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INTRODUCTION

This is the first full progress report prepared for the Cleveland Foundation and Living Cities by the team of local evaluators from Cleveland State University’s Levin College of Urban Affairs. The report covers baseline data for 2010 and summarizes qualitative findings for the first year of the Living Cities Integration Initiative (LC Initiative).

The report is divided into three major sections. The first section describes the process observed by the evaluators and discusses the evolution of the Greater University Circle Community Wealth Building Initiative as part of the original Greater University Circle Initiative, system changes that are underway, formative issues, strengths, and challenges. The second section discusses the major anchor institutions’ hiring and purchasing patterns. The third section describes the strategies and programs that underpin the main goal of the LC Initiative: improving the lives of residents in distressed neighborhoods. This section discusses the Evergreen Cooperatives in Cleveland, the Cleveland Health Tech Corridor, Community Engagement, Greater Circle Living, and NewBridge Cleveland Center for Arts & Technology. Each of these discussions includes a brief description of the strategy, observed changes, and baseline data for 2010.

The findings for this evaluation report emerged from the following:

1. Interviews with all of members of the Greater University Circle Community Wealth Building Initiative’s Economic Inclusion Management Committee and other key stakeholders (Appendix 1 includes a list of interviews).
2. Meeting agendas and minutes for the Management Committee (Appendix 2).
3. Briefings with LC Initiative principals at the Cleveland Foundation.
4. Reviews of background documents related to the LC Initiative.
5. Data collected from University Hospitals, the Cleveland Clinic, Case Western Reserve University, Greater Circle Living, NewBridge, the City of Cleveland,¹ and the Cleveland Foundation on base year conditions.

¹ Data from the City of Cleveland is not included in this report. When received, it will be incorporated.
FORMATIVE ISSUES AND SYSTEM CHANGE

Accelerating Existing Initiatives: The Evolution of the Greater University Circle Community Wealth Building Initiative

The Living Cities Integration Initiative in Cleveland began in January 2011. Known as the Greater University Circle Community Wealth Building Initiative supported by Living Cities, it built upon the work that had originated six years previously and was continuing to build momentum: the Greater University Circle Initiative (GUCI) and the Evergreen Cooperative (Evergreen) model, both led by the Cleveland Foundation, and the Cleveland Health Tech Corridor (HTC), led by BioEnterprise. The proposed goal of the Living Cities support was to “take this work to the next level.”

The GUCI was developed in Cleveland in 2005 when the president of the Cleveland Foundation first convened the heads of the anchor institutions located in the University Circle area to begin a collaborative effort to break down the barriers between the anchor institutions and the surrounding communities. These neighborhoods are home to nearly 85,000 people, 60% of who earn less than $25,000 per year.

GUCI is a unique partnership of philanthropy, the anchor institutions, the City of Cleveland, financial intermediaries, and local community groups. It has been working to develop a strong coalition of partners, focused on an “action oriented” approach to deliver priority infrastructure projects, and develop catalytic strategies for the revitalization of surrounding neighborhoods that include employer-assisted housing, the Evergreen Cooperatives, and community engagement. Some of GUCI’s early accomplishments include shared master plans for the anchor institutions (all of which are neighbors), a pooled investment fund for development, upgrading the quality of new transit stations in the area, and collaborative efforts to serve neighborhood residents.

With the Evergreen Cooperatives, GUCI introduced a new model of economic and community development. The Evergreen Cooperative in Cleveland is an experiment in employee-ownership, green job creation, and anchor-based community wealth building in a city experiencing population and employment losses. The Evergreen business model is based on three aspects of economic development and wealth creation: leveraging procurement from anchor institutions; developing a network of businesses linked to that procurement system that are community-based, employee-owned, and profitable; and ensuring that the businesses would be as “green” as possible in their own industries as well as sustainable. The hope is that if the experiment is successful, it can be adapted, not only in urban communities, but in more affluent suburbs and rural areas.

The Cleveland Health Tech Corridor (HTC) was launched in 2010. Its inclusion in the LC Initiative expanded the geography of GUCI beyond Greater University Circle to include the main transit corridor connecting University Circle to downtown Cleveland. The HTC’s primary activities are real estate development and business attraction for two types of companies. The first type is high-tech, bioscience companies, some spun out of the BioEnterprise incubators and accelerators, that want to locate near the anchor institutions. The second is supply chain companies that wish to locate in or near the corridor due to anchor demand. These two activities were merged as a result of the LC Initiative.
Although the HTC and GUCI involve many of the same players on their respective advisory boards, the LC Initiative has brought them together, expanded networks, and has begun to build trusting relationships.

The City of Cleveland’s role has been evolving. The mayor was involved with GUCI at its beginning and meets with Cleveland Foundation staff twice a year for updates. The director of Cleveland’s Department of Economic Development currently participates in GUCI and has, as a result of Living Cities, become an integral part of the initiative. This relationship has already resulted in new investments in the Health Tech Corridor, new investments in the Evergreen Coops, as well as new jobs and income tax revenue for the city.

To accelerate the goals of the LC Initiative, a portion of Living Cities’ first-year grant money ($935,000) has been invested in building staff capacity at a number of the partner organizations:

- The Cleveland Foundation (Project Director and Project Assistant)
- City of Cleveland Department of Economic Development (financing and development)
- Health Tech Corridor (marketing support at BioEnterprise - the annual grant of $50,000 to BioEnterprise enabled it to expand its role to do marketing and business development in the corridor)
- Evergreen Cooperative Corporation (pre-development and business support)
- Neighborhood Connections (community engagement)

**Governance**

**Leadership and Management Committees**

The various pieces of the LC Initiative converge at the governance level. The main governance table is the Greater University Circle Initiative Leadership committee. The GUCI leadership committee began six years ago and is convened by the President and CEO of the Cleveland Foundation. It is comprised of the heads of the anchor institutions and leaders from foundations, public sectors, and other nonprofit organizations. This committee meets quarterly and it offers new ways of connecting to and investing in Greater University Circle neighborhoods. It laid the groundwork for the relationships and trust upon which the Living Cities Initiative is based.

The hands-on management of the LC Initiative takes place at the Greater University Circle Community Wealth Building Initiative’s Economic Inclusion Management Committee. The committee’s first meeting was on April 12, 2011, a couple of months after the initiative director was hired. The management committee meets monthly and it has 16 members of which several serve on the GUCI leadership committee.

Members of the Management Committee include representatives from the Cleveland Foundation, Case Western Reserve University, University Hospitals, the Cleveland Clinic, the City of Cleveland, Cuyahoga County, Neighborhood Connections, BioEnterprise, the National Development Council, the Evergreen Cooperatives, Neighborhood Progress, and the local evaluators. The committee met monthly for the first two months and every other month thereafter. Cuyahoga County did not participate in GUCI under its old governance structure of three commissioners, but is now fully engaged in the Management Committee. For a list of current Management Committee members, see Appendix 3.
The first meeting served as a way to get all members on the same page regarding the Living Cities project’s mission, vision, and catalytic investments. The evaluation plan for the LC Initiative was also introduced at this meeting. The committee identified a number of ongoing agenda items including evaluation and system change, the Evergreen business model, catalytic capital investments, and the policy agenda. One of the early issues that the Management Committee identified, and a topic that continues to be a top priority, is local purchasing and the need for a common database of local vendors. Local food purchasing is considered to be an important part of this. Overall, the Management Committee provides a platform where the anchors may learn from each other and share successful practices in their respective institutions.

In July 2011, Neighborhood Progress, Inc. (NPI) joined the Management Committee. NPI is a local funding intermediary with a mission to restore and maintain the health and vitality of Cleveland’s neighborhoods through private investment and support for community initiatives. NPI has a new president and CEO and is undertaking a strategic plan. It is hoped that including NPI on the Management Committee will provide an additional connection to neighborhood organizations. For example, NPI is now represented on the board of the Green City Growers Cooperative through its Village Capital Corporation. Sarah Kresnye of the Center for Health Affairs has also joined the committee to focus on her work on the hospital database. In addition, at the most recent Management Committee meeting, Jill Rizika of Towards Employment joined the team.

Initially, there was confusion among Management Committee members about the name and scope of the LC Initiative. Participating in committee discussions and collaborating on common issues during meetings has created greater understanding and trust.

During the first few Management Committee meetings, the initiative director acted as the committee chairman. Now, to give the committee more ownership of its work, members feel it is appropriate to consider the election of co-chairs. Jenn Ruggles of Case Western Reserve University graciously accepted the role of co-chair with Walter Wright at the last Management Committee meeting.

### System Change is Underway

Since the launch of the LC Initiative, the evaluation team has observed a number of indicators demonstrating that system change is underway. Mt. Auburn Associates defines system change for the LC Initiative as new ways of “thinking and acting across three dimensions: geographic boundaries (linking neighborhoods to cities and regions); stakeholder groups (creating greater alignment among philanthropy, the public sector, and nonprofit and community-based organizations); and disciplines (including housing, jobs, skills, transportation, education, and healthcare). In short, the LC Initiative focuses on developing approaches that recognize the linkages between the issues affecting low-income individuals across these dimensions.”

---

2 The LC Initiative Formative Report, Year 0
Indicators of System Change in Cleveland

Relationships

• Creating and expanding the “table” linking Living Cities with GUCI. The GUCI leadership committee began six years ago. It is comprised of the heads of the anchor institutions and others, and is convened by the President and CEO of the Cleveland Foundation. This committee laid the groundwork for the relationships and trust upon which the Living Cities Initiative is based, and also offered new ways of connecting to and investing in neighborhoods. Committee members recognize that they benefit from the power of sitting at the table together to co-design projects that mutually benefit the anchors and the community.

• As a result of the Living Cities Initiative, Cleveland Foundation staff identified individuals to create a broader table and linked BioEnterprise and the Health Tech Corridor to the initiative. It keeps the focus on revitalizing low-income neighborhoods and adds support for community engagement.

• GUCI investments that occurred prior to the LC Initiative included Uptown Phase 1, Cedar Hill Bus/Rapid Stations, St. Luke’s project, E. 105th/MLK, and the Health Tech Corridor.

• The GUCI leadership recognized that there was great potential for economic inclusion tied to thinking more strategically on procurement and supply chain practices and their commitment has been strengthened and enhanced as the LC project moves forward.

• When the GUCI leadership committee met on October 19, 2011, it celebrated its achievements during its first six years and set new three-year goals. In light of the work now well underway through the GUCI and LC Initiatives, these new goals and priorities fall into three areas:
  o Development projects
    ▪ Uptown Phase II
    ▪ West District – West Campus/Upper Chester
  o Economic inclusion
    ▪ Re-launching the Greater Circle Living program
    ▪ Buying local
    ▪ Workforce, education, and hiring local
  o Community engagement

• The October 19th GUCI meeting was very important because it more formally aligned the work of Living Cities with the GUCI. The members of GUCI are the heads of the institutions, while the members of the Management Committee are the people with administrative and management responsibility for the work of Living Cities within their respective institutions. Our first round of interviews indicated that at the time there was still some confusion among the GUCI leadership regarding the LC Initiative. The October 19th meeting accomplished two things: the members voted to continue the partnership for another three years, and they agreed to pursue these goals with the understanding that priorities and more details about each goal would be discussed in future meetings.

• As a way of building awareness and buy-in for the LC Initiative from key stakeholders, Cleveland Foundation staff and the director of the initiative have recently reached out to bankers and
developers to inform them about the initiative, understand their challenges, and then explore ways to connect developers to financing and align bank’s small business clients to the anchors. This was initiated in September 2011.

Organizational Capacity

- The Community Engagement piece was the least defined portion of the GUC Initiative. The Cleveland Foundation staff had been working with Neighborhood Connections, a Cleveland Foundation-funded small grant and community building program and CWRU prior to being selected for the Living Cities Initiative. In March 2011, with increased grant funding approved by the Cleveland Foundation board and leveraged by Living Cities support, Neighborhood Connections (NC), began to lead the community building and engagement piece and funded a project manager and organizer to work in the GUCI neighborhoods. These two positions were filled in August 2011. NC has rented office space in University Circle to give it more of a neighborhood presence. NC’s mission has always included supporting programs that engage and empower neighborhood residents throughout the city, and with funding from the Cleveland Foundation and Living Cities has expanded its scope to include community building and engagement in the GUC neighborhoods. As a result, community building and engagement is rapidly ramping up in the target GUC neighborhoods, using the model of neighbor circles piloted by Lawrence Community Works. Neighborhood Voice, a community newspaper and outreach mechanism important to this effort, hired a new publisher in July 2011.

