

**Building Bridges Where There is Nothing Left to Burn:
The Campaign for Environmental Justice in a
Southwest Detroit Border Community**

by

Amy Erin Krings

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy
(Social Work and Political Science)
in The University of Michigan
2015

Doctoral Committee:

Professor Lorraine M. Gutiérrez, Co-Chair

Emeritus Professor Gregory B. Markus, Co-Chair

Professor Donald R. Kinder

Professor Michael Spencer

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I am heavily indebted and grateful to many people who guided me and supported me throughout my dissertation process. Perhaps the most meaningful part of my dissertation is that I was able to study a group whose mission I believe in. I want to thank and acknowledge the leadership of the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition for granting me access to their campaign and for helping me to better understand the impact of living or working within an environmental sacrifice zone. In particular, I need to thank Tom Cervenak, who mentored me in 2003 when I was a social work intern, and who welcomed me back to Southwest Detroit in 2010. Thank you Simone Sagovac for being patient with me and generous with your time. Thank you Scott Brines for your vulnerability, humility, and kindness. Thank you Debra Williams for teaching me about hope, and thank you Rashida Tlaib for teaching me about courageously and strategically speaking the truth to power.

In addition to the Delray residents and members of the Community Benefits Coalition, this dissertation would not have been possible without the consistent support of my dissertation committee--Donald Kinder, Michael Spencer, and my co-chairs Lorraine Gutiérrez and Greg Markus. I am humbled and grateful to have had the opportunity to learn from well-respected scholars who demonstrate that it is possible to concurrently advance critical thinking and social justice within and outside of the academy. Lorraine and Greg helped me to puzzle through my data and to situate my findings within the big picture, all the while helping me to access

resources to *finish*. My dissertation was also improved because of the investments made by my incredibly bright and committed research team. I thank the Undergraduate Research Opportunities Program at the University of Michigan for facilitating my collaborations with Anisha Kingra, Joel Klann, and Nolan McClain, who helped me develop the foundation of my research design, and with Stacey Matlen, who helped me to reframe the Delray case as exemplifying the production of environmental health disparities. I also thank Sam Russ, Xhensila (Janie) Velencia, and Sian Dowis, three former students, who continued to work on the project as volunteers. I especially want to acknowledge the contributions that Sian Dowis made to the development of chapter three and that Stacey Matlen and Janie Velencia made to the development of chapter four. These chapters are clearer and more accurate because of your contributions.

I also need to thank the many writing groups of which I was a part during my six years at in the joint Social Work and Political Science Doctoral Program. I found the dissertation writing process to be isolating and, quite honestly, I am not sure that I would have finished without their support. Thank you to my Social Work cohort writing group – Alix Gould Werth, Jackie Hawkins, Latasha Robinson, Lauren Reed, and Sojung Park – and my Political Science writing group – Anna Cotter and Vanessa Cruz – for your friendship and encouragement. All seven of you are brilliant scholars whose feedback has helped me to sharpen my writing. Thank you to my other Social Work and Political Science cohort members, especially Ben Peterson, Justin Williams, Eddie Zeng, Guillermo Sanhueza, Jeff Albanese, and Matthew Chin for challenging me academically and for commiserating with me over the years.

The University of Michigan offered me writing support as well, primarily through the Sweetland Writing Center Dissertation Program. Louis Ciccirelli and my 2014 cohort helped

me to clarify my arguments and, quite simply, to keep writing. Thank you to Rob Jansen in the Sociology department and his Professional Writing class, and to the members of Interdisciplinary Workshop on American Politics (especially Robert Mickey and Mika Lavaque-Manty), the Social Work Qualitative Methods Workshop (especially Karen Staller), the Social Movements Workshop (especially Kiyoteru Tsutsui and Sandra Levitsky), and the members of the University of Michigan Detroit School (especially Margi Dewar) for helping me to advance my work.

Thank you to Ann Alvarez for mentoring me as I completed my program and framed my research during my job search. Thank you Ann Lin, who helped me develop my research design, and Anne Pitcher, who helped me to identify the empirical gap to which my work contributes.

Thank you Dean Lein and Berit Ingersol-Dayton for supporting me through my program, and Todd Hyunh and Laura Thomas for ensuring that I was doing so properly. Larry Root and John Mathias, thank you for providing me with the opportunity to learn from the work of environmental justice activists in Kerala, India.

Thank you to old friends, including the members of the Ann Arbor ladies potluck, Jason Brooks, and the Xavier University Wild Women. Claire Mugavin, Annie Sobotka, Julie Glaser, and Molly Robertshaw, your phone calls and visits helped me to gain the confidence to complete my program, and to have some fun doing it. Thank you Luis Cuenca for helping me to prioritize my work and to remember its importance.

Finally, thank you to the members of my families. First, my Summit Street family -- Ezra Brooks, Hilary Levinson, and Erin Lane -- who made grad school fun and remain dear long-term friends. Second, my biological family, especially my grandparents Beverly and Russell Littman, who helped to make it possible for me to go to graduate school, my parents Dave and Christine, my sisters Katey and Sarah, and my dog Tucker and cat Bailey.

This dissertation represents my interpretation of the Southwest Detroit campaign for a community benefits agreement. I do not intend to speak on behalf of the Delray community. Instead, my hope is that my readers will empathize with the residents of Delray and the members of the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition, and perhaps even participate in efforts to change policy so that we no longer systematically build harmful developments in a way that unfairly burdens the most marginalized members of our society.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
LIST OF FIGURES	vii
LIST OF ACRONYMS	viii
ABSTRACT	ix
CHAPTERS	
I. The Politics of Equitable Development	1
II. The Business of Borders	27
III. From NIMBY to Negotiation: Deciding to Pursue a Community Benefits Agreement	51
IV. Access Denied: Obstacles to Community Benefits Agreements	69
V. The Promise and Limitations of Local Organizing for Equitable Urban Development	86
APPENDIX	101
REFERENCES	103

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1 - Data Collection – Participant Observation	25
Figure 2 - Data Collection – Interviews	26
Figure 3 – Industrialization in Delray	38
Figure 4 – Reduced and Neglected City Services	39
Figure 5 – Community Investment	40
Figure 6 – Community Resistance	41
Figure 7 – The Emergence of the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition	50
Figure 8 – Oppose the Bridge	77
Figure 9 – Support the Bridge	81
Figure 10 – What About Delray?	98
Figure 11 – Delray is Our Home	99
Figure 12 – Keep Your Promises	100

LIST OF ACRONYMS

Community Benefits Agreement	CBA
The Detroit International Bridge Company	DIBC
Locally Undesirable Land Use	LULU
Michigan Department of Transportation	MDOT
The New International Trade Crossing	NITC
Not in My Backyard	NIMBY
The Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition	CBC

ABSTRACT

This dissertation examines the nature of power in land use decisions that contribute to the production of environmental inequality. By analyzing land use conflicts concerning who decides, who profits, and who pays when it comes to the construction of urban infrastructure, I identify mechanisms that culminate in the disproportionate placement of hazardous facilities in low-income communities of color. Specifically, by tracing decisions about the plant to build a new international border crossing in the Southwest Detroit neighborhood of Delray, I demonstrate how economic and political inequalities incentivize the placement of locally undesirable land uses (LULUs) in low-income, vulnerable communities. I examine three phases of the decision-making process: the initial proposal regarding where to place the facility, the response by the host community, and the negotiation process involved in responding to the community's concerns.

Drawing from fieldwork, interviews with residents, activists, and elected officials, and an analysis of media coverage, I explain the emergence of the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition and why local stakeholders organized to conditionally support the new bridge, rather than oppose it, despite fears about contamination and relocation. I argue that the campaign for a community benefits agreement (CBA) resulted from a legacy of divestment and industrialization within the neighborhood, combined with the belief that residents lacked the political power to prevent the construction. Thus, a “not-in-my-backyard” (NIMBY) campaign was effectively organized out of the political process, despite concerns about health impacts.

I then trace the community benefits campaign, illuminating mechanisms through which the Delray group was manipulated, tokenized, and silenced.

