



Recommendations to the City of Newark, Mayor Ras Baraka

Submitted by:
Rutgers Equitable Development Working Group and
Rutgers Center on Law, Inequality & Metro Equity (CLiME)

October 2017



Overview

The Rutgers University-Newark Project on Equitable Growth was formed as a team of university researchers led by CLiME to provide research and recommendations about spreading the benefits of potential economic growth to all wards and neighborhoods in the City of Newark. Although housing and housing-related issues dominated our work, we viewed the task more broadly and asked:

How does a working-class city in the midst of economic interest from a fast-growing metropolitan region harness newfound resources to grow in ways that ensure the maximum amount of inclusion and opportunity for its current and future residents?

The recommendations that follow are both comprehensive and incomplete. The practices discussed below include ideas successfully attempted in other cities as well as innovations tailored to our unique home. The recommendations will be accompanied by CLiME's forthcoming Newark Housing Study, Ward-based Demographic Profiles and a methodological account of an assessment tool, CLiME's Displacement Risk Indicator Matrix (DRIM). The work reflects quantitative policy and legal research as well as qualitative interviews with individuals from multiple sectors. In all, the recommendations represent a holistic beginning to a critical collaboration between public sector leadership, its myriad community constituents and an educational anchor institution committed to the healthy and egalitarian development of our shared environment. We look forward to learning and doing more together.

Highlights of Recommendations

- 1) Plan with the CLiME **Displacement Risk Indicator Matrix** (DRIM) tool.
- 2) Establish an independent **Equitable Growth Advisory Council** with representatives from non-profits, developers, community, business and academia (appointed by mayor and city council).
- 3) Embrace a voluntary **urban AFFH** (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing) approach to development (borrowing from HUD regulations).
- 4) Reform key aspects of the **rent regulation process and operations**.
- 5) **Get the development the city wants:**
 - a) Expand the notion of “anchor tenancy” to include, for example, Community Land Trusts, Limited Equity Cooperatives and embedded artist-restricted housing units.
 - b) Give preferences to large developer-small/local developer partnerships and seek community benefits agreements that condition PILOTs and other perks on local training, financing or hiring.
 - c) Put city-owned land and other vacant parcels to productive, more creative uses, using APRA and other tools.
- 6) Restore the **Trauma-Informed City** approach to institutional training and care across city agencies, but especially for educators, law enforcement, firefighters and EMT (first responders) and health practitioners.
- 7) Make public institutions like libraries into “**Civic Learning Hubs**” with classes geared to the current needs of Newarkers of all ages (e.g., coding, financial literacy and Street Law).
- 8) Improve overall government transparency and public information access.

Background Factual Findings

- 1) Gentrification and/or housing displacement in Newark may follow patterns that are different than those in cities to which it is compared.
- 2) The extent of the “boom” is not yet clear, given the status of housing subsidies and changes in the priorities of the federal Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).
- 3) Newark’s median household income of \$37,000 makes it solidly working class. Only 14% of its adult residents have a college degree. Twenty percent (23,000 of 110,000) of its housing units are subsidized in some form.
- 4) Most Newarkers are renters (78%), the second highest rate in the nation. Most Newarkers are rent burdened (i.e., pay >30% of income on rent). Nearly half are *extremely* rent-burdened, meaning they devote more than 50% of income to housing costs.
- 5) Despite differences among wards, **Newark faces an affordability crisis today.**



Principles that Guide the Recommendations

- 1) Newark has a unique opportunity to define equity and inclusion as it grows.
- 2) Fair housing represents both equity and inclusion, and good government does both *affirmatively*. This entails an *urban Affirmatively Furthuring Fair Housing scheme* as broad as HUD's.
- 3) Get the development you want. Grow as much from within as without.
- 4) Gentrification and displacement are not always the same. They are connected by housing affordability trends. **Preserving affordable housing options is the most important factor in preventing displacement or destructive trends in gentrification.** *Preserving* affordability will require carefully *regulating* housing markets (e.g., rent control, public housing, vouchers, inclusionary zoning). Planning requires reliable metrics for both.
- 5) A city's "equitable growth" is more than just housing. It is a process involving the interaction of many critical **public and private institutions**, such education, social services, public health, arts, employment and transportation. Effective policies track these dynamics over time.
- 6) Establishing vehicles for democratic participation and government transparency are critical to galvanizing broad community support for change.
- 7) City-owned and vacant parcels allow key opportunities for targeted innovation.
- 8) Address displacement *before* it transforms your city.

