Opportunity Zone Community Impact Assessment Tool

User Guide

Solomon Greene, Brett Theodos, Kathryn Reynolds, Brady Meixell, and Martha Fedorowicz

January 2020

Contents

Introduction

In 2017, Congress included the Opportunity Zone tax incentive in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act to encourage private investment in high-poverty or low- to moderate-income neighborhoods. This incentive allows investors to defer and reduce taxes on capital gains when they invest those gains in designated Opportunity Zones, which make up 12 percent of all census tracts in the US. In addition, gains from investments in Opportunity Zones are excluded from taxable income after 10 years (Theodos and Meixell 2019).

The need for investment capital in many communities across the US is significant and pressing. Most cities and regions include neighborhoods characterized by concentrated poverty and lacking basic amenities and services; this results in wide disparities in access to economic opportunity and mobility (Gourevitch, Greene, and Pendall 2018; Turner et al. 2018). Concentrated poverty has increased dramatically since the Great Recession (Kneebone and Holmes 2016), and people of color—especially African Americans—are much more likely to live in poor neighborhoods than are white households with similar levels of wealth or income (Aliprantis, Carroll, and Young 2019). The lack of access to capital in these neighborhoods is the result of market forces, past public policies such as redlining and Jim Crow laws, and ongoing discrimination and structural barriers (Kijakazi et al. 2016).[1]

The Opportunity Zone incentive is designed to make investments in real estate development and businesses in selected neighborhoods more attractive, potentially bringing a new class of investors and investment dollars into the places that need it most. Despite this promise, limited oversight and the lack of protections and guidelines in the initial legislation and subsequent regulations could mean that investments fail to address inequity (Theodos 2019). State and local governments, mission-driven investors, and local advocates can push for additional incentives that can be used to drive investments toward projects that meet local needs and improve social conditions, rather than exacerbating existing inequities. However, it is difficult to measure the community impact of a given project in a systematic way that helps make decisions about which projects to support.

To help fill this gap, the Urban Institute created the Opportunity Zone Community Impact Assessment Tool, which prospectively assesses the potential social impact of a local development project using evidence-based indicators. The tool can be used by any stakeholder interested in the social impact of an eligible investment in an Opportunity Zone, whether an operating business; a residential, commercial, or industrial development; or some combination of these types. The tool is available for public use at www.urban.org/oztool.

We hope public officials, philanthropic and community organizations, and mission-driven investors use the tool to target support to projects that strengthen communities and deliver benefits to residents. Project sponsors can use the tool to assess how well their proposed project aligns with community priorities and identify areas for improvement. Public sector and community leaders can use the tool to identify projects that risk harming communities and negotiate with project sponsors to make improvements. This user guide provides information about the tool, including how to interpret project scores, how we derived our indicators, and where to find additional resources.

Why We Created the Assessment Tool

The Urban Institute's early research on the Opportunity Zone incentive revealed not only its promise but also the risk that investments made by Opportunity Funds, or funds set up to direct investments in Opportunity Zones, could unintentionally exacerbate disparities between neighborhoods within regions and cities (Theodos and Meixell 2019). Subsequent conversations with practitioners, mission-driven investors, philanthropic leaders, and community advocates showed that all were concerned with maximizing the benefit of any support or approvals they might provide to an Opportunity Zone project. Further, each of these stakeholders had mechanisms for encouraging local investment—such as predevelopment and gap financing, grant dollars, endowments, and critical community support—that could be used to steer investors in Opportunity Funds toward certain projects. However, local actors stated that they did not have a way of reliably assessing the community impact of proposed projects.

To address this gap, Urban drew from evidence and expertise across a range of sectors—including community development, environment, health, housing, and justice—to develop the community impact assessment tool. The tool can be used to assess real estate projects and operating businesses for their community impact across several areas, including access to high-quality jobs, affordable housing, health, and transportation.

How the Tool Can Be Used

The Urban Institute developed the Opportunity Zone Community Impact Assessment Tool for project sponsors, investors, community-based organizations, policymakers, local community advocates, and other stakeholders interested in assessing the community impact of a local project. The tool can serve several purposes.

- Users can use project scores provided by the tool to direct incentives, support, and funding to those projects with potential to advance community priorities, affect local residents, and promote inclusive growth in their communities.

- The tool can inform local debate about the best use of public subsidies and other support for projects, especially if stakeholders with different perspectives (e.g., neighborhood advocates, project sponsors, and public leaders) assess the same project and get differing results. Identifying where there is disagreement about community impacts could be the basis for useful dialogue.

- Project sponsors can determine how their project might positively affect the community and where there may be room for improvement.