Nearly all of the extant literature on CBAs draws its sample of cases from neighborhoods that are in the process of or have successfully completed a CBA negotiation. No existing research has examined the power dynamics that shape a community's ability to compel the developer to negotiate in the first place. By entering the community at an earlier policy-making state, I am able to demonstrate how political and economic inequalities contribute to environmental inequality. The dissertation closes with suggestions for how communities and policy-makers can more effectively prevent the reproduction of environmental injustice.

CHAPTER I

The Politics of Equitable Development

This dissertation examines the nature of power in land use decisions that contribute to the production of environmental inequality. By analyzing land use conflicts concerning *who decides, who profits, and who pays* when it comes to the construction of urban infrastructure, I identify mechanisms that culminate in the disproportionate placement of hazardous facilities within low-income communities of color. I examine power dynamics during three phases of the decision-making process: the initial proposal regarding where to place the facility, the response by the host community, and the negotiation process involved in responding to the community's concerns.

Theories of Land Use Conflict

A primary theory in contemporary urban politics research is that the central policy issue for city leaders is economic development; this theory is known as “growth machine theory.” Following World War II, cities began to experience declines in their manufacturing bases and populations. As property values fell and federal housing policy accelerated “white flight” to the suburbs (Sugrue, 2005), the percentage of lower-income, higher-need residents within central cities increased. To combat their decline in revenue raised from taxes, growth interests—composed of economic and political elites—collaborated to develop policies conducive to

business operations (Mollenkopf, 1989). These growth coalitions, sometimes referred to as a city's "growth machine" (Molotch, 1976) dominated city halls by pushing policy that would attract and retain capital. They did this by both supporting "friendly" legislation and also influencing which political issues would be taken up and voted upon and which would be ignored. Even when businesses groups did not lobby on issues explicitly, city leaders were conscious of capital's profit requirements—and of their ability to exit (capital mobility)—so they worked to continuously grow the city's economy while retaining existing business.

These growth coalitions have been particularly strong in the policy arena related to land use decisions. City officials and private corporations offer different tools for facilitating development, and a partnership can benefit both parties. City officials, for example, can exercise the power of eminent domain to assemble large parcels of land, give subsidies, provide zoning variances, build infrastructure, and offer assistance in the approval process for development projects. Developers provide capital investment and can generate tax revenues and jobs through their projects.

Another reason that city leaders seek to retain and grow capital is that cities are expected to provide services to their citizens, and they finance those activities mainly with revenue that they raise primarily through private, for-profit investment. As a result, cities compete with each other to host affluent residents and corporations that pay more in taxes than they absorb in services. This competition between cities for capital incentivizes city officials to provide favorable business environments. As a result, city leaders are reluctant to attach development requirements—such as local hiring programs or rules relating environmental regulations to local investment—because of the concern that added burdens to developers will scare off capital (Peterson, 1981), even if it means passing along negative externalities to host communities. Consequently, while development may profit economic elites, it may also lead to the

displacement of low-income residents through declines in public services, razing of buildings, or rising housing costs as a result of gentrification. Nonetheless, public funding for development projects is frequently justified according to the rationale that these projects provide benefits for all members of the community.

The conflict between capital and community is most obviously expressed in disputes over urban development. Following the basic Marxist distinction between “use value”—as the production of goods and services for one’s own use—and “exchange value”—as the production of goods and services for exchange with others, capital calculates the worth of cities according to an exchange relationship, while residents view a city’s worth in terms of its usefulness in providing services, sustenance, and quality of life. Thus, capitalists support urban development that will further the use of commodities, land, and infrastructure toward making a profit, while citizens press for urban development that preserves urban land and infrastructure for their use and that supports their community (Mollenkopf, 1981).

Regime theory, which emerged in the 1980s, is largely viewed as an extension, rather than a rejection, of growth machine theory (Logan, Whaley, & Crowder, 1997) in that it emphasizes the importance of informal but sustained relationships among local politicians and corporate actors who guide development and shifting coalitions connected to growth issues (Elkin, 1987; Stone, 1989). Thus, it argues that while pro-growth coalitions are still dominant in urban politics, the political balance between capital and cities varies based on the relative strength and interests of groups influencing development policies. When the elite is fragmented, there is a political opportunity for residents to pursue “use” value (Elkin, 1987; Stone, 1989).

Later work on resistance to urban development predicted that poor and minority communities would have a more difficult time influencing development because they are comparably weak institutionally and the organizations that defend them might be susceptible to

cooptation (Logan & Molotch, 2007). Similarly, Clark and Goetz found that antigrowth movements (those characterized as NIMBY, or “not in my backyard”) are more likely to emerge in areas where residents have higher levels of education, income, and professional occupations. Thus, economic development can exacerbate socio-economic inequality within cities, since capital profits from new projects while the poor and people of color disproportionately pay the associated costs (Storey & Hamilton, 2003).

Community Resistance

Despite the primacy of business interests aligning with political leadership, the local state is not completely free to support capital’s growth agenda while ignoring the citizenry (Elkin, 1987; Stone, 1989), and communities are not simply passive recipients of unwanted development. The term “not in my backyard” (NIMBY) is used to describe general opposition to the siting of locally undesirable land uses (LULUs) (Luloff, Albrecht, & Bourke, 1998). Suttles (1972) referred to such communities—in which opposition to unwanted development is strong—as “defended neighborhoods.”

In their book on the development of “megaprojects,” Altschuler and Luberoff documented how, in some cases, NIMBY opposition forced modifications and even cancellations of major infrastructure projects (Altschuler & Luberoff, 2003). Additional examples of citizens “defending” their neighborhoods include cancellations of urban renewal projects (Medoff & Sklar, 1994; Stoecker, 2010), highways, (Gotham, 1999; Gregory, 1999), airports (Flores Dewey & Davis, 2013), heavy industries (Almeida & Stearns, 1998; Checker, 2005; Pulido, 1996), and waste facilities (Pellow, 2004; Sze, 2007).

For example, Gotham (1999) documented efforts to build a new interstate through predominately black neighborhoods in Kansas City. The freeway was pitched as the “most

efficient route” to support trade “from the Gulf to Canada” and to bring new jobs and suburban development. The Kansas City Mayor at the time described it as “inevitable.” Yet the impacted, predominately Black host community organized to halt further property acquisition. Residents allied with the NAACP and other Civil Rights Movement organizations, charging that the new plan would have the effect of “destabilizing schools, blighting neighborhoods, and following racially discriminatory relocation activities” (Gotham, 1999, p. 339). Gotham argues that residents were able to reframe the highway proposal from a rational and objective transportation plan to one that would destroy black communities by segregating them, stealing property, isolating them, and creating a wall, while benefitting (white) suburbanites.

Likewise, in his book *Defended Community*, Stoecker tells the story of a Minneapolis community slated for total demolition and documents its resistance to new development, including the implementation of a community-controlled redevelopment plan that included a rigid “no-displacement” policy (Stoecker, 2010).

In contrast to those cases of successful resistance, it is also necessary to emphasize that urban scholars have demonstrated that awareness of an outside threat is not a sufficient condition to generate an organized citizen defense of a neighborhood. Gans, in his classic work *The Urban Villagers* (1982), conducted an ethnographic study while living in Boston’s West End neighborhood. During his residency, the neighborhood was slated for “slum clearance” as part of a federally supported attempt to improve city conditions through “urban renewal.” Gans documented that residents did not actively resist urban renewal plans until it was too late (Gans, 1982).

Connecting Equitable Development and Environmental Justice

Questions concerning *who profits* and *who pays* relating to land use policy and development are central to the analysis of both urban development and environmental justice. Since the late 1980s, scholars, policy-makers, and activists have documented the widespread placement of LULUs within low-income communities of color (Bryant, 1995; Bullard, 1993; Mohai & Bryant, 1992). In addition to being more likely to host LULUs, neighborhoods where residents are mainly poor and people of color are regulated differently than more affluent, whiter areas. When fines are levied against polluting industries areas based upon hazardous waste laws, it is more likely to happen in predominately white or affluent areas. Moreover, such penalties were about 500 percent higher at sites having the greatest percentage of white population than penalties at sites with the greatest percentage of minority population (Lavelle & Coyle, 1992). In addition, a *National Law Journal* investigation discovered that in minority areas, it took 20 percent longer to put hazardous waste sites on the Environmental Protection Agency national priority list than it did in white areas (Lavelle & Coyle, 1992). The investigation concludes: “There is a racial divide in the way the U.S. government cleans up toxic waste sites and punishes polluters. White communities see fast action, better results and stiffer penalties than communities where Blacks, Hispanics and other minorities live. This unequal protection often occurs whether the community is wealthy or poor” (Lavelle & Coyle, 1992).