- Evergreen made progress in 2011 in finding an effective balance between its social and business missions. Early in the LC Initiative it brought in people with business backgrounds. In October 2009, Evergreen launched two businesses — the Evergreen Cooperative Laundry and Ohio Cooperative Solar (which also has home weatherization as a line of business). In 2011 the third cooperative launching will be Green City Growers. Equally as important, the Evergreen Cooperative Corporation incorporated in the summer of 2011 and continues to build an umbrella structure with shared services including accounting, legal, and human resources. A business pipeline (the process for vetting potential Evergreen companies) is growing and a structure is now firmly in place to formalize the business model and centralize business functions. This more rigorous structure will hopefully help the Evergreen companies to generate profits so that their employee-owners can begin to build wealth.

- Further, Evergreen is already showing signs of becoming a part of the City of Cleveland’s economic development strategy. For example, if a company approaches the city’s economic development staff looking to locate or expand in the city, Tracey Nichols, Cleveland’s Economic Development Director, may see that the company would be appropriate as an Evergreen company and make the referral. Likewise, Evergreen may identify a need for a type of company that is not appropriate as an Evergreen coop and will refer the idea or the company to the city.

- Living Cities led to a greater role for the city’s economic development department to leverage its funding more strategically in the Greater University Circle neighborhoods and the Health Tech Corridor. Tracey Nichols, the department’s director, has been an integral part of the leadership team from the start and LC has elevated her role in the initiative. Living Cities has also increased the city’s deal-making capacity through greater access to the anchor institutions and the National Development Council (NDC). Through its participation in the LC Initiative, the city now reports having greater access to New Market Tax Credits, SBA loans, and the ability to attract a higher level of federal funds. At this point, the city has committed $10 million to the prioritized
area. The city has also developed an approach marrying HUD 108 funds with New Markets Tax Credits as a new tool in the city’s economic development portfolio. A new position was created and filled in the City of Cleveland’s Department of Economic Development as part of the Living Cities Initiative. Duties include reaching out to other departments to better understand work flows and goals, expediting permitting process, and working on deals in the HTC. This is expected to result in a greater alignment between economic and community development within the City of Cleveland.

- The city is supportive of the anchor-based strategy as well as the new ownership model presented by Evergreen. Chris Warren, the city’s Chief of Regional Development, will be chairing an anchor-based economic development strategy along the West 25th Street corridor reliant on two west side hospitals: Metro Health Medical Center and Lutheran Hospital. This effort is also supported by Ted Howard and Atlee McFellin from the Democracy Collaborative.

**Financing**

- Living Cities was directly responsible for bringing in NDC as a Community Development Financial Institution (CDFI) partner. A very important contribution, this new partnership has already resulted in the increased capacity to do real estate investment deals and small business lending (through SBA), not just those related to Living Cities. Twelve million ($12 million) in Living Cities financing is expected over the next two years for deployment as loans for pipeline projects related to the anchors/Evergreen, quality of life issues, and physical development. As of September 2011, there were 13 real estate projects and 8 small business projects in the pipeline. NDC is in the process of defining eligibility for inclusion in the pipeline. The role of NDC will be increasingly important as the local CDFI infrastructure evolves. Enterprise Cleveland will close its doors by the end of 2011 and their Shore Growth Fund is expected to be housed within NDC. In a related effort, the Cleveland Foundation has hired consultants to analyze the funding system.

- At its first meeting, the LC Initiative’s Management Committee agreed on a working definition of “catalytic investment” as containing some or most of the following characteristics:
  - Job creation, with a high priority on employee ownership and/or equity, and wealth creation.
  - Projects where anchors (Greater University Circle [GUC] cultural, medical, educational institutions, either for-profit or non-profit) are equity investors.
  - Investment that attracts other investment by demonstrating a market demand and viability that reduces the risk of future investment.
  - Investments that support the attraction or retention of general healthcare, bioscience, or supply chain businesses for GUC anchor institutions, specifically in the Health Tech Corridor.
  - Investment into indirect support services arising as a result of the anchor tenants deciding to buy locally, including hotel rooms, business services, child care services, restaurants, retail health services (doctors, dentists, and other service providers who serve local residents, not the anchor tenant).
  - Investments in small businesses that provide goods and services that support GUC-area community residents (e.g., groceries, housewares and hardware, apparel, book and card stores, electronic and media goods, bakeries, hair and nail salons, credit union, florists, etc.)

---

3 (Minutes of 7/19 management committee)
4 (Walter Wright PowerPoint, March 25, 2011)
All of these investments must meet a “but-for” test.

Policy and Administrative

• At its first meeting, the Management Committee agreed on the following set of economic inclusion principles:
  o Building assets and wealth for low-income households and communities
  o Creating new ways of working across partners
  o Transparency through active communication about the process and outcomes of the initiative
  o Sustainable and integrated approach which unites economic, environmental, and equity concerns
  o Environmental stewardship
  o Demand-driven career training

This is an important first step in aligning policies and administrative practices as the initiative moves forward.5

• The Cleveland Foundation team realized early on that any system change would require policy changes at the state and federal levels. To that end, they have discussed the need to engage the partners in advocating for state policies that would support technology and business development and employer-driven workforce training. At the federal level, the primary focus has been on HUD policies and programs related to the Evergreen strategy and the introduction of the Community Wealth Act by U.S. Senator Sherrod Brown. At this point, these efforts are in the formative stage.

• One of the first items on the agenda of the Management Committee was the development of common definitions of local purchasing among the anchors. This has remained a key focus and has progressed to the point that a meeting was held in August 2011 with the Cleveland Clinic’s purchasing staff to understand their procurement process and needs. Similar meetings have been completed with Case Western Reserve University and University Hospitals, and a consultant has been hired to help advance these goals and ‘staff up’ the initiative on a temporary basis; one of the deliverables will be a report and action plan to be implemented in 2012. This is a first step of a year-long discussion about the alignment of policies with initiative goals. At this point, each anchor institution is working on this issue internally. However, the groundwork is being laid for more collaborative learning and information sharing to build this capacity.
  o The Center for Health Affairs is creating a master list of local vendors that can sell their goods and services to the healthcare anchors. The hope is to integrate this master list with the city and county databases for women and minority-owned businesses. The goal is to find a way to institutionalize this process of creating and maintaining a database. The Management Committee established a subcommittee to work on database-related issues and Living Cities’ funds will be used to support the database.
  o The Cleveland Foundation is supporting the writing of a case study of University Hospital’s engagement of local contractors in its recent billion dollar construction project. In the course of that work, UH exceeded local hiring targets and created a system that built the capacity of participating local minority and female-owned firms to compete in the future on

5 (Walter Wright, PowerPoint, March 25, 2011)
other healthcare-related construction projects. This case study will be widely distributed to other “eds and meds” both locally and nationally so that they may learn from the model.

- The Greater Circle Living program is being reviewed with the goal of re-launching it in the spring of 2012. This program incentivizes anchor employees to live in the GUCI neighborhoods by providing financial assistance to purchase, rent, or rehabilitate a home. The program, started in 2008, will be revamped by changing eligibility rules and improving marketing to increase the number of GUC anchor and nonprofit employees who participate.

- NewBridge, a workforce training program based on the Manchester Bidwell model in Pittsburgh, opened in Cleveland just prior to the start of the LC Initiative. Although small in terms of its numbers of students, NewBridge is the demand-driven workforce training component of the initiative, focusing on jobs identified by the anchors: phlebotomy, pharmaceutical, and the proposed program for medical coding technicians. In September 2011, it graduated its first class of 14 phlebotomists. With new classes forming every 20 weeks or so, there is a continuously renewing ‘career ladder’ in place. Expanding the scale of NewBridge is a key goal for the next three years.

**Formative Issues**

The evaluation team has identified a number of formative issues that have been discussed with the leadership team at the Cleveland Foundation.

The convening role of the Cleveland Foundation in the Living Cities Initiative (and with the GUCI before that) has been instrumental in bringing the partners together, aligning them around specific projects and issues, and keeping them at the table. This role is key to successful collaboration. The leadership of Cleveland Foundation staff is highly valued. They have pushed the envelope while being able to remain neutral and objective. They are viewed as very important connectors, conveners, and facilitators. They are also viewed as being adaptable and open to change. This has resulted in a strong core group of partners and stakeholders who work well together as a result of their experience through the GUCI.

Among some of the members of the GUCI leadership group however, there is not a full understanding of how the goals of the Living Cities Initiative fit with the GUCI. The October meeting had planned to include Ben Hecht, the President of Living Cities. However, this was not possible and Living Cities was not discussed in depth. It should be noted that introducing the LC Initiative was not the main objective of the meeting. The Cleveland Foundation leads and drives both initiatives and its staff worked to align the new goals voted on by GUCI members with the overall goals of the LC Initiative.

In contrast, at the management group level, which was created as part of the LC Initiative, the representatives of the anchor institutions have a good understanding of the Living Cities goals. Having their leaders involved in GUCI for the past six years has given the members of the Management Committee greater authority and decision-making abilities. The Management Committee has agreed on three pillars or vehicles for their successful participation in the LC Initiative: ideas, purchasing, and investment (Figure 1).  

---

6 It should be noted that these three pillars have expanded to four, since local hiring is becoming a new pillar for the anchors.
In this early phase of the initiative, the Cleveland Foundation is the glue holding all the partners together, and the LC Initiative and the Cleveland Foundation are providing the funding and the impetus that will be vital to aligning key strategies. As noted above, the connection between the strategies is understood by some, but not all of the partners. Building this understanding will be important in maintaining collaboration over time as key individuals and institutional priorities may change.

The Cleveland Foundation is beginning to put in place mechanisms that will enable the strategic partners to become more independent of the foundation, both financially and in terms of leadership and taking ownership of the goals of economic inclusion. For example, the Evergreen Cooperative Corporation (ECC)'s long-term plans include becoming self-sustaining. This will enable it to raise additional capital, thus reducing its reliance on funding from the Cleveland Foundation. In addition, while the foundation will continue to be a valued funder and partner, the ECC is seeking to develop leadership internally and diversify its base of partners and funders to ensure greater sustainability of its business model over time. As it continues to institutionalize, the ECC is creating a formal board with diverse representation from the anchors, foundations, and neighborhood groups.

In some ways, collaborative relationships are still being built. One question that the partners ask on an ongoing basis is: “Who else needs to be at the table?” This is especially true on the community engagement front. While it is still early in the process and the new community engagement piece remains in development, it is clear that the LC Initiative needs more buy-in and ownership from the community. A big strength in terms of getting people to the table is that the initiative began with the Cleveland Foundation, but some perceive it as a weakness in that it was primarily owned by the foundation and the anchors.

One question that has been raised is how Neighborhood Connections fits in with the rest of the initiative and, more specifically, how neighborhood residents will be tied in. The community engagement piece has the potential to tie the whole initiative together, but there are still a number of issues that need to be worked through.

For example, how can Greater Circle Living play a more significant role in bringing new residents to the GUCI neighborhoods and how can it help existing residents/employees improve their housing? Is there a possible partnership role for the Cleveland Housing Network and their portfolio of affordable homes? Would there be mutual benefit from more direct institutional involvement in neighborhood...
revitalization? What are some clear pathways outside of hiring for residents to connect to the anchors and how can residents better connect to these pathways? Is there a role for the CDCs serving the GUIC neighborhoods? What is the role of Midtown Cleveland, the economic development corporation serving most of the HTC, and for University Circle, Inc., which serves the institutions and nonprofits in the one square mile area defined as University Circle? There are some new wealth building strategies underway in the community (Corporation For Enterprise Development may be involved and individual development accounts) to provide for potential ongoing partnership opportunities.

