

January/February 2014

Volume 23: Number 1

Autonomy, Mobility, and Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing in Gentrifying Neighborhoods

Rachel D. Godsil

Gentrification polarizes. The term usually connotes a process where “outsiders” move into an area whose once-attractive properties have now deteriorated due to disinvestment. The outsiders moving in are often, though not always, white. This migration can lead to arguably positive outcomes. Increased demand results in an increase in property values—which, from a pure market perspective, seems like a net positive. Indeed, those who currently own property acquire greater equity, and the tax base of the city containing the gentrified neighborhoods expands. Moreover, gentrification of affluent outsiders would seem also to further society’s collective interest in residential integration. Residential integration has enormous potential to address inequalities of other sorts, such

as education, access to job networks, and an increase in amenities resulting from the political capital of the outsiders. This too seems like a significant net positive.

Opposition to Gentrification

Why then is there significant opposition to gentrification by in-place residents? One concern is the possibility that the property price increase will result in displacement—building owners will drastically increase rents or the increase in taxes may become too great for current property owners to bear. There is some dispute as to the degree of direct displacement of individuals due to gentrification (i.e., evictions, failure to pay property taxes), but it is clearly the case that the economic and racial demographics of gentrifying neighborhoods often change dramatically.

In-place residents fear that the newcomers will change the culture and practices of the neighborhood. And they have reason for this fear—anyone who has spent time in Crown Heights, Brooklyn recently will be familiar with the phenomenon. According to one caricature, “Housing prices balloon; boutiques and bistros blossom; and before you know it, some bearded dudes in vests have bought the local bodega and opened a saloon fes-

tooned with taxidermied animals.”¹ While the image is ridiculous, the perceived loss to the in-place residents is not. Indeed, the pain of loss of community and the harm of lost autonomy have been well-recognized in the eminent domain literature.

My concern is the gentrification of city neighborhoods that were abandoned during the government-sponsored suburban migration of the 1950s through the 1980s. While the neighborhoods that gentrify tend to be in certain otherwise prosperous cities—New York, San Francisco, Chicago—many of these cities have large numbers of people who have not benefited from the “new economy” and remain working-class or poor with too few options for jobs that pay a living wage.

These neighborhoods that are now so popular with affluent young professionals and families were the same neighborhoods abandoned by both

(Please turn to page 2)

Rachel D. Godsil (rachel.godsil@gmail.com) is Eleanor Bontecou Professor of Law, Seton Hall Univ. School of Law. The original version of this article appeared in Brooklyn Law Review, Vol. 78, No. 2 (2013). I would like to thank the participants in the 2012 Brooklyn Law School Trager Symposium for their thoughtful comments on earlier drafts of this essay, as well as John Powell and Michelle Adams for their intellectual inspiration. Seton Hall University School of Law assisted this project with a summer research grant.

CONTENTS:

Gentrification	1
Human Rights: 2013	3
Development	5
Stop & Frisk: NYPD	9
PRRAC Update	12
Resources	13

(GENTRIFICATION: *Cont. from page 1*)

groups beginning in the post-World War II period. The neighborhoods generally became racially isolated and economically depressed during this same period. The residents who remained did not choose to have the middle class abandon their neighborhoods, nor did they have the option for themselves to leave. Now, after decades where those who remained invested labor, time and emotion in their neighborhoods, outsiders are moving in, and the residents who remained (or their descendants) are denied both the autonomy to prevent these changes and the means to exit to more desired environs.

How convenient to now claim that community members who were unable to purchase their property lack any recognizable “interest” in the communities in which they have worked and lived. The idea of recognizing the interests of renters and in-place small business owners might seem to be familiarly anti-gentrification. But knee-jerk anti-gentrification assumes that the goal of realizing community preferences requires compositional stasis. Compositional stasis, needless to say, is neither possible nor normatively appealing. Residential change in neighborhoods is inevitable whether a neighborhood gentrifies or not. The problem is that gentrification currently causes non-consensual exit—and, as such, threatens the *autonomy* of the displaced in a way that is unlike a

choice to move. But, by recognizing a broad scope of community preferences, the autonomy of in-place residents can be revived.

In-Place Residents

Many in-place residents—particularly renters—currently lack the ability to choose to remain when gentrification occurs. The forced exit of sizable numbers of community members is harmful both to them and to those who remain. The ideal response is a vehicle that allows in-place residents to remain but also allows

Gentrification polarizes.

them to *choose* whether to leave, rather than being involuntarily displaced. Such a vehicle would seem to blunt the criticism that gentrification is an illegitimate invasion by outsiders, and it would transform gentrification into a mechanism by which truly fair housing can be furthered.

Cities—with the help of the federal government—have the option of creating such a vehicle—and indeed they have when using eminent domain powers against owners. I argue that cities like New York, borrowing from eminent domain remedies and federal government mobility programs operated by the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), should be using rental vouchers or low-interest loans to restore the autonomy of in-place residents, providing them with viable, self-determining options to remain or exit the neighborhood. Indeed, the Fair Housing Act (Sec. 3608) legally obligates HUD and its grantees to “affirmatively further fair housing,” and HUD has funds available to fulfill this mandate. The current absence of true autonomy and choice for in-place residents of gentrifying neighborhoods threatens the legitimacy of any integration that may occur as a result of the influx of new residents.

Why Should Gentrification Trigger Government Action?

If gentrification occurs when an area experiences increased property values as a result of outsiders who identify undervalued property, it is important, as a preliminary matter, to note what caused the initial undervaluation. If the causes of decline and renewal are simply a result of individual preferences and consensual market exchanges, the argument in favor of a laissez-faire approach seems strong. It is exceedingly clear, however, that in the context of urban neighborhoods, declining property values are a direct consequence of decisions made by the federal government, bankers and real estate brokers. Historian Thomas Sugrue has shown that the boundaries between these three groups were blurred as bankers, real estate executives and developers moved back and forth from government service to private practice. The private hand of the market was consciously manipulated to cause a decline in property values and the quality of life in urban neighborhoods.

From the post-World War II period through the 1970s, the federal government engaged in programs enhancing the autonomy of white families to purchase homes and move to the suburbs, while simultaneously disinvesting in urban centers and contributing to the exclusion of Black and Latino families from those same suburbs. In particular, three federal programs combined to provide unprecedented opportunities and autonomy even for middle-class white families: the federal subsidization of highways, the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and the Veterans Administration (VA) homeownership loan programs. Moreover, some of these same programs resulted in massive displacement of poor people and the destruction of established neighborhoods.

In every major city, highway construction destroyed working-class

(Please turn to page 8)

Poverty and Race (ISSN 1075-3591) is published six times a year by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council, 1200 18th Street NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20036, 202/906-8023, fax: 202/842-2885, E-mail: info@prrac.org. Chester Hartman, Editor. Subscriptions are \$25/year, \$45/two years. Foreign postage extra. Articles, article suggestions, letters and general comments are welcome, as are notices of publications, conferences, job openings, etc. for our Resources Section. Articles generally may be reprinted, providing PRRAC gives advance permission.

© Copyright 2014 by the Poverty & Race Research Action Council. All rights reserved.

A Different Lens: Applying a Human Rights Framework to Disparities in the United States

Salimah Hankins & Balthazar Becker

Despite its complicated history in American politics and activism, human rights discourse is emerging once more as a powerful alternative framework to scrutinize issues related to poverty and race in the United States. This article offers a brief introduction of the U.S. Human Rights Network's (USHRN) 2013 report, "Advancing Human Rights: A Status Report on Human Rights in the United States," which outlines the implications of human rights as they relate, among other things, to housing, education and the criminal justice system. The article highlights pivotal policies reviewed in the report and examines the ways in which a human rights lens can provide a public forum for resolving civil rights abuses on a national level.

Salimah Hankins (Salimah.hankins@gmail.com) is the Director of Human Rights and Cultural Competency at the Black Women's Blueprint and author of the 2013 Human Rights Status Report for the US Human Rights Network. She is also a consulting attorney at the Fair Housing Justice Center in New York and the former Fair Housing Associate at the American Civil Liberties Union of Maryland.

Balthazar Becker (balthazar.becker@outlook.com) is a doctoral candidate in English literature at the City Univ. of New York Graduate Center. He teaches literature with an emphasis on emancipatory pedagogy and transnational social justice at Brooklyn College and currently serves as a writing fellow at Queens College. His work has appeared in the South Atlantic Review, Small Axe/sxsalon, Social Text, and Cultural Identities in Europe: Nations and Regions, Migration and Minorities (Eds. Richard Nate et al.).

While the language of civil rights, revolving around the U.S. Constitution, usually dominates much of mainstream discourse in this nation, for at least 65 years there has existed an alternative ethical and legal horizon. African-American organizations and individuals instantly recognized the rhetorical power and political potential of the emerging human rights discourse at its onset in response to the

A human rights lens can provide a public forum for resolving civil rights abuses on a national level.

ravages of World War II and the Holocaust. Fully aware of the inherent contradiction of the United States' ascension to moral world leadership—while the nation was holding on to a system of segregation in the South and practicing unequal access in a variety of areas, including housing and education—the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP) and others had, in Carol Anderson's words, "already decided that only human rights could repair the damage that more than three centuries of slavery, Jim Crow, and racism had done to the African American community." By contrast, "[c]ivil rights, no matter how noble, could only maintain the gap." Yet the NAACP's early efforts to establish human rights as the uncontested standard for equality in America were thwarted by several consecutive administrations who, in an effort to both protect the status quo and sanitize the nation's public image in the midst of the Cold War struggle, offered great resistance to allowing for American political discourse to be informed with the truly emancipatory rhetoric embedded in such founding

documents as the 1948 Universal Declaration of Human Rights. As Anderson further explains, any efforts to expose U.S. policies to human rights scrutiny were "ultimately destroyed ... by the Cold War and the anti-Communist witch hunts, which compromised the integrity of the black leadership, twisted the definition of human rights into the hammer and sickle, and forced the NAACP to take its eyes off the prize of human rights." The sixties saw another push for human rights, led by Malcolm X and Martin Luther King, Jr.'s efforts to bring the case of American racial injustice to the United Nations. In July of 1964, Malcolm X attended the meeting of the Organization of African Unity in Cairo, Egypt, where he petitioned the independent African States to urge the United Nations Commission on Human Rights to investigate the human rights abuses that African Americans endured as a result of racism. Unfortunately, because of pressure from the United States, they remained inactive.

