



Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities

Translation Paper Number One
December 1999

Opportunities for Smarter Growth: Social Equity and the Smart Growth Movement

Predictably, economic and environmental issues within the smart growth dialogue have had a broader appeal initially than equity. Some leading the movement fear that emphasizing the equity agenda may detract from their cause. Others recognize the centrality of equity, but don't fully understand the issues or know how to address them.

To allow the smart growth movement to move forward without leadership from those who understand equity is an enormous risk. Left alone, environmentalists and other stakeholders may define the equity agenda in ways that are not necessarily in the best interests of those who have historically been excluded from the benefits of growth. For example, strategies that are driven only by a desire to limit suburban growth and save open space can have a harmful impact on inner-city and inner-suburban communities. If the redirection of economic and residential development to inner cities does not include explicit strategies to benefit the current residents of those communities (e.g. support for home ownership, job linkage strategies, partnerships with community developers), it could result in large-scale displacement of low-income inner-city renters as inner-city property values rise.

This article has been written by Angela Glover Blackwell and Heather McCulloch of PolicyLink in collaboration with the Funders' Network for Smart Growth and Livable Communities. It is the first of a series of translation papers sponsored by the Funders' Network to translate the impact of sprawl upon issues of importance to America's communities and to suggest opportunities for progress that would be created by smart growth policies and practices. Future papers will

examine the implications of sprawl for arts and culture, health, transportation, jobs and workforce, energy, education, environment and open space, community and economic development, aging, and other key issue areas.

The article describes the implications of urban sprawl from an equity perspective and articulates why funders concerned with social equity should become involved in the emerging anti-sprawl, smart growth

movement. The article highlights the synergy between the smart growth and community building movements and suggests that these movements are leading to a historic shift in the community development movement: towards a new regional community building or "community-based regionalism" paradigm. Finally, it argues that funders have a critical role to play in this shift by recognizing and supporting a new metropolitan agenda.

Introduction

Achieving equity in America has been a Sisyphean task: like Sisyphus, the mythic son of King Corinth who was condemned for eternity to push a huge bolder to a high hilltop only to have it roll down, proponents of equity for the nation's poor and excluded have had their efforts incessantly thwarted and reversed by urban sprawl. So long as suburbs continuously spread outward – siphoning businesses, jobs, civic leaders, educational and financial resources from urban centers and rural communities—American inequality will continue.

Since the 1950s and 60s, equal opportunity advocates and community developers have focused on chasing or recreating resources and opportunities for neglected people and areas. Finally, after decades of reacting to the effects of inequity, the opportunity to re-examine the causes of concentrated pov-

erty has emerged from the confluence of interests spawning a major movement in American politics—anti-sprawl, livable communities, regionalism, smart growth.

Sprawl, a phenomenon that has defined the nation's landscape for almost half a century, has finally come under scrutiny. In November 1998, in communities across the nation, 240 ballot measures were proposed to limit sprawl or alleviate its impact on cities and regions. Across the country, governors identified limiting sprawl as a key priority for their administrations and state legislatures introduced new measures to curb metropolitan expansion.

This message is not lost in Washington. This past year alone, bipartisan task forces were formed in Congress, GAO reports – examining the causes of sprawl – were commissioned by members of both parties in

the Senate and a new "Livability Agenda" was introduced by the White House.

Sprawl is ascending as an issue in American political life because it is effecting a growing cross-section of suburban, urban and rural constituencies in negative ways. It is becoming inefficient and costly for suburban dwellers; it is encroaching on open space and farmland; and, it is seriously threatening the viability of urban centers. Whether the new movement is called anti-sprawl, smart growth, livable communities,

A Note About PolicyLink:

PolicyLink is a national, nonprofit advocacy, research and communications organization working to create a new generation of policies that achieve economic and social equity and build strong, organized communities. PolicyLink has offices in Oakland, CA and New York City.

Introduction, continued

or sustainable development, the issue is the same: how to limit the seemingly inexorable waves of development on the fringe of metropolitan regions and the simultaneous drain of resources from the urban core and inner-suburbs.

Given its diversity and appeal, this movement offers unprecedented opportunities to build new alliances and strategic coalitions among various constitu-

encies that have not been able to work in political unison. New coalitions may include individuals and groups concerned with the environment, the economy and equity. They may also include new cross-class alliances between inner-city and inner-ring suburban communities, which are now on the same path of economic decline.

