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Abstract

In 2012, the City of Richmond submitted a proposal and was selected to be home of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Second Campus. The elimination of more than $1.5 billion in federal funding halted the project, after which the Berkeley Global Campus concept was developed and introduced by the University of California, Berkeley (UC Berkeley) chancellor. The proposed Berkeley Global Campus is an international research and education hub that Richmond anticipates will anchor a revitalized waterfront district. The campus is an opportunity to build from the ground up a university campus that will also generate wealth for the local community. Richmond is grappling with challenges that are familiar to many cities: 1) how to enable redevelopment of a vacant, previously industrial site, and 2) how to shape a university-community partnership that facilitates deep economic impact in communities in areas including employment, local procurement, and housing. As UC Berkeley and the City of Richmond remain committed to realizing the vision for the university campus, this period can be utilized to articulate a deliberative and inclusive planning process building on the planning and collaborative infrastructure already in place. This thesis explores how the City of Richmond can help facilitate the university campus development and achieve social goals based on wealth creation.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

In 2012, the City of Richmond submitted a proposal and was selected to be home of the Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory (LBNL) Second Campus. The elimination of more than $1.5 billion in federal funding halted the project, after which the Berkeley Global Campus concept was developed and introduced by the University of California (UC Berkeley) chancellor. While the LBNL Second Campus was envisioned to centralize bioscience research and serve as the center of a biotechnology cluster, the proposed Berkeley Global Campus will be an international hub with a focus on global issues, culture, and collaboration. The campus is an opportunity to build from the ground up a university campus that will also generate wealth for the local community. Richmond is grappling with challenges that are familiar to many cities: 1) enabling redevelopment of a vacant, previously industrial site, and 2) shaping a university-community partnership that facilitates deep economic impact in communities in areas including employment, local procurement, and housing. As UC Berkeley and the City of Richmond remain committed to realizing the vision for the university campus, this period can be utilized to articulate a deliberative and inclusive planning process building on the planning and collaborative infrastructure already in place. This thesis explores how the City of Richmond can help facilitate the university campus development and achieve social goals based on wealth creation.

Once a location of the Kaiser Shipyards and supporting industries, the area along Richmond’s southern shoreline has economically declined as industrial uses have transitioned. UC Berkeley seeks to build a global campus on a 136-acre university-owned area. The vision for the Berkeley Global Campus is an international research hub that anchors a mixed-use waterfront district in Richmond. The Berkeley Global Campus is anticipated to include over 5.4 million square feet of research and development facilities at full build out. Plans for the Berkeley Global Campus include a population of 1,300 on the site after the first phase of construction, which would place the campus among the top ten employers in Richmond. At full build out by 2050, the campus plans to have a daily average of 10,000 workers, faculty, students, and guests.1 The City of Richmond’s plans for the surrounding area include retail and services, over 4,000 housing units, and public and natural open space (Appendix I).2 The contemporary urban university is an integrated, place-based concept that not only achieves its global research, education, and commercial goals, but creates social benefit for its surrounding region and community.

Purpose

This project concerns the prospect that a 136-acre site owned by UC Berkeley in Richmond, California can be developed into an international research and education hub that also creates and helps sustain community wealth. While the form of this development, calendar for construction, and other crucial factors are yet to be determined, stakeholders have begun to explore the ways that the Berkeley Global Campus can be planned to provide deep social benefit to Richmond. The objective of this thesis is to provide evidence of the ways in which the concept of an anchor institution,

---
2 City of Richmond. Draft Richmond Bay Specific Plan. October 2015.
and all that it entails and its implications, can be utilized to shape the effect of the development that takes place on the site to help facilitate community wealth creation. The notion of an anchor institution is explored as a development impulse for the Berkeley Global Campus that helps enable stakeholders to realize greatest social benefit for the Richmond community. As a client-based project, this thesis is intended to help inform the City of Richmond as it pursues development of the Berkeley Global Campus.

**Research Question**

This research project aims to answer the core question: How can the anchor concept help shape a university development project?

I will also explore the following questions:

- What is the role of the university in urban development?
- How do university anchor institutions work? What do they require?
- What are economic principles that guide development? Guiding this project? What are the social goals?
- What are common characteristics of university expansion or urban development projects that create social benefit for local communities? What are factors of success? What are lessons learned?
- What is the role of city government in development projects?

**Methodology**

This is a client-based thesis with the City of Richmond that will provide recommendations and potential next steps for its approach towards the Berkeley Global Campus. This project employs both primary and secondary sources of research. Academic literature, field-based publications, public documents, and community-based publications were reviewed as essential background information and basis for case study analysis. Generally speaking, literature review consists of anchor institutions and university-led urban development. Case studies were selected to provide insight to comparable aspects of university expansion, university-led urban revitalization, and/or university anchor projects in low-income and communities of color over the last 20 years. For insight into efforts in the field, I contacted professionals in anchor development. For insight into the Berkeley Global Campus, I contacted working group members and other Richmond stakeholders including institutional representatives and community members (Appendix II).

**Structure**

This report is organized into the following sections:

1. **Introduction**
2. **The University Anchor and Economic Development**: reviews literature on anchor institutions, universities and urban development; examines terms, common features, and economic development principles
3. **Drawing Lessons from Case Studies**: examines five case studies selected for lessons learned and best practices, synthesizes themes and models for lessons and best practices
4. **Recommendations**: offers steps by which the City of Richmond and its partners may adopt such models
5. **Conclusion**
Chapter 2 – Economic Development Principles of the University Anchor

The University Anchor

What is an Anchor Institution?

Anchors are large institutions that are rooted in place. As large anchors with a public service mission, educational and medical institutions have been most studied. Cities have often overlooked these fixed assets even though they are typically top employers and generators of economic activity. Many anchor institutions tend to operate in isolation from their surrounding neighborhoods, perpetuating structural inequities or at times advancing their interests to the detriment of communities. However, momentum behind refiguring anchor institutions is growing. Trends related to globalization, such as the decline of manufacturing, rise of the service sector, and growing government fiscal crisis, suggest the growing importance of anchor institutions to local economies. Within cities, national chain stores have replaced local and regional stores, and national banks have bought local and regional banks. Anchors are often the last large employers remaining after for-profit companies have relocated from cities in decline. The notion of an anchor institution has gained momentum as an asset-based development approach to strengthening local economies. It can further be used to assert rights to quality jobs, housing, and other needs for healthy urban living.

The anchor concept advances the idea of community wealth building. According to The Democracy Collaborative, “if traditional economic development tends to be about attracting industry to a community, building wealth is instead about using under-utilized local assets to make a community more vibrant. It’s about developing assets in such a way that the wealth stays local. And the aim is helping families and communities control their own economic destiny.” Building community wealth enhances the ability of communities and individuals to increase asset ownership, anchor jobs locally, expand public services, and ensure local economic stability. The Democracy Collaborative in Cleveland, Ohio and Netter Center for Community Partnerships at University of Pennsylvania have

amassed a tremendous amount of work, which includes an Anchor Institution Toolkit\(^9\), Anchor Dashboard study that begins to propose potential metrics for measuring the success of anchor institutions, and a website with several dozen anchor institution case studies.\(^{10,11}\)

**Universities and Urban Development**

Core to this inquiry is the question of the responsibility of the university to society. As one of the key institutions of the West, universities are intended to have a broad impact on society in intellectual thought and in the advancement of science and technology. Various authors discuss the ideological divides between the corporate and democratic, service-oriented faces of the university. The anchor concept deals specifically with that universities are often located in neighborhoods struggling with poverty, crime, and urban decline. They are large employers, significant providers of external funds, cultural opportunities, entrepreneurship and economic development. One of the main areas of contention between universities and their local governments is taxes, services, and the degree to which universities are subject to local ordinances and regulation.\(^{12}\) As tax-exempt institutions, they are not required to pay taxes that create a sustainable source of income for the city. Under the anchor institution concept, the university’s role advancing public service includes service to its immediate neighborhoods.