Recent years have seen the re-emergence of human rights rhetoric within the context of the United States, with a concerted focus on using a human rights framework to address issues that are often solely viewed within the rubric of civil rights, such as housing, education and the criminal justice system. Civil rights organizations, realizing the benefits of employing a human rights framework that includes a broader international language, have participated in the drafting of shadow reports and international review processes in order to leverage the moral authority that international law tends to garner regarding human rights abuses in the United States. The US Human Rights Network (USHRN) recently published its annual report "Advancing Human Rights: A Status Re-

(Please turn to page 4)

port on Human Rights in the United States,” which offers an alternative perspective on poverty and race in 2013.

Housing

As one of its central concerns, the report highlights housing issues such as the criminalization of the homeless, the lack of affordable housing, segregated neighborhoods, and housing discrimination, through the lens of Article 25 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights, which essentially guarantees the right to adequate and safe housing. The lack of affordable housing, racially segregated neighborhoods and violations of the Federal Fair Housing Act have been well documented amongst housing advocates. What is less mentioned is that, according to human rights law, not only is access to adequate housing a human right, but so are the concomitant economic opportunities. Civil rights legislation, according to *Human Rights in Our Own Backyard*, “does not speak to the question of economic rights that would enable one to access these civil, social, and political rights in a meaningful way. If one cannot afford to purchase adequate housing in an economically viable neighborhood, one is de facto denied equal access to quality education, job opportunities, and so forth.” In this context, then, predatory lending practices have multiple human rights implications. As a result of, among other things, subprime lending (more specifically, predatory lending) and the attendant foreclosure crises, many homeowners were divested of large amounts of their wealth. Of them, African Americans were targeted and saw a loss of wealth of nearly \$200 billion, bringing the gap between white and black wealth to a staggering 20:1 ratio. Human rights organizations make the argument that the practice of predatory lending is a violation of human rights law vis-à-vis two of the treaties that the United States has signed. Armaline, Glasberg &

Purkayastha clarify that “Article 25 [of the UDHR] provides for the right to adequate shelter, among other elements of a decent standard of living, and the right to security should one lose one’s job, become ill or disabled, widowed, or too old to work, all of which are beyond an individual’s control.” In addition to this, the U.S. has ratified the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination (ICERD or CERD), which asserts the human right to be free from racialized discrimination. In particular, “Article 5 lists the rights outlined in the UDHR, including a right to own property and a right to

Because of the history of racial oppression in this country, race is inextricably linked to socio-economic status.

housing regardless of one’s racialized categorization.” The practice of predatory lending targeting communities of color appears to violate these rights.

The National Law Center on Homelessness and Poverty states in their report, “Criminalizing Crisis: The Criminalization of Homelessness in U.S. Cities,” that between 2009 and 2011 laws, criminalizing homelessness increased by as much as 10%. Homeless individuals are targeted for merely being in public spaces and performing normal functions including sitting and sleeping. Of the 234 American cities surveyed, 40% make it a crime to sleep in public spaces, 56% prohibit loitering in public places, 53% prohibit begging and panhandling in public. Participants in a survey said that they were either arrested or received citations for camping/sleeping in public (55%), loitering (55%), public storage of their belongings (20%), and sidewalk-sitting (19%). This criminalization has been criticized by international experts, including the U.N. Special Rapporteur on Extreme Poverty and Human Rights, who stated that the U.S. should repeal or reform any laws that

criminalize life-sustaining activities in public places and refrain from criminalizing sanitation activities. The United States Interagency Council on Homelessness and Department of Justice’s 2012 report, “Searching Out Solutions: Constructive Alternatives to the Criminalization of Homelessness,” recognized for the first time that, in addition to possible violations under the United States Constitution, the criminalization of homelessness may contradict the United States’ human rights treaty obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR) and Convention Against Torture (CAT).

Education

Because of the history of racial oppression in this country, race is inextricably linked to socio-economic status. Because of this and the segregation that it created, the funding structure for schools (which get a large percentage of their funding from property taxes) perpetuates a system of separate but unequal education. In its shadow report, “Still Segregated: How Race and Poverty Stymie the Right to Education,” the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights (along with PRRAC and other civil rights groups) outlines that schools in America remain deeply segregated by race and class and that “schools serving low-income families and racial minorities consistently lack the funding, resources, and faculty experience and expertise necessary to improve the education outcomes of minority students.” Similarly, the Economic Policy Institute issued a study that suggests, “African American students are more isolated than they were 40 years ago, while most education policymakers and reformers have abandoned integration as a cause.” Indeed, “as of 2010, 74.1% of Black students and 79.1% of Latino students attended majority-minority schools.” This segregation is aggravated by the intersection of race and poverty. As such,

(Please turn to page 11)

Disadvantaged Communities Teach Regional Planners a Lesson in Equitable and Sustainable Development

Richard A. Marcantonio & Alex Karner

California's Senate Bill 375 (SB 375) tasks the state's metropolitan planning organizations with reducing greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions by better coordinating land-use planning and regional transportation investments. In this article, we describe how San Francisco Bay Area advocates for affordable housing, public transit, public health and other social equity outcomes came together to show that a more equitable plan is better for the climate *and* for low-income communities.

Advocates were motivated, in part, by the opportunities and risks associated with one of SB 375's primary policy tools for achieving GHG reductions—transit-oriented development (TOD). TOD theory holds that infill development linking high-density housing, jobs and high-quality transit will increase accessibility, shorten trip distances and encourage more travelers to ride transit, walk and bike. If theory is borne out in practice, this will mean reducing vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and therefore GHGs. Decisively shifting housing and population growth toward TODs, however, can mean gentrification as housing values skyrocket in low-income communities of color. At the same time, TOD strategies that direct growth to denser urban areas can fuel the exclusion of low-income families from high-opportunity suburbs by providing an environmental justification for exclusionary zoning practices.

Richard A. Marcantonio (rmarcantonio@publicadvocates.org) is Managing Attorney, Public Advocates Inc., San Francisco.

Alex Karner (alex.karner@gmail.com) is a Postdoctoral Research Fellow, Global Institute of Sustainability, Arizona State University.

Economic displacement in the San Francisco Bay Area's transit-connected urban communities is already at high levels, and the risk that a long-term regional plan for concentrated development could dramatically fuel displacement while encouraging suburban exclusion was not lost on community residents. In fact, the risk of unleashing "urban renewal 2.0" in their neighborhoods helped draw community organizing and policy advocacy groups with a focus on social, racial and environmental justice into a complex three-year, nine-county planning process to implement SB 375.

A social justice vision and coalition.

Community groups were drawn in not only by these risks, but also the promise of SB 375: If reducing GHGs meant undoing one of the effects of white flight—sprawl—then their region might also reverse the neglect and racialized exclusion of urban core communities that decades of suburban-focused policy and investment left in its wake. A social justice vision of a plan for the region's future could include policy and investment that helps people stay and thrive in their communities by building affordable housing, putting more local bus service on the street, and promoting the health of its residents, while also promoting fair housing opportunities in suburban job centers.

For community activists and their partners, this social justice vision served both as a campaign roadmap and a coalition structure. The social justice coalition that would carry that vision was born in mid-2010. Bringing together the goals of winning better local transit, more affordable housing,

investment without displacement, healthy communities and quality jobs, this formation was known simply as the 6 Wins Network. The sixth "win" expressed their hope that, as they engaged in this campaign, low-income communities and communities of color across the region would build collective power and voice.

By the time the process ended in the adoption of a regional plan by the Metropolitan Transportation Commission (MTC) and the Association of Bay Area Governments (ABAG), the 6 Wins Network had demonstrated that a community-developed plan that leads with the critical needs of disadvantaged communities can better meet the goals and aspirations of the entire region. Their plan, the "Equity, Environment and Jobs" (EEJ) alternative, held out the promise not only of delivering much-needed benefits to vulnerable communities, but also of reducing GHG emissions and environmental toxics more than the agencies' proposed plan. That confluence of environmental and public health values with social justice values helped spur unexpected levels of support for the EEJ alternative among members of the agencies' policy boards. In the course of engaging in this campaign, the 6 Wins Network has raised important concerns about the equity implications associated with SB 375 implementation and transit-oriented development more broadly.

The Multiple Faces of the Problem

The 6 Wins Network appeared on the scene of a Bay Area facing major challenges, ranging from inequitable and inadequate public transit, to ram-

(Please turn to page 6)

(DEVELOPMENT: Cont. from page 5)

pant displacement and insufficient affordable housing, all with consequences for public health disparities.

