



COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT IN MILWAUKEE AN ASSESSMENT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

PAUL C BROPHY

October 28, 2011

Background

The community development system continues to evolve in cities throughout the nation, as community development needs and capacities adjust to handle new challenges. In Milwaukee a number of community development funders¹ [the “Funders”] asked Paul C. Brophy to review the community development system to determine actions that should be taken to improve the system’s effectiveness. Brophy has reviewed community development systems in other cities, and brings both a historical and contemporary view of community development and neighborhood improvement initiatives. The Funders asked LISC to play the role of contract manager for the assignment, and Leo Ries and his able staff have been very helpful throughout.

Brophy began his work in July and conducted over 50 interviews of system stakeholders in Milwaukee (see appendix) and, with assistance from an associate, reviewed the community development systems in Indianapolis, Kansas City, and Columbus. Brophy met three times with the Funders to get input from those participants and to provide progress reports.

This report provides the framework and recommendations that Brophy has developed to advise the Funders and other interested parties on ways to improve the community development system in Milwaukee. The content of this report is also being presented at the LISC-sponsored community development symposium entitled, “Neighborhoods Matter: A Report to Stakeholders and Community Dialog,” on October 28, 2011.

¹The funders of this report are: Northwestern Mutual, LISC, Helen Bader Foundation, Greater Milwaukee Foundation, JP Morgan Chase, WHEDA, the City of Milwaukee, M&I Bank, Zilber Family Foundation.

In asking Brophy to do this study, the Funders viewed the following issues as important to understanding how to improve the system.

- Before decisions can be made about adapting the Milwaukee community development system, a framework for understanding the strengths and challenges of the community development system in Milwaukee is needed.
- A key current approach being deployed in Milwaukee--the Sustainable Communities approach--has energy and has gained traction and appears to be an effective way to organize community development activities. What is needed is clarity on whether the resources, structure and policies are in place to sustain this strategy, and what the group and others could do to improve the practice of CCR (Comprehensive Community Revitalization) as well as provide some policy recommendations.
- The Funders are seeking to improve the community development system in the city, and work is needed to educate public, private, and civic decision-makers that neighborhoods matter to the overall well-being of the city, and that the approaches underway in Milwaukee are showing great promise.
- The community development field nationally is becoming more driven by results measurement, and improving the data base and measurement techniques may be of value in Milwaukee.
- There are a number of initiatives underway (the “LISC” neighborhoods, the “Zilber” neighborhoods, the “GMF” neighborhoods, and the “City’s TIN” neighborhoods), and ways need to be found to increase coordination and targeting among these efforts.

This report addresses these issues and more.

The Current Situation in Milwaukee and the National Context

Like some other older industrial cities, the neighborhoods in Milwaukee have very different conditions. Some are thriving, some are languishing, and some are on a cusp. The city’s downtown and its immediate environment, the East Side, and select other neighborhoods are robust, and have been successful in holding residents and businesses and attracting newcomers. These neighborhoods are a great asset to the people living in them and to the region. There are other neighborhoods that are deeply impoverished, coping with high crime rates, failing schools, high unemployment and terrible reputations. These two categories constitute the bulk of the city. There are also some neighborhoods that are “in between” neighborhoods, areas that have seen better days, but continue to have community fabric and a functioning real estate market, assets that can be built on to bring them to a fuller recovery.

The poverty rate in the city continues to rise; the most recent census report indicates that the city poverty rate is now 29.5 percent, the eighth highest nationally among cities with populations above 250,000.² Poverty rates in the outlying Milwaukee counties are much lower. This very significant disparity in city-suburban poverty is a major challenge in gaining regional support for city-based programs to improve conditions in the city neighborhoods, as a commonly-held view is that the problem is an inner city one only, and that the consequences of these conditions do not affect the region.

There have been efforts to improve the city's neighborhoods that date back to the 1950s through the federal urban renewal program. During the 1980s, when the most recent wave of neighborhood improvement organizations emerged, Milwaukee was viewed nationally as a leading example of community improvement through strong community development corporations using real estate development as the key intervention strategy. This approach thrived for a short time, but the key groups engaged in neighborhood improvement were not able to sustain themselves and the major nonprofit institutions failed, demoralizing the players in the system. Since that time, various programs and approaches have continued until the present moment, when thoughtful funders are seeing an opportunity for greater strategic alignment.

This history is not unique to Milwaukee; in fact the community development system and strategy has evolved since its current inception in the late 1970s and early 1980s. At its beginning—with leadership from the Ford and Rockefeller Foundations, and national corporations and banks--major national intermediaries were created. The primary groups are the Local Initiatives Support Corporation (LISC), Enterprise, and what is now called NeighborWorks America. These national entities promoted a model of neighborhood change that was grass roots in its orientation (the antidote to top-down urban renewal), and focused on housing development. This community development model was based on the belief that housing is crucial to neighborhood improvement, and that community development corporations [CDCs] could sustain themselves financially through housing development.

Generally speaking, national funders are no longer basing their grants on the premise that housing improvement is sufficient to improve neighborhoods, and they have diversified their approach beyond CDCs as the primary change agents in neighborhoods. Their approaches are more diverse in both the mix of interventions and agents of change in neighborhoods. The result of the learning and shifts in emphasis in the approach means that there are transitions that are occurring in cities about how to conduct neighborhood improvement efforts, particularly at a time when the bottom has fallen out of many inner city neighborhoods due to the heavy foreclosure phenomenon. So, almost every major American city has some hybrid approach to community development, based on its particular history and points of learning.

Milwaukee is no exception. While it is challenging to characterize an overall system, based on the interviews conducted as part of this work, it seems safe to say that as the

² <http://www.jsonline.com/news/milwaukee/Poverty-numbers-spike-in-Milwaukee.html>

result of its history and current activities, the city's community development system has the following strengths and challenges:

System Strengths

Strength 1: There are some strong, interested civic and political leaders who understand the connection between neighborhood improvement and the overall well being of the Milwaukee metropolitan area.

The strength of neighborhoods is important to a regional economy in at least two ways. First, a growing segment of the workforce--intercity mobile knowledge workers--is choosing employment in places where jobs are available and where high quality of life neighborhoods exist. Having such neighborhoods is important as older industrial cities like Milwaukee compete for these knowledge workers.

Second, a growing body of academic literature indicates that those metro areas that have a relatively small income range—that is, there is not a huge gap between the haves and have nots—tend to have stronger economies than those that have a wide gap³. In other words, where more people are contributing to the local economy, the economy can be healthier because it is not supporting a large dependent population. Improvement of neighborhoods is a key strategy to reducing the dependent populations in a metro area.