The evolution of the university in the U.S. helps explain their historical trends, role, and impact on urban change today. The historical ties between top-tier universities and industry have been a key factor in the rise of the U.S. as a technological power. Professor Harley Etienne provides an account of the university as initially a colonial liberal arts concept with an anti-urban bias that evolved parallel to processes of urbanization and de-industrialization in the U.S.\(^{13}\) The tradition of state-funded colleges began in the south in the late 18\(^{th}\) century and spread from there on. In 1862, the Morrill Act allocated federal land to the states to establish land-grant colleges focusing on agriculture, engineering, and other professions. The contribution of land-grant universities to economic development is recognized as one of the successes of higher education. The establishment of the Cooperative Extension Service in 1941 formalized the public service mission of the land grant universities and created a model for university-community collaboration that remains in place today.\(^{14}\) Universities were drivers of industrialization in the U.S., responding to the needs in technology and training


the engineers and scientists to lead the industries. Through the middle of the twentieth century and particularly at the onset of the Cold War, universities became increasingly linked to the federal government, especially through military research contracts. Like other federal laboratories, LBNL was established next to the university, drawing on intellectual capital through faculty and students and co-benefiting from shared institutional resources. Stanford and MIT were part of the science military industrial complex and were engines for economic growth in the Silicon Valley and New England, respectively. The co-location of universities and industry continued to facilitate development, commercialization of technologies, and military research.

In surrounding communities, many universities have a legacy of displacement of low income and communities of color. During the urban renewal program enabled in 1949, legislation allowed federal funds to be used by cities to acquire properties considered slums. Universities were able to seize land in their vicinities for development. As cities de-industrialized after World War II, many universities found themselves not able to ignore urban crime and poverty plaguing surrounding neighborhoods. In the 1990s, university-community partnership centers began to form in a number of campuses across the country. University expansion projects often have significant economic impact to state and regional economies. However, ensuring that immediately surrounding communities are the beneficiaries of the development is only an emerging area of work. Wiewel and Perry document how, overall, the nature of university-community relations appears to have improved over the past fifty years in terms of ethical criteria and principles of fairness and transparency. The notion of an anchor institution aims to reconfigure universities so that they have as part of their core functions to create quality jobs, ensure housing, and other social benefits for the community.

**Emergence of the University as an Integrated, Place-Based Concept**

According to ICIC and CEOs for Cities, leveraging academic assets in urban economic growth strategies is one of the greatest untapped urban revitalization opportunities in the U.S. For urban communities, the engagement of universities represents the opportunity to leverage some of the only significant fixed capital still found in inner-city neighborhoods. This capital is significant. Universities have inner city real estate portfolios valued at almost $100 billion. In 2008, inner city anchors spent over $200 billion on goods, services, and pay. Furthermore, despite the recent economic recession, universities have sought to expand their campuses, suggesting the growing importance of attention to equitable university-led development.

---

The university is a particular kind of anchor institution characterized by a large and transient student population, significant intellectual capital, and a driving force in the service sector and knowledge economy. Universities can be challenging neighbors. Like other anchor institutions, they are large institutions that often operate in isolation, are tax exempt, and do not always provide the desired economic stimulus to cities. Their priorities are not often aligned with local community development. At worst, they have at times advanced interests that are at the detriment of surrounding communities. However, the urban university is evolving.

The role of the university is increasingly an engaged, place-based concept. Rita Axelroth-Hodges and Steve Dubb articulate the role of the university as an anchor institution as being to “consciously and strategically apply the institution’s long-term, place-based economic power, in combination with its human and intellectual resources, to better the welfare of the community in which it resides.” Though there has been tension in the history of university-community relations, universities that have set out to improve their surrounding neighborhoods have had success. While there is a broad literature on university-community relations, often known as “town-gown” relations, the anchor institution mission calls on universities to strategically reorient the university mission to focus corporate and academic resources to assist in community economic development and local problem solving work.19

**Economic Development Principles**

Economic development principles that shape U.S. cities today largely favor corporate private ownership, large-scale development projects, private and global investments, and market-based solutions. Typical economic development principles informing development in cities include:

- Pursue market-driven development – pursue development based on analysis of real estate characteristics
- Cluster industries – Co-locate industries to facilitate technology transfer and spinoff businesses, building on and positioning the competitive advantage of a region
- Attract major employers – Increase employment opportunities, expand the tax base, generate economic activity, and build strong industries
- Pursue large-scale development projects – Increase the tax base and help attract private investment
- Attract private investment – Leverage development to increase private investment in the city for a greater tax base and economic activity

**Local Economic Development Principles Guiding the Proposed Berkeley Global Campus**

All of the above economic development principles influence city government and the Berkeley Global Campus development. Additionally, the Berkeley Global Campus proposal is also guided by a set of local economic development principles. The use of the

---

anchor notion provides specific ways by which economies can be localized, or suggests links by which elements that are often drivers in the global economy. These local economic development principles include:

- Attract major employers – Create local job opportunities and redevelop vacant or underutilized space
- Create a retail environment – Expands the tax base and increases economic activity
- Ensure adequate housing – Ensure that economic development efforts are complemented with adequate housing in reasonable proximity
- Enable local enterprise – Enable successful local enterprise for a diverse, healthy small business ecosystem
- Create integrated, walkable neighborhoods – Develop physical environment with the goal of place-making

**Articulating Social Goals**

The anchor notion further articulates a set of social goals in economic development for the local population that includes:

- Quality construction jobs for local residents, women, and minorities
- Affordable housing to meet community needs
- Quality permanent jobs for local residents, women, and minorities
- Contracts for goods and services going to local, women, and minority-owned businesses
- Local business development and assistance
- Workforce development and pipeline programs for local residents
- Educational and pipeline programs for local residents
- Development that is based on and supports local culture and the arts
- Investment in public infrastructure and services
- Investment in community programs
- Community ownership of assets

**Shared Value**

The concept of shared value posits that institutions and communities can mutually gain from an anchor approach. According to Michael Porter, shared value is defined as “policies and operating practices that enhance the competitiveness of a company while simultaneously advancing the economic and social conditions in the communities in which it operates...shared value is not social responsibility, but a new way to achieve economic success.”

According to the Initiative for a Competitive Inner City (ICIC), there are seven capacities in which anchors typically interact with their communities: real estate developer, purchaser, employer, workforce developer, cluster anchor, community infrastructure builder, core product or service. From the perspective of the institution, gains from a successful partnership with the community around an anchor approach include access to desirable real estate, a healthier business community and competitive

---

pool of vendors, flourishing adjacent neighborhoods, and stronger branding. To reach maximum shared value, anchors, governments, not-for-profits, and local businesses need to work together. UC Berkeley and the Richmond community can benefit from approaching development through a shared value perspective. Table 1 shows six main anchor functions, as developed by the ICIC, and how university and community can approach each of the functions for their respective benefits.