Recommendation Overview: 5 Related Goals

I. Encourage Equitable Development

These recommendations recognize the centrality of coordinated and careful economic development planning for *all* the city's residents, now and in the future (See Appendix 1).

II. Reduce Displacement Risk

These recommendations focus on the proven probability that growing cities with affordability crises often displace vulnerable residents—and how to minimize those systemic risks.

III. Increase the Capacity of Existing Agencies

These recommendations recognize the reality of current limitations on capacity that affect city agencies' ability to advance reforms.

IV. Improve upon Existing Initiatives

These recommendations reflect research that suggests how current initiatives can be strengthened, often through collaboration with Rutgers University-Newark.

V. Become More Child-Centered

These recommendations focus on the fact that health of Newark's future resides primarily in the opportunities afforded the 25% of its residents who are children, many of whom—42%—now live in or close to poverty. These focus on ways to keep resources trained on education, public health, the arts and safety-related institutions that protect their growth.



I. Equitable Development Recommendations:

1. Plan with the CLiME **Displacement Risk Indicator Matrix** (DRIM)

The CLiME DRIM examines trends in multiple factors across neighborhoods, wards and the city as a whole over time in order to determine the nature and the extent of housing market change associated either with gentrification, increased displacement risk or both. This assessment tool can significantly aid policymakers in evaluating how particular housing markets within the city are changing, the effect of particular reforms or investments and, most importantly, the areas most in need of targeting by government resources.

2. Establish an independent **Equitable Growth Advisory Council** with representatives from non-profits, developers, community, business and academia (appointed by mayor and city council):

- a. To review IZO success, commission data, solicit expertise
- b. To advise regarding strategic development planning and its relationship to larger policy and fiscal goals
- c. To convene relevant inter-agency communications on development-related subjects, and
- d. To attract private support for public projects

A central function of the Equitable Growth Advisory Council will be to evaluate Newark's growth plans against the goal of increased access to opportunity for all residents. Specifically, the Council should periodically assess relevant data (such as the DRIM), identify barriers to housing opportunity, suggest goals and offer strategies for meeting them. In this way, the Council will help to ensure that Newark's redevelopment activity promotes inclusiveness rather than inequality and is a model for fair housing in central cities.

3. Embrace a voluntary **urban AFFH** (Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing) approach to development (borrowing from HUD regulations)

The greatest risk of successful economic development is rising inequality. Given that most notions of fair housing include goals for *both* racial equity *and* economic affordability; given that concerns about displacement by gentrification in Newark echo broader concerns about racial and economic exclusion in the city and across Northern New Jersey; and given that HUD's AFFH regulations encompass all of these considerations in a workable framework of development directives and incentives,¹

¹ According to the regulations:

“[A]ffirmatively furthering fair housing means taking meaningful actions that, taken together, address significant disparities in housing needs and in access to opportunity, replacing segregated living patterns with truly integrated and balanced living patterns, transforming racially and ethnically concentrated areas of poverty into areas of opportunity, and fostering and maintaining compliance with civil rights and fair housing laws. The duty to affirmatively further fair housing extends to all of a

Newark could lead the nation by implementing and developing a voluntary, distinctly urban approach to government as a force for *affirmatively* furthering the goals of inclusion and fair housing. These goals, which marry housing with many housing-related aspects of place-based opportunity (e.g., mixed-income development, avoiding racial and economic concentrations, putting new housing in areas with strong schools, health care access, transportation and access to healthy food), could showcase the promise of community planning philosophies as a force for broader equity. Many are already contained in the City's Master Plan.²

4. Get the development the City wants.

- a. Actively recruit the appropriate developer(s) for the most advantageous developments. Developer may be identified based on experience and expertise, demonstrated advancement of strategic goals in Newark and elsewhere, inclusive hiring practices and evaluated through RFPs, track records and scoring regimen.
- b. Realign development incentives to achieve Newark 2020 goals. Offer subsidies, bonuses and programs based on compliance with AFFH guidelines. Continually review incentives offered by peer cities to support informed negotiation strategy.

5. Put city-owned land and other vacant parcels to better use, by using the Abandoned Properties Redevelopment Act (APRA) and other tools.

- a. Model Neighborhood Initiative projects (*see* Part IV recommendations)
- b. Creating arts and cultural districts with restricted housing, more "Teachers Villages"; zone for "Tiny Houses"

Newark should expand upon its initiatives in providing artist housing by deliberately marketing itself as a city where artists can count on income-restricted housing options. Restrictions may come with reciprocity rules by which artists must contribute to local cultural activities in exchange for subsidies.