How the Tool Is Organized

The tool is made up of questions in seven impact areas: community goals and priorities; accessible and high-quality jobs; community wealth-building; affordable and accessible housing; environment and open spaces; health, social services, and cultural amenities; and transportation and connectivity. Tool users answer questions in each impact area, with some differences in the questions depending on the project type. Users can choose between residential, commercial, and industrial real estate projects and operating businesses, or they can choose a combination of types for mixed-use projects.

A crucial component of the tool is the first section: community goals and priorities. In this section, users rank community residents' priorities based on their engagement activities and local plans. At the end of the assessment, users receive a scorecard that includes an overall score weighted by this ranking; a summary of the anticipated level of social impact across areas; a graphic illustrating the unweighted scores by impact area; and responses to required questions. The tool also allows users to provide narrative responses ("show your work") when doing so would help validate a response to a required question or elaborate on how a project might deliver social impact beyond what is covered by the required questions. These optional responses appear in the scorecard, but they do not count toward the project's score.

This version of the tool is designed for beta testing. Urban will collect information from users that will be used to improve the tool. We encourage users to answer the questions at the end of the tool to help us make improvements to future versions.

Principles for Delivering Social Impact

Opportunity Zones are intended to benefit high-poverty and low- and moderate-income communities. But who should benefit, and how they should benefit, is not clear from the statute or regulations. Communities are dynamic and diverse, and residents and businesses are not fixed in place. To inform what success is for Opportunity Zone residents, we turned to two guiding principles: support mobility from poverty and advance racial equity.

Support Mobility from Poverty

In 2017, the US Partnership on Mobility from Poverty gathered insights from research, practice, and people who have experienced poverty to better understand what dramatically increasing mobility from poverty in the US would require. As part of its work, the partnership developed an expansive definition of mobility that has three components: **economic success**, **power and autonomy**, and **being valued in a community** (Acs et al. 2018; Ellwood and Patel 2018). Below, we discuss how the tool advances each of the three principles.

ECONOMIC SUCCESS

Opportunity Zone investments can have a large impact on the economic success of the surrounding community. Residential projects can create affordable housing, which lowers housing costs for residents and, in turn, can increase stability, promote positive health outcomes, and decrease disruptive moves for families with children. Commercial, industrial, and operating businesses can create jobs and bring new amenities like parks, grocery stores, and transportation. When these projects are locally owned or use local sourcing, they can increase community wealth and expand project benefits to surrounding local businesses.

But if projects are not developed with residents' needs in mind, they can create negative impacts by pricing out or displacing residents. Harmful projects could include those that drive gentrification and displacement or reduce air and water quality. Investments that repurpose naturally occurring or subsidized affordable housing as expensive rental or ownership units that price out current residents are perhaps the most harmful. The questions in this assessment tool are designed to determine whether a proposed project will support economic success for Opportunity Zone residents or risk displacing them or otherwise creating barriers to accessing jobs and economic opportunities.

POWER AND AUTONOMY

When creating this assessment tool, we wanted to enable Opportunity Zone residents to assess the benefits that capital will bring their community as a result of the Opportunity Zone tax incentive. With

this goal in mind, we designed the tool to start from a place of community voice and input by asking those completing the tool to share how they have engaged Opportunity Zone residents in determining community priorities and how their proposed project reflects these priorities.

BEING VALUED IN A COMMUNITY

Opportunity Zone residents may want to attract new investment to their communities, but they may also worry that the future prosperity that comes to the zone as a result will not be shared by all. By using this assessment tool, residents can assess projects against community priorities and influence action to reflect residents' vision of their community.

Advance Racial Equity

Opportunity Zones are disproportionately located in communities of color. While the average census tract in the US is more than 60 percent non-Hispanic white, the average census tract in Opportunity Zones is less than 40 percent white (Theodos, Meixell, and Hedman 2018). The shares of African American and Latino households in Opportunity Zones are significantly higher than the national average for all tracts and the average for tracts that were eligible for Opportunity Zone designations. Opportunity Zones also tend to have higher poverty rates and lower rates of public and private investment than the national average (Theodos, Meixell, and Hedman 2018).

Decades of racist policies and redlining have led to a lack of investment in communities of color across the US, especially low-income African American neighborhoods[2] (Kijakazi et al. 2016). Because of this lack of investment and the inequitable way that resources are held, residents in neighborhoods with high levels of poverty and high shares of people of color have had relatively little influence in shaping their communities and attracting development that aligns with community values and priorities (Turner et al. 2018). If done well, investments in Opportunity Zones can help reverse these trends and close racial gaps not only in access to capital and economic opportunity, but also in decisionmaking.[3] However, without community input and engagement surrounding an investment, it is less likely that projects will promote the inclusion and economic success of longtime residents. To be effective as a program, Opportunity Zones will have to ameliorate past disparities and ongoing barriers to resources.

