

Twenty-First Century Ownership

Individual and Community Stakes

by Hannab Thomas, PhD Student, *Assets & Inequalities*
 Thomas M. Shapiro, Director, Institute on Assets and Social Policy
 Heller School for Social Policy and Management, Brandeis University

In the current economic crisis, questions around ownership are at the forefront of policy responses. The banking industry bailout, and the auto industry supplications for a bailout, raise the prospect of a major transformation of the public-market relationship. Yet in much of the debate, the policy conversation seems polarized between the traditional two extremes: public investment on one side, and market oriented private ownership on the other. Quietly though, through practice and experimentation, diverse models of ownership have emerged in communities across the country. These models offer a different basis to building wealth for community development and economic recovery, and a potentially more sustainable and equitable economic system.

Underlying all of these conversations is the fundamental question of how we define “ownership.” While ownership as a theory has seized the academic imagination since at least the seventeenth century, recent scholarship has emphasized the link between owning assets and the opportunities these assets offer to low-income households. Developed by Michael Sherraden in the 1990s, this theory argues that assets, whether financial, social or educational, are as important to look at as income in assessing inequality and poverty.¹ Sherraden showed that while U.S. policy favors the accumulation of assets by the middle class and wealthy, primarily through tax benefits related to retirement accounts and homeownership, it creates disincentives for the poor to save. Since then a host of thinkers have pointed to the important role that ownership plays, particularly at the individual level.² Research has suggested that the impact of savings is not just added financial security, but that financial assets change behavior and attitude, opening up opportunities that go well beyond the number of dollars saved.

Most of the focus on assets and ownership has been on individual savings. We argue that there may be an opportunity to rethink that focus. When assets are held individually, there is the risk that these assets will leave the community in search of greater returns. For example, an IDA program participant in a low-income neighborhood may choose to move to the suburbs when it is time to buy a home. In contrast, community-held institutions, such as schools, local businesses, land, and open spaces, are important local assets that may also be able to leverage community change.

Figure 8.1 Tax benefit, in dollars, from the mortgage interest deduction, property tax deduction, and preferential rates on capital gains and dividends for households of different income levels.

Income	Tax Benefit
\$1–5,000	\$0
\$5,000–10,000	\$0
\$10,000–15,000	\$3
\$15,000–20,000	\$10
\$20,000–25,000	\$20
\$25,000–30,000	\$45
\$30,000–35,000	\$74
\$35,000–40,000	\$122
\$40,000–50,000	\$264
\$50,000–60,000	\$418
\$60,000–70,000	\$606
\$70,000–80,000	\$836
\$80,000–90,000	\$1,124
\$90,000–100,000	\$1,469
\$100,000–150,000	\$2,604
\$150,000–200,000	\$4,383
\$200,000–500,000	\$7,860
\$500,000–1,000,000	\$20,512
\$1,000,000 or more	\$169,150

Source: Corporation for Enterprise Development

However, some critical questions have yet to be addressed. Who is the most appropriate owner of such institutions and resources and/or who commands their use? How can these community assets become a foundation for long-term community well-being? As of yet, the majority of the asset field has not focused on shared ownership strategies for building wealth, nor looked at the benefits of holding critical community or natural resources or institutions communally.

This is changing, however. Recently the Annie E. Casey foundation hosted a meeting in Baltimore where a diverse range of shared-ownership strategies for building and

controlling assets were presented.³ The evidence from these strategies does point to positive and equitable outcomes from shared ownership.

Take for example the case of Market Creek Plaza, a community owned commercial development project in San Diego started in 1998. The project was a response to 800 neighborhood surveys sent out by The Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation that articulated a desire for a vibrant and creative commercial and cultural hub.⁴ Since 2007, this shopping center has been owned in part by the community, purchased by 415 residents through a community development IPO (initial public offering).⁵ Investors need only \$2,000 in net income, and can invest between \$200 and \$10,000.⁶ The community also holds a 20 percent ownership share in the company through the non-profit Neighborhood Unity Fund. Profits are split: one third of the wealth created through Market Creek goes for personal investor benefit, one third for community benefit, and the remaining third is for ongoing development of Market Creek. The project has had a significant impact on local residents, creating more than 200 new permanent jobs in the neighborhood, awarding 79 percent of construction contracts to minority and women-owned businesses, as well

These models offer a different basis to building wealth for community development and economic recovery, and a potentially more sustainable and equitable economic system.

as creating a multi-cultural community art collection estimated at \$570,000.⁷ Any profits from Market Creek go first to community residents, building wealth from their initial investment, then to Neighborhood Unity Foundation.

