



FURMAN CENTER
FOR REAL ESTATE & URBAN POLICY
NEW YORK UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF LAW • WAGNER SCHOOL OF PUBLIC SERVICE



**THE INSTITUTE
FOR AFFORDABLE
HOUSING POLICY**

139 MacDougal Street, 2nd Floor, New York NY 10012 • Tel: (212) 998-6713 •
www.furmancenter.org

An Overview of Affirmative Marketing and Implications for the Westchester Fair Housing Settlement

April 12, 2011

Table of Contents

Introduction	3
Defining the Target Audience for an Affirmative Marketing Campaign	7
Defining the Target Audience for an Affirmative Marketing Campaign	8
Location Decisions and the Likely Concerns of Prospective Residents	10
Potential Concerns Regarding Discrimination and Neighborhood Racial Composition	15
Important Components for an Affirmative Marketing Plan and Mobility Assistance Program	20
Marketing through Workplaces	20
Providing Neighborhood Tours for Prospective Residents.....	21
Introducing Prospective Residents to Community Resources	22
Engaging the Local Community Early in the Process	24
Coordinating Marketing Efforts.....	27
Target Income Levels and Increasing Demand.....	28
Other Innovative Efforts to Further Integration.....	29
Conclusion	32
Appendix I: Roundtable Participants	33
Appendix II: Discussion Questions for Affirmative Marketing Roundtable	35
Appendix III: Affirmative Marketing and Integration Programs in other Communities	38

Introduction

In April of 2006, the Anti-Discrimination Center (“ADC”) brought a *qui tam* action on behalf of the United States against Westchester County, alleging that the county violated the federal False Claims Act, 31 U.S.C. § 3729 et seq. (“FCA”), by making certain certifications to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”).¹ According to the certification requirements for the Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) program, grants under the program “shall be made only if the grantee certifies to the satisfaction of the Secretary that ... the grant will be conducted and administered in conformity with the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and the Fair Housing Act, and the grantee will affirmatively further fair housing.”² Regulations promulgated pursuant to this legislation stipulate that such certification serves as a jurisdiction’s assurance that it “will conduct an analysis to identify impediments to fair housing choice within the jurisdiction, take appropriate actions to overcome the effects of any impediments identified through that analysis, and maintain records reflecting the analysis and actions in this regard.”³ ADC alleged that Westchester County falsely certified that it fulfilled its obligation to affirmatively further fair housing. Specifically, ADC claimed that Westchester County failed to consider race-based impediments to fair housing choice and failed to identify and take steps to overcome such impediments.

¹ Westchester County is located immediately north of New York City. The county has a population of approximately 950,000 individuals and contains 45 local government units. These jurisdictions range in size from small villages with a few thousand residents to the city of Yonkers, which has approximately 200,000 residents. Thirty one communities in Westchester are eligible to receive housing under the terms of the settlement.

² 42 U.S.C. § 5304(b)(2).

³ 24 C.F.R. § 91.225(a)(1).

The Department of Justice subsequently intervened in the lawsuit and, following pre-trial proceedings, negotiated a settlement on behalf of HUD with Westchester County that required the County, *inter alia*, to pay damages and to develop and implement a housing policy that combats residential segregation.⁴ The settlement requires Westchester County to spend \$51.6 million to develop, primarily in municipalities with overwhelmingly white populations, at least 750 affordable housing units that affirmatively further fair housing.⁵ Under the terms of the stipulation, Westchester County is also required to “affirmatively market affordable housing within the County and in geographic areas with significant non-white populations outside, but contiguous with or within close proximity to, the County, and include in all agreements between the County and a developer requirements that the developer meet these same affirmative marketing requirements and hire consultant(s) to carry out outreach activities, where appropriate.”

The Court appointed a Monitor to oversee and facilitate the implementation of this stipulation. The Monitor requested independent research on affirmative marketing from New York University School of Law’s Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban Policy – which had received a grant from the Ford Foundation to provide the Monitor with expert assistance on issues relevant to the implementation of the settlement.⁶ To this end, the

⁴ Stipulation and Order of Settlement and Dismissal, *United States ex rel. Anti-Discrimination Ctr. of Metro N.Y., Inc. v. Westchester County*, No. 06-2860 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 10, 2009).

⁵ *Id.* at ¶¶ 2, 5.

⁶ Founded in 1995, the Furman Center for Real Estate and Urban policy at New York University is an academic research center devoted to the public policy aspects of land use, real estate development, urban affairs and housing. The Furman Center is a joint research center of New York University’s School of Law and the Robert F. Wagner School of Public Service. It provides objective interdisciplinary academic and empirical research on legal and public policy issues, promotes frank and productive discussions on critical issues, and presents essential data and analysis.

The Furman Center launched the Institute for Affordable Housing Policy in 2010. The Institute seeks to improve the effectiveness of affordable housing policies by providing timely and thoughtful policy analyses. The Institute is not an advocate and does not endorse specific legislation or candidates, nor is it partisan or ideologically predictable. The Institute draws on the resources of the Furman Center and the broader New York University community to help affordable housing leaders arrive at effective solutions to housing issues that are based on research, data, and rigorous evaluation of innovative practices.

Furman Center reviewed relevant academic literature on the subject, researched other affirmative marketing programs, and, under the auspices of the Center’s Institute for Affordable Housing Policy, convened a roundtable discussion on affirmative marketing with individuals from both within and outside Westchester with a range of relevant experience. The discussion was off-the-record and specific comments from the roundtable are not attributed to any individual participants.⁷ This review of affirmative marketing is the product of these efforts. It is intended not only to provide insight for Westchester County in the implementation of its affirmative marketing obligations under the settlement, but also to provide guidance to other municipalities that share the obligation to affirmatively further fair housing.

This review focuses on four primary issues, which also framed our roundtable discussion: (1) what are the best ways to identify and reach potential residents for housing that affirmatively furthers fair housing; (2) what are likely to be the primary impediments to a successful marketing plan and how can they be overcome; (3) what key components should be included in an affirmative marketing plan; and (4) what mobility assistance services should be offered and how should they be made available?

Broadly speaking, affirmative marketing entails an aggressive effort to market housing to groups identified as “least likely to know about and apply for the housing in question.”⁸ Under the terms of the settlement, Westchester County must affirmatively

⁷ The roundtable participants included professionals with experience in developing and marketing affordable housing, marketing to ethnic and racial minority households, providing housing counseling and mobility assistance, and working with communities to integrate new residents. A list of roundtable participants is included as an appendix to this report. The inclusion of the names of those who participated in the roundtable or who were contacted for this review does not indicate their agreement with any of the specific suggestions or ideas discussed herein.

⁸ Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, Handbook 8025.1, REV-2, IMPLEMENTING AFFIRMATIVE FAIR HOUSING MARKETING REQUIREMENTS 4-1 (1992). (“The purpose of the AFHM requirements is to promote a condition in which individuals of similar income levels in the same housing market area have available to them a like range of

market the properties both within the county and in geographic areas with large non-white populations that are either contiguous with or in close proximity to the county. The settlement also requires Westchester County to “identify and analyze . . . the potential need for mobility counseling, and the steps the County will take to provide such counseling as needed.”⁹ Mobility assistance can take many forms, but typically involves a range of services intended to aid individuals in searching for, applying for, being approved for, and moving to new housing, as well as becoming active and engaged members of their new community. In the context of homeownership, mobility assistance may include homeownership counseling and financial education.

