



Reflections on the Role of the Federal Government in Promoting Greater Urban Equity and Inclusion¹

Salin Geevarghese, Mixed-Income Strategic Alliance and SGG Insight, LLC

As we think about how far the country has come and how far it still must go to maximize equitable outcomes for residents of all communities, the place-based policies and initiatives of the Obama Administration offer a valuable set of experiences and lessons. For leaders across the federal agencies during that time, efforts to advance place-based policies were guided by some key realities about how people and place are inextricably linked and why some regions fared better than others, both during and after the Great Recession. One is that segregation by race and income – and the unequal access to opportunity that it creates – stand in the way of equitable, inclusive, mixed-income communities in which everyone can succeed. Another is that geographically concentrated poverty, an issue that spawned the mixed-income transformation work in public-housing communities decades ago, often is racially identifiable and has enduring impacts on those who have to contend with such marginalized conditions.

Obama-era government leaders recognized that the solutions to these realities would need to be as comprehensive as the problems were complex, requiring changes to policies, interventions, and investments and the development of cross-silo, cross-sector, and cross-jurisdictional capacities and approaches. Consequently, place-based initiatives to build mixed-income communities operated simultaneously across multiple frames, policies, interventions, and investments. Leveraging place to improve social, community, and economic outcomes became the “unfinished business” of mixed-income community transformation. This essay revisits the innovations of the Obama-era housing policies and community initiatives and examines the possibilities and implications for future action.

Hallmarks of Obama-Era Efforts to Achieve Equitable, Inclusive Communities of Opportunity

During the Obama Administration, approaches to “place,” including strategies to create mixed-income communities, had historical antecedents. Approaching program and policy innovation from a posture of humility and engagement was important for new leaders in the federal government. Several of the strategies built on what had been learned from previous efforts (e.g., the [HOPE VI](#) program); knowledge gained through research and evaluation (e.g., of

¹ This essay appears in Mark L. Joseph and Amy T. Khare, eds., *What Works to Promote Inclusive, Equitable Mixed-Income Communities*, please visit the [volume website](#) for access to more essays.

comprehensive community change initiatives and the [Moving to Opportunity](#) voucher program); and the collective wisdom of practitioners and policymakers who served as connective tissue and memory across the decades (e.g., President’s Council on Sustainable Development, U.S. Interagency Council on Homelessness, Enterprise Zones-Enterprise Communities). Experience drawn from these sources underscored the inter-relationships between policies and strategies and the critical importance of cross-sector partnership to achieving positive results. During 2009-2010, considerable creativity, innovation, and commitment emerged. In particular, federal efforts to create inclusive, equitable communities during this period required deliberate efforts to work across silos, sectors, and jurisdictions.

Cross-Silo Approaches. The cross-silo approaches taken during the Obama Administration recognized the interconnectedness of issues such as housing, education, transportation, health, economic development, and climate. Silo busting became the mantra, with local practitioners and policymakers describing the challenges of federal fragmentation and imploring leaders from the vast array of federal agencies to work more effectively and efficiently together. This entailed a huge investment in interagency work, which started at the leadership level and then expanded to involve policy development, programmatic initiatives, and new modes of day-to-day management and coordination.

Silo Busting at the Federal Level. The first interagency connection began in early 2009 between leaders at the [U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development](#) (HUD), the [Department of Transportation](#) (DOT), and the [Environmental Protection Agency](#) (EPA). Their first step was to develop a set of “livability” principles to establish the values that would guide the interagency partnership. These principles included equitable and affordable housing, support for existing communities, and increased transportation choices. The principles became an organizing construct for the work on the ground, they guided program design, and they informed federal budget requests and appropriations from Congress. New interagency staff workgroups were formed, and soon representatives from the Department of Agriculture, Health and Human Services, and others joined the collaborative working sessions. The new White House Office of Urban Affairs helped recruit, corral, and direct agency staff and leaders to these gatherings in the early period. A core early focus of the expanding collaboration was to find existing programs that could be redesigned to be more symbiotic across agencies. Along the way, staff learned more about the tools and programs that existed at other agencies.

