Expert Report of john a. powell in Davis v. CMHA
I. Introduction

Across the United States, the public housing stock is in great need of repair and rehabilitation. Where scarce funds are allocated for that purpose, they meet a growing demand for low-income residents to enjoy safe, improving neighborhoods proximate to public transportation and employment opportunities. This is especially true where public housing is located in neighborhoods with relatively lower levels of poverty and improving economic conditions, such as Westwood, Cincinnati.

In 2006 the Defendant, Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority (“CMHA) submitted a grant application to the United States Dept. of Housing and Urban Development (“HUD”) to rehabilitate the scattered site, public housing residence at 2329 Harrison Avenue (“2329 Harrison”). Specifically, CMHA sought and was awarded federal funds to install central air conditioning, fully remodel the kitchens and update all electrical systems in the 12 unit building built approximately 40 years ago. The planning for modernization was completed by mid-2011.

CMHA notified the families residing in the 12 units on Harrison Avenue that the federally funded modernization plan to rehabilitate the units would require them to relocate. The residents at 2329 Harrison were relocated in June, July, and August of that year. The relocation plan was based upon Defendant’s Transfer Policy, and the residents were not offered the opportunity to return.

In August, 2011, Defendant’s Board of Directors was scheduled to consider the bids publicly received for the modernization contract and award the contract accordingly. Instead, the Board refused to approve the modernization solicitation. The only public opposition to the staff recommendation to modernize the building came from members of the “Westwood Civic Association,” who also picketed the meeting, Plaintiffs contend that this refusal to modernize the public housing building at 2329 Harrison was a violation of their rights, and has a racial and community impact.

It is my expert opinion that the empirical evidence supports Plaintiffs’ contentions. Specifically, the available data indicates that the 2329 Harrison Avenue location is in an area of improving economic condition, proximate to accessible public transit in a main corridor to downtown Cincinnati. There are only 41 units of public housing in the neighborhood of Westwood. Therefore, denying its own federally funded modernization plan has the effect of excluding low-income public housing residents from meaningful fair housing options and may be evidence of disproportionate racial impact, and thereby a violation of fair housing rights.

CMHA has agreed to develop public housing in Hamilton County beyond the boundaries of the City of Cincinnati. The outcome of the 2329 Harrison building may portend the future of public housing units located in improving, higher opportunity neighborhoods throughout the region. Local opposition to modernization and rehabilitation results in effective denial of public housing residents of housing in all but the most distressed and low opportunity neighborhoods. The racial segregation and economic isolation of public housing residents in the Cincinnati metropolitan region has not only harmed the life chances of these individuals, but the harms the long-term prospects and vitality of the region as a whole.
II. Statement of Qualification

I am the Executive Director of the Haas Diversity Research Center and hold the Robert D. Haas Chancellor’s Chair in Equity and Inclusion at the University of California-Berkeley’s School of Law. I graduated from Stanford University with a B.A in Psychology and a Philosophy minor in 1969. I went on to receive my Juris Doctor from Boalt Hall at the University of California at Berkeley in 1973. From 1978 to 1980, I was a Post-Graduate Human Rights Fellow at the University of Minnesota.

I am the founder and past Executive Director of both the Kirwan Institute for the Study of Race and Ethnicity at the Ohio State University and the Director of the Institute on Race and Poverty at the University of Minnesota, and have served as National Legal Director of the American Civil Liberties Union (ACLU) and Director of Legal Services for the City of Miami, Florida. I have taught at Columbia University, Harvard Law School, American University, The University of San Francisco School of Law and the Law School at the University of Minnesota.

I am a member of the National Bar Association, the National Conference of Black Lawyers and the National Housing Law Center Association. I have worked with the National Housing Law Project, the Minnesota Supreme Court’s Implementation Committee on Multicultural Diversity and Racial Fairness and am a former chair of the Minneapolis Affordable Housing Task Force.

In addition, I have lived and worked in India, South America, Europe and Africa where I served as a consultant to the governments of Mozambique and South Africa. I served as part of a research team looking at comparative poverty in South Africa, Brazil and the United States. I have an ongoing working relationship with the Ford Foundation to develop strategies to ensure that opportunities and resources made available in the aftermath of hurricane Katrina actually reach the people who need them the most. I recently advised the United Nations’ Durban conference to track race and poverty, and this recommendation was part of the official recommendations in the final report.