Using the community impact assessment tool is one way to help assess whether investments benefiting from the Opportunity Zone tax incentive deliver positive outcomes in communities of color and help narrow racial disparities in access to capital and opportunities. The tool requires the user to rank community priorities, and it rewards projects that have engaged local communities to determine this ranking. Because Opportunity Zones are disproportionately located in communities of color, this

approach can help address racial gaps in "power and autonomy." The tool also includes several questions aimed at addressing racial disparities in business ownership and access to jobs.

We have not built the tool to directly measure racial equity, however. This is in part because not all Opportunity Zones have high shares of people of color and we designed the tool to apply broadly across designated zones. Ultimately, whether Opportunity Zones deliver on their promise of narrowing racial disparities in access to capital and opportunities will depend on whether more investments are made within Opportunity Zones that have high shares of people of color *and* whether those investments deliver positive impact to these residents. Our tool can help support the latter. We hope that using the tool can also help spark or support local conversations around racial equity—both within Opportunity Zones and across communities. In appendix B, we include resources for how to apply a racial equity lens when evaluating real estate development projects.

Interpreting and Applying Results

Your score is designed to indicate the social benefits and community impacts a project could achieve based on your answers to the community impact assessment tool. Scores depend on the answers provided, and we trust users to answer all questions truthfully and to the best of their knowledge. To the extent that there is uncertainty or disagreement over community priorities or anticipated project impacts, different users may receive different scores when evaluating the same project. When this occurs, we hope it sparks broader community discussion and closer consideration of the project's impacts and opportunities for improvement. Your score should serve as just one input when considering whether a project is likely to yield social benefits.

Overall project scores will fall into one of the following five tiers.

- 90 points or more: Based on your responses, the proposed project receives a "**very high**" score for expected community impact. If the project conforms to responses when executed, it is likely to provide strong social benefits that are aligned with community priorities.

- 75 to 89 points: Based on your responses, the proposed project receives a "**high**" score for expected community impact. If the project conforms to responses when executed, it is likely to provide substantial social benefits that are aligned with community priorities.

- 50 to 74 points: Based on your responses, the proposed project receives a "**moderate**" score for expected community impact. If the project conforms to responses when executed, it is likely to

provide moderate social benefits or benefits that are not fully aligned with community priorities.

▪ 35 to 49 points: Based on your responses, the proposed project receives a "**low**" score for expected community impact. If the project conforms to responses when executed, it is unlikely to provide social benefits and may conflict with or fail to align with community priorities.

▪ 34 points or fewer: Based on your responses, the proposed project receives a "**very low**" score for expected community impact. If the project conforms to responses when executed, it is unlikely to provide social benefits and likely conflicts with or undermines community priorities.

So You Have Your Results—Now What?

Your score can be used in several ways. A project sponsor may wish to share their score to solicit investments from Opportunity Funds and impact investors. A public entity, such as a local or regional government, may use a project's score to evaluate whether it qualifies for tax benefits and to understand the community impacts it will have. A nonprofit or community-based organization may use the project's score to work with the project sponsor to mitigate harms or increase benefits to community residents before the project begins. Table 1 lists some examples of stakeholders who might complete the assessment tool and how they might use their scores.

TABLE 1

How Different Stakeholders Might Use the Tool

Stakeholder type	Possible uses
Project sponsor	▪ Solicit investment from Opportunity Funds, impact investors, and other private funds. ▪ Share score with community groups to gain support for a project.
Public entity	▪ Evaluate proposed projects for tax benefits. ▪ Identify projects that present risks for closer scrutiny in development and permitting approvals.
Nonprofit or community-based organization	▪ Negotiate a community benefits agreement with a project sponsor. ▪ Seek funding for community-driven projects.
Project investor	▪ Find projects with maximal community benefits. ▪ Avoid projects that risk harming communities.

It is important to keep in mind that the score is not the final word on what a good project is, nor is it the last step in developing a project that maximizes community benefit. It could be a starting point for more formalized agreements, like community benefits agreements, or could be the basis for a public conversation about a specific investment. The tool can be used to preview potential issues in a project,

highlight avenues for increased benefits, or mitigate harms before a project is final. Project sponsors may wish to complete the tool at various phases in a project to demonstrate that they are responsive to community feedback.

Verifying Responses and Accountability

For this tool to be useful, those completing the questions must provide honest answers. One way to create accountability among tool users is to ask project sponsors to share the results of their scores publicly so that others may verify the responses provided. Communities might also consider asking multiple stakeholders to complete the tool with the information provided from the project sponsor to verify that they arrive at the same score.

