

8

MIXED-INCOME PUBLIC HOUSING TRANSFORMATION IN SAN FRANCISCO AND WASHINGTON, D.C.

Joni Hirsch, Mark L. Joseph, and Amy T. Khare

Introduction

Affordable housing crises and the intensified threat of displacement for low- and middle-income residents have become dominant narratives within the context of urban economic growth in the USA, but these dynamics around rapid neighborhood change can overshadow another story: the reality that low-income residents who require public housing face a precarious future. Tens of thousands of residents in major cities including San Francisco, California, and Washington, D.C. use public subsidies to secure housing in thriving neighborhoods but remain marginalized from the increased economic opportunity and changing urban fabric around them (Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University, 2019; Stacy et al., 2019).

In the mid-2000s, amidst accelerating gentrification and dwindling federal funding, the mayors of Washington, D.C. and San Francisco launched high-profile, large-scale public housing redevelopment programs, the New Communities Initiative (NCI) and HOPE SF, which aimed to transform some of the most distressed public housing developments into vibrant mixed-income communities (see dcnewcommunities.org; hope-sf.org). While typically the task of redeveloping public housing had fallen to local public housing authorities under the direction of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), these city-driven mixed-income redevelopment efforts represented a major shift in approach. The relatively weak financial and political positioning of the public housing authorities situated these cities' housing and planning departments at the forefront of funding and decision-making. With the aim to address both the physical decay *and* social exclusion of public housing communities, the mixed-income transformation strategies in these two cities promised the much-needed investment to blighted neighborhoods, while aiming to deconcentrate poverty and preserve deeply subsidized housing (Joseph et al., 2007). While neither Washington, D.C. nor San Francisco was the first city to launch large-scale mixed-income public housing redevelopment initiatives, they marked a significant departure from previous efforts – such as those in Atlanta and Chicago – in their explicit social missions, placing goals of success for low-income residents at the center of the design and approach. Given the particular dynamics around city-driven leadership and the rapid gentrification of surrounding neighborhoods in Washington D.C. and San Francisco, NCI and HOPE SF present helpful case studies for examining the effort to promote inclusive and equitable mixed-income transformations in the face of prevailing inequitable market forces.

In this chapter, we use an analytical framework put forth by Amy Khare in her forthcoming book *Poverty, Power, and Profit: Structural Racism in Public Housing Reform* to examine how the city-led public housing redevelopment initiatives in Washington, D.C. and San Francisco have fared in their efforts thus far to promote more equitable development. Khare’s analytical frames include (1) creative destruction, (2) urban entrepreneurial governance, (3) devolution, (4) privatization, (5) commodification of public property, (6) contestation, and (7) racial capitalism. We apply them to help situate NCI and HOPE SF both within the contemporary neoliberal urban policy context and also within the specific constraints and opportunities of city-driven housing revitalization amidst gentrification. We are particularly interested in using these frames to examine the inherent tensions between the social goals and market goals of these initiatives. We find that despite the articulation of intentional efforts to promote more equitable outcomes for low-income residents of color, leaders in both cities have experienced significant challenges to operationalizing their equity commitments. We identify strategic implications for future public housing redevelopment efforts.

The Inclusion and Equity Imperative in Mixed-Income Public Housing Transformation

In a recent essay, “Prioritizing Inclusion and Equity in the Next Generation of Mixed-Income Communities,” Khare and Joseph (2019) argue that racial and socioeconomic integration is necessary but not sufficient to create inclusion and *equity* through community redevelopment. They define inclusion as the active, intentional, and sustained engagement of traditionally excluded individuals and groups through informal activities and formal decision-making processes in ways that build connections and share power. They believe that inclusion occurs when a social context enables people of diverse backgrounds to interact in mutually respectful ways that reveal their similarities and common ground, honor their social and cultural differences and uniqueness, and value what each individual and group can contribute to the shared environment.

Khare and Joseph suggest that equity entails addressing structural disparities defined by race and class so that people receive a more fair share of resources, opportunities, social supports, and power, given their differential needs and circumstances based on different life experiences. In particular, racial equity places priority on ensuring that people of color, particularly African Americans, are afforded opportunities that they have historically been denied and from which they continue to be excluded. They advance both a fairness case and an economic and social value case for greater inclusion and equity. The imperative for more inclusive mixed-income communities includes recognition of the *value* of people of color and the *value* of people who are economically constrained with a recognition that greater opportunity for marginalized people can actually generate increased and sustained opportunities for all people.

Initiative Background and Context

In D.C., Mayor Anthony Williams launched the NCI in 2005 after the murder of an adolescent girl in Sursum Corda, a formerly low-income housing development. NCI first centered on the neighborhood surrounding Sursum Corda called “Northwest One,” which contained several deeply subsidized housing projects and was one of the 14 crime “hot-spots” that the City’s police department had identified as priority areas (see, for example, NCI Annual Report, 2014). Williams determined that Northwest One would be redeveloped as a part of his broader plans to revitalize some of the District’s most distressed neighborhoods by replacing subsidized housing projects with mixed-income developments. Williams targeted areas where violent crime,

concentrated poverty, and distressed housing were located (Northwest One Redevelopment Plan, 2005). Over the next few years, three additional sites were added to the initiative – Lincoln Heights/Richardson Dwellings, Barry Farm, and Park Morton – in reaction to political pressure by council members to address deteriorating, high-crime public housing developments in their wards. The Northwest One and Park Morton developments are in northwest D.C. neighborhoods that are rapidly gentrifying, while Lincoln Heights/Richardson Dwellings and Barry Farm are east of the Anacostia River in neighborhoods that remain predominantly black and will be slower to experience the gentrification pressures sweeping the rest of the city. The initiative is led by a team within the Deputy Mayor’s Office of Planning and Economic Development, which works in partnership with the D.C. Housing Authority. The commitment to and investment in NCI has ebbed and flowed significantly under the four mayors who have led D.C. in the 14 years since the initiative was launched. Current Mayor Muriel Bowser made NCI a centerpiece of her first election campaign in 2014, which reinvigorated a focus on the redevelopment effort that she has since sustained (see, for example, “Mayor Bowser Delivers on the Promise of the New Communities Initiative”). Her team is now looking to broaden major redevelopment activity to other public housing developments in her second term.