Table 1: Shared Value for Anchor and Community

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anchor Role</th>
<th>Shared Value for Anchor</th>
<th>Shared Value for Community</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Developer</td>
<td>Access to waterfront real estate, ability to leverage private development money, reduced time to construction and other savings</td>
<td>Appropriate real estate development in underutilized South Shoreline, ability to leverage private development money for mixed-use development complementary to campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchaser</td>
<td>A more competitive pool of vendors, suppliers that may be better able to meet the anchor's needs</td>
<td>Local jobs and a healthier business environment, enhanced neighborhood amenities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employer</td>
<td>Greater employee pool, better employee retention, more engaged and satisfied employees through the ability to live locally</td>
<td>Local, accessible jobs with opportunities for career advancement, increased demand for local goods and services, increased dollars spent in the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce</td>
<td>A stronger applicant pool, committed employees, improved employee retention</td>
<td>Access to appropriate local jobs, job training and opportunities for career advancement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer Cluster Anchor</td>
<td>Healthier business community, improved productivity, improved choices of vendors and business partners, better access to all levels of employees, stronger branding</td>
<td>Jobs, stronger tax base, opportunity for research collaborations, more research and development funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infrastructure</td>
<td>Depends on the anchor's competencies and focus and can include: safe streets, housing, qualified pool of potential hires, more accessible transportation systems</td>
<td>Varies greatly and may include reduction in crime, improved physical infrastructure, increased housing values, more jobs, better schools, improved retail systems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Chapter 3 – Drawing Lessons from Case Studies

Case Study Profiles

The following section provides profiles of five case studies based on inquiry into university-linked expansion, anchor initiatives, and neighborhood revitalization projects. This section aims to provide a descriptive analysis of examples of university anchor institutions, including how they came about, what they intended, what happened and why, and where they succeeded and failed. Profiles were developed through use of various primary and secondary sources. The cases are not intended to be models in and of themselves and their inclusion in this report should not be perceived as an endorsement of their practices. The case studies represent only a cursory examination of the complex histories and processes of each of these developments and university-community relationships. Accounts of development often vary widely between university- and community-published information. I aimed to illustrate these varying accounts. The five case studies are:

- Columbia University (New York, NY) – Manhattanville Campus
- Johns Hopkins University (Baltimore, MD) – East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative
- Syracuse University (Syracuse, NY) – Near Westside Initiative
- University of California, San Francisco (San Francisco, CA) – Mission Bay Campus
- University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, PA) – West Philadelphia Initiatives

Relevant to the Berkeley Global Campus context, all case studies are university developments or anchor strategies and have direct impact on surrounding low income and communities of color. Explicitly naming their projects anchor initiatives are Johns Hopkins University, Syracuse University, and University of Philadelphia. Columbia University and UC San Francisco do not explicitly name their projects as anchor initiatives. Explicit campus expansion projects are the Columbia University Manhattanville campus, Johns Hopkins University East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative, and UC San Francisco Mission Bay campus. These case studies also have biotechnology space expansion as central or component to facility build out. Syracuse University’s Near Westside Initiative and the University of Pennsylvania’s West Philadelphia Initiatives were more focused on neighborhood revitalization, although the university already had a long history of expansion in West Philadelphia and Syracuse’s Near Westside Initiative included facilities to house and synergize with university activities. I selected case studies that have had at least a few years of implementation. These projects illustrate relevant scenarios, encompassing elements of more conventional university development to more experimental partnerships to implement anchor strategies.
Columbia University (New York, NY) – Manhattanville Campus Expansion into West Harlem

Columbia University’s Manhattanville campus expansion in West Harlem is a 17-acre development with a cost of $6.3 billion. Construction of the campus began in 2003 and is expected to span 25 years. The development is to contain research facilities, Columbia Business School, School of the Arts, academic conference center, and spaces for art, culture, and community. The expansion project entails land acquisition, for some of which the university proposed invoking state eminent domain powers. Columbia University and the community have experienced contention over the Manhattanville expansion, with the university’s plan not perceived to address needs in a predominantly low-income, African American community.

Like many other universities, Columbia University and local communities have had a long and contentious history around university development and community displacement. A lawsuit over the use of eminent domain to seize private property for development was ruled in favor of the university. Community organizations opposed the planned development for lack of addressing community concerns and developing within the local context, and Manhattan Community District 9 proposed an alternative neighborhood plan. The lawsuit challenging the use of eminent domain was overturned and the university proceeded with development as planned.

This project included the West Harlem Community Benefits Agreement (CBA) between Columbia University and the West Harlem Local Development Corporation, a not-for-profit organization created to oversee implementation of the community benefits agreement. The Manhattanville campus plan boasts 40% of the construction workforce comprised of local, women, and minority-owned businesses among other mandates that help facilitate social benefits to the community. However, delivery on many of the mandates providing social benefit to West Harlem has yet to be achieved or to be verified.

---

Summary: Columbia University – Manhattanville Campus Expansion in West Harlem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size: 17 acres</th>
<th>Project cost: $6.3 billion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencement: 2003</td>
<td>Time to scale: 25 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project lead: Columbia University</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Proposal: University expansion that includes educational and research facilities, retail, and open space.

Relevant features: 24

- Use of eminent domain to acquire property. Ensuing lawsuit was ruled in favor of the university
- Long and contentious history between university and community around development and displacement
- CBA established between Columbia University and West Harlem Local Development Corporation
- Among CBA mandates are 40% of the construction workforce local residents, women, and minorities for the first 7 years, with a goal of the construction workforce composed of 50% over life of the project; 30% local hire for post-construction employment; and 35% goods and services contracts go to local, women, and minority business enterprises
- Among CBA mandates are $76 million benefits fund over 16 years, $20 million affordable housing fund and up to $4 million in related legal assistance benefits, minimum retail space designated to local businesses, funding for job readiness and training, establishment community public school, provision of community scholarships and local scholars program, and other contributions

John Hopkins University (Baltimore, Maryland) – East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative

A partnership by Johns Hopkins University, Johns Hopkins Medical Institutions, Annie E. Casey Foundation, and City of Baltimore launched the East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative in 2002 to build a science and technology park and revitalize East Baltimore, while aiming to implement an innovative plan for economic inclusion. The largest urban redevelopment project in the city since the late 1970s, the East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative began as a $1.8 billion initiative to address an 88-acre area with vacant buildings and land. 25 At the heart of the project is a biotechnology park surrounded by mixed-income housing, state-of-the-art elementary and middle school, grocery and other retail space, hotel, and community park. 26

This was a redevelopment project exhibiting conventional characteristics such as using public authority and funds to acquire and demolish homes, but that also aimed to

---

24 Ibid.
be an innovative partnership between university, public, and philanthropic sectors focused on economic inclusion. It included compensation to displaced residents and assistance to return to the revitalized community; training and job readiness assistance, increased opportunity for local, minority, and women-owned businesses; and community engagement in planning, design, and implementation. The initiative noted the effect of the recession, contributing to delayed project timeline and falling short of reaching some of the stated goals.

As can be imagined, relocation of several hundred households was a very contentious part of this project. While the initiative highlights compensation and first source hiring of displaced residents, others note that most efforts went into relocation of residents out of the area, rather than other forms of needed assistance such as ensuring their return or input into the redevelopment of the area.\(^{27}\) They note the lack of planning, policy, funding designated to afford residents to return to their community, sell the homes outside of Middle East Baltimore they had relocated into and relocate back, purchase affordable low income housing, pay increased taxes, and influence the neighborhood development to which they would be returning. This project is unique in its economic inclusion goals and met many of them. We can also learn from the challenges that were experienced in program design, community involvement, and effective implementation.

Summary: John Hopkins University – East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size: 88 acres</th>
<th>Project cost: $1.8 billion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencement: 2002</td>
<td>Time to scale: 20 years</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Project lead: Partnership between university, university medical institutions, city government, philanthropy, and others implemented by East Baltimore Development Inc. (EBDI)

Proposal: University expansion that includes educational and research facilities, retail, and open space.

