SMALL LEGACY CITIES, EQUITY, AND A CHANGING ECONOMY

Brian Agness
Meg Dahlgren
Ellie Devyatkin
Eileen Divringi
Ryan Debold
Daniel Farina
Jake Freedman
Kevin Hunter
Thomson Kao
Will Morgan
Amy Verbofsky
Daniel Wolf
Instructor: Harris Steinberg, FAIA

Department of City and Regional Planning
Spring 2014
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge many people for their help in preparing this report. First and foremost, we thank Harris Steinberg for his patient and tireless guidance throughout the semester. We also thank Keith Wardrip for his consistent help and encouragement, and Tom Burns and Allan Mallach for generously sharing their knowledge and experience with us. We are grateful to Alex Feldman, Amy Hillier, John Landis, Deborah McCullough, Theresa Singleton, Herbert Wetzel, Laura Wolf-Powers, and Dominic Vitiello for their feedback. In each of the cities that we studied, a number of people shared their time to help us in our research. In Bethlehem, Tony Hanna, Darlene Heller, Alan Jennings, and Ellen Larmer were invaluable sources of information. For their help with our research on Lancaster, we thank Ben Bamford, Dan Betancourt, Sam Bressi, Thomas Daniels, Carlos Graupera, the Honorable Richard Gray, Mary Colleen Heil, Mark Kocent, Randy Patterson, and David Proulx. Finally, we wish to thank Paul Calistro, Van Hampton, Scott Page, Michael Purzycki, and Christian Willauer for their help with our research on Wilmington.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preface</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executive Summary</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Introduction</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Methodology</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilmington</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conclusion</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appendix+References</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Economic disparity, segregation, and exclusion in all aspects of daily life are increasingly the subjects of academic studies and journalistic accounts. World leaders are spending political capital to spotlight the growing discontent. President Obama recently called economic mobility, "the defining challenge of our time." We increasingly have the sense that this state of affairs is threatening the well-being of our society.

In the northeastern United States, many cities feel that they are on the losing end of a stratified society, having suffered decades of job losses and out-migration with ever-declining industry. But at the same time, citizens and leaders in these cities are doing the hard work of revitalization. Their visions, planning, and building are starting to attract new people, activity, and investment. What this studio set out to understand is whether revitalization – with all the public and private resources that it captures – can be a vehicle for reducing inequities for the broader community. Furthermore, if redevelopment is failing to generate widespread benefits, how can cities adjust their strategies to improve the likelihood of equitable outcomes?

FIGURE I.01: (Left) An abandoned block in the city of Camden, NJ. The sides of the buildings are covered in hopeful murals, a sign that Camden is fractured but not broken. Throughout Camden there are a number of similar murals that seek to instill pride and hope that the city will once again be a viable community.
The 2012 report *In Philadelphia’s Shadow: Small Cities in the Third Federal Reserve District* by Alan Mallach examines conditions and challenges in thirteen small cities in the Greater Philadelphia region. While each of these cities has a unique historical and economic trajectory, all rose as industrial centers in the nineteenth century and experienced economic decline in the second half of the twentieth century. In the wake of population decline and disinvestment, their leaders have employed various redevelopment strategies in the attempt to attract residents, visitors and reinvestment. These strategies had varying degrees of success in bringing about economic turnaround, leading Mallach to classify each city in one of four categories: “rebounding,” “declining but stable,” “coping,” or “struggling.”

Recent redevelopment efforts in the three cities classified as “rebounding” – Bethlehem and Lancaster, Pennsylvania and Wilmington, Delaware – were the focus of this studio’s research. Mallach points out, economic conditions in these cities – whether or not they are directly attributable to these specific developers – have improved to the point that they are considered “rebounding.” However, not all residents are benefiting from the economic turnarounds that their cities are experiencing. Equitable development was not an explicit goal in these revitalization projects. Our studio’s goal was to consider what equitable revitalization would entail, both in general and in these three cities. We sought to develop a framework to use revitalization efforts – and the resources that such efforts consume – to reduce inequity and improve outcomes for everyone in the affected communities.

**DEFINING EQUITABLE DEVELOPMENT**

To establish a framework for equitable development, we first had to establish a clear definition of equity. Often confused with equality, an equitable system recognizes that equal distribution of resources cannot remedy decades of marginalization: equitable distribution acts affirmatively, intentionally targeting resources toward historically underserved populations.

Defining equitable development proved more difficult, as there is no agreed-upon definition of equity as it applies to planning. However, the studio was able to draw upon a long history of efforts to incorporate equity into planning, from the original intent of zoning to “improve the general welfare” to the rise of equity planning in the 1960s. More recently, there has been a resurgence of interest in equity as the third component of sustainability, along with its economic and environmental goals.

Building on this research, we developed a tool for integrating equity as a strategic priority into local economic development. Many equity initiatives are currently piecemeal efforts, such as the community benefits agreements negotiated on an ad hoc basis with...
individual developers. We sought to offer policy makers a flexible tool with which to build a cohesive strategy with equity as a core concern. The three major components or phases of our equitable development framework are:

1. Assessing Equity
2. Building & Implementing a Theory of Change
3. Monitoring & Reassessing

The first phase of the process involves conducting an honest assessment of the city’s current state of equity, identifying major challenges and opportunities. In the second phase, the framework incorporates the Theory of Change, a tool that allows policy makers to work backwards from the desired outcomes of redevelopment to identify specific conditions necessary for their attainment. Then, a set of specific interventions is designed to create these conditions. For example, a desired outcome might be to have a healthy, active city. Working backwards, we might determine that ensuring access to affordable healthcare is a critical condition to achieving this outcome. Finally, free mobile health screens could be a specific intervention that would contribute to creating this condition in a historically underserved community.

Once a set of interventions is developed, they are prioritized for impact and feasibility. As the prioritized interventions are implemented, the Theory of Change becomes an evaluation tool, providing an overall framework against which the impacts of interventions can be assessed. Finally, the third phase involves tracking progress towards the identified equity goals.

CASE STUDIES

We applied our equitable development framework to the three “rebounding” cities mentioned above. The desired outcomes for the three cities were the same: economic security and opportunity, a stable and supportive quality of life, and inclusive and progressive community leadership.

Wilmington

With just over 71,000 residents, Wilmington is Delaware’s most populous city. It is approximately 30 miles south of Center City, Philadelphia and 75 miles north of downtown Baltimore. The city was founded by Swedish traders in 1638 at the confluence of the Christiana River and Brandywine Creek. In 1802, the gunpowder mill that would go on to become the DuPont Corporation was founded in what is today the city’s Brandywine Village neighborhood. Demand for ships and gunpowder during the Civil War fueled Wilmington’s industrial rise. After World War II, however, Wilmington started to lose population to the suburbs, and its industrial strength began to wane. However, through its unique Court of Chancery and relatively liberal laws of...
incorporation, Delaware has positioned itself as an advantageous location for corporate headquarters. This position was further strengthened in 1981 with the passing of the Financial Center Development Act, which liberalized the state's banking laws and set the stage to attract back offices of many financial services firms to downtown Wilmington.

Over the past two decades, economic development efforts have focused on redeveloping large, vacant parcels along both sides of the Christiana River. Public and private investment here has resulted in the development of corporate offices, high-end housing, and cultural amenities. Our state of equity analysis revealed that Riverfront development has not resulted in an overall improvement in economic and quality-of-life circumstances for Wilmington as a whole. Our state-of-equity analysis revealed several major equity challenges in the city: there is a large gap in the level of education required by Wilmington's high-growth industries and the level typically attained by those living in the city's lowest-income areas, fragmentation of community organizations, sharp racial and income divides, and an increasing housing burden for low-income residents.

The Riverfront redevelopment as implemented was not originally designed with equity as an explicit goal; rather, its intent was to attract corporations and high-income households to the Riverfront and generate more tax revenue for the city. To apply our equitable development framework to Wilmington, we developed a new Theory of Change, both for the city as a whole, and for future Riverfront development. The new citywide Theory of Change, and its specific adaptation to Riverfront redevelopment, both consider conditions that would lead to the three desired outcomes in Wilmington. Several specific interventions could fulfill these conditions. These interventions include improving physical and economic access to the Riverfront for low-income residents through improved pedestrian crossings, more affordable housing, and inclusionary business opportunities that reserve office space for small businesses. While the Riverfront-specific interventions have the potential to improve access to the Riverfront, they will not improve the overall state of equity in Wilmington. The citywide interventions seek to address some of Wilmington's overall equity challenges. Some of these interventions include increasing citizen participation in future planning and budgeting efforts, to ensure that all city residents' voices are heard.

FIGURE II.04: New, high-end townhouse development at the Wilmington Riverfront.
Lancaster

Located in the heart of Lancaster County, a regional agricultural powerhouse about 80 miles west of Philadelphia, Lancaster was founded in 1730 as an agricultural commerce center. The city experienced its most rapid growth in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries, as it grew to be a regional food processing and manufacturing hub. After reaching its industrial and population peak around 1950, with just over 63,000 residents, Lancaster’s factories began slowly closing. The city experienced significant population turnover, with wealthier white residents leaving the city. There was a significant influx of Latino and Hispanic immigrants, many of whom moved to the region for employment in agriculture and food processing. This prevented the sharp population decline experienced by many post-industrial cities, but did represent a decline in wealth for Lancaster.

Today, Lancaster is a city with significant socio-economic divides, with poorer residents concentrated in the southeast quadrant of the city. This division is also along racial and ethnic lines: most of the city’s black and Latino population is concentrated in the southeast as well. Our analysis of the state of equity in Lancaster identified some key equity challenges. Many of the city’s renters are cost-burdened; further analysis revealed that the availability of higher-wage employment, rather than excessively high rents, was likely the root of the problem. In fact, income disparity has widened throughout Lancaster County over the past decade. Higher-wage employment remains out of reach for many of the city’s residents, in large part because of an educational disparity that falls along racial and ethnic lines. Finally, Lancaster is experiencing an occupational bifurcation; many of the city’s higher-wage jobs in healthcare and education are not accessible to city residents, while many of the jobs that are available are low-wage ones with limited opportunity for advancement.

Lancaster is widely considered to be an example of successful creative placemaking. While the arts scene has contributed to the revitalization of downtown, our research suggested that investments by the city’s anchor institutions – mainly Franklin and Marshall College and Lancaster General Hospital – are more likely to be drivers of Lancaster’s economic growth. With this in mind, we created a citywide Theory of Change to address some systemic equity problems in the city. Unlike the other two cities studied, we did not create a site-specific Theory of Change, but rather one that applied to anchor institution expansion and investment. Through such interventions as local procurement benchmarks and a technical assistance center for minority- and women-owned businesses, the city, the anchor institutions, and the community can realize mutual benefit from future growth.

Bethlehem

With over 75,000 residents, Bethlehem is the seventh largest city in Pennsylvania. Bethlehem and its neighboring cities of Allentown and Easton form the heart of the Lehigh Valley, a 731-square mile area that is home to over 800,000 residents. The city was founded on Christmas Eve in 1741 by a group of Moravian missionaries that had settled near the intersection of the Lehigh River and Monocacy Creek. The Moravian Church maintained complete ownership of all of Bethlehem’s land until 1844, when it began to sell parcels to individuals, paving the way for industrial development. In 1857, the Saucona Iron Company – precursor to the Bethlehem Steel Company – was chartered. Bethlehem thrived as a “company town” until the second half of the twentieth century, when demand for domestic steel declined. The 1,800-acre site became the largest brownfield site in the country after the company closed the facility in 1995. In the early 2000s, Pennsylvania’s legalization of gaming led to interest in developing a 130-acre portion of the site for cultural, retail and entertainment (including gaming) use. The group BethWorks Now, a team of investors led by Bary Gosin, partnered with the Las Vegas Sands Corporation and was awarded a casino license. The casino was completed in 2009 as the first component in a master plan to redevelop the entire site.

In the state of equity analysis that we conducted for Bethlehem, the major equity challenges we identified were declining incomes for Bethlehem’s poorest residents, housing cost burden, a skills mismatch relative to employment opportunities, and an
imbalanced job distribution—few jobs in Bethlehem are actually held by Bethlehem residents. The casino and other redevelopment efforts on the former Bethlehem Steel site represent an economic development opportunity for Bethlehem, and the city has accordingly positioned itself well to ensure that its benefits have a positive impact for as many residents as possible. The casino agreed to a local hiring agreement, and has made an effort to contract with local minority- and women-owned businesses. Union labor was used in the casino’s construction, although its management has subsequently resisted efforts by casino staff to organize. The casino contributed to the cost of developing the first phase of the South Bethlehem Greenway. Finally, the city has taken actions to address community concerns about undesirable spillover development from the casino by creating a new zoning overlay around the site.

However, it was not the intent of the casino’s development to create equitable outcomes for low- and moderate-income residents. Using the same desired outcomes as the other two cities, we developed a Theory of Change for Bethlehem that would guide future planning efforts toward these outcomes. The selected interventions for Bethlehem attempt to address equity both at the level of future development on the Bethlehem Steel site and at the level of the city as a whole. An example of one of the selected site-specific interventions is a proposed culinary center with ground-floor restaurants, to be located in a currently vacant building. This incubator space would host many of the smaller food enterprises that wish to partner with Sands Casino or Lehigh University, but need to scale up their production to meet these institutions’ demands. The culinary center would be located within Bethlehem’s newly created City Revitalization and Improvement Zone (CRIZ), and would thus be eligible for CRIZ funding to support a local hire or community benefits agreement.

SYNTHESIS

Our research and case studies revealed some common factors in successfully promoting equitable development. First, coordination across City agencies and among community organizations is essential to developing interventions. Proactive leadership is essential to making equity a goal in the planning process. Finally, a diversified economic development strategy offers a preferable alternative to chasing “silver bullets.” This last point is particularly important, because economic development incentives are increasingly being questioned for their wastefulness, or at least risky and inequitable.

Interventions targeted at increasing equity must be tailored to specific circumstances, as our three case study cities show. Equity must also be protected through ongoing monitoring and reassessment. However, ensuring such follow-up assessments can be challenging. The method that we developed places equity at the heart of the planning and redevelopment process. Considering equity from the beginning means that it can shape the redevelopment process.
Today, political leaders in many post-industrial cities have realized that their cities’ future stability depends on the ability to attract and retain new investment while ensuring that development has a positive impact on all residents, particularly disadvantaged populations. How to achieve this is the subject of the following chapters, but many developments over the last sixty years can shed light on the evolving role of equity in the planning process.

Jane Jacobs offers some perspective on equity in planning in *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. Jacobs states that equity has been one of many goals of revitalization efforts. However, equitable goals were not achieved by the contemporary approach of clearing distressed (yet functional) neighborhoods and replacing them with public housing projects.1 These developments lacked diversity in their uses and populations; furthermore, they obliterated stabilizing social structures that had existed in the neighborhoods they replaced. The federal government no longer builds large, single-use public housing developments. They do however subsidize the private development of housing in which affordable units are a component. This new system, while removing the systematic nature of creating inequity, has made it more difficult for those affected to participate in the process.

The Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia’s Office of Community Development Studies and Education supports the Federal Reserve System’s economic growth efforts in “promoting community development in low and moderate-income communities and fair and impartial access to credit in underserved markets.”2 As seen in the map (Figure 1.02), this branch of the Federal Reserve oversees the Third District, which comprises the eastern two-thirds of Pennsylvania, all of Delaware, and southern New Jersey. Within this district are a number of small, post-industrial cities in the greater Philadelphia region, three of which are the focus of this studio.

A 2012 report by Alan Mallach entitled *In Philadelphia’s Shadow: Small Cities in the Third Federal Reserve District* takes a close quantitative look smaller post-industrial cities within the Federal Reserve’s Third District. Many smaller cities in the Third District rose to prominence as industrial centers fueling smaller sub-regions surrounding Philadelphia proper during the 19th Century. Some cities had many small businesses, while others could be classified as “company” towns with a single large employer. They were also the centers of retail trade for their respective regions, often housing large department stores and shopping districts. However, as suburban sprawl increased during the second half of the 20th century, many of these smaller cities began emptying out, leaving behind aging infrastructure, fractured economies, and a poorer quality of life overall.3

Our client for this studio, the Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia’s Office of Community Development Studies and Education, asked us to examined equity issues in redevelopment through the lens of three cities in the Federal Reserve’s Third District. In each city, revitalization has been headlined by a particular strategy. Wilmington is remaking its industrial riverfront into a new neighborhood. Lancaster is pursuing a placemaking strategy centered on arts and culture, and Bethlehem has developed a casino where a large steel mill once operated. By evaluating the state of equity in each of these three cities before, during, and after their efforts, we attempted to determine whether these efforts have had equitable outcomes in addition to their stated goals. We suggest ways for these cities, as well as others across the northeast, to achieve equitable outcomes for many types of development strategies by infusing these growth and development strategies with equity goals throughout the planning and development process.

**Inter-Urban Competition for Redevelopment**

In recent years, economic development tactics have faced increased scrutiny from both academics and popular media in sources ranging from the New York Times4 to Forbes.5 This criticism has been bolstered by stories of bankrupt cities sinking millions of public dollars into sports arenas6 or neighboring states offering massive tax incentives to move company headquarters just a few
miles down the road. An estimated $80 billion of incentives are provided by state and local governments each year, often with no guarantee of public benefit or demonstration of company need.

The competitive pressures that give way to such seemingly wasteful policies have been growing since the latter half of the 20th Century. As capital becomes increasingly mobile, cities find themselves acting as buyers in a national (and often international) marketplace for private investment. The perception of growing scarcity in what local governments seek – for example, employment opportunities accessible to their residents, growing sales and property tax revenue bases, etc. – increases the price each is willing to pay for it. Strategies such as relocation incentives and tax abatements do little to grow the economy overall, but rather shift the distribution of investment away from public goods such as education and services towards the continued production of private goods.

With increasing recognition of their associated drawbacks, why do public officials continue to engage in these practices? Economists use the concept of the “Prisoners’ Dilemma” to illustrate how competitive pressures can overcome the potential for cooperative benefits. In this scenario, two individuals are arrested and interrogated in separate rooms. If the two cooperate by staying silent, both face a reduced prison sentence. However, if one provides testimony against the other – “defects” in the common terminology – they may receive an even lighter sentence in exchange for a harsher result for the other party. When both parties believe the other is likely to defect, the incentives for defection grow, resulting in worse outcomes for both than in the cooperative scenario.

The parallels to modern economic development efforts are clear. States and municipalities, in anticipation of being undercut by their investment-starved peers, offer greater upfront concessions and incentives. This reinforces these practices and makes the potential for cooperative outcomes seem increasingly remote. Indeed, many localities tout the existence of as-of-right tax incentives – something few economists would find theoretically defensible – as evidence of their “business-friendly” environments.

Recently, economists and political scientists have begun questioning this idealized competitive structure. The core assumptions of these models—that cities are functionally homogenous and that companies primarily respond to financial incentives—breakdown under empirical examination. The application of a perfectly competitive model erases regional nuance or local variations in key business considerations such as workforce readiness and access to markets.

However, whether or not the assumptions of the prisoners’ dilemma are congruent with competitive realities, it is clear that this framing of economic development policy has been internalized by political leaders and engrained in the broader economic development discourse. In the following case studies of three recovering legacy cities, we believe we have identified a key counter-narrative that points to the strategic capitalization on local assets and the development of intrinsic place-based value as the key to equitable economic recovery.
Creative Placemaking

Creative Placemaking focuses on shaping a community’s physical and social character around arts and cultural activities. As a revitalization strategy, creative placemaking seeks to foster urban neighborhoods that are rich in cultural activity and meaning, creating alternatives to suburbia for residents, visitors, and entrepreneurs. Benefits to revitalization include the re-use of vacant or underused property, increased retention of local income, entrepreneurship, and job creation by artists and designers, the attraction of non-arts businesses, and greater community identity. It can take decades, however, to realize such benefits.15

Downtown Development

Many revitalization strategies can be broadly classified as tools for downtown redevelopment. Some of these strategies include incentives to attract businesses, such as tax credits or abatements, while others attempt to create the conditions for increased downtown investment through infrastructure and quality-of-life improvements. Improvement Districts are public-private partnerships that provide a tool for extra services to make an area more attractive.13 Large-scale developments and capital improvements are often funded through Tax Increment Financing (TIF), which uses the revenue from increased property values to repay bonds issued to fund the development.14

Waterfront Development

Urban waterfronts in the United States were historically sites of industry; today they offer considerable potential as brownfield redevelopments due to their proximity to central business districts, views, and recreational opportunities. Waterfront redevelopments are challenging because they often cover large areas and involve regulatory compliance at all levels of government, ranging from local zoning to state and federal environmental statutes regulating wetlands, water quality, and brownfield cleanup. Cooperation among government and private actors is essential to the success of these projects.16

Big Bang Development

Many cities have pursued large single investments, such as convention centers, casinos, and stadiums. These large-scale, special-activity centers are thought to stimulate economic development through spillover effects. They are also thought to stimulate the construction of complementary facilities (e.g., hotels near convention centers). Such developments are believed to become ongoing attractions of tourism, as well as providers of jobs. Studies of casinos as economic development catalysts have mixed results: some assert that the economic boost of casinos is overstated, while others have found positive impacts.17

Common redevelopment strategies & typologies

FIGURE 1.05: Avenue of the Arts, Center City District, Philadelphia

FIGURE 1.06: Crossroads Arts District, Kansas City

FIGURE 1.07: Inner Harbor, Baltimore

FIGURE 1.08: Motor City Casino, Detroit
EQUITY IN CONTEXT

What Is Equity?

In order to discuss “equitable development,” we must first determine what is meant by equity. It is important to note that equity and equality are not coterminous. Equality refers to having a level playing field, while equity refers to taking steps to achieving a level playing field. Equity does not stop at reversing “separate but equal”; it acts affirmatively, to intentionally channel intervention toward people who have traditionally been underserved or marginalized.

In the context of planning and development, failing to consider equity can lead to destructive outcomes, such as those experienced under the urban renewal programs of the 1960s and 1970s. In the name of progress, neighborhoods were demolished or divided to make way for projects that would benefit the privileged. Little consideration was given to the far-reaching social impact of these projects. Not only is planning today based on the idea of promoting the general welfare, but also decades of urban renewal style strategies that further disenfranchised already marginalized communities have led to a climate in which specific steps must be taken in planning and development to promote equity.

Defining Equitable Development

Currently, there is no generally agreed upon framework or definition for equity as it relates to planning. The importance of equity, however, has been considered in several phases of planning’s history. By the end of the Progressive Era, several cities had adopted zoning codes, prompting then Secretary of Commerce Herbert Hoover to draft model state zoning enabling legislation. This original legislation justifies regulation under the given police power of the state, to promote the “health, safety, morals, or general welfare of the community” which logically extends to pursuing equity goals.18

Decades later, in the 1960s, both Advocacy Planning (Paul Davidoff) and Equity Planning theory (Norman Krumholz) introduced planning approaches that addressed equity more explicitly than in the past. Prior to the 1960s, planning was associated with large urban-renewal projects, which were generally undertaken without consultation with or much consideration for

EQUITY PLANS THROUGH THE YEARS

CLEVELAND POLICY PLANNING REPORT

The Cleveland Plan is widely regarded as the first official equity-oriented municipal plan. It was developed under Planning Director Norman Krumholz after the election of Carl B. Stokes as mayor.

“Equity requires that locally responsible government institutions give priority and attention to the goal of promoting a wider range of choices for those Cleveland residents who have few, if any, choices.”19

CHICAGO DEVELOPMENT PLAN

The Chicago Development Plan of 1984 was developed after the election of Harold Washington as mayor, with the explicit purpose being to use municipal linkage and incentive policies for redistribution. It also established the “Chicago Working Together 1984” Task Force.

Core Goal: “to redistribute equitable the flows of jobs and income to Chicagoans who typically have received proportionately less of the benefits in the past.”20

FIGURE 1.09: As illustrated in this word cloud, growing inequality brings with it many labels and headlines.
existing residents. Advocacy planning sought to empower these marginalized communities by putting the planner in the position of advocate for stakeholders, abandoning the traditionally more neutral stance.

Several years after Davidoff’s landmark piece, “Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning,” Norman Krumholz took the idea even further. As planning director of Cleveland, OH, he became a champion of Equity Planning in practice. The Cleveland Policy Plan, developed under Krumholz’s leadership, contained an explicit equity agenda whose goal was “to provide a wider range of choices for those Cleveland residents who have few, if any, choices.”

Krumholz attributes the failure of equity planning to take hold within the planning profession to the view among many practitioners that it was too actively redistributive. However, it is worth noting that the American Institute of Certified Planners’ Code of Ethics calls for redistributive measures. While “advocacy” or “equity” planning never did become the norm, they did not disappear, and their influence can still be found in more recent years in places ranging from Chicago to Toronto to King County, Washington.

In order to develop our own frameworks for equity and equitable development, we drew inspiration from these theories and past plans, as well as public administration literature, political theory, and the education and environmental justice fields.

John Rawls’ Theory of Justice considers justice and equality under the condition that “no one knows his place in society.” Under this condition, people choose an ideal distribution where everyone has “an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all.” In other words, when creating the rules and framework for a new society, from the ground up, people will decide upon an equitable distribution when operating under the “veil of ignorance.” Rawls views justice in terms of “distribution of social, political, and economic goods and bads” and concludes that in a just society everyone should have equal political rights and that distribution should benefit all members of society, even the disadvantaged.

Iris Marion Young criticizes Rawls’ ideal approach for neglecting to consider the current social and political conditions in which our society actually operates. Under her framework, inequity

FIGURE 1.10: Equity as a pre-requisite for democracy.

Toronto Cityplan 1991 specifically identified “social equity” as a core guiding principle. The plan enumerates 5 basic urban rights:

- Affordable housing
- Equal access to community services and facilities
- Secure, quality employment
- Safety and freedom from discrimination
- Community empowerment and participation

KING COUNTY, WA ORDINANCE 16948

Ordinance 16948 incorporated “equity” into the Countywide Strategic Plan. It covers 14 “Determinant of Equity,” including food access, affordable childcare, housing, job training, education, and healthcare.

In order to develop our own frameworks for equity and equitable development, we drew inspiration from these theories and past plans, as well as public administration literature, political theory, and the education and environmental justice fields.

John Rawls’ Theory of Justice considers justice and equality under the condition that “no one knows his place in society.” Under this condition, people choose an ideal distribution where everyone has “an equal right to the most extensive total system of equal basic liberties compatible with a similar system of liberty for all.” In other words, when creating the rules and framework for a new society, from the ground up, people will decide upon an equitable distribution when operating under the “veil of ignorance.” Rawls views justice in terms of “distribution of social, political, and economic goods and bads” and concludes that in a just society everyone should have equal political rights and that distribution should benefit all members of society, even the disadvantaged.