Another example comes from resident owned manufactured home parks. The New Hampshire Community Loan Fund helped finance the first model where residents of a manufactured home park bought out the park. This gave them control and ownership of the land their homes were on. Currently 88 manufactured home communities representing over 5,000 individuals have followed this model in New Hampshire alone. In comparison to traditional manufactured home parks where residents merely have leasing agreements, families in these communities are protected against excessive rent-hikes and have control over what happens in the park.⁸ Additionally, wealth building occurs for families if the land value of the park increases. A recent study found that homes in resident owned communities had higher prices per square foot than in investor owned communities.⁹

Or consider the Champlain Housing Trust (CHT) in Burlington, Vermont, the oldest example of a housing land trust in the U.S. It has a shared ownership model where the land trust owns the land and the individual family owns the house on the land, and leases the land for a nominal fee. Homebuyers have to be low-income. They access a lower priced home because the cost of the land is not included, but CHT also works with the bank to reduce mortgage costs by including the land as equity in the mortgage calculation. Their default rates have been very low even in this time of unprecedented foreclosures, and reportedly families have seen high (29 percent) levels of return on their investments in the homes.¹⁰

One final example is the Mission Asset Fund (MAF) in San Francisco, focused on place-based community and individual asset building. Initially envisioned as a traditional Individual Development Account program, the MAF emerged from an extensive series of community-based meetings which revealed that residents wanted to build communal assets to protect the rich cultural vibrancy of the neighborhood.¹¹ Since MAF's inception, it has helped fund worker-owned cooperative businesses such as Balloon Art Productions and Rental, and cooperatively owned homes in partnership with the San Francisco Community Land Trust.



Residents walking along the Laotian Tile Tapestry, part of Market Creek Plaza's Cultural Tapestry Walkways

MAF's focus on addressing savings and investments at the community level, as opposed to an individual based program approach, will hopefully spur not only greater wealth among residents, but also a greater level of community engagement and empowerment.¹²

Ownership of assets, whether community owned or individually owned, means that there is control over the assets.


This may be the most important lesson to be learned from these models. Ownership of assets, whether community owned or individually owned, means that there is control over the assets. This control allows the owner to make decisions about what happens to the asset. For example, if you own a house, you have control over it and can make decisions about what repairs to do, or whether you can have kids in the house. Having a stake in ownership, whether individual, or community, means that you are able to participate in making decisions about what happens to that asset.

This is a powerful idea, and can form the basis for a new policy response in this time of economic crisis. Any one of these models could be conceptualized at the national scale.

For example, rather than merely bailing out the auto industry, what would happen if we directed that investment to the community itself? The Mission Asset Foundation was formed in response to Levi-Strauss closing the doors of a factory that had long been a mainstay of jobs for residents in the community. The company made a commitment to the community, and invested one million dollars to jump-start MAF. In addition to investing government dollars into making the auto industry viable, it makes sense to

invest dollars into community institutions that can help residents build wealth and ownership through starting new cooperative businesses along the models of the MAF or Market Creek Plaza. This would offer more resilience for the community to manage the difficult times ahead as the auto industry restructures.

Instead of pumping money into bailing out the banks, the U.S. Treasury could establish a moratorium on foreclosures, and then invest in innovative shared-ownership strategies like the CHT. This idea is already gaining some traction at the local level. For example, efforts are being made by communities in Boston to organize tenants of foreclosed properties to buy out the bank or the original owner. The model will use a land trust to hold the land and the residents will purchase condos or the entire house.¹³ An example with a longer track record is the Anti-Displacement Project (A-DP) in Springfield, Massachusetts, which has established 1,400 units of tenant-owned cooperative housing. Members of A-DP are typically low-income and often single parents.¹⁴ Shared ownership doesn't have to be at odds with the marketplace, in fact, these types of investments could get markets back on track.

The national political conversation in the U.S. over-emphasizes a rigid public-market dichotomy that does not square with reality. Instead, out of the glare of the national spotlight, innovative practice has been re-molding this relationship for decades. The asset field, in particular, has been pushing public-private boundaries, emphasizing the large sphere of interaction and benefit of morphing models. The 2008 (im)perfect storm of a subprime meltdown, plunging housing and stock wealth, and the specter of a deep recession is recasting possibilities. We believe that bringing forth and investing in the innovative, shared ownership strategies that are percolating under the surface of this economic crisis would create a longer-term sustainable solution for a progressive ownership society benefiting families, communities, and the nation. 