The review begins by briefly discussing considerations for determining the proper audience for an affirmative marketing campaign. It then analyzes the likely concerns of prospective residents of affordable housing in predominantly white and middle class neighborhoods, drawing on relevant research and the contributions of roundtable participants. Because one of those primary concerns is the fear of discrimination or hostility, specific attention is given to how such fears could be addressed by a marketing plan.

The report then turns to suggestions of elements to include in an affirmative marketing plan. A few potential components of a marketing plan, which received considerable attention in our roundtable discussion, are discussed in detail, including: marketing through workplaces, providing neighborhood tours, engaging the local community, and coordinating marketing efforts. This section also describes a number of

choices in housing, regardless of the individual’s race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status or national origin. They are also a means to carry out the mandate of Section 808(e)(5) of the Fair Housing Act and ensure positive outreach and informational efforts to those who are least likely to know about and apply for the housing in question.”).

⁹ Stipulation and Order of Settlement and Dismissal, *United States ex rel. Anti-Discrimination Ctr. of Metro N.Y., Inc. v. Westchester County*, No. 06-2860 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 10, 2009), at ¶ 32.

programs in other communities that have sought to further integration goals and provides examples of their approaches.

The literature on this subject and the experiences shared by our roundtable participants suggest several key lessons. First, an affirmative marketing plan should seek to identify and address the specific concerns of prospective residents, particularly regarding access to resources including transportation, shopping, and schools. Second, offering opportunities for prospective residents to become aware of community resources, either through firsthand tours or through a well-developed website, is essential. Third, faith communities, civic organizations, and other local groups should be engaged early in the process. These groups can help to build community support and to provide a social network to new residents. Fourth, marketing efforts should be coordinated among developers and municipalities to avoid duplication and to reach the broadest audience possible. Although these components may not guarantee success, they are likely to strengthen efforts to develop a successful affirmative marketing plan that affirmatively furthers fair housing.

Defining the Target Audience for an Affirmative Marketing Campaign

Jurisdictions that receive Community Development Block Grant (“CDBG”) funds are required to affirmatively further fair housing.¹⁰ According to the HUD Fair Housing Planning Guide, the requirement to affirmatively further fair housing (“AFFH”) flows from Section 808(e)(5) of the Fair Housing Act and includes the requirement to affirmatively market the housing.¹¹ HUD’s handbook on Implementing Affirmative Fair Housing Marketing Requirements provides guidance to recipients of CDBGs and states that affirmative marketing must include outreach to groups identified as “least likely to know about and apply for the housing in question.”¹²

Participants in our discussion expressed the importance of targeting marketing efforts at individuals who would both qualify for and be likely to move into new affordable housing units, but who are “least likely to apply” because they lack information regarding the availability of units or the opportunities available to their families in the communities where the housing is located, or because some other obstacle discourages them from applying. These obstacles might include feeling unwelcome in the communities where housing is being constructed; lack of easy access to resources they rely upon on a daily basis, such as transportation and shopping; or fear of losing the support of an existing social network. Individuals who may be eager to move to a community with greater opportunity, but remain unlikely to do so due to their concerns, could benefit from targeted marketing and mobility assistance that makes a move a more realistic and appealing

¹⁰ 42 U.S.C. § 5304(b)(2); *see also* Stipulation and Order of Settlement and Dismissal, *United States ex rel. Anti-Discrimination Ctr. of Metro N.Y., Inc. v. Westchester County*, No. 06-2860 (S.D.N.Y. Aug. 10, 2009). Grant recipients are required by regulation to conduct an analysis of impediments to fair housing, take appropriate steps to overcome the effects of any identified impediments, and maintain records that reflect this analysis and the steps taken. 24 C.F.R. 570.601.

¹¹ Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, FAIR HOUSING PLANNING GUIDE.

¹² Office of Fair Housing and Equal Opportunity, United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, *supra* note 8, at 4-1.

opportunity. In light of this, it is important that those developing an affirmative marketing plan carefully consider whether to provide broad marketing and outreach to a large number of individuals in the target communities,¹³ try to more narrowly tailor efforts towards providing more robust outreach and mobility assistance to individuals in the target communities who are more likely to successfully make a move, or pursue some combination of these strategies.

¹³ During the roundtable discussion, a number of participants argued for marketing as widely as possible and attempting to generate broad interest. Participants with experience developing and marketing affordable housing noted that 10 to 15 interested applicants often are necessary in order to find one qualified individual interested in moving to a new community. Participants largely agreed that casting a broader net would not add significant additional expenses to a marketing plan.

Location Decisions and the Likely Concerns of Prospective Residents

Although there is little literature addressing the effectiveness of particular affirmative marketing plans in affecting households' choices about where to live, there is literature that examines location decisions households have made in the context of the Hope VI and Moving to Opportunity programs. Although these studies have found a range of concerns that shape the decision of whether to move to a new neighborhood, there appears to be a consensus that individuals focus on how a new community will meet concrete and specific concerns, including access to daily necessities like shopping and public transportation.

One study of 41 families leaving a HOPE VI public housing site in Philadelphia provided an in-depth look at the families' decisions of where to move, given the choice between moving into another public housing unit and moving with a Section 8 voucher into a privately-owned rental unit.¹⁴ It found that, in choosing a specific neighborhood, participants largely targeted neighborhoods that would fit their current daily routine, not necessarily ones that offered the greatest potential for social mobility. Other key factors influencing location decisions included the desire for a "quiet" area and moving near family.¹⁵

These findings indicate that respondents based their decisions more on concrete information regarding the availability of specific resources in the new community than on

¹⁴ Susan Clampet-Lundquist, *HOPE VI Relocation: Moving to New Neighborhoods and Building New Ties*, 15 Housing Policy Debate 415 (2004). The Hope VI program provides federal money to local public housing agencies to redevelop public housing. Residents required to move during redevelopment are generally given the choice of relocating to another public housing unit, receiving a voucher to move to private housing, or completely leaving assisted housing.

¹⁵ Although it is unlikely that a new suburban community will provide closer proximity to family for those moving from an urban area, a marketing effort might stress easy access to transport and the ability to visit one's former community. It might also attempt to alleviate concerns about moving away from family by providing information regarding relevant social networks in the new community.

a more generalized interest in opportunity. Accordingly, a marketing plan should address concerns regarding how a household will manage the challenges of daily life, in addition to focusing on the longer-term advantages of improved schools or economic opportunities. The plan should provide neighborhood tours, meetings with current residents, and other information resources that enable prospective residents to obtain first-hand knowledge about shopping, day care, houses of worship, or whatever other local features they consider important. A number of participants in the roundtable discussion agreed with these sentiments, stressing the importance of finding ways for prospective residents to visit and get to know the communities in which the housing will be built.