The big challenge will be defining the equity issues and elevat-

ing them to center stage while maintaining broad appeal and unity. This brief article encourages taking on that challenge. It explains why sprawl is an equity issue, and why funders and other supporters of equal opportunity, community building and community development should build on the new smart growth activism and the political environment it creates to define a new equity agenda.

Sprawl and Inequity

Sprawl – the continuous spread of businesses and housing beyond the boundaries of the central city and inner-suburbs into more and more distant, once rural, areas – has led to class and racial inequity. First sprawl creates regional inequity then it exacerbates an unequal distribution of resources and opportunities throughout metropolitan regions. This imbalance breeds poverty and hardship within urban centers and affluence and growth on the fringe.

Facts About Sprawl

Beginning after WWII, sprawl has intensified in the past three decades. Since 1950, the largest metropolitan areas in the country have grown significantly; but the growth has been almost exclusively in the suburbs, outside of central cities. Between 1988 and 1996, central cities lost a net total of between 2.4 to 2.9 million people per year while suburbs gained between 2.1 and 3.1 million people per year.¹

Those remaining and arriving in the cities are increasingly minority and poor. While central cities housed one third of the nation's poor in 1960, that number had climbed to 50% by 1990.² In specific cities the disparity is even more severe: in 1990, the poverty rate for the Atlanta metropolitan region was 7.7% while the city maintained a poverty rate of 24.6%.³

Why is Sprawl an Equity Issue?

The pattern of sprawl in the United States is not a natural consequence of the free market economy.⁴ While it was certainly fueled by post war optimism and the possibilities afforded by the broad availability of automobiles, it was also a direct result of public policy. The explosive growth of suburbs, and the racial character of that growth, resulted from clear choices between policy alternatives that could have strengthened cities or promoted exclusive suburban sprawl. At each juncture policy makers chose the latter: federal, state and local policies provided powerful incentives for consumers and business to move to the fringe of urban regions. Well-documented in recent literature, these incentives include tax incentives (e.g. mortgage deductions; capital gains tax laws), public subsidies (e.g. economic development subsidies that attract businesses and developers to the fringe) and public infrastructure investment (e.g. roads, water, sewers), all of which encouraged – and subsidized – suburban development.

But these incentives did not benefit all equally. The development of the suburbs coincided with the push for integration. While the civil rights movement sought to desegregate the na-

tion's cities, segregation of the urban fringe – in the name of suburbanization-- proceeded at a rapid pace. The same public incentives that encouraged white flight, discouraged or prohibited the movement of low-income minority residents into new suburban communities (see "housing" below). As described by University of Minnesota Professor John A. Powell, residential segregation in the suburbs was not an accident. It was the result of explicit government policy that included the Federal Housing Administration's policy against granting mortgages that would create integrated neighborhoods in the suburbs; and private practices like "blockbusting" by real estate professionals and restrictive racial covenants enforced by state courts.⁵

Much of today's race-based wealth inequity was borne out of these practices. White families who moved to the suburbs ended up with houses of great value that they could borrow against to start businesses or send children to college. Minority families were not able to acquire similar assets. Their houses (if they managed to get them) were depreciating or appreciating very, very slowly, thereby exacerbating inequality.



Sprawl creates regional inequity and exacerbates an unequal distribution of resources and opportunities throughout metropolitan regions. This imbalance breeds poverty and hardship within urban centers and affluence and growth on the fringe.

Effects of Sprawl

As the suburbs continued to grow, so did inequity. While white families were abandoning the cities for the suburbs in the 1960s and 1970s, minority families, who could afford to, were enjoying the fruits of civil rights legislation and moving to more affluent city neighborhoods. Over time, with the withdrawal of white and minority middle-class families, once vibrant economically integrated inner-city neighborhoods became mostly poor, with growing concentrations of people of color. For example, the Brookings Institute reports that between 1970 and 1990, the number of people living in neighborhoods where 40% or more of the residents are poor nearly doubled from 4.1 million to 8 million people.⁶

Studies of the egregious consequences of this “concentrated poverty” emerged in the 1970s and 1980s, perhaps most cogently advanced by the work of William Julius Wilson. Wilson argued that concentrated poverty results in increasing social fragmentation as low-income families are left with no access to livable wage jobs, good schools, adequate health services or protection from criminal activities. More recently, Professor John Powell has noted: “The concentrated poverty...is usually ruinous to people’s life chances...The quality of schools, housing, and municipal services and the availability of transportation and employment are undermined.”⁷