Relevant features:

- Anchor strategy including the use of university, government and philanthropic funding to build a science and technology park, revitalize East Baltimore, and implement an economic inclusion plan
- Plan included property demolition and the relocation of more than 700 households. EBDI engaged residents in creating the relocation policy, provided housing assistance and relocation benefits. However, the community advocated for the construction of affordable housing, right of return by displaced residents, and local ownership of business ventures and economic development opportunities. 28
- The initiative reports that 950 permanent jobs were created by 2015, significantly less than the 3,000 estimated by 2013. The current rate of permanent job creation suggests that actual jobs created will be fewer than 8,000 jobs anticipated.
- By 2015, 30% work hours on residential and 28% work hours on commercial projects going to local workers of color and women, 12.5% work hours on residential projects going to East Baltimore residents (Exceeding goals established in 2013 of 25% work hours on residential and 23% work hours on commercial going to local workers, 12% work hours on residential and commercial projects going to East Baltimore residents). 4,692 construction workers hired, with 641 from East Baltimore, by 2015 since 2006.

Syracuse University (Syracuse, NY) – Near Westside Initiative

The Near Westside Initiative is an economic and neighborhood revitalization project started by Syracuse University, Gifford Foundation, and the Center of Excellence in 2006. The project area is over 215 acres with a project cost to date of $74 million. Anchored by the Near Westside Initiative not-for-profit organization, the Near West Side Initiative has several layers of partnerships that include the City of Syracuse, National Grid, Queri Development Corp, Green and Seifter, Home Headquarters, and the Syracuse Neighborhood Initiative that is working to create the Syracuse Arts, Technology, and Design Quarter. 29 This project aims to “combine the power of art, technology and innovation with neighborhood values and culture to revitalize Syracuse’s Near Westside neighborhood.” 30 The SALT District of the Near Westside neighborhood adopted a logo and brand identity of “Syracuse. Arts. Life. Technology.” This project

28 Ibid.
includes residential housing renovation, commercial development including artists’ space, and workforce development program. While this project generated community concerns about gentrification, the university aimed to address this through a community engagement process, formation of the Near Westside Initiative board, and by asserting that the area needed mixed, higher density development that would bring wealth-generating activities. University real estate investments are expected to become self-sustaining.31

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Summary: Syracuse University – Near Westside Initiative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Size: 215 acres</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project cost: $74 million to date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commencement: 2006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Time to scale: ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project lead: Syracuse University, Near Westside Initiative, and other partners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal: Neighborhood revitalization project that integrates architecture, visual and performing arts, and green technology through investments by the university.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relevant features:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>▪ Anchor strategy that included the use of university, government and philanthropic funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Vision for revitalization through architecture, entrepreneurship, the arts, and green technology in line with neighborhood culture and values</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ An “unlikely coalition” of community members intended to be diverse and representative on the board of the Near Westside Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>▪ Did not anticipate project cost, but leveraged redevelopment for real estate improvements that are expected to become self-sustaining</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**University of Pennsylvania (Philadelphia, PA) – West Philadelphia Initiatives**

The University of Pennsylvania began the West Philadelphia Initiatives in 1996 to support neighborhood reinvestment through a major commitment of university leadership, administrative support, funding, and resources over in 14 square miles in West Philadelphia in five areas: public education, housing, streets, economic opportunity, and retail.32 The design and implementation of the West Philadelphia Initiatives is within the context of a long, contentious history of the university’s involvement in West Philadelphia, as well as a history of university leadership to advance an anchor mission nation-wide.

The University of Pennsylvania is among the most celebrated and documented accounts of university-led urban development. However there was a great deal of discontent in West Philadelphia, although protests and resistance were not more visible.33 Each president since urban renewal spent some of their tenure engaging the question of how to address West Philadelphia. The West Philadelphia Initiatives reports many
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successes, including more than 150,000 square feet of retail space added in 5 years, the largest commercial investment in West Philadelphia history. It also resulted in more than 200 homes being renovated, as well as the establishment of a public primary school. Some West Philadelphia residents assert that retail amenities for residents of more limited means have diminished because of the university’s development of high-end retail amenities.34

In the documentation of its history as a university anchor, the University of Pennsylvania illustrates that it, like many other universities, had a driving role in displacing adjacent communities during the urban renewal era. The anchor efforts that it is known for today emerged out of need to address serious crime and poverty in its surrounding communities that peaked in the 1960s. Since then, Penn began to develop strategies for improving campus life, which required expansion into previously residential and commercial areas that called for negotiation with surrounding communities.35 The West Philadelphia Initiatives was able to benefit from the University of Pennsylvania’s strong local purchasing program, which has achieved 12% local purchasing. The University of Pennsylvania is also a model for its emphasis on economic inclusion practices in its contract hiring.

Summary: University of Pennsylvania – West Philadelphia Initiatives

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size: 14.2 square miles</th>
<th>Project cost: n/a</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencement: 1996</td>
<td>Time to scale: ongoing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project lead: University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal: University-led neighborhood revitalization addressing the areas of public education, housing, streets, economic opportunity and retail.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Relevant features:
- West Philadelphia Initiative focus on five areas: 1) public education 2) housing 3) streets 4) economic opportunity, and 5) retail
- Key features included a acquisition and renovation of deteriorated properties, attracting university-affiliated homebuyers through financial incentives and counseling services; creating a special services district to manage coordinated sanitation, security, and other services; enhanced purchasing, contracting, and employment opportunities for West Philadelphia residents and businesses; and creating a university-assisted primary public school.
- West Philadelphia Initiative is within the context of the University of Pennsylvania’s long history of university-led urban development that began with a serious call to safety due to a peak of crime and murder in the university area.
- The University of Pennsylvania and Netter Center for Community Partnerships have a detailed account of the university’s complex history in urban development, and has developed valuable anchor institution resources.

34 Ibid.
35 Ibid.
biotechnology hub. UCSF Mission Bay is notable for its voluntary local hire goals for construction. While the City of San Francisco has a local hire ordinance, the university development was exempt from these standards but voluntarily adopted local hire standards, exceeding its hiring goal with 22 percent of construction workers coming from San Francisco. By San Francisco ordinance, all city-funded construction projects are required to achieve 20 percent local hire, rising 5% annually until a 50% goal is reached.

*Summary: University of California, San Francisco – Mission Bay Campus*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Size: 43 acres</th>
<th>Project cost: $1.5 billion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Commencement: 2003</td>
<td>Time to scale: 30 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project lead: University of California San Francisco</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposal: University-led redevelopment of Mission Bay into a medical center, educational, biotechnology research, and retail facilities with voluntary commitments to select social benefits.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relevant features:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- University campus expansion, including medical center and biotechnology facilities, on underutilized waterfront space</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Voluntary local hire for construction reaching 22%, aligned with city ordinance requiring 20% local hire, with incremental increases to 50%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

