

Production Transcript for Panel 5.mp4

[00:00:07]

>> Raphael Bostic: This panel is focusing on the question of place and how important place should be. And to manage this panel is a colleague of mine at the Price School, LaVonna Blair Lewis and LaVonna is one of the underappreciated heroes of our school. She does so many things that are very vital to our school but maybe doesn't get the spotlight or the glamour. So I'm going to try to give you some spotlight today and

[00:00:41]

>> LaVonna Lewis: OK, all right.

[00:00:42]

>> Raphael Bostic: -- really appreciate your being part of this conference and thank you for being here. It's good to see you. The panel is yours.

[00:00:48]

>> LaVonna Lewis: Thank you. I want to thank Raphael for that introduction. And I want to say, I think the only panel placement that's tougher than being the first panel after lunch is to be the panel before cocktail and dinner and so, so much for placement. I also want to make note of the fact that by what some people may consider accident but what I consider design, we're actually sitting in the order of all of our presentations. And so we're very grateful for the way that it happened and I want to start by talking about this issue of place because I actually had someone asked me at lunchtime what does that really mean. And so I will use my relationship with Raphael to kind of set the context. Raphael and I would not have met without Price. We would not have conversations on a regular basis about research and other opportunities without being in the same place at the same time. And that's really what we're trying to do with this last panel is to make explicit what has been implicit all day.

[00:01:54]

My school, my health care, my job, my house, all exist within a particular place and space. And so the question is as we build this broader, the kind of the general topic of poverty, we've talked about concentrated poverty, but we also want to talk about how are we doing in terms of defining our programs that address these poverty problems targeting maybe particular places, how our targeted efforts around place have become outdated and maybe need to be revised a bit to kind of address with the kind of current reality. But fundamentally, I want us to kind of think about the fact that all of the decisions that we've talked about today, you know, where I go to school, how do I get a job, who's my healthcare provider. All of those are decisions that people have to make in a particular place. And so as we talk about the choices that people make, place allows us to kind of talk about what's the choice set that is available in those spaces. And so the panel that we have this afternoon is going to kind of introduce us to a deeper conversation of place and also begin to get us thinking about do we have to re-imagine place as we kind of move forward to the next iteration of research and also practice.

[00:03:03]

And so, our presentation as I've said will go in order as seated. We have first here from Margery Turner, Alan Berube, Angela Blanchard, our first discussion, and Philip Tegeler, our second discussion. But again I think that they've agreed that we're all going to sit here, not because we can't move but because we just want to sit here, so all right. So Margie, please go ahead and start.

[00:03:25]

>> Margery Turner: Thanks, I'm hoping everybody got some jumping jacks and some sugar and so you're all ready to start back in again. And Alan and I agreed we got extra-- we buy ourselves an extra 30 seconds by not standing up and walking over to the podium.

[00:03:40]

>> Alan Berube: You're wasting it right now, Margery.

[00:03:42]

[Laughter]

[00:03:43]

>> Margery Turner: So, I'm going to reiterate that place really matters to the well-being of families and their kids. There's a substantial body of research that establishes that conditions in very severely distressed neighborhoods undermines the long-term life chances of parents and children. And interventions that explicitly target the neighborhood conditions that are most damaging to family well-being and to kids' healthy development really have to be a part of any larger strategy that's trying to move the needle on poverty, especially if it's concerned about families of color. And I want to highlight here that a focus on place gives us an opportunity for integration across domains. Something we've talked about a bit today. It gives us an opportunity to knit together some of the specific proposals that have been talked about in various people's presentations.

[00:04:47]

So historically, a lot of efforts are trying to overcome the negative effects of neighborhood conditions on families have primarily focused on changing conditions within the boundaries of a distressed neighborhood. Building and rehabilitating housing, providing new community amenities, delivering needed services, maybe even expanding jobs within the neighborhoods. But today what I'm seeing is a group of practitioners and advocates and thought-leaders defining a next generation of strategies that I think are better termed "place-conscious", as opposed to "place-based." And this is a term that Manuel Pastor and I experimented with a couple of years ago and I'm sticking with it. So these place-conscious strategies recognize the importance of place and target the particular challenges of distressed neighborhoods, but they are much less constrained by narrowly defined boundaries.

[00:05:47]

They're more attuned to market-wide opportunities and market-wide barriers, and they're more open to alternative ways of thinking about how neighborhoods might function for their residents. So in my paper, I highlight what I see as six big lessons that distinguish this emerging place-conscious approach to combating poverty from the more narrowly place-based efforts of the past. And I'm just going to hit on these six quickly, I'd be happy to go back and talk about any of them more. So first, the best geographic scale for tackling a problem really varies across policy domains. In some cases, interventions can have a huge impact by really zooming in, say, at the block level. But in other cases, it really makes more sense to intervene across a larger neighborhood space, across the whole city or across the whole region. Trying to address crime, schools, job readiness, health at the same geographic scale isn't fruitful.

[00:06:52]

It doesn't get at the systems that are driving disparities in those different domains. Second, a lot of the services and opportunities that families need to thrive are located outside the neighborhood in which

they live. They're in a larger city or region. So, interventions that connect people to those opportunities can be a lot more effective than interventions that try to build everything inside the boundaries of the neighborhood. Third, low-income families move a lot. And this mobility complicates conventional ideas about what neighborhood revitalization means and what it means for families. I think it really argues for three complementary responses. Strategies that reduce involuntary mobility turning, so families can stick around in a place long enough to benefit from new neighborhood services and supports. Affordable housing preservation to minimize displacement, if and when market forces take off in a neighborhood that was previously poor.

[00:07:59]

But also for assisted housing mobility options that give families who want them the option of moving to other neighborhoods that better meet their needs, their desires, their priorities. Those are often seen as competing strategies, I think they're complementary. Fourth lesson is that no single organization can perform all the tasks and activities that are needed to transform a distressed neighborhood into a neighborhood that effectively serves poor families. But experience does argue very strongly for one organization to play a coordinating role, a leadership role, facilitating multiple stakeholders to prepare shared vision. And performing this kind of orchestra conductor role takes time, resources, money, we need to provide financial support and give time to build that capacity to do it well. I'm going to go fast. Fifth, when an ambitious and multidimensional vision is made explicit by a set of agreed upon and measurable goals, the participating organizations can hold each other accountable and their work can be aligned.

