Building Successful Neighborhoods

Peter A. Tatian
G. Thomas Kingsley
Joseph Parilla
Rolf Pendall

Urban Institute

April 2012

*The **What Works Collaborative** is a foundation-supported research partnership that conducts timely research and analysis to help inform the implementation of an evidence-based housing and urban policy agenda. The collaborative consists of researchers from the Brookings Institution's Metropolitan Policy Program, Harvard University's Joint Center for Housing Studies, New York University's Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy, and the Urban Institute's Center for Metropolitan Housing and Communities, as well as other experts from practice, policy, and academia. Support for the collaborative comes from the Annie E. Casey Foundation, Ford Foundation, John D. and Catherine T. MacArthur Foundation, Kresge Foundation, Rockefeller Foundation, Surdna Foundation, and the Open Society Institute.*

The views expressed here are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of those funders listed above or of the organizations participating in the What Works Collaborative. All errors or omissions are the responsibility of the authors.

Contents

Introduction	1
Basic Policy and Strategy	3
Programmatic Strategies	13
Building Institutional Infrastructure	29
Research Summary and Conclusion	33
Bibliography	38

Introduction

Policymakers have been concerned about improving conditions in America's distressed urban neighborhoods for more than a century. Interest was heightened in the 1980s and 1990s by research shedding new light on the devastating effects of concentrated poverty, for cities overall as well as for the residents of the affected neighborhoods (Jargowsky 1997; Wilson 1987).

Since then, there have been serious debates about how best to address the issue. Some have emphasized direct investment to improve conditions in the troubled neighborhoods themselves, while others have put more weight on mobility strategies, facilitating the movement of the poor out of the worst areas and into "neighborhoods of opportunity" elsewhere. Now, however, there is a growing recognition of the benefits of seeing these approaches as complementary and explicitly planning for their implementation regionally in concert with policies that support sustainable regional development. Pastor and Turner (2010) conclude:

> In our view, effectively addressing the problem of concentrated poverty and neighborhood distress requires moving beyond either inward-looking approaches or mass departure. Instead, we need a broader portfolio of *place-conscious* strategies that simultaneously improve neighborhood conditions, open up access to opportunity rich communities, and realign regional growth and development strategies to better connect low-income people and places with regional opportunities.

Direct efforts to improve conditions in troubled neighborhoods (through improvements in housing, schools, and other services and amenities) are thus viewed as an important part of the solution. Accordingly, policy makers need to know in some depth how this "inside the neighborhood" work can be motivated and accomplished and what it might mean to try to do so in a regional context. However, while there is a rich literature offering valuable general information on past community initiatives, there is surprisingly little concrete guidance on exactly what to do, how to do it, and where.

This paper offers a pathway to address this deficit. Its purposes are (1) to review what policymakers need to know in relevant topical areas; (2) to summarize what is already known in these areas (noting the research basis for the findings); and, thereby, (3) to identify research gaps, outlining a menu of studies that could serve the basis for a new research agenda on neighborhood policy.

Scope of This Paper

Since the scope of neighborhood policy is potentially vast, it is important to define the boundaries of what we are able to cover in this paper. Three factors are considered.

Which neighborhoods?

First, we confine our inquiry to existing low-income neighborhoods and other neighborhoods where low-income populations may grow over the coming decade. This is where we believe the policy priority belongs. We say virtually nothing about attributes of successful higher-income neighborhoods. Research recognizes that neighborhood success factors are more important to lower-income residents (e.g., Ahlbrandt 1984) and that they likely differ from those for wealthier areas. Second, the topic of building new neighborhoods (e.g., at the urban fringe) is not covered in any depth. This still, however, leaves substantial scope. As of the late 2000s, 13,200 census tracts (a quarter of all tracts in U.S. metropolitan

areas) had poverty rates above 20 percent (which we later suggest is not a bad approximation of the group of neighborhoods that policymakers should be concerned about).[1]

Defining successful neighborhoods

We tentatively define successful low-income neighborhoods as those whose conditions and change trajectories enhance the well-being of the families and children that live within them and, in particular, support the advancement of their socioeconomic status. We recognize, however, the need to monitor a wide range of conditions that indirectly influence that goal, such as property values and crime rates. (We also propose research in the first section of this paper that will support clarification and, perhaps, revision of this definition.)

Model approaches

The U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has implemented important programs to transform neighborhoods in the past, most recently HOPE VI (Cisneros and Engdahl 2009). Lessons from HOPE VI and other programs have shaped HUD's newest initiative in this field, *Choice Neighborhoods* (PD&R 2011; HUD 2011). HOPE VI focused on the physical transformation of a public housing project, often replacing deteriorated high-rise buildings with attractively designed lower-density townhomes and apartments. Choice Neighborhoods also includes the physical transformation of an assisted housing project, but it reaches beyond that to address housing and service needs (e.g., education, workforce development) in the surrounding neighborhood.

On a parallel track, the federal government is implementing the *Promise Neighborhoods* initiative, which offers a "cradle to career" approach to child and youth development (Biglan et al. 2011).[2] This initiative seeks a coherent set of programs that begins with early childhood development and stretches into links to fruitful careers, all focused on the residents of geographically defined neighborhoods.

We believe that the central themes of both these initiatives (most important, related to resident engagement, strategic integration, collaboration, and breaking down silos) are critical to the success of all neighborhood improvement efforts. Accordingly, this paper emphasizes how these principles can be applied in community initiatives more broadly.

Choice and Promise will entail intensive federal investment in some of the nation's most troubled neighborhoods. We believe that their principles are relevant as well, however, to guide community improvement in distressed areas where poverty rates are somewhat less severe and local resources will have to cover most of the costs. HUD and other federal agencies have considered what can and should be done to motivate improvement for a broader range of neighborhoods in need in the context of their *Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative* (White House 2011).[3] This initiative talks of "braiding and sustaining flexible funding from diverse sources." In the remainder of this paper, we emphasize research

---

[1] Urban Institute analysis of the five-year (2005–09) American Community Survey.

[2] See also Promise Neighborhoods Institute, "What is a Promise Neighborhood?" http://www.promiseneighborhoodsinstitute.org/What-is-a-Promise-Neighborhood.

[3] This Initiative proposes five key elements for an effective neighborhood revitalization strategy: (1) resident engagement and community leadership; (2) developing strategic and accountable partnerships; (3) maintaining a results focus supported by data; (4) investing in and building organizational capacity; and (5) aligning resources to a unified and targeted impact strategy.

opportunities that will flesh out programmatic suggestions in a manner consistent with the guiding concepts of the *Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative*.

Structure of This Paper

To achieve the purposes of this paper, we present the results of the work in three major sections.

Basic Policy and Strategy. The first section explores what is known about key determinants of appropriate policies and strategies for neighborhood improvement and begins to identify research gaps at this level. There are two subsections: a review of basic approaches to neighborhood revitalization (assumptions that will guide identification of research needs), and designing neighborhood revitalization strategies (issues related to prioritizing neighborhoods for action and varying strategies based on neighborhood conditions and scales, considering threshold effects, and leveraging opportunities). This second subsection emphasizes research related to questions about investment: levels and composition by type (CDBG, city capital budget, etc.), what investment is needed to make a difference, reasonable guidelines for leveraging in different neighborhood circumstances, and so on.

Programmatic Strategies. This section reviews literature on the mechanisms by which different conditions influence neighborhood success, examines selected approaches to interventions to build successful neighborhoods based on these mechanisms, and discusses related research gaps. This discussion is organized according to four groupings, roughly consistent with a taxonomy developed by Galster (2010): (1) institutional/service mechanisms, (2) social-interactive mechanisms, (3) environmental mechanisms, and (4) geographical mechanisms. However, we add a fifth category increasingly recognized as critical to neighborhood outcomes: (5) residential mobility.

Building Institutional Infrastructure. Researchers and policymakers widely recognize that neighborhood revitalization will never be delivered at scale unless the institutional infrastructure needed to deliver it is enhanced markedly. This infrastructure occurs at three levels: (1) neighborhood management of community initiatives, (2) citywide institutional infrastructure (intermediaries and information), and (3) the potential for regional strategies for housing and community development.

Throughout the three sections, we present research gaps and ideas for possible future research. While past research has explored many characteristics of successful neighborhoods, there is still a great deal to learn about how different neighborhood conditions affect individuals and families. Nevertheless, rather than enumerating all the areas in which further research can be done, we focus our proposed plan for future research by using the lens of strategies that will help build successful neighborhoods.

Our research ideas are presented as they emerge naturally from the discussion in the three main sections, highlighted in “further research needed” boxes. To provide the reader with an overview of all the recommendations, we recap the research questions and proposed research projects in a table at the conclusion of this paper.

Basic Policy and Strategy

This section focuses on broad questions related to policy and strategy that can make neighborhoods successful, prosperous, and supportive places to live. As in the subsequent two sections, we consider

the knowledge base and research gaps pertaining to interventions intended to improve neighborhood conditions.

Basic Approaches to Neighborhood Revitalization

As mentioned, this first subsection reviews the basic approaches to neighborhood revitalization. It addresses three questions: (1) What should be the scope of policy concern and possible intervention? (2) What should be the substantive content of revitalization efforts? and (3) What sort of institutional framework is likely to be most effective in delivering neighborhood improvement? This subsection clarifies the underlying assumptions that guide the structure of the rest of the paper.

The scope of policy concern and possible intervention

The amount of neighborhood improvement activity that takes place in our metropolitan areas, and where it takes place, are now largely a product of decentralized negotiations between neighborhood leaders, funders, and other local stakeholders, sometimes assisted by intermediaries. No one prepares a "regional strategy" for community initiatives. We think there is some potential for strategic thinking about the deployment of such work regionally (to be discussed later), but here we focus on what is known about community improvement in individual neighborhoods.

Most metropolitan neighborhoods offer their residents satisfactory living conditions, but a sizeable number of them do not, and past literature does not offer any clear criteria for identifying those that warrant broader policy concern and intervention. The criterion likely to be most broadly accepted would surely relate to level of distress. Neighborhoods that warrant public concern and intervention are those whose populations and physical conditions evidence serious problems that are not being corrected through market mechanisms.

We think another condition needs to be considered as well: the likelihood of imminent change in conditions. For example, a neighborhood about to be gentrified may warrant special interventions to guide the process and avoid displacement. Alternatively, a neighborhood in the suburbs beginning to experience significant racial change or increasing poverty may need assistance, again to guide the process and minimize disruption. The goal would be to discourage large numbers of existing residents from moving out, so as to yield a stable mixed-income community over the long term (see further discussion in Kingsley 2009).

Decisions about the appropriate scope of policy concern—that is, about which neighborhoods warrant monitoring and possible intervention—need to be made by local stakeholders at the metropolitan level. These decisions need to take into account various data pertaining to the criteria suggested above.

Still, it is important to have at least some sense of the proportion of all neighborhoods likely to warrant concern in this regard. Fundamental ideas about policy would differ depending on whether that proportion is very large or very small. We think a ballpark estimate to meet this immediate need can be gained by looking at data on poverty rates (often used as a proxy for distress). Important research by Jargowsky (1997) highlighted the dire circumstances of extreme poverty neighborhoods (those with

poverty rates above 40 percent).[4] However, setting the threshold for concern of intervention at that level would be too conservative, for at least five reasons:

- First, as of 2005/09, a very small fraction (only 14 percent) of all poor people in metropolitan areas lived in census tracts with poverty rates of 40 percent or more, whereas 36 percent lived in tracts in the 20 to 40 percent poverty rate range. Thus, redefining the threshold of concern from a poverty rate of 40 percent to 20 percent would expand coverage from 14 percent to 50 percent of the metropolitan poor. As of the 2005/09 ACS, only 3,000 metropolitan census tracts had poverty rates in excess of 40 percent, compared with 13,200 tracts with poverty rates above 20 percent.
- Second, there is some evidence that the 20 to 40 percent poverty range is where change has the greatest impact. Galster (2010, 7) concludes that "independent impacts of neighborhood poverty rates in encouraging negative outcomes for individuals like crime, school leaving, and duration of poverty spells appear to be nil unless the neighborhood exceeds about 20 percent poverty, whereupon the externality effects grow rapidly until the neighborhood reaches approximately 40 percent poverty."
- Third, while problem conditions are even more severe in the extreme poverty group, conditions in the 20 to 40 percent range are still much worse than conditions for people in tracts with poverty rates below 20 percent. For example, as of 2000, single-parent households account for 45 percent of all households with children in tracts with poverty rates from 20 to 30 percent, compared with only 24 percent in tracts with less than 20 percent in poverty; the share of adults that lack high school degrees was 35 percent in the former, 15 percent in the latter.
- Neighborhoods in the 20 to 40 percent poverty rate range are capturing a growing share of the metropolitan poor. Between 1990 and 2005/09, the share of the poor in metropolitan areas living in 40+ percent poor neighborhoods decreased from 18 to 14 percent, while the share living in neighborhoods that are 20 to 40 percent poor increased from 32 to 36 percent.
- Finally, the problems of extreme poverty neighborhoods are probably the most expensive to fix. Investment to improve neighborhoods in the 20 to 40 percent poverty range might yield higher payoffs per dollar invested and prevent neighborhoods from falling into the 40 percent plus poverty range.

At the very least, it seems that neighborhoods in the 20 to 40 percent range warrant more study (as suggested in the sections below and in Kingsley and Franks, 2012). Again, we do not suggest that the 20 percent rate is the correct threshold for intervention. In reality, appropriate criteria for neighborhood selection probably should be based on several indicators (not just the poverty rate) and differ in different metropolitan areas. Nonetheless, it seems that neighborhoods in that range should warrant the concern of policymakers, since only looking at neighborhoods 40 percent threshold seems too narrow a perspective.

The substantive content of revitalization: comprehensiveness

As noted earlier, the Choice Neighborhoods and *Promise Neighborhoods* initiatives offer approaches to neighborhood improvement that contrast sharply with past approaches. The central themes of these initiatives include programmatic integration, collaboration across varied participants in the process,

---

[4] For reviews of trends in concentrated poverty since1990 see Jargowski 2003, Kingsley and Pettit 2003, Kneebone and Berube 2008, Pendall et al 2011, and Kneebone, Nadeaux and Berube 2011.

which inherently means a breaking down of the programmatic silos that can block so many aspects of neighborhood progress. PD&R (2011) notes how *Choice Neighborhoods* reaches beyond the goals of HOPE VI to motivate broader neighborhood transformation.

> It expands eligibility to other assisted housing and requires leveraging resources for neighborhood revitalization beyond the publicly assisted housing stock. The approach explicitly requires an approach that considers employment access, education quality, public safety, and health. To do this, *Choice Neighborhoods* enlists the institutions of the affected communities, including neighborhood residents, in all phases of planning and implementation.

We believe these general principles are also relevant to guide community improvement in areas where poverty rates are less severe and local resources will have to cover most of the costs, consistent with themes of the *Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative* (White House 2011).[5]

Actually, the themes of integration and comprehensiveness have already gained more acceptance in the neighborhood improvement field. This was not always the case. Through the early 1990s, there were competing views. Community development, implemented on the ground mainly by CDCs, focused on the bricks and mortar side of change: improving the housing stock and commercial activity in the neighborhood. Others advocated community building, which emphasized resident engagement, building neighborhood institutional capacity, and human development programs for families and children.