Environmental justice concerns include the disproportionate placement of undesirable land uses in areas where residents are poor and people of color. In addition, environmental justice advocates seek a fair and inclusive process relating to land use decisions.

The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency defines *environmental justice* as:

The fair treatment and meaningful involvement of all people regardless of race, color, national origin, or income with respect to the development, implementation and enforcement of environmental laws, regulations, and policies. Fair treatment means that no group of people, including racial, ethnic, or socioeconomic groups should bear a

disproportionate share of the negative environmental consequences resulting from industrial, municipal, and commercial operations, or the execution of federal, state, local, and tribal programs and policies. (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1998)

The term *environmental racism* refers to a similar concept. Coined by Reverend Dr. Benjamin F. Chavis Jr., a former executive director of the National Association for the Advancement of People of Color (NAACP), environmental racism is defined as “racial discrimination in environmental policy-making, enforcement of regulations and laws, and the deliberate targeting of communities of color for toxic waste disposal and the siting of polluting industries” (Chavis, 1993).

Ninety-four percent of the twenty-three thousand largest polluting facilities release their pollutants on site into the air, water, and soil. Thus citizens who work and reside in the areas in which these facilities are located typically experience much greater rates of exposure to industrial pollutants (Faber & Krieg, 2002, p. 282). A number of terms have been used to describe the areas where people live near severe contamination: “environmental high-impact areas,” “fence line communities,” and “hot spots.” Like Lerner (2010), I use the term *sacrifice zones* because it dramatizes the fact that when we spatially concentrate LULUs, we “sacrifice” the health of the environment and its residents, at times justifying that decision as one that benefits “the greater good.” Typically, sacrifice zones are geographically isolated—the type of neighborhood that you do not go to unless you live or work there. They are easy to ignore, and their residents are often politically and economically marginalized. Thus, the health of people who live in highly industrialized areas is not protected to the same degree as that of citizens who can afford to live in exclusively residential neighborhoods (Lerner, 2010, p. 6).

Social determinants of health are factors in the social environment that contribute to, or detract from, the health of individuals and communities. Such factors include SES, transportation, housing, access to services, discrimination by social grouping, and social or

environmental stressors. Inequitable distribution of these conditions across various populations is a significant contributor to persistent and pervasive health disparities in the U.S.

Numerous studies have demonstrated the unequal chemical exposure burden suffered by many low-income and heavily minority communities (Bryant, 1995; Bullard, 1993; Mohai & Bryant, 1992). Public health researchers use the term *environmental health disparities* to describe health inequalities that are determined, in part, by exposure to contamination (Gee & Payne-Sturges, 2004). For example, people who live close to major highways often suffer disproportionately from respiratory problems (Srinivasan, O'Fallon, & Dearry, 2003).

Environmental inequality is inextricably tied to deep-seated patterns of racial and economic segregation. When different stakeholders struggle for access to valuable resources, the benefits and costs of those resources are distributed unevenly. Those who are least able to mobilize resources will most likely bear the brunt of environmental harm. These hazards have an effect on the health of communities. Conversely, those with the greatest access to valuable resources will enjoy cleaner and safer places to live, work, and play. As New York City's master planner Robert Moses said, when it comes to the placement of undesirable land uses, "You can't make an omelet without breaking some eggs" (Caro, 1974).

The Intervention: Community Benefits Agreements

For some environmentalists, the solution to contamination and environmental health impacts is to close toxic industries or to prevent their construction (a NIMBY approach). Yet, particularly in impoverished communities, many residents view these calls as threats to their jobs and livelihood, especially when they are not included in related decision-making processes.

Furthermore, there are land uses such as waste, energy, and clean water plants that need to go somewhere. Are there ways to mitigate the harm associated with these LULUs and perhaps

event to augment their benefits to the host community? Is there a way to allow for urban development that does not burden host communities by “sacrificing” their land, air, water, and health?

Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs) are private contracts negotiated between a developer and a community coalition that aim to mitigate harm associated with urban development while sharing the benefits of any anticipated positive outcomes with existing residents of the host community (Baxamusa, 2008; Gross, 2008; Gross, LeRoy, & Janis-Aparicio, 2002; Janis, 2007; Larsen, 2009; LeRoy, 2009; Parks & Warren, 2009; Salkin & Lavine, 2008). They result from a bargain in which the community coalition typically agrees to support the new development, thereby offering the developer increased assurances that public review processes will be expedited. In exchange, the developer agrees to a set of investments (“community benefits”) that can include anything from environmental protections, to investments in local schools or affordable housing, to access to clear and timely information and local accountability relating to the project.

Advocates of CBAs have been careful to define them clearly because local government officials and developers may use the term “community benefits agreement” to describe any set of community benefits commitments on which they agree. Julian Gross, a lawyer who has negotiated several CBAs, defines them as “legally binding contracts (or set of related contracts), setting forth a range of community benefits regarding a development project, and resulting from substantial community involvement” (Gross, 2008, p. 3). His definition emphasizes that accountability and citizen leadership are crucial to a true CBA, which goes beyond mere developer concessions. Parks and Warren, two social work scholars at the University of Chicago, later built upon Gross’s definition. They define CBAs as:

Legally binding agreements between a private developer or governmental body and a coalition of community-based organizations, labor unions, environmentalists, and other

advocacy groups. In an agreement, community members pledge their support for a development in return for tangible benefits such as living wage jobs, local hiring agreements, and green building practices, funds for parks, affordable housing, and childcare. (Parks & Warren, 2009)

Their definition also emphasizes accountability and citizen inclusion. However, they add that an agreement is not a CBA unless it includes “tangible benefits,” as well as a range of community interests. As Gross warns, the definition matters. Indeed, without a precise definition—one that includes accountability, citizen inclusion, and tangible benefits—a CBA could be used simply as a convenient term for any commitment to a community or, to put it less charitably, as a project proponents hope will fill the political space a community-driven CBA campaign would have occupied, thus easing project approval and marginalizing opposition (Gross, 2008, p. 37)

The Scope of Community Benefits Agreements

The CBA movement was born in the late 1990s as a mechanism for community groups to organize and work collaboratively to communicate and negotiate directly with developers (Gross, 2008; Gross et al., 2002). Since then, CBA campaigns have become increasingly visible across the country and have been signed in association with the development or expansion of airports, various baseball and basketball stadiums, universities, and housing developments (Mulligan-Hansel & LeRoy, 2008). A 2008 study identified more than 50 CBAs that had been implemented in response to proposed large development projects in the United States (Salkin & Lavine, 2008). CBAs are present in 10 cities, which means some cities have more than one CBA (Dreier, 2009). In my review of the literature, I did not come across any examples of community groups that had attempted to secure a CBA and had been unsuccessful in doing so—an empirical gap to which I will return later.

It is hard to predict whether the use of CBAs will increase in the future. For one thing, they are controversial. Some critics note that there are already safeguards and protections associated with new development. Others believe that almost any economic development is good development, in the sense that it can build a city's tax base and provide jobs. From that perspective, everyone gains from new development, and there is no reason to distribute capital to the host community, or, for that matter, anyone else burdened by the new development. CBAs have also been described as a form of extortion perpetuated by special-interest groups against developers.

CBAs have been critiqued as well. Some CBAs have been characterized as a bribe given by developers to community groups for their support (Wolf-Powers, 2012) particularly when investments involve issues that are not directly related to the project (Been, 2010). Yet some CBA advocates argue that their strength lies precisely in their flexibility and praise their ability to address issues beyond the specific project. For example, Lucas-Darby describes CBAs as a form of "environmental reparations" for historical and current damages to neighborhoods through redevelopment (Lucas-Darby, 2012).