An earlier study of the Hope VI program used focus groups to examine the housing choices of both individuals who relocated to a new neighborhood and those who remained close to their former public housing location. The study examined residents in four cities: Baltimore, MD; Louisville, KY; San Antonio, TX; and Seattle, WA.¹⁶ It found that households that relocated sought neighborhoods that were safe, had good schools and were convenient to shopping and transportation. Access to shopping, transportation, and quality schools were found to be more important than proximity to social service providers, which was rarely mentioned by the respondents.¹⁷ However, these preferences were often secondary to concerns regarding the housing units themselves, including unit size, style (single family, townhouse, etc.), and price. The report noted that “[t]he tenor of conversations was similar to discussions one might have with the average middle class

¹⁶ Robin Smith, with Arthur Naparstek, Susan Popkin, Lesley Bartlett, Lisa Bates, Jessica Cigna, Russell Crane & Elisa Vinson, The Urban Institute Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center, *Housing Choice for HOPE VI Relocates* (2002).

¹⁷ Qualitative research involving focus groups of Section 8 holders in Chicago revealed that when making neighborhood choices, respondents placed substantial importance on transportation access, community services, schools, playgrounds, stores and churches. Susan J. Popkin & Mary K. Cunningham, Urban Institute, *Searching for Section 8 Housing in Chicago* 30 (2000). A “strong sense of community” and “good neighbors” was also highly valued by focus group participants. *Id.*

homebuyer rather than the stereotypical image of the service dependent public housing resident.”¹⁸

Other studies have examined the location decisions of participants in the Moving to Opportunity (“MTO”) program.¹⁹ This literature indicates that place attachment – “people’s emotional bonds with places, bonds that develop over time and provide stability in people’s live” – often plays the most substantial role in a relocation decision.²⁰ Social networks can play a crucial role, particularly for lower income workers, in finding employment. Concerns regarding the ability to maintain such networks often influence a respondent’s decisions on whether to move to a new neighborhood. Place dependence – “the reliance of a person on a place to meet his or her needs” – is also highly important.²¹ This literature echoes the conclusion that locations are often assessed based on the availability of resources for meeting specific goals or needs.

Roundtable participants emphasized the importance of identifying the concerns prospective residents have regarding issues such as transportation, parking, schools, religious institutions, local businesses, access to parks, and community amenities. Some participants stressed that transportation costs could be a particular concern for individuals, especially those who previously relied on public transportation and would need to purchase a vehicle. A helpful lesson in this regard could be drawn from the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program. This program worked with an existing nonprofit car ownership

¹⁸ Smith, *supra* note 16, at 19.

¹⁹ Under the MTO program, participating public housing tenants were placed in one of three groups: (1) an experimental group – which was issued vouchers and required to move to a low-poverty neighborhood (less than 10 percent poverty) and provided counseling and moving assistance, (2) a comparison group – which was issued vouchers but with no requirements on where they moved and no assistance, and (3) a control group – which remained in public housing.

²⁰ For a discussion of place attachment and place dependence see Rachel Garshick Kleit and Lynne C. Manzo, *To Move or Not to Move: Relationships to Place and Relocation Choices in Hope VI*, Housing Policy Debate, 17:2 (2010), 271-308, at 276.

²¹ *Id.* at 277.

program, Vehicles for Change, which provides low-cost financing for used car purchases to enable employed participants to purchase a vehicle.²² A foundation provides funding to help support the program. Establishing a similar program, and featuring it in an affirmative marketing campaign, may make locations with fewer public-transportation options more attractive to potential residents.

Quality of life concerns, safety, and taxes were also discussed as important concerns. One roundtable participant whose organization provides homeownership counseling discussed how property tax rates can be a primary obstacle for individuals deciding whether to move to Westchester. Accordingly, providing detailed information regarding taxes and other cost of living expenses will be important for prospective residents, particularly those considering ownership properties.

Roundtable participants agreed that careful consideration of the design and locations of the housing will play a crucial role in the successful marketing of these properties to a diverse pool of prospective residents and that site selection decisions should be made with the concerns and interests of prospective residents and their implications for marketing in mind. A few participants contended that – because transportation can be a substantial expense for individuals and many prospective residents will be moving from other communities and may need to travel to an existing job in their prior communities or

²² Approximately 20-25 participants in the Housing Mobility Program purchase a car each year through this program. The purchases are partially subsidized and individuals pay on average between \$800-1,500. To be eligible to purchase a vehicle a participant must be employed full-time and be able to obtain car insurance and a title in her own name. For more information see Lora Engdahl, Poverty & Race Research Action Council (PRRAC), *New Homes, New Neighborhoods, New Schools: A Progress Report on the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program* 21 (Oct. 2009), available at <http://www.prrac.org/pdf/BaltimoreMobilityReport.pdf>. Information on Vehicles for Change is available at <http://www.vehiclesforchange.org/>.

to visit family – emphasizing access to transportation when selecting sites will make properties easier to market.²³

²³ Access to transportation may also help reduce any concerns that the housing location is isolated from a prospective resident’s existing community. However, there was some disagreement at the roundtable regarding whether transit-oriented development should be emphasized or whether less-dense developments would be more attractive to potential residents. One participant, who drew on prior experience developing affordable housing in suburban locales, questioned the attractiveness of transit-oriented development to prospective residents. According to this participant, properties closest to transit are often the most difficult to market, as individuals prefer less dense areas with greater open space.

Potential Concerns Regarding Discrimination and Neighborhood Racial Composition

An affirmative marketing plan should also address the likely concerns of prospective residents regarding potential discrimination or racial hostility. In addition, a marketing plan may need to consider whether and how to address surveys regarding discrimination in the community²⁴ or high profile news reports of specific incidents.²⁵ One roundtable participant emphasized that negative publicity regarding the treatment of

²⁴ Two recent studies examined perceptions regarding discrimination in Westchester County. A telephone survey conducted by Manhattanville College in November 2007 found that nearly 60 percent of black residents and 50 percent of Hispanics in Westchester, Rockland and Putnam counties said they experience discrimination, compared with 30 percent of whites. Lea Rae, *Survey: Race Shapes View of Suburbs*, THE JOURNAL NEWS (Westchester), Nov. 22, 2007, at 1B. Black residents overwhelmingly believed they were treated less fairly by the police and the court system. However, black respondents had a more favorable view of their ability to purchase a home without regard to their race than they did in response to a prior 1999 survey. The poll also revealed that white respondents were more likely than they were at the time of the prior survey to perceive the existence of bias against minority groups, particularly in housing.

Westchester Residential Opportunities, Inc., a not-for-profit located in White Plains, conducted undercover fair housing testing in 2010. It found that Westchester County had made significant improvements since previous testing in 2005, but that discrimination still exists. Eighteen percent of testers found discrimination in rental housing in Westchester, compared with 47 percent in 2005. The declining evidence of discrimination was credited in part to the work of the Westchester Putnam Association of Realtors, the county's Department of Planning and the Westchester Human Rights Commission in improving education regarding Fair Housing laws. The report, *WRO Fair Housing Testing: Equal Housing in the Lower Hudson Valley*, was based on an eighteen-month testing program funded by HUD. WRO conducted 111 "paired" audit tests involving white control testers and black or Hispanic protected testers. "The protected testers were assigned a higher income and, overall, a more stable financial situation than the counterpart control testers." Westchester Residential Opportunities, Inc., WRO FAIR HOUSING TESTING REPORT: EQUAL HOUSING IN THE LOWER HUDSON VALLEY? 4 (2011). Any inferior treatment of the minority tester was assumed to be based on racial or ethnic discrimination. The report is available at: http://www.wroinc.org/documents/WRO_2010_Testing_Report_Press_Release_1_25.pdf.