Reflecting the community-building approach, several community initiatives were under way in the 1990s, most often with foundation support (their stories were well told in Kubisch et al. 1997), and community development activity was also expanding and racking up many accomplishments (Walker 2002). But growing numbers of practitioners at that time began to see the need to merge these approaches. Probably the most influential early implementation of such a merger (launched in 1992) took place in the Comprehensive Community Revitalization Program (CCRP) in the South Bronx.[6]

Sponsors and practitioners now stress the recognition that the problems of troubled neighborhoods are multidimensional and interrelated, and that work in any one field (e.g., housing improvement) will clearly be insufficient to deal with them. This recognition seems a strong reinforcement of the *Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative*'*s* emphasis on "alignment of resources to a unified and targeted impact strategy."

The most expansive implementation of this approach at this point is that by the Local Initiative Support Corporation (LISC), the nation's largest community development intermediary. In the late 1990s, LISC used the CCRP approach as the model for its 14-neighborhood New Communities Program in Chicago; this program has in turn been the model for the Building Sustainable Communities (BSC) initiative, now operating in almost 100 neighborhoods in 24 other metropolitan areas (Walker, Rankin, and Winston 2010).

---

[5] This Initiative proposes five key elements for an effective neighborhood revitalization strategy: (1) resident engagement and community leadership, (2) developing strategic and accountable partnerships, (3) maintaining a results focus supported by data, (4) investing in and building organizational capacity, and (5) aligning resources to a unified and targeted impact strategy.

[6] Documented in Miller and Burns (2006); see also Kingsley, McNeely, and Gibson (1997).

These efforts are still under way, and it is too early to expect evaluation, but given designs based on lessons from prior work in this field, they may provide useful models for neighborhood revitalization strategies more generally. The core tenets of BSC are extensive and include continuing community organizing, engaging residents in the preparation of a community quality-of-life plan, enduring community partnerships, and active intermediation across sectors and between the neighborhood and the broader system of support. The model explicitly calls for coordinated investment across five programmatic domains: housing and real estate, connection to regional economies, family income and wealth generation, education, and public health and safety (Walker, Rankin and Winston 2010). In some BSC neighborhoods, the range is wider still, including, for example, early childhood development and youth programs (efforts that some suggest should play a much more central role in community initiatives—see Andrews and Kramer 2010).

It is important to understand, however, that comprehensiveness does not mean doing everything at once. These initiatives recognize that setting priorities is essential, but priorities should be set based on an objective assessment of comparative importance across the full spectrum of problems and opportunities the neighborhood faces—not restricted to any one, or any small set of, narrowly defined programmatic specialties. The BSC initiative defines its work as "comprehensive community development" and talks of "strategic integration of effort across domains . . . coordination of investments, co-location or co-production of public services, networks of client referral, and other joint efforts by actors within and across domains" (Walker, Rankin and Winston 2010).

What do we know about the contribution of comprehensive community change efforts to date? Kubisch et al. (2010) identify 48 "major community change efforts" implemented since the early 1980s and provide many useful lessons drawn from these experiences. Overall, it appears that these efforts have resulted in many positive improvements but clearly less complete "transformation" than most of their sponsors had hoped.

This review, however, offers little in the way of quantification of results. Because of the complexity of this work, the influence of outside forces, and the uncertain dynamics of internal change processes, these initiatives are notoriously hard to evaluate. Specific measures of activity and outcomes, and understanding of causal linkages between interventions and outcomes, remain elusive (Connel et al. 1995; Brown 2010).

While practice in this field may always remain more art than science, we think moving a little more toward science at this point would be beneficial. In the sections below, we examine existing knowledge and gaps that need to be filled (in most cases, with more quantification) in several topic areas.

The institutional framework for delivering neighborhood improvement

Who is to design, manage, and implement comprehensive community initiatives? At one time, it might have been expected that doing so would be assigned totally to local government agencies (and citywide nonprofits that work under contract to them). Gradually, over the years, however, there has been widening acceptance of the view that residents and institutions within the neighborhood should play a meaningful role (often the dominant role) in setting priorities among, and coordinating, the constituent programs.[7] The first tenet of the federal *Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative* is, in fact, "resident engagement and community leadership" (White House 2011).

[7] This evolution is chronicled in Rohe's history of neighborhood planning efforts in the United States (2009).

There are many variations in the expansiveness of the community role and how it may be executed. In some cases, outside program managers call the meetings but community representatives considerably influence decisionmaking. In other cases, the community convenes the meetings and takes the lead in drafting the plans and negotiating budgets and schedules with agency and nonprofit personnel. The community role may be played by a loose coalition of indigenous groups, or one neighborhood entity (a neighborhood association, church, CDC, etc.) may be assigned to take the lead and coordinate the work of all other players. The BSC initiative, for example, favors the latter approach.

While there are exceptions, we think the basic approaches discussed in this section are becoming dominant in practitioner views about how to improve neighborhoods. It is hard to find much disagreement on the views that neighborhood problems need to be addressed comprehensively and that indigenous residents and institutions should play important roles in the process. This conclusion has influenced our thinking as we explore existing information about interventions and possible research gaps in the remainder of this paper.

Designing Neighborhood Revitalization Strategies

This second subsection focuses on questions related to the design of neighborhood revitalization strategies within the framework of assumptions just reviewed (issues related to prioritizing neighborhoods for action and varying strategies based on varying neighborhood conditions and scales considering threshold effects and leveraging opportunities). It is here that we begin to identify major research gaps and research projects that could address them.

Selecting neighborhoods and forming overall revitalization strategies

An important question, about which little hard information is available, is how individual neighborhoods should be selected for revitalization efforts. The BSC initiative is one of the few programs where neighborhood selection is explained at all. There, three criteria were considered: neighborhood need and the tractability of community problems, community capacity to attack these problems, and presence of unique developmental or programmatic opportunities (Walker Rankin, and Winston 2010). The basic idea, noted specifically in one city, was to, “choose target areas that were neither too well-off to merit attention nor too distressed to be responsive to community development investment.”

Beyond general guidance, however, the specifics of neighborhood selection were left to the practitioners in each city. Considerable negotiation was always required. Neighborhood boundaries selected had to be acceptable to local stakeholders—residents, nonprofits and other groups participating in the revitalization, and outside local leadership. Therefore, where opinions differed, the results were (inevitably) a product of political compromise. Historic factors (e.g., traditional views about neighborhood boundaries; service areas of neighborhood associations, CDCs, and other organizations; etc.) played a role in these decisions, and these of course differed in every city.

This process of negotiation by stakeholders could never be replaced by any formula or analytic routine. Nevertheless, it does seem that more data and analysis could better inform the decisionmaking. In particular, when resources are so severely constrained, the idea of aligning the level and nature of investment to possible payoffs deserves consideration. Per the notion advanced by Galster (2010), it seems that thresholds exist in the continuum of distress. Spillover effects and other aspects of neighborhood performance may differ substantially depending on where a particular neighborhood stands in relationship to these thresholds.

A given level of investment in some bands, so defined, may yield much better results (on several dimensions) than in others (see arguments in Thompson 2010). For example, it is likely to take much more investment to restore healthy market conditions in a neighborhood now composed mostly of vacant and abandoned structures than in one that is still largely inhabited, if declining. This idea has recently been reinforced by lessons from the federal Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) in response to the foreclosure crisis. Evidence shows that investments in property rehabilitation that work well in some neighborhoods can be largely wasteful in others with different (particularly notably weak) market conditions (Goldstein 2010).

To sufficiently understand for the capacity to more effectively select neighborhoods for intervention, and select appropriate strategies for different types of neighborhoods, substantial empirical research is needed to answer the following questions:

- What key indicators predict neighborhood decline or revival—what characteristics make a neighborhood successful and resilient?
- What types of neighborhoods (varying combinations of neighborhood conditions and change trajectories) warrant what combinations of interventions (varying mixes of programs and levels of investment)?
- Are there thresholds for these indicators that offer early warnings of major changes in trajectories?
- How are these results influenced by metropolitan market conditions—how would they differ from metro to metro?

Further research needed: Research to answer these questions could take two forms. The first would involve analysis of data on conditions and trends for all neighborhoods in a large number of metro areas. This would involve examining a sizeable number of variables (social, economic, and physical) for all neighborhoods in each metro (probably at the census tract level) over as long a period as possible. Statistical analysis would identify varying neighborhood change trajectories and relate them to varying outcomes.

This research would attempt to (1) identify and gain greater understanding of threshold effects, (2) support the identification of "early warning indicators" (indicators that reliably predict major changes in neighborhood trajectories, such as gentrification), and (3) support the construction of neighborhood typologies (typologies that relate neighborhood situations to varying packages of interventions). The research would be designed to learn how neighborhood change processes (and related policy interventions) differ at different distress levels (as measured by poverty rates and/or other indicators).

This work would take advantage of national datasets with small area data that have already been assembled (see *www.MetroTrends.org*). The most recent effort to construct neighborhood typologies in multiple metropolitan areas (Weissbourd et al, 2009) should offer valuable lessons for this research, although that effort was more narrowly focused than the one we propose (on property value change).

The second element of this research (conducted simultaneously) would have similar objectives and research processes but it would focus a much smaller number of metro areas. These would be selected for more intensive study because they have local data intermediaries who have assembled substantial holdings of additional neighborhood level data going back for a long period (most likely, partners in the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership, or NNIP). This research would incorporate a rich list of indicators not available in national datasets.

Before taking on the full project designed above, it might be useful to conduct exploratory research along these lines, focusing on just one or two key policy questions in just a few metro areas; for example, the potential for developing and sustaining mixed-income neighborhoods as the process of change occurs or the implications of the relationship between recent trends in neighborhood poverty rates (increasing) and crime rates (decreasing).

If the broader research is successful, it should contribute to practical application in the near term. Several NNIP partners already maintain recurrently updated information systems with neighborhood level indicators covering their entire metro areas. These could be improved and used more effectively.

Further research needed: Design and test a prototype of a real-time monitoring system for neighborhoods, which would be the basis for developing a data infrastructure to allow researchers and government agencies to intervene in neighborhood change more effectively (based on research suggested above–improvement in existing NNIP systems). (Also see recommendations concerning regional strategies for housing and community development in the last section of this paper.)

Forming more detailed investment strategies

While some observers may have a stereotypical view of the neighborhoods selected for community initiatives, analysis of the 103 neighborhoods in the two LISC initiatives showed that they differed from each other in many respects. For example, only 23 percent of neighborhoods were in the extreme poverty category (poverty rates of 40 percent or above) in 2000. A notably larger share of these neighborhoods, 31 percent, was in the 30–40 percent poverty range, and 33 percent were in the moderate range (20–30 percent poverty rates). These neighborhoods differed from each other along several other dimensions as well (Kingsley and Franks, 2012):

- On average, 65 percent of the housing units were renter occupied, but this rate varied from 50 percent or less for the lowest quarter to 77 percent or more for the highest.
- The share of all households that had children was 35 percent on average, but the interquartile range was 29 percent to 42 percent
- The average unemployment rate was 13.9 percent, with an interquartile range from 9.7 percent to 17.5 percent.

The need to vary strategies in response to the differing conditions of neighborhoods selected for community initiatives is hardly ever recognized in the research literature. Yet it seems important. One might expect that at least the emphases within strategies should differ in a neighborhood with a 60 percent poverty rate versus one with a 25 percent rate, in one with an 80 percent homeownership rate versus one where renters predominate, or in one where most families have children versus one where very few children reside.

In fact, practitioners and residents who plan community development initiatives do regularly vary their plans based on characteristics of the neighborhoods at hand. What is missing is sufficient effort to document their approaches and how they work; how differences in neighborhood conditions and trajectories can and should influence strategy.

Another related set of questions, about which there is virtually no research, pertains to scale. How big should neighborhoods (areas) selected for revitalization be? Does the appropriate scale and pattern of activity for the task of, say, strengthening social networks, differ from those for the task of physical revitalization or workforce development?

Robert Chaskin (1995) points out that there is “no universal way of defining the neighborhood as a unit” and suggests that neighborhood identification be “be guided by particular programmatic aims.” He also recognizes that within any initiative, differing functions may indicate the need for neighborhood constructs at differing scales, ranging from the intimate “face-block” to the much larger “institutional neighborhood.”[8]

The overall area selected for revitalization can be thought of as an “institutional neighborhood” (perhaps the total community in which a particular neighborhood association or CDC might work), understanding that all programs might not work ubiquitously within it. There can considerable latitude, however, as to the size of the overall institutional neighborhood, and the variation is surprisingly wide in existing community initiatives (Kingsley and Franks, 2012).

As to internal patterns, it is now generally understood that spreading investment dollars evenly block by block in a community is not likely to be a cost-effective method of inducing a broader market response that will enhance flows of investment into the neighborhood. Rather, targeting is called for: clustering investments in a few strategic locations so market successes in those locations will be strong, with effects that hopefully will ultimately spill-over to boost property values in the remainder of the project area (Galster, Tatian, and Accordino 2006). But there is little or no clarity about what specific spatial patterns of investment work best in what kinds of communities and how overall scale might influence those determinations.

We believe that substantial research is called for to support more effective design of comprehensive community improvement strategies in different types of neighborhoods. This research might begin with a few fairly low-cost studies.

Further research needed: Research to respond to these questions might start with a convening of practitioners, asking them their initial views on these issues and about example communities where different hypotheses might be tested. This might be followed up with a broader survey and specific tests of options in several locations. Practitioners would be asked to describe how they would vary their strategies (program by program) in varying types of neighborhood situations and to give examples of specific neighborhoods where these ideas have been applied. They would also be asked about how they address the issues of scale and internal patterns. Research staff would go back to collect information on the examples practitioners identify (baseline conditions and change over time).

[8] See further thinking on the meaning and scale of neighborhoods by Coulton, Chan, and Mikelbank (2009).

Studies like these, however, are not likely to be sufficient. There are a host of unanswered questions pertaining to investment in neighborhood improvement. What is the level and composition of investment that flows into neighborhood revitalization initiatives over time, and how do these investment flows relate to outcomes? What are the mechanisms by which neighborhoods change, and how do varying forms and mixes of investment affect those mechanisms and, thereby, outcomes? How much and what mixes of investment are required to make a difference and what are reasonable leveraging expectations? What programmatic priorities offer the highest yield? What differences are there in roles and spatial allocation processes for different forms of public investment (CDBG, city capital budget, etc.)? What are the guidelines for doing what the *Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative* suggests: "braiding and sustaining flexible funding from diverse sources?"

> *Further research needed:* First, while it will be expensive, intensive research on several neighborhoods that are (or recently have been) a part of community initiatives will be essential. Researchers would attempt to (1) quantify the major private, public, and nonprofit investments made in these communities over time; and (2) chronologically link these flows to changes in other instrument and outcome variables (property values and others). Neighborhood change mechanisms would be identified and logic models (charts of expected cause and effect relationships) would be developed. Recognizing that neighborhood change is also strongly influenced by metropolitan market forces, key metropolitan indicators would also be considered in the model.

Assembling useful data on investment flows by type is indeed challenging, but it has been done successfully in the past (a recent example is the *Neighborhoods In Bloom* initiative in Richmond, Virginia, reported in Galster, Tatian, and Accordino 2006). Nonetheless, we feel that a yet more ambitious, multi-city analysis is essential to gain sufficient understanding of determinants at this point.