I am recognized as an expert on issues relating to race, ethnicity, poverty and the law. Over the past 10 years, I have overseen over sixty funded research projects. Many of these projects focused on expanding our understanding of racial disparities and the structures from which they arise. These projects have been international, national, and local in scope. I am a prolific writer with four books, 15 book chapters and more than 70 invited journal articles, essays and position papers listed on my curriculum vitae.

I have published four books including In Pursuit of a Dream Deferred: Linking Housing and Education Policies. I have contributed book chapters to anthologies analyzing the entrenchment of racial disparities through urban sprawl, examining regionalism, understanding racial categories, understanding how structural racism functions in America and understanding the contributions of government taxation policies and housing policies to segregation. I have written extensively about racial justice and regionalism, concentrated poverty and urban sprawl, the link between housing and school segregation, opportunity-based housing, and other issues and I have published over 50 articles in academic journals, law reviews, and newspapers.
I am considered to be a leading expert in the area of opportunity-based housing and I have played an integral role in the development and implementation of the concept. Specifically, I have published a number of studies related to opportunity-based housing, spoken throughout the country on the topic of opportunity-based housing, and have worked with numerous opportunity-based housing initiatives. I served as the lead expert witness in the Thompson v. HUD case, one of the most significant fair housing cases in recent years. HUD was found liable for failing to take affirmative steps to implement an effective remedial regional strategy for desegregation and poverty de-concentration in Baltimore. As part of the remedial phase of the litigation, I designed a potential remedy to desegregate Baltimore’s public housing using the opportunity-based housing approach.

My recommendation to employ the “communities of opportunity” approach in the Baltimore region to remedy HUD’s fair housing violation has been embraced by both the NAACP LDF and Maryland ACLU, which has recently (8/24/12) announced a settlement with HUD, adopting my approach and citing my report.

I was also the expert witness for a class action suit against the Lucas Metropolitan Housing Authority in the Toledo metropolitan area, using a similar framework and set of principles. The opportunity-based housing concept was influenced by my earlier work mediating a dispute between advocates of in-place affordable housing strategies and mobility based affordable housing strategies in the Chicago region. This work expanded into an early opportunity mapping initiative in the Minneapolis-St. Paul region and my work advising Chicago Metropolis 2020. As a consultant I advised Metropolis 2020 to adopt the opportunity-based housing framework, which it did. Since my work with Metropolis 2020 the organization has worked with major employers to better connect housing and employment in the region.

I have also worked with the Leadership Council for Metropolitan Open Communities in Chicago (LCMOC). The LCMOC was the largest fair housing organization in the nation, and was founded as a result of Dr. Martin Luther King’s open housing campaign in 1966. LCMOC administered the Gautreaux program in Chicago and thus has unique experience in understanding the effect of place on the outcome of subsidized housing residents. In 2001, I prepared a policy paper outlining the potential for an opportunity-based housing framework for the Chicago region. The LCMOC is using the opportunity-based housing framework to further both their advocacy and efforts to reform policy for the Chicago region. I have also consulted with HUD on a number of issues, including the development an opportunity based model.

My work in applying the opportunity-based housing framework has expanded beyond the Chicago region and I have applied the model from a research and policy perspective in multiple states and regions. Most recently, I advised the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Agency on how to modify their Low Income Housing Tax Credit guidelines to reflect principles of the opportunity-based housing framework. I conducted several recent statewide research projects on the connection between Low Income Housing Tax Credit housing production and opportunity. The most recent projects—in North Carolina and Maryland—assessed how state housing finance agency policies were siting developments
relative to segregation and opportunity. In 2004, I completed an opportunity analysis of the subsidized housing supply in Columbus, Ohio for a faith-based regional housing advocacy agency.

I am in high demand as a speaker and average about 75-100 speeches a year to groups to policymakers, business executives, faith-based organizations, advocacy groups and funding organizations. I am known as one of the pre-eminent authorities in the country on linking metropolitan growth patterns to civil rights. In the past few months alone I have spoken about race, regionalism and equity at three national conferences and several national and regional training events for the Gamaliel organization, a national faith-based foundation that trains and supports community organizers. I cosponsored a national “Race and Regionalism” conference in May of 2005 with the Institute of Race and Poverty and am co-editing a book to be published from conference findings in 2006. I was awarded a grant by an organization of African American business leaders in Cleveland to assess the impact of regionalism on the social, economic and political health of the African American community in the Cleveland region. I supervised a team of experts from different disciplines, including demographers, planners, mappers, sociologists and psychologists. We produced a report that has been used for planning in the Cleveland Area for the last three years. I also am cofounder of the African American Forum on Race and Regionalism, a group representing the leading African American experts on interactions between regional dynamics and racial disparity.