[00:09:10]

This is also a way in which residents can have real voice and have an opportunity to hold service providers and systems accountable to their priorities. And finally, we need to recognize that this kind of place-conscious anti-poverty work has to be tailored to regional context and conditions. For example, Angela, I think will talk more about the fact that there are some metros in the south and southwest where poor neighborhoods may not be as isolated and isolating as we're used to thinking of them in the northeast and the Midwest where booming economic conditions create huge opportunities for people. And in those kinds of regions, the strategies for tackling issues of place need to be really different than the strategies that we're used to thinking about that we kind of invented and grew up in the Detroit, Chicagos, New Yorks and maybe even Atlantas of the world. So I will stop, look forward to talking about all those ideas at greater length.

[00:10:15]

[Applause]

[00:10:20]

>> Alan Berube: OK, I'm up. And I'm also motivated to do this efficiently because this is the panel that crosses over into the first games of the Sweet 16, too. So if you got a dog in that fight, I want to get you there. So I am mindful this is a conference on-- I think it says Innovating to End Urban Poverty. And I'm going to talk to you all about sub-urban poverty, which doesn't mean that it's less than urban poverty. It's just in a slightly different kind of community and this is based on some work that my colleague, Elizabeth Kneebone and I did over the past few years. And the book that we wrote available on Amazon.com called Confronting Suburban Poverty in America. So, and I say this-- I don't want to be humble about this because as many other panelists have noted, concentrated inner city poverty is still an enormous problem in US cities today. In some cases, it's at least as large an issue as it was at the

dawn of the war on poverty 50 years ago. And cities overall remain poorer places than the rest of the country. If you live in the city, you're more likely to be poor than somebody somewhere else.

[00:11:24]

That said, we have a lot more poor individuals in the United States today than we did at the dawn of the war on poverty as Richard's presentation showed this morning. And so, I think as a result, probably not a surprise that you find poverty in more kinds of places today than you did 40 years ago, 50 years ago. And a lot of those places are not in cities and inner city neighborhoods. They're outside of cities and in particular, they're in suburban communities in our major metropolitan areas, which today collectively have three million more people underneath the poverty line than their big cities do. Over the past decade, low-income populations in suburban communities overall grew by 65 percent, which is staggering versus 29 percent in cities, also staggering, but less than half that way. And as poverty occurs in suburban communities, it's also important to note, it's not sort of fanning out evenly across the map, right? It's actually re-concentrating in some regards at lower levels than in inner cities, but it's ending up in certain kinds of suburban communities that maybe don't have the kinds of opportunities that a lot of us associate with the suburban American dream.

[00:12:39]

And in the end, I think, as we sort of conceptualize, well, how do we address this, it's important to not think about this as suburbs versus cities but rather this is a regional phenomenon and something that's happening across the entire side of certain regions that are growing from the city out into suburban communities. Just to pick a couple of examples that we spent some time in researching the book. So South Cook County, Illinois, right, just south of the South Side of Chicago, one of the major hubs of the US steel industry four, five decades ago, but since then it's endured a lot of job loss, and the immigration of low-income families from the South Side of Chicago. Middleclass flight from those communities moving out to the next ring of suburbs. And then really excessive fragmentation and competition among very small municipalities in that county with very small fiscal capacity to deal with some of the issues that are clearly there. Or a very different economic context but also challenges in South King County, Washington.

[00:13:43]

So we have a lot of King County representatives here today. It's a-- it was and still is a hub of the US aerospace industry. It's where Boeing Airfield is located. You have the Port of Seattle there but there are a lot fewer middle class jobs that are used to be there. It is a portal for migration from all around the world. One of the major refugee resettlement areas in America today is in these suburban communities. And you got a lot of low-income families coming from the city of Seattle, who are getting priced out of that city today or this is the affordable portion of the Seattle metropolitan area today. So, that both kinds of places and in each of these kinds of places what we saw was very interesting work at a small scale, trying to get at some of the issues that families and communities were confronting but basically a lack of political, philanthropic and private sector focus and engagement that you might see in cities around some of these issues. So, I have set this up just to put this on the table that if we do everything we're talking about today and we redouble our efforts over the next five decades to address inner city poverty but we don't reform our approaches in ways that actually address the needs of these other kinds of communities with growing poverty to have slightly different needs and different capacities, we might lose the support we currently have, we're doing-- what we're doing in cities politically.

[00:15:06]

And we'll end up with similarly stark challenges in the suburban communities that we've sort of left to their own devices without focusing on them. So what do I say we should do in the paper? Assuming that before we get ourselves organized and redistricting, we don't have a lot more money to do much, how would we approach this in a more regional or at least, sub-regional way when it comes to poverty alleviation? And one thing we do is just sort of work around place and make place less relevant for addressing poverty. I think, you know, Phil will talk about some of the residential mobility strategies, transportation. We maybe give people cars instead of focusing on public transportation. There are some-- and boosting the EITC I think is worth concerning. We could make our place-based interventions more relevant for suburban communities. And we could value the sorts of scaled interventions that I think Angela is going to talk about much more explicitly when we talk-- when we think about who we give money to deliver services. We could build capacity and connections of communities that don't have much.

[00:16:09]

We could make enterprise level investments in high capacity organizations instead of just dealing at the program and the transaction level of the organizations. And then finally, the big idea is a competitive, bundled place-based fund for regional and sub-regional strategies. That's really about supporting the kinds of intermediaries, orchestra conductors, quarterbacks that facilitate across programs, across policies, and importantly across places. Because when you get into these suburban jurisdictions, no matter where you are, there's just too much competition and lack of coordination to deal with what in the end is a region-wide phenomenon. It's something that needs a region-wide strategy, focus and delivery mechanisms. It's just really not there today, there are too many places eating one another's lunch when there's really not much lunch to be had. So, let me just offer one observation about why this is important is getting practitioners together with academics, like this is what foundations should fund, right?

[00:17:10]

Like the way to sell this stuff is actually like not for me to go talk to people about it but for me and Angela, or me and Phil, you and Phil to go talk to people about this. Because that's how you explain how this-- it can be a context but then you explain how the stuff really works. So I just-- Raphael, you deserve a lot of credit for putting it together in this way and getting us to talk to people that maybe we don't talk to enough and present our case in this way. I think that's what's powerful. Thanks.

[00:17:37]

[Applause]

[00:17:39]

>> Angela Blanchard: I'm always a little terrified to be a practitioner at a policy conference because this is why I'm really scared. When I come, I think you're going to tell me that it can't be done, and I've been told that. And so, everything that neighborhood centers have tackled, we've been told that it could not be done. So my fear when I come in here is that you will have evidence that it cannot be done. And you're all so much smarter and you spend a lot of time thinking about it. I've spent 30 years doing it and I am so proud to say that I've gotten to work with Alan and Marge and Erika and Bruce and other people at Brookings and Urban Institute. We love doing it because we don't have time to think about it. We're really busy doing it. So I have to tell you I'm from Houston, Texas in case you didn't figure out by the accent. And actually we need more time, we talk slower. You heard my friend from Waco, poor guy, half the words in the same amount of time, it's not fair. So Bruce Katz says Houston is the nation on demographic fast forward that's why you should care.