Programmatic Strategies

The preceding section dealt with overall approaches to neighborhood improvement strategies. This section focuses on individual *programmatic elements*, grouped according to five categories of neighborhood effects mechanisms adapted from Galster (2010): (1) institutional/service mechanisms, (2) social-interactive mechanisms, (3) environmental mechanisms, (4) geographical mechanisms, and (5) residential mobility. Within each category, we first explore the current research and understanding of these mechanisms and how they affect neighborhoods and their development. We then discuss the ways that these mechanisms have been, or can be, exploited through intervention strategies and, where appropriate, present ideas for new research that can further enhance the ability of policymakers and practitioners to promote successful neighborhoods.

In considering the current research on these groups of mechanisms, we did not intend to be exhaustive, which would be impossible given the broad scope of this paper, but rather to highlight those issues where research was the strongest or where community development policy and practice have been focused. We further recognize that our five categories, while conceptually useful, are not mutually exclusive and that each mechanism can interact with the others. For example, schools, which we have placed in the institutional/service mechanism category, can also affect neighborhood social mechanisms (through parent networking or student peer interactions), environmental mechanisms (through the design and accessibility of school buildings and facilities), and geographical mechanisms (through the spatial distribution of quality educational opportunities throughout a city or region). Finally, in the research discussion that follows, we are mindful of Galster's (2010, 6) admonition that, given the current state of knowledge, "most empirical conclusions regarding neighborhood effect mechanisms should be treated as provisional at best."

Regarding intervention strategies related to these neighborhood change mechanisms, almost all these program actions operate at two levels: those involving city- or region-wide actors and actions, and those involving actions by neighborhood-level stakeholders. We generally focus on the latter in this discussion. For example, reviewing options for citywide public school reform would be clearly beyond the scope expected of this paper, but we can examine ideas about actions community initiatives can take to partner with, and work to enhance the performance of, neighborhood schools.

It is, of course, understood that neighborhood problems can seldom be fully resolved unless the citywide policies and programs are operating effectively. To be sure, one activity that should be a part of the agenda of all community initiatives is forceful advocacy for the strengthening and adequate funding of such policies and programs across neighborhoods. Nonetheless, direct neighborhood-level actions can make a difference in all of these categories.

Institutional/Service Mechanisms

This set of mechanisms involves important institutional or service resources located within a neighborhood. Nearby facilities can provide needed community assets and resources, or can detract from neighborhood quality and discourage positive outcomes. These resources may be under the

control of neighborhood residents, but most typically they will represent the presence and influence in the neighborhood of outside actors.

Research on institutional/service mechanisms has been broad, examining a wide variety of neighborhood institutions. The availability and quality of child care and health care facilities is known to vary widely, with critical gaps most prominently found in low-income neighborhoods (Galster 2010). Hospitals, typically along with universities, are also thought to be promising community development "anchors" that have the potential to spur urban revitalization (Rutheiser 2011; Weissbourd et al. 2009). Churches, clubs, and other social groups create a "sense of community" and promote trust (Putnam 2007). In their absence, social bonds may weaken, to the detriment of the whole community (Kornhauser 1978).

Neighborhoods with no or distant grocery stores—areas known as "food deserts"—are also the subject of a growing body of research and action. The pattern of supermarket locations has been well documented, and a recent systematic review found disparities in food access in the United States by income and race (Beaulac, Kristjansson, and Cummins 2009). In their analysis of neighborhood markets in four metropolitan areas, Weissbourd, Bodini, and He (2009) found that supermarkets were the one significant retail amenity consistently correlated with increased house prices. Although a direct link between food access and diet or other health outcomes remains difficult to prove (Galster 2010), Gallagher (2006, 2007) found that areas in Chicago and Detroit with relatively lower access to grocery stores had more adverse health outcomes. Responding to these concerns, community development efforts have increasingly recognized the importance of grocery stores in neighborhood revitalization plans. For example, both The Reinvestment Fund in Philadelphia and Washington DC LISC have used federal new markets tax credits to attract supermarkets to underserved areas (The Reinvestment Fund 2006).[9]

Other research has focused on examples of market actors stigmatizing lower income and minority neighborhoods. Research has shown that reducing proximity to liquor stores reduces alcohol usage while the presence of alcohol outlets may weaken a community's sense of empowerment (Briggs 1997; Cohen, Inagami, and Finch 2008; Theall et al. 2009). Disadvantaged and minority communities have less access to mainstream financial institutions. Between 1975 and 1995, bank branches in low- and moderate- income areas declined by 21 percent while increasing by 29 percent overall (Avery et al. 1997). As commercial banks retreated, fringe banking institutions such as payday lenders and check cashers filled the void, making these areas are more susceptible to predatory lending (Squires and Kubrin 2005). All else being equal, it is harder to secure a loan in a low-income neighborhood, which impedes homeownership, business development and job creation (Immergluck and Weinstein 1995; Richter and Craig 2010).

The location of subsidized affordable housing, and whether it affects a neighborhood differently than market-rate housing, has also been a topic of significant research. The widely held notion that subsidized housing always decreases property values, concentrates poverty, and increases crime is certainly not the case. A more accurate conclusion is that the impact of affordable housing on neighborhoods depends on the context. If subsidized housing is overconcentrated in vulnerable neighborhoods, it can have negative effects on resident and neighborhood outcomes (Freeman and Botein 2002; Galster 2002b; Galster et al. 2003; Popkin et al. 2002). But if it is sited in more stable

---

[9] See also Washington DC LISC, "Congress Heights,"
http://www.lisc.org/washingtondc/sustainable_communities/congress_heights.php.

property value areas, subsidized housing may have no detectable negative impacts on the surrounding neighborhood, Further, if subsidized housing is part of a concerted revitalization strategy in lower–property value neighborhoods, it can have the exact opposite influence, creating positive spillover effects for nearby properties (Ellen and Voicu 2005; Freeman and Botein 2002; Galster 2002b; Galster et al. 2003).

Schools

The above discussion illustrates the breadth of research on institutional/service mechanisms and their impacts on neighborhoods. In this section, we focus more attention on a particular institution that is generating increasing interest as a focal point for neighborhood revitalization activities: a school. As we discuss, "school-centered community revitalization" is being tried in several places, and the federal *Promise Neighborhoods* initiative provides the opportunity, especially when combined with other place-based investments, to test this relatively new development model.

Educational achievement is of paramount importance for the employability and economic success of young people and adults, as poorly educated workers are increasingly struggling to find work in our modern economy (Rothwell and Berube 2011). It is natural, therefore, to hypothesize a link between the quality of schools in a neighborhood and the success of that neighborhood and its residents. Indeed, several efforts across the country to pursue community development approaches combining schools with housing and place-based services have now been documented (Khadduri, Schwartz, and Turnham 2007; Khadduri et al. 2003; McKoy, Vincent, and Bierbaum 2011; Proscio 2004). The idea motivating such efforts is that linking housing, place-based services, and schools can create "positive feedback that enhances neighborhood vitality, improves school quality, and promotes equity and opportunity for families and their children" (Turner and Berube 2009, 1). Although evidence of the success of these initiatives is still preliminary and lacks rigor, it is a highly promising approach worthy of more study. (Potential further research in this area will be introduced in the intervention strategies discussion, below.)

Most research on the link between neighborhoods and schools has focused on the extent to which a quality school can enhance the appeal of a neighborhood and possibly serve as an anchor institution for revitalizing a high-poverty neighborhood. The concept of "school-centered community revitalization" is based on the "conviction that high-quality public education is an essential component of transforming distressed urban neighborhoods into healthy communities that sustain themselves over time" (Khadduri, Schwartz, and Turnham 2008, 1).

Research seems to support the assertion that schools play a significant role in determining who chooses to live in a neighborhood. In a National Association of Realtors poll, people ranked the quality of public schools and neighborhood safety as the two most important factors considered in choosing where to live (Weiss 2004). Several studies have found that good schools increase home values (Bayer, Ferreira, and McMillan 2004; Black 1999; Kane et al. 2003; Weissbourd et al. 2009), which can be a proxy for neighborhood desirability, although these increases are modest when other neighborhood quality factors are accounted for. Bayer, Ferreira, and McMillan extended this analysis, however, using a general equilibrium model to demonstrate that school quality accounted for 25 percent of the stratification of neighborhoods based on income and 30 percent based on educational attainment. Therefore, to the extent that demographic and economic diversity create beneficial conditions for development, having quality schools in an area can help promote neighborhood success.

School-based neighborhood improvements can potentially yield other community benefits apart from increasing property values. For example, The Enterprise Foundation's redevelopment of the Sandtown-Winchester neighborhood of Central West Baltimore includes reform of two elementary schools and the creation of the Home Instruction for Parents of Preschool Youngsters (HIPPY) program. HIPPY uses local neighborhood parents as outreach workers to build relationships with parents with very young children in the neighborhood and provide them with support (Proscio 2004). This model helps build collective efficacy and social networking within the community, which can have benefits for other aspects of community development and neighborhood success.

A second way in which schools could serve as a mechanism for neighborhood success is if the presence of a high-performing school in a neighborhood increases the likelihood that local children will attend that school and receive a quality education. Neighborhood children would then be expected to have more successful educational outcomes, such as higher rates of high school graduation or college acceptance, than they would without the presence of a nearby, quality school. In addition, place-based services could be co-located near, or within, neighborhood schools, providing the potential of mutually enhancing the effectiveness of both educational and other interventions. For example, creating full-service community centers in revitalized schools can create "trajectories of opportunity" for boys and young men of color (McKoy et al. 2011).

It seems little research has examined directly whether the presence of a quality school improves educational or other success indicators in a neighborhood. Research on the impacts of school choice for economically and socially disadvantaged children, such as those whose families live in public housing or high-poverty neighborhoods, has largely focused on giving them opportunities to attend better schools *elsewhere,* either through enhanced school choice (i.e., allowing open enrollment in traditional public schools, creating public charter schools as alternatives to traditional public schools, or giving students vouchers to attend private schools) or through residential relocation to low-poverty neighborhoods. Some of this research has found that when students attend better schools or exercise school choice, their educational outcomes improve (Nichols and Özek 2010; Schwartz 2010). Evidence from the *Moving to Opportunity (MTO)* demonstration, however, revealed few detectable gains in educational outcomes for children and youth whose families had relocated from high- to low-poverty neighborhoods (Sanbonmatsu et al. 2011). The final MTO evaluation noted, however, that the destination neighborhoods for MTO families did not offer significantly better schools than those available to them before moving.

In several places, attempts have been made to improve failing schools or to introduce new, high-quality schools in distressed neighborhoods. While these efforts have yielded some notable improvements in educational outcomes for students attending those schools (Khadduri et al. 2007), they lack rigorous evaluations that would tell us whether they have produced any *neighborhood-level* impacts. Further, little evidence exists to confirm that co-location of services yields important benefits compared to school reform without such services. For example, the *Harlem Children's Zone (HCZ)* has created new charter schools along with a "pipeline" of cradle-to-college supportive services for children and families living within the designated HCZ neighborhood. While HCZ is an impressive model, and has inspired the federal government's *Promise Neighborhoods* initiative, perceptions differ on the HCZ's success to date. An evaluation of student performance data conducted by the Brookings Institution, for example, found that students attending the HCZ's schools did show significant improvement in math test scores, but no more so than students attending most other New York City charter schools (Whitehurst and Croft 2010). Their conclusion was that the place-based model of the HCZ appeared to offer no advantage over simply getting students into a good school. Geoffrey Canada (2010), HCZ's president and CEO, has challenged

these conclusions, however, and defended the place-based approach as essential to HCZ's success. Clearly, further research in these areas would be beneficial.

Intervention strategies

Of the many possible activities in this category that warrant community attentions, we think two deserve priority. The first is action to coordinate human and social service delivery inside the neighborhood. One of the strongest criticisms of social services today is that they are delivered through multiple independent silos without coordination, which sometimes inflicts harm rather than benefits for residents (Corbett and Noyes 2008; Hutson 2004). Progress in breaking down the bounds of these silos at the federal and even the city levels remains painfully slow. Some argue that an effective way to encourage service coordination is by *co-location*, In the co-location model, representatives of different programs come together to provide services in the same physical space, providing greater opportunity to deliver varied assistance in an integrated manner to neighborhood residents (Ginsburg 2008; Task Force on Collaborative Services Report 2006).[10]

Comprehensive community initiatives can take advantage of the benefits of co-location with varying emphases. For example, the Annie E. Casey Foundation has pioneered the development of Centers for Working Families in several cities. This approach involves "bundling access to a full range of essential economic supports in a convenient location." Services offered include workforce and career development, income and work supports, and financial services and asset building. The aim is that services be "seamlessly integrated" to more effectively support family economic success overall (Center for Working Families 2010).[11] Other centers might have different emphases, such as coordinating service programs for children.

Further research needed: Documentation on co-location and its effects has been sporadic at best. Next steps in research here start with a systematic polling of substantive experts who can identify serious examples in cities across the country. A basic description (programs involved, scale, manager's estimate of impacts) would be developed for all of them. Then, a sample would be selected for in-depth study. This would involve detail on program activity levels by type over time (before and after the intervention) and surveys of participants to begin to assess effects and effectiveness. The research would synthesize findings and disseminate lessons.

Our second key programmatic institution in this category is schools. Education and early child care outcomes are, of course, at the core of *Promise Neighborhoods,* but the initiative also aspires to produce broader positive impacts on neighborhoods, such as improved child health and poverty reduction. Much will be learned from evaluation of *Promise Neighborhoods* activities as they are implemented.

In addition, the idea of school-centered community revitalization deserves more attention and evaluation. As Khadduri and colleagues (2008, 7) have noted, this concept "has not been replicated and evaluated at any scale." They call for a federally funded demonstration project and local pilot projects, ideas that we support, that would permit a rigorous evaluation of the school-centered community revitalization model to determine whether it should be widely implemented. At the other end of the

[10] See also Jean Butzen, "Expand Your Nonprofit's Mission Through Co-Location," *Stanford Social Innovation Review* blog, January 11, 2012,
http://www.ssireview.org/blog/entry/expand_your_nonprofits_mission_through_co_location.

[11] LISC has adopted this approach (now calling them Financial Opportunity Centers) in Chicago and nine other cities that are a part of the BSC (http://www.lisc.org/section/ourwork/sc).

spectrum, research has not yet examined the impact of greater school choice on neighborhoods. For example, does allowing greater school choice result in fewer children attending their nearby neighborhood school and thereby weaken neighborhood social networking and collective efficacy?

Further research needed: As described in Khadduri and colleagues (2008), a federally funded school-centered community revitalization demonstration project would provide funding to sponsors willing to make long-term commitments to a neighborhood and an elementary school. Activities in the demonstration would include a combination of school reform and a substantial effort to revitalize the neighborhood through housing and other investments. The evaluation would examine changes in school and neighborhood quality indicators over 10 years relative to comparable schools and neighborhoods that do not receive demonstration project funding. We would add to this design that, if possible, comparable neighborhoods should include those with housing-only or school-only investments, to test whether the combination of school and neighborhood interventions yields greater benefits when combined than when done separately.

To study the impact of greater school choice on neighborhoods, one could conduct a comparative survey of families with school-age children in communities that offer varying levels of school choice to determine whether social interaction outcomes are correlated with school choice.