Those early leadership meetings led to the creation of the Partnership for Sustainable Communities between HUD, DOT, and EPA, the first place-based partnership to be rolled out. Each participating agency offered different resources for communities. For instance, the new [Sustainable Communities Initiative](#) (SCI), managed by HUD, represented the largest federal investment in comprehensive, integrated planning across agencies in 40 years. DOT had the TIGER competitive grant program (now known as [BUILD](#) grants), which focused on comprehensive infrastructure planning and investments that served multiple community goals.

And EPA led the Brownfield Remediation program, which targeted revitalization activities including assessment, cleanup, technical assistance, and lending. The agencies worked together on program design and policy alignment, and collaborated on decision-making. Notably, all of the funding availability announcements for these competitive grant programs made similar references to the jointly crafted livability principles and other program alignment in order to signal to local communities that the agencies were purposefully collaborating.

HUD, the Department of Justice (DOJ), and the Department of Education (ED) then worked together to develop the Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative (NRI) to establish neighborhood-scale initiatives to complement the efforts at the city and regional scale. During this period, collaborators further defined language about equitable and inclusive communities. It was within the context of NRI that HUD began to design the [Choice Neighborhoods Initiative](#), a comprehensive approach to mixed-income transformation of high-poverty public housing and assisted housing complexes.

Silo Busting Between Local, State and Federal Leaders. As these cross-silo initiatives rolled out, federal leaders looked to local governments and partners to help shape their design and target investments. The federal agencies were aware of concerns that government policies seemed to be created in a vacuum without meaningful public input and that the public comment process was inadequate. So the agencies established a more responsive process with local leaders, including an interactive web presence, a phone hotline for questions, and frequent stakeholder meetings. This desire to engage led HUD to produce and disseminate an advanced version of the Sustainable Communities Initiative's notice of funding availability, the first of its kind. The notice was essentially a five-page outline of the initial thinking about the initiative. HUD officials then held listening sessions around the country in early 2010, which generated thousands of comments and letters. This feedback informed program design and generated local interest, support, and stake in the program. Consequently, when the initiative began taking applications, an extremely high number of applicants responded—nearly 75 percent of all eligible applicants in the country, even though HUD was only able to award grants to 11 percent.

Outcomes of the Cross-Silo Approach. At the state and local levels, governmental departments began to re-consolidate and better align. The federal government's effort to bridge silos motivated some states to look for ways to do so, too. Furthermore, localities could not play federal officials from different agencies against each other, because those agencies were in closer conversation and collaboration.

Community officials had long begged the federal government to act as one enterprise supporting people and places, and cross-silo coordination helped to actualize that vision. It enabled multiple points of entry, allowing each agency's grantees to be more favorably recognized by the other agencies. For example, [Preferred Sustainability Status](#) (PSS) gave preference points in competitive grant competitions across HUD, DOT, and EPA. Promise Zones gave preference points in more than 10 agency grant competitions. Choice Neighborhoods,

Byrne Criminal Justice Innovation Program (now known as the [Community Based Crime Reduction Program](#)), and the [Promise Neighborhoods Initiative](#) also gave reciprocal recognition to grant applicants. These policy innovations were not without criticism, as some communities that did not receive awards claimed that the preferencing practices layered rewards on the same grantees at the expense of others and of a sense of overall fairness. Overall, however, these innovations proved popular and helped communities push toward stronger results through more comprehensive approaches and investments.

Beyond the preferencing, cross-silo approaches also fostered better policy alignment as interagency policy review processes and practices improved. Traditionally, increased agency engagement usually created extensive delays as policies underwent multiple cycles of legal review. Requests for review also tended to come out of the blue, and comments from reviewing agencies sometimes were relatively uninformed. Because of the interagency infrastructure built for cross-silo coordination, however, the review processes became much tighter and fewer items landed on administrators' desks for review without being previously discussed.

