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TO: THE MAYOR, THE BOSTON REDEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY AND THEIR SYCOHANTS, THE COMMITTEE FOR NORTH HARVARD ST."

FOR NINE YEARS: WE HAVE RESISTED YOUR EFFORTS TO FORCIBLY EVICT US FROM OUR HOMES. YOU HAVE FAILED TO ACHIEVE YOUR GOAL: THE TOTAL DESTRUCTION OF OUR NEIGHBORHOOD. BY YOUR ACTIONS YOU HAVE DENIED US THE RIGHT TO BE FREE AND SECURE IN OUR OWN HOMES. YOU CANNOT MORALLY WIN HERE, AND NO RATIONALIZATION ON YOUR PART CAN JUSTIFY YOUR ACTS OF THEFT AND BRUTALITY. YOU VALUE MONEY AND BUILDINGS MORE THAN PEOPLE’S FREEDOM. THIS LAND IS RIGHTFULLY OURS, AND YOU KNOW IT! WE SHALL DEFEND IT WITH OUR LIVES!

WE STILL WON’T MOVE!

TO HELL WITH URBAN RENEWAL!

IN MEMORIAM: TO ANNIE SORICELLI AND OTHERS WHO HAVE DIED IN DEFENSE OF THEIR HOMES

JULY 4, 69
HOW IS TODAY’S COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIFFERENT?
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HOW DO WE CREATE HEALTHY, INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES?
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REVIEW OF HOPE VI INVESTMENTS

• Led with the real estate investments
  • Critical given the conditions of the public housing stock and the legacy of decades of disinvestment
PHYSICAL TRANSFORMATION
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REVIEW OF HOPE VI INVESTMENTS

- Led with the real estate investments
  - Critical given the conditions of the public housing stock and the legacy of decades of disinvestment
  - Insufficient attention to community development goals

- Impacts on neighborhood greatest in cities that were already experiencing supply pressures
  - Increased property values and loss of affordability in the surrounding community
  - Shifting populations, with a loss of lower-income households
    - Changing racial composition
  - Limiting the benefits of redevelopment, by limiting who can access the new community
  - Landscape of educational opportunity remains unchanged, or relies on “charters” to bring new students in
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• Market metrics
  • Increasingly sophisticated at targeting investments in specific areas
  • Insufficient attention to spillover effects outside the development
    • Our metrics generally see the spillovers as “positive” – e.g. increased property values – but haven’t developed the right indicators to capture how well we’re doing on inclusion and community goals
    • Articulate equity goals (e.g., through an Results Based Accountability or collective impact process)

• Proactive strategies for surrounding area
  • Couple community development projects with linked investments in the surrounding area (e.g., RAD, affordable housing preservation, rehab of owner-occupied units)
    • Housing Development Fund’s (HDF) Landlord Entrepreneurship Affordability Program (LEAP)
  • Inclusionary units – incentivize their construction in neighborhoods that are seeing an uptick in private market activity
  • Community preference policies
CREATING INCLUSIVE COMMUNITIES

• Economic and Workforce Development
  • Proximity, social networks, and “neighborhood effects” are insufficient to move the needle on employment outcomes for chronically or inter-generationally poor households

• Put “Community” back in Community Development
  • Trauma informed community building

• Cross-city/agency partnerships that can facilitate other forms of community investment and that have a profound effect on resident well-being
  • Schools
  • Public Health agencies
  • Police

• Focus on adolescents and young adults, not just pre-school

• Link community-based interventions to real estate investments, rather than the other way around
Thank you!