



Community
Benefits
Agreements



THE POWER, PRACTICE, AND
PROMISE OF A RESPONSIBLE
REDEVELOPMENT TOOL



Part of a monograph series on Neighborhood Development
from the Annie E. Casey Foundation

©2007, The Annie E. Casey Foundation, Baltimore, Maryland

The Annie E. Casey Foundation is a private charitable organization dedicated to helping build better futures for disadvantaged children in the United States. It was established in 1948 by Jim Casey, one of the founders of UPS, and his siblings, who named the Foundation in honor of their mother. The primary mission of the Foundation is to foster public policies, human-service reforms, and community supports that more effectively meet the needs of today's vulnerable children and families. In pursuit of this goal, the Foundation makes grants that help states, cities, and neighborhoods fashion more innovative, cost-effective responses to these needs. For more information, visit the Foundation's website at www.aecf.org.

TABLE of CONTENTS

- I. *Preface* **3**
- II. *Foreword* **4**
- III. *Keynote Address: Reaching Uncommon
Common Ground* **6**
- IV. *Background on Community Benefits
Agreements: The Process, the Projects, and
the Prospects for the Future* **10**
- V. *Framing Questions* **21**
- VI. *Session Summary* **22**
- VII. *Participant Bios* **37**

The subject of community benefits agreements (CBAs) is important to me both personally and professionally. As a resident (and would-be community organizer) in the Federal Hill community of South Baltimore, I have witnessed the negative results of allowing developers to manage projects that maximize profits while paying scant attention to the social and economic implications of their work for the families and children living in the surrounding areas. These agreements have the power to engage public- and private-sector stakeholders in a different kind of development—one that simultaneously enables profits, fuels positive economic development, and benefits the community.

My personal conviction about the importance of responsible development and redevelopment also influences the focus of the Casey Foundation on these issues. When the Foundation expanded its scope to include neighborhood development, it was because the leadership of this organization firmly believed that intelligent urban development in the United States had the potential to narrow the gap in outcomes between advantaged and disadvantaged families. While there may be several other positive outcomes of responsible development, this single outcome of “narrowing the gap” for vulnerable families and children was, and remains, paramount for the Foundation.

As the co-chair of Living Cities, a group of major foundations and financial institutions that funds urban and community development, I have been involved in several discussions about the need to reequip cities with infrastructures that foster sustainability, such as environmentally sustainable public transportation systems. As cities redevelop over the next 20 years, it will be important to leverage public and private investments to yield not only financial profits, but also meaningful social and economic benefits for families and children who have suffered the consequences of decades of disinvestment. CBAs can ensure that development and redevelopment deliver in both ways.

Douglas W. Nelson, President

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

II. FOREWORD

Over the past decade, CBAs have become a prominent feature in urban development projects. CBAs are a vehicle by which communities memorialize commitments and understandings with private developers and government officials that want to undertake development projects that will impact nearby communities. These agreements cover a wide range of community concerns and needs, and they have changed the paradigm of community involvement in the development process. Previously there was ad hoc consideration of community priorities; now CBAs enable all parties to make clear and binding commitments to address the priorities of the community as a precondition of giving their approval or at least not objecting to the project moving forward. Through CBAs, communities are now playing a vibrant role in helping to make decisions that support the families and children who live in the communities where development is taking place.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation convened a consultative session in May 2007 to explore how the trend toward the increased use of CBAs in community development scenarios is affecting families and children living in low-income, often-marginalized communities and empowering these families to become involved in the planning and negotiation of the terms for the redevelopment of their communities. The participants that attended the session, *Community Benefits Agreements: The Power, Practice, and Promise of*

a Responsible Redevelopment Tool, included grassroots community organizers, advocates, public sector officials, private sector developers, and foundation colleagues.

The first segment of the session focused on the power of CBAs as a tool for responsible redevelopment. Discussion centered on the imbalance of power among the parties involved in CBAs, some approaches to dealing with these imbalances, and the importance of building power in the community. A significant thread throughout this discussion was the importance of community voice and how to empower communities to advocate for those terms that will improve the quality of life of families and children that live in redeveloping neighborhoods and are affected by the redevelopment projects.

The second segment of the session focused on the CBA negotiation process. The centerpieces of this discussion were leverage, enforceability, political leadership to initiate the process, and debate about financial benefits accruing to community groups as a result of the negotiation of a CBA. This conversation brought to light many of the issues that arise regarding the implementation of CBAs and allowed participants to suggest possible solutions to these issues.

The final segment of the session focused on the promise of CBAs as a tool to change the way development and redevelopment are done. While there was broad consensus that there is a move to increase the use of CBAs,

this portion of the conversation focused on how to continue the movement in a way that produces development projects that benefit all stakeholders. Discussion also centered on some of the steps the movement will need to take in the near future to ensure its sustainability.

The session—planned in large part by Salin Geevarghese, Senior Associate; Felipe Floresca, Senior Consultant; and Becky Hobgood, Administrative Assistant—brought together a diverse set of perspectives on the use of CBAs in responsible development. Special thanks also to Jessica Donaldson, Program Intern, for her tireless work in putting together this monograph. We hope that it will help to strengthen the knowledge base on various aspects of CBAs by: 1) introducing the CBA process and movement; 2) giving an accurate account of the conversations that took place during the session; and 3) focusing on some of the questions and debates that exist within the movement.

We hope that sharing this monograph and continuing this discussion will bring more attention to the promise of CBAs to change the way cities, developers, and communities approach development projects and ultimately will help to benefit the children and families who reside in communities that are facing redevelopment.

*Roger Williams, Senior Fellow
The Annie E. Casey Foundation*

THROUGH CBAs,
COMMUNITIES ARE
NOW PLAYING A VIBRANT
ROLE IN HELPING TO MAKE
DECISIONS THAT SUPPORT
THE FAMILIES AND
CHILDREN WHO LIVE IN
THE COMMUNITIES WHERE
DEVELOPMENT IS TAKING
PLACE.

III. KEYNOTE ADDRESS:
REACHING UNCOMMON COMMON GROUND

The following text is a transcript of the Keynote Address that was given at the session by Manuel Pastor, Professor, University of Southern California.

Introduction

Something seems to be changing in America. It's not just that a movie about climate change—heck, a PowerPoint about climate change—just won an Academy Award. It's also that another “inconvenient truth”—the startling gap between rich and poor—is being recognized and questioned.

And not just by the usual suspects. Just a few weeks ago, *Business Week*, hardly a left-wing journal, pictured on its front cover a Native American woman who had been ripped off by predatory lenders. The feature article in which her story was told, “The Poverty Business: Inside U.S. Companies’ Audacious Drive to Extract More Profits from the Nation’s Working Poor,” laid out the problems not just with subprime mortgages but also with payday loans and other forms of consumer finance. The main conclusion: extending the reach of the free market is no excuse for such exploitation.

When *Business Week*, a magazine concerned mainly with economic growth not economic inequality, says you're going too far, something is definitely shifting. It suggests an opportunity for forming new understandings and alliances about generating and sharing

economic prosperity in ways that can bring together business, labor, and community.

My argument to you is that CBAs are manifestations of that. They are specific tools in which the interests of developers, workers, and residents are made compatible in ways that facilitate a project's acceptance and completion—they spur equity and growth. They are not a full remedy to the large set of economic inequalities that confront us but they do offer a potential reframing that can point the way to a new politics of economic opportunity in the United States. As such, they should be nurtured, explored, and expanded.

The Times, They Are a Changin’

The problems of inequality are well known and well documented. Not only have we seen a growing gap between income classes, we have also seen a slow-down in mobility in recent years. The challenges are particularly pronounced in my own state, California. Once viewed as a land of opportunity, we are now the sixth most unequal state in the U.S. when comparing the top fifth of households to the bottom fifth of households and the eighth most unequal when comparing the income of the top 5 percent to the bottom 20 percent. And the gap has significant racial/ethnic aspects: for example, while immigrant Latinos comprise 16 percent of households in the state, they comprise 52 percent of households considered to be working poor.

In some ways, this is “old news”—more exacerbated perhaps, but hasn’t poverty (and racial inequality) been with us always?

When most analysts counter that this is indeed “new news,” they tend to point to the degree of the gap. There may be merit in that position but what I would suggest is new is the dysfunction of the gap. That is, while it may have been possible in the past to argue that reducing the income of one group of people and enhancing the income of another group could lead to economic growth—the logic of “trickle down” economics—this is no longer the case.

Indeed, even business is slowly beginning to understand that inequality is not conducive to economic health and development. Research is backing this up. My own work has focused on the relationship between growth and opportunity at the regional level—and I and other colleagues have consistently found that more unequal regions in fact exhibit lower levels of per capita income growth. The reasons for the correlation between equity and growth are complex and still under-specified but may have to do with the ways in which inequality can trigger an under-investment in basic education, create social tensions that impact economic decision-making, and erode the “social capital” that can tie a region together.

And these are not just the musings of a progressive economist. In support of a business- and philanthropic-led effort in Northeast

Ohio called the Fund for Our Economic Future, economists from the Federal Reserve recently looked at the driving factors behind growth in mid-size regions—and after performing a statistical analysis of nearly 120 metropolitan areas throughout the U.S., they found that a skilled workforce correlated strongly with economic success but so did high levels of racial inclusion and income equality. The bottom line: doing good and doing well can go hand in hand, and business is beginning to get the picture.

Why CBAs?

Even as business has begun to “get it,” community and labor-affiliated organizations are shifting their own thinking as well. First, they have come to realize that business is actually “sticky” at a local level—that even if the economy is global, firms tend to be regionally rooted, a fact that means securing benefits is still possible but probably more likely at the metropolitan than the national level. Second, they have shifted from the paradigm of protest to the framework of progress—from decrying what is (or isn’t) toward proscribing what should be in ways that are pragmatic and possible.

CBAs fit very well into this picture. They also try to group three things that are usually disconnected: economic growth, mobility, and standards.

- **ECONOMIC GROWTH:** Growth within a region is led by key industry sectors that drive

C BAs ALSO OFFER
TWO OTHER OPPOR-
TUNITIES THAT SEEM
SUITED TO CONTEMPORARY
AMERICA: ACCOUNT-
ABILITY AND A NEW FORM
OF GOVERNANCE.

the regional economy and create significant multiplier effects. CBAs support economic growth by allowing businesses to develop and expand in a way that is sustainable over the long term.

- **MOBILITY:** Mobility of the workforce means that workers can find jobs and also move upwards through the labor market by advancing their skills and experience. CBAs, such as the L.A. Staples Center agreement, enabled such programs as the Figueroa Community Jobs Program, which trains community residents for jobs created in the area.
- **EMPLOYMENT STANDARDS:** This refers to such policies as minimum wage laws, policies to improve employment practices (such as those passed in Chicago and the state of Maryland aimed at large big-box retailers), and laws that support workers to form unions. CBAs have secured many of these policies as part of arrangements with developers.

CBAs incorporate each of these elements. But the true beauty of the deal is in making economic growth, mobility, and standards the language business and community leaders share. Each piece serves business interests by ensuring growth, a well-trained workforce, and a good business reputation. Community groups are also well served because these goals guarantee that their community will be a place where opportunities are expanding and where people are both

employed and able to earn enough to provide for their families.

Traditionally, business has supported growth, encouraged education for mobility (but often been unwilling to pay for it), and worried about standards (like the minimum wage). Community groups have embraced standards, supported education and mobility, and paid scant attention to economic growth. CBAs, by combining these three elements, offer a new route for reframing what our economy is about—and by doing this, open up political possibilities well beyond those of just the agreements themselves.