Another important outcome of the cross-silo coordination was greater efficiency in how resources were allocated. As agencies coordinated around shared aims to achieve better alignment, synergy, and joint targeting of resources, they could saturate particular places with potential impacts. Agencies could coordinate investments to sequence them more effectively, too; for example, it might make sense for an EPA brownfields remediation grant to precede another place-based initiative operating in the same place. In this way, the federal government began to operate as a system of systems designed to advance shared results.

Cross-Sector Approaches. For these cross-silo approaches in government to achieve maximum impact, cross-sector capacity and partnership was crucial. Government cannot solve complex issues with comprehensive solutions without the help of capable partners and stakeholders in the private, nonprofit, and philanthropic sectors; nor is government always best equipped to be in the lead or to convene other partners. Therefore, cultivating, reinforcing, and institutionalizing partnership instincts and behaviors across sectors was critical for Obama-era domestic policy priorities. This was accomplished through multiple strategies, including:

- Leverage scenarios, in which private and philanthropic sector actors were encouraged to scale their risk, funding, and impact by co-investing with the public sector. Thus, for example, grant applications that included private and philanthropic funders' investments were evaluated and scored more favorably, taken as a sign of stakeholder engagement and commitment to long-term impact.
- Cross-sector participation in processes by which public, nonprofit, private, and philanthropic representatives worked together to plan, govern, and manage public resources and set priorities. For example, the SCI Regional Planning and Community Challenge grants required broad stakeholder engagement and allowed set-asides for

- community-based organizations' participation (e.g., in planning for land use, housing, transportation).
- Civic leadership and engagement, as residents were incentivized and encouraged to participate in the local stakeholder collaborations responsible for framing, holding, and implementing the vision for change, alongside leaders from community-based nonprofits, municipal government, metro/county agencies, and philanthropy.
 - Strategic information sharing, in which federal program officers communicated with all types of informal and formal community representatives, regardless of their position, rather than limiting their contact to grantees.
 - Establishing public-private partnership offices in several federal agencies, which worked to cultivate external partners, identify program and policy innovations from outside government, create information exchanges, and determine rules of engagement.
 - Technical assistance, whereby high-capacity partners were identified and supported to build the implementation skills and knowledge of local actors; and,
 - Proposal evaluation, with nonprofit and philanthropic leaders joining with agency leaders to assess applications and learn from each other as they scored the proposals.

Outcomes of the Cross-Sector Approach. Through cross-sector partnerships, leaders in each sector came to learn about the value propositions and unique roles of other sectors, including the tools available to them and their risk tolerance, orientation to results, political sensitivity, and motivations for taking action.

Cross-Jurisdictional Approaches. The issues that affect equity and inclusiveness in mixed-income communities do not follow jurisdictional boundaries. Racially concentrated poverty may show up in specific ZIP Codes, for instance, but the causes and impacts are not confined to neighborhood boundaries or circumstances. Furthermore, the levers and solutions to problems of equity, inclusion, and opportunity cannot be limited to what can be accomplished at the project or neighborhood scale. Housing markets, jobs, transportation and other infrastructure, economic opportunities, the environment, and health factors exist within a larger geographic dynamic and ecosystem, revealing the interconnectedness of neighborhoods, cities, and regions. Consequently, many of the Obama Administration's early, signature place-based initiatives operated at multiple jurisdictional levels. Two prominent examples of cross-jurisdictional initiatives were [Strong Cities, Strong Communities](#) (SC2) and the [Partnership for Sustainable Communities](#) (PSC).

Strong Cities, Strong Communities targeted post-industrial cities that have experienced economic and population decline, needed capacity building at the city level, and required investment beyond challenged neighborhoods. SC2 placed loaned federal staff in city halls, often in mayoral offices, to help the city manage key federal initiatives, remove federal administrative barriers that impinged on work, and assess what additional capacity-building resources were

needed. The SC2 staffers also helped local government leverage resources and influence for neighborhood transformation efforts such as a Choice Neighborhoods Initiative implementation grant.

