which has emerged in Chicago. It would also be nice to show in this project how our tools can be adapted to other, somewhat less segregated metro areas (we’ve explored Richmond and Charlotte) where the potential exists to try other strategies that can promote racial and economic integration, and keep the momentum towards desegregation flowing.

Important issues to address in our June 11th meeting include:

- 1) How do we strengthen the community engagement in these processes, and address the qualitative side of integration?
- 2) How does our initiative relate to education and public schools?

- 3) Which of our institutions can play a formal role in the proposal/project? What does our “collaboration” look like? What other critical institutions (e.g., PRAAC) should be involved, and what’s the best way to involve them?
- 4) What are the specific changes we seek to bring about in these metro areas?

I. Quick Pitch

This is your opportunity to make a strong first impression. Offer a brief and compelling overview of your proposal. Avoid using jargon or language that a non-expert may not understand. The information in this section is likely to be made publicly available in a variety of online settings.

a. **Project Title (10 words)**

Choose a name for your project which easily identifies your solution and distinguishes it from any other projects.

“Breaking the structure of racial inequality in urban America.” or
“Sparking cycles of integration in urban America.”

b. **Project Description (25 words)**

Provide a short description for your project in one sentence.

We propose to change the dynamics of housing segregation in two major American metropolitan areas and to create new, self-sustaining cycles of housing opportunity.

c. **Executive Summary (150 words)**

Write an overview of your project that answers the following three questions:

- *What is a brief description of the problem that you are trying to solve?*
- *How will you solve it?*
- *How will your solution change the lives of the people you wish to serve, including historically marginalized people within that population?*

Your Executive Summary should be a stand-alone statement of the problem and solution. It should not require any other context to clearly explain what you are seeking to accomplish.

Racial inequality has many sources, but by far the key underlying driver of gaps in racial outcomes in urban America is extreme housing segregation. While segregation levels are high in most metro areas, enough desegregation has occurred in many areas to show clearly that wherever it falls significantly, it sets in motion forces that shrink gaps in racial outcome gaps. In very highly segregated metro areas, for example, the black-white unemployment gap is five times larger and the mortality gap is three times larger than in moderate-segregation areas. Where housing desegregation occurred, it was not through exceptional public interventions, but because those metro areas had demographic conditions that, when combined with drops in housing discrimination rates, produced self-sustaining cycles of housing opportunity and integration. Carefully-designed programs and well-leveraged funding can build similar self-sustaining cycles in highly-segregated metro areas – Chicago and Memphis in our proposal – and transform the geography of opportunity.

II. Video Presentation (90 seconds)

*You are required to submit a video that captures your project and why it should be funded. The video is an opportunity to showcase your passion and to pitch your story in a succinct format. We want you to share your vision with the judges in a way that is different from the written proposal format. This DOES NOT need to be a professionally produced video. In order to complete this part of your application, your team will upload a short digital film using YouTube. Set the Privacy Settings on your video to Public or Unlisted – do **not** set them to Private. Your video may be extracted from your submission and made available to the public and other donors. Appeal to a broad audience. Video submissions should follow these guidelines will render the application ineligible:*

- *A length of no more than 90 seconds.*
- *Your pitch must be in English.*
- *Your video must be captioned. See these [instructions](#) on how to use You Tube automatic captioning.*
- *You video should not contain identifiable children without parent consent.*

Here are general suggestions for delivering a high-quality video pitch:

- *Introduce yourself and your organization(s) and/or team.*
- *Describe the problem that you are committed to solving.*
- *Explain your solution.*
- *Explain what is unique about your solution.*
- *Describe how you would you plan to measure success and achieve broad but meaningful impact.*

Paste the full YouTube URL in the box below.

[We think we can make a compelling video. Maria has a colleague with expertise who can help.]

III. Your Team

Now that you've provided a brief overview of your project, focus on the talent and management of your team.

a. Principle Organization

During the registration process, you identified the Principal Organization responsible for receiving and taking accountability for any grant funds, as well as providing the direction, control, and supervision for the project. If the Principal Organization has changed, please Edit Registration Form from the Profile menu to update this information.

b. Principle Organization Website or Social Media Page (5 words)

What is the URL of the website or social media page of choice for the Principal Organization? If your Principal Organization does not have a website or social media page, then please insert "Not Applicable."

c. Project Website or Social Media Page (5 words)

Provide us with a URL to your project website or social media page of choice, if one exists. Having a project website or preferred social media page is not a requirement for the competition and will not impact your eligibility. If you have not created a project website or a social media page, then please write "Not Applicable."

d. Primary Area of Expertise

Please select the primary area of expertise for the Principal Organization.

e. Team Collaboration

Does your team consist of two or more organizations?

- Yes
- No

f. Memorandum of Understanding

If your team consists of two or more organizations, all of the partners working within a formal collaboration must execute a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) in which one organization clearly has control and discretion over the use of the grant funds. Learn more about MOUs by watching this webinar on Common Legal Challenges for applicants. For additional guidance, read the Requirements Regarding Any Proposed Collaboration.

A fully-executed MOU that controls the relationships among the parties must be uploaded. You must upload a PDF file that does not exceed 10MB.

If your team does not consist of two or more organizations, then check “not applicable.”

g. Case for Partnership (150 words)

If your team consists of two or more organizations and has executed an MOU, present a clear case as to why it is important to collaborate and why you believe this will be an effective collaboration. Have the entities successfully collaborated in the past? What can the two or more organizations accomplish together that they couldn't accomplish alone? Explain how the partnership is positioned to deliver the solution as an integrated team.

If your team does not consist of two or more organizations, then simply respond by entering “Not Applicable.”

Partnership is vital to our initiative because it promotes expertise, leveraging, cross-neighborhood learning, and complementary effort. Expertise is vital in, for example, measuring and gauging the extent of exclusionary zoning, or setting up an “early-warning” system to detect gentrification (Urban Institute and Furman Center will assist with these.) Leveraging is vital to harness private-market incentives to our desegregation goals (for example, through the below-market mortgages our banking partners can provide). Partnerships with neighborhood organizations are vital to make sure that improved mobility harmonizes with other neighborhood goals and produces positive integration results. And complementary effort is vital because each of the modest-sized initiatives we describe in our proposal is designed to build upon and reinforce other efforts, so that the whole is larger than the sum of the parts.

h. Why Your Team? (250 words)

Explain how your team is uniquely positioned to deliver results and why you are the best choice to solve this problem. Your response can include:

- *How your solution aligns with the primary purpose of your organization(s) or, if there is loose or indirect alignment, explain why you have decided to solve this problem.*
- *Your team's previous performance or relevant experience that highlights your ability to deliver results.*
- *Description of the largest project you've overseen in the past (financially and/or in terms of the number of people involved).*
- *Description of what draws the leader or the group to this project on a personal level. What are your team's core values?*

Emphasize that you have the right capabilities, experience, and commitment to execute your project.

[We need to figure out the configuration of our team; in this section, we would explain why our various and key players are partnering, and provide evidence that we are effective as a functional team.]

Biographies of Key Staff. *For each of the top three key staff members, who are responsible for the success of the project, please provide a name (First/Last), affiliation, and a brief biographical statement. The biographical statement should include the title for the key staff member and briefly emphasize the credentials and experiences which are most relevant to the project.*

Key Staff #1:

- *First Name (5 word limit)*
- *Last Name (5 word limit)*
- *Affiliation (10 word limit)*
- *Biography (100 word limit)*

Key Staff #2:

- *First Name (5 word limit)*
- *Last Name (5 word limit)*
- *Affiliation (10 word limit)*
- *Biography (100 word limit)*

Key Staff #3:

- *First Name (5 word limit)*
- *Last Name (5 word limit)*
- *Affiliation (10 word limit)*
- *Biography (100 word limit)*

IV. The Problem

Choosing the right problem to solve is the first step towards developing an effective solution. Show that you understand the nuances of the challenges ahead and that you've researched and engaged experts who have informed your strategy.

a. Problem Statement (250 words)

Describe the specific challenges that your solution will address, using non-expert language (do not cite papers or studies). If appropriate, connect it to any larger social concerns or systems. As part of your description address:

- *Who is impacted by the problem?*
- *Why does the problem exist in the current environment?*
- *What are the most influential ways to effect the necessary change, and where are the leverage points where the smallest change can have the biggest impact?*

Focus on setting the stage for your solution (versus describing how you intend to solve it).

A half-century after adoption of the federal Fair Housing Act, most of America's largest metropolitan areas are still highly racially segregated. It is straightforward to measure actual levels of housing segregation with census data, and when we do, we find that segregation is very highly correlated with a host of other phenomena. Over the past decade, a substantial degree of scholarly consensus has concluded that these high correlations exist because housing segregation has powerful direct and indirect effects upon a host of other phenomena. Three effects are especially notable:

- High segregation exacerbates racial outcome gaps. In highly-segregated metro areas (e.g., Chicago, New York, Birmingham, and a dozen other major metro areas) outcomes – particularly for those without college degrees – lag far behind white outcomes. Compared to metro areas with moderate segregation (e.g., San Antonio, Seattle, San Diego), high segregation areas have much larger racial gaps in poverty, employment, test scores, health outcomes, marriage rates, and income. The gaps continue to shrink in moderate segregation areas; they stagnate in high segregation areas.
- High segregation concentrates poverty. The proportion of people living in high-poverty neighborhoods is more than twice as high, on average, in high-segregation compared to moderate-segregation areas.
- High segregation hurts the “commons” and aggregate measures of well-being. Moderate-segregation metro areas have lower crime levels in both “majority” and “minority” communities. Their politics are less racially polarized. And their governments invest more in public goods, with broad public support.

b. Demand to Address the Problem (150 words)

Describe the current demand for solving the problem among stakeholders (target beneficiaries, local leaders, government agencies). Is the chosen problem recognized as urgent among stakeholders in the locations where you are planning to scale your solution?

The underlying problem we seek to address – the large impact race has upon life outcomes and choices – has, of course, long been one of America’s gravest domestic challenges. What is new is the degree to which intense housing segregation is now recognized as a key (we believe the key) driver of inequality. The Obama Administration recognized this when it issued regulations in 2015 that, for the first time, required local governments to directly address housing segregation. The Supreme Court recognized it in 2015 when its decision in *Inclusive Communities* linked continuing segregation to the need for strong fair housing remedies. Congress recognized it in early 2019 when bipartisan majorities funded a small but important housing mobility experiment. Recent books that examine segregation, like *The Color of Law* and *Evicted*, have made best-seller lists. And large majorities of Americans respond in polls that they would like to live in more integrated neighborhoods.

V. Your Solution

This section provides the opportunity for you to more fully explain how you intend to solve the problem.

a. **Solution Overview (250 words)**

Using non-expert language, address the following questions:

- *How does your solution meaningfully contribute to resolving the chosen problem?*
- *How will you know that you are making progress?*
- *Describe the impact that your solution will have on the chosen problem over a five-year grant period. Will it have broad impact on a large population or geography, or will it have deep and intense impact on a small population or geography?*
- *Describe who will benefit from your solution and the benefits or outcomes of your solution.*

We propose a coordinated strategy to reduce housing segregation among Anglos, African-Americans, and Latinos in two large and highly-segregated metropolitan areas, Chicago and Memphis. Our strategy would reduce the black/white index of dissimilarity by a point a year (roughly six times the rate of decline in recent decades), meaningfully increasing metro-level integration over a five-year period, and setting in motion self-sustaining feedback loops for continuing drops in segregation. The key principles behind our interventions are (a) a focus on directly addressing segregation; (b) reducing segregation by increasing mobility and the opportunity for homeseekers to make informed comparisons across neighborhoods; (c) providing support and assistance both for integrating households and integrated neighborhoods; and (d) leveraged, complementary strategies that increase the resources available for our efforts and that mutually reinforce one another.

We will establish eight “housing mobility centers” (six in metro Chicago and two in metro Memphis) that would foster both pro-integrative moves (by renters and owners) throughout the metro areas, and ifoster ntegrated communities around each housing center site. We will ctreate state-of-the-art housing search engines that will help homeseekers in the Chicago and Memphis areas easily compare neighborhoods as well as housing units, and will generate demand for the housing centers. The centers will assist clients to access a range of housing subsidies, including a \$1 billion pool of below-market mortgage funding for first-time homebuyers and those making pro-integrative moves. In our targeted communities, we will protect affordable housing through multifamily housing trusts and we will foster “deep” integration by coordinating with neighborhood groups and relevant agencies to strengthen local institutions.

b. Technical Process Description (200 words)

If your solution requires a technical, scientific, medical, or engineering process, then provide an explanation of your solution. Describe how it involves a technical, scientific, medical, or engineering process. Use this space to offer more detail for your specific technical approach that was not suitable for a non-expert audience. If necessary, you may cite academic literature or papers in this section by placing a bracketed number [#] next to each citation that you will later reference in your Bibliography.

If your solution does not require a technical, scientific, medical, or engineering process, please enter “Not Applicable.”

“Not applicable” (unless we get into search engine/financing mechanisms, etc.)

c. Priority Populations

Select your priority population(s) as the primary target beneficiaries for your solution. While not all projects directly serve human populations, applicants should be able to identify a target population that will benefit from the project (including advocacy or environmental projects where human populations may be indirect beneficiaries). You must select at least one priority population as your primary target beneficiaries (from a provided list), and you are welcome to provide up to three.

African-American residents of metropolitan Chicago and Memphis
Latino residents of metropolitan Chicago and Memphis

d. Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion (250 words)

Compelling proposals will fully demonstrate a commitment to the values of diversity, equity, and inclusion. 100&Change values organizations that think critically about how to be more inclusive across their teams and projects. Not only do we expect that teams will be thoughtful about how to work with a range of beneficiaries, but we also expect teams to think carefully about how to actively plan for and include the

most marginalized and/or vulnerable from within those populations in solutions design, program planning, and ongoing work.

- 1. Explain how you will ensure, or have ensured, that the design and implementation of your solution authentically embraces diversity, equity, and inclusion across all aspects, including persons with disabilities, religious or ethnic minorities, people of color, native/Indigenous peoples, women, gender identity and sexual orientation.*
- 2. How will you provide opportunities and reasonable accommodations for historically marginalized populations, including religious or ethnic minorities, people of color, native and Indigenous people, sexual orientation, gender identity, and women to actively participate and/or benefit from your solution, including as staff, advisors, partners, consultants, etc.*

“Diversity, equity, and inclusion” is, of course, what our project is all about. In no part of America are the lives of racial minorities more separate and unequal than in the housing markets of our most segregated cities. We seek to demonstrate that even intense patterns of segregation can be broken down through thoughtful, community-based, and coordinated strategies. Our initiative will have a direct effect on segregation, an indirect effect upon many racial disparities outside of housing, and will provide a blueprint for effective local actions across much of urban America. Although we are primarily addressing racial segregation, most of our initiatives will also have a direct effect in reducing economic segregation – a problem that has been growing steadily more severe over the past two decades.

Most of our constituent organizations are intrinsically diverse, because their focus is on problems of inequality and problems of urban centers. A racially diverse group of scholars and activists have developed the research insights and program innovations upon which our proposal is based, and our planning consortium has been diverse in multiple ways from its inception. Moreover, fair housing organizations play a central role in our collaboration, and fair housing in the 21st century is concerned with more than racial issues; they are also in the forefront of pursuing fair and inclusionary treatment for all marginalized groups, including persons with disabilities, LGBT communities, and households receiving government benefits.

Our neighborhood-based strategies can only succeed to the extent that we are collaborating with community residents and institutions in formulating and executing our initiatives in each place.

[This is a good place for us to address substantive methods of community engagement that are not window dressing but represent genuine mechanisms for voice and participation.]

e. Opportunities and Accommodations (150 words)

How will you provide opportunities and reasonable accommodations for persons with disabilities to actively participate and/or benefit from your solution, including as staff, advisors, partners, consultants, etc.?