The Other Benefits of CBAs

If creating a common ground for business and community does not seem like enough of an accomplishment, CBAs also offer two other opportunities that seem suited to contemporary America: accountability and a new form of governance.

Many citizens are worried about whether their government is really doing its job—and they are demanding that government be more accountable. CBAs and their policy sister, Living Wage Laws, essentially say that public subsidies to developers should not have increases in poverty as one of their side effects—middle-class tax dollars should not be wasted in this way. This has enormous appeal to the public, and it better links the

middle class with the fate of those with even lower income.

CBA's are also illustrative of a new form of governance in which people interact to create positive change. The period after World War II saw a grand national bargain between labor and business, and it produced the era of rapid increases in productivity, profits, and wages that characterized the United States until the early 1970s. That social pact unraveled in the latter half of the 1970s and a Darwinian struggle has taken its place, with the negative results now clear. CBA's offer an alternative: they are a form of direct civil society bargains between community groups and private developers that are then presented to public sector. It's a new way of interacting, and while the relationships that are built during a CBA campaign are sometimes thin, the experience at least creates space for a new kind of deliberate democracy.

Next Steps

While I am hopeful about what all this points to, we clearly need to learn more from each other about how all this works on the ground. This consultative session is an exciting step in that direction.

As for the bigger picture, we need to think about what we can learn from CBA's regarding combining growth, mobility, and standards. Put simply, most equity advocates have not brought an adequate or compelling enough

economic growth agenda to the table. The assumption seems to be that the business sector and politicians will worry about economic drivers, while equity advocates will worry about "the people." But you cannot press for equality in a stagnant economy—if the economy doesn't work, the people don't work. And ironically poor people are most dependent on economic growth and most in need of the jobs created by a region's economic drivers.

Equity proponents, I would suggest, need a clear economic growth model and agenda. CBA's cannot just be a tool limited to "hot market" cities in which the regulations help to redistribute benefits. We also need to see how they can be used to restore growth and revitalize areas that have been long neglected in more distressed cities and regions.

Can we do this? Of course. The same creativity that has led to the development of CBA's can be extended to other arenas of economic development policy. And if we do, perhaps we can capture the national imagination for a more progressive economic policy much as the groups here have managed to capture their cities' support for a new set of ideas about the compatibility of growth, equity, and community.

IV. BACKGROUND ON COMMUNITY BENEFITS AGREEMENTS: THE PROCESS, THE PROJECTS, AND THE PROSPECTS FOR THE FUTURE

The following text is an article written by Madeline Janis, Executive Director of the Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy, with Brad Lander, Director of the Pratt Center for Community Development.

Large-scale urban development has represented both a blessing and a curse for many low-income communities in the United States. Cities have increasingly become the focus of developers seeking to build upscale housing, stadiums, retail malls, office towers, and new hotels, even as devastating poverty persists in urban areas nearby. This renewed interest in cities offers the promise of jobs and neighborhood improvements for impoverished districts. But too often renewal efforts have come at the expense of poor and working-class residents, who find the new housing unaffordable, the construction jobs unavailable, and the retail and service jobs part-time and low-wage.

As a result, local residents have faced a quandary. In some cases, they have agreed to support development projects, in the hopes that the influx of jobs and services will outweigh the negative impacts on the community. In other cases, community organizations, fearful of rapid gentrification of their neighborhoods, have fought urban development with the goal of stopping a project or scaling it back.

Over the past decade, organizations representing residents of poor, urban areas have sought more proactive and sophisticated

approaches for dealing with the effects of growth. Coalitions of community groups, labor unions, and advocates have demanded more accountable economic development: living wage policies, linking workforce development and first-source hiring to new jobs facilitated by public action, inclusionary zoning to guarantee affordable housing units, community planning and fair share policies to ensure that low-income communities of color are not forced unfairly to bear the burdens of growth, and new “green-collar” job creation to capture the benefits of more sustainable development.

One important tool in these efforts is CBAs—project-specific contracts between developers or cities and community coalitions. CBAs are legally binding, enforceable agreements that call for a range of benefits to be produced by the development project. They allow community groups to have a voice in shaping a project, to press for community benefits that are tailored to their particular needs, and to enforce developers’ promises.

The idea of CBAs originated in response to the development of retail and entertainment complexes, but it is flexible enough to respond to many kinds of development. In recent years CBAs have been negotiated for airport modernization projects (Los Angeles), industrial projects (Los Angeles), sports-related complexes (San Diego), hospital expansions (New Haven), franchises for broadband internet access (Twin Cities),

and even whole urban renewal projects (Milwaukee and Atlanta).

The community benefits approach involves organizing diverse interest groups, from community groups to labor unions to housing and environmental advocates, around a common set of demands. This coalition engages in direct negotiations with the developer to achieve an agreement that has something for all parties—a more equitable and sustainable development project for coalition members, and crucial community support for the developer.

For a CBA to have real value, it must do more than provide token concessions. The coalition must garner some tangible benefit for each constituency the coalition represents, and the CBA should constitute a victory that reflects—and builds—the coalition’s collective power. The community benefits movement is not only about concrete benefits but also about a set of principles: that community members should have a say in economic decisions that affect them; that economic decisions should enhance quality of life; and that quality of life depends on a range of factors, including access to good jobs, a clean environment, and decent and affordable housing. The community benefits movement is pro-growth, but understands that growth must come with a measure of justice and that it must be sustainable.

The CBA concept was pioneered by the Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE),

which in 1998 worked with then City Council-member Jackie Goldberg to incorporate community benefits provisions—including living wages, job training, and a health benefits “trust”—into the development agreement for Hollywood and Highland, a large entertainment and retail project in the heart of Hollywood. The first full-fledged CBA came in 2001, when a broad coalition of community groups negotiated a far-reaching agreement with the developer of Los Angeles Sports and Entertainment District (the Staples Center expansion project). This was followed by four more CBAs on projects across Los Angeles. Since then, dozens of additional projects in Los Angeles have had community benefits provisions incorporated into their development agreements.

Many communities across the country are now using the community benefits model. Groups in New York, Milwaukee, Denver, Atlanta, New Haven, Santa Rosa (CA), Oakland, and San Diego have recently won far-reaching CBAs, while in San Jose two huge projects have incorporated community benefits provisions into development agreements. Groups in numerous other cities, including Seattle, Orange County, New Orleans, Miami, and Pittsburgh are actively pursuing CBAs.

Why Are Community Benefits Needed?

CBAs are critical in part because the current “back to the city” movement sees many large U.S. cities promoting economic growth targeting middle- and upper-income

T HE COMMUNITY
BENEFITS APPROACH
INVOLVES ORGANIZING
DIVERSE INTEREST
GROUPS, FROM COMMU-
NITY GROUPS TO LABOR
UNIONS TO HOUSING AND
ENVIRONMENTAL ADVOCATES,
AROUND A COMMON
SET OF DEMANDS.

consumers and residents. Sports stadiums, entertainment arenas, hotels, office parks, “big box” retail outlets, upscale residential projects, and other such developments are occurring regularly in urban areas—including many areas inhabited predominantly by low-income residents and people of color. These projects have the potential to offer significant opportunities for low- and moderate-income neighborhood residents, but, absent intervention, can be devastating to them.

While many of these projects are bringing sorely needed jobs and tax revenues back to areas that have been disinvested, there is usually no guarantee that the “ripple effects” of the projects will benefit those residents who need them most. CBAs give a role in the process to community residents and other stakeholders and help ensure that all sectors share in the benefits as urban areas are redeveloped.

Developers of these large projects have a particular social responsibility, not only to residents of communities where they build, but also because taxpayer dollars typically subsidize their projects. Large development projects almost always benefit from subsidies such as land parceling through eminent domain, new streets and other infrastructure, property tax reductions or abatements, tax increment financing, and industrial revenue bonds or other loans. Even projects outside of redevelopment areas—sports stadiums are a well-known example—often benefit from public subsidy in the form of tax relief, direct

subsidies in the guise of “incentives,” infrastructure improvements, and regulatory relief. Researchers at the national think tank Good Jobs First have estimated that public subsidy in private development in the United States amounts to more than \$50 billion annually.

At the same time that cities are being revitalized with help from public dollars, the nation is resegregating. Too many non-white, low-income, urban residents are moving deeper into poverty, lacking decent housing, quality jobs, or medical care, and living in environments that are unhealthy, resulting in disproportionate incidences of diseases, especially respiratory ailments and cancers.

Despite large public subsidies and substantial need, too often the typical process through which a municipality considers a new economic development project consists of a series of procedural steps with little attention to the potential impact of the project for good or ill on the neighborhood in which it is to be located, the people who live there, or the people who will ultimately live or work in the project. In spite of extensive land-use and development powers, as well as powers to withhold approvals, subsidies, or other inputs for development, appointed and elected city officials often find themselves unable to change a development process that is developer-driven. Redevelopment agency staff may be driven primarily, like the developers themselves, by a desire to “do deals,” and therefore be reluctant to bargain for

provisions that add public value...if developers simply threaten to walk away from the table. As a result, too often the community's interests—and the broader public interest—are not effectively represented in negotiations.

Community Benefits Agreement Strategy

Community benefits campaigns seek to change this imbalance by building a powerful coalition, organizing residents of the area, conducting research, and ultimately negotiating with the developer to shape the development and the benefits it will provide.

The successful community benefits campaign identifies problems—too many working people in poverty, lack of decent and affordable groceries, environmental pollution—and forges a broad-based coalition to address the needs. Based on credible research, a proposal is developed, and then advanced through a comprehensive campaign, that includes grassroots and coalition organizing, advocacy, and then a values-based communications strategy that conveys a powerful message to the public and to policymakers.

This comprehensive campaign model recognizes that a multipronged strategy is needed to achieve change. Policy, research, organizing, communications, and legal all must be part of the coalition's resources. Groups that engage in organizing without a research capacity, for instance, often find themselves stymied because they lack a strategic understanding of the oppositional forces arrayed

against them, or an analysis of the financial structure of the proposed deal. Other groups may have a strong research capacity but are limited without the base that is built by an organizing program.

Hence, organizations that hope to win community benefits campaigns must have the capacity to access each of the requisite resources either on-staff or through close partnerships or consultants. For this reason, many organizations with community benefits programs have joined in the Partnership for Working Families, a national organization that develops the capacity of local groups and facilitates sharing of resources needed to win campaigns (for more information, see www.communitybenefits.org).

Essential Elements of the Community Benefits Agreement Process

Research and decision-making. The CBA process begins with research staff monitoring development proposals in their region and identifying those that have the potential to offer important benefits—or pose significant risks—to the neighborhood in which they will be sited and the community as a whole. Organizers contact interested members of the community and other stakeholders to gauge interest and priorities—often conducting neighborhood surveys—and begin to identify how a proposed development project might benefit, or harm, residents and potential employees of the project.

Research looks into the development proposal, the developer, the use of public subsidies and other resources, the proposed anchor commercial tenant(s), the housing elements, the number and type of construction and permanent jobs, the environmental considerations raised by the project, and so forth. Along with neighborhood surveys, research begins to define the broad outlines of a potential CBA.