As noted by author David Bollier, in *How Smart Growth Can Stop Sprawl: A Briefing Guide for Funders*: “In effect, land-use policies and development practice have trumped laws guaranteeing equal opportunity.”⁸ While the Civil Rights movement succeeded in legally forbidding discrimination against individuals based on race, sprawl per-

petuated discriminatory impacts so that discrimination became tied to geography. Though individual minorities can no longer legally be relegated to the worst schools, housing, and jobs based on their race or ethnicity, in most metropolitan areas, this is exactly what has happened to them because of where they live. Today, while most minorities live in cities or inner-ring suburbs with failing schools, declining housing stocks and limited job opportunities, most whites live in suburbs with better schools, better housing and expanding job opportunities.

Housing

As touched upon earlier in this article, the history of sprawl has been characterized by housing policies that perpetuated residential segregation by limiting the movement of minority and low-income families into suburban communities and depressing housing values in the inner-city. The causal factors are well summarized by David Bollier:⁹

In the 1940s and 1950s, federal rules for Federal Housing Administration (FHA)-insured mortgages discouraged loans to neighborhoods with “inharmonious racial or nationality groups,” thereby eliminating a critical supply of credit. At the same time, it was legal for developers, private homeowners and landlords to discriminate in the sale and rental of housing.

In 1968, the Fair Housing Act gave African Americans and other minority groups the opportunity to live in suburban communities, but enforcement was weak.

Prior to the passage of the Community Reinvestment Act in 1977, bank “redlining” perpetuated residential segregation by limiting mortgage credit to certain low-income neighborhoods (banks were said to be drawing a “red line” around these neighborhoods”).

Today, enforcement of the Act is still mixed. Its future will be impacted by the implications of the new Financial Modernization Act.

As described by Bollier, land use policies in suburban towns also have had an impact on residential segregation:

In some suburban towns, zoning codes and mandatory large lot sizes keep out low-income individuals and families.

In others, the construction of apartments or affordable housing is blocked by special permit processes and fees; or the outright banning of multi-family developments.¹⁰

These and other factors have perpetuated a cycle, familiar to most Americans, that lies at the heart of regional inequality. As white middle and upper-class Americans have fled to the suburbs, to enjoy the twin benefits of low taxes and improved services, low-income minority individuals and families are relegated to high-tax, low-service inner cities. By the 1990 census, 80% of whites nationwide lived outside of cities, while 70% of African Americans and Latinos lived in cities or inner ring suburbs. In the mid-1980s, 86% of suburban whites lived in suburbs with a black population of less than 1%.¹¹

Employment

Since the 1960s, suburban sprawl has produced job growth on the outer fringes of metropolitan regions as newly incorporated cities offer tax incentives for businesses to locate in “greenfields” -- newly developed commercial real estate. These new jobs are largely inaccessible to inner-city residents due to the lack of affordable housing in the suburbs (as described above), and the lack of public transportation alternatives that connect inner-city residents to

By the 1990 census, 80% of whites nationwide lived outside of cities, while 70% of African Americans and Latinos lived in cities or inner ring suburbs.

New jobs are largely inaccessible to inner-city residents due to the lack of affordable housing in the suburbs and the lack of public transportation alternatives that connect inner-city residents to suburban job opportunities.

Sprawl has drained money, quality teachers and public support away from city schools, and children of low-income and minority inner-city families have been dramatically impacted.

The creation of effective linkages between community residents and vibrant regional economies demands a dramatic restructuring of metropolitan transportation systems.

Effects of Sprawl, continued

suburban job opportunities. In the 1980s, two thirds of net employment growth and 120 percent of net manufacturing jobs went to suburbs and exurbs.¹² But the distance between this new employment and urban job seekers -- a phenomenon called "spatial mismatch" by Harvard economist John Kain -- prohibited inner-city and inner-ring suburban residents from accessing those jobs. Spatial mismatch is a common feature of metropolitan job markets across the U.S.

Transportation

Historically, America's transportation infrastructure has prioritized the building of new highways -- thereby facilitating the creation of a car-dependent society and fueling the exodus of people and resources away from inner cities -- rather than the development of alternative transit systems. Without adequate housing or transportation options, the employment opportunities for inner-city residents are severely curtailed.