The Partnership for Sustainable Communities operated regionally, covering multiple neighborhoods, cities, and towns. It made investments across the range of policy priorities and consistent with the livability principles developed by federal collaborators in 2009, but it also acknowledged the importance of planning and investing across jurisdictional lines. PSC's grants, guidance, and capacity building aligned housing/community development, transportation, environment, and economic development strategies and resources as a way to counteract the fragmented nature of local government, which can make regional collaboration difficult if not impossible. By hard-wiring cross-jurisdictional collaboration into place-based policy and practice, PSC made it possible to use the federal government's tools to create more equitable, inclusive, opportunity-rich communities.

Challenges and Solutions

Cross-silo, cross-sector, and cross-jurisdictional approaches for creating more inclusive, equitable communities faced several challenges, particularly after the 2010 midterm election when an environment of resource scarcity, regulatory and administrative constraint, and legislative gridlock was the norm. In particular:

- As HUD sought to focus everyone's attention on the importance of increasing equity and opportunity in disinvested, marginalized, and isolated neighborhoods, some stakeholders argued that the agency's purview was broader and HUD could not target a limited number of places at the expense of others.
- Cross-silo approaches pushed up against statutory barriers, where legislation impeded interagency collaboration and broader flexibilities. For instance, the desire to hire local residents (consistent with the Section 3 obligation at HUD) for an infrastructure project ran up against rules at the Department of Transportation that forbade it.
- Cross-sector approaches revealed how the public sector's role was paramount and could not be subsumed by other sectors. The public sector's role in setting local policy conditions for action and accountability – such as requiring jurisdictions to invest in equitable and inclusive strategies as a condition of a grant program – cannot be assigned to nonprofit, private, or philanthropic partners. This includes the use of federal enforcement authority when inappropriate local actions are taken—for example, when jurisdictions subverted obligations to affirmatively further fair housing, only to be held accountable in court by the federal government. When compliance must be forced, only government possesses the hammer.

- Cross-jurisdictional efforts often encountered push-back, as some units of local government objected to other units’ “intrusions” into their authority (i.e., it’s my job, not yours) while also shifting blame to each other in terms of role and responsibility (i.e., it’s your job, not mine).

These challenges required agency officials to build the case for why equity, inclusion, and opportunity deserve everyone’s attention and why taking a more comprehensive approach would be more effective. That persuasive case-making often started with White House leadership (e.g., Office of Urban Policy), agencies (e.g., HUD) and program leaders (e.g., environmental justice, Office of Civil Rights, Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity) whose equity emphasis is crafted into their missions but whose authorities and scope are limited. These leaders acknowledged the need for an “all-of-government” approach to equity through which all policies and levers could be brought to bear. If housing investments are not aligned with transportation and economic development investments, equitable outcomes become more elusive. However, transportation departments do not necessarily come pre-wired for engagement on equity considerations; nor is their performance measured by equity criteria. Consequently, equity champions within government had to convince other leaders to use their tools for equity, inclusion, and opportunity even when a statutory mandate did not exist. For example, when the [Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing](#) (AFFH) rule was being developed, leaders of the Partnership for Sustainable Communities and the Neighborhood Revitalization Initiative met with AFFH rule drafters to determine ways in which, for example, the transportation and health components of the data and mapping tools could be strengthened. Because of the interagency mandates within the Fair Housing Act, AFFH leaders could persuasively engage non-housing policy leaders about the law’s original intent to have all domestic agencies carry their own burden to fulfill the vision of communities that are free of discrimination and that offer maximum opportunities for all.