Iris Marion Young criticizes Rawls’ ideal approach for neglecting to consider the current social and political conditions in which our society actually operates. Under her framework, inequity
stems from injustices such as domination and oppression that have colored our current distributions, not just mal-distribution as Rawls suggests. Additionally, she stresses the need to recognize that there are different groups and factors that cause poor distributions among them.29

Reconciling these two views of equity leads us to consider a Pareto improvement view of equity in planning and development. In this view, there should be no circumstance in which some groups are made better off while those at a socioeconomic disadvantage are materially harmed without compensation. Public administration literature addresses equity in implementing policy. Regens and Rycroft stress that equity requires both an equitable process and an equitable outcome.30 An equitable outcome without an equitable process is only equitable by chance. Additionally, we incorporated Arnstein’s Ladder of Citizen Participation into our concept of an equitable development process. This scale ranges from “manipulation” to complete “citizen control,” and where a process falls along this scale will affect its equitability.31

Equity Indicators

From these ideas, we devised a general definition for equitable development as a set of processes and outcomes that advances opportunities, choices, and access for all citizens, with particular regard for disadvantaged groups and individuals. In the context of planning, this refers to advancing opportunities, choices, and access to a variety of quality of life and economic components. These components include:

- **DECENT, AFFORDABLE HOUSING**
- **HIGH QUALITY, CULTURALLY APPROPRIATE EDUCATION**
- **ACCESSIBLE HEALTH CARE, HEALTHY FOODS, RECREATIONAL OPPORTUNITIES, AND A HEALTHY ENVIRONMENT**
- **DIVERSE AND PRACTICAL TRANSPORTATION OPTIONS**
- **SAFE, LIVING-WAGE EMPLOYMENT**
- **MEANINGFUL PARTICIPATION IN POLITICAL AND CIVIC LIFE**

The other critical aspect of our definition is the set of processes and outcomes. This refers to an iterative process in which an outcome that is less equitable than intended informs adjustments to the processes that lead to the next set of outcomes. Additionally, the decision and development processes themselves should be approached in an equitable manner, meaning that necessary stakeholders should be included in the decision-making process so as to address the needs and concerns of everyone.

**FIGURE 1.11: New housing in the quickly gentrifying neighborhood of Northern Liberties in Philadelphia.**

**FIGURE 1.12: Considering both process and outcome is essential in achieving equity goals.**
Why Equity?

Income disparities in the United States today are at a level not seen since before the Great Depression. Since 1970, the size of the national economy has more than doubled; however income gains during that time were concentrated at the very top of the income ladder. Income gains for most of the population failed to increase proportionally, and have even stagnated in recent years.\(^32\)

Income and wealth disparities lead to disparate outcomes in terms of health, education, and opportunity. Income and wealth disparities are becoming more accurate predictors of one’s success and outcomes than race. Neighborhoods are increasingly segregated by income. Compared to several decades ago, many more households find themselves in neighborhoods at one end of the spectrum or the other, with ever fewer in the middle. Place and space – where one lives – dictate many opportunities (or hurdles) to which one will be exposed. Less affluent areas are more likely to be close to locally unwanted land uses (LULUs) such as treatment plants, dumps, and landfills, as well as other disamenities, such as highways that impede access to other parts of the city.\(^33\)

Income and wealth disparities are also closely tied to health disparities. Living in less healthful environments – environments closer to pollution, farther from parks and open space – can affect people’s health. Additionally, access to health care and healthy food has an impact on health outcomes.\(^34\) Poor health precludes many from maintaining productive, fulfilling livelihoods. This also translates to disparities in life expectancy across income and ethnic groups, showing that inequities lead to lower life expectancies with lost creativity, contribution, and participation of citizens.\(^35\)

Educational disparities are also present when comparing different income groups. A widely-cited 2011 study found that even though disparities between African-Americans and Whites have narrowed, the achievement gap among students from different classes has widened dramatically in both math and reading.\(^36\) The inability of all students to obtain a quality education undermines the ability of these individuals to fully realize their economic and social potential, and it threatens our society’s future prosperity.

Income, health, and opportunity disparities all affect an individual’s ability and opportunity to contribute to society, both economically and socially. This also means that equity is necessary for a strong democracy. The strength of our political system rests on the assumption that individuals are in a position to participate in the political process. Without equity, individuals do not have access to education, information, politicians’ ears, or public meetings – the tools and means by which to make informed decisions and participate in the democratic process.\(^37\) Over time, inequity could weaken the political voice of much of American society.
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To help communities achieve more equitable outcomes, we have designed a methodology for integrating equity as a strategic priority into local economic development efforts. This framework is intended to guide stakeholders through the process of identifying, selecting, and implementing strategies with that address the values and needs specific to their community.

This methodology was created in response to the status quo of ad hoc, reactive equity initiatives in economically challenged cities. Too often, incorporating equity into economic development is pursued in a piecemeal fashion through one-off agreements or tailoring programs to funding opportunities. While such efforts can generate some community benefit, the lack of a broader vision and cohesive strategy around these efforts limits local leaders’ ability to institutionalize equity as a core policy concern.

This methodology offers policymakers a flexible and adaptive framework that can be applied at a variety of scales – from site-specific efforts to citywide strategic planning. This flexibility is demonstrated in the Case Studies section of this report, where both a high-level and opportunity-specific application of this framework is presented for each city.

In addition to providing a cohesive equity vision, the methodology is designed to be responsive to the realities of economic development opportunities in our case study cities. Recognizing that many such opportunities in legacy cities arise through the potential for public-private partnership, the framework provides a strategic guide for the negotiation of public benefits.

Our methodology comprises three phases, each of which will be outlined in greater detail:

1. Assessing the State of Equity
2. Building & Implementing a Theory of Change
3. Monitoring & Reassessing

Though these phases are initially chronological, the framework is designed to be iterative and responsive to changing social and economic contexts.
PHASE I

Assessing the State of Equity

The first phase of this process is to conduct an honest assessment of a community’s current state of equity, identifying both challenges and opportunities. To fully develop and refine the assessment tools utilized this phase, we drew from both academic precedents and stakeholder consultations. Though our ability to engage community members was constrained in the context of this course, extensive public participation will be a critical component of this phase in future applications of this methodology.

This process should result in a series of both quantitative and qualitative indicators that provide a baseline of existing conditions. In the context of this project, we focused on the components of equity outlined in our definition of equitable development, including housing, employment, education, health, and civic participation.

Synthesizing the results of these indicators with the community’s equity vision yields a set of desired equity outcomes. When comparing this analysis and stakeholder feedback across the three case study cities, we ultimately converged on the following shared outcomes:

- Inclusive and Progressive Community Leadership.
- Stable and Supportive Quality of Life.

Across all three cities covered by this analysis, THREE EQUITABLE OUTCOMES were collectively identified to direct future planning and development strategies:

Inclusive & Progressive Community Leadership

Economic Security & Opportunity

Stable & Supportive Quality of Life
FIGURE 2.05: Phase II of the methodology involves developing a theory of change based on the outcomes derived in Phase I. In the example above, the desired outcome is a healthy, active city. Working back from this outcome, one may determine that ensuring access to affordable healthcare is a necessary precondition. Free mobile health screenings are proposed as a potential intervention for creating this condition in historically underserved communities.

**PHASE II**

**Building and Implementing a Theory of Change**

The second phase translates these desired outcomes into an implementation and evaluation strategy using a tool called a “theory of change.” This tool is used to work backward from desired outcomes to identify more context-specific conditions that are necessary for their attainment. It is used to develop a set of specific interventions that will produce these conditions. This process is illustrated in the figure above.

This phase also incorporates a prioritization component. In many cases, cities will have to choose among various interventions that draw upon finite financial and administrative resources. In our case study cities, we utilized our knowledge of local assets and constraints to prioritize interventions that optimized for both impact and feasibility. In some cases, the time horizon of an intervention might also be a factor, but in these cases the timeline was outweighed by impact and feasibility.

Once the selected interventions are implemented, the theory of change becomes an evaluation tool, providing goals against which the impacts of interventions can be assessed.

**PHASE III**

**Monitoring & Reassessing**

Finally, phase three involves tracking progress towards the identified equity goals, embedding this process in a broader iterative framework. Here again, community engagement should play a key role in assessing outcomes and refining strategies. Evaluation in the short term will make use of the framework outlined by the theory of change, measuring progress against current goals and based on the original state of equity. In the long term, however, a recalibration of the model that adapts to changing intellectual conceptions of equity and societal priorities may be necessary.

By adapting this methodology to their individual needs, communities will have a useful framework for determining the current state of equity, identifying needed interventions, and monitoring progress toward equitable outcomes. This offers policymakers a tool with which they can engage and guide their communities to a more equitable future.
FIGURE 2.06: The full process for implementing the methodology embeds Phases I, II and III in an iterative process that enables feedback loops between equity assessments, strategic goals, and outcome measurement.
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CASE STUDIES
With nearly 71,300 residents, Wilmington is the most populous city in the state of Delaware. The city covers nearly 11 square miles of land and is located in New Castle County. The city is part the Philadelphia metropolitan area and lies along the spine of the Northeast Megalopolis. Wilmington is approximately 30 miles south of Center City, Philadelphia, and approximately 75 miles north of downtown Baltimore.

**HISTORY**

Swedish traders founded Wilmington in 1638 as Fort Christiana at the confluence of the Christiana River and Brandywine Creek. This was the first Swedish colony in North America. By the 1660s, however, the area was under British rule and was renamed Wilmington after Spencer Compton, Earl of Wilmington. In 1802, French immigrant Eleuthere Irenee du Pont, began to produce gunpowder at a mill in the Brandywine Village section of the City. The DuPont company soon became the largest supplier of gunpowder to the United States Armed Forces. Today, DuPont is one of the world’s largest chemical companies and is still headquartered in Wilmington.

The American Civil War had a great impact on the industrial economy of Wilmington. The war created a high demand for ships, railroad cars, and gunpowder. Wilmington produced approximately half of all gunpowder used by union troops during the war. By 1868, the city’s shipyards were building more iron-hulled ships than the rest of the country combined. Shipbuilding continued as a major industry, reaching its height during World War II. Wilmington shipbuilder, the Dravo Corporation, was at one time the largest employer in the state with 11,000 workers.

Post-war prosperity and the rise of the suburbia pushed development outward beyond Wilmington’s borders. The city’s population declined with this fundamental shift. Between 1950 and 1970, Wilmington lost 27 percent of its population. However, New Castle County continued to grow. In 1950, Wilmington accounted for 50 percent of the county’s population but declined to only 13 percent of the county’s population by 2010. Manufacturing in the city also waned from a mid-20th century peak of nearly 24,000 employees to approximately 1,500 in 2007.

One pivotal moment in Wilmington’s modern history occurred during 1968 when riots erupted after the assassination of Martin Luther King Jr. This led Mayor of Wilmington John Babairz to request that Governor Charles Terry deploy National Guard troops to restore order in the city. A week later, the Mayor asked that the troops be withdrawn from the city, but Governor Terry refused. Approximately 2,800 troops were deployed to Wilmington, and remained in the city for nine months. The riots and the subsequent occupation further hurt the city’s reputation. “White flight” from the city continued unabated. In 1950, only 16 percent of Wilmington residents were not white, by 2010, over two thirds of the city’s population was African American or Latino.

Beginning in the late 19th century, the Delaware positioned itself as an advantageous location for corporations through less stringent corporate laws and its unique Court of Chancery. Today, over 50 percent of all publicly traded companies in the United States and 64 percent of Fortune 500 companies are incorporated in Delaware.

Beginning with the 1981 Financial Center Development Act, Delaware also liberalized state banking laws. The state enacted...
laws removing caps on interest rates and created a host of other advantages for the credit card and banking industry.\textsuperscript{11} This financial liberalization attracted many high-end professional jobs to Wilmington. Today, the back offices of many financial service firms are a dominant force in the economy of the City.

Wilmington’s shipbuilding industry waned throughout the latter half of the twentieth century. The Dravo Corporation closed in 1965. Remaining port operations moved to more modern facilities on the Delaware River. This left the Riverfront, the once bustling industrial center of Wilmington, to deteriorate into an expanse of vacant lots, warehouses, junkyards, and storage facilities. In the late 1990s, the Riverfront began a process of large-scale redevelopment that continues through to today.\textsuperscript{12} This transformation of the Riverfront is often seen as a key strategy in the revitalization of Wilmington.

\section*{CONTEXT}

\subsection*{The Riverfront}

The Riverfront straddles both sides of the Christina River and saw high levels of public and private investment over the last two decades. Redevelopment brought new corporate offices, high-end residences, and cultural amenities. Office and residential properties on the Riverfront are located closer to downtown Wilmington, while cultural attractions and auto-oriented retail are mostly located along the southern portion of the site. Some areas, particularly those south of the Christina River, are still home to industrial uses. Much of the Riverfront is cut off from the surrounding neighborhoods by physical barriers including Interstate 95, the Amtrak railroad Viaduct, and Martin Luther King Boulevard. Surrounding the Riverfront on three sides are downtown Wilmington and the East Side to the northeast, West Center City and Quaker Village to the north, Hedgeville and Browntown to the west, and Southbridge to the east.

\subsection*{Downtown}

Wilmington’s traditional downtown is centered on Rodney Square at King and 11th Streets. From here, office buildings radiate out to the west along 11th Street and to the north and south along King Street between the Christina River and the Brandywine Creek. This area of the city hosts most of Wilmington’s commercial offices and government buildings.

Lower Market Street serves as the historic retail corridor in downtown. This area in particular saw significant revitalization in recent years through streetscape improvements, restoration of blighted properties, adaptive reuse, and expanded cultural venues. Much of this revitalization is geared toward attracting a creative class of young professionals with a host of boutique stores, bars, and restaurants.\textsuperscript{13}

\subsection*{East Side}

To the east of Downtown Wilmington is the East Side. Some areas, including Compton Village, are composed predominantly of low-income urban renewal era housing developments. Other areas of the East Side are made up of more traditional style rowhomes. Most of the area is separated physically from downtown by walls, fences, and large blank building fronts along Walnut Street.

\subsection*{West of Downtown}

On the west side of downtown are the neighborhoods of West Center City, Quaker Hill, and Trinity Vicinity. This portion of Wilmington is made up of more traditional rowhouse development. While some blocks remain relatively strong, there a
many abandoned buildings and homes in poor condition. A strong unabated drug presence also seems to dominate certain areas, particularly close to Interstate 95.

**Browntown and Hedgeville**

Browntown and Hedgeville are located on the opposite side of Interstate 95 from the Riverfront. These neighborhoods developed as working class communities with residents of primarily polish decent. In the 1960s, Interstate 95 divided the neighborhoods from the Riverfront. In recent years, the neighborhood became more diverse a now hosts a large African-American and Hispanic community.¹⁴

**Southbridge**

Southbridge, to the east of the Riverfront, is physically separated from the rest of the city. The neighborhood is surrounded by impaired wetlands, under utilized industrial sites, and several brownfields. The areas housing stock is made up of mostly rowhomes and some larger multifamily housing projects. The neighborhood also experiences regular flooding due to its low lying location along the Christina River.¹⁵
This section explores the demographic and economic conditions that reflect the current quality of life for all residents in Wilmington. These state-of-equity indicators look at several key measures of equity across the city and use the most current data available. The indicators are not intended to reflect causation, but provide background context on several equity related conditions.

**Jobs Distribution**

One of the most visible aspects of Wilmington’s economy is the large number of banks and financial institutions in the city. The concentration of the finance and insurance sector in Wilmington is more than three and a half times that of the United States as a whole. The professional services, scientific, and technical, and the management of companies and enterprises sectors are also significantly overrepresented, at 1.7 times and 2 times the United States as a whole, respectively. These three sectors make up close to 40% of Wilmington’s jobs and appear to have major leverage in driving the development conversation in the city.16

**Skills Mismatch**

A clear skills mismatch also exists between the typical level of education required by Wilmington’s high job growth sectors and the educational attainment of those living in lower-income areas of the city. High growth sectors that added 1,000 or more jobs since 2000, like health care and social assistance and professional, scientific, and technical services mostly require postsecondary educations.17 Poor areas of the city, however, have a low share of workers with enough education to fill these roles. Only 14% of all low-income Wilmington residents in primarily low-income census tracts have a bachelor’s degree or higher.18 According the most recent Census estimates, 46% of working age adults in Wilmington had a high school diploma or less. The unemployment rate among this group was approximately 17%. In contrast, 28% of the city’s working-age adults had a bachelor’s degree and only 4% were unemployed.19

**Organizational Fragmentation**

Another issue concerning Wilmington’s state of equity is the fragmentation of organizations in the city. Many different groups are involved in the revitalization of Wilmington. These include organizations like the Downtown Visions business improvement district and the Wilmington Renaissance Corporation, along with a host of Neighborhood Planning Councils and approximately 50 separate civic and neighborhood organizations.20 It appears,

---

**FIGURE 3.06: Skills mismatch: educational attainment of population age 25+ in low-income tracts as compared to the educational requirements of Wilmington’s growing job sectors.**

---

SOURCE: BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS; COUNTY BUSINESS PATTERNS; AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY 2008-2012
however, that these groups lack a unified vision. Indeed, as Mayor Dennis Williams acknowledged, there is a need to “develop a more active and engaged community to help give power to change the state of our neighborhoods to the people who live in them.”

In January 2014, the Mayor’s office began a series of quarterly community cluster meetings that bring together city officials, Neighborhood Planning Councils, community groups, and civic associations in four separate geographic clusters “to address issues of public safety; community organizing and development; and provide information about how to navigate and receive City resources and services relative to neighborhood improvement.”

Race and Ethnicity

In terms of race and ethnicity, Wilmington is a majority minority city. 62% of the city’s nearly 71,300 residents are of a race other than white or of one or more races. Wilmington is also a city of sharp racial and ethnic divides. Wilmington’s non-hispanic black residents, which make up 54% of the City’s population, are located predominantly in the north, south, and east. Non-Hispanic white residents make up 30% of the City’s population and tend to live mainly in the northwest. The City’s Latino population, which makes up 13% of city residents, is centered in the west.

Since 2000, the total population of Wilmington declined 1.8%. The number of non-Hispanic white residents declined 8.5%, a loss of nearly 2,000 residents. Similarly, the number of non-Hispanic black residents declined 5%, a loss of roughly 2,100 residents. However, the number of Latino residents increased by over 2,600 people, a 39% increase.

Income Disparity

Median household income levels appear to follow a similar spatial pattern to race. Those census tracts with household incomes lower than $35,000 are concentrated on the East Side and in Hedgeville, Hilltop, West Center City, areas north of the Brandywine Creek, and South Wilmington. The census tracts with the highest median household incomes, those with median household incomes above $70,000, are the northwest neighborhoods of Highlands, Forty Acres, and Wawaset.

Measuring the gap between the two wealthiest census tracts in New Castle County and the two poorest census tracts in Wilmington provides a method to gauge the change in income disparities over time. The poorest census tracts in Wilmington saw a 6% increase in median household income between the years 2000 and 2012.
FIGURE 3.08: The Chase Center, an 87,000-square-foot exposition center, is an adaptive reuse of an existing warehouse structure. It was one of the Riverfront’s first major projects. The attached 187 room Westin Hotel was completed in 2014.

Despite this 6% inflation adjusted increase in income for the poorest areas, the absolute increase in median household income for these census tracts was only $1,000. The wealthiest tracts in New Castle County saw incomes decline by 7%, but a gap of approximately $148,000 remained between the richest and poorest census tracts. Wilmington as a whole saw a significant declines over the same period, with inflation-adjusted incomes declining 18% from $48,000 to $40,000.24

**Housing Costs**

Housing costs are one the largest components of household expenses. Generally, a high housing cost burden is defined as spending more than 30% of household income on housing.25 In Wilmington, there are clear issues concerning housing costs burdens. 54% of renters and 45% of homeowners city-wide have housing costs burdens. Moreover, the percentage of burdened low-income residents has increased over time. In the year 2000, 51% of renters in the city’s poorest areas (those with a median household income lower than 50% of area median income) had high housing costs burdens. These census tracts made up 38% of the city’s population. By 2012, those areas of very low-income residents grew to include 47% of Wilmington’s population. Within these areas, 57% of renters had a high housing cost burden.26

**Synthesis**

These indicators begin to examine the state of equity citywide in Wilmington. Four key factors stand out in the overall state of equity. First, community fragmentation and a lack of citywide coordination hinder comprehensive or actionable plans. Second, there is a mismatch between the educational attainment of low-income populations and the qualifications needed for high-growth job sectors. Third, sharp income and race disparities persist in Wilmington, as overall incomes have declined citywide and stagnated for the poorest areas. Fourth, declining housing affordability has permeated a significantly larger swath of Wilmington since the year 2000, as more neighborhoods host more low-income residents and rents become more unaffordable.
The redevelopment of Wilmington’s Riverfront is often viewed as the key strategy in Wilmington’s post-industrial rebound. This section examines the Riverfront in terms of the original vision, current development context, the goals and intentions of redevelopment, as well as implementation and costs. It also discusses several key indicators concerning the equity of outcomes from the redevelopment of the Riverfront.

Background

By the 1990s, Wilmington’s Riverfront was mostly abandoned. What was once a major port and shipbuilding center became a place of mostly vacant lots and abandoned industrial buildings. In 1992, Governor Michael Castle created a state-level taskforce to examine the possibility of revitalizing the Wilmington Riverfront. In 1994, the task force released its “Vision for the Rivers” plan. The plan focused mainly on creating a tourist-driven destination, which included a convention center, sports arena, marinas, entertainment venues, restaurants and hotels. In 1995, the State created the Riverfront Development Corporation (RDC) to plan, develop, manage, and promote recreational, residential, commercial, and industrial programs and projects on the Riverfront. This original revitalization plan sought to replicate the success of other waterfront redevelopment like Baltimore’s Inner Harbor, Fisherman’s Wharf in San Francisco, Navy Pier in Chicago, or the Tennessee Riverfront in Chattanooga. However, over time the strategy shifted away from a purely regional tourist and retail destination to developing high-end residential properties and corporate office space.

The Riverfront Today

Excluding the wildlife refuge to the south, the Riverfront encompasses more than 300 acres. Only about a third of this area has been fully redeveloped since the creation of the RDC. Development on the Riverfront can be divided into four categories: regional attractions, auto-oriented retail, corporate offices, and high-end housing. Regional attractions include a number of cultural and tourism-centered projects like the Delaware Center for the Contemporary Arts, the Delaware Theatre Company, the Delaware Children’s Museum, Frawley Stadium, a 14-screen cinema, a wildlife refuge and environmental education center, a 180-room Westin Hotel, and an 87,000 square foot exposition center. More than 760,000 people a year visit the Riverfront.

Auto-oriented development includes both a strip-style shopping center and several pad-site restaurants. The shopping center, now called the Shipyard Business Center, was originally known as the Shipyard Shops. The complex began as an outlet mall in the 1990s but proved unsuccessful. Today it remains partially vacant. There are also several pad-site restaurants on the Riverfront, including national and local chain establishments like Joe’s Crab Shack and Iron Hill Brewery.

Unlike some of the regional attractions and auto-oriented development, corporate offices and residential properties are located closer to downtown Wilmington. Banks like Barclay’s and Capital One along with other corporations like the American Automobile Association, have offices in the Riverfront. While some of these properties are purpose-built office buildings, others utilize retrofitted historic structures. In 2012, more than 4,250 people worked on the Riverfront.

Residential properties are located on both sides of the Christina River. This high-end housing includes over 750 townhomes, condos, and apartments. At 25 stories, Christina Landing is tallest of these residential properties. In 2012, over 1,250 people lived on the Riverfront.

FIGURE 3.09: The Residences at Justinson Landing is a mixed-use retail and residential building on the Riverfront. The building hosts some of the Riverfront’s more than 750 high-end apartments, condos, and townhomes.
**Implementation and Costs**

Ultimately, the Riverfront developed in a top-down fashion with the State of Delaware leading the planning and development of the area. Based on 2011 data, more than $346 million in public funds have been put towards the development of the Riverfront since 1996. State funded transportation and infrastructure improvements accounted for $148 million and were utilized for public parking, road construction, new walkways, bridge repair, and other projects. Business and economic development programs accounted for $132 million, with $99.5 million directed toward the RDC and $30 million toward the Delaware Economic Development Office and strategic funds. Expenditures by the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control totaled $18 million, with most funds going toward brownfield remediation efforts. In addition to these state funds, the City of Wilmington spent over $23.5 million dollars on the development of the Riverfront, including $7 million in economic development funds, and $12 million on the Christina Landing project. The economic recession saw total spending on the Riverfront decline precipitously from a high of over $50 million in 2005 to roughly $5 million in 2010.33

**Theory of Change**

The outcomes expected by the State of Delaware were not necessarily focused on equitable development. Instead, the intended focus was on improving the economy of the state and attracting new higher-income residents. The project utilized a number of interventions to meet the conditions that led to these outcomes. Interventions included historic preservation, brownfield remediation, wetland rehabilitation, the construction of new cultural attractions, state bond funding, and the leveraging of existing financial sector assets. These interventions brought about conditions that attracted visitors, improved perceptions of the Riverfront and Wilmington, and transitioned the area away from its industrial past. Ultimately, these conditions led to outcomes that would improve the state’s economy through high-income jobs and revitalize Wilmington to attract new residents.

**Indicators and Equity**

Several indicators clearly show that the strategy to redevelop the Riverfront has not had an equitable impact on nearby neighborhoods or in Wilmington as a whole. This can be seen
in changes in income, poverty, jobs, environmental degradation, civic participation, and tax revenue. Based on these indicators, it is apparent that the revitalization of the Riverfront has used predominantly regressive economic development tactics. The State of Delaware, in particular, spent considerable public funds on a project that benefits mostly corporations, wealthier individuals, and visitors, while adjacent neighborhoods continued to stagnate or decline.