Public Transit Inequities

The Bay Area is home to dozens of independent transit operators which cater to specific demographics. Alameda-Contra Costa Transit (AC Transit), for example, operates local bus service mostly used by people of color and low-income people in the East Bay. Caltrain, on the other hand, operates commuter rail connecting Silicon Valley and San Francisco and carries relatively wealthier and whiter passengers. MTC enjoys some discretion in allocating funds between the region's transit agencies. A 2005 class action lawsuit, *Darensburg v. Metropolitan Transportation Commission*, alleged that MTC's regional transit expansion plan that invested substantial sums in regional rail while short-changing local bus service violated state and federal civil rights law. Plaintiffs claimed that MTC's facially neutral funding policies discriminated against people of color, who comprise 80% of AC Transit's bus riders.

Bay Area equity advocates have also challenged individual projects on civil rights grounds. A 2009 administrative Title VI complaint filed with the Federal Transit Administration alleged that a proposed Oakland Airport Connector project proposed by Bay Area Rapid Transit (BART)—a rail extension that would link East Oakland to the nearby airport – would not benefit the communities of color through which it passed. That complaint led FTA to revoke \$70 million that MTC had programmed for the project.

In the absence of more comprehensive reform, however, the performance of AC Transit has recently suffered. According to the National Transit Database, AC Transit's busses traveled 8% fewer miles in 2011 than in 2008. Over the same period, ridership declined by 12% while the average fare paid per trip increased by 11%. Transportation planners refer to this pattern as a "vicious cycle" in which decreased

ridership leads to service cuts and fare increases, leading to further drops in ridership. This cycle was poised to continue, to the detriment of the region's low-income and people of color populations that rely on local bus service to meet their essential needs.

Affordable Housing and Displacement

The Bay Area's wealthiest suburbs have long successfully excluded low-income people of color. For example, the Bay Area county with the highest median income, Marin, is 80% non-Hispanic white, compared to just 52% in the region overall. In the South Bay, a significant number of the jobs on which the economic engine of Silicon Valley depends pay low wages but af-

Displacement pressures continue to mount.

fordable housing is generally lacking; for instance, 40% of those expected to be employed at Facebook's new headquarters in Menlo Park, where the median home value is over \$1 million, will be low-wage workers. The struggle for affordable housing in suburban communities of opportunity like Menlo Park has always been difficult. For example, protracted litigation was necessary to put an end to the City of Pleasanton's "housing cap," requiring it to zone land for higher-density multi-family housing.

Research has shown that the pursuit of otherwise laudable environmental goals can dramatically affect neighborhood demographics. Investments in public transit have been associated with increasing property values, neighborhood income, educational attainment and decreasing proportions of people of color. Not only do these changes bode ill for existing low-income residents, whom they tend to price out, they also work against robust transit ridership and reductions in GHG emissions, as wealthier newcomers are less likely to use transit than those they displace. Of particular concern in the regional planning process was the indication early on that "priority develop-

ment areas"—identified voluntarily by cities as prime locations for high-quality transit—would receive the lion's share of planned new housing growth. Not surprisingly, the existing residents of those areas, who would be placed at a high risk of displacement, were overwhelmingly low-income families of color.

Recent demographic trends in the Bay Area depict the very real phenomenon of economic displacement. Figures from the decennial US Census show that cities with historically large proportions of African-American residents lost significant numbers of black residents from 2000 to 2010. Both Richmond and Oakland saw their total black population decline by 23%, while East Palo Alto had 31% fewer black residents in 2010 than it did in 2000. Over the same time period, many outer-ring suburban and exurban cities saw their number of black residents grow at high rates, including Antioch (100%), Tracy (91%) and Stockton (30%).

The trend that sees many lower-income families, especially African-American families, pushed out to the region's exurban fringes is particularly troubling in light of the difficulties they face in those places, which have been hard hit by the foreclosure crisis and offer little economic opportunity.

Public Health

Geographic location and socioeconomic status have long been known to influence health outcomes. Movements for *health equity* regard differences in health outcomes based on income, race and residential location as both avoidable and unfair. Inequities are pervasive. The gap in life expectancy between African-American and white residents in Alameda County is widening, even as both groups see improvements in overall longevity. Efforts to plan for more climate-friendly cities in California intersect crucially with public health and health equity in the areas of air quality and physical activity.

One cause of health inequities is differential exposure to air pollution. Although overall regional air quality in

the Bay Area has improved substantially over the past two decades, recent research has highlighted the importance of heavily traveled roadways as emissions sources. In California, poor school-aged children of color disproportionately reside near these air pollution hotspots, suffering from attendant health problems, including high rates of emergency hospital visits due to asthma attacks.

SB 375 again offers an opportunity to undo the patterns that led to health inequity. Ensuring access to high-quality transit and walking and bicycling infrastructure across the Bay Area can facilitate physical activity, reducing the incidence of diabetes, depression and some types of heart disease. Reducing automobile trips can improve air quality near roads, ensuring that the region's most vulnerable residents can breathe easier.

The 6 Wins Network Develops a Community-Based Alternative Plan

In the Spring of 2010, as MTC and ABAG geared up their planning process, community groups across the nine-county region saw the potential perils and opportunities that SB 375 posed for low-income families of color. These varied groups also recognized the daunting nature of the challenge they faced. Disadvantaged communities had struggled, to little avail, to have their needs recognized in past regional transportation planning cycles, as documented by Prof. Thomas Sanchez and others. Like most metropolitan planning organizations nationally, the regional agencies charged with adopting a plan were dominated by suburban votes that under-represented minority residents.

In that context, policy advocates came together with community groups to create a regional policy and investment platform that would put the needs of disadvantaged communities first. At an October 2010 retreat, some 40 participants launched the 6 Wins Network, and the campaign began in earnest. The Network developed a framework both for an initial, community-centered

agenda for the complex SB 375 planning process, and for a structure in which coalitions working in different issue silos could come together as a unified regional equity formation.

A great deal of time was spent simply keeping up with the numerous public meetings at each stage of the agencies' process. For instance, the 6 Wins Network asked the agencies to conduct a assessment and prioritization of transportation and related needs at the outset of the planning process; won the inclusion of plan performance measures around displacement and housing-plus-transportation cost burden early on; succeeded in eliminating poor-performing "legacy" projects from the plan; and prevailed on the agencies to conduct equity analyses on an ongoing basis, rather than only at the end. The Network also demon-

A community-based alternative.

strated, with data showing large numbers of in-commuting low-wage workers, that many cities—typically, suburban communities of opportunity—needed far more housing growth than they were volunteering for.

While keeping its eye on the public process, the 6 Wins Network made it a priority to move forward its internal deliberations over the particular outcomes it would seek. Discussions about specific priorities first worked their way through issue-silo working groups organized around individual "wins," with policy advocates and community members at the table together. These meetings were followed by a series of discussions at which the 6 Wins Network came together across issue silos to see if it would be possible to reach consensus on key outcomes.

Months of deliberation paid off, and just in time. In June 2011, when the agencies released five staff-developed alternative regional plans, the 6 Wins Network immediately issued its EEJ alternative. The EEJ was designed to protect families in disadvantaged communities by providing improved local transit service, affordable homes near jobs (especially in high-opportu-

nity suburbs), and protections from rampant displacement pressures in the urban core. The EEJ proposed to achieve displacement protection by requiring local governments to produce affordable housing and to put effective community-stabilization measures in place, as conditions for receiving a share of regional infrastructure funding.

The introduction of a community-developed scenario immediately sparked intense debate at the agencies, bringing the needs of disadvantaged communities to the fore in a planning process that had mostly sidelined them. At first, the agencies refused to analyze the EEJ alternative against those developed by staff, and their final "preferred alternative" included no elements from the 6 Wins Network plan. Ongoing 6 Wins Network advocacy, including analyses, comment letters, one-on-one outreach with elected officials, and mobilizing community members to attend important meetings, led the agencies to analyze the EEJ as one of the alternatives in the required environmental review of the plan.

That March 2013 environmental impact report concluded that the EEJ was the "environmentally superior alternative." More than that, it concluded that the EEJ outperformed the "preferred alternative" substantially on a wide range of performance measures, including those relating to air quality, public health and transportation system effectiveness. For instance, MTC and ABAG found that the EEJ would result in 83,500 fewer cars on the roads and 165,000 more people riding transit each day than the preferred alternative. They also found that the EEJ would place 15,800 fewer families at risk of displacement.

The community plan, by leading with equity, produced a better future for the entire region, and the agencies' own demonstration of its superiority had a big impact in the final weeks of the three-year planning process. By the close of the public comment period, the agencies had heard more than 40 organizations—including groups focusing on public health, the environment, business and good government—call for the incorporation of key elements

(Please turn to page 12)

(GENTRIFICATION: *Cont. from page 2*)

neighborhoods as homes were leveled to make way for expressways, on and off ramps, and overpasses. These neighborhoods were comprised of many ethnic groups; however, the white ethnics were able to benefit from the highway construction because it enabled easy commutes to and from the suburbs.

The federal government did not act alone. Decisions about where to place highways and other unwanted land uses—such as the concentration of large public housing projects—all were made at the local level.² The central role of government in creating the deteriorating conditions that now lend themselves to gentrification and reduced autonomy for in-place residents suggests that it is appropriate for the government to now play a role in addressing gentrification and enhancing such autonomy.

Legal Mechanisms to Address Gentrification

If the in-place residents of a small town or suburb feel strongly about the scale and design of homes, the tacky signage of a chain store, or even the intensive development of open space, there are a range of legal and regulatory options available. The primary mechanism, of course, is zoning. Standard zoning tools of maximum height requirements, setback rules and floor area ratios—supplemented by modifications such as “cubic content ratio”—are readily available to protect against certain changes, so long as the residents can garner sufficient political support. Some communities have also imposed aesthetic zoning requirements and design review as part of the permitting process. Other powerful existing tools are requirements for permits for subdivision with associated design conditions, historical districts, and emerging open-space requirements.