In San Francisco, HOPE SF was launched in 2006 under Mayor Gavin Newsom and, unlike NCI, has enjoyed a consistent, and in some ways expanded, commitment and focus from the two mayors who have succeeded Newsom, Mayor Ed Lee, and now Mayor London Breed. Both Lee and Breed spent parts of their childhood living in public housing and brought an intuitive commitment for a dramatic and equitable approach to harnessing the burgeoning economic vitality in the city to advance the redevelopment of the four HOPE SF neighborhoods. At the time of the launch of HOPE SF, the San Francisco Housing Authority (SFHA) had redeveloped several public housing sites with HOPE VI funding, but had stalled in its progress in part due to mismanagement and dysfunction, as demonstrated through several years on HUD’s troubled housing authorities list. A 2005 study by the San Francisco Department of Human Services revealed that 60% of vulnerable households in San Francisco lived within walking distance of seven street corners in the city, five of which were public housing neighborhoods (“The Seven Key Street Corners for At Risk Families in San Francisco.”). At the same time, an assessment found that HOPE VI funding would not be sufficient to transform these neighborhoods. Mayor Newsom appointed a citizen task force to propose a new model for revitalizing public housing. In response to their recommendations, Mayor Newsom and the Board of Supervisors launched HOPE SF and authorized \$95 million in local bond funding to initiate the redevelopment of four public housing sites in the Bayview area city: Hunters View, Alice Griffith, Potrero, and Sunnydale.¹

The basic approach to both NCI and HOPE SF reflects the mixed-income model of the federal HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhoods programs, as well as redevelopment efforts in cities such as Atlanta and Chicago. Private developers are engaged by the city to replace the deteriorating public housing with mixed-income developments, using public funding to leverage private capital for development. Land abatement, infrastructure investments, and other incentives support the development process. One-for-one replacement housing for the original public housing units is complemented by affordable rental housing funded with Low-Income Housing Tax Credits as well as market-rate housing. While in D.C. some of the tax-credit units and market-rate units will be integrated into new buildings with the public housing replacement units, development plans in San Francisco locate the market-rate units in separate buildings. This model combines physical redevelopment and human capital investment, bringing market activity into disinvested neighborhoods to address concentrated poverty, provide higher-quality housing, and offer comprehensive supportive services to residents (Joseph & Miyoung, 2019; Vale & Shamsuddin, 2017).

Dramatically different from previous large-scale public housing redevelopment efforts, however, both NCI and HOPE SF are comprehensive multisite initiatives that articulate a set of clear set of principles aimed to promote neighborhood redevelopment that avoids displacement of original residents and achieves transformative outcomes for those residents. From pre-development to post-development, these principles are intended to guide a number of decisions from the selection of master developers, the approach to relocation, the human capital and community building strategies, and the metrics of success.

Largely in response to the strident advocacy of resident leaders and housing advocates who were concerned about how NCI's redevelopment efforts would affect existing public housing residents, the NCI established four guiding principles at the outset of the effort (see NCI website):

1. One-for-one replacement
2. Right to return
3. Mixed-income housing
4. Build first.

These principles underscored the city's priority to minimize displacement. More broadly, NCI now touts an overarching goal of "100% resident success," defined as ensuring that the original residents of the developments are stably housed and personally thriving, whether they return to the new mixed-income developments or relocate to another area of the city (see, for example, NCI Stakeholder Report, 2016–2017). This ambitious goal requires a strategy that extends beyond housing redevelopment and includes comprehensive efforts to address human capital needs and promote community building and resident participation.

In its 2006 recommendations for the launch of HOPE SF, the mayor-appointed citizens task force developed a set of eight guiding principles (see HOPE SF website).

1. Ensure no loss of public housing
2. Create an economically integrated community
3. Maximize creation of new affordable housing
4. Involve residents in the highest level of participation in the entire project
5. Provide economic opportunities through rebuilding process
6. Integrate process with neighborhood improvement plans
7. Create environmentally sustainable and accessible communities
8. Build a strong sense of community.

When he stepped in as director of HOPE SF in 2015, Theo Miller branded the initiative as a "reparations effort" to indicate its commitment to acknowledging and redressing the marginalization of low-income African American residents and other residents of color in San Francisco (see, for example, "Low-Income Neighborhoods Approved for Redevelopment").

NCI and HOPE SF also depart from previous public housing redevelopment efforts in other cities in that they are city-led with varying degrees of partnership with the housing authority, rather than managed by the local housing authority. While public housing redevelopment has traditionally fallen under the scope of public housing authorities and has relied on core funding from the federal government, severe decreases in both funding and capacity within the housing authorities provided an opening for city departments to lead the implementation of a mixed-income solution to failed public housing (Kleit & Page, 2015). These initiatives thus fell more directly under the authority of the mayors and served to advance broader political and economic

agendas, with the intention of deploying market-oriented development approaches to achieve comprehensive social outcomes including inclusion and equity, a proposition that had limited previous success in these and other cities.

Conceptual Framework: Analyzing Mixed-Income Public Housing Redevelopment in a Neoliberal Urban Policy Context

In her forthcoming book *Poverty, Power and Profit*, Khare examines the multisite public housing redevelopment in Chicago over a 20-year period with particular attention to the trade-offs navigated by a city focused on leveraging the resources and capacity of the private sector and harnessing market forces to drive revitalization for the benefit of low-income communities of color. The detailed evidence shows how and why market-based reforms intended to improve public housing actually furthered the marginalization of low-income, African American communities. At the same time, those in power bolstered a mayoral agenda that largely prioritized reshaping the city's built environment for the benefit of the affluent.

Khare finds that Chicago's reforms resulted in land appropriation, capital accumulation, and the displacement of thousands of low-income African American residents. The financial resources the reforms required, upwards of \$8 billion, and the profits generated, nearly \$75 million in payments to developers to build 12 mixed-income developments, quantify the massive extent of the market-driven nature of the effort. Ultimately, Chicago's reforms contributed to reproducing racial oppression by furthering the economic interests of elites through decisions made by government officials to repurpose public housing, land, and resources for profit-making and non-public housing uses. *Poverty, Power, and Profit* brings to light the contradictory dynamics at work within a neoliberal framework: competing ideas about the proper partnerships between the public and private sectors, shifting authority among local and national government agencies, and activist struggles for community revitalization on land where public housing projects once stood.

Khare's analysis of the Chicago experience yielded an analytical framework with seven concepts she found key to understanding how mixed-income transformation played out in that city: creative destruction, urban entrepreneurial governance, devolution, privatization, commodification of public property, contestation, and racial capitalism. We introduce this framework briefly here in order to apply the concepts to our examination of NCI and HOPE SF.

Creative Destruction

Khare deploys the Marxist concept of creative destruction to frame the process of reshaping the urban policy environment toward a more market-based system, rolling back collectivist redistributionist systems, such as public housing, while rolling out restructured state institutions, policies, and governing approaches focused on facilitating capital expansion. Within the context of urban redevelopment, the creative destruction process extends beyond the shifting of policy regimes to the literal destruction and rebuilding of inner-city communities. And in a broader sense, the image and function of the entire city can also be seen as being remade for broader economic prominence and appeal (Harvey, 2005).

Urban Entrepreneurial Governance

Khare frames urban entrepreneurial governance as a shift in policy decision-making whereby local urban leaders seek to position their cities at the forefront of a global economic stage by

attracting capital, expansion, and investment. Seeking to leverage existing city assets, such as public land and public housing, as a means for expansion and growth, elected leaders and government officials focus policies on maximizing the economic value of these assets. Entrepreneurial governance strategies meant to stimulate economic growth often generate strategies and outcomes that marginalize low-income households of color, instead initiating benefits for whites and people with existing wealth (Clarke & Gaile, 1989; Leitner, 1990).