Coalition building: At the heart of the community benefits strategy is coalition building. The logic is simple: if enough stakeholders come together with a common vision for economic development, savvy developers are likely to want to negotiate an agreement. The CBA process offers developers an attractive alternative to litigation and polarizing public debates, which can delay or doom a project. One of the best examples of building and maintaining a broad and deep coalition is the group that won a half-billion dollar CBA for LAX Airport, which will dramatically improve the quality of life for low-income communities near LAX through environmental and employment benefits. The LAX Coalition includes labor unions, local school officials, environmental and public health groups, business leaders, community-based organizations, religious leaders, and elected officials. Keeping this coalition together, facilitating compromise, and crafting a shared agenda was necessary to develop the CBA demands, to negotiate with the airport and city officials over nearly a year, to advocate for passage by the City Council and

Airport Commission, and—for the past three years—to oversee implementation of the program.

The typical coalition includes community organizations, religious leaders, labor, and environmental groups. In Seattle, a new CBA campaign is under way around a proposed major commercial development in a primarily Vietnamese area. In this case, the usual partners have joined with Vietnamese owners of small businesses to design and negotiate the CBA. In Denver, the range of environmental groups that were part of the coalition that won the Cherokee-Gates CBA included the Livable Communities Support Center, an organization focused on promoting smart growth from a community health perspective (pedestrian friendly, reduced pollution, more open space, and live-work proximity); Colorado Apollo Alliance, which includes five state and local environmental organizations; and the Sierra Club, as well as business organizations that support environmental protection.

Community organizing: In many cases, community organizers go door to door or conduct phone banks to survey residents to ascertain their needs and desires with regard to the proposed development. This process also enables the organizers to identify grassroots leaders in the community for training in leadership skills, economic development, and communications. The second step usually is to organize one or more public meetings with help from identified leaders to

maximize turnout. Out of these meetings a residents' committee is formed with support and advice from the community organizer to take the lead in shaping the community benefits agenda, to keep the community informed, and to build support for the CBA.

One of the advantages of CBAs is their flexibility: community advocates can negotiate for the benefits their particular community needs the most. In fact, when community groups come together over a proposed development, it is an excellent occasion to assess the community's needs. This assessment—and the coalition building that can accompany it—can spark organizing and advocacy well beyond any single project.

Getting the developer to the table: Once resident support is organized and a coalition is in place, the community can demonstrate that it has enough power to either facilitate or to raise concerns about the development. Therefore, the CBA campaign has the capacity to bring the developer to the table. CBA negotiations cannot be effective without such capacity. Of course, once the CBA negotiation process becomes routine in a city, the developer is often ready to negotiate at a much earlier stage—even in advance of making a proposal to the city. In Inglewood, Los Angeles, for example, a community benefits coalition had shown its power by stopping a proposed Wal-Mart superstore project in 2004 and was thereafter approached by virtually every major developer wanting to do business with the city. Often, especially when

the movement is new to a city, having the support of key public officials can bring the developer to negotiations. Occasionally, it might be necessary to take legal action to challenge problematic aspects of a development in order to get the developer to the table.

Negotiation: The process of negotiating a CBA must be firmly based in a strong alliance of coalition partners and community representatives. This alliance is critical because developers often use a “divide and conquer” strategy when dealing with community groups, making just enough accommodation to gain the support of one group, while ignoring the concerns of others. Sometimes this accommodation is little more than a monetary payoff to one or more groups. The developer can then claim community support for the project and obtain necessary government approvals, even though most community issues have not been addressed. For example, a developer may agree to build a project with union construction labor while ignoring the concerns of those unions whose members will fill the project's permanent retail and service jobs, and then claim the project has “labor's support.” Or a developer might agree to environmental demands, leaving jobs and housing out of play. The members of the coalition must stand firm on all the issues, maintain cohesion, and agree on compromises in order to counter these divide-and-conquer efforts. Typically, every member of the coalition will not be at the table, so it is crucially important that a process for setting

ONE OF THE ADVANTAGES OF CBAs IS THEIR FLEXIBILITY: COMMUNITY ADVOCATES CAN NEGOTIATE FOR THE BENEFITS THEIR PARTICULAR COMMUNITY NEEDS THE MOST.

WHILE A CBA IN
ITS NARROWEST
SENSE IS A CONTRACT
BETWEEN A COMMUNITY
COALITION AND A DEVELOPER,
THE AGREEMENT
CAN BE EVEN STRONGER IF
IT IS APPROVED BY THE
REDEVELOPMENT AGENCY
AND/OR ELECTED OFFICIALS
AS PART OF THE
DEVELOPER'S AGREEMENT
WITH THE CITY.

priorities and making negotiating decisions is established in advance and that information is exchanged constantly to ensure that all members have input.

The CBA is a complex legal agreement and can be fraught with loopholes and traps. It is, therefore, important to involve an attorney who understands the issues as well as the legalities to assist in the negotiations. In the case of the LAX CBA, for example, where negotiations went on nearly daily for almost a year, at the end of each day, representatives of the coalition provided a summary of the discussions to the attorney who advised them about the legal language needed to achieve the desired outcomes.

Agreement to approval: When agreement is finally reached to the satisfaction of coalition members and the developer, the outcome must be communicated to the community, to constituents by each coalition member, and to the media. Communications strategies must be crafted to deliver the message about this "win-win" agreement and its importance as a model for future development.

While a CBA in its narrowest sense is a contract between a community coalition and a developer, the agreement can be even stronger if it is approved by the redevelopment agency and/or elected officials as part of the developer's agreement with the city—so it can be monitored and enforced not only by the coalition in court, but also by the municipality. To achieve this, the members of the

coalition and community residents must work with decision-makers throughout the process and must communicate the importance and value of the CBA not only to the coalition partners but to the city as a whole.

Implementation and enforcement: The CBA process is not over after approval. In Los Angeles, where the CBA movement is oldest, it has been amply demonstrated that without constant vigilance implementation of the agreement will be minimal or nonexistent. Monitoring, oversight, meetings, and regular reports are necessary to hold the developer accountable. The CBA itself should establish provisions for mediation and enforcement. But no matter how good the written agreement, the community coalition must stay actively involved, which requires staffing, outreach, ongoing community education, and an open and transparent process.

The public sector also has a critical role to play in implementation and enforcement. The city's workforce development system can be deployed to help facilitate first-source hiring and sectorally targeted job training. Affordable housing can be registered and monitored by experienced housing officials. Public open space can be integrated into the parks department. While community members have a higher degree of input on CBA projects, the strong involvement of the public sector improves the chances that agreements will be well-implemented over the long term. This requires community coalitions that can both pressure and partner with public

agencies, and municipal leadership that embraces community benefits efforts.

Models from Around the Country

A survey conducted in 2006 identified nearly 40 CBAs and community benefits policies that had been adopted around the country from Atlanta to Boston to Milwaukee to Denver and to several cities in California. CBAs have been negotiated all over the country and around a full range of developments that might occur in metropolitan regions, including:

- Several mixed-use developments: the Staples Center expansion in Los Angeles, the Cherokee-Gates development in Denver, and a proposed project in Seattle
- Transit-oriented developments: Beltline development projects in Atlanta
- Redevelopment areas: Milwaukee Park East Redevelopment Compact
- Stadium-centered developments: San Diego BallPark Village mixed-used project
- Housing developments: Oakland's Oak to Ninth housing project
- Large-scale "new town" type developments: Coyote Valley in San Jose
- Casino projects: in process in Pittsburgh
- Industrial parks: Sunquest in Los Angeles (never built)
- Entertainment complexes: Hollywood and Highland in Los Angeles
- Hotel-anchored developments: Hollywood and Vine in Los Angeles
- Public or community infrastructure developments: Los Angeles Airport
- Hospital redevelopments: Yale-New Haven hospital expansion
- Cable and wireless Internet franchises

No two CBAs or policies are precisely alike. Elements that have been most common in CBAs include:

- Living wage requirements (either universal or a percentage) for permanent jobs created at the development
- Local hiring preferences (especially important where the local population consists primarily of disadvantaged people of color) and preferences for women going off welfare, at-risk youth, homeless people, or people with disabilities
- Training for career ladder and construction jobs
- Responsible contractor requirements that disbar from construction work or permanent occupancy businesses that have a poor record of compliance with law and regulation
- Affordable or low-income housing mandates usually set as a percentage of units

AT THEIR BEST, CBA COALITIONS ARE SUFFICIENTLY BROAD AND INCLUSIVE, AND THEREFORE EFFECTIVE IN REPRESENTING A COLLECTIVE SET OF INTERESTS IN NEGOTIATIONS WITH DEVELOPERS AND THE PUBLIC SECTOR.

being affordable to households at stipulated income levels

- Environmental cleanup of sites with a history of toxins in the ground
- Green building standards, limits on vehicle traffic and pedestrian-friendly design, “clean” construction requirements, and other measures designed to mitigate pollution or enhance the environment
- “Smart growth” principles of density, proximity of residential to commercial services, and mass transportation
- Green space, recreation facilities, and parks
- Child care centers and public health clinics
- Health benefits trust funds to incentivize provision of medical insurance
- Community involvement in the selection of permanent tenants

Cautions and Concerns

CBAs have already achieved substantial results in recent years, and they hold enormous potential for ensuring that urban redevelopment projects deliver on the promise of creating opportunity for low-income families. At the same time, there are a range of concerns that must be addressed—in individual CBAs and in the movement as it grows.

Who represents “the community?” The coalitions that come together to organize for CBAs are made up of independent groups with particular interests—labor, neighborhood, housing, environmental, etc. Without this type of organizing, interests often go unrepresented as deals are made. However, no single group can legitimately claim to represent “the community” given the diversity of people, interests, and perspectives. Some cities have considered an official, public process for CBAs, but this could circumscribe the community organizing and coalition building that have been the hallmarks of CBA efforts. At their best, CBA coalitions are sufficiently broad and inclusive, and therefore effective in representing a collective set of interests in negotiations with developers and the public sector. But the breadth and consistency of support take enormous work, and may not be possible on every project.

What if it’s a bad project (and who decides)? A particular challenge arises in deciding whether a project is so risky that it should be opposed outright. Impacts are often difficult to predict, and different actors have different priorities, so it can be hard to weigh the potential costs (displacement of residents and businesses, traffic, loss of historic structures, the pain of eminent domain, public subsidies, etc.) against the potential benefits (new jobs, housing, services, and opportunities). In some cases, one set of community interests may determine that the developer

is proposing a bad project that should simply be rejected, but from another angle this opposition can look like NIMBYism.

Who should deliver the benefits? At their best, CBAs have concrete positive outcomes for thousands of individuals—in the form of jobs and job training, affordable housing, new open space, affordable child care slots, and community programs. As with any organizing campaign, “delivering the goods” is an essential part of continuing to build power for future efforts. But who is in the best position to deliver these benefits in a fair and transparent way? Do groups involved in the organizing effort have the right (and ability) to implement the victories, or should implementation be left to neutral groups with potentially more experience in specific programmatic areas? How should the city’s workforce or housing departments be involved? And how can groups in the CBA coalition have the resources needed to staff, implement, and monitor without appearing to organize for their own benefit?

Do CBAs undermine public planning processes? CBA coalitions are often responding to developer-driven deals, in which little public planning has taken place. But best practice in municipal policy is to establish a public framework for development plans and subsidies upfront, so that all development supported by public action advances public benefits. How can CBA efforts improve individual projects, transforming them into

opportunities for communities to benefit, without further advancing a process of privatized deal-making?

As the CBA movement matures, a wide range of actors—community and labor groups, developers, public officials, foundations, and financial institutions—increasingly have the opportunity to address these challenges and to develop new strategies and best practices. The roundtable at the Annie E. Casey Foundation, which we were honored to facilitate together, provided a space to discuss what a range of experienced partners have learned from their experiences so far about CBA basics, about addressing concerns, and about where the CBA movement can go in the future.