The “up-scaling” of reasonably stable urban neighborhoods shares many of the same characteristics of

standard new developments: It alters the current aesthetic and uses norms of a particular area. The existing land use legal toolkit, however, is rarely at play to protect community interests. The reasons are myriad. A simple, but important, difference is scale and political power. Most of the cities where gentrification has already occurred or where it is currently underway are fairly large, and even during the nadir of American cities, most retained a financial base of middle class residents, wealthy residents and job sources. New York, San Francisco, Philadelphia, Boston and Chicago all saw significant decline in the post-World War II period through the 1970s, but they never were abandoned to the degree of cities like Detroit, Newark, Hartford or Camden. Accordingly, when “gentrification” begins—when outsid-

Current residents should have a choice of whether to stay or move.

ers with more capital move into abandoned neighborhoods—the current residents have to counter the political might of the extant middle class of the city.

In addition, gentrification often does not result in changed use in the traditional sense. The brownstones or old Victorian mansions that were used for housing in the pre-gentrification period are being used for housing now. The difference is only who is living in the house. The bodegas, small hardware stores and social clubs are replaced by other retail uses—boutiques, upscale restaurants, and cafes. None of these require zoning changes. This means that in-place residents of gentrifying neighborhoods lack many of the current land use controls that others utilize to protect their autonomy, and new devices are needed to afford that protection.

In-place residents appear to have two separate but related bases to oppose gentrification: displacement and cultural change that reflects the interests of the incoming gentrifiers. Displace-

ment of both residents and businesses is a result of increased demand for housing and commercial space, which results in higher rental and purchase prices. Cultural change is caused in part by the newly arriving upscale retail stores, the loss of long-known retail proprietors, and the different habits and norms of the gentrifiers. Without access to existing land use tools, in-place residents must look elsewhere to address these concerns. But in order for these new devices to take shape, two threshold matters must be resolved. First, governments will need to decide what level of gentrification warrants intervention; and second, they will need metrics to determine which residents qualify for protection. To the extent that any intervention requires expenditures, governments, in these budgetary times, will also need to identify sources of funds.

The Gentrification Trigger

The first issue in structuring protection for in-place residents is how to determine when gentrification is occurring. The two phenomena most often mentioned are increased housing and retail prices, and a higher percentage of high-income whites becoming homeowners (although some omit the racial designation). Needless to say, for constitutional and other reasons, linking the trigger for gentrification to the percentage of people of a particular race is a nonstarter. The same concerns, however, do not apply if the trigger is a particular increase in prices. For ease of example, I presume that gentrification occurs when rental and home purchase prices have increased by 25% over a two-year period.

What might a city do to preserve the autonomy of renters? An option that relies upon existing tools and a “market” model would be to issue a voucher to cover the increased rental costs to all renters able to establish that they had lived or operated a business in the neighborhood for a set number of years. Arguably, those entitled to the voucher would include the grown

(Please turn to page 10)

The New York State Attorney General's Report on Arrests Arising from Stop-and-Frisk

(Executive Summary from "A Report on Arrests Arising from the New York City Police Department's Stop-and-Frisk Practices," November 2013)

Background

The stop-and-frisk practice of the New York City Police Department (NYPD) has been the subject of significant public debate and litigation. Supporters and opponents of the practice agree that only 6% of all stops result in an arrest. Yet until now, no known study has sought to assess what happens following those arrests.

In November 2013, the Office of the Attorney General issued a report that examines what happens following those arrests. By analyzing close to 150,000 arrests from 2009 through 2012 (out of the approximately 2.4 million stops conducted during those years), the Attorney General's report offers new data on the outcomes of stop-and-frisk.

Key Findings

- Close to half of all arrests arising from stops did not result in a conviction. Put differently, only 3% of stops resulted in a conviction.
- Just one in fifty arrests—or about 0.1% of all stops—led to a conviction for possession of a weapon.
- Just one in fifty arrests—or about 0.1% of all stops—led to a conviction for a crime of violence.

- Fewer than one in four arrests—or 1.5% of all stops—resulted in a jail or prison sentence. Almost one quarter of arrests (24.7%) were dismissed before arraignment or resulted in a non-criminal charge such as an infraction or a violation at the time of arraignment.

Year	Total Stops	Arrests Arising from Stops	Arrests, % of Stops
2009	581,168	34,912	6.01%
2010	601,285	41,633	6.92%
2011	685,724	41,290	6.02%
2012	532,911	32,495	6.10%
Total	2,401,088	150,330	6.26%

for lawsuits alleging violations by the NYPD. In 2009, for the first time in 30 years, the NYPD became the city agency with the highest dollar amount of legal settlements.

Additional Findings

The Office of the Attorney General also conducted meetings with prosecutors, the defense bar, the Civilian Complaint Review Board, and the Office of the New York City Comptroller to explore the practical effects of the trends apparent in the stop-and-frisk data. Among others, the following observations emerged from these meetings:

- The need to avoid collateral consequences of open arrests—including possible loss of employment, housing, student loans, and immigration status—creates an incentive for arrestees to plead guilty; and
- As stops increased, New York City saw a sharp uptick in litigation costs

Conclusions

The Attorney General's findings offer insight into the costs and benefits of stop and frisk as a tool for targeting serious crime. Among other things, they suggest that approximately half of arrests arising from stops did not lead to a conviction. For those that did, few involved guns or crimes of violence or yielded prison sentences longer than 30 days. Other convictions were for offenses that are not criminal under the penal law. Overall, such convictions, which include non-criminal violations, represent a very small percentage of total stops.

These findings merit consideration in the broader discussion of the efficacy of stop-and-frisk as a law enforcement tool. □

Read the full report at www.ag.ny.gov/civil-rights/stop-and-frisk-report

For more information regarding the Report, contact: Kristen Clarke, Civil Rights Bureau Chief, Office of the Attorney General, 120 Broadway, New York, NY 10271, Kristen.Clarke@ag.ny.gov

Stops Resulting in Conviction (2009-2012)



(GENTRIFICATION: *Cont. from page 8*)

children of people who had lived in the neighborhood for the set number of years, since they would have inherited the home, had their parents been homeowners rather than renters. The voucher would be available for a set number of years; five years is the number that often is given when eminent domain is at issue. An additional option would be to offer these same residents a very low-cost guaranteed loan with a minimal down-payment to allow for purchase of a home.

The rental voucher or low-cost loan would directly address the displacement concerns. Any long-term resident (or their children) would have the option of remaining in the neighborhood. And while perhaps paradoxical, I argue that such a voucher or loan option should also be transferable out of the neighborhood, which would offer true choice and autonomy for in-place residents. When long-term residents or business owners and their children have choice and autonomy, the anger over any change to the culture of the neighborhood would seem to be quelled.

Once current residents have a choice of whether to stay or move, there is the potential for residents to organize and to persuade other residents and business owners to stay. If many current residents and business owners were to remain, the retail offerings and street life would likely not change in any meaningful way. Or if they did, the change would occur on the residents' own terms. If too few people stayed, those who remained might feel a sense of loss but not, presumably, a sense that outsiders pushed out their neighbors.

If most voucher holders remain, one presumes the gentrification cycle would either slow down considerably or halt altogether. Gentrifiers tend to come in waves—artists and others seeking low rent and an “authentic” community, families seeking diverse neighborhoods, and then, as amenities follow, wealthier families whose capital drives the housing costs and retail demands even higher. If most in-place residents remain, however, a lack of

Thanks for your contributions to PRRAC!

Edward Barlow	Dan Goldstein &	Larry Pearl
Jon Bauer	Laura Williams	Fred Pincus
Paul Birnberg	Kathleen Graham	Ian Reifowitz &
Lauralyn Blanchard	Willis Hawley	Jane Kaufman
Joel Blau	Richard Healey	Nancy Rion
Marcia Bok	Alice Henkin	Allan Rodgers
Courtney Bourns	Edward Herman	Richard Rothstein
John Brittain	Phyllis Holman	David Rusk
Steven Brockhouse	Henry Kahn	Tony Sarmiento
Harry Carey	Henry Korman &	Scott Schoem
William & Ann Cronin	Ann Houston	Henry Schriever
Patricia Devivo	Margaret Levy	Tony Schuman
Judith Eisenberg	Judith Liben	Greg Squires
Fair Housing Center of	John Maher	Carolyn Stockman
Metropolitan Detroit	Alan Mallach	Howard Winant
Paul Fischer	Catie Marshall	Jody Yetzer
Craig Flournoy	Nancy McArdle	
Henry Freedman	Norma Neumann-Johnson	
Faith Fuerst	Varley Paul	

You can also donate online at www.prrac.org

supply would prevent the subsequent waves. Although this harms the economic interests of landlords, in gentrifying neighborhoods, rental properties were among those that were devalued by the disinvestment and abandonment and so landlords would have been able to buy very cheaply initially, which mitigates any equity concerns.

Affirmatively Furthering Fair Gentrification

Why should the federal government play a role in facilitating these vouchers? To respond to its legal obligations under the Fair Housing Act of 1968. Congress required HUD and its grantees to do more than combat private housing discrimination. In recognition of HUD's own legacy of segregation, the Agency has a mandate to actively promote integration. The obligation to “affirmatively further fair housing” has been integrated by HUD in its 2010-2015 strategic plan, which includes the pledge that HUD will operate its programs “with an eye toward ensuring choice and opportunity for all

people pursuing the promise of a better life.” HUD has included these goals in the criteria by which it will judge applications for grants from cities and regional development offices.

Government played a significant role in creating the conditions that led to the harms to in-place residents; therefore, government at the city and federal levels ought to lead the effort to eliminate the aspects of gentrification that generate the most intense opposition. And, given HUD's mandate, cities experiencing gentrification have the option of seeking HUD funds to counter the current dynamic, which continues the cycle of denying autonomy to residents of urban neighborhoods.