²⁵ There have been a few recent examples of incidents with a racial component that received considerable attention in Westchester County. In February 2011, after a Westchester grand jury declined to indict white officers accused of shooting and killing a black college football player at Pace University, the Department of Justice announced it would review the case to determine whether any civil rights laws were broken. According to an article in the New York Post following the grand jury's decision, the shooting "had stoked racial tensions in Mount Pleasant." Chuck Bennett, *Pace U. Cops Cleared in Student Slaying*, N.Y. POST, Feb. 15, 2011; see also James Barron, *Justice Department will Review Fatal Shooting of Pace Student by Officer in Westchester*, N.Y. TIMES, Feb. 15, 2011.

In a widely reported incident in Cortlandt, in November 2007, a young white man burned a cross on the lawn of a black high school student's family. The cross burning occurred hours after the man's younger sister had been in an altercation at school with the black student. According to a news report, one attendee at a community forum on tolerance convened in response to the cross burning "rejected the idea that it was an isolated incident, instead calling it representative of a sentiment that exists within the community and can't be ignored." Brian J. Howard, *400 Attend Community Forum on Tolerance, Hate Crimes in Wake of Cortlandt Cross-Burning*, THE JOURNAL NEWS (Westchester), Nov. 30, 2007, at A1.

minority individuals in Westchester County communities could have a significant adverse effect on marketing efforts. Another participant stressed the need for directly addressing such incidents in a marketing effort. Although it is uncertain to what extent prospective residents would be aware of any negative incidents and how they might perceive them, it is important for those marketing housing to be aware of any such occurrences and prepared to respond to questions or concerns they might raise. Separate from concerns regarding discrimination or hostility, social science research reveals that black individuals have a preference for living in integrated neighborhoods and seek to avoid all-white communities. This preference should also be considered when structuring a marketing plan.

The literature on housing choice voucher programs indicates that both actual and perceived discrimination can play a key role in an individual's decision of whether to move to an unfamiliar neighborhood, particularly one without a critical mass of residents of the same race. Qualitative focus group research involving Section 8 participants in Chicago revealed that most participants restricted their housing search to low- and moderate-income African-American neighborhoods because they assumed "that they would not be welcome in white or integrated communities."²⁶ These sentiments were prevalent even though relatively few participants shared personal experiences of overt racial discrimination. However, many participants did share stories they had heard or experienced of hate crimes committed against African Americans in certain communities.²⁷ This led them to believe that racism was particularly bad in certain areas and to avoid those communities. Many

²⁶ Susan J. Popkin & Mary K. Cunningham, Urban Institute, *CHAC Section 8 Program: Barriers to Successful Leasing Up* 23(1999); see also Popkin, *supra* note 17 at 33-34 & 43-44. The 2000 report by Popkin and Cunningham also reported that many focus group participants believed that the effort to encourage Section 8 recipients to move to the suburbs was "part of a larger conspiracy to reclaim the city for middle-class whites." *Id.* at 35. Other literature has found similar concerns among advocates for low-income minorities. See John Goering, *Expanding Housing Choice and Integrating Neighborhoods: The MTO Experiment*, in *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America* 131 (Xavier de Souza Briggs, ed., 2005).

²⁷ Popkin, *supra* note 17, at 44.

participants in the Chicago focus groups did share experiences of encountering discrimination against families with children, including statements by prospective landlords that the children would cause problems and be destructive. Nearly all participants stated that they had encountered at least one landlord who refused to consider accepting Section 8.

In addition to concerns regarding discrimination or hostility, studies find that black individuals prefer to live in integrated neighborhoods and seek to avoid communities with few other people of their race.²⁸ Data from a multi-city study conducted in the 1990s provided insight into the preferences of different racial groups for neighborhoods of a certain racial composition.²⁹ Survey results showed that blacks preferred to live in mixed neighborhoods and most strongly preferred a neighborhood that was 50-50 black and white. Blacks rated an all-white neighborhood where they would be the only black family as the least desirable alternative.³⁰

²⁸ For a description of several studies of racial neighborhood preferences, see Maria Krysan and Reynolds Farley, *The Residential Preferences of Blacks: Do They Explain Persistent Segregation?* SOCIAL FORCES, Vol. 80, No. 3, at 937-80 (2002); see also Camille Z. Charles, *Can We Live Together? Racial Preferences and Neighborhood Outcomes* in *The Geography of Opportunity: Race and Housing Choice in Metropolitan America 131* (Xavier de Souza Briggs, ed., 2005).

²⁹ Details of the study are available in Krysan and Farley, *supra* note 28. The Multi-City Study of Urban Inequality used face-to-face interviews with approximately 9,000 randomly selected adults in Atlanta, Boston, Detroit and Los Angeles in the mid-1990s. The respondents were shown five cards depicting neighborhoods containing fourteen homes each. The neighborhoods on the cards ranged from all black to all white, with three racially mixed neighborhoods. Respondents were asked to rank their preferences among the five different neighborhoods and then asked if there were any of the five neighborhoods they would not want to move into. Respondents were also asked open-ended questions about why they found a neighborhood most attractive and why they would not move into certain neighborhoods. Krysan and Farley studied the open- and closed-ended survey data from the more than 2,000 African American participants in the MCSUI.

³⁰ In 2009, Krysan and Farley followed up on their study with a different method using a video survey and quantitative analysis. Maria Krysan, Mick P. Couper, Reynolds Farley, and Tyrone A Forman, *Does Race Matter in Neighborhood Preferences? Results from a Video Experiment*. THE AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, Vol. 115, No. 2, 527-59 (2009). The survey examined how blacks exposed to discrimination view fictional neighborhoods – as depicted in short videos – with certain racial compositions. The study found that neither experiences with discrimination nor perceptions of discrimination were strongly correlated with the racial preferences exhibited in the experiment. The study concluded that “[h]ow blacks rated neighborhoods was influenced by the quality of housing and the race of residents but not by their perceptions of racial discrimination, their feelings about whites, or their own identification with blacks.” *Id.* at 548.