Another emerging issue is that the Evergreen Cooperative Corporation is beginning to redefine “anchor partner” and “anchor contribution.” This is important as the traditional anchors are a key component of the Evergreen business model. An “anchor partner” was initially thought of as a healthcare or educational institution that would invest in and purchase goods or services from an Evergreen coop created primarily for the purpose of selling goods or services to the anchors. Conceptualization has now evolved to the point that, for Evergreen’s purposes, anchors are considered as having a commitment to stay in a place or neighborhood, a commitment to the Evergreen model, and a commitment of dollars. The anchor contribution now goes beyond purchasing to include ideas for new companies, dollars to support new companies, and business volume. The Evergreen Cooperative Corporation considers itself a potential new anchor.

The ECC is taking a comprehensive approach to community-based economic development that includes leadership programs for employee-owners to develop the next generation of neighborhood leaders and responding to new employee needs. As an example of the latter, ECC identified the lack of quality, affordable housing as an issue for employee retention. They have been exploring options with Cleveland Foundation staff. One result was that the Cleveland Housing Network, one of the city’s largest non-profit developers of affordable housing, was enlisted to conduct a survey assessing the housing needs of Evergreen employees, and discussions are now underway about ways to provide affordable housing for Evergreen employees. The evaluation team will track progress on both of these efforts.

### National Survey

From July through September 2011 Mathematica conducted a survey of key players in each of the five sites in the Living Cities Integration Initiative, including Cleveland’s Greater University Circle Community Wealth Building Initiative. The survey was designed to collect information on the degree of participation, the level of integration among various partner organizations, and the degree of collaboration among the partner organizations. It asked respondents to make comparisons from August 2010, before the initiative began, through July 2011, after the initiative was in operation for six months. Nineteen people responded to the Cleveland survey. All respondents but one are formally involved with the project in some capacity. Some highlights of the findings follow.

Not surprisingly, on average, all respondents noted an increase in their level of involvement with the other stakeholder organizations in the initiative. Respondents also reported increases in their level of involvement with organizations in other cities, increases in their involvement in each of the nine issue areas identified in the survey, increases in the level of importance they attach to policy areas and factors affecting the lives of low-income people, and increases in the importance they place on the mission to work with other stakeholders in their own neighborhoods as well as in geographies beyond their immediate area, including the city and the region.
When asked about the extent to which their organization has the background and information needed to contribute to investment-related decisions that can affect the local initiative, on a scale of one to four, with one being "not at all" and four being "to a great extent," respondents reported an average of 3.79, indicating that they feel well informed in this area. When asked about the focus areas they deemed most important for the initiative, the responses included workforce development, community development, economic development, health care development, partnerships, the utilization of the anchors, and inclusion.

The survey also included questions about improvements that could be made to the Greater University Circle Community Wealth Building Initiative. Most of these related to the work and composition of the management committee. Respondents on average rated the productivity of management committee meetings as 2.37 out of 3; a score of only 79%. Also, respondents felt that there were still organizations missing from "the table" including representatives from Cuyahoga Community College, Cuyahoga County Administration, Cleveland State University, JobsOhio, the State of Ohio, and residents from the target neighborhoods.

**Emerging Strengths**

The relationships between the anchors, The Cleveland Foundation, BioEnterprise, and MidTown, built through participation in the GUC and the LC Initiatives, have been used by the City of Cleveland to attract federal funds and anchor investments used to leverage other dollars. Further, these relationships have strengthened the city’s ability to work with state agencies. The relationship between the City of Cleveland’s Department of Economic Development, the foundations, and the anchor institutions is allowing the city to obtain support letters for state and federal grants and loans. This in turn allows the city to invest in Evergreen and HTC projects. These initiatives have created a true public-philanthropic-private partnership. If the geographic targeting of the LC Initiative can be maintained, it is expected to enable HTC to become a new regional employment center connecting the two employment centers in Cleveland: Downtown and University Circle.

**Year One Challenges**

Several challenges have been observed during the past several months. The LC Initiative is working to address some of these challenges.

- The LC Initiative is continually evolving. For example, the initial name of the initiative, the Cleveland Economic Inclusion Initiative, was confusing to people and had to be changed as the name is used for other initiatives in Northeast Ohio. A decision was made to change the name to the Greater University Circle Community Wealth Building Initiative.

- Several areas of tension emerged in the start-up phase and first year of the Initiative as Living Cities and The Cleveland TII developed a working relationship. First, it took some time for Living Cities to understand the strength and capacity in Cleveland. Second, for the purposes of the TII, the Cleveland Foundation took on the role of grantee, which is very different from their more
traditional role as grantor. This brought with it a process of finding ways for the two to work together.

For example, when Living Cities requested that the foundation secure formal MOUs between the GUCI members participating in the TII, the foundation staff argued that an MOU would upset the trust relationships and dynamics of GUCI. Now, the project is proceeding without formal MOUs. Also, in a second example, Living Cities insisted on the creation of a management committee. The foundation agreed following several conversations between the foundation and Living Cities. The management committee is playing a key role in implementing the TII, as described in this report.

A continuing area of tension between the Cleveland Foundation and Living Cities is around the question of what strategies should be included in this initiative. This has played out most notably around the role of the Evergreen Cooperatives. Evergreen was seen by the Foundation as a key strategy for both the GUCI and the TII. However, Living Cities was not interested in supporting the Evergreen Cooperatives or in efforts to take the Evergreen model national. They were much more interested in seeing a strong workforce component. The way this has played out is that Living Cities money was invested in Evergreen in the first year, but there will be no Living Cities money for Evergreen in the second year of the TII. There will be a stronger workforce component as the TII moves forward.

Finally, there was tension surrounding how the Living Cities commercial debt and catalyst fund dollars could be deployed and balancing that with the financing needs in Cleveland. Also, NDC had to create a Special Purpose Entity (SPE) for the purposes of investing the money in order to shield the rest of their portfolio. In addition, Living Cities was using pro-bono legal services which made the process slow. Robin Hacke was instrumental in negotiating terms with the Living Cities board. All of this has led to a delay in the signing of the financial terms.

- At the outset of the LC Initiative, one of the strategies under serious consideration was the creation of a land trust geared toward job creation and economic development. It was intended to enable the community to capture investment in land and buildings for ongoing community benefit. As work on the land trust progressed, however, the thinking evolved. It became a job creation land trust, then it became part of the ECC and finally, the idea was put on hold because it failed to serve the immediate needs of the New Markets Tax Credit program. It may yet emerge as a useful tool but won’t be launched until the need arises.

- One of the most significant challenges is the process of getting the anchors aligned around common goals for local hiring and procurement. Not all anchors have the same goals for local procurements (one practical issue is that they have preexisting long-term contracts). What can reasonably be expected in three years? A structured process for working on this issue has recently been suggested and GUCI leaders have agreed to include “buy local” as one of their goals for the next three years. A consultant agreement is now in place to review current process, provide additional staff and resource support, and make recommendations for the next funding cycle.

- Another challenge is in the area of workforce development. NewBridge and Cuyahoga Community College (CCC) are the workforce development partners of the LC Initiative. NewBridge is a very new, small program that can be scaled up if successful. The strategy for
tying in CCC’s workforce training has not yet been defined. The larger workforce development system in Northeast Ohio is viewed as mostly ineffective at linking employment-challenged residents to jobs. NewBridge and Evergreen are workforce development “workarounds” to this ineffective system. If they are successful at finding long-term employment for hard-to-employ GUCI neighborhood residents, it will be important to determine what can be learned from these programs to educate the traditional workforce-training and local-hiring providers. Towards Employment, the agency which played an early role in Evergreen employee recruitment, has recently implemented a new strategic plan and has been engaged as a possible partner for broader strategic efforts. As part of the work with CFED (see above), it is anticipated some potential workforce ‘system change’ elements and programs may be identified as well.

• The HTC has a number of challenges:
  o HTC marketing is critical to attracting supply chain and other companies to locate in the target area. A suggestion was made that this function needs to be strengthened. BioEnterprise has hired an HTC marketing person and MidTown Cleveland has partnered with BioEnterprise to serve the real estate and development function. It will be appropriate to review this partnership after one year to assess how it is progressing and where it can be strengthened.
  o Developments in the HTC take time, especially when there is a lack of available financing for tenant build-out and pre-development for speculative buildings.
  o There is a lack of state commitment (at this point) to the HTC. For example, the City of Cleveland has requested that the state of Ohio approve the use of New Markets Tax Credits for another building in the HTC, but the state does not want to have too many investments in the corridor. The state would prefer to diversify its investments and “not put all its money in one area.” The new gubernatorial administration has yet to decide what to do with the corridor’s designation as an Innovation Zone Hub.
  o Another financing issue in the HTC is that future HUD 108 funding is at risk. There is a need to push at the federal level for continued funding. HUD 108 is tied to the federal Community Development Block Grant program, which is linked to population size; therefore, the city, which lost population between 2000 and 2010, is expecting its funding will be cut without some type of intervention. The City of Cleveland, along with other Great Lakes cities, has proposed a formula adjustment for Great Lakes areas to compensate for the loss of manufacturing jobs, brownfields, and the foreclosure crisis.
  o There is a need for more retail and service jobs in the HTC to provide additional employment opportunities for neighborhood residents and services for the tenants.
  o Work is underway to engage the new Cuyahoga County administration and make the HTC a priority for them.

• The community engagement strategy is still evolving, but it will be a challenge within the 3 year time frame to create community ownership across all 6 neighborhoods, to connect residents to the benefits of the anchors and to clarify the roles and relationships between Neighborhood Connections and the existing CDCs, CSCs (Midtown and UCI), and other neighborhood organizations.

• One significant challenge for the evaluation team is how to define the expected impact on neighborhoods within the three-year timeframe of the LC Initiative. It is obvious that neighborhood-level data will not show the impact of the initiative. As a result, the evaluation
team will utilize indicators that measure individual strategies, as well as indicators of system change derived through both quantitative and qualitative research.
ANCHOR INSTITUTIONS

The LC Initiative is built upon the theory of place-based economic and community development. One key element of this type of development, which is present within each of the initiative’s aforementioned strategies, is engaging local anchor institutions. This new paradigm of community and economic development focuses specifically on large-scale institutions, typically higher education and medical institutions that are rooted in local communities and regions. The argument is that these anchor institutions do not have the luxury of relocating their operations; therefore, anchors have a stake in the success and failure of their local communities and should actively participate in their development.

Anchor Institutions Involved in Greater University Circle

Three of the anchor institutions in the Greater University Circle area are participating in the GUCI and Living Cities: Case Western Reserve University, the Cleveland Clinic, and University Hospitals. These anchors have a central role in the LC Initiative in terms of improving the quality of life for low-income GUC residents through real estate projects, economic inclusion, and community engagement. Historically, there has been a disconnect between the anchors and residents. Many residents still view the anchors with suspicion and distrust and don’t take advantage of the resources that exist within the anchors and the other arts and cultural institutions in University Circle. Bridging this divide is one of the goals of the LC Initiative. There are four ways that the anchors will be working to do this: investment, procurement, ideas, and hiring. The hope is that these four pillars will successfully change the culture of separation and distrust between the anchors and residents and ultimately improve the quality of life for GUC residents.

Pillars for Success

The four pillars for success—investment, procurement, ideas, and hiring—are now an integral part of the anchor-based strategy. The first pillar, investment, refers to the funding that the GUC anchors contributed to the various projects and organizations of the LC Initiative. The second pillar, procurement, refers not to the total amount of goods and services purchased by each anchor, but to the amount purchased from local vendors. One of the objectives of the LC Initiative is to work with the anchors to increase their percentage of local procurement. The third pillar for success, ideas, refers to the use of the anchors’ demand for specific goods and services as a foundation for developing or attracting new businesses. The final pillar for success, hiring, refers specifically to the hiring of GUC neighborhood residents by the anchors.

Baseline Data

Annual evaluation will track the changes and progress in each of these pillars. This requires baseline data, which in this case means anchor investment, procurement and hiring in base year 2010. Ideas will be tracked separately. We will also be tracking changes in policies or administrative decisions that lead to increased activity in these pillars.

Investment

As of September 30, 2011, the three anchor institutions had made substantial investments in real estate development, Evergreen, NewBridge, and Greater Circle Living through their participation in the GUCI.