**Median Income**

First, one can examine the change in median income and poverty levels in Wilmington census tracts located within a half-mile radius of the Riverfront. Between the year 2000 and the year 2012, these areas saw median incomes decline 22%. This was greater than the city as a whole, which saw a decline of 18%, and twice the decline seen in New Castle County. Over the same period, the number of those living in poverty grew more in areas near the Riverfront than in the city as a whole. Near the riverfront, poverty increased by 5% between the year 2000 and the year 2012 to encompass a third of all residents in these areas. The city saw poverty climb by 2% to 23% of the city’s population and New Castle County saw an increase of 3% to 8% of all County individuals living in poverty over the same period.34

**Employment**

Riverfront employment opportunities have not necessarily been equitable. Between 1997 and 2012, the Riverfront created more than 2,000 net new jobs in Delaware. Total jobs on the Riverfront grew from 1,250 in 1997 to a high of 4,500 in 2008, with employment declining after the recession. In total, all jobs on the Riverfront have an average annual wage of $68,600. That average wage is more than $20,000 higher than Wilmington’s overall household median income. If one looks only at net new jobs, the average wage grows to $107,000, $67,000 higher than the city’s overall household median income.35

In terms of overall jobs in the city, Wilmington saw a net loss of approximately 2,900 jobs between the year 2002 and the year 2011. 1,500 of these lost jobs were classified as low-income jobs (earnings of $1,250 or less per month). An even larger loss of approximately 5,500 jobs was seen in those jobs classified as moderate-income jobs (earnings of $1,251 to $3,333 a per month). Even with this loss of jobs, Wilmington added approximately 4,100 high-income jobs over the same period (earnings of $3,333 or more per month). Isolating these high-income jobs, it’s clear most of them were not going to Wilmington residents. More than 90% of new high-income jobs had an average annual wage of $68,000 in 2012, $20,000 higher than the overall median household income for Wilmington.

---

**FIGURE 3.11:** Corporate offices for Barclays and AAA Mid-Atlantic on the Riverfront. Riverfront jobs had an average annual wage of $68,000 in 2012, $20,000 higher than the overall median household income for Wilmington.
income jobs went to people living outside the city. In terms of high-income jobs overall, 27,000 of them were filled by people living outside the City and only 3,000 were held by Wilmington residents.36

Environmental Cleanup

One of the key interventions undertaken on the Riverfront, was the cleanup of brownfield sites. While most of the brownfields on the Riverfront have been remediated, many still remain in Wilmington. Approximately a quarter of the city's brownfield lands are remediated. Wilmington's remaining brownfield sites total 460 acres. Most of these remaining brownfields are located adjacent to lower income neighborhoods, with some unremediated sites being significantly larger than those around the Riverfront. In particular there are several larger sites adjacent to the Southbridge neighborhood, and on both sides of the Brandywine Creek. 37

Citizen Involvement

The Riverfront was a top-down, state-initiated project. The RDC, a relatively autonomous state-created authority, drives much of the development of the Riverfront. Many of the steps in the planning and implementation of the Riverfront development appear to have solicited limited public input or involvement with surrounding neighborhoods. This largely misses an opportunity to incorporate the interests of local residents.

Tax Revenue

Perhaps the greatest benefit brought by the redevelopment of the Riverfront is the increase in tax base and tax revenue. According to the most recent analysis, these revenues from private investment have not covered public expenditures on revitalizing the Riverfront. In total, inflation adjusted public revenues amounted to $230 million between 1997 and 2010. The state saw an average annual revenue of $14.5 million mostly from income tax and bank franchise tax receipts. The city saw an average of $4.5 million in annual revenue over the same period, mostly from wage tax, property tax, and head tax receipts. Since 1997, the Riverfront has seen more than $716 million in private investment.38

Progressive Efforts Near the Riverfront

In the neighborhoods around the Riverfront, there were several attempts to implement more progressive redevelopment initiatives over the past decade. Among these efforts are the Blueprint Communities program, the Southbridge HOPE Zone, and the Wilmington Residential Improvement and Stabilization Effort (RISE).

Blueprint Communities

Several neighborhoods in Wilmington, including the Eastside and Browntown, are designated Blueprint Communities. Blueprint Communities is a Federal Home Loan Bank (FHLB) of Pittsburgh revitalization initiative that is designed to improve neighborhood capacity and leadership, promote effective planning efforts, and coordinate investment. Teams made up of community leaders, member bankers, developers, and local officials receive leadership and planning training, grants for technical assistance, and priority access to FHLBank affordable housing and business development funding.39 The East Side neighborhood was selected as a Blueprint Community in 2008 and completed its Blueprint Community Strategic Plan in 2009. The plan focused on neighborhood beautification and branding, reducing crime, and improving the affordable housing stock.40 Browntown was selected as a Blueprint Community in 2011, but a completed plan is not publicly available. As of 2013, the East Side was still working to implement its plan. In November 2013, local leaders formed the East Side Collaborative as "the first step toward implementing East Side Blueprint Strategic Plan."41

Southbridge Hope Zone & South Wilmington Planning Network

In 2006, Mayor James Baker established the Wilmington Hope Commission to build programs and initiatives to revitalize undeserved areas in Wilmington. One of the core strategies
was the development of Hope Zones to “establish inter-agency collaboration, stimulate economic opportunities… and create human service programs as a means of ensuring and enhancing the well-being of every individual and household in the Zone.”42 In 2007, the Southbridge neighborhood became the City’s HOPE Zone pilot project. The project focused on improving collaboration with local community groups, non-profits, and institutions. The pilot program provided tutoring to at-risk youth, offered adult employment and training referrals, completed several beautification projects, and worked to improve community policing. Funding for the initiative came from a mix of private and public funds.43 The pilot program was to be expanded across Wilmington, but ultimately abandoned do to limited funding resources.44

In some respects, some of efforts of the Hope Commission were taken up in 2009 by the South Wilmington Planning Network (SWPN), a partnership between residents and over 30 government, non-profit and private agencies to address “environmental, workforce, and economic development; health care and preventative services; and youth development and programs.”45 A 2012 report by SWPN found that while progress was achieved on transportation improvements, parks enhancements, and expanded community policing, little to no movement was made on housing affordability, increased employment, and retail development.46

**Wilmington RISE Program**

The Wilmington Residential Improvement and Stabilization (RISE) program began in 2004 as cooperative effort between the city and the Wilmington Housing Partnership. RISE is designed to stop deterioration in “at-risk” neighborhoods through “leveraging private, state, and federal funds while encouraging private market reinvestment.”47 The defined “at risk” areas include Riverfront adjacent Browntown, Hedgeville, West Center City, and the East Side.48 From 2004 to 2009 the RISE program raised over $10 million and had 239 affordable units in production. One of larger RISE projects is the 40-unit Christina Overlook, which was built on a former industrial site in Browntown.49 Between 2009 and 2014, the program reduce its affordable housing goals by 29% because of poor market conditions. Today, the RISE program has shifted focus toward the East Side, working with several partners to implement the East Side Rising Plan. The goal of this initiative is to acquire 150 blighted properties, and create 75 new homeownership units. However, the City’s Annual Action Plan notes that limited funding resources is a significant obstacle to achieving these goals.50

**CONCLUSION**

There have been several successes on the Riverfront, but serious equity challenges remain. In terms of success, the state has done much to remediate and redevelop a once desolate and blighted area of on Wilmington. It has also increased the tax base available to the city and to the state. However, high-end development continues to be a priority on the Riverfront. This does not target the needs of low- and moderate-income residents. Ultimately, lower income communities in Wilmington are left out and the areas adjacent to the Riverfront continue to decline, even as several initiatives have attempt to create more equitable results. These neighborhoods continue to face fewer job opportunities, higher poverty, and a comparative lack of investment in their neighborhoods. The current strategy of redevelopment has clearly left many equity concerns unaddressed.
THEORY OF CHANGE

Revisiting the State of Equity

A new theory of change designed to achieve equitable outcomes was created for Wilmington and the Riverfront. This theory of change focuses on meeting certain conditions through strategic interventions that bring about equitable outcomes. It considers several factors evident in the previous analysis of the existing state of equity. These factors include:

- Community fragmentation in creating a comprehensive or actionable vision
- A mismatch between educational attainment of low-income populations and necessary job qualifications
- Sharp income and race disparities perpetuated through a relative lack of investment in Wilmington’s poorest neighborhoods
- Declines in incomes and housing affordability across Wilmington, particularly in the city’s poorest areas

The new theory of change for Wilmington considers these challenges and attempts to address them through the outcomes shared by all the cities in this report. The outcomes are economic security and opportunity, a stable and supportive quality of life, and inclusive and progressive community leadership. The outcomes were the same at both the citywide level and the site-specific level. Different sets of desired conditions and strategic interventions were derived for both the citywide level and the site-specific level.

Equitable Outcomes

Economic Security and Opportunity

Several mid-skill employment sectors are projected to grow in Wilmington over the next several years. However, many mid-skill careers are unavailable to Wilmington residents because of a mismatch between needed skills and workforce qualifications. Citywide, median incomes declined by nearly 18 percent between 2000 and 2012. Meeting several conditions could enhance economic security and opportunity within the city by improving the quality of Wilmington’s workforce to meet business needs. The relevant conditions to achieve this outcome are improving the skills base of Wilmington’s workforce and increasing the diversity of Wilmington’s economic base and available opportunities. The Riverfront in particular exemplifies the prevalence of the finance and insurance and professional services sectors within the city, with existing development catering to these industries. Moreover, wages on the Riverfront average $68,600. Surrounding lower-income neighborhoods, appear relatively excluded from the benefits of the Riverfront. Including underserved local small business and providing additional amenities that serve local populations could address economic security an opportunity at the site-specific level.

Stable and Supportive Quality of Life

Wilmington’s poorest neighborhoods face increasingly burdensome housing costs. As noted, 57% of renters in low-income areas have a high housing cost burden. While several existing programs endeavor to increase the supply of affordable housing, an overall decrease in funding from public and private actors along with a lack of focused efforts appears to have hindered these efforts. These communities also continue to be overlooked by revitalization efforts that favor prolonged investment in the Riverfront. This is particularly acute in terms of environmental justice issues like the prevalence of brownfields and natural hazards in low-income neighborhoods. Based on these circumstances, meeting the quality of life outcome requires conditions that increase the supply of quality affordable housing and work to improve environmental justice in underserved areas. Interventions to achieve this outcome focused on strategic place-based improvements, improved tax
incentives, and emphasis on more effective leveraging of existing programs.

At the site-specific level, the Riverfront remains separated from surrounding neighborhoods by several physical and psychological barriers. The benefits of its revitalization are largely self-contained and difficult to access. In addition, current residential options lack affordable choices. Selected interventions focus on integrating the Riverfront into surrounding neighborhoods and ensuring the availability of affordable housing options.

**Inclusive and Progressive Community Leadership**

Wilmington is host to many community groups, civic associations, and revitalization organizations. These organizations tend to work independently, reducing their overall impact. Furthermore, the city has focused primarily on small-area, high-income serving projects, like Lower Market Street or Christina Landing, rather than seeking to affect greater change in underserved neighborhoods. These challenges indicate a clear need to improve community engagement, coordination, and leadership. The conditions to meet this outcome focus on improving community leverage in guiding citywide priorities. They also seek to coordinate revitalization efforts to build a consistent and strategic vision across Wilmington. To meet these conditions, interventions look to institutionalize a coordinated community engagement process, increase overall citizen participation, and develop a unified strategic vision. When applied to the Riverfront, desired conditions include fostering cooperation between Riverfront stakeholders and surrounding neighborhood residents, incorporating community participation, and addressing local residents’ concerns in Riverfront plans.

**CITYWIDE INTERVENTIONS**

**Economic Security and Opportunity**

*Develop a Sector-Based Workforce Development Strategy and Explore Mid-Skill Industry Growth Potential*

A shortfall exists between the skills of Wilmington’s workforce and the qualifications necessary to access middle-skill jobs in the region. As noted, 46% of working age adults in Wilmington had a high school diploma or less. The unemployment rate among this group was approximately 17%. In contrast, 28% of the city’s working-age adults had a bachelor’s degree and only 4% were unemployed.54 Based on ONet data and Delaware Department of Labor forecasts,
FIGURE 3.16: One of many parking garages in downtown Wilmington. The city currently offers a 20-year tax abatement to parking garages, but does not incentivize mixed-use affordable housing projects.

there is projected growth of 500 jobs or more across several middle-skill occupations (those that require a high school diploma or some additional training) in New Castle County. These sectors include construction, office and administrative support, installation and maintenance, production and manufacturing, and healthcare support. The high unemployment rate among residents with limited education could be addressed by building a strong career pipeline to these occupations and other growing industries. Such sector-based workforce strategies focus on collectively addressing industry demands and have the potential to “close the skill and labor gaps…support retention and expansion of local industries, address poverty and unemployment challenges, increase community cooperation, and use public resources more effectively.” Sector-based strategies target specific industries or occupation clusters and work with employers to understand the specific needs of that sector. Workforce organizations then interact with employers to “create education, training, and other supports customized to the workplace that fit the needs of industry employers and workers to promote skill attainment and career advancement.”

Delaware’s Department of Labor and the Delaware Economic Development Office already manage a workforce development system that encompasses Wilmington, but it is mostly driven by employer needs and limited to providing job-training funds. Wilmington needs a more effective and intentional sector-based strategy, one that will jointly pursue workforce development and economic development that goes beyond job training. This program should have dedicated staff and resources to develop a comprehensive pipeline that leads workers to secure, householdsustaining employment while simultaneously connecting employers with quality job candidates. Job seekers would receive job-specific training over the course of several months, learn soft skills (like time management and budgeting), and receive assistance with supportive services (like child care or transportation). In parallel, the program would build partnerships with employers, reducing the uncertainty, costs, and risks employers face when trying to recruit quality employees. This strategy requires stakeholders to advance solutions based on data, research, and evaluation. A deep knowledge of industry practices, strong education and training programs, public funding, and policy actions are necessary to close the skills gap, increase job quality, and advance the inclusion of low-income populations in the workforce.

A partnership launched in 2014 between Delaware Technical Community College and the Delaware Manufacturing Association is piloting a sector-based strategy with its Accelerated Career Paths program. This program will allow high school juniors and seniors to take manufacturing classes, work in their field, and earn certification upon finishing high school. This manufacturing sector strategy will create much-needed middle-skill employment options, but workforce organizations should take a closer look at other industries in need of new middle-skill workers. These are the jobs that will help people facing high unemployment and offer living wages that sustain families and provide a chance at further career advancement.

Implement a First Source Local Hire Requirement

In 2012, Wilmington residents held less than 15% of jobs in the city. However, Wilmington’s local hiring initiatives are currently limited to the city’s Disadvantaged Business Enterprise Program, which affords business owned and operated by socially or economically disadvantaged residents direct access to city contracting and subcontracting opportunities. A local hiring initiative, like a first source requirement, could potentially reduce unemployment of city residents and help company’s fill positions with quality employees.

A first source requirement would mandate that businesses taking city contracts or receiving public financial assistance give first consideration to workers referred by local workforce agencies The referring program could be the sector-based pipeline described above or other local job training and placement programs. Affected companies must advertise available positions with local workforce agencies prior to advertising to the general public. They
are then required to interview and consider candidates referred by these programs. If a first source applicant is not hired, the company should provide justification to the city. In addition to benefiting workers, a first-source program acts as a public service for employers, focused on reducing the costs of finding, screening, training, and retaining quality workers for lower-skill positions.

**Stable and Supportive Quality of Life**

**Reform Tax Abatement System to Promote Affordable Housing**

Wilmington currently offers several property tax abatements for new construction and improvements in certain target areas and for certain types of development. These abatements could do more to serve an equity-driven strategy. The city currently offers a five-year abatement to any new construction or improvements for residential properties in defined “at-risk” or “deteriorating” areas. For improvements made to previously vacant properties, a 10-year 85% abatement for rental properties or a 100% abatement for owner-occupied properties is available on the value of the improvements. Commercial construction in urban renewal zones or projects that add more than 25 “blue collar” jobs are eligible for a tax abatement lasting up to 10 years.

The city only provides residential/commercial mixed-use property tax abatements to multi-family market-rate structures. These abatements range from 5 to 15 years. This abatement should be changed to require a set-aside for affordable units or incentivize affordable housing with increased abatements. Such standards could also be applied to the existing purely residential abatements considered above. Wilmington also has generous 20-year abatement on off-street parking structures. While the intent may have been to reduce the number of surface parking lots, in practice, it appears to incentivize the building of parking structures. This reduces the potential for commercial or residential uses while reducing property tax receipts for a long period of time. This abatement should be folded into the existing commercial and residential abatements. This would incentivize off-street structured parking in conjunction with commercial or residential development and likely increase overall tax receipts, which could be used to fund affordable housing programs.

**Promote Environmental Justice through Brownfield Remediation and the Mitigation of Natural Hazards**

One of the key elements of the redevelopment of the Riverfront was the mitigation of several brownfield sites and a large-scale wetlands...
FIGURE 3.18: A participatory budget meeting in New York City. Participatory budgeting can expand resident inclusion in decision-making and address community-level needs.

restoration project. However, the city still has 93 brownfield sites totalling 460 acres. Many of these sites are located in Wilmington’s underserved, low-income communities. Moreover, lower income neighborhoods, like Southbridge and portions of Brandywine Village, are subject to regular flooding. These issues illustrate that environmental injustices need to be addressed in Wilmington. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines environmental justice as “the fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation, and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies... [Ultimately, environmental justice] will be achieved when everyone enjoys the same degree of protection from environmental and health hazards and equal access to the decision-making process to have a healthy environment in which to live, learn, and work.”

Several nascent efforts in Wilmington are attempting to achieve greater environmental justice outcomes. In North Wilmington, Habitat for Humanity of New Castle County worked with state and local leaders to complete its Mill Stone Brownfield Revitalization initiative. The project, which includes 21 affordable housing units, was built on the site of a former textile manufacturing site, dry cleaner, and auto body shop. The project’s leaders worked closely with the Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control’s Brownfield Development Program to remediate the site. In the future, the city could partner with the state and private actors on similar projects.

In Southbridge, the city is in the process of developing a flood mitigation plan that will include a restored 22-acre wetland on a former industrial site. Low-income neighborhoods like flood-prone Southbridge are particularly vulnerable because residents have less political influence to secure infrastructure improvements and less ability to relocate. Health issues from combined sewer overflow backups during flooding are also a concern. The $8 million flood mitigation project should be completed through a combination of city, state, federal, and nonprofit funds. The wetland will be a cost-effective green infrastructure solution by temporarily holding and filtering storm water. New open space will also provide recreation opportunities for neighborhood residents. The project, which leverages a host of funding sources, provides a clear example of a green, multi-use solution to an environmental issue, which could serve as a model for other underserved communities in Wilmington.

Inclusive and Progressive Community Leadership
Pilot a Participatory Budgeting Program
The traditional municipal budgeting process tends to lack transparency, accountability, and social inclusion. Participatory budgeting is increasingly employed as a “democratic process through which community members can directly decide how to spend part of a public budget.” By piloting a participatory budgeting initiative, Wilmington could expand resident inclusion in the government decision-making process and implement spending programs that address critical community-level needs.

This process was first developed by the Brazilian city of Porto Alegre in 1989, and has since been used by more than 1,500 cities around the world, including New York City and Chicago. While the process can vary, typically residents brainstorm potential ideas, volunteer delegates develop proposals based on those ideas, and residents vote on proposals to select projects. The city then implements the selected projects. Participatory budgets typically use discretionary funds from the capital or operating budget, individual set asides, or non-governmental sources like foundations or community organizations. Participatory budget funds usually account for 1 to 15 percent of the total municipal budget.

Institutionalize Community Engagement in the Development Process
Though a small city, Wilmington has nearly 50 separate civic associations. In addition to these associations, the city also has several business associations, improvement organizations and eight neighborhood planning councils. While strong community involvement is laudable, efforts should be made to bring these
groups together to build unified priorities and increasing community leverage in the broader development conversation.

The city recently implemented a series of quarterly “community cluster” meetings that bring together neighborhood planning councils, community groups, and civic associations to address public safety, community development, and the allocation of city resources to neighborhood improvements. While this is still a promising initiative, institutionalizing these cluster meetings could help to reduce the current fragmentation among local community groups and organizations. Currently, all meetings are held at the isolated Emergency Operations Center in Southbridge. These meetings should be a permanent fixture in the city but could be held in each respective neighborhoods to increase the ability of local residents to attend.

In addition to these cluster meetings, there is a potential to use the city’s eight Neighborhood Planning Councils (NPCs) to greater effect. NPCs are intended to “make the city more responsive to the needs of the neighborhood and the people who live in them” and initiate “a community-wide planning process to address the physical, social, and economic needs of the community.”

Currently, these groups are limited in the scope of their project review to city-funded residential construction two weeks prior to the issuance of building permits. Moreover, an NPC’s ability to provide local project funding is contingent on discretionary capital appropriations from the city. With their ability to serve as a bridge between the city and the local community, the NPCs should serve as the lead organization in a community-led project review process. NPCs should host regular public meetings among community members, community organizations, and project developers to review all projects of a certain size or those requesting zoning relief or by-right projects of a certain size and scale. The recommendations from these meetings should guide City Planning Commission review and the Zoning Board of Adjustment decisions. Such initiatives are not unprecedented, with cities like New York first empowering its community boards in 1951 and creating the Uniform Land Use Review Process in 1975.

Develop a New Citywide Strategic Plan

Wilmington is required under Delaware law to have a comprehensive plan. Though Wilmington has a comprehensive plan in place, the city should pursue a more strategic planning process. The current plan follows traditional practices that focus on land use, municipal services, and capital improvements. While this type of planning provides an extensive overview of statistics, functions, and policies, it often fails to define a unique mission and a clear strategy to allocate limited human and capital resources.

By comparison, a strategic plan tries to answer four questions: where are we now, where do we want to be, how do we get there, and how do we measure our progress. Strategic planning often uses a participatory visioning process to define an image for the future and sets defined goals and measurable objectives to achieve that vision. These plans also include action plans with implementation strategies, a detailed work plan, and methods to measure performance and monitor progress. While strategic plans tend to not have the same long-term objectives and extensive scope as a traditional comprehensive plan, they do compel a municipality to examine their strengths, deficiencies, opportunities, and constraints to design a workable program under a defined vision.

SITE-SPECIFIC INTERVENTIONS

Economic Security and Opportunity

Implement an Inclusionary Business Strategy

Commercial development on the Riverfront is currently oriented toward single tenant office buildings. These developments do little to incorporate the area into the city or provide disadvantaged city residents with direct commercial space opportunities. Single-tenant office buildings are easier to finance and lease, especially since the downturn in the real estate market. Without lining up a prospective tenant to pre-lease a building, it can be financially difficult to build speculative office space in the current market.

FIGURE 3.19: An inclusionary business space program would set aside a portion of leasable commercial space for local small businesses, a co-working space, or a business incubator. Eligibility could use existing disadvantaged business guidelines.
Applying an inclusionary business space program to new office construction could help change this paradigm. Inclusionary business space programs have not yet been widely used but could be an effective way of providing space to neighborhood businesses and local entrepreneurs. This is particularly necessary on the Riverfront, which is dominated today by large financial and professional service firms. Similar to inclusionary zoning for housing, it would require a portion of leasable space to be set aside for small businesses, a business incubator, or a co-working space. These spaces would be partially subsidized by the rents of the larger, market-rate tenants. This could extract value from continued commercial investments made by the state and city to the benefit of city residents, not just large financial and professional service firms. Eligibility could be based on existing requirements used by other city programs to favor disadvantaged business.

**Study Local Serving Retail Opportunities**

Development at the Riverfront incorporates several retail strategies, with varying success. There are retail spaces on the first floor of new apartment buildings at Justison Landing, freestanding pad-site restaurants, a small marketplace primarily serving the lunchtime market, and an unsuccessful strip shopping center. As residential development continues on the Riverfront, greater attention to the retail environment and store mix will be crucial to meet the needs of both Riverfront residents and those living in adjacent neighborhoods. A new market study should be completed by the RDC for the entire Riverfront area to reassess changes in retail opportunities, particularly those that serve local residents. The Riverfront Development Corporation can use this market study to develop a new retail scheme that serves all residents in and adjacent to the Riverfront.

Moreover, reoriented neighborhood-serving retail has been successfully integrated into housing developments in many cities. A prime example is the On The Park Apartments in the Ballard neighborhood of Seattle. Here, a 45,000 square foot grocery store was incorporated into a larger affordable apartment complex as a food access solution. Other communities have worked with large national retailers to implement mixed-use projects on a smaller scale. In Davidson, North Carolina, for example, the town worked with CVS to develop an architecturally contextual and financially successful mixed-use project that included offices above the retail

FIGURE 3.20: This Wal-Mart Neighborhood Market in Chicago exemplifies a national retailer trend that incorporates smaller custom stores into mixed-use projects and in urban areas. The existing Riverfront retail strategy is “destination” focused, does not serve surrounding neighborhoods, and has failed to meet expectations. Pivoting to serving local retail needs could allow local residents easy access to daily goods. This local serving retail could also be combined with affordable and market rate housing in a single mixed use building.
In general, national retailers have started to move toward incorporating stores into mixed-use projects and rolled out smaller customized stores for the urban marketplace.

**Stable and Supportive Quality of Life**

*Focus Development in Locations Adjacent to Existing Neighborhoods*

Existing development on the Riverfront is scattered across the site and not well concentrated near existing neighborhoods. Rather than rebuilding densely, the rehabilitated historic structures and new construction are surrounded by parking lots for office workers. This supports the perception that the Riverfront is a separate entity from the surrounding neighborhoods. It also prevents the critical mass of density for affordable housing and reinforces the psychological effects of existing physical barriers like the Amtrak viaduct and the Interstate 95 bridge.

A modified approach to new development should encourage infill development, especially at key connections to adjacent neighborhoods, including Beech Street and Martin Luther King Boulevard. Currently, vacant and underutilized parcels line these streets. Prioritizing connections could create meaningful links between the Riverfront and residents in nearby neighborhoods. This concentration of development can reinforce other efforts to reduce the psychological barriers between the Riverfront and its neighbors. Affordable housing and inclusionary commercial incentives can be incorporated into this new development to further equity goals and enhance adjacent neighborhoods.

**Improve Access and Crossing Points**

The Amtrak railroad viaduct is a major barrier that separates the Riverfront from surrounding areas. The six to eight lane Martin Luther King Boulevard to the north and the Interstate 95 Bridge to the west both reinforce this barrier. Together these three barriers create an unpleasant and dangerous pedestrian experience when traveling between the Riverfront and surrounding neighborhoods. Those without cars cannot comfortably visit the Riverfront, further reinforcing the auto-oriented and separated nature of the site.