My curriculum vitae is attached to this report, and provides a more detailed look at my accomplishments and qualifications. In preparing my report, I have been assisted by Stephen Menendian, Assistant Director for the Haas Diversity Research Center and Mikyung Baek, a Research Associate at the Kirwan Institute. The methods of analysis, secondary sources, databases, and other sources that I rely upon in this report are consistent with the manner in which I routinely address issues and questions of the nature discussed in this report.

III. Low-Income Housing in Westwood and Hamilton County, Ohio

2329 Harrison is located in the Cincinnati neighborhood known as Westwood. Westwood is the largest neighborhood in the City of Cincinnati, with over 35,000 residents, incorporating three census tracts and 26 census block groups. To its south, Westwood is bordered by the Cincinnati neighborhood of West Price Hill; to its north, Mt. Airy; to its east, the neighborhoods of North and South Fairmont; and finally the City of Cheviot, Ohio to its western most border. It is located on the far west-side of Cincinnati. Major neighborhood corridors include Harrison Avenue, Montana Avenue, Queen City Avenue, and Werk Road (see Figure 1 below).
Figure 1

One of the claims of the Westwood Civic Association, described in the “Westwood 2010 Strategic Plan” is that “a disproportionate amount of subsidized housing is located in Westwood” (pages 4 and 19). As is evident from the following map, however, Westwood does not have a disproportionate amount of subsidized housing; Westwood has less than the County or City averages in this regard.
There are only 41 units of public housing in the neighborhood of Westwood. No census block group in Westwood contains more than 12 public housing units. The Harrison Avenue public housing building is the only public housing unit in that block group. The modest amount of public housing in Westwood is dispersed fairly evenly across Westwood. The Hamilton County map illustrates the fact that many other census block groups contain much larger concentrations of public housing by comparison to Westwood.

With respect to subsidized housing, which includes public housing, housing vouchers and other project based government assisted housing for low income persons, Westwood has approximately 1,100 subsidized housing units or 6% of total housing units. That is much less than the 11.5% average for the City of Cincinnati. With respect to public housing which is owned and operated by CMHA, Table 1 indicates the ratio of public housing in Westwood compared to the County. Westwood has proportionally much fewer public housing units than the County as a whole. Specifically, Westwood contains less than 1% of the total public housing units in the County, despite having almost 5% of the total housing units in Hamilton County. Despite being the largest neighborhood in the city, Westwood has only 41 public housing units out of nearly 5,000 public housing units in the County as a whole.
One of the concerns raised in the Westwood Civic Association’s Strategic Plan is the ratio of owner-occupied units in Westwood. In particular, the Plan states that “a key goal of the Strategic Plan is to promote home ownership in the community. [...] A higher homeowner-occupied rate will result in a more stable neighborhood.” While a higher homeowner-occupancy rate might result in a more stable neighborhood, the Strategic Plan does not carefully distinguish between privately owned rental housing and other forms of rental housing, such as subsidized or public housing in relation to this goal.

Eliminating or reducing subsidized housing may not contribute to the goal of neighborhood stability. Subsidized housing is likely to be a source of housing stability in contrast to a private housing stock buffeted by foreclosures and real estate market turmoil. Moreover, subsidized housing is likely to be more stable than the privately owned rental units that are common in the Westwood neighborhoods. By the Plan’s own admissions, Westwood was the site of intense rental unit housing development in the last 50 years (page 11). The Westwood Civic Association has made demolition and transitioning these properties a priority, which could contribute to greater neighborhood stability. But it is a mistake to assume that the same problems of turnover and instability inherent in private rental housing apply to subsidized housing. In fact, the availability of rehabilitation and modernization funds for older public housing stock belies this notion. 2329 Harrison has been a stable source of housing for over 40 years, with some of the same tenants for over half of that duration. Plaintiff’s Cueston Morris and Carla Kinkade were each residents of 2329 Harrison for more than 20 years, prior to being relocated in 2011.