The CBA Negotiation Process

Baxamusa (2008) presented the following description of the CBA negotiation process based upon data that he collected from two case studies, which was supplemented by research on other CBAs. He identified eight steps to secure a meaningful CBA:

- (1) Formation of the CBA Coalition
- (2) Initiation of a CBA negotiation
- (3) Selection of negotiating team, leaders, and moderators
- (4) Proposals and counter proposals

- (5) Caucus and time out
- (6) Data gathering during negotiations
- (7) Check with public development agency and planners
- (8) Signing and enforcements

I outline these steps in greater detail below.

A host community is more likely to achieve a meaningful CBA when its stakeholders are mobilized and organized. At their core, CBAs are political outcomes; as such, they rely first and foremost on the organizing power of the community for their emergence, implementation, and enforcement. Strong CBAs result from carefully crafted organizing strategies that bring together community and labor constituencies with overlapping interests and that engage both “insider” and “outsider” tactics (Luce, 2004). The first step, then, is to form a CBA coalition, which requires grassroots organizing (Haas, 2002; Leavitt, 2006; Parks & Warren, 2009; Salkin & Lavine, 2007). CBA groups generally comprise numerous community groups which must first deliberate among themselves before approaching a developer (Baxamusa, 2008).

The second step is to begin the CBA negotiation process. Negotiation during the approval process is the one time that community organizations have leverage; once the project is approved, that leverage disappears (Gross et al., 2002). This step requires compelling the developer to come to the bargaining table and then to negotiate. There is an important question here: why would a developer want to come to the negotiation table, especially if signing a CBA requires financial investments that cut into the profit of a project? Developers are largely motivated to negotiate when they believe that doing so will be more profitable or efficient than not doing so; the CBA thus serves as a “risk mitigation exercise.” Indeed, developers understand that NIMBY movements are a frequent feature of the urban landscape. They know that it is possible to be engulfed in protracted legal battles against opponents of a controversial project

(Frug, 2001; Popper, 1991). Those legal battles—or even the possibility that a legal battle may emerge—have contributed to the costs associated with development and developers’ insecurity. Thus, there are planners and developers with a “politically astute awareness of resistance” (Sanyal, 2005) who reach out to potential protesters to implement a planning process that is deemed fair and open to all affected groups, even if the gesture turns out only to be symbolic. By reaching out, they aim to reduce the likelihood of opposition and to remove any uncertainty associated with the project (Baxamusa, 2008). One such example is economist Jack Kyser,

who as vice president of the private Los Angeles County Economic Development Corp., is the closest thing the city has to a business community spokesperson, and is no fan of living-wage ordinances or, more generally, increased regulations on business. He has kind words, though, for CBAs, which, he believes, often ‘defuse the opposition to very high-profile projects. Purists may say this is not the best way to go. But if you want to get something built, especially in an area as contentious as L.A. can be, it’s a good way to go. You get your project, and everybody benefits’. (Meyerson, 2006)

In sum, CBAs may be the most cost-effective route for developers to expedite their projects, particularly in contrast to other means used within the public approval process.

In the third step, the CBA team selects its leadership, deciding who should represent impacted groups, including both residents and business owners. In order to be fully representative, organizers must seek out community members and community preferences. This process may include going door to door, conducting surveys, or speaking with already-established groups and holding public meetings. In addition, empirical studies of CBAs have emphasized the importance of allying with organized labor (Wolf-Powers, 2012).

At the fourth stage, there are proposals and counter proposals. Again, this requires leverage with the developer as well as the ability to negotiate within the coalition. For a broad-based coalition, this stage may be the hardest. Different community groups have varying agendas with different needs and requests. Moreover, as Laing points out, additional challenges may emerge when differences of opinion reflect racial or class dynamics (Laing, 2009). One way to

overcome those challenges is to assess the overall needs of the coalition, including a survey of what the coalition brings to the table and what is needed from the developers. Some negotiating teams create a “CBC Operating Agreement” to define membership and procedures for dealing with conflicts of interest, as well as to address other coalition issues.

In a similar vein, the fifth step is that the negotiation team takes time to caucus and to be accountable to its constituent groups. In some cases, representatives may disingenuously bargain on behalf of narrow interests while publicly stating that they represent the interests of the broader community. Thus, the coalition must communicate its efforts to community members, union members, and the general public in order to mobilize support (Laing, 2009).

Baxamusa presents the sixth step as data gathering. This step may require accessing technical information about the impacts of the project or the value of proposed mediation measures. In some cases, technical reports are highly specialized and may necessitate help from experts such as lawyers, engineers, or urban planners.

The seventh stage requires both the community coalition and the developer to ensure that agreed upon CBA provisions are within the city’s regulatory framework. The development agency will need to ensure that the development and CBA process are legal. Questions may emerge about the legality of zoning or public participation processes, for example.

In the eighth and final stage, there is a signed CBA with guaranteed enforcement measures. To effectively reach this final stage, the community needs to be able to hold its coalition together both during the negotiating of the CBA and after the project’s completion so as to ensure that promises made by the developer are honored after the project has been finished (Simmons & Luce, 2009). It may be difficult to sustain the energy to monitor and enforce the CBA. Some coalitions have worked to resolve this problem by “requiring the developer to set aside seed money for the maintenance of a coalition... However, conflicts of interest (perceived

or actual) may arise if the developer funds enforcement efforts and inadequate assurances of independence are made” (Salkin & Lavine, 2008).

In sum, all seven steps require community power and leverage, which only emerge from the right context and through strong organizing practices. The “right” context has typically included strong unions, organized neighborhoods, and progressive city councils; CBAs first appeared in cities with those elements in place. In fact, organized labor and supportive local government have been found to be critical in negotiating, implementing, and enforcing CBAs, particularly when public subsidies or public land is required to complete the project (Wolf-Powers, 2010, 2012). The community coalition is also stronger when the developer is constrained by some feature of the landscape and when the local real estate market is strong (Cain, 2014; Parks & Warren, 2009). In addition, CBAs require good timing. CBAs are more likely to be signed when local coalitions are able to impede or delay the approval of projects (Larsen, 2009; Salkin & Lavine, 2008)

Strong organizing practices include strategies that require social action and community mobilization tactics in conjunction with research and community development expertise (Sites, 2007). Thus, success emerges from more than just a strong will and is most likely in cases where the various groups involved can be effectively organized to ally and work together toward a clear set of goals.

Empirical Gaps

To understand the politics of equitable development, including the nature of power within land use decision-making, we must remember that there are at least seven steps that are necessary to secure a CBA. However, most of the empirical research on CBAs solely evaluates

their processes at the time of negotiation or the outcomes after an agreement is secured. As such, I suggest that the research reflects two important empirical gaps, both of which relate to timing.

First, the literature tends to take the community's goal of securing a CBA for granted, assuming that communities are willing to tolerate what is typically considered undesirable development. In doing so, it neglects to consider why some communities desire – or are at least willing to tolerate – what are typically conceptualized as locally *undesirable* developments. To better understand why a community might conditionally endorse a LULU, rather than pursuing an oppositional, not-in-my-backyard strategy, it is necessary to analyze goal setting within the impacted community once it has been selected to host the LULU. This analytic strategy matters because of the way it highlights the different factors that lead to pursuing an oppositional-NIMBY strategy versus a collaborative-CBA strategy. The differences in these two strategies could reflect a community's perception of its own power: of what it perceives to be a viable and achievable goal rather than a true, but unachievable, preference. It demonstrates why impacted residents, at times, appear complicit in supporting developments that will dismantle their communities, harm their surrounding environment, and ultimately hurt the health and wellbeing of their families and neighbors. In turn, these decisions reveal an important way in which some political issues are actually organized outside of the political arena.

Second, because existing empirical evaluations of CBAs nearly exclusively draw their sample from communities at the time of negotiation or implementation, they effectively ignore the communities that cannot get the developer to the negotiation table in the first place. It is not in a developer's interests to cut her profits by investing in the surrounding community. Thus, she will likely resist signing a CBA unless the community can offer something in exchange. And because the least powerful communities are also the least likely to incentivize negotiations, I argue that the extant body of literature reflects a truncated, biased sample.

In other words, if we consider the universe of communities that could host new development, we know that public and private developers are comparatively more likely to propose to place LULUs in low-income communities of color than in whiter, more affluent areas. In this context, the extant literature on CBAs samples the subset of communities that are both selected to host a LULU *and powerful enough to compel a developer to negotiate*, a relatively small subset.