[00:18:42]

Ordinarily, you don't think innovation happens in Houston, in fact, if you listen to some of the people you elect in Texas, you probably wonder what exactly goes on in that state every day. But good things happen in Texas and we're one of them. This is an organization that I didn't found. I've led it for a long time. We've grown every year for the last 27 years. We're rooted in the Settlement House Movement, and we got scale. It's Texas, everything is real big. We're real big. Big matters and I'll tell you why. Because it's not that easy to do the kind of integrated approaches that you've heard and are so important in neighborhoods. So, every one of these little dots is a place that we operate. We have 70 something locations and while I was sitting here today, we added four more and dropped a program that we can no longer afford to do because after sequestration, those funds were not-- and it was an enormously successful program. So I am happy and sad and that's my day every day. Houston, in case you're wondering, if we just did Houston, that 600 square miles, we go beyond Houston.

[00:19:46]

Every neighborhood we work in has been defined much the way you all are used to studying things. In terms of the lacks, gaps, needs, wants, what's broken? All the ways in which the people and families in place don't measure up. It's not walkable, everybody is overweight, low birth weight babies, non-English speaking, uninsured, undocumented. All of those things are true about every neighborhood we go into, we can't wait to get there 'cause we know what's really there is a tremendous amount of energy and potential and vision and aspirations. These photographs you see around the room today are the people I see every day. And while there's a great deal that makes them worthy of our investment, they are by no means either helpless or hopeless. So the story we like to tell at neighborhood centers is about why investment matters, why these people are our future and they make a difference. And that new story has garnered an enormous amount of support for our work.

[00:20:47]

And from the private sector, from the very people as one board member says, we get folks to write checks for things we can't get them to vote for. And by getting people to vote for things ain't my job, getting checks so that we can build these kinds of really big, coordinated, non-siloed responses is my job. And it's a wonderful thing to see a site like this go up, be paid for and be operating. It is an immigrant welcome center. It has a library, a charter school we operate, a community development credit union, a full time tax center. It has a performance space and an art barn and mister corporate folks, you know, they are as a corporation's name on almost everything, you know, every little window and doorknob. We like to give them credit when they do good stuff. I will say that because it's hard for people to recognize that Houston has become the most diverse city in United States, hard for people to understand that in the state that brags about its success, we also have devastating poverty.

[00:21:55]

It's also hard for people to find a way to invest if they're not in Houston. This was our site and thank you Manuel Pastor, I don't need to do a slide on public policy interventions, that's the one. Number one on the list for public policy interventions are vital, important to our state and to our communities is immigration reform. This was the day after DACA was announced. We prepared for 600 people inside, we filled up, then we held another event outside. We had 500,000 people in a region of six and a half million who cannot navigate the existing system and desperately need our help and we need them. So, that's my scoop and it is a wonderful thing to see health, education, financial opportunity, immigration services, art and dance and music come together in a community where you hold the meetings in eight languages. So, come and see us.

[00:22:56]

[Applause]

[00:23:02]

>> Philip Tegeler: OK, I'm going to respond in the more traditional way to the two papers as quickly as I can in five minutes. First of all, I think that both Marge and Alan's movement away from place even though we're called the place-based panel is excellent. Really deemphasizing place in the traditional way, I think, is an important move. The first thing I want to say about Alan's approach and the book really on decreasing suburban poverty is refrain that I-- when the book first came out, my first response was, increasing suburban poverty is a good thing. If we're not going to make an investment as a nation in reducing poverty overall, the more poor people we can get to more places, the better off we're going to be. It's better off for the families. It spreads the burden of poverty. It increases the visibility of families and political support for anti-poverty programs.

[00:24:03]

In every way it's better than concentrated urban poverty. That being said, you know, the danger as you said is re-concentration of poverty. And to deal with the potential for re-concentration of poverty, the recreation of concentrated poverty neighborhoods in the suburbs, we have to understand the mechanisms that generate concentrated poverties. It's not a natural phenomenon. It's driven by public policy law, our municipal and regional structures, school districts, tax-based land use policy. The kind of overlay of housing that we've created in our regions and it's very important to intervene and reengineer that outcome because we're getting close in a lot of places to creating little mini ghettos in inner suburban areas. We have to support diverse places with place-based interventions. I've always talked about a Choice Neighborhoods' program for the suburbs.

[00:25:04]

You know, really going in and doing comprehensive community development and infrastructure investment in the places that is starting to become concentrated poverty. We have to go back to the Carter administration and the Romney administration at HUD to look at regional fair share housing programs and housing mobility programs. Because you're not-- you're never going to deal with concentrated poverty in the inner suburbs unless we have a truly diverse, integrated suburban region as a whole. We can't have two type-- you know, two suburbs, black, white, poor, wealthy. The new Rulemaking on Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing that's coming out of HUD maybe this year, is maybe an entry point to revisiting some of those policies. I think one thing in both papers, I have to say this because who knows who's here? I do housing and education policy. I gather there are a lot of people who don't do housing policy here.

[00:26:04]

It's been enlightening for me to hear from those other fields. But I want people to know when-- if you've read Alan's paper and Marge implies this too that there's this tension between place-based community investment and housing mobility. There's a-- if there's this policy tension between, you know, housing desegregation and rebuilding communities, OK. I just want to say for the record that that is not true, it's almost nonsense. It's an academic debate about the relative value of doing community reinvestment versus housing mobility. What's actually happening on the ground, in federal policy, is a tiny commitment to helping families move to opportunity places. There have been many trees killed with the articles written about the Moving to Opportunity experiment from the 1990s, an amazing social science effort to do experimental design moving families to lower poverty.

[00:27:05]

That was 5,000 families who really didn't move very far in the end. Compare that to the 2.2 million families who are in the Housing Choice Voucher Program today who are now moving to opportunity. All four of our major federal housing programs are steering families continually to lower opportunity communities, lower performing schools, higher poverty schools. That's the housing policy we have today and we need to move away from this. So this I just want to point that out that we're-- we talk about a lot about this tension, about-- you need to do both end but we're not doing both end now and we need to. And if we don't, our inner suburbs are going to look just like the concentrated poverty neighborhoods we're focusing on today. Alan's theme about services following families and obviously what Angela is doing in Houston, I think that's very powerful. I think it's wrong.