Similar neighborhood enrichment strategies can be created for incentivizing the residency of the City's other "anchor professionals," such as police officers, public utility workers, firefighters, nurses, sanitation workers. Workforce-restricted housing would expand upon the Teachers Village idea in order to diversify the make-up of Newark's existing "villages."

Newark can experiment with the kind of attractive and innovative in-fill development associated with both SmartGrowth and low-cost home ownership by zoning some parcels for planned "Tiny House" developments. Design-friendly homes that cost less than \$80,000 to build require zoning changes, but once in place can attract national attention to an intriguing yet affordable urban market.

program participant's activities and programs relating to housing and urban development." *See* 24 C.F.R. sec. 5.152 "definitions".

² Newark's voluntary incorporation of AFFH norms in city planning and service delivery may increase support among the nation's central municipalities for the equitable logic of the HUD framework in spite of efforts by the current administration in Washington to dismantle it.

- c. Discourage speculative hoarding of properties. Utilize APRA to take down speculator slum landlords and to acquire desirable land. Consider receivership programs to increase maintenance of small apartment buildings.
- d. Expand the use of “Anchor Tenants”
(see Part IV recommendations)

6. Make **Master Plan conformity** a greater priority.

Newark’s 2015 Master Plan represented a tremendous effort to re-imagine the City’s future. It is an unusually comprehensive source of data and a clear expression of community goals. It resulted from significant public input, making it a signature instance of democratic city planning. Although its voluminous size is daunting, its priorities are not only aspirations but guideposts against which future development must legally comply. It should be followed as closely as possible.

7. Dedicate **affordable housing and recreational areas funding through linkage fee programs** with developers.

The projected loss of over \$32 million in federal funds for housing will require the City to navigate affordable housing maintenance and development in a more challenging fiscal climate. Impact fees from new development might defray costs. Also, for residents of the City’s wards and most distressed neighborhoods, a clear benefit of downtown development could be an expansion of sports and recreational areas and programs for Newark households. Park maintenance and renovation is expensive but critical to the healthy development of Newark’s residents—especially its children. Linkage fees from development could be specifically earmarked for recreational projects in exchange for density bonuses, expedited permitting and other perks.

8. Work in **regional consultation** – all of Newark’s neighbors face the benefits and burdens of Newark’s growth.

The results of CLiME’s housing study show that trends affecting Newark affect the City’s neighbors, too. It is critically important that communication lines are open between the mayors of surrounding cities on issues of equitable growth.

9. Consider tools for informing public understanding of **development dynamics**.

Residential development is challenging and risky work on which growing cities rely. Misperceptions about risk calculations, costs and the relationship between successful projects and city administrators abound. Public meetings and information seminars can help interested constituents understand and overcome redevelopment priorities.



II. Recommendations to Reduce Displacement Risks

Research shows that the most important tool against housing displacement amid increasingly unaffordable rents is *preservation of existing income-restricted units*. Newark is fortunate to have four regulatory means for preserving—and even equitably expanding—affordability: public housing, rent control, housing choice vouchers and inclusionary zoning. Another key stabilizer is reducing evictions through government support for anti-eviction court reforms.

1. Plan with the CLiME Displacement Risk Indicator Matrix (DRIM)

The CLiME DRIM examines trends in multiple factors across neighborhoods, wards and the city as a whole over time in order to determine the nature and the extent of housing market change associated either with gentrification, increased displacement risk or both. The tool can significantly aid policymakers in assessing how particular markets within the city are changing, the effect of particular reforms or investments and, most importantly, the areas most in need of targeting by government resources. The index can be read not merely to assess gentrification. It can signal displacement risk even in the absence of gentrification.

2. Reform key aspects of the **rent regulation process** in order to

- a. Ensure landlord registration and compliance (e.g., give a deadline for a mandatory annual registration, raise min fines to \$1250).
- b. Increase compliance/enforcement capacity) by assigning code enforcement officers to the rent control office.
- c. Revise ordinance to clarify ambiguities and specify clear agency powers.
- d. Regulate buy-outs by ordinance, specifying terms (e.g., notice, must be in writing and recorded with city, tenants' right of rescission within a time period, notification of tenants' rights).³
- e. Sponsor the adoption of a Uniform Rental Application with set fees and selection criteria so that both sides to a lease transaction have the same expectations of the transaction process.⁴

3. Advocate for specific **anti-eviction** and **anti-foreclosure reforms** (e.g., civil right to counsel, judge training in alternatives to eviction, coordinated wrap-around services)

³ See, e.g., San Francisco Rent Control Board buy-out ordinance, <http://sfrb.org/new-ordinance-amendment-regulating-buyout-agreements>; Berkeley, CA, http://www.ci.berkeley.ca.us/Rent_Stabilization_Board/Home/Tenant_Buyout_Ordinance.aspx; Santa Monica, CA, https://www.smgov.net/uploadedFiles/Departments/Rent_Control/Forms_and_Petitions/Buyout_Rights_Disclosure_Form.pdf.