Your score may also be a good starting point to negotiate more formalized agreements between the project sponsor and the community. Community members may wish to execute agreements with project sponsors to hold them to their commitments. Investors may also use the results to hold project sponsors accountable to the commitments they have made.

Limitations of the Assessment Tool

The assessment tool is not comprehensive. The questions were developed based on extensive research, multiple rounds of feedback from experts in the field, and results from a user testing questionnaire (see appendix A), but they may not be the right questions for your community. We attempted to account for the wide variety of community priorities by allowing users to rank which categories are of greatest importance to their community, but it's possible that some communities may have priorities not included in the tool. The tool also does not assess project feasibility—a project that receives a high score may still not be financially viable given the economic and political climate, and tool users should account for that in their plans. Your score is not the final word on what a good project is—it is one piece of information among various factors for consideration.

Next Steps

This is the beta version of the Opportunity Zone Community Impact Assessment Tool. We are eager for feedback on how the tool works in both conceptual and procedural terms. After you complete the substantive questions in the tool, you will be asked to provide feedback. Please do so—we value your responses. Also, as you proceed in decisionmaking or project-vetting, please send any additional feedback on how the tool was helpful or could be improved to opportunityzones@urban.org.

Appendix A. Methodology

Selection of questions

We developed and refined the questions in the Opportunity Zone Community Impact Assessment Tool through an iterative process that relied upon a scan of existing social impact assessment tools; subject-matter expertise at the Urban Institute; interviews with stakeholders in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County, Ohio; a workshop with national experts on Opportunity Zones, mission-driven investment, and community development; and feedback from local leaders in five markets during the piloting and testing phase.

To begin this process, we undertook a scan of existing project- or firm-level tools that addressed racial equity or social impact. Table A.1 shows which of our impact areas are covered by the social impact tools we reviewed. Of the nine tools we found,

- two were designed to measure racial equity at the project level, the Equitable Development Scorecard[4] and the Strong, Prosperous, and Resilient Communities Challenge's capital project screen survey[5] (SPARCC);

- two were designed to measure other types of social impact at the project level, the San Francisco Indicator Project's Healthy Development Checklist[6] and New York City's Environmental Quality Review Technical Manual[7];

- one was designed to assess racial equity for government policies and programs, the King County Equity Impact Review Tool[8];

- two were designed to measure social impact for firms or enterprises, the B Impact Assessment[9] and Just Capital's Just 100 Corporate Justness Rankings[10]; and

- two were designed to measure social impact for investment funds or firms, Aeris's Community Investing Impact Metric Set[11] and the GRESB Real Estate Assessment.[12]

Each tool measured racial equity and/or social impact using a range of questions or indicators related to economic development and jobs, wealth creation and entrepreneurship, transportation, housing, health, and environment.

TABLE A.1

Impact Areas Addressed in Existing Social Impact Tools

	Community input	Jobs	Wealth-Building	Housing	Environment	Health	Transportation
Equitable Development Scorecard	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
SPARCC	x	x	x	x	x	x	x
San Francisco Indicator Project	x	x		x	x	x	x
NYC Environmental Quality Review				x	x	x	x
King County Equity Impact		x		x	x	x	x
B Impact Assessment		x	x		x		x
Just Capital rankings		x			x	x	
Aeris impact metrics		x		x	x	x	x
GRESB real estate	x	x		x	x		

Source: Authors' analysis.

Next, we conducted semistructured interviews with advocacy groups, business owners, city and county government officials, developers, local investors, and neighborhood leaders in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County. Through these interviews, we sought to identify future Opportunity Zone investments and project types, to understand how local stakeholders define social impact and how they envision achieving positive social impact through Opportunity Zones, to identify and refine the criteria to include in our assessment of eligible Opportunity Zone projects, and to understand how our assessment tool could be used by a broad range of local stakeholders in support of racial and economic equity.

As we sought to create a tool that could be applied to any project or business receiving Opportunity Zone financing, we drew upon the existing tools (listed above) and racial equity frameworks being used in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County to conceptualize potential impact areas to include that would span the universe of community impact. After refining our overarching impact areas, we developed questions for each that would address potential community impact while maintaining brevity. We chose to ask different questions based on project type (residential, commercial, industrial, or operating business), aiming to capture the impacts possible and applicable for each eligible use.

After drafting an initial list of questions, we held a workshop in June 2019 with 20 people from across the country who have expertise in Opportunity Zones, mission-driven investment, and community development to gather feedback on the impact areas, questions, and scoring, as well as to better understand potential uses for the tool. These sessions provided detailed input into the general framework used for the tool and led us to edit question language and to add and remove questions.

The final edits to the questions came as a result of piloting and testing.