Procurement

Table 1 contains a breakdown of each anchor institution’s procurement spending in 2010 by geographic area. A discussion of procurement spending follows.
### Table 1: Anchor Procurement by Geographic Region, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vendors</th>
<th>Case Western Reserve University</th>
<th>Cleveland Clinic</th>
<th>University Hospitals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>Dollar Amount</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Procurement</td>
<td>$365,000,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,577,770,221</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors located within Ohio</td>
<td>$69,083,777</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>$293,461,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors in Northeast Ohio</td>
<td>$64,240,839</td>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>$271,696,976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors in Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>$63,369,380</td>
<td>17.4%</td>
<td>$247,385,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors in the City of Cleveland</td>
<td>$58,162,899</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>$165,082,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Tech Corridor Companies</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$53,941,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cooperatives</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$8,491</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vendors located Outside Ohio</td>
<td>$295,916,223</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>$1,284,308,732</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: 1 Northeast Ohio is defined as the 21-county area including: Ashland, Ashtabula, Carroll, Columbiana, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Erie, Geauga, Holmes, Huron, Lake, Lorain, Mahoning, Medina, Portage, Richland, Stark, Summit, Trumbull, Tuscarawas, and Wayne counties.

Case Western Reserve University spent $365 million in procurement in 2010. Analyzing procurement patterns in geographies within Northeast Ohio reveals that 18% ($64.2 million) of the university’s total procurement was purchased from vendors in Northeast Ohio, nearly all of which were located in Cuyahoga County. Over $58 million in goods and services were purchased from vendors located in the City of Cleveland.

In 2010, 17.2% ($271.7 million) of the Cleveland Clinic’s $1.6 billion in procurement originated from vendors located in Northeast Ohio. A full 15% ($247.4 million) of the Cleveland Clinic’s total procurement came from vendors in Cuyahoga County, 10.5% ($165.1 million) came from vendors in the City of Cleveland, and 3.4% ($53.9 million) came from Health Tech Corridor companies.

University Hospitals spent $805.3 million in total procurement in 2010. Of that amount, 63% ($507.2 million) was purchased from vendors in Northeast Ohio. Analyzing procurement patterns in geographies within Northeast Ohio shows that 44.8% ($361.1 million) of University Hospitals total purchasing came from vendors in Cuyahoga County, 37.8% ($304.6 million) came from vendors in the City of Cleveland, and no goods and services were yet procured from companies in the Health Tech Corridor. University Hospitals’ percentages of local procurement are much higher than the other two anchors largely because its leadership initiated policies to prioritize local purchasing prior to the start of the LC Initiative. As a result, University Hospitals has a head start in institutionalizing procedures geared toward ensuring procurement of goods and services from local, minority-owned, and women-owned businesses. For instance, University Hospitals awards additional points to local businesses when reviewing project bids.

As can be seen from the data, University Hospitals far exceeds Case Western Reserve University and the Cleveland Clinic in their share of procurement from vendors in Northeast Ohio, Cuyahoga County, and the City of Cleveland. The procurement data shows, however, that the Cleveland Clinic bought $54 million worth of goods and services from vendors located in the Health Tech Corridor, compared to no purchases from HTC companies by Case or University Hospitals. It should be noted that this is the first year procurement data has been requested from the anchors due to the LC Initiative.
There are several technical issues regarding data reporting that may affect the information reported here; these issues are being discussed currently. At present, a database of local businesses is being developed and discussions among the health-related anchors, the Center for Health Affairs, and the Cleveland Foundation have begun regarding the goals, geography, and variables of the database. In addition, health care institutions are organizing to begin a conversation on what counts as “buy local” with the goal of adopting one definition that can be used in reports by all of the region’s health care institutions.

**Hiring**

One primary goal of the LC Initiative is to increase hiring from within the GUC neighborhoods. In 2010, the Cleveland Clinic employed over 39,000 employees system-wide in Northeast Ohio (Table 8). Of those employees, 75% identified themselves as Caucasian alone, 17% identified as Black or African American alone, 6% identified as Asian, and 2% identified as Hispanic or Latino. Three quarters (74%) were female, 65% resided in Cuyahoga County, 36% resided specifically within the City of Cleveland, and 14% resided within the Greater University Circle neighborhoods. The latter statistic is an important benchmark for improvement as one of the objectives of the LC Initiative is to hire from within the GUC neighborhoods (Table 8).

University Hospitals employed approximately 16,000 employees system-wide in 2010, 8,200 of which were located at the UH Case Medical Center in University Circle. Of University Hospitals’ total employment base, 69% identified themselves as Caucasian alone, 23% identified as Black or African American alone, 4% identified as Asian, and 2% identified as Hispanic or Latino. Seventy-five percent (75%) of total employees were female, 62% resided in Cuyahoga County, 13% resided in the City of Cleveland, and 4% resided within the Greater University Circle neighborhoods. Of the UH employees working exclusively at Case Medical Center in University Circle, 75% resided in Cuyahoga County, 19% resided in the City of Cleveland, and 6% resided within the Greater University Circle neighborhoods. Again, the latter statistic is an important target for improvement.

University Hospitals is beginning discussions about the possibility of hiring people with criminal records. This hiring process will follow state and federal laws and will include an assessment of each candidate regarding the risk they may pose to patients and employees.

Case Western Reserve University employed 5,200 full-time and part-time personnel as of the summer of 2011. Of these employees, 61% reside in Cuyahoga County and 26% reside in the City of Cleveland. Data limitations prevent the further classification of City of Cleveland residents between those who live in Greater University Circle neighborhoods and those living in non-Greater University Circle neighborhoods. Data limitations also prevent Case’s employment data from being classified by demographic characteristics. In the future Case Western Reserve University will provide employment data similar to the other anchors, allowing for better tracking.
### Table 2: Anchor Institution Employment Data, 2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employee Race</th>
<th>Cleveland Clinic</th>
<th>University Hospitals</th>
<th>Case Western Reserve University</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North-east Ohio Employees</td>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>System Wide (Total)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Indian and Alaska Native alone</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asian alone</td>
<td>2,155</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
<td>629</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black or African American alone</td>
<td>6,535</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
<td>3,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some other race alone</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caucasian alone</td>
<td>29,129</td>
<td>74.6%</td>
<td>10,996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two or more races</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>704</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Hispanic or Latino</td>
<td>38,371</td>
<td>98.2%</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10,283</td>
<td>26.3%</td>
<td>3,623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>28,792</td>
<td>73.7%</td>
<td>12,033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing in Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>25,494</td>
<td>65.2%</td>
<td>9,880</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing in City of Cleveland</td>
<td>14,147</td>
<td>36.2%</td>
<td>2,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residing in GUC neighborhoods</td>
<td>5,510</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>686</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** Case Western Reserve University employment data is unavailable by demographics. Residence data for Case Western Reserve University was formatted by zip code. This did not allow the Center for Economic Development to distinguish with 100% accuracy between residents of GUC neighborhoods, the City of Cleveland, and Cuyahoga County suburbs. In the future, addresses will be geocoded to avoid this issue.
Ideas
As described in the above sections on the Evergreen Cooperative and NewBridge, discussions with the anchors through the GUCI generated ideas about their demand for laundry services, alternative energy sources, locally-produced food, and a more highly-skilled workforce. The anchors’ demand for these goods and services played an active role in the creation and development of NewBridge and all three current Evergreen cooperatives.

The identification of feasible businesses based on the anchors’ demand continues today and remains a vital component of the GUCI and the LC Initiative. The involvement of the anchor institutions is critical to the continued identification of needs that may be met through new Evergreen companies or supply chain companies. In addition, the business ideas currently in the Evergreen pipeline—recycling, data scanning, printing, and transportation—are a direct result of demand-driven ideas generated by the anchors.
GREATER UNIVERSITY CIRCLE WEALTH BUILDING INITIATIVE:
STRATEGIES AND PROGRAMS

Figure 2 links the economic inclusion and community engagement goals adopted recently by the GUCI Leadership Committee (as described above) with the strategies and programs that are being implemented as discussed below. Underpinning these goals, strategies, and programs are leadership, funding, and governance without which none of these would have happened.

Figure 2: Greater University Circle Anchor-Based Community Wealth Building Initiative: Goals, Strategies, and Programs, 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strategies</th>
<th>Buy Local</th>
<th>Hire Local</th>
<th>Live Local</th>
<th>Connect Residents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Tech Corridor</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Engagement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Programs</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Corporation</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HTC Marketing &amp; Attraction</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Connections</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater Circle Living</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewBridge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Towards Employment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>★</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local First Cleveland (new buy local database)</td>
<td>★</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following strategies and programs are being implemented to achieve the initiative’s goals: Evergreen Cooperative in Cleveland, Health Tech Corridor, Community Engagement, Greater Circle Living, and NewBridge Cleveland. Many of these are anchor-based strategies. The previous part of this section reviews the anchors’ local procurement and hiring.
Evergreen Cooperative Model in Cleveland

Overview

Launched in 2007 by the GUCI and the Cleveland Foundation, the Evergreen Cooperative in Cleveland is an economic inclusion program designed primarily to rejuvenate the seven low-income Cleveland neighborhoods that collectively comprise Greater University Circle (GUC). Specifically, Evergreen is designed to help build the wealth of residents living in these impoverished neighborhoods by connecting them to and leveraging the resources of the anchor institutions located in GUC: the Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, and Case Western Reserve University. The Evergreen model is designed to create a variety of for-profit, environmentally-sustainable cooperatives that hire from within the GUC neighborhoods, produce living wage jobs and community stabilization, and offer employees benefits and opportunities for ownership within the businesses.

To achieve its long-term wealth-building goal, the Evergreen Cooperative in Cleveland was built upon several strategies. First, Evergreen relies heavily upon increasing the local procurement by the anchor institutions in Greater University Circle. Viewed as regional economic engines, the three anchor institutions purchased a combined $2.7 billion in goods and services in 2010; 30.7% was purchased from businesses located in Northeast Ohio.8 This leaves much room for growth.

The first step in increasing the percentage of locally-purchased goods and services was to determine product demand. The Cleveland Foundation and Ted Howard, from the Democracy Collaborative working in conjunction with the anchor institutions and the Evergreen Cooperative leadership, identified goods and services they require that could feasibly be provided by local sources. Examples of such goods and services include commercial laundry services and alternative energy, both of which resulted in the creation of cooperative companies. The Evergreen Cooperative leadership continues to use this market-based approach as a guide for choosing what cooperatives to develop. Producing goods and services required by the anchors allows Evergreen to capture a greater percentage of the anchors’ procurement dollars, which in turn can be circulated throughout the Greater University Circle neighborhoods, the City of Cleveland, and Northeast Ohio.

Another key strategy of the Evergreen model is that its cooperatives are designed to be employee-owned. In each cooperative, employees can officially become owners following the completion of a six month probationary period. This model of employee ownership provides employees with a means by which to obtain financial equity in the businesses and build their personal wealth.

A final aspect of the Evergreen Cooperative model that heavily impacts its development efforts is its focus on environmental sustainability and a mechanism to create “green jobs”. According to the Cleveland Foundation, the goal of the Evergreen Cooperative model is “to build a network of cooperative businesses that are the greenest firms within their sectors.”9 This goal is in line with the

---

7 The target neighborhoods of the Evergreen Cooperative Initiative are Cleveland’s Buckeye-Shaker, Central, Fairfax, Glenville, Hough, and University neighborhoods, as well as the city of East Cleveland.
8 Northeast Ohio is defined as the 21-county area including Ashland, Ashtabula, Carroll, Columbiana, Crawford, Cuyahoga, Erie, Geauga, Holmes, Huron, Lake, Lorain, Mahoning, Medina, Portage, Richland, Stark, Summit, Trumbull, Tuscarawas, and Wayne counties.
9 Howard, T., Kuri, L., & Pierce Lee, I. The Evergreen Cooperative Initiative of Cleveland, Ohio: Writing the next chapter for anchor-based redevelopment initiatives. White paper prepared for The Neighborhood Funders Group Annual Conference (Minneapolis, MN), September 29-October 1, 2010.
national movement toward a green economy and provides a competitive advantage with the anchor institutions, which are pursuing greener business practices. Specific examples of green practices within the Evergreen Cooperatives can be found in the discussions of each individual cooperative.