Another challenge came in the form of the budget appropriations process, which constrained the resources that could be dedicated to place-based approaches, especially as the political climate changed. The more these initiatives were labeled as favored programs of a particular administration, the more vulnerable they were to the political headwinds blowing against or in favor of the president. To combat these risks, the solution was to shift from an either/or, exclusive mentality to a both/and, inclusive one. For example, in the policy development process for the AFFH rule, a choice between neighborhood revitalization versus housing mobility strategies emerged. Research, practices, and legislative history were divided on this choice, as were practitioners, policymakers, and advocates. Citing the existing evidence, some advocated strongly for housing mobility while others took up the call for neighborhood revitalization, asserting that not every resident wants to move out of their community. The Obama Administration landed on a both/and approach and pushed cities and states to base plans

on a recognition that both revitalization and mobility are important strategies for maximizing opportunity.

While not all issues lend themselves to both/and solutions, the goal was to expand choices rather than limit them. As the Choice Neighborhoods Initiative was being designed, for instance, policy and program designers understood that investing in housing alone would be insufficient; to maximize opportunity for residents, it would also be crucial to use Choice Neighborhoods resources to co-invest in neighborhood amenities and services. Therefore, agency officials allowed Choice Neighborhoods grant recipients to deploy HUD resources for non-housing purposes. Similarly, to optimize the development of high-quality schools to drive mixed-income community transformation, some communities were able to secure funding from both the Department of Education's Promise Neighborhoods program and HUD's Choice Neighborhoods Initiative to increase the probability of access to high-quality education within a revitalized neighborhood.

The innovations that emerged capitalized on tools the federal government possessed independent of Congressional mandates: leadership, agency alignment, administrative and regulatory relief, and capacity building. Two of the most celebrated, durable initiatives—Strong Cities, Strong Communities and Promise Zones, each of which conferred benefits but no new, direct grant dollars—enabled the federal government to press forward with available tools and, in doing so, exemplified the value proposition that government support is not just about new money but also non-financial tools and capacities. State and local governments as well as social investment and philanthropic organizations mirrored this approach as they attempted or launched parallel programs. For instance, the Partnership for Sustainable Communities, a collaboration among HUD, DOT, and EPA, prompted the State of North Carolina to reorganize its own agencies to reflect the Partnership. Similarly, local councils of government and metropolitan planning organizations with economic development responsibilities pressed the U.S. Economic Development Administration (EDA) to recognize that their efforts aligned to PSC policies and programs and therefore should qualify for consideration by EDA. Consequently, EDA accepted plans that met the agency's Community Economic Development Strategy (CEDS) criteria, even though they had been submitted for other federal agency requirements. This type of reciprocal recognition, administrative barrier removal, and technical assistance by the federal government added clear value to communities beyond grantmaking.

Unfinished Business: New Opportunities and Directions for Equitable, Inclusive, Mixed-Income Communities

The job of ensuring access to equitable, inclusive, mixed-income communities remains unfinished, and probably will be for some time. The country now is reeling from an unprecedented combination of a global health crisis, a deep economic recession, and widespread

social unrest and disruption advancing a national reckoning on enduring structural racism. All of this is occurring in the midst of a time of high distrust and increased cynicism in our political, cultural, civic, and media institutions and an increased polarization among Americans on the basis of political, racial, and economic differences.

Despite these extreme challenges, the work of transforming communities into places for all people across all lines of difference is not at all hopeless. Indeed, the breadth and depth of the challenges should refresh our mission, strengthen our resolve, and induce a new generation of stakeholders to pick up the baton. These new leaders are already picking up the mantle of civil rights icons like Rep. John Lewis and Justice Ruth Bader Ginsberg, demanding that we deliver justice, fairness, equity, and opportunity to those who have been denied that promise.

The advantage of cross-silo, cross-sector, cross-jurisdictional, comprehensive approaches is that the roots of these efforts reach far and wide, increasing the odds that a commitment to and stake in the common enterprise and desired results will endure. To succeed, we must diligently improve on previous efforts, learning from previous mistakes and holding ourselves accountable to building on evidence about what has worked. As other essays in this volume have documented, nonprofit and philanthropic leaders and state and local actors have stepped up to deploy interventions that tackle the challenges in front of them, even without all of the necessary supports and accountability tools fully in place. They are working to fill gaps made wider by the inattentiveness of federal leaders in any given political cycle. These local and nonprofit actors have grown accustomed to compensating for an absence of leadership and innovating where they can but, when they operate with limited resources, the cost to community impact is clear. In this context, inspiration is not hard to find. The bigger challenge—and the greatest opportunity—will be to balance and manage our steps forward while maintaining the sense of imagination and innovation that brought us this far.