Other cities have successfully implemented physical improvements to underpasses and crossings, making them more welcoming to pedestrians and reestablishing strong physical connections. In 2008, a light art installation called “This Way” was constructed at the pedestrian entrance to the Brooklyn Bridge. The installation employed fiber optic arrays, blue LED lighting, and new signage to engage pedestrians. According to the artists, “the artwork simultaneously performs as place-making and way-finding.”

Similarly, the Race Street Connector in Philadelphia, using bold signage, a light screen, and improved sidewalks to link the Race Street Pier Park with the Old City neighborhood. The LightRails project in Birmingham, Alabama incorporated multi-colored LED lights to create a pedestrian-friendly experience under a large rail viaduct. This project was paid for through a community foundation grant, with future projects being funded by local businesses.

**Use Incentives and Bonuses to Promote the Development of Affordable Housing**

Affordable housing options are noticeably absent from new residential development on the Riverfront. Current One-bedroom apartment rents range from $1,180 to $2,300. According to Delaware State Housing Authority income thresholds, none of theses developments would qualify for Low Income Housing Tax Credits (LIHTC) for residents making even 80% of the area median income. For the Riverfront neighborhood to serve a greater spectrum of socioeconomic levels, an emphasis should be placed on including affordable housing options. As noted, FHLB Pittsburgh has designated portions of the Riverfront and the adjacent neighborhoods of Brownstown and East Side as Blueprint communities. Blueprint Communities are given special technical guidance on planning for revitalization efforts and priority access to the bank’s funding opportunities. The RDC, the city, or community organizations could leverage this access to funding to build new affordable housing on the connecting corridors between the Riverfront and these surrounding areas.
Construction of new affordable residential space is often dependent on the construction of high-end housing. Any mandatory requirement to provide affordable housing, such as inclusionary zoning, will likely reduce the financial feasibility of a project. In light of existing market conditions, an incentive-based system for affordable housing would be the most effective way to produce units when alternative funding sources are unavailable. Under a density bonus, developers would be able to exceed the zoning code’s maximum floor area ratio, height limit, or other standards if they provide a certain number of affordable units. Moreover, certain other incentives, such as expedited review and permitting, could further encourage the development of affordable units. However, these incentives must be carefully calibrated to provide an actual benefit to the private market or could otherwise go unused by market rate housing developers.

Inclusive and Progressive Community Leadership

Create a Citizen’s Advisory Committee

Much of the development on the Riverfront is the product of state-driven decisions and planning from the Vision for the Rivers plan in 1994 through the leadership of the state-created the RDC. The RDC has focused on attracting and guiding the development of corporate offices, high-end residential properties, and regional attractions. For the redevelopment of the Riverfront to develop from a more equitable standpoint, the RDC should explore creating an advisory committee composed of Riverfront residents and residents from adjacent neighborhoods.

Municipalities and institutions often use community advisory boards to improve communication, discuss mutual interests, and propose solutions to problems. The Trinity River Vision Authority, an agency tasked to implement a riverfront protection and development plan in Fort Worth, Texas, created a Citizens Advisory Committee provide “direction and feedback throughout the project timeline.” In San Francisco, the Office of Community Investment and Infrastructure, an agency responsible for the redevelopment of the city’s Mission Bay neighborhood, created a local Citizens Advisory Committee to provide consultation in the development process. In Seattle, Citizen Advisory Committees are a required part of the master plan process for major institutions (like hospitals and universities). These Committees advise both the institution and city concerning the “impact of the development proposed… [and] recommend changes to the plan or possible mitigation of impacts to maintain the health and livability of the surrounding communities.”

Utilize Participatory Techniques in Future Planning

In 2006, the Philadelphia firm of Wallace, Roberts, and Todd completed the South Walnut Street Urban Renewal Plan. This latest Riverfront plan included a larger vision for extending the scale and density of Downtown Wilmington to the southeast of the Christina River. The plan approaches the site in terms of urban design and large-scale private investment. There is no mention of community involvement or measures to incorporate existing residents in the development process. It has been almost a decade since the plan’s completion, and it appears that very little of the plan has actually been implemented.

A renewed planning effort for the Riverfront that includes participatory planning measures would help bring redevelopment projects in line with resident desires and needs. As defined by the World Bank, participatory planning is “a tool for identifying the needs of all individuals within a community, a way of building consensus, and a means of empowering disadvantaged or disenfranchised groups.” Moreover, the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development notes that “involving community members and organizations not only enhances understanding of and by the target population, it is fundamental to identifying the best way to meet the community’s needs.”

Participatory planning efforts can include a variety of processes, including community design charrettes, advisory committees, participatory mapping, brainstorming events, and scenario planning. A nearby example of participatory waterfront planning is the Bucks County Pennsylvania Waterfront Redevelopment Plan. This plan, which considers portions of the county that border...
the Delaware River, encouraged public participation through extensive outreach efforts. The public input process included public meetings, one-on-one stakeholder interviews, and a series of community representative steering committee meetings to provide guidance as the plan developed. These collaborative efforts with the community created a unified vision for the waterfront among a variety of separate jurisdictions. Prior to this process, each individual municipality approached waterfront development separately and without much direction on what would best benefit the region.\textsuperscript{108} By employing similar techniques, the Wilmington Riverfront may be able to build consensus around a plan that emphasizes community needs and desires.

\section*{Implementation}

While the above site-specific interventions and several of the citywide interventions could be deployed across the Riverfront, we devised a potential implementation strategy to illustrate one way these interventions could be applied. To improve access, interventions ranging from small-scale artistic lighting improvements to restored physical connections could be undertaken on the series of access routes. Priority access improvements would include the links between the key activity nodes of Lower Market Street, the Riverfront’s Justison Landing, and Maryland Avenue in Browntown.

However, creating greater integration between the Riverfront and the city will not be achieved simply through improved physical access. The belief that the Riverfront is a separate entity from the rest of the city needs to be addressed through a greater integration of the urban fabric. Immediately to the northwest of the rail viaduct and highway bridge is an approximately 23-acre area that consists of mostly parking lots, vacant land, and underutilized industrial space. Development of these parcels, along with the aforementioned access improvements, would reduce the isolation between existing nodes of activity on the Riverfront, Lower Market, and Browntown. This also has the potential to bring new investment into surrounding underserved neighborhoods.

This proposed strategy could be applied directly to Beech Street, an underutilized street connection between the Riverfront, Browntown, and Kosciusko Park in Hedgeville. Beech Street in Browntown is currently lined by vacant spaces, underutilized parking and industrial sites and the Wilmington offices of the
Delaware Transit Corporation (DART First State). The Riverfront portion of Beech Street includes the Penn Cinema Complex, a small office building, and former Delmarva Power manufactured gas plant, which completed environmental remediation in 2014.109 Opportunities exist here for mixed-use affordable housing, local serving businesses, inclusionary business space, brownfield remediation, and new greenspace.

Affordable housing projects could involve new construction or rehabilitation of existing structures. Development could come through a public-private partnership involving the RDC, the city, or private non-profits. Depending on the deal structure, financing could be covered by federal low-income housing tax credits, density bonuses and permitting incentives for developers, or funds from partner foundations. Affordable housing partnerships do have some recent precedent in the immediate area. The Wilmington Housing Partnership worked with the City of Wilmington and Castle Construction to develop Christina Overlook, a 40-unit project several blocks south of Beech Street.110 Moreover, the area’s status as a Blueprint Community gives the neighborhood preference for Federal Home Loan Bank affordable housing funds.

The Riverfront could also pivot away from its current regional retail and single-tenant office orientation to serve local needs. To date, Riverfront development has pursued a mostly destination retail strategy that does not serve the needs of surrounding neighborhoods and, in some cases, failed to meet original expectations. A new building along Beech Street could be constructed to house a large format, local serving retail space along with affordable and market rate housing in a single mixed use structure. Potential retail tenants could range from a smaller-scale drug store to a big box variety store. This could bring daily goods within easy access of local residents and add additional low-skill employment opportunities on the Riverfront. New development along Beech Street could also include entrepreneurial spaces that cater to disadvantaged businesses and provide disadvantaged city residents with direct commercial
space opportunities. An inclusionary business program could also provide space to neighborhood businesses and local entrepreneurs in a co-working and business incubator configuration.

This implementation proposal also incorporates several new active green spaces, green infrastructure components, and environmental remediation. New park spaces will create an amenity for existing and new residents in adjacent neighborhoods. Green infrastructure could be incorporated into these corridors, reducing flooding potential and the strain on Wilmington’s combined sewer system. Beech Street would be transformed into a green street that utilizes bioswales for stormwater management and creates a unified green link between the existing green spaces of Kosciuszko Park in Hedgeville and the Riverwalk along the Christina River. Beyond these interventions, several aspects of the implementation proposal would likely require some remediation of existing industrial sites, reducing the exposure to toxic materials and reducing the visual obtrusion of unsightly brownfield sites.

The strategies utilized on Beech Street could be applied to other connections between the Riverfront and the surrounding neighborhoods, particularly to the north of Martin Luther King Drive and west of Lower Market. Combined, these interventions could create a community that is more connected to the rest of the city. These efforts not should take place in a completely top-down process. Employing the participatory planning efforts would help bring community desires and needs into the redevelopment process, through collaborative design, asset mapping, and brainstorming.

**SYNTHESIS**

All of these interventions, both site-specific and citywide, aim to achieve conditions which fit into a larger strategy that addresses the four key inequity issues identified through the state of equity analysis. This proposed strategy would address equitable development concerns by engaging city residents, policy makers, and private actors in targeted efforts. Implementing specific interventions that meet equitable outcomes will increase citywide economic resiliency and the ability of city to respond to the needs and desires of all Wilmington residents.

However, there are challenges to the implementation of this strategy. The difficulty of attracting the necessary capital to continue the development of the Riverfront could prevent the creation an equitable development agenda. Potential hurdles also exist in working to change a political culture that currently does not prioritize community-driven equity outcomes or citywide visioning. Moreover, there is a universal difficulty in measuring whether equitable outcomes are achieved from both a qualitative and quantitative perspective. Success is clearly possible but these potential challenges should be kept in mind. Almost certainly the integration of equity into revitalization will create a more fair, connected and prosperous Wilmington that benefits all residents and stakeholders.
The City of Lancaster is located in the center of Lancaster County, roughly 60 miles west of Philadelphia. Though the County is primarily known as a regional agricultural center, the City has historically served as its urban core and seat, with a higher concentration of non-agricultural private and public sector employment. Like many legacy cities, Lancaster’s economic base was once a strong manufacturing sector that has undergone substantial decline in recent decades. The City has less than half the manufacturing establishments and a roughly a quarter of the manufacturing employment of its industrial peak. Despite this, Lancaster continues to serve as a regional job center. With 11% of the County’s population, the City is the location of 18% of primary jobs.

Lancaster has strong transportation connections to many major regional centers in the Northeast and Mid-Atlantic. The City’s train station is one of the busiest in the state. Two Amtrak lines connect Lancaster to Harrisburg and Pittsburgh in the west and Philadelphia and New York in the east. United States Route 222, a major avenue of Puerto Rican outmigration from the New York area, crosses through the city, contributing to Lancaster’s profound demographic shifts in recent years. Both Reading and Allentown also lie along this Route and have experienced similar population trends.

**HISTORY**

Lancaster shares in much of the broad historical narrative of legacy cities, including strong industry-driven growth throughout the first half of the 20th century, subsequent economic decline, and failed large-scale attempts at urban renewal. However, where Lancaster departs from this narrative provides crucial insights into its current status as a “rebounding city.”

In 1729, Lancaster County broke off from the larger Chester County. Shortly thereafter, the City of Lancaster was founded as a center of agricultural commerce. Farmers from across the County would come into the City’s Central Market to sell produce. Today, the Central Market continues to thrive as the country’s oldest continually operating farmers market, providing a tangible link to the City’s agricultural heritage.

While agriculture continued to be the backbone of the County’s economy, the City itself developed as an industrial center in the second half of the 19th century. Lancaster factories produced goods ranging from Conestoga wagons to watches to ceiling and floor tiles. As a result of its regional location, Lancaster and its surrounding communities also became hubs for processing food and agricultural products, notably tobacco and cigars.

By the 1950s, Lancaster had established itself as a successful industrial city in Southeast Pennsylvania, with local factories and laboratories for companies such as RCA and Hamilton Watch. The latter became involved in defense contracting after World War II and was later acquired by Bulova. From 1940-1960, Lancaster’s population remained above 60,000, peaking at just over 63,000 in the 1950s. During this period, Lancaster was deemed significant enough to warrant a stop on John F. Kennedy’s 1960 Presidential campaign tour.

After reaching their height in the 1950s, factories began slowly closing, weakening Lancaster’s industrial base. Dramatic demographic changes ensued as the White population began leaving the city, gradually replaced by Latino immigrants who came to work in the region’s agriculture and food processing sectors. This shift in demographics coincided with a decline in wealth for the...
However, this influx of Latino residents prevented sharp population decline, perhaps saving Lancaster from the downward spiral of depopulation and disinvestment familiar to other legacy cities.

Deindustrialization proved to be particularly devastating for the City’s African-American population, who, in addition to sharing in economic hardship, were subject to the dislocating forces of urban renewal. In the late 1950s, Lancaster initiated an aggressive residential blight-removal effort in the City’s southeastern neighborhoods, where a majority of its African-American population resided. Like many slum clearance efforts of the time, large-scale site clearance and forced relocation were central components of its initial phases. The community fragmentation wrought by this displacement can be seen today, as Lancaster’s African-American residents continue to lack cohesive civic representation to voice their interests in City decision-making.

In addition to residential projects, urban renewal was also pursued in the City’s deteriorating downtown. Most notably, Lancaster Square was a downtown shopping center designed by prominent mall architect Victor Gruen and constructed in the late 1960s. Intended to compete with the increasing availability of retail in the City’s suburbs, Lancaster Square failed within a few years of opening and has sat vacant ever since. The Bulova building, which is adjacent to this development, has also been vacant for a number of years, creating a pocket of blight within the City’s downtown.

While the economic distress that coincided with deindustrialization is clear, it arguably set the stage for much of the City’s creative placemaking strategy today. Armstrong World Industries, a national tile manufacturer that was, at one point, the city’s largest private employer, retained a significant in-house art department in offices in downtown Lancaster. In the 1980s, the company transitioned away from providing these services in-house, spinning them off into their own smaller enterprises. Advances in communication technology enabled these enterprises to remain in Lancaster while accessing client networks in Philadelphia, New York, and beyond. Other artisans who found themselves out of work formed local artist collectives, further solidifying the arts community as a fixture of downtown.

In the early 2000s, Armstrong’s financial viability became threatened by a protracted asbestos liability lawsuit. In 2006, the settlement from the lawsuit led the company to declare bankruptcy. The subsequent restructuring of the company resulted in even further layoffs, providing a definitive end to the industrial chapter of Lancaster’s history.

In fact, Lancaster has experienced consistent population growth since the 1980s, albeit at a slower rate than the County overall. Demographically, of course, the City has changed dramatically. In 1960, over 95% of Lancaster’s population was White. By 2010, Lancaster was a majority-minority community. Though non-Hispanic Whites continue to represent the plurality of residents (41.3%), substantial Hispanic/Latino (39.3%), African-American (16.4%), and Asian (3.0%) communities are now present and growing.

Of Lancaster’s sizable Hispanic/Latino population, 79% identify Puerto Rico as their place of origin or ancestry. Members of this community have begun to make inroads into the City’s political

FIGURE 4.03: Victor Gruen shopping mall, Lancaster Square

CONTEXT

The City was originally platted as a square grid, with major corridors extending one mile in each direction from Penn Square in the centrally located downtown. After a series of annexations that departed from the square grid pattern, Lancaster today is just over seven square miles, yet retains its largely walkable urban core.

As noted earlier, Latino in-migration prevented Lancaster from experiencing dramatic population loss during the White flight of the 1960s and 1970s. The most recent Decennial Census puts the City’s population at 59,322, roughly 93% of its peak in the 1950s. In fact, Lancaster has experienced consistent population growth since the 1980s, albeit at a slower rate than the County overall.

Demographically, of course, the City has changed dramatically. In 1960, over 95% of Lancaster’s population was White. By 2010, Lancaster was a majority-minority community. Though non-Hispanic Whites continue to represent the plurality of residents (41.3%), substantial Hispanic/Latino (39.3%), African-American (16.4%), and Asian (3.0%) communities are now present and growing.

Of Lancaster’s sizable Hispanic/Latino population, 79% identify Puerto Rico as their place of origin or ancestry. Members of this community have begun to make inroads into the City’s political
and cultural mainstream, gaining representation on the school board, city council, and in local media. However, representation within the business community has lagged, despite the strong presence of Latino entrepreneurs.

White flight also changed the political dynamic between Lancaster and its surrounding communities. As the highest concentration of poverty and people of color in an otherwise predominantly White and conservative county, the City of Lancaster faces significant race- and class-based tension with its neighbors. Many County residents highlight the City’s disproportionately high crime rate, which, though significantly higher than for the County overall, has seen marked improvements in recent years. Unsurprisingly, the City and County are often politically at odds with each other, compromising their ability to collaborate on policy and public projects.

Lancaster’s urban core is divided up informally into four neighborhood quadrants, with much of the City’s economic development efforts focused in the northwest and southeast. King Street divides the northern and southern halves of Lancaster and is considered a major socioeconomic boundary, with communities to its north being generally more stable and having a higher income than those communities to its south.

The neighborhoods in the northwest quadrant are Lancaster’s most affluent communities. Though primarily residential, the quadrant is also home to the City’s largest anchor institutions—Franklin & Marshall College and Lancaster General Hospital—both of which have a strong presence in the area. Notably, John Frye, the former University of Pennsylvania administrator credited with implementing much of the West Philadelphia Initiatives, served as president of Franklin & Marshall from 2002 to 2010. Frye translated many of the same strategies to Lancaster, most notably employer-assisted housing programs that incentivized staff and faculty homeownership in the vicinity of the University.

By contrast, the City’s southeast quadrant is largely impoverished. Home to a high concentration of the City’s Latino population, there is also a significant African-American presence. In recent years, there has been tension between the African-American and Latino communities, with long-term African-American residents feeling as though the growing Latino community is being favored for public investments. While the area is home to the Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology, a highly regarded two-year college, the school has limited ties to the surrounding community.
Like the other cities profiled in this report, Lancaster was analyzed against a set of equity indicators, with particular attention to the challenges facing low- and moderate-income (LMI) populations and communities of color. These indicators illustrate a city that is increasingly segmented between affluent, stable neighborhoods and high-poverty communities that face persistent barriers to human capital development. Though Lancaster was categorized as a “rebounding” city by “In Philadelphia’s Shadow”, the city actually ranks in the bottom half of the 13 cities studied on several indicators of residents’ social and economic condition.28

Income and Poverty

Roughly 40% of Lancaster households make less than $25,000 per year, with over half of all residents’ income falling below 200% of the federal poverty level.29 As Figure 4.05 demonstrates, the city’s high-poverty neighborhoods largely correspond with the predominantly Latino neighborhoods in the southeast. Indeed, the poverty level among the City’s Latino (38.9%) and African-American (38.6%) residents is nearly double that of their White counterparts (20.5%).30
Lancaster head just over one fifth of all households, they make up a significant majority of households living below the poverty line. This rate of single mother poverty is notably higher than that of the state or nation as a whole.31 The severity of this disparity is exacerbated by its apparent invisibility—none of the community stakeholders we interviewed were aware of any programs or initiatives targeted towards this economically vulnerable group.32

As in Wilmington, we compared the change in weighted average median household income of the two highest-earning tracts in all of Lancaster County and two lowest-earning census tracts in the City. Between 2000 and 2012, median income increased for the richest census tracts in Lancaster County, but declined for the poorest tracts, as well as for the City and County as a whole.33 Given these trends, the regional extent of poverty and the disparity between rich and poor appear to be increasing.

**Housing**

Many City residents face excessively burdensome housing costs. This is particularly true for renters, who constitute a majority of Lancaster’s households. Gross median rent exceeds 30% of monthly income for 58% of renter households. Homeowners also face a significant, if less dramatic, burden, with 32% of such households paying more than 30% of their income toward monthly owner costs. However, given that median gross rent in most neighborhoods does not exceed $700 and Lancaster’s median...
home value is only 54% of that of the County as a whole, these affordability challenges are likely the result of inadequate incomes rather than excessive expense.34

While affordability remains a major concern, the City has undertaken significant efforts in recent years to improve the quality of life of its renters. Until the 1980s, lax code enforcement had enabled major pockets of deteriorating housing quality in the City’s renter-dominated neighborhoods. Over the course of the next 20 years, the City slowly reformed its inspection practices to increase oversight of problem properties. In 2007, Lancaster instituted a new review, licensing, and registration process for rental properties. This new process placed every rental unit on a four-year review cycle and has resulted in substantial improvements to the City’s rental housing stock. However, as part of this housing quality campaign, the City has informally adopted a position of opposing conversion of single-family homes into multi-family units.35  While preventing overcrowding and preserving architectural heritage are laudable goals, this may have the unintended consequence of constraining housing supply and limiting access to smaller, more affordable units.

**Education and Workforce Development**

The poor quality of public schools in Lancaster presents a major barrier to LMI residents’ human capital development and economic mobility. The Lancaster School District covers the entire City and consistently ranks among the lowest performing districts in the state. A majority of the District’s students are Hispanic/Latino and over three quarters are considered economically distressed. While the graduation rate at the District’s single high school is an already low 69%, this actually masks significant disparities—the figure is only 64% for Hispanic/Latino students and 58% for English language learners.36  Perhaps unsurprisingly, residents of Lancaster’s predominantly Latino and Hispanic tracts are considerably less likely to have graduated from high school, and more likely to be unemployed than residents of predominantly White tracts.37

This educational disparity has translated into economic barriers for the City’s LMI community. The top half of Figure 4.08 shows the educational attainment of adult residing in high-poverty tracts as compared to the educational requirements of Lancaster’s growing job sectors.38  The bottom half of the diagram compares these levels of education with the skills requirements of local high-growth sectors. Notably, the types of employment that are increasingly available to Lancaster’s LMI workers are concentrated in the services and accommodations sectors, both of which are associated with low pay, lack of job security, and limited opportunities for advancement. Several high-growth sectors, namely health care & social assistance and educational services, require levels of post-secondary attainment that are currently out of reach for many LMI residents.39

---

**FIGURE 4.08: Skills mismatch: educational attainment of population age 25+ in low-income tracts as compared to the educational requirements of Lancaster’s growing job sectors.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment:</th>
<th>Less Than High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of Population:</td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph" /></td>
<td><img src="image" alt="Graph" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Growth Sectors:</td>
<td>Accomodation and Food Services</td>
<td>Accomodation and Food Services</td>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>Educational Services</td>
<td>Educational Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
<td>Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>Other Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= one percentage point of the age 25+ population

SOURCE: BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, COUNTY BUSINESS PATTERNS; AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY 2008-2012
Across the region, Lancaster’s arts-based revitalization is considered a model for creative placemaking efforts. However, the basis of this strategy was not initially a top-down effort, but rather an organic development by independent actors who found themselves connected to the City in various ways. By the time institutional actors recognized the potential of creative placemaking, the arts community had already become well established in the City’s downtown.

The strategy that was implemented, then, was less about creating an arts community than capitalizing on an opportunity to re-brand the City. While the impacts of this strategy have transformed the City’s downtown, solely analyzing creative placemaking efforts fails to provide a full picture of the important shifts in Lancaster’s economy. As a result, we extended the scope of our analysis to other interventions that are likely to be important contributors to Lancaster’s turnaround.

**Creative Placemaking**

As noted earlier, the decline of Armstrong World Industries and the closing of their in-house art & design department left Lancaster with a community of out-of-work artisans and creatively-inclined professionals. Forming arts collectives and independent firms out of economic necessity, this community developed as a natural foundation for the City’s arts-based revitalization efforts.40

Another early event that set the stage for arts-based revitalization was the relocation of the Pennsylvania College of Art & Design to a site in downtown Lancaster in 1987. Since then, the College has encouraged its students to be fully integrated residents of the city. The College has no dormitories, food service or art supply store. The College instead assists students in finding off-campus housing and encourages students to support local merchants for their everyday needs.41

During the mid-2000s, institutional stakeholders began to take notice of the burgeoning arts scene. The Lancaster County Community Foundation in particular saw an opportunity to capitalize on the arts as a placemaking strategy, funding the creation of a comprehensive marketing, branding, and event planning apparatus called Lancaster City Arts. This organization plans and advertises “First Friday” gallery walk events, which have been very successful at attracting visitors from outside the City.42

The City’s political leadership also stepped in to support the rebranding, creating a “Director of Public Arts” position within the local government.43

Soon, private developers started to capitalize on the momentum created by the growing arts community in Lancaster. This is exemplified by two major arts-linked historic restoration projects: the Fulton Theater, which was renovated in 1995, and the Lancaster Arts Hotel, which opened in 2006 in a former tobacco warehouse.44 Additionally, First Friday events have helped catalyze development around Gallery Row—the informal name for the downtown section of Prince Street that is home to a high concentration of art galleries.45 While much of downtown Lancaster’s commercial space had been vacant throughout the 1980s and 1990s, galleries, studios, and restaurants have since taken up many of these vacancies.46

The development of Gallery Row, renovation of Fulton Theater, creation of First Fridays and the marketing efforts surrounding all
of these events helped rebrand Lancaster as a place worth visiting. As the perception of Lancaster improved and the number of visitors increased, the arts became an important component of the City’s identity. Arts-related tourism, improved reputation, and the redevelopment of vacant, blighted buildings all contributed to the revitalization of the City’s downtown.  

Indeed, the impact of creative placemaking on downtown vacancies has been largely positive. There has been a substantial decline in residential vacancies in downtown census tracts between 2000 and 2012, suggesting that the arts community has made the area more attractive place to live. However, the impact on retail vacancies presents a more mixed picture. While the parts of downtown that have capitalized on the arts brand are approaching full occupancy, just a few blocks away is the massive vacant Lancaster Square site, which continues to be entangled in financial and legal issues that impede its redevelopment.  

From a social equity perspective, a revitalized downtown can contribute to an increased tax base and greater resources to put towards public needs. However, stakeholders we interviewed suggested that Lancaster has yet to reap these benefits. Current City revenue streams are insufficient to fully support even basic government services such as public safety and trash collection, leaving community and economic development efforts to be funded primarily through fees and intergovernmental grants. While property values have appreciated in certain parts of the City over the past few years, their value has been almost entirely offset by assessment appeals from owners of older, unimproved properties.  