[00:28:06]

As a civil rights lawyer I can take that and say that in the moral sense it's wrong to require families to stay in a particular place as a condition of receiving services, particularly to require families to stay in a segregated neighborhood as a condition of receiving healthcare, or education, or anything else. In that vein, I think it's important when families move into suburban communities, into higher opportunity areas that they get the same kind of services that other families get. They're going to be sharing the same schools, which is a good thing. But why do they have to have separate healthcare systems? In the Baltimore area where we've looked at this, some of the higher opportunities suburban communities have the richest, most dense pediatric services in the whole region. And yet those services are not accessible to the poor families moving out to those neighborhoods, who are on Medicaid.

[00:29:09]

So, we have to think about how do we integrate low-income families into the same services the middle class families are getting in these communities. That goes for early education too. We just submitted comments to the Department of Education on the new 250-million-dollar race-to-the-top early learning program. And early education, crucially important for children but the evidence shows that integrated early education where low-income children are going to early ed with middle class kids, you get more language acquisition, it's a better outcome for kids. So why not have a program that gets kids into the same early ed programs that the middle class kids are in. As opposed to Head Start where you put, you know, create separate buildings, separate classrooms for low-income kids of color. Same goes with cars. You've mentioned that in your paper and thanks for bringing that up. Why shouldn't low-income families in suburbs use the same transportation systems that everyone else in those towns-- those towns-- suburban towns are built for cars.

[00:30:19]

So can we-- and in many ways, and I think that one of Marge's colleagues is doing work on this now. In many ways it's less expensive to deliver used cars to low income families than create elaborate transit systems for them that don't work as well and don't get them to the places they need to get with their kids and their groceries. Finally, I guess on the broader theme of thinking regionally and moving to a regional level, I think, you know this-- the politics of that are very difficult as you've pointed out. The Sustainable Communities' Initiative at HUD was very ambitious, exciting effort to move away from jurisdiction by jurisdiction block grants, like community development block grants and the home program, to move away from that way of thinking about separate jurisdictions within a region and create an integrated planning program for both housing, transportation and-- well, they didn't get to education.

[00:31:22]

But, you know, to basically think about a region as a region and as a single housing and transportation and job market. That program died after a few years. Congress has not reauthorized it. A lot of places did some really exciting planning and now the program is on its way out. I think it's a really cautionary tale. And it's interesting to me now to see that in the budget, this year, the proposed 2015 budget, we're seeing those individual block grants like the CDBG program pretty drastically cut. And that I think is the writing is in the wall, we're losing-- if those just become intercity entitlement programs, you know, politically they lose their constituency. And you know, with the current Congress, I don't see how we get to that regional fund you're talking about. I really don't, but that's what the Sustainable Communities' Initiative is moving to.

[00:32:23]

And I remember-- I think it may have been-- I may have been sitting in Ron Sims' office back when he was deputy secretary. And he was explaining and if I get this wrong, I'm sorry, I apologize, but how the vision of the Sustainable Communities' Initiative was eventually to transfer all of these individual jurisdictional block grants into a regional fund. I mean it had the same idea you did a couple years earlier before you. So I'd like to see us move that, I think that there are some positive things I've seen in Chicago. We're working with a group of-- with the Metropolitan Planning Council. A group of eight public housing agencies have come together to pull their project-based vouchers together in a regional consortium. If things like that can happen, it takes a lot of work on the ground. It took them several years even to get to that point.

[00:33:29]

And I guess finally what I'll say in response to Marge's intro about the impacts of living in concentrated poverty. I think it's important to remember what those costs are to families and what the long-term costs are to government of the harms that families experience living in extreme poverty neighborhoods. You know, but how do we measure this cost? We really haven't done a good job of measuring what that cost is to families. We really haven't done a good job of measuring what the cost is to society. And we're really a long way, you know, we talk-- we see these pay for success social impact bond approaches being applied in very short-term situations. We're a long way from really figuring out how do we reap the benefits of helping families move out of those concentrated poverty communities. And that's I think something I'd like to hear some feedback from you guys on.

[00:34:30]

You know, how do we-- how can we apply that kind of social impact investing approach to the kind of place-based programs you're talking about.

[00:34:39]

[Applause]

[00:34:40]

>> LaVonna Lewis: So, Marge and Alan, I'd like to give you a chance to respond to the discussants and to what you've heard and then I have a couple of questions before I turn it over to the audience.

[00:34:47]

>> Alan Berube: I think Angela also got five minutes less than what you're supposed to get. So you should-- We should be sharing. She gets--

[00:34:53]

>> Angela Blanchard: Should I go back? Yeah.

[00:34:54]

>> Alan Berube: That was back over time. Yeah.

[00:34:55]

>> Angela Blanchard: I just-- this is a very challenging conversation for me to be in because I disagree with so much of what gets said. Even though I understand the factual accuracy of some of it, it's just not the experience on the ground. So first of all, to counter the idea that we like to talk about concentrated poverty as if it were a disease and that if people congregate together will continue to spread. But in communities where people live close to one another and all are poor, there's also a strong sense of community and we find again and again that people do find ways to help one another. Someone talked earlier about the best person to learn from is not someone a mile ahead of you, or 10 miles ahead of you but just a few steps ahead of you. We can distance people from one another and spread it around because it might make it more convenient for us or maybe we have a better argument for how you have one person instead of a whole neighborhood certainly seems easier.

[00:36:01]

But at the end of the day, people need one another and they're together for a reason. So I counter on that. I think also everyone, here's where we get into trouble, we begin to think about a poor neighborhood and imagine that a whole different set of ideas should apply that don't apply when we're talking about a neighborhood we'd want to live in. But you want to live in a neighborhood where there's a financial institution you trust and a school you are proud for your child to go to. You want to be able to walk, you want to be-- but then we get to a point and then we say, well, we've got to engineer all this in a different way. And really, the truth of the matter is every resource that's designed to help a poor neighborhood is at the bottom of a silo that goes miles in the air. You know, all the way from the federal to the state to the local, it's all siloed, so drip, drip, drip. And then if you're here, where I sit with the community, hungry and full of aspirations and hopes and dreams, it's a job to put all that together but it is our job to put that together, to make it work.