⁴ See Princeton's use, <https://patch.com/new-jersey/princeton/universal-rental-application-available-princeton-affordable-housing-units>

As a spokesperson for the interests of the city as well as a landlord in its own right, the City can lobby for and assist in the development of reforms with a demonstrated history of reducing evictions. The rising rate of evictions in Newark (about 25 percent) contributes to family instability, exposure to traumatic experiences, homelessness, declining mental and physical health, violence and school absenteeism. Other program ideas help reduce foreclosure risk. Consider:

- a. Increased tenant legal advocacy through a civil right-to-counsel
 - b. Increased training of landlord-tenant court judges in alternatives to eviction
 - c. Wrap-around services to help at-risk tenants get the help they need
 - d. Freeze property tax increases on elderly households.
 - e. Launch a home maintenance grant program to long-term residents of Newark
4. Unify **zoning compliance mechanisms** available to city and citizens and **publicize them**.

Both perceptions and policies can displace residents. A policy of granting variances to developers has left the perception for some Newarkers that zoning compliance can always be negotiated. The City can positively affect both by disclosing to the public the rules for zoning compliance and variances and invite the public to participate through more regularly advertised public forums.

5. **Public Housing Preservation:** Consider suspending disposition of any current NHA inventory, including Terrell Homes, until three steps are accomplished:
- a. Finalize the means by which residents' have can continue to reside in neighborhoods in or close to growing opportunity (1-for-1 and simultaneity);
 - b. Meet with stakeholders to ensure maximum participation and creative decision making; and,
 - c. Explore options to refurbish or preserve existing public housing stock with HUD and other resources.
6. **Litigation:** Consider seeking legal damages as a city Fair Housing Act plaintiff against private label foreclosures in key homeowner neighborhoods.

Recently, the U.S. Supreme Court upheld the City of Miami's standing to sue large national banks for the city-wide fiscal harms caused by their subprime lending and subsequent foreclosures in minority neighborhoods, practices Miami argued violated the federal Fair Housing Act.⁵ Newark is perhaps the foreclosure capital of New Jersey. CLiME and others investigated the extent of private label foreclosures that

⁵ See *Bank of America v. City of Miami*, No. 15-1111, May 1, 2017 available at https://www.supremecourt.gov/opinions/16pdf/15-1111_5i36.pdf.

appeared to result from subprime lending from at least one of the banks sued in the Miami case. Foreclosures have been especially devastating in once solidly middle class neighborhoods like Vailsburg. Recouping the City's costs associated with crime prevention, property maintenance and lost revenues related to foreclosures might support foreclosure relief as well as other equitable growth initiatives.

7. Consider advocating **creative rental options**, including short-term leases and boarder arrangements in order to encourage both greater wealth maximization by Newark homeowners and continued tenure for senior owners.



III. Recommendations to Increase the Capacity of City Agencies to Advance Reforms

1. Invest in rent control operations

Newark's Rent Control Office is in charge of monitoring annual rents of ~50,000 housing units that fall under rent control (renter-occupied, not public housing, housing built before 1987). This is the division of Newark government that has the largest influence on maintaining the supply of affordable housing in the City. They currently have 3 staff and manage a customer-facing window with a constant flow of in-person citizen requests for assistance.

- a. Invest in digitization
 - i. City must support digitization of all forms as well as past records so the Office can properly monitor registration rates and rent increases.
- b. Registration requirements are weak
 - i. No deadline for registration
 - ii. No fee for registration
 - iii. All property owners in the city are required to register, even just to prove exemption. This is not widely known.
 - iv. Lack of marketing and education to property owners in city
- c. Enforcement capacity

Currently, the City has outsourced enforcement to individual citizens. Self-reporting is the only way the Rent Control Office currently pursues enforcement. They have no way to determine if landlords are charging rent as registered or are issuing illegal additional fees onto tenants because they currently have no enforcement officers. In order for rent control to preserve affordability in the city, there is a clear need for more enforcement officers.

This office can be partially or completely self-supporting if it can issue and collect registration fees.

2. Improve overall government transparency

Digitization and data-sharing: Newark should continue to digitize forms as well as digitize paper records related to housing and housing assistance.