The percentage of owner occupied housing have increased in every census tract in Westwood from 1990 to 2010 (see maps below). The 2329 Harrison Avenue census block group has had an increase in the percentage of owner occupied housing units from 42.88% in 2000 to 49.79% in 2010, although the boundaries of the block group have shrunk. These facts also suggest that there are fewer affordable housing options available in Westwood.
Contrary to the claims advanced by the Civic Association in its public representations, the neighborhood is not in decline, nor does Westwood contain a disproportionate amount of subsidized housing units. In fact, just the opposite is true. Westwood contains a disproportionately low amount of subsidized and public housing relative to Hamilton County. Although it may be true that the community is interested in reducing rental property and increase owner-occupancy, the public housing at 2329 Harrison is the wrong target if the goal, as avowed, is neighborhood stability. Even if this goal were appropriate for the Civic Association and defendant to pursue, it would not justify ignoring the rights of tenants to be free of
discrimination and live in an integrated community. This is especially the case where public housing stock already exists. If the efforts of the Strategic Plan are successful, then the improvements in education and quality of life in the neighborhood will make Westwood an even better living environment and increase educational and employment opportunities for low-income residents fortunate enough to reside within them. The demolition or transition of rental housing reduces the available supply of affordable housing at a time of increased demand, reducing housing options for low-income families. The failure of the CMHA Board of Directors to approve the modernization plan, and to give effect to the wishes of the Westwood Civic Association, not only undermines the stability of the Harrison Avenue neighborhood, but it also threatens the future of fair housing for low-income residents in Westwood, and increases the likelihood that CMHA’s public housing residents are likely to be more racially and economically isolated.

IV. Race and Homeownership in Westwood

The following map (Figure 4) illustrates the distribution of the non-white population in Hamilton County as well as Westwood.

**Hamilton County, Ohio**
Proportion of Non-White Population in 2010 by Census Block Group

![Map of Hamilton County showing the distribution of non-white population in Westwood.](image)

*Figure 4*
As is the case in most major metropolitan regions, patterns of racial concentration are evident throughout Hamilton County, and not just Westwood. The census block group with the 2329 Harrison counted 596 residents in the 2010 census, 71.31% black and 23.83% white. While it may be the case that there are a disproportionate number of minority residents in eastern Westwood, that can hardly be attributed to the presence of the 2329 Harrison, which had just 12 units and 19 people living there. Furthermore, even if the 2329 Harrison were demolished, and families permanently displaced, it is impossible to conclude that this would result in a lower non-white concentration. The prevailing pattern suggests otherwise. Although the concentration of racial minorities, and African Americans in particular, may be higher in Westwood than the population of Hamilton County as a whole, it is certainly lower than many other far more racially concentrated neighborhoods in the metropolitan region.

Importantly, while homeownership rates have increased in Westwood, and despite a larger non-white population in some of the census block groups in eastern Westwood, the percentage of homeowners that are non-white are well below the non-white population in these neighborhoods. The percentage of homeowners who are non-white in the census block group with 2329 Harrison is 42.07% compared to 49.78% for all householders. Non-white homeownership lags significantly behind white homeownership in Westwood. With respect to African American homeownership, the lag is even greater.iii

![Figure 5](image-url)
V. The Opportunity Framework

The Geography of Opportunity

Most Americans readily appreciate the importance of growing up in the right neighborhood. Decades of empirical research validate these intuitions, and vividly illustrate a powerful series of relationships between family residence and an individual’s projected life chances along a number of scales. The geographically varying set of institutions, systems and markets dramatically influence a person’s achieved socioeconomic status. Together, these institutions, systems and markets constitute the “opportunity structure.” This structure serves to enhance or diminish an individual’s life chances depending on their location within it.

The opportunity structure operates directly without regard to the decisions made by individuals or parents on behalf of an individual by imparting high level skills through the educational system and providing access to quality employment opportunities, viable transportation, quality childcare, and primary health care providers. The opportunity structure also operates indirectly by influencing the decisions that people make within the structure. The range and quality of opportunities available depending upon one’s location within the structure dramatically influences the decisions of individuals within the structure that will in turn affect future socioeconomic possibilities. For example, individuals with limited skills and few economic opportunities confront not simply fewer choices, but reduced incentives and expected benefits from making decisions that correlate with greater achieved socioeconomic status, such as refraining from childbearing until marriage or avoiding participation in the criminal labor market. Consequently, the decisions made within low opportunity contexts often feed back to the detriment of individuals located within that space in the form of felony convictions, reduced educational attainment, and fewer developed job skills.