Moving Beyond Project-Specific Agreements

Until recently, community benefits were primarily delivered through project-specific agreements, negotiated between the developer of a project and a coalition representing the community and other stakeholders. As the movement has developed, tools with a broader reach are being tested around the country.

In Milwaukee, a defined list of community benefits has been attached to an entire redevelopment area. In Atlanta, community benefits—to be separately defined—are required for all projects built in connection with the Beltline rapid transit project. In Los Angeles,

community benefits were tied to all phases of the multibillion dollar “modernization” of LAX Airport. And the LA Community Redevelopment Agency now considers the social benefits of projects—does it create good jobs, mixed-income housing, and sustainable urbanism for residents of its project neighborhoods and their children?—as its central criteria for support.

Cities where CBAs have been tested at the project level have demonstrated that the approach can be a “win-win” for developers, the community, and the city as a whole. CBAs have been required in some cities for all projects that use tax increment financing, and other cities are increasingly incorporating community benefits standards into requests for proposals for development projects. Even beyond individual projects, officials in these cities are becoming more willing to look at ways of lifting the concept to the policy level. This could mean incorporating requirements for local hiring preferences for construction and permanent jobs, living wage standards for permanent jobs in all subsidized developments, minimum thresholds for affordable or mixed-income housing, job training requirements, or “green” building standards into development policies.

Conclusion

Over the past several years, an increasing number of organizations across the country have begun using the CBA model as an integral part of their strategy. This growth is

linked to the creation of new, broad-based coalitions willing to embrace partnerships with both traditional and nontraditional allies and to empower disenfranchised communities.

As advocates seek to advance an agenda of social and economic justice, they might do well to study the CBA movement, which has offered a way to transcend the differences that too often have splintered community forces. Indeed, CBAs provide a potent example of coalition building that extends beyond progressive groups to a wide array of stakeholders. Such alliances may point the way toward a promising future in which the common aspirations of the majority are harnessed for social progress.

Laura Joseph, from the Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy, contributed to this article.

V. FRAMING QUESTIONS

This consultative session brought together community organizers, advocates, public officials, and developers to discuss the use of CBAs as a tool for development. The session organizers sent the following framing questions to session participants in advance to guide the conversations throughout the day.

The Essentials of Community Benefits Agreements

- What is the history and important context for CBAs?
- What are the enabling conditions that must be present for CBAs to be most helpful? What capacity must be present for it to work?
- What are the key elements of the CBA process and products?
- What is the relationship between CBA processes and other public processes? Where do they converge and diverge?

The Power: Organizing the Coalition and the Community

- What have we learned about the key constituencies in communities that must be part of the coalition? What is the healthy balance of voices, perspectives, expertise, experience, etc., that should be in the mix?
- What are the forces that enable the coalition to cohere or disintegrate? What coalition supports are necessary to sustain the partnerships over time?

The Practice: Highlights from Executing and Enforcing Agreements

- What are the typical ways that developers and government collaborate with or work against the community?
- From a developer's perspective, why is a CBA useful?
- What have we learned about strengthening the accountability and enforceability of CBAs?
- What have we learned about the key levers that coalitions use as they are negotiating the agreements?
- How have processes been different across the country? What important lessons can we learn from different approaches?

The Promise: Do the Ends Justify the Means? A Conversation about Results and the Future

- Are CBAs delivering on their promise of good results for the community? If so, what have been the results? If not, what can we learn?
- What are the direct and indirect outcomes of these processes? How have behaviors and community norms changed?
- Is there a movement afoot regarding CBAs? If so, what is the frame on this movement?

VI. SESSION SUMMARY

I. CROSSCUTTING THEMES

Although the framing of the conversation encouraged three separate, yet related sections on the power, practice, and promise of CBAs, the actual conversation yielded several crosscutting themes that threaded through each of the three discussions:

- Elevating the voice and participation of community members
- Structural inequality
- The relationship between CBAs and public policy

a. Elevating the voice and participation of community members

Race and class: Within the present context of CBAs, there is often a noticeable difference between the race and class of the community members and the race and class of the people who are representing these communities in formulating agreements. Coalitions comprised of educated, middle class, white professionals often serve as the voices for communities that consist largely of marginalized and disenfranchised, low-income, minority residents. As the use of CBAs increases, race and class will be ongoing issues for discussion and must be considered in conversations about who can serve as an authentic voice for communities undergoing redevelopment.

Community representation: As CBAs proliferate, opportunities will continue to emerge for community members to advocate for themselves and to assume leadership positions, e.g., contractors, public officials, city planning positions, and spokesmen, in the public- and private-sector work related to development projects. Concerted efforts must begin to create leadership opportunities for community members and to build capacity in communities so that residents can assume leadership positions as they are created. The capacity for self-advocacy will help to bridge the divide of race and class that currently exists within the movement.

Training and educational opportunities: Training and educational opportunities for community members will allow communities to advocate for themselves in forming CBAs. By offering a variety of training and educational opportunities to community members, the CBA movement can ensure that community members gain skills in several areas, including advocacy, public speaking, small-business management, city planning, and public service.

b. Structural inequality

Strong-market vs. weak-market cities: Most of the positive examples of using CBAs are from strong-market cities. While the levers available are relative to the type of market, it appears that communities in strong-market cities have had more leverage to use this tool when dealing with city governments and

private developers. Because CBAs can be customized to meet the needs of each particular community, they have the power to work in both markets. In the future, more emphasis should be put on the development of CBAs in weak-market cities.

Disparities among cities in America: As the label of strong-market and weak-market cities implies, not all American cities operate the same way. Although one of the strengths of CBAs is their ability to adapt to individual contexts, should the contexts in American cities be as individualized as they are? Should this inequality among American cities be an accepted part of conversations around development in the United States? CBAs may serve as one tool to bridge the gap that currently exists among American cities.

Concentrated poverty: Development and redevelopment often take place in communities that are marked by concentrated poverty. While CBAs may hold promise to empower these communities to advocate for themselves, they will not be the “silver bullet” for concentrated, urban poverty. If we overburden CBAs with unattainable expectations, they will almost certainly fall short. Including CBAs on the menu of possible tools for redevelopment is a more responsible frame to utilize.

The Role of Foundations in the Community Benefits Agreement Movement

Leadership:

- Developers receive funding for large development projects from bond banks. Asking bond banks to require developers to participate in CBAs would likely help to ensure developer participation and to encourage responsible development. Foundations could lead an initiative to engage bond banks in a discussion of how they could influence developers to participate in responsible development practices.
- Foundations can also assume a leadership role in implementing a set of minimum standards that would guide all large-scale development projects. Some examples of minimum standards would be: creating living-wage jobs, regulating the concentration of affordable housing units, or building environmentally friendly projects.
- As the CBA movement grows, it will be important to share good practices and lessons learned from previous experiences. Foundations can support the development of peer networks to engage in these important discussions.

T HE COMMUNITIES WE ARE TALKING ABOUT ARE PREDOMINANTLY BLACK AND BROWN COMMUNITIES. UNTIL WE BEGIN TO DEVELOP A SET OF LEADERS FROM THE COMMUNITY TO BEGIN TO EDUCATE THEMSELVES ON THESE ISSUES SO THAT THEY CAN EVENTUALLY LEAD THESE MOVEMENTS, IT'S ONLY GOING TO BE A LIP-SERVICE KIND OF CONVERSATION IN THE COMMUNITY.

—Deborah Scott

THE ASSUMPTION
 THAT WE ARE
 OPERATING FROM IS THAT
 COMMUNITY BENEFITS
 AGREEMENTS ARE GOOD.
 IF YOU THINK THAT, THAT
 MEANS THAT WE HAVE ALL
 DECIDED THAT WE WANT
 THIS DEVELOPMENT TO GO
 FORWARD. I THINK THAT
 WE REALLY OUGHT TO NOT
 GLOSS OVER THE FACT
 THAT THERE ARE PEOPLE
 WHO DO NOT WANT
 DEVELOPMENT—PERIOD.
 THEY JUST DON'T WANT IT.
 —Bertha Lewis

c. Community benefits agreements and public policy

Lack of policy vs. bad policy: City- and state-level development policies are often antiquated and do not support the use of CBAs in the development process. While some cities and states lack development policies altogether, others have bad development policies that do not promote responsible development practices. Policy vacuums around urban development make responsible development particularly challenging, but bad policies that allow and even promote irresponsible actions on the part of developers and public agencies are worse. Stakeholders must navigate development policies in their communities carefully during the CBA process.

The role of policy in creating development norms: City and state policies have the ability to create norms for development projects. These policies could include a CBA process into every development project that takes place within a jurisdiction. While mandatory inclusion of the CBA process would be beneficial to the movement, overly prescriptive policies that dictate a hard and fast CBA process to be used in all development projects may limit the flexibility of CBAs to be customized to individual development projects and communities. The debate over the mandatory inclusion of CBAs into development policies will likely continue far beyond this conversation and may only be

fully understood from the experiences of jurisdictions that attempt this approach.

II. THE POWER: ORGANIZING THE COALITION AND THE COMMUNITY

While CBAs offer a tool for negotiating development projects that are mutually beneficial to developers, community members, and public officials, all stakeholders must compromise and share power in order for them to deliver. The discussion of the power of CBAs focused on perceived or real power imbalances and how to manage these imbalances as well as on how to build power in often marginalized communities.

a. Power imbalance

Fear of development: Most discussions of CBAs begin with two assumptions: 1) redevelopment will take place in the community; and 2) redevelopment, if done responsibly, can be beneficial. Following from these assumptions, conversations focus on using CBAs to ensure that development projects are mutually beneficial to all stakeholders, including community members, public officials, and private developers. However, the above-mentioned assumptions are not always shared by all parties. Segments of communities often feel that development will not be undertaken responsibly and that it will lead to gentrification and unforeseen changes in the community. These feelings arise from past

experiences in which communities were left out of the planning process for large developments and suffered at the hands of public officials and developers. Community members that view all development as negative are often the most disenfranchised members of society, and they may never engage in the process.

Reality vs. perception: Several session participants feel that an inherent power imbalance exists in development negotiations. In this frame, developers have the most power, city officials have some power, and community members have very little power. This view also tends to envision developers as power-hungry capitalists who use public officials to take power from marginalized people who cannot advocate for themselves. This absolute view of the power imbalance of development seems extreme, but it highlights many of the generalizations, prejudices, and self-perceptions that stakeholders carry into the negotiation process.

While many feel strongly about this power imbalance, some also feel that perceptions of power and hierarchy may contribute to creating and perpetuating an unequal environment. For instance, city officials may have more power in development than they recognize, and by underestimating their power, they may contribute to creating an environment in which developers have free reign and community members feel marginalized. To make CBAs as productive as possible, it will be important for stakeholders to understand

the viewpoints that their fellow stakeholders may bring to the process and to try to begin each negotiation with an open mind.

b. Managing the power imbalance

Building partnerships: CBAs are a useful tool in redistributing and balancing both the real and perceived power imbalances of development because they bring all stakeholders to a negotiation as partners. An approach that fosters relationships around development projects that are mutually beneficial for all parties will help to balance power. As partnerships and long-term relationships develop among community members, developers, and public officials, stakeholders may be able to abandon prejudices and generalizations about each other.

Recognizing power in community members and public officials: As mentioned above, developers feel that community members and public officials often underestimate their power in the development process. These two groups have immense power, but they must recognize their power and learn how to use it in negotiating CBAs. For instance, organized communities can ask developers to compete for projects based on the benefits they can offer. Public officials can transition from processing projects to being actively involved in planning projects.