Strengthening Community Development Infrastructure

1. Malanga, Steven (2005). "America's Worst Urban Program: The Bush Administration is right to put the community development block grant out of its misery." *City Journal*, Spring 2005. Online at www.city-journal.org.
2. Richardson, Todd (2005) "CDBG Formula Targeting to Community Development Need." Office of Policy Development and Research, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington, DC. February 2005.
3. Czerwinski, Stanley (2006). "Community Development Block Grant Formula: Options for Improving the Targeting of Funds." United States Government Accountability Office, Testimony Before the Subcommittee on Federalism and the Census, Committee on Government Reform, House of Representatives. June 27, 2006, and Buss, Terry (2008). "Reforming CDBG: An Illusive Quest" *Reengineering Community Development for the 21st Century*, eds. Donna Fabiani and Terry Buss, National Academy of Public Administration, ME Sharpe, Armonk, New York, 2008.
4. Accordino, John, George Galster, and Peter Tatian (2005). "The Impacts of Targeted Public and Nonprofit Investment on Neighborhood Development." LISC and the Federal Reserve Bank of Richmond, July 2005.
5. Buss, Terry (2008).

Encouraging Entrepreneurship

1. This paper is based in part on a policy paper developed by the Microenterprise Anti-Poverty Consortium (MAP). Comprising the Corporation for Enterprise Development (CFED), the Association for Enterprise Opportunity, The Aspen Institute and the Center for Rural Affairs, the mission of MAP is to advance microenterprise as an anti-poverty and economic development strategy.
2. Association for Enterprise Opportunity (2008) "About Microenterprise" www.microenterpriseworks.org
3. National Community Reinvestment Coalition. "The Community Reinvestment Act" http://www.nccr.org/index.php?option=com_content&task=view&id=100&Itemid=123
4. Joachim, David (2008). "Betting your Retirement on Your Startup," *The New York Times*, published September 30, 2008.
5. "2006 Annual Report to Congress." (2006) National Tax Payer Advocate. <http://www.irs.gov/advocate/>
6. "Report to Congress Assets for Independence Program, Status at the Conclusion of the 8th Year", Office of Community Services, Administration of Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services (2008). <http://www.acf.hhs.gov/programs/ocs/afi/research.html>; "ORR Individual Development Account Program: An Evaluation Report; full report," Office of Refugee Resettlement, Administration of Children and Families, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, <http://www.ised.us/template/page.cfm?id=223>; and CFED's 2006 IDA program survey.
7. Joyce A. Klein, Ilgar Alisultanov and Amy Kays Blair, *Microenterprise as a Welfare-to-Work Strategy: Two-Year Findings*. (Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute, November 2003), 48; and Peggy Clark and Amy Kays, *Microenterprise and the Poor*. (Washington, D.C.: The Aspen Institute, 1999), 69.

A New Look at the CRA

1. Press release of Senator Robert Menendez, "Fed Chairman Bernanke Confirms to Sen. Menendez that Community Reinvestment Act is not to Blame for Foreclosure Crisis" December 2, 2008. <http://menendez.senate.gov/pdf/112508ResponsefromBernankeonCRA.pdf>

2. Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (1993), Report to the Congress on Community Development Lending by Depository Institutions (Washington: Board of Governors), pp. 1-69; and Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System (2000), The Performance and Profitability of CRA-Related Lending (Washington: Board of Governors, July), pp. 1-99.
3. Please see the speech "The Community Reinvestment Act and the Recent Mortgage Crisis" by Federal Reserve Governor Randall Kroszner, delivered December 3, 2008 for more information. www.federalreserve.gov/newsevents/speech/kroszner20081203a.htm
4. Laderman, Elizabeth and Carolina Reid (2008). "Lending in Low- and Moderate-Income Neighborhoods in California: The Performance of CRA Lending During the Subprime Meltdown" Working paper presented at the Federal Reserve System Conference on Housing and Mortgage Markets, Washington, DC, December 4, 2008.