The creation of effective linkages between community residents and vibrant regional economies demands a dramatic restructuring of metropolitan transportation systems. In the meantime, remedies like

"reverse commuting programs" are being implemented in response to incentives included in the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (PRWORA) and the Transportation Equity Act (TEA 21). Though innovative, these remedies only scratch the surface of the deep structural imbalance in the jobs/housing footprint of most regions.

Education

Sprawl has drained money, quality teachers and public support away from city schools, and children of low-income and minority inner-city families have been dramatically impacted. Huge disparities exist between wealthy suburban and poor urban districts. The unequal distribution of resources was documented in a 1991-1992 GAO report that showed that wealthier school districts exceeded poorer districts in funds per weighted pupil by 24 percent.¹³

More money, new facilities and the absence of some of the education challenges that are often associated with urban districts, have enabled suburban districts to attract well-trained, seasoned professionals. This has often been at the expense of inner-city and inner-suburban schools that could

not compete. Also, as community leaders and middle class families moved to the suburbs, their advocacy on behalf of urban schools was usually lost, leaving poor families, with few powerful allies, to fend for themselves.

Segregation of public schools has long been seen as one of the primary causes of inequity in the education system. Despite efforts to address segregation -- beginning with *Brown v. Board of Education* in 1954 -- a recent book by Harvard University scholars Gary Orfield and Susan Eaton demonstrates how court decisions and other policies have undermined the *Brown* decision.¹⁴

Segregation continues to exacerbate regional inequity in American public education. In a recent case against segregation in Connecticut public schools, plaintiffs challenged the ongoing inequity between public schools in the inner-city and the metropolitan region of Hartford and demanded that state officials address the economic and racial isolation of inner-city students by providing additional resources to ensure equal opportunity to all Hartford students. In 1996, the State Supreme Court ruled in favor of the plaintiffs.¹⁵

A Window of Opportunity: The New Community Building Paradigm

The smart growth movement offers a window of opportunity to address the equity impacts of sprawl within a new paradigm of community development: regional community building or "community-based regionalism." The natural synergy between smart growth and community-based regionalism is described below.

Community Building within a Regional Context

Community building emerged in the early 1990s as an alterna-

tive approach to (or some would argue that it's a subset within) the community development movement. In contrast to the movement's emphasis on "bricks and mortar" -- i.e. housing and real estate -- development, community building aims to strengthen inner-city and inner-ring suburban communities through a mix of people- and place-based strategies. Community building is characterized by the following features: it is community driven and incorporates broad-based

resident involvement; it's asset-based (i.e. community-builders focus on identifying community assets and building upon them). Community building aims to link neighborhood residents to institutions outside of the community and to address racial barriers to neighborhood development.

Regional community building or "community-based regionalism" is an extension of this approach whereby leaders of low-income communities recognize and

A Window of Opportunity, continued

consciously seek to address the challenges and opportunities presented within a regional context. They recognize that a regional approach requires establishing linkages to the regional economy and acquiring a voice in regional policy discussions.

Smart growth proponents share common ground with these regional community builders or community-based regionalists. They recognize the common interests of diverse stakeholders within a region and try to build alliances between them. They recognize the interdependencies of urban and inner-ring suburban communities. They see sprawl as a function of policy and not simply the natural outcome of the free market. And they recognize that to effectively address the interconnected causes and consequences of sprawl it takes policy activism at a multi-jurisdictional, or regional, level.

Examples of Community Based Regionalism

Given this obvious synergy, the smart growth movement offers an opportunity for community builders to be participants in and leaders of a new civic dialogue about building the social and economic infrastructure for regional communities. In fact, in metropolitan regions across the country, community residents and leaders are already stepping up to the plate as leaders in the emerging regional dialogue. As described below, examples of this new “community-based regionalism” are emerging from across the country.