The research indicates that a neighborhood's racial composition, and what it is believed to indicate about potential hostility towards certain races, can have a substantial effect on location choices, even for individuals with no prior personal experiences of overt discrimination. In general, areas with substantial diversity are viewed as welcoming, while segregated neighborhoods evoke concerns about hostility, isolation and discomfort.³¹ These perceptions of hostility may cause some minority families to limit their housing search to areas where they feel welcome or to not search at all, even passing up material benefits to remain in their existing neighborhoods. As one study concluded, while "being a pioneer in an all-white neighborhood is an unattractive option among African Americans" the presence of some number of African-Americans in a neighborhood "was sufficient to differentiate the evaluations of it from those of the all-white neighborhood."³²

An affirmative marketing plan can seek to address these concerns through an aggressive public relations campaign that involves minority residents currently living in the community who are willing to share their own experiences with prospective residents and that identifies concrete steps the community will take to further diversity and integration.³³

Roundtable participants also raised a separate but related point. In addition to addressing the concerns of potential residents, an open dialogue should be initiated with current residents of the settlement communities. This dialogue should allow current

An analysis of Chicago's Gautreaux program by Rubinowitz and Rosenbaum concluded that blacks are hesitant to move into all-white neighborhoods, particularly those with reputations for harassment and discrimination. Leonard S. Rubinowitz and James E. Rosenbaum, *Crossing the Class and Color Lines. From Public Housing to White Suburbia* (2000). They cite an example of a family that, fifteen years into the program, was accepted by a landlord in Cicero, "one of several notoriously racially exclusionary suburbs." *Id.* at 57. According to the authors, "[t]he family ultimately decided not to move, after friends and family members predicted that they would encounter racial hostility there." *Id.*

³¹ Charles, *supra* note 28.

³² Krysan, *supra* note 30, at 551.

³³ The South Orange/Maplewood Community Coalition on Race, which is listed in Appendix III of this report, has a number of programs focused on furthering integration in those communities.

residents to express their concerns and thoughts frankly, to provide accurate information regarding the new housing, and to foster the development of effective networks for integrating the new housing and residents into the community.

Important Components for an Affirmative Marketing Plan and Mobility Assistance Program

Roundtable participants emphasized the importance of a long-term affirmative marketing strategy aimed at enabling prospective residents to gain greater familiarity with the communities in which housing will be developed. Initial outreach should introduce prospective residents to the community, and as much as possible should engage local community residents and organizations, including prominent local businesses, chambers of commerce, civic groups, and faith communities.

Participants emphasized the importance of word-of-mouth advertising and the effectiveness of testimonials by minority individuals who currently live in communities where the marketed housing is located. Word-of-mouth marketing can occur through networks such as houses of worship or faith-based organizations, community groups, schools, and adult education classes. Respondents in a study of the Hope VI program discussed earlier in this report stated that they gained information regarding housing from sources including newspapers, published apartment guides, friends and family, and their own exploration of neighborhoods.³⁴

Marketing through Workplaces

A few roundtable participants discussed the need for affordable residential opportunities for minority individuals who currently work in suburban communities but who are unable to live near their place of work. One participant noted that in Westchester, for example, many healthcare workers and other service providers commute from South Yonkers to work in healthcare facilities in Mt. Kisco and other areas. Participants

³⁴Smith, *supra* note 16, at 20; *see also* Popkin, *supra* note 17, at 20 (finding that participants in focus groups relied primarily on friends, family and newspaper listings for information on available housing).

emphasized that marketing housing to racial and ethnic minority individuals who already work in a community, but cannot afford to live there, may be particularly valuable in attracting individuals who will be invested in the community. Individuals who both live and work in the community are more likely to become vital and engaged members of the community than those who move to Westchester but continue to work outside the county.

Accordingly, an affirmative marketing plan might include a component marketing properties at workplaces with a diverse group of employees who work in the community but live outside of it. In the same vein, participants suggested working with local business bureaus in marketing the housing. A number of participants, drawing on their own experience, agreed that starting with the business community would be an efficient use of resources.

Providing Neighborhood Tours for Prospective Residents

Participants emphasized the value of tours and visits for prospective residents, which would allow them to learn more about a community and would enable them to become more comfortable with moving to the community. The Housing Mobility Voucher Program in the Baltimore metropolitan area, which was introduced pursuant to a court settlement, provides two types of tours.³⁵

³⁵ Lora Engdahl, *supra* note 22, at 16. Metropolitan Baltimore Quadel administers the Baltimore Special Mobility Housing Choice Voucher Program, which works to enable low-income families to live in “Opportunity Neighborhoods,” described as neighborhoods with “lower concentrations of poverty and government-assisted housing and greater ethnic diversity than the regional average.” These communities are located in five counties outside of Baltimore as well as neighborhoods within the city. Eighty-eight percent of participating families have moved from inner city locales to suburban counties.

The program, which originated as a partial settlement of the litigation in *Thompson v. HUD*, a public housing desegregation case, is limited to current or former residents of Baltimore City public housing or individuals who were on the waiting list as of a specific date. Housing counselors provide assistance with housing searches, visits to available units, and assessing different neighborhoods. The program also conducts readiness workshops on a range of financial and housing search issues and includes a homeownership component.

The Baltimore program brings individuals seeking housing through the program on a bus tour early in the process. The two-hour tour goes out of the city and into surrounding suburban areas where housing is available. Guides point out differences between urban and suburban living and identify where local amenities, including transportation, shopping, housing, healthcare, and schools are located. One of the goals of the tour is to show that the services that prospective residents will need are available in the suburban areas. The participants do not visit housing units as the entire tour is conducted from the bus.

Program participants who are ready to obtain housing later visit specific units with a housing counselor or a housing search assistant – an individual who has previously participated in the program. Housing search assistants also share their experiences living in the prospective communities and are able to answer specific questions. These tours are customized to meet the specific needs of individual families and to help them determine whether a given community would satisfy their needs.³⁶

Although some of these activities are uniquely tailored to this voucher-based program, these tours may provide a useful model for innovative affirmative marketing efforts aimed at making prospective residents more knowledgeable about the communities in which housing is located.

Introducing Prospective Residents to Community Resources

Participants noted that the cost of moving to a new and unknown community can often be daunting for lower-income individuals seeking new housing opportunities. These

³⁶ The South Orange/Maplewood Community Coalition on Race also offers neighborhood tours to prospective residents of those two neighboring communities, although it focuses on prospective home purchasers. The Coalition, which seeks to further integration in South Orange and Maplewood New Jersey, also conducts broader marketing efforts, provides information sessions to realtors to help them market properties to prospective homebuyers of all races and to ensure individuals are shown properties in all parts of the towns, and works with neighborhood associations and civic organizations to promote inclusiveness and hold discussions on race-related issues. It also provides consulting and guidance to other communities. For more information visit www.twotowns.org.

costs extend beyond down payments, deposits, and moving expenses. Individuals may no longer have access to a social network that can assist with childcare and other daily needs, resulting in additional expenses. They may lose the support of a faith community or the valuable relationships fostered with teachers and other staff at their children's schools. It is important that new residents be introduced to potential sources of social support in their new communities early in the marketing process in order to alleviate concerns and aid this transition. Individuals may also be more attracted to communities located in areas that enable them to easily return to their former neighborhood.

A number of articles in the housing choice voucher literature reflect the same concerns with the difficulty of searching for a suitable unit. For some individuals, the process of finding childcare or missing work to enable a search for a unit and exploration of a neighborhood was daunting enough to discourage relocation. Providing resources and assistance with the housing search process can therefore play a crucial role in enabling individuals to actively pursue housing in a new community.

