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Executive Summary

The segregation of African American public housing residents isolates them from the opportunity structures that are critical to quality of life, stability, and social advancement. The safe and stable neighborhoods, successful schools and employment opportunities available to Whites in the greater Baltimore region have been denied to African American public housing residents. To effectively remedy the segregation inflicted upon African American public housing recipients two objectives must be met: 1) the remedy must give African American public housing residents the opportunity to live in racially integrated areas in the Baltimore region and 2) the remedy must affirmatively connect African American public housing residents to high performing neighborhoods of opportunity in the Baltimore region.

I propose a “communities of opportunity” approach to guide the remedy. With this approach, using mapping technology I identify communities of opportunity in the Baltimore region (see map on page 3). My analysis finds African Americans (and most subsidized housing) to be segregated from opportunity rich areas of the region (see map on page 4). I recommend utilizing opportunity mapping to rectify this segregation and to guide this remedy. As described in this report, opportunity mapping analysis provides a powerful analytical framework to guide the expansion of affordable housing opportunities in the Baltimore region.

I believe six principles should guide the remedy in this case. First, the remedy must be sensitive to opportunity and to the importance of location in determining access to opportunity. Second, the remedy must be metropolitan–wide to be successful. Third, a race-conscious approach is necessary to ensure an effective remedy in light of HUD’s housing duties and the realities of the housing market. Fourth, the remedy should not force the dispersal of public housing residents, but should be a structured choice model in which residents voluntarily participate in a program that creates housing opportunities specifically in integrated high opportunity communities. Fifth, while process based remedies are important, the remedy must also be goal driven and adaptive to the dynamic nature of the housing market. Finally, the remedy must require HUD to utilize the wide variety of tools available, including vouchers and new housing production, to ensure housing opportunities in high opportunity communities.
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Introduction

To redress the harms created by HUD’s failure to desegregate and further fair housing in Baltimore, it is my opinion that a remedy must be implemented that accomplishes two intertwined objectives that lie at the heart of the Fair Housing Act and at the heart of the constitutional obligation to disestablish segregation. The remedy must give African American public housing residents the opportunity to live in racially integrated areas of the Baltimore metropolitan region. It must also ensure that African American public housing residents are able to move to communities that provide the opportunities that have heretofore been denied to them by virtue of the segregated public housing system in Baltimore.

In order to accomplish these twin objectives, I propose a “communities of opportunity” approach to guide the remedy in this matter. This approach is founded upon and informed by decades of research on opportunity and well-being and the determinative role that racial segregation plays in these. It is also informed by the successes and limitations of past public housing policies and programs, and by programs and policies in the housing arena in general. It is a methodology that identifies opportunity-rich areas in the Baltimore region and uses this identification to guide the location of public housing opportunities. As I discuss below, it is also my opinion that this opportunity-oriented targeting of vouchers and housing production should be combined with other remedial features, including supportive services, to ensure that participating public housing residents are able to successfully access those opportunities afforded by the remedy.

Section I of this report, lays the foundation for the communities of opportunity approach, drawing upon research on the relationship between opportunity and racial segregation in general, and as it specifically relates to past public housing programs (Section IA). I apply this approach to public housing in Baltimore by analyzing the distribution of opportunity in Baltimore and identifying those areas of the region in which housing opportunities should be targeted (Section IB). I also discuss lessons learned from other housing mobility programs that should inform this remedy (Section IC). Furthermore, it is my opinion that the remedy imposed ought to be shaped by several principles and considerations; in Section II of this report I discuss those principles.

Statement of Qualifications

I am a Professor of Law at the Ohio State University and the Executive Director of the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity. I graduated from Stanford University with a B.A in Psychology and a Philosophy minor in 1969. I went on to receive my Juris Doctor from Boalt Hall at the University of California at Berkeley in 1973. From 1978 to 1980, I was a Post-Graduate Human Rights Fellow at the University of Minnesota.

I have worked as a practicing attorney in the Seattle Public Defender’s Office, in private practice, for Evergreen Legal Services, and as the Executive Director of Legal Services of Greater Miami. I have been a consultant to the government of Mozambique and lived and worked in India. I have also worked in Europe and South America. I am the former National Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU).
I have taught at the Columbia University School of Law, Harvard Law School, University of Miami School of Law, American University, the University of San Francisco School of Law, and the University of Minnesota Law School and I currently teach at Ohio State University, where I hold the Williams Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties at the Moritz College of Law. I held the Earl R. Larson Chair in Civil Rights and Civil Liberties Law at the University of Minnesota Law School and also the Marvin J. Sonosky Chair of Law and Public Policy. I was also a graduate professor in American Studies at the University of Minnesota.

I am a member of the National Bar Association, the National Conference of Black Lawyers and the National Housing Law Center Association. I have worked with the National Housing Law Project, the Minnesota Supreme Court’s Implementation Committee on Multicultural Diversity and Racial Fairness and am a former chair of the Minneapolis Affordable Housing Task Force.

I co-founded the Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC) and founded the Institute on Race and Poverty (IRP) at the University of Minnesota and the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity at the Ohio State University. I am recognized as an expert on issues relating to race, ethnicity, poverty and the law. Over the past 10 years, I have overseen over sixty funded research projects. Many of these projects focused on expanding our understanding of racial disparities and the structures from which they arise. These projects have been international, national, and local in scope: developing worldwide indicators of racial disparity for the World Conference Against Racism (WCAR) in Durban, South Africa; two extensive studies of racial profiling and police behavior (one for Saint Paul, Minnesota and one for multiple jurisdictions across the State of Minnesota); an analysis of voting patterns and disenfranchisement among racial minorities in Minnesota and the country in general; an examination of structural racism in the contemporary United States with a focus on metropolitan dynamics and regional planning; a survey of racial preferences for the Hollman case in Minnesota; a project examining the effectiveness of the Mt. Laurel initiative in creating opportunities for marginalized people of color; a project examining the effectiveness of the Metropolis 2020 plan in creating a revitalized and equitable Chicago metropolitan area; a research initiative to identify strategies and impediments to minority business development in Cleveland; a project analyzing the gender disparity in performance between African American male and female students; a diversity awareness research initiative; a report comparing the effectiveness of race-conscious remedies in South Africa, Brazil and the United States; and projects that have developed templates for measuring opportunity structures, for analyzing opportunity-based housing, and for analyzing the racial justice qualities of proposed initiatives.

I have published three books including In Pursuit of a Dream Deferred: Linking Housing and Education Policies. I have contributed book chapters to anthologies analyzing the entrenchment of racial disparities through urban sprawl, examining regionalism, understanding racial categories, understanding how structural racism functions in America and understanding the contributions of government taxation policies and housing policies to segregation. I have written extensively about racial justice and regionalism, concentrated poverty and urban sprawl, the link between housing and school segregation, opportunity-based housing, and other issues and, I have published over 50 articles in academic journals, law reviews, and newspapers.
I am considered to be a leading expert in the area of opportunity-based housing and I have played an integral role in the development and implementation of the concept. Specifically, I have published a number of studies related to opportunity-based housing, spoken throughout the country on the topic of opportunity-based housing, and have worked with numerous opportunity-based housing initiatives. The opportunity-based housing concept was influenced by my earlier work mediating a dispute between advocates of in-place affordable housing strategies and mobility based affordable housing strategies in the Chicago region. This work expanded into an early opportunity mapping initiative in the Minneapolis-St. Paul region and my work advising Chicago Metropolis 2020. As a consultant I advised Metropolis 2020 to adopt the opportunity-based housing framework, which it did. Since my work with Metropolis 2020 the organization has worked with major employers to better connect housing and employment in the region.

I have also worked with the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities in Chicago (LCMOC). The LCMOC is the largest fair housing organization in the nation, and was founded as a result of Dr. Martin Luther King’s open housing campaign in 1966. LCMOC administered the Gautreaux program in Chicago and thus has unique experience in understanding the effect of place on the outcome of subsidized housing residents. In 2001, I prepared a policy paper outlining the potential for an opportunity-based housing framework for the Chicago region. The LCMOC is using the opportunity-based housing framework to further both their advocacy and efforts to reform policy reform for the Chicago region.

My work in applying the opportunity-based housing framework has expanded beyond the Chicago region and I have applied the model from a research and policy perspective in multiple states and regions. Most recently, I advised the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Agency on how to modify their Low Income Housing Tax Credit guidelines to reflect principles of the opportunity-based housing framework. I conducted several recent statewide research projects on the connection between Low Income Housing Tax Credit housing production and opportunity. The most recent projects--in North Carolina and Maryland--assessed how state housing finance agency policies were siting developments relative to segregation and opportunity. In 2004, I completed an opportunity analysis of the subsidized housing supply in Columbus, Ohio for a faith-based regional housing advocacy agency.

I am in high demand as a speaker and average about 75-100 speeches a year to groups to policymakers, business executives, faith-based organizations, advocacy groups and funding organizations. I am known as one of the pre-eminent authorities in the country on linking metropolitan growth patterns to civil rights. In the past few months alone I have spoken about race, regionalism and equity at three national conferences and several national and regional training events for the Gamaliel organization, a national faith-based foundation that trains and supports community organizers. I cosponsored a national “Race and Regionalism” conference in May of 2005 with the Institute of Race and Poverty and am co-editing a book to be published from conference findings in 2006. I have recently been awarded a grant by an organization of African American business leaders in Cleveland to assess the impact of regionalism on the social, economic and political health of the African American community in the Cleveland region. I also am cofounder of the African American Forum on Race and Regionalism, a group
representing the leading African American experts on interactions between regional dynamics and racial disparity.

My curriculum vitae is attached to this report, and provides a more detailed look at my accomplishments and qualifications. I am being paid $275/hr for time spent in research on this report and $300/hr for time spent in testifying at deposition or at trial. In preparing my expert reports, I have been assisted by Jason Reece, Research Associate at The Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity, Gavin Kearney, former Director of Research at the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota Law School, and to a lesser extent by other members of my staff at the Kirwan Institute. The methods of analysis, secondary sources, databases, and other sources that I rely upon in this report are consistent with the manner in which I routinely address issues and questions of the nature discussed in this report.
I. The Remedy Should Connect Subsidized Housing Residents to Communities of Opportunity

An effective remedy must connect subsidized housing recipients to areas of opportunity in the Baltimore region. A race-conscious, voluntary remedy that combines vouchers with housing production and other supply-side strategies, and is targeted to integrated communities of opportunity, provides the best mechanism for doing so.

The foundation for this opportunity-based housing model is addressed in Section IA, immediately below. It is based on decades of empirical evidence demonstrating the link between racial segregation and access to opportunity, and has informed a number of housing initiatives throughout the country. In Section IB, of this report, I apply the opportunity-based approach to Baltimore, identifying high and low opportunity areas in the Baltimore region. Not surprisingly, my analysis reveals that African Americans are segregated from high-opportunity communities and that subsidized housing is clustered in segregated low-opportunity areas. The opportunity framework used in this analysis should inform where units are placed and be used to evaluate how the remedial process is progressing. The opportunity maps discussed in this section provide a framework for guiding subsidized housing policy to remedy the segregation facing African American subsidized housing recipients. The high opportunity areas identified in this analysis are locations for further investigation for targeting subsidized housing opportunities. Low opportunity areas should not be designated for remedial housing opportunities. In Section IC, I identify some key lessons learned from other voucher and mobility programs that should inform this remedy.

**Opportunity Based Housing**

Whites and people of color have different levels of access to opportunity, and housing segregation is a central cause of this disparity. Ideally, the remedy imposed in this matter should deliberately connect affordable or assisted housing to regional opportunities, such as high performing schools, meaningful employment, viable transportation, quality childcare, responsive health care, and other institutions that facilitate civic and political activity. I refer to such an approach as “opportunity-based housing.”

The central premise of opportunity-based housing, borne out of experience, is that residents of a metropolitan area are situated within an interconnected web of opportunities that shape their quality of life. The location of housing is a powerful impediment to or asset for accessing these opportunities and as such housing policies should be oriented towards providing this access wherever it may exist. While policy discussions often focus on the dichotomy of city and suburb, opportunity is dynamic, as evidenced by the existence of declining inner ring suburbs and redeveloping inner city neighborhoods in many regions today.

**The Opportunity Based Housing Model in Practice**

Variants of the opportunity based housing model can be seen in a number of areas, including fair share and workforce housing strategies. Both models seek to open the region’s

---

1 powell, Opportunity-Based Housing, 12-WTR J. AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEV. L. 188.
2 powell, Opportunity-Based Housing, 12-WTR J. AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEV. L. 188.
housing markets to address the exclusionary impact of land use policies.\(^3\) Both aim to connect housing to economic opportunities, implicitly in the case of fair share housing programs such as *Mount Laurel*, and explicitly in the case of work force housing initiatives which seek to create housing opportunities close to regional employment opportunities and affordable at the wages that such opportunities pay.\(^4\) Due to the “win-win” nature of work force housing initiatives (for both housing advocates and employers), work force housing programs are growing across the nation.\(^5\)

The opportunity-based housing framework has been most explicitly accepted in the Chicago region. The region’s largest fair housing organization, the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities (which was charged with administering the Gautreaux program) has embraced the opportunity-based housing framework. As stated by the organization in its 2005 report *The Segregation of Opportunities: The Structure of Advantage and Disadvantage in the Chicago Region*, “The Council has focused its energies on institutional, structural change and recognized housing, where one lives, as a crucial point of access to other economic and life opportunities.” The organization has conducted two opportunity mapping exercises in the region to assess if African Americans are separated from opportunity and to frame advocacy efforts to reduce regulatory barriers that bar access to opportunity for African Americans.\(^6\)

Chicago Metropolis 2020 is another regional organization that has embraced the opportunity-based housing framework. The organization was created by business interests but also includes labor, civic, religious and governmental organizations. Metropolis 2020 seeks to guide regional development policy to promote a socially, environmentally and economically healthier region. The organization has embraced the opportunity based housing framework for future growth of the region. As discussed in the *Metropolitan Housing Index: Housing as Opportunity*, a study analyzing what housing policy reform would improve the region’s economy:

The decision to focus the Index on housing is significant in two respects. First, it underscores our belief that housing is far more than a place to live. A home is also a gateway to opportunity - the most important connection to jobs, schools, transit and community. If we are to provide access to economic opportunity for more Chicago area families, then we must provide a broader range of housing choices throughout the region. Second, the Metropolis Index reinforces our belief that housing, like so many other issues, must be tackled regionally. It is an economic imperative: Workers must have housing choice reasonably close to job centers if our economy is to remain robust.\(^7\)

---

Metropolis 2020 has moved forward on housing initiatives connecting affordable housing to economic opportunities. The organization also developed a corporate pledge that commits employers to considering public transit access and availability of affordable housing when making expansion of investment decisions. More than 100 business leaders in the Chicago region have signed this pledge.8

Principles of opportunity-based housing can also be seen in the framework some states are using for assessing Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) applications. Established in 1987, the Low Income Housing Tax Credit program is the largest single source of publicly subsidized affordable housing construction today. The LIHTC program accounts for over $5 billion in federal subsidies annually and the program produced over 800,000 subsidized units in the 1990’s (in contrast, HUD’s affordable housing production was less than 50,000 units during this time).9 The Internal Revenue Service administers LIHTC, but individual states have significant flexibility in setting evaluation criteria for the projects. Traditionally, LIHTC has concentrated units in distressed segregated neighborhoods (most notably in the Northeast and Midwest). Increasingly, however, states are revising their project siting criteria to focus on building in areas of opportunity. LIHTC provides a good example of how affordable housing production can be tied to opportunity. Traditionally, LIHTC evaluation criteria primarily targeted distressed neighborhoods (or Qualified Census Tracts) for investment, but research indicates that preferences for higher poverty neighborhoods declined in state qualified allocation plans in the 1990’s.10 States are now more likely to mandate that the only distressed neighborhoods eligible for credits are those with active revitalization plans and some states have begun to orient LIHTC neighborhood preferences more to economic opportunity.11 Also, many states integrate other opportunity structures into their site selection evaluation, such as proximity to childcare, access to public transit, and access to nearby services, such as grocery stores and medical facilities.12

Several states add incentive scoring “points” in the competitive scoring criteria for Low-Income Housing Tax Credit developments in areas of income diversity, population growth or job

---

11 For an example of a LIHTC program requiring revitalization plans in qualified census tracts please review North Carolina’s QAP guidelines at: http://www.nchfa.com/Rental/RD2005qap.aspx
12 Research by Lance Freeman indicates that LIHTC production is still primarily in racially concentrated areas, the program is locating projects in less segregated and lower poverty neighborhoods than other traditional site based subsidized housing programs. See Lance Freeman, SITING AFFORDABLE HOUSING: LOCATION AND NEIGHBORHOOD TRENDS OF LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE 1990’S. Brookings Institute (2004). Available online at: http://www.brookings.edu/urban/publications/20040405_Freeman.htm
opportunities. Wisconsin recently modified its scoring criteria to prioritize zip codes with recent job growth for LIHTC investment. LIHTC developers seeking to build affordable housing in these areas are given 5 bonus points when applications for tax credits are reviewed. Minnesota utilizes indices of population growth and job growth to prioritize LIHTC projects. Illinois designed “live near work” criteria (granting 5 bonus points to applicants) to promote LIHTC development in suburban areas with job growth and labor shortages. Although 5 bonus points is not a large component of the total scoring criteria for LIHTC projects, the additional point margin can be critically important due to the high degree of competition between developers for tax credits awards. While these initiatives by individual state are admirable, HUD could and should use its leadership role to have the IRS require all states, including Maryland, to follow suite or at least provide strong incentives for the states to do so.