Neighborhoods undergoing gentrification generally experience significant influxes of private wealth and political clout. This combination tends to generate increased commercial activity and governmental services and amenities. If in-place residents have the financial means to remain, they will ideally be able to benefit from the employment opportunities, educational opportunities, and other quality-of-life

improvements that are precisely the qualities HUD seeks to incentivize in its pursuit of “Mixed-Income Communities of Opportunity.” Accordingly, the federal government should be encouraged to expend funds to transform gentrification into a strategy for affirmative furthering fair housing, rather than allowing it to continue as yet another racialized dynamic that denies autonomy to the black and Latino families that remained in the neighborhoods that were hard hit by the policies of the last century. □

¹Adam Sternbergh, “What’s Wrong with Gentrification,” *N.Y. MAG.* (Dec. 11, 2011), <http://nymag.com/news/intelligencer/62675>.

(HUMAN RIGHTS: *Cont. from page 4*)

“[t]oday, many black children still attend schools in racially and economically isolated neighborhoods, while their families still reside in lonely islands of poverty: 39 percent of black children are from families with incomes below the poverty line, compared with 12 percent of white children.”

In addition to this, the recent mass closing of schools (particularly in places like Chicago), has disproportionately impacted students (and teachers) of color and could be construed to interfere with Article 26, giving parents the “right to choose the kind of education that shall be given to their children.” Some human rights organizations have even brought their concerns to the United Nations, asking them to monitor the nearly 50 school closings in Chicago. Although the right to an education has not always been viewed as a solution to social problems, one could, according to Armaline, Glasberg & Purkayastha, “easily argue that the manifest goals of public education are closely intertwined with the concept of [human rights].” The USHRN report recommends, among other things, that the United States fulfill its obligations under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (ICCPR), which would include an aggressive federal role in ensuring equitable in-

vestment of resources in public schools. It also recommends that the United States ratify the Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) and the Committee on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (CESCR) both of which articulate higher standards of accountability in ensuring the human right to education.

Criminal Justice

One population especially affected by the United States’ non-compliance with the United Nations Human Rights Council is prisoners. In particular, over the last two decades, prisons in the United States have increasingly relied on solitary confinement, even building entire facilities that primarily serve to hold individuals for years and sometimes even decades in extreme isolation. According to the ACLU, there are currently over 80,000 people held in solitary confinement in

America, oftentimes suffering from long-term depression and a slow and irreparable decline of a prisoner’s mind as a result. 2013 has seen unprecedented resistance to this form of punishment. On July 8, 2013, representatives of the inmates at Pelican Bay State Prison—an institution that, according to the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, has held more than 400 prisoners in solitary confinement for over a decade, with an average time of 7.5 years spent in solitary confinement—demanded in a petition, upon other things, an end to long-term solitary confinement. Consequently, up to 30,000 California inmates participated in a 60-day hunger strike to protest the conditions of their imprisonment.

Outside of the prison system, resistance against solitary confinement has been simultaneously mounted from both civil liberties and human rights organization. In *Asker v. Brown* (Please turn to page 12)

Works Cited

- American Civil Liberties Union. “ACLU Calls on International Human Rights Body to Investigate Solitary Confinement in U.S.” March 12, 2013.
- Anderson, Carol. *Eyes Off the Prize: The United Nations and the African American Struggle for Human Rights, 1944–1955*. Cambridge: Cambridge Univ. Press, 2003.
- Armaline, William T., Davita Silfen Glasberg & Bandana Purkayastha, eds. *Human Rights in Our Own Backyard: Injustice and Resistance in the United States*. Philadelphia: Univ. of Pennsylvania Press, 2011.
- Center for Constitutional Rights. “Court Must Intervene to End Torture of Solitary Confinement, Attorneys Argue.” March 14, 2013.
- Hankins, Salimah. “Advancing Human Rights: A Status Report on Human Rights in the United States.” USHRN. December 10, 2013.
- Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights et al. “Still Segregated: How Race and Poverty Stymie the Right to Education.” September 13, 2013. www.prrac.org/pdf/Still_Segregated2013.pdf
- National Law Center on Homelessness & Poverty. “Criminalizing Crisis: The Criminalization of Homelessness in U.S. Cities.” November 2011.
- Rothstein, Richard. “For Public Schools, Segregation Then, Segregation Since: Education and the Unfinished March.” Economic Policy Institute. August 27, 2013.
- United Nations Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights. “California jails: ‘Solitary confinement can amount to cruel punishment, even torture’.” August 23, 2013.
- U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness. “Searching Out Solutions: Constructive Alternatives to the Criminalization of Homelessness.” 2012.

(2012), the Center for Constitutional Rights alleged that “prolonged solitary confinement violates Eighth Amendment prohibitions against cruel and unusual punishment, and that the absence of meaningful review for SHU [Pelican Bay’s Security Housing Unit] placement violates the prisoners’ right to due process.” In addition, and as a consequence of the Supreme Court’s failure to significantly curb the use of solitary confinement in the past, U.S.-based organizations are increasingly referring to international human rights laws to mount pressure on the administration. At a first-ever hearing on solitary confinement in the Americas in March 2013 the ACLU called on the Inter-American Commission on Human Rights (IACHR) to investigate the practice of solitary confinement in the United States, calling it “an extreme form of punishment.” In a reaction to the grievances of prisoners at Pelican Bay State Prison, the United Nations Special Rapporteur on torture, Juan E. Méndez, released a statement, arguing that solitary confinement in many cases amounts to torture, urging the U.S. Government “to adopt concrete measures to eliminate the use of prolonged or indefinite solitary confinement under all circumstances, including an absolute ban of solitary confinement of any duration for juveniles, persons with psychosocial disabilities or other disabilities or health conditions, pregnant women, women with infants and breastfeeding moth-

(DEVELOPMENT: Cont. from page 7)

of the EEJ scenario into the final plan. The 6 Wins Network demonstrated that a regional plan that leads with the needs of disadvantaged communities can better promote the general welfare. In doing so, the Network also won some tangible victories. For one, the agencies adopted a regional One Bay Area Grant (OBAG) program that conditions grants to local jurisdictions for planning activities and infrastructure on the completion of state-certified af-

PRRAC Update

- We are pleased to welcome **Rachel Godsil** to PRRAC’s Board of Directors. She is a law professor at Seton Hall Law School, with research interests in civil rights, housing, education, and environmental justice. Professor Godsil is also the co-founder and research director for the American Values Institute, a national consortium of social scientists, advocates and law professors focusing on the role of implicit bias in law and policy.
- PRRAC Board member **Damon Hewitt**, has joined the Open Society Foundations as a Senior Adviser. working on a variety of policy issues in U.S. Programs. His transition to OSF ends a twelve-

ers as well as those serving a life sentence and prisoners on death row.”

Conclusion

Culling data from civil and human rights organizations, the US Human Rights Network’s report seeks to provide a snapshot of human rights in America by looking at the connections and intersections between various policies, particularly at the crossroads of individuals’ various identities. For example, housing and segregation can have a direct bearing on the quality of

year stint at the NAACP Legal Defense Fund, where he served as Director of the Education Practice Group for the past four years.

- PRRAC Board member **Craig Flournoy** has received a National Endowment for the Humanities fellowship to work on his book project, *The New York Times*, *the Black Press*, and *the Epic Battle to Report the Civil Rights Movement in the U.S.*

- The Society of American Law Teachers has honored former PRRAC Board member **Florence Roisman** with their M. Shanara Gilbert Human Rights Award.

education an individual receives, which further impacts the job opportunities, earnings and housing they can afford, and ultimately translates into a vicious cycle that can span generations. The coming together of educational institutions and the criminal justice system through so-called school-to-prison pipelines adds another layer that is addressed in the report. Highlighting these particular issues from a human rights point of view can have an impact on their resolution at the local level. □

fordable housing plans.

Moreover, at the final hearing before the Plan’s adoption, the 6 Wins Network achieved three eleventh-hour amendments that hold out the promise of real change in the future. Among them are a commitment to adopt a strategy to fund improved levels of transit service, the integration of anti-displacement protections into the OBAG program, and the allocation of \$3 billion in anticipated “cap and trade” revenues in the region, with at least 25% to be spent to benefit disad-

vantaged communities.

The fight is far from over. Displacement pressures continue to mount as the housing share allocated to many suburban job centers falls far short of the real need. Yet the 6 Wins Network proved that a multi-issue, region-wide coalition could successfully change the discourse and priorities of a regional planning process, and bring legitimacy to community concerns and solutions. □

Resources

Most Resources are available directly from the issuing organization, either on their website (if given) or via other contact information listed. Materials published by PRRAC are available through our website: www.prrac.org

Prices include a shipping/handling (s/h) charge when this information is provided to PRRAC. "No price listed" items often are free.

When ordering items from PRRAC: SASE = self-addressed stamped envelope (49¢ unless otherwise indicated). Orders may not be placed by telephone or fax. Please indicate from which issue of P&R you are ordering.