Devolution

In the process of devolution, local jurisdictions assume greater authority and responsibility over the management of public goods and services, as well as the local allocation of federal subsidies. In the public housing arena specifically, this means a decreased role for HUD and greater influence for cities and public housing authorities (Hackworth, 2000). The federal Moving to Work (MTW) demonstration program, a designation the Chicago Housing Authority was granted in 2000, is a formal manifestation of this devolution which provides for more flexible use of federal funds and waivers from certain regulatory constraints. The D.C. Housing Authority received MTW designation as well. Khare demonstrates that the shift of influence can be partial and inconsistent, with the federal government maintaining a degree of control and exerting its authority episodically.

Privatization

The privatization of public housing redevelopment entails a shift of responsibility away from the public sector to private developers, property managers, investors, social service organizations, for-profit corporations, and non-profit community organizations. Privatization shifts power and decision-making away from a publicly accountable entity and introduces profit-oriented motives. It also introduces the danger of making affordable housing production dependent on market conditions and the availability of private capital (Khare, 2017; Vale & Freemark, 2018). Khare uses this frame to bring into sharp relief the trade-offs between the social mission and economic interests of these redevelopment projects.

Commodification of Public Property

Khare elevates attention to a particular form of privatization that involves the commodification of public property. Publicly owned land is shifted into the private marketplace through government policies that incentivize and increase private investment (Aalbers & Christophers, 2014). The current model of mixed-income housing development requires that public land be made available to private entities to build market-rate and affordable housing. In Chicago, following the Great Recession, the commodification of public property became a controversial issue when mixed-income housing development was no longer profitable. Policymakers shifted their focus away from mixed-income housing and instead made public land available for private retail and recreational development without a clear social purpose.

Contestation

Contestation refers to organized resistance to market-driven and profit-oriented agendas. Khare notes that neoliberalism is a process that evolves and responds to ongoing pressures and resistance. This resistance can promote alternative approaches that reshape specific decisions and

the overall political-economic environment (Leitner et al., 2007). In the case of public housing redevelopment in Chicago, contestation reshaped the dynamics of devolution and compelled HUD to exercise its role on key issues.

Racial Capitalism

Khare invokes racial capitalism as the co-production of capitalist exploitation and racial domination. With this frame, the urban landscape in the US cities can be understood as a contested place in which historic and contemporary racist politics and policy processes contribute to producing racialized spaces, such as isolated, disinvested public housing sites (Melamed, 2015). In public housing redevelopment, this frame illuminates the role of racism in shaping how African American communities and households have been further marginalized through housing and community development efforts that have been purported as physical and economic revitalization efforts that will benefit existing residents of color.

Examining the HOPE SF and NCI Efforts to Achieve Greater Equity and Inclusion through Mixed-Income Redevelopment

We now turn to our exploration of the redevelopment efforts in Washington, D.C. and San Francisco. Using Khare's seven frames, we examine whether and how each city attempted to counteract the forces of inequity and exclusion inherent in the public housing redevelopment process, and we consider how those efforts have fared thus far. Then, we draw implications for more effective approaches to promoting equitable, inclusive mixed-income transformations.

Creative Destruction

Relevance of the Frame

In both cities, the public housing redevelopment initiatives emerged in a context of heightened public sensitivity to the inequitable process of "creative destruction" that was radically reshaping the cities' image and identity, altering the priorities and processes of urban policy, and re-making the character of city neighborhoods. An increasing wave of gentrification was sweeping over both cities, resulting in the residential and cultural displacement of African Americans and other low-income households. In Washington, D.C., as Derek Hyra has framed it, along with the urban renaissance it was experiencing, Chocolate City was becoming Cappuccino City (Hyra, 2018). Between 2000 and 2013, D.C. had the highest percentage of gentrifying neighborhoods in the country, leading to the displacement of 20,000 black residents (Richardson et al., 2019). In San Francisco, the disruption and exodus of the African American population was even more drastic, with only one in 20 city residents being black in 2000, down from one in seven in 1970 (Urban Displacement Project). The emergence of San Francisco as a 21st-century global tech hub was only intensifying and accelerating the creative destruction process.

Policymakers and housing advocates in both cities were well aware of the track record of previous public housing redevelopment efforts, most notably through the federal HOPE VI program, which had experienced a median return rate of 18% across almost 259 projects (Gress et al., 2019).

As described earlier, both redevelopment efforts were explicit and intentional about their commitment to minimizing the level of disruption and displacement of the original residents of the public housing sites. Both cities committed to one-for-one replacement of any public

housing units that were demolished, ensuring no overall loss of deeply subsidizing housing. Unlike previous redevelopment efforts locally and nationally which started by moving residents off the site in order to commence the demolition and rebuilding process as quickly as possible, both cities committed to a phased, “build first” strategy. This often entailed first constructing new housing on a contiguous off-site parcel, then moving residents from a targeted area of the development to the new housing, and then demolishing the building vacated by the relocatees.

In one case in San Francisco, the Hunters View development, redevelopment started on the site itself, with residents being moved within the site to vacate an initial set of buildings that could be demolished and replaced. The process continued in phases so that no residents would be forced to leave the site during redevelopment. Over time in San Francisco, particularly under the leadership of the second director of HOPE SF, Theo Miller, the label of “legacy residents” was applied to the original residents of the sites to signify the particular commitment that was being made to prioritizing their well-being and positive outcomes through the redevelopment.

There were also specific residents rights protections put in place in both cities. D.C. Housing Authority (DCHA) Resolution 16-06, for example, defines the rights and priorities for residents and stakeholders during the relocation and return process. Among other specifications, it ensures that requirements for eligibility to move back into an NCI property after redevelopment not be any more stringent than existing DCHA policies for residents residing in current public housing units (such as new work requirements, criminal background requirements, or credit or drug screening requirements) (*DCHA Resolution 16-06*). Housing advocates have criticized Resolution 16-06 as being an unenforceable statement of intent without any penalties or ramifications if it is not followed by the private owners and property management corporations.

In San Francisco, the City Council adopted Ordinance 227-12 in October 2012, which established the San Francisco Right to Revitalized Housing Ordinance to set city policy regarding the right to return to revitalized public housing units. The ordinance applies to any redevelopment project in the city that receives financial assistance from the city. It guarantees public housing tenants’ relocation rights and the highest priority for tenancy in the new developments. It prevents landlords from submitting public housing tenants to any additional screening to determine their eligibility to return to a redeveloped unit. Notably, unlike in D.C., the ordinance establishes new powers for the San Francisco Residential Rent Stabilization and Arbitration Board to hold revitalization projects accountable to the ordinance.

Emerging Outcomes

In both cities, initiative leaders pronounced early commitments to achieving 100% rates of return of original residents to the new mixed-income developments. In San Francisco, two factors led to a softening of the goal of complete retention of residents in their original neighborhoods. First, preventing residents from leaving the site ran counter to the basic principles of the effort, particularly as delays in redevelopment became more extensive. An initiative that claimed a fundamental commitment to promoting resident choice and opportunity could not restrain residents from using the redevelopment opportunity to move away from the site. Second, the development process itself generated noise, dust, and other inconveniences that required some households, for example those with a family with asthma, to move to another location. Later in the process, opportunities to make replacement units available in new developments in other parts of the city also led to an increase in off-site relocation. In D.C., the commitment to 100% return was replaced with the aspirational commitment to “100 percent resident success,” which indicated a commitment that residents would thrive in their new residential location whether or not they returned to the replacement housing. Just as in San Francisco, the slow pace of

redevelopment, the desire of some residents to make permanent moves away from the site, and the inconvenience of staying on-site through the redevelopment meant that a 100% return rate was infeasible.