[00:37:09]

And I'll give you one example. Earlier you heard about the importance of ESL classes. They're very important. And when we first started working in Baker-Ripley and Gulfton, we had to have tons of ESL classes and we had to pay teachers to teach them. But now they're being taught by the people who are graduates from those classes. We build on the aspirations of the people there. Everything that is born of a deep, meaningful conversation with community is sustainable. Now if it's you that supply and impose eventually is-- you want to talk about failures, you look at the failures, and they were really born out of the fixes we thought were necessary for communities, and not out of what communities themselves were willing to work for. So, I'll argue strongly for don't talk about people you haven't talked with, don't assume you read those study therefore you know what that experience is really like that so-called concentrated poverty may be. Somebody else may be thinking that's community, that's home, that's where I live and that's the neighborhood I'm proud I made it to 'cause it took me a long time to get here, so--

[00:38:18]

[Applause]

[00:38:23]

>> Margery Turner: Angela, I've learned a lot about this issue from meeting you and hearing you talk and visiting the incredible community centers that you've built. And I think one of the things I'm learning is that our language of talking about concentrated poverty as the problem implies, as you said, that the poverty is a contagion. That it's screwing things up, it's the people are screwing things up for one another. And I actually-- I mean, that's certainly not what I understand when I use that shorthand and I've been trying to change my language. What is creating horrible challenges and barriers for people like the people in these pictures and the people in your videos is the systemic disinvestment in places where poor people are concentrated, disinvestment by larger systems, public and private, and also by the systemic exclusion of lower income people and people of color from other neighborhoods.

[00:39:39]

So, these combined systemic failures are what I think we are trying to tackle when we talk about tackling place. And so I'm not deemphasizing place, I'm reemphasizing the importance of place but trying to argue as Alan does, I think, that we're now ready for a more complex, more nuanced, less myopic way of thinking about what it means to tackle place. And it includes work with the families in the communities where they live. It includes breaking down the barriers of exclusion. It includes bullying larger systems into delivering the public and private services that should go to those neighborhoods. And it includes opening up options for families to move where they think is best for them. All of those things to me are about place.

[00:40:42]

>> Philip Tegeler: Right, and the one thing we're not doing is opening up opportunities for families in other places and it's those voices that we have to listen to too. We can't just listen to the people who are invested in their communities, the community leaders, you know, who want more low-income housing built in their community. You know, who want more concentrated poverty in their community, which is what that leads to. And concentrated poverty is associated with the kind of disinvestment that Marge talks about. It's part of the political economy the way our country and our system works. That's how disinvestment happens. I've certainly heard the voices and met with families and talked to families and I think the-- Stefanie DeLuca's recent work in Baltimore is very interesting. You know, the way that families-- once they make a move into a different type of community, a new community, and that's one of the few exceptions to the rule that we're not promoting this in this country.

[00:41:44]

It's a court-ordered housing mobility program. These are families who voluntarily make these moves. And once they move, they begin to value. In interviews with Stefanie or colleagues the diversity of the community, the quality of the schools, the safety of the streets. All of the things that were not really on the radar before they moved when they're in the low income community, those families have a right to move too, and we have to reinvest, we have to value the community. Nobody's ever saying that we shouldn't do that. We have to have this other complementary strategy that Marge describes or else, you know, we're going to continue perpetuating segregation and disinvestment and marginalizing poor communities. And to have a much more diverse and inclusive regional approach where you don't have communities that are identifiable by race and poverty, I think that's where the future-- maybe you've got that in Houston and if you do, I salute you. But the parts of the country I've mostly worked in the Midwest and the Northeast are not like that at all.

[00:42:50]

You have very racially and economically identifiable communities where people can't leave and our public policies are confining them there. And to our credit, most of our public policies are focused on building those communities up and helping them move. We're not helping families integrate and move out.

[00:43:10]

>> Angela Blanchard: Well, I just want to plug the Urban Institute for a minute because, and Brookings, because I think they've shone a light on the fact that a lot of the approaches that we have taken to addressing-- to realizing the potential of people who are very low income have been built on a model in a map of a city that looks more like Chicago or New York. And there are a whole other bunch of cities in the south and the southwest that look very different. And any, you know, I was thinking about the number of applications we made for some of the, you know, more place conscious support that was put out there while the starting formula has to do with density. Well, by most standards, all of Houston is a suburb, and so we're not going to ever achieve the density that would make us eligible for that. So I think it really is time and I think that what I love most especially about identifying the fact that there is a different landscape and a different map is it also allows us to look at different solutions.

[00:44:24]

Or to embrace the idea, for example, 90 plus percent-- I think it's around 96 percent of the half a million people we serve are car dependent. So making a car loan available for a non-predatory institution was the best strategy. So it just opens up, I think this is the kind of policy writing that opens up people to possibilities and other frameworks.

[00:44:51]

>> LaVonna Lewis: So we all could have-- I wanted to kind of ask the question at something that you mentioned in terms of setting up the infrastructure if you will, in terms of what's needed for the next generation. And one of the things that you talked about, and Alan mentioned it as well, was the role of the conductor or the quarterback. And you made mention of the fact that we don't have enough of those kinds of people or organizations that are ready to take on this responsibility. And we have one on the panel but what is it-- what is this kind of hindering the type of boundary span and leadership, the type of collaboration across these multiple sectors to really kind of energize some of the changes we're talking about.

[00:45:33]

>> Alan Berube: Maybe you know, I mean, right, I mean it takes--

[00:45:35]

>> Margery Turner: Money. Money.

[00:45:36]

>> Alan Berube: Yeah, it takes money, and then it just takes the, you know, it takes the willingness to battle the 40 silos that you battle on a day-to-day basis and the 45 data systems behind them, right? And the 12 reports that you have to issue every single month to a local, federal, state agency for those programs that you run. And these things can't talk to one another in a way that helps you serve your family. So you have to rig up something else that helps you do that, right? So it's just the system is-- anyway, the system is built, as far as I've seen, you should confirm this, to frustrate you at every opportunity to pull this stuff together and to do more than one thing in more than one place at the same time. And it's-- and look, and it's hard, it's-- you know, we're talking about-- we tried to catalog

place-based anti-poverty programs that the-- just at the federal level. And there's something like 80 of these, right? But then they get to the state level and those get fragmental a bit more. So maybe it's like 160 by the time you do that and then. So it's not like there is like one thing that you can do to just sort of cuts across all those and that makes it easier.

[00:46:42]

Other than just to say like, look, we're going to look for high performers and then we're just kind of like give them points and everything we award. And we're just going to-- or find a special pot of money that we can invest in people like this, right, because they play just-- yeah, they play just such an essential function that makes all these other things work so much better.

[00:47:00]

>> LaVonna Lewis: But I think the issue that what I wanted to respond to is the fact that even though someone is a high performer, if the grant is written in a particular way, you automatically disqualify for the competition. And so there's this kind of-- this kind of rank--

[00:47:16]

>> Angela Blanchard: That's why I keep coming for these things.