Social-Interactive Mechanisms

Social-interactive mechanisms are neighborhood social processes (Galster 2010), which include social contagion (changed behaviors, aspirations, and attitudes from contact with neighbors), collective socialization (conforming to local social norms through role models or social pressures), social capital (connections within and between social networks), and collective efficacy (social cohesion combined with a willingness to work together for the common good). Neighborhood success can be influenced both positively and negatively through these processes.

Many of these concepts have been developed through a long history of research. William Julius Wilson's pioneering work, *The Truly Disadvantaged*, explored the theory of collective socialization, which posits that adults in low-income neighborhoods influence not only their children, but other children in the community as well. Therefore, in areas of concentrated poverty, families that are socially isolated from positive role models fail to develop behavioral norms that allow for success later in life (Wilson 1987). Neighborhood peer influences are also important determinants for youth behavior. If your peers are more likely to skip school, commit crimes, and engage in risky sexual behaviors, you likely will be as well (Case and Katz 1991; Krivo and Peterson 1996). But, in reviewing the literature, Galster (2010) found that, through social controls and collective socialization, the presence of more affluent neighbors appears to provide positive benefits for lower-income residents.

The level of social capital—or the connections within and between social networks—also has consequences for residents. Informal social networks interact within neighborhoods to exchange information about employment (J. Elliott 1999), although other evidence finds that most employment-related networks exist outside the immediate neighborhood (Lee and Campbell 1999). Further, when social networking is happening within neighborhoods, evidence suggests it tends to occur along strict race, class, and education lines (Bayer, Ross, and Giorgio 2004; Kleit 2005; Joseph 2011), although the Gautreax study found that low-income black families that stayed in suburban neighborhoods for extended periods interacted as much with their white neighbors as they did in their previous neighborhoods (Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum 2000). Galster's (2010, 16) review of the literature

concludes, however, that "there is relatively little social networking between lower-income and higher-income households or children in the same neighborhood, and this lack is compounded if there are also racial differences involved."

In addition to social capital, research has explored the social organization of neighborhoods. Robert Sampson has defined these shared norms and behaviors as a community's collective efficacy, or the willingness and ability of residents to work together for the neighborhood's common good. Neighborhoods with higher collective efficacy are able to mediate the effects of concentrated disadvantage and residential mobility (Sampson, Raudenbush, and Earls 1997). Conversely, areas in which residents distrust their neighbors and exhibit greater social disorder are more likely to experience higher crime and greater mental distress (D. Elliot et al. 1996; Morenoff, Sampson, and Raudenbush 2001; Sampson, Morenoff, and Gannon-Rowley 2002).

Problems of social disorder are exacerbated in neighborhoods with concentrations of poor or socially disadvantaged households. Galster (2010, 15) found that such neighborhoods, which typically are heavily Hispanic- and especially black-occupied, "have been consistently empirically linked to weaker cohesion and structures of informal social controls in their neighborhoods." Further, he observed that since neighborhood poverty rates are related to various outcomes in a "non-linear, threshold-like fashion," it is highly likely that social contagion or collective socialization mechanisms are at work.

Intervention strategies

Engaging and building the capacity of the residents of low-income neighborhoods, and strengthening their social networks, have been strongly emphasized in the CCI movement since the early 1990s (Kubisch et al. 2010). There has been considerable learning about relevant concepts along the way, research defining and exploring the influence of collective efficacy being a particularly important contribution (Sampson et al. 1997).

However, while there has been research on beneficial effects of collective efficacy on various urban outcomes (crime, most prominently), much more research is needed about what it takes to *produce* collective efficacy. Community organizing may well be part of the answer, but there are different forms of community organizing. An approach known as "network organizing, which gives more priority to building basic interpersonal relationships, emphasizes that "community building has to build *habits of engagement* to replace deeply embedded *habits of detachment* that dominate place" (Traynor 2008, 10). It is embodied in the functions of a Lawrence, MA, community development corporation, Lawrence Community Works (LCW). Its activities are demand driven rather than being mandated via some theory at the top. One function is NeighborCircles, where "LCW-trained facilitators convene a group of neighbors in a given area for a series of dinner discussions focused on getting to know each other, identifying common challenges . . ., and developing discrete, manageable projects for tackling those challenges" (Traynor and Andors 2005).

But most of what LCW does is based in a former mill that has been divided into a large number of small spaces, implementing a quite extensive form of co-location as discussed. The idea is to house many concurrent activities for people with varied needs and interests (e.g., a meeting to talk about a proposed zoning change, a sewing club, a SAT preparation class for teens, a seminar on managing personal finances, a session to plan a neighborhood clean-up campaign, a job-training course). New activities are added, and old ones dropped or modified, depending on evidenced demand. Day care is always provided. The idea is for people engaged in one activity to get interested in other activities being offered and to get to know a broad range of their neighbors in process (Traynor and Andors 2005).

Further research needed: This discussion of LCW is simply to illustrate that various approaches are in play. Yet none of them has been formally evaluated. The next step required here should be to design a viable method of evaluation. It is difficult to imagine a workable full randomized test of LCW. Yet, a program of well-designed interviews of participants, supplemented by administrative data, should yield valuable insights. Other valuable information could be gained by measuring collective efficacy in communities before and after the implementation of actions intended to influence it (e.g., community policing, the development of community gardens).

Environmental Mechanisms

Environmental mechanisms deal with how natural and human-made attributes of a neighborhood affect residents. We address two primary environmental aspects of places here: exposure to crime and the neighborhood physical environment.

Crime can be both a product and cause of neighborhood decline. Based on cost-benefit models that weigh the risk of arrest and incarceration against the economic returns to crime, scholars argue that individuals living in neighborhoods with few legitimate economic opportunities are more likely to participate in criminal activity, a phenomenon known as the *social-strain perspective* (R. Freeman 1996; Hannon 2002; Raphael and Stoll 2011).

Declining neighborhoods can experience a negative feedback loop where disadvantage leads to crime, resulting in further social disorganization, which in turns lead to more crime. As households with means recognize the neighborhood's decline, they typically leave, further concentrating poverty and continuing the downward spiral. All else being equal, the more violent crime increases in a neighborhood, the greater its total population loss (Morenoff and Sampson 1997). Those that remain exposed to crime and violence are more likely to suffer from physical and mental health problems and poorer educational outcomes (Galster 2010; Sharkey 2009).

The physical space of a neighborhood—buildings, sidewalks, roads, green spaces, and other infrastructure—has traditionally been the focus of urban planners, designers, and architects. Neighborhood initiatives, starting with slum clearance, but also including historic preservation and sidewalk and infrastructure improvement, have been typical of interventions designed to improve an area's appearance and livability. But a neighborhood's "bricks and mortar," or built environment, have been increasingly linked to the economic and social outcomes of neighborhood residents as well. HOPE VI redevelopments, for instance, explicitly acknowledge the link between physical environment and outcomes public housing tenants in implementing the redesign of assisted developments.

Research varies on the positive benefits to residents of built environment features. In her book on urban design, Talen (2008) explores the link between urban forms and social diversity, and how one influences the other. She outlines strategies and tools for urban designers and architects for sustaining and nurturing social diversity, which she sees as providing benefits for neighborhoods and residents. Brower (2011) strikes a similar theme in his discussion of successful community design. Based on case studies in several communities, he discerns several characteristics of "community-generating neighborhoods," including the presence of facilities such as stores, parks, plazas, and civic buildings that bring people together; being a suitable size for a neighborhood-based community organization; comprising houses and spaces that are arranged to facilitate social interaction; and having the appearance of a community.

Other analyses have focused on specific impacts of neighborhood design. The possible link between built environment and health, for example, is becoming the focus of greater interest (Northridge, Sclar, and Biswas 2003). In a review of several studies, Galster (2010) cites possible impacts of neighborhood built environment on health as including weakened efficacy from exposure to physical decay and detrimental effects from exposure to noise and pollutants.[12] Neighborhood built environment can also affect residents' levels of physical activity and obesity.

Physical space can influence social interactions among residents as well. Wilkerson and colleagues (2011) investigated the link between neighborliness and the presence of sidewalks, front porches, traffic-calming devices, bars on windows, and litter or graffiti, finding higher levels of neighborliness as the total number of positive physical-environment characteristics increased. These results were robust and remained unchanged after controlling for personal factors, such as race and years of neighborhood residence. Nearby parks have been positively associated with increasing collective efficacy (Cohen et al. 2008).

Other research has focused on benefits of density, walkability, and mixes of land use in neighborhoods. For example, compact development may provide greater opportunities for physical activity by facilitating walking and bicycling (Transportation Research Board 2009). Leyden (2003) found that persons living in walkable, mixed-use neighborhoods in Galway, Ireland, were more likely to know their neighbors, participate politically, trust others, and be socially engaged than those living in car-oriented suburbs. Wood and colleagues (2008) also found that built environment had a significant but small effect on social capital and feelings of safety, but their findings were mixed. Closer bus stops were correlated with lower social capital; closer shops with higher social capital. The authors concluded that the type and quality of available destinations may be more important than quantity. Mixed development can also have benefits for elderly residents. Clarke and George (2005) found that older adults reported greater independence in instrumental activities when they lived in environments with more land-use diversity.[13]

A neighborhood's physical conditions can send important signals to residents and visitors alike regarding the community's trajectory. In their famous article, Kelling and Wilson (1982) conjectured that early signs of physical decay may portend a spiral of decline: "If a window in a building is broken and is left unrepaired, all the rest of the windows will soon be broken…one unrepaired broken window is a signal that no one cares." Subsequent research on this topic has not fully confirmed this view. Wood and colleagues (2008), for example, found that a high level of neighborhood upkeep was associated with both higher social capital and feelings of safety among residents. In another study, however, neighborhood physical disorder was not found to be related to participation in instrumental organizations, but rather increased disorder was correlated with higher rates of problem-solving behavior among residents, such as speaking with a politician or attending neighborhood group meeting.

Further, at this time it is clear that the force having the most impact on the physical conditions in many existing distressed neighborhoods is the foreclosure crisis. It is widely recognized that a significant concentration of foreclosures in an area leads to further decline. Vacant unmaintained properties attract heightened crime. Both exert downward pressure on property values, raising the likelihood of more

[12] Regarding the findings on pollutants, Galster notes that failure to control for confounding personal factors and lack of precision in measurement of exposure are potential weaknesses in the existing research.

[13] For land-use diversity, Clarke and George used a proxy measure: the proportion of workers who commute to work within 5 minutes.

foreclosures and straining city budgets in the process (Harding, Rosenblatt, and Yao 2008; Immergluck and Smith 2005; Apgar and Duda 2005). Thus, for a sizeable share of the neighborhoods of concern for revitalization, addressing foreclosures must become a prominent part of the community development agenda in the near term.

Intervention strategies

We next address intervention strategies for our two priority environmental mechanisms, crime exposure and physical conditions, with a focus on mitigating the problem of foreclosures for the latter. As discussed above, crime and social disorder are particularly important determinants of neighborhood vitality. Recognizing this trend, policing efforts have increasingly incorporated alternative, place-based crime prevention approaches.[14] Community-level interventions typically fall within two categories. The first involves targeting resources to specific *physical places* within a neighborhood, such as placing more cops on the beat in high-crime areas. The second category involves explicitly targeting *place-based human services* to neighborhoods with disproportionally high concentrations of populations most affected by crime and violence (e.g., low-income children, ex-offenders, etc.).

At the federal level, both intervention categories were incorporated most prominently through the Department of Justice's (DOJ) Weed and Seed program. As its name implies, the program tried to "weed out" criminals in certain areas while "seeding" neighborhood revitalization by providing human services and other reinvestment activities. Implemented in over 250 sites, Weed and Seed allowed localities to devise strategies based on their local need and context. Because of the diversity of approaches, it is difficult to determine whether the program as a whole was effective. One eight-site evaluation found mixed results in the program's ability to decrease crime (Dunworth et al. 1999). Perhaps because of this inconclusiveness, Weed and Seed has been discontinued. As of 2011, DOJ has been unable to obtain funding for its replacement, the Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation program, which was slated to be a main crime prevention component of the *Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative*.

While national community-level crime prevention initiatives may have stalled, several local initiatives targeting high-crime areas have emerged. Over the past decade, more detailed data and advances in mapping technology have allowed police departments to more accurately identify and target crime "hot spots" within neighborhoods. In a review of nine experiments, Braga (2001) found that intensive police action in hot spots can reduce crime without displacing it to other locations. Police have also attempted to address the problems associated with Kelling and Wilson's "broken windows" theory. Research also shows that actions that decreased physical disorder—broken windows, litter, public intoxication—can improve resident perceptions of safety and potentially reduce crime (Braga and Bond 2008). Finally, police have also experimented with more passive crime prevention strategies such as closed-circuit television surveillance cameras. An Urban Institute report found that well-positioned surveillance cameras, if actively monitored, can be a cost-effective way to reduce crime (La Vigne et al. 2011).

Placed-based supportive services may also be an effective way to target the root causes of crime. Several initiatives, both completed and under way, can help inform these efforts. Place-based initiatives such as *Choice Neighborhoods* and *Promise Neighborhoods* will be tracking crime levels before and after implementation, particularly youth violence. CASASTART, a program that explicitly targets youth age 11 to 13 growing up in vulnerable environments, successfully reduced violent crime, drug sales, and drug use. CASASTART provided community-enhanced policing, case management, juvenile justice

---

[14] We focus on promising place-based crime prevention strategies; as broader interventions seeking to change individual behavior or implement policing, sentencing, and prison reforms are beyond the scope of this paper.

intervention, family services, after-school and summer activities, education services, mentoring, and incentives (Harrell, Cavanagh, and Sridharan 1998). More information about the efficacy of place-based youth services will likely emerge from the evaluation of the recently launched *Housing Opportunity and Services Demonstration*, a partnership of the Urban Institute and several housing authorities that serves vulnerable youth living in public and assisted housing.

Reintegrating ex-offenders may also require a community-level approach. Fontaine and Biess (2011, 2) outline this particular challenge: "Reentry is also concentrated in certain neighborhoods, which are likely to be disadvantaged, disproportionately minority, and with low institutional investment, the very type of neighborhoods associated with returns to prison." As we discuss earlier, human service delivery has been criticized for being overly diffuse and difficult to access. It is particularly important to co-locate mental health, substance abuse, employment, housing and other supportive services within neighborhoods that receive high concentrations of ex-offenders, given their high level of need.

Further research needed: Despite the prominence of crime prevention in the national policy discourse, surprisingly few community-level crime prevention programs are rigorously evaluated. In an effort to establish best practice models, *Blueprints for Violence Prevention*, a project of the Center for the Study and Prevention of Violence at the University of Colorado, recently reviewed over 900 crime and drug prevention initiatives.

Leveraging this impressive undertaking would be a relatively efficient way to learn more about effective *community-level* crime interventions, which, to our knowledge, the Center for the Study and Prevention Violence did not specifically explore. A research project would perform a comprehensive scan of this list with an explicit neighborhood lens to categorize lessons learned and best practices from past community-level crime interventions to inform future policymaking and program investments.