Elements of the opportunity-based housing concept can also be seen in recently proposed legislation reauthorizing HOPE VI. While it remains to be seen whether the proposed legislation would actually provide access to opportunity, it explicitly acknowledges that housing location is critical “to support excellent outcomes for families; especially children, with emphasis on excellent, high performing neighborhood schools and excellent quality of life amenities, such as first class retail space and green space.” In the proposed reauthorization, HOPE VI project evaluation would consider the quality of nearby educational opportunities and continue to focus on siting developments in lower poverty neighborhoods.

A. Foundation of the Communities of Opportunity Approach

Beyond the various policies and programs discussed above, the opportunity-based housing model I recommend is based on an extensive body of research identifying the harms of segregation and impact of neighborhood conditions on family well being. Neighborhood conditions have a critical impact on quality of life and access to opportunity. Racial segregation results in segregation from opportunity for African Americans and this isolation inflicts significant harm on African Americans (particularly those in subsidized housing). Mobility programs for subsidized housing recipients prove that accessing higher opportunity communities improves family social, economic and educational well being. Experiences from previous mobility programs also illustrate that the programs must provide support services and counseling for recipients, be fully integrated into regional opportunities, be race-conscious and recognize the constraints of the regional housing market.

13 The State of Minnesota grants bonus LIHTC points for projects built in the top ten and top twenty (job and population growth) counties in the State, for more information visit: http://www.mhfa.state.mn.us/multifamily/HTC2005forms.htm. California grants bonus points for projects in locations with inclusionary housing policies in high income and high job growth areas through its “balanced communities” guidelines. For more information visit: http://www.treasurer.ca.gov/ctcac/programreg/20050608.pdf
The Interrelationship of Racial Segregation and Opportunity Segregation

The segregation of African Americans results in their isolation from opportunity and clustering of subsidized housing contributes to this isolation. African Americans are primarily segregated into low-opportunity communities, with limited job access, neighborhood instability and poor schools. This opportunity segregation (and the harms associated with it) are present in the Baltimore region and are reinforced by the region’s clustering of subsidized housing opportunities.

African Americans remain the most racially segregated population in the nation (in reference to Whites). Despite very modest improvements in recent decades, racial residential segregation remains severe in most metropolitan regions in the United States. Nationally, the average metropolitan region has a dissimilarity index score for African Americans and Whites of .65 in 2000. This means that 65% of the metropolitan African American population would have to relocate in order for them to become fully integrated in our metropolitan regions.18

In most metropolitan regions today, few truly integrated communities can be found.19 In regions with larger African American populations, segregation is even more extreme.20 Residential segregation (as measured by the dissimilarity index) declined by more than 12 points between 1980 and 2000 in regions that were less than 5% African American, but this decline was only 6 points in regions that were more than 20% African American.21

In Baltimore, levels of segregation have decreased slightly over recent decades but the region is still highly segregated. These trends are seen in the dissimilarity index and other segregation indices (including the isolation index, delta index, and absolute centralization index).22 African Americans primarily live in the City of Baltimore and the western suburbs of Baltimore County (See Map 1). Generally, dissimilarity index scores greater than 0.6 indicate a very high degree of residential segregation. Various analyses of Baltimore indicate dissimilarity index levels greater than 0.71 for the City of Baltimore and greater than 0.67 for the metropolitan area.23 Others segregation indices also show high levels of residential segregation for the Baltimore region. Analysis by the U.S. Census Bureau using five different measures of

23 ETHNIC DIVERSITY GROWS: NEIGHBORHOOD INTEGRATION LAGS BEHIND (2001), Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Analysis http://mumford1.dyndns.org/cen2000/report.html. See also, Douglas S. Massey and Nancy A. Denton, AMERICAN APARTHEID: SEGREGATION AND THE MAKING OF THE UNDERCLASS (1993) at 20 (“A simple rule of thumb in interpreting these indices is that values under 30 are low, those between 30 and 60 are moderate, and anything above 60 is high.”); Edward L. Glaeser and Jacob L. Vigdor, RACIAL SEGREGATION IN THE 2000 CENSUS: PROMISING NEWS (April 2001) http://www.brookings.org/dybdocroot/es/urban/census/glaeserexsum.htm at 3 (“Generally, dissimilarity measures above 0.6 are thought to represent hypersegregation.”).
segregation finds the Baltimore region to be the 14th most segregated large metropolitan area in the nation as of the 2000 Census.24

The segregation of African Americans in metropolitan areas is not just segregation from Whites, but also segregation from opportunities critical to quality of life, stability and social advancement. Bruce Katz and Margery Turner synthesized the impact of this opportunity segregation in the 2003 Brookings Institute research brief Rethinking Affordable Housing Strategies: An Action Agenda for Local and Regional Leaders:

Residential segregation denies families of color full and free choice about where to live, while often denying minority neighborhoods the services and resources they need to thrive and grow. As a consequence, minorities’ access to quality schools, jobs, and economic opportunity is limited. The most extreme consequences of residential segregation are found in the central cities’ large urban areas. Because communities of color experience higher poverty rates than whites, the concentration of minorities in inner city neighborhoods also concentrates poverty and compounds its social costs. As jobs, wealth and economic opportunities have migrated to the suburbs, poor minority communities in the central city have become increasingly isolated and cut off from access to the mainstream of our society and economy. Thus, housing segregation helps sustain economic inequality and contributes to the persistence of urban poverty.25

Residential location plays a determinative role in life outcomes and social, physical and mental health.26 As stated in the findings report of the Congressional bi-partisan Millennial Housing Commission:

Neighborhood quality plays an important role in positive outcomes for families. Stable housing in an unstable neighborhood does not necessarily allow for positive employment and child education outcomes.27

African Americans continue to be concentrated in opportunity-poor inner city neighborhoods. Racial segregation in America results in segregation from opportunities such as employment, high quality education and safe, stable healthy neighborhoods. In the Baltimore region, persistent residential segregation, opportunity segregation, and the concentration of assisted housing in opportunity poor communities is evident. Research suggests that this correlation is apparent to many Whites and that they use the presence or absence of people of color as a proxy for the neighborhood and educational quality of a specific community.28

Economic Opportunity

Segregation affects the employment opportunities of low-income communities of color by

28 Please see race-conscious discussion in Section II.
impeding their educational growth and by physically isolating them from job opportunities. As white middle-class populations have moved outward to the fringes of metropolitan areas, businesses and jobs have followed. Policies that restrict the residential choices of public housing residents create a “spatial mismatch” between job opportunities and low-income families that need them. Moreover, gains achieved during the 1990’s in closing the gap between African Americans and jobs were generated by increasing the residential mobility of Blacks rather than redistributing employment opportunities. Jobs that remain in central business districts and are geographically accessible from racially and economically segregated neighborhoods are disproportionately unattainable because of a skills mismatch between job seekers and job requirements. Inner cities residents also have more difficulty getting vital information about job openings and support during the application process because of their isolation.

Research by the Brookings Institute in 2005 indicates that the “spatial mismatch” phenomenon persists. Analysis of metropolitan residential patterns and employment in 2000 for the U.S. reveals that 54% of the metropolitan African American population would need to relocate in order to eradicate the mismatch between housing and jobs for African American households. In comparison only 34% of Whites were segregated from employment.

Current transportation policies exacerbate the effects of this spatial mismatch. The lack of viable transit options in most metropolitan areas limits options for those without cars and it prevents central city residents from accessing jobs located in the suburbs. Nationally, people of color tend to rely on public transportation far more than whites, and the distances they must travel to new jobs in regions experiencing spatial mismatch can hurt their employment prospects. In urban areas, African Americans and Latinos together comprise 54 percent of public transportation users (62% of bus riders, 35% of subway riders, and 29% of commuter rail riders.) Twenty-eight percent of public transportation users have incomes of $15,000 or less, and 55
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30 A 1999 study showed that predominantly white suburbs in the United States contain 69.4% of the low skill jobs, while the central city typically holds 10.2 % of these jobs. Similarly, a recent study found that “metro areas with higher levels of black-white residential segregation exhibit a higher degree of spatial mismatch between blacks and jobs” and that the same applied to other communities of color. See Michael Stoll, Harry Holtzer, and Keith Ihlanfeldt, WITHIN CITIES AND SUBURBS: RACIAL RESIDENTIAL CONCENTRATION AND THE SPATIAL DISTRIBUTION OF EMPLOYMENT OPPORTUNITIES ACROSS SUBMETROPOLITAN AREAS (1999), available on-line at: http://ideas.repec.org/PaperSeries.html.
31 Id.
32 These jobs require college degrees more than in any other sub-metropolitan area. Id.
percent have incomes between $15,000 and $50,000. Only 17 percent have incomes above $50,000. Just 7 percent of white households do not own a car, compared with 24% of African-American households, 17 percent of Latino households, and 13 percent of Asian-American households. In addition to the barrier of distance, the employment prospects of transit riders are also diminished by longer commute times relative to car owners and infrequency of service. Spatial isolation contributes to the employment gap between African Americans and Whites, as indicated by a recent survey of spatial mismatch research:

Our review of recent SMH (spatial mismatch hypothesis) studies clearly suggests that the lack of geographical access to employment is an important factor in explaining labor market outcomes. Racial segregation is also heavily correlated with concentrated poverty; concentrated poverty is defined as a neighborhood where more than 40% of the population lives in poverty. African Americans and Latinos are the most likely to be segregated into concentrated poverty neighborhoods and 70% of the 7 million people living in concentrated poverty neighborhoods were African American or Latino in 2000. Paul Jargowsky described the detrimental effect of living in concentrated poverty neighborhoods in his 2002 study of concentrated poverty.

The concentration of poor families and children in high-poverty ghettos, barrios, and slums magnifies the problems faced by the poor. Concentrations of poor people lead to a concentration of the social ills that cause or are caused by poverty. Poor children in these neighborhoods not only lack basic necessities in their own homes, but also they must contend with a hostile environment that holds many temptations and few positive role models. Equally important, school districts and attendance zones are generally organized geographically, so that the residential concentration of the poor frequently results in low-performing schools. The concentration of poverty in central cities also may exacerbate the flight of middle-income and higher-income families to the suburbs, driving a wedge between social needs and the fiscal base required to address them.

---


38 “[T]he time spent traveling per mile for black central city residents is twice that of suburban whites, partly because more whites use their own car to get to work than do blacks (69 percent for whites versus 43 percent for blacks) who are more dependent on public transportation.” See Congressional Office of Technology Assessment, TECHNOLOGICAL RESHAPING 221-22 (1995) (citing Harry Holzer, Keith Ihlafeldt, and David Sjoquist, Work, Search, and Travel among White and Black Youth. 35 JOURNAL OF URBAN ECONOMICS 320-345 (1994).


On average, African Americans in the Baltimore region live in neighborhoods with higher poverty, higher unemployment and higher vacancy rates than other residents (See Table 1). The average African American neighborhood in the Baltimore region has a poverty rate that is nearly three times the poverty rate of the average White neighborhood. The vacancy rate in the average African American neighborhood is nearly double the rate for the average White neighborhood. The average African American neighborhood unemployment rate is more than double the rate found in the average White neighborhood.42

African Americans are also more likely to be isolated from employment opportunities in the Baltimore region than other residents. Research by the Brookings Institute in 2005 found that nearly 53% of African Americans in the Baltimore region would need to relocate to overcome the mismatch between employment centers and African Americans.43 This spatial disparity is greatest between African Americans and entry level, low skill employment opportunities and this is particularly problematic for public housing residents who tend to need such jobs. As seen in Map 2, the largest clusters of estimated entry level and low skill employment opportunities are found in the suburbs surrounding the City of Baltimore, while African American neighborhoods are found primarily in the central city. Most of the region’s recent job growth is oriented toward the suburban fringe of the region, and not well connected to the public transportation network indicating that this mismatch is worsening (See Map 3). Spatial analysis of projected job growth in the Baltimore region suggests that these trends will worsen in the future. As seen in Map 4, the projected fastest growing areas for job growth in the region are primarily outside of both the City of Baltimore and Baltimore County.

Educational Opportunity

While the African American labor force is isolated from economic opportunities, African American children remain concentrated in the poorest performing and most economically segregated school districts in the nation. Educational opportunities for most African Americans are segregated by race and class. Almost half of African American students in the U.S. attend a central city school district, compared to 17% of White students.44 Research measuring dissimilarity for metropolitan school districts in 2000 found that black/white dissimilarity in schools was .65, thus nearly 2 out of 3 children would need to transfer to integrate the nation’s metropolitan school districts. While neighborhood segregation declined slightly during the 1990’s, school segregation increased. Racial segregation is accompanied by economic segregation and African American children are much more likely to attend high poverty schools than their white counterparts. The average African American child attends a school with a 65% student poverty rate, compared to 30%

42 This data represents the characteristics found in typical neighborhood for the average African American and White resident of the Metropolitan Area. These figures were calculated by the Lewis Mumford Center and can be reviewed on-line at the “Measuring Neighborhood Inequality,” from the “Separate and Unequal” databases on neighborhood characteristics by race. Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Analysis. http://mumford1.dyndns.org/
for the average White student’s school. Segregated high poverty schools are also failing African American students. Three quarters of White students in ninth grade graduate on time while only half of African American students finish high school with a diploma in four years. Researchers feel that this is creating a educational crisis for urban youth, as stated by Gary Orfield at the Harvard Civil Rights Project.