[Suggestions?]

f. Theory of Change (250 words)

Describe the logic of how your solution will lead to the desired outcome. Your Theory of Change should read as a narrative explanation of both the projected and desired outcomes. Emphasize the methodologies that you intend to employ and how they create a causal link to your shorter-term, intermediate, and longer-term goals. As you develop your response, consider this [Practical Guide for Creating a Theory of Change](#).

Urban areas like Greater Chicago and Greater Memphis are trapped in “cycles of segregation.” Intense segregation means that when members of one racial group plan moves, they are guided by same-race contacts and information sources that guide them to same-race neighborhoods. Communities that are completely dominated by other races seem forbidding. The small number of integrated communities attract so many homeseekers that they are in continual danger of tipping.

To change this, we need to create contrary “cycles of integration,” using a set of complementary strategies to create feedback loops that reinforce patterns of opportunity and mobility, which cumulatively undermine segregation. Our search engine and housing centers help homeseekers to expand the range of neighborhoods they consider and catalyze pro-integrative moves; word-of-mouth from these moves, helping to persuade, in Chicago for example, other whites to consider neighborhoods like South Shore, Chatham and Englewood, and other blacks to consider Chicago’s northwest side and the northern suburbs. They also help to increase the range and scale of neighborhoods with robust integration, so that such neighborhoods no longer seem so exceptional. Our complementary efforts to reduce exclusionary zoning, catalyze first-time owners, and expand affordable housing help to equalize levels of economic diversity across the metro area. Moreover, by defusing gentrification and fostering diversity, we forestall “tipping” and increase confidence across the metro area that integration is not a way-station towards resegregation. Every one of these steps reinforces the others and sets in motion cycles of integration.

g. Barrier Assessment and Risk Mitigation (150 words)

Describe any barriers to the short and long-term success of the project and your plans to mitigate them. Barriers can include problems inhibiting solution scalability, political or public policy concerns, or any other potential operational or tactical hurdles that may hinder your solution’s success. What are the most threatening barriers? How are you prepared to address them?

Efforts to break down segregation patterns have often relied on two strategies: (1) building so-called “subsidized” housing in affluent, white neighborhoods, and (2) “gentrifying” minority neighborhoods. Both strategies tend to generate strong community opposition, out of distinct but parallel fears that these forms of integration will unfavorably and dramatically change the character of neighborhoods and ultimately push the original residents out. Our strategies aim to avoid these traps. First, we aim to foster mobility across the economic spectrum, and to do so mainly by fostering individual, largely market-based moves rather than through new projects or developments. Second, we specifically seek to identify neighborhoods in danger of gentrification and, in those areas, protect affordable housing, disperse in-migration to adjacent neighborhoods, and build mechanisms for authentic neighborhood integration. Third, we are community-based and working with resident-groups to identify and allay concerns is part of our DNA.

h. Primary Subject Area

Select the primary subject area of the solution that you and your team are proposing (list provided).

i. Location of Current Solution

*Where are you currently implementing your solution? Provide up to five locations.
[Oak Park, Illinois; Baltimore, Maryland \(other integration experiment sites\)](#)*

j. Location of Future Work

Where are you planning to implement your solution, if you are awarded a MacArthur 100&Change grant? Provide up to five locations.

[Metropolitan Chicago and Metropolitan \[Memphis\]](#)

[For discussion: if we can explain this without creating too much complexity, we would also like to experiment with other pro-integration efforts in two or three metro areas where segregation is less intense (dissimilarity indices in the .6 to .7 range) but where further progress is clearly needed; in other words, we would like our initiative to provide valuable lessons for metro areas grappling with various levels of segregation. Two additional areas we think have great promise are Charlotte, NC, and Richmond, VA. In metro Charlotte, a great mix of subsidies are available that should permit an ambitious program of high-quality, diverse and integrated housing in a range of neighborhoods. In metro Richmond, we have a great expert (Carol) and an excellent network of interested leaders.]

k. Sustainable Development Goals

The United Nations’ Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) are considered by many donors when looking to support both domestic and international work. Select one or more of the SDGs that aligns with your solution. To learn more about each SDG and/or to understand better where your work fits into the SDG framework you can read more [here](#).

[Address]

l. Solution Stage

Select the stage of development that best represents your solution. Use the Organizational Readiness Tool to better understand your ability to be competitive.

- **Research and ideation:** You are in the process of developing a new solution. You have not yet started implementation with target beneficiaries and do not have evidence of impact. Note that solutions without an existing evidence base are unlikely to be competitive in this process. In fact, solutions with weak evidence of effectiveness are likely to be screened out of the competition.
- **Pilot:** You have developed a new solution and are in the process of testing and refining it with a small number of target beneficiaries. You are beginning to develop evidence of impact. Note that solutions without an existing (or with only a limited) evidence base are unlikely to be competitive in this process. In fact, solutions with weak evidence of effectiveness are likely to be screened out of the competition.
- **Proof of concept:** You have a prototype concept that you are pressure testing in different settings or environments to determine whether its outcomes are durable in different contexts and which adaptations are possible. Note that solutions with only a limited evidence base are unlikely to be competitive in this process. In fact, solutions with weak evidence of effectiveness are likely to be screened out of the competition.
- **Scaling:** You have evidence that your solution achieves impact and are in the process of expanding and adapting the solution to a greater number of target beneficiaries, potentially in new contexts or geographies. You are continuing to monitor for impact and refine the solution but have yet to achieve large-scale implementation.
- **Operating at scale:** You are delivering your solution at scale and are in the process of expanding target beneficiaries substantially. You are continuing to monitor for impact and refine the solution.

Scaling. [Though in large part this is about weaving together solutions already operating successfully in isolation....our solutions vary in where they fit in MacArthur's spectrum, but enough of what we are doing has successful prototypes to make the "scaling" argument persuasive.]

m. Key Words (5 words)

Provide a list of five key words that can best be used to describe your project. Choose key words that capture the essence of your project and its intended outcomes. Separate each key word with a comma.

Opportunity, mobility, access, unifying, integration

VI. Projected Impact

This section provides the opportunity for you to provide evidence that supports your solution.

a. Evidence of Effectiveness (250 words)

What evidence do you have, or why do you believe that the solution you propose will work? Present any internal evidence or formal academic evidence. You may cite academic literature or papers in this section by placing a bracketed number [#] next to each citation that you will later reference in your Bibliography

Our first proposition is that lowering the metropolitan black/white index of dissimilarity will produce, over the medium-term, large gains in relative black outcomes and significant aggregate benefits to the metro area. There is now a wealth of careful social science research substantiating these effects. Moreover, the evidence is strong that these effects are more or less linear: even modest declines in segregation have proportionally significant benefits. The benefit-cost ratio of this investment is staggering – on the order of 30:1.

Our second proposition is that the specific means we use to foster opportunity and lower segregation are effective. Several case studies have shown the effectiveness of the Oak Park housing center; [other components of our strategy have operated in other metro areas and also achieved great success in placing families....the untested parts of our approach are the *combination* of these individual components into a unified strategy, and the substantial scaling-up of these components.]

Our third proposition is that creating a substantially larger number of integrated “nodes” in a metro area will catalyze additional pro-integrative moves and generate self-sustaining cycles of integration. This is demonstrated in the social science literature that has closely examined metropolitan patterns of housing desegregation, such as Krysan and Crowder (2017) and Sander et al (2018).

Our strategy is not riskless, and of course social innovation necessarily involves more unknowns than would be the case in, say, a medical or public health intervention; but there is substantial, high-quality evidence and experience supporting each step of our proposal.

b. Type of Evidence

What kind of data do you collect and/or will you collect to measure success? Which best describe the kind of evidence you currently have or will have to show that your solution works? Select all that apply.

- *Informal check-ins with the people you serve to see how things are going*
- *Formally collecting and documenting qualitative feedback*
- *Routinely collecting program and other data on progress*
- *Piloting or user testing new programs, products, or policies*
- *Internally conducting evaluation or assessment of outcomes*
- *Externally conducting evaluation or assessment of outcomes*

- *External assessment on impact (e.g. randomized control trial; quasi-experimental design; contribution analysis; collective impact)*
- *Other*

c. Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning (250 words)

As you develop your responses, review our [Guidance for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for context](#). The MacArthur Foundation values monitoring, evaluation, and learning activities that are capable of flexing as the context may change and as the work evolves, yet sufficiently rigorous to document and measure results, learn from them, course correct, and adapt, as necessary.

Briefly describe what you expect to learn over the course of implementing your solution and how you plan to learn it. This is the first step toward developing a more comprehensive Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning plan. Your response should address:

- *How are you thinking about evaluating your Theory of Change?*
- *What are your methods for collecting data?*
- *How will that data be used in ongoing performance improvement?*
- *How will you use data to learn if the project is successful?*

[Our team includes a number of prominent scholars, who have the experience and skill to do careful program evaluation and impact analysis, and who are excited by the research opportunities this initiative creates.](#)

[We envision four different types of evaluation and learning.](#)

[First, we have specific expectations, based on past experience, about the cost of each initiative and the output to be achieved. For example, based on the decades of experience with the Oak Park housing center, we anticipate a cost of \\$1100 per successful pro-integrative move \(with more detail about component costs\). We will carefully monitor these costs and outputs, and make adjustments where deviations occur. Because we will have multiple sites for each program component \(i.e., a total of eight housing centers\), we will be able to experiment with variations and friendly competition to identify our most successful practices and extend those.](#)

[Second, we will measure the demographic effect of our initiative. How are racial demographics changing, at the block and neighborhood level, in our two metro areas? Public counts generated by the Bureau of the Census are a comprehensive, authoritative source, but there is a significant lag time between collection and useful release of the data. Several team members have used internal census data, and we are optimistic that this can be utilized to give us something closer to “real-time” information. Local and state jurisdictions also](#)

collect relevant data. We will assemble these to determine what “multiplier” effects our various initiatives are producing at the neighborhood level.

Third, we will conduct research on the “quality” of integration and neighborhood life achieved in our target neighborhoods, compared to control areas. Surprisingly, the best work on this topic remains a large study conducted in the late 1960s by the National Opinion Research Center. The PI of that study (Norman Bradburn) has given us valuable input on how to assess – through in-depth interviews with neighborhood residents and key “informants” -- the differing circumstances that contribute to genuine integration and community involvement.

Fourth, we will use a variety of sources to monitor how aggregate outcomes and racial disparities evolve over the course of the initiative. Here too we will do comparative research to understand more definitively how declining segregation levels improve outcomes.

d. Planning for Scale and Amplifying Impact (250 words)

*Describe your plan for scaling your solution and its benefits. Scale may mean expanding to new populations or geographies, or it may mean how you intend to amplify your impact more deeply in one geography or population or context. If appropriate, explain whether and how you will need to tailor and adapt your solution for scaling and/or amplifying impact. What is the evidence, or why do you believe your results can be replicated? As you prepare your response, read *Scaling-Up: Tools & Techniques for Practitioners* and *Scaling-Up: Management Framework for Practitioners*.*

[We haven’t read their guide yet.]. Successful scaling has two dimensions. One is the organizational challenges of operating at a larger scale, adding and training staff, creating a unified sense of mission while fostering friendly competition, and maintaining efficiency. The second is adapting one’s efforts to local circumstances. On the first front, we are aided by our close partnership with Pedcor, and the involvement of Pedcor’s top leadership in our effort. Pedcor is a \$3 billion company, the nation’s largest developer of affordable housing, and it has achieved success in each of the twenty states in which it operates. Pedcor has the administrative expertise to guide the scaling-up of our initiative. On the second front, we are aided by the inside involvement of community groups and leaders in each of the neighborhoods in which we will operate. Central to our thinking and effort is the indispensability of each center representing a neighborhood collaboration, and learning through that collaboration about the special needs and issues at each of our sites. Collectively, our leadership has many decades of experience in undertaking successful neighborhood collaborations.

e. Durability of Impact (150 words)

Describe the durability of your solution. Does your solution expect to solve the problem in five years or create a pathway to solving the problem over a longer time horizon?

Yes and yes. We conservatively estimate that our initiative will lower the black/white index of dissimilarity by five points over the five years of the initiative in Chicago and [Memphis], and will lower the Hispanic-Anglo index of dissimilarity by 2.5 points. Since the relationship between lower segregation and better outcomes is linear at the metropolitan level, this means that this decline, by itself, will have very powerful effects and large benefits. But the whole point of our strategy is to create self-reinforcing cycles that undermine segregation and promote mobility and opportunity, so we expect that the effects, and the benefits, will continue to grow over time.

Moreover, our substantial focus on evaluation, and on creating replicable models, arises from our expectation that this initiative can create models applicable to dozens of major metropolitan areas in the United States. At its core, our initiative is about demonstrating that intense housing segregation is an eminently solvable problem.

f. Bibliography (250 words)

If you included citations [#s] in the Technical Explanation section above and/or in the Evidence of Effectiveness section above, provide your bibliography here with a corresponding bracketed number [#] for each citation. If you did not use citations, offer a list of resources that may be used to validate general claims made in your application. Please link to any articles that may be accessed online, even if behind a paywall.

[Easy to add]

VII. Resource Requirements

Explain your project plans and the related costs to implement your solution.

a. Project Phases

Divide your project into three phases over a five-year grant period. For each of your three phases, provide a name, the total duration in months, and a brief description. As part of your description, explain the milestones that you intend to measure and any key activities critical to reaching those milestones to know if you are successful or on track to be successful during the prescribed duration. This could be a plan for achieving full impact, if your solution can be completed in a five-year grant period, or this could be a plan to show your interim results toward achieving longer-term impact over more than five years. Your description of each phase will be used later to compare any details for achieving milestones against the financial details of your project.

PHASE #1:

- *Name:* Establishing program elements

- *Duration* Six months
- *Description.* We expect to hit the ground running. We are already building institutional capacity to implement our strategies, and already have some of the required funding for our initiatives in place. We are forming teams to develop and execute each part of our strategy, and we are building coalitions in our intended sites. All of this will accelerate if we are advanced through the early rounds of the “100%Change” competition. Our partner, the Inclusivity Institute, will be preparing groundwork in terms of collaborative agreements, institutional partners, and convening community panels in target neighborhoods. We will also, before Day 1, have good working drafts of all our procedures, methodologies and evaluation criteria.
- During Phase 1, we will (a) lease space for the eight mobility centers, (b) hire and train staff, (c) complete and launch our housing search engine, and (d) begin implementation of our major program components.

PHASE #2:

- *Name:* Implementation Phase A
- *Duration.* Eighteen months
- *Description* By the beginning of this phase, we expect all of our housing centers to be in operation and providing mobility counseling and assistance; we will be working to widen usage and make improvements in our housing search engine. Our mortgage-assistance programs will be fully in place by the beginning of Phase A as well. We anticipate assisting a total of seven thousand pro-integrative household moves during Phase A. Each of our other program activities will also be underway, though that will mean a variety of things depending on the program. We would issue our first Inclusivity Ratings – for all jurisdictions in metro Chicago and metro Memphis – during Phase A, and begin negotiations with low-graded jurisdictions to make reforms. Our “early-warning” system would also be fully operational by the beginning of Phase A, and we would complete our first set of “housing trust” purchases and resales in protected areas. Two of our activities would be in “set-up” mode during Phase A: (1) new and rehabilitated affordable housing catalyzed by our efforts would be in the planning and development phase, but it is unlikely units would be completed in Phase A; (2) our research and evaluation efforts will be developed during Phase A.