Piloting and Testing

Throughout the development process, we worked closely with partners at the Fund for Our Economic Future to pilot the assessment tool in Cleveland and Cuyahoga County through localized Opportunity Zone efforts led by a group of local government, nonprofit, and private stakeholders known as Opportunity CLE. The group provided feedback during the early stages of tool creation and eventually piloted the tool on two projects seeking Opportunity Zone financing in Cleveland.

The Urban Institute team also used a series of hypothetical Opportunity Zone projects to test tool questions and scoring.

A final stage of piloting was conducted in Alabama, Atlanta, Baltimore, and Washington State to ensure that the tool captured projects equally well in various regional contexts and housing markets, as well as in both urban and rural areas.

Scoring

The scoring system for the assessment tool has four components.

1. **Individual question scoring**: each question is assigned a score range based on its relative importance within an impact area.

2. **Bonus questions**: some impact areas contain bonus questions whose points are added *after* the individually weighted questions have been tallied.

3. **Impact area scoring**: scores for each impact area are calculated by totaling the scores for responses to individual questions and dividing by the maximum possible score (excluding the bonus questions).

4. **Impact area weighting**: each impact area is then weighted by a user-generated ranking based on community priorities to calculate the overall project score.

INDIVIDUAL QUESTION SCORING

Within each impact area, users are asked a set of questions tailored to the project type. Not all project types are asked the same questions or number of questions. For each question, we assign a score range, with each possible answer assigned a number within that range. Certain questions have larger score ranges than others based on relative importance. For instance, in the "accessible, high-quality jobs" category, the score range for the long-term jobs question is 5, compared with a range of 2 for the short-term jobs question. Score ranges were refined during the testing and piloting phase to ensure comparability across project types.

BONUS QUESTIONS

For some questions in the tool, affirmative responses indicate substantial community benefit; however, the benefit may be relatively uncommon or not always applicable. As a result, we count these questions as "bonus" questions—meaning that their points are added *after* the individually weighted questions have been tallied using the process described above. So, an affirmative answer will increase a project's score in that impact area (up to the maximum score possible without bonus questions), but a project that does not provide this benefit will not see its score decrease.

Questions scored as bonuses are listed in Table A.2.

Bonus Questions

Impact area	Question
Community goals and priorities	Is there a mechanism in place to hold the project sponsor accountable to commitments such as a community benefits agreement?
Accessible, high-quality jobs	Does the project sponsor or principal have a history of providing jobs for populations facing employment barriers?
Accessible, high-quality jobs	Do the project/business's hiring guidelines have language or practices that reduce barriers for populations facing employment barriers to apply and get hired?
Accessible, high-quality jobs	Will the project/business offer apprenticeships or on-the-job training opportunities?
Community wealth-building	Have project/business investors agreed to formal steps that will leave wealth in the business with considerations to the timing of the equity sale and selection of the buyer?
Community wealth-building	Will the project/business directly expand or incubate new entrepreneurs—for example, via a business incubator or accelerator? Will the project/business facilitate shared-employee or tenant ownership?
Environment and open spaces	Will the business produce a product or service that preserves, conserves, or restores the environment?
Environment and open spaces	Will the project facilitate site remediation?
Health, social services, and cultural amenities	Will the project/business create space for a health clinic?
Transportation and connectivity	Will the project/business increase community access to broadband?

IMPACT AREA SCORING

We calculate scores for each impact area by totaling the scores (including bonus questions) for responses to individual questions and dividing by the maximum possible score (excluding bonus questions). In this way, we standardize scores in each impact area, so the number of questions posed for a project type in an impact area does not determine its weight. The housing impact area is treated slightly differently. For projects that do not include a residential component, users are asked substantially fewer (or no) questions in this impact area. These projects default to a "do no harm" score, although they will receive a lower score if responses to questions suggest that they may cause displacement or exacerbate affordability challenges. This is done to ensure that community needs and priorities around affordable housing are considered and accounted for. For projects without a residential component, we encourage users to take caution in extrapolating based on limited inputs in this impact area.

Each impact area's score (before the impact area weighting described in the next section) is normalized to a scale of 1 to 10 shown in the graphic on the project's scorecard. We present the unweighted impact area scores to show how a project fares across impact areas. A project sponsor can use the disaggregated impact area scores to prioritize areas for improvement, especially when the community has prioritized those areas.

IMPACT AREA WEIGHTING

In the community goals and priorities section, we ask users to rank the other six impact areas against one another (1 being highest, 6 being of lowest relative importance). This assigns each impact area a weight that increases the scores of the most important impact areas while diminishing those of the least important. These weights are applied in descending order of relative importance: 2.5x, 1x, 1x, 0.75x, 0.5x, 0.25x (the community goals and priorities area always receive a 1x and is not included in weighting). The process of weighting, grounded in community priorities, allows the tool to adapt to different community environments. This proved to be an important factor in feedback from various communities, particularly for assuring that the tool was responsive to local conditions and needs.