One of the most common critiques of case study methods is that they are particularly prone to versions of “selection bias” (Geddes, 1990). Selection bias can occur when the researcher unwittingly selects cases that represent a truncated sample along the dependent variable of the relevant population of cases (King, Keohane, & Verba, 1994).

Thus, while the existing empirical findings of these earlier studies would hold, if it is true that the literature represents a truncated sample that has consistent characteristics, it would be necessary to (1) nuance our interpretation of these findings and (2) examine CBA campaigns in which communities cannot compel the developer to negotiate. For example, the optimism that many researchers have about the strength of CBAs would need to be questioned, since we have only been sampling neighborhoods that are successful. After all, a policy is no good if the communities that need it cannot access it – and they cannot access it if it is removed from the negotiation table (or if they never even make it to the table in the first place). The study of power needs to include the non-decisions that are made when contentious policy issues are avoided or sidelined rather than subjected to obvious and observable challenge: not only what was done, but also what was not done – and why (Crenson, 1971; Schattschneider, 1960).

The Study of Non-Decisions

To shed light on the nature of power in urban land use decision-making, I begin my analysis of CBA negotiations at an earlier time point. Rather than evaluating power dynamics within the negotiation or the implementation of the CBA, I begin by touching on the factors that influenced the decision of where to place a locally undesirable land use, focusing on race and class. Second, I examine why the impacted neighborhood opted to pursue a CBA campaign rather than a NIMBY campaign. Finally, I explore the actors who effectively blocked the impacted neighborhood's ability to secure a CBA, at least thus far. By analyzing both decisions and "non-decisions" that were made in relation to the placement of the LULU, the community response to the proposal, and the process of resistance, I am able to construct a broader story about the relationship between economic and racial inequalities and environmental inequalities.

The approach I take here honors the call from political scientists and sociologists who, in their efforts to understand the nature of power and decision-making within cities, have emphasized the need to examine why some policy issues are avoided or sidelined rather than subjected to obvious and observable challenge. Rather than assuming that some policy issues do not emerge because there is simply no discontent or—if there is discontent—that it represents one of countless dissatisfactions that divert citizens from registering their complaints (Dahl, 2005), I suggest that a form of power is the ability to shape political agendas. Bachrach and Baratz (1962) call the ability to prevent grievances from entering the political arena the "second face of power." Thus, "non-decision-makers" are "people whose political power consists in their ability to prevent the consideration of some kinds of issues" (Crenson, 1971, p. 21). By restricting the scope of the political process, some issues are organized into politics, while others are organized out (Schattschneider, 1960). By studying the CBA process, including which issues are organized into politics and which are organized out, I am able to investigate the openness of

urban land use politics, that is, the degree to which those in power are able “to prevent the consideration of some kinds of issues.”

Furthermore, the study of “non-decisions” helps to avoid selection bias. As explained by Kristin Goss in her book *Disarmed: The Missing Movement for Gun Control in America*:

By studying only movements that have happened, we risk misunderstanding the causal processes behind those movements. There are two possible sources of error. First, by focusing only on positive cases, we risk attributing causal significance to factors that were merely correlates (thereby upwardly biasing those factors’ importance.) Second, and conversely, we risk overlooking variables that are in fact important. Only by studying “non-movements” can we hope to produce valid causal models. (Goss, 2010)

In the case of CBA campaigns, if one considers a CBA as the dependent variable, then the “universe” of cases that have been examined thus far is truncated because of a systematic error. Specifically, nearly every CBA study that I am aware of that has evaluated CBAs has done so during or after the time of negotiation. The variance of the DV is thus the “strength of the CBA.” However, as I noted above, this method ignores communities that do not get to the negotiation table in the first place. For example, there are communities that would not pursue a CBA at all, perhaps because they perceive the new development as an issue to be resisted. And there are neighborhoods that are unable to get to the policy negotiation table and are thus prevented from working in favor of their own interests. And finally there are communities that may get to the negotiation table but are unable to gain concessions. This study makes an important addition to existing literature because I “entered” the CBA-negotiation process at an earlier time than other researchers, and as a result, I am able to examine a case that would otherwise be considered a “non-event” or non-decision.

Research Design

I conducted a political ethnographic examination of the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition (CBC) and its campaign for a CBA in exchange for hosting a new

international border crossing.¹ In September 2011, I presented my research project to the CBC Board, formally asking for permission to follow their campaign. A motion to support my research by allowing access to their work was passed unanimously.

My research involved several types of data: participant observation (2011 – 2014), formal and informal interviews, and a review of organizational documents. I observed nearly every CBC public meeting, board meeting, and membership event during that period (n=58). In April of 2011, I received IRB approval for my project. I also observed public hearings relating to the NITC and/or Community Benefits at the State Senate Economic Development Committee (n=10), State House Transportation Committee, Detroit City Council Meeting, and public debates. I traveled with CBC members to the State Capitol or to City Hall when they went to lobby or give testimony, thus allowing me to observe strategic planning on the trip up and debriefing on the way back.

In addition to observing the CBC, I participated in their work by assisting their board and staff by conducting research, contacting members through phone calls and door-to-door canvassing, and coordinating volunteers. During the three-year study, I frequently spent time informally in Southwest Detroit with CBC members doing what political scientist Richard Fenno described as “soaking and poking” (Fenno, 1978; Schatz, 2009). Within informal settings, I listened and observed as members interpreted recent events, made sense of new or conflicting information, strategized for the future, or went about the work of building an organization (K. C. Walsh, 2009).

¹ Note that under Democratic Michigan Governor Jennifer Granholm, the new bridge was called “The Detroit River International Crossing” or the “DRIC”. In 2012, when Republican Governor Rick Snyder took office, the proposed bridge was re-branded and given the name the “New International Trade Crossing” or NITC. In this dissertation, I refer to it as the NITC because that is the name that corresponded with my fieldwork. In 2015, however, the bridge was given a new name by both the United States and Canada: The Gordie Howe International Bridge.

In 2013, I moved to Southwest Detroit and rented an office in the neighborhood. Although this move took place toward the end of my formal data collection period, I was able to gain in my understanding of what it is like to live near a border crossing. This move also occurred during the time period in which the City of Detroit declared bankruptcy. By spending more time informally in Southwest Detroit, I was able to seek out the spaces where my study's participants engage in "real" interactions (Ocejo, 2012).

It is important to note that I had some prior experience working in Southwest Detroit before 2011. In 2003, as a student of community organization in the University of Michigan Masters of Social Work program under the guidance of Lorraine Gutiérrez, I held an internship that was based in the Southwest Detroit neighborhood of Mexicantown, the neighborhood that borders where the new bridge was proposed to land. Mexicantown is also the home of an existing international border crossing, the Ambassador Bridge. During my internship, I partnered with Mexicantown stakeholders and elected officials to establish a new community organization, "Bridgeward Detroit." Our mission was to educate residents about the health impacts of diesel emissions, to reduce the number of trucks on local streets, and to protect neighborhood homes and businesses from encroachment by the Ambassador Bridge. When I returned in 2011 to begin my fieldwork, I was welcomed back by several familiar faces. They served as guides for me to meet Delray stakeholders and vouched for me as a trustworthy person. Furthermore, I was already familiar with many of the concerns and dilemmas faced by border communities.

In addition to participant observation, I conducted in-depth interviews (n=77) with residents, lobbyists, and elected officials to understand why Delray was chosen to host the new crossing, how the community responded to the proposal, and finally the nature of power dynamics within the CBA campaign. Notably, I conducted a minimum of one in-depth interview with nearly all of the CBC's fourteen Board Members and six of its at-large members, as well as

key elected officials, including the Lieutenant Governor, who—along with the Governor—was “championing” the new bridge at the time. I interviewed Delray’s State Representative, State Senator, and six of the seven members of the State Senate Economic Development Committee, the committee in which the bridge was debated for nine months in 2011. I interviewed community activists who live and work near the Windsor side of the bridge, as well as journalists who have covered this story for years. When I could not interview a respondent, I drew from texts in the media such as editorials or interviews. For more information about my respondents, please see Appendix.