PHASE #3:

- *Name:* Implementation Phase B
- *Duration* Thirty-six months
- *Description.* [Phase B largely continues Phase A, with our research and evaluation mechanisms driving improvements, with assisted housing units coming on line, with efforts to broaden the coalition of supportive partners, and efforts to institutionalize the most effective parts of our initiative through collaboration among local governments, with state and federal

assistance. We will be able to measure with census data actual effects of the initiative on the metro area as a whole by the middle of Phase B.]

b. Total Resource Requirements (100 words)

Will the total projected costs exceed \$100 million (USD)? Your budget must be a minimum of \$100 million to be considered. If your total projected costs exceed \$100 million (USD), then explain how you have secured (or plan to secure) the balance of any necessary funds.

Our budget is \$100 million, and that will fully fund our core activities over the five years of the two-metro-area initiative. Moreover, we already have commitments that will magnify the fiscal impact of the \$100 million. For example, we have agreements with local financial institutions to provide us with access to mortgage credit at 100-150 basis points below market for our clients undertaking “pro-integrative” moves. This could easily scale to \$1 billion in mortgage lending, and of course would significantly increase interest and participation in our mobility programs.

If your total projected costs do not exceed \$100 million (USD), then simply enter “Does not require more than \$100 million.”

c. Other Funders

Has this project received support from any other funders?

Our focus thus far has been on building partnerships rather than direct funding for the initiative. Our partnership efforts have been highly successful; in addition to the agreements with banks noted above, the Inclusivity Institute will work to complement our efforts.

The “100&Change” competition has valuably spurred us to develop a detailed, concrete plan for our initiative, and simultaneously with our participation in the competition, we are approaching ten to fifteen other funders with complementary interests.

If your project has received support from any other funders, then provide the following information for up to three of the top other funders. For each funder, provide the legal name of the entity responsible for funding your project. Provide the period of funding (in months to date) for the funding. Last, provide the amount of funding within the prescribed period.

If your project has not received any support from other funders, then please enter “not applicable” in the first box for Funder #1.

FUNDER #1:

- Name
- Year of Funding
- Last Year of Funding
- Amount of Funding

FUNDER #2:

- Name
- Year of Funding
- Last Year of Funding
- Amount of Funding

FUNDER #3:

- Name
- Year of Funding
- Last Year of Funding
- Amount of Funding

d. Budget Narrative (250 words)

Offer a broad and narrative description of your budget needs for the \$100 million (USD) grant. As you draft this narrative, map your costs against each of your three (3) defined phases. Here are general guidelines for writing your Budget Narrative:

- *Your budget must sum to \$100 million (USD).*
- *Your budget must allocate no more than \$10 million (USD) to a contingency fund or budget buffer. [This is unclear – does it mean that there must be a buffer fund, and if so must it be \$10 million?]*
- *In MacArthur’s experience, funds to support Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning activities typically require anywhere from 5-20% of the total projected total costs. Review our Guidance for Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning for more context.*
- *Familiarize yourself with the Indirect Cost Policy and represent how you intend to address any indirect cost categories. [We need to identify and examine this. If there are sponsoring institutions that customarily require indirect cost funding, we will need to negotiate those down to very modest levels.]*
- *Your budget should afford reasonable accommodations to make your project accessible to people with disabilities, as implementors, participants, and beneficiaries. Estimates frequently used for an inclusive (i.e. non-disability-specific) project are 1-3% of administrative costs and 5-7% of program costs. Review this Guidance on Budgeting for Inclusion for more context.*

As you link descriptions of your budget needs to the three phases that you have previously described, a reviewer should be able to read your description of the phases and key results and understand how your budget relates to the milestones that you are planning to achieve.

e. Detailed Budget

Based on the three phases that you have described, provide a detailed breakdown of total costs for each phase. Cost categories for each phase should include, but not be limited to, descriptions that you've already explained in more detail as part of your Budget Narrative. You are encouraged also to include any more detailed cost categories that support a more thorough description of your total costs. Use this opportunity to reflect and clarify any general explanations provided in your Budget Narrative and elsewhere in your application. As you describe each line item for each phase, avoid terms that are ambiguous or vague (e.g., miscellaneous). Instead, offer descriptions of costs which directly correlated to your previous explanations of the project. A reader should be able to review your detailed budget and understand how the pieces fit together. All budgets must total \$100 million (USD) for proposals to be eligible.

[We have not broken down the budget into phases as yet, and of course the budget depends on the conclusions produced by our discussion. But the following provides a rough ballpark based on some empiricism, and we think generally capable of producing the results we describe.]

Regional housing centers	\$850k/year per center Seven centers	\$30 million
Housing trust mechanisms	\$7,000 per unit; one-time cost 3000 units	\$21 million
Assisted housing development	\$24,000 per unit subsidy 1000 units	\$24 million
Inclusivity index; disparate impact litigation; early-warning system	\$500,000 per year	\$2.5 million
Housing Opportunity search engine	\$400,000 per year	\$2 million
Facilitating linkages to mortgage/ Voucher assistance	\$1 million per year	\$5 million
Community and metro outreach	\$800k per year	\$4 million
Research, monitoring and evaluation		\$5 million
Contingency/overhead/other administrative		\$6.5 million
Total		\$100 million

PHASE #1: BUDGET BREAKDOWN

LINE ITEM DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT (US DOLLARS)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
SUB-TOTAL:	(\$ TOTAL COST)

PHASE #2: BUDGET BREAKDOWN

LINE ITEM DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT (US DOLLARS)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
SUB-TOTAL:	(\$ TOTAL COST)

PHASE #3: BUDGET BREAKDOWN

LINE ITEM DESCRIPTION	AMOUNT (US DOLLARS)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
ENTER COST CATEGORY & DESCRIPTION	(\$ ENTER COST)
SUB-TOTAL:	(\$ TOTAL COST)

NOTE: your total costs must equal \$100 million (USD).

TOTAL COSTS: ALL PHASES

SUMMARY	AMOUNT (US DOLLARS)
PHASE #1: SUB-TOTAL	(\$ ENTER COST)
PHASE #2: SUB-TOTAL	(\$ ENTER COST)
PHASE #3: SUB-TOTAL	(\$ ENTER COST)
TOTAL (must equal \$100 million USD):	(\$ TOTAL COST)

f. Financial Sustainability (150 words)

How do you plan to operate and sustain the impact of your project over time? If your plan requires additional resources in the future, above and beyond the \$100 million (USD) budget, to be sustainable, describe the most likely pathway for securing any additional and ongoing support. If you believe your plan will NOT require additional financial resources to be sustainable, explain why.

In 2015, the Obama Administration promulgated new “Assessment of Fair Housing” regulations, requiring local CDBG recipients to engage (for the first time) in meaningful efforts to address housing segregation, and encouraging jurisdictions to approach these problems at the regional (rather than jurisdictional) level. Although the Trump Administration placed a moratorium on implantation of these regulations, many jurisdictions (including 19 Chicago-area governments) are proceeding in the spirit of the Obama guidelines, and we expect that future

administrations will take this approach or even expand upon it. Our initiative can provide a perfect template for regional anti-segregation strategies, and CDBG funding provides a potential revenue stream for jurisdictions to broadly support it. If we can demonstrate the viability and effects of this initiative, there is abundant reason to believe that the public sector will sustain and expand it.

g. Other Resource Requirements (100 words)

This is your opportunity to describe your need for any non-financial resources, to achieve the goals articulated in you plan.

VIII. Legal Compliance

The following information is required to ensure your compliance with specific legal conditions, which are further explained in the RULES.

a. Charitable Purpose (150 words)

What is the charitable purpose of your project? Describe how the public or a subset, which is a charitable class, will benefit from your project. A charitable class must generally be an indefinite number of individuals who are the subject of the charitable purpose and not a limited number of specified individuals. For example, the class can be needy persons within a disadvantaged community but not a specified person in the community, even if the person is disadvantaged. There can be a comparatively small number of individuals, if the individuals are not identified and the class is open ended. Learn more about Charitable Purpose by watching this webinar on Common Legal Challenges for applicants.

b. Private Benefit (150 words)

Will private interests (such as shareholders, for-profit companies, contractors, consultants, or other individuals) benefit more than incidentally from the project as compared to the public or charitable benefit?

If your project will trigger any private benefit to one or more individuals, provide an explanation of how the public benefit cannot be achieved without necessarily benefiting those individuals and to what degree any private benefit compares to public benefit. It is insufficient to say that benefits gained will be due to all of humanity benefitting. Learn more about private benefits by watching this webinar on Common Legal Challenges for applicants and by reading our Private Benefit Rules.

If your project will not benefit any private interests, provide an explanation of your response.

c. Lobbying Activities (150 words)

Does your project involve any efforts to effect public policy through changes in existing legislation or the enactment of new legislation, and does your project require lobbying activities with respect to a specific legislative proposal? Refer to our Lobbying Policy for clarification.

If your project does involve any lobbying activities, then explain how the project involves any lobbying activities (as defined in the Lobbying Policy).

If your project does not involve any lobbying activities, then simple enter “Not Applicable.”

d. Human Subjects Research

Should your application be selected as a Finalist, you will be asked to describe any specific research that involves human subjects. You will be asked to Include in your response evidence of specific plans and the support mechanisms required to safeguard the rights and welfare of those human subjects. Refer to our Human Subjects Research Policy for clarification.

Does your project require any research that would involve human subjects?

- Yes
- No

e. Intellectual Property

Should your application be selected as a Finalist, you will be asked describe how you intend to treat such intellectual property to comply with the RULES. If your project relies on existing specific technology, products, ideas, or processes on which there are existing claims of copyright or patent right, review our Intellectual Property Policy, which describes the treatment of Grant Work Product (as defined therein) funded by the MacArthur Foundation.

Does your project involve the creation or use of any technology or other products, ideas, or processes on which copyright will be asserted or patents claimed?

- Yes
- No

IX. Administrative Information

In this section, we ask you to provide some additional information about the Principal Organization. Before answering, use the Organizational Readiness Tool to understand your ability to be competitive according to the size of your annual operating budget.

a. Identification Number for Principal Organization

The Principal Organization must be incorporated in an appropriate jurisdiction. Typically, an identifying number is provided upon incorporation. Select the Country and Identification Type of number that the Principal Organization has been provided.

- *United States: Employer Identification Number (EIN)*
- *Australia: Australia Business Number (ABN)*
- *Brazil: CNPJ (this is for companies)*
- *Canada: Revenue Agency Business/Registration Number*
- *India: FCRA Registration Number*
- *Netherlands: KVK Number*
- *South Africa: Nonprofit Organization Number*
- *United Kingdom: Charity Number*

- *United Kingdom: Company Number*
- *OTHER (5 words max): Enter name of country*

b. Identification Number for Principal Organization

Based on your selection above, enter the associated identification number for the Principal Organization. Any identification number that you provide will be used to link your application to other key data that is publicly available for the associated organization.

If you selected OTHER and your Country does not provide an Identification Type of number, then enter “Not Applicable.”

c. Annual Operating Budget

What is the annual operating budget in United States Dollars (USD) of the Principal Organization?

- *<\$10 Million*
- *\$10 to 50 Million*
- *\$100 to 200 Million*
- *\$200 to 500 Million*
- *\$500 Million to \$1 Billion*
- *\$1 Billion +*

d. Number of Employees

How many full-time employees does the Principal Organization employ?

- *<50 Full-time Employees*
- *50 to 100 Full-time Employees*
- *100 to 300 Full-time Employees*
- *300 to 500 Full-time Employees*
- *500 to 1,000 Full-time Employees*
- *1,000+ Full-time Employees*

e. Audited Financial Records

We require information necessary to understand the financial health of the Principal Organization. Upload audited financial reports from the past three (3) years for the Principal Organization.

NOTE: Audited financials must be in English, including all columns, rows, and footnotes.

Financial Records will not be shared during the Peer-to-Peer review process. However, financial information is important to assessing your financial health and potential to receive a \$100 million (USD) grant from the MacArthur Foundation. Financial records may be shared with the following persons: MacArthur staff and directors, financial, technical and other experts assisting MacArthur with the assessment of applications, persons assisting with administrative reviews, and other consultants retained by MacArthur in connection with the competition.

You may submit the three years of audited financial records in any standard format. You must upload a single PDF file that does not exceed 10MB.

X. Additional Information to be Provided

If your team is invited to participate in any future phases of this competition, you may be required to provide additional information (refer to the RULES and Timeline), including but not limited to:

- *A Tax Determination Letter, if applicable.*
- *Articles of Incorporation, Charter, or similar documentation.*
- *A more comprehensive Monitoring, Evaluation, and Learning Plan for the project.*
- *Existing policies, if any, addressing conflicts of interest, whistleblower, internal controls, anti-money laundering, intellectual property, human subjects research, code of conduct, ethics, gifts, and any similar policies governing the organization*
- *If you are not a public charity, a statement that any MacArthur Foundation grant funds will not be used for lobbying purposes, or if you are a public charity under the Internal Revenue Code, a lobbying budget in which you specify the amount of lobbying expenses and non-lobbying expenses*

The MacArthur Foundation reserves the right to perform background checks on key individuals associated with the project, and the refusal by the key individuals to provide necessary authorizations will be a reason to reject any application for further consideration. Background information and the results of any background checks will be kept confidential.

Appendix: Concept Outline for the MacArthur proposal

Is it possible to have a meaningful effect on American racial inequality for \$100 million? We believe so. This memo outlines the basic approach we plan to develop into a detailed funding proposal for the MacArthur “100&Change” initiative, and for other potential funders.

This proposal is built around three key insights:

First, it is now clear that intense housing segregation is the most important and fundamental impediment to improving African-American outcomes. Eight of the nation’s sixty largest metropolitan areas have experienced substantial drops in segregation over the past forty years. In all eight areas, black-white gaps on virtually every measurable outcome are dramatically smaller than in highly-segregated metro areas like Chicago and New York. The black-white mortality gap is two-thirds smaller; the unemployment gap is three-fourths smaller; the test-score gap is one-fourth smaller; the relative likelihood of blacks living in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty is sixty percent smaller. Careful research shows the direction of causation is primarily from lower segregation to better black outcomes (though of course improved black outcomes also reinforce integration). It follows that if we can materially reduce housing segregation,¹ we can narrow black-white outcome gaps in fairly dramatic ways.

Second, our understanding of the causes of housing segregation’s persistence – and how to reduce it – has come into focus in just the last few years. Two books – *Cycle of Segregation* (2017) by Krysan and Crowder, and *Moving Toward Integration* (2018), by Sander, Kucheva and Zasloff – synthesize a good deal of other recent work and demonstrate some key facts. Housing discrimination still exists and is an important problem, but it is no longer a decisive barrier in any metropolitan area to significant housing desegregation. Racial “tipping” still exists, but it is dramatically less common than in the 1970s and 1980s. The crucial scale for thinking about housing desegregation is the metropolitan area. When a critical mass of integrated neighborhoods exist in a metro area, integration becomes self-reinforcing. There is no instance in the last forty years where a metro region has had a large decline in housing segregation, and then an increase; *metro-level* integration in the modern era is consistently stable and self-reinforcing. Importantly, socioeconomic gaps between blacks and whites do not, by themselves, impose a relevant lower boundary on the amount of housing integration achievable today.

¹ The simplest and most widely-used measure of segregation is the index of dissimilarity; 100 on this scale represents complete separation of two groups, while 0 means that within small units of measurement (in the housing context, neighborhoods, census tracts or blocks) the ratio of two groups is constant (e.g., all neighborhoods are 20% black). In the U.S., the average block-level, black-white index of housing dissimilarity in metropolitan America was 92 in 1970, and quite uniform across the nation. The population-weighted average is now in the low 70s, with many major urban areas still in the 80s. The half-dozen large urban areas that saw black-white segregation levels decline to about 70 by 1990 now have levels in the high 50s to low 60s. By way of comparison, housing dissimilarity levels for Chinese-Americans (compared to whites) average around 40; for Italian-Americans (compared to other whites) around 25.