## Case Study Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Project Type</th>
<th>Project Area</th>
<th>Project Cost</th>
<th>Commencement</th>
<th>Time to Scale</th>
<th>Project Lead</th>
<th>Key Features</th>
<th>Form of Agreement</th>
<th>Major Challenges</th>
<th>Major Successes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New York, NY</td>
<td>University expansion including academic conference center &amp; biotechnology facilities</td>
<td>17 acres</td>
<td>$6.3 billion</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>25 years anticipated</td>
<td>Columbia University</td>
<td>- Use of eminent domain to acquire private property</td>
<td>CBA (University &amp; West Harlem Local Development Corporation)</td>
<td>- Lawsuit on use of eminent domain ruled in favor of university</td>
<td>- Adoption of a community benefits agreement with relatively strong targets for social benefit to the community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baltimore, MD</td>
<td>University expansion including biotechnology facilities &amp; neighborhood revitalization</td>
<td>88 acres</td>
<td>$1.8 billion</td>
<td>2002</td>
<td>20 years anticipated</td>
<td>EBDI &amp; various partners</td>
<td>- Collaborative anchor strategy including university, government &amp; philanthropy</td>
<td>Various inclusion agreements and policies</td>
<td>- Recession impacted project</td>
<td>- 28-30% work hours on residential &amp; commercial projects going to local workers of color and/or women, exceeding goal of 23-25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syracuse, NY</td>
<td>Neighborhood revitalization focused on arts, technology, &amp; innovation</td>
<td>215 acres</td>
<td>$74 million to date</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>NWI &amp; various partners</td>
<td>- Various economic inclusion agreements and policies</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>- Fewer permanent jobs created than anticipated</td>
<td>- Several successful building renovations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philadelphia, PA</td>
<td>Neighborhood revitalization – education, housing, streets, economic opportunity &amp; retail</td>
<td>14.2 square miles</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>ongoing</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
<td>- Property demolition and relocation of 742 households</td>
<td>Various agreements</td>
<td>- Ongoing struggle to address poverty, improve local public schools, and attain impact in project &quot;outer ring&quot;</td>
<td>- Largest commercial investment in West Philadelphia history</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>San Francisco, CA</td>
<td>University expansion including medical center &amp; biotechnology facilities</td>
<td>43 acres</td>
<td>$1.5 billion</td>
<td>2003</td>
<td>30 years anticipated</td>
<td>UCSF</td>
<td></td>
<td>Voluntary commitments</td>
<td>- Concerns about the project causing gentrification</td>
<td>- Voluntary local hire for construction reaching 22% aligned with city ordinance requiring 20% local hire, with incremental increases to 50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Form of Agreement:**
- CBA (University & West Harlem Local Development Corporation) for 35% construction contracts to local, women, and minority-owned businesses; 35% non-construction contracts to minority firms; 30% local hire post-construction
- Various inclusion agreements and policies
- None
- Various agreements
- Voluntary commitments

**Major Challenges:**
- Lawsuit on use of eminent domain ruled in favor of university
- Recession impacted project
- Concerns about the project causing gentrification
- Ongoing struggle to address poverty, improve local public schools, and attain impact in project "outer ring"
- Law suit on use of eminent domain fabric questioned
- Impact on neighborhood fabric questioned
- Fewer permanent jobs created than anticipated

**Major Successes:**
- Adoption of a community benefits agreement with relatively strong targets for social benefit to the community
- Several successful building renovations
- Largest commercial investment in West Philadelphia history
- Impactful project branding highlighting the arts, technology, & innovation
- Project reported to go according to plan
- More than 200 rental housing units renovated
- Voluntary local hire for construction reaching 22% aligned with city ordinance requiring 20% local hire, with incremental increases to 50%
Analysis of Core Approaches

Anchors are specific to place. Appropriate pathways for university-led urban development depend on a host of factors, as there is no one-size-fits-all prescription for university-led urban development or anchor institution strategy. However, the anchor concept is helpful in providing the possible roles that the university can play in advancing urban development that benefits local communities. The information gathered about case studies and literature on university anchors and urban development reveal a set of issues and themes. This section synthesizes findings for consideration in the Berkeley Global Campus development organized by the following topics:

- Anchor mission and delivery
- Development lead and financing
- Formal to informal agreements for community benefits
- Community participation and engagement
- Area specific considerations

Anchor Mission and Delivery

The anchors in each of the case studies generally did what they sought out to do, though approaches were determined based on context and varied. While timeline and delivery sometimes varied due to unforeseen circumstances, the anchor’s articulation of its mission and method of delivery are key factors determining outcomes:

- Anchor Mission – Clearly articulating the social goals of anchor development is key to a comprehensive and effective program. This means that anchors consciously apply their place-based economic power, in combination with human and intellectual resources, to improve the long-term welfare of the community. The articulated objectives of the project are critical to what, how, and to what extent the development or initiative will be implemented. In all of the cases studied, the anchors achieved all or most of their stated goals.

- Priorities – Anchor priorities vary widely. They are articulated typically specific to anchor interests and place, although generally local hire in construction; procurement from local, minority, and women-owned businesses; and housing were among top priorities in terms of social benefit. Although not always prioritized, planning for high quality and affordable housing and preventing displacement are critical areas to consider at the onset of planning. While each of the case studies had varying project priorities, anchor can fulfill a number of roles in creating social benefit. These should all be considered for inclusion in a long-term implementation plan.

---

Delivery – Timeline and success of delivery on stated goals can be difficult to control. Critical to delivery are institutional capacity and method. Anchors must be well resourced and politically positioned to act. Method of delivery, particularly engagement of the community in decision making, affects commitments for social benefits and may affect the ease with which the anchor can act.

Development Lead and Financing
Initiatives were either led by the university itself or by a collaboration of anchors. University-led initiatives can advance nimbly through an existing institutional structure while affecting deep social impacts. However, growing momentum behind the anchor notion suggests support and enthusiasm behind collaborative anchor efforts, though there is significantly more need for coordination. Advisory boards that are representative of the community may help facilitate design and implementation shaped by community interests. Whether led by the university itself or by a collaboration of anchors, institutional capacity is key to success. Anchors must dedicate resources and house the development project or anchor initiative within an office that has the power to affect decisions and mobilize resources:

- University-led – Columbia University’s Manhattanville Campus, the University of Pennsylvania’s West Philadelphia Initiatives, and UCSF Mission Bay were generally university-led expansion projects. The West Philadelphia Initiatives was made a top-priority university policy that widely engaged the institution, and responsibility and authority were delegated across the university’s major administrative departments. Contentious university-community relationships are as old as universities themselves; however, this relationship can be improved with planning for equitable development.

- Anchor collaboration – Other initiatives began with a handful of collaborating anchors. The East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative was conceptualized as an innovative collaboration to achieve deep impacts in economic inclusion. The Casey Foundation played a significant role in the East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative, including making investments and supporting efforts to engage residents and businesses. The Near Westside Initiative highlights their efforts to form a diverse and representative board to advise on development.

Because the university is best positioned to seek financing and as a client project with the City of Richmond, this section will not go into detail about financing options. Most basically, standard financing mechanism that universities use for most real estate projects include bonds (revenue bonds and bonds secured by general revenue of the university or

leasing provisions, debt finance through a separate entity, tax increment financing, standard commercial loans, endowment funds and other private gifts, and internal university funds from indirect cost recovery, tuition or other revenue. The university case studies financed development in various ways, including university investment, government grants and financing mechanisms, and philanthropy. The city can help inform the university's development goals and leverage the university development to finance private investment in complementary areas.

Formal to Informal Agreements for Community Benefits

The City of Richmond has already begun to detail components to be included in a community benefits agreement (CBA). A CBA or other forms of agreements and policies can help facilitate benefits to the local community:

- **CBA** – A CBA helps articulate goals and set standards for various areas of anchor contribution. Columbia University’s Manhattanville Campus project included a CBA. Columbia University’s CBA was developed amidst contention with the community about planned university development. A CBA can help set a comprehensive set of standards for affordable housing; construction workforce; procurement from local, women, and minority-owned businesses; workforce development; community fund; and other critical areas. However, CBAs, particularly large ones, have mixed records. One important area to note is ensuring that development and delivery of community benefits is enhanced through a CBA, and not hindered by dense and prolific legal language and processes. Other related areas are ensuring that a CBA does not set a ceiling for contributed benefits, and that the CBA is used as a tool to ensure benefits from the developer promoting greater equity into the future.