In Milwaukee, the Campaign for Sustainable Milwaukee has become a national model for regional collaboration among diverse constituencies. Sustainable Milwaukee is a broad-based community advocacy coalition that includes over 200 community, religious, labor and

business organizations. The Campaign was formed to address a number of inter-related issues impacting the city and region that were beyond the capacity of any one organization to address. The Campaign began with the development and adoption of a regional plan in 1994, entitled, “Rebuilding Milwaukee from the Ground Up.” The plan called for the development of local family-supporting jobs that are accessible to inner-city residents and improvements in the region’s mass transit system. The Campaign has since built on its victories, through a number of initiatives including the Jobs Access Task Force and the Central City Workers Center.¹⁶

In Columbus, a collaborative of over 30 faith-based organizations called Building Responsibility, Equity and Dignity (BREAD), is demonstrating how community institutions can be leaders in regional planning activities. BREAD campaigned to direct federal transportation dollars to Columbus’ inner-city public transportation system. The campaign resulted in additional bus routes linking inner-city residents to suburban job centers. This reallocation of public resources serves the entire region, including inner-city residents who now have access to jobs and suburban businesses that benefit from a new labor pool.¹⁷

In Los Angeles, the Los Angeles Metropolitan Alliance, a regional alliance of community-based organizations, labor unions, religious institutions, and service providers anchored by the community organization AGENDA waged a two-year campaign to link the use of public subsidies for development projects to workforce development and job access for residents of poor, inner-city communities. The focus of the campaign was the DreamWorks/Playa Vista

development, the new state-of-the-art movie, television, animation, and music corporation.¹⁸

Working with the Los Angeles Community College District, the Metropolitan Alliance developed a set of proposals aimed at opening up the multimedia/entertainment industry to people of color and low-income residents who have been historically locked out of jobs and business opportunities, and establishing a precedent for the use of public subsidies to address regional economic inequities. The Alliance won agreement to create and provide resources for a Workforce Development Fund that would fund multimedia/entertainment training programs and a commitment of at least 10% of the jobs created through the development project for participants from the training programs. The Metropolitan Alliance was written into the actual development agreement as a partner with DreamWorks and the city in developing and monitoring these programs.¹⁹

The New Metropolitan Agenda

These and other models of community-based regionalism are setting the agenda for a new metropolitan equity coalition – between inner-city and inner-suburb communities, labor, environmentalists and rural communities – that sees the roots of sprawl in policy decisions and seeks to address the outcomes with appropriate policy responses. This new coalition recognizes the power of building relationships between diverse stakeholders and is not afraid to exercise power to address common issues.

The smart growth movement offers a window of opportunity to address the equity impacts of sprawl within a new paradigm of community development.

These models of community-based regionalism are setting the agenda for a new metropolitan equity alliance – between inner-city and inner-suburb communities, labor, environmentalists and rural communities.

A Window of Opportunity, continued

As the focus on sprawl escalates, new alliances are also emerging at the national level with a similar coalition-building agenda. For example, the first organizing meeting of the newly formed National Smart Growth Coalition was held in Washington, D.C. on June 18th, 1999, with representation from the

environmental, inner-city, faith-based, academic, labor, progressive business and preservationist communities. This coalition seeks to build a progressive national agenda to address the consequences of sprawl from a diversity of perspectives. Other national efforts, like the Smart Growth Network, the Na-

tional Neighborhood Coalition's Neighborhoods, Regions and Smart Growth project, and the Livable and Sustainable Communities Network, supported by the Ford Foundation, are also building relationships and expanding the dialogue among diverse groups of anti-sprawl proponents.

An Opportunity for Funders

If funders who are concerned about equity want to bring these efforts to scale they must quickly begin to utilize their convening power and resources to bring community builders and equity advocates into the smart growth movement.

The opportunity for action is now and the role of funders is critical. Many funders are already supporting the efforts of community-based actors to promote equity-based smart growth. If funders who are concerned about equity want to bring these efforts to scale they must quickly begin to utilize their convening power and resources to bring community builders and equity advocates into the smart growth movement.

The current environment presents many opportunities for funders. A strong economy combined with an active and growing anti-sprawl/smart growth movement, is resulting in the increasing attractiveness of inner-city and inner-ring suburban property – abandoned lots and buildings, brownfields, etc. – for commercial and residential development. Yet as capital flows shift, low-income inner-city communities – most with a preponderance of renters – are threatened by displacement caused by rising property values. Creative strategies developed by communities and funders could help low-income residents and agencies reap the benefit of these rising values, in collaboration with new partners.

Academics who are laying the intellectual foundation for the movement should be encouraged, through requests for proposals, to partner with commu-

nity-based groups to identify the research questions that will inform a regional equity agenda. Funders could sponsor convenings, with advocacy organizations like the Mexican American Legal Defense and Educational Fund or the NAACP Legal Defense and Educational Fund, that lead to the development of an advocacy agenda to advance equity within the context of smart growth.