[00:47:17]

>> LaVonna Lewis: OK.

[00:47:19]

>> Angela Blanchard: We write the grant a different way. Well, I think everything Alan said is really true. You know, people who study this know that we need holistic-- we need interventions and we need assistance that's thoughtful and sensitive and evolutionary. And by the way, it takes 7 to 10 years to turn around a neighborhood, not 2. And so, an organization that is capable of making that commitment. And let me just say, what gets led, gets done. So if your sentence is about any community begins with "they" and-- that's not, then it's not going to happen. When it begins with "we" then it's-- then the ball begins to roll. What gets led, gets done. So I think we do fantasize about some value investor, some-- the Warren Buffet of nonprofits that looks at what you deliver and the results you're getting and doesn't force you into, you know, microscopic examination of every single detail of how you get there but buys the result and the transformation that you can produce.

[00:48:27]

We've yet to find that so what we do is what Alan described. You go after every single thing and you build an organization that can handle the brain damage, the brain damage of dealing with multiple bureaucracies and 40 externally imposed separate databases that are forbidden to talk to one another, multiple reporting years, et cetera. But, you know, if you care enough you'll do it. You folks have the chance-- you have a possibility in making that easier. And the work you're doing really revealing that there is a different world out there organized in a different way than what we've seen in the past makes me hopeful that it'll come down in a different way.

[00:49:09]

>> LaVonna Lewis: This will be my last question and then I will turn it over to the audience. This is the second panel where explicitly we've heard that there was this really great program, it was doing great things, and it's gone. And so what is it that forces us to keep starting over, right, how come we don't have the sustainability or the institutional memory to say, this is working, let's do what we can to sustain

it. Are we waiting too late in the process to go after that additional funding? Are we waiting too long to tell the story of those efforts or kind of-- what do we do to kind of create the urgency around continuing success of these types of programs? You mentioned a program that you said goodbye to today, Building Families in Nebraska is gone. And so what is it that we didn't do to let other people see the value of that?

[00:49:57]

>> Philip Tegeler: [Inaudible] you look at-- look at-- HUD, one of the reasons it's such an immovable object, you know, Erika can attest to this, you know, the clients of HUD are these institutions that HUD funds. It's the entitlement-- it's the jurisdictions that get the block grants, it's the public housing agencies. Thousands and thousands of these entities that are getting the stream of funds. And you've mentioned how many billions of dollars in the place-based programs you wrote about in your book, Alan, I mean, those are all political interest that are not going to give up without a fight. And it's brutal, you know, so how do you like shift this to like a regional fund? I don't know. I don't know. You have to take away a lot of money from a lot of public housing agencies and jurisdictions that are used to getting their grant every year. I... Help!

[00:50:52]

>> Alan Berube: Well, I mean like it made me-- the race to the top analogy is probably over utilized and whatever you think of what it did. I mean, what it did it did in a kind of big way in a very short amount of time if it just bought reform, right, they said-- they had an opportunity and they've spent 4 million dollars and they bought a ton of reform with 4 billion dollars. So you got to buy it, you can't, right, you got to find a way to buy it in a way that says, oh OK, now, I can do, you know, if I'm given a little bit of money and put in the right hands, we can do business differently. That's the, you know, that's the challenge and I think with what we're talking about it's even more complicated because there's such supplicants to the federal government in a way that's, you know, school districts and states really aren't with the Federal Department of Education quite as much--

[00:51:39]

>> Philip Tegeler: Yeah, yeah.

[00:51:39]

>> Alan Berube: But I think that's the, you know, how do you get widespread reform rapidly, you got to buy it.

[00:51:44]

>> Margery Turner: I want to add one other idea to this that's not disagreeing at all. But, each of those programs that got discontinued is a piece of what has to be a mosaic of efforts. And we don't think about the mosaic enough. So any one of those little pieces that gets proven but then not enough attention is paid for it or it can't get supported, it can't be continued, it's partly because all by itself, it's not going to end poverty, right. In fact, the sort of discouraging element of today is that we've talked about all these promising little pieces but no single one of them all by itself even if totally funded could do it. Because the problems are structural and systemic, they're complicated, they're multifaceted. So I feel like the challenges are around helping communities at different levels in the political system put together the pieces of the mosaic as opposed to thinking, well, why did that one little chip in the mosaic die?

[00:53:01]

>> Alan Berube: And that, you know, in the piece we haven't really talked a lot about today either is even though I talked about is labor demand, right?

[00:53:08]

>> Margery Turner: Yes, right.

[00:53:08]

>> Alan Berube: We haven't really talked about what are the-- how are you creating economic opportunities for people who are in poverty. Some people talked about some employer engagement and apprenticeships and transitional jobs. I think those are important but you know what's especially the case in these suburban communities, right, is that there are-- the ones that are facing, you know, increasing levels of economic distress is there is no economic vision. There is nobody to speak for the economic vision or future strategy for those communities. In some places, maybe that's OK, it'll just go over its own volition like Houston just keep creating jobs and your job is to connect people to those jobs, prepare them for those jobs. Jobs are not like just appearing in South Cook County right now, right? That place needs-- the place needs a vision of what it's going to be. Rahm Emanuel has got one for the City of Chicago, he's executing on it day in and day out. But all those neighborhoods in South Cook County, they don't have one. And so you need some glue money to help people do that and then make sure that that's-- that that vision then connects to all the other supportive services, human capital strategies we've been talking about today that will let people out of poverty.

[00:54:10]

>> LaVonna Lewis: OK, thank you all for the panel. So, I open it up to the audience if there are questions.

[00:54:14]

>> Harry Holzer: Just a quick comment. There have been a few references now to we keep killing off these programs that work and, Marge, you actually made a reference to like the mosaic of little programs put all together. But there's a whole different view on this. There's a ton of programs that do not work and that have been evaluated and they survive. In my field, federal workforce program, there's 47 federal workforce programs. Now most of the money is in the biggest two or three. But you go to almost every agency, I sit on a national academy's panel on young adults since you bring in people from every agency now list the 26 different programs they have for each different-- that's problematic as well. And I think if we're only going to sit here and advocate for more money for these programs without identifying all the crap already on the books that's not doing anything, we're going to have a hard time building a broader coalition of people. And so, I think somehow in the reform conversation that's got to be there too.