While in San Francisco, the phased, build first approach was fully adhered to, in D.C. there has been mixed follow-through on this commitment. In San Francisco, and to some extent in D.C., this has resulted in a much slower pace of redevelopment, with the additional benefit of extended time to engage residents and prepare them for the coming disruption. In D.C., the Northwest One site was the first to be completely vacated and demolished. While two off-site buildings were indeed constructed and occupied, only about 15–20% of original residents moved into those buildings, with the remainder being, at least temporarily, displaced to other areas of the city. The City proposed to outright demolish Temple Courts, a high-rise building located on the Northwest One site with 211 HUD-subsidized units, because of the particularly egregious building conditions. The City purchased the building from the absentee slumlord with the intention of redeveloping it as a part of NCI. Tearing the building down before new housing had been built on-site threatened the “Build First” promise, and the mayor at the time, Adrian Fenty, provided existing residents with an opportunity to give input on the decision at a community meeting. The prevailing opinion expressed by those that attended the meeting was to tear the buildings down and take vouchers to relocate, and Temple Courts was demolished in late 2008. It has still not been rebuilt!

At the Barry Farm site in D.C., legal challenges and other delays in the redevelopment process, increasing violence and crime on-site, and the rapid deterioration of the buildings resulted in a mass relocation of residents from the site before any replacement housing had been constructed (Giambrone, 2010). At the Park Morton site in D.C., the commitment to building off-site housing first was sustained for well over a decade but has been waylaid by a variety of factors, including legal challenges to the planned off-site development that has generated extensive delays in what was intended to be the first phase of the entire redevelopment process. Since the D.C. Housing Authority has received HUD demolition approval and funds are currently available to issue Housing Choice Vouchers, there are plans emerging to move all residents off-site and skip to the first phase of on-site development. At the fourth NCI site, Lincoln Heights/Richardson Dwellings, two off-site buildings have been completed and occupied and no on-site development has yet been initiated. At a broad scale, the D.C. case shows immense physical destruction of public housing communities without the creation of new homes in which residents were expected to move.

In San Francisco, at two sites, Hunters View and Alice Griffith, all of the replacement public housing has been completed, and, due to the phased redevelopment, return rates of over 70% and over 90%, respectively, have been achieved among original residents. At Alice Griffith, this successful retention of original residents, in large part motivated by the five-year project completion timeframe of a federal Choice Neighborhoods Implementation grant, came at the significant strategic cost of an out-of-sync mixed-income transformation. Due to post-recession market slowdowns and other logistical, financial, and technical challenges, the development of market-rate buildings was put on hold, and the replacement public housing was designed and built as a separate, wholly contained site, thus replicating the housing segregation that had previously existed. Market-rate development was similarly stalled at the Hunters View redevelopment, but unlike Alice Griffith, there are designated parcels for market-rate development integrated throughout the site, and thus the complete physical separation that exists at Alice Griffith will be avoided. The other two HOPE SF sites, Potrero and Sunnydale, completed their first off-site housing in 2019, prior to any demolitions on-site. Both off-site buildings are directly contiguous to the original public housing site.

Implications for More Equitable Policy and Practice

To promote more inclusive outcomes, the creative destruction inherent in a market-driven redevelopment should be complemented by a commitment to “equitable transformation,” in which drastic changes in policy approach and community make-up are accepted and even embraced, but with an explicit and disciplined commitment to positive results for original residents of the site and other marginalized populations. It is important to acknowledge and value the ways of life and community history that is being creatively destructed and proactively seek ways to retain the legacy of existing people, history, culture, and traditions. This also requires combating the sense that all that is new – incoming residents, outside norms, and culture – is superior and all that came before – public housing residents and communities – was expendable. Achieving this narrative and strategic shift requires establishing a shared language and commitment, creating spaces and settings for discussion and deliberation, and appointing and positioning leaders and initiative personnel with the natural inclination and operational skill to promote this approach. Even within neoliberal, market-driven framework, a strong vision and process can be established to guide and compel developers to adhere to a more inclusive approach.

Urban Entrepreneurial Governance

Relevance of the Frame

The operational responsibility for the mixed-income efforts in both cities was a significant departure from previous multisite transformations in other cities, including Chicago and Atlanta, where the lead entity was the public housing authority with the mayor as a champion for the effort and city departments acting in support of the effort. In both D.C. and San Francisco, mayors and city government officials play a lead role in the design, funding, and implementation of the initiatives. With the public housing authorities in both cities overwhelmed by shrinking resources and decades of mismanagement, city government, with burgeoning resources in their coffers from their economic vibrancy, stepped in to drive the efforts. This makes the frame of urban entrepreneurial governance even more salient as the initiatives were conducted with high levels of technical competence and transactional efficiency in the context of mayoral agendas to position their cities for economic vitality and global prominence. In D.C., the Mayor’s Office of Planning and Economic Development managed NCI alongside other major urban revitalization projects across the district. In San Francisco, HOPE SF was first launched within the San Francisco Redevelopment Agency, also alongside other major revitalization efforts. When all redevelopment agencies across the state were closed in 2012 to promote budget-cutting consolidation, HOPE SF was integrated into the Mayor’s Office of Housing and Community Development, with the director of HOPE SF reporting directly to the mayor.

Both initiatives have now been sustained across multiple mayoral administrations, four in D.C. and three in San Francisco.² The commitment to NCI waxed and waned considerably with shifts among mayors, with Mayor Muriel Bowser re-elevating NCI as a prominent city commitment in her mayoral campaign. The attention to the initiative seems to parallel the strength of the local housing market, further evidence that an urban entrepreneurial approach is fueled by economic opportunity in the private market. In comparison, the mayoral commitment to HOPE SF as a priority investment and focus in San Francisco has been remarkably consistent, largely undeterred by the slowdown of the market in the years following the Great Recession. Started under Gavin Newsom, who would eventually become governor of

California, HOPE SF benefited from the fact that, as referenced earlier, his successors Mayor Lee and Mayor Breed both lived in public housing during their childhoods and have a personal commitment to resident-centered public housing reform.

There is a striking similarity in how mayor's office leadership has unfolded in both initiatives. Midway through both efforts, African American initiative directors were appointed who brought a deep personal commitment to equity and inclusion, a skepticism about a primarily transactional approach to mixed-income transformation, and the political savvy and personal integrity to position the initiative to forge a different redevelopment path. Angie Rodgers came to NCI with a professional background in affordable housing, with direct experience managing implementation of development projects, underwriting public gap financing, and engaging in policy, research, and advocacy as they relate to affordable housing throughout the D.C. region. She was also a co-convenor of the D.C. Affordable Housing Alliance, a coalition of individuals and organizations dedicated to promoting the development, preservation, and operation of affordable housing. Theo Miller stepped into the role of HOPE SF director after having been lured away from his doctoral studies at Harvard to lead Mayor Lee's efforts to design and implement a racial equity strategy for the city.