Third, one can make very substantial inroads into housing segregation by focusing on the “critical mass” mechanism, capitalizing on market-based mechanisms and readily available subsidies, and recognizing that successful metropolitan-wide integration requires movement in all directions: African-Americans and Hispanics into white neighborhoods, Anglos into black and Hispanic neighborhoods, and so on. Properly leveraged, \$100 million over five years can decisively move two metropolitan areas onto the path of self-sustaining housing desegregation, and demonstrate that similar initiatives are worth pursuing throughout urban America.

While we are still crafting important aspects of our proposal, in general outlines we envision something like the following:

- 1) Our initiative would be based in two metropolitan areas, which are each now highly segregated (black-white indices of dissimilarity above .75) but which are otherwise different from one another in several key respects: size, region, economic base, and so on. For now, we assume that Chicago and Memphis will be our two metro areas. In each of these, we will partner with several important local organizations in implementing our strategy.
- 2) In each metro area, we will establish several “housing opportunity” centers that will provide free assistance to households planning to buy or rent. (The highly successful Oak Park Regional Housing Center is working closely with us to develop our model.). The centers will assist homeseekers to consider “other-race” neighborhoods (i.e., helping blacks to identify housing opportunities in white neighborhoods, and vice versa), and will orchestrate subsidies (security deposits for renters, lower-cost mortgages for homebuyers) to encourage pro-integrative moves. Over five years, these centers will facilitate 40,000 pro-integrative household moves (roughly 120,000 people) in metro Chicago, and 10,000 pro-integrative household moves (roughly 30,000 people) in metro Memphis, reducing by 25% the number of racially isolated neighborhoods in each metro area.
- 3) We envision these centers as having two types of focus. The first type (similar to the OPRHC’s current mission) focuses on communities or community areas with a population of 50k to 150k; the goal in these areas is to promote a high level of integration, with no census tract with the area having more than a 70% presence of any of the four major racial groups. Good sites for these areas would be communities that border segregated neighborhoods, or where there are good prospects for broad and stable integration. The second type of focus is on fostering entry into neighborhoods where a particular racial group currently has a presence of less than .5% -- i.e., neighborhoods with virtually no blacks or virtually no whites. The goal here is dispersion – bringing these neighborhoods into the mobility maps of the groups not present, and reducing the number of segregated neighborhoods by a substantial number.

- 4) In addition to providing counseling, the centers would help connect movers to housing subsidies aimed at further smoothing the path for pro-integrative moves. We will develop cooperative agreements with regional banks for low-interest mortgages (targeting especially first-time homebuyers), and we will work with local housing agencies to target rental voucher assistance on households making moves to opportunity areas. We estimate that these forms of assistance will be available to about a third of the participating households. The leveraged volume of mortgage loans will be approximately \$1.2 billion; the leveraged volume of rental voucher assistance will be approximately \$80 million.
- 5) We will create modern, online search engines both to attract movers to the housing centers and to interactively assist homeseekers in understanding housing opportunities and neighborhood amenities in neighborhoods they would not ordinarily consider, further contributing to pro-integrative moves and increasing opportunity and mobility through the metro area.
- 6) Working with the Urban Institute and the Inclusivity Institute, we will develop “inclusivity indices” for all jurisdictions in the Chicago and Memphis metro areas, based on in-depth analysis of the zoning and land-use practices of each city, as well as the actual practical operation of these cities in allowing or preventing the development of inclusive housing. The “indices” will be used in three ways: (a) to help movers identify and reward inclusive jurisdictions by making them more attractive; (b) to help low-and-moderate income housing developers identify friendly sites for development; (c) to help galvanize disparate impact litigation aimed at the most exclusionary jurisdictions. We will also fund or otherwise actually bring about such litigation in at least ten sites between Chicago and Memphis.
- 7) We will develop an “early-warning” system to identify neighborhoods in danger of experiencing resegregation through gentrification, and will use an inexpensive housing trust mechanism (estimated cost, \$7,000 per unit) to insulate three thousand units of low-and-moderate income housing in gentrifying neighborhoods from market pressures, and thus help to preserve racial and economic integration in those neighborhoods.
- 8) In conjunction with (6), we will work with central city officials (i.e., in the City of Chicago and City of Memphis) to deploy a series of strategies aimed at fostering integration and opportunity in neighborhoods experiencing gentrification [discuss and add detail here]
- 9) We will use roughly \$20 million in Chicago, and \$3.5 million in Memphis, to assist non-profit developers in using existing federal and state subsidies to create approximately \$200 million in new or rehabilitated, economically integrated housing in the two metro areas. By coordinating with our regional housing centers, these housing developments will have racially diverse applicant pools.

- 10) We will spearhead metro-level campaigns to explain the housing desegregation program and its goals, to document the positive effects of housing integration in other metro areas; we will also work closely with community groups to design community-level initiatives aimed at making integration “real” and personal.
- 11) Based on patterns in desegregating metropolitan areas, we anticipate that each pro-integrative move we facilitate will be matched by another pro-integrative move, meaning well over two hundred thousand persons moving to more integrated neighborhoods in metropolitan Chicago over the five years of the program, and more than forty thousand persons moving to more integrated neighborhoods in metropolitan Memphis.
- 12) We will underwrite regional cooperation efforts among local governments to help complement our integration strategies.
- 13) We will design each of these components in a way that they can be rigorously evaluated for effectiveness by top social scientists involved in our initiative.

These collective efforts will leverage the \$100 million foundation investment into investment activity of nearly \$1.5 billion in the two metro areas. There are three measureable goals we will monitor and expect to achieve:

- 1) A 1-point reduction in the black/white index of dissimilarity each year (5 points over 5 years) and a 0.6-point reduction in the Hispanic/Anglo index of dissimilarity in Chicago each year (2.5 points over 5 years).
- 2) A 30% reduction in the number of segregated neighborhoods over five years – defined by the number of neighborhoods that have less than a five percent presence of African-Americans (in predominantly white areas) or a less than five-percent presence of Anglos (in predominantly African-American and Latino areas).
- 3) An increase of 50,000 low-and-moderate income people living in “opportunity neighborhoods.” [definition]

The crucial effects of desegregation upon outcome measures related to racial inequality will be measurable by Year 4. At the end of five years, we anticipate the following effects:

Summary of budget

Activity	Unit Cost	Five-Year Total
----------	-----------	-----------------

Regional housing centers	\$850k million/year per center Seven centers	\$30 million
Housing trust mechanisms	\$7,000 per unit; one-time cost 3000 units	\$21 million
Assisted housing development	\$24,000 per unit subsidy 1000 units	\$24 million
Inclusivity index; disparate Impact litigation; early- Warning system	\$500,000 per year	\$2.5 million
Housing Opportunity search engine	\$400,000 per year	\$2 million
Facilitating linkages to mortgage/ Voucher assistance	\$1 million per year	\$5 million
Community and metro outreach	\$1 million per year	\$5 million
Research, monitoring and evaluation		\$5 million
Contingency/overhead/other administrative		\$6.5 million
Total, 5-year budget		\$100 million

MEMORANDUM

To: IMI Group
From: Rick Sander
Date: June 5, 2019
Re: Next steps on Inclusivity Ratings

At our March 29th meeting, there was strong and general enthusiasm for the idea of creating “inclusivity ratings”. (On the next two pages of this packet, I’ve included the original write-up on the idea from the packet for our March meeting, and the notes from our discussion.). Key questions that emerged from our discussion were these:

- 1) Has anyone already done this? Is there a model for us to follow?
- 2) More generally, what sort of systematic information has anyone collected that we could use?
- 3) What, exactly, should go into such a rating?

Collectively, we’ve made some progress answering these questions, or at least developing resources that can help us move forward. Greg Squires hired an RA to gather information on past efforts to rate jurisdictions, cities, or metro areas in ways related to diversity and inclusivity. That led to a memo which we circulated last month (copies will be available at our June 11th meeting). One could reasonably conclude from that search that the field is open; many ratings exist, but mostly these are at the metropolitan or central-city level, and they usually are related to general measures of urban quality or demographic diversity, and are not based on the degree to which individual jurisdictions are helping or hindering the development of economically- or racially-diverse housing.

Marge put us in touch with Solomon Greene, who will attend on the 11th and who has been closely involved with efforts at the Urban Institute (“UI”) to create systematic information about local zoning and land use practices. Our interest closely parallels UI’s; during the recent 50th anniversary think-fest at UI, one central topic of discussion concerned a possible UI initiative to create national databases on zoning and land use regulations. The first two memos attached (pages 5-10) describe some of the efforts and thinking at UI.

Bruce Cordingley, of Pedcor and the Inclusivity Institute, (“II”) envisions the Inclusivity Ratings as something analogous to a Standard & Poor’s municipal bond rating: a fairly detailed analysis, several pages long, that considers qualitative as well as quantitative factors, leading to a specific rating, and an explanation of what steps a jurisdiction would need to take to improve its rating. As we’ve noted, Pedcor’s experience in working with many dozens of jurisdictions to get approvals for housing developments gives it a rich institutional memory and understanding of actual local practices in land use and permitting, which is a great complement to UI’s “web-scraping” to get objective, comparative data on zoning standards and the like.

The Inclusivity Institute is likely to be at least somewhat “staffed up” by mid- to late-summer. One possible path forward would be a collaboration between the Institute and UI, focusing on a few metro areas; in those areas, UI could gather hard data on zoning and land-use rules for all sizeable jurisdictions, and II could gather complementary “soft” data on actual permitting practices, conduct interviews with local officials and developers, and create prototype reports.

This still leaves us with questions about what ordinances and practices we should examine, and how should they be judged? To help answer this are two other documents in this packet. The first is a memo prepared by Juhi Kore (pages 11-23), II’s summer intern (and first employee). Juhi has examined some of the scholarly and “center” literature in the field – that is, articles and reports examining the effect of zoning on exclusion/inclusion -- with an eye toward identifying the actual methodologies used in these studies and the methods through which information was collected. (Some of the most interesting and relevant recent work she identifies is work involving UI researchers.). The second is the survey used by Rolf Pendall in his landmark study of local zoning and land-use practices in 2003 (pp. 24-31).

It’s worth noting that in our Chicago meetings, we discussed with several civil rights lawyers the potential use of the Inclusivity Index in helping them to galvanize work on exclusionary practices, and providing more concrete and justiciable standards for when a jurisdiction’s practices might have an objectively adverse and disparate impact upon protected groups. They certainly saw the value of this approach and were interested in learning more. If we secure funding to do something ambitious in Chicago or any other metro area, it seems clear that deploying the Inclusivity Rating in some form would be part of the plan.

All of this, we hope, can facilitate a concrete discussion of potential next steps.

From the packet for March 29th:

Inclusivity Ratings As we all know, local jurisdictions engage in a wide variety of strategies and tactics – many involving zoning and permitting – to foster economic and sometimes racial exclusivity. While there is empirical debate about how effective these strategies are and how much they contribute to overall racial segregation, there is consensus among those in the field that existing restrictions are excessive and pressure should be brought to bear upon local governments to become more inclusive. A possible tool in this effort is the development of “inclusivity ratings” that “grade” local areas on the degree to which local policies foster exclusion or inclusion.

Suppose, for example, that we are pursuing a multi-pronged effort to foster racial integration in a metropolitan area of three or four million residents. A logical part of that effort is to foster broad consensus among government and civic leaders on the value of more inclusionary policies. Just the process of developing and explaining a rating system could help to articulate the characteristics and workings of exclusionary and inclusionary policies. And assigning “grades” to particular areas could help to identify “outliers” in the spectrum of local practices. It’s plausible that these grades could be helpful in multiple ways:

- 1) Bringing political pressure upon “bad” outlier jurisdictions and kudos to “good” outlier jurisdictions
- 2) Making “bad” jurisdictions less appealing (and “good” jurisdictions more appealing) to millennials who will take into account such “reputational” issues in deciding where to live or buy;
- 3) Helping to identify target jurisdictions for disparate impact litigation;
- 4) Conducting objective research on the practical effect of exclusionary or inclusionary strategies on economic and racial diversity.
- 5) Feeding these efforts into the AFFH process at both the local and HUD level.

Existing fair housing assessment work, and “fair share” regulations that exist in California and other states, provide a number of alternate guides for what practices one should examine in constructing such an evaluation, and how to get the information to do it. Several academics have also undertaken studies that, in effect, develop measures similar to these ratings, which they then use to test hypotheses. [A recent initiative to create “Racial Equity” scores (add more) is another promising example and perhaps partner.]

Issues/concerns:

- 1) Can we reach consensus on the exact process of assigning such grades?
- 2) To be effective, such ratings should be comprehensive across a metro area. How difficult is that to do? (It seems likely that, even under pessimistic assumptions, this is not a high-cost initiative, and one with which local allies could valuably help.)`
- 3) Would such a rating system alienate potential allies?

- 4) Who is already doing this or things like this? (Consider the “equity offices” in cities like Portland and Seattle, CityLab, other sources.)

From the discussion on March 29th:

Inclusivity Ratings. We discussed this idea in detail and generally liked it a lot. Several of us pointed out that there have been various types of “ratings” tried in the past, but none that really gets at the key issue here: to what extent is a jurisdiction “open” to the entry of low- and moderate-income housing? We agreed that a rating, and the substantive evaluation that went along with it had several potential uses: (a) it could help focus media and public attention on particularly bad actors, and reward good ones; (b) in the hands of a regional agency seeking to facilitate integration, it could be a valuable tool for focusing pressure against bad actors; (c) it could also provide a focus for disparate impact litigation.

How should such a rating be implemented? While we didn’t fully resolve this, several points were made: (1) this should be a “rating” and not a “rank” – we thought rankings tended to be gimmicky, while a rating would be more substantive; (2) the rating should not merely look at “formal” obstacles to economic diversity (e.g., exclusionary zoning), but actual practices as well (does the permitting process exclude in practice what is allowed in theory?); (3) the rating should not be a demographic measure of what exists (though it could certainly be useful to have a separate demographic rating) but an evaluation of current barriers. As our later discussion suggested, the experience of affordable-housing developers like Pedcor would provide valuable insights into these barriers.



Zoning Innovation Knowledge Lab

Takeaways & Tools

Solomon J. Greene, Jorge Gonzales, and Lydia Lo

May 17, 2019

Below we summarize the insights and resources shared during the Zoning Innovation Knowledge Lab at the Urban Institute's Next 50 Changemaker Forum on May 15th, 2019.

Zoning Innovation and Housing Affordability

Here is what we learned about **how reforms to local land use regulations can accelerate solutions to the nation's affordable housing crisis...**

- Current zoning and land use reforms to increase housing supply are generally aimed at one or more of the following **goals**: 1) increasing density and “toppling the hegemony of single-family homes”; 2) reforming and streamlining the approval process; 3) reducing requirements that drive-up costs of development; and 4) incentivizing and/or requiring dedicated affordable housing units.
- **New coalitions** are forming, but much more needs to be done. While there is growing national political consensus on the importance of local zoning reforms, we have seen uneven and halting progress on the ground. To build stronger and more enduring coalitions, we may need to redefine communities and representation, better understand “mutual self-interest,” and create more “win-win” opportunities.
- Zoning is a powerful tool that can be used to **include or exclude**. Achieving equity will require more than providing more affordable housing – it will also require dismantling segregation, reducing neighborhood disparities, and protecting against displacement. What this will look like will vary by neighborhood, city and region. For example, without paying attention to local dynamics, upzoning in urban neighborhoods that face gentrification pressures can create a wedge that prevents reforms or further exacerbates inequalities.
- How zoning functions and what types of communities it creates depends on **who gets to decide**. To ensure that zoning happens “with, rather than to,” historically excluded communities, we

need to ensure that the residents who are most impacted have a seat at the table. Beyond zoning, we need thoughtful and inclusive planning processes.