Participants also discussed the need for credit counseling and the role it can play in preparing prospective residents to rent or purchase units and in improving their chances of successfully obtaining housing.³⁷ In addition to such counseling, the Baltimore Housing Choice Program provides two years of post-placement assistance. Counselors conduct at least five visits to an individual's home over the first two years of residence, starting with an initial visit in the first week to ten days. These visits are conducted by a dedicated team of counselors who are focused in particular geographic areas and have a deep knowledge of the amenities in the community. During the initial visit they work with residents to aid

³⁷ The housing mobility program in metropolitan Baltimore offers extensive pre-move credit counseling and financial counseling, in addition to "readiness workshops" for prospective tenants. Engdahl, *supra* note 22, at 16-17.

them in becoming familiar with and involved in the community.³⁸ Instituting such a program could serve not only to provide support for prospective residents, but may be equally important in assuaging any concerns of current residents. Moreover, the availability of this or similar assistance might provide an added incentive to prospective residents and could be featured in an affirmative marketing campaign.

Engaging the Local Community Early in the Process

There was general agreement among roundtable participants that marketing should begin as early as possible. In particular, the participants emphasized the importance of beginning early with efforts to engage current residents of the communities in which the housing will be located. This may involve holding sessions to encourage and facilitate open dialogue among current residents regarding their concerns and also to share information regarding the new housing with local residents. It should also entail building support and fostering relationships among community groups that may play an active role in welcoming new residents and in easing their transition and successful integration. Fostering this kind of dialogue early on, and bringing together a range of interested parties, can play an important role in effective affirmative marketing.

The experience of Boston's Pine Street Inn ("PSI") may provide a helpful example of a successful effort to foster dialogue with the community surrounding a new development. PSI, which provides outreach, shelter, housing, and other services, consciously engages neighbors prior to opening new supportive housing sites. In 1993, as it was preparing to open a ten-unit housing site, the organization provided neighborhood residents with tours of the site, made a presentation to neighborhood organizations, and

³⁸ *Id.* at 18 & 20. This enhanced mobility program was funded in part by the Annie E. Casey Foundation.

conducted door-to-door canvassing in the neighborhood to share information and answer questions.³⁹

Roundtable participants said that municipalities should play an active role in facilitating dialogue between groups of prospective and current residents. In addition, faith communities were emphasized as groups that could play an active role throughout the process, from disseminating information regarding available housing through fostering a welcoming community for new housing and residents and then continuing to engage new residents and aid efforts at community integration.⁴⁰ Faith communities may also assist new residents in acclimating to a new location and in building a support network.⁴¹

Organizations that facilitate dialogue in the community on important issues can also serve an important role. One organization in Westchester, the Larchmont-Mamaroneck Local Summit, offers a potential model for developing a community network to support integration, community dialogue, and welcoming new residents.⁴² The Local Summit is an informal community council comprised of not-for-profits, municipalities, and places of worship that meets regularly each month, often inviting local leaders to speak about timely community issues. All meetings are open to the public and seek to encourage an exchange of ideas and the discussion of possible solutions to community issues. The Local Summit hosts a range of forums and public dialogues on community issues, with past topics including immigration, summer recreational opportunities for youth, mental

³⁹ Michael Allen, *Why Not in Our Back Yard?*, PLANNING COMMISSIONERS JOURNAL, No. 45, at 1-2 (Winter 2002).

⁴⁰ One participant suggested interfaith groups that could provide a base of support for the settlement efforts. Suggestions in Westchester included the Peekskill Area Pastors Association (PAPA), which includes the settlement community of Cortlandt, see <http://pastorsofpeekskill.org/about-us/>; and the Chappaqua Interfaith Council, which includes representatives from the Baha'i, Christian, Jewish, and Muslim communities.

⁴¹ Religious groups have frequently played an active role starting organizations that facilitate residential integration in other communities throughout the country. For example, church communities helped start the Vollintine-Evergreen Community Association (VECA) in Memphis, Tennessee. VECA fosters housing development and interracial communication. For more information, see <http://veca.org/about-3/history>.

⁴² For more information, see <http://larchmontgazette.com/guide/address/data/localsummit.html>.

health services, and local teen drug and alcohol use. It also regularly publishes a Community Services Directory that describes in detail over 50 local and county-wide human services organizations.

One roundtable participant emphasized the need to carefully target marketing aimed at immigrant communities, as individuals in these communities may find it particularly difficult to move out of a strong social network and into a new area. These individuals may particularly benefit from efforts to involve immigrant service organizations and other relevant groups in the community in the marketing process. These groups can serve to make what might at first seem like a daunting and isolating relocation into a more attractive opportunity.

One roundtable participant recounted a barbecue held in one community for new residents of an affordable housing development. The event played an important early role in fostering positive relationships. Planning centralized integration activities may be more difficult in communities where new housing is developed in scattered site properties with few units. In such communities, community-wide groups could play a more active role in outreach to new residents by hosting potlucks or similar community-building events.

A few participants shared another potential method of engaging the existing community – the inclusion of resources for the broader community in a new housing development. Although this relates more to the location and design of new housing, it can also affect how new units are marketed to the existing community. This could include, for example, a library or recreation center or some other community service that provides a valuable benefit to the community. The housing could then aid in serving an important community need. Not only would such resources have the potential for building local

support for the new housing, they may also become vibrant community centers that aid efforts to integrate new residents into the broader community.

Coordinating Marketing Efforts

Roundtable participants working in other regions shared frustrations with the marketing requirements for developers, which they said could often lead to duplication among developers. They noted the value of enabling developers to pool their resources and to share the cost of developing an effective marketing infrastructure, which would better spread the cost of marketing. Participants recommended a system whereby a developer, in order to fulfill the marketing requirements, could place money towards a centralized marketing campaign, rather than pay for his own marketing plan. This combination of resources could enable more robust marketing – including billboards and widespread radio advertising in multiple languages –all directed towards a common web or telephone resource.

A centralized marketing infrastructure should include advertisements for additional units, beyond those built pursuant to the settlement, which would be affordable to individuals at the income levels targeted by the settlement housing. This would increase traffic to the website and render it a more effective tool for prospective residents.

A centralized website should also include a range of information not only on available units, but also on organizations providing homeownership or mobility counseling, community groups in the settlement community, and even descriptions of the settlement communities and the resources and infrastructure available to new residents. Literature examining relocation decisions of participants in the Hope VI program has

found that individuals often lack information regarding available relocation assistance.⁴³ In particular, respondents said they sought assistance with transportation for viewing potential housing and information regarding utility costs.⁴⁴ A website should provide prospective residents with these and other resources. One roundtable participant suggested as a particularly helpful model an affordable housing website in New Jersey, which can be found at njhousing.com.⁴⁵

At the same time, although the internet can provide a useful and far-reaching resource, participants reemphasized the importance of word-of-mouth advertising and of providing more personalized and hands-on assistance and outreach to prospective residents.

Target Income Levels and Increasing Demand

A number of participants suggested that an attempt should be made to layer the income requirements in the settlement onto other affordable housing program requirements. In some situations, a marketing band can become constricted, so that the housing is affordable only to families earning between, for example, \$75,000 and \$79,000 per year for example. It is important to make sure that developers of the housing are able to leverage all public and private sources of funding for affordable housing without creating so many restrictions that only a small number of families are able to qualify.

⁴³ Smith, *supra* note 16.

⁴⁴ *Id.*; see also Popkin, *supra* note 26, at 31.