Development incentives registry: There lacks an authoritative public record of the incentives given to developers in exchange for concessions. The city is currently in minimal compliance with the Governmental Accounting Standards Board's Statement No.77, which requires state and local governments to disclose certain information about tax abatement agreements for periods beginning after December

15, 2015. However, the city does not currently report other costs such as zoning and permitting variances, grants, loans, or transfers of capital assets such as city-owned land. In addition, the city lacks transparency on whether developers followed through on their promised benefits for affordable housing unit construction, jobs created, or other public amenities.

Foreclosure registry: Pass a municipal ordinance is passed which requires registration of properties in foreclosure, which allows for revenue generation *and* reliable data collection. Recommended fee is \$500 every six months. Municipality and County enter into a shared services agreement relating to the registry program, possibly with a third-party vendor.⁶

Affordable housing fund use disclosure: Make regular disclosures of accounts and expenditures of affordable housing funds.

3. Clarify the Collaborative and Functional Organization between City Departments

Cities with limited resources and disproportionate costs must find commonsense efficiencies to implement their programs for greatest impact. This requires clear roles, a lack of duplication, elimination of conflicts and professional synergies. In our research, we were not clear about issues such as the relationship between redevelopment authority and public housing administration; the roles of the Newark Community Economic Development Corporation and the Office of Planning, Zoning and Sustainability; landlord-tenant court and rent control registration. For example, we recommend that landlord-tenant court judges should disallow eviction proceedings by landlords who are not registered with the Rent Control Board or have outstanding tax liens or code enforcement violations. This will increase registration, as well as discourage use of eviction in weak cases.

4. Broaden Alliances with Professional Allies

Educational Anchors: The current mayoral administration has been wise to take advantage of resources available through anchor institutions, but the tasks may be broadened to include project-based alliances with institutions such as Rutgers School of Public Affairs and Administration (SPAA), the Cornwall Center for Metropolitan Studies, the Rutgers School of Public Health, the Rutgers Law School

⁶ See Hudson County's agreements with Community Champions (documents available through CLiME). According to Hudson County Division of Housing and Community Development, the uses may work as follows: *Use of Foreclosure Registry List*

- Registry is constantly updated as new properties are added.
- List can be utilized by multiple municipal departments including code enforcement to ensure properties are maintained.
- Hudson County Division of Housing and Community Development pulls monthly lists of those still occupying their homes and sends a resource package.

Hudson County Division of Housing and Community Development is working with nonprofit developers to determine the feasibility of obtaining bank-owned properties, providing necessary improvements and selling back to low/moderate income homeowners.

centers such as the Center for Law, Inequality and Metropolitan Equity (CLiME), the Rutgers Business School, NJIT and others.

ULI and professional organizations: We recommend the City consider partnering with the Urban Land Institute (ULI). Earlier this year, ULI announced a renewed commitment to its Advisory Services program, which taps industry experts from within ULI's national membership to volunteer their candid and objective advice to cities on specific real estate challenges. While this program has existed for 70 years, it is only recently that ULI has gained significant philanthropic partners to cover the costs of convening advisory panels, and has tasked its leadership to improve access to communities in need that it has not reached before. Newark needs to be able to plan regulations and programs that balance its obligations to the community with the benefit of professional advice from disinterested experts.



IV. Recommendations to Improve Existing Initiatives

Neighborhood Development/Model Neighborhood Initiative:

Described to us as an approach to deconcentrating poverty through distressed development zones in the South and West Wards maximizing the use of city-owned land, this initiative and others like it can be important sites of neighborhood innovation, including “mixed-use” development (where uses include community assets, too), “anchor tenancy” where anchors are key people as well as key uses, democratic participation and empowerment as well as improved service delivery. We specifically recommend incorporating the following into existing plans:

1. **Expand the notion of “anchor tenancy”** to include, for example, housing identified community leaders/organizers in specific developments; restricting some units/blocks/floors to specific workforce categories (e.g., artists, nurses, teachers, cops); clinics and other health-related operations; themed community-based organizations; arts organizations.
2. **Plan for central community land trusts (CLTs) and Limited-Equity Co-ops within larger development projects.** Particular parcels positioned centrally within larger developments may “anchor” community planning as either CLTs developed for a certain purpose (e.g., worker cooperative, child care and youth recreation center, performing arts enclave) or as limited-equity cooperatives for residential use. Limited-equity coops allow residents to own per-unit shares in a corporation that owns the building and builds wealth and a sense of community stakeholdership while imposing resale restrictions in order to maintain affordability.
3. **Give preferences to projects with CDC (equity) participation** (e.g., “AFFH subsidies,” bonuses). In order to advance the AFFH norm of city-involved project development, consider adding to the MNI selection criteria a clear preference for those projects in which CDCs partner with private developers or have some meaningful form of participation. Doing so may also aid in the kinds of public funding available for projects.
4. **Give preferences to projects that include wrap-around services.** Residential projects aimed at low- and very low-income families should anticipate the need for access to services and limitations on household mobility (e.g., transportation costs). Planning for wrap-around services within larger development projects will contribute to the stability of families and neighborhoods. Coordination among service providers may also strengthen a sense of community as they work interdependently.
5. **Give preferences to large developer-small/local developer partnerships and seek binding community benefits agreements that condition PILOTs and other perks on local training, financing or hiring.**
We heard many good ideas for how to overcome the significant challenges associated with developing affordable housing in distressed areas. The most optimistic combined established developer incentives (e.g., PILOTs) with partnerships between

larger and smaller firms to help either build them, finance them or both. Newark can also achieve some of these partnerships for growth through binding community benefits agreements.

6. **Create Community Planning Boards in each ward.** A consistent trait of poor neighborhoods is a lack of citizen involvement with planning what belongs and what doesn't. Yet local democracy is the cornerstone of suburban life. Cities like New York bridge this gap with community planning boards, which also collect information about their areas. Newark should consider doing the same in each ward, if not in each neighborhood.

Newark 2020:

Seek more "Teachers' Villages" workforce-restricted housing options and broader use of "Anchor Tenants."

We considered the "Live" prong of "Hire. Buy. Live. Local" since many of these recommendations could be applied to the link between housing development and targeted populations. In addition to the above, we'd like to see Newark get the kind of development designed to attract people who already have a financial stake in the city. Thematically, Teachers' Village does this. However, Newark could experiment with mixed-occupation designated housing along with the inclusion of particular "anchors" such as worker cooperatives, performing arts CLTs and Library Learning Hubs in order to maximize the assets of each residential community for the most stable, broadest possible membership.



V. Child-Centered Recommendations

1. Restore the **trauma-informed city** approach to institutional training and care across city agencies, but especially for educators, law enforcement, firefighters and EMT (first responders) and health practitioners.

A city that grows equitably must also be a loving city. A city delivers love through the quality with which its institutions interact with its residents, thereby helping to build personal opportunity from the inside out. Research at RU-N indicates high levels of toxic stress and psychological trauma among many of Newark's school children (and their families), interfering with their ability to learn and lead healthy, productive lives. As research on the prevalence of debilitating psychological trauma becomes better understood, especially among low-income families, the public institutions with which they interact have an increased obligation to help diminish exposure to traumatic events like community violence, abuse and removals and to help build resiliency through trauma-informed services. Newark can lead by adopting available models for personnel training in order to ensure that its children's invisible needs for safety, support and, when necessary, therapeutic intervention are recognized.

2. In education, encourage the **communities of care** model for high-poverty schools.

Newark's economic future relies on the full participation of its children in employment, civics and community. Yet many Newark kids do not even finish high school. The so-called "school-to-prison-pipeline" is fed by high absenteeism and drop-out rates. Educators can identify students at risk. Newark can be a model in developing curricular models that help even the most at-risk students succeed beyond graduation. Approaches like Youth build's "Communities of Care" model can be modified across city schools.

3. Plan for **housing disabled children**. We learned from clinicians that there is a shortage of housing accessible to disabled children, thereby leaving these families in acutely vulnerable and unstable housing arrangements. New housing development should prioritize them.
4. Ensure **equitable access to special education services** across *all* schools in Newark.

Just as regions like Essex county have seen the unequal distribution of affordable housing between wealthy suburb and working class city, special education services in Newark may not be evenly available across all public and private schools. Enforce the laws on equitable access for the benefit of all children.

5. Make public institutions like libraries into "civic learning hubs" with classes geared to current needs (e.g., coding).

Learning is naturally infectious when community members model it to each other in safe shared spaces. Libraries can be a hub of more than just books. They can

become de facto sites of “continuing education” for residents of all ages, with everything from coding classes for kids to financial literacy workshops for adults to computer basics for seniors. Community rooms may hold lectures, book fairs and candidate forums. Libraries also enjoy access to resource networks with other libraries in the region and the world. In some areas, schools and CBOs may also serve as neighborhood learning assets.