- **Time is money**, and complex and lengthy approval processes drive up costs for all projects and often kill affordable housing developments. Streamlining environmental review and expediting permitting process can make all the difference in whether projects “pencil out.” Developers and planners also often have very different estimations of how long it takes to complete approvals. Educating planners about development realities may help in the streamlining process.
- While easing local land use regulations and expediting approvals can go far in unleashing the housing supply, we also need **public subsidies** and support to provide or preserve affordable housing for very low-income families and increase options in high-opportunity neighborhoods.
- Zoning in the US is distinctly local, and unlike many other countries, the **federal government** cannot directly control local land use policies. But the federal government still plays an important – if inconsistent – role in ensuring that localities aren’t unfairly discriminating or perpetuating segregation, and can provide data and tools to support local innovation. **States** have more power to shape local zoning but are pulling in different directions. Some states (like CA and MA) are overriding restrictive regulations and providing incentives; others (like TX) are preempting the tools local governments need to deliver affordable housing at scale.
- **Land** generally isn’t the main constraint on growth. We need to find ways to add density to existing developed land, without unnecessary demolitions and displacement (such as through ADUs and overlays). We also need to find ways to creatively repurpose public land and build permanent affordability into projects (such as through inclusionary policies and CLTs). **Infrastructure gaps** in many urban areas and inner ring suburbs can thwart reforms efforts. We also need to consider **transportation connectivity**, and states can play an important role in expanding transit options in areas of opportunity.

Technology and Housing

Here is what we learned about **how technology is changing the way we build and how we zone...**

- Technology is unleashing innovation in **building design and construction** (such as 3D-printed and modular homes), and developers are increasingly interested in these innovations as construction costs increase. But local approval processes have not caught up. New entrants who rely on technological innovation to produce housing more quickly and cheaply are exposing inefficiencies in approvals process, and can help drive change.
- Technology can also improve **planning and approvals processes**. New data and tech tools (some of which are listed in Box 1 below) can help planners work with communities to set their own priorities and assess tradeoffs. These tools can also ease (or eliminate) onerous review requirements while delivering social, economic and environmental benefits.
- Technology is also changing the **way we live** and form households, and can help support new models of shared living. But laws may need to catch up – for example, by changing reforming number of unrelated individuals who can live together.

- Finally, technology can give us the tools to [better understand local zoning](#), market dynamics, and approval processes. Since the most valuable data is “buried in voluminous tomes” in planning agencies or held in proprietary databases, data science techniques (such as AI and machine learning) can help “unlock” data to understand local zoning issues, opportunities and challenges at a national scale. “Democratizing data” help us understand impacts of reforms, engage communities, assess tradeoffs in land use decisions, and realize a more inclusive future.

BOX 1

Data Tools to Support Decisionmaking and Action

While we have a long way to go, plenty of existing research, data and tools already exist. Here are a few that were mentioned during the discussion. If you haven't already seen them, check out them out!

- The University of Miami's [Land Access for Neighborhood Development \(LAND\)](#) (supported by Citi Community Development) identifies thousands of vacant parcels of public land that could be used for affordable housing in Miami.
- The Urban Institute's [Mapping America's Futures](#) data tool allows users to test possible scenarios for how the US population across commuting zones by 2030.
- Up for Growth's [Affordability Calculator](#) allows users to examine how various policy choices impact the likelihood of housing getting built and estimates how policy choices affect housing supply and affordability across the city. The first version of the calculator focuses on Seattle but will be expanded to other cities.
- Grounded Solution Network and Lincoln Institute of Land policy recently released their report, [Tracking Growth and Evaluating Performance of Shared Equity Homeownership Programs During Housing Market Fluctuations](#), which demonstrates the economic benefits of shared equity homeownership programs. This is the largest study of these programs to date, tracking more than 4,000 units across 20 states, using data from Grounded Solutions' [HomeKeeper National Data Hub](#).
- Grounded Solution's [Inclusionary Housing Calculator 2.0](#) allows communities to explore the relationship between various local incentives and the development of mixed income housing.
- [UrbanFootprint](#) streamlines urban planning and mobility decisions with actionable data and allows non-experts to model the impacts of different urban planning scenarios, such as zoning changes and road reconfigurations.

Role of Research, Data and Evidence

Here is what we learned about **how research, data and evidence can help fill knowledge gaps and accelerate promising local reforms...**

- It is not enough to simply measure the “dimensional requirements” of zoning and land use regulations. We also need to data on the **processes** by which development approvals are made and what can feasibly be built. This is a major impediment and the least understood. We also need to understand whether planning and zoning decisions should be at wholesale or retail level – do “big” processes (such as major rezonings) reduce time and effort over lots of smaller, discretionary decisions?
- We need to better understand the **impacts** of reforms over time – do they deliver the kind of outcomes we’re hoping to achieve? This can not only help improve reform efforts by grounding in evidence of what works, but also address local opposition.
- We can use microsimulation models and scenario planning to project **future growth** trends and build the cities and regions we’ll need in the decades to come. This knowledge can serve to catalyze change in current zoning regimes that hold us back from creating an inclusive and prosperous future.
- We need to better understand how **coalitions** for reform come about and why they succeed. It’s happening in some places, but not always where we expect or need it. We need to understand these local trends and what structural or contextual factors drive change.
- We need to better understand which policies and tools for **value capture** deliver benefits without stifling growth. A related question is what is the right scale for distributing the benefits of value capture – at the neighborhood level or on a more regional scale? There are strong arguments both for keeping benefits tied to the places in which they’re created and to distributing them to places that need them most.
- Other data and knowledge gaps include: We need better data on underutilized or underbuilt **land** and **infrastructure gaps**. Additional research is needed to connect housing production to **other systems**, like transportation. We also need to better understand “**missing middle**” housing and “naturally occurring” affordable housing. We need more reliable indicators of **neighborhood quality** and which neighborhood attributes promote upward mobility, and target reforms accordingly.
- Facts matter, but so does **framing and messaging**. We need data and evidence to help change hearts and minds. For example, research can help personalize the impacts of current land use and zoning decisions by showing how they shape our lives and who benefits of innovations and reforms. Research can also point to how current restrictions hold back the economy and stifle upward mobility.

BOX 2

Coalitions and Campaigns

New coalitions and campaigns are forming to bring together diverse community stakeholders to create smart and effective local zoning and land use reforms. Here are a few that we discussed during the Knowledge Lab:

- PolicyLink's [Anti-Displacement Policy Network](#) advances bold new ideas while building the power, voice, and capacity of communities directly impacted by displacement in defining challenges and advancing solutions.
 - Urban Land Institute's [UrbanPlan Program](#) supports dialogue among local stakeholders involved in land use decisions through the education of tomorrow's voters, neighbors, and community leaders. It educates high school students and public officials about the development process, and helps them evaluate tradeoffs when making land use decisions.
 - Habitat for [Humanity's Cost of Home](#) (to be launched in June) is a five-year, nationwide advocacy campaign designed to influence policies and systems to increase home affordability for 10 million people.
-

Decoding Zoning: Using Data Science to Transform Policy and Practice

Understanding how cities and regions regulate local land use is crucial to addressing many of the world's most pressing challenges— from affordable housing to education to inclusive growth to climate change and resilience in the face of natural disasters.

Restrictions on height and density affect housing supply and price, which affect [geographic mobility](#) and [economic opportunity](#) for workers and force cities to expand horizontally, increasing vehicle miles traveled and greenhouse gas emissions. Zoning restrictions also impact [education](#) – where people can afford to live affects school attendance, and breaking down [exclusionary barriers](#) has been shown to improve student achievement.

Zoning determines whether residential construction is allowed and how street and transit networks are designed, which can significantly impact the ability of residents to evacuate in a [disaster](#) and the ability of the city to efficiently design and improve transit networks.

Yet citizens, researchers and local governments do not have access to basic comparable zoning data to help them understand these challenges, address them, and identify best practices across jurisdictions .

The data are so sparse that in the United States, no systematic, up-to-date, tabular data is available on even basic parameters such as the types of development allowed on a parcel, maximum height, or the number of housing units that can be built across jurisdictions . The data are currently locked in complex text descriptions in PDF documents, webpages, or physical code publications at local city and county planning departments.

These documents take significant time and expertise to parse, making them nearly unintelligible to the average citizen. Unlocking these data would allow policymakers to make better decisions and citizens to take constructive action on many of society's critical challenges.

To address this gap, we propose to combine innovative text classification and information extraction techniques to automate the process of converting local zoning codes into structured , open data that can be easily accessed, analyzed, and shared. Our initial stage, we plan to study approximately five cities and counties across the United States with sufficient geographic and policy diversity . After we successfully validate our techniques on a small sample, we plan to expand to additional cities and counties across the US

The team will produce tabular data, along with the open source code and documentation necessary to allow the process to be replicated in other contexts. The data produced will be designed to be comparable across places and diverse environments and be easily updated.

This effort brings together leading experts in computer science, natural language processing (NLP), legal text extraction, land use, and housing policy across multiple universities (UC Berkeley, NYU, University of Pittsburgh, University of Illinois Chicago, University of Memphis) local government agencies (Washington DC, Howard County, MD, San Francisco, and others) and non-profit policy research organizations (Urban Institute) .

MEMORANDUM

To: Rick Sander
From: Juhi Kore
Date: 5th June, 2019
Re: Quantifying Land-use Regulation

From Traditional to Reformed: A Review of the Land Use Regulations in the Nation's 50 largest Metropolitan Areas

Rolf Pendall, Robert Puentes, and Jonathan Martin (2006)

rolf.pendall@gmail.com

rpuentes@enotrans.org

jmarti18@pratt.edu

- Surveyed 1,800 cities, townships, and counties responded to questions about land use regulations that affect housing
- 50 largest U.S. metropolitan areas (according to 1999 metropolitan definitions and 2000 Census results, based on CMSAs and MSAs); Jurisdictions over 10,000 residents included 2,365 jurisdictions
- In total, 1,844 of the 3,177 jurisdictions—over 58 percent—responded.
 - Page 8 describes more about who responded and who did not
- Factor analysis was used to characterize the prevalence in each metropolitan area in each of the six areas of land use regulation:
 - 1) **Zoning:** Presence of zoning, Low density-only zoning, Zoning allowed above 30 dwellings per acre, Permission for the prototype high density apartment complex
 - 2) **Comprehensive planning:** Presence or absence of a comprehensive plan
 - 3) **Containment:** Presence of a containment device
 - 4) **Infrastructure Regulation:** Presence of adequate public facilities ordinances, Utilization of impact fees
 - 5) **Growth Control:** Utilization of building moratoria, Presence of permit caps
 - 6) **Affordable housing programs & funding:** Presence of a regulatory affordable housing program, Existence of a funding source (such as a trust fund)
- Once the surveys were complete and coded, estimates were constructed of the incidence of 16 key land use regulations and housing programs at the metropolitan level and stratified by three and sometimes four dimensions. The result was a table of probabilities that were then applied to non-respondents and non-surveyed municipalities
- Between one and four survey measures were used for each of the analyses; for each of the measures, there were three variables: the percent of jurisdictions covered, the percent of population covered, and the percent of land area covered; the number of variables ranged between 3 for comprehensive planning and containment and 12 for zoning

- Hierarchical cluster analysis was used to gain a more empirically based view of which metropolitan areas most resemble one another in their regulatory structure based on the land use tools/factors.
- The cluster analysis resulted in 12 clusters/typologies that identify similar approaches to residential land use regulation in the 50 largest metropolitan areas; the 12 clusters can be combined into four major groups based on their similarity to one another
- **Available data:**
 - Results of Factor Analysis, by metropolitan area (or part) and rank
 - Several questions from the actual survey are mentioned on pages 7 & 8

Predicting Zoned Density Using Property Records

Emma Nechamkin, Graham MacDonald (2019)

enechamkin@uchicago.edu

gmacdonald@urban.org

- Combined property assessment records provided by Zillow (ZTRAX) with data from the Washington, DC, Office of Zoning, and using a random forest regression, predicted zoning characteristics in zones with residences
- Created two models: general & DC-specific
- Goal is to predict the maximum floor area ratio (FAR) for the average residential property in each zone because there are too many variables (currently) and no single density limit
- The focus is on modeling density limits for their proof-of-concept because density limitations have the potential to affect housing affordability, educational access, greenhouse gas emissions etc.
- If a zone has a FAR maximum of 1 for a typical building and a FAR maximum of 1.2 for an inclusionary zoning building, the FAR limit for the zone would be 1.002 ($0.99 * 1 + 0.01 * 1.2$)
- ZTRAX fields used:
 - Lot Size: the area in square feet of each property
 - Standard Land Use Code: a standardized code that describes how land is used
 - Year Remodeled: the last major remodel to the building
 - Year Built: the year a building was erected
 - Geographic descriptors: property longitude, latitude, legal block, address, & lot number etc.
- Variables in final dataset
 - The minimum build year and remodel year for all properties in the zone
 - The maximum build year and remodel year for all properties in the zone
 - The mean build year and remodel year for all properties in the zone

- The zone district type, determined by the most common land use type by area from commercial office, commercial retail, governmental, industrial, residential, residential multifamily, and vacant land
- The share of high-, medium-, and low-density homes by lot area, derived from the standard land use designations, which detail building type; see appendix C for more detail
- The total amount of residential lot area in the zone
- The average lot area in the zone per residential property
- The number of residential and total properties within the zone
- The share of neighboring zones categorized as high, low, or medium density based on the county-level land use code; see appendix C for more detail
- The number of neighboring zones in total and that were categorized as residential neighbors, using the standard land use code
- The share of residential land in the zone, defined as properties with residential land use category descriptions
- For the analysis, they manually selected each feature, then used a LASSO regression to penalize features that have minimal impact on the outcome variable and finally removed the most penalized features to further reduce the total number of features used in the model
- Then a random forest regression with the selected features was used to predict the FAR maximum for residential zones in DC because it allowed them to generalise their results while decreasing overall errors
- Errors reported using:
 - root mean squared error
 - mean absolute error
 - relative absolute error
 - weighted relative mean average error
- **Available data:**
 - Generalized Model: Most Zones Have Few Properties, and Few Zones Have Most Properties
 - Categories by density level for Washington, DC
 - Mathematical formulas

A New Measure of the Local Regulatory Environment for Housing Markets: The Wharton Residential Land Use Regulatory Index

Joseph Gyourko, Albert Saiz, and Anita A. Summers (2007)

gyourko@wharton.upenn.edu

saiz@mit.edu

summers@wharton.upenn.edu

- Immediate goal: provide a current ranking of communities in terms of the stringency of land use regulatory environments
- Conducted a nationwide survey of local land use control environments; combined that with a state-level analysis of the legal, legislative, and executive actions regarding land use policies and the development of measures of community pressure using information on environmental and open space-related ballot initiatives
- They constructed a master file of all U.S. localities from Census-designated place definition files and then created a sample selection dummy variable. A value of one was assigned to each municipality that also was in our ICMA- based sample, with all other localities being assigned a value of zero for this variable
- The data were then used to create a summary measure of the stringency of the local regulatory environment in each community
- This aggregate measure has eleven subindexes; nine pertain to local characteristics and two reflect state court and state legislative/executive branch behavior
- Subindexes:
 - The Local Political Pressure Index (LPPI)
 - Local Zoning Approval Index (LZAI)
 - Local Project Approval Index (LPAI)
 - Local Assembly Index (LAI)
 - Supply Restrictions Index (SRI)
 - Density Restrictions Index (DRI)
 - Open Space Index (OSI)
 - Exactions Index (EI)
 - Approval Delay Index (ADI)
 - The State Political Involvement Index (SPII) – state
 - The State Court Involvement Index (SCII) – state
- Factor analysis was used to create the aggregate index; aggregate index was standardised; sample mean is zero and the standard deviation equals one
- Factor analysis of the subindexes was used to create WRLURI and they selected the first factor as the WRLURI because they wanted to capture a single dimension of the data and rank localities according to whether they have a more or less restrictive regulatory environment regarding housing development
- The outcome of the factor analysis was not all that dissimilar to the results obtained from simply adding the standardized sum of the component indexes; correlation between the

- WRLURI and the sum of the standardized component indexes = 0.8 therefore final index value is not particularly sensitive to the factor analysis weights of the component indexes
- They found a strong positive correlation across the component indexes that make up the aggregate WRLURI
 - The overall response rate was 38%, with 2,649 surveys returned which represents 60% of the surveyed population
 - **Available data:**
 - Survey Instrument
 - Index construction details
 - Mathematical formulae

The Growth of Control? Changes in Local Land-Use Regulation in Major U.S. Metropolitan Areas From 1994 to 2003

Rolf Pendall, Jake Wegmann, Jonathan Martin & Dehui Wei (2018)

rolf.pendall@gmail.com

jagw@utexas.edu

jmarti18@pratt.edu

dehuiw@hotmail.com

- Sent same survey by Pendall in 1994 and again in 2003, drawn from 728 localities within the largest 25 metropolitan areas in the United States
- Trying to answer two questions:
 - To what extent have local governments adopted or retained land-use regulations?
 - And what motivates local governments to adopt or retain them?
- The survey makes it possible to evaluate changes in land use in a large number of communities across the country, over a period of time
- 1994: 1,530 local governments in the largest 25 metropolitan areas; 77% responded
- 2003: 50 largest metropolitan areas; over 3,100 jurisdictions were surveyed; 58% responding
- The 728 twice-responding jurisdictions contained just under 24% of the total U.S. population in 2000
- two descriptive techniques and one statistical method. Our first descriptive technique is to simply report the incidence of these residential land-use regulations in the jurisdictions that responded in both 1994 and 2003. Second, we report rates of use of a subset of regulations by state in 1994 and 2003, and their rates of adoption and abandonment between these two points in time.
- Our statistical method is a logistic (logit) regression analysis to identify factors that appear to associate independently with the adoption and retention of these measures between 1994 and 2003.