Improving communication with developers: A disconnect exists between developers and the communities within which they manage

projects. This disconnect originates from both misunderstanding and miscommunication. Developers often do not understand what communities hope to attain with CBAs. Without a concerted effort to discuss the benefits that are sought and why the community seeks those particular benefits, miscommunication can take place between parties and may result in contentious relationships. Instead of alleviating this miscommunication on an agreement-by-agreement basis, it may be more efficient to educate developers through professional organizations about CBAs as a tool to engage the community in responsible development projects.

c. Building community power

Community benefits agreements or community organizing—which should come first?: Community organizers argue that sound grassroots community organizing is a necessary prerequisite to the formulation of appropriate CBAs. Others argue that one step in the CBA process should always be community organizing but that this step does not need to come before the CBA process begins. Essentially, this debate focuses on whether community organizing should be an ongoing process or a project-specific activity.

Advocacy vs. self-representation: Advocacy efforts are generally undertaken by professionals who work within organizations and coalitions on behalf of others. Because advocacy around CBAs has historically been a movement of professionals, advocates must

be intentional in ensuring that they are representing the voices of all community members. Advocates can play a role in building the capacity of community residents for self-representation and in providing venues in which community members can advocate for themselves. Without ongoing, professional advocacy, the CBA movement may falter because of variability and discontinuity between project-specific agreements. Therefore, advocacy efforts should continue to provide continuity to the movement and to prepare community members to use their voice.

Political influence: Community organizers often overlook political influence as a tool for building power. Developers manage the political system to their own benefit, and community organizers should do the same. Two strategies for communities to gain political influence are 1) increasing the voting population in the community; and 2) grassroots advocacy. Community organizers should focus on building political influence by increasing the proportion of residents who vote in local elections. Elected and appointed officials listen to communities that participate in the political process because their jobs depend on it. Grassroots advocacy allows community organizations and coalitions to participate in the political process similarly to developers who participate in lobbying efforts. Communicating with people and public officials and then holding public officials accountable to their constituents are useful ways to gain political influence.

III. THE PRACTICE: HIGHLIGHTS FROM EXECUTING AND ENFORCING AGREEMENTS

The CBA movement is still relatively new, and therefore the CBA process is still evolving and adapting itself to new situations. In light of this ongoing evolution, the second portion of the session invited CBA practitioners to share their experiences around many of the process issues that arise in using CBAs. Conversations included the following topics: trust, leverage, enforceability, political leadership, pecuniary benefit, and mutual benefits and accountability.

a. Specific how-to information

Building trust in the community benefits agreement process: Trust is an essential element of all negotiation processes, but it is particularly important to the CBA process because all parties depend on each other to negotiate a mutually beneficial development project.

At the beginning of the process trust is often lacking because of histories of broken promises and corruption. Many of the communities that are currently attempting CBAs as a redevelopment tool have lived through bad times: people have lost jobs when industry pulled out of urban areas; neighborhoods have often believed promises of developers and public officials only to be disappointed; and “successful” redevelopment projects have often resulted in gentrification and widespread displacement. These bad

experiences have contributed to feelings of distrust and continue to shape communities’ expectations for future projects. Additionally, many cities have histories of corruption that continue to affect their abilities to convince people of their intentions. To alleviate distrust, public officials and agencies must work to build a reputation for honest, straightforward dealings that benefit the communities they serve.

CBAs may serve as a powerful tool to build trust among all stakeholders involved in the agreement by: 1) building a history of mutually beneficial development projects in the area; 2) maintaining a relationship where all parties are responsible for holding up their parts of the agreements; and 3) building review systems into the agreements so that future phases of the development or future development projects are awarded based on adherence to previous agreements.

Leverage points: The ability of communities to find points of leverage in the development process is central to them negotiating beneficial agreements for their residents. Four forms of leverage are entitlements, public funds, land ownership, and institutions that offer financing to developers.

- Communities can use land entitlements to produce demand-driven development projects. Land entitlements govern the way that developers can use land in their projects, including zoning and density restrictions. By controlling entitlements, communities can

leverage power in negotiations by blocking rezoning efforts at the city level. While entitlements may be a powerful tool, developers caution that negotiating based on entitlements may result in suboptimal development projects if developers are ultimately forced to work within the current zoning restrictions.

- Public funds through bonds and development incentives are another means of influencing negotiations around CBAs. Public agencies can incorporate the CBA process into all projects in which developers rely on the use of public funds.

- Land ownership is the strongest form of leverage in negotiations around development deals. If the community owns the land on which development will take place, it will have power to negotiate an agreement that is advantageous for its residents. Land ownership produces a demand-driven development situation where developers compete with each other for development projects based on the benefits they can offer to the community. The community holds the land and leases it often indefinitely to the developer who can provide the best benefits for the community.

- Most large-scale development projects are funded through bond banks, and these bond banks make demands on the developers regarding not only financial yield but also how development will proceed. Bond banks, therefore, may be a point of leverage for communities and public officials who want

to use CBAs in large developments. If bond banks stipulate the use of these agreements in order for developers to gain funding, they will become a regular component of all development projects.

Enforceability: Because the CBA movement is still relatively new, the best practices around enforceability are rapidly evolving. As some CBAs have moved forward to implementation, the field has learned several lessons about ensuring the enforceability of agreements. The primary means of enforceability lies in the language that is used in agreements. Language must be specific and measurable in order to be enforceable. For example, early agreements often used the term “best efforts,” which is not specific or measurable, to describe the contributions of developers or public agencies. Because of the lack of specificity, communities have been unable to prove that outcomes were not the result of “best efforts” and therefore could not hold the agencies and developers accountable. As the movement has developed, CBAs now include clear language with specific measures, e.g., numbers of jobs that will be created, square feet of green space that will be preserved. In order to ensure legal enforceability, negotiations should involve lawyers in crafting the language for agreements.

b. Benefits and accountability

Mutual benefit: CBAs provide a unique opportunity for multiple stakeholders to enter an

agreement that allows all parties to benefit from the development project. Developers benefit from profits as well as social investment—a double bottom line. Public officials benefit when the results of responsible economic development within their jurisdictions become apparent. And community members benefit by garnering solutions to self-identified community needs.

Mutual enforcement: In addition to including all stakeholders in the benefits of development, CBAs must consider enforcement from a multiple stakeholder perspective. While most conversations of enforcement have historically centered on the role and responsibility of developers to hold up their ends of agreements, few have focused as closely on the roles and responsibilities of communities and public agencies. In order for all stakeholders to embrace CBAs, mutual enforceability will be necessary. For instance, if the developer promises to provide 1,000 living-wage, skilled jobs to community members, but the city fails to prepare these workers because of poorly executed job training programs, then enforcement efforts should focus first on the city to improve its job training programs and then on developers once the appropriate workforce is available.

Importance of understanding differences around work style and organizational culture: CBAs draw a diverse group of stakeholders together to discuss development projects. While this diversity strengthens and broadens the

conversation, it can also cause tension. As the CBA movement evolves, it will be important for all stakeholders to consider the work styles and organizational cultures of the other members of the agreement.

Throughout the conversation, several comments drew attention to misunderstandings in work style and culture:

- Public officials asked that community organizers and developers approach them together with relatively defined plans because they do not necessarily have time to consider all development options.
- Community organizers asked that developers and public officials take the time to speak with their communities and to listen to their demands and the rationale behind those demands.
- Developers asked to receive discrete tasks to complete for the community but not to be involved in the conceptual discussions that lead into developing these tasks.

Stakeholders must recognize that none of these approaches is “right” or better than any of the others; they are simply different. To manage these differences, it will be necessary for all stakeholders to enter negotiations with an understanding of the varied work styles and organizational cultures that exist. Though difficult, this process may yield less contentious agreements and more pleasant and productive development relationships.

I F WE'RE DEMANDING LOCAL HIRE, IF WE'RE DEMANDING 30 PERCENT LOCAL HIRE AND 10 PERCENT BE AT RISK FOLKS, THEN WE HAVE TO CREATE THE PIPELINE OF GROUPS THAT DO THAT, AND IT'S OUR RESPONSIBILITY AS THE AGENCY TO WORK WITH OUR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT TO GET THE WORKFORCE MONEY TO BE SPENT BETTER. WE CAN'T DEMAND THIS OF DEVELOPERS UNLESS WE FIX THE SYSTEM.

—Cecilia Estolano

c. Political leadership

Spectrum of political leadership: The framing comments for the discussion on the practice of CBAs outlined a spectrum of political will and how position on this spectrum affects the possibility of a successful CBA:

- The public official does not share the value or concern of the CBA. He/she considers any development to be good development and focuses on making the deal. In this situation, it may not be possible to use a CBA.
- The public official shares the community's concern, but he/she cannot accommodate the demands in the agreement. Public officials often understand their communities but worry that CBAs will slow or dissuade economic development. In this situation, the community may be able to convince the public official to participate using research that calms his/her worries.
- The public official shares the community's concern and believes that using CBAs is possible, but thinks it is politically unwise. As leaders, public officials need to make difficult decisions. Putting together a network of public officials who are familiar with the CBA process may help public officials at this point in the spectrum to make difficult leadership decisions.
- The public official shares the community's concern and is willing to lead. In this situation, the public official uses research to show that the CBA process works. These officials

may be able to reach out to other public officials to introduce them to the movement.

- The public official uses CBAs regularly and hopes to institutionalize the process for all development projects in the jurisdiction. These officials are perfect candidates to share their experiences and to encourage others to join the movement.

Communities hold politicians accountable: While there is a broad spectrum of leadership among public officials around CBAs, it is the responsibility of the community to hold public officials accountable and to demand that they become involved in the CBA process. Most public officials are either elected or appointed by elected officials, and therefore they are responsible to their constituents. Community members must utilize their power as constituents to move their public officials along the spectrum of political leadership.

The Role of Foundations in the Community Benefits Agreement Movement

Supporting an Enabling Environment:

Federal and state development policies and programs are not always conducive to responsible development. Foundations can use their influence to reshape policies and programs to promote the use of CBAs.

Power of elections to place and remove officials:

If there is a spectrum of political leadership for public officials, there is also a spectrum of community reaction to public officials who refuse to engage in the CBA process. As constituents, community members have the power to remove elected officials and their appointed staff members from office if they do not promote development that benefits the community. While this approach may be extreme, it may be the only means of dealing with public officials who are in the first stage on the spectrum—those who see any development as good development and refuse to negotiate agreements because of fear of losing development projects.

d. Money

Point of disagreement: The conversations on money that took place during this consultative session involved some disagreement and were therefore somewhat tense. Both regional and sector divides became obvious in that West-coast cities and professional advocates were more likely to dissuade the exchange of money within CBAs. Thankfully, participants did not shy away from this controversial topic, but rather offered many insightful arguments for the inclusion or exclusion of money from the CBA process.

Justification against accepting money: Among those participants who believe that negotiations around CBAs should not include any pecuniary benefit for negotiating entities, arguments focused on the history of money

being used as a tool for division, on lessons learned from the labor movement, and on the difference between development partners and stakeholders on a common CBA.

The strength of CBAs lies in solid community organizing where all members of the community coalition adopt an “all-for-one” mentality. Historically, developers have used money to splinter coalitions to the ultimate detriment of the greater community. Excluding money from the negotiation process eliminates this opportunity and helps to ensure that the coalition will represent the needs of the whole community.