Emerging Outcomes

Under the parameters set by the respective mayors and with the persistent leadership of Rodgers and Miller, both initiatives established an explicit commitment to prioritizing the well-being and outcomes of original residents. Miller followed-up on the aforementioned "100 percent resident success" by contracting with the Urban Institute to develop a logic model and social service strategy to map out a pathway to ensuring the successful relocation of all residents. However, despite her best efforts, Rodger's ability to maintain social entrepreneurial momentum toward her mantra of "100 percent resident success" has thus far been thwarted by several factors, including resistance and lack of cooperation from the housing authority, the lack of experience in city departments with the complexities of public housing development, legal challenges and other slowdowns to the redevelopment process, and high levels of staff turnover on her team. Ultimately, after more than four years as NCI Director, Rodgers was promoted within the department, to the prominent position of Chief of Staff, and responsibility for the initiative was shifted to Denise Robinson, a newly hired staffer who was charged with managing the initiative along with a broader portfolio of development efforts.

In San Francisco, Miller has successfully positioned HOPE SF for continued priority attention and investment from the city and continues to press for strategic implementation across the sites that center "legacy residents." Like Rodgers, he too has confronted significant challenges to momentum, including dysfunction at the housing authority, delays at the developments, enduring crime and violence at the sites, and high levels of fear and distrust among residents.

Unlike Rodgers, Miller has been able to draw on substantial additional social entrepreneurial leadership from a number of valued partners. The partnership for HOPE SF is a civic alliance led by the San Francisco Foundation, Enterprise Community Partners and the mayor's office, created to provide additional resources and capacity to the transformation effort. To date, the Partnership has raised over \$30 million of philanthropic support for HOPE SF and has taken lead responsibility for managing communications, research and evaluation, and best-practice technical assistance on behalf of the initiative (see HOPE SF website). Miller has also benefited from city partners at the Mayor's Office of Housing who have been willing to elevate the social goals of HOPE SF.

Implications for More Equitable Policy and Practice

While both Rodgers and Miller could certainly be characterized as urban entrepreneurs in their energetic and enterprising approach to navigating government bureaucracy to advance implementation, they both added a dimension of *social* entrepreneurship to their priorities and focus. As practiced by both Rodgers and Miller, urban social entrepreneurial governance can be defined as using the resources, tools and influence of city leadership to prioritize and advance social goals as well as economic growth goals.

Avoiding redevelopment that privileges the economic revitalization over inclusive redevelopment requires a broadening of the leadership paradigm from “urban entrepreneurial governance” to “urban social entrepreneurial governance.” Mayors, their lead staff, and key public/private partnership leaders need to see themselves not just as economic entrepreneurs but also as social entrepreneurs. This means continuing the imperative for more efficiency, competence, and innovation in implementation of the redevelopment, but adding an expectation of enterprising innovations that achieve a balance of market *and* social goals, not just market goals. This will require the recruitment of personnel with a social entrepreneurial mindset and skills and the ability to galvanize an equity commitment across the initiative. Key staff will need training and support to apply more equitable policies and practices and clear benchmarks and accountability that elevate social goals alongside market goals.

Devolution

Relevance of the Frame

The devolution of responsibility for public housing redevelopment from the federal government to local authorities is a fundamental dimension of the mixed-income transformation efforts in D.C. and San Francisco. Just as in cities across the nation, city and public housing authority leaders in D.C. and San Francisco were faced with dramatically declining federal resources for operating public housing and increased control over decision-making and strategy. However, as HUD stepped back from its federal funding and oversight role, it was unclear how the balance of local responsibility was to be distributed between the public housing authority, which had primary responsibility and control over its land, funds, and residents, and the city government which has broader authority, a public mandate, greater resources, and more efficient infrastructure.

As described earlier, the mayors and their staff in both cities approached the devolution vacuum in the same way, with an assertion of a lead role, creation of the initiative and its transformational aims, and an expectation that the public housing authority would comply with the vision and momentum for change. However, in both cities, officials at the public housing authorities proved resistant to city dominance and, in turn, asserted their own lead responsibility and role in any initiative that involved public housing authority land and residents. In D.C., the housing authority was led by an experienced and respected President/CEO Adrienne Todman who presented a formidable political force. DCHA’s designation of federal MTW status granted it considerable flexibility and authority to manage its resources and program strategy. Furthermore, MTW status was normally only granted by HUD to select high-performing PHAs around the country, so the designation alone conferred a certain level of prestige and self-assurance. However, Todman left DCHA partway through the initiative, and her successor has struggled to establish strong leadership and credibility with institutional partners. In San Francisco, where the housing authority has spent several years on HUD’s list of most troubled

housing authorities and the leader was ousted a few years into HOPE SF in a corruption scandal, city leadership has been steadily working to transition power and responsibility away from the housing authority. The city used the federal Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program to move much of the public housing stock into private ownership with project-based vouchers. Rather than a city-housing authority partnership, HOPE SF has become another element in the gradual shrinking and closing down of the housing authority.

Further complicating devolution dynamics in both cities, HUD's role and decisions about when and how to intervene were inconsistent and often marked by considerable delay before actions. In San Francisco, for example, there was an extensive delay in the approval of allocation of Tenant Protection Vouchers that would transition ownership of the Potrero and Sunnysdale units to private property managers.

Emerging Outcomes

Ultimately, devolution has provided broad latitude for both city governments to forge ahead with bold revitalization efforts across the four initiative sites. However, the intransigence of the housing authorities in both cities, along with the inconsistently played role of mediator and arbiter by HUD, has generated considerable delays and impeded decisive, strategic action by the initiative leaders and implementers at numerous critical junctures of the efforts.

As both SFHA and DCHA have resisted relinquishing control or changing their policies, it has generated complex and obstructive power dynamics which manifest at conceptual and operational levels. The cities and housing authorities have fundamentally different goals and priorities, inhibiting collaboration. The city agencies running HOPE SF and NCI emphasize broad goals of neighborhood revitalization and economic development, requiring collaboration with a wide range of public and private stakeholders. The housing authorities, on the other hand, foster a narrower focus on developing, maintaining, and managing public housing specifically, administering the Housing Choice Voucher program and coordinating relocation. In practice, SFHA and DCHA have not gotten on board with a broader place-based approach to the transformation and remained focused on a narrow, people-based approach. The misalignment is compounded at the operational level, leading to the spread of misinformation, confusion among residents, duplication of efforts, administrative complications, as well as an unwillingness to share data about residents' needs and relocation. In both San Francisco and D.C., political tension between City leadership and the local housing authority has had crippling effects on the pace of progress, the ability of residents to navigate these complex systems, the potential for tracking resident success over the short- and long-term, and the ability to ensure a smooth relocation process. In D.C., City Council Legislation introduced in February 2019 would move DCHA from an independent authority to under the purview of the Office of the Mayor (*District of Columbia Housing Authority Amendment Act of 2019*).

Implications for More Equitable Policy and Practice

To facilitate a more consistent and deliberate local effort toward inclusive public housing redevelopment would require a shift from the pattern of relatively hands-off, uneven devolution by HUD to a more "strategic devolution." In this more strategic form of devolution, HUD and key local actors including the city and housing authority would dedicate extensive time early in the initiative to establish clarity about rules of the game and rules of engagement. This would include agreements about the roles of each entity, lines of authority and decision-making, and accountability processes. HUD would retain a clear accountability and mediating role and

would be transparent about when and why it was stepping in. HUD would also work to promote local capacity and positioning to ensure local accountability mechanisms are robust and engaged across multiple levels including state government, local government, civic leaders, and community-based organizations.