When an entire racial or ethnic group experiences consistently high dropout rates, these problems can deeply damage the community, its families, its social structure, and its institutions.

Racial and economic segregation harm the quality of education received by children for a number of reasons. Poverty creates numerous challenges for families and their children’s learning processes that schools must address. In segregated areas, the scale of these challenges is much greater as the number of kids experiencing them is greater. As one study has found, “high poverty schools have to devote far more time and resources to family and health crises, security, children who come to school not speaking standard English, seriously disturbed children, children with no educational materials in their homes, and many children with very weak educational preparation.” Low-income students and students of color are also less likely to have qualified teachers, more likely to have teachers who completed an alternative certification program, and more likely to be taught by substitute teachers.

Because of these educational impediments, research has consistently found that both racial and economic segregation negatively affects students. For example, one study finds that there is a “consistent negative effect of high poverty concentrations in school on students’ academic achievement.” Another study finds that the poverty of a school, far more than the poverty of an individual, determines educational outcomes, and that impoverished students do better if they live in middle-class neighborhoods and/or attend more affluent schools.

Conversely, a wealth of research indicates that students who receive education in integrated environments fare better than their segregated peers. For example, a recent analysis of school desegregation in Louisville, Kentucky found that students of color who attend more integrated schools demonstrate increased academic achievement levels and higher test scores.\textsuperscript{52} Intergenerational gains also ensue when students of color attend desegregated schools. One study concludes “improving economic and educational opportunities for one generation of minority individuals raises the socioeconomic status of the next generation, so that those who follow are more apt to begin school at the same starting point as their non-minority classmates.”\textsuperscript{53} Attending a desegregated school also translates into higher goals for future educational attainment and occupational choices\textsuperscript{54} and improved social networks.\textsuperscript{55} The benefits of an integrated education do not just accrue for students of color. Diverse educational settings contribute to all students’ ability to participate in a pluralistic society.\textsuperscript{56} Blacks and Whites who attend desegregated schools are more likely to attend a desegregated college, live in a desegregated neighborhood, work in a desegregated environment, and possess high career aspirations.\textsuperscript{57}

Educational disparity has far reaching implications due to the fact that educational attainment is linked to many life indicators including health, income and employment. There is a strong positive relationship between the education level and health status of an individual; the lower the level of educational attainment the higher incidence of mortality rates and more common the prevalence of specific diseases such as cancer and heart disease.\textsuperscript{58} This can be largely attributed to the relationship between educational attainment and earnings. In the United States, each successively higher education level is associated with higher earning power, and data over the last 25 years shows that this gap is only widening.\textsuperscript{59} Furthermore, higher levels of educational attainment are associated with greater labor force participation rates and a lower


probability of unemployment. The gap in employment rates between college and high school graduates has been widening steadily as well.\textsuperscript{60}

Educational opportunity is segregated by race and class in the Baltimore region. The dissimilarity index for African American and White students in the Baltimore region’s schools was .73 in 2000 indicating that nearly 3 of 4 African American students in the region’s public schools would need to change schools to desegregate the region’s schools.\textsuperscript{61} The average African American student in the Baltimore region attends a school with a student poverty rate of 42%, while the average White student attends a school with a 19% student poverty rate.\textsuperscript{62}

The majority of African American children in the Baltimore region are concentrated in the Baltimore City school district, the poorest performing district in the region. In 2005, 51% of African American K-12 students in the region attended schools in the Baltimore City district, compared to 23% of the region’s total student population.\textsuperscript{63} For low-income African American children (those most likely to be living in subsidized housing) this concentration is more extreme. In 2000, 59% of African American children (all persons under 18 years of age) in the Baltimore region were found in the City of Baltimore, while 77% of the region’s African American children in poverty (as defined by the Census Bureau in the 2000 Census) were found in the City of Baltimore.\textsuperscript{64} Analysis of students who are eligible for free and reduced lunch supports this finding. In 2003, the percentage of economically disadvantaged students (the federal governments definition for free and reduced lunch children) in the Baltimore City School District was 73%, nearly three times the rate of the Baltimore County district (29%), and more than four times the rate of any other district in the region.\textsuperscript{65} Test scores in the Baltimore City district are considerably lower than those of its regional counterparts. Only 37% of Baltimore City students who took proficiency exams passed the reading proficiency test and only 26% passed the math proficiency test in 2003. The pass rates for all other districts in the region were approximately double the rates of Baltimore City.\textsuperscript{66} The Baltimore City District also contains the lowest percentage of classes taught by highly qualified teachers among all districts in the region. In 2004, almost two-thirds of classes taught in the Baltimore City schools were not taught by highly qualified teachers (65.7%).\textsuperscript{67} In comparison, 37.0% of classes taught in the Baltimore County district were not taught by highly qualified teachers. For other districts in the region this figure was considerably lower: Anne Arundel County (17.8%), Carroll County (13.1%), Harford County (19.9%) and Howard County (18.3%).\textsuperscript{68}

\begin{thebibliography}{99}
\bibitem{JointEconComm} Joint Economic Committee Study. January 2000. \textit{INVESTMENT IN EDUCATION: PRIVATE AND PUBLIC RETURNS. UNITED STATES CONGRESS.} Available on-line at: \url{http://www.house.gov/jec/educ.htm}
\bibitem{SegregationIndex} School segregation database for Metropolitan Areas by the Lewis Mumford Center for Comparative Urban and Regional Analysis. \url{http://mumford1.dyndns.org/}
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Maps 5 through 8 depict indicators of educational quality/opportunity in the region’s elementary school catchment areas. Most of the elementary schools in the City of Baltimore perform poorly based on all indicators (with the notable exception of the northern central area within the City of Baltimore). As seen in Map 5, the highest concentration of schools with large numbers of students eligible for free and reduced lunch (students in poverty) is located in the City of Baltimore. Conversely, low poverty schools are primarily located in the region’s suburban counties. Proficiency test scores show similar spatial disparities, with most of the City of Baltimore’s elementary schools performing poorly and suburban elementary schools (primarily in Baltimore County and Howard County) performing better (Maps 6 and 7). Spatial patterns of teacher qualification also follow these trends; the largest number of schools with large proportions of classes are taught by non-highly qualified teachers located in the City of Baltimore (Map 8).

**Health and Environment**

Racial and economic segregation also have negative health consequences. A recent study concluded:

Racial residential segregation is the cornerstone on which black-white disparities in health status have been built in the U.S. Segregation is a fundamental cause of health differences between blacks and whites because it shapes socioeconomic conditions for blacks not only at the individual and household levels but also at the neighborhood and community levels.69

Margery Austin Turner and Dolores Acevedo-Garcia, in a review of research on neighborhood effects on health, note that residents of poor, segregated neighborhoods experience poorer health outcomes because of increased exposure to the toxic substances that are disproportionately sited in their communities, and because of greater barriers to sustaining healthy behaviors such as limited access to adequate grocery stores.70 Recent research in Maryland finds that Census tracts with higher African American populations and lower socioeconomic status are more likely to be high risk in respect to exposure to cancer causing air toxins.71

A *New York Times* article synthesized research on the negative health effects of living in a racially and economically segregated environment. Among other things, the article noted that research “has shown that people who live in disadvantaged neighborhoods are more likely to have heart attacks than people who live in middle-class neighborhoods, even taking income differences into account.”72 The article also references recent findings from research on the Moving to Opportunity program: “HUD's most remarkable early findings had to do with health. In Boston, poor children who moved to low-poverty neighborhoods were less likely to experience severe asthma attacks. Adults in New York who moved were less likely to suffer

---

69 David R. Williams and Chiquita Collins, Racial Residential Segregation: A Fundamental Cause of Racial Disparities in Health, 116 PUBLIC HEALTH REPORTS 404, 405 (Sept.-Oct. 2001). Specific health risks of segregated neighborhoods that the authors reference include: elevated risks of cause-specific and overall adult mortality, infant mortality and tuberculosis; elevated exposure to noxious pollutants and allergens; a lack of recreational facilities; higher cost, poorer quality groceries; and limited access to high quality medical care.


71 Benjamin J. Apelberg, Timothy J. Buckley and Ronald H. White, Socioeconomic and Racial Disparities in Cancer Risk from Air Toxics in Maryland 113 ENVIRONMENTAL HEALTH PERSPECTIVES (June 2005).

72 Helen Epstein, Enough To Make You Sick?, The New York Times Magazine (10/12/03).
from symptoms of depression and anxiety than those who stayed behind, and adults in Boston
were more likely to report that they felt ‘calm and peaceful.’

Crime and Safety

One of the primary motives for public housing residents’ participation in residential
mobility programs is the desire to live in a safer neighborhood. This is not surprising given the
relationship between segregation, violence, and crime. A number of studies have linked segregation
to an increased likelihood of perpetrating and being victimized by violence and crime. The level
of stress experienced in high-poverty, isolated neighborhoods contributes substantially to this risk.
When parents face a high level of stress, child abuse and neglect, and family breakups are more
likely. Children exposed to violence can be more anxious and aggressive when they are in school,
and may have trouble concentrating. These and other risk factors have a cumulative effect and
this accumulation of risk contributes more significantly than any one factor to the likelihood that
young people will be exposed to violence.

Population Stability and Opportunity

Over the last several decades, many American central cities, including Baltimore, have
undergone significant population decline. These population losses have been greatest in cities
and neighborhoods that are poor and are racially segregated. This out-migration deepens the
levels of racial and economic segregation in these neighborhoods, as those who are able to move
are more likely to be affluent and white.

As one would expect, loss of population, particularly upper and middle class population,
is accompanied by loss of tax base. This in turn leads to a decline in the quality of municipal
services and in the availability of funding for education, resulting in increased tax rates for those
who are least able to shoulder them. Also accompanying central city population declines are the
out-migration of investment and employment opportunities discussed above. Conversely, more
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73 Helen Epstein, Enough To Make You Sick?, The New York Times Magazine (10/12/03).
74 The MOVING TO OPPORTUNITY INTERIM IMPACTS EVALUATION found that “perhaps most notable
from the perspective of the families themselves is the fact that they were successful in achieving the goal that
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Jacob, and Beecroft (Abt Associates Inc.) and Sanbonmatsu, Katz, Liebman and Kling (NBER), U.S. Department of
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stable neighborhoods tend to have higher property values, higher quality public services, and higher household incomes.  

As African Americans and Latinos increasingly move to the suburbs these patterns tend to follow them. They are more likely than whites to move to fiscally stressed suburbs with poor public services. Recent research has found that in major metropolitan areas nearly 80% of African Americans and Latinos who live in the suburbs live in “at-risk suburbs”.  

Research on Baltimore’s inner-ring suburbs, particularly those in Baltimore County and northern Anne Arundel County, illustrates trends similar to the national trends. Although Baltimore’s inner-ring suburbs are growing more racially diverse, they are growing more economically isolated and overall population growth has been stagnant. Between 1980 and 2000, Baltimore’s inner-ring suburbs experienced a 10% increase in the African American population, while the White population decreased by 15%. The inner-ring suburbs also have a diminishing share of the region’s employment, decreasing household income and increasing poverty rates. The Baltimore County suburb of Lochearn illustrates this point; between 1980 and 2000 the African American population increased from 49% of the total population to 78%. During this same time period, its poverty rate nearly doubled while inflation adjusted income and home values declined. Similar trends were seen in other suburbs like Lansdowne and Woodlawn.

Subsidized Housing and Opportunity Segregation

The clustering of assisted housing reinforces racial and opportunity segregation. Although subsidized housing does not necessarily cause White flight (especially if sited in moderate numbers), the extreme clustering of units in inner city neighborhoods does contribute to racial segregation. As of 2000, three quarters of the nation’s traditional assisted housing units were located in central cities while only 37% of the nation’s metropolitan population lived in
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80 See e.g., Chengri Ding and Gerrit-Jan Knaap, Property Values in Inner-City Neighborhoods: The Effects of Homeownership, Housing Investment, and Economic Development, 13 (4) HOUSING POLICY DEBATE 701-727 (2003). It should be noted, however, that stability by itself may not be an unmitigated good. One recent study found that neighborhoods with residential stability and low affluence were associated with poor health outcomes. Christopher R. Browning and Kathleen A. Cagney, Moving Beyond Poverty: Neighborhood Structure, Social Processes and Health, 44 JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR 552-571 (December 2003).


central cities. Low Income Housing Tax Credit projects are also clustered in central city locations: in 2000 58% of all LIHTC units were found in central city locations.\textsuperscript{85}

While the average metropolitan neighborhood had a 13% poverty rate in 2000, neighborhoods with traditional assisted housing\textsuperscript{86} had a poverty rate of 29%. While only 4% of all metropolitan housing units were in concentrated poverty neighborhoods, more than 11% of assisted housing units were found in concentrated poverty neighborhoods. The average neighborhood with traditional assisted housing had household incomes that were more than 40% lower and home values that were more than 20% lower than the average metropolitan neighborhood.\textsuperscript{87} Research in the 50 largest metropolitan regions (where the majority of African Americans live) has identified even greater concentration of assisted housing in high poverty (low-opportunity) areas. Almost 50% of public housing and 27% of project based section 8 housing is located in a concentrated poverty neighborhood in the 50 largest metropolitan regions.\textsuperscript{88} It is my understanding the expert report of Dr. Gerald Webster will illustrate the concentration of subsidized housing in the Baltimore region in segregated lower opportunity communities.


\textsuperscript{86} Note: This figure does not include LIHTC Units. LIHTC units were on average found in neighborhoods with a 19% poverty rate in 2000. Lance Freeman, SITING AFFORDABLE HOUSING: LOCATION AND NEIGHBORHOOD TRENDS OF LOW INCOME HOUSING TAX CREDIT DEVELOPMENTS IN THE 1990’S, Brookings Institute (2004). Available on-line at: \url{http://www.brookings.edu/urban/publications/20040405_Freeman.htm}


B. Identifying Communities of Opportunity in Baltimore

The first step in applying an opportunity-based approach in this remedy is to assess the regional distribution of opportunity. Mapping opportunity in the region requires selecting variables that are indicative of high (or low) opportunity. Once derived, opportunity maps should be used to guide subsidized housing (and affordable housing) policy. For the purpose of this remedy, the identified high opportunity areas should be further considered as potential locations for subsidized housing opportunities. Site-specific impediments may eliminate some locations from consideration and some anomalies may exist, but tracts identified as high opportunity areas provide a geographic framework within which to locate subsidized housing. In the future this analysis should be updated as the remedy progresses. Opportunity is dynamic and additional analysis should be undertaken to identify future potential high opportunity areas not captured in this analysis, in the future the exact measurements and metrics of opportunity may need to be periodically updated.

Measuring Opportunity

The opportunity indicators upon which I have focused include measures of economic health, educational opportunity, and neighborhood quality (and/or other quality of life indicators). Economic opportunity is primarily measured by focusing on the availability of jobs and on job growth as a way of determining future areas of job availability. Educational opportunity is primarily measured through student performance measures, teacher qualifications, and student economic status. Neighborhood quality is measured through a wide range of data reflecting neighborhood stability and quality, including housing values, vacancy, poverty rates, and crime. For this report, I have gathered data on these opportunity indicators for communities and neighborhoods throughout the Baltimore region.