The organized labor movement provides a good example of lessons learned from collective bargaining processes. It is illegal for organized labor unions to accept money from businesses during negotiations because accepting money may affect the union’s ability to advocate for its members. Similarly, although accepting money during one negotiation may not adversely affect the union members during that negotiation, unions may be compromised when entering future negotiations if they have received money from businesses in the past.

When money passes between a developer and a community organizing group, such as a community development corporation, their relationship transforms from being stakeholders on a common CBA to being development partners. Based on lessons learned from organized labor, this relationship

transformation may be permanent in that the community organization may no longer be able to negotiate fairly with a developer with whom it has been a development partner in the past. Regardless of their actual ability to negotiate, community organizations that partner with developers may lose their credibility as strong negotiators on future agreements.

Justification for accepting money: Among those participants who believe that financial support to individuals or organizations can be included as one benefit within a CBA, arguments focused on the financial realities of sustaining community organizations and on the ultimate beneficiaries of funds that change hands during negotiations.

Community organizers argue that an ongoing community organization is necessary to ensure that communities are equipped to self-advocate when a development project begins. The need for an ongoing organization requires significant funding, and negotiating with developers to include some funding for community organizations within CBAs may be one way to ensure that community organizations maintain the level of funding required to provide good services to their communities.

When negotiations include money, it is important to consider who will ultimately receive the funds. Some CBAs have been able to provide shared profits to community members. In this instance, money is

purposefully included in the agreement as one of the community's demands. It seems unlikely that community members would be unable to advocate for themselves in the future because of transactions that have taken place on past agreements.

IV. THE PROMISE: DO THE ENDS JUSTIFY THE MEANS? A CONVERSATION ABOUT RESULTS AND THE FUTURE

The community benefits movement is well underway. To ensure its sustainability, it will be important for the movement to continue to evolve and grow. This portion of the session involved discussion of the potential of the CBA movement to change the way development and redevelopment are done, but it also included suggestions of gaps that exist in the movement and that must be filled in order for it to progress. Conversation covered the need to broaden the view of development projects beyond economic development, the potential for CBAs to serve as foundations for development partnerships, the necessity for and reality of transparency in negotiations, and the positive feedback loops that have potential to propel the movement.

a. Broadening the view beyond economic development

Goal: Uplift the entire community: Historically, many people have viewed development projects solely as a means for economic

development. CBAs offer communities, public officials, and developers a broader perspective of development as a means to lift up the entire community. Because CBAs include community-dictated demands that are agreed upon by all parties, development projects become a mechanism to create jobs, to ensure job training in growth industries, to improve schools, and to accomplish any number of other social goals. The limits to what CBAs can do to improve the lives of families who live in developing areas lies in the creativity and willingness of all stakeholders to engage in the process and to embrace this tool as a mechanism for social change.

Coordinate government agencies: City governments have historically allowed several government agencies to operate in parallel to each other. The CBA movement provides cities the opportunity to change the way they operate and to investigate ways to coordinate the activities of several of their agencies to meet a common goal. For instance, if a CBA calls for job creation by developers, the city could capitalize on this opportunity to coordinate the efforts of workforce development units, transportation officials, and urban planners to ensure that the developer is able to access trained workers once it has created jobs.

b. Relationship-building opportunities

Contentious community benefits agreements are squandered opportunities: Although negotia-

tions may be difficult at times because of differing interests, miscommunication and misunderstanding, it is important to try to maintain a productive relationship among stakeholders. If a CBA yields particular demands but leaves no common ground on which to build future development projects, it is a lost opportunity to build new community norms for working collaboratively. All stakeholders must consider sacrificing some of their short-term goals for the long-term goals of the larger community.

Importance of healthy, long-term relationships: While contentious agreements are a lost opportunity, CBAs hold promise as a means to build long-lasting relationships centered on the development of communities. If all stakeholders can enter negotiations with an open mindset and strive to maintain good relationships, future developments are more likely to take place in a way that is beneficial to the community. In one example from New York, a good relationship between community, government, and developers allowed stakeholders to continue discussions around one demand following the agreement's completion. Because of the continued conversation with advocates, the developer was able to accommodate this community demand despite its lack of inclusion in the original agreement. Without a strong relationship, the discussion may not have continued and the demand may not have been met.

T HE COMMUNITY
BENEFITS AGREEMENT BEGINS TO CREATE
LONG-TERM RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN LOCAL
COMMUNITY GROUPS AND
DEVELOPERS IN THE
NEIGHBORHOODS BEYOND
JUST THE COMMUNITY
BENEFITS AGREEMENT SO
THAT THERE IS A SYNERGY
THAT BEGINS TO TAKE
PLACE BETWEEN THOSE
GROUPS.

—Randall Touré

c. Transparency

Is it realistic?: Like the conversation about money, the conversation around transparency in negotiating included some debate. Advocates and community organizers argued that transparency in the process would be helpful to the community; developers tried to explain why complete transparency was unlikely to occur.

Advocates and community organizers understand that developers need to make profits and that CBAs are about mutually beneficial development. But, a lack of transparency may contribute to an imbalance of power because of disparate levels of knowledge: developers and public officials understand the financial demands of the project much more fully than community organizations. This unequal access to information can be frustrating and can leave community organizers wondering if they could have helped their communities more than they did.

From the developers' perspective, the financial end of development projects is quite complex, and they cannot realistically trust communities and cities to understand some of the complexities. For instance, developers have to make a certain level of profits in order to stay in business overall. Sometimes this requires balancing profits and losses from several different projects. It would be difficult for a developer to explain to a community in New Orleans that they cannot afford a particular benefit because they need to regain

losses from a project in Chicago. Because of this complexity, complete transparency does not seem likely in the near future.

d. Positive feedback loops

Community benefits agreements success stories: As the CBA movement grows, stories of successful agreements that provide benefits to all stakeholders will be one means of fueling the movement. As in the discussion of political leadership, there is a spectrum of openness to a new idea, and success stories will help to move people along this spectrum.

Endorsements from developers: For developers, the primary measure of whether or not CBAs are a good tool for development will be their likelihood to engage in the process for future development projects. If developers do not feel that they are benefiting from these agreements, they will be less likely to enter into them in the future. But, if developers feel that they profit both financially and socially from the CBA process, they will be more likely to participate in these agreements in the future and to advocate for their use with other developers.

Importance of metrics to measure success: Little attention has focused on measuring the success of CBAs as tools for responsible development. At this point in the evolution of the movement, it will be important to develop metrics to measure the outcomes of these agreements over time. With good metrics that can reliably show the positive

outcomes of CBAs for communities, cities, and developers, the movement will be able to prove that these agreements simultaneously produce profits, economic development, and improvements in quality of life. As reports of good outcomes surface, stakeholders will become more willing to initiate the process for future development projects.

V. CONCLUSIONS

a. Takeaways from the consultative session and implications for the future

The power: The CBA process invites private developers, public officials, and community members to enter into negotiations around development projects that have the power to yield positive social and economic outcomes for all stakeholders. In order for CBAs to generate positive outcomes, all parties participating in the agreement must be cognizant of and attempt to manage real and perceived power imbalances in ways that support a productive negotiation process. First, private developers, public officials, and organized community members must recognize that marginalized groups often choose not to engage in the CBA process because of prior negative experiences with development projects. All agreement stakeholders must attempt to engage these marginalized groups to ensure that their voices are included in negotiations. Second, public sector officials, community members, and private developers must acknowledge that some real and some

perceived power imbalances will affect negotiations, and they must attempt to mitigate the negative consequences of these imbalances by recognizing their own power within the process and by communicating openly with their fellow participants in the agreement about the imbalances that exist. And, finally, disenfranchised community

The Role of Foundations in the Community Benefits Agreement Movement

Funding and Technical Assistance:

- Community coalitions cannot subsist without funding. Foundations can play a role in providing these organizations with funding for human resources and technical assistance to build capacity.
- Many developers, public officials, and community members are unaware of the CBA process or do not fully understand how to utilize it. Foundations can fund the preparation of training curricula for stakeholder groups and professional organizations.
- The ability to measure outcomes related to the use of CBAs will be an important component of supporting the growth of the movement. Foundations can fund and participate in the development of CBA metrics.

members and public sector officials must engage constructively in the CBA process to gain power. As stakeholders become more comfortable with the CBA process, they may be able to shift the real and perceived power imbalances that surround development projects.

The practice: As with any relatively new tool, the content and negotiation of CBAs are still evolving to meet the needs of the stakeholders that are attempting to use them. With every new CBA, the movement improves upon the content and community impact of the CBA by incorporating lessons from previous agreements. Some of these lessons are in areas that are highly process specific—enforceability, leverage points, or trust-building processes—while others deal with major thematic issues, such as how to encourage politicians to lead the movement or whether it is ethical for advocacy groups and intermediaries to accept financial support in the form of money or otherwise during negotiations or as a result thereof. It seems clear that the practice of CBAs will continue to evolve over the coming years. Public officials, private developers, and community members must strive to create professional networks to share lessons learned from negotiating and enforcing agreements over time. Stakeholders must also identify ways to involve the philanthropic community to further the development and use of CBAs.

The promise: CBAs are a promising tool for responsible redevelopment because they allow stakeholders to expand their perspective from the narrow view of development projects as economic development to the broader view of development projects as part of a holistic approach to community development. They also provide opportunities for local jurisdictions to coordinate the efforts of several government agencies to participate in a collaborative development process and for historically opposing groups to build relationships that result in beneficial outcomes for all. Until now, CBA success stories have been primarily anecdotal and have not, therefore, garnered as much attention as they may be due. As the use of CBAs increases and these agreements evolve, stakeholders must develop ways to measure the achievements of these agreements, and they must also design communication strategies that allow them to share their positive findings.

VII. PARTICIPANT BIOS

RUSS ADAMS

Russ Adams currently serves as Executive Director of the Alliance for Metropolitan Stability. Adams has worked as a nonprofit advocate and community organizer for over 22 years and has helped to build community coalitions in support of economic and racial justice; sustainable and equitable development; and better land-use and urban growth policies. The Alliance has secured millions of dollars in public investments for transit, affordable housing, “digital inclusion,” and brownfield cleanup. It has also advanced innovative strategies like Community Benefits Agreements and Inclusionary Housing measures (receiving the National Neighborhood Coalition “Communities Leading the Way” award in 2000). In June of 2006, he took a temporary leave of absence from the Alliance to work as the Field Director for the successful Keith Ellison for U.S. Congress campaign, helping to elect the nation’s first Muslim-American member of Congress.

SEMIRA AJANI

Semira Ajani is a Program Associate with the Community Building team at the Center for Working Families, Inc. For nearly five years, she has been assisting downtown neighborhoods to increase capacity around community development issues related to public safety and health, to manage housing problems ranging from affordability to code violations, and to increase residents’ civic

participation around social and economic issues that influence their quality of life. Ajani holds a BA in Sociology from the University of Missouri and a Master in Urban and Regional Planning from the University of Illinois, Champaign-Urbana. She approaches community development with a passion for helping others and working with community groups to advocate for better access to life-sustaining resources.

UNA ANDERSON

Una Anderson serves as the Executive Director of New Orleans Neighborhood Development Collaborative (NONDC), a nonprofit organization whose mission is to increase the production of affordable housing in New Orleans neighborhoods. NONDC coordinates and facilitates neighborhood planning and development; demonstrates and promotes innovative models and approaches to expanding affordable housing production; advocates for affordable housing policy; and provides technical and financial support to organizations involved in the development and production of affordable housing. Anderson has extensive experience in business and real estate development as well as a history of public service in New Orleans, where she holds a seat on the Orleans Parish School Board and advocates for reform and charter schools. She also participates in and handles logistics for the Mayor’s Housing Commission Committee and spearheads neighborhood outreach on

the Advisory Work Group for the neighborhood planning process. She is actively involved in multiple neighborhoods and serves as a member of the advisory board of Central City Renaissance Alliance. Anderson graduated cum laude from Harvard University.