[00:55:11]

>> LaVonna Lewis: I mean, I think it's very clear that the toughest thing to do is to get people to sacrifice their program. I mean, politically if it's a program that has a lot of support, it's going to keep going forward but I think part of the challenge is to for those people that are direct beneficiaries of those programs, I mean, are they doing-- are we asking them to do the due diligence that's required to really say, you know, do the proper evaluation and to be honest and transparent about the results. And so we're pushing that way and we're saying that we're moving toward more and more toward evidence-based. We're moving more toward kind of trying to fund innovation, but again the jury is still out. But I think part of the question is if we keep saying that there are programs on the books that demonstrated

superior outcomes and those are disappearing, that's what I'm talking about, not just kind of arbitrary things that we continue to support simply because they've got political support.

[00:56:00]

>> Margery Turner: Right, and I would just pair your point, Harry, about we should be getting rid of the things that don't work and we should be willing to say these things don't work, don't pay for them anymore. But we pair that with the point you made earlier which is you have to give a program time to get its feet on the ground, get itself implementing properly. Actually the design is actually being demonstrated before you put your random control trial in place because we're throwing away a lot of things that never got a chance to prove that they might work.

[00:56:38]

>> Philip Tegeler: Well, I have to just slightly different I-- much of the money we're throwing out there is going into poor communities. So if you're talking about cutting programs that don't work, you're really talking about cutting off money that's flowing into low-income communities. And I don't believe-- if there's one-for-one substitution of that money, you cut the program that doesn't work and that there'll be one-for-one substitution of that same money going to the community, that's fine. But that's not the way it works. They're going to cut the program that doesn't work and the money is going to stop flowing. So I don't think it's such an easy thing to say, you know, stop funding the programs that don't work, 'cause those are the same programs that are-- those are the only programs we have that are sending money to this community.

[00:57:20]

>> Harry Holzer: But a lot of the money is flowing to service providers who aren't really providing the service that--

[00:57:25]

>> Philip Tegeler: Well, that's--

[00:57:25]

>> Harry Holzer: -- justifies the cause. You know again--

[00:57:26]

>> Philip Tegeler: That's true, that's true.

[00:57:27]

>> Harry Holzer: -- Triple duplication over and over again is just isn't rational.

[00:57:31]

>> Daphna Oyserman: So, another wonderful panel and I loved your statement that poverty is not a disease and growing up poor in and of itself isn't a problem. The problem is, are people having a quality of life? Are they able to have hopes that are sustained for their children? Are they able to have some sense of meaning and purpose? And those aren't about money per se. And the question is, are the institutions in those, as you're saying, right, do I have a school, not only that I feel proud but is providing my child access to things that I might not have had access to, right? Do I have access to banking? Do I have all the healthcare, all the kinds of things that make for well-being? And that I think is-- when we're thinking about innovating to end urban poverty, maybe it's not about the poverty per se. When people were-- when the money was good, we weren't so much worried about-- we thought we had mobility.

But what we had is people at the bottom were earning better. And we stopped having that now and somehow that needs to be part of the discussion because it's really not about like, how much money do I have?

[00:58:39]

It's, do I have a life that feels worthwhile and with meaning? Am I able to move my children forward? If I came and I had only a sixth grade education and my opportunities were limited, was I able to do something and was I able to give my children more? And I think those are the kinds of things that everybody is trying to talk about because where you're located, we're not infinitely malleable. Where we're located really matters because getting even an hour down the road is very difficult as the person who said a quarter of a mile versus a mile for the park. So I think we have an ethos of thinking as if there are no physical boundaries. But in fact, the physical boundaries of place are much more proximal than we would like to otherwise imagine.

[00:59:24]

>> Edgar Olsen: So actually I want to put in a plug for one of Marge's ideas that she didn't mention. It's regarded as a no cost proposal to actually lead to a better situation and that is, metropolitan level administration of the Housing Voucher Program, which, one, would give the recipients greater choice which I like, and two, I'm pretty sure it would lead to more economic integration. So I think it'd be good in all respects. I take Phil's point that taking vouchers away from the housing authorities is a problem but in the future there will be more vouchers. So we could sort of establish these things and give the incremental vouchers to these, and then over time, I think that would make things a little bit better.

[01:00:08]

>> Margery Turner: That's a proposal that's made me very unpopular with many housing authority.

[01:00:13]

>> Alan Berube: It's a good thing, yeah.

[01:00:14]

>> Margery Turner: No, no, I have not disavowed it.

[01:00:18]

>> LaVonna Lewis: I would just want to say that we're making the case that people should have more choice. And I agree with that 100 percent. But we also have to recognize that, you know, where I get to exercise that choice isn't unlimited. There's a very clear sign for some people that you're not wanted here. And to discount that without-- with kind of our policymaking I think is very naive. I mean, it's like when we talk about place, we're talking about the choices within that place. And if I have this voucher that says I can go anywhere I want to but nobody is taking my voucher, I really haven't moved very far. And I think that kind of tension also has to be--

[01:00:54]

>>Edgar Olsen: [Inaudible Remark] But--

[01:00:58]

Lavonna Lewis: OK, let's say, I think that I'm enjoying the conversation and I do think it's important because when we say talking about the place argument for me is really beginning to drill down and ask the question, what's available? Are they sufficient to meet the needs of the populations that are there?

Not just the deficits but also the assets that are there, and are we taking-- are we cognizant of both? And kind of how do we leverage both in some kind of way.

[01:01:25]

>> Philip Tegeler: Well, just to respond at this point, you know, the-- we're working now a little bit in Philadelphia. The voucher program there-- the way the voucher program is structured, it is re-concentrating poor families in very narrow places within the southeast Pennsylvania suburbs outside of Philadelphia. We're creating these intense pockets of poverty through this program. Yeah, everybody wants to affirmatively move to these low opportunity places in the Philadelphia suburbs is that-- that's where the program where they end up. That's where the landlords are who are soliciting clients. That's where the rents are at the right level, given the way the program is structured. It's built into the program policy and the legal way as structured. So it's not a natural outcome and we can fix that and that's true of all of these programs. We have to kind of look down the road and, you know, obviously I don't want to put down these places that are poor enclaves in the Philadelphia suburbs. These are valuable communities, we should raise them up.

[01:02:27]

We shouldn't through our policies create more concentrated poverty in those neighborhoods and communities. That's just bad policy. When the families are eager to, you know, happy to move to other communities nearby, why should we create the problem over again of--

[01:02:45]

>> Edgar Olsen: The voucher program doesn't insist on that, there's not a rule in the voucher program that says they have to move there, that's where they do move.

[01:02:52]

>> Philip Tegeler: Well, we can talk about this at greater length when we have more time.