For present remedial purposes, indicators of opportunity need to be tailored to the unique needs of subsidized housing residents. While opportunity indicators generally focus on standard categories of opportunity (jobs, school quality, and neighborhood quality), for our purposes this should be expanded and framed to address needs that are specific to this population, such as entry-level job access and public transit access. Moreover, the overall guidance provided by opportunity mapping should be employed flexibly so that the individual needs and attributes of public housing residents can be accounted for in a manner that maximizes desegregation and opportunity access. Indicators of opportunity will be of varying significance for different public housing residents. For example, school quality will be of less importance to elderly residents than to residents in general. Similarly transit access may be less critical for public housing residents that own cars.

89 John A. Powell, Opportunity-Based Housing, 12 WTR J. AFFORDABLE HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEV. L. 188.
Opportunity mapping is a critical step to link subsidized housing to opportunity. Although opportunity mapping provides an understanding of neighborhoods in the region where opportunity is great and where additional in-depth (site-based) analysis should be conducted. Conversely, opportunity mapping identifies where low opportunity areas are located. In the context of this remedy, this opportunity mapping analysis is a critical first step.

**Opportunity Mapping is grounded in Practice**

As discussed earlier, principles of opportunity-based housing have informed programs and policies for decades. With advances in research technology and Geographic Information Systems, opportunity mapping has also been increasingly used to guide such policies, as evidenced by several recent housing initiatives. For example, two opportunity-mapping exercises have been conducted in the Chicago region. The most recent assessment by the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities identifies “communities of opportunity” in the six-county Chicago metropolitan area. The opportunity-mapping project assists in analyzing housing need in the Chicago region as well as assessing the application of housing programs.

The policy of locating subsidized housing based on “impacted” or “non-impacted” areas in the Baltimore consent decree, utilizes some of the principles of opportunity mapping, focusing on an absence of poverty and racial concentration as indicators of opportunity. As seen in Map 13, 2000 Census Tracts that meet the race and poverty impacted areas guidelines (with 2000 African American populations and poverty higher than the regional average) generally coincide with low-opportunity areas in Baltimore. The growth in neighborhood indicator systems in major cities also uses a similar spatial framework to analyze neighborhood distress.

An extensive neighborhood indicator system for the City of Baltimore is already in use. The Baltimore Neighborhood Indicators Alliance (BNIA) utilizes neighborhood indicator analysis to inform housing and development policies. As stated by the BNIA:

The Alliance designed its core functions based on the knowledge that Baltimore needed a common way of understanding how our neighborhoods and overall quality of life are changing over time. Baltimore needed a common threshold from which to have discussions about what is best for changing conditions. Baltimore needed a mechanism to hold itself, and all others who work, live, play, and invest in its neighborhoods, accountable for moving in the right direction.

The private sector utilizes similar models in identifying appropriate locations for residential and commercial investment. Commercial entities make investment decisions based upon market research to quantify a geographic market’s relative health by using indicators. The databases used in this type of “cluster analysis” spatially identify locations for new businesses.
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95 SEGREGATION VS. OPPORTUNITY (2005). The Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, Chicago, IL.
97 BALTIMORE NEIGHBORHOOD INDICATOR ALLIANCE. Available on-line at: http://www.bnia.org/about/index.html
and investments. Similar to opportunity mapping, these indexes provide a first step in site location decisions and are followed by more detailed site-by-site analyses of investment potential.

**Indicators and Methods**

For the purpose of this analysis, opportunity was measured in three primary categories: economic opportunity/mobility, neighborhood health, and educational opportunity (Maps 9-12). A cumulative map of regional opportunity was created based on all three categories (Map 12). Census Tracts are classified into five groups (very low, low, moderate, high, very high) based on the quintile in which their opportunity index scores fall. Each group contains 123 census tracts. Thus, very low-opportunity areas represent the 123 lowest scoring Census Tracts in the region and very high-opportunity areas represent the 123 highest scoring Census Tracts.

Multiple opportunity indicators were identified and analyzed at the census tract level for each category of opportunity. Data for the opportunity indicators was obtained from multiple sources including the U.S. Census Bureau, state and national school quality databases and the Baltimore Regional Council. The indicators identified in Appendix A, were used to assess the relative level of opportunity for the primary opportunity categories. Appendix B describes in more detail how the opportunity index was calculated and what Geographic Information Systems techniques were used to analyze the data.

Social science research and previous opportunity mapping research guided the selection of indicators chosen for this analysis. Although the precise measurements used to assess indicators are flexible and can be refined, the primary indicators utilized (education, economic opportunity, and neighborhood health) are critical to the opportunity analysis. For example, the manner in which educational quality is measured can be modified, but education as a core indicator of opportunity must be included in the analysis.

**Indicators of Economic Opportunity and Mobility**

For purposes of the remedy, economic opportunity and mobility must be particularized to the unique employment and mobility needs of African American subsidized housing residents. As indicated by the spatial mismatch literature, proximity to employment is important to accessing employment opportunities. It is apparent from the extensive literature on spatial mismatch that inner city residents do not have access to much of the region’s employment opportunities. Jobs are moving further away from the inner city and this disparity is even greater for entry level or low skill jobs.

In addition, lower income central city residents of color are much more dependent on public transportation. In the City of Baltimore, African American auto ownership is very low (an estimated 44% of African American households did not own an automobile in the 2000 Census) and more residents rely on public transit to reach employment. In the 2000 Census, 20% of
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99 For a complete description of all indicator data, see Appendix A.
100 For more information please review the discussion on spatial mismatch in the “economic opportunity” section of this report.
101 For more information on spatial mismatch, see Section 1A.
commuters in the City of Baltimore used public transit to reach work and this figure was even higher for African American commuters (28%).

Given these factors, measures of locally available entry level and low skill jobs, and identification of areas with less competition for entry-level jobs, employment trends, and transit access must be included in an opportunity analysis. Specific economic opportunity indicators data included:

- The number of estimated entry level and low skill employment opportunities within 5 miles of each census tract in 2002. The analysis focuses on entry level and low skill jobs as these are jobs most likely to be attainable for subsidized housing residents.
- The ratio of entry level and low skill employment opportunities per 1,000 residents within 5 miles of each census tract in 2002. This measure helps to determine locations with relatively high demand for entry-level workers. Although low wage jobs may be found in inner-city areas, there are also many low-income workers nearby competing for these jobs. Therefore, jobs located near concentrations of low income households may be less accessible to potential employees than jobs outside the urban core. Previous researchers have also utilized a method of "weighting" job accessibility measurements to account for this competition for available jobs.
- The absolute change in employment opportunities within 5 miles of each census tract from 1998 to 2002. This is included to identify areas of increasing employment opportunity.
- The proportion of each census tract within one-half mile of a public transit line. As addressed in the discussion above, public transit is important for low income inner city African Americans. Although transit is highly flexible and can be improved in non transit, high opportunity communities, to best address the direct needs of subsidized housing residents, transit was included as one of the factors in the opportunity analysis.
- The median commute to work time (in minutes). Commute time is a general measure commonly utilized to assess the proximity to regional employment opportunities. The purpose of including this measure was to identify areas that are the most accessible (in respect to travel time) to the region’s employment opportunities.

103 It is important to note, however, that there is a long history of transportation discrimination and areas with exclusive housing policies are also likely to be areas that resist transit lines. Thus, an opportunity-based housing approach must balance the need to meet the transit needs of residents with the potential for reinforcing the exclusion of public housing residents from opportunity-rich areas that do not participate in the mass transit system. In crafting a remedy, it is important to recognize that the transit system is flexible and, to the greatest extent possible, efforts should be made to overcome transit barriers in otherwise opportunity-rich areas.
104 Five miles is the proximity distance used in previous opportunity mapping analysis. This distance measure could be further refined based on local input and assessment of the potential travel barriers of subsidized housing residents.
105 There are various methodologies to define entry level or low skill employment; this is just one approach utilizing zip code industry business patterns data. It should be noted that this methodology will differ from the methodology used in the expert report of Dr. Basu. From my understanding, Dr. Basu’s low wage employment analysis utilized county level occupational employment data, this county level data source is not available at the geographic scale needed for our analysis (zip codes) and therefore was not an applicable methodology for our analysis.
**Indicators of Neighborhood Health**

Neighborhood quality affects residents by determining local public and private services; shared norms and social control, peer influences, social networks, crime and violence, and job access.\(^{107}\) Research shows that living in a severely distressed neighborhood undermines the health and well-being of both adults and children.\(^{108}\)

Measures of neighborhood health included:

- **Rate of population change from 1990 to 2000.**\(^{109}\) As discussed earlier, population declines are associated with neighborhood disinvestment, higher taxation and lower public service quality.\(^{110}\)
- **Estimated crime rates in 2000.** Crime and physical deterioration are identified by residents as the most critical elements of neighborhood quality.\(^{111}\) The crimes include murder, rape, robbery, assault, burglary, theft, and motor vehicle theft. Linking low crime areas to subsidized housing is not unprecedented. A recent article by *The Dallas Morning News* reported that the Dallas Housing Authority will soon stop allowing section 8 voucher use in areas where crime rates within a ¼ mile of the section 8 housing development are higher than the city average in the previous six months.\(^{112}\)
- **Poverty rates for the general population in 2000.**\(^{113}\) An extensive body of literature has identified the detrimental impact of concentrated neighborhood poverty on quality of life.\(^{114}\)
- **Vacant property rates in 2000,** gathered from the 2000 Census of Population and Housing. As discussed earlier, physical deterioration is a principle indicator of neighborhood quality.\(^{115}\) Vacant property is also associated with higher crime, higher

---


\(^{109}\) Although population loss can be more specifically targeted to loss of middle income and higher income residents, in this analysis loss was measured by the total population only. Refinement of this analysis may want to modify this methodology to target these households.


\(^{112}\) Kim Horner, *Rentals in Unsafe Areas Won’t Get Vouchers; Dallas Agency’s Program Will Make Crime Rates a Factor*, The Dallas Morning News (08/10/05).

\(^{113}\) Although unemployment is referenced often in the literature in respect to neighborhood conditions, for this analysis poverty was utilized as a better measure of socio-economic status. We had concerns about the accuracy of local unemployment rates and the potential impact of varying degrees of labor force participation distorting the local unemployment rates. Thus, neighborhood unemployment rates may vary significantly based on labor force participation, potentially showing low unemployment if large numbers of the work force have stopped looking for employment.

\(^{114}\) For more information please review discussion on concentrated poverty in the economic opportunity section, earlier in this report.

public service costs, and neighborhood property depreciation and as a threat to public safety.\textsuperscript{116}

- Property values for owner occupied homes in 2000, measured as median home value in the 2000 Census.\textsuperscript{117} As discussed earlier in this report, more stable neighborhoods tend to have higher property values.\textsuperscript{118} Housing prices and neighborhood quality are highly correlated, and housing prices are influenced by many factors, including proximity to jobs and commercial establishments, access to environmental amenities, taxes and public services, and the income level of neighborhood residents.\textsuperscript{119}

**Indicators of Educational Opportunity**

A comprehensive analysis of educational opportunity should rely on a broad variety of measures. For purposes of this analysis, however, I have focused on a handful of key indicators. These include teacher quality, economic segregation and isolation, and measures of academic proficiency.\textsuperscript{120} As discussed in more detail below, measures of educational opportunity include:

- The proportion of elementary and middle school students qualifying for free and reduced lunch in 2004. As stated earlier in this report, school quality and the economic status of its student body have been shown to have significant connections to student performance.\textsuperscript{121} Higher poverty schools have been proven to negatively impact student performance, regardless of the individual student’s economic status. Also, teachers in higher poverty schools must spend more time to address the additional needs of high poverty students and as a result have less time to focus on teaching course work.

- The proportion of classes not taught by highly qualified teachers in 2004. Teacher qualifications are important in assessing whether students receive high quality instruction.\textsuperscript{122}

\textsuperscript{116} For more information on the impacts of vacant and abandoned properties visit the resource page of the National Vacant Property Campaign. Located on-line at: \url{http://www.vacantproperties.org/facts.html}

\textsuperscript{117} Much of the research on housing cost and neighborhood quality focuses on homeowner property values and not rents. In this analysis, home values were utilized due to concerns about the statistical validity of data on rental property rents in suburban areas. Some suburban areas have relatively few rental units and only a sample of these units is used to produce Census 2000 gross rent data. Thus, utilizing rents to determine neighborhood quality may be less reliable than utilizing home values.

\textsuperscript{118} Chengri Ding and Gerrit-Jan Knaap, Property Values in Inner-City Neighborhoods: The Effects of Homeownership, Housing Investment, and Economic Development, 13 (4) HOUSING POLICY DEBATE 701-727 (2003). It should be noted, however, that stability by itself may not be an unmitigated good. One recent study found that neighborhoods with residential stability and low affluence were associated with poor health outcomes. Christopher R. Browning and Kathleen A. Cagney, Moving Beyond Poverty: Neighborhood Structure, Social Processes and Health, JOURNAL OF HEALTH AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR 44: 552-571 (December 2003).


\textsuperscript{120} The state of Maryland uses additional indicators of educational quality that were not used in this analysis. These include attendance, absenteeism and graduation rates. For the purpose of this analysis, graduation data was not utilized because of concerns about the validity of this indicator for elementary schools (which were the basis of our analysis).


• The proportion of elementary and elementary school students proficient in reading in 2004 (as measured by the 3rd and 5th grade Maryland school assessments). Although test scores are not perfect tools to measure student proficiency and may be discriminatory, given the central role that they play in determining advancement and the opportunities available to students, and the importance of scores in the federal No Child Left Behind legislation they must be acknowledged as important measures.

• The proportion of elementary and elementary school students proficient in math in 2004 (as measured by the 3rd and 5th grade Maryland school assessments). See comments above.

Comprehensive Opportunity Map

I have combined the individual indicators of opportunity to derive a composite map of opportunity for the Baltimore region. The opportunity-based housing framework guides analysis of neighborhoods with respect to a holistic approach to defining opportunity. As Galster and Killen note, the housing, mortgage, criminal, labor, political, social service, educational systems and local social networks are “bound in an immensely complicated nexus of casual interrelationships.”123 While the opportunity-based housing framework emphasizes housing as the central determinant of opportunity, this is largely because of housing location relative to other opportunity structures, such as jobs and education. Map 12 depicts the overall opportunity index for the Baltimore region. This comprehensive assessment includes all 14-opportunity indicators, measured by averaging standardized scores for the three sub-categories (economic opportunity and mobility, neighborhood health, educational opportunity).

Results

As seen in Maps 9 through 12, the distribution of opportunity has distinct spatial patterns in the region. Economic opportunity and mobility are greatest in three primary areas in the region. North of the City of Baltimore in Baltimore County, in some areas near downtown Baltimore, and in areas of Howard and Anne Arundel Counties southwest of the City of Baltimore (Map 9).

Map 10 depicts the distribution of healthy neighborhoods in the Baltimore region. Indicators of neighborhood health locate the healthiest neighborhoods almost entirely outside the City of Baltimore. Large clusters of healthy neighborhoods are found in all surrounding counties in the region.

Map 11 depicts the distribution of educational opportunity in the Baltimore region and these results mirror neighborhood health in the region. The distribution of educational opportunity is highly skewed toward the region’s suburban counties. All very low educational opportunity census tracts are clustered within the City of Baltimore. The only suburban County with a large concentration of low educational opportunity areas is the portions of Baltimore County west and east of the City of Baltimore.