The Evergreen Cooperative model is built on both social and business principles, both of which are equally important to achieving its goals. In early 2011, the Cleveland Foundation hired a consultant to provide strong business expertise and improve the operations of the Evergreen Cooperative businesses. As a result, a new framework was proposed for an umbrella organization, the Evergreen Cooperative Corporation (ECC), which was incorporated in 2011.

The mission of the ECC is to create new jobs, build community wealth, and stabilize the GUC communities. Figure 3 identifies the six components of the ECC’s structure that will help the nonprofit achieve its mission. The individual Evergreen cooperatives are included in the ECC’s Business Ventures component. The ECC Fund will become the new home of the Evergreen Cooperative Development Fund (ECDF), which is intended to support the creation and development of individual Evergreen cooperatives through strategic investments. The ECDF is currently administered by the Enterprise Cleveland Group. The Shared Services will provide key services to the individual cooperative companies, including legal, accounting, human resources, marketing and branding, and technology services. Evergreen Business Services will provide training on the Evergreen model to both employees and future cooperative entrepreneurs.

Figure 3: Evergreen Cooperative Corporation Structure

The ECC will be the keeper of the vision of the Evergreen Cooperative model. It will work to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Evergreen Cooperatives by growing the existing cooperatives and developing new ones. The tactics will include vetting new business ideas, finding entrepreneurs who

---

10 Enterprise Cleveland Group, http://www.enterprisecleveland.org/
will develop business plans, improving the financial and human resources functions, training workers and managers in the Evergreen principles, and creating new cooperatives.

The Evergreen model has garnered national attention for its unique approach to economic development. An article in *Time* magazine cites the “Cleveland model” as a way to stabilize jobs and build wealth for employee-owners. The potential of the model has also been recognized at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In an interview with *Shelterforce* magazine, Ron Sims, then-deputy secretary of HUD, called Cleveland’s Evergreen Cooperative model "brilliant" and suggested that HUD look for ways to encourage coop formation.

**Funding**

The business plans of the Evergreen Cooperatives are designed to achieve fiscal self-sufficiency and generate profits that will fund employee capital accounts. In its first few years, however, the Evergreen Cooperatives did rely upon external investments for initial capital to both fund its development stage and to cover the initial staff, equipment, and operating expenses of each cooperative.

Since 2006, the Evergreen Cooperative of Cleveland as a whole has obtained a total of $7.9 million in investments from various sources. This funding has been classified into two different categories. The first is funding provided directly to the Evergreen Cooperative of Cleveland to cover such expenses as development, workforce training, and staffing. The second category is funding raised for the Evergreen Cooperative Development Fund (ECDF). As seen in Table 1, the Cleveland Foundation has provided the most funding, accounting for 45% of Evergreen’s total investments. Additionally, Living Cities grant for year one was $275,000. No additional funding was approved for year two. Living Cities investments comprise over 3% of Evergreen’s total funding.

Excluded from Table 3 are expenses for Cleveland Foundation staff who are dedicated to the GUCI, the Evergreen model, and other components of the Living Cities Initiative. Over the past 5 years, about 70% of India Pierce Lee and Lillian Kuri’s time has been devoted to GUCI, of which 40% is devoted to economic inclusion (Evergreen). In addition, Ted Howard, the Steve Minter Fellow, spent about 50-70% of his time in the past year to build support for Evergreen and building wealth in low-income communities. Table 3 also excludes public sector funding because complete data was unavailable to the evaluators.

---

11. A new *Time* magazine article is pending which will revisit the Cleveland Model.
Table 3: Evergreen Funding by Philanthropy and Anchors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Use of Funding</th>
<th>Total Funding Contributed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Evergreen Initiative*</td>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Development Fund**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>$560,000</td>
<td>$3,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Cities (Year 1)</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Clinic</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hospitals</td>
<td></td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higley Fund</td>
<td></td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelvin and Eleanor Smith Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minigowin Foundation</td>
<td></td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nathan Cummings Foundation</td>
<td>$375,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rockefeller Foundation</td>
<td>$650,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surdna Foundation</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,010,000</td>
<td>$5,850,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes funding for initiative development, staffing, Evergreen Cooperative Corporation, and worker training.

**Includes funding Evergreen Cooperative Laundry, Ohio Cooperative Solar, Green City Growers Collaborative and pipeline businesses.

The Individual Cooperatives

The Evergreen Cooperative of Cleveland has two operating cooperatives—Evergreen Cooperative Laundry and Ohio Cooperative Solar—and a third, Green City Growers Cooperative, has just broken ground. The following subsections provide overviews of these three cooperatives as well as an analysis of the data available for base year 2010.

Evergreen Cooperative Laundry

Evergreen Cooperative Laundry, the first of the Evergreen cooperatives and a pioneer of the urban revitalization cooperative “Cleveland model,” was designed to provide its clients with industrial-scale, energy-efficient laundry services at competitive prices. The cooperative’s business plan targets Northeast Ohio’s healthcare cluster, an area of business continuously growing larger in response to both the region’s specialty in this area and its aging population. The laundry was built to operate under unique infection control standards with special sanitizing for its sorters, carts, and trucks. Located in Cleveland’s Glenville neighborhood, the mission of Evergreen Cooperative Laundry also includes provisions to facilitate “green” business practices and invest in the local community.

Evergreen Cooperative Laundry was implemented through the efforts and financial investment of the

---

14 The financial information from the City of Cleveland will be added when it is made available.
Cleveland Foundation and the GUCI institutions. It employed 23 workers in 2010, just over two-thirds (16) of which were male. The employees were predominantly middle-aged with 69.5% (16) falling between the ages of 35 and 54. The remaining seven employees were younger and fell between the ages of 18 and 34. Eighteen of the 23 employees self-identified as African American, four self-identified as Caucasian, and one self-identified as Hispanic or Latino. Eleven employees graduated from high school, three obtained their GED, and four possessed some college experience.

Eighteen (78.2%) of the 23 employees in 2010 lived in the Greater University Circle neighborhoods. Five (21.7%) had a current or former affiliation with the United States military. Over half of the laundry employees (13 or 56.5%) had been convicted of some kind of criminal offense and 19 had some contact with the criminal justice system, making it harder for them to find employment. Six of 23 employees (26.1%) received some kind of public assistance, be it for housing, healthcare, food and nutrition, or child care. Eleven of 23 employees (47.8%) were homeowners and 13 of 23 (56.5%) had a valid driver’s license. In September 2011, the laundry employed 21 workers.

Evergreen Cooperative Laundry has undergone a series of changes, including a shift in its target clients. Originally, the laundry’s target clients included the anchor hospitals. However, 95% of the hospitals’ laundry is currently contracted out to large service providers whose prices are so competitive the laundry would have been unable to compete and produce a profit. In response, the laundry changed its clientele focus, opting instead to target nursing homes within the region’s healthcare cluster. Since nursing homes typically have on-site laundry facilities, Evergreen Cooperative Laundry is negotiating contracts with nursing homes at prices that are beneficial enough to justify the nursing homes outsourcing their laundry needs. As of September 2011, the laundry had 15 customers (2 hotels and 13 nursing homes), and the laundry’s management is presently negotiating with 3-4 additional nursing homes.15

Evergreen Cooperative Laundry has also undergone changes to its management team. In response to management, contractual, and quality problems, the Cleveland Foundation hired a new management team in March 2011 to overhaul the laundry and ensure that it operates as a competitive, for-profit company. It was under this new leadership that the laundry began servicing the nursing home segment.

With its new leadership and market segment, combined with increased foci on quality standards and employee retention, it is projected that Evergreen Cooperative Laundry will reach its breakeven production point of 4.2 million pounds per year (350,000 pounds per month) in April or May 2012. Production is currently at approximately 2.4 million pounds per year (200,000 pounds per month), a 360% increase since February 2011. Working to reach its breakeven milestone, the laundry’s main goal is to implement slow and steady growth to achieve its full capacity of 10 million pounds per year, a level of service that will require 50 employees. The laundry leadership believes this goal is achievable because the region’s annual nursing home laundry market is estimated to be 120 million pounds. The laundry is not currently providing services to the three anchor institutions, nor is its management team expecting to do so.

Other goals of Evergreen Cooperative Laundry include maintaining quality standards; retaining current customers; increasing customer satisfaction; offering additional training for worker-owners; providing clear, concise, and timely communication to worker-owners; obtaining minority business enterprise licenses; and

15 Interview with Jim Anderson, Evergreen Cooperative Laundry. Interviewed conducted September 12, 2011.
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Ohio Cooperative Solar

The second of the Evergreen Cooperative companies, Ohio Cooperative Solar, was also incorporated in 2008. Like Evergreen Cooperative Laundry, the solar cooperative is aimed at facilitating energy efficiency and “green” practices; specifically, Ohio Cooperative Solar offers its clients a source of alternative energy and measures for energy efficiency and conservation. It also hires locally from within the Greater University Circle neighborhoods and the city of Cleveland and provides wealth-building opportunities to stabilize the community.

Ohio Cooperative Solar (OCS) has two business lines. First, the OCS installs and maintains cooperative-owned PV solar arrays on commercial, governmental, and institutional buildings. As the owner of the solar panels it installs, the cooperative receives a specified amount of revenue per kilowatt hour (kwh) energy used within the buildings on which the solar rays were installed. As of September 2011, Ohio Cooperative Solar had completed five solar installations: Cleveland Clinic’s Health Space Building, University Hospitals’ Ahuja Medical Center, Case Western Reserve University’s Adelbert Gym, Euclid City Hall, and the Euclid Public Library. Each solar array takes 2-3 weeks to install.

The solar cooperative’s second business line is weatherizing residential and commercial structures. Weatherizing a structure entails a variety of activities such as insulating attics, caulking windows, installing roof vents, fixing air leaks, waterproofing basements, and performing blower-door tests to check for energy leaks. The solar cooperative has completed 127 weatherization jobs as of September 2011. Thus far, Ohio Cooperative Solar receives its weatherization jobs strictly through the City of Cleveland delegates including Cleveland Housing Network and Cudell, but the cooperative’s new CEO, hired during the summer of 2011, intends to expand the cooperative’s services into the private sector (see below).

Ohio Cooperative Solar employed 21 workers in 2010; 18 were men and three were women. The ages of these employees were distributed relatively equally among the applicable age groups; 52.3% (11) were between the ages of 18 and 34 while the remaining 10 were between the ages of 35 and 64. Thirteen (61.9%) of 21 employees self-identified as African American, half of the remaining eight employees (4 or 19.0%) self-identified as Caucasian; one-half of the employees self-identified as Hispanic or Latino. In terms of education, all the employees of Ohio Cooperative Solar, at the least, graduated from high school or earned their GED. Two of the 21 employees received some kind of higher education certificate, eight had some college experience, one earned an associate degree, and one earned a bachelor’s degree. Eight employees work on solar arrays and 13 work on weatherization.

Fifteen employees (71.4%) of Ohio Cooperative Solar lived in one of the Greater University Circle neighborhoods. Two employees had a current or former affiliation with the United States military. Over half of the OCS employees (61.9%) had been convicted of some sort of criminal offense. Four employees (19.0%) were homeowners and three quarters (16 or 76.1%) possessed a valid driver’s license, which is an important asset as the job requires extensive mobility. None of the employees received public assistance in 2010. Figure 4 below offers a comparative perspective of the demographic

---

16 As of October 2011, the laundry has completed the submittal process for MBE and Edge status. These designations are expected to help the laundry attract a small percentage of volume from several very large customers including the anchor hospitals.
Ohio Cooperative Solar faces two primary challenges. The first is its human capital. There are nine skill levels in weatherization, but the majority of Ohio Cooperative Solar’s workforce only has training and certification in the most basic trades. This puts the solar cooperative at a distinct competitive disadvantage as all of its competitors provide more extensive training for their employees. In response to this issue, OCS’ new CEO wants all employees to receive more extensive training within the next 6 to 12 months. A second human capital concern is the recent turnover of the solar cooperative’s staff. At one point turnover in the company was 100%, but that rate dropped to 20% for the last six months. Since the new CEO took control in mid-August 2011, there has been no turnover. This apparent change in the OCS’s turnover trend in both lines of business, however, should not prevent further actions from being taken to maintain the stability of Ohio Cooperative Solar’s workforce.