⁴⁵ The site was designed by socialserve.com.

Other Innovative Efforts to Further Integration

In addition to the organizations discussed throughout this report, a few other organizations have instituted innovative programs for furthering residential integration.⁴⁶

Through the late 1950s, Shaker Heights, a suburb of Cleveland, Ohio, used restrictive covenants to exclude minorities.⁴⁷ After these covenants were invalidated by the Supreme Court, the community's leaders sought to encourage stable integration. In the 1960s, the community established a municipal housing office and worked to market the area as an integrated community. This affirmative-marketing program was funded by the city and the school system. In 1986 the Fund for the Future of Shaker Heights (FFSH) was created. It continues to provide low-interest loans for down payment assistance to home buyers who will help sustain Shaker Heights' racially diverse neighborhoods.⁴⁸

After a few racial incidences in the 1950s and early 1960s, religious organizations in Oak Park, a suburb of Chicago, took action and the Oak Park River Forest Citizens Committee for Human Rights was formed to lobby for a fair housing ordinance and to pressure realtors to show houses to all races. The Village of Oak Park passed a fair housing ordinance in 1968 (the same year as the federal Fair Housing Act). The Oak Park Regional Housing Center was founded in 1972 as the Oak Park Housing Center, with the goal of promoting and sustaining an integrated community in Oak Park. In subsequent years, the Housing Center began to take a more regional approach, prompting it to change

⁴⁶ For a broad review of different communities' attempts to establish and maintain diversity see William Peterman and Philip Nyden, *Creating Stable Racially and Ethnically Diverse Communities in the United States: A Model for the Future*, SOCIAL POLICY & ADMINISTRATION, Vol. 35, No. 1, at 32-47 (Mar. 2001).

⁴⁷ Grant Saff, *An Evaluation of Neighbourhood Integration Management Programmes in the United States: Their Relevance for South Africa*, URBAN FORUM, Vol. 4, No. 1, 55-80, at 63-64 (1993).

⁴⁸ For more information, see www.shakeronline.com/about/incentive/FundfortheFutureofShakerHeights.asp.

its name. It now works to promote diverse and integrated communities throughout the region. In its own words, “[t]he Housing Center provides a model to promote the affirmative furthering of fair housing through community-based action. It is a pro-active model that engages housing seekers during their search for a home, whether it be a rental or a purchase.”⁴⁹ More specifically, the Center offers services that include apartment referrals, homeownership counseling, credit counseling, and fair housing training and education.

Oak Park also has a program, originally called the Diversity Assurance Program, and now known as the Multi-Family Housing Incentives Program, which is “designed to encourage fair housing practices.”⁵⁰ The program provides small grants for building improvements to buildings with four or more units. In exchange for these grants, the building owner is required to enter into a five-year Marketing Services Agreement to affirmatively market the units in coordination with the village and a designated Marketing Agent (the Oak Park Regional Housing Center). Building owners can also independently enter into a Marketing Services Agreement for one year with the village. In exchange for making a good faith effort to affirmatively market their units, with the assistance of the village and the Marketing Agent, all fees for marketing services are waived.⁵¹

Housing Choice Partners of Illinois, Inc., which is also located in the Chicago area, works to “provide expanded housing choice to families in concentrated areas.” Among other services, it provides opportunity counseling – offering information about housing

⁴⁹ For more information on the Oak Park Regional Housing Center, see <http://www.oprhc.org/>. The Center also has a separate website specifically for home-seekers at <http://liveinoakpark.com/>.

⁵⁰ For more information on the Multi-Family Housing Incentives Program, see http://www.oak-park.us/Community_Services/Home_Buyers_Assistance.html.

⁵¹ Additional information on the Multi-Family Housing Incentives Program is provided in Oak Park’s January 2010 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, at pages 95-99. The AI is available at http://www.oak-park.us/public/pdfs/Housing/Impediments_to_Fair_Housing.pdf. The program encourages both moves by non-white households into predominantly white neighborhoods and moves by white households into predominantly non-white neighborhoods.

options throughout the region – to any low-income residents who seek assistance. It also offers home-ownership counseling.⁵²

In Dallas, Texas, the Inclusive Communities Project (“ICP”), originally named The Walker Project, Inc., was created pursuant to a consent decree in *Walker v. HUD*, a housing desegregation case. ICP engages in a range of educational, research, and advocacy activities to promote and support fair housing. It strives to create and maintain stable racially, ethnically, and economically integrated communities. The organization facilitates a mobility assistance program that provides housing search assistance and counseling to families participating in the Dallas Housing Authority’s Housing Choice Voucher Program. In addition, ICP works with local communities, non-profits, and affordable housing developers to develop plans for furthering integration and diversity.⁵³

⁵² For more information, see <http://www.hcp-chicago.org/hcp/>.

⁵³ For more information on these efforts, see <http://www.inclusivecommunities.net/build.php>.

Conclusion

Most participants in our roundtable agreed that an affirmative marketing plan should not devote energy to trying to persuade individuals who simply do not want to move and are highly unlikely to be convinced otherwise. Instead, it should target members of underrepresented racial groups who would be interested in moving, but who simply lack information regarding available units or would be much more likely to move if provided with mobility assistance. These individuals are most likely to be ready and able to make a move work and to have the resources necessary for a successful transition.⁵⁴

This report provides a series of suggestions of potential components of an effective affirmative marketing plan and mobility assistance program. By carefully identifying the concerns of prospective residents and tailoring a marketing plan to address these concerns, municipalities like Westchester County have the potential to fulfill their obligations to affirmatively fair housing and to make quality housing opportunities available to prospective residents.

⁵⁴ This conclusion is echoed in relevant literature. A study of mobility counseling services offered in conjunction with a Housing Choice Voucher Program in Chicago argued that program resources should be focused on “recruit[ing] households that are more likely to move to opportunity neighborhoods and just need the extra encouragement and services.” Mark K. Cunningham and Noah Sawyer, Urban Institute, *Moving to Better Neighborhoods with Mobility Counseling* (Brief No. 8, March 2005). The study found that households offered mobility assistance and housing search assistance were substantially more likely to move. *Id.*; see also Mary Cunningham and Molly Scott, What Works Collaborative & Urban Institute, *The Resident Choice Option: Reasons why Residents Change from Project-Based Vouchers to Portable Housing Vouchers* 16 (2010).

Appendix I: Roundtable Participants

Gloria Ashby

Homeownership Counselor
Neighborhood Housing Services of the
North Bronx

Keith Getter

Relationship Manager / Partnership
Development Specialist
NeighborWorks America Northeast
District

Tony Hoeltzel

Community Housing Resource Center

Valerie Leon

Customer of NHS Homeownership
Counseling Program

Bob Miller

President
Westhab, Inc.

Rose Noonan

Executive Director
Housing Action Council

Dolores Pena

Homeownership Counselor
Neighborhood Housing Services of the
South Bronx

Cathy Pennington

Managing Director
New Jersey Quadel

Frank Piazza

President
Piazza & Associates, Inc.