In 2009, LancasterARTS commissioned F&M to conduct a study of the economic impact of creative placemaking in Lancaster. Using a combination of input-output modeling and telephone surveys, the study estimated that $36 million was spent locally at art-related events, indirectly supporting hundreds of jobs, largely in the food service and accommodations sector. However, these types of models are hard to verify, making it unclear how large the margin of error may be. As shown in Figure 4.10, our own analysis reveals a slight shift towards employment in arts and accommodations among downtown residents corresponding to the intervention period. However, this shift is offset by a significantly larger decline in manufacturing employment, resulting in a net loss.  

Looking at the overall employment picture in Lancaster, it becomes apparent that arts-related job growth has been relatively small. Figure 4.11 shows the net job growth by sector in the zip codes that make up Lancaster City. While some of the services and accommodations growth could reasonably be attributed to creative placemaking, the two sectors with the greatest job growth—health care and social services and education—are unlikely to be directly related to the arts.

---

**FIGURE 4.11: Job growth in Lancaster zip codes, 2000-2011.** Red highlighted bars indicate the healthcare and educational anchors to the left, as well as the arts and entertainment sector to the right believed to be associated with Lancaster’s creative placemaking strategy. **SOURCE: BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, COUNTY BUSINESS PATTERNS**
The extent to which Lancaster residents hold locally created jobs is an important indicator of equitable development. To begin with, relatively few Lancastrians both live and work within the City, and the share of both non-residents commuting in and workers commuting out has increased in recent years. Stakeholders we interviewed suggested that a large portion of the Latino community commutes to food processing and small manufacturing jobs elsewhere in the County. They indicated that these are typically low-paying jobs with little potential for advancement. Additionally, it is important to note that the overall number of jobs declined as commuting increased, suggesting that remaining local jobs are increasingly misaligned with the City’s workforce.

**Other Economic Development Efforts**

**Lancaster County Convention Center**

One of the most visible downtown developments has been the Lancaster County Convention Center, a County-backed $177.6 million project completed in 2009. The development consists of a large convention space and a 299-room Marriott hotel. In addition to hundreds of temporary construction jobs, the Convention Center’s development created 200-300 permanent jobs, largely in hospitality services. According to Lancaster Mayor Richard Gray, roughly 70% of these permanent jobs are intended to be held by Lancaster residents and include benefits such as health care and paid sick leave. However, we were unable to find documentation of this, suggesting any job quality or local hire agreement was informal at best. Further, the Convention Center has struggled to gain its financial footing as negotiations for refinancing its $63 million construction debt proceed.

**Anchor Institution Expansion**

The expansion of local anchor institutions—particularly Franklin & Marshall College and Lancaster General—is likely to have been the major driver of the City’s job growth over the past decade. While arts-based revitalization can play an important role in facilitating anchor expansion by providing a more attractive environment for staff and students, it is worthwhile to note that neither institution was directly involved with the development of the arts community.

In addition to being some of the largest private employers in the County, both Franklin & Marshall and Lancaster General have negotiated a Payment in Lieu of Taxes (PILOT) with the City of Lancaster. Each year, the College and Hospital contribute a total of $350,000 to the City’s coffers, helping to offset the costs of servicing these otherwise tax-exempt institutions.

After a handful of piecemeal facilities expansions over the past decade, Franklin & Marshall and Lancaster General plan to undertake a large-scale redevelopment of the former site of...
Armstrong World Industries’ manufacturing operations. This 47-acre site is located along the rail lines near the City’s northern border.66 Though nothing has been finalized as of the writing of this report, the City and the institutions are currently negotiating potential uses for the site, including athletics fields, a new nursing school, public space, and workforce housing. The Mayor has indicated that he intends to negotiate some sort of community benefits agreement to go along with the redevelopment, particularly if public support is involved.65

As noted previously, these anchor institutions are located in the northwest quadrant of the City and can feel disconnected from the LMI communities south of King St. However, in 2010, Lancaster General provided financial support for the expansion of SouthEast Lancaster Health Services, a community health clinic in one of the City’s highest-poverty neighborhoods.62 Additionally, Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology has also been planning an expansion of its southeast Lancaster campus.63 It remains to be seen whether this and other anchor-driven developments will be linked to economic benefits for the City’s LMI residents.

**Tec Centro**

Since the City of Lancaster has limited revenue generation tools, it relies heavily on the initiative of independent nonprofit and civic organizations for community development activities. One organization—the Spanish American Civic Association (SACA)—has been particularly active and effective at bringing together resources to serve the Latino community in the southeast.

In early 2014, SACA completed the construction of a bilingual technical college and learning center called Tec Centro, a project initiated in part because local technical schools failed to offer courses accessible to English language learners. In partnership with the Harrisburg Area Community College, Tec Centro targets programming towards high-growth occupations in the county, including healthcare, business office administration, and skilled trades. By providing introductory coursework with language support, Tec Centro intends to prepare its graduates for entry-level work or further training at local vocational schools.64 At full enrollment, Tec Centro will have the same size student body as PCAD,65 establishing it as a significant education intermediary within the community.

**City Revitalization and Improvement Zone (CRIZ)**

In late 2013, Lancaster became one of the first Pennsylvania cities to be awarded the chance to implement a new development incentive program called the City Revitalization and Improvement Zone (CRIZ). The CRIZ is a value capture tool that functions similarly to a TIF, though applies only to business-related tax increment instead of property taxes. Unlike many other tax incentive zones, the CRIZ is designed to be revenue neutral, meaning it will not detract from state or school district revenue streams collected from the sites to which it applies. However, the sites’ taxable value increment will be diverted to the CRIZ fund, likely to cover debt service on capital improvement bonds.66

Designed for cities defined as “third-class” under Pennsylvania law, CRIZs provide opportunities for cities with limited resources to finance large-scale development projects.67 However, if efforts are not made to ensure that site improvements serve the interests of LMI communities and that the jobs created through the development process are accessible to local residents, such financing tools can have a regressive impact on the overall distribution of public resources. Since the CRIZ is a new tool with no existing track record, it remains to be seen whether it can be used to pursue equitable development goals effectively.

While many of the sites included in Lancaster’s CRIZ application are clustered downtown—including areas around Lancaster Square, which is set to be redeveloped as an entertainment center—the City elected to include a commercial area in the southeast slated for redevelopment. This mixed-used development, planned and spearheaded by SACA, is intended to provide a commercial anchor for the surrounding neighborhood. Furthermore, as the site of a former landfill, CRIZ funds could help cover the costs of environmental remediation.68

**CONCLUSION**

In summary, we see strong evidence of the creative placemaking strategy’s contribution to the revitalization of downtown and the improvement of Lancaster’s standing in the region. However, its impact on LMI communities has been limited. Few jobs have been produced directly by the arts, and the jobs produced indirectly are largely in the low-wage accommodations and services industry. As a result, we feel that Lancaster’s current creative placemaking efforts have made a minimal contribution to equitable development, though they may play an important role in strengthening the City’s core and attracting private investment to help the City grow in the long term.

On the other hand, the economic development potential of expanding anchor institutions is substantial, and many of the jobs created in the process have a higher potential to pay a living wage. The key equity challenge will be aligning these high-quality jobs and potential public benefits with LMI residents, who currently face major social and educational barriers to connecting with them. Fortunately, there are strong existing and emerging precedents for connecting Lancaster’s anchor institutions with equitable development objectives.
CENTRAL MARKET
THEORY OF CHANGE

Revisiting the State of Equity

Within the three overarching equity outcomes applied to each City, Lancaster's Theory of Change is guided by the challenges and opportunities identified in the State of Equity analysis, specifically:

1. Growing housing cost burdens driven by inadequate income levels
2. Deep disparities in educational and human capital development opportunities
3. Increasing occupational bifurcation that leaves only low-skill, low-wage employment accessible to the city’s LMI population.

Despite these challenges, Lancaster has a number of assets on which it can build a citywide equitable development strategy. The city has a strong anchor institution presence, which, in addition to providing high-wage employment, has had a stabilizing effect on the local economy. Furthermore, both Lancaster General Hospital and Franklin & Marshall College have demonstrated community orientation through efforts such as employer-assisted housing and community health services. Lancaster’s Latino LMI community has a strong civic intermediary, SACA, which appears to possess both the ambition and organizational capacity to initiate transformative equitable development projects. Local funders – from foundations to CDFIs – actively and often collaboratively respond to community needs. Finally, progressive political leadership provides opportunities for equity-oriented policy interventions.

Equitable Outcomes

Three equitable outcomes emerged from our understanding of the challenges identified in the State of Equity analysis as well as Lancaster’s existing assets. These outcomes are:

- Economic Security & Opportunity
- Stable & Supportive Quality of Life
- Inclusive & Progressive Community Leadership

Each outcome is linked to conditions that will enable the equitable outcome. In this section, we explain each equitable outcome and its conditions as they relate to Lancaster.

Economic Security & Opportunity

The core strategies for fostering economic equity were built to acknowledge the occupational realities and structures of Lancaster’s core and growing sectors. While there is emphasis placed on moving LMI residents into more stable career paths with greater opportunities for advancement, this is balanced by recognition of the need to improve the quality of the existing abundance of low-wage work.

The first two conditions, as well as the interventions designed to produce them, are intended to improve the quality of low-wage work and increase access to higher-quality employment.

The third condition addresses non-wage opportunities to foster economic security. For LMI community members, many of whom work for small food processing and light industrial firms in the County, profit sharing mechanisms such as cooperatives and employer-stock ownership plans (ESOPs) enhance otherwise limited earnings.

Stable & Supportive Quality of Life

The two core quality of life issues identified by our analysis were increasingly burdensome housing costs and lack of supportive services for single mothers. As noted earlier, housing affordability issues appear to be driven by inadequate incomes, rather than price or supply pressures. Accordingly, the housing interventions are geared towards providing income supports and transitioning
stably employed households into affordable homeownership, with an eye towards expanding supply as Lancaster’s economy grows.

Our interactions with stakeholders suggested limited knowledge of the range of human service needs. We propose to address this by integrating community input into the development of service priorities and increasing the physical accessibility of service locations.

**Progressive & Inclusive Community Leadership**

Though Lancaster has a progressive political culture and a history of neighborhood engagement efforts, there are relatively few formal opportunities for incorporating community input into the development process. As a result, Lancaster’s recent economic revival has produced few direct benefits for its LMI communities. By targeting public subsidy towards projects with an equity component and increasing community agency in the planning process, the City can institutionalize the consideration of a broader community needs as its economy grows.

CITYWIDE INTERVENTIONS

At the city level, the Theory of Change analysis provides an opportunity to develop a strategic framework for fostering equity-oriented economic development practices. Future efforts in this space can be evaluated against their ability to contribute to the identified conditions, and in turn, the desired outcomes. Many of the interventions outlined in this section are broadly applicable policy tools that serve to align traditional economic development practices with equity goals.

**Economic Security & Opportunity**

Many of the interventions outlined in this section emphasize regulatory and administrative tools designed to leverage existing public investments in economic development efforts to create high-quality employment opportunities for local residents.

**Targeted Living Wage Ordinance**

Living wage ordinances set a local wage floor for employment generated through public contracts or subsidy. This regulatory
tool is designed to ensure that the expenditure of public dollars supports the creation of high quality jobs that provide workers with a pathway to economic security.69 A 2005 study of living wage ordinances in Boston, New Haven, and Hartford found that the enactment of living wage ordinances did not have a consistent impact on the number of bids for each contract or their average cost.70

Since the City of Lancaster is actively involved in many local development projects, such an ordinance would ensure that LMI residents have the opportunity to share in the benefits of this economic activity. As of the writing of this report, the estimated living wage for a household in Lancaster County that includes one adult and one child is $17.34/hour, assuming the adult is the sole provider for the household and works full time. For a single adult, the estimate is $8.11/hour. Both exceed the current state minimum wage of $7.25/hour.71

Local Contracting Preferences
Local contracting preferences are designed to give local vendors (or vendors who can demonstrate substantial local employment) preference in the procurement of public services or goods. Most municipalities already have procedures in place for scoring and selecting bids for public contracts based on price and service quality. Typically, local preference requirements are structured to give local firms a percentage advantage in overall bid cost. For example, if a local firm's bid was within a certain percentage—typically ranging from 5-10%—of a comparable bid from an outside vendor, the contract would be awarded to the local firm.72 From the municipality's perspective, increased local revenue generation and economic activity counterbalance this cost discrepancy.

Local CDFIs, such as the Community First Fund in Lancaster, can play a key role in enabling local firms to compete for public contracts by providing working capital in anticipation of contract payments. This assistance would be critical for smaller firms that may otherwise have difficulty covering up-front labor and material costs.

Job Training & Placement Assistance
Moving Lancaster's LMI residents into high-quality career pipelines will require close coordination of local workforce intermediaries and employers. There are strong precedents for such partnerships, which help to increase the representation of women and people of color in skilled fields. The Wisconsin Regional Training Partnership (WRTP) is a collaborative effort of community service providers, labor unions, and regional employers that is widely considered a model for these partnerships. WRTP provides individualized programs of tutoring and apprenticeship preparation for both job seekers and incumbent workers to address barriers to employment. From there, the WRTP provides counseling and job search assistance as well as additional certification programs in response to employer need.73

Local and regional intermediaries such as Tec Centro, Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology, and the Lancaster County Workforce Investment Board could replicate and adapt the WRTP model in partnership with employers in the growing healthcare, transportation, and construction fields.

Support for ESOP/Cooperative Conversion
Stakeholders we interviewed suggested that a large portion of the City's Latino LMI residents commute to low-wage jobs at small food processing and manufacturing firms in the County. The firms were described as largely family-owned with limited internal career ladders.74 From an economic competitiveness perspective, it is unlikely to be feasible for these firms to raise wages for entry-level employees. However, from a wealth-building perspective, there is a potential to increase the economic security and stability of such employment through business succession planning. In particular, providing technical assistance for retiring owners who convert their business to Employee Stock Ownership Plans (ESOP) or worker-owned cooperatives creates an alternative to business closure or sale that yields better outcomes for local workers. Academic studies have found a number of community benefits to increased

FIGURE 4.16: Farmers with Hillside Farmers Co-op in Minnesota, where an increasing number of Latino immigrants are becoming farm owners
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worker participation in business management, including higher productivity and improved job retention. At the federal level, owners who pursue ESOP conversions already receive favorable tax treatment.

Implementing this intervention would likely require county-level efforts to encompass the geographic range of these businesses. Though the City and County have often been politically at odds, the potential for local job retention demonstrates a shared benefit that provides a compelling economic rationale for both parties.

**Stable & Supportive Quality of Life**

Interventions in this section are aimed towards improving the ability of LMI individuals and families to access critical services and build household stability.

**Shared-Appreciation Mortgages**

Shared-appreciation mortgages are an emerging tool to support low-income homebuyers who, despite qualifying for a mortgage, may not be able to afford a decent-condition home in their community. A shared appreciation mortgage is a zero-interest second mortgage with no monthly payments. It is sized to cover the gap between the mortgage amount for which the homebuyer qualifies and the price of the home they wish to purchase. Principal plus a share of appreciation—proportional to the share of the overall home price covered by the shared appreciation mortgage—is due either at the point of resale or loan maturity. At this point, the homeowner can tap into the home’s equity to finance the repayment.

For example, if a well-maintained home in southeast Lancaster were listed at $125,000 and a prospective homebuyer were able to qualify for a $85,000 loan (with a $15,000 down payment), that homebuyer could opt to take out a shared-appreciation mortgage of $25,000 to complete the purchase. At resale or loan maturity, the provider of the shared-appreciation mortgage would be entitled to the $25,000 plus one-fifth of any home value appreciation.

The City of Oakland, California operates a shared-appreciation mortgage program through their Department of Housing & Community Development. Eligible applicants must be first-time homebuyers making 80% or less of the Area Median Income. The maximum value of the loan is set at the lower of 30% of purchase value or $75,000. Principal repayment is due after 30 years or at the point of resale, at which the City is entitled to a percentage of appreciation equal to the share of the purchase price financed by the City loan. The City of Lancaster could establish a similar program using a combination of CDBG funds and local philanthropic support.

**Community Services Task Force**

To address the complex and interrelated service needs of Lancaster’s LMI community, the City should convene a stakeholder task force that includes County human services officials, local funders, leaders of community organizations, and LMI community members. This task force would be charged with identifying gaps in existing services, setting community priorities, evaluating progress, and refining approaches as necessary. Such arrangements between professional service providers and communities are said to result in
the “co-production” of services, an increasingly popular strategy in which the technical expertise of professionals is blended with local knowledge to enhance the quality and appropriateness of service options.79

Models for community-professional coproduction can be found at varying levels of formality, from faith-based service providers that work in concert with their congregations to public housing tenant organizations that plan and facilitate on-site services and activities. The integration of community input into the planning of services increases the agency of LMI individuals, fosters a sense of shared responsibility for community outcomes, and mobilizes community resources in ways that could not be achieved through the application of technical expertise alone.80

**Co-located Services at Schools**

Finding time to access social services outside of daily routines can be a major challenge for low-income parents, particularly those with limited access to personal transportation. Research has found these barriers to be acutely burdensome for single mothers81 and Latino families.82 As noted previously, Lancaster has a disproportionally high representation of both groups, making access to community services a key quality-of-life priority.

The School District of Lancaster is fortunate to have a partnership with Lancaster General Health System though which they have established a number of on-site clinics at schools in the southeast and southwest neighborhoods. To build on this precedent, the School District could partner with a local human services agency to replicate the PATH, Inc. school-based services model that exists in a number of Philadelphia public schools. In this model, each school is provided with a Resource Specialist who works with vulnerable youth and their families to identify needed supports and facilitate enrollment in programs and services, providing families with case management services that might otherwise be difficult to access.83

**Progressive & Inclusive Community Leadership**

While Lancaster’s political leadership has actively supported community engagement efforts in the past, there is currently a dearth of opportunities for community members to engage with major development decisions occurring across the City. The interventions in this section are designed to provide space for community members and organizations to identify and propose strategies that ensure the economic benefits of growth are shared among all Lancaster residents.

**Standardize Public Meeting Best Practices**

The first step towards empowering community members as active participants in the development process is to ensure that formalized public engagement sessions are as accessible, informative, and participatory as possible.

Accessibility requires addressing physical, cultural, and linguistic barriers. Public meetings should be held in locations that are central to the target community and can accommodate individuals with disabilities. In many of the City’s neighborhoods, translation services may need to be provided for members of Lancaster’s growing Latin American and Southeast Asian immigrant communities. Additionally, because communication customs can vary across different cultures, it may be wise to consult with representatives of different groups before structuring meeting activities.

In order to be meaningfully informative, public meetings must provide community members with project backgrounds that are both comprehensive and comprehensible. It is critical to communicate who is involved with the project, what proposed uses are being considered, and the nature and amount of public support that may be provided. Meetings must also be scheduled early enough in the development process for community members to be able to act on the information they receive.

Finally, participatory public meetings must give communities a genuine opportunity to provide input on proposals. This includes the ability to identify widely held concerns and bring forward ideas for how to address them.
**LMI Representation on Boards & Committees**

While providing information and gathering community input is an important precondition to inclusive leadership, LMI communities must be able to share in decision-making and advisory power in order to reach the next rung on Arnstein’s ladder of participation. One way this can be achieved is by increasing the representation of LMI community leaders on boards and committees that provide advice and approval for economic development efforts.

However, studies of community representation on planning boards in the United States and Canada suggest that representation alone does not necessarily result in empowerment. To ensure that LMI community members’ views are not marginalized or co-opted to mask the continued centralization of power, boards should be consensus-oriented, organized around clear, mutually agreed-upon goals, and retain a high degree of autonomy from the broader government.

**Community Benefits Standards for Projects Receiving Public Subsidy**

To ensure that the expenditure of public resources results in proportional public benefit, all projects receiving public subsidy should be required to meet a set of community benefit performance standards. In addition to the living wage requirements outlined above, these standards can include increased access to public amenities, commitments to local contracting and purchasing, investments in job training programs, or other criteria that may be suitable for a given project.

To avoid creating onerous administrative or financial burdens that deter development, these requirements should be as standardized as possible and align with private sector needs – for example, by improving supplier relationships or increasing access to human capital. Additionally, the City, business organizations, and local funders should identify ways to collaborate to simplify compliance, such as maintaining a database of local contractors or identifying appropriate training programs.

**ANCHOR INTERVENTIONS**

**An Anchor-Based Approach to Equitable Development**

As noted earlier, Lancaster’s anchor institutions are critical to the City’s economic resilience and have been major drivers of local job growth. In the same way that some post-industrial cities have site-specific opportunities to engage private investment, the presence of anchors presents a similar opportunity for public-private partnerships. As the anchors grow to adapt to changing economic circumstances, the strategies outlined here could ensure that that growth benefits the city’s LMI community.

The equitable development strategy outlined in this section adapts the citywide framework to the economic opportunities associated with anchor institution presence. While many anchors are naturally more community-inclined than other potential development partners, they are still private entities that seek to advance their own institutional interests. In order to be sustainable, strategies for incorporating equity into their practices must acknowledge and support these interests, identifying opportunities for shared benefit between these institutions, the City, and LMI communities. Though all three benefit from Lancaster’s ability to grow and thrive, interventions under this strategy are designed to foster one or more of the following benefits for each party:

- **Anchors:**
  - Expanded customer base
  - Increased access to human capital
  - Improved quality of services
  - Stronger relationships with contractors and suppliers

- **Municipalities:**
  - Increased tax base
  - Stable local economy
  - More attractive business environment
  - Improved regional perception

- **Communities:**
  - Increased employment opportunity
  - Expanded access to capital
  - Increased access to services
  - Opportunities for inclusion in decision-making
Economic Security & Opportunity

The interventions in this section match anchor institutions’ needs for a skilled workforce and flexible suppliers with the LMI community’s need for employment and business development opportunities.

Local Hire Benchmarks

Our analysis of commuting patterns suggests that the vast majority of new jobs in Lancaster – many of which were created by anchor investment and expansion – are held by individuals who live outside the City. Given the City’s relatively high rate of unemployment, particularly in communities of color, this represents a missed opportunity for generating substantial community benefit and increasing their local economic multiplier.

Targeting future hiring efforts toward local residents can benefit anchors as well as the City’s LMI population. When the Institute for Competitive Inner Cities interviewed the top 100 fastest-growing inner city businesses, a number of firms that engage in local hiring practices noted lower employee turnover rates and higher workplace engagement. This was particularly true for those that provided continued professional development opportunities. In addition to these benefits, the public goodwill generated by local hiring practices can be valuable as anchors seek to expand their physical presence within Lancaster.

High School Bridge Programs

Workforce training and development is a critical component of any successful local hiring effort. While Tec Centro can play an important role in adult education, the exceptionally high dropout rate among Lancaster’s high school students suggests that earlier intervention may be required. Given that many anchor institutions have educational and professional development services built in to their core organizational activities, they can play a natural role in supporting these efforts and growing their own local talent base.

Bridge programs typically involve dual enrollment agreements between high schools and local community colleges or vocational schools, allowing students to take courses at the latter while remaining enrolled in the former. In addition to providing engaging, applied coursework, these programs give students a head start on attaining post-secondary credentials. The School District of Lancaster already offers dual enrollment options to some of its high school students and has identified expanding these as a component of their most recent five-year strategic plan. By coordinating these efforts with local anchors, the School District can create pipelines into existing jobs and increase the affordability of post-secondary coursework.

Local Procurement Preferences

The purchasing power of large anchor institutions – such as hospitals and universities – is immense, with each spending hundred of billions of dollars on goods and services nationally each year. While Lancaster’s anchors are of a somewhat smaller scale than those of larger cities, they still represent a key local service and product procurement base. Directing even a portion of that spending locally can have a transformative effect on a community’s economy, particularly in post-industrial cities that have struggled to attract investment and build new competitive niches. For anchors, the development of a strong pool of local suppliers and contractors can lead to more competitive service options and increased flexibility.

Successful local procurement strategies must be multifaceted efforts that address a range of initial barriers, including the administrative decentralization of purchasing, lack of relationships with smaller local vendors, and limited capacity of many small businesses. However, the
track records of such efforts at institutions like University Hospitals of Cleveland,91 the University of Pennsylvania,92 and Columbia University93 demonstrate that these barriers can be overcome to the benefit of both anchors and communities.

**Expand Working Capital for Small Businesses**

Anchors can help build the capacity of potential local suppliers by expanding the supply of working capital for small businesses. Both hospitals and institutions of higher education have sizable investment portfolios, including endowments and other long-term funds. Pooling a small portion of these investments into a low-rate revolving loan fund for local businesses can help potential vendors scale their products and services to meet anchor demand.94

By partnering with local CDFIs or other prominent small-business lenders, anchors can take advantage of existing expertise in managing small business investments and minimize the risk to their investments. In 1999, Harvard University provided $20 million in low interest lending capital to Boston-area CDFIs, enabling them to expand their local business and real estate development activities.95

**Small Business TA Center**

Navigating the anchor procurement process can be a complex task for small business owners. To meet their goal of directing 10% of all base contracts to women- and minority-owned businesses, the University of Minnesota established the Office for Business and Community Economic Development as a part of its broader campus diversity and social inclusion plan. In addition to working with departments across the University to direct purchasing towards local businesses, the Office provides training and technical assistance to vendors to build capacity and facilitate transactions with the University.96

**Stable & Supportive Quality of Life**

While there is only one specific intervention recommended under this outcome, others -- such as anchor investment in the development of community amenities and affordable housing options -- may become more feasible or necessary as Lancaster’s economy grows and its institutional relationships strengthen.

**University-Assisted Community Schools**

The University-Assisted Community School (UACS) model was pioneered by the Netter Center for Community Partnerships at the University of Pennsylvania in the early 1990s. The core premise of the model is the mobilization of university resources toward the goal of transforming traditional public schools into multifaceted community schools that serve as neighborhood centers. This is achieved through a series of university-school partnerships.

*FIGURE 4.21: High school students being given tutorials on computer science as part of a program offered by the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory in partnership with local high schools. Located in Berkeley, CA, this program is a good example of a strong anchor-based community outreach effort.*
including service-learning coursework, student extracurricular organizations, and knowledge-sharing efforts.97

These partnerships provide schools with key services such as after-school enrichment activities, academic support, and community programming. In return, colleges and universities receive opportunities to advance their research, enhance their curriculum, and develop their students’ civic leadership capacities.98 Lancaster’s diverse yet underperforming public schools could both benefit from and contribute to such a partnership. With its current service-learning course offerings, it is clear that Franklin & Marshall already recognizes the value of Lancaster’s urban setting for the education of its students.