A New Safety Net for Low-Income Families

1. This article is adapted from "A New Safety Net for Low Income Families," by Sheila Zedlewski, Ajay Chaudry, and Margaret Simms (2008). The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/publications/411738.html
2. Acs, Gregory and Margery Austin Turner (2008). "Making Work Pay Enough: A Decent Standard of Living for Working Families." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411710_work_pay.pdf
3. U.S. Census Bureau News (2008). "Household Income Rises, Poverty Rate Unchanged, Number of Uninsured Down." Press release, August 26, 2008.
4. Perry, Cynthia and Linda Blumberg (2008). "Making Work Pay II: Comprehensive Health Insurance for Low-Income Working Families." The Urban Institute. http://www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411714_working_families.pdf
5. Waters Boots, Shelly, Jennifer Macomber, and Anna Danzinger (2008). "Family Security: Supporting Parents' Employment and Children's Development." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411718_parent_employment.pdf
6. Holzer, Harry and Karin Martinson (2008). "Helping Poor Working Parents Get Ahead: Federal Funds for New State Strategies and Systems." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411722_working_parents.pdf
7. Loprest, Pamela and Karin Martinson (2008). "Supporting Work for Low-Income People with Significant Challenges." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411726_supporting_work.pdf
8. Simms, Margaret (2008). "Weathering Job Loss: Unemployment Insurance." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411730_job_loss.pdf
9. McKernan, Signe-Mary and Caroline Ratcliffe (2008). "Enabling Families to Weather Emergencies and Develop." The Urban Institute. www.urban.org/UploadedPDF/411734_enabling_families.pdf

Return on Investment

1. Alan Greenspan, "Sustainable Community Development: What Works, What Doesn't, and Why?" remarks delivered at Federal Reserve System conference on Community Affairs Research, March 28, 2003. <http://www.federalreserve.gov/boarddocs/speeches/2003/20030328/default.htm>.
2. The Urban Institute (2008). *Beyond Ideology, Politics, and Guesswork: The Case for Evidence-Based Policy: Revised 2008* (Washington, D.C.: The Urban Institute).
3. National Academy of Sciences (2008). *Rebuilding the Research Capacity at HUD* (Washington, D.C.: National Academy of Sciences).
4. Ibid., p. 2-13.

Supporting Young Children and Families

1. This article is adapted from "Supporting Young Children and Families: An Investment Strategy That Pays," by Julia Isaacs, published by The Brookings Institution Opportunity 08 project and the First Focus publication *Big Ideas for Children: Investing in Our Nation's Future*.
2. The estimate assumes annual per child costs of \$9,200 per year and participation rates of 75 percent for poor four-year olds, 60 percent for poor three-year olds as well as partially subsidized four-year olds, and 35 percent for partially subsidized three-year olds. For more details, see Isaacs, 2007.
3. Subtracting out the \$6.5 billion currently provided to three- and four-year olds through Head Start yields the \$18 billion figure for new costs. The long-term goal would be to bring the national Head Start program and the burgeoning state pre-kindergarten programs together into an expanded national pre-kindergarten initiative that provides comprehensive, high-quality services to three- and four-year-olds. Initially, however, the federal government might have to continue separate funding streams for Head Start and the new pre-kindergarten initiative.
4. Rolnick, Arthur and Rob Grunewald (2007). "The Economics of Early Childhood Development as Seen by Two Fed Economists," *Community Investments* 19(2), Federal Reserve Bank of San Francisco.
5. Olds, David L. (2006). "The Nurse-Family Partnership: An Evidence-Based Preventive Intervention." *Infant Mental Health Journal*, vol. 27, no. 1: 5–25.
6. The \$2 billion estimate follows the methodology outlined in Isaacs, 2007 (Cost Effective Investments in Children, Brookings Institution) except that it assumes that 50 percent of eligible women would participate, as in typical sites operating today, rather than 75 percent, as in the initial three experiments. This change, based on information provided by the Nurse-Family Partnership National Service Office, reduces the cost estimate from \$3 billion to \$2 billion.
7. Waldfogel, Jane (1999). "Family Leave Coverage in the 1990s." *Monthly Labor Review*. October 1999, 13–21.
8. See Boots, Macomber, and Danziger (2008) "Family Security: Supporting Parents' Employment and Children's Development," The Urban Institute, for further information on California's Paid Family Leave program and for a similar proposal for employee-financed paid family leave through state pooled funds.

Beyond Shelter

1. "Enterprise Commends House Ways & Means Committee for Passage of Landmark Low-Income Housing Tax Credit Modernization Legislation." (2008) Enterprise Community Partners.
2. The credit allocation is generally derived by multiplying the "qualified basis" of approved development costs by the applicable percentage.
3. "Low-Income Housing Tax Credit: Tax Credit Percentages." Novogradac & Company, LLP. http://www.novoco.com/low_income_housing/facts_figures/tax_credit_2008.php
4. Neighborworks America (2008) "Low Income Housing Tax Credit Modernization in HERA 2008" www.nw.org/Network/policy/documents/RegaringPublicLaw110--289MF-LIHTCCChanges10-4-08.pdf
5. Ibid.
6. Federal Policy Project (2008). "California Advocates Propose Major New Stimulus Spending on Affordable Homes." www.chpc.net/dnld/NOV08_FPPstimulus-FINAL.pdf
7. "National Housing Trust Fund: President Signs Housing Trust Fund Into Law on July 30, 2008," National Housing Trust Fund, www.nhtf.org
8. Sard, Barbara and Will Fischer (2008). "Preserving Safe, High Quality Public Housing Should be a Priority of Federal Housing Policy." Center on Budget and Policy Priorities.
9. Ibid.
10. Lipman, Barbara. (2006) "A Heavy Load: The Combined Housing and Transportation Burden of Working Families," Center for Housing Policy. http://www.nhc.org/pdf/pub_heavy_load_10_06.pdf