Purposeful attempts to use urban design to improve social and economic outcomes are rarely evaluated, making it difficult to identify promising intervention models. The most comprehensive reviews have explored the influence of the physical environment of mixed-income developments on resident outcomes and social interactions between residents. A recent review of qualitative studies found that results are mixed (Levy, McDade, and Dumlao 2010). Case studies in the United Kingdom indicate that the design of public space in mixed-income developments is a more important factor in facilitating interaction among residents than the organization of housing units (Roberts 2007). Research on HOPE VI developments in Chicago reveals that the physical improvements in the design and quality of the buildings have helped create healthier, safer environments (Chaskin and Joseph 2011).

Further research needed: Much of the research on HOPE VI has been collected from a small number of sites, with no comprehensive evaluation of physical design features and their impacts. A first step might be to field a survey that would explore, among other topics, how the physical design of mixed-income developments affects outcomes such as social networking.

As noted above, the force clearly having the most impact on physical conditions in many distressed neighborhoods today is the foreclosure crisis. Accordingly, it makes sense for us to focus on that force here. Recent analysis of CoreLogic data shows that nearly half the nation's foreclosures from 2008 to 2010 occurred in only 10 percent of its census tracts (Joint Center for Housing Studies 2011). In all regions, incidence was highest in minority and low-income tracts, but even within these categories there was considerable variation. Neighborhoods in a shortlist of states most affected by the housing bubble

(boom and bust) in the 2000s typically were much harder hit than those in the rest of the country (Arizona, California, Florida, Georgia, and Nevada).

Since 2008, the federal government's three-stage *Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP)* has been under way to deal with the issue, allowing expenses on five activities (Joice 2011).

1. Establishing financing mechanisms for the purchase and redevelopment of foreclosed homes.
2. Purchasing and rehabilitating properties that have been abandoned or foreclosed upon.
3. Establishing and operating land banks for homes and residential properties that have been foreclosed upon.
4. Demolishing blighted structures.
5. Redeveloping demolished or vacant properties.

It is generally recognized that the funding provided for NSP ($7 billion) is not sufficient to address more than a small fraction of the need. It is also recognized that the NSP does not fund many of the tools used by city agencies and CDCs in neighborhood revitalization (e.g., related to innovative applications of code enforcement, other means of foreclosure prevention, aspects of new development). Nonetheless, NSP has been the major governmental response at the neighborhood level and certainly warrants study.

Little serious research on NSP has been completed to date, but some is beginning to surface. One advance that has been documented is the use of data to drive the development of NSP strategies. Deciding which mix of actions are appropriate for which properties and what priorities to give to each may be one of the most challenging assignments neighborhood planners have ever had to face. Without substantial updated information about specific properties in the targeted neighborhood, they would largely be shooting blind. The best example is work with the NEO CANDO system in Cleveland. That system regularly updates a very rich set of parcel-level data, including property-by-property information on mortgage status and foreclosures (Coulton, Schramm, and Hirsch 2010; Sand and Bush 2011). NPI (Cleveland's primary community development intermediary) has been central in developing a collaborative strategic planning process to take advantage of the data, working with local officials and neighborhood residents.

Mallach's (2010) research on investor purchases in Phoenix and New Haven offers concrete suggestions on policies for dealing with different types of investors in the NSP context and is relevant here. Also, Nelson, Petrus, and Richter (2011) review NSP1 experiences in selected Ohio and Pennsylvania communities, noting, "actual program implementation led to partnerships and in some cases supported institutions, training, and tools that communities needed to provide a longer term response to the crisis."

HUD's NSP2 tracking study (being conducted by Abt Associates) will ultimately yield substantial quantitative information on NSP performance on different types of neighborhoods. But that study is not yet in the field and results are not expected until 2013. We recommend two additional research efforts that will not overlap.

Further research needed: First, the circumstances of neighborhoods hardest hit by foreclosures should receive special emphasis in the study related to the development of neighborhood typologies noted earlier. Tract-level information pertaining to the mortgage market (e.g., from HMDA) should be incorporated into the comprehensive dataset for that work.

Second, detailed analysis of trends should be undertaken in 6–10 neighborhoods that are both (1) among the hardest hit by foreclosures and (2) already a part of a comprehensive community development effort (like BSC). Research here would involve thorough qualitative examinations of process (how community development strategy was altered to address the foreclosure crisis, how relationships with local agencies and other players changed, how stabilization work affected other elements of the comprehensive strategy).

Finally, further research could shed more light on how different types of built environments might be more conducive to promoting neighborhood development conditions. A number of these mechanisms would benefit from further research, but one particular area that has not be subjected to empirical study is whether certain built environment features promote the generation of local small businesses in a neighborhood. For example, having smaller buildings and commercial spaces may be more conducive to local business creation because of lower rents and because large spaces are less suitable for small businesses. Additionally, flexible, multi-use facilities—such as interior spaces that can be adapted to various needs or units with combined office and residential accommodations—may promote a wider variety of neighborhood business development opportunities.

Further research needed: An empirical analysis could examine different places that vary according to built environment features, including those listed above, to see if local business development indicators (such as the number of businesses or diversity of business types) can be explained by these variations, while controlling for other factors.

Geographical Mechanisms

Geographical mechanisms refer to characteristics of the location that a neighborhood occupies within the larger city or metropolitan area. This can include issues such as whether neighborhood residents have ready access to employment or other economic opportunities and whether the underlying public services and facilities provide benefits or challenges for the neighborhood.

Compared to other areas discussed in this paper, relatively little research has addressed the extent to which broader city and metropolitan conditions and trends affect changes in specific neighborhoods. Nevertheless, the research that has been done demonstrates the importance of understanding the larger spatial, demographic, and economic contexts in which neighborhood development takes place. Weissbourd and colleagues (2009) attributed a third of the observed variation in neighborhood conditions to metropolitan-level changes. This analysis, however, relied on data for only four metropolitan areas (Chicago, Cleveland, Dallas, and Seattle), and the range of estimates for metropolitan effects varied widely, from 7 to 81 percent of total neighborhood variation. The wide range of estimates does not diminish the importance of these findings, however. Rather, it highlights the necessity to distinguish among different metropolitan and city contexts and recognize that effects may vary across them.

The level of direct public services and resources is also salient. A weakened tax base makes paying for basic city services—trash pickup, police, fire fighting—more difficult, exacerbating disinvestment, and

creating a vicious cycle of decline (Orfield 1997; powell 2002). Exacerbating these problems is the fact that neighborhoods suffering from disinvestment typically house residents with little influence over local political and fiscal matters (Galster, Cutsinger, et al. 2008). As communities lose a sense of their own agency, partly through a perceived lack of public control on the part of residents, it jeopardizes social stability and public trust in institutions (Sampson and Groves 1989; Bursik and Grasmick 1993; Bauder 2001). In contrast, cities that provide easy access to convenient public transportation and to cultural and leisure amenities (such as theaters, museums, concert halls, parks, sports facilities, shops, stores, and libraries) have been found to promote happiness of their residents (Leyden, Goldberg, and Michelbach 2011).

Much of the current research on city and metropolitan context has focused on the effect of spatial development patterns and their impact on various aspects of quality of life. The subject of sprawling development (or "sprawl" for short), where residential and economic infrastructure spreads steadily out from central cities into low-density suburbs, has been a particular focus. Many commentators have speculated that sprawl hurts inner-city residents by depriving their neighborhoods of resources and making vital services and opportunities inaccessible to these populations (Brueckner 2001; Nechyba and Walsh 2004). Nevertheless, research on links between sprawl and urban decline or social inequity did not find any correlation between these phenomena (Downs 1999; Foster-Bey 2002). Sprawl also appeared to be unrelated to the formation of neighborhood social ties (L. Freeman 2001). In reviewing the literature, however, Ewing, Pendall, and Chen (undated) noted that most studies failed to "define sprawl in all its complexity," generally relying on simple density measures. This lack of precision in specifying what constitutes sprawl may have confounded the ability to discern neighborhood effects in this earlier research.

To the extent that regional development patterns result in a spatial mismatch of jobs and residential locations, the lack of access to employment opportunities can be a major concern for residents of inner-city neighborhoods. In a spatial analysis of private-sector jobs in 98 metropolitan areas, Kneebone (2009) found that employment steadily decentralized between 1998 and 2006, with jobs shifting away from the city center in almost every major industry. Stoll (2005) examined the spatial mismatch between blacks and jobs in 300 metropolitan areas, finding significant and positive effect of job sprawl on the employment mismatch conditions faced by blacks. Most recently, researchers at the Brookings Institution have compiled data from 371 transit providers nationally to examine neighborhood access to public transportation and jobs. They found that a typical metropolitan resident can reach only about 30 percent of jobs via transit in 90 minutes and that job access by neighborhood differs considerably across metropolitan areas (Tomer et al. 2011).

Intervention strategies

This section deals with a neighborhood's location in its city or regional context, and, as noted earlier, these larger forces can powerfully influence neighborhood status and change trajectory. Most critical policies in this area operate at a regional level. They are normally not directly influenced by individual community initiatives, but neighborhood actors can have a say in them depending on the existence of mechanisms through which they can act collectively, participating in the creation of regional strategies for housing and community development. In the first stages, research related to how this idea might play out relates more to building institutional infrastructure than substantive analysis. Accordingly, we examine the potential in that section of the paper.

Neighborhood-level players can take some actions directly that would fit in this category. One type includes steps that enhance the ability of neighborhood residents to access opportunities elsewhere in

the region; for example, a program to raise funds to subsidize automobile purchases by residents; securing funding, and negotiating with transportation agencies to provide new transit stops or key road improvements in the neighborhood. We could not identify research needs in this area, however, that we thought ranked high enough in priority to be included in this paper.

Residential Mobility

Finally, the issue of residential mobility is gaining increasing recognition as an important consideration in understanding how social composition of neighborhoods changes. Neighborhoods are dynamic and, at times unstable, geographies. Families, particularly low-income renters, can move often, and the level of residential stability in a community has implications for neighborhood cohesion, social control and the exchange of social capital (Coulton, Theodos, and Turner 2009). While not the only determinant of neighborhood change, high residential instability in a neighborhood can result in reduced social cohesion and disrupt institutions, which, in turn can make a neighborhood more susceptible to crime (Morenoff et al. 2001; Sampson et al. 1997). The types of residents that move into and out of a neighborhood can affect the level of fiscal and business investment in the community (Galster 1987; Bruch and Mare 2006).

The literature on community initiatives says very little about residential mobility, although it is widely known that a very large number of residents in low-income neighborhoods move every year. Practitioners naturally worry about the seemingly impossible challenge of building social networks and social capital if large numbers of residents are likely to soon move away. But recent research based on surveys sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation offers a fundamentally different understanding.[15]

The Casey surveys confirm that the rate of mobility in distressed neighborhoods is indeed high: 28 percent of families with children move annually. But the finding not previously understood is that most of the movers (20 of the 28 percent) do not actually move "away"—they relocate in or near their original neighborhood and are thus still reachable by community-building efforts. The 8 percent that represent longer distance "up and out moves" largely represents families making a move to improve their circumstances and life chances.

What about the shorter distance movers? Some of these moves were normal adjustments; for example, people who need a larger home finding one a few blocks away. But a large share of them (13 of the 28) have been termed "churning moves"—moves by vulnerable families forced to leave their apartment because of the loss of a job, a health problem, or other change in circumstances (Coulton et al. 2009).

Churning moves are clearly problematic. Substantial research has demonstrated that frequent moves by young children have strongly negative effects. This sort of "residential instability" has been associated with a host specific educational problems (including low reading scores and low high school completion rates) and serious health problems often arising in part due to high levels of family stress (Cohen and Wardrip 2011).

[15] The original research on mobility summarized here was conducted by Coulton, Theodos, and Turner (2000). The data are from cross-site surveys sponsored by the Annie E. Casey Foundation for its ten-city Making Connections Initiative. See http://www.aecf.org/MajorInitiatives/MakingConnections.aspx and http://mcstudy.norc.org/.

Intervention strategies

What can and should comprehensive community initiatives do to address the issue of residential mobility? Kingsley and Hayes (forthcoming) suggest some ideas to start:

- Solutions should be guided by characteristics of the households that exhibit residential instability. Available data suggest that the churning movers are a mixed group. Some are likely to be highly vulnerable families with multiple problems: varying mixes of issues like physical and mental disability, substance abuse, and lack of education as well as low income. But at the other end of the spectrum, large numbers of households likely to have more capacity; their moves appear to be the result of one-time problems that may be easier to resolve.
- In all urban areas, a host of citywide programs already exist to help families with problems like these. Basic social and human development services have existed for many decades and, more recently, homelessness prevention programs have been developed that are particularly relevant to the problem at hand. Community development initiatives should certainly work with relevant officials to try to improve the delivery of these services in their neighborhoods recognizing their constraints (many of these programs are likely to be underfunded and/or have functional difficulties).
    - However, there would seem to be other important things community initiatives could do to respond. They could (1) fortify social networks within the community that will both directly build the capacities of the most vulnerable families and facilitate their connection to needed supports from others; (2) develop or support facilities in the community that provide integrated service delivery related to those needs; (3) perform some homelessness prevention (and housing first) services inside the community; and (4) become stronger advocates for reform and strengthening of the relevant citywide programs.

A growing body of research on homelessness prevention is highly relevant to thinking about how to further understanding in this area (Burt, Pearson, and Montgomery 2007; Cunningham 2009; Khadduri 2008), but this research says little so far about specific roles for community-level institutions. There are programs that are attempting to address this issue within communities, perhaps most prominently HomeBase in New York. The research question is, What methods to reduce residential instability have worked well at the neighborhood level?

> *Further research needed:* The next steps for research in this area would include (1) interviews with (perhaps a convening of) specialists knowledgeable about community-level efforts to address residential instability to identify promising efforts under way; (2) developing case studies (with quantification) of a number of those efforts and, to the extent possible, their results.

It would be very beneficial as well if community initiatives could monitor the level and nature of mobility in their areas. Full longitudinal surveys like those sponsored by Casey are prohibitively expensive for this purpose in most cases. However, additional sources of data could provide substantial valuable, if partial, information on the topic.

> *Further research needed:* This research will require bringing together and exploring the potentials of various types of data (some proprietary) in several cities: for example, credit reports, cell phone records, change of address forms, and utility records. The data would be examined to determine types and characteristics of movers in specific neighborhoods and relate those characterizations to types of destinations.

Building Institutional Infrastructure

As noted earlier, there is a wide recognition that neighborhood revitalization will never be delivered at scale unless there is a marked enhancement of the institutional infrastructure needed to deliver it. This infrastructure occurs at three levels: (1) neighborhood-level management of community initiatives, (2) citywide institutional infrastructure (intermediaries and information), and (3) the potential for regional strategies for housing and community development.

Internal Neighborhood-Level Management of Community Initiatives

We mentioned earlier that, as of the late 2000s, there were 13,200 census tracts with poverty rates in excess of 20 percent. It is certain that the capacity does not exist to mount serious comprehensive community initiatives in all these neighborhoods. While there is no fully satisfying inventory of neighborhood improvement capacity nationwide, one type of neighborhood-based institution involved in this work is the community development corporation (CDC). A fairly recent survey found around 4,600 CDCs in operation, located in every state and most major cities (NCCED 2005). But there are undoubtedly thousands of other neighborhood associations, other types of nonprofits and grassroots entities mounting various program actions. It is well recognized that the level of such capacities varies widely across the country; some cities are known for sizeable numbers of strong neighborhood-level organizations, while others have hardly any.