Progressive & Inclusive Community Leadership

As anchors expand their role in Lancaster, the need arises for new spaces for communities to engage in decision-making. The strategies under this outcome identify areas where anchors can integrate public participation or support the understanding and communication of community needs.

Community-Based Participatory Research

Community-based participatory research (CBPR) is form of applied social research that is based on a collaborative and equitable relationship with the communities it engages. CBPR topics typically reflect issues of importance within a marginalized community. The research process takes an empowerment-oriented approach toward mobilizing stakeholders to address the given issue. While CBPR can be an effective tool for uncovering disparities and challenges, it is also a powerful means of identifying and strengthening community resources that can be leveraged to address those challenges.99

A number of Universities, including Stanford University, the University of Pittsburgh, and the University of Michigan, offer CBPR fellowships for undergraduate students. Many of these programs integrate training in the methods and ethics of CBPR with placements at community organizations in the region, ensuring that students’ work products are relevant and supportive of existing community efforts.100 Franklin & Marshall has offered a number of courses involving community-based research and also sponsors student placements at local nonprofits through the Ware Institute for Civic Engagement, but they do not have a comparable formal CBPR program.

Community Advisory Boards

Community advisory boards come in a wide range of sizes and structures depending on the nature of the activities they are intended to guide. Generally, such advisory boards should be established whenever an institution is engaging with communities that are socially, economically, or politically marginalized or otherwise not well represented among its staff or student body.

Following the passage of the Affordable Healthcare Act in 2010 (though fully enacted in tax year 2013), nonprofit hospitals must now conduct community health needs assessments (CHNAs) every three years. In order to maintain their tax-exempt status, they must also develop strategic plans for addressing identified needs.101 The CHNAs must explicitly consider input from members or representatives of medically underserved, low-income, or minority communities.102 Hospitals have the opportunity to embrace this new mandate by developing strong, representative community advisory boards that both guide CHNAs and oversee their implementation. While Lancaster General Health System completed their first CHNA in 2012, they relied almost entirely on secondary data analysis completed by public health officials.103

IMPLEMENTATION

Implementation of these anchor-based equitable development interventions will depend on strategic partnerships between institutions, community organizations, and municipal entities to
leverage opportunities for mutual benefit. The proposed interventions range from internal administrative changes to the development of long-term relationships between each party. Given Lancaster’s relatively small size, there may be opportunities for local anchors to pool their resources towards implementing certain interventions to maximize their public impact while minimizing the private cost to each institution.

The interventions pertaining to increasing local hiring and procurement are largely internal to anchor institutions, though their prospects of success are dramatically improved when implemented in conjunction with workforce and small business development efforts. Since hiring is a heavily decentralized process in most anchors, organization-wide benchmarks for local hiring efforts should be supported by targeted incentives for managers. To support its workforce diversity goals, the Henry Ford Health System in Detroit links a percentage of senior executives’ bonuses to attainment of related benchmarks. A similar system can be used to reward procurement staff who achieve increases in local purchasing.

To take advantage of its location in the middle of the region’s agricultural breadbasket, Franklin & Marshall has identified increasing local food purchasing as a component of campus sustainability efforts. Given that many of the City’s LMI residents commute to agricultural and food processing jobs in the County, this also has the potential to expand demand and foster employment growth in this key sector. To further leverage its purchasing power for community benefit, Franklin & Marshall could formalize preferences for companies that meet living wage standards, provide essential employee benefits, or meet other workplace quality standards.

While some degree of local hiring and purchasing increases could likely be achieved in Lancaster’s current economic landscape, the potential for these interventions to meet the goals of equitable development is multiplied by investments in human capital and local business support. Lancaster is home to the Community First Fund (CFF), one of the nation’s leading small business-focused CDFIs and a strong potential partner in fostering LMI entrepreneurship and building local firm capacity. With a loan portfolio of more than $22 million in 2013 and portfolio management practices that limit net loan losses to less than 1% (roughly one-third the average for small-business CDFIs), CFF would be a natural home for the working capital loan fund described above. This loan fund could be capitalized by local anchors that want to support the development of local vendor capacity while still receiving a modest return on their funds. With multiple institutions participating, investments ranging from as little as $250,000 to $2 million could meaningfully expand the pool of resources available to local minority- and women-owned firms. Additionally, CFF could house local vendor technical assistance services, which anchors could support through grants or in-kind donations such as funded student intern placements or faculty consultations.

On the human capital end, Lancaster has a number of local institutions that provide vocational and technical coursework, including Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology, Tec Centro, the Lancaster Campus of the Harrisburg Area Community College, and the Pennsylvania College of Health Sciences. Touring the model of the West Philadelphia Skills Initiative (WPSI) operated by the University City District, the School District of Lancaster could partner with anchor institutions to structure dual enrollment and bridge programs around areas of high job demand. This would enable the creation of pipelines to employment for high school students while expanding the pool of qualified applicants available to anchors. While participants in WPSI are not guaranteed placement at the end of their programs, graduates are well prepared to seek employment elsewhere.

### Potential Implementation Partners

**Community Organizations**
- Community First Fund
- Lancaster County Community Foundation
- Spanish American Civic Association

**Anchors**
- Lancaster General Health System
- Franklin & Marshall College
- Millersville University

**Educational Institutions**
- Thaddeus Stevens College of Technology
- Tec Centro
- Harrisburg Area Community College
- Pennsylvania College of Health Sciences
- School District of Lancaster
The development of a university-assisted community school model, establishment of community advisory boards, and expansion of community-based participatory research activities will also require a close working relationship between anchors, the School District, and community partners. Franklin & Marshall (and to a lesser extent, the Pennsylvania College of Health Sciences) will be the natural anchor partner for all three. There are also possibilities for cross-synergies between these efforts. For example, Community Based Participatory Research could be a valuable tool for identifying the youth needs around which the UACS model is structured and can be employed in the development of Lancaster General’s next CHNA. This serves to institutionalize meaningful community engagement opportunities while increasing the quality of anchor services, whether they are the academic development of students or community health promotion.

Lastly, while the strategy outlined above illustrates the potential for anchor-based equitable development practices, it is important to note that these efforts must be paired with strong leadership from the public sector. Ultimately, anchor institutions are private entities that seek to advance their own internal interests. While there are many instances in which these interests overlap with those of LMI communities, creating the potential for shared benefit, there may be other areas where they do not. Indeed, many urban anchor institutions have tense relationships with LMI neighborhoods and communities of color. Defusing these tensions requires public sector efforts to ensure that these communities have the opportunity to share in the benefits of anchor-driven development.

### SYNTHESIS

The City of Lancaster has a number of existing assets, however there are still notable equity challenges. Our proposal, at both the citywide and strategy-specific levels, builds upon existing strengths such as a strong anchor presence and active and engaged funders, to provide expanded opportunities, choices, and access to all of Lancaster’s residents, but particularly for LMI residents.

These outcomes, conditions, and interventions were all derived from our Theory of Change and State of Equity assessment. Figure 4.23 illustrates how specific interventions could address the equity challenges we identified.
With over 75,000 residents occupying just over 19 square miles, the City of Bethlehem is the seventh largest city in Pennsylvania. Bethlehem is located approximately 50 miles north of Philadelphia and 80 miles west of New York City, and lies in both Northampton and Lehigh Counties. Along with the cities of Allentown and Easton, these cities and their surrounding suburbs form the Lehigh Valley – a 731-square-mile area that is home to over 800,000 residents. Today, Bethlehem comprises four neighborhoods: Northeast, West, Central, and South Bethlehem. This report will focus primarily on South Bethlehem since it was the home to Bethlehem Steel for over 140 years and is now the site of the Sands Casino.

HISTORY

The City of Bethlehem was founded on Christmas Eve in 1741 by a group of Moravian missionaries that had settled on 500 acres near the intersection of the Lehigh River and Monocacy Creek. During its first hundred years, Bethlehem developed as a classic Moravian Settlement – a communal settlement where the Church owned all of the land. The Moravian church maintained complete ownership until 1844, when they began to sell land to individual owners. This change paved the way for significant industrial development. Railroads connecting Bethlehem, Allentown, Easton, and Philadelphia arrived in the 1850s. In 1857, the Saucona Iron Company, precursor to the Bethlehem Steel Company, was chartered. Construction of the steel mill in South Bethlehem began in 1860 but was delayed until 1863 due to the outbreak of the Civil War. The Saucona Iron Company, known as the Bethlehem Iron Company at the time, produced its first rails from the rolled mill in 1863. After a few name changes, the Saucona Iron Company became known as the Bethlehem Steel Company in 1899. As was the case with many cities built around industry, both Bethlehem and its steel plant prospered in the first half of the 20th Century. Bethlehem Steel became a major supplier for the US military during WWI and WWII, providing steel for guns, armor plating, and ships. Bethlehem Steel also contributed steel to many notable structures like the Golden Gate Bridge, the Ben Franklin Bridge, and the George Washington Bridge. At its peak in 1943, Bethlehem Steel employed over 30,000 people at the plant in Bethlehem and over 300,000 people nationwide. Bethlehem Steel continued to prosper throughout the 1950s and 1960s Bethlehem’s population reaching a peak of 75,408 in 1960. However, demand for Bethlehem Steel declined in the latter half of the 20th century, leading to the eventual closing of its facility in 1995. Six years later, the company declared bankruptcy.

Without Bethlehem Steel, “its iconic 285-foot-tall blast furnaces and 31 vintage machine shops and mill buildings [were] left to rust and deteriorate. The 1,800 acres stretching more than a mile along the Lehigh River, was left fallow as the largest brownfield site in the country.” The site sat vacant for a number of years until Bethlehem Steel hired consultants to develop plans for re-using the site. Together with the City, Bethlehem Steel wanted to rename the 163-acre site as BethWorks and redevelop the property as a cultural, recreational, educational, entertainment, and retail development. One of the options that Bethlehem Steel and the city considered was the National Museum of Industrial History; however this vision is still a work in progress. In 2003, International Steel Group purchased 130 acres of the Bethlehem Steel Site. One year later, Bethworks Now, a group of equity investors led by KG principal Barry Gosin, bought the site from International Steel Group. In July of 2004, the Pennsylvania General Assembly legalized gaming.
This legislative change opened up new possibilities for the recently formed Bethworks Now group. Bethworks Now partnered with the Las Vegas Sands Corporation and applied for a casino license. After an 18 month public participation process, they were awarded a license. The casino, which was completed in 2009, was the first component of a master plan to redevelop the entire Bethlehem Steel site. That work has continued since 2009.

**CONTEXT**

**Casino and SteelStacks**

South Bethlehem has grown and changed significantly since the closure of Bethlehem Steel. One of the biggest changes was the development of the former steel site into the Sands Casino, hotel, outlet mall, and event center. These amenities, which have opened since 2009, are part of the master plan to redevelop the site and are all owned and operated by the Las Vegas Sands Corporation. Just west of the Casino, on a portion of the Bethlehem Steel site, is the SteelStacks campus. SteelStacks is a performing arts and community space that is home to the nonprofit ArtsQuest, Levitt Pavilion, PBS39, and the Visitor Center. ArtsQuest hosts outdoor concerts and music festivals at Levitt Pavilion almost every weekend in the summer.

The redevelopment of the Bethlehem Steel site, especially the Casino site, have received significant attention as a major revitalization and brownfield remediation effort. In addition, South Bethlehem has a number of assets, institutions, and employers that work to serve existing and new residents alike.

**Lehigh Valley Industrial Park VII**

To the east of the casino is the Lehigh Valley Industrial Park VII (LVIP VII), another relatively new development. Located on former Bethlehem Steel land that was not a part of the Bethworks Now purchase, LVIP is home to a number of companies, including many start-ups, technology firms, and light manufacturing companies that provide jobs that attract Bethlehem’s growing young adult population.

**Lehigh University**

Lehigh University, situated atop a hilly section south of the steel site, is within walking distance of many of the attractions in South Bethlehem. Despite its physical proximity, both the Executive Director of the Redevelopment Authority of Bethlehem and the Executive Director of the Community Action Development Corporation of Bethlehem noted that the University was somewhat removed from the residents and concerns of the neighborhood; however they were trying to develop stronger town-gown connections. Lehigh’s Mountaintop campus is home to Ben Franklin TechVentures, a business incubator that has graduated more than 55 successful companies grossing more than $620 million in annual revenue as well as creating more than 5,400 jobs all since 1983.

**Eastern Gateway**

The Eastern Gateway is an area between LVIP, South Bethlehem, and the Casino that is the focus of a number of planning efforts in the city. Currently, the infrastructure and topography of 3rd Street form a strong barrier between the community of South Bethlehem and the former steel Site. A renovated Eastern Gateway could help to create a welcoming entrance to the neighborhood and Casino.

**South Bethlehem Community**

The community of South Bethlehem is another distinct component of this area. South Bethlehem has historically been a poorer section of the city, housing many Bethlehem Steel workers over the past 150 years. Within the last 20 years, the community experienced a growth in immigrant population, primarily Latinos. However, in the more recent past (approximately 5 years), South Bethlehem has seen an influx of Asian residents, which anecdotaly has been tied to employment at the Casino. South Bethlehem has a vibrant
main corridor along 4th Street, with a number of locally-owned small businesses. 4 Blocks International, a designated historic area, is also located in South Bethlehem along a section of 4th Street. In addition to being a physical location, 4 Blocks International is an organization that promotes and holds events for the many immigrant-owned businesses of the area. Importantly, South Bethlehem is also home to two strong community organizations, the Community Action Committee of Lehigh Valley (CACLV) and their sister organization, the Community Action Development Corporation (CADC), both of which played a large role advocating on behalf of the residents of South Bethlehem during the development of the Casino.

**Downtown Bethlehem**

Finally, Downtown Bethlehem is located just over the Lehigh River from South Bethlehem. It contains the city’s historic district with many Moravian buildings. It is also home to Bethlehem’s main commercial district, with a classic main street.
The State of Equity analysis looks at demographic and economic conditions that reflect the city’s current quality of life for all residents. These indicators look at a few key measures of equity citywide during the time when the Casino development occurred; however, these indicators only reflect correlation and do not provide a complete causal link. Additionally, many of the conditions described by the indicators, such as race and poverty, interact with other conditions, such as housing burden. Therefore the state of equity should be considered as a whole.

**Race**

Bethlehem has been, and continues to be, a city where the vast majority of its residents are white. Almost 79% of Bethlehem residents identified as white in 2012, which represents a 3% decrease from 2000. During this same period, the percent of Black, Asian, and Hispanic residents grew by 3.5, 0.8, and 5.4% respectively. The Black population grew by 2,732 residents, which constituted 75% of Bethlehem’s population growth during the twelve year

---

**FIGURE 5.06: RACIAL DISTRIBUTION**

- **79% of Bethlehem Residents Identified as White in 2012; however Bethlehem has Grown Increasingly Diverse**

Data Source: American Community Survey 2008-2012
period between 2000 and 2012. The Hispanic population grew by 4,704 people, making up for the 3,700 decrease in residents that identified as White alone.\textsuperscript{11} These demographic changes did not occur evenly across Bethlehem. The map to the left illustrates the concentration of Hispanic and Asian residents in South Bethlehem, with the majority of white residents living in North and West Bethlehem.

Poverty

The distribution of poverty follows a similar spatial pattern to race, with higher concentrations of residents living at or below the poverty line in the tracts surrounding the former Bethlehem Steel Site. The poverty level in Bethlehem in 2012 was 15.1%, up 4% from 2000.\textsuperscript{12} Over a quarter of Bethlehem residents under 18 were living in poverty in 2012. Both the percent of residents citywide and percent of children living in poverty in Bethlehem are greater than the State poverty rates during the same period. 9.1% of Pennsylvania residents and 18.4% of Pennsylvania residents under 18 were living in poverty in 2012.\textsuperscript{13}

Income Distribution

Similar to poverty rates, the income disparities indicator measured the gap between the two richest and two poorest tracts in the counties that encompass Bethlehem city. The findings showed that weighted average median household incomes dropped across the board between 2000 and 2012; however, the decrease was greatest among the poorest residents. The median income for the poorest two tracts in Bethlehem dropped 14%, from about $22,000 to about $19,000; whereas the median household income for the richest tracts (located in the county) fell from about $110,000 to $107,000 during that same period. The richest two tracts earn, on average, more than 5 times the income of the two poorest tracts. Overall, low- and moderate-income households experienced a more significant impact from declining incomes during this period.\textsuperscript{14}

Housing Cost Burden

Households that pay more than 30% of their income towards housing are considered to be housing cost burdened. Like poverty and race, housing cost burdens are also distributed in similar spatial patterns, with higher concentrations in census tracts with higher rates of low-income residents. Over half of the renters in Bethlehem are cost burdened, whereas 30% of homeowners are cost burdened; however, both groups have grown since 1990. 61% of renters in these tracts experienced a housing cost burden, an increase of 10% from 2000. Additionally, the number of tracts with very low incomes grew from 2000.\textsuperscript{15} This indicates that people with very low incomes and high housing burdens are increasing and dispersing throughout more of Bethlehem.

Commuting Patterns

The availability of decent living wage jobs for residents of all education levels is one indicator of the state of equity in a given place. If a city or developer is creating jobs through subsidized economic development tools, are those jobs going to city residents or are the subsidies indirectly benefiting highly educated, high-income residents of the surrounding suburbs? This indicator shows that most of the jobs in Bethlehem are held by commuters. Over 26,914 jobs in Bethlehem were held by commuters, whereas only 6,055 were held by Bethlehem residents in 2011. Delving deeper into the jobs available in Bethlehem shows that the number of higher paying jobs increased by 63% from 2002 to 2011, making up 44% of the jobs available in Bethlehem. Only 16% of those jobs were held by Bethlehem residents. Overall, only 18% of jobs in Bethlehem were held by Bethlehem residents, indicating that most Bethlehem residents leave the city for work. This pattern has increased since 2002, with the share of both people commuting into the city and the share of residents that have to leave the city to find work rising.\textsuperscript{16}
Transit

The Lehigh and Northampton Transit Authority (LANTA) is the regional transit provider for the Lehigh Valley. LANTA is a private-municipal cooperative serving both Northampton and Lehigh Counties. Residents in low-income census tracts are nearly twice as reliant on LANTA as residents in higher-income tracts.17 Fortunately, service throughout South Bethlehem and to the redevelopment site is fairly comprehensive, with four bus routes serving the community. Two of the stops are at the doors of the casino and also serve the Steel Stacks, the Community College, and the Lehigh Valley Industrial Park. Additionally, revenue generated from the casino’s host impact fees has gone to funding a circulator bus, which takes riders between the casino and downtown Bethlehem.18

Synthesis

These indicators begin to assess the state of equity citywide for the period of 10 to 12 years surrounding the redevelopment of the Bethlehem Steel Site. While the redevelopment of the steel site had a tangible impact on the city, it is difficult to tie the changes in these indicators to the development of the Casino and Steel Stacks. The casino development occurred during the Great Recession, when individuals and cities across the country and the globe were struggling with decreasing incomes and rising expenses. However, regardless of the cause, these indicators demonstrate that Bethlehem has grown increasingly diverse but continues to struggle with poverty, local job retention, and housing affordability.
While the analysis just presented provides a basic understanding of social and economic conditions in Bethlehem before and after the Casino, understanding the intentions and actions of the Casino development is important to understanding the current state of equity in Bethlehem.

**Bethlehem Steel Site**

As mentioned previously, the former Bethlehem Steel Site presented a significant development problem for both Bethlehem Steel and the City of Bethlehem. The portion of the former Bethlehem Steel site that became the casino and ArtsQuest is approximately 163 acres and occupies a significant parcel in South Bethlehem. However, more pressingly, the site constituted a significant portion of the City of Bethlehem’s property tax base. As stated in Structuring Healthy Communities: Municipal Case Studies, “With the company’s bankruptcy, the City’s tax base (both property tax and earned income tax) suffered a major decline over a short period of time. Redeveloping this site and bringing the land back into a productive, revenue-generating form was a priority for the City.”19 The vision for the redevelopment was to take a unique, well-located, historically significant site and transform it into a multi-use regional attraction that would preserve the history of Bethlehem Steel and start to generate tax revenues for the city again.

**Project Background**

The key players involved in the redevelopment of the former Bethlehem Steel site were Bethworks Now, Las Vegas Sands Corporation, the City of Bethlehem, and the State of Pennsylvania. The redevelopment process was effectively top-down, on both the public and private sides, with a small amount of community engagement as well. Mayor John Callahan, whom one local paper called “the Sands’ head cheerleader,” was very involved in bringing the casino to Bethlehem.20 Public leaders from Bethlehem toured other casino developments to better understand the potential impacts and learn from their challenges. Mayor Callahan repeatedly stated that he wanted Bethlehem to be the city that got casinos right. The development costs of the Sands Casino totaled $743 million,21 ArtsQuest $26 million, and the Visitor’s Center $5 million.22 The intended goals for the redevelopment of the Bethlehem Steel site were threefold: remediation, historic preservation, and, revenue generation, but not necessarily equitable development.

**Remediation**

Following Bethlehem Steel’s departure, the site faced many contamination issues. At the time of the casino development, the site was the largest brownfield in the United States; therefore, whatever redevelopment strategy was ultimately successful would need to account for significant remediation costs. The state contributed $7.5 million to remediate the site, which required extensive soil removal before it could be given release of liability and put back into functional use.23 South Bethlehem today remains an EPA Environmental Justice Area, a designation for areas in which low-income and minority populations have the potential for exposure to harmful environmental conditions.24

**Historic Preservation**

Preserving the legacy and physical structure of the former steel site was very important to many Bethlehem residents. In 2003, over 1,000 people signed a petition circulated by the South Bethlehem Historical Society in favor of Bethworks Now and preserving the historic Bethlehem Steel structures.25 The Executive Director of the Redevelopment Authority noted that “For some in the city, the Sands not only respected the character of the original site, it provided a service the city couldn’t perform for over a decade: rebuilding a massive, historical brownfields site that contains the memories of generations.”26

**FIGURE 5.11: The Historic Hoover Mason Trestle, which used to carry ore in cars from the ore yard – now site of the casino – to the blast furnaces, will be redeveloped and preserved as an elevated walkway.**
Development Program

The casino opened in 2009 and was the first element of the Sands development to be built. It was followed by the hotel and outlet mall in 2011 and the Events Center in 2012. All of these elements are connected internally, and visitors can go from one to another without ever going outdoors. Additionally, all of these components are owned and operated by the Sands Corporation.

SteelStacks is a multi-building, mixed-use complex that serves as the home to performing arts and community organizations. SteelStacks is anchored by ArtsQuest and also contains the local PBS Station and the Visitor’s Center. It is directly adjacent to the iconic blast furnaces that were left intact during the remediation and redevelopment process. SteelStacks was the result of a collaboration between the City of Bethlehem and the Las Vegas Sands Corp., which sold the 2.5-acre site to the city for one dollar.27 The city then leased the site to ArtsQuest for one dollar per year in return for an agreement to operate the Visitor’s Center, maintain the Levitt Pavilion, and provide over 40 free outdoor concerts and events every year.28 SteelStacks is surrounded by additional Bethlehem Steel buildings that remain vacant but offer substantial opportunities for adaptive reuse.

Resident Sentiment

The development of the Casino involved a public participation process with multiple stakeholder groups, including local public officials and community organizations. Residents of South Bethlehem were primarily represented by the Community Action Committee of Lehigh Valley. CACLV recognized early on that the casino was going to happen and wanted to take a proactive role to ensure that the community’s needs were considered in the process. In general, South Bethlehem residents were excited by the prospect of a large employer that would occupy the vacant site. North Bethlehem residents, who are generally wealthier, were strongly opposed. Many residents expressed concerns about crime, addiction, and the attraction of undesirable uses. The Executive Director of the Redevelopment Authority noted that:

“Linking the casino’s creation to the plant’s revitalization proved to be a key selling point for residents, who take pride in the plant that supplied steel to much of New York City’s skyline and fueled America’s efforts in both world wars… Soon after the state legislature approved slot machines in 2005, public opinion in Bethlehem was evenly divided on bringing a casino into town. But it went to 60/40—in favor of gaming—when you asked people whether they approved of a casino if it would mean saving the Bethlehem Steel site.”29

Ultimately, the city council approved the Casino development by a 4-3 margin.30 More recently, the Casino’s license was renewed with little public objection.31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Educational Attainment:</th>
<th>Less Than High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Bachelor’s Degree or Higher</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share of Population:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Growth Sectors:</td>
<td>● Transportation and Warehousing</td>
<td>● Administrative and Support</td>
<td>● Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
<td>● Health Care and Social Assistance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>● Accommodation and Food Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>● Professional, Scientific, and Technical Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

= one percentage point of the age 25+ population

SOURCE: BUREAU OF LABOR STATISTICS, COUNTY BUSINESS PATTERNS; AMERICAN COMMUNITY SURVEY 2008-2012

FIGURE 5.12: Skills mismatch: educational attainment of population age 25+ in low-income tracts as compared to the educational requirements of Bethlehem’s growing job sectors.
Employment and Education

As shown in the chart to the left, a large proportion of low-income Bethlehem residents have educational attainment levels at or below high school; however the accommodation and food services category, which includes the casino, its hotel, and numerous restaurants, is accessible to essentially all education levels. On the other end of the spectrum are two well-paying and rapidly growing sectors that are effectively out of reach to all but 16% of Bethlehem’s residents based on educational attainment. Although many jobs may not require an advanced degree, they may still require further education or training. Northampton Community College’s (NCC) Fowler campus, located just west of the Steel Stack complex, has a hospitality training program that meets the needs of residents seeking employment at the casino. The number of students enrolled in this program more than doubled when the casino opened. Since opening in Bethlehem, Sands has been a major benefactor to NCC. Since 2009, Sands has sponsored the annual Lehigh Valley Food and Wine Festival, which raises $200,000 annually for NCC’s scholarship fund.

Economic Development

The City of Bethlehem has positioned itself well to take advantage of the casino’s presence. The map above shows the boundaries of existing tax incentive programs. The eastern portion of the site is covered by the Local Economic Revitalization Tax Assistance (LERTA) designation, which is a 10 year tax abatement. Additionally, the entire site borders a Keystone Innovation Zone, which reduces the tax liability for new, for-profit companies. Other revenue capture and incentive programs include a Tax Increment Financing (TIF) district and the Empowerment Zone. The TIF was created specifically for the casino redevelopment. To date, the Redevelopment Authority has spent $27 million of TIF revenue to finance the SteelStacks development, while reinvesting additional revenue associated with the Sands Casino into community assets. The vast majority of South Bethlehem is covered by an Empowerment Zone, which provides financing opportunities to foster economic development in distressed areas. The most recent development tool is the City Revitalization and Improvement Zone (CRIZ), which allows Bethlehem to use state and local taxes to
repay the debt service on certain economic development projects. Bethlehem was one of only two Pennsylvania cities awarded this designation in December of 2013. According to its CRIZ application, the city plans to use the CRIZ to redevelop some of the vacant Bethlehem Steel buildings. The CRIZ is expected to create 3,000 construction jobs and 4,000 permanent jobs over the life of the program.  