I triangulated my original data collection (through direct observation and interviews) with a combination of mass-mediated documents and official documents related to the selection of the host site, such as the project’s Environmental Impact Statement. I reviewed mass-mediated information including every newspaper article or blog containing the word “Delray” and/or “New International Trade Crossing” (as identified using Google alerts) between 2011 and 2014.

My analysis involved a combination of inductive and deductive approaches to my data. Originally, I developed most of my questions based on my personal experience as a community organizer, as well as on academic and practice literatures relating to community organizing, urban politics, and civic participation. Over time, my research questions—and thus my analytical codes—evolved as I immersed myself in the case.

In my first iteration of coding, I simply coded in a descriptive manner for (1) stakeholders and (2) frames. I constructed a dataset with every stakeholder that I observed or that was quoted in the media in relation to the CBC. This included community members; political leaders at local, state, and federal levels; bureaucrats; lobbyists; and more—and on both sides of the border. This quickly became unwieldy, although it was helpful for clarifying relevant actors and their interests.

In my second iteration of coding, I tried to streamline my process. This time, I only coded for “Delray / CBC Allies,” “Delray / CBC Opponents,” “CBC Target / Decision-maker,” and “Within Group Dynamics,” with sub-codes of leadership development and membership recruitment. However, as I analyzed them to look for patterns, I noticed many seemingly contradictory instances in which CBC members expressed concerns about the NITC, but identified pro-NITC actors as allies. This created an empirical puzzle: Why wasn’t the CBC allying with opponents of the NITC to oppose it and, as such, pursuing a NIMBY campaign? This new question contributed to a need for a third round of coding.

In my third iteration of coding, I began to note “strategic decisions,” particularly those made by the CBC. I created several new codes including: “history of the NITC project,” to understand why Delray was chosen as the host site; “history of Delray,” to understand what, if any, previous community campaigns influenced the strategy of the CBC; “goal selection,” to understand the factors that gave rise to the CBA campaign; “strategy selection,” to understand decisions relating to tactics and messaging; and finally “the process of negotiation” to tease out relevant decision-makers and non-decision-makers.

In all three rounds of coding, I included the codes “Good Quotes” and “I don’t know how to code this” for things that were particularly surprising or that provoked an emotional reaction. I also added a code for “relating to my research methodology” because some day I hope to write about ethical dilemmas within community engaged research, as well as about managing a research team.

After completing my coding, I read through all of my excerpts to either construct a timeline or to pull out themes or identify contradictions. This read-through led either to additional interviews or the development of research memos. The culmination of that work is this dissertation.

Outline of the dissertation

Chapter Two, “The Business of Borders,” introduces the case study, including a history of the proposed New International Trade Crossing (NITC). It includes an analysis of the political actors that influenced political decisions relating to the new crossing. It concludes with an analysis of why Delray was identified to host the new crossing, thereby identifying mechanisms through which political and economic inequality shape to environmental inequality.

Chapter Three, “From NIMBY to Negotiation: Deciding to Pursue a Community Benefits Agreement,” examines the power dynamics that contributed to the decision to pursue a CBA campaign, rather than a NIMBY campaign. It demonstrates how community political power was constrained, in part, because Delray stakeholders opted to frame their demands in a manner that would put them in alliance with some actors and not others. In so doing, the Delray stakeholders chose to articulate a moderated demand that, at times, led them to appear complicit in the destruction of their community.

Chapter Four, “Access Denied: Obstacles to Community Benefits Agreements,” lays out a new framework identifying categories of “gatekeepers” who (at times unintentionally) undermined the CBC from securing a CBA.

Chapter Five concludes that the power dynamics woven throughout the Delray campaign, beginning the decision to place the crossing in Delray, resulted in growing health disparities and the reproduction of an environmental sacrifice zone. In this chapter, I argue that these power dynamics reveal the insidious way in which some topics never become political issues, thereby rendering marginalized groups at times politically invisible.



Figure 1. Data Collection – Participant Observation. The Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition and me, in front of the state capitol in Lansing, Michigan. (Source: Xhensila (Janie) Velencia)



Figure 2 - Data Collection – Interviews. Reporters interviewing the president of the Community Benefits Coalition on the day that the New International Trade Agreement was signed between Michigan Governor Rick Snyder and Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper. Members of the Community Benefits Coalition, as well as organized labor, stand with signs in the background. I am in the foreground, standing with the reporters. (Source: Sian Dowis)

Chapter II

The Business of Borders

In this chapter, I introduce the case of the Southwest Detroit neighborhood of Delray, where a border crossing, the New International Trade Crossing (NITC), is proposed to land. The chapter proceeds in three parts. It begins by introducing the low-income, highly industrialized neighborhood of Delray by detailing its historical relationships with the Detroit River, transportation, and industry. It demonstrates that the demise of the neighborhood was brought on by a combination of low-income people occupying a site that was attractive to industrialists and the city's growth regime, in conjunction with a reduction in city services.

Next, I explain the rise of a coalition—composed of multinational companies and the Canadian federal government—that pushed for a new trade route between the United States and Canada. This section also introduces the opposition to this proposed crossing: a billionaire family that owns the largest and most profitable border crossing in North America. It then summarizes the timeline and tactics involved in the political fight over the NITC.

Finally, I conclude the chapter by describing factors that shaped the decision of a bi-national group of Canadian and American elected officials and transportation bureaucrats to build the new crossing in Delray, instead of another location. I demonstrate how justifications were linked with a lack of political power (other areas were better equipped to mount an effective NIMBY campaign), a lack of economic power (Delray had the cheapest land), and even

a contaminated environment (the bridge could take over brownfields that were never properly remediated). Thus, I suggest that the decision to place the NITC in Delray reinforces existing political, economic, and environmental inequalities.

Delray

Delray, like many polluted urban communities (aka “sacrifice zones”), contains crumbling infrastructure, deteriorating housing, chronic unemployment, high poverty, and few public services. The residents of Delray live in dangerously close proximity to a number of industrial and heavy transportation facilities, exposing them to what has been described as a “toxic soup” of chemicals and toxins.

Typically, when Americans imagine communities that are located near rich natural resources but do not profit from their extraction, they consider towns in Africa, Asia, and South America where residents live near precious stones like diamonds or emeralds, deposits of uranium or petroleum, or near forests. Yet, despite (or perhaps because of) living at the confluence of the Detroit and Rouge Rivers on a stretch of fresh water that connects them to the largest body of fresh water in the world (the great lakes), the residents of Delray are part of a similar economic system. They have seen the fresh water and the border effectively profit outsiders—starting with French traders to the present steel mills and port—with little profit being reinvested locally. Furthermore, over time, fewer and fewer residents have worked in the local industries, thereby limiting the benefits that they receive in exchange for hosting facilities that use their air, land, and water.

The land where Delray sits today was originally home to Native American tribes who were drawn by the fresh water and fish. In 1701, it was colonized by the French, who took advantage of the Rivers to trade fur and other goods. In the 1800s, as a port on the Great Lakes,

Delray and the rest of Detroit became increasingly important for shipping raw materials from forests, mines, and farms. In the 1840s, Fort Wayne was built as a defensive reaction to threatening armaments by the Canadians across the Detroit River.

In 1905, while it was a thriving village, Delray was annexed by Detroit. During this time, the landscape of Delray began to transition from fertile farmland to filled-in marshes that attracted many industries. In addition to shipping, Delray began to prosper from hosting industries which were situated along the riverfront (Galster, 2012, p. 48).

Over time, more and more factories were built along with homes for laborers. The 1920 / 1921 Detroit City Directory observed:

A peculiar situation has developed in Detroit... with regard to the location of industries. There are no well-defined factory districts, such as are found in most cities. Instead the plants are to be found in every section. (As cited in Galster, 2012, p. 49).

In Delray, the most imposing factory was the Solvay Process Company, which produced chemicals. In 1900, Solvay employed 1,000 workers, many who walked to work from the neighborhood. The company invested in the area by providing public lights, paved streets, trash pick-up, a water pumping station, sewers, and a horse-drawn fire truck manned by Solvay workers. It established the Solvay Hospital to look after the injuries and illnesses of employees without charging a fee. The Solvay Lodge provided living quarters for foremen. Workers could buy company-subsidized lunches and had access to athletic and recreational facilities (Abonyi, Horvath-Monrreal, & Southeast Michigan Regional Ethnic Heritage Studies Center, 1975; Klug, 1999). While conducting fieldwork, every so often I heard long-term residents of Delray describe Solvay as “a company that did right” by the neighborhood. Despite the foul smells and pollution that came from the company, it employed residents and invested in necessary public services.