- We ran a total of 12 logit models: one for the adoption, and one for the retention, of each of six residential land-use regulations for which we have complete data in both 1994 and 2003
- They performed all logit model runs using the glm function in the R programming language using the R Studio environment
- Land use tools:
 - 1) **Exclusionary:** Low density zoning, recent downzoning
 - 2) **Growth Control:** pace control, moratorium
 - 3) **Growth Management:** Adequate public facilities ordinances, urban growth boundary, impact fee
 - 4) **Smart Growth:** High density zoning, recent upzoning
 - 5) **Affordable Housing:** Inclusionary zoning, density bonus
- **Available data:**
 - 2003 Survey Instrument
 - Descriptive statistics for variables used in logit models
 - Correlation matrix for variables used for logit regression models

Why Do Cities Matter? Local Growth And Aggregate Growth

Chang-Tai Hsieh and Enrico Moretti (2015)

chsieh@chicagobooth.edu

moretti@berkeley.edu

- Wanted to study how economic growth of cities determines the growth of nations.
- Used a spatial equilibrium model and data on 220 US metropolitan areas from 1964 to 2009 to estimate the contribution of each U.S. city to national GDP growth; then provided a normative analysis of potential growth for each
- Calculated that wage dispersion lowered the aggregate GDP by 13.5% and that it would increase by 9.5% if cities lowered regulatory constraints
 - Pages 5-8 describe the model
- Calculated the contribution of each US city to aggregate growth and compared it with an accounting measure based solely on the growth of the city's GDP
- Switched from a positive analysis of the local forces underlying aggregate growth to a normative analysis of potential growth
- The model is a standard Rosen-Roback model with a spatial equilibrium
- Extensions available for basic model:
 - Ownership of housing stock
 - Specialisation
 - Imperfect Labour Mobility
 - Heterogeneity in Labor Demand Elasticity
 - Endogenous TFP and Amenities

- **Data Sources:**
 - 1964, 1965, 2008 and 2009 County Business Patterns (CBP)
 - 1960 and 1970 Census of Population
 - the 2008 and 2009 American Community Survey (ACS)
 - 1964 and 2009 Current Population Survey (CPS)
 - Saiz 2010 to separate overall elasticity of housing supply in each U.S. city into the availability of land and municipal regulations.

Note: Since they could only find city-industry level data on wages & employment starting in 1964, they focused on changes between 1964 and 2009

- we decompose aggregate GDP growth into the contribution of each US city and compare it with a naïve “accounting” calculation (section 4.1). Second, we turn to the increased dispersion of wages and calculate how much larger US GDP would be in the counterfactual where the spatial dispersion of wages is fixed from 1964 to 2009 (section 4.2).
- Results suggest that local land use regulations that restrict housing supply in dynamic labor markets have important externalities on the rest of the country
- **Available Data:**
 - Mathematical formulae

// I was not exactly sure as to how I would describe the data and modelling any further because from what I understand, they created the formulae for the model and used the data to run the models.

Housing Constraints and Spatial Misallocation

Chang-Tai Hsieh and Enrico Moretti (2019)

chsieh@chicagobooth.edu

moretti@berkeley.edu

- This is an updated version of “Why Do Cities Matter? Local Growth And Aggregate Growth”

A National Survey of Local Land-Use Regulations: Steps Toward a Beginning

Robert W. Burchell and Michael L. Lahr (2008)

burchell@rutgers.edu

lahr@rutgers.edu

- This report provides valuable information and guidance to anyone in the research and policy communities concerned with obtaining sound data for regulatory barriers and related land-use issues
- **Goals:**
 - determine the types of land-use regulations that exist in various sizes of communities and in various geographic locations throughout the United States
 - indicate the degree to which communities have various types of residential zoning, what densities are permitted, whether mobile homes are allowed, and how often requests for rezoning to higher-intensity residential development are granted
 - address the level of development activity, permit- approval times associated with various types and sizes of developments, whether growth boundaries or adequate public facilities requirements exist locally, and whether affordable/workforce housing is being developed on a regular basis
 - hypothetical developments and questions about acceptance and approval times would provide quantitative statistics
- **Cities:**
 - 1) New Brunswick, New Jersey (pre-test)
 - 2) Portland, Oregon (Focus Group 1)
 - 3) Atlanta, Georgia (Focus Group 2)
 - 4) Minneapolis-St.Paul,Minnesota (Focus Group 3)
 - 5) Boston, Massachusetts (Focus Group 4)

Available Data:

- Original Survey Instrument
- Final Survey Instrument
- City-specific Survey Instrument

Race, Land Use Regulation, and Housing Affordability

Christopher A. Wheeler and Paul A. Jargowsky (2018)

christopher.wheeler@rutgers.edu

paul.jargowsky@rutgers.edu

- This article estimates the impact of various kinds of exclusionary land use regulation on individual housing affordability by housing tenure and race because very few studies have previously examined the relationship between land-use regulation and affordable housing or the effect of specific regulations on the difference between different racial and ethnic households
- This is an important consideration for planners in light of the Supreme Court’s 2015 ruling in Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs vs. Inclusive Communities Project

- They used Tobit and Instrumental Variables (IV) regression models to evaluate the impact of variation in regulation types at the metropolitan area level on individual households by race and ethnicity; the analysis measures the effects of types of regulations on housing affordability for different types of households; they instrument the land use regulation measures by historical population density (at least 30 years prior), decennial change in population density, and year of statehood for the state that makes up the majority of the metropolitan area by population; included a binary instrument indicating whether the metropolitan area borders a major coastline; used the number of governments with zoning powers and the number of these governments per 100 square miles are used
- Used a Sargan and Basman chi-square tests of overidentifying restrictions are performed to determine if the instruments are valid for each regression
- **Other variables:**
 - the ratio of owner costs to income for owner households
 - the ratio of gross rent to income for renter households
 - educational attainment levels through bachelor's degree attainment
 - population and population density for metropolitan areas
 - ratio of property taxes to home value for households
 - rental units' proportion of all housing units for metropolitan areas
 - total area taken up by water
 - Wharton Density Restrictions Index: density restrictions in the form of minimum lot size requirements
 - Density Restriction Importance Index: importance of single family and multi-family density restrictions to regulating development

Note: A factor analysis showed that single and multi-family density restrictions were highly correlated and together formed a density restriction dimension emergent from the data.

- Single-Family Development Limit Index: Single family construction and building permit limits
- Multi-Family Development Limit Index: multi-family dwelling limits and building permit limits
- From Pendall: a new development moratorium is in place, whether there is a residential pace restriction, whether a mobile home ban is in effect, whether a rezone is required for rezoning to multi-family, whether there is a density bonus or other inclusionary housing incentive offered, and the maximum residential density, whether there is an urban growth boundary in place, whether there is an urban limit line, whether there is a sprawl containment tool in place
- **Data used:**
 - Public Use Microdata Sample (PUMS) data from the US Census Bureau's American Community Survey (ACS) 2005-2009 5-Year Estimates, obtained from the University of Minnesota's Integrated Public Use Microdata Series (Ruggles, Genadek, Grover, and Sobek, 2015); includes household-level data on a wide

- array of demographic, economic, housing, and housing cost characteristics including gross rent, monthly owner costs, and household income.
- Used the components of the Wharton Residential Land Use Regulation Index (WRLURI) as the primary source of measurement for various types of land use regulation
- Used the Pendall land-use regulation data to analyse data on some land use regulations not captured in the Wharton survey
- Sample used in this study includes PUMS households within the 65 metropolitan areas for which there are at least eight responding jurisdictions in the Wharton survey, providing a minimum sample of municipalities per metropolitan area; the sampled municipalities are used to generate a weighted estimate of land use regulations for each of the retained metropolitan areas
- Regression results show that exclusionary land use regulation is an important contributor to the lack of housing affordability especially in African American and Hispanic households because it restricts and the availability of affordable housing options

Racial Enclaves and Density Zoning: The Institutionalized Segregation of Racial Minorities in the United States

Jonathan Rothwell (2011)

jrothwell@brookings.edu

- The goal of this paper is to explain why segregation of black households in the United States is higher than that of immigrants and why the levels of each are now converging
- First paper that did a comparative analysis on the effect of zoning across racial groups and fixed effects in metropolitan areas
- The focus is on maximum allowable density because it has the most important effects on housing supply growth and racial demographics at the local and the MSA levels
- Coded a variable for the percentage of jurisdictions that use growth controls, in the form of a moratorium on permits and caps on permits; calculated an infrastructure tax that was aggregated to the MSA level; calculated the percentage of jurisdictions in the MSA that use inclusionary zoning laws like affordable housing bonuses, density bonuses, and expedited permitting for affordable housing production; coded a fourth variable for containment regulations like the presence of growth boundaries, greenbelts, or sprawl control regulations
- Used regressions to identify the sources of 2000 levels of segregation in a cross section of MSAs for Hispanics, Asians, and Blacks; modelled segregation as a function of density regulation, minority income relative to income to Whites, demographic characteristics, and other variables that correlated with density regulation and segregation
- The analysis used the number of general governments in the metropolitan area to measure government fragmentation using data from the 1962 U.S. Census of Governments;

regressions showed a trade-off between the problems of endogeneity and omitted variables; analysis found a strong relationship between year of statehood and anti-density zoning with a simple regression of the two resulting in an F-statistic of 35.4 and an adjusted R^2 of 0.42

- Results found that Blacks moved to areas with higher density zoning scores and density zoning was positively or negatively correlated with relative income depending on the group; using the dissimilarity index with respect to Whites, the results show that the higher the permitted density score, the less segregation there is for all three racial groups and this result was robust across parsimonious and robust sets of controls.
- The research also checked for racial bias, aggregation bias, and regional effects in the 2000 levels model
- Zoning was found to be strongly associated and causally linked to segregation in a variety of different estimation strategies, including using year of statehood as an instrumental variable for density zoning, using an alternative measure of density zoning, controlling for all other aspects of land regulation, adjusting for individual characteristics, and using different aggregation strategies
- **Data used:**
 - Pendall et al. 2006
 - Gyourko et al. 2008
 - Cutler and Glaeser 1995
 - U.S. Mint
 - U.S. Census
 - HUD
 - U.S. Census of Governments
 - Federal Housing Finance Agency
 - National Climatic Data Center
- **Available data:**
 - Formula for profit to development from each housing unit
 - Empirical model
 - OLS Regression of 1990–2000 Change in Segregation Conditional on Permitted Density in MSA

How Land-Use Regulation Undermines Affordable Housing

Sanford Ikeda and Emily Washington (2015)

sanford.ikeda@purchase.edu

<https://www.linkedin.com/in/washingtonemily/>

This is a literature review covering the price effects of various land-use regulations, and the its cost on low-income households. The paper is structured to first cover literature on minimum lot sizes and density restrictions; then literature on the economic consequences of parking

requirements; then smart growth regulations; and finally, some proposals to limit the negative consequences of current land-use regulations:

- 1) Minimum Lot Sizes And Maximum Density Rules
 - a) Joseph Gyourko, Albert Saiz, and Anita Summers (2007)
 - b) Glaeser, Gyourko, and Saks (2003)
 - c) Glaeser, Schuetz, and Ward (2006)
 - d) Quigley and Rosenthal (2005)
 - e) Glaeser and Gyourko (2002)
 - f) Turner, Haughwout, and van der Klaauw (2014)
 - g) Nancy Wallace (1988)
- 2) Parking Requirements
 - a) Donald Shoup (1997)
 - b) Ryan Russo (2001)
 - c) Wenyu Jia and Martin Wachs (1998)
 - d) Simon McDonnell, Josiah Madar, and Vicki Been (2011)
- 3) Smart Growth Regulations
 - a) Gerrit Knaap (1985)
 - b) Keith Ihlanfeldt (2007)
- 4) Land-use Regulation And Regressive Effects
 - a) William A. Fischel (2004)
 - b) Diana Thomas (2012)
 - c) Peter Ganong and Daniel Shoag (2013)
 - d) Jonathan Levine (2005)

The Effect of Density Zoning on Racial Segregation in U.S. Urban Areas

Jonathan Rothwell and Douglas S. Massey (2009)

jrothwell@brookings.edu

dmassey@princeton.edu

This paper focuses on the relationship between zoning and segregation in U.S. metropolitan areas. The main argument is that anti-density zoning laws increase residential segregation between white and black households because it reduces the total number of available affordable housing units in predominantly white areas. The study uses the Pendall research paper to create regression models and calculate the effect of maximum density zoning on residential

segregation. The findings were based on OLS results that showed a cross-sectional relationship between low-density zoning and racial segregation; this stayed the same under two-stage least squares estimation. They also found that the best prospects for desegregation were metropolitan areas with more liberal density regulations.

Land-Use Policies and Housing:
A National Survey on Local Residential Development Regulation

This survey is part of a research project to identify local land-use and housing programs and policies in the 50 largest metropolitan areas in the United States. Please answer all the questions to the best of your ability. While accuracy is important to us, your time is also important, so please **provide your best estimates for any information that is not readily available**. If you wish to comment on any questions or qualify your answers, feel free to use the space in the margins; there is also space for comments on the back of the survey form. Your comments will be read and taken into account.

When you complete the form, you may

- e-mail it, if you have an electronic version, to [REDACTED]
- fax it at no cost to [REDACTED]
- mail it to
[REDACTED]

Thank you very much for your help.