The Berkeley Global Campus working group provides a more formal process for developing recommendations for benefits to the local community for consideration by UC Berkeley. However, in other cases community demand for a CBA through an adversarial approach was necessary and resulted in greater benefit to the local community.

- **Other agreement forms** – Also available are nonbinding partner, voluntary, and other forms of agreements between organizations. These are typically not as
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comprehensive as CBAs. The East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative implemented a series of economic inclusion policies. UCSF Mission Bay included voluntary commitments to local hire for construction that are reported to have exceeded requirements by city ordinance. While these agreements may offer greater flexibility, they require strong leadership, commitment, and a good relationship between parties over time.

Community Participation and Engagement
In the Manhattanville Campus, perceived lack of community consultation and historical relationship with the university prompted the community to oppose development and create an alternative neighborhood plan. In the East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative, the relocation of several hundred households appeared to be complicated by inadequate resident engagement and assistance throughout the process. In the Near Westside Initiative, a 1.5-year community engagement process and formation of a board that aimed to be diverse and representative of the community was highlighted as an important element. Overall, meaningful engagement of the people that the project may impact most, as well as the anchor’s responsiveness to community needs, should be a standard of engagement.

Area Specific Considerations
Establishing measurable standards for the social benefits of anchors is important for effective delivery. The Democracy Collaborative has begun to propose metrics. In April 2014, the UC Berkeley Chancellor and LBNL Lab Director issued a Joint Statement of Commitment to Strengthen Community Partnerships Between UC Berkeley, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, and the Richmond Community. The statement details broad commitments regarding procurement, workforce development, education, and local employment and introduced the Berkeley Global Campus working group to develop specific recommendations in these areas. This section details some findings intended to contribute to this process. Appendix III provides some additional area-specific references.

- Housing and displacement – Affordable housing and displacement are a crucial consideration requiring dedicated planning early on in the process. In examples across the country, university expansion and technology parks have had adverse impacts on the local residents and community. Planning for quality and affordable housing for current residents is crucial, adequate university housing for the campus population, and development that complements the local context are crucial.

- Construction – To meet construction goals for the East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative, EBDI staff members worked with the master developer and general contractors to ensure subcontracting with minority and women-owned businesses.

---
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Requests for proposals outline detailed goals and expectations for contractors including an economic inclusion plan and how they will meet contracting requirements. For the anchor mission of University Hospitals in Cleveland, Ohio, ongoing and frequent interaction with the labor unions was key.  

- **Local supply chain** – The anchor institution should have ample dedicated resources to evaluate its supply chain, outreach, and maximize goods and services procured from local, minority, and women owned businesses. While in the case studies the percentage of purchases from minority suppliers may seem modest by percentage, this should not be underestimated. For the University of Pennsylvania this has amounted to $80 million directed to minority suppliers. Currently, UC Berkeley and UCSF have one staff person for supply chain diversity. Additionally, as a public university, the University of California has various procurement requirements and limitations that must be navigated so that they meet the community’s goals for local and minority procurement.

- **Permanent jobs** – Working group and community member interviewees emphasized the need for jobs in Richmond. The anchor institution should provide information about the expected quantity and type of jobs created. City government can help shape standards for percentage that should be designated for local residents, and identify and plan for any needed job preparation.

- **Education** – Universities have a role to play in raising educational aspirations and making the pipeline to a four-year university a reality from K-12 and community college. The university could strengthen pipelines to the University of California from high school and community college in ways including educational curriculum, summer programs, and transfer services. Additionally, universities can provide support for community schools.

- **Procurement from local, minority, and women-owned businesses** – Anchor contracts can be designated to local, minority, and women-owned businesses. The anchor can support training and outreach to help ensure that local, minority, and women-owned businesses are supported in application for anchor contracts for goods and services.

- **Arts and culture-based development** – Anchor institutions can both facilitate and be driven by arts and culture-based development to support flourishing local communities and assets. Syracuse University’s incorporation of the arts in the Near Westside Initiative was one aspect of the project that appeared to garner broad and various forms of attention and support.

---
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Community investment – A potentially powerful contribution of anchors is a schedule of investment into community programs over an extended period of time.

Aspirational Goals
The approaches of the previous section are becoming more typical to standards for anchor-based development. Additionally, there are other approaches that facilitate community ownership, city governance beyond conventional functions, and other aspirations for more equitable, community wealth-building development. This section provides aspirational community wealth-building approaches:

Explore Community-Owned Development
Some projects provide models for greater community control. Market Creek Plaza in San Diego, California is the first commercial real estate project in the country to be designed, built, and owned by neighborhood residents. Supported by San Diego-based Jacobs Foundation, this project featured a commercial plaza including a grocery store, restaurants, fitness center, and amphitheater on 10 acres that previously housed an aerospace factory. Financing was through a Community Development Initial Public Offering (IPO). This allowed people in the community to buy shares at affordable rates and own assets of the plaza. Challenges of this approach include the intensive resources needed to navigate the legal landscape and to implement a participatory planning process while facilitating commercial development. However, Market Creek is a model for residential ownership of local assets.

The City of Richmond may also explore the community land trust model such as that successfully implemented by the Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative in Boston, Massachusetts. The Dudley Street Neighborhood Land Trust was established within the context of significant vacant parcels and the need for affordable housing in the community. There is also community interest in cooperative enterprise in Richmond. Anchor investment into Richmond could help capitalize a revolving fund or other forms of assistance to cooperative enterprise incubation.

Explore Innovation and Serve as a Community Connector
City government can help analyze and plan for university anchor functions and facilitate the organization of city institutions and community members accordingly. One opportunity area is helping build a local supply chain. This can help inform university local procurement goals and form the basis of a future university-local business supply chain. The Bronx Cooperative Development Initiative in New York is developing a vendor platform that has two goals: 1) to connect local supply and demand 2) to provide services for vendors and purchasers, including digital invoicing financing capacity,
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customized assistance for local sourcing opportunities, and marketing and promotion for purchasers.\textsuperscript{56}

Explore Land Use Reforms
Local governments typically resort to attracting large-scale development projects to increase their tax bases. While not explored beyond mention within this thesis, a crucial area for social equity is land use reforms in cities. Democratic land-use planning and tax structure change are key areas to explore to fundamentally change these dynamics.\textsuperscript{57}

\textsuperscript{56} Interview with Dara Nussbaum-Vasquez, Bronx Cooperative Development Institute.

\textsuperscript{57} Interview with Nicholas Marantz, UC Irvine.
Chapter 4 – Opportunities for the Berkeley Global Campus and the City of Richmond

UC Berkeley, the City of Richmond, and key stakeholders have a significant opportunity to shape commitments for the Berkeley Global Campus to create deep benefit in its surrounding community as well as region. Relations between universities and city governments tend to be project- or task-oriented, episodic, and subject to political and personal vagaries. Given the importance of universities to cities and local government to university projects, both can benefit from engaging in more systematic, continuous, and comprehensive joint planning. Beyond best practices for university civic engagement as well as corporate models for social responsibility, the full extent of the anchor institution model establishes the centrality of community wealth generation for deep and sustained economic success. Richmond can develop a leading anchor initiative through the Berkeley Global Campus and is in a unique position to do so. It has a host of leading policies and initiatives already illustrative of the community’s vision and leadership, a strong social infrastructure that can help shape an anchor institution initiative, and a network of stakeholders able to shape the campus development.