6. Consider establishing a Children’s Cabinet, a cross-sector team made up of mayors, superintendents, health and human services directors, and community and civic leaders to create integrated systems of opportunity and support from early childhood through to higher education. Six cities across the U.S. are partnering with the [By All Means initiative](#)⁷ at the Harvard Graduate School of Education to pilot this approach. Monitor learnings and outcomes.



⁷ <http://edredesign.org/by-all-means/news>

Appendix 1

Displacement Risk Indicator Matrix (DRIM)

CLiME, Fall 2017

Color Legend		
Higher risk	Lower risk but still high	Lower risk

2015	Newark		East Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vulnerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
1 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	High	31%	Less rent-burdened	26%	Less rent-burdened	28%	Equally rent-burdened	31%	More rent-burdened	34%	More rent-burdened	37%
2 RENT (Median gross rent)	Moderate	\$973	More expensive	\$1,026	Less expensive	\$859	Less expensive	\$945	Less expensive	\$909	More expensive	\$1,004
3 INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$33,139	More income	\$41,952	Less income	\$31,162	Less income	\$31,830	Less income	\$30,315	Less income	\$32,615
4 POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	29%	Less poverty	23%	More poverty	34%	Less poverty	29%	More poverty	32%	More poverty	30%
Market Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$900)	Low	42%	More affordable	30%	More affordable	53%	Less affordable	40%	Less affordable	47%	More affordable	39%
6 HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$1250, FMR for 2-bed)	Low	24%	More high-rent units	28%	Less high-rent units	19%	Less high-rent units	22%	Equal high-rent unit	24%	More high-rent unit	26%
7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 2012-2016)*	Low	7.7	More occupancy pe	9.5	More occupancy pe	11.4	Less occupancy pe	5.0	Less occupancy pe	5.2	Less occupancy pe	4.3
"Gentrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low	20,086		3,446		3,083		4,155		4,210		5,192
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	Low	22%	Less owner-occupa	18%	Less owner-occupa	19%	Less owner-occupa	22%	More owner-occupa	23%	More owner-occupa	26%
9 NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low	11%	More non-Hispanic	31%	Less non-Hispanic v	7%	Less non-Hispanic	8%	Less non-Hispanic	2%	Less non-Hispanic	2%
10 BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low	13%	Less college-educat	13%	More college-educat	19%	Less college-educat	13%	Less college-educat	12%	Less college-educat	13%

2000	Newark		East Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vulnerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
1 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% of households)	Moderate	23%	Less rent-burdened	18%	Less rent-burdened	22%	More rent-burdened	24%	More rent-burdened	24%	More rent-burdened	26%
2 RENT (Median gross rent)	Low	\$586	More expensive	\$600	Less expensive	\$456	More expensive	\$614	Less expensive	\$523	Less affordable	\$619
3 INCOME (Median household income)	Low	\$27,058	More income	\$32,464	Less income	\$23,642	More income	\$27,429	Less income	\$25,988	Less income	\$27,862
4 POVERTY (% of households with incomes below poverty level)	High	28%	Less poverty	21%	More poverty	39%	Less poverty	26%	More poverty	30%	Less poverty	27%
Market Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% of households paying <\$750)	High	76%	Less affordable	73%	More affordable	86%	Less affordable	71%	More affordable	78%	Less affordable	70%
6 HIGH RENTS (% of households paying >\$900, inflation-adjusted FMR)	Low	9%	More high-rent units	10%	Less high-rent units	5%	More high-rent unit	11%	Less high-rent units	8%	More high-rent unit	11%
7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (per 1000 housing units in 1997-2011)*	Moderate	24.5	Less occupancy pe	23.5	More occupancy pe	41.0	Less occupancy pe	16.8	Less occupancy pe	9.3	Less occupancy pe	14.4
"Gentrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (Number of households)	Low	21,738		4,129		2,714		4,313		4,515		6,057
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (% of households)	Low	22%	More owner-occupa	23%	Less owner-occupa	14%	More owner-occupa	23%	Less owner-occupa	21%	More owner-occupa	27%
9 NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% of population)	Low	14%	More non-Hispanic	48%	Less non-Hispanic v	5%	More non-Hispanic	16%	Less non-Hispanic	1%	Less non-Hispanic	5%
10 BACHELORS DEGREE (% of population)	Low	9%	Less college-educat	7%	More college-educat	9%	More college-educat	10%	Less college-educat	9%	More college-educat	11%