The second challenge of Ohio Cooperative Solar is financial. Ohio Cooperative Solar has already achieved its financial breakeven point, yet funding remains a concern. In addition, the cooperative receives about 4% of the City of Cleveland’s weatherization jobs where other vendors typically do 10-15% of the jobs. With this situation in mind, future plans have been created. On the solar array side of the business, additional sites for solar array installations have been identified by the Cleveland Clinic and Case Western Reserve University. On the cooperative’s weatherization side, the new CEO wants to
expand the solar cooperative’s weatherization and waterproofing services into the private market. To service the private market, however, Ohio Cooperative Solar needs to train its employees in advanced skills and customer service. The new CEO and the ECC are currently discussing the possibility of dividing Ohio Cooperative Solar into two distinct units.

**Green City Growers Cooperative**

The Green City Growers Cooperative is currently under development to be the third employee-owned, for-profit cooperative in the Evergreen Cooperative Corporation’s business portfolio. Green City Growers will be housed in a 3.25 acre hydroponic greenhouse in Cleveland’s Central neighborhood and will be capable of year-round food production. Physically, the large-scale design of Green City Growers will allow for the production of approximately 3 million heads of lettuce and 300,000 pounds of fresh herbs annually.

Although Green City Growers took much longer than anticipated to launch, its groundbreaking took place on October 17, 2011. The company is about a year behind schedule due to difficulties in land assembly, arranging the complex financing package, and changing the source of alternative energy to be used in the greenhouse’s operations. However, there have been several accomplishments worthy of recognition. A business plan has been developed that will employ 35-40 local workers and, in line with Evergreen’s mission statement, allow employees to earn equity in the company. In addition, several sources of advanced energy have been identified that could potentially “reduce the operating costs of the business and significantly reduce the projected carbon emissions of the facility.” Finally, and most important, Green City Growers has managed to obtain approximately $27.5 million in startup funding in the form of grants, loans, and New Markets Tax Credits to finance the operation (Table 4).

**Table 4: Green City Growers Funding by Source (as of October 19, 2011)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Evergreen</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Development Fund</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developer loan less loan fee on HUD108 (payable to City)</td>
<td>$107,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (BEDI) grant</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cleveland, HUD Section 108 Loan Guarantee Program</td>
<td>$8,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>U.S. Department of Treasury</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Markets Tax Credit Program</td>
<td>$16,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$27,507,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the greenhouse is under construction, the leadership of Green City Growers is planning to search for, hire, and begin training its first employees.

---

19 Interview with Mary Donnell, Chief Executive Officer of Green City Growers. Interviewed conducted May 17, 2011.
Cleveland Health-Tech Corridor

Overview
The Health Tech Corridor (HTC) is a 3-mile, 1,600-acre transit corridor served by the RTA HealthLine, Cleveland’s new Bus Rapid Transit (BRT). The HTC stretches from Downtown Cleveland to University Circle, connecting 10 city neighborhoods along the way (Figure 5). This targeted geography, with many acres of vacant land and properties ready for rehabilitation, is envisioned as a place capable of nurturing the development of the healthcare and biomedical clusters in Northeast Ohio. The HTC is marketed as a prime location for healthcare, biomedical, and technology companies that provides resident businesses with close proximity to a number of world-class healthcare institutions; universities; business incubators; and dozens of high-tech, innovative companies. In addition, the HTC seeks to fill the demands for space of supply chain companies of the anchor institutions currently located outside the city and of local companies, particularly startup companies graduating from the HTC business incubators, searching for expanded space.

Plans for the HTC were unveiled in April 2010 and the project was initiated by several collaborators including BioEnterprise, a Cleveland-based initiative geared toward growing healthcare companies and commercializing biotechnology; the City of Cleveland; Cuyahoga County; the Cleveland-Cuyahoga County Port Authority; and Midtown Cleveland, which oversees development efforts in Cleveland’s Midtown neighborhood. Today, these collaborators have been joined as partners by organizations including private economic development organizations, universities, medical centers, foundations, and the state government.

---

21 In June 2010, Ohio Governor Ted Strickland named the Cleveland Health-Tech Corridor one of seven Hubs of Innovation and Opportunity. The Ohio Hubs were designed to strategically build upon a region’s assets, in this case Cleveland’s growing healthcare industry. However, with new governor and other elected officials the status of the corridor as an Hub of Innovation is currently unknown. For more information, see http://development.ohio.gov/Urban/OhioHubs.htm.
Figure 5: Map of the Cleveland Health-Tech Corridor

Source: Cleveland Health-Tech Corridor, http://www.healthtechcorridor.com/facilities/
Specific objectives for the HTC’s role in the Living Cities Initiative include creating a vision and promoting the HTC brand; attracting more technology, health-related, and supply chain companies; increasing employment in existing companies; increasing the square footage of real estate that is used for technology, health-related, and supply chain companies; retaining and expanding existing companies; securing brownfield redevelopment funds as needed; and, over the long-term, helping the real estate market function faster and more efficiently. This, in turn, will bring more jobs and businesses to the target area and will generate more tax dollars for the city.

The HTC Today
As of September 2011, the HTC is occupied by a number of businesses and organizations, including 21 pharmaceutical companies, 36 medical device companies, 3 healthcare technology companies, 31 non-healthcare technology companies, and 7 venture capital firms. Additionally, the HTC is home to three higher education institutions (Cleveland State University, Case Western Reserve University, and Cuyahoga Community College) and four clinical and research institutions (Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals Case Medical Center, Louis Stokes Cleveland VA Medical Center, and St. Vincent Charity Medical Center) that contribute to the research, education, and workforce training needs of local companies.

Another vital element of the HTC is its seven business incubators, which house a portion of the aforementioned businesses. These incubators are tasked with providing business services to develop startup biomedical and high-tech companies. The incubators currently offer 392,000 square feet of space for businesses, but that amount will increase as MidTown Cleveland, Inc., and Hemingway Development enter the second phase of its collaborative MidTown Tech Park project, which includes renovating a 40,000 square foot on Euclid Avenue for additional research and office space. The hope is that this building, located in the heart of the HTC, and the MidTown Tech Park will attract new businesses and retain the businesses being developed in the HTC incubators.

Funding
Base funding for the HTC comes from BioEnterprise, which counts the HTC among its portfolio of initiatives. Additional funding is collected on a real estate project-by-project basis from a variety of public, philanthropic, and private organizations.

The Cleveland Foundation has pledged $50,000 (renewable) of its Living Cities grant money to BioEnterprise for the HTC. With this money, the HTC is expanding its marketing strategy and presence by increasing the number of conferences and site visits it undertakes, upgrading its marketing materials and resources to better showcase the region and the services it provides, purchasing additional street banners to reinforce its identity through increased physical branding, and hiring a consultant to identify 15 out-of-region marketing targets. The Cleveland Foundation separately supports BioEnterprise operations, currently $200,000 per year for the HTC over the past two years and additionally $600,000 for their work in entrepreneurship.

---

Community Engagement

Overview
The third strategy of the LC Initiative is community engagement. Community engagement can be defined as the active and voluntary participation of neighborhood residents in their community. The LC Initiative uses a grassroots, bottom-up approach to develop a sense of community in the Greater University Circle (GUC) neighborhoods. The objectives of this strategy include the following: supporting and encouraging positive relationships among community members based on equality and valuing everyone’s contributions; developing the capacity of resident leaders and neighborhood groups; assisting residents in identifying assets, building connections, and organizing to create positive change in their community; building relationships, networks, and trust across neighborhoods and preparing residents to take action on common concerns; and building relationships, networks, and trust between grassroots leaders and anchor institutions. Expected outcomes for residents include a sense of ownership and responsibility for their communities; the development of trust and communication within the GUC neighborhoods, between the neighborhoods, and with the anchor institutions; and, ultimately, the implementation of positive changes in the GUC neighborhoods.

The community engagement strategy focuses specifically upon three types of connections. The first is connecting residents and neighborhood-based organizations with one another both within and across the GUC neighborhoods. A sense of connection can facilitate a more hospitable, attractive, and desirable place to live both for current and potential residents. The second is connecting GUC residents and the anchor institutions. This can result in residents having greater access to resources available through the anchors, including services and jobs, and can help to inform the community involvement efforts of the anchors. The third is connecting residents with a variety of programs available to the community that can improve quality of life by providing access to affordable housing, job training, wealth-building opportunities, and more. Such programs include the Evergreen Cooperatives (discussed above), Greater Circle Living, and NewBridge Cleveland (both discussed below).

Neighborhood Connections
The community engagement strategy of the GUCI, supported through the Cleveland Foundation and the LC Initiative, is run by Neighborhood Connections (NC), a special small grant program created and funded by the Cleveland Foundation. It works at the grassroots level with community members and leaders in the cities of Cleveland and East Cleveland to address community needs. Neighborhood Connections funds a variety of projects through small grants of between $500 and $5,000. Grants can be used for a wide array of projects including those that address community issues like housing, health and wellness, and community building. The formal process of selecting projects to receive funding is undertaken twice a year with grants being distributed each February and August. Now in its ninth year of operation and having distributed its 18th round of grants, Neighborhood Connections has invested $4.9 million in more than 1,300 projects.

Neighborhood Connections was integrated into the LC Initiative in April 2011 to engage the community. Its goal of (1) creating opportunities for individuals to become actively engaged in the community and (2) building relationships between community members, community-based organizations, and anchor institutions align very closely with those of the LC Initiative. Under Living Cities, NC will focus additional
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23 Originally, Neighborhood Connections only serviced the City of Cleveland and its individual neighborhoods. As part of the Living Cities Initiative, service was expanded to the city of East Cleveland in August 2011.
effort and resources in the GUC neighborhoods using a $75,000 grant from Living Cities. A program coordinator and community organizer were hired in August 2011 to work specifically in the GUC neighborhoods. They are using the model of neighbor circles, which starts with small community gatherings for residents to meet, develop trust, and ultimately work together, to identify and bring about changes to improve their communities.

NC also houses *Neighborhood Voice*, a GUC-oriented newspaper and outreach mechanism published twice per month. A grant from Living Cities of $50,000 helps to pay for the editor/publisher and underwrite the cost of the paper. The newspaper began publishing in 2010 and hopes to become a trusted source of community news to keep GUC residents involved and informed. Although the *Neighborhood Voice* began as an Evergreen Cooperative, oversight of the newspaper is now under the purview of Neighborhood Connections and is independent of Evergreen.

**Strategy in Action**

During the initial stages of the LC Initiative, community engagement was the least developed of the initiative’s three strategies although the Cleveland Foundation and Neighborhood Connections had been working to develop this strategy. Since then, however, steps have been taken toward solidifying the strategy’s goals and objectives. In fact, one major achievement was operationalizing community engagement before the end of 2011 with ongoing support from the Cleveland Foundation supplemented by funds from Living Cities.

The internal structure of Neighborhood Connections has expanded to take on the added responsibilities of community engagement for the LC Initiative. The small 3-person staff of Neighborhood Connections has grown to encompass three new, Living Cities-funded employees. The *Neighborhood Voice* newspaper is being managed by a new editor/publisher hired in late June 2011. In addition, a program coordinator and a community organizer were both hired in August 2011. These three new employees are being housed in office space located in the heart of University Circle while the preexisting staff members are located downtown in the Hanna Building.

Overall, important, strategic steps have been taken in regard to the community engagement strategy, but the strategy remains in its formative stage.

**Greater Circle Living**

**Program Description**

Greater Circle Living (GCL) is an economic development housing initiative seeking to grow and improve the Greater University Circle neighborhoods of Cleveland. Greater Circle Living is designed to “improve access to affordable housing, assist individuals in wealth building, reduce commute times and costs, and enhance quality of life by offering employees of eligible institutions an opportunity to live and work close to world-class cultural institutions and services.”

The program, started in 2008, is a collaborative effort of the participating anchor institutions and nonprofits located in Greater University Circle and University Circle, Inc., the development, service, and advocacy organization serving the member institutions and nonprofits located in University Circle.