While the individual opportunity maps provide insight into specific areas for improvement, the comprehensive opportunity map is most critical for informing housing policy as it provides the most complete assessment of opportunity in the region. As seen in Map 12, opportunity-rich areas are distributed throughout the counties in the region but the primary

concentration of high-opportunity tracts are found in suburban counties. The largest clusters of very high opportunity tracts are located in central Baltimore County, southern Howard County, northern Anne Arundel County and southern Harford County. The City of Baltimore is the primary location of very low-opportunity tracts in the region, but areas of high opportunity are found on the north central edge of the City of Baltimore.

**African Americans are Segregated into Low Opportunity Areas**

In the Baltimore region, the distribution of opportunity rich and poor communities mirrors patterns of racial segregation. As seen in Map 15, African Americans are segregated away from high-opportunity neighborhoods and into low-opportunity neighborhoods in the Baltimore region. Census tracts identified as very low-opportunity were 81% African American in 2000 and very high-opportunity tracts were only 12% African American in 2000. Conversely, very low-opportunity tracts were 15% White and very high-opportunity tracts were 80% White in 2000. In the six county region, over 72% of African Americans are located in either very low or low-opportunity areas; in contrast only 18% of Whites reside in very low or low-opportunity areas (See Table 2).

Racial segregation from opportunity operates independently of income in Baltimore as low-income Whites are considerably less segregated from opportunity than low-income African Americans. Almost 84% of the region’s low-income African American households were found in low-opportunity Census Tracts. In comparison, only 33% of the region’s low-income White households were found in low-opportunity Census Tracts. More low-income Whites lived in higher opportunity Census Tracts (37%) than lived in low-opportunity Census Tracts (33%). Only 10% of low-income African Americans lived in high-opportunity Census Tracts (See Table 3).

Similarly, high-income African Americans do not have the same access to higher opportunity areas as high-income Whites in Baltimore. Sixty seven percent of high-income White households lived in high-opportunity Census Tracts in 2000, while only 30% of high-income African Americans lived in high-opportunity Census Tracts. In 2000, more than half of high-income African American households (56%) lived in low-opportunity Census Tracts, compared to 11% of high-income White households (See Table 3).

**Affordable Housing is Deficient in High Opportunity Areas**

Rental housing is primarily clustered in low-opportunity areas but opportunity rich census tracts do contain a significant number of rental housing units. Analysis of price data for these rental units in high-opportunity areas indicates that it is relatively expensive and thus beyond the means of low-income households. Nearly half of the region’s rental housing in 2000 was found in low-opportunity communities (49%). Of the 104,000 rental housing units located in high-opportunity areas, approximately 60% cost more than the HUD fair market rent for a 2 bedroom apartment in the Baltimore region as of 2000 ($643). The region’s supply of rental units below fair market rent in 2000 was even more clustered in low-opportunity areas than rental

---

124 Low Income households earn less than $30K, Middle Income households earn $30K to $60K, and High Income households earn more than $60K. This methodology was adopted from the Lewis C. Mumford Center’s research on the dynamics residential segregation by race and income, delineating (poor, middle income and affluent households). For more information visit the Mumford Center’s website at: [http://mumford.albany.edu/census/segregation/home.htm](http://mumford.albany.edu/census/segregation/home.htm)
units in general. Only 21% of the 210,000 rental units with rent less than $650 a month were found in high-opportunity communities (See Table 4).  

**Subsidized Housing is Concentrated in Low Opportunity Areas**

The region’s subsidized housing is primarily clustered in low-opportunity areas. **Map 14** illustrates this clustering of subsidized housing sites in 1998 and LIHTC sites in 2001 in low-opportunity areas (primarily in the City of Baltimore) in the region. Nearly two-thirds of Section 8 voucher households (65%) are located in low-opportunity Census Tracts (Table 5). Approximately 20% of all Section 8 households are located in high-opportunity areas, and an even lower percentage of African American Section 8 households are located in high-opportunity areas. Over three-fourths (77%) of all African American Section 8 voucher holders were found in low-opportunity Census Tracts, while only 29% of White Section 8 voucher holders were located in these tracts. Conversely, high-opportunity Census Tracts contained 35% of White voucher holders and only 15% of African American Section 8 households (Table 5).

**Additional Considerations When Applying Opportunity Mapping to the Remedy:**

Identifying communities of opportunity is a dynamic process that should adapt to account for the particular needs of subsidized housing recipients and to incorporate new and updated data as it becomes available. The opportunity maps created for this report provide an initial portrait of how opportunity-based housing can be applied to the remedy.

**C. Mobility Program Lessons for Remediying Racial and Opportunity Segregation**

It is my understanding that the expert report of Turner and Briggs will discuss the successes and failures of public housing mobility programs in terms of providing access to integrated environments and to opportunity. Given this, my discussion will focus on specific lessons that can be learned from these programs in terms of implementing an opportunity-based housing strategy.

**The Gautreaux Program**

The first lawsuit to result in a metropolitan-wide housing desegregation remedy was filed over three decades ago on behalf of the more than 40,000 African-American families in, or waiting for, public housing in Chicago. The Court ordered HUD to develop and implement a program that would result in the movement of thousands of black families from poor, segregated neighborhoods to low-poverty, white suburban neighborhoods. This metropolitan-wide remedy became known as the *Gautreaux* program and was the country’s largest and longest-running residential, racial, and economic integration effort. Over twenty years, about six thousand

---

125 Note: gross rent data from Census 2000, the Census gives values in ranges for the number of units within ranges of $ values (e.g. $550 to 699, $600 to $649). Thus $650 was selected as the dividing range to represent units that cost more or less than HUD’s 2 bedroom FMR in 2000.
126 Data used in this map was from the HUD 1998 picture of subsidized housing and is not current; LIHTC developments in this data were updated to 2001 but all other data from this map is from 1998. Due to the age of this data, this information will not be consistent with more recent data from the expert report of Gerald Webster. A small number site based data in the HUD 1998 picture of subsidized housing has not geographic information (longitude and latitude coordinates). Due to this missing geographic information these points could not be mapped.
families participated in this remedy and it was administered by the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities, which counseled families, recruited landlords, worked with public housing agencies, and made subsidy payments under the Section 8 program.

The Gautreaux remedy used both tenant vouchers for participants to access existing housing and incentives for Section 8 units to be set aside in new construction. For the former, the remedy required that no more than 25% of participants relocate within the City of Chicago or within minority areas of the metropolitan area beyond Chicago. In order to avoid resegregation, the Leadership Council “initially de-emphasized and later excluded the large portions of the city and parts of the southern and western suburbs where significant numbers of Blacks lived. Those areas contained a disproportionate amount of the area’s affordable rental housing – and many landlords there accepted Section 8 tenants.”  Moreover, the Council limited the total number of Gautreaux families in any one area in order to maintain existing racial integration. Further, the Council assured landlords that applicants were pre-screened for credit-worthiness, and that both tenants and landlords participation would be anonymous.

The Moving to Opportunity Demonstration Program

The success in providing housing opportunities throughout the metropolitan region, and the positive results that ensued, were the impetus for HUD’s Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program which began in 1994. MTO was designed as a ten year social science experiment to rigorously test the “geography of opportunity” thesis supported by Gautreaux. However, unlike the Gautreaux remedy, the MTO program was poverty, not race-based. As a result, families often moved to neighborhoods that were highly racially segregated and within the same service districts, such as public school districts, as their prior housing. MTO demonstration sites included Baltimore, Boston, Chicago, Los Angeles, and New York.

Counseling, transportation, and affordable, appropriate units are critical to successful mobility program implementation:

To identify barriers to effective desegregation with mobility vouchers, we reviewed research on representative housing desegregation programs which included a mobility-based remedy. In Chicago, an overwhelming majority of tenants enrolled in the Chicago Housing Authority’s mobility program had trouble finding a place they liked with enough bedrooms; finding landlords who would accept Section 8 vouchers, and accessing transportation for apartment hunting. Because of this, most voucher users were reconcentrated in high-poverty segregated neighborhoods, or poor, minority areas at the neighborhoods scale, even if the census tract was

131 HUD also incorporated the mobility approach into its Regional Opportunity Counseling (ROC) and Vacancy Consolidation Programs. Leonard Rubinowitz & James Rosenbaum, CROSSING THE CLASS AND COLOR LINES: FROM PUBLIC HOUSING TO WHITE SUBURBIA (2000).
largely low poverty.\textsuperscript{133} Pointing to the need for meaningful connection to stable communities of opportunity, more respondents wanted help with long-term, rather than short-term, services, such as obtaining a GED and getting computer training.\textsuperscript{134}

In Dallas, operating under the consent decrees issued in \textit{Walker v. HUD}, African American public housing tenants were similarly struggling with a tight housing market, increasing rents, and community resistance.\textsuperscript{135} Because about half of Dallas Housing Authority families need three-bedroom apartments, and only 3.5\% of the private market offers units this large, there is intense competition for available units.

In Minneapolis, during the implementation of a negotiated consent decree in \textit{Hollman v. Cisneros}, African-American participants had difficulty locating a unit in a non-impacted area that would rent to them; therefore they had to make segregative moves out of necessity.\textsuperscript{136} Lack of transportation was another problem with accessing suburban areas. Minneapolis’ Hmong community opposed forced dispersal, and felt rushed to find new units, again struggling to find units with enough bedrooms for large families.\textsuperscript{137}

\textit{Unrestricted voucher use leads to reconcentrations of poor minorities:}

Unstructured choice voucher programs may disperse some tenants successfully, but a 2003 HUD study of Housing Choice Voucher (HCV) location patterns found that minority participants are much more likely to live in neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated: “Black and Hispanic families are more likely than White participants to live in neighborhoods where poverty is concentrated…the latter are more likely to live in low-poverty neighborhoods.”\textsuperscript{138}

While \textit{Gautreaux} emphasized racial desegregation through a race-based structured choice framework, research from MTO and HOPE VI, which are not race based, tend to show racial reconcentrations. Although HOPE VI was not a housing mobility program, the experiences of HOPE VI voucher users are relevant. While HOPE VI survey respondents who used vouchers to move wanted to move to safer, less poverty-stricken neighborhoods, 30 to 40\% still live in high

\textsuperscript{133} Mary K. Cunningham and Susan J. Popkin, CHAC MOBILITY COUNSELING ASSESSMENT FINAL REPORT (October 2002). Published by the Urban Institute (Washington D.C.) and the Great Cities Institute at the University of Illinois at Chicago.

\textsuperscript{134} Mary K. Cunningham and Susan J. Popkin, CHAC MOBILITY COUNSELING ASSESSMENT FINAL REPORT (October 2002). Published by the Urban Institute (Washington D.C.) and the Great Cities Institute at the University of Illinois at Chicago.


\textsuperscript{136} Mary K. Cunningham et. al., CH. 5: BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC HOUSING DESEGREGATION CASES: MINNEAPOLIS by BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC HOUSING DESEGREGATION CASES: CASE STUDIES – VOLUME 2; Prepared by the Urban Institute in February 2000 for HUD.

\textsuperscript{137} Mary K. Cunningham et. al., CH. 5: BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC HOUSING DESEGREGATION CASES: MINNEAPOLIS by BASELINE ASSESSMENT OF PUBLIC HOUSING DESEGREGATION CASES: CASE STUDIES – VOLUME 2; Prepared by the Urban Institute in February 2000 for HUD.

\textsuperscript{138} Devine, Deborah et. al. HOUSING CHOICE VOUCHER LOCATION PATTERNS: IMPLICATIONS FOR PARTICIPANTS AND NEIGHBORHOOD WELFARE. U.S. Dept. of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research (January 2003).
poverty and high crime neighborhoods. Since there is no race-conscious element in unrestricted voucher use, 76% still live in neighborhoods with at least 80% minorities. Because of the lack of appropriate units in the suburbs for large families, many families reconcentrated in the city, in under-resourced neighborhoods similar to their previous ones. In fact, because the housing market was so limited, residents vied for any available housing away from their former developments, regardless of any increases (or lack thereof) in amenities and services.

One last note of caution with respect to the use of mobility-based programs is the possibility that the neediest families, those hardest to house (large families with children; adults with disabilities and lack of education and skills) might be lost entirely, leading to a reconcentration of the very poorest outside of public housing.

Research on mobility programs to date thus illustrates the need for a race-conscious opportunity-based housing framework: public housing residents need not just housing vouchers, but a choice of units that meets their needs in a range of opportunity-rich areas across the metropolitan area. Otherwise, unstructured choice may lead, as it has in the past, to significant reconcentrations of racialized poverty in neighborhoods already facing increasing poverty and lack of opportunity.

---

140 Larry Buron, Abt Associates, AN IMPROVED LIVING ENVIRONMENT? NEIGHBORHOOD OUTCOMES FOR HOPE VI RELOCATEES. Urban Institute Metropolitan Housing and Communities Center Brief No. 3, (September 2004).
142 Robin E. Smith et. al. at the The Urban Institute Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center; HOUSING CHOICE FOR HOPE VI RELOCATEES (Final Report: April 2002). Prepared for HUD.
II. Concluding Remedial Principles

In order to effectively remedy the harms in this matter, it is my opinion that the remedy must account for the following principles/considerations:

A. **The remedy must be sensitive to opportunity and to the importance of location in determining access to opportunity.** Where we live and where we have the opportunity to live determine not only our ability to live in an integrated environment, but also determine our ability to access those opportunities and resources that are critical to life outcomes and health.

HUD officials have long recognized that housing, in particular its location, is a key determinant of a family’s well-being and access to opportunity. For example, in a 1967 “Briefing on Civil Rights Progress,” HUD officials stated the Department’s commitment to eradicating segregation and providing housing in healthy and opportunity-rich environments:

The Department is publicly committed to extract the legal maximum from existing laws and orders on equal opportunity and civil rights in administering its programs so as to break down racially restrictive housing and provide the disadvantaged and discriminated against families with the widest possible opportunity and choice for good housing in wholesome environments. Indeed, the all-important focus of the Department’s business and endeavors is people and improving their life and choices for all members of the public to the optimum. …We must look at the totality of the urban environment and the quality of the lives of all its people and the impact of our programs on broadening their opportunities and choices.145

Then HUD Secretary Robert C. Weaver similarly acknowledged the link between fair housing and opportunity one year later:

[T]he enforced patterns of racial separation, which have characterized many aspects of our society, are handmaidens to the problems of racial discrimination and hostility which so plague us today. Separate but equal is inherently unequal because it denies to one group the choices and opportunities which are the promise of American life and the badge of first class citizenship. The goal is ... to allow every man the same natural choices as to where to live and travel and the same opportunity to fulfill his potential.146

Similar statements and policy commitments have been espoused by HUD officials since that time. For example, during a 1993 Senate hearing, then-Secretary of HUD Henry Cisneros denounced "the extreme spatial segregation or separations in American life by income, class and

---

145 Robert A. Sauer and B. T. McGraw, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Secretary’s Staff Meeting, BRIEFING ON CIVIL RIGHTS PROGRESS, July 12, 1967, at pp.12-13; Adker 058914, 058925-6 (HUD1).