2000-2015 Change	Newark		East Ward		Central Ward		North Ward		South Ward		West Ward	
Vulnerability	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic								
1 EXTREME RENT BURDEN (% change in % of households)	More rent-burdened	37%	Larger increase	43%	Smaller increase	26%	Smaller increase	29%	Larger increase	43%	Larger increase	43%
2 RENT (% change in number)	More expensive	66%	Larger increase	71%	Larger increase	88%	Smaller increase	54%	Larger increase	74%	Smaller increase	62%
3 INCOME (% change in number)	More income	22%	Larger increase	29%	Larger increase	32%	Smaller increase	16%	Smaller increase	17%	Smaller increase	17%
4 POVERTY (% change in % of households)	More poverty	3%	Larger increase	5%	Decrease	-12%	Larger increase	9%	Larger increase	7%	Larger increase	12%
Market Dynamics	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic								
5 AFFORDABLE RENTS (% change in % of households)	Less affordable unit	-45%	Larger decrease	-59%	Smaller decrease	-38%	Smaller decrease	-44%	Smaller decrease	-40%	Equal decrease	-45%
6 HIGH RENTS (% change in % of households)	More high-rent units	166%	Larger increase	176%	Larger increase	262%	Smaller increase	100%	Larger increase	190%	Smaller increase	148%
7 OCCUPANCY PERMITS (% change in number of permits)*	Less occupancy pe	-69%	Smaller decrease	-60%	Larger decrease	-72%	Larger decrease	-70%	Smaller decrease	-44%	Larger decrease	-70%
"Gentrifier" Population	Characterization	Statistic	Compared to city	Statistic								
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (Change in number of households)		-1,652		-683		369		-158		-305		-865
8 OWNER-OCCUPIED (% change in % of households)	No change	0%	Decrease	-19%	Increase	33%	Decrease	-5%	Decrease	-9%	Decrease	-3%
9 NON-HISPANIC WHITE (% change in % of population)	Less non-Hispanic	-24%	Larger decrease	-35%	Increase	48%	Larger decrease	-53%	Increase	165%	Larger decrease	-53%
10 BACHELORS DEGREE (% change in % of population)	More college-educat	48%	Larger increase	87%	Larger increase	103%	Smaller increase	36%	Smaller increase	36%	Smaller increase	18%

Data Sources	
1/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000	6/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000
2/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000	7/ City of Newark Open Data Portal
3/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000	8/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000
4/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000	9/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000
5/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000	10/ American Community Survey 2011-2015, Census 2000

Notes
 *Occupancy permit data was pulled from City's open data portal and may not be reliable.

Appendix 2. Limitations of the Study and Issues for Future Research

The following is a list of items we acknowledge are relevant to these recommendations, but were not possible to study within the timeframe of the work. They importantly represent the kinds of data that can attract philanthropic and other nonprofit institutional interest and support that is commensurate with Newark's identity as a place to invest in. Therefore, it should be read as a list of limitations as well as items for future analysis.

- Fiscal state of the “boom” and fiscal implications of recommendations. We lacked a comprehensive budget analysis.
- Our ability to analyze the future impact of new development was limited by unreliable or unavailable data on certificate of occupancy permits and renovation permits.
- Transportation dynamics, efficiency and affordability
- Foreclosure analyses
- Comprehensive real estate equity analysis: Who gets subsidies, for what, who monitors and which parcels?
- Employment granularity: Who works where with what skills?
- Detailed asset mapping of neighborhoods
- Public health particulars (e.g., HIV, cervical cancer, mental health delivery, violence hot spots)
- Immigration specifics: Who comes from where, who leaves for what and where do they go?
- Crime data by geography: What kinds of crimes occur where and by whom? How can innovative traditional and community policing strategies help reduce violence, dislocation and higher fiscal costs?
- The education nexus
- Access to private funding streams and grants for increasing capacity

CLiME Communication Platforms:

Twitter https://twitter.com/Rutgers_Clime
FaceBook <https://www.facebook.com/RutgersClime/>
Blog <http://www.endinequality.com>
Website <http://www.clime.newark.rutgers.edu>
Email clime@rutgers.edu
YouTube <https://www.youtube.com/playlist?list=PLXsaqB6r2qVrJMrLSc6u3VDxNiMq20xEL>

Acknowledgements & Staffing

CLiME wishes to acknowledge that this report would not have been possible without the continued support of the Newark Chancellor's Office and the Graduate School, as well as the hard work and talents of Cristina Garmendia, Senior Research Fellow, and law student research assistants, Immanuel Adeola, Kelly Degen, Rexton Gordon and Fred Volcovinski. We are deeply grateful to have played a role in advancing this moving and important work.

Center on Law, Inequality and Metropolitan Equity
Rutgers Law School—Newark
123 University Avenue
Newark, New Jersey 07102