Implications for Action

Implications for Policy. Policymakers at the local, state, and federal levels can take the following steps to create stronger conditions for inclusive, equitable communities:

- To reduce governance fragmentation, align policies that affect cross-silo, cross-sector, and cross-jurisdictional approaches. This will entail incentivizing more equitable and inclusive partnerships by requiring cross-sector partners to engage in projects with distinct roles and responsibilities; more flexibility in blending and braiding resources across silos by allowing funds to be designated for shared results beyond the central purpose of the agency; and strategic barrier removal through early identification of impediments and the creation of a legislative or regulatory action plan for policy fixes.
- Confront the effects of racial and income segregation and inequality by encouraging and providing cover for local leaders to examine the effects of structural and institutional

racism across systems and silos as communities plan, invest in, and implement equitable, inclusive, mixed-income community strategies. The revised 2015 Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing rule, data and mapping tools, and guidance have been rescinded, but this—along with other federal civil rights legal frameworks—still provides guidance for those local leaders who seek to advance change in their jurisdictions.

- Position civil service government officials as a voice of continuity in times of change and as a bulwark to protect gains made for equitable, inclusive approaches. Investing in staff capacity at the local, state, and federal level to institutionalize work should be an early priority of policymakers as well as nonprofit and philanthropic partners. Training career staff on key place-based programs and policies and engaging them early in design and implementation will prove beneficial later on, when leadership churn occurs. Because these career professionals may be subjected to loyalty screens and be unfairly tested in new administrations, enshrining their efforts in legislation will help to protect their new practices, policies, and innovations.

Implications for Research and Evaluation. Researchers and evaluators have roles to play in increasing our knowledge base and our confidence in approaches to equitable, inclusive community development.

- Compared with recent work on housing mobility, evidence on the role of neighborhood revitalization as an opportunity-making strategy is more limited. Therefore, more longitudinal studies of residents of mixed-income transformation efforts are needed to determine what works. These studies will likely require funding from partnerships between the public and philanthropic sectors. Given that need for external investment, federal agencies should continue creating public-private structures for joint deliberation and decision making on research agendas.
- Increasingly, if “both/and” strategies are to prevail, we must meet the evidence standards set by the regional housing mobility movement with their seminal research findings on the importance of place. In the absence of rigorous evaluation and research, the mixed-income movement will likely be overly reliant on its most fierce advocates and practitioners to protect a place at the table for neighborhood revitalization. Advocacy must be bolstered by strong evidence that neighborhood revitalization can consistently lead to stronger economic, social, and community outcomes for all residents of mixed-income communities.
- The importance of “big data” innovations, randomized controlled trial designs and quantitative methods, and the use of large administrative data sets has emerged over the last decade, producing a great deal of knowledge on key social science questions. Government and the private sector can operate more authoritatively with interventions based on these studies’ findings. These research approaches should continue, but they

should also be accompanied by qualitative methods that enable us to understand the challenges of improving social and community outcomes in mixed-income communities.

Implications for Development and Investment. Developers and investors must continue to focus on physical transformations that make housing stability a platform for family success, but they also must help to create equitable, inclusive mixed-income communities by bringing all of the tools and influence they can muster for the sake of better social and economic outcomes.