Within the United States, the web of physical, social, and cultural influences that constitute the opportunity structure vary across three spatial domains: 1) metropolitan regions, 2) municipal jurisdictions, and 3) neighborhoods. Metropolitan regions feature distinct economic conditions that affect all of the markets within the region, regardless of the strength of individual municipal or suburban areas within the region. Even thriving communities such as Livonia, Michigan are negatively affected by the depressed economic circumstances in the Detroit metropolitan region. A stronger metro Detroit would produce an even more vibrant Livonia. Using Michigan as an example, the quality and range of services and programs, such as the provision of primary education, recreation or safety programs, depend upon the municipality, especially the tax base capacity of the jurisdiction. The tax base capacity of jurisdictions, a function of the property values and commercial business within the municipality, vary within metropolitan areas. Municipal zoning ordinances and land use policies play a role in this process. Even within municipal jurisdictions, neighborhood conditions play a powerful role on the quality of life and access to opportunity of individuals. Neighborhoods vary in terms of peer influences, including exposure to non-standard spoken English, safety and amenities, as well as social networks and organizations. The proximity to parks, sidewalks, and safe playgrounds can have a direct impact on physical and emotional well-being. At the same time, neighborhoods determine exposure to both environmental contaminants as well as physical violence.
**Opportunity Mapping**

Because the opportunity structure is spatial it can be represented and mapped using geographic information systems technology. Mapping opportunity requires selecting variables that indicate high or low opportunity. The selection process is driven by social science research and empirical evidence that supports the use of such indicators. This process is only limited by the availability of reliable data and the strength of underlying research. High opportunity indicators include low unemployment rates, low neighborhood poverty rates, increased proximity to libraries, and a greater number of health clinics in the neighborhood, high performing schools and low crime rates. Low opportunity indicators would be low graduation rates, high student teacher ratios, remote access to employment, and unsafe environments.

Using twenty-seven different opportunity indicators in five different opportunity areas (Education and Child Welfare, Economic Opportunity and Mobility, Housing, Neighborhood and Community Development, Public Health, Public Safety and Criminal Justice), my team at the Kirwan Institute created an opportunity map for the entire state of Ohio (see Map 1). For each indicator, data was gathered for the State at the census tract level and analyzed at that level. The comprehensive map represents the composite of all of the opportunity indicators. The map geographically represents the State in terms of the quintiles very high, high, moderate, low, or very low opportunity. See the Appendix for a table with a complete list of indicators.

The quintiles were calculated after an index was generated by a standardizing process known as creating “z scores.” A z score is a statistical measure that quantifies the distance (measured in standard deviations) a data point is from the mean of a data set. The use of z scores allows data for a census tract to be measured based on their relative distance from the data average for the entire region. The final “opportunity index” for each census tract is based on the average of all z scores for all indicators by category. The corresponding level of opportunity (very low, low, moderate, high, very high) is determined by sorting all census tracts into quintiles based on their opportunity index scores. Thus, the census tracts identified as “very high” opportunity represent the top 20% of scores among census tracts. Conversely, census tracts identified as “very low” opportunity represent the lowest scoring 20% of census tracts. Z scores are helpful in the interpretation of raw score performance, since they take into account both the mean of the distribution and the amount of variability (or the standard deviation). The z score indicates how far the raw score is from the mean, either above it or below in standard deviation units. A positive z score is always above the median (upper 50%). A negative z score is always below the median (lower 50%) and a z score of zero is always exactly on the median or equal to 50% of the cases. Thus, when trying to understand the overall comparative performance of different groups with respect to a certain variable, we can assess how a certain group (of individuals, tracts, etc.) is performing with respect to the median performance for the certain variable. No weighting was applied to the various indicators; all indicators were treated as equal in importance.
This map displays the spatial pattern of distribution of opportunity in Ohio based on Education, Economic Mobility, Housing & Neighborhood, Public Health and Public Safety & Criminal Justice indicators.

Source: US Census 2000; HUD, ODRC, ODE, USDA (Rural Devel.); State Library of Ohio; ESRI Date: Feb. 13, 2009
A similar map, but just for Hamilton County with a zoomed in snapshot of Westwood has been created, based on 2000 Census data.