While financing for the Berkeley Global Campus is yet to be determined by UC Berkeley, the City of Richmond can facilitate and consolidate community visions for the campus for integration into plans for the Berkeley Global Campus, help form strategic partnerships to develop the direction for an anchor institution, and offer creative strategies for building community wealth for the university as well as the private development complementing the university campus. Based on the analysis of the previous chapters, Chapter 4 proposes guiding principles for planning and development for the City of Richmond’s consideration.

Guiding Principles for Planning and Development

Financing is needed for the UC Berkeley-owned 136 acres and for the adjacent complementary development through private investment. UC Berkeley is currently seeking private donors to support the financing of the Berkeley Global Campus. As UC Berkeley is the lead on assembling and providing financing for the campus, it should continue to organize university, key stakeholders, and community towards an anchor institution that serves and is integrated into the local landscape. The City of Richmond can help inform community needs.

As it plans for residential and commercial development to complement the Berkeley Global Campus, the City of Richmond can support exploration of various models, which could potentially be used as a way to attract investment for an innovative development concept. This may include physical development and processes for defining and achieving anchor goals.

Anchor Mission and Collaboration

Clearly Articulate the Anchor Mission
UC Berkeley, City of Richmond, and others should be explicit about an anchor mission for the Berkeley Global Campus. That is, it should consciously and strategically apply the institution’s long-term, place-based economic power, in combination with its human and intellectual resources, to better the welfare of the community in which it resides. 59 This entails comprehensively evaluating what being an anchor institution means and the models and resources available to facilitate this process. Collaborations across public, philanthropy, and not-for-profit sectors can be forged through an explicit anchor strategy.

Plan for a Long, Committed Relationship
Strong and committed leadership of the institutions cannot be emphasized enough. Prioritization of communication between university and community communication that informs development based on community needs is key. Ohio State invested $28 million from its endowments. Penn has been involved in West Philadelphia for several decades, involving hundreds of faculty members and thousands of students. Yale invested $20 million from its endowment in physical redevelopment of its adjacent commercial area. 60 Projects require a lot of time and concerted attention.

Pursue Collaborative Leadership and Prioritize Learning
The importance of strong leadership and institutional collaboration is emphasized in virtually every account of a successful anchor initiative. This includes dedication of resources, implementing authority, and transparent and effective processes. UC Berkeley should continue to dedicate resources to make the Berkeley Global Campus development, community engagement process, and social benefits to Richmond a top priority. The City of Richmond’s strong leadership in recent years is a significant asset. Successful anchor initiatives note a good working relationship and frequent communication between the anchor and collaborating institutions as important elements. Carefully designed contracts and MOU’s help ensure good partnerships.

Process and Institutionalizing Anchor Functions

Establish Clear Goals, High Standards, and Implementation Plan
The City of Richmond can work with UC Berkeley to establish clear goals with high standards and an implementation plan. A strategic business plan for the campus by Social Sector Solutions details how anchors can survey and assist local businesses to ensure that they maximize on construction and procurement opportunities. 61

59 Ibid.
Make Process Transparent and Commitments Public
Making the process transparent and commitments public through community meetings, press conferences, clearly written documents, etc. can help elevate community enthusiasm and trust. Finally, transparent process and public commitments help ensure follow through and accountability. Development plans should be linked to direct and indirect outcomes for the community, indicating number of jobs, timeline, employment benefits, number of ownership and rental housing, housing cost, financial structure to assure affordability for residents. Cities should support communities that are organizing themselves before, during, and after plans. 62

Work to Institutionalize Anchor Functions
Working to incorporate desired anchor functions, particularly ones that benefit the local community, into the operations of the university and other relevant institutions, can facilitate structural change. An office can be established or the duties of existing departments can be specified to be responsible for addressing community benefits.

Strengthen Local Assets and Facilitate Community Ownership

Proactive City Government Role
Richmond has already been a model for proactive city government in advancing social equity. The relationship between anchor institutions and local government is often centered on financing and development partnerships, land use decisions, and taxation strategies. How anchors and local leaders navigate these challenges is where cities have the most to gain or lose. 63 The lack of city government involvement is a missed opportunity. Furthermore, the City of Richmond has a lot to offer. One of the critical roles of the city can fulfill is as a signatory to an eventual CBA and the entity that will be charged with long-term enforcement of the agreement. Not-for-profit organizations and other stakeholders can come and go over the long term, but city government is an enduring institution, and thereby in a position to enforce the commitments made by these anchor institutions over the long haul. 64

Maximize Opportunities for Local Community Development
University developments that prioritize local community development are a relatively recent trend. Dedicating resources towards a defined physical area with a comprehensive plan for all neighborhoods that could be affected by an institution’s actions and to build healthy place is crucial. This includes plans for both physical and social design. Additionally, how the wealth of such high tech developments is channeled towards local community development, at the same time made to fit and enhance the community fabric are key principles.
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Prioritize Strengthening Cultural Assets
Richmond is a city with strong cultural assets. It is a center of Black, Latino, and Asian heritages. It has a history of environmental justice and activism for social equity. The city has historical significance. Development should complement and build on these cultural assets. This may include development that complements local visions for the city and is incorporated into the community fabric, jobs for local residents that are reflective of the city’s demographic, and prioritization of retail space for Richmond’s locally owned businesses.

Explore Community Ownership of Assets and Processes
Richmond is well positioned to experiment and carry out innovative ideas promoting community ownership. It is a mid-sized city that benefits from significant economic activity and proximity to major cities, as well as relatively intimate communities. It has relatively affordable land where if a form of community ownership were to be successful, could have significant positive effects for the community in the future given the rapid changes and displacement occurring in many parts of the Bay Area. The Anchor Richmond report by the Haas Institute for a Fair and Inclusive Society at UC Berkeley provides recommendations for areas identified by community groups to build community wealth. Additional, Richmond recent initiatives in various areas provide strong infrastructure for participatory planning processes.

Participatory Planning

Engage Stakeholders Early on Through Participatory Planning
Engage stakeholders early on and throughout the planning and development process with maximum opportunities for participatory planning. Community members are most knowledgeable about the neighborhoods where they live and work, and can provide crucial insights helping shape plans and strategy. Planning processes should be participatory, designed for community members to meaningfully participate and shape development outcomes.

Make Participatory Planning a Given
Opposition in most university expansion projects is due to development that is not integrated with the neighborhood fabric, community’s vision for the future, or that enables displacement. The City of Richmond has already been successful in using form-based code, which has applicability to the mixed-used development already being planned for the site. While the area is primarily underutilized industrial space with less dense and defined neighborhood fabric as other places, Richmond as a city has a unique character and resident visions for the future in the South Shoreline can inform planning and the development phases.

---
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Tracking and Reporting

Develop Systems for Tracking and Reporting on Outcomes
The Berkeley Global Campus, City of Richmond, and other stakeholders should continue to solidify expectations for physical development and social and economic contributions. While metrics for anchor institutions are identified as an area that needs more attention in the field, Richmond can learn from many case studies of anchor institutions that have worked to determine priorities and ensure affordable housing, create local jobs, reach local procurement goals, and carry out other anchor functions. Systems for tracking and reporting on outcomes are important to measuring success and innovating, as are required compliance with agreed standards and contributions.
Chapter 5 – Conclusion

The Berkeley Global Campus can help Richmond build community wealth, creating jobs, housing, and economic and educational opportunities. The City of Richmond is already taking a proactive role in working to shape the Berkeley Global Campus. It is preparing the South Shoreline area for development complementing the Berkeley Global Campus, looking into how the university campus will benefit the community, and providing technical assistance to the Berkeley Global Campus Working Group. The City of Richmond’s strong relationships with Richmond’s institutions and organizations are an asset, and the city is in a position to explore and advance equitable development, community wealth building strategies, and community-based planning. In a time of increasing globalization, technological advancement, inner city decline, and growing importance of the information economy, ever more important is place-based development that enables local livelihoods. As financing for the project is pursued, UC Berkeley and the City of Richmond can facilitate a deliberative and inclusive planning process building on the planning and collaborative infrastructure already in place.