In many cities, the community development system is viewed by those working on overall metropolitan area competitiveness as relatively independent and in its own sphere. Interviews with select civic and business leaders in Milwaukee, however, indicate that there is an understanding of the importance of the connection between neighborhood improvement and the overall well being of the Milwaukee metropolitan area. While by no means widespread, this understanding is quite important, and can be built upon to create greater alignment between metro-wide and neighborhood improvement strategies.

In addition, Milwaukee city and county governments, like others elsewhere, are coping with declining revenues for community development. The City of Milwaukee and Milwaukee County have elected and appointed officials with a strong commitment to improving neighborhoods. This commitment comes not only from the Mayor, County Executive, and Aldermen and County Supervisors, and the community development staff, but from other public officials, including the Chief of Police and District Attorney, who see neighborhood improvement as a direct path to crime reduction.

Strength 2: There is strong philanthropic interest and commitment to neighborhood improvement.

In just about every major American city, local foundations are making grants of one kind or another to neighborhood-based groups to improve neighborhood conditions. In

³ See Manuel Pastor and Chris Benner, "Been Down So Long: Weak-Market Cities and Regional Equity," in Richard M. McGahey and Jennifer Vey, *Retooling for Growth: Building a 21st Century Economy in America's Older Industrial Cities*, Washington, DC: The Brookings Institution, 2008, pp. 89-118.

Milwaukee, the Helen Bader Foundation, the Greater Milwaukee Foundation, the Zilber Family Foundation, as well as private companies like Northwestern Mutual and banks are making grants on a sustained basis, funding initiatives in selected neighborhoods. In 2010, philanthropies in Milwaukee made substantial contributions for neighborhood improvement in the city.

Strength 3: LISC has strong professional and lay leadership and is well respected in the community, and is providing capital needed to improve selected neighborhoods.

The Local Initiatives Support Corporation [LISC] is a large national organization working with neighborhood groups and others in 29 cities and states and in some of the nation's rural areas. In Milwaukee, LISC is the dominant community development player, providing capital for community development real estate transactions, and technical assistance to community groups. LISC Milwaukee has invested \$22 million in the city's neighborhoods since 2005, leveraging well over \$200 million in other capital for community improvement. Consistent with LISC's national direction, Milwaukee LISC is implementing a "sustainable communities" program, having selected five neighborhoods (in collaboration with the Zilber Family Foundation) for comprehensive community change. LISC is well staffed, and has an active and committed Local Advisory Board.

Strength 4: Leaders of community based organizations understand that they are responsible for making the case for support for neighborhood improvement and to show demonstrable results.

It is easy for neighborhood-based workers to experience frustration at the mismatch between the resources needed and the resources available. The bright side of the Milwaukee situation is that many neighborhood-based workers understand that this funding gap is a challenge and that helping the "powers that be" understand the value proposition in making funds available for neighborhood improvement activities is a case that they at the neighborhood level need to make. They are ready and willing to work in an environment in which goals are clear and progress measures are agreed upon.

Strength 5: There is strong state interest from WHEDA in thinking and acting at large scale in Milwaukee.

State governments are often a minor player in community improvement, because resources are scarce and because the state's relationships are typically with units of local government. New leadership at the Wisconsin Housing and Economic Development Authority is thinking big about how to garner and leverage resources to improve the job situation in the City of Milwaukee in ways that will create job opportunities for the many unemployed and underemployed residents of the city's neighborhoods.

Strength 6: There are capable for-profit and non-profit developers ready to do more to rebuild the physical environment in Milwaukee's neighborhoods.

Nationally the community development field has learned that both for-profit companies and non-profit corporations have capacity to work separately and together to strengthen neighborhoods by building and rehabbing affordable and market housing and space for commercial, industrial, and institutional uses in neighborhoods. Milwaukee developers indicate that they are interested in doing more and can do so if resources are made available and if city government can streamline its approval processes for development.

Strength 7: Milwaukee has a well-built housing stock that can serve its future needs well.

The housing stock in Milwaukee is old, but was well built and much of it can be rehabilitated to serve future generations, a genuine asset, particularly when compared to many other cities in the Great Lakes and Midwest region.

Strength 8: Major initiatives that are connected to neighborhood improvement are underway or under study that can dovetail strategically with neighborhood improvement.

Neighborhood initiatives need to be connected to related system improvements in order to be successful. Fortunately, there is underway in Milwaukee system improvement efforts in workforce (the Milwaukee Area Workforce Funders Alliance); success in schools (Milwaukee Succeeds), and proposed improvements to the system of economic development proposed by the Public Policy Forum.

System Challenges

Challenge 1: Despite considerable commitment to neighborhood improvement among key players, there is very little strategic alignment.

Milwaukee's community development activities are best described as a series of initiatives rather than a concerted strategy. City government officials and community development plans describe a set of transactions and initiatives rather than an overall strategic framework. Some of the reasons for this are historical evolution, the practice of spreading funding around to ensure political support, and a general environment in which concerned individuals and organizations stepped up to intervene directly in the absence of centralized orchestration.

Challenge 2: There is no apparent correlation between ambitions and resources.

One important consequence of side-by-side initiatives—some of which are quite ambitious—is that there may not be sufficient aggregate financial resources to for all of the initiatives to succeed. No one in the system has been charged with estimating the resources needed and aggregating these resources to accomplish the neighborhood improvement initiatives over the next five to ten years. And, there has been no calculation made regarding what “internal” improvements to the system will be needed,

improvements like increasing the skills of players in the system, and strengthening the capacity of the organizations carrying out neighborhood improvement.

Challenge 3: The system would be more effective if there were more emphasis on building from market strength in city neighborhoods.

A key neighborhood improvement strategy being followed in many older industrial cities is to build from market strength wherever it can be found. Although the city of Milwaukee is relatively strong, it was still a modest population loser in the 2000s. The logic to a “build from market strength” strategy is that scarce public and philanthropic resources need to leverage private investment, and, more leverage can be realized if improvements are targeted to areas that are near a source of market strength—a strong neighborhood, a major private employer, a university or hospital, an amenity like a park or water. This point was made well in a recent report from the American Assembly aimed at cities that have been struggling to hold their populations: “Areas with strong market activity should be targeted for investment, with the goal of increasing demand, strengthening property values, and rebuilding confidence in the community.”⁴

This market-oriented strategy is present in the Healthy Neighborhoods program and was a criterion in LISC’s selection of its sustainable neighborhoods, but is not a central driver in the other current private or city government neighborhood initiatives.

Challenge 4: The support system for CBOs appears to have atrophied over the years.