[01:02:55]

>> LaVonna Lewis: Over a drink. I think we have time for one more question.

[01:02:58]

>> Audience Member: I was quite inspired by what you had to say, Angela. And I have some questions for you about what you're seeing in terms of outcomes. So in your Neighborhood Center model, I'm assuming you're also tracking things like income, education, health, you know, improvements, security, income mobility and what are you seeing from your model?

[01:03:20]

>> Angela Blanchard: So we're tracking everything under the sun because everyone's interested in something. Usually some narrow sliver of miniscule irrelevance, right? But the three things that our folks care about the most are raising their incomes, what's happening with their children, most of them. You know, there are-- they have very realistic expectations for their future and that is that they think they're going to be working hard all their lives. And they're deepest hope is it'll be different for their kids so when their kids are doing well in school, that's important. And then the third one is very difficult for us to measure and track but we committed to it nonetheless and it's connection so-- because we really think that, you know, we-- Alan told me about the cul-de-sacs of misery. You know, the-- you go in, you go round and round, you never get out. But the more connected communities, people

connected to one another and then connected to the larger region. So we will do that through looking at census participation that we-- voter participation, all of which we worked very hard to get.

[01:04:25]

And then really the number of times and we draw maps of the ways people know one another in community. We give those maps back to community. So for example, in Gulfton, crime in Houston over the period of time in which we were working in Gulfton dropped 6 percent. But in Gulfton, which was the highest juvenile crime zip code in the country, it dropped 17 percent. The surrounding property values which makes all those property, those huge apartment complex owners extremely happy. All those values have gone up largely 'cause we've completely stabilized the people in those because they're not going to leave 'cause they like living next to them, figuratively. So we're measuring kind of the greater good impact which was what we essentially sell. And then we also measure at the, you know, we do tax returns. We, I think, we did 35,000 last year and so we did 35,000 tax returns, we pretty much know whether people are earning more or not and if they're earning more than the rest of the neighborhood is earning that aren't-- that isn't working with us.

[01:05:27]

So through our ESL classes and through citizenship and all of that, you know, we can see their earnings impact there and we can extrapolate that for a lifetime of an impact that we're having. So, I mean, measurement is very difficult and people are interested in measurement in all different scales. But I-- you know, I just want to say one thing, I just want to tell you all this because you know in some ways when we are at this conference is it becomes very discouraging, and I don't know why. Because the individuals that I know that actually were the beneficiaries of any of these programs you're talking about, they never-- they don't do what I call WBC, W, whine, B, I'm not saying, and complain. They're really not doing WBC, they're saying, oh my God, thank God, I had help for child care for three years because it enabled me to go to school and even though as a teen mom, now, I have my MBA. That's what they say. And that problem is gone, they're not gone. And these are investments in human capital. We're imperfect in the way we make them but they make a difference.

[01:06:29]

And they continue to make a difference in the life of individual. We've fallen in love with scale as if we can't do it a million times, then make it the biggest thing we've ever seen, it didn't matter, but that's not true. So I just want to say that before we spend too much time talking about, oh my God, this is not-- we're not doing it anymore. Somebody's life changed 'cause we did it.

[01:06:49]

>> Marianne Hill: Marianne Hill again from MEND in Pacoima, and to the point about the length of time it takes to really implement programs to make a change and to your point about, you know, the sustainable communities that funding has died. Well, Pacoima was just chosen recently to be one of the promised neighborhoods initiative, right? So it's a five-year program, huge federal investment. My big question is in my lifetime, the democrats have only held office for eight years. So what happens two years from now? I have a preference about what happens. I'm not a political pundit. But, you know, if things really change, what happens to that five-year plan, I mean, how much can you do to transform a community in two years? I think that's a lot of the issue around some of it and then of course you go chasing after some other funding. But if federal funding is a huge part of that and there isn't other resources to kind of pick up the gap immediately then what kind of happens? You know, if it's a mix of funding, it's a different thing.

[01:07:49]

So I don't know if anybody would want to comment on that and maybe from Houston, you have a--

[01:07:53]

>> Angela Blanchard: Hustle.

[01:07:53]

>> Marianne Hill: Yeah. Well, I'm not in charge of it, another agency. We're just a subcontractor.

[01:07:58]

>> Angela Blanchard: Milk every cow but you do what you can-- and yeah, you do what you can with what you have where you are right now, when it goes, you go looking for it more.

[01:08:07]

>> Alan Berube: That's right but that's why--

[01:08:08]

>> Angela Blanchard: Yeah, it's horrible.

[01:08:09]

>> Alan Berube: Your kind of organization is so important because you've got-- you're a 280-million dollar agency. So 5 million dollars dries up, you don't go poof, right? You're still around and you can hustle and you can find a way to make it work with the other resources that you've got. So I don't know, it's just another-- to me, it's another endorsement of, yeah, having-- going with organizations that have a big budget and to diversify funding portfolio.

[01:08:30]

>> Angela Blanchard: Yeah, I think that might-- sounds like it's easier than reforming bureaucracy.

[01:08:34]

>> Alan Berube: Screw that, yeah.

[01:08:36]

>> LaVonna Lewis: Please, a round of appreciation for our panel.

[01:08:40]

[Applause]

[01:08:44]

>> Raphael Bostic: This panel was actually, it raised a bunch of really important questions and issues around individuals versus systems. Around the question of choice and how should we think about what real choice is and the choices people can make. And I'm really pleased that Harry brought up the issue about things that don't work and how do we deal with them. Because there is the perpetuation of a lot of investment and things that we all have a belief are only at best marginal. And if we are worried about available resources and the persistence of them, we might want to recapture those and use them in more effective ways, and find ways to do that. And that brings us around to the political question because ultimately this is about need leadership and who is making decisions done, the allocation of these resources. And we need to think about this is maybe something for academics to think about is

how do we design systems and structures that allow us to have policies bridge across administrations as they change and evolve so that we can actually get to five years or seven years, or ten years so that the programs can be mature.

[01:10:00]

And so the neighborhoods actually have a hope of changing and we have to think about that. The last thing I'm going to say 'cause there are drinks outside and I want one, is that, Marge, you've made a tremendous evolution. And I remember we were at an APPAM Conference, maybe eight years ago and we were talking about race in America. And I was saying, you know, there's the East Coast, northeast conception of race and then there is the rest of the country, right? And Houston is part of that, Los Angeles is part of that and I think the more conversations, so you guys have a great paper that you're writing. The more conversation that we have about the diversity of how race plays out in America, the more likely you are to have a menu of solutions that will allow us to embrace and engage that.

[01:10:48]

[Silence]