Race/Racism

- ***The Internal Enemy: Slavery and War in Virginia, 1772-1832***, by Alan Taylor (Norton, 2013, 605 pp., \$35), is, in the words of reviewer James Oakes, "a remarkable new book" (see his excellent review in the Nov. 3, 2013 *Wash. Post*). The book's theme, as he characterizes it, is "the way white Americans so readily equated their own freedom with the enslavement of blacks." [14395]
- ***Cracking the Codes: The System of Racial Inequality*** is a 2013(?) documentary by Shakti Butler. Inf. (and to arrange an event with Butler present) from rhummanee@worldtrust.org, 510/632-5156. [14421]
- "Neoliberalism in Blackface: Barack Obama and Deracialization, 2007-2012," by Hermon George (37 pp., Dec. 2013), appeared in *The Journal of Pan African Studies*, Vol. 6, No. 6, available at www.jpnafrican.com/docs/vol6no6/6.6-Georgetownpaper.pdf [14424]
- "Racism as Policy: A Critical Race Analysis of Education Reforms in the United States and England," by David Gillborn (16 pp., Nov. 2013), appeared in *The Educational Forum*, Vol. 78, Issue 1, available at www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/00131725/2014.850982#.Uq86fid4hA4 [14425]
- "Ending the Legacy of Racism in Sports and the Era of Harmful Indian Sports Mascots," a 29-page, Oct. 2013 report from the Natl. Congress of American Indians, is available at www.ncai.org/resources/ncai_publications/ending-the-legacy-of-racism-in-sports-the-era-of-harmful-indian-sports-mascots [14426]
- "Losing an Arm': Schooling as a Site of Black Suffering," by Michael J. Dumas (29 pp., Dec. 2013), appeared in *Race, Ethnicity and Education*, Vol. 17, Issue 1, available at www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/13613324.2013.850412#.Uq9HuCd4hA4 [14428]

- "Needed: Freedom Summer 2014" is a Dec. 15, 2013 *Huffington Post* column, by Robert Kuttner, focusing on attempts to turn back voting rights. Available at www.huffingtonpost.com/robert-kuttner/voting-rights-act-section-5_b_4450999.html [14464]
 - "Diverse Suburbs" is a compilation of resources on promoting fair housing in diverse suburbs. www.prrac.org/projects/diversesuburbs.php
 - "The Business Case For Racial Equity," an Oct. 2013 report from the Altarum Inst. & the W.K. Kellogg Fdn., quantifies the cost of racism in the United States. Available (no price given) from the Fdn., 1 Michigan Ave., E. Battle Creek, MI 49017, 269/968-1611
 - "JusticeJustice" is an upcoming event commemorating the 50th anniversary of the arrest of several dozen rabbis in St. Augustine, FL demonstrating for civil rights. The St. Augustine Jewish Historic Society is planning to interview the surviving demonstrators in early 2014. Inf. from sajhs1565@gmail.com and from Al Stein, asteinca@gmail.com
 - ***WE SHALL NOT BE MOVED: The Jackson Woolworth's Sit-In and the Movement It Inspired***, by M.J. O'Brien, Foreword by Julian Bond (384 pp., March 2013, \$40), has been published by Univ. Press of Mississippi. [14468]
 - Bayard Rustin: The civil rights icon was one of 16 people awarded (in his case, posthumously) the Presidential Medal of Freedom in Feb. 2013. [14471]
 - "Civil Rights at a Critical Juncture" was the 10th Annual Wiley A. Branton-Howard Law Journal Symposium, with Mass. Gov. Deval Patrick delivering the Keynote Address, Oct. 24, 2013. [14407]
- ## Poverty/Welfare
- "Punishing Hard Work: The Unintended Consequences of Cutting SNAP Benefits" (8 pp., Dec. 2013) is available (no price listed) from childrenshealthwatch@childrenshealthwatch.org [14416]
 - "Concentrated Affluence and Concentrated Poverty: Notes Toward a Comparative Research Project," by Herbert Gans, is available in an updated version. For a copy, contact him at hjg1@columbia.edu
 - "Concentration of Poverty in the New Millennium: Changes in Prevalence, Composition, and Location of High-Poverty Neighborhoods," by Paul A. Jargowsky (29 pp.) is a 2013(?) report from The Century Fdn. & Rutgers Ctr. for Urban Research and Education

- **“In Poverty, Under Surveillance: Examining the Trade-Off Between Privacy and Public Assistance”** was a Dec. 12, 2013 event held at the New America Fdn. Inf. at 202/986-2700, www.newamerica.net [14414]

Criminal Justice

- **“Prison Memoir Of a Black Man in the 1850s”** headed an article in the Dec. 12, 2013 *NY Times*, reporting on a 304-page recovered memoir — “The Life and Adventures of a Haunted Convict, or the Inmate of a Gloomy Prison,” written in an upstate NY prison by Austin Reed. Yale English Prof. Caleb Smith is preparing the ms. for publication. A short item in the Dec. 16, 2013 *NYT* reported that Random House will publish the book, with an early 2016 release date. [14422]
- **“Law and Order and White Power: White Supremacist Infiltration of Law Enforcement and the Need to Eliminate Racism in the Ranks,”** by William Y. Chin (69 pp., 2013), appeared in the *Journal of Law and Social Deviance*, Vol. 6, available at www.lsd-journal.net/archives/Volume6/WhiteSupremacists.pdf [14427]
- **“Markets for suspicion: Assessing cost-benefit analysis in criminal justice,”** by Tiffany Bergin (26 pp., 2013), appeared in *Interdisciplines Journal of History and Sociology*, available at www.interdisciplines.org/bghs/index.php/indi/article/view/97/78 [14429]
- **The Prison Policy Initiative** has issued its first annual report, covering 2012-13. Available at www.prisonpolicy.org/reports/PPI_Annual_2012-2013.pdf [14452]
- **“The Death Penalty in 2013: Year-End Report,”** by Richard C. Dieter (8 pp., Dec. 2013), is available (free) from the Death Penalty Inf. Ctr., 202/289-2275. [14456]
- **“Trends in U.S. Corrections,”** a graphic presentation, has been released in an updated version by The Sentencing Proj., 1705 DeSales St. NW, 8th fl., Wash., DC 20036, 202/628-0871. [14473]
- **“Reducing Crime by Reducing Incarceration: longer sentences don’t mean fewer crimes,”** by David Cole & Marc Mauer, was an op-ed commentary in the Nov. 14, 2013 *Washington Times*. [14474]
- **“Unlocking Justice”** is the title of a series of webinars by The Sentencing Project. Two recent ones were “The Impact of the Federal Drug Ban on Welfare Benefits” and “The Historic Rise of Life Sentences in America,” held Dec. 4, 2013 & Dec. 11, 2013, respectively. Inf. from staff=sentencingproject.org@mail.salsalabs.net [14478]
- **“Imbalanced Scales: Why There Is an Access-To-Justice Crisis in a Nation with Too Many Lawyers”** is a Jan. 29, 2014 panel discussion sponsored by The Aspen Inst. Justice & Society Program, at their Wash., DC office,

featuring Profs. Sheldon Krantz & Milton Regan and U.S. Ct. of Appeals Judge David Tatel. Inf. from Michael Green, 202/736-2539, michael.green@aspensinstitute.org [14476]

- **“Lives in the Balance: Asylum Adjudication by the Department of Homeland Security,”** featuring Georgetown Univ. Law Profs. Andrew I. Schoenholtz & Philip G. Schrag, and Jaya Ramji-Nogales, will take place Feb. 2, 2014 at the Gewirz Student Ctr., 120 F St. NW, DC. [14415]

Economic/Community Development

- **“The Detroit Bankruptcy,”** by Wallace C. Tuberville (60 pp., Nov. 2013), a Demos report, is available at www.demos.org/sites/default/files/publications/Detroit_Bankruptcy-Demos.pdf [14430]
- **“Sandtown-Winchester – Baltimore’s Daring Experiment in Urban Renewal: 20 Years Later, What Are the Lessons Learned?,”** by PRRAC Social Sci. Adv. Bd. member Stefanie DeLuca & Peter Rosenblatt (12 pp., Nov. 2013), is Vol. 26, No.8 of *The Abell Report*, published by the Abell Foundation
- **“Human Capital in the Inner City,”** by Dionissi Aliprantis (43 pp., 2013), is available (no price given) from the Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland, <http://www.clevelandfed.org/research/workpaper/2013/wp13Oct.pdf>, www.clevelandfed.org/research
- **“A National Gathering of the New Economy Movement”** will be held June 6-8, 2014 at Northeastern Univ. Inf. from the New Economics Inst., 1 Broadway, 14th fl., Cambridge, MA 02142. [14472]

Education

- **“Education and the Intergenerational Transmission of Advantage,”** by Florencia Torche (32 pp., Nov. 2013), from the Stanford Ctr. on Poverty and Inequality, is available at www.stanford.edu/group/scspi/_media/working_papers/torche_education-intergenerational-transmission.pdf [14431]
- **“Investing in Young Children: A Fact Sheet on Early Care and Education Participation, Access, and Quality,”** by Hannah Matthews, Taylor Robbins, Stephanie Schmit & Sheila Smith (13 pp., Nov. 2013), from the Ctr. for Law & Social Policy and the Natl. Ctr. for Children in Poverty, is available at www.nccp.org/publications/pdf/text_1085.pdf [14432]
- **“Student Loans Are Widening the Wealth Gap: Time to Focus on Equity,”** by Melinda Lewis (78 pp., Nov. 2013), from the Univ. Kansas Assets & Education Initiative, is available at save2limitdebt.com/wp-content/

uploads/2013/11/Student-Loans-Widening-Wealth-Gap-Fullreport.pdf [14433]