RICHARD BARON

Richard Baron is the President of McCormack Baron Salazar, a large developer that rebuilds and revitalizes urban neighborhoods in central cities across the United States. The firm is noted for its work in building mixed-income affordable housing.

EMILY BUSTOS

Emily Bustos is Deputy Site Coordinator for *Making Connections*—Denver, a national community change initiative of the Annie E. Casey Foundation. She was previously with the City and County of Denver's Division of Housing and Neighborhood Development (DHND) as a Community Development Specialist and neighborhood liaison to four of Denver's low-income neighborhoods in Northeast and West Denver. Prior to working at DHND, Bustos worked at the Latin American Research and Service Agency (LARASA) and the Elyria/Swansea Community Economic Development Corporation. She has a BA in Urban Design and Architecture Studies from New York University and a Master of Urban and Regional Planning degree from the University of Colorado at Denver. She

also serves on the Governing Board of The Gathering Place, a Denver nonprofit that provides refuge, services, and support for homeless women and their children.

MANUEL DELGADO

Manuel Delgado serves as the Executive Director of the Cramer Hill Community Development Corporation (CHCDC) in Camden, New Jersey. The CHCDC is a nonprofit group dedicated to building an economically and culturally diverse community; fostering resident leadership and civic engagement; and creating diverse housing opportunities. Delgado is responsible for all aspects of the CDC's revitalization plan, which includes community organizing, strategic planning, feasibility assessment, site selection, and packaging the financing, construction, and final disposition.

TERESA DEMITRI

Teresa Demitri works with the Cramer Hill Community Development Corporation in Camden, New Jersey.

CECILIA V. ESTOLANO

Cecilia V. Estolano is the CEO of the Community Redevelopment Agency of the City of Los Angeles. Prior to accepting this position, she held positions as Counsel and Associate at the Los Angeles office of Gibson, Dunn & Crutcher; Special Assistant City Attorney for Los Angeles City Attorney Rocky Delgadillo;

appointee of the Speaker of the California Assembly to the California Coastal Commission; Senior Policy Advisor with the U.S. EPA; and Environmental Policy Advisor to Los Angeles Mayor Tom Bradley. Over the years, Estolano's work has focused on economic development, land use, zoning, redevelopment, municipal law, environmental permitting, and regulatory issues. She is a graduate of the Boalt Hall School of Law and holds an MA in Urban Planning from University of California at Los Angeles. She received her undergraduate degree in Social Studies with honors from Harvard-Radcliffe Colleges.

RONNIE GALVIN

Ronnie Galvin is a Community Organizer at the Center for Working Families, Inc. in Atlanta, Georgia.

SHAWNTERA M. HARDY

Shawntera M. Hardy is a City Planner for the City of Saint Paul. She is responsible for various projects throughout the city, including planning for the proposed Central Corridor light rail transit project and Central Corridor business and community outreach. Her depth of public policy experience includes interning with the Ohio Legislative Service Commission, operating the district office of State Representative Ray Miller, and staffing the Ohio Redistricting Task Force. Hardy completed her undergraduate studies at the Ohio State University College of Human Ecology. She also earned a Master of Urban and

Regional Planning with a specialization in Community Development from the State University of New York at Buffalo, where she was a U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Fellow. While living in New York, her passion for leadership development led her to create a mentoring program to teach local students about the planning profession. Hardy is a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Inc.; Vice President of the Assembly of Architects; Historic St. Paul board member; EverybodyWins Minnesota board member; Model Cities board member; Urban Embassy founding board member; and member of the Planning in the Black Community Division of the American Planning Association.

MADELINE JANIS

Madeline Janis is the Co-founder and Executive Director of the Los Angeles Alliance for a New Economy (LAANE), a national leader in the effort to reduce working poverty and rebuild the American middle class. LAANE first gained recognition in 1995 with the passage of Los Angeles' worker retention law, which helped save the jobs of nearly 1,000 LAX workers. In 1997, LAANE led the campaign to pass the city's living wage law, which quickly became a national model. Under Janis's leadership, LAANE pioneered a new approach to economic development, which has led to the adoption of landmark community benefits agreements guaranteeing quality jobs, affordable housing, and other

protections for low-income communities. She also serves as a volunteer commissioner on the board of the city's Community Redevelopment Agency, the country's largest such agency, and is a Senior Fellow at the UCLA School of Public Affairs.

AUDREY JORDAN

Audrey Jordan started as a Senior Research Associate at the Annie E. Casey Foundation in 2001. As the evaluation liaison to five *Making Connection* cities (Savannah, Louisville, Providence, Denver, and Atlanta), she has developed intensive relationships with the Local Learning Partnerships in these sites. Her responsibilities also include working with the Foundation's other evaluation staff and consultants to develop the national evaluation of *Making Connections*. Jordan previously served as the lead evaluator on the Richmond Urban Mental Health Initiative where she first learned of Casey's strategy of using research to improve the lives of families and children. She also served as a program evaluator at the Virginia State Department of Mental Health. Jordan earned a degree in Psychology from Carroll College, a Master of Social Psychology at the University of Virginia, and a Master of Social Work and a Ph.D in Social Policy and Social Work from Virginia Commonwealth University.

MALIK JORDAN

Malik Jordan joined the Annie E. Casey Foundation as an intern in the KIDS COUNT

initiative in 2005. In this position, he supported the management of KIDS COUNT grantees from around the country and also managed the logistics for the annual KIDS COUNT conference. Since the completion of his internship, Jordan has served as a consultant to the Foundation. In this role, he supports the Louisville and Providence *Making Connections* sites; he manages the equity, diversity, and inclusion portfolio to develop and implement strategies that promote equity and increase educational, housing, and workforce opportunities for low-income minority children and families; and he produces a brown bag film series aimed at introducing new staff to the Foundation's initiatives via documentaries and moderated discussions with senior leadership. Jordan received his BA in English from Coppin State University.

JEN KERN

Jen Kern works for the ACORN Living Wage Resource Center.

STEVEN KEST

Steven Kest is the Executive Director of ACORN.

JOHN KIMBLE

John Kimble is the New Orleans Public Policy Director for the Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations (LANO) where he advocates to the federal and state government

for social equity as a policy priority for recovery efforts in New Orleans. He also focuses on building capacity in the nonprofit sector for advocacy through public policy awareness. Prior to returning to New Orleans (his native home) and joining LANO, Kimble served as the San Francisco Program Director for One Economy, an organization that works nationally with local government, nonprofit, and industry partners to maximize the potential of technology to connect low-income individuals to the economic mainstream. He also coordinated a coalition of nonprofit and government agencies in Oakland addressing unequal access to financial services. He has worked internationally on sustainable, equitable urban development in Belize, Laos, and Nepal and studied urbanism as a visiting student at Oxford University. Kimble received a BA in history from Princeton University. His thesis on the role of the federal government in the urban ghettoization of African Americans was recently published in *Law and Social Inquiry: Journal of the American Bar Foundation*.

ROBIN KNEIECH

Robin Kniech is the Program Director and Staff Attorney for the Front Range Economic Strategy Center (FRESC) in Denver, Colorado. She coordinates a community, labor, and environmental coalition known as the Campaign for Responsible Development (CRD), which promotes family-supporting jobs, affordable housing, environmental

sustainability, and neighborhood investments in publicly supported redevelopment projects. Much of her current work is focused on achieving these benefits at transit-oriented developments (TODs). Through FRESC and its network of partners across the country—the Partnership for Working Families (PWF)—Kniech consults both locally and nationally on topics ranging from workforce development in the construction industry and first source/local hiring, to community benefits agreements and other progressive economic development policies. Prior to joining FRESC in 2004, her work included legislative policy and lobbying, employment and worker’s rights law and advocacy, immigrant rights work, electoral organizing, and advocacy on behalf of battered women.

BRAD LANDER

Brad Lander directs the Pratt Center for Community Development, which works for a more just, equitable, and sustainable city for all New Yorkers by empowering communities to plan and realize their futures. During his tenure, the Pratt Center has helped to shape new zoning and tax policies to create affordable housing in New York City and to advance new strategies for how growth can be made to work for New York City’s low-income communities. Lander also teaches affordable housing, real estate, and community planning at Pratt. Before coming to Pratt, he served for a decade as Executive Director of the Fifth Avenue Committee, a community-

based organization in Brooklyn that develops and manages affordable housing; creates economic opportunities; and organizes tenants and workers to fight for a better community.

CHRIS LASKOWSKI

Chris Laskowski is a Program Associate at the DC Appleseed Center for Law and Justice. His program focus at DC Appleseed includes recommending policy solutions for problems from affordable housing and workforce development to HIV/AIDS education and health care systems to voting rights for residents facing the District of Columbia. He received a bachelor's degree from the University of Michigan, a Master of Education from Johns Hopkins University, and a JD from George Washington University Law School. Before attending law school, Laskowski was a third grade teacher in the Baltimore City Public School System for four years, having been placed by Teach For America. He was recognized by the Fredrick B. Abramson Foundation for his work with DCAppleseed.

SHIRLEY LAWRENCE

Shirley Lawrence is a Community Organizer at Connecticut Center for a New Economy in New Haven, Connecticut.

IRENE LEE

Irene Lee, a Senior Associate with the Annie E. Casey Foundation, is in charge of

managing and shaping the Foundation's civic investments in Atlanta and Washington, DC. She also manages and shapes the Foundation's portfolio on refugees and immigrants, often helping to link and embed this work through co-design with other senior associates and their portfolios. Just prior to arriving at the Casey Foundation, Lee held a Senior Program Officer position at the Eugene and Agnes E. Meyer Foundation with responsibilities in a broad array of areas, including housing and community development, education, health, and the arts. A graduate of Michigan State University with a joint major in economics and history, she earned her MA in anthropology from the University of Michigan and her MPA from Bernard Baruch College at City University of New York.

GREG LEROY

Greg LeRoy is the Executive Director of Good Jobs First (www.goodjobsfirst.org). Dubbed "America's chief whistle-blower" on state and local economic development subsidies, Good Jobs First is a national resource center promoting corporate and government accountability in economic development and smart growth for working families. With more than 25 years of experience, he is the author of *The Great American Jobs Scam: Corporate Tax Dodging and the Myth of Job Creation* (2005) and *No More Candy Store: States and Cities Making Job Subsidies Accountable* (1994). Good Jobs First serves constituency-based

groups and public policymakers with research, training, consulting and testimony. Good Jobs First also includes Good Jobs New York (www.goodjobsny.org), Good Jobs First-Illinois, and the Corporate Research Project (www.corp-research.org).

BERTHA LEWIS

Bertha Lewis has been a community activist for over 19 years with New York ACORN and now serves as Executive Director. She was a negotiator and is now an active signatory member of the first community benefits agreement for the Atlantic Yards Project, the first legally binding agreement signed between a developer and members of the community in New York City. She has also been active in informing community leaders, religious groups, and individuals about the 50/50 Affordable Housing Program that was included in this agreement to assist low- to moderate-income individuals and families. Lewis has dedicated her time and efforts to help improve local neighborhoods, housing, tenant rights, predatory lending, education, school reform, fair wages, and immigration issues. She has also helped to form a citywide coalition of labor, religious, community, and political groups that passed a living wage law in City Council. Lewis is one of the co-chairs of the Working Families Party, founded in 1998 to help low-income and working people educate themselves politically and have an active voice in legislation and political policies that affect their daily lives.