Privatization

Relevance of the Frame

Both NCI and HOPE SF represent the complete adoption of the neoliberal approach to urban policy wherein the private sector and market-based principles and forces are harnessed to manage and advance efforts in arenas that are usually the province of the government. Private developers have been engaged as the long-term owner-operators of the sites and contracted to manage the real estate redevelopment process and conduct property management for the new buildings. Private non-profit agencies have also been contracted to provide social services and other supports to residents. Considerable public funds have been leveraged to raise millions of dollars in private sector investment in NCI and HOPE SF.

In both initiatives, different teams of for-profit and not-for-profit private developers were selected for each of the four sites. While national not-for-profit developers, The Community Builders and Preservation of Affordable Housing, led the development in some D.C. sites, at Northwest One, a local for-profit development team was chosen for the major on-site redevelopment. For HOPE SF, two for-profit developers (John Stewart Company and McCormack Baron Salazar) and two non-profit developers (BRIDGE and Mercy Housing) were selected. The selection of development teams has proven a key leverage point in maintaining a focus on the success of low-income residents through the relocation process. Developers with experience, expertise, and a commitment to serving low-income communities of color approach these projects differently than those oriented toward market-rate development. In all cases, challenges remain in aligning their mission and approaches with their public partners.

Emerging Outcomes

In NCI, for the most part the development teams have played out their roles in ways that reflect business as usual for mixed-income redevelopment, without any particular actions that indicate any particularly innovative efforts to promote more inclusive or equitable outcomes. POAH was originally in a joint venture with a for-profit developer at Barry Farms, but ultimately the for-profit developer stepped away from the project due to irreconcilable differences with the city and POAH has been left as the sole developer.

In San Francisco, the developers have been subject to far more engagement, direction, and oversight from the HOPE SF team in the mayor's office. This has created some tension, with developers feeling that the city has maintained too much control and has not given them their appropriate positioning as long-term owners of the site.

Implications for Greater Equity and Inclusion

While multisite transformation initiatives as ambitious as NCI and HOPE SF certainly require private sector capacity and resources and sophisticated financing strategies, achieving more equitable outcomes requires a shift from purely “profit-maximizing privatization” to something that might be called “equitable privatization.” In this shift, financing schemes and models would

be designed and shaped to promote greater inclusion and equity, for example co-operative models that distribute ownership among residents and other stakeholders, land trusts that designate and facilitate commitment to specific goals of affordability and inclusion, affordable home ownership, savings incentive models (like the successful federal Family Self-Sufficiency program) that provide escrow accounts for residents to accrue savings toward home ownership and other personal investments, models that promote entrepreneurship and small businesses. Once again, selection, training, and accountability of initiative personnel are key, with a premium on positioning individuals in asset management and influential roles with the expertise, interest, and commitment to social innovation in the financing space.

Commodification of Public Property

Relevance of the Frame

In the context of rapidly gentrifying cities and skyrocketing land values, a crucial asset in both initiatives was the availability of city and housing authority-owned land that could be made available for market-driven investment and revenue generation. In Chicago, as described by Khare, the commodification of land became a major point of controversy when Mayor Rahm Emanuel pivoted from making the public available land to private developers for a mix of affordable and market-rate housing, to also making the land available for non-housing uses such as a grocery store and a tennis center (Khare, forthcoming). This particular issue has not yet become relevant in either D.C. or San Francisco.

Emerging Outcomes

Thus far in both D.C. and San Francisco, the use of public land has been largely for housing redevelopment. An exception in San Francisco is a planned neighborhood hub in the Sunnydale neighborhood with a community center, YMCA, Boys and Girls Club, daycare, other activities for intergenerational use, and retail establishments. In D.C., a historic theater is undergoing a redevelopment into a mixed-use building.

Implications for Greater Equity and Inclusion

Great equity would entail a shift from “inequitable commodification” to “equitable commodification.” City and initiative leaders should articulate a clearer strategic vision upfront about how land is to be used for community benefit. There should be a clear prioritization and commitment to socially beneficial uses of commodified land. Policy and regulatory parameters should be established over how land is used and transferred. A portfolio approach could be designated to track land transfer and use, with specified proportions of the portfolio to be dedicated to largely social uses (for example, affordable housing and parks), purely market uses (for example, luxury condo and high-end retail), and a blend of social and market uses (for example, a community bank).

Contestation

Relevance of the Frame

Contestation involves the organized resistance to neoliberal agendas and the promotion of alternative approaches to restructure the political-economic environment. For example, contestation

can come in the form of political protest, organized activism, and social movements that challenge dominant market-centered practices. Contestation also involves actions by people working within government that shape policies in ways that make them more equitable.

Both initiatives owe their establishment of explicit guiding principles for the initiative to effective early contestation from residents and housing advocates. These principles have remained relevant over time. In San Francisco, an updated set of principles was recently released.

In both cities, contestation to the public housing redevelopment process has shaped the pace and direction of the redevelopments, but the political resistance and legal challenges have been considerably more disruptive in D.C. In both cities, elected city officials have exerted significant influence over the process, but both city teams have generally found ways to secure the support of these elected officials for the broad strategic direction of the effort. Examples include unanimous support for the DCHA relocation rights resolution by the D.C. City Council and the approval of bond financing by the San Francisco Board of Supervisors.

Emerging Outcomes

In D.C., before the establishment of Resolution 16-06, there was active contestation by housing advocates around legislating the right to return. NCI had articulated a right to return principle in theory, but no one could say what that meant and the initiative had not operationalized it. As the initial replacement housing was coming online and private property managers were taking on their roles, they were not acting differently, nor was any agency forcing them to. This led to a buildup of unaddressed complaints about residents not able to get back into units for reasons such as criminal background checks.

While HOPE SF has proceeded without any major or long-standing lawsuits or other legal roadblocks, NCI has been severely hampered and delayed by multiple lawsuits. In D.C., contestation against redevelopment plans has arisen from public housing residents, advocates and organizers, neighboring renters, and home-owners. Despite intentional efforts to include community input early on in decision-making, a number of aspects of various redevelopment plans and policies have been fought through lawsuits and planning tools. In some cases, this opposition had the effect of reshaping planning decisions, and in others has resulted in major delays in construction, with few concrete changes to show for it. During these years of delay, residents continue to move to other public housing properties or take vouchers to move into private market housing, thereby forgoing their right to return to the redeveloped property. New residents have continued to lease up, further complicating the right to return.

Barry Farm in NCI is an example where major contestation through a lawsuit filed by the Barry Farm Tenant Allies and Empower D.C. has had the impact of reshaping the plans for redevelopment, though it has so far failed to ultimately block the project. A litany of protests and lawsuits in Barry Farm has delayed redevelopment for many years. In 2018, the D.C. Court of Appeals demanded that the city and DHCA go back to residents and engage them more thoroughly around what their redevelopment preferences. As a result, the city proposed amendments to the plan, which decreased on-site density and increased the size of units. There will also be greater attention to historic preservation in the design and construction process.