In the 1920s, Delray was known in the region for its Hungarian population. It boasted the

largest population of Hungarians outside of Budapest and was called “Little Hungary” (Gershenhorn, 2012). In addition to its factories, it was known for its thriving business district that included lively beer gardens with “gypsy music” and dancing (Nagy, 2011). During World War I, as Detroit industries turned to the south to recruit Blacks to work in their foundries, the demographics of Delray began to change.

While the population of Detroit peaked twenty years later, in the 1950s, the population of Delray reached its peak in the 1930s at about 24,000 people. Since the 1930s, however, the population has steadily declined.

At first, the change reflected shifting demographic patterns that were taking place throughout Detroit—particularly due to “white flight” (Sugrue, 2005). Following World War II, Blacks, Mexicans, Puerto Ricans, and southern Whites, attracted by jobs and inexpensive housing, began to move to Southwest Detroit in large numbers. As the Black population grew, it became concentrated in northeastern part of the neighborhood where the NITC is proposed to land today.

As Black residents, Latinos, and southern Whites began to move into Delray, existing residents who could afford to leave began to do so and were facilitated by the automobile and attractiveness of the suburbs. Many relocated to the Detroit working-class suburbs of Melvindale and Allen Park, and some continued to work in the Delray factories. During World War II, some of the Delray factories temporarily shifted their focus from building cars and car parts to providing parts that were needed for the war effort. Following the war, industries began to downsize and / or shift to more mechanized processes in which they required less hired labor (Farley, Danziger, & Holzer, 2000). With fewer opportunities for employment, more residents left the neighborhood.

In 1955, the City of Detroit Master Plan designated Delray as an industrial area despite the fact that more than 20,000 residents still lived there. This decision created a tension between the City and residents that has never been resolved. While the City planned to depopulate Delray, its residents worked to protect their investments, schools, faith institutions, and businesses. They opposed the City plan and organized to build their community, doing their best to maintain and preserve housing, schools, community centers, and faith institutions.

Despite local resistance and community building, the balance between industry and residences shifted in favor of industry. For example, private and public utilities—including two coal-fired power plants—began to fill the vacancies in Delray’s industrial and residential patchwork (Larsen et al., 2014). Residents who did not want to live with the contamination and could afford to move out continued to do so. People seeking affordable housing continued to move in. Residents report that as early as the 1940s, city services in the neighborhood began to decline as well.

The 1960 census counted a population of only 13,581 residents in Delray. In 1964, Interstate 75 was constructed and it now boxes in Delray on its northern border (with the Detroit River to the south and the Rouge River to the west). Although the interstate did not result in the widespread demolition of buildings in Delray, it diverted people away from the neighborhood business district. Likewise, Jefferson Avenue, a main thoroughfare in Detroit, was closed along the Eastern border of Delray. While touring the neighborhood with a long-time resident, I was told that the closure of Jefferson was “the final nail in the coffin” for the neighborhood (Williams, 2011). The neighborhood was entirely boxed in and isolated from the rest of the city. There was no reason for people to drive through it on their way home from work to pick up something from the small businesses. Delray, as a neighborhood, was having its limbs cut off by city planners—once again, without resolving what to do with the residents living in,

and even moving to, the area. Over time, as residents became more and more isolated, Delray—like the residents of most sacrifice zones—became increasingly hidden from view.

By the 1970s, Delray's population fell to fewer than 10,000 people. By then, the Detroit Water Board expansion practically wiped out its Polish community because of expansion of the region's wastewater treatment plant. When I was touring the neighborhood with the residents described above, I asked if residents protested its construction. She told me that they did not. The water board took the land, just a few parcels at a time. She likened it to a frog in slowly boiling water. Thus, a large sub-section of the neighborhood was ultimately taken through eminent domain while remaining residents continued to live with the stench of hosting a wastewater plant.

The new industry was not the only reason for Delray's decline. The city also began to reduce public spending in the area. Following the 1967 Detroit uprising, \$7.75 million allocated to relocate Delray residents was redirected toward redevelopment projects in other areas of Detroit (Darden, Hill, & Thomas, 1987). The city began to close schools and neighborhood centers as well.

By this time, the City of Detroit was also losing manufacturing jobs and residents, and the city began to develop a 375-acre parcel in Delray, even though it had obtained no commitment from any large industry to use the site. One reason was that the automakers were growing out of their small factories, preferring single-story factories that required a lot of land. To accommodate them, Detroit's 1979 Economic Development Plan announced that one of its industrial development strategies was to prepare a large industrial site for a single large industry. Ultimately, this plan was abandoned for a different site—Poletown—and Delray's Fisher Body Plant, which employed many residents in the community, was closed while its manufacturing was transferred to the Poletown plant (Darden et al., 1987).

A 1975 report evaluating Delray states:

Most of the housing left in Delray was built in the late 1800's or early 1900's and is showing the ravages of time, pollution and neglect. Businesses along Jefferson Avenue have suffered and the boarded up, burned out, and abandoned buildings on 'main street' are evidence of the lack of business on one hand, and on the other, the failure of the City of Detroit to enforce laws regarding abandonment and absentee landlords. (Abonyi et al., 1975)

However, the report ends on an optimistic note because of the emergence of a new civic organization and strategy:

Mutual Aide – New Delray, Inc. was formed in March, 1975 as a result of a “Delray Revitalization Task Force” meeting called by Council President Carl Levin at the request of several Delray organizations, primarily Holy Cross Church, the Hungarian Social and Athletic Club, Delray Improvement Association, and Delray United Action Council. The purpose of this new non-profit organization was to revitalize, renovate and rebuild Delray. *As this guide is printed, changes are being made with the help and cooperation of local industry.* Buildings on Jefferson are being cleaned, painted and decorated with Hungarian designs suggested by a master plan developed by Alexander Pollock of the Community Development Commission, City of Detroit. *The residents of Delray are out to prove that heavy industry and families can co-exist in a mutually beneficial atmosphere.* (Abonyi et al., 1975) – *emphasis added*

Thus, in some cases, the relationship between citizens and industry was continuing to evolve as organizations began to tap into industries to invest in the community.

However, during this time period, there were also instances of resistance to the construction of new LULUs. In 1969, residents organized a NIMBY campaign and effectively blocked the construction of a new incinerator that was proposed to be built at the old Solvay Process Company site. According to one observer, “This fight brought together the residents of Delray closer than they had been, especially in a racially tumultuous environment” (Gershonhorn, 2012).

Today, Delray is one of the most poor, most vacant, most divested, and most polluted neighborhoods within Detroit—and certainly within Michigan. Despite periodic wins, by 2000, just 4,000 people lived in Delray, 40 percent of whom were in poverty (Larsen, 2009). Among

Detroit communities, Delray is somewhat exceptional because of its racial and ethnic diversity. Data from the 2000 Census indicate that Delray's ethnic composition is White (32.4%) Black (32.3%), and Latino (Mexican and Puerto Rican) (30.2%).

Detroit River International Crossing Study Demographics
Delray Neighborhood (Census Tracts 5235, 5236 and 5237)

Race	Total	Percent
White alone	1,351	32.4%
Black or African American alone	1,347	32.3%
American Indian and Alaska Native alone	17	0.4%
Asian alone	4	0.1%
Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islander alone	0	0.0%
Some other race alone	52	1.2%
Two or more races	141	3.4%
Hispanic or Latino:	1,253	30.2%
Total Population	4,164	100.0%

Source: U.S. Census.