A key principle in neighborhood improvement and sustaining that improvement is to engage neighborhood residents and property owners and other stakeholders in the work needed to improve the neighborhoods. The failure of large CDCs in the late 1990s and early 2000s led to significant disillusionment with the value of the CDC model. One result is that Milwaukee has evolved and multiple players and strategies are underway in neighborhoods, and real estate development by neighborhood-based groups is less important than it was fifteen years ago. A similar evolution of the CDC system has occurred in Baltimore, Kansas City, Chicago and Columbus.

However, community-based groups [CBOs], that are improving neighborhoods—but not through real estate development-- play very important roles in neighborhoods in Milwaukee and in other cities. Efforts at improving the capacity of these groups appear to be underway in each initiative, but there is more work needed to see to it that the system of strengthening CBOs can be improved.

Challenge 5: There does not appear to be any organized grass roots advocacy for neighborhood improvement.

The community development system is handicapped because there is no organized advocacy for increasing resources for efforts that improve neighborhoods. This weakness

⁴ “Reinventing America’s Legacy Cities: Strategies for Cities Losing Population,” The American Assembly, Columbia University, p.13.

has at least two dimensions. First, there needs to be more work on making the case that improving neighborhoods and the lives of people in them is in the best interest of the City of Milwaukee and the metro area. It is not self-evident. Second, some agreed-upon vehicle is needed to make the case, and to play the role of advocating for investment in neighborhoods overall, as distinguished from the advocacy for investments into particular initiatives and transactions.

Challenge 6: Lender interest is primarily focused on transactions, not overall neighborhood improvement.

The banking industry has changed dramatically over the past twenty-five years, with more concentration occurring through bank acquisitions. One result is that there are far fewer locally-based financial institutions (banks, savings and loans, credit unions) than had been the case when the community development movement began in the 1970s. In that earlier period, locally-based financial institutions had an easier time than today seeing their self interest in stabilizing neighborhoods because the neighborhoods constituted a significant part of their lending area.

Today, the long-term trend of consolidation of lending into large banks is coupled with the housing finance crisis the nation is confronting, resulting in banks that are generally interested in transactions rather than broad neighborhood improvement initiatives. There are important exceptions to this broad statement, and the commitment to Harambee by JP Morgan Chase is particularly noteworthy.

In Milwaukee this combination results in lenders who are willing to finance transactions that make good financial sense and/or result in favorable Community Reinvestment Act credit, but more initiatives and creativity on the part of the lenders to provide the capital that neighborhoods need to thrive is needed.

A good example of this is the stark contrast in capital availability coming from Baltimore banks for the Healthy neighborhoods Program compared to the program in Milwaukee. In Baltimore, six lenders have committed \$40 million in mortgages at favorable terms and below market in the 41 neighborhoods targeted by the Healthy Neighborhoods program. Four guarantors give these lenders the capacity to lend up to 120% of appraised value when rehabilitation is also involved. When lenders were approached in Milwaukee some time ago to form a loan program for the Greater Milwaukee Foundation's program, the discussion languished and then ended with no loan pool created.

Challenge 7: There is not enough connection between regional thinking and neighborhood improvement.

As stated above, there are some encouraging signs that some regional leaders see the connection between neighborhood improvement and regional success, but this is not the norm. Those working on economic development in the region and those working on neighborhood improvement travel in different circles and seldom intersect for purposes

of strategic alignment. It would be of significant benefit to those working in both systems for greater strategic alignment to occur.

Challenge 8: Race is an undercurrent that needs to be contended with to develop a more effective community development system.

The history of race and race relations in cities can get in the way of developing effective neighborhood improvement strategies. The Milwaukee region is one of the most racially segregated in the nation, and racial segregation and the income gap between minorities and the majority population affect both the realities of living in many neighborhoods, and in how the issue of neighborhood improvement is viewed. Neighborhood improvement is both about creating opportunities for people to move out of poverty, and about improving the quality of life in neighborhoods so that people with increased choices choose to live in particular neighborhoods. Some of these improvement strategies are neighborhood-based (e.g. school improvement); other approaches may be less place-based in their delivery (e.g. job training and job development). The need to bridge gaps in understanding based on race can add a major challenge to effective strategizing between neighborhood leadership and capital sources, making it even more difficult to craft the best solutions.

Challenge 9: Communication throughout the community development system needs to be strengthened.

While there is regular communication about what is occurring in various initiatives and by various organizations, there is little in the way of systematic communication so that more learning can occur, more strategic alignment can be fostered, and more understanding of what is and is not working on the ground can inform better decisions throughout the system. LISC's recent focus groups with a broad range of players in community development is an important step in building communications links. The work of the Urban Economic Development Association (UEDA) in organizing annual summits is another good example.

What does this set of strengths and weaknesses add up to? While past and current initiatives to improve neighborhood conditions have had some important successes, the general trends in Milwaukee's neighborhoods are not promising.

- The city continues its very significant racial and ethnic isolation;
- Poverty is growing in inner city Milwaukee;
- Vacant housing has increased substantially;
- Property values in many neighborhoods have plummeted;
- The path to upward mobility remains blocked for many.

These trends are in no way unique to Milwaukee; this is a bad time for the many neighborhoods across the country. Yet these trends are an indication that the current

community development system is not up to the challenge of improving the city's neighborhoods, and that radical changes are needed in the way the city conducts its business of neighborhood improvement. Failure to substantially improve the system is likely to lead to profound disappointment and further decline in neighborhood conditions.

This report recommends a fresh approach to neighborhood improvement, one described as "collective impact." It is a proposed new way of conducting community development work in Milwaukee, but it is not an entirely new approach in the city.

Collective Impact: A Fresh Approach to Community Development in Milwaukee

One of the challenges to improving a system as complex as community development is thinking about the system in its entirety, and understanding what it takes to improve the system. One recent report and a thought-provoking article are relevant to Milwaukee at this moment.

The first is a report from the prestigious Aspen Institute called *Voices from the Field III*, which takes a thorough look at the many comprehensive community initiatives [CCIs] that have been tried in many cities.⁵ The report reviews 48 major CCIs and related community change efforts of the past two decades, and offers a framework for thinking about place-based initiatives in the future. While noting some progress from many of these initiatives, the report states that ". . . most CCIs and related community change efforts have not produced the degree of community transformation envisioned by their designers."⁶

The reasons for this disappointment are worth quoting at length:

"When the first CCIs were created more than two decades ago, their designers understood that alignment of their many parts would be key to generating meaningful change in poor communities. The assumption was that a "comprehensive" approach to neighborhood change would generate the necessary alignment in programs and strategies, and that "community building" would generate the necessary alignment among stakeholders. As it has turned out, alignment has been harder to achieve than was anticipated. It does not automatically result from a one-time community planning process or a foundation-sponsored initiative. The alignment that is needed is about fundamental ways of working, and it addresses goals, activities, capacities, relationships, and learning priorities. It also needs regular recalibration as the work proceeds. As with most ambitious change endeavors, we start with a hope for an efficient and direct route to our goals, only to find that there is no easy path or shortcut."⁷

So, how does Milwaukee take the lessons from the past 20 years and build a neighborhood improvement system that is more likely to succeed?