146 Memorandum from Robert C. Weaver, HUD Secretary to "All Principal Staff" RE: "Clarification of Law and Department Policy RE: Integration," p.2 (Oct. 15, 1968); Adker 056850, 056852 (HUD1).
race.” In its stead he called for the deconcentration of poverty and greater residential choices for impoverished persons of color, particularly in suburban areas.

These statements are consistent with a large and growing body of knowledge on the harms of segregation and its denial of opportunities to people of color. These harms touch all major life areas including education, employment, and health and safety. Conversely, research and experience indicate that there are a number of benefits to accessing housing in neighborhoods that are racially and economically integrated. The harms of residential segregation and benefits of providing public housing residents with access to integrated neighborhoods are more fully discussed in Section I of this report.

B. The remedy must be metropolitan-wide.

In order to remedy the harms of its failure to desegregate and further fair housing, HUD must pursue metropolitan-wide strategies. Various policies and practices, including those of HUD, have triggered two related demographic changes in the City of Baltimore over recent decades: substantial population loss and a large increase in the proportion of residents that are African American. Between 1950 and 2000, the city lost a third of its population and the African American population increased from 24% of the City’s population in 1950 to 64% in the 2000. During this same time period, over a half million Whites left the City. As a result of these demographic trends the City of Baltimore and the larger Baltimore region are severely segregated.

147 Hearing Before the Senate Comm. on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, 102d Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (Apr. 28, 1993) (statement of Henry Cisneros, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development).
148 In his testimony, Secretary Cisneros warned that "[u]nless we can deconcentrate the populations of our poorest ... [u]nless we can make it possible for people to have greater choice and move to suburban areas ... we will not succeed." Hearing Before the Senate Comm. on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs, 102d Cong., 2d Sess. 7 (Apr. 28, 1993) (statement of Henry Cisneros, Secretary of Housing and Urban Development).
149 Expert report of Shelly Lapkoff, Ph.D. "Demographic Analysis of Baltimore and Its Federally Assisted Housing" (October 1st, 2003)
As this Court noted in its January decisions, the demographics of the City of Baltimore make desegregating public housing with only City-level remedies impossible:

Geographic considerations, economic limitations, population shifts, etc. have rendered it impossible to effect a meaningful degree of desegregation of public housing by redistributing the public housing population of Baltimore City within the City limits.152

As seen in Map 1, African American majorities are found in most of the Census Tracts within the City of Baltimore. As of 2000, only 26 of the City’s 200 Census Tracts contained an African American representation lower than the regional average of 27%. Over half of the City’s Census Tracts were more than 75% African American.153 Moreover, the average African American in the City of Baltimore was living in a Census Tract that was 83% African American in 2000.154 This segregation is even more pronounced for African Americans living in poverty. The City of Baltimore contains almost 60% of the Baltimore region’s African American population, but nearly 80% of the Baltimore region’s African Americans living in poverty are found in the City of Baltimore.155 With these population distributions, meaningful public housing desegregation that focuses only on the City of Baltimore is impossible. This Court noted the futility of trying to desegregate housing within the City of Baltimore alone:

The Court finds it no longer appropriate for HUD, as an institution with national jurisdiction, essentially to limit its consideration of desegregative programs for the Baltimore Region to methods of rearranging Baltimore's public housing residents within the Baltimore City limits.156

Due to these constraints, a regional approach is necessary to provide public housing residents with integrated housing choices. This Court, in its January decision, articulated the need for such an approach:

The Court finds an approach of regionalization to be integral to desegregation in the Baltimore Region and that regionalization was an important alternative course of action available to Federal Defendants. By the term ‘regionalization’ the Court refers to policies whereby the effects of past segregation in Baltimore City public housing may be ameliorated by providing housing opportunities to the Plaintiff class beyond the boundaries of Baltimore City.157

153 Based upon analysis of Census 2000, STF3 Census Tract data (analysis does not include population claiming two or more races in 2000).
155 Data derived from analysis of Census 2000, STF3 data for the Baltimore region.
In addition to being necessary to provide desegregated public housing opportunities (as noted above and discussed in detail in Section I of this report), a metropolitan-wide approach must be utilized because opportunity is largely lacking in those Baltimore neighborhoods that public housing residents are currently able to access. For public-housing residents to access a variety of critical opportunities -- such as good schools, healthy neighborhoods and economic opportunities -- they must have the opportunity to live in opportunity-rich neighborhoods throughout the metropolitan area. Thus, a successful remedy would not reconcentrate public housing residents from the central city in those inner-ring suburbs facing the same shortage of resources and diminished opportunities. A successful remedy would instead transcend the city-suburb dichotomy and focus on creating public housing options wherever desegregated, opportunity-rich neighborhoods exist.

In the absence of effective regional housing planning, local actions can undermine efforts to integrate housing and provide access to opportunity. Political fragmentation -- the division of metropolitan areas into numerous local governmental entities -- plays a significant role in the racial segregation and opportunity segregation that exist in metropolitan America, including in the Baltimore region in particular. Political fragmentation allows municipalities to enact parochial policies, such as exclusionary zoning, that ensure residential segregation. These policies contribute to racial segregation and segregation from opportunity. Suburban housing and land use policies that promote larger lot development have been found to depress the growth of suburban rental housing and limit in-migration of African American and Latino households. These exclusionary policies combined with the fragmentation of local government and school districts in metropolitan areas works to uphold persistent racial segregation. Density, site restrictions and land use restrictions make most affordable housing difficult to construct. For example, lot size requirements, provisions requiring large setbacks, or a lack of land zoned for multi-family housing add to the cost of housing construction.

Because county government, as opposed to municipal government, is Maryland’s primary form of local government, the Baltimore region is often described as a “big box” region. Overall, big box regions have been shown to exhibit lower segregation indices than “small box” regions. However, Baltimore is one of the most segregated big box regions in the nation, and has been described by David Rusk as highly “inelastic” because of the inability of the City of Baltimore to annex and influence more of the region. Of the 119 major metropolitan areas analyzed by David Rusk, Baltimore falls in the top 10% of inelasticity, with a similar measure to

158 Rolf Pendall, Local Land Use Regulations and the Chain of Exclusion, 66 (2) J. AMERICAN PLANNING ASS’N (Spring 2000).
159 For more information regarding the nexus between fragmentation and segregation please review my article: “Sprawl, Fragmentation, and the Persistence of Racial Inequality: Limiting Civil Rights by Fragmenting Space,” found in Greg Squires, ed., URBAN SPRAWL: CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES, AND POLICY RESPONSES (2002).
160 For more information regarding the nexus between fragmentation and segregation please review my article: “Sprawl, Fragmentation, and the Persistence of Racial Inequality: Limiting Civil Rights by Fragmenting Space,” found in Greg Squires, ed., URBAN SPRAWL: CAUSES, CONSEQUENCES, AND POLICY RESPONSES (2002).
that of Pittsburgh, Cleveland, and New Haven. Inelastic areas, usually corresponding with small box governance structures (i.e. Pittsburgh and Cleveland) are more racially segregated than elastic areas. Therefore, despite the potential for reduced segregation in a big box structure, Baltimore exhibits the increased racial segregation of an inelastic region due to the powers possessed at the county level. This fact was identified in the 1996 analysis of impediments prepared for the Baltimore Metropolitan Council.

Although it is beyond the scope of this report to identify every zoning requirement or land use policy that has or may have a negative impact on fair housing choice in the Region, it is clear that some zoning requirements and land use policies in the Region do have such an impact and they present an impediment to fair housing choice.

Just as fragmented planning promotes exclusion, regional inclusionary policymaking can effectively reduce metropolitan segregation and inequity. For example, Montgomery County, Maryland has one of the longest running inclusionary zoning ordinances in the nation. The Montgomery County program, requiring private development to make 15% of units affordable in large housing developments, has produced over 11,000 affordable housing units since its inception. Research by David Rusk in Maryland projected the impact of applying such a policy to the Baltimore region. Rusk estimates that had such a policy been in place in Baltimore between 1980 and 2000, the region would have produced an additional 15,800 units of workforce housing and 7,900 units owned by a subsidized housing authority. He notes that less than 10% of these units would have been located in Baltimore City. Perhaps the most striking part of Rusk’s projection is that if these units had been specifically targeted to the residents of Baltimore city’s poorest neighborhoods, all concentrated poverty would be eliminated.

Although this type of inclusionary zoning policy is beyond the power of HUD to mandate, it illustrates metropolitan-wide policies can reduce metropolitan racial and economic segregation. It also demonstrates the potential created when regional planning mechanisms supersede local exclusionary impulses. HUD must not rely on local governmental entities to implement a remedy that desegregates public housing on a regional level. HUD is not impotent to encourage, facilitate and structure incentives and discentives for local practices in order to further regional desegregation and need not provide federal approval, ratification, funding and assistance or legitimacy to practices that impede the regional implementation of fair housing.

It is my understanding that the expert report of Margery Austin Turner and Xavier De Souza-Briggs will discuss how fragmentation of public housing programs among local Public Housing Authorities also maintains the segregation of public housing residents by limiting their ability to seek housing opportunities in jurisdictions other than the ones in which they currently

163 David Rusk, CITIES WITHOUT SUBURBS 3RD EDITION: A CENSUS 2000 UPDATE (2003). See Table 2.2.
reside. This is particularly true in the context of voucher programs where local administration limits voucher portability. An effective remedy should ensure that opportunities are provided throughout the Baltimore region and be designed in a manner that overcomes the structural impediments created by fragmented administration.

C. The remedy must be race-conscious. Such a remedy is compelled by the nature of the violation in this matter, and by the nature of HUD’s fair housing duties. As demonstrated below, it is also compelled by the realities of the housing market, which preclude an effective race-neutral remedy.

A race-conscious remedy is appropriate in this case because of the undisputed history of de jure racial segregation of public housing in Baltimore. A race-conscious remedy is also necessary to avoid unintended outcomes that frustrate the goals of providing meaningful opportunity access in integrated neighborhoods to public housing residents. One very real outcome that could emerge from a race-neutral approach is a re-clustering of African American public housing residents in new neighborhoods in a manner that triggers new waves of White flight. Such a process could destabilize otherwise healthy neighborhoods and frustrate the goal or providing public housing residents with meaningful access to opportunity and to integrated neighborhoods. Research regarding the stability of integrated neighborhoods during the last two decades of African American suburbanization supports this concern. In a study of integrated neighborhoods in 15 major metropolitan areas from 1980 to 2000, researchers found that traditionally integrated neighborhoods were found to rapidly segregate after the African American make-up of the neighborhood exceeded 29%.167 It is my understanding that the expert report of Briggs and Turner discusses that re-clustering of African American public housing residents could also trigger declines in neighborhood property values further contributing to neighborhood destabilization. A race-neutral remedy that failed to consider these dynamics and the racial demographics of neighborhoods in which subsidized housing opportunities might be created runs the long-term risk of replicating the racial segregation and denial of opportunities currently experienced by public housing residents.

Neighborhood racial composition is a direct consideration when Whites are making housing and school choices.168 In a 2001 national survey, researchers found that the likelihood of White’s choosing to purchase a home in a neighborhood declined significantly as the percentage of African Americans in the neighborhood surpassed certain thresholds. Whites become much less likely to purchase a home in a neighborhood with an African American composition higher than 15% and if the African American population increased to more than

168 Multiple studies have identified race as a factor impacted the location decisions of Whites. For more information see Nancy Denton and Douglas Massey, Residential Segregation of Blacks, Hispanics and Asians by Socioeconomic Status and Generation, 69 SOCIAL SCIENCE QUARTERLY 797-817 (1998); Lawrence Bobo and Camille Zubirnksy, Attitudes on Racial Integration: Perceived Status Differences, Mere In-Group Preferences or Racial Prejudice? 74 SOCIAL FORCES 883-909 (1996); and George Galster, Residential Segregation in American Cities: A Contrary Review, 7 POPULATION RESEARCH AND POLICY REVIEW 93-112 (1988).
65%, few Whites would choose the neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{169} Although some debate exists around the implicit motivation for these choices, it is clear that Whites equate the presence of African American residents in a neighborhood with poor neighborhood quality regardless of the underlying reality:

Whites avoid living in neighborhoods with non-token black populations because of the associations they make between the presence of blacks and high crime, low housing values, and low quality education.\textsuperscript{170}

Additionally, because racial segregation and opportunity segregation are largely coextensive, White residential choices motivated by a desire to live in opportunity-rich areas also exacerbate segregation.\textsuperscript{171} That said, it is possible to fashion an effective integrative remedy in spite of these preferences. A recent study by George Galster of section 8 housing voucher usage found that such usage in high property value White neighborhoods had positive or negligible effects unless they were used in large numbers in a concentrated area.\textsuperscript{172}

Residential choices driven by race and residential choices driven by opportunity can both have adverse effects for African Americans and for this reason an effective remedy should be both race-conscious and opportunity-conscious. The choices that Whites make are always related to the structures of opportunity and the housing market. Government policies directly impact the distribution of opportunity and the housing market, therefore government policy influences the racialized choices made by Whites. White perceptions have been influenced by the government’s long history of actions and policies that have concentrated and segregated assisted housing, and discriminatory actions by other government agencies and private actors that diminish opportunity in African American communities. A remedy that does not take into account race and opportunity will not account for the racialized choices made by White homeowners and renters. Although, White flight is a real phenomenon, the government is not powerless to influence this behavior. The potential for White flight can addressed and mitigated if the following steps are taken: new assisted housing opportunities should be located in moderate numbers and not over concentrated, assisted housing should be targeted to higher opportunity White areas and not lower opportunity White communities and assisted housing should be sited at a metropolitan level.

\textsuperscript{172} George Galster, Peter Tatian and Robin Smith, The Impacts of Neighbors Who Use Section 8 Certificates on Property Values, Vol. 10. No. 4. HOUSING POLICY DEBATE (1999).
A race-conscious remedy is also important because of the persistence of racial discrimination in the housing market.\textsuperscript{173} It is reasonable to expect that this discrimination will impact African American participants in the remedy. A race-conscious remedy could track this, reveal broad discriminatory patterns, and allow for remedies to be adapted to overcome the role of discrimination.

Experiences from another state support the finding that a race neutral remedy would be unsuccessful in this context. The potential for such an outcome that does not achieve its original purpose is illustrated by the \textit{Mount Laurel} decisions in New Jersey and the “fair share” policies that emerged from them. Plaintiffs in the first \textit{Mount Laurel} decision claimed that local municipalities in New Jersey were creating and perpetuating racial segregation through racially discriminatory “exclusionary zoning” policies. The court rejected this race-based claim and accepted defendants’ assertion that these policies were driven by purely economic motives. Nonetheless, the court invalidated these policies under the New Jersey constitution and mandated that each municipality take steps to provide for its fair share of the low and moderate income housing needs of its region.

Over time, the \textit{Mount Laurel} decisions, and the state housing act that resulted from them, have resulted in the construction of a large number of low- and moderate-income housing. Because the fair share remedy has been implemented in an ostensibly race-neutral manner, however, it has not reduced the racial segregation of New Jersey’s regions as would be expected if these exclusionary policies were solely economically motivated. Suburban units are overwhelmingly occupied by White low and moderate income residents while central city units are overwhelmingly occupied by residents of color.\textsuperscript{174} These trends have been attributed to a number of factors. One is that some suburban municipalities have fulfilled their fair share obligations by deliberately constructing low- and moderate-income housing that is more likely to be occupied by white residents and less likely to be useful for residents of color. For example, municipalities have favored the production of elderly housing and studio and one bedroom units, both of which serve a disproportionately white sector of the low and moderate-income population, and have refused to create multi-bedroom housing, housing that is more likely to benefit families of color. It is critical that the remedy in the present matter evaluate the racial impacts of the various mechanisms through which desegregation and access to opportunity are to occur. Failure to do so creates the capacity for well-intentioned “race-neutral” policies to be implemented in ways that frustrate the goals of the remedy.\textsuperscript{175}

D. The remedy need not and should not force the dispersal of public housing residents who wish to remain in their present location.