Still, for many neighborhoods in this range, needs may be comparatively modest. For some, a strengthened neighborhood association could provide important benefits without much new external support (e.g., through more effective strategic coordination of services and other work already being provided by nonprofits and government agencies operating in the neighborhood). The first major research gap we identify in this section is inadequate knowledge of the adequacy of neighborhood-level institutional capacity to manage neighborhood revitalization.

> *Further research needed:* A new national survey of institutional capacity in low-income neighborhoods in all metropolitan areas seems warranted to better understand the potential scope of for community initiatives. This could begin with analysis of the NCCS (National Center for Charitable Statistics) database to identify nonprofit institutions doing this type of work nationwide (the NCCS database, maintained at the Urban Institute, contains records for nonprofits that file IRS returns). Then, two types of surveys might be appropriate: (1) surveying a sample of the identified nonprofits themselves to learn more about their capacity and the nature of their work; and (2) a survey of knowledgeable individuals in several metro areas to learn more about neighborhood improvements groups that are not captured in NCCS records.

The second research gap we identify relates to what institutional forms within neighborhoods work best to manage change. No question is more central to the potential for community initiatives than how to deploy and enhance the capacity of neighborhood level institutions to carry them out. A decade ago, a major work examined this issue comprehensively: *Building Community Capacity* by Chaskin, Brown, Venkatesh and Vidal (2001). Approaches and techniques were reviewed in four major areas:

- Leadership development

- Organizational development
- Community organizing
- Organizational collaboration

That volume did not endorse any one approach to establishing a management structure for CCIs. As noted earlier, however, the BSC Initiative has developed fairly definite expectations along these lines. To carry out the program in any neighborhood, it requires that one entity already working in the neighborhood be selected as the "lead agency." The lead agency must be willing to mobilize, coordinate and monitor the work of multiple other institutions that will be involved.

There has already been an initial evaluation of the institutional side of the LISC New Communities Program in Chicago (by an MDRC team—Greenberg et al. 2010). Also, LISC has employed consultants to assess the progress of institutional development in a number of its Sustainable Communities sites (approach discussed in Walker, Winston and Rankin 2009), and reports on these are now in preparation.

This work can feed updated answers to the following question: What does recent evidence have to say about the kinds of organizational arrangements, collaboration techniques and management practices that work best in community initiatives?

Further research needed: Needed next in this area is not new research but rather a synthesis of the lessons of this recent work and serious consideration of its implications, probably documented in a white paper. An outgrowth of that would be consideration of new research tasks tightly focused around particular questions not adequately resolved in the LISC evaluations. Hopefully this would soon lead to the production of guides to help civic leaders learn about organizational structures for community initiatives elsewhere.

Citywide Institutional Infrastructure—Intermediaries and Information

While, as noted, there is no fully satisfying inventory of neighborhood improvement activity nationally, many practitioners would argue that community-building capacity almost everywhere is woefully inadequate in relation to the need.

No one expects a notable expansion of such activity to occur spontaneously. If such an expansion is to occur, supportive institutional infrastructure at the city level will be essential. Since the movement began, several intermediary institutions have been established to support entities that work in individual neighborhoods. LISC, which was established by the Ford Foundation and several corporations in 1980, was mentioned earlier. Other national intermediaries include Enterprise Community Partners and the federally funded NeighborWorks America. In addition, there are intermediaries that support community development activity in individual cities. One example is Neighborhood Progress Inc. (NPI) in Cleveland. (See the review of the development of institutions in this field by Rohe 2009.) A review of the capacities of the national community development intermediaries has been conducted (Walker 2002), but that is now a decade out of date.

However, the existence of a community-oriented intermediary in a city is certainly not enough. Success is sure to depend on effective collaboration with, and support from, an array of other local institutions: government agencies, local philanthropies, service nonprofits, research entities, other civic leaders, and

so on. (Dewar 2010). This sort of collaboration is quite advanced in Chicago, where it has been talked about as "building the *platform* for ongoing and effective community change work."

Further research needed: Documentation of the institutional infrastructure that supports community improvement at the city level is quite sparse. Research that would be most valuable at this point would be fairly detailed case studies on this topic in several cities where the local infrastructure seems to be strong, stable, and functioning well. These best practice cases should go into some depth in explaining the nature of the partners in the collaboration, the roles that they play, the recurrent processes that have been established to sustain the work, and the story behind the way the coalitions were built initially.

Another component of institutional infrastructure that warrants high priority relates to information, information systems and information intermediaries. Over the past two decades, impressive neighborhood-level information systems (with data from multiple local and national sources) have been built in many cities and, with the current momentum of the open-data movement, access to data relevant to community initiatives is sure to grow even more. In many cities, local intermediary institutions have been established to maintain and expand data availability and facilitate data use for various local decision making purposes. Such intermediaries in 35 cities are a part of the National Neighborhood Indicators Partnership (NNIP), which gives high priority to using data to help neighborhood groups advance their goals in community building (Kingsley 2011).

An important innovation in the use of data is in monitoring program performance to achieve *collective impact*. The basic idea is that, rather than traditional program-by-program performance measurement, several programs operating in related fields agree to openly track relevant outcomes related to key goals and to work collaboratively to achieve them. The *Strive* initiative in Cincinnati, which focuses on "cradle to career" education/child and youth development programs, is the most prominent example of this approach so far (Kania and Kramer 2011). But it would seem applicable to the work of comprehensive community initiatives, possibly offering a major advance in learning and coherent program motivation.

Further research needed: Developing workable systems of performance management in community initiatives that take advantage of collective impact principles will be challenging. Again, it would seem that the next steps for research should entail a series of fairly detailed case studies on this topic in several community initiatives that have been the most innovative in data use, particularly as applied in performance management and evaluation.

The Potential for Regional Strategies

We noted earlier that most decisions about community improvement activity are now made in a decentralized manner. There are at present very few regional strategies for affordable housing and none that we know of that offer guidance for community development regionwide.

But there are calls for new forms of metropolitan-wide strategic planning and policymaking related to housing and development patterns—processes that would, at minimum, loosen the rigidities that have frustrated smart growth and slowed the mixing of incomes across the regional terrain. Planning like this is central to the mission of HUD's Office of Sustainable Development, and others have suggested ideas about how it might be carried out (Pastor and Turner 2010; Katz and Turner 2008). What are the prospects for such planning and for making community development a part of it?

California requires that localities prepare general plans with housing elements that must be submitted for state review. Housing element provisions require analysis of local housing needs in the context of regional needs and the adoption of programs and policies to meet the needs identified (Pendall 2008). Katz and Turner (2008) recommend that Metropolitan Planning Organizations (MPOs) be required to do similar planning for housing at the metropolitan level in conjunction with the planning they already do for transportation. There would be strong incentives to reduce barriers to smart growth and encourage the creation and spread of mixed-income neighborhoods. Individual local governments that did not comply with adopted metropolitan plans would risk loss or reduction of federal transportation funding as well as HUD grants. This sort of planning would automatically provide guidance for the deployment of community development activity, even if it did not specify it explicitly.

Unfortunately, there has been negligible take up on the Katz/Turner proposal and Pendall concludes that “the prospects for widespread adoption of California-style housing elements, however, appears to be remote” (2008, 267). Still, there is no reason that the lack of a formal governmental planning process should totally prevent progress on regional strategies.

In every metropolitan area there are individuals and organizations that care deeply about these issues. Depending on the area, they include nonprofit housing organizations, community foundations, other local funders, and other planning and advocacy groups working on regional issues. These organizations could form a coalition (formal or informal) to further this cause. They would partner with local and metropolitan government officials whenever possible.

Building political constituencies for a regional strategy for community improvement is likely to be a part of this process. Pastor and Turner (2010) argue that, “building civic capacity and engagement at the regional scale has to be a part of meaningful place-conscious policy.”

An important way to motivate this work and keep it on track would be for the coalition to prepare an annual report on metropolitan development patterns with strategic “guidance” on needs, opportunities and priorities for community development. In some cases, metropolitan councils of governments might be willing to prepare such a “suggestive” document (even where they would not have the power to override contrary plans of individual localities to implement it). More often the coalition of non-profits and civic leaders would probably take the lead, but hopefully some governmental actors would collaborate.

A large part of this report would be analytic. Data would show changing patterns of comparative need and opportunity for neighborhood interventions (e.g., analysis of levels of distress, early warning indicators of gentrification or other imminent changes, and other factors yielding typology of action types), the progress of community development activities under way, and other characteristics that might influence neighborhood strategies. Regular meetings of the actors around these analyses, could promote powerful informal agreements about community development strategy, even if they are not a part of an “adopted” government plan. And these informal agreements could certainly have influence on the decisions that are made in more formal public sector planning.

Further research needed: Research is needed here to test capacities and methods by which this idea might be implemented. One part of this would be the comprehensive analysis of neighborhoods in several metro areas we called for in an earlier section— analysis designed to (1) identify and gain greater understanding of threshold effects; (2) support the identification of "early warning indicators" (indicators that reliably predict major changes in neighborhood trajectories, such as gentrification); and (3) support the construction of neighborhood typologies (typologies that relate neighborhood situations to varying packages of interventions). This type of analysis would be a primary guide for designing the regular analytic reports we call for here.

In addition, research is needed on the capacities of institutions in the nation's large metropolitan areas to conduct recurrent neighborhood level analyses and develop strategic guidance based on those analyses. This institutional inventory would note the existence of regional data intermediaries and scope of their data holdings. It would also review the range of nonprofits and other actors that have evidenced interest in central city and regional development strategies. Analysis of regional submissions made to HUD in recent rounds of Sustainable Communities planning grant competitions should provide valuable information as well (Rose et al. 2011).

Research Summary and Conclusion

The purpose of creating this plan for future research is to inform government agencies, foundations, and other stakeholder organizations about research questions that will help move policy and practice forward. Prioritizing these questions will help focus investments and stimulate the interest of researchers from academic and research organizations, ensuring that research undertaken is policy relevant and helping inform the adoption and implementation of programs and policies that lead to improvements in neighborhood outcomes. To optimize the value of research findings, research designs should include rigorous data collection strategies, including quasi-experimental and experimental designs where appropriate; qualitative data collection strategies that help understand program design, implementation; and cost analyses that provide data to policymakers so that they can weigh costs and benefits of different program and policy approaches.

Drawing on the evidence outlined in this framing paper on strategies to build successful neighborhoods, we provide the following plan for future research (table 1).

Table 1: Research Questions and Potential Research Projects

	Research questions	Potential research projects
Basic Policy and Strategy	**Selecting Neighborhoods and Forming Overall Revitalization Strategies**	
	• What are the key indicators that predict neighborhood decline or revival–the characteristics that make a neighborhood successful and resilient? • What types of neighborhoods (varying combinations of neighborhood conditions and change trajectories) warrant what combinations of interventions (varying mixes of programs and levels of investment)? • Are there thresholds for these indicators offer early warnings of major changes in trajectories? • How are these results influenced by metropolitan market conditions?	• Statistical analysis of neighborhood conditions and change trajectories in a large number of metro areas that would relate change trajectories to outcomes. Research designed to (1) identify and gain greater understanding of threshold effects; (2) support the identification of "early warning indicators"; and (3) support the construction of neighborhood typologies (typologies that relate neighborhood situations to varying packages of interventions). • More detailed analysis (similar goals and procedures) incorporating richer local neighborhood level data in selected metros.
	• How can neighborhood change be tracked over time to alert policymakers when signs of new problems and opportunities appear?	• Prototype a real-time monitoring system for neighborhoods, which would be the basis for developing a data infrastructure to allow researchers and government agencies to (based on research suggested above—improvement on existing NNIP systems).
	Forming More Detailed Investment Strategies	
	• How do skilled practitioners vary strategies to address needs and opportunities in varying types of neighborhoods?	• Interviews with practitioners and case studies of their work in a sample of neighborhoods. Develop data on conditions before and after intervention. Synthesize findings and disseminate lessons.
	• What are the ranges of appropriate scales for community initiatives, overall and for the different functions that comprise them?	• Structured convening of practitioners to find out views on scale in their work and recommendations on sites where hypotheses can be tested. • Research in identified sites to document scales of activity (populations and areas covered) for various community development functions and relate them to measures of community change. Synthesis of lessons and dissemination of guidance.
	• What is the level and composition of investment that flows into neighborhood revitalization initiatives over time, and how do these investment flows relate to outcomes? How much and what mixes of investment are required to make a difference?	• Thorough multiyear quantification and analysis of investment flows related to changes in many indicators of neighborhood conditions in several neighborhoods in advance stages of revitalization. • Construct models to forecast investment needs and impacts for different types of neighborhoods.

Programmatic Strategies	Research Question	Approach
	Institutional/Service Mechanisms	
	• What methods are effective in coordinating human and social service delivery at the neighborhood level (including the role of facilities that permit co-location)?	• Interviews with practitioners and case studies of their work in a sample of neighborhoods. Develop data on conditions before and after intervention; survey participants. Synthesize findings and disseminate lessons.
	• Is a school-centered community revitalization strategy effective in improving both educational and neighborhood outcomes?	• National or local demonstration projects to fund investments in schools and neighborhoods, with long-term tracking of outcomes against comparable neighborhoods.
	• Does increasing school choice options weaken neighborhood social networking and collective efficacy?	• Conduct a comparative survey of families with school-age children in communities that offer varying levels of school choice to determine whether social interaction outcomes are correlated with school choice.
	Social-Interactive Mechanisms	
	• What factors affect the level of collective efficacy in neighborhoods? What approaches to developing collective efficacy and strengthening social networks are most effective?	• Formal evaluations of Lawrence Community Works and other efforts to strengthen social networks. (First step to design workable methods of evaluation.) • Measure collective efficacy in communities before and after the implementation of actions intended to influence it (e.g., community policing, the development of community gardens). Statistical analysis of results.
	Environmental Mechanisms	
	• What has the experience been with place-based crime interventions? What are the best practices?	• A comprehensive scan of *Blueprints for Violence Prevention* with an explicit neighborhood lens to categorize lessons learned and best practices from past community-level crime interventions.
	• How does physical design of housing and neighborhoods affect social networking?	• Survey of HOPE VI developments to learn how physical design has affected social interaction and collective efficacy.
	• How has the foreclosure crisis affected physical conditions and property markets in distressed neighborhoods and community development initiatives under way in hard-hit neighborhoods?	• Give special emphasis to neighborhoods hard hit by the foreclosure crisis in overall analysis of neighborhood conditions in large metros suggested above. • Conduct more detailed analysis of conditions and trends in 6–10 hard-hit neighborhoods that are also a part of community development initiatives. Include qualitative analysis of how initiative plans and strategies have been affected.
	• Are different types of neighborhood built environments more conducive to promoting neighborhood development conditions?	• Conduct an empirical analysis that would examine different places that vary according to built environment features to see if local business development indicators can be explained by these variations, while controlling for other factors.

Geographical Mechanisms	
No direct research suggested (see section on regional strategies below).	
Residential Mobility	
• What methods to reduce residential instability have worked well at the neighborhood level?	• Interviews with specialists to identify and classify promising practices. • Detailed case studies of promising practices. Synthesis of lessons and dissemination of guidance.
• How can available data sources be used to monitor mobility in urban neighborhoods?	• Explore various types of data (some proprietary) in several cities: for example, credit reports, cell phone records, change of address forms, utility records. Determine types and characteristics of movers and relate those characterizations to types of destinations.