**Progressive Tools**

Both Sands and the City of Bethlehem also used more progressive development tools to try to ensure that the casino development had a positive impact on as many Bethlehem residents as possible. The casino committed to a local hire agreement, which was coordinated through the local community action organizations. To help with the local hiring, the Sands Casino, in conjunction with Community Action, held hiring fairs for South Bethlehem residents. Information on the percent of casino employees that are also Bethlehem residents is not available. The casino also made an effort to contract with local minority and women owned businesses; however many of the local businesses did not have the operational capacity to meet the needs of the casino. The Executive Director of the CADC told of one particular success story, where a South Bethlehem resident who makes homemade ice cream was able to sell her product to the Emeril restaurants inside the casino. However, local contracting has not gone as well as either party would have liked, despite good intentions.

Sands also used union labor for the construction of the casino, although they have resisted efforts among current staff to unionize. Additionally, the sale of the two-acre SteelStacks site included a provision that prohibited people from organizing and protesting on the land.

The casino contributed to the cost of the development of Phase I of the South Bethlehem Greenway, a trail that runs just south of the site and was built along a former rail line.

Finally, the city took action to address community concerns about the potential arrival of undesirable uses following the construction of the casino by creating a new zoning overlay around the site that prevents pawn shops, cash-checking establishments, and “adult entertainment” stores from locating within 5,000 feet of the casino.

**Casino by the Numbers**

Financially, the casino has done relatively well compared to other casinos. Sands Bethlehem generated $122M in revenue during the third quarter of 2012. Sands Bethlehem had $177 million in Gross Table Games Revenue in 2013, up from $146 million in 2012. Bethlehem benefits from the Sands’s profitability through both taxes and host fees. Slots are taxed at 55% and table games are taxed at 14%. Although most of that tax revenue goes to the state, the City of Bethlehem receives 4% of Sand’s slot revenues and 2% of table game revenues. These taxes generate approximately $8M in revenue and $9.6M in host fees for the city every year. In addition to tax revenue for the City of Bethlehem, the Sands Casino, hotel, outlet mall, and event center have created roughly 1,800 jobs.

**CONCLUSION**

The redevelopment of the former Bethlehem Steel site as a casino and entertainment complex created an additional stream of tax revenue and brought a new, vibrant use to a key portion of South Bethlehem. However, the South Bethlehem community and the city as a whole still face challenges that were not addressed by the redevelopment strategy, including the fact that jobs have been going to individuals outside the city and that the Sands Casino’s attempts to provide local contracting opportunities to minority and women owned business have been hampered by a lack of operational capacity. Additionally, housing burden remains a persistent concern. As noted previously, it was not the intent of this redevelopment program to create equitable outcomes for low and moderate income communities. While the city and the developer made concerted efforts to ensure that certain benefits were extended to these communities, some were more successful than others, leading to a development that has reinvigorated an abandoned site without having a significant impact on quality of life for all Bethlehem residents.
THEORY OF CHANGE

Revisiting the State of Equity

In formulating a new Theory of Change for Bethlehem, we revisited the State of Equity summary, which identified three barriers to equitable outcomes for both the city as a whole and South Bethlehem specifically:

1. Increasing housing cost burden
2. Imbalanced job distribution
3. Declining incomes

We also reanalyzed the transcripts from our interviews with Bethlehem stakeholders, and in some cases conducted a second round of interviews with them. Stakeholders included Tony Hanna, Director of the Redevelopment Authority, Darlene Heller, Director of Planning and Zoning, Alan Jennings, Executive Director of the Community Action Committee of the Lehigh Valley, and Ellen Larmer, Director of Community Action Development Corporation - Bethlehem. We synthesized the key takeaways from these transcripts and noted several additional barriers to equitable outcomes:

4. A lack of regional collaboration
5. Insufficient M/W/DBE capacity
6. Undersupplied training and education opportunities targeted to high-growth industries
7. The need for greater sustained participation in planning and development decisions by community members

Equitable Outcomes

Having recorded these deficiencies, we proceeded to identify desired outcomes for our new Theory of Change that would present a “state of being” for Bethlehem in which equity would play a critical role in the planning and development of the city. From these outcomes, we worked backwards to develop two sets of targeted conditions and interventions unique to the needs of the city and South Bethlehem, respectively, that would achieve those outcomes.

Our desired outcomes shared with the other two legacy cities in this study:

- Inclusive and progressive community leadership
- Economic security and opportunity
- A stable and supportive quality of life

Inclusive and Progressive Community Leadership

The local community development organizations, particularly those in South Bethlehem, have done an excellent job to date of organizing local residents, including minority residents, and ensuring their participation in community affairs. This effort was particularly apparent in the approvals process for the casino, for which a multi-party stakeholder group was created to express community opinions and concerns. To further this work and...
ensure that it remains a priority, we selected ‘diversify community representation’ as the one condition for this outcome at the city level.

At the South Bethlehem level, we again identified just one condition, as community leadership is already fairly well established in this area. The condition, ‘expand 4 Blocks International effort,’ seeks to build upon the success of CADC-B’s existing work in the small area southwest of the Steel site on 4th Avenue, where there is a large concentration of ethnically focused and minority-run businesses. In doing so, South Bethlehem will be systematically building upon its already growing cohort of minority community leaders.

**Economic Security and Opportunity**

Regarding the second outcome, economic security and opportunity, we felt that this area represented the most significant focal point for Bethlehem’s new Theory of Change, as many of the equity deficiencies identified in our State of Equity analysis fell into this category. Our first condition created under this outcome at the city level, ‘bolster M/W/DBE capacity,’ explicitly addresses the ability of M/W/DBE to meet the needs of a changing city. The next conditions at the city level sought to address the opportunity gap for local residents by offering educational and training opportunities, both in the classroom and on the job, to accommodate Bethlehem’s growing industries, particularly within the healthcare sector. To the extent possible, these programs are tied to economic development incentives to spare the city any additional expense. The accessibility of these programs, as well as the large employment centers with which they are intertwined, stands as the last condition for this outcome at the city-wide level.

At the South Bethlehem level, we sought to concentrate the aforementioned efforts (M/W/DBE assistance, growth-oriented education and training programs) to the site best suited for such expansion - the Lehigh Valley Industrial Park (LVIP). A portion of the park that is not yet developed is within the CRIZ boundaries and therefore provides the opportunity for innovation in employer-led recruitment and training. The condition identified here, ‘prioritize business creation at LVIP,’ emphasizes partnership possibilities with local institutions and employers, including institutions already involved in this work such as Lehigh Valley Career and Technical Institute and NCC Center for Business and Industry Biominiufacturing & Cleanroom Training Programs.

**A Stable and Supportive Quality of Life**

Regarding the third and final outcome, we focused on issues of service provision, physical environment, and affordability. At the city level, we first identified ‘establish regional collaboration’ as a method for not only improving service efficiency throughout the Lehigh Valley, but also generating savings that could then be reinvested in progressive economic development activities, such as those mentioned in the previous two outcomes. The second condition at the city level, ‘increase/stabilize affordable housing
supply,’ is a direct nod to the city’s substantial housing cost burden. Our State of Equity analysis and stakeholder interviews revealed that this burden is caused almost wholly by low and declining incomes, rather than by increasing housing costs. As such, the majority of the interventions tied to this effort focus on preservation, maintenance, and homeownership assistance, instead of new construction.

At the South Bethlehem level, interventions were targeted on the remaining structures on the Steel site, which are excellent candidates for historic preservation (and the tax credit dollars that come with it) and could potentially support live-work space for artists or even multifamily employer-assisted housing geared towards LVIP businesses. Like LVIP, a portion of the Steel site is encompassed by the CRIZ boundaries and, as such, presents an excellent opportunity for attraction of new businesses that can locate in architecturally significant spaces adjacent to mixed-use services. Tying all of these components together is critical to ensuring their economic vitality. As such, we focused our last South Bethlehem condition on the physical connection between 4 Blocks International to the west and LVIP to the east, which includes the Eastern Gateway area, a vital link between the casino and LVIP.

Prioritization

Both the Bethlehem Steel site and the Lehigh Valley Industrial Park have the capacity to handle further growth, the former in the form of preservation and redevelopment of existing structures and the latter in the form of new business attraction. We assumed as much when conducting our prioritization in order to truly test the applicability of our conditions and interventions and assess the potential for equitable development in South Bethlehem. As a result, although our intent was to focus on those interventions with the highest impact, the majority of the interventions that ultimately were selected scored higher on feasibility and timeframe given the context and constraints of the hypothesized development areas. Interventions such as shared regional services proved too broad for the specificity of our focus, while others proved too onerous, costly, or inapplicable.

Unlike the case studies for Lancaster and Wilmington, the case studies for Bethlehem intertwined interventions from both the citywide and site-specific Theories of Change. Bethlehem’s case studies focus on several specific development proposals in order to illustrate how the equitable development process might actually play out in the city; as such, we chose this hybrid intervention approach because we felt that these development proposals, while concentrated in South Bethlehem, contributed to improving the city’s overall state of equity. As such, citywide interventions worked just as well within these development contexts as did the site-specific interventions.

CITYWIDE INTERVENTIONS

Inclusive and Progressive Community Leadership

Sustained community participation beyond execution

Ellen Larmer, of CADC-B, noted that the stakeholder group created for the casino development fell away once the approvals process has been completed; she would have liked to have seen sustained involvement. The City would be largely in control of this effort, with a certain level of assistance from and outsourcing to the community development organizations already active in this arena. The intent of this intervention is to create a clearer and less onerous path for local residents, particularly minority residents, to become involved in planning decisions as local leaders and have incentive to remain in those positions throughout the implementation process. This intervention would necessitate updating the requirements surrounding public approvals to outline more specifically the long-term responsibilities of stakeholders.

Economic Security and Opportunity

Local M/W/DBE registry

This registry would allow businesses and other entities looking to fulfill M/W/DBE requirements to find a listing of all certified, locally based M/W/DBE businesses in one place. This registry could be managed by the Bethlehem Department of Economic Development or the Redevelopment Authority. The city currently does not have a local registry, and the state has stopped updating its registry, so the only available registry is the federal registry.
localized version could be more efficiently updated and attuned to the M/W/DBE needs of regional employers.

**M/W/DBE technical assistance and training**

In addition to providing a registry, Bethlehem could also provide other business support to help M/W/DBEs grow and gain new business. Interviews with stakeholders revealed that, although the Sands made a formal and concerted effort to contract locally with M/W/DBE organizations, many of these organizations were not able to serve the casino because of a lack of capital at several levels – the financial capital necessary to fund the operation required to serve such a large contract, the human capital necessary to provide the contracted service, and the physical capital to produce the goods and services requested. NYC’s Opportunity M/W/DBE, as an example, provides technical assistance and loan programs specifically for M/W/DBE firms and assists subcontractors in conducting outreach to bidders and recently awarded contractors to let them know of their interest in the project.

**Cooperative and vocational education programs**

Two of the five largest and fastest growing industries in the region are inaccessible to those without a bachelor’s degree and/or significant training experience. Healthcare is one of these industries, and given the presence of St. Luke’s Hospital (and to a lesser degree, Lehigh Valley Hospital), it represents “low-hanging fruit” in terms of training options. Cooperative educational models could be utilized in order to combine education and training into a comprehensive learning model that channels residents directly into careers. As an example, Cooper Hospital in Camden, New Jersey, has instituted a community training and hire program that seeks to bring unskilled workers into the growing and fairly stable healthcare job market. Stakeholder interviews also revealed that the region faces a deficit of skilled building tradesmen. Formalized apprenticeship programs could again serve as a conduit directly into full-time work.

**Local hire and diversity agreements**

The local hire and diversity agreement instituted as part of the casino redevelopment served as an excellent first step toward incorporating equity conditions directly into planning and development processes. While the onus for providing trained and qualified local residents falls on the municipality, the community development organizations, and the institutions committed to the advancement of the local population, these agreements should become a formalized component in negotiating development approvals and new business incentives. The municipality should also ensure that additional barriers to the hiring of local residents are addressed, including awareness of available opportunities (through the hosting of local hiring fairs and providing multilingual translation), accessibility to application materials (through providing paper-based and internet-based options at local libraries and community centers), and access to employment centers (through improved transit service).

**Provide below-market-rent commercial space**

Smaller, entrepreneurial businesses started in Bethlehem, particularly those that are production-oriented, frequently lack the physical capacity to produce at a scale that will allow them to compete and grow. The costs of such commercial space are prohibitive, but shared incubator spaces offer financial savings by splitting the costs among multiple businesses while offering a production space sized for a much larger organization. This model has frequently been used by food production and processing companies that have significant up-front equipment needs. Often such space is provided at a subsidized rate by the building’s developer/owner following negotiations with the host community as part of a larger project in need of public approvals. This effort would be an excellent
complement to the targeted interventions that seek to bolster the capacity of M/W/DBEs and would enable more fluid connections between these local organizations and larger businesses requiring their services.

**Procurement and services agreements**

Bethlehem is home to many large institutions, including Lehigh University, Moravian College, and St. Luke’s Hospital, all of which have significant procurement needs. By committing to purchase a certain percentage of these goods and services through locally owned and operated businesses, these institutions can support the efforts of local residents while being able to more immediately source their goods and services. The University of Pennsylvania, Franklin & Marshall College, and other regional institutions have implemented such programs to good effect. Again, as with many of the interventions selected for Bethlehem’s new Theory of Change, this opportunity would serve a complementary role to the other capacity-building efforts mentioned previously.

**Stable and Supportive Quality of Life**

**Home repair and maintenance financing**

Bethlehem has an adequate supply of affordable housing stock that can support existing demand. Therefore, rather than focusing on supplying new construction housing, this intervention seeks to provide funds to assist landlords and homeowners in completing necessary repairs and upkeep. Doing so will ensure that the current housing stock can continue to serve the city’s residents at the price points they can afford. Local community development organizations, including in South Bethlehem, currently provide funds for this type of maintenance work and it should remain a vital component of achieving the equitable outcomes identified for Bethlehem as a whole.

**SITE-SPECIFIC INTERVENTIONS**

**Economic Security and Opportunity**

*Provide trained/in-training local employees for new LVIP businesses*

A portion of the LVIP is within Bethlehem’s CRIZ boundary, which serves as an incentive for new and/or out-of-state businesses to locate on the site. The CRIZ is a potent economic development tool that provides the city with the opportunity to negotiate for larger equity considerations from new employers in exchange for financial assistance. Such considerations could include a local hire agreement, for which there should be a direct connection to the local residents completing vocational education programs. Northampton Community College was an excellent partner in this effort during the development of the casino, training roughly a third of all of the casino’s current employees. Currently, the CRIZ legislation includes a few equitable components, including the requirements that all construction work using CRIZ funds be prevailing wage. Ultimately, enabling economic development legislation for tools such as the CRIZ could be revised in order to incorporate equitable elements, such as the local hire agreement, a community benefits agreement, or vocational training, to which businesses would commit upon applying for funds.
Stable and Supportive Quality of Life

Implement Eastern Gateway plans

The Eastern Gateway, situated between the Sands casino and the Lehigh Valley Industrial Park, provides an opportunity for achieving a cohesive and well-designed whole throughout South Bethlehem. The site has been the focus of significant planning activity recently and we view this new Theory of Change as the opportunity for setting in motion the proposals contained within those plans. The Eastern Gateway contains a mix of established residential neighborhoods and transportation networks, and as such, to ensure as equitable a result as possible, specific attention should be paid to the preservation of those neighborhoods and enhancing their access to South Bethlehem’s growth and vitality.

Employer-assisted housing

Employer-assisted housing is not a new concept to Bethlehem or the Lehigh Valley. St. Luke’s Hospital, Lehigh University, and the City of Bethlehem have all implemented programs of some kind. The city’s program offers qualified city employees a $5,000 deferred payment loan that is forgiven over five years. The funds are available for employees moving into Bethlehem and are to be used for down payment and closing costs on the primary residence. Universally, however, these programs are underpublicized and, as a result, underutilized. It would therefore be worthwhile to revisit each of the programs to identify their successes and challenges and craft revised programs that are more attuned to the needs of employees. This process should be conducted in partnership with community members and business owners to aid in understanding how best to structure these programs and to create an inventory of best practices that can be replicated by other employers in the region. Sands Casino, for instance, decided not to pursue such a program, the reasons for which should be understood and incorporated into the lessons informing this new approach.

Historic Preservation Tax Credits

Both Central Bethlehem and South Bethlehem are designated as historic districts in the National Register of Historic Places. Interestingly, the only building on the Bethlehem Steel site that is designated as a historic place is the Lehigh Plant Mill #2 Annex, which was built in the early 1940s. However, it is reasonable to assume that additional buildings on the site could be eligible for the designation as well, which would position them to receive historic preservation tax credits to cover partially the cost of rehabilitating them into commercial use. This program would have excellent synergy with the newly designated CRIZ, the boundaries of which encircle portions of the Steel site, including several of the mill buildings adjacent to Steel Stacks. A developer would be able to both generate substantial equity through the tax credits and use the CRIZ to take on more debt than previously sustainable in order to bear the costs of restoring the buildings and bringing in commercial tenants. Again, these economic development incentives provide the host community with leverage that it can use to ensure that equitable goals are met through the investment. Such goals could include some of the interventions mentioned above, including below-market-rate commercial space and capacity-building opportunities for M/W/DBEs.

IMPLEMENTATION

We found that Bethlehem’s intentional actions—implementing a local hire agreement and holding career fairs with the Sands, updating the zoning code around the casino to prevent undesirable uses, implementing economic development tools to capture additional benefit from the Casino and redirect it towards community assets—were essential to making the Casino a more equitable development. However, while Bethlehem made great strides towards incorporating equitable components into the Sands Casino development, there are still strategies that the city could pursue in an effort to achieve the equitable outcomes of stable and supportive quality of life, economic security and opportunity, and inclusive and progressive community leadership. The City is currently pursuing a number of possible development opportunities as part of the new CRIZ tool. We decided to focus the implementation section of our new Theory of Change on these potential developments, using them to illustrate how equity could be incorporated into future development projects and to demonstrate how certain policies could be adopted to make equity more of a priority citywide.
Culinary Center

Our first development concept proposes the creation of a culinary center with ground floor restaurants located in the approximately 30,000-square-foot former Cold Drawn building on Founder’s Way, just south of the new ArtsQuest and PBS39 buildings. The building is currently owned by the partnership entity formed between the Sands Casino and Bethworks Now, called Sands Bethworks Retail LLC, and is located within the CRIZ designation boundary, which opens up financing opportunities for new commercial development.

The culinary center idea was the brainchild of Steven Horn, the director of PBS’s “The Chef’s Kitchen.” Horn envisioned turning the space into a version of Chelsea Market in New York City and has already spoken to a number of big-name chefs. The culinary center is in the idea stage, as a developer, financing, and ownership still need to be obtained. We saw this stage as the perfect opportunity to intervene and imagine how this project could be realized with a strong focus on equity. In addition to being a retail market and/or restaurant space, the facility could include a culinary incubator space for use by growing local businesses, including M/W/DBEs, and vocational education programs. This space could be a separate kitchen that is financed through a set-aside by the developer(s) in exchange for CRIZ funding, in a loose form of commercial inclusionary zoning. The incubator could be managed by CADC-B, similar to how the Enterprise Center CDC operates the Center for Culinary Enterprises in Philadelphia.

The creation of a culinary incubator would help to provide substantial commercial kitchen space to many of the small businesses that want to partner with larger companies like the Sands or Lehigh University but need to scale up to meet their demand. Additionally, the creation of the culinary incubator would provide partnership opportunities with many of the institutions in the area. Northampton Community College could provide food service, food safety, and cooking classes on site. Lehigh University, the Small Business Association, and/or the Penn State Extension could provide small business development courses around topics like obtaining financing, developing a business plan, projecting cash flow, and marketing. These partnerships would be coordinated by the Culinary Center manager (possibly staffed through CADC-B) and would take advantage of the many great workforce development programs that already exist in Bethlehem and the Lehigh Valley. Institutions like Lehigh University and St. Luke’s Hospital could also serve as purchasers of value-added products created by small businesses utilizing the incubator, the proceeds of which could be split between the businesses themselves and the incubator (to help pay its operating expenses). These partnerships and procurement efforts could be supported even further by the creation of a local M/W/DBE registry, as referenced earlier.

Because the identified site of the culinary center is located within the CRIZ zone and therefore is eligible for public financial support, the City of Bethlehem has the opportunity to include stipulations that would help to engender more equitable outcomes. The city did so in its negotiations with the Sands Casino and, as such, it...
should tie the CRIZ funding to a local hire or community benefits agreement. As an example, the City of Boston used its development approval authority to negotiate a community benefits agreement with Biomed Realty, the developer of a medical research and office building in the city’s hospital district. As part of the agreement, the developer funded four new community classrooms in the building, known collectively as the Community Training Center. Two nonprofit organizations were tapped to coordinate programming in the classrooms, which focuses on training entry-level workers for higher-skill, higher-wage jobs in the healthcare industry. The training, which draws from a resident base of 500 workers, is conducted in partnership with local health care employers and two community colleges.70 Such a model could work for the development of Bethlehem’s culinary incubator center. It should be noted that the CRIZ is intended either to bring in businesses from out of state or create new businesses within the CRIZ, and as such, the new restaurants and culinary center would need to meet these criteria in order to be eligible for CRIZ funds.

An initial pro forma and site plan were created for this development proposal. The site plan illustrates the development’s relation to other uses, both existing and proposed, within and adjacent to the Steel Stacks complex. The site plan locates the culinary center adjacent to ArtsQuest and the PBS studios. Existing uses include the Steel Ice Center, Northampton Community College, and the Bethlehem Visitor’s Center on adjacent parcels. Additional proposed uses include an East Coast facility for Stone Brewing, a Bass Pro Shop, and other adaptive reuse possibilities, including a new supermarket.71 The site plan also reflects improvement accessibility to the South Bethlehem Greenway and 3rd Ave.

The pro forma stipulates two potential development programs for this site, one with second-floor office space and another with second-floor market-rate rental housing. Both options include four restaurants and the culinary incubator center on the ground floor. Likewise, both options assume that the developer is able to secure historic preservation tax credits to cover a portion of the development costs. The rehabilitation is projected to cost slightly over $16M ($185 per-square-foot x 62,524 square feet). Of this total, historic preservation tax credits cover 20 percent, or roughly $3.2M. Calculating CRIZ funds is difficult without knowing much more about current and projected non-property-related taxes, but for the purpose of this financial model, it was assumed that the office program would generate $2.7M in CRIZ funds, while the residential program would generate $1.35M (these figures are based on approximate CRIZ funds allocated to mixed-use projects located at 600 E. 3rd St. and 30 W. 4th St.).72 The difference is because residential uses do not produce CRIZ-eligible tax increment. With a construction loan at 60% loan-to-cost, the office program is left with a small equity gap of roughly $500,000, while the residential program has a wider gap, at roughly $1.85M. Both are amounts that a commercial developer would be able to cover, as at worst, they would need to invest equity equivalent to just 11% of total development costs.
Ultimately, the office program is the more viable option, as the net operating income derived from it is higher than with the residential program, and it requires less equity from the developer. Additionally, there are a number of market-rate and mixed-income residential projects proposed for South Bethlehem, several of which are adjacent to the Cold Drawn building. These include developments at 420 Atlantic St., 419 Hayes St., and the aforementioned 600 E. 3rd St. and 30 W. 4th St. As such, residential demand in South Bethlehem is already being well-served.

To review, the culinary center development would incorporate or work in collaboration with the following equitable interventions:

- Local M/W/DBE registry
- M/W/DBE technical assistance and training
- Cooperative and vocational education programs
- Local hire and diversity agreements
- Below-market-rent commercial space
- Procurement and services agreements
- Historic Preservation Tax Credits

The majority of these interventions were initially categorized as being city-wide, yet are clearly adaptable to a site-specific level.

LVIP Business Development

The second development concept is the creation of a new green energy, such as solar, or medical technology business at the Lehigh Valley Industrial Park. As mentioned earlier, LVIP is located on former Bethlehem Steel land, just east of the Casino and the Eastern Gateway. It has great access to rail lines and major highways. This transit access, combined with Bethlehem’s proximity to large metropolitan markets, has made LVIP an attractive location for many logistics, distribution, and warehousing businesses and services. For example, Walmart is scheduled to open a distribution center at LVIP during the first quarter of 2014. It is projected to employ over 350 people year round, and over 800 during holidays. Stakeholder interviews revealed a desire to attract more diverse businesses beyond logistics, distribution, and warehousing to LVIP, especially businesses with higher paying jobs and income ladders that would serve the residents of South Bethlehem and help to retain Lehigh University students after graduation. This goal is in line with the equitable outcomes identified in the new Theory of Change for the city. To this end, we believe that attracting companies that take advantage of the academic and professional strengths of Bethlehem residents while providing a higher wage with room for advancement would be an ideal result. Green energy and medical technology are two sectors that fit these criteria well. As with the portion of the Bethlehem Steel site identified for our first development proposal, portions of the LVIP are encompassed by the CRIZ boundary and, as such, allow for the provision of financial incentives to attract new businesses, in exchange for which the city can negotiate equitable conditions. In particular, the medical technology field, under the broader healthcare sector umbrella, is one of the fastest growing in Bethlehem and provides excellent opportunities for career training and advancement. OraSure Technologies is a good example of a medical technology company that has sited its business in Bethlehem. The company participated in the Ben Franklin Technology Partners of Northeastern Pennsylvania program, which is a state-funded business incubator program located on the Lehigh University campus, and recently posted record annual earnings in 2013.