- **“The School-Readiness Gap and Preschool Benefits for Children of Color,”** by Farah Ahmad & Katie Hamm (7 pp., Nov. 2013), from the Ctr. for American Progress, is available at www.americanprogress.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/11/PreschoolBenefits-brief-2-pdf [14434]
- **“Early Education for Dual Language Learners: Promoting School Readiness and Early School Success,”** by Linda Espinosa (Nov. 2013), is available (free) from the Migration Policy Inst., 1400 16th St. NW, #300, Wash., DC 20036, 202/266-1940, communications@migrationpolicy.org [14436]
- *The New Public*, a forthcoming documentary directed/produced by Jylian Gunther, was the subject of a column by Joe Nocera (“What Is Good Teaching?”) in the Dec. 17, 2013 *NY Times*. [14450]
- *Latinos and Education: A Critical Reader*, eds. Antonia Darder & Rodolfo D. Torres, 2nd ed. (398 pp., Nov. 2013), has been published by Routledge. Complimentary exam copy available at orders@taylorandfrancis.com [14454]
- **“Expanding Access to Quality Pre-K is Sound Public Policy”** is a Dec. 2013 paper, available (likely free) from Rutgers Natl. Inst. for Early Education Research, 732/993-8051, kbrown@nieer.org [14463]
- **“Excellent Teachers for Each and Every Child: A Guide for State Policy”** (31 pp., Dec. 2013) has been published by NEA, AFT and several other orgs. Available (no price listed) from info@otlcampaign.org [14475]
- **“The Growing Convergence of Community Schools and Expanded Learning Opportunities”** is a 44-page 2013 report from the Coalition for Community Schools & the Inst. for Educational Leadership. Available (no price given) from both orgs., 4301 Conn. Ave. NW, #100, Wash., DC 20008, 202/822-8405. [14481]
- **“Segregation, Desegregation, and Integration: From History, to Policy, to Practice”** is a special issue of *Teachers College Record* (Vol. 115, No. 11, 2013). Contactable at Teachers College, Box 103, Columbia Univ., 525 W. 120th St., NYC, NY 10027
- **Turnaround Arts Initiative** is a program aimed at improving arts education in low-income schools. A Nov. 2013 Progress Report is available at <http://turnaroundarts.pcah.gov/resources/>. Inf. from Kathy Fletcher, 202/682-5571.
- **“Building Blocks for Better Schools,”** by Clara Hemphill, Kim Naueri, Andrew White & Thomas Jacobs (56 pp., Nov 2013), is available (no price given) from Michael Hamill Remaley, 212/714-0699, x222, mremaley@philanthropynewyork.org

- **“The Resegregation of America’s Public Schools,”** by Sheldon Berman, appeared in *The School Administrator*, Vol. 70, No. 11 – Dec. 2013. Available (no price given) from them at 1615 Duke St., Alexandria, VA 22314, 703/528-0700, info@aasa.org
- **Financial Aid Guide for Minority Students** is available at www.onlineschools.org/financial-aid/minority/
- **“A New Civil Rights Agenda for American Education: Creating Opportunity in a Stratified Multiracial Nation”** was the 10th Annual Amer. Educational Research Assn. Brown Lecture, by Gary Orfield, held Oct. 24, 2013. Inf. from 202/238-3234, www.aera.net/brownlecture [14405]
- **“Reclaim the Promise of Public Education: Our Schools, Our Solutions”** was a Dec. 9, 2013 National Day of Action. Inf. from The Natl. Opportunity to Learn Campaign, 675 Mass. Ave., 8th flr., Cambridge, MA 02139, 617/876-7700, www.otlcampaign.org [14487]

Employment/Labor/Jobs Policy

- **“Community and Labor: Synergies, Frictions, and Innovation”** is the title of the 51-page Fall 2013 issue of *Progressive Planning*. 14 articles, on topics like Food, Space/Land Use, Education, Latin America. \$10 from Planners Network, 106 W. Sibley Hall, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, NY 14853, www.plannersnetwork.org [14399]
- **The Labor History Research Ctr.** is located in the Gelman Library of George Washington Univ., containing historic materials & documents that tell the story of labor movements during the 19th through the 21st centuries. Currently featured is their extensive collection of the International Brotherhood of Teamsters. Inf. at teamstersarchives.gwu.edu [14411]
- **“Out of Many, One: the Changing Faces of America”** (74 pp., Dec. 2013), from Generations United & The Generations Initiative, is available at www.gu.org/Portals/0/documents/Reports/13-Report-Out-of-Many-One.pdf [14438]
- **“Super-Sizing Public Costs: How Low Wages at Top Fast-Food Chains Leave Taxpayers Footing the Bill”** (5 pp., Oct. 2013), from the Natl. Employment Law Proj., is available at www.nelp.org/page/-/rtmw/uploads/NELP-Super-Sizing-Public-Costs-Fast-Food-Report.pdf?nocdn=1 [14440]
- **“Native American Veterans: DOL Needs a Clear Plan to Improve Employment and Training Services on Tribal Lands”** is a Sept. 2013 GAO report (GAO-13-664), available (doubtless free) from Andrew Sherrill, 202/512-7215, sherrilla@gao.gov [14485]

Families/ Women/Children

- **“The First Eight Years: Giving Kids a Foundation for Lifetime Success”** (20 pp., Nov. 2013), from the Annie E. Casey Fdn., is available at www.aecf.org-media/Pubs/Initiatives/KIDS%20COUNT/F/FirstEightYears/AECFTheFirstEightYears2013.pdf [14435]
- **“Through the Eyes of a Child: Life with a Mother in Prison”** (16 pp., Dec. 2013), from Volunteers of America, is available at <http://www.voanet.org/through-the-eyes-of-a-child> [14441]
- **“Incarceration, Poverty and the Family”** was a Dec. 17, 2013 Webinar, put on by the Univ. of Wisconsin. Inst. for Research on Poverty, featuring UW-Madison Profs. Michael Massoglia & Julie Poehlmann. Inf. from irpwebinars-request@ssc.wisc.edu [14467]

Food/Nutrition/Hunger

- **“2014 Hunger Report: Ending Hunger in America”** (262 pp., Nov. 2013), from Bread for the World Inst., is available at files.bread.org/institute/hr14/hunger-report-2014.pdf [14443]
- **“Strengthening SNAP for a More Food-Secure, Healthy America,”** by Diane Whitmore Schanzenbach (Dec. 2013), is available (free, along with a policy brief) from the author, at the Brookings Institution, 1775 Mass. Ave. NW, Wash., DC 20036, 202/797-6484. [14444]

Health

- **“Opportunities and Challenges in the Affordable Care Act for Asian American, Native Hawaiian and Pacific Islanders Small Businesses”** (16 pp., July 2012), from the Asian & Pacific Islander American Health Forum, is available at www.apiahf.org/sites/default/files/PA-brief07-12.pdf [14445]

Homelessness

- *The American Journal of Public Health* published a 111-page Supplement 2 (to Vol. 103, No. S2, 2013) on homelessness, with over 3 dozen articles, research reports, etc. (many—but by no means all—focusing on homeless veterans). Amer. Public Health Assn. is reachable at 202/777-APHA [14410]
- **“Homelessness is a Public Health Issue,”** by Barbara Poppe, a short Dec. 2013 blog, is available (likely free) from Misha Galley, communications@usich.gov at the U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, 409 3rd St. SW, #310, Wash., DC 20024. [14417]
- **“Youth Homelessness — What are the Challenges for Policymakers, Practitioners, and Researchers?”** was a Dec. 10, 2013 Child & Family Policy Forum put on by

Chapin Hall at the Univ. of Chicago. Inf. from Christopher Jones, 773/256-5228, cjones@chapinhall.org [14451]

Housing

- **“Maintenance and Investments in Small Rental Properties: Findings from New York City and Baltimore”** (Sept. 2013), from the Furman Ctr. for Real Estate & Urban Policy & the Johns Hopkins Inst. for Policy Studies, is available (free) from the Center, 139 MacDougal St., 2nd fl., NYC, NY 10012, 212/998-6713, furmancenter@nyu.edu [14446]
- **“Moving to Educational Opportunity: A Housing Demonstration to Improve School Outcomes,”** by Megan Gallagher, Simone Zhang & Jennifer T. Comey (Nov. 2013), is available (free) from The Urban Inst., 2100 M St. NW, Wash., DC, 202/261-5709, publicaffairs@urban.org [14447]
- **“Puertas Cerradas: Housing Barriers for Hispanics”** (30 pp., 2013), from The Equal Rights Ctr. & Natl. Council of La Raza, is available (no price listed) from the Ctr., 11 Dupont Circle, #450, Wash., DC 20036, 202/234-3062. [14453]
- **“America’s Rental Housing: Evolving Markets and Needs”** is a Dec. 2013 study from the Harvard Joint Ctr. for Housing Studies, available at www.jchs.harvard.edu/americas-rental-housing [14465]
- *New Deal Ruins: Race, Economic Justice, and Public Housing Policy*, by Edward Goetz (256 pp., March 2013, \$69.95hb, \$23.95pb), has been published by Cornell Univ. Press. [14466]
- **Fair Housing Testing:** NPR aired a show (This American Life) sometime over the weekend of Nov. 22, 2013 on the work of the Fair Housing Justice Ctr., which also has a new film, *A Matter of Place* (accessible at www.fairhousingjustice.org). Addl. inf. from Fred Freiberg at FHJC, 212/400-8231. [14489]
- **“Incidence and Price Discrimination: Evidence from Housing Vouchers,”** by Robert Collinson & Peter Ganong (55 pp. + Apps.), is an Oct. 2013 report available (no price given) from the Harvard Jt. Ctr. for Housing Studies, 1033 Mass. Ave., 5th fl., Cambridge, MA 02138, 617/495-7908, www.jchs.harvard.edu/research/publications/incidence-and-price-discrimination-evidence-housing-vouchers, jchs@harvard.edu
- **The National Initiative on Mixed Income Communities** is a project of the Case Western Reserve Ctr. on Urban Poverty & Community Development. Contact mark: joseph@case.edu
- **“A Matter of Place,”** a 2013(?) documentary directed by Bill Kavanaugh, produced by the Fair Housing Justice Ctr. of NY, is accessible from the Center’s website. PRRAC Bd. members Olati Johnson & Betsy Julian are

interviewed in the film.