11. Lipman, Barbara. (2005) "Something's Gotta Give: Working Families and the High Cost of Housing," Center for Housing Policy. http://www.nhc.org/pdf/pub_nc_sgg_04_05.pdf
12. Housing + Transportation Affordability Index <http://htaindex.cnt.org/>
13. Reconnecting America. "Realizing the Potential: Expanding Housing Opportunities Near Transit." www.reconnectingamerica.org/public/reports
14. Ibid.
15. "Research Demonstrates Positive Impact of Family Resident Services on Property Financial Performance" (2007) Enterprise Community Partners, Inc. <http://www.practitionerresources.org/cache/documents/645/64551.pdf>
16. Proscio, Tony. (2006) "More than Roofs and Walls: Why Resident Services are an Indispensable Part of Affordable Housing" Enterprise Community Partners.
17. "2008-2010 Research and Policy Agenda" National Resident Services Collaborative. http://www.enterprisecommunity.org/programs/documents/research_policy_agenda.pdf
18. Waller, Margy. (2005) "High Cost or High Opportunity Cost? Transportation and Family Economic Success," *Brookings Institution Policy Brief*, Center on Children and Families #35, December 2005.
19. Garfinkel, Perry. "A Hotel's Secret: Treat the Guests Like Guests." *New York Times*, August 23, 2008. <http://www.nytimes.com/2008/08/23/business/23interview.html>
20. Proscio, Tony. (2008) "Sustainable, Affordable, Doable: Demystifying the Process of Green Affordable Housing" Enterprise Community Partners.
21. "H.R. 6078: GREEN Act of 2008" Govtrack. www.govtrack.us
22. Proscio, Tony. (2008) "Sustainable, Affordable, Doable: Demystifying the Process of Green Affordable Housing" Enterprise Community Partners.
23. Ibid.

Twenty-First Century Ownership

1. Sherraden, Michael (1991). *Assets and the Poor*. Armonk, NY: M.E. Sharpe.
2. Brown, Larry, Robert Kuttner, and Thomas Shapiro (2005). "Building a Real Ownership Society."; Bynner, J. and Will Paxton (2001). "The Asset Effect." London, Institute for Public Policy Research; Schneider, Daniel and Peter Tufano (2004). "New Savings from Old Innovations: Asset-Building for the Less Affluent." Community Development Finance Research Conference; Shapiro, Thomas (2004). *The Hidden Cost of Being African-American*: Oxford University Press; Sodha, Sonia (2006). "Lessons from Across the Atlantic."
3. Woo, Beadsie and Heather McCoullough (2008). "Expanding Asset Building through Shared Ownership." Annie E Casey Foundation.
4. Market Creek Plaza website, www.marketcreek.com
5. Interview with Tracy Bryan, Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation
6. Stuhldreher, Anne (2007). "The People's IPO: Lower-income patrons of Market Creek Plaza can now invest in the shopping center." *Stanford Social Innovation Review*, Winter 2006.
7. Interview with Tracy Bryan, Jacobs Center for Neighborhood Innovation
8. New Hampshire Community Loan Fund (2008). News release, "Loan Fund sends housing strategy nationwide." May 6, 2008.
9. French, Charlie, Kelly Giraud, and Salld Ward (2008). "Building Wealth through Ownership: Resident-Owned manufactured housing communities in New Hampshire." *Journal of Extension*, 46.
10. Fireside, Daniel (2008). "Community Land Trust Keeps Prices Affordable - for now and forever." *Yes! Magazine*, Fall 2008.
11. Mission Asset Fund website. "The Mission Asset Fund: Investing in the American Dream." www.missionassetfund.org
12. Ibid.
13. Interview with Steve Meacham, Tenant Organizing Coordinator, Vida Urbana, October 3, 2008
14. Silverman, Ann, Kalima Rose, and Dwayne S. Marsh (2006). "Community Controlled Housing for Massachusetts: Securing Affordability for the Long Term." Action for Regional Equity, Policy Link.