⁵ Anne C. Kubisch, Patricia Auspos, Prudence Brown, and Tom Dewar, 2010, *Voices from the Field III: Lessons and Challenges from Two Decades of Community Change Efforts*, Washington, DC: The Aspen Institute. Available at

http://www.aspeninstitute.org/sites/default/files/content/docs/pubs/VoicesIII_FINAL_0.pdf

⁶ Kubish, et. al, p. viii.

⁷ Ibid, p. x.

An article by John Kania and Mark Kramer, “Collective Impact” points in a promising direction, and incorporates the approaches recommended in *Voices*.⁸ Kania and Kramer’s essential message is that large scale social change—like improving neighborhoods and the lives of people in them—requires broad cross-sector coordination, yet the usual approach is focused on the isolated interventions of individual organizations.

Collective impact initiatives are long-term commitments by a group of important actors from different sectors to a common agenda for solving a specific social problem. Their actions are supported by a shared measurement system, mutually reinforcing activities, ongoing communication, and are staffed by an independent backbone organization. This approach, if executed well, has the benefit of the participants keeping an eye on progress in the overall system, and drops the assumptions that have led to earlier disappointments that individual initiatives are the best path.

Collective impact initiatives are not new to Milwaukee. While not called a “collective impact” initiative, the work that has been underway for the past few years by the Milwaukee Area Workforce Funding Alliance, essentially meets the definition of a collective impact initiative. Its goals are to (1) fund agencies, programs and projects that provide career advancement support of low-income and low skilled people; and (2) develop a better coordinated workforce development system of public and private collaboration that enhances regional competitiveness. Its Leadership Council consists of executives of fifteen private funders, six public funders, and seven employers. The Alliance has a multi-dimensional system improvement strategy including the improvement of workforce partnerships, promoting improved policies to make workforce development more successful, shared performance measures, and capacity building of elements in the workforce system.

Similarly, as the Funders seek to improve the neighborhood improvement system in Milwaukee, they need to build a collective impact initiative. While efforts that fall short of this way of thinking and acting on neighborhood improvement in Milwaukee may do some good, side-by-side initiatives are likely to fall short of the broader ambition—to create a community development system that is capable of dramatically improving neighborhoods and the lives of people living in them.

The dimensions of a collective impact initiative are:

1. A common agenda
2. Shared measurement systems
3. Mutually reinforcing activities
4. Continuous communication
5. Backbone support organizations.

⁸ John Kania and Mark Kramer, “Collective Impact”, *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2011, pp. 36-41. http://www.ssireview.org/articles/entry/collective_impact/

What follows is an analysis of where Milwaukee's community development system currently scores against these dimensions and recommendations to substantially improve the community development system.

1. A common agenda

"Collective impact requires all participants to have a shared vision for change, one that includes a common understanding of the problem and a joint approach to solving it through agreed upon actions."⁹

There are actually two key elements imbedded in this dimension. First, "all participants" raises the question of who needs to be involved to make a collective impact initiative for neighborhood improvement successful. Second, how does this group get to a shared vision for change and to a common agenda?

The community development system has four kinds of players: (1) those providing capital (debt, equity, grants) in the system; (2) those using the capital; (3) those connecting the capital providers with the capital users (intermediaries like LISC); and (4) other stakeholders working on community improvement, like the police department, local healthcare systems, neighborhood associations, real estate agents, volunteer groups, and some social service providers.

The capital providers include foundation and corporate philanthropy, government, lenders, and equity sources. Capital users include community development corporations, real estate developers, and staffed neighborhood-serving organizations.

The first step in creating a collective impact initiative to improve the community development system is to identify the relevant key players in each of these sectors and get them organized enough that the second element of a common agenda—a shared vision for change—can be achieved.

Milwaukee is exactly on the edge of this task.

The Funders' interest in examining the community development system is an important start that can lead to a shared vision among the capital providers. The focus groups conducted by LISC and the system-wide meeting in late October can be the basis for organizing the capital users and other stakeholders.

The fact that capital users are routinely approaching capital providers for resources requires a safety zone between the two sectors, so neither crowds the other, but in the best of circumstances, there is a mutual respect and clarity of vision and action in transactions and decisions being made. A broker role is typically needed. LISC is already playing a capital intermediation function, and is

⁹ Ibid, p. 39.

poised to step into a larger intermediary role—to serve as the communications link and idea broker among the key players in the system.

This positioning leads to three recommendations:

Recommendation 1: The Funders should organize themselves into a group that includes a broad range of capital providers, and select community partners (e.g. the Chief of Police, the executives of the Greater Milwaukee Committee and the Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce, Marquette University, the University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, and perhaps executives from local healthcare systems), and this group should develop a shared vision for the improvement of neighborhoods, and the community development system, in concert with those at the grassroots level.

Recommendation 2: Using the input from its focus groups, LISC should go beyond its work in select sustainable communities and organize a group of capital users and community stakeholders to develop their vision for the community development system and neighborhood improvement and to become organized advocates for it.

Recommendation 3: LISC should formally take on the role of connecting these key elements of the system to help all parties reach a shared vision for the community development system and neighborhood improvement, hosting all-party discussions as appropriate to the process, and routinely cross-fertilizing the discussions in the system.

Moving in this recommended direction sets the table for the discussion on vision and a getting to a shared agenda for strategy and action. But, that is only the necessary start. Structured discussions among the players are needed to answer key vision questions about the community development system. These include:

1. A successful system needs capable people and organizations. What organizations should be designated and equipped to strengthen the capacity of the people and organizations in the system, particularly at the neighborhood level? What roles should the universities be asked to play in building this capacity?
2. How much capital does the system need over the next 10 years to accomplish its current goals as imbedded in particular initiatives, and who should play the role of helping to assemble this capital? Once a vision for neighborhood improvement is clearer, the capital requirements may change. What is within the realm of the possible?
3. Who can and should align the agenda of the community development system with broader economic development goals for the metropolitan region?