---

24 Greater Circle Living informational pamphlet, 2011.
Greater Circle Living is administered by the Fairfax Renaissance Development Corporation (FRDC), a community development corporation serving the Fairfax neighborhood (home to the Cleveland Clinic’s Main Campus). Greater Circle Living is run by a FRDC-hired program administrator that works closely with the participating anchors, nonprofits, and University Circle, Inc., which does the program’s marketing.

Financial assistance offered by GCL can be used for a variety of housing-related purposes. These purposes include: (1) down payment or closing costs associated with the purchase of an owner-occupied home; (2) improvements to a newly-purchased owner-occupied home; (3) exterior repairs to homes already owned by Greater University Circle employees; and (4) assistance with rental costs. In addition to financial assistance, Greater Circle Living provides those who are eligible with assistance in the application process; budgeting and the management of their finances; training for home buyers; and education regarding existing housing options.

To be eligible for the program, individuals must fulfill at least two basic criteria.25 First, a person must be employed by a nonprofit institution located in Greater University Circle. The Greater University Circle area is defined by Greater Circle Living as the Buckeye-Shaker, Fairfax, Glenville, Hough, Little Italy, and University neighborhoods of the city of Cleveland, and the southwest quadrant of the city of East Cleveland.26 In addition to employment with a local nonprofit, eligibility requires that a person rent, rehabilitate, or purchase a home within the boundaries of Greater University Circle. Those that meet these two requirements and participate in a homeownership class are eligible for a $5,000 loan which comes as a second lien on the property. Employees of Case Western Reserve University, the Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, the Cleveland Museum of Art, and Judson at University Circle may be eligible for an additional $10,000 in loans from their employer.

A key element of the loans offered by Greater Circle Living is that they are completely forgivable. If a grant awardee continues to live in the home and maintains employment at a Greater University Circle nonprofit organization for five years after the loan closes, the loan is forgiven.

In addition to the forgivable loans for home purchases, employees at Case Western Reserve University, the Cleveland Clinic, University Hospitals, the Cleveland Museum of Art, and Judson at University Circle are also eligible for a one-month reimbursement for rental properties in the program footprint. Also, those employees currently living in the district can apply for exterior renovation grants of up to $8,000, each with a match from the homeowner.

Funding

Funding for GCL comes from a variety of sources. Table 5 lists the funders as well as how much each contributed to the program. Note that the money contributed by each anchor institution of Greater University Circle is available only to assist employees of that institution.

---

25 Additional requirements are imposed by each of the participating employers.
26 This definition of Greater University Circle differs from the boundaries established by the Greater University Circle Initiative as it does not include the City of Cleveland’s Central neighborhood or portions of the city of East Cleveland.
Table 5: Greater Circle Living Funding by Institution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Western Reserve University (anchor)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Clinic Foundation (anchor)</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cleveland Museum of Art</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Judson at University Circle</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kent H. Smith Foundation</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surdna Foundation</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>University Hospitals (anchor)</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,000,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Program Accomplishments, 2008-2010

Since the launch of Greater Circle Living in 2008, the Fairfax Renaissance Development Corporation has received 486 inquiries about the program’s various financial assistance offerings. Between 2008 and 2010, a total of only 26 employees had received funds to assist in either purchasing a home or improving a newly-purchased home. Of those 26, nine received funding in the year 2010. Of those nine, just over half relocated to Greater University Circle from outside the geographic boundaries of the GUC neighborhoods; one relocated from Cleveland’s Central neighborhood and four relocated from the Cuyahoga County suburbs of Richmond Heights, Shaker Heights, Solon, and Westlake. None relocated from outside the county.

A second source of financial assistance provided by Greater Circle Living is support to fund external home repairs and renovations to homes in the Greater University Circle neighborhoods already owned by eligible individuals. Eight repair projects were funded and completed between 2008 and 2010, three of them in the year 2010. Two of the projects completed in 2010 took place in the Glenville neighborhood; the third was in the Buckeye-Shaker neighborhood. In addition to the finished projects, a number of projects are in various stages of the completion in the pipeline: four projects were funded and are presently underway, seven projects are undergoing the bidding process, and four are currently on hold.

The final source of financial assistance offered by Greater Circle Living is a subsidy for one month of rental assistance. Twenty-two employees received funding between the creation of Greater Circle Living in 2008 and base year 2010; 12 in 2010 alone. Of those 12, only four were previously residents of Greater University Circle. The remaining eight funding awardees relocated from other Cleveland neighborhoods (2, North Collinwood), suburbs in Cuyahoga County (1, University Heights; 1, Lakewood; and 1, Mayfield Heights), or from out of state (1, Maryland; 1, North Carolina; and 1, Michigan). The rental reimbursements for these residences in 2010 ranged from $629 to $2,300.

Table 6 below shows the number of people who received each type of financial assistance between the start of Greater Circle Living in 2008 and the end of 2010, categorized by their former area of residence. Table 7 shows the number of people who received each type of financial assistance in 2010 only, also categorized by their former area of residence.
Table 6: Number That Received GCL Financial Assistance by Former Area of Residence, 2008-2010

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Financial Assistance</th>
<th># That Received Assistance</th>
<th># Relocated from Within GUC</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside GUC but Within City</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside City but Within NEO</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside NEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds to Purchase or Improve a New Home</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for External Home Repairs &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for Rental Assistance</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 7: Number That Received GCL Financial Assistance by Former Area of Residence, 2010 Only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Financial Assistance</th>
<th># That Received Assistance</th>
<th># Relocated from Within GUC</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside GUC but Within City</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside City but Within NEO</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside NEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds to Purchase or Improve a New Home</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for External Home Repairs &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for Rental Assistance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Programmatic Changes

As seen in Tables 6 and 7, the number of Greater University Circle employees who have received financial assistance from Greater Circle Living is small as compared to the total 486 inquiries the program received. This low level of output has been attributed to the fact that the program started in 2008, which coincided with the onset of the recent recession. The downturn of the economy resulted in a tightening of lending guidelines and increased the difficulty in providing conventional loans to those eligible for the program.

In response to the economic hardships brought on by the recession, Greater Circle Living was modified in the third quarter of 2009. The modifications made included:

- Increasing the amount of financial assistance offered for exterior repairs and renovations to $8,000 and reducing the employee match from a 1:1 match to a 25% requirement from the homeowner;
• Utilizing Federal Housing Administration (FHA) loans for upgrades and improvements;\textsuperscript{27}
• Some institutions reducing the eligibility requirements for their employees.\textsuperscript{28}

A Preview of 2011
In 2011, Greater Circle Living has continued to provide financial assistance to Greater University Circle employees. From January to August 2011, a total of 14 individuals received GCL funds (7 for purchasing or improving a new home; 3 for exterior repairs; and 4 for rental assistance) (Table 8). The 2011 data show that the program is on track to meet the level of service provided in 2010; in fact, in 2011 thus far GCL has already matched the number of loans distributed in 2010 for external repairs and renovations. The large gap in the number of rental assistance subsidies provided in 2010 and 2011 (12 and 4, respectively), however, leads one to presume that the program will fall short of its 2010 benchmark in this instance.

Table 8: Number That Received GCL Financial Assistance by Former Area of Residence, January-August 2011

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Financial Assistance</th>
<th># That Received Assistance</th>
<th># Relocated from Within GUC</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside GUC but Within City</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside City but Within NEO</th>
<th># Relocated from Outside NEO</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Funds to Purchase or Improve a New Home</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funds for External Home Repairs &amp; Renovations</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidies for Rental Assistance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is clear from comparing the 2010 and 2011 data that Greater Circle Living continues to fall short of reaching its full potential. It was the hope of the program funders and the Fairfax Renaissance Development Corporation that the 2009 modifications would improve the program’s accessibility, output, and progress toward its goals. However, it appears that further changes are needed to develop a larger pool of potential participants. Possible programmatic changes include: (1) further adjusting the requirements employees must meet to be eligible for the program; (2) standardizing the eligibility requirements among the anchor institutions; and (3) expanding the program’s marketing strategy.

\textsuperscript{27} Due to the economic downturn, potential homebuyers in Greater University Circle were unable to obtain a traditional mortgage loan. Instead, many turned to FHA loans to finance their purchase. Unfortunately, due to FHA restrictions, Greater Circle Living funding cannot be used to make a down payment on a house. Therefore, GCL funding is being used more for home upgrades and improvements rather than for down payments.  
\textsuperscript{28} Two significant changes to eligibility requirements were made. First, University Hospitals reduced the period of employment necessary for eligibility from 3 years to 90 days. Second, Judson at University Circle opened eligibility for the program from registered nurses only to all employees.
Currently, changes to Greater Circle Living are being considered by the funders of the program, including the Cleveland Foundation and the participating anchor institutions, who are collaborating to improve the eligibility of employees, the awareness of the program, and, ultimately, the number of employees who benefit from the program.

**NewBridge Cleveland Center for Arts & Technology**

**Program Description**

NewBridge Cleveland Center for Arts & Technology is an innovative nonprofit organization with a focus on providing career and vocational training to under- and unemployed adults.\(^{29}\) Launched in 2011, NewBridge’s design was based on Pittsburgh’s proven Manchester Bidwell Corporation program, which has an 85% success rate of job placement for adult graduates.\(^{30}\)

NewBridge utilizes a market-based approach with regard to choosing the training programs it offers. Specifically, the organization collaborated with the Cleveland Clinic and University Hospitals to gauge their employment needs, and created a specialized training to fill that gap in skills and experience. The focus of its initial programming and curriculum are two subject areas, pharmacy tech and phlebotomy, that were chosen due to present and projected future demand nationwide. The demand for pharmacy technicians is expected to grow 25% by the year 2018. Likewise, the demand for phlebotomists is expected to increase 14% by 2018.\(^{31}\) In addition to demand, both career paths are capable of producing living wage employment with benefits. To that end, it is the hope of program creators and funders that at the conclusion of the program, trainees will be hired by the anchor institutions and other organizations.

NewBridge’s training programs combine both in-class and on-the-job experience. The pharmacy technician and phlebotomy programs provide students with 38 weeks and 20 weeks, respectively, of in-class education. In addition, NewBridge works with local healthcare institutions to supplement student education through externship opportunities that provide practical, on-the-job experience. The pharmacy technician program offers a 6-week externship while the phlebotomy program offers a 4-week externship.

**Funding**

Classes at NewBridge are offered at no cost to students. This arrangement is made possible through funding from multiple sources including University Hospitals Health System, the Cleveland Foundation, KeyBank, the Kelvin & Eleanor Smith Foundation, and the Lennon Trust. The Cleveland Foundation was also responsible for contributing 100% of the seed capital for NewBridge ($3 million).

**Base Year and Beyond**

NewBridge is a boutique workforce development organization. Its goal is to serve 50 adults annually between its two programs. For the first classes of each program, there were a total of 32 spots available for students; both classes operated at a full capacity of 16 students. This is an admirable feat due to the

\(^{29}\) NewBridge also offers year-round, after-school arts programs for local youth. Classes include ceramics and a variety of digital multimedia. These youth programs will not be examined in this report because of their incongruity with the mission and goals of the LC Initiative.


\(^{31}\) NewBridge Cleveland Center for Arts & Technology, http://www.newbridgecleveland.org/about/.
fact that NewBridge did not publicly advertise either of its programs. In the first class of phlebotomy students, one was hired by the Cleveland Clinic midway through the program, one dropped out of the program, and 14 students graduated. Of the 14 graduates, six received job offers from the anchors within 60 days (four accepted offers and two declined offers due to difficulties in the shift times offered). One student has even decided to further their education by pursuing an advanced degree. Meanwhile, the first pharmacy technician class began on August 22, 2011. Due to the length of the pharmacy tech program (38 weeks), it will be some time before it produces graduates. Also, work has begun on a third program which will hopefully launch in 2012 focusing on medical coding.

While the first classes of the phlebotomy and pharmacy technician programs have met success, preparation has begun on subsequent classes. The second class of the phlebotomy program began on September 6, 2011, once again at a full capacity of 16 students. In addition, NewBridge has begun constructing the waiting lists for the third phlebotomy class and second pharmacy technician class, both of which will commence upon the graduation of its preceding class. Due to its structural size and resources, NewBridge only operates one class of each program at a time.