Building Institutional Infrastructure		
	Internal Neighborhood-Level Management	
	• What is the state of the nation's neighborhood-level institutional capacity to conduct comprehensive community revitalization?	• National survey/inventory of community building and development nonprofits taking advantage of the NCCS database. • Survey of knowledgeable individuals in several metros to learn about capacities of other neighborhood improvement groups not in NCCS (neighborhood associations and other neighborhood-level institutions).
	• What does recent evidence have to say about the kinds of organizational arrangements, collaboration techniques and management practices that work best in community initiatives?	• Synthesis of results of recent qualitative evaluations or organizational side of community initiatives. • Develop of agenda for additional research to fill gaps.
	Citywide Institutional Infrastructure	
	• What institutional infrastructure has been developed to support community initiatives in major cities where such support has proven effective? What are the roles of national and local intermediaries in this work? • How can viable systems of performance management be developed in community initiatives (particularly those that emphasize the principles of "collective impact")?	• Detailed case studies of institutional infrastructure in 6–7 cities, detailing characteristics of all partners in the collaboration, the roles that they play, the recurrent processes that have been established to sustain the work, and the story behind the way the coalitions were built initially. Highlight the roles of community development intermediaries. • Synthesis and dissemination of guidance. • Detailed case studies of innovative approaches to data use in performance management and the use of performance management to motivate collective impact.
	Regional Strategies	
	• What are the prospects for developing regional housing and community development strategies? What institutional capacities exist for doing this work?	• Detailed inventory of institutions concerned with spatial housing and development patterns in several selected metro areas and case studies describing how they work together and with other groups. Synthesis of lessons and recommendations as to how strategy development could be approached elsewhere. • Analysis of submissions made to HUD for Sustainable Communities planning grants.

Bibliography

Ahlbrandt, Roger S., Jr. 1984. *Neighborhoods, People and Community*. New York: Plenum Press.

Andrews, Nancy O., and Christopher Kramer. 2010. "Coming Out as a Human Capitalist: Community Development at the Nexus of People and Place." Community Development Investment Review, Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.

Apgar, William, and M. Duda. 2005. *Collateral Damage: The Municipal Impact of Today's Mortgage Foreclosure Boom*. Minneapolis, MN: Homeownership Preservation Foundation.

Avery, Robert B., Raphael W. Bostic, Paul S. Calem, and Glenn B. Canner. 1997. "Changes in the Distribution of Banking Offices." *Federal Reserve Bulletin* 83(9): 707–25.

Bauder, Harald. 2001. "You're Good with Your Hands, Why Don't You Become an Auto Mechanic: Neighborhood Context, Institutions and Career Development." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 25(3): 593–608.

Bayer, Patrick, Fernando Ferreira, and Robert McMillan. 2004. *Tiebout Sorting, Social Multipliers and the Demand for School Quality*. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Bayer, Patrick, Stephen L. Ross, and Topa Giorgio. 2004. "Place of Work and Place of Residence: Informal Hiring Networks and Labor Market Outcomes." Manuscript, Federal Reserve Bank of New York.

Beaulac, Julie, Elizabeth Kristjansson, and Steven Cummins. 2009. "A Systematic Review of Food Deserts, 1966–2007." *Preventing Chronic Disease: Public Health Research, Practice, and Policy* 6(3): 1–10.

Biglan, Anthony, Christine Cody, William Aldridge II, Alexis Dubroski and Jean Kjellstrand. 2011. "The Promise Neighborhoods Initiative: Improving Developmental Outcomes Through Comprehensive Interventions." *Journal of the Institute for Comprehensive Community Development* 2(2): 25–33.

Black, Sandra E. 1999. "Do Better Schools Matter? Parental Valuation of Elementary Education." *Quarterly Journal of Economics* 114(2): 577–99.

Braga, Anthony. 2001. "The Effects of Hot Spots Policing on Crime." *ANNALS of the American Academy of Political and Social Science* 578:104–25.

Braga, Anthony A., and Brenda J. Bond. 2008. "Policing Crime and Disorder Hot Spots: A Randomized Controlled Trial." *Criminology* 46(3): 577–607.

Briggs, Xavier de Souza. 1997. *Yonkers Revisited: The Early Impacts of Scattered-Site Public Housing on Families and Neighborhoods*. New York: Teachers College, Columbia University.

Brower, Sidney. 2011. *Neighbors & Neighborhoods: Elements of Successful Community Design*. Chicago, IL: American Planning Association Planners Press.

Brown, Prudence. 2010. "Evaluating and Learning from Community Change Efforts." In *Voices from the Field III: Lessons and Challenges from Two Decades of Community Change Efforts*, by Anne C. Kubisch, Patricia Auspos, Prudence Brown, and Tom Dewar. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Brueckner, Jan K. 2001. "Urban Sprawl: Lessons from Urban Economics." *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs*, 65–97. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Bruch, Elizabeth E., and Robert D. Mare. 2006. "Neighborhood Choice and Neighborhood Change." *American Journal of Sociology* 112:667–709.

Bursik, Robert J. Jr., and Harold G. Grasmick. 1993. *Neighborhoods and Crime: The Dimensions of Effective Community Control*. New York: Lexington.

Burt, Martha R., Carol Pearson, and Ann Elizabeth Montgomery. 2007. "Community-Wide Strategies for Preventing Homelessness: Recent Evidence." *Journal of Primary Prevention* 28(3/4).

Canada, Geoffrey. 2010. *The Harlem Children's Zone Response to the Brookings Institute's Report: "The Harlem Children's Zone, Promise Neighborhoods, and the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education."* New York: The Harlem Children's Zone.

Case, Anne, and Lawrence Katz. 1991. "The Company You Keep: The Effects of Family and Neighborhood on Disadvantaged Youth." NBER Working Paper 3705. Cambridge, MA: National Bureau of Economic Research.

Center for Working Families. 2010. "An Integrated Approach to Fostering Family and Economic Success: How Three Model Sites Are Implementing the Center for Working Families Approach." Baltimore, MD: Annie E. Casey Foundation.

Chaskin, Robert. 1995. *Defining Neighborhoods: History, Theory and Practice*. Chicago, IL: Chapin Hall Center for Children.

Chaskin, Robert J., and Mark L. Joseph. 2011. "Social Interaction in Mixed-Income Developments: Relational Expectations and Emerging Reality." *Journal of Urban Affairs* 33(2): 209–37.

Chaskin, Robert J., Prudence Brown, Sudhir Venkatesh, and Avis Vidal. 2001. *Building Community Capacity*. New York: Aldine de Gruyter.

Cisneros, Henry G., and Lora Engdahl, eds. 2009. *From Despair to Hope: Hope VI and the Promise of Public Housing in America's Cities*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Clarke, Philippa, and Linda K. George. 2005. "The Role of the Built Environment in the Disablement Process." *American Journal of Public Health* 95(11): 11–17.

Cohen, Rebecca, and Keith Wardrip. 2011. *Should I Stay or Should I Go: Exploring the Effects of Housing Instability and Mobility on Children*. Washington, DC: Center for Housing Policy.

Cohen, Deborah A., Sanae Inagami, and Brian Finch. 2008. "The Built Environment and Collective Efficacy." *Health & Place* 14(2): 198–208.

Connel, James P., Anne C. Kubisch, Lisbeth Schorr, and Carol Weiss, eds. 1995. *New Approaches to Evaluating Community Initiatives: Concepts, Methods and Contexts*. Washington DC: The Aspen Institute.

Corbett, Thomas, and Jennifer L. Noyes. 2008. *Human Services Systems Integration: A Conceptual Framework*. Discussion Paper 1333-08. Madison: Institute for Research on Poverty, University of Wisconsin–Madison.

Coulton, Claudia J., Tsui Chan, and Kristen Mikelbank. 2009. *Finding Place in Making Connections Communities: Applying GIS to Residents' Perceptions of Their Neighborhoods*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Coulton, Claudia, Michael Schramm, and April Hirsch. 2010. "The Aftermath of the Foreclosure Crisis in Cuyahoga County, Ohio." In *REO and Vacant Properties: Strategies for Neighborhood Stabilization,*

edited by Prabal Chakrabarti, Matthew Lambert, and Mary Ellen Petrus. Washington DC: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland and Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Coulton, Claudia J., Brett Theodos, and Margery A. Turner. 2009. *Family Mobility and Neighborhood Change: New Evidence and Implications for Community Initiatives*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Cunningham, Mary. 2009. *Preventing and Ending Homelessness–Next Steps*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Dewar, Tom. 2010. "Aligning With Outside Resources and Power." In *Voices from the Field III: Lessons and Challenges from Two Decades of Community Change Efforts*, by Anne C. Kubisch, Patricia Auspos, Prudence Brown, and Tom Dewar. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Downs, Anthony. 1999. "Some Realities about Sprawl and Urban Decline." *Housing Policy Debate* 10(4): 955–74.

Dunworth, Terence, Gregory Mills, Gary Cordner, and Jack Greene. 1999. *National Evaluation of WEED & SEED: Cross-Site Analysis*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Ellen, Ingrid Gould, and Iaon Voicu. 2005. "Nonprofit Housing and Neighborhood Spillovers." *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management* 25(1): 31–52.

Elliott, Delbert S., William Julius Wilson, David Huizinga, Robert J. Sampson, Amanda Elliott, and Bruce Rankin. 1996. "The Effects of Neighborhood Disadvantage on Adolescent Development." *Journal of Research in Crime and Delinquency* 33:389–426.

Elliott, James R. 1999. "Social Isolation and Labor Market Insulation: Network and Neighborhood Effects on Less-Educated Urban Workers." *Sociological Quarterly* 40(2): 199–216.

Ewing, Reid, Rolf Pendall, and Don Chen. Undated. *Measuring Sprawl and Its Impact: Volume 1.*

Fontaine, Jocelyn, and Jennifer Biess. 2011. *Housing as a Platform for Formerly Incarcerated Persons*. Washington, DC: What Works Collaborative.

Foster-Bey, John. 2002. *Sprawl, Smart Growth and Economic Opportunity*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Freeman, Lance. 2001. "The Effects of Sprawl on Neighborhood Social Ties." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 67(1): 69–78.

Freeman, Lance, and Hilary Botein. 2002. "Subsidized Housing and Neighborhood Impacts: A Theoretical Discussion and Review of the Evidence." *Journal of Planning Literature* 16:359–78.

Freeman, Richard B. 1996. "Why Do So Many Young American Men Commit Crimes and What Might We Do about It?" *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 10(1): 25–42.

Gallagher, Mari. 2006. *Examining the Impact of Food Deserts on Public Health in Chicago*. Chicago, IL: Mari Gallagher Research and Consulting Group.

———. 2007. *Examining the Impact of Food Deserts on Public Health in Detroit*. Chicago, IL: Mari Gallagher Research and Consulting Group.

Galster, George. 1987. *Homeowners and Neighborhood Reinvestment.* Durham, NC: Duke University Press.

———. 2002a. "An Economic Efficiency Analysis of Deconcentrating Poverty Populations." *Journal of Housing Economics* 11:303–29.

———. 2002b. *A Review of Existing Research on the Effects of Federally Assisted Housing Programs on Neighboring Residential Property Values*. Washington, DC: National Association of Realtors.

———. 2010. “The Mechanism(s) of Neighborhood Effects: Theory, Evidence, and Policy Implications.” Paper presented at the ESRC Seminar “Neighborhood Effects: Theory & Evidence,” St. Andrews University, Scotland, February 4–5.

Galster, George, Jackie Cutsinger, and Ron Malega. 2008. “The Costs of Concentrated Poverty: Neighborhood Property Markets and the Dynamics of Decline.” In *Revisiting Rental Housing: Policies, Programs, and Priorities*, edited by Nicholas Retsinas and Eric Belsky (93–113). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Galster, George C., Peter Tatian, and John Accordino. 2006. “Targeting Investment for Neighborhood Revitalization.” *Journal of the American Planning Association* 72(4): 457–74.

Galster, George, Peter A. Tatian, Anna Santiago, Kathryn L. S. Pettit, and Robin Smith. 2003. *Why NOT in My Backyard?* New Jersey: Center for Urban Policy Research, Rutgers University.

Ginsburg, Susanna. 2008. Colocating Health Services: A Way to Improve Coordination of Children’s Health Care? Pub. 1153. New York: The Commonwealth Fund.

Goldstein, Ira. 2010. “Maximizing the Impact of Federal NSP Investments through the Strategic Use of Market Data.” In *REO and Vacant Properties: Strategies for Neighborhood Stabilization*, edited by Prabal Chakrabarti, Matthew Lambert, and Mary Ellen Petrus. Washington, DC: Federal Reserve Bank of Boston, Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland and Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Greenberg, David, Nandita Verma, Ken-Nicole Dillman, and Robert Chaskin. 2010. *Creating a Platform for Sustained Neighborhood Improvement: Interim Findings from Chicago’s New Communities Program*. New York: MDRC.

Hannon, Lance E. 2002. ‘‘Criminal Opportunity Theory and the Relationship between Poverty and Property Crime.’’ *Sociological Spectrum* 22:363–81.

Harding, John P., Eric Rosenblatt, and Vincent Yao. 2008. “The Contagion Effect of Foreclosed Properties.” Storrs, CT: University of Connecticut.

Harrell, Adele V., Shannon E. Cavanagh, and Sanjeev Sridharan. 1998. *Impact of the Children at Risk Program: Comprehensive Final Report II*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Hutson, Rutledge Q. 2004. *Providing Comprehensive, Integrated Social Services to Vulnerable Children and Families: Are There Legal Barriers at the Federal Level to Moving Forward?* Washington, DC: Center for Law and Social Policy.

Immergluck, Daniel, and Geoff Smith. 2005. *The Impact of Single-Family Mortgage Foreclosures on Neighborhood Crime*. Chicago, IL: Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago. ideas.repec.org/a/fip/fedhpr/y2005iaprx6.html.

Immergluck, Daniel, and Samantha Weinstein. 1995. *Small Business Lending for Economic Development Volume II: Model Urban Programs*. Chicago, IL: Woodstock Institute.

Jargowsky, Paul A. 1997. *Poverty and Place; Ghettos, Barrios, and the American City*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.

Jargowsky, Paul. 2003. “Stunning Progress, Hidden Problems: The Dramatic Decline of Concentrated Poverty in the 1990s”. The Living Cities Series. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Joice, Paul. 2011. “Neighborhood Stabilization Program.” *CityScape* 13(1): 135–41.

Joint Center for Housing Studies. 2011. *The State of the Nation's Housing, 2011*. Cambridge MA: Joint Center for Housing Studies, Harvard University

Joseph, Mark. 2011. "Reinventing Older Communities Through Mixed-Income Development: What Are We Learning from Chicago's Public Housing Transformation?" In *Neighborhood and Life Chances: How Place Matters in Modern America*, edited by Harriet B. Newburger, Eugenie L. Birch, and Susan M. Wachter (122–39). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Kane, Thomas J., Douglas O. Staiger, Gavin Samms, Edward W. Hill, and David L.Weimer. 2003. "School Accountability Ratings and Housing Values." *Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs* (83–137). Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Kania, John, and Mark Kramer. 2011. "Collective Impact." *Stanford Social Innovation Review* 9(1).