These gatherings could explore issues like the geographic allocation of public infrastructure expenditures or the disclosure of public subsidies for local economic development projects, issues that offer opportunities to highlight inequity and open the door for seeking solutions. Funders could assist groups like the National Congress for Community Economic Development, the National Neighborhood Coalition or the National Community Building Network to devise ways to alert their members to the emerging opportunities and then provide technical assistance to support the ongoing engagement of their members in their regions.

Foundations could play a valuable role by pursuing equity agendas with a regional orientation in their traditional funding areas. For example, the Annie E. Casey Foundation Jobs Initiative, launched in 1995, provides funding and support for community-based efforts, in six

target cities, to link young, low-income residents to jobs in key sectors within the regional economy. The Initiative acknowledges that community leaders can not be effective actors in developing regional strategies to address the jobs/spatial mismatch if they do not have the staff, resources and information they need.

To build an informed constituency for regional school improvement a foundation interested in education could fund a regional commission to look at education issues both in the city and the inner-ring suburbs that are beginning to manifest the same problems that have plagued inner cities for years: teen pregnancy, gangs, failing schools, unemployment, etc. Foundations could also help to build regional alliances for change by providing opportunities for savvy inner-city community leaders to share their years of learning with inner-ring suburban residents who do not have the community-based infrastructure in place to effectively tackle these issues.

Foundations also have an important responsibility to serve as a convener and facilitator of regional dialogues across interest groups. New opportunities must be found to bring business, equity, and environmental stakeholders together to forge a mutually supportive smart growth agenda.

An Opportunity for Funders, continued

A dialogue around regionalism also provides a venue to bring together grantees from different program areas to develop integrated approaches to addressing community concerns at the regional level. Alternatively, addressing issues within a regional context could offer different foundations that are working within the same region the opportunity to work together around common concerns.

These new partnerships could leverage foundation investments in building community infrastructure and jump-start efforts to begin regional planning around human development, not just around physical

development issues like water and transportation.

Conclusion:

Admittedly, these new local, regional and national discussions are still in their infancy; but a common vision is emerging that builds on the three "E's" of sustainable development: environment, economy and equity. Proponents of the first two E's are finally beginning to recognize that without the third E – equity – they will be facing a zero-sum game in which they are pitted against community advocates; but with the third E, powerful new urban/suburban coalitions can

begin to change the regional landscape. Equity advocates should not wait for an invitation. These are their issues. Getting involved early could set the stage for lasting change.

Within today's economic and political context, the philanthropic community has a unique opportunity to effect the Sisyphian equation that has plagued equity advocates for decades. With the support of foundations, working in partnership with community leaders, the playing field can be leveled; without that support we will all see gains rolling away from inner city community residents.

In some instances where invitations have been extended to inner-city and civil rights leaders to join anti-sprawl discussions and activity, the response has been faint. The reasons are many. Decades of focusing on the symptoms of urban disinvestment at the neighborhood and municipal level have led many community leaders to ignore the regional context within which they operate. Furthermore, local actors often do not have the resources to "stay at the table," nor have they always been welcomed. Unhealed old wounds and pressing current issues related to race often stand in the way of regional alliances.

Ultimately, the absence of community leaders from the regional planning table and the dearth of relationships between regional and community leaders means that the needs and concerns of inner-city communities are not represented in regional decision-making.