2. *Shared Measurement Systems*

Milwaukee's current neighborhood improvement efforts are stand-alone initiatives and transactions. Each has merit and may produce some positive outcomes, but given the focus on initiatives (or projects from a city perspective), there is no articulation of an overall agenda for change that is held in common.

Engaging in a process of agreeing on measures of progress (or outcomes) will drive out the ambiguity about goals and strategies that currently exists.

A starting point is understanding current neighborhood conditions. In Milwaukee, this should be a three-part effort.

First, an up-to-date understanding of condition of the "people" conditions in the neighborhoods is important. This socio-economic look at neighborhoods can inform policy makers, governments, and philanthropies regarding the interventions needed to help improve the lives of people in the neighborhoods. (Note: identifying more clearly what needs to be done, does not mean that the interventions need to be provided by neighborhood-based organizations)

Second, an understanding of the assets in the neighborhoods, particularly the social capital in the neighborhoods is needed. How much neighboring and formal and informal support exists in neighborhoods? Where do neighborhood associations exist? Block groups? Crime watches? Youth programs and sports activities? This kind of inventory can identify the assets to build from and help spot gaps that exist and will press the players in the system to focus on these neighborhood asset indicators.

Third, an understanding of the market conditions in the neighborhoods is needed. This is the kind of work done by The Reinvestment Fund (<http://www.trfund.com>). Its basic rationale is quite straightforward: neighborhoods compete with each other in a metropolitan context and the market values some neighborhoods more than others. Hence, residential real estate values are a bottom line measure of the strength of one neighborhood versus another. The second premise is that neighborhoods need different interventions from government, philanthropy, and other capital sources based on the market conditions in the neighborhoods. An appropriate goal is to help Milwaukee neighborhoods hold and attract middle income people (as is true of the Healthy Neighborhoods Program), and to succeed at this, an understanding the current and changing market conditions in these areas is essential.

As these baselines are established, the system leaders need to be in dialogue about the overall neighborhood improvement goals and the particular goals, beliefs, and constraints each major player brings to the table. Before measures can be agreed upon, the parties in the discussion need to be articulate about what they are trying to accomplish.

For example, current initiatives have the following goals:

- Proactive policing and the development of police community relationships, as well as social bonds among residents, will lead *to those neighborhoods developing the capability to sustain civic life.*—Milwaukee Police Department
- In 2008, the Zilber Family Foundation announced a \$50 million commitment to *improve the quality of life in Milwaukee neighborhoods*, starting with Lindsay Heights and Clarke Square. It formed a partnership—called the Zilber Neighborhood Initiative—with Walnut Way Conservation Corp. in Lindsay Heights, Journey House in Clarke Square, LISC Milwaukee, and United Neighborhood Centers of Milwaukee to organize the effort.—Zilber Family Foundation.
- The Healthy Neighborhoods Initiative aims to work with those neighborhoods that are at a tipping point. By focusing on their assets and engaging neighbors, we *hope to strengthen and revitalize neighborhoods and make the metro area an even greater place to live and work.*—Greater Milwaukee Foundation
- LISC Milwaukee *transforms distressed urban neighborhoods into healthy communities of choice and opportunity*—great places to work, do business and raise children—LISC Milwaukee

These are complementary goals, and the work underway in all of them is important and desirable. However, the premise in a collective impact approach is that for the system to be successful in producing results that are more pervasive and enduring than came from the initiatives reviewed in *Voice*, greater alignment and choice making is needed. Focusing on the measures of progress and establishing a system of measurement is essential to accomplish this.

Recommendation 4: The Funders should engage the expertise needed to establish a baseline, building from reports that currently exist for the socio-economic and social capital baselines, and should engage The Reinvestment Fund to conduct a market value analysis.

Recommendation 5: On the basis of this work, the Funders, in dialogue with others, should set a goal of establishing shared measures and a system of updating the measures by the end of 2012.

3. *Mutually Reinforcing Activities*

“Collective impact initiatives depend on a diverse group of stakeholders working together, not by requiring that all participants do the same thing, but by encouraging each participant to undertake the specific set of activities at which it excels in a way that

supports and is coordinated with the actions of others.”¹⁰ This element of collective impact is particularly important for neighborhood improvement efforts, given the multi-dimensional nature of the efforts needed to succeed.

A very simple example: The success of an investment in a neighborhood of a new or rehabilitated housing development may depend on whether the police department and neighborhood residents can work together to improve public safety. The housing may be a leverage point to get existing property owners to improve their properties, and city deployment of code enforcement may be a useful complement to the housing investment to trigger improvements. Connecting the new residents to the neighborhood association may be a third important element of leveraging the housing investment. Aligning these approaches requires a great deal of communication and cooperation.

Similar related activities should occur in conjunction with school improvement programs as they unfold in neighborhoods. The connection between school improvement decisions (by the school system or charters) and other neighborhood improvement activities should be well coordinated.

This kind of collaboration is already underway in the LISC sustainable communities neighborhoods and in the Zilber target neighborhoods and the overall system needs to build from these approaches.

Milwaukee is well positioned to execute this element because there is a base of good will among the relevant actors. This approach requires each key player—regardless of the particular role being played—to stretch the level of flexibility they are bringing to the system, and to help partners know where the limits are.

Operationalizing this is both attitudinal and is based on excellent communications and outstanding orchestration, as indicated below.

Recommendation 6: The Funders should review each major initiative underway to discover the opportunities for mutually reinforcing activities, and to test the practicality of broadening the engagement in each.

4. *Constant Communication*

Improving the community development system will require a significant increase in substantive communication among the key parties. This requires a considerable time commitment in an environment where people are generally fully occupied. The purpose of the increased communication is to:

- Keep key players informed on what is going on in the system, in neighborhoods, and within the lives of the key players involved.

¹⁰ Kania and Kramer, p. 40.

- Create a learning environment so that large and small lessons can be distilled as quickly as possible.
- Build trust among the players, and to help participants in different roles to understand the value that each brings to the table.
- Create opportunities to intervene when something harmful to collective efforts might be on the horizon.
- Break down stereotypes and prejudices, racial and otherwise.

Fortunately, LISC is in the process of stepping up to play the role of connecting players throughout the system. The recent LISC focus groups involved 119 participants and gave LISC a fresh understanding of the aspirations and challenges faced by many grass roots players. One result is LISC's understanding that it should expand its financial intermediary role to a broader role of intermediating communications among players in the community development field, both among grass roots players and between the "grass roots and the grass tops"—the capital users and capital providers.

Recommendation 7: LISC should step up its communication function, serving as communications link in the community development system in Milwaukee, and also playing the role of being the feedback loop for the system.