There are several obstacles identified as barriers to the success of NewBridge and its students. A large barrier for the ultimate success of the program’s target participants is the requirements for entry. While most applicants did have the requisite high school diploma or GED, only 25% were able to pass the Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) at the necessary 11th grade level. In response, NewBridge has established a program providing academic refresher courses that will help prepare potential students to pass the test. Thus far, 15 people have taken advantage of the academic refresher courses.

A second barrier is the operational size of the NewBridge program. As aforementioned, the demand for pharmacy technicians and phlebotomists is great; for instance, 404 potential participants applied for 32 spots available in the programs. The demand is so great, in fact, that the training capacity of NewBridge is too small to successfully service the number of individuals who wish to partake in the program and it is also too small to meet the demand of the health care institutions. Program expansion is needed to meet demand, but a number of factors limit NewBridge’s ability to grow. First, the staff includes only eight full-time and four part-time employees. Second, facility size needs to be considered. While it is true that NewBridge can hire more employees and expand into the upper stories of its building in exchange for increased program costs, a third growth limitation is NewBridge’s choice to remain a small, boutique organization.32

The other barriers to success faced by the target population of NewBridge are common issues faced by under- and unemployed individuals. These barriers include quality child care, adequate nutrition, and transportation. NewBridge is working to eliminate these barriers through partnerships with the YWCA, the Center for Families and Children (child care), and the Cleveland Food Bank (nutrition). It should be noted that the location of the facility was quite intentional: it is located in the Midtown neighborhood adjacent to a stop on the RTA Health Line, which makes it accessible from all directions.

32 Interview with Jeffrey Johnson, Executive Director of NewBridge. Interview conducted July 1, 2011.
APPENDICES
## Appendix 1: Living Cities Interview List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Organization</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Heidi Gartland</td>
<td>University Hospitals</td>
<td>4/21/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom Jackson</td>
<td>NDC</td>
<td>4/27/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Clark</td>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>4/28/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Kiel</td>
<td>Ohio Cooperative Solar</td>
<td>4/28/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baiju Shah &amp; Bob Baxter</td>
<td>BioEnterprise</td>
<td>5/2/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom O’Brien</td>
<td>Neighborhood Connections</td>
<td>5/2/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Vernon</td>
<td>Cleveland Clinic</td>
<td>5/4/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wheeler &amp; Jenn Ruggles</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>5/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Jones</td>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Corporation</td>
<td>5/12/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steve Standley</td>
<td>University Hospitals</td>
<td>5/13/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Nichols</td>
<td>City of Cleveland</td>
<td>5/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mary Donnell</td>
<td>Green City Growers</td>
<td>5/17/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom O’Brien*</td>
<td>Neighborhood Connections</td>
<td>6/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ron Jones*</td>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Corporation</td>
<td>6/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lillian Kuri*</td>
<td>Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>6/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Wheeler*</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>6/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tracey Nichols*</td>
<td>City of Cleveland</td>
<td>6/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laura Clark*</td>
<td>Cuyahoga County</td>
<td>6/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ellen Mavec*</td>
<td>Smith Foundation</td>
<td>6/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina Vernon*</td>
<td>Cleveland Clinic</td>
<td>6/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Baxter*</td>
<td>BioEnterprise</td>
<td>6/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oliver Henkel</td>
<td>Cleveland Clinic</td>
<td>6/13/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyonette Cheairs</td>
<td>Fairfax Renaissance Development</td>
<td>6/22/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Johnson</td>
<td>NewBridge</td>
<td>7/1/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allison Motz</td>
<td>Health &amp; Science Innovation Coalition</td>
<td>7/25/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chris Warren*</td>
<td>City of Cleveland</td>
<td>8/22/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Wright</td>
<td>Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>9/2/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tom O’Brien &amp; Danielle Price</td>
<td>Neighborhood Connections</td>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyonette Cheairs**</td>
<td>Fairfax Renaissance Development</td>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Johnson**</td>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Corporation</td>
<td>9/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jim Anderson</td>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Laundry</td>
<td>9/12/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joel Ratner</td>
<td>Neighborhood Progress</td>
<td>9/15/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Susan White</td>
<td>Enterprise Cleveland Group</td>
<td>9/19/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tim Tramble</td>
<td>Burton, Bell, Carr Development</td>
<td>9/20/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyonette Cheairs**</td>
<td>Fairfax Renaissance Development</td>
<td>9/26/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regina Johnson**</td>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Corporation</td>
<td>9/26/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Name</td>
<td>Organization</td>
<td>Date</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cliff Wood</td>
<td>Ohio Cooperative Solar</td>
<td>9/28/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyonette Cheairs**</td>
<td>Fairfax Renaissance Development</td>
<td>10/12/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeff Johnson**</td>
<td>NewBridge</td>
<td>10/13/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bob Sorin</td>
<td>Evergreen Cooperative Laundry</td>
<td>10/17/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ted Howard</td>
<td>Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>11/28/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marie Cervay &amp; Annette Stevenson</td>
<td>Novogradic &amp; Company</td>
<td>12/5/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jenn Ruggles &amp; Susan O'Donnell</td>
<td>Case Western Reserve University</td>
<td>12/12/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*with National Evaluator  
** telephone follow-up
### Appendix 2: Living Cities Meeting List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Occasion</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living Cities Integration Initiative Launch in Detroit</td>
<td>10/28/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Cleveland Foundation &amp; Partners</td>
<td>11/10/2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>1/5/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in Boston</td>
<td>2/8/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in Boston</td>
<td>2/9/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in Boston</td>
<td>2/10/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>3/11/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Walter Wright</td>
<td>3/24/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Cleveland Foundation</td>
<td>4/7/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Committee Meeting</td>
<td>4/12/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living Cities Site Visit</td>
<td>4/26/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Walter Wright</td>
<td>5/10/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Committee Meeting</td>
<td>5/20/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in Chicago</td>
<td>6/21/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in Chicago</td>
<td>6/22/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in Chicago</td>
<td>6/23/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Committee Meeting</td>
<td>7/19/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Walter Wright</td>
<td>8/4/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Walter Wright</td>
<td>9/2/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management Committee Meeting</td>
<td>9/8/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Deployment Meeting</td>
<td>9/20/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in DC</td>
<td>10/4/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dinner meeting with Walter Wright &amp; Tracey Nichols</td>
<td>10/4/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in DC</td>
<td>10/5/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Learning Communities in DC</td>
<td>10/6/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Walter Wright</td>
<td>10/20/2011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting with Tom O’Brien &amp; Danielle Price</td>
<td>11/18/11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 3: Management Committee

Members:

Bob Baxter (retiring)
Vice President
BioEnterprise

Daniel Budish
Development Officer
City of Cleveland

Aparna Bole, MD
Sustainability Manager, University Hospitals
Assistant Professor, Department of Pediatrics,
Rainbow Babies & Children’s Hospital

Laura Clark
Senior Development Finance Analyst
Cuyahoga County Department of Development

Heidi Gartland
Vice President, Government Relations
University Hospitals Health System

Tom Jackson
Director
National Development Council

Ron Jones
Consultant
The Evergreen Cooperatives

Shilpa Kedar
Program Director for Economic Development
Cleveland Foundation

Sarah Kresnye
Community Development Manager
The Center for Health Affairs

Lillian Kuri
Program Director for Architecture,
Urban Design, and Sustainable Development
Cleveland Foundation

India Pierce Lee
Program Director for Neighborhoods,
Housing, and Community Development
Cleveland Foundation

Tracey Nichols
Director of Economic Development
City of Cleveland

Christine Nelson
Vice President, Business Attraction
Team Northeast Ohio Cleveland Plus Business

Aram Nerpouni
Director of Business Development
BioEnterprise

Tom O’Brien
Program Director
Neighborhood Connections

Joel Ratner
President
Neighborhood Progress, Inc.

David Ricco
Director, Business Development
BioEnterprise

Jill Rizika
Executive Director
Towards Employment

Jennifer Ruggles
Executive Director, Government Relations
Case Western Reserve University

Baiju Shah
President and CEO
BioEnterprise

Stephanie Strong-Corbett
Director of Sustainability
Case Western Reserve University

Christina Vernon
Sr Director, Sustainability & Environmental Strategy
Office for a Healthy Environment
Cleveland Clinic

Walter Wright
Project Manager, Greater University Circle
Community Wealth Building Initiative
Cleveland Foundation
Other:

Ziona Austrian  
*Director, Center for Economic Development*  
Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs  
Cleveland State University

Kathy Hexter  
*Director, Center for Community Planning and Levin College Forum*  
Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs  
Cleveland State University

Candi Clouse  
*Research Associate*  
*Center for Economic Development*  
Maxine Goodman Levin College of Urban Affairs  
Cleveland State University

Ted Howard  
*Steven Minter Senior Fellow for Social Justice*  
Cleveland Foundation
Appendix 4: Greater University Circle Leadership Team

BioEnterprise
Baiju Shah
President and CEO

Case Western Reserve University
Pamela Davis, M.D., Ph.D.
Dean and Vice President for Medical Affairs
Jennifer Ruggles
Executive Director of Government Relations
Barbara Snyder
President
John Wheeler
Senior Vice President for Administration

Charter One, Ohio
Carrie Carpenter
Vice President of Public Affairs
Ken Marblestone
President & CEO

The City of Cleveland
Robert Brown
City Planning Director
Tracey Nichols
Director of Economic Development
Chris Warren
Chief of Regional Development

The Cleveland Clinic
Gayle Thompkins Agahi
Director of Government Sponsored Programs
Delos (Toby) Cosgrove
CEO and Chairman of the Board of Governors
John D'Angelo
System Facility Manager
Oliver (Pudge) Henkel
Chief External Affairs Officer
Pamela Marshall Holmes
Senior Director of Community Service
Bill Peacock
Executive Director, Facilities and Construction Management
Brian Smith
Administration Director, Construction Management
Anthony Stallion
Pediatric Surgeon/Chief Community Relations and Diversity Officer
Christina Vernon
Senior Director, Sustainability and Environmental Strategy

The George Gund Foundation
David Abbott
Executive Director
Bob Jaquay
Associate Director

The Greater Cleveland Regional Transit Authority
Joe Calabrese
CEO & General Manager
Maribeth Feke
Director of Planning
Mike Schipper
Deputy General Manager

Early Stages Partners
James Ireland, III
Managing Director

Kelvin and Eleanor Smith Foundation
Ellen Mavec
President

The Kent H. Smith Charitable Trust
William LaPlace
President
Phillip Ranney
Secretary

Neighborhood Progress, Inc.
Joel Ratner
President

University Circle Incorporated
Debbie Berry
Vice President of Planning and Development
Christopher Ronayne
President
Thomas Stanton
Chairman of the Board and Executive Committee
University Hospitals Health System
Aparna Bole
Sustainability Manager
Brad Bond
Vice President of Treasury
Ron Dziedzicki
Senior Vice President and General Manager of Operations
Heidi Gartland
Vice President, Government Relations
Steve Standley
Senior Vice President
Thomas Zenty
President and Chief Executive Officer

Village Capital Corporation
Linda Warren
President

The Cleveland Foundation
Jennifer Cimperman
Public Relations Officer
Bob Eckardt
Executive Vice President
Ted Howard
Steven A. Minter Senior Fellow for Social Justice
Shilpa Kedar
Program Director for Economic Development
India Pierce Lee
Program Director for Neighborhoods, Housing and Community Development
Lillian Kuri
Program Director for Architecture, Urban Design, and Sustainable Development
Ronn Richard
President and CEO
Walter Wright
Program Manager, Living Cities Integration Initiative

The Evergreen Cooperatives
Jim Anderson
CEO Evergreen Cooperative Laundry and Program Coordinator
Ohio Employee Ownership Center
Mary Donnell
CEO
Green City Growers Cooperative
Ron Jones
President & CEO
The Copious Group, LLC
Steve Kiel
CEO
Ohio Cooperative Solar
Lila Mills
Publisher
Neighborhood Voice
Susan White
President
Enterprise Cleveland