After the weights are applied, the scores across all seven impact areas are summed. This combined score is then normalized to a scale of 0 to 100 to create the final project score.

Appendix B. Additional Resources

General Resources

OPPORTUNITY ZONE RESOURCES AND DATA TOOLS

Urban Institute web page containing Opportunity Zone publications and data resources:
https://www.urban.org/policy-centers/metropolitan-housing-and-communities-policy-center/projects/opportunity-zones

Citi City Builder tool:
https://www.citivelocity.com/citybuilder/eppublic/cb

Enterprise Community Partners' Opportunity Zone Explorer tool:
https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/opportunity360/opportunity-zone-eligibility-tool

Mastercard Center for Inclusive Growth's Inclusive Growth Score:
https://inclusivegrowthscore.com/

US Impact Investing Alliance, Beeck Center for Social Impact + Innovation, and the Federal Reserve Bank of New York's Opportunity Zones Reporting Framework:
https://ozframework.org/about-index

SOCIAL IMPACT AND RACIAL EQUITY ASSESSMENT TOOLS AND FRAMEWORKS

Government Alliance on Race and Equity's racial equity toolkit:
https://www.racialequityalliance.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/10/GARE-Racial_Equity_Toolkit.pdf

Riverside University Health System's healthy development checklist:
https://cheac.org/wp-content/uploads/2017/10/RUHS-HDC_FINAL09142017.pdf

Smart Growth America and National Complete Streets Coalition's "elements of a complete streets policy":
https://smartgrowthamerica.org/resources/elements-complete-streets-policy/

Strong, Prosperous, and Resilient Communities Challenge's capital project screen survey:
https://www.sparcchub.org/2018/03/20/a-new-tool-for-rethinking-community-investment-the-sparcc-capital-screen/

Equitable Development Principles and Scorecard:
https://www.metrotransit.org/Data/Sites/1/media/equity/equitable-development-scorecard.pdf

Resources in Each Impact Area

COMMUNITY ENGAGEMENT AND ALIGNMENT

Enterprise Community Partners' community engagement toolkit:
https://www.enterprisecommunity.org/opportunity360/community-engagement-toolkit

US Environmental Protection Agency's public participation guide: Charrettes:
https://www.epa.gov/international-cooperation/public-participation-guide-charrettes

Community Planning Toolkit:
https://www.communityplanningtoolkit.org/community-engagement

Michigan State University's placemaking guidebook:
https://www.canr.msu.edu/resources/pmedtguidebook

HIGH-QUALITY JOB CREATION AND ACCESS

B Impact Assessment:
https://bimpactassessment.net/?_ga=2.1124529.1841012908.1542727702-1448206116.1542727702

Good Jobs Institute's Good Jobs Strategy Diagnostic:
https://goodjobsinstitute.org/good-jobs-strategy-diagnostic/

PolicyLink's All-In Cities Policy Toolkit:
https://allincities.org/toolkit

US Equal Employment Opportunity Commission's barrier identification and elimination:
https://www.eeoc.gov/federal/directives/md715/section2.cfm

SMALL BUSINESSES AND WEALTH-BUILDING

National Association for Latino Community Asset Builders' Guide to Equitable Neighborhood Development:
https://nalcab.org/wp-content/uploads/2019/07/END-Toolkit.pdf

Aspen Institute's "Unleashing Latino-Owned Business Potential":
https://www.aspeninstitute.org/publications/unleashing-latino-owned-business-potential/

AFFORDABLE HOUSING

Abt Associates and NYU Furman Center's "Local Housing Solutions":
https://www.localhousingsolutions.org/

Grounded Solutions' policy toolkit for inclusive growth:
https://groundedsolutions.org/housing-policy-toolkit

Urban Institute's Housing Matters initiative:
https://housingmatters.urban.org/

ENVIRONMENT

Change Lab Solutions' Complete Parks Playbook:
http://www.changelabsolutions.org/sites/default/files/Complete-Parks-Playbook_FINAL_20150706.pdf

A Citizen's Guide to LEED for Neighborhood Development: How to Tell If Development Is Smart and Green:
https://www.nrdc.org/sites/default/files/citizens_guide_LEED-ND.pdf

HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

American Hospital Association's "Equity of Care: A Toolkit for Eliminating Health Care Disparities":
https://www.aha.org/ahahret-guides/2015-01-29-equity-care-toolkit-eliminating-health-care-disparities