UC Berkeley can further its reputation as a leader by working with Richmond to develop and implement a model university-community partnership that builds community wealth. UC Berkeley, City of Richmond, and the community can work to shape the Berkeley Global Campus so that it addresses community needs and is integrated with the social fabric of Richmond. UC Berkeley can benefit from supporting cutting edge community wealth building strategies through the Berkeley Global Campus and Richmond Bay waterfront district.

Developments should be pursued with planning processes that comprehensively addresses social benefit to the local community. UC Berkeley’s commitment to the Richmond community includes aligning its global, national, and regional interests with a comprehensive community development plan developed alongside local institutions, organizations, and residents. This can be done through strong leadership and planning to set the stage and follow through development. UC Berkeley and the City of Richmond should continue to examine the Berkeley Global Campus and South Shoreline from a community development perspective to hone in on opportunities that will be most impactful as well as how to create the ecosystem that is needed for healthy place.

Anchor-based development is an opportunity to localize economies. Richmond is no stranger to experimenting with innovative initiatives that advance environmental justice, community health, and equitable development. The resources of UC Berkeley consultants, academic studios, and programs can be used to explore aspects of community development linked to regional interests. UC Berkeley and Richmond should plan for affordable housing in the long term especially as the housing landscape in the Bay Area continues to change rapidly, maximize economic opportunities particularly for low income and communities of color in Richmond, and explore land use reforms affecting mixed-use development and incentives for creating healthy places.
The Berkeley Global Campus development is an opportunity to raise the standards for university-community partnerships for deep and meaningful community wealth creation. The anchor and community wealth creation concepts and all of their implications can be used to shape the Berkeley Global Campus. Built on a history of struggle for environmental justice, community health, and social equity, the Berkeley Global Campus can be instrumental in creating the structural change that allows all of Richmond’s residents to flourish.
# Appendices

## Appendix I: Richmond Bay Campus Illustrative Plan

![Image of Richmond Bay Campus Illustrative Plan]

**Long Term Richmond Bay Campus Area Development Program**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Program</th>
<th>Sub Area 1 (up to 5 stories)</th>
<th>Sub Area 2 (3-5 stories)</th>
<th>Sub Area 3 (up to 55 feet)</th>
<th>Sub Area 4 (up to 8 stories)</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Units</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R&amp;D/Business/Service</td>
<td>1,870,000</td>
<td>140,000</td>
<td>1,560,000</td>
<td>2,120,000</td>
<td>5,690,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail (ground floor)</td>
<td>270,000</td>
<td>130,000</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>320,000</td>
<td>720,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>1,160</td>
<td>1,330</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,590</td>
<td>4,080 units</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Open Space</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>144.8 acres</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

Appendix II: Interviews

7. Tammeil Gilkerson, Vice President of Academic and Student Affairs, Contra Costa College. Phone Interview. May 4, 2015.
9. Bill Lindsay, City Manager, City of Richmond. Phone Interview. May 5, 2015.
12. Nicholas Marantz, Assistant Professor, UC Irvine Department of Planning, Policy, and Design. Phone Interview. April 26, 2015.
Appendix III: Anchor Targets and References

Anchors across the country have developed and implemented a number of strategies to advance community development and wealth building. Based on the assessment in Chapter 3 and on additionally encountered anchor initiatives through this study, the table below provides a summary of typical anchor activities, the range of targets or objectives found across studies, and anchor references. While the assessment in Chapter 3 focuses on university-based developments and anchor initiatives, this appendix considers more broadly the initiatives of relevant anchors that include hospitals, clinics, university-linked community development corporations (CDCs), foundations, and not-for-profit organizations. While the table does not provide a comprehensive listing of all anchors that have taken initiative on listed goals, it provides a reference to a handful of anchor initiatives that it would be helpful to reference given a particular anchor activity area.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Targets / Goals</th>
<th>Anchor References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction jobs going to local, women (WBE), and minority-owned (MBE) businesses</td>
<td>40 – 66%</td>
<td>East Baltimore Revitalization, UCSF Mission Bay, City of San Francisco’s local hire ordinance, City of Boston &amp; Boston Jobs Coalition, University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Permanent jobs – local, minority &amp; women</td>
<td>30 – 50%</td>
<td>University of Southern California, East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative, University of Pennsylvania employees are 15 percent local residents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable housing construction</td>
<td>Affordable housing construction ensuring economic stability and preventing displacement</td>
<td>Duke-Durham Neighborhood Partnership / Durham Community Land Trust, Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, Boston MA, Rochester Area Foundation capitalized by Mayo Clinic, Rochester MN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Campus housing construction</td>
<td>Campus housing for students and faculty to reduce impact on surrounding neighborhoods</td>
<td>Various</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rent / homeownership assistance</td>
<td>Provides subsidies, loans, counseling to support rental and homeownership</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania – West Philadelphia Initiatives, Syracuse University, East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial development</td>
<td>Commercial development generating revenue, enhances local community &amp; character</td>
<td>Yale University, Market Creek Plaza, San Diego CA, Syracuse University, West Philadelphia Initiatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supply contracts with local, women and/or minority owned businesses</td>
<td>15% to 1/3</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business incubation and support</td>
<td>Local business assistance to strengthen sector and for preparation for anchor contracts</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania, Syracuse University Southside Innovation Center, LeMoyne-Owen CDC Business Development Institute, Memphis TN, Northeastern University, Boston MA, Neighborhood Development Center, St Paul, University of Chicago Local</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industry cluster anchor</td>
<td>Supports industry cluster</td>
<td>Cleveland Clinic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration with local educational institutions for education and pipeline</td>
<td>Supports neighborhood schools, provides college preparation, scholarships to local community</td>
<td>Indiana University Purdue University Indianapolis (IUPUI) opened a community school, University of Pennsylvania helped develop neighborhood based K-12 school, Harvard Allston community scholars program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support workforce development initiatives</td>
<td>Provide training local residents with the goal of quality employment</td>
<td>Boston Allied Health Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments to municipalities (user fees, PILOTs)</td>
<td>Payments to municipalities to compensate for tax exemption and infrastructure use</td>
<td>University of Pennsylvania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community ownership of assets</td>
<td>Enhance opportunities for community ownership via cooperative businesses, community land trusts, etc.</td>
<td>Evergreen Cooperatives, Cleveland OH, Market Creek Plaza, San Diego CA, Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, Boston MA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community engagement in development process</td>
<td>Maximize opportunities for community members to influence development</td>
<td>Syracuse University Near Westside Initiative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community investment fund capitalization</td>
<td>Capitalizes fund that resources community programs</td>
<td>Columbia University – Manhattanville CBA, Harvard University – CDFI capitalization, University of Cincinnati dedicated 15 percent of endowment, Evergreen Cooperative Development Fund, Port of Oakland Social Justice Fund, Portland Community Benefits Agreement Funds</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arts and culture based development</td>
<td>Makes arts and culture a core aspect of development, preserves the local character</td>
<td>Market Creek Plaza, San Diego, Syracuse University Near Westside Initiative, NewBridge Center for Arts &amp; Technology, Cleveland OH, Arts and Public Life Initiative, University of Chicago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration between anchors</td>
<td>Anchor collaboration to deepen and broaden impact</td>
<td>East Baltimore Revitalization Initiative, Henry Ford Health System, Wayne State University, and Detroit Medical Center</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>