Name of respondent: _____
 Title: _____
 Name of Community: _____
 City: _____ State: _____ Zip: _____
 Telephone number: () _____ - _____ Fax: () _____ - _____
 E-mail: _____ Date of Response: _____

A. Planning and Zoning

The first two questions concern overall regulations, including comprehensive planning and zoning that are currently in force in your county.

1. Does your county have a comprehensive (master, general) plan?
 _____ No.
 _____ Yes.
 If you answered "yes," what year was the Land Use element of the plan last updated?
 _____ (year)

2. Does your county have a zoning ordinance?
 _____ No.
 _____ Yes.
 If you answered "yes," what year was the ordinance last updated? _____ (year)

If you answered "no" to questions 1 and 2, please skip to Section C.

B. Zoning for Housing

Please answer questions 4-8 only for the areas to which the county zoning ordinance applies and not for townships or cities that have their own zoning ordinances.

3. What is the theoretical maximum number of dwelling units that may be constructed per net acre in areas to which your county zoning ordinance applies, in areas zoned in the **highest residential density category**?
 _____ Fewer than 4
 _____ 4-7
 _____ 8-15
 _____ 16-30
 _____ more than 30

4. How has the maximum permitted density **changed since 1994**?
 _____ Stayed approximately the same (within 10%)
 _____ Reduced more than 10%.
 _____ Increased more than 10%.
 _____ Don't know.

5. Does your county permit the placement of new **mobile homes**, either on a single lot or in a mobile home park?
 _____ No.
 _____ Yes; double-wide only.
 _____ Yes; double- or single-wide.

6. Assume your county has a vacant 5-acre parcel. If a developer wanted to build 40 units of 2-story apartments and was flexible with planning, landscaping and building configuration, would there be an existing zoning category that would allow such development?

- No.
- Yes; by right.
- Yes; by special permit, PUD, or other special procedure.

7. Does your county require a **popular vote of the county’s residents as a precondition to rezoning?**

- No.
- Yes, in open town meeting.
 - Applies to all rezonings
 - Applies only to selected rezonings (describe below)
- Yes, ballot measure.
 - Applies to all rezonings
 - Applies only to selected rezonings (describe below)

C. Jurisdiction Expansion Potential

These questions will help us understand whether development in your county can expand into unincorporated and undeveloped areas.

8. Is a popular vote required as a precondition to annexation in your county? (Please answer “no” if the only vote required is that of landowners or residents in **the area to be annexed.**)

- No.
- Yes, a binding referendum has been required since _____ (year).
- Yes, an advisory referendum has been required since _____ (year).

9. Does your county currently have any of the following?: (Please check “yes” or “no”)

- | | | |
|-----------------------------|------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Urban service area/urban service boundary in place since _____ (year) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Urban growth boundary in place since _____ (year) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Greenbelt in place since _____ (year) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Urban limit line in place since _____ (year) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> No | <input type="checkbox"/> Yes | Other tool to control spread of development in place since _____ (year) |

D. Other Regulations Pertaining to Housing

The next few questions concern other local regulations that your county uses for the management of residential growth, including growth (rate) controls, moratoria, and adequate public facilities ordinances.

10. Does your county currently have a measure that explicitly restricts the pace of residential growth?

- No.
- Yes; population growth limited to _____ percent per year; adopted _____ (year).
- Yes; residential building permit issuance limited to _____ (number) per year; adopted _____ (year).

11. Does your jurisdiction currently have a moratorium on issuance of new residential building permits or the processing of subdivision plats covering all or part of the county's unincorporated geographic area? (Please include moratoria imposed by either your county or another unit of government or utility district.)

- No.
- Yes; **a jurisdiction-wide moratorium.**
- Yes; **a moratorium covering part of the jurisdiction** (specific zoning districts, geographic areas, environmental zones, etc.) that affects
 - less than half** of the jurisdiction's undeveloped land area.
 - more than half** of the jurisdiction's undeveloped land area.

Moratorium in force since _____ (year);
 Moratorium will expire _____ (year).
 Moratorium does not have a definite expiration date.

If you answered "no" to both question 10 and question 11, please skip the next question and go to question 13.

12. **Does your current residential growth control or moratorium offer exemptions or incentives for affordable housing?**

- No.
- Yes; projects that consist mostly (more than 50%) of affordable housing are exempt from the control.
- Yes; the permit allocation system gives preference to affordable housing.

13. **Apart from any residential-growth limiting measures currently in force, has your jurisdiction had growth-limiting measures that lasted more than a year since 1980?**

- No.
- Don't know.
- Yes; growth rate or building permit cap from _____ (year) to _____ (year)
- Yes; permit or subdivision moratoria (including moratoria imposed by either your jurisdiction or another unit of government or utility district)
- Yes; jurisdiction-wide moratorium from _____ (year) to _____ (year)
- Yes; moratorium on part of the jurisdiction from _____ (year) to _____ (year)

14. Does your jurisdiction charge **impact fees**?

- No.
- Yes; we impose fees based on a case by case review of project off-site impacts.
- Yes; (we review projects) and fees are imposed at a flat rate of
 - \$ _____ / square foot.
 - \$ _____ / single-family unit.
 - \$ _____ / multi-family unit.

If so, **fees apply to:** (please check all that apply)

- Schools
- Stormwater
- Transportation facilities (roads, highways, transit)
- Public safety facilities (police, fire stations)
- Water supply and/or wastewater treatment, supply, delivery, and/or storage facilities
- Parks, recreation and/or open space facilities
- Water supply
- Waste water treatment
- Other: _____

15. Does your county have an adequate public facilities ordinance that makes development permission contingent on the levels of **off-site** public services?

- No.
- No, but we case review projects' off-site impacts on a case-by-case basis to estimate and mitigate impacts.
- Yes, an adequate public facilities ordinance was adopted in ____ (year) and applies to
 - Schools
 - Stormwater
 - Transportation facilities (roads, highways, transit)
 - Public safety facilities (police, fire stations)
 - Water supply and/or wastewater treatment, supply, delivery, and/or storage facilities
 - Parks, recreation and/or open space facilities
 - Other: _____

If your county has an adequate public facilities ordinance, does it apply

- in unincorporated areas only
- in both unincorporated and incorporated areas

E. Affordable Housing

The final questions are on affordable housing in your county. (We define affordable housing as units guaranteed to remain affordable for at least five years to households earning less than 120 percent of area median income.)

16. Does your county use any incentives or requirements to encourage **private-sector builders to develop affordable housing?** (Please check all that apply.)

- No.
- Yes; residential density bonus (to developers of market-rate housing who agree to provide affordable housing units).
- Yes; inclusionary zoning (developers of market-rate housing are required to include affordable housing units in their developments, at least _____ percent of the units must be affordable).
- Yes; developers may satisfy this requirement by paying a fee instead of building housing on site.
- Yes, we provide “fast-tracking” (expedited permitting) for builders who agree to provide some affordable housing.
- Yes; we require linkage fees (monies collected to help support or develop affordable housing) from non-residential builders.
- Yes; other:

17. What **other programs** does your county use to encourage affordable housing construction and substantial rehabilitation? (Please check all that apply.)

- We use public funds or provide staff to support local non-profits.
- We work with the local public housing authority to build new affordable housing and/or substantially rehabilitate existing uninhabitable units.
- We arrange for purchase of existing private-sector units for conversion to long-term affordability.
- We have adopted an ordinance providing for waivers of planning or development impact fees on affordable housing projects.
- Other programs in place (please list programs):

18. Approximately how many affordable housing units (see definition above), assisted by either the public or private sector, are there in the unincorporated areas of the county? If you cannot answer this question, please indicate in the space provided below the name and telephone number of someone who can.

- There is no government-assisted affordable housing in the county's townships.
- # of units built or substantially rehabilitated by the public housing agency or a non-profit with federal, state, or local subsidies (including existing private-sector units bought and made affordable).
- # of units built or substantially rehabilitated by private-sector developers as a result of a local government regulatory incentive or requirement (condition of approval).
- # of units built or substantially rehabilitated by private-sector developers with federal housing programs (eg. LIHTC, HOPE VI, Section 235/236, etc.).
- # of units total.
- Number of these housing units built between 1990 and 2002 (inclusive)
- Please call _____ at (____)_____ to obtain this information.

19. Does your county have a local affordable housing funding mechanism (e.g., housing trust fund)?

- No.
- Yes; this fund is dedicated solely for affordable housing.
- Yes; this fund may also be used for projects other than affordable housing.

20. **Compared to your jurisdiction's current level of regulation** on land use and residential development, how would you describe your jurisdiction in: (please check)

	more regulated	about the same	less regulated	no regulation
1970	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1980	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
1990	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

Thank you for your assistance. Please feel free to write additional comments or questions about the survey on the remainder of this page.

Is there anything else we should know about planning and zoning for residential development in your community? If so, please use this space for that purpose.

We very much appreciate your contribution to this effort. If you would like a summary of our results, please print your name and address on the **back of the return envelope**. We will see that you get a summary.

MEMORANDUM

To: IMI Group
From: Rick Sander
Date: June 5, 2019
Re: A few background materials on policy

At our March 29th meeting, and in conversations afterwards, many of you expressed interest in the idea of generating a “policy brief” that all or some subset of us could subscribe to, and which could help bring our ideas into public discussion, and provide a concrete path for outreach and communication to political candidates. That said, not much has happened on this front since our meeting – perhaps mostly or entirely because those of you most interested in moving forward on this idea were “booked” in April and May. So we have included this subject in the June 11th agenda, and I attach a few materials that may provide useful jumping-off points for our discussion:

- 1) A memo from our Inclusivity Institute intern, Juhi Kore, summarizing the positions of the Democratic presidential candidates on issues of housing and inclusivity (pp. -2-7);
- 2) A couple of materials explaining or related to the Housing Mobility pilot passed by Congress earlier this year (pp. 8-12)
- 3) The Executive Summary from the Urban Institute’s report on *Opportunity Neighborhoods* (pp. 13-14).

Democratic Presidential Hopefuls on Housing-related Policy

Note: 1-5 have some semblance of a plan; 6-8 & 10 have mentioned housing policy as being important but no substantive content on the issue; 9 can be assumed to have a comprehensive plan due to his former role; 11 & 12 have expressed support for the Equality Act that does in a way relate to housing discrimination

1) Elizabeth Warren:

<https://medium.com/@teamwarren/my-housing-plan-for-america-20038e19dc26>

Goals:

- Bring down rental costs by 10% over the next 10 years by addressing the severe lack of affordable housing supply and provide state and local governments with incentives to change land-use regulation
- Invest \$500 billion (including private money) over the next ten years to build, preserve, and rehab affordable housing for lower-income families
- Create 1.5 million new housing construction & rehabilitation jobs
- Invest \$500 million in rural housing programmes
- Invest \$2.5 billion in the Indian Housing Block Grant and the Native Hawaiian Housing Block Grant to build or rehab 200,000 homes on tribal land
- Invest \$4 billion in construction of affordable housing for middle-class families
- Encourage states and cities to reform land-use legislation by creating a new \$10 billion competitive grant programme
- Provide families in formerly redlined neighbourhoods with down-payment assistance grants
- Prohibits housing discrimination
- Covers non-bank mortgage lenders
- Invests \$2 billion in rural areas so families that are still underwater from the 2008 crisis can build economic security

How?

Lower the estate tax threshold from \$22 million to \$7 million that will affect 14,000 families and cover the entire cost of the plan

2) Cory Booker

<https://medium.com/@corybooker/corys-plan-to-provide-safe-affordable-housing-for-all-americans-da1d83662baa>

Goals:

- Create a Renters Credit to help cap rental costs at 30 percent of income for working and middle-class Americans and cover rent costs for 57 million Americans
- Create Baby Bonds i.e. savings account with \$1,000 for every child that can increase by \$2,000 every year depending on household income
- Incentivise local authorities to eliminate restrictive zoning rules in order to qualify for \$16 billion in federal funding from Surface Transportation Block Grant Program; National Infrastructure Investments Program; Nationally Significant Freight and Highway Projects Program; Transportation Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act Program; Railroad Rehabilitation and Improvement Financing Program; and Community Development Block Grant Program
- Increase funding for discretionary and formula transportation programs and provide greater access to funding for local governments that are prioritising affordable housing
- Construct new units for low-income renters
- Invest in rural America and Indian Country
- Protect for *all* Americans from housing discrimination
- Expand access to stable, decent, and affordable housing
- Restore the fair housing protections like the Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing, a central mandate of the 1968 Fair Housing Act
- End tenant blacklisting
- Fund anti-homelessness grants
- Make the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness permanent

How?

- Restore the 2009-era estate tax rules and close loopholes that allow currently wealthy households to avoid paying taxes on investments held at death
- Fully fund the Housing Trust Fund with \$40 billion each year to build, rehabilitate, and operate rental housing
- Fund the USDA 515 program to provide loans to build apartments for low-income residents in rural areas, and the Housing Preservation and Revitalization Demonstration Program, which will preserve and improve the availability of affordable rental units, and provide essential funding and technical assistance for tribal housing authorities
- Incentivise landlords to sell land to mobile park residents

- Create a national Eviction Right to Counsel Fund, to provide funding to states and localities that commit to enacting a right to counsel for low-income tenants facing eviction
- Pass the Equality Act and outlaw discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity
- Strengthen federal protections and encourage state laws to end “source of income” discrimination
- Reform the screening and eviction processes for federal housing assistance programs to end unfair barriers, eliminate “one strike” eviction policies, and end discriminatory practices against those with arrest records and the formerly incarcerated to find affordable housing
- Pass legislation modeled on his Tenant Protection Act to prohibit consumer reporting agencies from using information from eviction courts if the tenant has won the case

3) **Jay Inslee**

<https://www.jayinslee.com/issues/evergreen-economy#building-sustainable-climate-smart-infrastructure-anchor>

Goals:

- Invest federal dollars combined with public & private investment to address the housing crisis
- Create greener and safer communities
- Confront health effects on communities of colour and address gentrification by stabilising neighbourhoods for working families

How?

- Relaunching & expanding the Sustainable Communities Initiative
- Increasing financial incentives for private investment by increasing per-capita allocations for Low-Income Housing Tax Credits & state and local exempt Private Activity Bond capacity
- Increasing funding for HOME, project-based Section 8, and Rental Assistance Demonstration programmes
- Requiring Community Benefits Agreements to invest in affordable housing programmes

4) **Pete Buttigieg**

<https://peteforamerica.com/issues/>

Goals:

- Ensure every American has safe, affordable housing

- Invest in affordable housing for working families
- Reform unnecessary land-use legislation that prevents affordable housing construction
- Address housing discrimination that has caused limited economic mobility
- End homelessness for families with children
- Fund national investment in affordable housing construction
- Expand federal protections for tenants against eviction and unjust harassment

5) Andrew Yang

<https://www.yang2020.com/policies/zoning/>

Goals:

- Make housing more affordable for buying and renting
- Consider the needs of renters and those interesting in moving into specific areas

How?

- Relax zoning ordinances to increase development of affordable housing
- Encourage new housing options like micro-apartments and communal living in high-density urban areas
- Encourage people to put pressure on their local governmental authorities
- Pay people a government subsidy to move where they want

6) Kamala Harris

<https://kamalaharris.org/issues/>

Goal:

Fight for affordable housing

How?

Pass the Rent Relief Act to provide a tax credit for people spending 30 percent or more of their income on rent and utilities

7) Beto O'Rourke

<https://betoorourke.com/kickoff-remarks/#democracy>

Goals:

- Provide access to capital for communities that have been effectively shut out of capital and home loans for generations.
- Provide housing for every homeless veteran

8) Kirsten Gillibrand

<https://kirstengillibrand.com/issues/values/>

Goals:

- Address institutional racism in housing
- Ensure veterans have safe housing available upon their return

9) Julian Castro

<https://www.julianforthefuture.com/about/>

As the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development, he made housing more accessible, lessened the number of homeless veterans and provided internet access to families in public housing.