**Hamilton County, Ohio - Opportunity Map 2000**

![Map of Hamilton County, Ohio - Opportunity Map 2000](image)

**Figure 7**

*Opportunity Segregation by Race*

Nationally, our opportunity structures have a racial footprint. African-Americans and Latino’s tend to be disproportionately located within the lower opportunity areas, even controlling for income level. For example, in the State of Massachusetts, we found that 90% of African-American and Latino households in 2000 were isolated in the lowest opportunity neighborhoods in the State.\(^{xvi}\) By contrast, only 31% of White, Non-Latino households were found in low-opportunity neighborhoods.\(^{xvii}\) Low-income Whites were not as concentrated in low-opportunity communities as other races. Only 42% of low-income White households were living in low-opportunity communities, compared to more than 95% of low-income Latinos, and 93% of low-income African-Americans.\(^{xviii}\) Conducting a more recent analysis of Florida’s four major metropolitan regions, Miami-Dade, Orlando, Tampa, and Jacksonville, we found that 7 out of 10 African Americans and half of all Latinos live in low opportunities areas, while only 3 out of 10 non-Hispanic Whites live in such areas.\(^{xix}\) Similar patterns obtained in a study of Austin, Texas.
While 39% of Whites in the region lived in very low- or low opportunity census tracts, 60% of Latinos and African Americans were concentrated in these tracts.\textsuperscript{xx}

The Kirwan Institute’s two-year research study of Ohio found that Black Ohioans are disproportionately concentrated into the lowest opportunity neighborhoods.\textsuperscript{xxi} Nearly 3 out of 4 Black Ohioans, 1 in 2 Latino Ohioans and 1 in 4 Asian and White Ohioans were found in the State’s very low and low opportunity neighborhoods (which represent 2/5s of the State’s total census tracts). See Table 2 below, from the full Report\textsuperscript{xxii}:

### Table 2: Proportion of total State population by race, within each neighborhood type (based on neighborhood opportunity analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Opportunity Rank</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low and Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>26.66%</td>
<td>73.64%</td>
<td>48.37%</td>
<td>22.67%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>22.60%</td>
<td>10.53%</td>
<td>19.00%</td>
<td>13.31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High and Very Opportunity</td>
<td>50.74%</td>
<td>15.82%</td>
<td>32.56%</td>
<td>64.02%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importantly, these trends maintain even across income groups. Significant and disproportionate concentrations of Black Ohioans of all income groups are found within low and very low opportunity neighborhoods (see Figure 2). More than 80% of low income Black households lived in low opportunity areas (areas representing just 2/5s of the State’s census tracts). For low income Whites, only 38% lived in low opportunity areas; for low income Latino and Asian households, these figures were 52% and 29% respectively. Higher incomes for many Black households did not necessarily translate to living in high opportunity areas at rates similar to other racial groups. More than 2 out of 3 middle income Black households and more than 1 in 2 high income Black households lived in low opportunity neighborhoods.

Comparative figures for Whites indicate that less than 1 in 3 middle income White households and less than 1 in 5 high income White households live in low opportunity neighborhoods. This geographic analysis indicates that Black Ohioans are disproportionately isolated in lower opportunity neighborhoods in Ohio, at rates greater than all other racial groups, regardless of income level.
Table 3: Proportion of the State’s total racial population (subcategorized by household income), within each neighborhood type (based on neighborhood opportunity analysis)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Type</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Latino</th>
<th>Asian</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low and Very Low Opportunity</td>
<td>37.92%</td>
<td>82.78%</td>
<td>51.75%</td>
<td>28.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate Opportunity</td>
<td>24.20%</td>
<td>8.42%</td>
<td>18.29%</td>
<td>14.38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High and Very Opportunity</td>
<td>37.88%</td>
<td>8.80%</td>
<td>29.96%</td>
<td>57.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8 below is an opportunity map for the Hamilton County, illustrating the geographic concentration of African-Americans into the State’s lowest opportunity neighborhoods. Each green dot represents 500 African-American families. Non-whites, and African-Americans in particular, are disproportionately segregated, not simply by race, but from opportunity throughout the state and within the Cincinnati metropolitan region.
Reducing or eliminating affordable housing options in moderate or high opportunity neighborhoods has the predictable consequence of relegating most African-American families to low or very low opportunity neighborhoods. As we will show, opportunity indicators are improving in the Westwood area.
VI. Opportunity in Westwood

Westwood is a large and diverse community. Using four core opportunity indicators, Median Household Income, Educational Attainment, Neighborhood Poverty Rates, and Unemployment rates (see table below), Westwood contained a mixture of low, very low, moderate and high opportunity census block groups in 2000 (see figure below).

Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opportunity Indicator</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Median Household Income</td>
<td>median household income of households in block group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Attainment</td>
<td>% of adults (age 25+) in block group with a college degree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Poverty Rates</td>
<td>% of individuals in census tract (2010) or block group (2000) living below the Federal poverty line</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployment Rates</td>
<td>% of civilian population in labor force in census tract (2010) or block group (2000) that is unemployed</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9
Despite increasing levels of poverty in the suburbs under the 2010 census following the economic recession of 2008, the opportunity indicators for the Harrison Avenue block group improved from 2000.

Figure 10

The following map illustrates the changes by census block group from 2000 to 2010. The Harrison Avenue census block is one of a few census tracts that had improved indicators from 2000 to 2010 in the Westwood neighborhood. That block group improved from low to moderate opportunity.
When we examine the underlying indicators, we have a better appreciation for the improving economic conditions in eastern Westwood. From 2000 to 2010, median household income has steadily risen throughout Westwood: The 2329 census tract had a $41,269 medium household income, the second highest median household income census tract in Westwood. The census block group that includes 2329 Harrison Avenue is even better off than the larger Tract. It saw a rise from $42,229 in 2000 to $58,750 in 2010, adjusted to 2010 dollars. In fact, the 2329 Harrison Avenue census block group was the highest quintile for median household income, with the third highest median household income in the entire Westwood neighborhood of 26 census block groups.
Since Harrison Avenue runs along the far east-side of the neighborhood, it is one of Westwood’s main thoroughfares and primary gateway from the downtown replete with accessible public transportation and most directly proximate to downtown Cincinnati. There are two major bus lines within a few blocks of the 2329 Harrison Avenue (see map below). This means that residents who live in the far east end of Harrison Avenue, where 2329 building is located, have direct access to public transportation and greater employment opportunities in downtown Cincinnati.
Westwood, Hamilton County, Ohio - Opportunity Map 2010

Source: American Community Survey 2006-2010, Cincinnati Metropolitan Housing Authority Date: August 28, 2012
Note: Opportunity index was calculated based on median household income, educational attainment, neighborhood poverty rate, and unemployment rate.

Figure 13
VII. Comparing Opportunity To Relocation Sites

The table below lists initial offer addresses of the residents of the Harrison Avenue unit, and their eventual final relocation address.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>First Offer</th>
<th>Final Offer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Maliaka Davis</td>
<td>582 Strand Lane</td>
<td>540 Prospect Pl. #10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45232</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lisa Holley</td>
<td>600 Dutch Colony Dr.</td>
<td>9982 Hollis Dr.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45232</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kim McCrary</td>
<td>600 Dutch Colony Dr.</td>
<td>920 Nassau #4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45232</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Angela Brown</td>
<td>6060 Strand Lane</td>
<td>3206 Gobel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45232</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Patricia Shields</td>
<td>1621 Linn St. #513</td>
<td>3271 Gayway Ct. #2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45214</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cueston Morris</td>
<td>835 Poplar St. #310</td>
<td>Forced out of PHA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45214</td>
<td>After 20+ Years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latasha Freeman</td>
<td>Liberty St Townhomes</td>
<td>3032 Westknolls Lane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45214</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Verbal offer and immediate rejection by Ms. Freeman)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carla Kinkade</td>
<td>586 Claymore Terr. #3</td>
<td>586 Claymore Terr. #3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45238</td>
<td>Cincinnati, Ohio 45238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following map illustrates the location, with various colored pins, of the initial and final relocation sites for the residents of 2329 Harrison Avenue. Uniformly, the initial offerings were in lower opportunity areas than the Harrison Avenue site.
Figure 14

The initial offers were each in very low opportunity census block groups, using 2000 census data. The final offers were also in lower opportunity census block groups than 2329 Harrison Avenue. Not only that, but as you can see from the following map, the initial offers were located in some of the areas with the densest concentrations of public housing in Hamilton County.
In addition to proposing lower opportunity neighborhoods for relocation, the Defendant also proposed more racially isolated neighborhoods for relocation. The following map of Hamilton County shows the non-white population of Hamilton County using 2010 census data overlaid with the relocation addresses.
The table below indicates the racial demographics of the initial and final relocation offers for each of the residents of 2329 Harrison.