\textsuperscript{173} See, \textit{e.g.}, Camille Z. Charles, \textit{The Dynamics of Racial Residential Segregation}, 29 \textit{ANNUAL REVIEW OF SOCIOLOGY} 167-207 (2003).


\textsuperscript{175} See, Florence W. Roisman, \textit{The Role of the State, the Necessity of Race-Conscious Remedies, and Other Lessons from the Mount Laurel Study}, 27 \textit{SETON HALL L. REV.} 1386 (1997).
It is my opinion that the remedy imposed in this matter should impose mandates upon HUD consistent with its statutory and constitutional duties. I believe that public housing residents, however, should be given the opportunity to opt into the integrative housing program or programs that result from this matter. While participation should be optional, to be effective, the remedy should present participants with structured choices, choices guided by the duty to desegregate public housing and provide access to opportunity. Moreover, interest in the opportunities created via the Partial Consent Decree in this matter suggests that there is strong demand for the type of program envisioned.176

Past experiences with public housing programs demonstrate success where residential choice and the goals of desegregation are balanced, i.e. in those cases where program participation is optional and desegregation guides choices within the program. Chicago’s Gautreaux program illustrates the potential benefits of a voluntary structured choice mobility program. To address racial discrimination in Chicago’s public housing program, the Court-ordered Gautreaux program facilitated the move of thousands of Black families from pockets of severe urban poverty and lack of opportunity to low-poverty, White suburban neighborhoods. The Gautreaux remedy was guided by a race-conscious, structured choice model in which residents voluntarily applied to move out of existing public housing into a limited range of suburban communities. Suburban areas identified as already having a disproportionate share of the region’s affordable housing, or areas already integrated, were eliminated to avoid reconcentrating racialized poverty in inner-ring suburbs. High demand for the program illustrated that many African American public housing residents were eager to have the choice to move to safer, more affluent communities while others opted to remain in public housing within the City of Chicago.177

E. The remedy must be goal-driven.

The processes and policies through which African American public housing residents are offered the opportunity to live in desegregated, opportunity-rich neighborhoods are critical. To be truly effective, however, the success of these processes and policies must be explicitly evaluated against the goals of desegregation and opportunity access. I believe that this Court envisioned such a remedy when it stated in a letter of April 14, 2005:

[T]he Court must be presented with evidence that permits the consideration of remedial actions invoking the Court’s power to require processes to effect HUD’s meeting its legal duties while retaining HUD’s executive discretion to the fullest extent appropriate.178

Evaluating any process-based remedies against their success in providing African American public housing residents with access to desegregated, opportunity-rich neighborhoods would

---

176 According to the October 2004 Statistical Report from Baltimore Metropolitan Quadel, up to this date over 7,200 families applied to take part in Partial Consent Decree Program. The Local Defendants Report for the period of July 2005 indicates that between January 1st and June 30th of 2005 an additional 1,469 families submitted preliminary applications to take part in the Partial Consent Decree Program.


ensure that HUD meets its legal duties without mandating the means by which they do so. Such an evaluation would help ensure the effectiveness of the processes pursued, and would also provide HUD with the flexibility to adapt its strategies in response to unexpected outcomes or changing conditions.

The possibility of a remedy being undermined by unexpected outcomes is discussed in section II(C) above. The possibility of it being undermined by changing conditions is evidenced by the changing conditions of Baltimore’s rental housing market over the last decade or so, and the impact of this change on the viability of public housing vouchers. As of the mid-1990s, HUD considered the Baltimore region’s housing market to be “soft,” indicating that rental vouchers would provide ample opportunity for public housing residents to access opportunities throughout the region.179 These conditions have changed rapidly, however. As this Court observed earlier this year, Baltimore now has a tight rental market and this change has significant implications for the impact of public housing programs: "One of the 'lessons learned' from the HOPE VI program was that housing vouchers are 'not viable replacement housing options' in tight housing markets like Baltimore's."180

F. The remedy should make use of the variety of tools available to HUD.

Housing vouchers have proven to be an effective method of providing access to opportunity if programs are supported properly and adequately account for housing market conditions. In tight or fluctuating housing markets, however, vouchers may provide access only to segregated, opportunity-poor neighborhoods and/or may not allow holders to access housing at all. Market forces “tend to steer low-income residents into areas where other low-income residents already live” – even when the goal is to deconcentrate poverty.181 This is particularly true in tight housing markets such as those of Baltimore. A recent study of the effectiveness of vouchers in creating housing mobility found:

Mobility programs were hindered by a lack of units at or below the FMRs. Very tight rental housing markets in NYC, Minneapolis, Dallas and Omaha made the competition for units very intense and made it difficult for housing authorities to recruit landlords to participate in the program.182

Experiences from the HOPE VI program further illustrate the problems with vouchers in constrained housing markets. Beyond the cost of rent in opportunity-rich areas, HOPE VI relocatees with Section 8 vouchers often clustered in poor areas due to the lack of units outside such areas that met their needs. Specifically, because of the lack of rental units for large families in less segregated lower poverty areas, many families reconcentrated in under-resourced

---

179 David Varady, CASE STUDIES OF VOUCHERED-OUT ASSISTED PROPERTIES. U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Office of Policy Development and Research. (Page 1-8; Exhibit 15.)
181 John M. Hartung and Jeffrey Henig., Housing Vouchers and Certificates as a Vehicle for Deconcentrating the Poor, 32 URBAN AFFAIRS REVIEW 403-419 (January 1993). Page 416.
182 Edward G. Goetz, Housing Dispersal Programs, 18 JOURNAL OF PLANNING LITERATURE 3-16 (August 2003).
neighborhoods similar to those they had left.\textsuperscript{183} The limited utility of vouchers was noted by this Court in its previous decision: 'One of the 'lessons learned' from the HOPE VI program was that housing vouchers are 'not viable replacement housing options' in tight housing markets like Baltimore’s.'\textsuperscript{184}

Real estate data produced by Metropolitan Regional Information Systems, Inc. indicate rapid increases in housing cost in the Baltimore metropolitan market. The median sales price for a home in the Baltimore region increased by 64\% between 2000 and 2004.\textsuperscript{185} Between 2003 and 2004 median sales price has increased from $172K to $210K, an increase of 22\%. According to the National Low-income Housing Coalition, 2 Bedroom Fair Market rents for the Baltimore Metropolitan Statistical Area have increased from $628 in 1999 to $847 in 2005, an increase of 35\%.\textsuperscript{186} It is my understanding that the expert report of Dr. Basu will address the changing housing market conditions in the Baltimore region in greater detail.

It is my understanding that the expert report of Dr. Gerald Webster will indicate that voucher users in the Baltimore region are highly clustered in the City of Baltimore and suburban vouchers are generally clustered near the City’s boundaries. For African American voucher holders, this clustering is even more severe, with most voucher holders located in urban areas. Some of the market constraints in the region’s rental housing supply impact these trends. Regionally, rental housing remains clustered in the City of Baltimore and inner-ring suburban communities (\textit{See Map 16}). In the 2000 Census, the City of Baltimore contained 40\% of the region’s occupied rental housing, in comparison the City of Baltimore contained only 20\% of the region’s owner occupied housing units.\textsuperscript{187} Fifty percent of rental housing in the Baltimore region is in Census Tracts with an African American population greater than 27.2\% (the metropolitan average African American population) and more than 50\% is located in tracts with an African American population that is smaller than 27.2\%.\textsuperscript{188} Those rental options that do exist outside of these areas are cost prohibitive at current subsidy levels; gross rents in most of the suburban portions of the Baltimore region are more expensive than rental housing found in the City of Baltimore (\textit{See Map 17}). The remedy ordered in this matter needs to account for these dynamics. Vouchers must be structured to provide access to opportunity-rich areas and must be designed to adapt to fluctuating market conditions.

\textsuperscript{183} Robin E. Smith et. al. at the The Urban Institute Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center; HOUSING CHOICE FOR HOPE VI RELOCATEES (Final Report: April 2002). Prepared for the US Department of Housing and Urban Development. However, “[those] who moved farther away from their developments were more likely to discuss increased opportunity as a by-product of their move.”


\textsuperscript{185} Real estate data taken from the on-line housing price database at Metropolitan Regional Information Systems Inc. Located on-line at: \url{http://www.mris.com/tools/stats/index.cfm}

\textsuperscript{186} Fair market rent data taken from the “Out of Reach” housing wage database produced by the National Low-income Housing Coalition. The database uses HUD’s FMR estimates and gives fair market rent data for 2-bedroom units in the Baltimore region. Available on-line at: \url{http://www.nlihc.org/oor2004/}

\textsuperscript{187} Source: U.S. Census Bureau, Census 2000. STF3 data. \url{http://www.census.gov}

\textsuperscript{188} Based on analysis of Census Tract rental unit data and African American population data from the 2000 Census.
Appendix A: Opportunity Indicators

The following notes and source information pertain to the indicators utilized in the opportunity index. Discussion of the relationship between each indicator and high or low-opportunity is included in the body of the report.

Indicators of Economic Opportunity and Mobility:


2. Proximity to Potential Entry Level and Low-Skill Jobs 2002: Estimated with U.S. Census Bureau Zip Code Employment Data. Estimate based on industry categories associated with low skill or entry-level employment. The potential number of low-skill and entry-level jobs is based on industry employment from the zip code level. Entry level job industries included: Forestry, fishing, hunting, and agriculture, Mining, Construction, Manufacturing, Wholesale trade, Retail trade, Transportation & warehousing, Admin support, waste mgt, remediation services, Accommodation & food services and Other services (except public administration). An estimate of entry level employment for each sector was calculated based on the median of the employment range given by the Census Bureau. Final figures were calculated by analyzing the number of estimated jobs in 2005 within 5 miles of the center of each Census Tract. Zip code business patterns data contains information for all business establishments with one or more paid employees. This data does not include the self-employed, domestic service, railroad, agricultural production workers, and most government workers.

3. Ratio of Entry Level and Low Skill Employment Opportunities per 1,000 Residents: Calculated by assessing the number of estimated entry level and low skill jobs (discussed in #2 above) per 1,000 residents living within 5 miles of the center of each Census Tracts. Population figures were calculated from Census 2000, Census Tract data for population (STF3 data).

4. Proximity (within a ½ mile) of Public Transit Lines: Analyzed by calculating the proportion of each Census Tract (in area) within 0.5 miles of a public transit line. Measured with public transit GIS data acquired from the Baltimore Regional Council.

5. Median Commute to Work Time: Median commute time for workers traveling to work from each Census Tract. Measured with U.S. Census Bureau Decennial Census data. Date Source: Census 2000, STF3 Dataset at the Census Tract level.

Indicators of Educational Opportunity:

Note: All data was collected and analyzed for elementary school only, the larger number of elementary schools (and smaller catchment areas) enabled a more precise geographic
analysis of opportunity than high schools or middle schools which have larger catchment areas.

1. Proportion of Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch: Data represents the percentage of students eligible for free and reduce lunch in 2004, this is the most common indicator traditionally used to identify student poverty. Data acquired from the State of Maryland, Department of Education for 2004.

2. Proportion of Classes Not Taught by Highly Qualified Teachers: Data represents the proportion of classes taught by “not highly qualified” teachers, as defined by the Federal No Child Left Behind Act. Data acquired from the State of Maryland, Department of Education for 2004. “Highly Qualified Teachers” defined by the Federal No Child Left Behind Act. General qualifications for “highly qualified teachers” include: earning a bachelor’s degree from an accredited institution of higher education and having a valid standard professional certificate of advanced professional certificate or resident teacher certificate in the subject area they are teaching. Additional requirements are expected dependent grade level taught, these requirements can be found at: http://www.marylandpublicschools.org/MSDE/programs/esea/docs/TQ_Regulations/general_definition.htm

3. Proportion of Elementary Students Proficient in Reading: Data represents the proportion of students proficient or advanced in 3rd and 5th grade reading tests. Data acquired from the State of Maryland, Department of Education for 2004.

4. Proportion of Elementary Students Proficient in Math: Data represents the proportion of students proficient or advanced in 3rd and 5th grade math tests. Data acquired from the State of Maryland, Department of Education for 2004.

Indicators of Neighborhood Health:

1. Rate of Population Change 1990 to 2000: Proportional change in population from 1990 to 2000. Measured with U.S. Census Bureau Decennial Census data for 1990 and 2000. Data Source: 1990 and 2000 Census Tract population data (1990 data adjusted to 2000 Census Tract boundaries). Neighborhood change data was from the Geolytics Neighborhood Change Database software. Due to limitations with this data, 100% count population data was utilized instead of sample population counts.


4. Property Vacancy Rates: Measured with U.S. Census Bureau Decennial Census data. Calculated by dividing the number of vacant properties defined as “other”, (thus not for sale or rent, or for seasonal use) by the total number of housing units (utilizing the 1990 vacant “other” definition. Data Source: Census 2000, STF3 Dataset at the Census Tract level. Data was extracted from the Geolytics Neighborhood Change Database software.
5. Estimated Crime Index 2000: Calculated with Block Group crime index data produced by AGS demographic for 2000. Original data extracted from the ESRI Business Analyst software. The Crime Index data is an estimate produced by AGS demographic based on multiple years of local crime data (from the 1990’s) and more recent macro level (state and jurisdictional) crime data. A summary of the methodology utilized to create this index can be found online at:
Appendix B: Notes on Geographic Information Systems techniques and statistical methods.

Calculating the Opportunity Index:

The various opportunity indicators were analyzed relative to the other Census Tracts within the region by standardizing through the use of z scores. A z score is a statistical measure that quantifies the distance (measured in standard deviations) a data point is from the mean of a data set. The use of z scores allows data for a census tract to be measured based on their relative distance from the average for the entire region. The final “opportunity index” for each Census Tract is based on the average z score for all indicators by category. The corresponding level of opportunity (very low, low, moderate, high, very high) is determined by sorting all census tracts into quintiles based on their opportunity index scores. Thus, the census tracts identified as “very high” opportunity represent the top 20% of scores among census tracts. Conversely, census tracts identified as “very low” opportunity represent the lowest scoring 20% of census tracts.

Z scores are helpful in the interpretation of raw score performance, since they take into account both the mean of the distribution and the amount of variability, the standard deviation. The z score indicates how far the raw score is from the mean, either above it or below in in standard deviation units. A positive z score is always above the median (upper 50%). A negative z score is always below the median (lower 50%) and a z score of zero is always exactly on the median or equal to 50% of the cases. Thus, when trying to understand the overall comparative performance of different groups with respect to a certain variable, we can assess how a certain group (of individuals, tracts, etc) is performing with respect to the median performance for the certain variable.

No weighting was applied to the various indicators, all indicators were treated as equal in importance, please refer to the discussion in Section 1B for more information on this issue.