Katz, Bruce, and Margery Austin Turner. 2008. "Rethinking U.S. Rental Housing Policy: A New Blueprint for Federal, State and Local Action." In *Revisiting Rental Housing,* edited by Nicolas P. Retsinas and Eric S. Belsky. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Kelling, George L., and James Q. Wilson. 1982. "Broken Windows: The Police and Neighborhood Safety." *Atlantic Magazine*, March.

Khadduri, Jill. 2008. *Housing Vouchers Are Critical for Ending Family Homelessness*. Washington, DC: The Homeless Research Institute, The National Alliance to End Homelessness.

Khadduri, Jill, Heather Schwartz, and Jennifer Turnham. 2007. *Reconnecting Schools and Neighborhoods: An Introduction to School-Centered Community Revitalization*. Columbia, MD: Enterprise Community Partners.

———. 2008. *Policy Roadmap for Expanding School-Centered Community Revitalization*. Columbia, MD: Enterprise Community Partners, Inc.

Khadduri, Jill, Jennifer Turnham, Anne Chase, and Heather Schwartz. 2003. *Case Studies Exploring the Potential Relationship Between Schools and Neighborhood Revitalization*. Cambridge, MA: Abt Associates, Inc.

Kingsley, G. Thomas. 2009. "Taking Advantage of What We Have Learned." In *From Despair to Hope: Hope VI and the Promise of Public Housing in America's Cities,* edited by Henry G. Cisneros and Lora Engdahl. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

———. 2011. "Data and Comprehensive Community Development: Unlocking the Potential." *Journal of the Institute for Comprehensive Community Development*, Summer.

Kingsley, G. Thomas, and Kaitlin Franks. 2012. *Neighborhoods Chosen for Community Initiatives; Unexpected Variety and Its Implications*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

Kingsley, G. Thomas, and Christopher Hayes. Forthcoming. *Mobility in Low-Income Neighborhoods: Implications for Community Development*. Washington DC: The Urban Institute.

Kingsley, G. Thomas, and Kathryn L. S. Pettit. 2003. Concentrated Poverty in the 1990s: A Change in Course. Neighborhood Change in Urban America Series, No. 2. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute. May.

Kingsley, G. Thomas, Joseph McNeely, and James O. Gibson. 1997. *Community Building Coming of Age*. Washington, DC: The Development Training Institute and The Urban Institute.

Kleit, Rachel. 2005. "HOPE VI New Communities: Neighborhood Relationships in Mixed-Income Housing." *Environment and Planning* 37:1413–41.

Kneebone, Elizabeth, Carey Anne Nadeaux, and Alan Berube. 2011. The *Re-Emergence of Concentrated Poverty: Metropolitan Trends in the 2000s*. Washington DC: The Brookings Institution. November.

Kneebone, Elizabeth. 2009. *Job Sprawl Revisited: The Changing Geography of Metropolitan Employment*. Metropolitan Policy Program. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Kneeborne, Elizabeth, and Alan Berube. 2008. *Reversal of Fortune: A New Look at Concentrated Poverty in the 2000s*. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution.

Kornhauser, Ruth. 1978. *Social Sources of Delinquency.* Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Krivo, Lauren J., and Ruth D. Peterson. 1996. “Extremely Disadvantaged Neighborhoods and Urban Crime.” *Social Forces* 75:619–50.

Kubisch, Anne C., Patricia Auspos, Prudence Brown, and Tom Dewar. 2010. *Voices from the Field III: Lessons and Challenges from Two Decades of Community Change Efforts*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

Kubisch, Anne C., Prudence Brown, Robert Chaskin, J. Hirota, Mark Joseph, Harold Richman, and M. Roberts. 1997. *Voices from the Field: Learning from the Early Work of Comprehensive Community Initiatives*. Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute.

La Vigne, Nancy G., Samantha S. Lowry, Joshua A. Markman, and Allison M. Dwyer. 2011. *Evaluating the Use of Public Surveillance Cameras for Crime Control and Prevention—A Summary*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Lee, Barrett A., and Karen E. Campbell. 1999. “Neighbor Networks of Black and White Americans.” In *Networks in the Global Village: Life in Contemporary Communities*, edited by Barry Wellman (119–46). Boulder, CO: Westview.

Levy, Diane K., Zach McDade, and Kassie Dumlao. 2010. *Effects from Living in Mixed-Income Communities for Low-Income Families: A Review of the Literature*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Leyden, Kevin M. 2003. “Social Capital and the Built Environment: The Importance of Walkable Neighborhoods.” *American Journal of Public Health* 93(9): 1546–51.

Leyden, Kevin M., Abraham Goldberg, and Philip Michelbach. 2011. “Understanding the Pursuit of Happiness in Ten Major Cities.” *Urban Affairs Review* 47(6): 861-88.

Mallach, Alan. 2010. *Meeting the Challenge of Distressed Property Investors in America’s Neighborhoods*. Washington, DC: Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

McKoy, Deborah L., Jeffrey M. Vincent, and Ariel H. Bierbaum. 2011. *Opportunity-Rich Schools and Sustainable Communities: Seven Steps to Align High-Quality Education with Innovations in City and Metropolitan Planning and Development*. Berkeley: Center for Cities and Schools, University of California, Berkeley.

Miller, Anita, and Tom Burns. 2006. *Going Comprehensive: Anatomy of an Initiative That Worked–CCRP in the South Bronx*. Philadelphia, PA: OMG Center for Collaborative Learning.

Morenoff, Jeffrey, and Robert J. Sampson. 1997. “Violent Crime and the Spatial Dynamics of Neighborhood Transition: Chicago, 1970–1990.” *Social Forces* 76:31–64.

Morenoff Jeffrey D., Robert J. Sampson, and Stephen W. Raudenbush. 2001. “Neighborhood Inequality, Collective Efficacy, and the Spatial Dynamics of Homicide.” *Criminology* 39(3): 517–60.

National Congress for Community Economic Development (NCCED). 2005. *Reaching New Heights: Trends and Achievements of Community Based Development Organizations*. Washington, DC: National Congress for Community Economic Development.

Nechyba, Thomas J., and Randall P. Walsh. 2004. "Urban Sprawl." *Journal of Economic Perspectives* 18(4): 177–200.

Nelson, Lisa, Mary Helen Petrus, and Francisca R-C. Richter. 2011. "Neighborhood Recovery and NSP1: Implementation in Select Fourth District Communities." In *CR Report*. Cleveland, OH: Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Nichols, Austin, and Umut Özek. 2010. *Public School Choice and Student Achievement in the District of Columbia*. Washington, DC: National Center for Analysis of Longitudinal Data in Education Research.

Northridge, Mary E., Elliott D. Sclar, and Padmini Biswas. 2003. "Sorting Out the Connections between the Built Environment and Health: A Conceptual Framework for Navigating Pathways and Planning Healthy Cities." *Journal of Urban Health: Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine* 80(4): 556–68.

Orfield, Myron. 1997. Metropolitics: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Pastor, Manuel, and Margery Austin Turner. 2010. *Reducing Poverty and Economic Distress after ARRA: Potential Roles for Place-Conscious Strategies*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Pendall, Rolf. 2008. "From Hurdles to Bridges: Local Land Use Regulations and the Pursuit of Affordable Rental Housing." In *Revisiting Rental Housing,* edited by Nicolas P. Retsinas and Eric S. Belsky. Washington, DC: Brookings Institution Press.

Pendall, Rolf, Elizabeth Davies, Lesley Freiman, and Rob Pitingolo. 2011. *A Lost Decade: Neighborhood Poverty and the Urban Crisis of the 2000s*. Washington, DC: Joint Center for Political and Economic Studies.

PD&R (Office of Policy Development and Research). 2011. "Choice Neighborhoods: History and Hope." In *Evidence Matters: Transforming Knowledge into Housing and Community Development Policy*, winter 2011. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research.

Popkin, Susan J., Diane Levy, Laura E. Harris, Jennifer Comey, Mary K. Cunningham, and Larry Buron. 2002*. HOPE VI Panel Study: Baseline Report.* Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

powell, john. 2002. "Sprawl, Fragmentation, and the Persistence of Racial Inequality: Limiting Civil Rights by Fragmenting Space." In *Urban Sprawl: Causes, Consequences & Policy Responses*, edited by Gregory D. Squires (73–118). Washington, DC: Urban Institute Press.

Proscio, Tony. 2004. *Schools, Community & Development: Erasing the Boundaries*. Columbia, MD: Enterprise Foundation.

Putnam, Robert D. 2007. "E Pluribus Unum: Diversity and Community in the Twenty-First Century, The 2006 Johan Skytte Prize Lecture." *Scandinavian Political Studies* 30(2): 137–74.

Raphael, Steven, and Michael A. Stoll. 2011. "Neighborhoods, Social Interactions, and Crime: What Does the Evidence Show?" In *Neighborhood and Life Chances: How Place Matters in Modern America*, edited by Harriet B. Newburger, Eugenie L. Birch, and Susan M. Wachter (73–88). Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Reinvestment Fund, The. 2006. *New Markets Tax Credit Program*. Philadelphia, PA: The Reinvestment Fund.

Richter, Francisca G.-C., and Ben Craig. 2010. "Lending Patterns in Poor Neighborhoods." Working Paper 10-06. Cleveland: Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Roberts, Marion. 2007. "Sharing Space: Urban Design and Social Mixing in Mixed-Income New Communities." *Planning Theory and Practice* 8(2): 183–204.

Rohe, William M. 2009. "From Local to Global: One Hundred Years of Neighborhood Planning." *Journal of the American Planning Association* 75(2): 209–30.

Rose, Kalima, Denielle Bergstrom, Athena Ullah, and Pamela Sparr. 2011. *The 2011 Sustainable Communities Regional Planning Grant Guide: How to Incorporate Equity into Your Grant Application*. Oakland, CA: PolicyLink.

Rothwell, Jonathan, and Alan Berube. 2011. *Education, Demand, and Unemployment in Metropolitan America*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Rubinowitz, Leonard S., and James E. Rosenbaum. 2000. *Crossing the Class and Color Lines: From Public Housing to White Suburbia*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Rutheiser, Charles. 2011. "The Promise and Prospects of Anchor Institutions: Some Thoughts on an Emerging Field." PD&R Edge. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Sampson, Robert J., and W. Byron Groves. 1989. "Community Structure and Crime: Testing Social-Disorganization Theory." *American Journal of Sociology* 94(4): 774–802.

Sampson, Robert J., Jeffrey D. Morenoff, and Thomas Gannon-Rowley. 2002. "Assessing 'Neighborhood Effects': Social Processes and New Directions in Research." *Annual Review of Sociology* 28:443–78.

Sampson, Robert J., Stephen Raudenbush, and Felton Earls.1997 "Neighborhoods and Violent Crime: A Multilevel Study of Collective Efficacy." *Science* 277:918–24.

Sanbonmatsu, Lisa, Jens Ludwig, Lawrence F. Katz, Lisa A. Gennetian, Greg J. Duncan, Ronald C. Kessler, Emma Adam, Thomas W. McDade, and Stacy Tessler Lindau. 2011. *Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program: Final Impacts Evaluation*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Sand, Peggy, and Phillip Bush. 2011. *Market Data-Driven Stabilization: A Case Study of Cleveland's NEO CANDO Data System*. Washington, DC: Enterprise Community Partners, Inc.

Schwartz, Heather. 2010. *Housing Policy Is School Policy: Economically Integrative Housing Promotes Academic Success in Montgomery County, Maryland*. New York: The Century Foundation.

Sharkey, Patrick. 2009. "Neighborhoods and the Black-White Mobility Gap." Economic Mobility Project. Washington, DC: Pew Charitable Trusts.

Squires, Gregory D., and Charis E. Kubrin. 2005. "Privileged Places: Race, Uneven Development and the Geography of Opportunity in Urban America." *Urban Studies* 42(1): 47–68.

Stoll, Michael A. 2005. *Job Sprawl, Spatial Mismatch, and Black Employment Disadvantage*. Los Angeles: California Center for Population Research, University of California.

Talen, Emily. 2008. *Design for Diversity: Exploring Socially Mixed Neighborhoods*. London: Architectural Press.

Task Force on Collaborative Services. 2006. *A Report to the Minnesota Legislature*. St. Paul: Minnesota Department of Human Services.

Theall, Katherine P., Richard Scribner, Deborah Cohen, Ricky N. Bluthenthal, Matthias Schonlau, and Thomas A. Farley. 2009. "Social Capital and the Neighborhood Alcohol Environment." *Health & Place* 15(1): 323–32.

Thomson, Dale E. 2011. "Strategic Geographic Targeting in Community Development: Examining the Congruence of Political, Institutional and Technical Factors." *Urban Affairs Review* 47:564–94.

Tomer, Adie, Elizabeth Kneebone, Robert Puentes, and Alan Berube. 2011. *Missed Opportunity: Transit and Jobs in Metropolitan America.* Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Transportation Research Board. 2009. *Driving and the Built Environment: The Effects of Compact Development on Motorized Travel, Energy Use, and CO2 Emissions*. Washington, DC: Transportation Research Board.

Traynor, William J. 2008. "Building Community in Place: Limitations and Promise." Lawrence, MA: Lawrence Community Works.

Traynor, William J., and Jessica Andors. 2005. "Network Organizing: A Strategy for Building Community Engagement." *Shelterforce* Online, Issue #140, March/April

Turner, Margery Austin, and Alan Berube. 2009. *Vibrant Neighborhoods, Successful Schools: What the Federal Government Can Do to Foster Both*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2011. *Choice Neighborhoods: Summer 2011 Update*. Washington, DC: U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development.

Walker, Christopher. 2002. *Community Development Corporations and Their Changing Support Systems*. Washington, DC: The Urban Institute.

Walker, Christopher, Sarah Rankin, and Francisca Winston. 2010. *New Approaches to Comprehensive Neighborhood Change: Replicating and Adapting LISC's Building Sustainable Communities Program.* Washington, DC: Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

Walker, Christopher, Francisca Winston, and Sarah Rankin. 2009. "Assessing Community Development Program Performance: Quantitative Assessment Strategies for the LISC Sustainable Communities Initiative." Washington, DC: Local Initiatives Support Corporation.

Weiss, Jonathan D. 2004. *Public Schools: What the Research Shows*. Cincinnati, OH: KnowledgeWorks Foundation.

Weissbourd, Robert, Riccardo Bodini, and Michael He. 2009. "Dynamic Neighborhoods: New Tools for Community and Economic Development." Living Cities: The National Community Development Initiative. Chicago, IL: RW Ventures.

White House, The. 2011. *Building Neighborhoods of Opportunity: White House Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative Report*. Washington, DC: The White House.

Whitehurst, Grover J., and Michelle Croft. 2010. *The Harlem Children's Zone, Promise Neighborhoods, and the Broader, Bolder Approach to Education*. Washington, DC: Brown Center on Education Policy, The Brookings Institution.

Wilkerson, Amy, Nichole E. Carlson, Irene H. Yen, and Yvonne L. Michael. 2011. "Neighborhood Physical Features and Relationships with Neighbors: Does Positive Physical Environment Increase Neighborliness?" *Environment and Behavior* XX(X): 1–21.

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

Wood, Lisa, Tya Shannon, Max Bulsara, Terri Pikora, Gavin McCormack, and Billie Giles-Corti. 2008. "The Anatomy of the Safe and Social Suburb: An Exploratory Study of the Built Environment, Social Capital and Residents' Perceptions of Safety." *Health & Place* 14(1): 15–31.