- **“The 2013 MHC State of Metropolitan [Louisville] Housing Report”** is available (possibly free) from the Metropolitan Housing Coalition, 502/584-6858, info@metropolitanhousing.org
- **Evictions:** *Harvard Magazine* Jan./Feb. 2014 has an excellent piece on the work of sociologist Matthew Desmond describing the lives of the urban poor after being evicted. The whole text is available free online at <http://harvardmagazine.com/2014/01/disrupted-lives>
- **“Affirmatively Further: Reviving The Fair Housing Act’s Integrationist Purpose,”** by Austin W. King (*N.Y.U. Law. Rev.*, December 2013) www.nyulawreview.org/sites/default/files/pdf/NYULawReview-88-6-A-King.pdf
- **“Moving to Higher Opportunity Summit: Exploring Options and Opportunities for Housing Mobility”** is a free HUD-sponsored conf., **Jan. 9, 2014** at Montgomery County (PA) Community College (outside Phila.) Inf. from 202/708-1112. [14486]

Immigration

- **“The Role of Immigrant Enclaves for Latino Residential Inequalities,”** by Richard Alba, Glenn Deane, Nancy Denton, Ilir Disha, Brian McKenzie & Jeffrey S. Napierala, appeared in the Sept. 2014 *Journal of Ethnic and Migration Studies* 40(1):1-20 [14448]
- **“The Top 10 Migration Issues of 2013”** is available (likely free) from The Migration Policy Inst., 202/266-1940. [14458]
- **Non-Citizen Voting Rights:** DC Councilmember David Grosso has submitted a bill to allow legal non-citizen DC residents to vote in local elections. Inf. from Dionne Johnson Calhoun, 202/724-8105. [14483]
- **The 2013 E Pluribus Unum Prize**, honoring exceptional immigrant integration work, has been awarded by The Migration Policy Inst. Inf. from Michelle Mittelstadt, 202/266-1910, mmittelstadt@migrationpolicy.org

Miscellaneous

- **“Progressive Planning in the American South”** was the theme of the special Spring 2013 issue of *Progressive Planning*, with 12 articles dealing with such topics as race, housing, community planning, economic development. Publisher Planners Network is reachable at 106 W. Sibley Hall, Cornell Univ., Ithaca, NY 14853, 607/254-8890, info@plannersnetwork.org, www.plannersnetwork.org [14408]
- **URBAN**, the Urban Research Based Action Network, launched its Website Oct. 2013, to feature participatory action research projects, resources for engaged scholars,

and related events throughout the country and from different disciplines. Inf. from aditim@MIT.EDU [14409]

- **“Joining the Surveillance Society? New Internet Users in an Age of Tracking,”** a 17-page, Sept. 2013 paper, is available (no price given) from the New America Fdn., 1899 L St. NW, #400, Wash., DC 20036, 202/986-2700, www.newamerica.net [14413]
- **A Human Rights Conf.**, sponsored by West Virginia State Univ. College of Business & Social Sciences, will be held **April 10-12, 2014**. A Call for Papers has been issued for presenters, panel sessions, workshops, etc., with a Jan. 15, 2014 deadline. Inf. from Dr. Billy Joe Peyton, 304/766-3235, peytonbi@wvstateu.edu [14484]

Job Opportunities/Fellowships/Grants

- **The ACLU Fdn.** (SF, NYC) is hiring a **Staff Atty.** for disability rights/voting work. Ltr. (w/salary reqs.)/resume/legal writing sample/3 refs. to hr.jobs@VR@aclu.org with “VRP-04” in subj. line. [14397]
- **The Economic Policy Inst.** is hiring a **Director of Program on Race, Ethnicity, and the Economy**, to replace its current long-time Director. CV/ltr. to communications-jobs@epi.org or mail to HR Dept., EPI, 1333 H St. NW, #300 East, Wash., DC 20005 or fax to 202/775-0819. [14418]
- **Fair Share Housing Ctr.** (Cherry Hill, NJ) is hiring a **Planning & Policy Analyst** for its work on Superstorm Sandy. Applies. to jobs@fairsharehousing.org. Announcement requested applies. by end of week of Dec. 16, but you can always check to see if they still are accepting applies. — 856/665-5444. [14420]
- **The Ella Baker Summer Internship Program**, created by the Ctr. for Constitutional Rights, is accepting applications from 1st or 2nd yr. law students for next summer’s program, June 2-Aug. 8, 2014. Inf. from sjifellowshipinquiries=ccrjustice.org@mail.salslabs.net, 212/614-6464. [14457]
- **Minnesota Legal Aid** is hiring a **Homeowner/Tax Staff Attorney** for their Mpls. office. Ltr./resume by Dec. 16, 2013 (but you can check to see if there is a later deadline) to <http://bit.ly/100PDwU>, 612/746-3784. [14482]
- **The Anti-Discrimination Center** (NYC) is hiring a **Senior Litigating Attorney**. \$125-150,000. 212/537-5824. Inf./applic. at antibiaslaw/node/1400
- **The Proteus Fund** (Amherst, MA) seeks a **Consultant** Position for its Race & Redistricting 2021 project. Inf. from them at 15 Research Dr., #B, Amherst, MA 01002 413/256-0349, hr@proteusfund.org, www.proteusfund.org

PRRAC'S SOCIAL SCIENCE ADVISORY BOARD

Dolores Acevedo-Garcia
Brandeis Univ.

Xavier de Souza Briggs
Massachusetts Institute of Technology

Camille Zubrinsky Charles
Dept. of Sociology, Univ. of Pennsylvania

Stefanie DeLuca
Johns Hopkins Univ.

Ingrid Gould Ellen
New York Univ.
Wagner School of Public Service

Lance Freeman
Columbia Univ. School of Architecture,
Planning and Preservation

John Goering
Baruch College, City Univ. of New York

Heidi Hartmann
Inst. for Women's Policy Research (Wash., DC)

William Kornblum
CUNY Center for Social Research

Maria Krysan
Univ. of Illinois, Chicago

Fernando Mendoza
Dept. of Pediatrics, Stanford Univ.

Roslyn Arlin Mickelson
Univ. of No. Carolina-Charlotte

Pedro Noguera
New York Univ. School of Education

Paul Ong
UCLA School of Public Policy
& Social Research

Gary Orfield
UCLA Civil Rights Project

Gregory D. Squires
Dept. of Sociology, George Washington Univ.

William Trent
Univ. of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Margery Austin Turner
The Urban Institute (Wash., DC)

Margaret Weir
Dept. of Political Science
Univ. of California, Berkeley

David Williams
Harvard School of Public Health

**If You Are Not Already a *P&R* Subscriber,
Please Use the Coupon Below.**

Sign Me Up! 1 year (\$25) or 2 years (\$45)

Please enclose check made out to PRRAC or a purchase order from your institution.

Name _____

Address _____

Address Line 2 _____

City, State, Zip _____

Telephone: _____ email: _____

*Mail to: Poverty & Race Research Action Council
1200 18th Street NW • Suite 200 • Washington, DC 20036*

Poverty & Race Research Action Council

1200 18th Street NW • Suite 200
Washington, DC 20036
202/906-8023 FAX: 202/842-2885
E-mail: info@prrac.org
Website: www.prrac.org

Nonprofit
U.S. Postage
PAID
Jefferson City, MO
Permit No. 210

Address Service Requested

1-2/14

POVERTY & RACE RESEARCH ACTION COUNCIL *Board of Directors/Staff*

CHAIR

John Charles Boger
*University of North Carolina
School of Law
Chapel Hill, NC*

VICE-CHAIR

José Padilla
*California Rural Legal
Assistance
San Francisco, CA*

SECRETARY

john a. powell
*Haas Institute for a
Fair and Inclusive Society
University of California-
Berkeley
Berkeley, CA*

TREASURER

Spence Limbocker
*Neighborhood Funders
Group
Annandale, VA*

John Brittain

*University of the District
of Columbia School of
Law
Washington, DC*

Sheryll Cashin

*Georgetown University
Law Center
Washington, DC*

Craig Flournoy

*Southern Methodist
University
Dallas, TX*

Rachel Godsil

*Seton Hall Law School
Newark, NJ*

Damon Hewitt

*Open Society
Foundations
New York, NY*

Olati Johnson

*Columbia Law School
New York, NY*

Elizabeth Julian

*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

Demetria McCain

*Inclusive Communities
Project
Dallas, TX*

S.M. Miller

*The Commonwealth Institute
Cambridge, MA*

Don Nakanishi

*University of California
Los Angeles, CA*

Dennis Parker

*American Civil Liberties
Union
New York, NY*

Anthony Sarmiento

*Senior Service America
Silver Spring, MD*

Theodore M. Shaw

*Columbia Law School
New York, NY*

Brian Smedley

*Health Policy Institute
Joint Center for Political and
Economic Studies
Washington, DC*

Catherine Tactaquin

*National Network for
Immigrant & Refugee Rights
Oakland, CA*

Camille Holmes

*National Legal Aid &
Defender Assn.
Washington, DC*

*[Organizations listed for
identification purposes only]*

Philip Tegeler

President/Executive Director

Chester Hartman

Director of Research

Megan Haberle

Policy Counsel

Ebony Gayles

Policy Counsel

Gina Chirichigno

*Co-Director
One Nation Indivisible*

Silva Mathema

Research Associate

Michael Hilton

Law & Policy Fellow

George Davis

Law & Policy Intern