5. *Backbone Support Organizations.*

Collective impact will not occur without strong, capable staff support to "plan, manage and support the initiative through ongoing facilitation, technology and communications support, data collection and reporting, and handling the myriad logistical and administrative details needed for the imitative to function smoothly."¹¹

Getting staff support, however, is the second step in actually implementing a collective impact initiative for community development in Milwaukee. As was stated in Recommendation 1, the first is for the Funders to agree on who should be at the "grass tops" table and who should take on the responsibility of leading and driving the group. Once this is done, the Funders will be positioned to think through their staffing needs.

Once this table is set, getting the right level of support in place will require some buy in by the Funders to allocate budget to an entity or entities to play this support role. The particulars of this are beyond the scope of this assignment and report, yet it seems possible and likely that the some of the support work could be carried by existing organizations.

Recommendation 8: The public and private funders should engage the backbone staffing needed for the new way of doing community development business to emerge.

¹¹ Ibid, p. 40.

A Concluding Comment

Greater Milwaukee is one of many Midwest and Great Lakes' metropolitan areas that is in economic competition with other metro areas domestically and globally. Some of these cities will thrive in the 21st Century; others, unfortunately, will languish. Many, many factors are in play—location, strength of economic clusters, civic and governance capacity, degree of innovation, workforce capacity and quality of life.

The health of Milwaukee's neighborhoods is important to the future of the area most directly in the areas of workforce capacity and quality of life. A collective impact initiative is underway to improve the area's workforce through the Milwaukee Area Workforce Funding Alliance, and that work has the system poised to perform when the national economy recovers.

Similarly, the approach outlined in this report to improve the quality of life in Milwaukee's neighborhoods using a collective impact approach can also be more effective in improving the quality of life in Milwaukee's neighborhoods than the separate initiatives that are currently in place. Unless a new approach is taken, the city's competitiveness and attraction as a place to live and create and grow businesses may be in jeopardy.

This connection is in the minds of some key civic leaders, but all involved in the community development system need to contribute to making the case that neighborhood improvement is not only important to the people living in the city's neighborhoods, but to the region as a whole.

It will be very challenging to adapt the way Milwaukee has been working on neighborhood improvement because the adaptation requires key players to move outside of their personal and professional comfort zones in order to collaborate more intensively and successfully.

There is much hard work ahead.

Appendix I: A Summary of Community Development Approaches in Peer Cities

Peer Cities Survey

No two cities are alike, and ways of doing business vary. The community development system has evolved based on local circumstances, and lifting approaches from one place to another has been difficult, because of the difference in local cultures about how to do business. Nevertheless, what follows is a description of how community development is being conducted in cities similar to Milwaukee, offered to place Milwaukee's system in a broader context.

KANSAS CITY

Goals

Overall, there is general agreement that community development initiatives in the Kansas City area need to be strategic are aimed at improving quality of life, and that neighborhood engagement and relationship development are key to any sustained success no matter how large or small.

The Mid-America Regional Planning Council [MARC], a nonprofit association that promotes regional cooperation in the Greater Kansas City area and is governed by a board of elected local officials, has convened a working group that is in the process of developing a bi-state approach for neighborhood revitalization with a strong focus on transit and workforce development. Involved in these planning efforts are several agencies as well as private philanthropies that fund community development.

The Community Development System

In the late 1990s, the Kansas City Community Foundation housed a fund and had dedicated staff to manage the Kansas City Community Development Initiative, the largest local funding effort in the history of Kansas City involving foundations, corporations and local government.

The Initiative was modeled after a highly successful collaboration of the nation's largest foundations called Living Cities. The Initiative used the strategic plan developed by Kansas City Missouri FOCUS, which was a comprehensive 25-year plan developed by the City and citizens in 1994. The goal of the Initiative was to help citizens of the core city rebuild their neighborhoods physically, economically and socially and to address gaps and weaknesses in the local community development system.

The Initiative funded and assisted CDCs and grassroots neighborhood groups in five ways:

1. Helped CDCs coordinate physical, social and economic development efforts to generate stronger results.
2. Improved the efficiency and effectiveness of CDCs and other groups.
3. Sought opportunities to link corporations, CDCs and neighborhoods.

4. Created a dialogue about community development in Kansas City.
5. Encouraged more cooperation and coordination among funders.

Due to changes in elected and private leadership, the Initiative "collapsed" and has never been reconstituted. Over the years, Greater Kansas City LISC and its NeighborhoodsNow initiative have provided the best structure for any organized community development work via LISC's Quality of Life Plan.

While housing is still the highest priority for various agencies, the economy has challenged the capacity of agencies to engage in much housing development – there is a lack of nonprofit agencies able to do large scale housing development – and the current focus appears to be on youth development at the neighborhood level.

There is a general feeling that if community development corporations [CDCs] are only concentrating on housing development then those CDCs will not have a sustainable business model. Instead, most CDCs with capacity are organizing their neighborhood work around themes - such as greening of the neighborhood, early childhood education, transportation, or parental engagement – and working in partnership with relevant nonprofit and for-profit organizations to accomplish their goals.

Kansas City has a strong banking sector yet the banks have mostly focused on loans, lending and other banking issues related to housing and less attention given to other aspects of community development. The engagement of human service providers with community and neighborhood development leaders and their work has been weak yet some of the larger charities, such as Catholic Charities and some government task forces, such as the Kansas City Crime Commission, have been actively engaged in neighborhood initiatives.

Capital

While there are federal and local resources channeled to community development – Kansas City received nearly \$8.3 million in Neighborhood Stabilization Program I funding - there is a wide gap. The two largest private philanthropies interested in community development – the H&R Block Foundation and the Hall Family Foundation – are playing a leading role and are actively engaged in strategic planning via MARC and have proactively developed relationships with city hall. The goal is to create a cohesive plan that the public and private sector can together advance over time.

LISC, MARC and Neighborhood Housing Services, a large nonprofit housing developer, are working to educate and garner support from the philanthropic community on the need for overhead and help with cash flow gap funding. The tightening economy and need to scale up efforts to have an impact seems to be driving this collaborative.

Technical Assistance

Generally, technical assistance is sought via LISC, the NeighborhoodsNow program and MARC – the MARC technical assistance tends to focus on green impact zones, transportation and workforce development.

Cohesion

People involved in community development efforts view strategic planning and strategic partnerships as primary to any sustained impact related to neighborhood revitalization. There is a general sense that while there is an effort to be strategic about community development via coalition building, development of a plan, and creating financial resources, the fundamental approach to community development must be broadened beyond housing to include a wide variety of community issues. There is overall agreement that this is best done through cross-sector dialogue, relationship development, and residential input. Most acknowledge that by looking beyond housing a broader definition of community development emerges and, at the residential level, it can mean different things to different people.