As with the Culinary Center, the CRIZ funding agreement with this new business could have a local hiring agreement to help ensure that Bethlehem residents have the opportunity to benefit from the recruitment of growing businesses to the city. Perhaps more so than with the culinary center development, this proposal requires that a successful workforce development program be in place in order to funnel trained residents directly to these employers. Otherwise, the local hire agreement will ring hollow, running in to the same problem experienced with the casino where
local small businesses did not have the skill or capacity to meet the casino’s needs. Currently, the Lehigh Valley Workforce Investment Board and Northampton Community College are both very active players in this effort and present the opportunity for more formalized incorporation into CRIZ financing negotiations. This updated workforce development program could be housed at NCC, which already offers a number of vocational courses, or it could be structured as an apprenticeship program directly with the employer, which is a model in which stakeholders have shown interest.

As noted above, these workforce development efforts should grow from already existing and successful programs in the community. The city should not try to reinvent the wheel, but instead should marshal all of the available resources and deploy them in a way that helps to train workers for new employment opportunities in Bethlehem. Additionally, having a workforce development program directed at a particular industry or skill will help in attracting businesses seeking those specific types of workers. It will also ease some of the burden of the local hiring agreement, as these types of requirements, if structured incorrectly, can act as a deterrent to new business recruitment. Ultimately, a successful workforce development program targeted to growing industries clustered at LVIP could achieve the outcome of economic security and opportunity.

To review, the culinary center development would incorporate or work in collaboration with the following equitable interventions:

- Cooperative and vocational education programs
- Local hire and diversity agreements
- Provide trained/in-training local employees for new LVIP businesses
Eastern Gateway

The final South Bethlehem-specific development program that we want to highlight is the Eastern Gateway. As mentioned previously, this area is located at a very important intersection between LVIP, the Sands Casino, and South Bethlehem. The City of Bethlehem and local community development organizations have already devoted significant planning effort to this area, with strong community representation and participation. While the above two development proposals are more singular and targeted in scope, the implementation of the Eastern Gateway plans would provide the opportunity for instilling equitable outcomes into a larger redevelopment process. Broadly speaking, we feel that seeing through the transformation of the Eastern Gateway is essential to better connecting residents of South Bethlehem with jobs at LVIP and the amenities provided by the Steel Stacks development. The focus here would be on one specific intervention: sustained community participation beyond execution.

There is a diversity of interests represented in the Eastern Gateway, not the least of which is the residential neighborhood south of Route 412. The local community development organizations are well-versed in bringing together these contingents and directing them towards a universal goal. The next step in the process is to ensure that such collaboration does not fall away during the implementation process, and that these community stakeholders continue to have a definitive voice in the progression of the plans. While many potential methods exist for ensuring sustained participation, one approach - and the one advocated for here - is to involve these residents in the program/project evaluation process.

EVALUATION

Evaluation is an integral part of the planning process regardless of its intended outcomes. With equitable development as our primary concern, an expertly planned and efficiently managed set of practices is necessary to ensure efficacy of the process. Program- and development-based evaluations can be expensive and cumbersome, even in the best circumstances. The challenge for cities like Bethlehem is how to create evaluation and measurement practices that are cost effective, reliable, and efficient. An inappropriately constructed evaluation process can have negative impacts on the intended outcomes of a given project. Loss of confidence in the project, for instance, can undermine the initial goal of the equitable planning process. In order to properly measure the state of equity as affected by a given project or program, both qualitative and quantitative analysis is necessary.

The CIPP (Context, Input, Process, Product) model for program evaluation could be adapted to almost any potential program with equity as a primary concern. While originally conceived in the 1960s to evaluate the effectiveness of policy within the Ohio School District, the CIPP model evaluates programs with two intentions: to determine their effectiveness, and to inform their changes. It is an appropriate model when the intent of evaluation is also to provide a basis for improvement of the programs themselves and to ensure that the needs of affected residents are being accounted for. Importantly, the CIPP model takes into account the socio-political context in which a given program takes place. A program is then evaluated on its inputs, such as the theory behind the program and its objectives, which is appropriate given the attention paid to the new Theory of Change for Bethlehem. Next, the implementation process is evaluated on the basis of its accomplishment of the aforementioned theory and objectives. Lastly, the product, or in this particular case the equitable outcomes, are evaluated. After the product is evaluated, a complete picture is drawn of the program's efficacy and informs the discussion of changes that need to take place in order for the program to continue achieving its equity goals. This closed loop of evaluation is highly valuable in judging the efficacy of equitable planning goals because of its iterative design, not unlike the Theory of Change itself. As such, the evaluation process is not only a healthy exercise to undertake during the implementation phase of the Eastern Gateway plans, but it is also an effective method for ensuring that community stakeholders continue to remain actively involved and invested in the results.
CITYWIDE & LONG-TERM POLICIES

A number of the efforts highlighted in the examples above could be institutionalized citywide, or even statewide in the case of the CRIZ, so that they do not rely on specific developers or projects to ensure that equity is considered. These efforts include the creation of a M/W/DBE registry, the inclusion of a local hiring or community benefits agreement in the statewide CRIZ language, and the adoption of a local procurement/services agreement by the city and school district. Cleveland, another legacy city undergoing revitalization, serves as a compelling precedent for these initiatives. Cleveland has played a key role in the creation of a large cooperative industry, known as the Evergreen Cooperatives, that use local labor in an employee-owned format to provide certain services to the City and its many institutions. These services include laundry service, solar power, and hydroponic food production. The Evergreen Cooperatives represents an intentional and multi-party effort at both the public and private level to institutionalize the efforts of local residents through technical assistance and business opportunities, and it serves as an example for Bethlehem's long-term equity needs, particularly if M/W/DBE and small business efforts could be incorporated into this model.81 The creation of a position within Bethlehem's Office of Economic Development that focuses on workforce development and integrating the existing efforts of NCC and the Lehigh Valley Workforce Investment Board could aid in achieving a more broad-based (and well-capitalized) coalition. In addition to the cooperative model, this effort could also focus on two undersupplied sectors, the building trades and the healthcare industry, potentially through formalized connections with labor union efforts, such as the SEIU’s 1199 SEIU Funds training program.82

Many of the site-specific recommendations do not directly address the city’s housing cost burden, which has become greater and more dispersed over the last decade. Given the job growth hypothesized by the several developments referenced above, it is not unreasonable to revisit the concept of employer-assisted

FIGURE 5.27: 4th Street Entrance, South Bethlehem Eastern Gateway Vision
housing, incorporating a larger community voice into the analysis process. Why, for instance, have the existing programs suffered from limited awareness and participation? Given that our state of equity analysis revealed that many jobs within Bethlehem are staffed by non-Bethlehem residents, while at the same time many Bethlehem residents leave the city each day, providing residents with a compelling and financially sustainable reason to both live and work in the city is a logical approach. Franklin & Marshall College has a well-known employer-assisted housing program in which the only discernible differences between it and the existing Bethlehem programs are its level of advertisement and the amount of funds offered ($10,000). The reevaluation of the employer-assisted housing programs in Bethlehem should look to this precedent, as well as others, to analyze the benefits and costs of a revamped program.

While the majority of the site-specific development recommendations made here are intended to be immediately actionable, we envision a South Bethlehem in the long-term that is well-connected, well-amenitized, and supportive of a high-quality of life for residents living and working in the neighborhood. Part of this vision assumes a higher residential and commercial density, especially given the scale of development already proposed throughout the neighborhood, on the Steel site, in the Eastern Gateway, and at LVIP. To this end, our own research and stakeholder interviews revealed that one element that would tie together many of these projects would be a mid-sized (~40,000 square feet) supermarket in South Bethlehem. At this scale, the supermarket could be a part of a larger commercial or mixed-use development, potentially on the Steel site itself. The synergy of uses that are existing and proposed in and around Steel Stacks would provide the necessary consumer traffic that supermarkets of this size require in order to operate profitably. TIF funds could certainly be used for such a project.

**SYNTHESIS**

The new Theory of Change for Bethlehem, at both the citywide and the site-specific level, identifies three desired equitable outcomes:

- Inclusive and progressive community leadership
- Economic security and opportunity
- A stable and supportive quality of life

These outcomes were arrived at based on a summary of our state of equity analysis, which revealed several equity deficiencies:

1. Increasing housing cost burden
2. Imbalanced job distribution
3. Declining incomes
4. A lack of regional collaboration
5. Insufficient M/W/DBE capacity
6. Undersupplied training and education opportunities targeted to high-growth industries
7. The need for greater sustained participation in planning and development decisions by community members

The conditions determined that could achieve these outcomes are a combination of missed opportunities and lessons learned from precedents across the region and in other legacy cities undergoing a similar level of revitalization. Perhaps more so than the other two cities covered by this report, Bethlehem has both an ample range of economic development tools and well located available land, a potent combination for future planning and development opportunities. Many of the interventions hypothesized for Bethlehem revolve around the ability the city has to instill equitable outcomes into these opportunities. The city and its community development organizations, institutions, employers, and residents all have a larger role to play in this future, and in many cases, a heavier financial burden, at least in the near-term. We acknowledge that the capacity of some of the players to fund and support these efforts remains a challenge in achieving these three equitable outcomes. The intention here is to identify a process for incorporating equity into the planning and development process to allow Bethlehem stakeholders to envision what future efforts could look like, how it might be implemented, and how it could be assessed.
CONCLUSION
TAKEAWAYS

Drawing on analysis of our three case study cities, we developed two big-picture takeaways:

First, in order for development to be equitable, equity has to be an intentional part of the process from the beginning.

The community benefits realized in Bethlehem were secured by equity-oriented stakeholders early in the development process. By contrast, integrating equity into Wilmington’s existing waterfront redevelopment projects after the fact is substantially more challenging.

Second, big economic development projects do not necessarily translate into expanded opportunities for LMI communities.

In each case study, we see limited evidence for the assertion that the benefits of large-scale projects naturally filter down to economically marginalized residents. This appears to be driven by some combination of the following factors: the need for large public expenditures to enable these developments, a mismatch between new jobs and LMI residents’ skill levels, or the prevalence of low-quality employment opportunities among the newly created jobs.

SUCCESS FACTORS

The following four success factors have been distilled from our case studies. Each was seen as playing a key role in either existing equitable development successes or in enabling proposed interventions.

Capacity for Collaboration

An equitable development strategy that embraces the interconnectedness between economic, political, and quality-of-life issues requires the engagement of a diverse set of actors. At the negotiation stage, collaboration is key to securing mutually agreeable outcomes for each party, including private investors and marginalized communities alike. From an implementation perspective, executing community benefits requirements often requires the support of local workforce development organizations, human service agencies, economic development corporations, and other institutional actors. A strong collaborative culture is critical for facilitating these relationships and identifying unrealized opportunities.

In Bethlehem, coordination between steel stack remediation advocates, private developers, and the local community action committee was critical to securing commitments for public benefits. Similarly, partnerships between diverse stakeholders are central to the proposed equitable development strategies of both Lancaster and Wilmington. For Lancaster, public-private collaboration is the key to aligning the missions of local anchor institutions with the needs of economically marginalized communities. In Wilmington, a successful sector-based workforce development strategy is predicated on a strong network of employers, job-training organizations, and state economic development agencies.

Empowered Civic Organizations

An important prerequisite to securing community benefits in the development process is the presence of strong, high-capacity civic organizations. These organizations provide a vehicle for marginalized communities to exercise influence over public decision-making. Some, such as the Spanish American Civic Association in Lancaster, have become sufficiently high capacity to engage in their own independent economic development efforts.

As described above, the leadership provided by the Community Action Committee of Lehigh Valley demonstrated the role civic
organizations can play as influencers in the equitable development process. By contrast, Wilmington’s top-down riverfront planning process precluded the participation of independent civic actors who could have more effectively represented the interests of low- and moderate-income residents.

**Strong Political Leadership**

Municipal leadership that is willing and able to effectively use political and economic capital in the pursuit of equitable outcomes is a critical early-stage enabling factor. This appears to be particularly true in smaller cities where there are fewer actors engaged in the development process.

Unfortunately, this success factor is also a key constraint of equitable development. Shifts in the leadership and priorities of city administrations are frequent, creating a lack of continuity that can hinder long-term equity goals. As a result, sustaining equitable development efforts requires the development of a supportive stakeholder coalition that can outlast a mayor or city manager’s term in office.

**Diversified Strategies**

Lastly, it is important for local leaders to pursue a diverse range of economic development strategies and avoid putting all of their resources into “silver bullet” solutions. Though efforts to revitalize the commercial cores of Wilmington and Lancaster have achieved success in some measures, these strategies alone were not sufficient to generate substantial benefit for those cities’ low- and moderate-income communities.

A more diversified approach enables the creation of a fuller continuum of economic opportunity, as opposed the polarization of high-skill, high-wage and low-skill, low-wage employment seen in each of the three cities. The creation of opportunities in a broad range of industries may also make equitable outcomes – and cities’ economies – more resilient in the long run.

**ONGOING CHALLENGES**

Though the strategies outlined in this book provide a blueprint for integrating equity into economic development, we acknowledge that there continue to be substantial barriers to its implementation. These factors largely arise from political and economic constraints beyond the purview of individual cities.

**Limited Public Resources**

Many of the municipal officials we interviewed expressed frustration with their inability to independently finance local development efforts. In Lancaster, the constraints are so severe that the only consistent sources of funds for community development activities are dwindling federal programs such as the Community Development Block Grant. State-imposed limitations on the abilities of smaller cities to raise revenue have led to the development of a multitude of tax incentive-based economic development tools – CRIZ, TIF, LERTA, etc. – in a desperate attempt to fill these gaps. However, these tools are structurally regressive and limit cities’ opportunities to affirmatively address their community development needs.

**Local Capacity Constraints**

For cities that have undergone decades of disinvestment, it should be no surprise that basic economic infrastructure such as supplier networks, access to financial capital, and workforce development intermediaries have weakened. This constrains the ability of low- and moderate-income communities to immediately realize the benefits of economic growth. For example, even though the Community Action Committee of Lehigh Valley was able to secure local contracting preferences from the casino developers, the inability of local business to meet their needs limited the impact of this provision. Local contracting and hiring policies in other cities face similar limitations in the absence of deliberate capacity building and job training efforts.

**Scale**

Finally, a persistent challenge in virtually all economic development efforts is the lack of alignment between political and economic...
geographies. In particular, the capacity of each case study city to pursue housing- or labor-market level interventions was constrained by their inability to affect policy change at the regional, state and national levels. While political boundaries reflect meaningful administrative realities, their incongruence with the scale of the challenges facing low- and moderate-income communities limits the effectiveness of local municipal efforts alone. Small cities in particular tend to be significantly more dependent on state resources and priorities than their larger counterparts.

Beyond the Prisoner’s Dilemma

The true successes of the “rebounding cities” profiled in this report have been their ability to capitalize on their place-based assets. Wilmington saw an opportunity to transform the blank canvas of the Riverfront into the city’s new economic core. Lancaster realized the potential to convert their cultural assets into a revitalized downtown. And Bethlehem saw a catalytic development possibility in a massive brownfield with a distinctive historical character. These stories contradict a core assumption of the prisoner’s dilemma – that all cities offer essentially the same qualities to potential private investors and industries. This represents a core lesson of these case studies: building on strengths, and not race-to-the-bottom tactics, is the foundation of economic recovery.

It is important to note that this is not a wholesale rejection of growth-oriented strategies or traditional economic development incentives, both of which may be necessary to the revitalization of these long-struggling cities. Indeed, incentive policies can provide important points of leverage for cities to shape local development in the public’s interest. Instead, the strategies outlined in this book are intended to provide a framework for cities to challenge the idea that they are functionally interchangeable with their peers, allowing them to adopt a more strategic orientation and identify opportunities to institutionalize equitable development practices.

State and national governments have a major role to play in facilitating this shift. For example, state projects and funding programs could be structured to require public benefit performance assessments, leveling the playing field for cities to negotiate these agreements. Interventions that are prohibitively expensive for local governments, such as income supports for cost-burdened renters in weak real estate markets, can also be implemented at this larger scale. Finally, states hold the key to paving the way for intermunicipal collaboration on policies such as living wages, public transportation, or economic sector-based strategies.

At the national level, the growing discourse around income inequality and social mobility provides a key opportunity to spark a conversation around their place-based determinants. The future of legacy cities – large and small – must be part of this conversation.
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**WHY EQUITY?**

**SUPPORTING STUDIES**

**Income Growth**

According to data from the Congressional Budget Office, cumulative growth in after-tax income for top 1% of households has been disproportionately large since 1979, outpacing cumulative GDP growth over the same period. Gains for the vast majority outside this group have been substantially lower than the rate of growth.

![Graph showing income growth](image)


**Education Gap**

Though educational disparities between black and white students have been narrowing nationally, the achievement gap among students from the lowest-income and highest-income families has widened dramatically. When many students are unable to get a quality, competitive education, they cannot participate as equals in a deliberative democracy; nor can they realize their full potential to pursue meaningful work.

![Graph showing test score difference](image)

*DATA SOURCE: S. REARDON, "WHITHER OPPORTUNITY? RISING INEQUALITY, SCHOOLS, AND CHILDREN’S LIFE CHANCES"*
**Social Distrust**

An analysis by Bowles and Jayadev indicates that the U.S. employs more security workers than teachers. Additionally, they established a strong statistical relationship between income inequality and the proportion of workers in protective services. This implies that inequity is economically inefficient because it fosters distrust, as different groups emerge that have few interests, needs, or preferences in common.

**Life Expectancy**

As reported by the Centers for Disease Control, significant differences between black and white Americans exist in life expectancy and in years of active living. These health disparities lead to years of lost productivity and societal participation.

**Spatial Segregation**

Bischoff and Reardon documented a trend of families increasingly ending up in neighborhoods dominated by one end of the income spectrum. This separation inhibits mutual understanding and exacerbates unequal resource allocation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Interventions**

- Sector-based workforce development strategy
- Explore mid-skill industry growth potential
- Implement first source hire requirements
- Create a small business advocate office
- Make tax structure more progressive
- Attract fresh food into food deserts
- Fill key gaps in public transportation network
- Develop a comprehensive bike network
- Calm wide and high-speed streets
- Enforce fair housing laws
- Better leverage existing housing initiatives
- Reform tax abatement system
- RemEDIATE brownfields
- Mitigate natural hazards
- Pilot a participatory budgeting program
- Institutionalize engagement in the development process
- Create a coalition of leaders from the city, businesses, & residents
- Develop new citywide strategic plan
THEORY OF CHANGE

WILMINGTON: CITYWIDE

- Increase skills base & human capital
- Increase economic base diversity & opportunity
- Employ a fair and effective tax structure

Economic Security & Opportunity

- Improve access to health & nutrition
- Expand alternative transportation access
- Increase access to affordable housing
- Promote environmental justice in underserved areas

Stable & Supportive Quality of Life

- Integrate community voice into visioning & development
- Coordinate revitalization efforts & develop citywide vision

Inclusive & Progressive Community Leadership

CONDITIONS

OUTCOMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**INTERVENTIONS**

- Recruit tenants to complement existing jobs mix
- Create an inclusionary business strategy
- Study local serving retail opportunities
- Require local hiring & living wages in leasing agreements
- Focus development adjacent to existing neighborhoods
- Improve access & crossing points
- Develop safe bicycle routes
- Improve transit access
- Use incentives & bonuses to promote affordable housing
- Create a citizen advisory committee
- Utilize participatory planning techniques

**FEASIBILITY**
- Easy
- Moderate
- Difficult

**IMPACT**
- High
- Medium
- Low

**TIMELINE**
- Short
- Intermediate
- Long
Diversify economic opportunities
Increase local hiring by Riverfront employers
Integrate Riverfront into surrounding neighborhoods
Develop alternative transportation access
Ensure availability of affordable housing
Foster cooperation between Riverfront stakeholders & area residents
Incorporate local resident input in Riverfront planning

Economic Security & Opportunity
Stable & Supportive Quality of Life
Inclusive & Progressive Community Leadership

THEORY OF CHANGE
WILMINGTON: SITE-SPECIFIC
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✔️</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Interventions**

- Labor-related conditional use permitting
- Targeted living wage ordinance
- Local contracting requirements
- Job training & placement assistance
- Labor-Community partnerships
- Enhanced CTE high school curriculum
- Incentivize co-op/ESOP conversions
- Shared-appreciation mortgages
- State-level renter tax credit
- Development incentives for housing
- Community task force to assess service needs
- Co-location of services in schools
- Stakeholder review for projects with public funds
- LMI representation on boards/committees
- Accessible meeting locations
- Translation services
- Transportation services for public meetings
- CBA requirement for publicly funded projects
- State-level performance requirements for economic development incentives

**Interventions**

- Inclusive & Progressive Community Leadership
- Economic Security & Opportunity
- Stable & Supportive Quality of Life
THEORY OF CHANGE

LANCASTER: CITYWIDE

Ensure job quality in growing sectors

Connect high-quality jobs to LMI residents

Expand wealth-building opportunities for residents

Alleviate housing cost burden

Expand access to critical family-supporting services

Expand community engagement opportunities

Ensure all residents share in benefits of economic growth

Economic Security & Opportunity

Stable & Supportive Quality of Life

Inclusive & Progressive Community Leadership

CONDITIONS

OUTCOMES
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Set benchmarks for local hiring**

- Integrate HR departments with technical schools
- Develop bridge programs with local high schools

**Set benchmarks for local procurement**

- Establish preferences for MBE/WBE
- Include labor standards in procurement requirements

**Invest in CFF for working capital**

- Create business technical assistance center

**Support school-based clinics**

- Develop university-assisted community schools

**Encourage investment in local amenities**

- Encourage investment in affordable housing options

**Collaborative program evaluation**

- Community-based participatory research
- Community advisory boards for local investments
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Short</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Long</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Selected Interventions**

- M/W/DBE Clearinghouse
- Technical assistance and training
- Small business loans
- Connection to large employers
- Co-operative and vocational education programs
- Adult ESL classes
- STEM education in school system
- Better minority student recruitment
- Local hire and diversity agreements
- Rotational leadership programs
- Below-market-rent commercial space
- Increased service during rush hour
- Procurement and services agreements
- Infrastructure and service sharing
- Redistribution of diverted costs
- Affordability preservation programs
- Municipal land assemblage/disposition
- Home repair and maintenance financing
- Small-scale municipal incentives
- Employer-assisted housing
- Advertisement of open board positions
- Sustained community planning participation

**Interventions**
THEORY OF CHANGE

BETHLEHEM: CITYWIDE

- Bolster M/W/DBE Capacity
- Expand workforce training & education programs
- Implement employer-led investment programs
- Enhance transportation to regional employment
- Bolster anchor institution partnerships
- Establish regional collaboration
- Increase/stabilize affordable housing supply
- Diversify community leadership

CONDITIONS

OUTCOMES

- Economic Security & Opportunity
- Stable & Supportive Quality of Life
- Inclusive & Progressive Community Leadership

theory of change

b

ethlehem:
citywide
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>FEASIBILITY</th>
<th>IMPACT</th>
<th>TIMELINE</th>
<th>SELECTED</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Easy</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Intermediate</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difficult</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Provide trained and in-training local employees**
- **Expand Ben Franklin TechVentures**
- **Incorporation of equitable components in economic development legislation**
- **Continue to implement South Bethlehem Greenway Plan**
- **Implement Eastern Gateway plans**
- **Provide affordable housing options**
- **Employer-assisted housing**
- **Historic Preservation Tax Credits**
- **CRIZ implementation**
- **Live-work space for artists**
- **Connect ‘Start Your Own Business’ participants to investors and funding sources**
- **Listings of homes and land/space for sale**
**THEORY OF CHANGE**

**BETHLEHEM: SITE-SPECIFIC**

- Prioritize business creation at LVIP
- Implement statewide policy changes
- Enhance physical connections to Steel site
- Preserve existing Steel structures
- Expand 4 Blocks International effort

**CONDITIONS**

**OUTCOMES**

- Economic Security & Opportunity
- Stable & Supportive Quality of Life
- Inclusive & Progressive Community Leadership
**FINANCIAL ANALYSIS**

**COLD DRAWN BUILDING PRO FORMA**

---

### RESTAURANTS/INCUBATOR + OFFICE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Uses</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Cost</td>
<td></td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hard Costs</td>
<td>$185</td>
<td>$11,566,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Soft Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,048,429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Uses</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,015,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Historic Tax Credit Equity</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>$3,203,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRIZ Funding</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,700,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Loan</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>$9,609,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equity Gap</td>
<td></td>
<td>$503,074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Sources</td>
<td></td>
<td>$16,015,369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

### Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Annual Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>62,524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>$</td>
<td>$374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant #1</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant #2</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant #3</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant #4</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Incubator</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Area</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office</td>
<td>28,552</td>
<td>$17</td>
<td>$492,522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Area</td>
<td>3,172</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$ 866,522</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Operating Expense Ratio** | 33% | $285,952
- **Net Operating Income** | $580,570
- **Value** | 10% | $5,805,697

---

**Sources**

- Northampton County: RS Means, Comps
- HUD: Comps, Comps
- FoodService Warehouse, Loopnet: Comps, Comps
- Colliers, assumption: Comps, NAI

---

**Diagram:** Map of Cold Drawn Building with surrounding areas labeled (e.g., Northampton Community College, 4th St, 3rd St, 1st St, Mechanic St, Polk St, Sands Casino, Daly Ave, Lehigh River).
### Uses Rate Cost

- **Land Cost**: $400,000
- **Hard Costs**: $185, 11,566,940
- **Soft Costs**: $4,048,429
- **Total Uses**: $16,015,369

### Sources Rate Cost

- **Historic Tax Credit Equity**: 20%, $3,203,074
- **CRIZ Funding**: $1,350,000
- **Construction Loan**: 60%, $9,609,221
- **Equity Gap**: $1,853,074
- **Total Sources**: $16,015,369

### Program

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Units</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
<th>Rent</th>
<th>Annual Rent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Building</td>
<td>62,524</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>30,800</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$374,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant #1</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant #2</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant #3</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant #4</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>$18</td>
<td>$81,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culinary Incubator</td>
<td>10,000</td>
<td>$5</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Area</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>31,515</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>$325,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-Bedroom Units</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>$550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2-Bedroom Units</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>800</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3-Bedroom Units</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1,075</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Area</td>
<td>2,865</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Revenue</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$699,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source**
- Northampton County
- RS Means
- Comps
- HUD
- Comps
- Comps

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FoodService Warehouse, Loopnet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colliers, assumption</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NAI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PadMapper, comps</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Operating Expense Ratio**: 33%, $230,934

**Net Operating Income**: $468,866

**Value**: 10%, $4,688,660

**Source**
- Comps
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6.04. Equitable development must be considered at all levels of government in order to fully achieve equitable outcomes.

6.05. Actions and programs that enable a community's opportunities, choices, and access to that community's components of equity should shape the policies that will govern how equity is incorporated into redevelopment.
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