The same advocates behind Barry Farm are now involved in the lawsuit against the Bruce Monroe site, the first off-site development to be built in the Park Morton neighborhood. The Park Morton redevelopment initially appeared to be a development scenario that was set up for a successful and timely process – the funding was in place, the development team was in alignment with DMPED's goals, and City Council members and advisory neighborhood commission members were supportive of the development plans. But local community members,

concerned about the plans to use public park land to create off-site replacement public housing in a mixed-income building, have blocked the plans.

Implications for Greater Equity and Inclusion

Given the momentum of market forces and the influence of profit-seeking private actors, even under the most enlightened and equity-oriented city leadership, it is likely that some degree of contestation and external accountability will be needed to aid the balancing of market goals with social goals. Thus, the implication for achieving greater equity and inclusion is to seek a level and form of contestation that is strategically disruptive and ultimately generative of equitable outcomes without completely stalling or derailing progress and creating long-term harm for low-income residents. This could be framed as moving from “periodic contestation of limited effectiveness” to “transformative contestation.”

Transformative contestation would entail a strategic blend of oppositional and constructive resistance. It would require city and initiative leadership that sees contestation as opportunity for strengthening policy, practice, and outcomes and ultimately gaining support for and inclusion in the change process. Transformative contestation would involve a wide variety of actors in accountability and contestation, not just community residents, grassroots activists, and housing advocates, but also policy actors, business actors, philanthropy, and, as mentioned above, internal actors within the system at multiple levels who use lower profile decisions and actions to promote more equitable processes. Transformative contestation would require capacity building and positioning for advocates and other accountability actors, strategies for durable contestation over the decades-long initiative lifespan, and transparent accountability to clearly established equity and inclusion goals.

Racial Capitalism

Relevance of the Frame

Racial capitalism, as defined by Cedric J. Robinson, refers to the racialism that influenced the formation of capitalism as it emerged as a primary political-economic structure. Racial capitalism provides the analytical key for understanding how racism undergirds the accumulation of wealth – not how class relations within capitalism led to or further heightened existing prejudice and power based on race relations. Racial capitalism helps to explain how public housing transformation creates negative consequences for low-income communities and benefits for majority-white institutions and actors.

The redevelopment efforts in both cities have emerged with a heightened awareness of the historical marginalization of African Americans that has characterized both cities’ approaches to public housing investment and management. One central impetus for both initiatives was the recognition of the continued failure of public housing to provide a quality and safe environment for low-income households of color. In D.C., the encroaching gentrification with rapid real estate development geared toward the return of a white population in neighborhoods throughout the city made readily the way in which market-driven development was reinforcing racial disparity.

In San Francisco, the dramatic exodus of the African American population presented an even more stark demonstration of market forces exacerbating the alienation of already-marginalized households. In both cities, the “mixed-income” redevelopment solution portends

a “mixed-race” reality, and thus raises deep concern among existing residents and advocates about who the redevelopment efforts will benefit and how the new communities will be experienced by those African American and low-income households of color that are able to remain. While a black-white racial framing is largely appropriate for the D.C. context, in San Francisco it is important to acknowledge the complexity of the long-standing multiracial context in public housing with a substantial Asian population in some of the developments along with Latino households and a Samoan population. Samoan residents, in particular, share with African Americans deep concerns about long-standing marginalization and discrimination. And this multiracial context means both friction on a white, non-white dimension and, sometime more relevantly, friction between populations of color.

Emerging Outcomes

In the NCI initiative, there has been little explicit engagement by initiative leaders on the racialized dimension of the challenges at hand and no expression of race-focused strategies for initiative implementation. In San Francisco, under the leadership of Miller, there has been a very different story. As previously noted, soon after taking the helm of HOPE SF, Miller rebranded the initiative as a “reparations effort” and encouraged explicit naming of the past trauma and isolation experienced by African Americans and other low-income households of color in San Francisco public housing. Until 2019, this branding largely served to invoke a clear spirit of a prevailing commitment to ensure the centering of African Americans and other households of color in initiative activities. In 2019, Miller began to lay out in writing more specifics about his reparations framework, including articulation of four phases of the process: truth, restitution, reconciliation, and liberation.

Implications for Greater Equity and Inclusion

Given the limited and emergent progress thus far in NCI and HOPE SF, to name and address the realities and pitfalls of racial capitalism, there are some fundamental implications for greater momentum on this front. The task here can be understood as a shift from enduring and transmitted “structural racism” to what might be called “antiracist development.” This would include an explicit acknowledgment of the historical and contemporary racialized context in which the initiatives are taking place, including the naming of race and racism, not just class and income. There could be an identification of specific decision and action points in redevelopment process that often lend themselves to reinforcing structural racism, for example, the establishment of house rules and lease agreements. There would then be an implementation of “antiracist practice and policy” – procedures and actions to disrupt the natural racism that inevitably is carried out through implicit bias on the part of actors and baked into existing systems. Progress will entail the selection and training of leaders and personnel with the commitment, comfort, and ability to name and address racism as an actionable component of the overall redevelopment effort.

Overarching Implications

Using Khare’s frames to examine these two initiatives has generated numerous implications for how mixed-income redevelopment efforts can adhere more effectively to a commitment to greater inclusion and equity.

Vision and Principles

There should be a clear articulation of the vision for creating communities that retain those original residents who wish to stay and that promote belonging and influence for those residents. Explicit principles should be established to guide redevelopment decisions. In particular, the commitment to racial equity and a recognition of the demands and trade-offs required by an antiracist approach to development should be made abundantly clear.

Elevate Commitment to Social Goals

While the commitment to promoting economic growth and the engagement of the private sector are integral elements of the neoliberal urban policy context, there should be more vigilance by public and civic actors to strive for a greater balance of social and market goals.

Strategic Collaboration and Role Alignment

It is critical that there be more effective collaboration and role alignment among the numerous actors involved in multisite public-private partnerships.

Innovation and Social Entrepreneurship

Unlike many facets of real estate development that are well-developed with broadly accepted techniques and processes that can be deployed across various contexts, designing, creating, and sustaining inclusive and equitable mixed-income communities remain highly complex, context-specific endeavors that require high levels of innovation and entrepreneurial drive. Any reliance on “business as usual” will likely replicate existing structural disparities.

Personnel Selection and Management

Ultimately the success of these efforts will depend on the vision, commitment, and capacity of the leadership and key personnel. This places a high premium on thorough recruitment and hiring procedures along with strong orientation, training, and management processes.

Accountability

Even with the best of intentions from initiative leaders and personnel, the pull of market forces, status quo procedures and practices, and existing power dynamics present formidable pressure toward accepted and familiar ways of doing business. Achieving a more inclusive and equitable results will require effective accountability mechanisms at all levels of the effort.