World Health Organization's health equity assessment toolkit:
https://www.who.int/gho/health_equity/assessment_toolkit/en/

US Department of Health and Human Services' National Partnership for Action to End Health Disparities Toolkit for Community Action:
https://minorityhealth.hhs.gov/npa/files/Plans/Toolkit/NPA_Toolkit.pdf

TRANSPORTATION AND CONNECTIVITY

Smart Growth America's National Complete Streets Coalition:
https://smartgrowthamerica.org/program/national-complete-streets-coalition/

Los Angeles County Metropolitan Transportation Authority's transit supportive planning toolkit:
https://www.metro.net/projects/tod-toolkit/

PolicyLink's equitable development toolkit for transit-oriented development:
https://community-wealth.org/sites/clone.community-wealth.org/files/downloads/tool-policylink-TOD.pdf

Notes

1 Brett Theodos, Eric Hangen, and Brady Meixell, "'The Black Butterfly'" Racial Segregation and Investment Patterns in Baltimore," Urban Institute, February 2019, https://apps.urban.org/features/baltimore-investment-flows/.

2 Brett Theodos, Eric Hangen, and Brady Meixell, "'The Black Butterfly'" Racial Segregation and Investment Patterns in Baltimore," Urban Institute, February 2019, https://apps.urban.org/features/baltimore-investment-flows/.

3 See "Opportunity Zones—Guiding Principles and Perspectives," PolicyLink, accessed November 13, 2019, https://www.policylink.org/opportunityzones; and Kevin Alin and Peter Truog, "The Race for Economic Opportunity Is About to Begin. Who Is Ready?" *The Avenue* (blog), June 18, 2018, https://www.brookings.edu/blog/the-avenue/2018/06/18/the-race-for-economic-opportunity-is-about-to-begin-who-is-ready/.

4 "Equitable Development Principles & Scorecard: A Tool for Communities and Planners," The Alliance, 2016, http://thealliancetc.org/wp-content/uploads/2016/06/EquitableDevelopmentScorecard.pdf.

5 "Capital Project Screen Survey," SPARCC, 2018, http://www.sparcchub.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/03/SPARCC-Capital-Screen-Guide-Survey-Tool.pdf.

6 "Healthy Development Checklist," San Francisco Indicator Project, accessed December 22, 2018, https://www.sfindicatorproject.org/resources/development_checklist.

7 "CEQR: City Environmental Quality Review Technical Manual," New York City Mayor's Office of Environmental Coordination, 2014, https://www1.nyc.gov/assets/oec/technical-manual/2014_ceqr_technical_manual_rev_04_27_2016.pdf.

8 "King County Equity Impact Review Tool," King County, 2010, https://www.kingcounty.gov/~/media/elected/executive/equity-social-justice/documents/KingCountyEIRTool2010.ashx?la=en.

9 "The B Impact Assessment," B Impact Assessment, accessed December 22, 2018, https://bimpactassessment.net/?_ga=2.1124529.1841012908.1542727702-1448206116.1542727702.

10 "Just Capital Ranking Methodology 2017–18," Just Capital, https://com-justcapital-web-v2.s3.amazonaws.com/pdf/18May2018_JUST_Capital_2017_Ranking_Methodology.pdf.

11 "Community Investing Impact Metric Set: Guidance Paper for CDFIs" Aeris, 2017, https://www.aerisinsight.com/wp-content/uploads/2018/10/Aeris-Impact-Metrics-Guidance-Paper-for-CDFIs-Rev-July-2017.pdf.

12 "2018 Developer Assessment," GRESB Real Estate, 2018, http://gresb-public.s3.amazonaws.com/2018/Assessments-and-Reference-Guides/2018-GRESB-RE-Developer-Assessment.pdf.

References

Acs, Gregory, Amrita Maitreyi, Alana L. Conner, Hazel Rose Markus, Nisha G. Patel, Sarah Lyons-Padilla, and Jennifer L. Eberhardt. 2018. *Measuring Mobility from Poverty*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Aliprantis, Dionissi, Daniel Carroll, and Eric R. Young. 2019. "What Explains Neighborhood Sorting by Income and Race?" Working Paper 18-08R. Cleveland: Federal Reserve Bank of Cleveland.

Ellwood, David T., and Nisha G. Patel. 2018. *Restoring the American Dream*. Washington, DC: US Partnership on Mobility from Poverty.

Gourevitch, Ruth, Solomon Greene, and Rolf Pendall. 2018. "Place and Opportunity: Using Federal Fair Housing Data to Examine Opportunity across US Regions and Populations." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Kijakazi, Kilolo, Rachel Marie Brooks Atkins, Mark Paul, Anne E. Price, Darrick Hamilton, and William A. Darity Jr. 2016. *The Color of Wealth in the Nation's Capital*. Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Kneebone, Elizabeth, and Natalie Holmes. 2016. *U.S. Concentrated Poverty in the Wake of the Great Recession*. Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution.