Endnotes

- 1 Economic and Statistics Administration, U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Commerce, Geophysical Mobility: March 1995 to March 1996, P20-497, Table A'3, December 3, 1997. As cited in *Once There Were Greenfields: How Urban Sprawl is Undermining America's Environment, Economy and Social Fabric* by F. Kaid Benfield, Matthew D. Raimi, and Donald D.T. Chen. Natural Resources Defense Council, 1999, p. 6
- 2 *Current Population Survey*, U.S. Department of Commerce, Bureau of the Census, 1997. As cited in *Once There Were Greenfields*, p.123.
- 3 Robert Bullard, "Sprawl Atlanta: Social Equity Dimensions of Uneven Growth and Development." Environmental Justice Resource Center, January 1998.
- 4 This point is illustrated by the fact that the opposite outcome has resulted from differing government policies in other parts of the world where city centers are typically the hub of wealth and vitality, housing affluent single families, while millions of poor people living on the city's edges in ramshackle paper, mud and corrugated iron shelters with little or no infrastructure to support them.
- 5 powell, john a., "Race and Space," *Brookings Review*, Fall 1998, pg. 20-22.
- 6 Presentation by Bruce Katz, Director of the Brookings Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy, to the South Florida Donors' Forum, September 9, 1999.
- 7 powell, pg. 20-22.
- 8 David Bollier, *How Smart Growth Can Stop Sprawl: A Briefing Guide for Funders*, Washington, D.C.: Essential Books (1998), pg. 19.
- 9 Bollier, pg. 16.
- 10 Bollier, pg. 16-17.
- 11 Swanstrom, Todd and Dennis R. Judd. *City Politics: Private Power and Public Policy*. New York: Addison-Wesley Educational Publishers, 1998. pg. 200.
- 12 Stegman, Michael A. and Margery Austin Turner, "The Future of Urban America in the Global Economy," *Journal of the American Planning Association*, vol. 157, Spring 1996, p. 158. As cited in *Once Were Greenfields*, pg. 14. As noted in *Once Were Greenfields*, "the number exceeds 100 percent because cities were losing manufacturing jobs to the suburbs at the same time that new ones were being created in suburbs."
- 13 U.S. General Accounting Office, School Finance: "State Efforts to Reduce Funding Gaps Between Poor and Wealthy Districts." (Government Printing Office, GAO/HEHS-97-31), p.7. As cited in *How Smart Growth Can Stop Sprawl: A Briefing Guide for Funders*, by David Bollier. p.19.)
- 14 Orfield, Gary and Susan Eaton. *Dismantling Desegregation: The Quiet Reversal of Brown v. Board of Education*, New York: The New York Press, 1996. As cited in "Segregation Today" on World Wide Web page. www.tnt.turner.com.
- 15 The American Civil Liberties Union, "The Connecticut Supreme Court Rules That Racial and Ethnic Segregation in Hartford Area Schools Violates State Constitution," World Wide Web, Press Release, July 9, 1996. As cited in "Segregation Today" on World Wide Web page: www.tnt.turner.com.
- 16 For more information, contact Steve Holt, Executive Director of the Milwaukee Jobs Initiative, at (414) 372-7387.
- 17 For more information, contact Carl Gray, BREAD Chairperson, at (614) 258-8748.
- 18 The Dreamworks corporation was founded by Steven Spielberg, Jeffrey Katzenberg and David Geffen. The project proposed to build the world's most technologically advanced multimedia studio complex as part of the largest development in Los Angeles history, to be located on a sprawling stretch of undeveloped land called Playa Vista. Costing over \$8 billion, the Playa Vista development has been touted as the ultimate planned community, with housing, transportation, businesses, and hotels in a beautiful ocean front setting. The City of Los Angeles proposed to provide \$35 million in job creation subsidies, along with millions more in infrastructure development as an incentive for the development project.
- 19 In an example of the power of the campaign, DreamWorks recently decided not to locate on the Playa Vista site, but agreed to honor its commitment to the workforce development fund and job access agreements, including providing an initial five million dollars to get the programs started. For more information, contact Anthony Thigpen, AGENDA's Chairperson, at (323) 730-4950.



One can imagine a better future:

Broad-based coalitions of community, labor, environmental and business leaders are working together to advocate for policies that redirect public and private resources away from the wasteful consumption of land, habitat and natural resources on the urban fringe and back to inner-city and inner-suburban communities.

With ongoing pressure from this organized constituency, public funding for regional infrastructure, transportation systems, education and services are distributed in a manner that ensures that everyone has an opportunity to benefit from a growing regional economy.

With community builders at the table, this resource reallocation process is engendering new partnerships between the public, private and nonprofit sectors where community-based organizations (community development corporations, community building intermediaries, comprehensive community initiatives and neighborhood associations) and residents are partners in community reinvestment projects. New and innovative equity instruments that build a sense of ownership in inner-city communities are fueling these new partnerships.

Residents have opportunities to access livable wage jobs, to own their homes, to design equitable educational systems that serve the needs of the entire region, and even to invest in new economic development ventures in their own communities.



*Funders' Network for Smart
Growth and Livable Communities*

L. Benjamin Starrett, Executive Director

*Working to strengthen funders'
individual and collective abilities to
support organizations promoting
smart growth and creating livable
communities.*

Collins Center for Public Policy, Inc.
150 SE 2nd Avenue, Suite 709
Miami, Florida 33131

Phone: 305-377-4484
Fax: 305-377-4485
Email: bstarrett@collinscenter.org