Notes on Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Techniques:

1. Due to geographical inconsistencies with the various sources of data, specific geographic information systems techniques were applied to analyze the data at the census tract level. An “area aggregation” or “area weighting” was used to redistribute data for conflicting boundary files. This analysis was done using the “Two Themes” Arcview analysis extension. This is a very traditional approach to transforming geographic attribute data. This technique aggregates data based on the proportional area shared by overlapping polygons. This technique was used in all analysis of zip code employment data.

2. GIS boundary files were gathered from the following sources: U.S. Census Bureau, Maryland State Data Center and the Baltimore Regional Council. All maps and GIS analysis were produced in the following projection: Maryland State Plane 1983.

3. Educational opportunity scores were calculated by analyzing the characteristics of elementary schools only. School indicator data was gathered for individual school “catchment” areas for elementary schools within the region. This catchment area data was then transferred to the corresponding census tracts within each catchment area for analysis. For areas with no (or missing) elementary catchment data, district wide averages (for all schools) for each indicator were used.
4. When calculating final z scores for the neighborhood health indicators, census tracts with missing data were given z scores of 0 (analyzed as being equivalent to the mean for the region).

5. A small number of zip codes in the Census Business Patterns database contain only employment ranges for confidentiality purposes. For these zip codes the median value of the employment range was used to estimate the number of employees in that zip code.

6. The comprehensive opportunity index score represents the average score of the three subcategories (economic opportunity and mobility, educational opportunity and neighborhood health) for each census tract. Thus, the impact from the difference in the number of indicators in each sub-category (education only has 4 indicators instead of 5 indicators in the other categories) is eliminated in the comprehensive analysis.
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### Table 1: Neighborhood Characteristics for the average White and African American person in the Baltimore MSA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATORS OF INCOME</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median HH Income</td>
<td>$53,985</td>
<td>$57,889</td>
<td>$34,882</td>
<td>$37,549</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$23,871</td>
<td>$27,008</td>
<td>$15,596</td>
<td>$18,162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Below Poverty</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATORS OF HUMAN CAPITAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% College Educated</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Professional</td>
<td>37.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>30.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Unemployed</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INDICATORS OF HOUSING</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Vacant Housing</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Homeowners</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>72.7</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Table directly adapted from "Separate but Unequal" database from the Mumford Center at: [http://mumford.albany.edu/census/SepUneq/PublicSeparateUnequal.htm](http://mumford.albany.edu/census/SepUneq/PublicSeparateUnequal.htm)

Note: Data represents the neighborhood conditions for the average neighborhood by race. Calculations performed by the Mumford Center.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of People by Opportunity Area 2000</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>White Population</th>
<th>African American Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>365,383</td>
<td>56,352</td>
<td>296,633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>460,346</td>
<td>232,819</td>
<td>204,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>508,852</td>
<td>416,234</td>
<td>68,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
<td>594,452</td>
<td>510,440</td>
<td>53,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>583,398</td>
<td>467,608</td>
<td>67,957</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage of Persons by Race by Opportunity Area 2000</th>
<th>White Population</th>
<th>African American Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>81.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>44.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>81.8%</td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
<td>85.9%</td>
<td>9.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
<td>11.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
<td>42.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>18.3%</td>
<td>14.9%</td>
<td>29.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>20.3%</td>
<td>24.4%</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
<td>23.7%</td>
<td>30.4%</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>23.2%</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Opportunity Analysis and Census 2000 STF3 Tract Data
## Table 3: Population by Race and Income/Poverty by Opportunity Area in the Baltimore Region in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>8.8%</td>
<td>57.5%</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>37.6%</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>26.2%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>34.3%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
<td>27.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
<td>21.6%</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>28.4%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>16.8%</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
<td>23.6%</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Low Income households earn less than $30K, Middle Income households earn $30K to $60K, and High Income households earn more than $60K. This methodology was adopted from the Lewis C. Mumford Center’s research on the dynamics residential segregation by race and income, delineating (poor, middle income and affluent households). For more information visit the Mumford Center’s website at: [http://mumford.albany.edu/census/segregation/home.htm](http://mumford.albany.edu/census/segregation/home.htm)

## Table 4: Rental Housing Characteristics by Opportunity Area in the Baltimore Region in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rental Housing Characteristics by Opportunity Area in 2000</th>
<th>Rental Units Gross Rent Less than $650</th>
<th>Rental Units Gross Rent More than $650</th>
<th>% of Rental Units with Rents Less than $650</th>
<th>% of Rental Units with Rents More than $650</th>
<th>% of Region’s Rentals with Rents Less than $650</th>
<th>% of Region’s Rentals with Rents More than $650</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>71,376</td>
<td>4,025</td>
<td>94.8%</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
<td>34.0%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>60,031</td>
<td>14,851</td>
<td>81.4%</td>
<td>18.6%</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
<td>15.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>35,610</td>
<td>14,587</td>
<td>75.0%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>30.7%</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
<td>25,924</td>
<td>25,627</td>
<td>46.2%</td>
<td>53.8%</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>27.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>17,076</td>
<td>35,884</td>
<td>32.6%</td>
<td>67.4%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sources of Data: Opportunity Analysis and U.S. Census Bureau, 2000 Census Tract Data
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units by Opportunity Area</th>
<th>Section 8 Households</th>
<th>White Section 8 Households</th>
<th>African Amer. Section 8 HH’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>6,701</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>6,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>5,908</td>
<td>1,138</td>
<td>4,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>2,989</td>
<td>1,737</td>
<td>1,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
<td>2,173</td>
<td>1,193</td>
<td>947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>1,621</td>
<td>488</td>
<td>1,090</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Units by Opportunity Area</th>
<th>Section 8 Households</th>
<th>White Section 8 Households</th>
<th>African Amer. Section 8 HH’s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>34.6%</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>44.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Opportunity</td>
<td>30.5%</td>
<td>23.8%</td>
<td>32.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>15.4%</td>
<td>36.3%</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Opportunity</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>24.9%</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very High Opportunity</td>
<td>8.4%</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
<td>7.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Section 8 Voucher Data from HUD
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Map 2: Estimated Entry Level and Low Skill Employment by Zip Code in 2002 for the Baltimore Region

Legend:
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- Counties in Region

Potential Entry Level and Low Skill Jobs 2002
- 0 - 500
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- 1,000 - 3,500
- 3,500 - 7,000
- More than 7,000

Prepared by: Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity
Date Prepared: 06.29.2005
Notes: Potential number of jobs represents an estimate based on the number of jobs for economic sectors associated with entry level employment or low skill employment.
Employment sectors identified as a potential source of entry level or low skill employment include: Forestry, Fishing & Agriculture; Mining; Construction; Manufacturing; Wholesale Trade; Retail Trade; Transportation & Warehousing; Administrative Support & Waste Management; Accommodation & Food Services; Other Services (except Public Administration).
Employment estimates calculated based on employment range for each establishment by industry.
Map 4: Projected 20 Year Change in Jobs by Traffic Analysis Zone in the Baltimore Region (2005 to 2025)

Legend:
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- More than 50%

Prepared by: Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity
Date Prepared: 06.29.2005
Sources of Data: Baltimore Regional Council and U.S. Census Bureau
Notes: Number of jobs represents an estimate for each Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ).
Map 5: Percentage of Elementary Students Eligible for Free and Reduced Lunch 2004 (Students in Poverty)
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% of Students Free and Reduced Lunch:
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Note: Boundaries represent elementary school catchment areas (received from school districts). Data represents individual school data for each catchment area. Areas with missing data were given the corresponding data for the district average.

Prepared by: Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity
Date Prepared: 06.29.2005
Source of Data: State of Maryland Dept. of Education
Map 7: Percentage of Elementary Students Proficient in Math 2004
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- 10.1 - 50.2
- 50.2 - 63.4
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Note: Boundaries represent, elementary school catchment areas (received from school districts). Data represents individual school data for each catchment area. Areas with missing data were given the corresponding data for the district average.

Prepared by: Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity
Date Prepared: 06.29.2005
Source of Data: State of Maryland Dept. of Education
Map 8: Percentage of Elementary Classes Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers in 2004

Legend:
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% of Classes Taught by Non-Highly Qualified Teachers:
- 0 - 6.5
- 6.5 - 16.1
- 16.1 - 29
- 29 - 58.6
- 58.6 - 95

Note: Boundaries represent, elementary school catchment areas (received from school districts). Data represents individual school data for each catchment area. Areas with missing data were given the corresponding data for the district average.

Prepared by: Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity
Date Prepared: 06.29.2005
Source of Data: State of Maryland Dept. of Education
Map 9: Economic Opportunity and Mobility Index for the Baltimore Region

Legend:
- Counties
- Water

Opportunity Index Scores Represent Quintile Distribution of the 615 Census Tracts (Ranked by Opportunity Index Z Scores) (With each category containing 123 Census Tracts)

Opportunity Index Results:
- Very Low Opportunity
- Low Opportunity
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- High Opportunity
- Very High Opportunity

Prepared by: Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity
Date Prepared: 06.29.2005
Sources of Data: Opportunity Analysis (See Maps 9-12 and Appendix A).
Map 13: Census 2000 Tracts Meeting Race/Poverty Criteria for Impacted Areas overlaid with Opportunity Areas (Tracts w/ Race or Poverty Rates Higher than 2000 MSA Average)

Legend:
- Counties
- Water
  - Opportunity Index Scores Represent Quintile Distribution of the 615 Census Tracts (Ranked by Opportunity Index Z Scores) (With each category containing 123 Census Tracts)
  - Opportunity Index Results
    - Very Low Opportunity
    - Low Opportunity
    - Moderate Opportunity
    - High Opportunity
    - Very High Opportunity
  - Areas Meeting Race/Poverty Impact Criteria in 2000 (poverty rates higher than 9.8% or African American population larger than 27.2%)

Prepared by: Kinwan Institute for the Study of Race & Ethnicity
Date Prepared: 08.10.2005
Sources of Data: Census 2000, Opportunity Analysis (See Maps 9-12 and Appendix A).
Appendix G: Photo Display of Conditions in Low and High Opportunity Areas

To better understand the conditions in high and low opportunity communities, I have assembled a collection of photographs related to employment opportunity, educational opportunity and neighborhood conditions in some of the region’s high and low opportunity communities. As indicated in the map below (Map A1) our photos were collected from two high opportunity areas and one low opportunity area. The general vicinity of photo sites is indicated on the map below. High opportunity area photos were collected from Baltimore County and Howard County and low opportunity area photos were collected from a neighborhood in the City of Baltimore. High opportunity area photos were primarily from the Cockeysville area in Baltimore County and the Ellicott City area in Howard County. Low opportunity photos were primarily near the Johnson Square area in the City of Baltimore.

Map A1: Comprehensive Opportunity Index for the Baltimore Region and Generalized Location of Photos.
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Opportunity Index Scores Represent Quintile Distribution of the 615 Census Tracts (Ranked by Opportunity Index Z Scores) (With each category containing 123 Census Tracts)

Opportunity Index Results:
- Very Low Opportunity
- Low Opportunity
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- High Opportunity
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Baltimore City

Map A1: Comprehensive Opportunity Index for the Baltimore Region and Generalized Location of Photos.
Economic Opportunities

Figure 1: Low Opportunity Area – With a limited market for retail, most traditional retail employment centers are in decline in low opportunity areas. Photo from the Old Town Mall shopping district in the City of Baltimore (Near intersection of Aisquith and Monument).

Figure 2: High Opportunity Area – Thriving retail economic center in Baltimore County (Hunt Valley Mall).
Figure 3: Low Opportunity Area - Remaining businesses in some low opportunity communities are marginal enterprises, as seen in this photo in the City of Baltimore. Photo location at intersection of Homestead and Harford Road.

Figure 4: High Opportunity Area – A Concentrated hub of economic activity (offices and retail) in Baltimore County (Hunt Valley Mall Area).
Figure 5: High Opportunity Area – As illustrated in these photos, new employment opportunities are more abundant in high opportunity areas (Photo on left, 225 International Circle, Hunt Valley, photo on right from Hunt Valley Mall).

Figure 6: Low Opportunity Area – view of downtown (photo on left) and proximity of public housing to Johns Hopkins (photo on the right). Although this low opportunity area is in close proximity to downtown employment opportunities, research on spatial mismatch indicates that many of these employment opportunities are not accessible to low income people and the labor market competition is more difficult for these opportunities. Conversely, most new employment opportunities are growing in suburban areas far from the Central Business District. (Photo on left at Fayette and Broadway, photo on right Aisquith St).

Figure 7: High Opportunity Area – light rail transit (photo on left) and bus transit (photo on right) are available in these high opportunity suburban areas. Light rail stop located at the Hunt Valley Mall in Baltimore County, bus stop in Ellicott City, Howard County.
Educational Opportunity

Figure 8: Low Opportunity Area – Johnston Square Elementary School in the City of Baltimore.

Figure 9: High Opportunity Area – St. John Lane Elementary School in Howard County.
Figure 10: Low Opportunity Area – Dunbar middle school (left) and barbed wire fencing at Johnston Square Elementary (right) in the City of Baltimore.

Figure 11: High Opportunity Area – Patapsco middle school (left) and Hollifield elementary school in Howard County.
Figure 12: Low Opportunity Area – Children’s playground and recreational area located at Harford Road between Chase and Eager in the City of Baltimore.

Figure 13: High Opportunity Area - Children’s playground near Warren elementary school in Baltimore County.
Figure 14: Low Opportunity Area – Public housing development in the City of Baltimore (Abbot Court, Latrobe Homes).

Figure 15: Low Opportunity Area – Public housing development in the City of Baltimore (Abbot Court, Latrobe Homes).
Figure 16: Low Opportunity Area – Public housing development in the City of Baltimore (Aisquith Street between Orleans and Monument).

Figure 17: Low Opportunity Area – Public housing development in the City of Baltimore (Aisquith Street between Orleans and Monument).
Figure 18: High Opportunity Area – Housing options found in high opportunity areas (photos from Greenside Drive).

Figure 19: High Opportunity Area – Housing options found in high opportunity areas (photos from Ellicott Hills).

Figure 20: High Opportunity Area – Housing options found in high opportunity areas (photos from High View in Hunt Valley and Normandy Drive in Ellicott City).
Figure 21: High Opportunity Area – As illustrated in these photos, population growth, new investment and construction are often found in high opportunity communities. Image on left from Ellicott Hills and image on left from Old Bosley Road.

Figure 22: Low Opportunity Areas - In low opportunity communities, vacancy is more prevalent than new construction. As illustrated in this streetscape view of vacant properties in the City of Baltimore. Photo from northeast corner of 20th and Greenmount.

Figure 23: Low Opportunity Area – Some new construction has occurred due to the Hope VI program in some low opportunity communities, as illustrated in this photo of the New Hope Circle Hope VI development in the City of Baltimore. Although the housing has been rehabilitated, residents of these communities remain in the same low performing neighborhoods (in respect to schools, jobs, and other neighborhood conditions). (Photo from Forrest Street).
Figure 24: Low Opportunity Area – Crime, vandalism and public safety are significant issues in low opportunity communities. Note the 24 hour police observation camera in the picture on the left (box attached to light pole in center of picture) and graffiti on playground equipment in image on the right. Image on the left taken at NW corner of the intersection of Preston and Greenmount, image on the right taken at Johnston Square elementary playground.

Figure 25: Low Opportunity Area - Abandoned housing in low opportunity area as seen in streetscape photo from the 1200 block of Valley Street in the City of Baltimore.
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