There are fewer CDCs in Kansas City than a decade ago and each is more diversified in services and more stable in the last few years. Most feel that CDCs in the past have been weak, felt entitled and have not been professionally managed.

Overall, an environment that is less territorial, less political, more professional and more collegial has emerged. CDCs are part of a consolidated planning process and feel that the playing field for community development is "more level" than it has ever been. The process of strategic engagement of stakeholders and consensus building is a key foundation for those wanting to affect long term and sustained community development.

INDIANAPOLIS

Goals

The term "comprehensive community development" is used often in Indianapolis. There is a broad and diverse definition of community development that encompasses myriad issues beyond housing development. There is recognition of the role of public education, economic development, and transit in neighborhood growth and sustainability and conversations and partnerships evolve around these complex issues.

There is a coalition – the Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development - that convenes agencies that meet to share information, develop partnerships and work strategically at the neighborhood level. A recent retreat was held that included representatives from city hall, evidence that there is a growing avenue of shared vision and strategy.

The CDCs are generally working toward common goals in their respective place-based settings, and the local government - also focused on a range of issues impacting neighborhoods – supports a wide range of organizations beyond CDCs.

The Community Development System

CDCs are the primary delivery vehicle for community development and are now seen as strong and unique partners in neighborhood improvement; they have matured in the last decade led by professional staff and are now undertaking complex transactions. This was not always the case; in fact, CDCs were viewed as acting "entitled" and seen as not well-managed several years ago.

Today, most CDCs in the Indianapolis area see the complex issues at play in neighborhood improvement and are working beyond housing development to include intergenerational programming, charter school creation, and jobs programs. There appears to be a strong link on the part of CDC leaders regarding the role of public education and community development.

The Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development is an association of neighborhood-based community development corporations that links CDCs with one another, with institutional partners, and with Indianapolis neighborhood residents. The Coalition also provides a vehicle for CDC advocacy and partnership.

A recent retreat convened by the Coalition included CDC leaders, other agency executives, and representatives from city hall. The goal was to share information, advance a shared vision and continue to develop relationships across sectors.

The Sustainable Communities initiative that is the thrust of LISC Indianapolis' strategic goals has been vital. The Quality of Life Plans created through LISC's Sustainable Communities work are important guides for social service agencies, CDCs and others engaged in quality of life improvements in the greater Indianapolis community and have been used by many as a roadmap for networking and engagement in neighborhood planning. For example, new resources have been garnered because of the Quality of Life Plan – such as the SuperBowl Host Committee's focus on the Near East neighborhood resulting in over \$125 million in the past three years in one neighborhood.

The Indianapolis Neighborhood Housing Project [INHP] administers a Lilly Endowment fund aimed at providing operating and technical support to CDCs. In the last three years, 12 to 14 CDCs have been awarded nearly \$1 million dollars annually through a transparent allocations process administered by INHP and developed three years ago in collaboration with LISC and the Central Indiana Community Foundation. In order to qualify for these funds, CDCs must pass high standards in the following areas:

- Governance
- Financial accounting
- Staff experience
- Neighborhood and stakeholder engagement
- Execution of resources
- Compliance reporting

- Annual work plan development

Capital

Federal and local resources have been an important source of funding for community development. The Neighborhood Stabilization Program II grant totaled over \$30 million for Indianapolis and the agencies engaged in community development. The Indiana Affordable Housing and Community Development Fund [formerly known as the Indiana Housing Trust Fund] and Community Development Block Grant funds are also integral yet do not cover the gap of resources needed for capital or programmatic development. While the Lilly Endowment is the largest philanthropy in Indianapolis, its definition of community development is broad and channels much of its community development funds via Indiana community foundations, arts councils, and United Ways, seeing these entities as important community assets.

Technical Assistance

INHP provides a menu of technical assistance support for the CDCs and other agencies. This assistance generally takes the form of seminars in areas that include asset management, human resources, information technology and financial planning. There is emerging a need for technical assistance in social media to help CDCs and others effectively inform and engage neighborhood residents and the surrounding communities. The Indiana Affordable Housing and Community Development Fund also provides \$250,000 in matching funds to implement capacity building projects within each CDC. The state-wide organization, Indiana Association for Community Economic Development, provides training and technical assistance as well as serves as a forum and organizing vehicle for public policy advocacy and works closely with the Indianapolis Coalition for Neighborhood Development.

Cohesion

The CDCs and other agencies involved in community development know each other, maintain a collegial relationship and are banding together more and more through formal and informal means to influence public education, workforce development and transportation decisions and policies. While there is a need for more resources to accomplish the work, the dialogue, strategy and subsequent actions by all are part of an effort to work more effectively together on issues and policies that can improve communities.

COLUMBUS

Goals

There is no coordinated regional strategy in Columbus nor coalition – formal or informal – that works to advance comprehensive community development. Rather, individual neighborhoods have "champions" that use their leverage to engage others, primarily large

employers and anchor institutions, in the neighborhood development effort. It has historically been a competitive environment that is stoked by the political landscape and the challenge of garnering scarce resources and remains so today.

The Community Development System

In Columbus, the system consists of various entities working in defined neighborhoods. Often, good work is done but in isolation and lacks long-term strategy, partnership synergy, cross-discipline learning, and effective coalition development that could accelerate or change for the better the work happening at the individual and regional neighborhood level. It is often noted by those in Columbus the stark contrast to how Cleveland approaches community development. The \$50 million received in NSP funding provided an important catalyst for the public, nonprofit and private sector leaders to work together and proven important in providing much needed capital.

In general, community development is driven by large private employers and "eds and meds" institutions in Columbus. Primary drivers are JPMorgan Chase, Ohio State University and Nationwide Children's Hospital that focus on adjacent communities to those educational and medical institutions. Recently, the United Way of Columbus created a Neighborhood Partnership Center – driven in part by private sector leaders - that is in the process of defining a broader agenda in five neighborhoods.