Theodos, Brett. 2019. "A Tailored Opportunity Zone Incentive Could Bring Greater Benefits to Distressed Communities and Less Cost to the Federal Government." Statement before the US House of Representatives Committee on Small Business's Subcommittee on Economic Growth, Tax, and Capital Access, Washington, DC, October 17.

Theodos, Brett, and Brady Meixell. 2019. "How Chicago and Cook County Can Leverage Opportunity Zones for Community Benefit." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Theodos, Brett, Brady Meixell, and Carl Hedman. 2018. "Did States Maximize their Opportunity Zone Selections? Analysis of the Opportunity Zone Designations." Washington, DC: Urban Institute.

Turner, Margery Austin, Solomon Greene, Anthony B. Iton, and Ruth Gourevitch. 2018. *Opportunity Neighborhoods: Building the Foundation for Economic Mobility in America's Metros*. Washington, DC: US Partnership on Mobility from Poverty.

About the Authors

Solomon Greene is a senior fellow in the Research to Action Lab and the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center at the Urban Institute. His research focuses on how land-use and housing policy can improve access to opportunity and how data and technology can support more inclusive urban development. Before joining Urban, Greene was a senior adviser at the US Department of Housing and Urban Development, a senior program officer at the Open Society Foundations, a law fellow and adjunct professor at New York University, and a law clerk on the US Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals. Greene serves on the board of the National Housing Law Project. He received his BA from Stanford University, his MCP from the University of California, Berkeley, and his JD from Yale Law School.

Brett Theodos directs the Community Economic Development Hub at the Urban Institute, where he is a senior fellow in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center. His work focuses on economic and community development, neighborhood change, affordable homeownership, consumer finance, and program evaluation and learning. His economic and community development research includes evaluations of the US Economic Development Administration, the New Markets Tax Credit program, small business loan and investment programs, Opportunity Zones, and the US Department of Housing and Urban Development's Community Development Block Grant and Section 108 programs. He is studying how capital flows (or fails to flow) into communities and the roles of mission finance actors like community development financial institutions.

Kathryn Reynolds is a policy program manager with the Research to Action Lab. Her work focuses on equitable economic development and inclusive growth. Previously, she served on the White House Council on Strong Cities, Strong Communities, which was founded by President Obama to help achieve economic recovery in US cities. As the council's deputy director, Reynolds oversaw implementation of the Strong Cities, Strong Communities initiative in 14 cities nationwide and managed a council of

representatives from 19 federal agencies. She was a 2011–13 Presidential Management Fellow. Reynolds holds a master's degree in public administration from New York University's Wagner Graduate School of Public Service, where she focused on public policy and urban development.

Brady Meixell is a research analyst in the Metropolitan Housing and Communities Policy Center. His work focuses on community and economic development, racial and economic disparities, and place-based interventions.

Martha Fedorowicz is a policy analyst in the Research to Action Lab, where she works with local government agencies and nonprofits to deliver technical assistance and translate research into practical tools for policymakers. Before joining Urban, Fedorowicz was a special projects administrator with the City of Lansing, Michigan, where she developed tools, resources, and programs for the Department of Neighborhoods and Citizen Engagement and a summer policy associate in the City of Detroit's Department of Neighborhoods. A recent graduate of the University of Michigan's Gerald R. Ford School of Public Policy, she specialized in neighborhood development, local government innovation, civic engagement, and housing policy. Fedorowicz has a BA in political science and French from the University of Michigan and served as a Youth Development Peace Corps Volunteer in Morocco from 2012 to 2014.

Acknowledgments

- Cody Evans, Homecoming Capital

- Alex Flachsbart, Opportunity Alabama

- Debby Goldberg, National Fair Housing Alliance

- Larry Jackson, US Department of Housing and Urban Development

- William McCusker, Habidatum

- Aditya Rau, Mastercard Center for Inclusive Growth

- Caroline Ross, Sorenson Impact

- Charles Rutheiser, Annie E. Casey Foundation

- Fran Seegull, US Impact Investing Alliance

- Ben Seigel, Baltimore Development Corporation

- Peter Truog, Opportunity Exchange

The views expressed are those of the authors and should not be attributed to the Urban Institute, its trustees, or its funders. Funders do not determine research findings or the insights and recommendations of Urban experts. Further information on the Urban Institute's funding principles is available at urban.org/fundingprinciples.

500 L'Enfant Plaza SW
Washington, DC 20024

www.urban.org