Conclusion

The NCI in Washington, D.C. and HOPE SF in San Francisco set out to chart a more inclusive, equitable approach to transforming public housing developments into mixed-income communities. This has been a daunting aspiration in the face of the full-on commitment to neoliberal urban policy at all levels of government and overwhelming market forces that are rapidly transforming the form and demographics of the urban environment. While we found numerous examples of policy and practice in both cities that were deployed to help achieve better social

outcomes for the original residents of the public housing communities being redeveloped, ultimately it has been extremely difficult to do so in both the cities. Despite the shortcomings and challenges, there is no question that but for the principles, policies, strategies, and political compromises put in place by the urban social entrepreneurs tapped to lead both efforts, the outcomes would have been far less favorable for the original residents of the developments. Furthermore, we find enough evidence of serious intent toward principle-driven development by city leaders and initiative practitioners to warrant continued persistence in determining ways to leverage mixed-income development processes for more equitable social outcomes. Using an analytical lens that elevates a focus on race and spotlights the strategic trade-offs associated with issues such as privatization, devolution and entrepreneurial governance can be a useful and practical device for promoting greater strategic action and stronger accountability.

Notes

- 1 There were originally eight public housing sites planned for inclusion in HOPE SF. Alice Griffith was added as a priority site in response to the opportunity and criteria of the federal Choice Neighborhoods Initiative when it was launched in 2010.
- 2 In San Francisco, there have technically been five mayors: upon the sudden death of Mayor Lee in December 2017, Mayor London Breed assumed office in her role as President of the Board of Supervisors. She subsequently was forced to step down to run in the special election, and Mark Farrell served as temporary mayor until Breed won her official position as mayor.

References

- Aalbers, M. and Christophers, B. (2014) Centering housing in political economy. *Housing, Theory & Society*, 31(4), 373–394.
- City and County of San Francisco Human Services Agency (2005) *The Seven Key Street Corners for at-Risk Families in San Francisco*. Unpublished report.
- Clarke, S. and Gaile, G. (1989) Moving toward entrepreneurial economic development policies: Opportunities and barriers. *Policy Studies Journal*, 17(3), 574.
- DCHA Resolution 16-06. Retrieved from www.dchousing.org/docs/res16_06.pdf
- District of Columbia Housing Authority Amendment Act of 2019. Retrieved from <http://lims.dccouncil.us/Download/41812/B23-0125-Introduction.pdf>
- Giambrone, A. (2010) D.C. resets Barry Farm redevelopment after unfavorable court decision. Retrieved from: <https://dc.curbed.com/2018/8/4/17648968/dc-barry-farm-redevelopment-court-decision-public-housing-new-communities-initiative>
- Gress, T.G., Joseph, M.L., and Cho, S. (2019) Confirmations, new insights, and future implications for HOPE VI mixed-income redevelopment. *Cityscape*, 21(2), 185–212.
- Hackworth, J. (2000) State devolution, urban regimes, and the production of geographic scale: The case of New Brunswick, NJ. *Urban Geography*, 21, 450–458.
- Harvey, D. (2005) *A brief history of neoliberalism*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Hope SF. Website. Retrieved from www.hope-sf.org/timeline/
- Hyra, D. (2018) *Race, Class and Politics in the Cappuccino City*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Joint Center for Housing Studies of Harvard University (2019) *The State of the Nation's Housing*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University.
- Joseph, M.L., Chaskin, R.J., and Webber, H.S. (2007) The theoretical basis for addressing poverty through mixed-income development. *Urban Affairs Review*, 42(3), 369–409.
- Joseph, M.L. and Miyoung, M. (2019). Mixed-income development. In Orum, A. (ed.), *Wiley-Blackwell Encyclopedia of Urban and Regional Studies*. John Wiley & Sons Ltd.
- Khare, A.T. (2017) Privatization in an era of economic crisis: Using market-based policies to remedy market failures. *Housing Policy Debate*, 28(1), 6–28.
- Khare, A.T. (forthcoming). *Poverty, Power, and Profit: Structural Racism in Public Housing Reform*.

- Khare, A.T. and Joseph, M.L. (2019) Prioritizing inclusion and equity in the next generation of mixed-income communities. In Joseph, M.L. and Khare, A.T. (eds.), *What Works to Promote Inclusive, Equitable Mixed-Income Communities*. San Francisco, CA: Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco, pp. 10–19.
- Kleit, R.G. and Page, S.B. (2015) The changing role of public housing authorities in the affordable housing delivery system. *Housing Studies*, 30(4), 621–644.
- Leitner, H. (1990) Cities in pursuit of economic growth: The local state as entrepreneur. *Political Geography Quarterly*, 9(2), 146–170.
- Leitner, H., Sheppard, S.E., Sziarto, K., and Maringanti, A. (2007) Contesting urban futures: Decentering neoliberalism. In Leitner, H., Peck, J., and Sheppard, S.E. (eds.), *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers*. New York: The Guilford Press, pp. 1–25.
- Melamed, J. (2015) Racial capitalism. *Journal of the Critical Ethnic Studies Association*, 1(1), 76–85.
- New Communities Initiative Annual Report (NCI) (2014) Retrieved from https://dcnewcommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/FINAL-FOR-PRINT_NCI-Annual-Report_1140513-2.pdf
- New Communities Initiative Stakeholder Report (NCI) (2016–2017). Retrieved from <https://dcnewcommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/04/NCI-2016-AnnualReport-03.22.18-v3b-PREVIEW.pdf>
- New Communities Initiative. Retrieved from dcnewcommunities.org
- Northwest One Redevelopment Plan (2005) Retrieved from: <https://dcnewcommunities.org/wp-content/uploads/2014/06/Northwest-One-Plan.pdf>
- Office of the Mayor (2016) “Mayor Bowser Delivers on the Promise of the New Communities Initiative. Retrieved from <https://mayor.dc.gov/release/mayor-bowser-delivers-promise-new-communities-initiative>
- Peck, J., Theodore, N., and Brenner, N. (2009) Neoliberal urbanism: Models, moments, mutations. *SAIS Review of International Affairs*, 29(1), 49–66.
- Richardson, J., Mitchell, B., and Franco, J. (2019) Shifting neighborhoods: Gentrification and cultural displacement in American cities. National Reinvestment Coalition. Retrieved from <https://nrc.org/gentrification/>
- San Francisco Board of Supervisors Resolution 227-12. Retrieved from <https://sfbos.org/ftp/uploadedfiles/bdsupvrs/ordinances12/o0227-12.pdf>
- San Francisco News Staff (2017) Low-income neighborhoods approved for redevelopment. *San Francisco News* (February 2). Retrieved from www.thesfnews.com/low-income-neighborhoods-approved-redevelopment/34787
- Stacy, C., Meixell, B., and Srin, T. (2019) Inequality versus inclusion in US cities. *Social Indicators Research*, 145(1), 117.
- UC Berkeley’s Urban Displacement Project (n.d.) Rising housing costs and re-segregation in San Francisco. Retrieved from www.urbandisplacement.org/.
- Vale, J.L. and Freemark, Y. (2018) The privatization of American public housing: Leaving the poorest of the poor behind. In Anacker, K.B., Nguyen, M.T., and Varady, D.P. (eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Housing Policy and Planning*. Abingdon: Routledge, pp. 184–202.
- Vale, J.L. and Shamsuddin, S. (2017) All mixed up: Making sense of mixed-income housing developments. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 83(1), 56–67.