**Table 5**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Offer</th>
<th>Street Address</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>Resident</th>
<th>Total Population</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>% Black</th>
<th>White</th>
<th>% White</th>
<th>% Non-White</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Initial Offer</td>
<td>2329 Harrison Ave</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Maliaka Davis</td>
<td>596</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>71.31%</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>23.83%</td>
<td>76.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Offer</td>
<td>582 Strand Lane</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Lisa Holley</td>
<td>3940</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>90.96%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>96.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Offer</td>
<td>600 Dutch Colony Dr.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Kim McCrary</td>
<td>3940</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>90.96%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>96.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Offer</td>
<td>606 Strand Lane</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Angela Brown</td>
<td>3940</td>
<td>3584</td>
<td>90.96%</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>3.48%</td>
<td>96.52%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Offer</td>
<td>1621 Linn St.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Patricia Shields</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>95.89%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>97.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Offer</td>
<td>835 Poplar St.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Cueston Morris</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>95.89%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>97.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Offer</td>
<td>916 W Liberty St</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Latasha Freeman</td>
<td>730</td>
<td>700</td>
<td>95.89%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.05%</td>
<td>97.95%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial Offer</td>
<td>586 Claymore Terr.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Carla Kinkade</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>90.92%</td>
<td>9.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Offer</td>
<td>540 Prospect Pl.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Maliaka Davis</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>95.89%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.83%</td>
<td>98.17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Offer</td>
<td>9982 Hollis Dr.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Lisa Holley</td>
<td>1916</td>
<td>302</td>
<td>15.76%</td>
<td>1517</td>
<td>79.18%</td>
<td>10.65%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Offer</td>
<td>920 Nassau St.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Kim McCrary</td>
<td>601</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>33.11%</td>
<td>369</td>
<td>61.40%</td>
<td>7.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Offer</td>
<td>3206 Gobel Ave</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Angela Brown</td>
<td>835</td>
<td>711</td>
<td>85.15%</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>11.02%</td>
<td>3.83%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Offer</td>
<td>3271 Gayway Ct.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Patricia Shields</td>
<td>1073</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>5.96%</td>
<td>969</td>
<td>90.31%</td>
<td>9.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Offer</td>
<td>3032 Westknolls Lane</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Latasha Freeman</td>
<td>1494</td>
<td>1107</td>
<td>74.10%</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>16.47%</td>
<td>8.43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Offer</td>
<td>586 Claymore Terr.</td>
<td>Cincinnati</td>
<td>Carla Kinkade</td>
<td>1399</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>1272</td>
<td>90.92%</td>
<td>9.08%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: U. S. Census 2010
Date: August 28, 2012
This table illustrates that in all but one case, the initial offer was in an extremely or hyper-segregated neighborhood, with 90% or more African-American population, and 96% or more non-white population. Three of the final offers were in neighborhoods much more racially concentrated than the 2329 Harrison neighborhood.

VIII. Conclusion

It is my expert opinion that both the failure to approve the modernization plan and to relocate displaced residence in moderate or high opportunity neighborhoods denies the former and future residents of 2329 Harrison Avenue fair housing options in the Westwood neighborhood.
john a. powell, Executive Director
Haas Diversity Research Center
University of California -- Berkeley
September 28, 2012

i Thompson v. HUD settlement agreement, available online at:


iii The 2010 US Census confirms that in Westwood, 1264 blacks are homeowners while 3526 whites are homeowners.


v William Julius Wilson, When Work Disappears: The New World of the Urban Poor (1996). For example, “the decline in legitimate employment opportunities among inner-city residents has increased incentives to sell drugs.” Id. at 23.


http://www.brookings.edu/es/urban/publications/jargowskypoverty.htm


This effort was conducted for the State of Black Ohio Report. The State of Ohio research comprehensively assessed conditions in the areas of education, housing, neighborhoods, economic opportunity, public safety and many other critical topics for African Americans in Ohio. The initiative looked at trends impacting the African American community, analyze how Ohio’s African American community is faring in respect to other states and identify policies and best practices to improve conditions for African Americans in Ohio. The two-year project commenced in January of 2008 and was presented in early 2010. See http://kirwaninstitute.org/research/projects/stblackohio.php for more.

We do not simply average all indicators, but we average those within each sub-category (e.g. education, housing etc.). This helps eliminate any bias a higher number of indicators, say, in housing sub-category, might have on the comprehensive index.


The two charts were taken from the Kirwan Institute’s State of Black Ohio Report p. 48 and 49.
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