10) Michael Bennet

<https://michaelbennet.com/vision/drive-economic-opportunity/>

Goal:

- Tackle the housing affordability crisis

11) John Delaney

<https://www.johndelaney.com/issues/lgbtq/>

Supports the Equality Act which prohibits housing discrimination

12) Marianne Williamson

<https://www.marianne2020.com/issues/lgbtq-rights>

Supports the Equality Act which prohibits housing discrimination

No mention of housing policy:

- 1) Joe Biden
- 2) John Hickenlooper
- 3) Amy Klobuchar
- 4) Steve Bullock
- 5) Bill de Blasio
- 6) Eric Swalwell
- 7) Tim Ryan
- 8) Tulsi Gabbard

- 9) Bernie Sanders
- 10) Seth Moulton
- 11) Wayne Messam *** *could not access his website*

Link to spreadsheet:

https://docs.google.com/spreadsheets/d/1C_-rkMXgY3_Mu6TGVcIz938JKosR9oZ4LGVFPX64JQg/edit?usp=sharing

Housing Mobility Demonstration Will Improve Families' Access to High-Opportunity Areas

The Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) program can enable low-income families with children to move to safe neighborhoods with high-quality schools. But many families participating in the program remain in high-poverty areas, for a variety of reasons. The recently enacted Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration, included in the fiscal year 2019 funding bill for the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and other agencies, provides incentives to public housing agencies (PHAs) to help thousands of families realize their goal of moving to high-opportunity communities. The 2019 funding bill included \$28 million for the demonstration: \$20 million for housing mobility services, \$5 million for new vouchers for families with children, and \$3 million for research.

Why Do We Need a Housing Mobility Demonstration?

PHAs have limited resources and incentives to help low-income families gain access to neighborhoods that traditionally have been out of reach. The demonstration program will help PHAs plan and implement a housing mobility program to provide this assistance. It includes an evaluation component to help determine which interventions are most cost effective and beneficial to families.

A growing body of evidence shows that children who move to low-poverty areas do better in the long term. As the funding bill [report](#) issued by the House Appropriations Committee explains:

Low-income families, including voucher holders, tend to be concentrated in high-poverty neighborhoods where schools are under-resourced, transportation is limited, and well-paying jobs are scarce. This demonstration will harness the power of the housing choice voucher platform to help families with children seek housing and successfully move to privately-owned units in lower-poverty areas. A growing body of research finds that when families move to higher opportunity areas with less poverty, more jobs, and quality schools, their children experience significant earnings and educational attainment improvements that persist into adulthood. The persistence of the improved outcomes for children is remarkable and gives hope that family mobility could hold the key to arresting generational poverty in families served by HUD.

Given this important research, the housing mobility demonstration has enjoyed strong bipartisan support in both the House and the Senate.

Funding for Services

PHAs need additional resources to offer robust services to give more families access to high-opportunity communities. The demonstration includes \$20 million for services, which will allow selected PHAs and their partners to work together to develop and operate a housing mobility program. Those services might include:

- Informing families of the advantages of areas of opportunity.
- Working directly with individual families to address barriers they may need to overcome to successfully move to a high-opportunity area, such as by providing financial coaching.
- Providing outreach to landlords to recruit more of them to participate.
- Providing housing search assistance to help families find affordable units that meet their individual needs.
- Providing post-move services, such as regular check-ins, resource coordination, and landlord/tenant mediation, to help families living in areas of opportunity remain there.

Funding for Vouchers

The demonstration includes \$5 million for new vouchers for families with children that participate in the demonstration. This funds about 500 new vouchers, which will boost incentives for PHAs to undertake the substantial planning needed to meet the demonstration's goals.

The demonstration also allows participating agencies to use voucher funding for security deposits in designated opportunity areas. Lack of funds for security deposits is a significant barrier for poor families to move to higher-opportunity areas, where landlords often require large deposits.

How Would HUD Select Agencies to Participate?

HUD would select PHAs to participate in the demonstration through a competitive process. The proposal requires HUD to prioritize regional collaborations that have high concentrations of voucher holders in low-opportunity neighborhoods, or one or more small housing agencies, or a high-performing Family Self-Sufficiency (FSS) program and a commitment to allow families in the demonstration to maintain FSS participation, among other factors. PHAs selected for the demonstration would coordinate with partners and other service providers in the region to:

- Identify low-poverty areas and analyze access barriers for voucher holders.
- Determine what information, services, and resources families need to access high-opportunity areas.
- Develop a plan to recruit families and landlords to participate in the program.
- Create educational materials, including maps of the region, transportation options, and educational resources, to help families understand the regional housing market.
- Collaborate to make it easier for a family to move from one PHA's jurisdiction to another.
- Modify agency policies, such as payment standards and search time, as needed to facilitate moves to areas of opportunity.
- Enhance the quality of the Housing Choice Voucher program generally, to encourage more landlords to participate.

To implement the demonstration, HUD likely will issue two separate documents: a notice defining terms and specifying policies that will apply to the demonstration, and a Notice of Funding Availability to launch the competition to select the regions that will participate. These steps ideally will not take longer than six months. PHAs would then apply for the funding. HUD would likely make awards in late 2019 or early 2020.

Updated February 15, 2019

We look at bill sponsorship and key votes for a unique analysis of the twelve Democratic presidential hopefuls. [Updated] (<https://govtrackinsider.com/what-can-govtrack-data-tell-us-about-the-nine-most-recent-and-current-members-of-congress-running-14bc37b1f4b8>) X

[Congress \(/congress\)](#) / [Bills \(/congress/bills\)](#) / [H.R. 1122 \(116th\) \(/congress/bills/116/hr1122\)](#) / Summary

H.R. 1122: Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act of 2019

React with an emoji

 3  1  ...

Save your opinion

 ● ● ● ● ● ● ● ● 

 Add Note All Positions » (/accounts/positions)

[Overview \(/congress/bills/116/hr1122\)](#)

[Summary \(/congress/bills/116/hr1122/summary\)](#)

[Details \(/congress/bills/116/hr1122/details\)](#)

[Text \(/congress/bills/116/hr1122/text\)](#)

[GovTrack's Summary](#)

[Library of Congress](#)

Should families receiving government assistance for housing be encouraged to move to more well-off neighborhoods?

Context

The government's [Housing Choice Voucher \(HCV\) program \(https://www.hud.gov/topics/housing_choice_voucher_program_section_8\)](https://www.hud.gov/topics/housing_choice_voucher_program_section_8) was created in 1937 during the Great Depression to help low-income families afford housing costs. A person or family receiving the voucher chooses their own residence (as long as it meets the program's requirement), and a housing subsidy is paid to the landlord. Recipients only have to pay [about 30 percent \(https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/trump-administration-blocks-housing-voucher-policy-that-would-expand-opportunity\)](https://www.cbpp.org/research/housing/trump-administration-blocks-housing-voucher-policy-that-would-expand-opportunity) of housing costs.

A 2015 Harvard study found that voucher recipients who move to better-off neighborhoods [were better educated and later earned more \(http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/images/mto_exec_summary.pdf\)](http://www.equality-of-opportunity.org/images/mto_exec_summary.pdf). Yet a House Financial Services Committee report found that the program has not been as effective as it could be. Lower-income families receiving the voucher [did not move out of lower-income neighborhoods as often \(https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CRPT-115hrpt809/pdf/CRPT-115hrpt809.pdf\)](https://www.govinfo.gov/content/pkg/CRPT-115hrpt809/pdf/CRPT-115hrpt809.pdf) as many of the program's supporters would prefer.

What the bill does

The Housing Choice Voucher Mobility Demonstration Act would establish a pilot program to award housing vouchers to in such a way to encourage recipients to move to communities with less poverty.

The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) would administer the program for up to five years, at the conclusion of which it would submit a report to Congress—and, if successful, the program could possibly expand nationwide.

The legislation was introduced in the House on February 8 as bill number [H.R. 1122](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/116/hr1122) (<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/116/hr1122>) by [Rep. Emmanuel Cleaver \(D-MO5\)](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/members/emanuel_cleaver/400639) (https://www.govtrack.us/congress/members/emanuel_cleaver/400639), and in the Senate on January 31 as bill number [S. 291](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/116/s291) (<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/116/s291>) by [Sen. Todd Young \(R-IN\)](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/members/todd_young/412428) (https://www.govtrack.us/congress/members/todd_young/412428).

What supporters say

Supporters argue the bill helps those who need a leg up, by better targeting an existing government assistance program to help people move out of poverty.

“This piece of legislation is all about expanding opportunities for low-income families that have been left behind,” Rep. Cleaver [said in a press release](https://cleaver.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congressmen-cleaver-and-duffy-re-introduce-housing-bill-to-increase) (<https://cleaver.house.gov/media-center/press-releases/congressmen-cleaver-and-duffy-re-introduce-housing-bill-to-increase>). “As a former resident of public housing, I know firsthand that these individuals are desperately seeking greater access to employment opportunities.”

“By allowing families to relocate to low-poverty areas with better job prospects, we can help end the cycle of poverty that has ensnared far too many American families for too long,” Rep. Cleaver continued.

What opponents say

Opponents counter that the bill tweaks an existing big government program, rather than limiting or even ending its usage as they would prefer. The few [House members who voted against the legislation](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/116-2019/h119) (<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/116-2019/h119>) are all limited-government Freedom Caucus or Liberty Caucus affiliated Republicans.

However, GovTrack Insider was unable to locate any explicit statements of opposition. [No House member publicly spoke out](https://www.congress.gov/116/crec/2019/03/11/CREC-2019-03-11-pt1-PgH2618-8.pdf) (<https://www.congress.gov/116/crec/2019/03/11/CREC-2019-03-11-pt1-PgH2618-8.pdf>) against the bill during floor debate.

Odds of passage

The bill passed the House on March 11 by an overwhelming [382 to 22](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/116-2019/h119) (<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/116-2019/h119>) vote.

Every voting Democrat was in favor, 219–0. Republicans largely supported as well, though with some dissenting votes: 168–22.

It now goes to the Senate, but could face the same fate as last year. A previous version passed the House, then under Republican control, by a similar [368–19](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/115-2018/h314) (<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/votes/115-2018/h314>) vote— but never received a Senate vote (<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/115/hr5793>).

The current Senate version has five bipartisan cosponsors: [three Democrats and two Republicans](https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/116/s291/details) (<https://www.govtrack.us/congress/bills/116/s291/details>). It awaits a potential vote in the Senate Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs Committee.

Last updated Mar 21, 2019. View [all GovTrack summaries](/events/bill-summaries/) (/events/bill-summaries).

site MENU

[Home](#) (/)

[Start Tracking](/start) (/start)

[About GovTrack](/about) (/about)

[About the Data](/about-our-data) (/about-our-data)

[Privacy & Legal](/legal) (/legal)

[Log in](/accounts/login) (/accounts/login)

follow GOVTRACK

[f Facebook](https://www.facebook.com/govtrack/) (<https://www.facebook.com/govtrack/>),

[t Twitter](http://twitter.com/govtrack) (<http://twitter.com/govtrack>),

[M Medium](https://medium.com/govtrack-insider) (<https://medium.com/govtrack-insider>),

[\\$ Patreon](https://www.patreon.com/govtrack) (<https://www.patreon.com/govtrack>),

[” Blog](/blog) (/blog),

[c Code](https://github.com/govtrack/govtrack.us-web/commits/master) (<https://github.com/govtrack/govtrack.us-web/commits/master>)

Launched in 2004, GovTrack helps everyone learn about and track the activities of the United States Congress. This is a project of [Civic Impulse, LLC](http://www.civicimpulse.com) (<http://www.civicimpulse.com>). GovTrack.us is not a government website.

[About the Site](/about) (/about) | [Contact Us](/contact) (/contact)

You are encouraged to reuse any material on this site. Hackers/journalists/researchers: See these [open data sources](/about-our-data) (/about-our-data).

Executive Summary

Every family should be able to live in a neighborhood that supports its well-being and boosts its children’s chances to thrive and succeed. But today, the neighborhoods where many low-income families live—especially low-income families of color—suffer from disinvestment and distress that harm their residents. And many low-income families—especially low-income families of color—are excluded from neighborhoods that offer their residents opportunities critical to economic stability and mobility, including thriving schools, good jobs, healthy environments, and access to public transportation.

This did not happen by accident, nor is it the result of unconstrained housing choices or freely functioning housing markets. Rather, over many decades, the United States built separate and unequal neighborhoods through public policy and institutional practices. Low-income families and families of color have been blocked from areas rich in amenities and opportunities by housing discrimination and exclusionary zoning, while low-income communities of color have been starved of capital and resources.

So, what can we do to lift place-based barriers to upward mobility in US metros? We can invest in distressed neighborhoods so they become springboards for their residents. In neighborhoods experiencing revitalization, we can preserve affordable housing and discourage displacement. And we can make more affordable housing available in opportunity-rich neighborhoods so that families are no longer excluded based on their race or ethnicity, country of origin, or income.

Organizations across the country are already doing important work on all these imperatives. These organizations warrant continued support. However, they rarely work in tandem or across jurisdictional boundaries to coordinate strategies at a regional scale. Investing neighborhood by neighborhood or family by family cannot achieve lasting impact if the underlying patterns of segregation, disinvestment, and exclusion persist in the surrounding region. Rather, we need to support metro-wide investment strategies that combine revitalization, preservation, and inclusion—each targeted to the neighborhoods where they are needed and reinforced with policy reforms that respond to local barriers, opportunities, and dynamics.

This paper lays out a proposal to “go big” in a handful of metropolitan areas to test whether a coordinated regional strategy—planned and executed over a decade and supported by residents’ voices and power—can reverse the 20th century legacy of segregation, disinvestment, and exclusion. We recommend investing in institutional capacity building, monitoring, and continuous learning to achieve and sustain real progress in improving neighborhood quality and access to opportunity. Specifically, we propose developing and implementing “opportunity neighborhood” plans in select metropolitan regions that test strategies to

- restore well-being and opportunity to historically distressed neighborhoods,

- preserve affordable housing in revitalizing neighborhoods, and
- expand access to opportunity-rich neighborhoods for people living in distressed communities.

Participating regions would commit to engaging residents of low-income neighborhoods and low-income people across the region in data-driven, participatory planning to identify and address place-based barriers to opportunity.

If successful, this proposal could go far to sever the stubborn link between zip code and destiny in US metros and ensure that all people have a fair shot at achieving economic success, regardless of where they live.

Impact on Three Dimensions of Mobility

The Partnership's definition of mobility has three core principles: economic success, power and autonomy, and being valued in community.

Investment: We recommend expanding access to opportunity for low-income families and families of color using metro-wide investment strategies that combine revitalization, preservation, and inclusion—each targeted to the neighborhoods where they are needed and reinforced with policy reforms that respond to local barriers, opportunities, and dynamics. We envision an investment of \$100 million (\$15 million in grant funding from public, private, and philanthropic sources for three sites over a 12-year period, plus \$85 million in capital through social impact investments to support implementation).

Impact:

- **Economic Success:** Communities will see their ratings on the Neighborhood Opportunity Score (a newly developed index) rise, and will experience lower crime rates and better public and private amenities. Improvements in neighborhood quality and choice also can be expected to lead to higher employment rates, higher incomes, and lower poverty. Because the investments will be site-specific and tailored to the communities' needs and priorities, the projected monetary return will vary.
- **Power and Autonomy:** Community collective efficacy will rise, as will indicators of civic activity such as voting.
- **Being Valued in Community:** Residents of all races, ethnicities, and incomes will report a greater sense of belonging and have higher perceived standing in the community and society. Also, experiences of discrimination and racial resentment should fall.