RICK MCGAHEY

Rick McGahey is a Program Officer in the Economic Development Unit at the Ford Foundation with a portfolio on regional economic development. His proposed initiative concentrates on increasing transparency in development policy, fostering new strategies for creating good jobs, and building stakeholder networks that support equitable regional development. He is part of the workforce development team in EDU, which does shared programming on policy and research issues that affect the workforce development field. He is also starting to work on the Program Related Investment (PRI) portfolio as well. Prior to coming to Ford, McGahey was a Managing Vice President at Abt Associates, where he directed the practice on education, workforce development, and social welfare. He has worked in public policy at different levels of government, including serving as Assistant Secretary for Policy at the U.S. Department of Labor under President Clinton, and as Executive Director of the Joint Economic Committee of the U.S. Congress. He has a Ph.D in Economics from the New School for Social Research.

RACHEL MCINTOSH

Rachel McIntosh is currently a Program Associate for the Annie E. Casey Foundation where she is responsible for helping to manage the design, development, and implementation of results, resources, and support for the *Making Connections* initiative. She also

coordinates the Foundation's Children in North America Initiative. Prior to joining Casey, she was the project director for a pilot project in Central Ohio working to build the capacity of immigrant-founded and -led organizations. McIntosh has over nine years experience in community development and has studied and worked abroad, including a fellowship awarded through the Center on Philanthropy where she worked with the International Research and Exchanges Board's Civil Society Support Program in Moscow. She has a BA in Political Science, an MA in Philanthropy and an MPA in Nonprofit Management from Indiana University.

LESLIE MOODY

Leslie Moody is the Executive Director at the Partnership for Working Families in Denver, Colorado.

MAURICE MOORE

Maurice Moore is a Program Associate at the Annie E. Casey Foundation in the Planning, Research, and Development unit. His primary responsibilities include management of the Fathers and Families initiative and support for *Making Connections* activities. Moore is especially proud of his work with innovative juvenile justice initiatives; his experience includes management of serious and violent youth offender programs for the Illinois Department of Corrections and the National Council on Crime and Delinquency, as well as serving as Deputy Director of

Delaware's Division of Youth Rehabilitative Services. He holds a BA in Business Administration from Southern Illinois University and an MA in Sociology from Eastern Illinois University.

JACKY MORALES-FERRAND

Jacky Morales-Ferrand was selected by Mayor Hickenlooper to lead Denver's Division of Housing and Neighborhood Development (DHND) in the Office of Economic Development. DHND administers approximately \$30 million in federal funds, \$22 million in private activity bond allocation, and \$17 million in a Fannie Mae line of credit to provide housing, community revitalization, and economic development opportunities to Denver residents. Morales-Ferrand has over 15 years of nonprofit, public, and for-profit sector experience focusing on affordable housing policy and housing development, working in such areas as homeless, transitional, rental, and for-sale housing development. She has been a speaker and presenter at numerous workshops and conferences on workforce housing and inclusionary zoning, including the National Inclusionary Housing Conference (2005), ULI Workforce Housing Roundtables. She has also taught a continuing education class for the University of Wisconsin on implementing inclusionary housing programs. She graduated from the University of Colorado at Boulder with a degree in Women's Studies and has an MPA from the University of Colorado at Denver.

SUSAN MOTIKA

Susan Motika is the Site Coordinator for *Making Connections* Denver.

JANICE HAMILTON OUTTZ

Janice Hamilton Outtz is a Senior Associate and Special Assistant to Vice President Tony Cipollone with the Measurement, Evaluation, Communications and Advocacy unit at the Casey Foundation. She is responsible for several key projects related to the Foundation's East Baltimore investments, including coordinating the development of an East Baltimore Data Book and working with others to manage and monitor an evaluation of the East Baltimore Development Initiative. She formerly founded and served as the president of Hamilton Outtz Consultants, a demographic and survey research firm whose clients included the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Center for Gender Equality in New York City, the Widmeyer Black Women's Health Project, and the Institute for Educational Leadership. Outtz earned her BS in Psychology and her MA in Educational Psychology from Howard University and has completed post-graduate study at the U.S. Department of Agriculture Graduate School and the University of Maryland at College Park.

CHRISTOPHER PARR

Christopher Parr is the Director of Housing at the Denver Housing Authority.

MANUAL PASTOR

Manuel Pastor is a Professor of Geography and American Studies and Ethnicity at the University of Southern California. He was founding Director of the Center for Justice, Tolerance, and Community, a research center at the University of California, Santa Cruz, and has received grants and fellowships from the Irvine Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, the Ford Foundation, the National Science Foundation, the Hewlett Foundation, the Kellogg Foundation, the MacArthur Foundation, and many others. His recent books include *Staircases or Treadmills: Labor Market Intermediaries and Economic Opportunity in a Changing Economy* (co-authored with Chris Benner and Laura Leete) and *Searching for the Uncommon Common Ground: New Dimensions on Race in America* (co-authored with Angela Glover Blackwell and Stewart Kwoh). He speaks frequently on issues of demographic change, economic inequality, and community empowerment and has contributed opinion pieces to such outlets as the *Los Angeles Times*, the *San Jose Mercury News*, and the *Christian Science Monitor*.

CECILIA K. SANCHEZ DE ORTIZ

Cecilia K. Sanchez de Ortiz (Cec) has devoted her professional career to community and economic development. She has extensive experience in governmental affairs, public policy development and comprehensive, community development initiatives. Sanchez de Ortiz has also held several leadership

positions, including Executive Director of Mi Casa Resource Center for Women, Inc.; State Director of the Governor's Women's Business Office; and State Director of the Colorado Small Business Development Center. Under Mayor Hickenlooper's administration, she served as the Director of the Division of Workforce Development for the city and recently was appointed by the Mayor to be Deputy Director for the Mayor's Office of Economic Development. Prior to her position with the city, she was an active Partner/Owner of Catalyst Resources Inc., a firm that provides community and economic development project management services to businesses, foundations, and governmental agencies.

DEBORAH SCOTT

Deborah Scott is the Executive Director of Georgia Stand-Up (Georgia Strategic Alliance for New Directions and Unified Policies), a policy think and act tank for working communities and an alliance of community, faith, and labor that promotes smart growth strategies and economic justice through research, education and advocacy. Stand-Up's mission is to address the growing need of our communities in Atlanta and across the South to build civic capacity and leadership from neighborhoods, schools, and religious institutions to build a shared vision of what social and economic justice will look like across all sectors of our community and economy. Scott complements Georgia Stand-Up with over 20 years of unique professional experience

resulting from her work within the civil rights community, progressive coalition politics, political empowerment, City of Atlanta and Georgia State Government, labor unions, and the nonprofit sector. She is a seasoned political operative, trainer, and strategist, and has served as a national political consultant, campaign and project manager, and organizational development trainer for progressive organizations and small businesses. She also has served on the boards of several local and regional progressive organizations.

MICHAEL SHAW

Michael Shaw, a Program Assistant at the Annie E. Casey Foundation, supports the Foundation's Baltimore-based neighborhood development and family strengthening agenda. He provides strategic coordination and support to the Baltimore civic site team; assists grantees; ensures that information about innovations, policies, and lessons learned is added to the knowledge management system; and helps with the general operations of the Baltimore team. Shaw earned both his BSW and MSW from Syracuse University, and complemented his education with a strong set of internships and placements, including The Rosamond Gifford Foundation and Delaware Academy in Syracuse. Additionally, he was the Co-founder and Director of Development for Roots and Wings, a project designed along with a faculty member at Syracuse to expose elementary students to unique life experiences and areas of study.

KURT SOMMER

Kurt Sommer serves as Legislative Director and Special Assistant to Secretary Ray Skinner of the Maryland Department of Housing and Community Development (DHCD). He works on policy, legislative, and programmatic elements for the department including BRAC, state and federal legislation, implementation of the Department's Transition Report, and a cadre of other special projects and initiatives. He joined DHCD following a similar assignment with the City of Baltimore where he served in the Mayor's Office of Intergovernmental Relations and worked as a Special Assistant to the Executive Director/Commissioner of Baltimore Housing. His duties included research, planning, and data analysis, as well as policy and program development to support urban revitalization and affordable housing developments. Sommer also served as a Research Assistant to Bruce Katz at the Brookings Institution's Center on Urban and Metropolitan Policy where he focused on the analysis of data trends, public policies, and programs as they relate urban and metropolitan growth patterns. He holds a BA in Political Science from Washington College and a Master of Community Planning from the University of Maryland.

RANDALL N. TOURÉ

Randall N. Touré, Vice President for Community Development, represented Forest City Ratner Companies in the CBA for the Atlantic Yards Project. He and his team are now

charged with its successful implementation. Touré started his public service career as the Founding Executive Director of Southeast Queens Clergy for Community Empowerment, implementing programs related to housing, AIDS, education, and economic development. He was a Revson Fellow at Columbia University, where he concentrated on the entrepreneurial model in relation to the future of nonprofit and charitable organizations at the Columbia Business School. A graduate of the City College of New York and Benjamin Cardozo School of Law, he started his legal career at the firm of Dellapa and Lewis. He is also adjunct professor at Medger Evers College in the School of Public Administration, a member of the NYS Bar, and a proud father of three.

JESSICA VENEGAS

Jessica Venegas is Vice President of Public Policy for the Louisiana Association of Non-profit Organizations (LANO). LANO works to build knowledge and capacity around policies and activities at the local, state, and federal levels. LANO policy priorities include the Louisiana Budget Project, the Louisiana Housing Alliance, the New Orleans Non-profit Agenda, and Long-Term Recovery-Emergency Preparedness and Coordination. Venegas came to Louisiana from Washington, DC, where her most recent position was Director of Community Assessment with the Community Preservation and Development Corporation (CPDC). She has worked primarily in the nonprofit housing sector and

has 11 years of urban community development and program management experience. She has held a number of positions on local DC neighborhood corporations and non-profits and is currently Vice President of the Neighborhood Networks National Consortium Board of Directors.

RICK WELLS

Rick Wells is an acting manager of CPS Investments, LLC, a privately held real estate development group that redeveloped the former Mercy Hospital site in Denver, Colorado. He is a former Executive Vice President and Chief Operating Officer of a \$9 billion, Fortune 500 energy company. Wells is also serving as a consultant on Cherokee's redevelopment of the former Gates Rubber Factory, advising on public financing, disposition, and construction management aspects of the project. In addition, CPS is under contract to act as master developer for the 14-acre infill redevelopment of the former Children's Hospital site in Denver. Wells received a BS in mechanical engineering and an MBA from Colorado State University.

GARLAND YATES

Garland Yates joined the Annie E. Casey Foundation as a Senior Associate in 1995 and currently serves as a Senior Consultant to the Foundation. While at the Foundation, he supported the Rebuilding Communities Initiative as well as several *Making Connections* sites, and participated heavily in the community development portfolio. Prior to joining the Foundation, Yates served as a Senior Organizational Development Counselor with the Management Assistance Group in Washington, DC. He also worked with the Center for Community Change to provide technical assistance to community-based organizations working in low-income neighborhoods. His education has been largely on-the-job training, learning invaluable lessons about community building through his broad range of professional and volunteer activities, as well as by being a Jobs Corps graduate.

The Annie E. Casey Foundation

701 St. Paul Street
Baltimore, MD 21202
410.547.6600
410.547.6624 fax
www.aecf.org