- Unless developers and investors combine housing with the opportunity structures of access to high-quality “living wage” jobs, schools, transportation, and health, families in mixed-income communities will continue to have difficulty getting on a pathway to economic mobility. Housing stability is foundational and necessary, but it is insufficient for the results that communities aspire to reach.
- Although it is essential to keep attention focused on increasing opportunities for the most marginal populations, mixed-income developers, investors, and practitioners also need to make communities places where everyone can belong if they hope to sustain racial, social, and income mixing over time. To leverage the social mix as an asset, developers and investors can keep a keen eye on how social mix is sustained over time within a community, and they can fund the programming, marketing, and design work that leverages social mixing as a key asset. Policymakers may need to think differently and creatively about how to incentivize developers and investors to sustain the social mix, including flexibility with how subsidies can be used beyond low-income populations.
- Sustainable financing and funding is the next frontier. New cost-saving models are proliferating and producing a stronger evidence base than in the past. In conjunction with these advances, new models for preventing negative outcomes and achieving greater system efficiencies may enable a fresh look at how to support this work financially (e.g., by creating housing interventions that produce health benefits, leading to investments in housing by health systems).

Implications for Residents and Community Members. Residents play critical roles in completing the unfinished business of inclusive, equitable, and mixed-income communities where there is an opportunity to build assets and close racial wealth gaps.

- Indigenous low-income residents—often families who live in public housing—must gauge whether mixed-income communities will serve their interests directly, assessing what is and is not favorable to their circumstances. They must also join with other residents in creating a community that will support and value all members, regardless of individual circumstances.
 - To foster self-agency and self-determination, residents should be involved in making choices about design, governance, and community building for the community. Residents may need access to capacity-building resources in order to self-advocate with power.

- The pursuit of equity and inclusion cannot stop at jurisdictional borders. Residents and their leaders will need to organize and participate at decision-making tables beyond their neighborhood boundaries in order to advocate successfully for better jobs, wealth building, health services, schools, and transportation. The actors charged with managing these tables will need to make sure residents' voices and knowledge are present.
- In neighborhood redevelopment situations, not all residents will return to their former homes. Families that choose to leave should have the choice to leverage the redevelopment of their physical space into an opportunity to move elsewhere. This will require putting more effort, attention, and investment into regional housing mobility strategies and adopting both revitalization and mobility policies for residents who qualify. In addition, residents need comprehensive services and supports in these new areas beyond just housing.
- Redevelopment imposes trauma on residents, so steps must be taken to mitigate its negative effects. In particular, residents need the opportunity to protect and preserve the essential cultural identity of their community, even as gentrification and income mixing may introduce an alternative one.
- Residents of market-rate and workforce units have their own balancing act to perform in mixed-income communities. While they may choose the community because of its high-quality affordable housing, they may or may not celebrate or be well-equipped to be part of an equitable, inclusive, diverse community. Therefore, helping all residents see the advantages of living amongst racial and income diversity is key. Because our segregated existence in the United States leaves us ill-equipped for diversity and inclusion, all residents need to be engaged in the effort to determine how best to share neighborhoods and help all residents succeed in mixed-income communities.

About the Volume

This essay is published as part of a volume titled, *What Works to Promote Inclusive, Equitable Mixed-Income Communities*, edited by Dr. Mark L. Joseph and Dr. Amy T. Khare, with developmental editing support provided by Leila Fiester. Production is led by the National Initiative on Mixed-Income Communities (NIMC) at the Jack, Joseph, and Morton Mandel School of Applied Social Sciences at Case Western Reserve University, with lead funding provided by The Kresge Foundation. The volume aims to equip a broad audience of policymakers, funders, practitioners, community activists, and researchers with the latest thinking and tools needed to achieve more inclusive and equitable mixed-income communities. This is the fifth volume in the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco's What Works series, which has sought to analyze a variety of key themes in urban development.

The views expressed in the essays reflect the authors' perspectives and do not necessarily represent the views of The Kresge Foundation, the Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco or of the Federal Reserve System.

Readers can view this essay, the [framing paper](#) for the volume, and all currently posted essays on NIMC's [website](#) where new pieces are being uploaded every month. Essays will be compiled and released in a final print volume, with an anticipated release in 2020.

You can also sign up to receive email updates and notice of other content releases by signing up for newsletter updates [here](#).