Jonathan Rose

Jonathan Rose Companies

Rebecca Ross

Vice President, Economic Mobility
ideas42

Jon Shenk

Director of Housing Resource Center
Cluster Community Services

Monitor's Team

James E. Johnson

Court-appointed Monitor
Partner
Debevoise and Plimpton, LLP

Noelle Duarte Grohmann

Associate
Debevoise and Plimpton, LLP

Furman Center Staff

Vicki Been

Boxer Family Professor of Law
NYU School of Law
Faculty Director, NYU Furman Center
for Real Estate and Urban Policy

Caitlyn Brazill

Director of Policy and Communications
NYU Furman Center for Real Estate and
Urban Policy

Ingrid Gould Ellen

Professor of Urban Planning and Public
Policy at NYU's Wagner School
Co-Director of the Furman Center for
Real Estate and Urban Policy

Sarah Gerecke

Executive Director
NYU Furman Center for Real Estate and
Urban Policy and its Institute for
Affordable Housing Policy

John Infranca

Research Fellow
NYU Furman Center for Real Estate and
Urban Policy

Additional Individuals Spoken to for Report

Jeremy N. Ingpen

Executive Director

Washingtonville Housing Alliance

Jim Evans

Managing Director

Metropolitan Baltimore Quadel

Jennifer Lee O'Neil

Director

Quadel Consulting Corporation

Jeannette Philips

Executive Vice President, Hudson River HealthCare

Executive Director, The Preservation Company

Appendix II: Discussion Questions for Affirmative Marketing Roundtable

Although not all of these questions were directly addressed during the Roundtable, they provided the structure for the discussion.

Framing the affirmative marketing plan:

1. Should a marketing plan broadly target those least likely to apply, or should it focus more narrowly on those who would apply for, qualify for, and move into new units, but for a lack of information regarding these units?
2. If the latter, how do we identify these individuals and craft an effective affirmative marketing plan that will reach them?

Questions regarding prospective market:

1. What are the best ways to identify the concerns of prospective residents and to determine whether they are open to moving to a new neighborhood?
2. Based on your prior experience, what are likely to be the major concerns of individuals who might be targeted by affirmative marketing to move into the new units?
3. What are the best ways to respond to the fears of prospective residents who are reluctant to move into a new neighborhood because of possible discrimination?
4. What factors or neighborhood characteristics, including differences between urban and suburban environments, would make members of targeted communities interested in moving to new units?
5. How important are these factors (e.g., how do these factors make sites more or less difficult to market):
 - a. Home characteristics
 - b. Homeownership versus rental
 - c. Income opportunities in neighborhood and affordability of units
 - d. Proximity to employment location
 - e. Proximity to public transportation
 - f. Proximity to sources of social support, including community groups, church, etc.
 - g. Perception of neighborhood safety
 - h. Walking distance to daily needs
 - i. Availability and cost of parking
 - j. Quality and location of schools
 - k. Ability to return to prior community to visit friends and family
 - l. Sense of inclusion and enthusiasm towards neighborhood of minority individuals currently residing in neighborhood
6. What are the most effective methods for determining which segments of the eligible population are least likely to apply for new units? Possible segments include:
 - a. Elderly heads of household
 - b. Households requiring a large unit for their family

- c. Households with handicapped members
 - d. Employed heads of household
 - e. Heads of household without prior vocational training
 - f. Heads of household previously on welfare or other support services
7. How should the size of the prospective market be determined?

Questions regarding elements of a marketing campaign:

1. What are the most important elements of an effective marketing and outreach program?
2. How can current minority residents or individuals who previously moved to Westchester from the communities being targeted with affirmative marketing play a role in a marketing campaign?
3. Do you have prior experiences to share of effective marketing through testimonials by existing residents?
4. Are there other examples you would share of particularly effective affirmative marketing campaigns or campaigns that have dealt with issues similar to those in Westchester?
5. How do we identify appropriate local stakeholders and encourage their participation to ensure the success of the affirmative marketing plan?
6. How can an affirmative marketing campaign best determine the most effective media resources for reaching the target community?
7. Which of these potential resources are typically most effective? Least effective?
 - a. Newspapers
 - b. Radio
 - c. Television
 - d. Internet and social media
 - e. Public advertisements, such as billboards
 - f. Workplaces
 - g. Community organizations
 - h. Churches
 - i. Schools and childcare
 - j. Other forms of outreach?
8. The 750 units to be built in Westchester may be dispersed among a large number of separate sites.
 - a. How should the County and the builder/owners of particular properties share responsibility for affirmative marketing?
 - i. Are there particular elements of an affirmative marketing campaign that would be best performed by a particular party?
 - b. In what ways should marketing of very small-scale developments (1 to 3 units) differ from marketing of larger-scale developments?
9. What counseling or mobility assistance should be provided to prospective residents as part of an affirmative marketing campaign?
10. Structure of the plan:

- a. What is an appropriate budget for the marketing of a development (e.g., as a percentage of the total development budget)?
 - b. How long prior to expected occupancy should an affirmative marketing campaign begin?
 - i. What is the proper timeline for different elements of an affirmative marketing campaign?
 - c. What financial and affordability information should be part of a marketing campaign?
 - d. What information regarding resale of deed-restricted housing should be included?
 - e. What training should the people involved in affirmative marketing receive regarding the Fair Housing Act?
 - f. How should an affirmative marketing campaign include information about the availability of counseling or mobility services for prospective and actual residents?
 - g. Are you aware that the County has created an online, centralized intake tool for rental opportunities in housing developed pursuant to the settlement?
 - h. What factors should be considered in measuring the effectiveness of a marketing program?
11. How can a marketing campaign most effectively address different and potentially conflicting preferences of different segments of the target population (e.g., assuring the units' affordability to a lower-income target population while avoiding potentially negative perceptions of the developments among higher-income members of the target population)?

Questions regarding site selection:

1. Are there specific housing or site characteristics that you have found render a property more attractive to potential residents?
2. What factors should be considered to ensure that the sites chosen for new units appeal to targeted individuals? What factors would create a risk of stigmatization of a site?

Questions regarding marketing to existing residents in community:

1. What have you found to be the most effective methods for encouraging receiving communities to become more accepting of new units and new residents?
2. Can you offer specific examples of particularly successful efforts?

Appendix III: Affirmative Marketing and Integration Programs in other Communities

Fund for the Future of Shaker Heights

216-491-1457

fundforthefuture@hotmail.com

www.shakeronline.com/about/incentive/FundfortheFutureofShakerHeights.asp

Housing Choice Partners

28 E. Jackson Blvd., Suite 1109

Chicago, IL 60604

312-386-1009

<http://www.hcp-chicago.org/hcp/>

Inclusive Communities Project

3301 Elm Street

Dallas, TX 75226

214-939-9329

<http://www.inclusivecommunities.net/>

Metropolitan Baltimore Quadel

231 East Baltimore Street, Suite 400

Baltimore, MD 21202

410-223-2222

www.mbquadel.com

Oak Park Regional Housing Center

1041 South Boulevard

Oak Park, IL 60302

708-848-7150

<http://www.oprhc.org/>

The South Orange/Maplewood Community Coalition on Race

P.O. Box 1309

516 Prospect St.

Maplewood, NJ 07040

973-761-6116

www.twotowns.org