Two prominent examples illustrate the landscape in Columbus:

- JPMorgan Chase Foundation and Ohio State University are the champions for Weinland Park, a depressed area north of downtown. It has engaged the Columbus Foundation and others to invest in the area and has created the Weinland Park Collaborative, which is focused on improving and sustaining the quality of life through renovating housing and providing educational and employment opportunities for existing residents. The collaborative strategy involves coordinated investments of \$15 million pledged by the institutions over the next three to five years for improvements in housing, education, employment, public safety, health, and civic engagement of the residents. There is a goal to build or renovate a net gain of 40-60 homes. The principal funders of the Weinland Park Collaborative are the JPMorgan Chase Foundation, The Columbus Foundation, United Way of Central Ohio, the City of Columbus, Ohio State University, and Campus Partners for Urban Redevelopment. This collaborative work in Weinland Park is viewed as a model to learn from and use what is learned for work in other neighborhoods.
- The Nationwide Children's Hospital is currently engaged in a \$700M to \$1 billion dollar expansion and as such is working in their adjacent communities to the south and east of the hospital to create home ownership and neighborhood stabilization programs. The Hospital has created its own nonprofit entity to accomplish this and will invest \$3-5 million in seed money over 5-7 years to garner a net community gain of at least 40-60 homes. Community Development for All People and Nationwide Children's Hospital have partnered to form the

nonprofit Healthy Neighborhoods, Healthy Families Realty Collaborative to build and rehabilitate and repair houses to sell.

CDCs are not viewed as strong partners and over the years consultants have been critical of CDCs in Columbus. While a few of the CDCs have developed into strong, professional organizations this is viewed as the exception.

Capital

The eds and meds institutions, as well as philanthropic community, are playing a key role in spurring investment in Columbus neighborhoods using a place-based approach, however, there does not appear to be any strategic planning across the community to address neighborhood development comprehensively.

Federal dollars have been important, with Columbus receiving nearly \$23 million in Neighborhood Stabilization Program grants.

Technical Assistance

Technical assistance to CDCs is mostly provided by Ohio Capital Corporation for Housing and the Ohio Community Development Corporation Association.

Cohesion

Community development in Columbus appears to be driven by "anchor institutions" that on their own form strategic partnerships to advance neighborhood improvement in communities adjacent to their institutions.

Overall, there is little cohesion in Columbus among the various institutions involved in community development and agencies are "invited in" when a civic leader/institution champions a particular area. Community development is being driven by the largest employers in Columbus and, as yet, no comprehensive plan is emerging since there appears to be no convener or coalition in Columbus to jump start this dialogue.

Appendix 2: Interviews Conducted

		Milwaukee
Chris	Abele	Milwaukee County Executive
Nancy	Anderson	Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)
Tom	Barrett	Mayor, City of Milwaukee
Al	Bathrick	Retired Executive, Robert W. Baird & LISC Milwaukee Advisory Board m
Melissa	Borino	Vice President, U.S. Bank
Chris	Boston	LISC staff
Martha	Brown	Deputy Commissioner, Department of City Development
Michelle	Bush	LISC consultant
John	Chisholm	Milwaukee Count DA
Patrick	Curley	Chief of Staff, Mayor Tom Barrett
John	Daniels	Managing Partner, Quarles & Brady, LLP
Gwen	Dansby	Vice President, JP Morgan Chase
Ald. Joe	Davis	Alderman, Milwaukee Common Council
Ricardo	Diaz	Executive Director, United Community Center (UCC)
Kathryn	Dunn	Vice President, Community Investment, Greater Milwaukee Foundation
Chief Ed	Flynn	Milwaukee Chief of Police
Erin	Frederick	Program Officer, Zilber Family Foundation
Ellen	Gilligan	President, Greater Milwaukee Foundation
Mike	Gousha	Distinguished Fellow in Law and Public Policy, Marquette University Law
Jesse	Greenlee	Community Development Manager, WHEDA
Gary	Grunau	President & Owner, Grucon Group
Rob	Henken	President, Public Policy Forum
John	Kersy	President, Zilber Ltd
Kal	Lawler	Retired Executive, Harley-Davidson Motor Company
Donald	Layden	Partner, Quarles & Brady, LLP
Bob	Lemke	Partner, Wisconsin Redevelopment, LLC, Associate Professor, MSOE
Susan	Lloyd	Executive Director, Zilber Family Foundation

Mike	Lowell	Chancellor, UW-Milwaukee
Vince	Lyles	President, M&I Bank Community Development Corporation
Cathie	Madden	Retired Executive, American Express & Milwaukee LISC Advisory Board
Barry	Mandel	President, Mandel Group
Rocky	Marcoux	Commissioner, Department of City Development
Ben	McKay	Southeastern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SEWRPC)
Linda	Mellowes	Community Volunteer
Ald. Mike	Murphy	Alderman, Milwaukee Common Council
Pat	O'Brien	President, Milwaukee Development Corporation
Julie	Penman	Retired, Former Commissioner, Department of City Development
Tony	Perez	Executive Director, Housing Authority of the City of Milwaukee
Skip	Poliner	President, Northwestern Mutual
Clare	Reardon	Executive Director, Community Affairs - Froedtert Hospital
Leo	Ries	LISC
Mason	Ross	Retired Executive, Northwestern Mutual
Darlene	Russell	Program Officer, Greater Milwaukee Foundation
Ray	Schmidt	Executive Director, Select Milwaukee
Mike	Schubert	GMF Healthy Neighborhoods consultant
Erich	Schwenker	President, Cardinal Capital Management, Inc.
Tim	Sheehy	President, Metro Milwaukee Chamber of Commerce
Julia	Taylor	President, Greater Milwaukee Committee
Deanna	Tillisch	Vice President, Northwestern Mutual Foundation
Teig	Whaley-Smith	President, Community Development Advocates
Samis	White	Professor of Urban Affairs at UW- Milwaukee
Wyman	Winston	Executive Director, WHEDA
Beth	Wnuk	President, PNC Bank of Wisconsin
Steve	Zimmerman	LISC Consultant

Kansas City

Julie Porter, Executive Director, Great Kansas City LISC
David Miles, President, H&R Block Foundation
Tracy Foster, President, Hall Family Foundation
Mark Stalworth, President and Chief Executive Officer, Neighborhood Housing Services
Joanna Bussiner, Executive Director, Blue Hills Community Services

Indianapolis

William Taft, Executive Director, Indianapolis LISC
James Taylor, Chief Executive Officer, John Boner Community Center
Patricia Gamble-Moore, Executive Director, Indianapolis Neighborhood Housing Project
Jacqueline Nytes, Chief Executive Officer, Mapleton-Fall Creek Community Development Corporation and City Council Member, Indianapolis
Andrew Frazier, Executive Director, Indiana Association for Community Economic Development

Columbus

Amy Klaben, President and Chief Executive Officer, Columbus Housing Partnership
Lisa Courtice, Vice President for Community Research and Grants Management, The Columbus Foundation
Dominique Jones, Vice President Community Engagement, United Way of Columbus
Jeff Lyttle, Midwest Region Vice-President, Corporate Philanthropy, JPMorgan Chase
Boyce Safford, Director, City of Columbus Department of Development