Although Delray is racially and ethnically integrated, residents similarly impoverished. According to the 2000 census, slightly more than 40 percent of Delray households live below the poverty level. The unemployment rate in Delray was about 11 percent, while the comparable statistic for the Detroit region was six percent. According to a 2007 study:

Few or no residents are employed by local businesses, which is a break with the historical pattern of the neighborhood ... In 2000, of 1,168 workers age 16 and older in the three census tracts that comprise Delray, zero travelled less than 5 minutes to work, and only 121 (10.4%) travelled between 5 and 9 minutes (US census 2000). In short, the Delray neighborhood and the local economic infrastructure are not highly integrated, as they

once were. Rather, that infrastructure is oriented toward the regional and national economy. (The University of Michigan Urban and Regional Planning Program, 2007)

Among residents over the age of 25, three percent have a college education. Nearly 20 percent report that their highest degree is an 8th grade education; 34 percent completed some high school but do not have a high school diploma; and 25 percent have a high school diploma or have passed a high school equivalency exam. In 2013, the last school in Delray – Southwestern High School – was closed, despite local opposition.

The health outcomes in Delray are also poor. In Southwest Detroit, the asthma rate is three times higher than the state average, and its rate of preventable hospitalization among children with asthma is the highest in the city (Tanner-White & Lam, 2010; The University of Michigan Urban and Regional Planning Program, 2007). During my fieldwork, I observed several adults stating that they did not have asthma until they moved to Delray. This is due to the fact that in addition to being exposed to disproportionately high levels of toxins, many residents of sacrifice zones are susceptible to the ill effects of toxic exposure, due to compromised immune systems, poor diet, lack of access to medical care, and other problems associated with poverty.

About a quarter of Delray households reported in the 2000 Census that they did not have access to an automobile. There are no grocery stores in Delray, and only neighborhood convenience stores, so residents must leave the neighborhood to purchase fresh food.

Delray is also unique in comparison with other poor, urban areas because of its vacancy. A 2009 study found that of the 1,406 properties in Delray, “924 (or 66%) are vacant lots, many of which are substandard residential lots. The conditions of the existing properties with structures are blighted (180), needs assistance (197), and habitable (105)” (Capital Access & Michigan State Housing Development Authority, 2009).

The litany of community problems experienced by residents could go on. During community meetings, I frequently heard residents complain about people scrapping the empty homes in their neighborhood—a phenomenon that some attribute to the multiple places that buy scrap within the neighborhood. In addition to scrappers stealing metals from vacant buildings, I began to hear more and more residents express fears about scrappers lighting buildings on fire (some potentially occupied) so that they could access the metal more easily. While going door-to-door one day, I came across a home in which the residents—probably in their late 20s or early 30s, and White and Latino—were sitting on the front porch. They told me that their home had been broken into the day prior by a scrapper who stole their air conditioner. They were watching out for the person doing it. As I talked to them, a woman jumped up and pointed yelling, “That’s him! He just ran into the vacant house!” One of the men ran up the street while the alleged scrapper ran out from the back of the house. The woman yelled instructions to the chasing man to catch the scrapper, but he got away. The woman then complained to me that the police never come and that they have to protect their own property.

Likewise, the only remaining neighborhood center in the community, the same one where I rented my office, became the “poster child” of scrapping in Detroit. The Detroit Free Press featured People’s Community Services and its Executive Director Tom Cervenak in a front page article about the devastation caused by scrapping in Detroit. In the story, Cervenak recounted how the center’s fence had been stolen. The center was afraid of losing its insurance and had reached out to local donors to replace the fence. Soon after, that fence was stolen and scrapped too.

The tensions between residents and industry, as well as residents and city planners have not dissipated in Delray. The 2012 city plan—the Detroit Future City framework—emphasized that future land use should complement its “exceptional concentration of very heavy industry,

and a unique convergence of freight transportation modes. It should also take advantage of the Detroit River and the availability of sound industrial buildings” (Detroit Works Long Term Planning Steering Team, 2012). Thus, the plan calls for more industry, but does not include plans to relocate residents—a policy that I have heard many residents refer to as “benign neglect” or “demolition by abandonment.” Many of the remaining residents therefore feel trapped in the community, surrounded by industry, unable to sell their homes, while losing city services.



Figure 3 – Industrialization in Delray. Heavy industry is located in close proximity with residences in Delray. This photo depicts an operating steel mill just blocks from occupied homes. (Source: Amy Krings)



Figure 4 – Reduced and Neglected City Services. Delray suffers from public and private divestment. I took this photo on August 3rd, 2011 while Scott Brines and I toured the neighborhood documenting the conditions. In this image, a vat from the region's wastewater treatment plant is allowing raw sewage to overflow into the street. (Source: Amy Krings)



Figure 5. Community Investment. Despite the growth of industry and corresponding divestment, some Delray residents continue to invest in their homes, and more Latino families are moving to the area in search of affordable housing. (Source: Amy Krings)



Figure 6. Community Resistance. Some residents resist the industrial encroachment, even in small ways.

The sign reads:

Attention
sewer plant traffic
this is not the plant driveway
it is a residential street! If you
have no business keep off it
city vehicles included
you are lazy or inconsiderate if you do
you choose what you are
(Source: Amy Krings)

The New International Trade Crossing (NITC)

Part two of this chapter shifts the focus of the story from Delray to the proposal that has the most potential to change land use in the neighborhood: The NITC. Before I explain some of the factors that led a bi-national team to identify Delray as the host community of the new bridge, I need to provide a brief overview of the actors involved in pushing for, and opposing, the international crossing.

First, it helps to understand that there is already a border crossing near Delray, located two miles up river in Southwest Detroit. The Ambassador Bridge spans the Detroit River. It was built in 1929, prior to the construction of the interstate system. Its leg on the Canadian side lands in Windsor, in a residential and commercial area. Therefore, trucks that get off of the bridge in Windsor must travel along a city road with many traffic lights before they are able to get back onto the interstate system.

The Ambassador Bridge is notable for many reasons. First, one quarter of trade between the United States and Canada crosses it every day, making it the busiest border crossing in North America. This also makes the Ambassador Bridge one of the busiest border crossings in the world, as the United States and Canada are the largest trade partners in the world (URS & Canada-U.S.-Ontario-Michigan Border Transportation Partnership, 2004). Thus, multinational corporations—who seek the most efficient routes possible to ship their goods—favor an additional border crossing.

Second, the bridge is privately owned. This means that the largest trade crossing in the United States is owned and operated by the Detroit International Bridge Company (DIBC), which is owned by a billionaire family whose patriarch is Manuel “Matty” Moroun. In 2004, *Forbes Magazine* estimated that they gross an estimated \$60 million per year in toll revenue (Fitch & Muller, 2004; Guyette, 2010). In addition, the family “owns seven trucking companies

that use the bridge; a logistics firm; several customs brokerages; and a monopoly on duty-free retail, including a gasoline station at the Detroit end of the bridge and a currency-exchange service” (Fitch & Muller, 2004). As part of a trucking empire, it is estimated that the family’s total revenue exceeds \$1 billion per year (Fitch & Muller, 2004). The Moroun family and the DIBC want to protect their investment from competition. Thus, they vehemently oppose the construction of a new border crossing in the region. Unless, that is, they own the new one too.

For decades, questions about the construction of a new crossing were sidelined or postponed, in part because of the Moroun family’s political connections. However, the political landscape began to change in 1994 after the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) was signed. Following NAFTA, shipping of goods between the U.S. and Canada grew at an exponential rate and, over time, the need for a new crossing could not be ignored. The coalition that supports the new crossing estimated that \$43.8 billion in trade moves through the Detroit-Windsor corridor annually, and more than "450 major Michigan businesses" count on “the free flow of trade with Canada to keep their businesses competitive” (Guyette, 2010). Advocates for the new crossing stated that the Ambassador Bridge, which at that time would have been almost 70 years old, simply did not have the capacity to host the growing truck traffic and, further, it was inefficient to have trucks sit in local traffic. Furthermore, advocates argue that such a huge volume of U.S.-Canadian commerce should not be entrusted to such an aging piece of infrastructure. In sum, a new crossing was supported because it would increase efficiency and predictability for corporations shipping their goods in light of increasing volumes of trade.

The push for a new crossing became even stronger following September 11th, 2001. That day, the borders were shut down for hours. During my fieldwork, residents and elected officials recalled how trucks were backed up for miles and miles that day. Asthma hospitalizations spiked around that time in Southwest Detroit because of additional diesel emissions released from idling

trucks. Additionally, national security officials became involved in the bridge debate, arguing that having separate bridges makes it less likely that either would be targeted; taking out just one would not shut down international traffic.

Finally, organized labor—particularly the steelworkers’ and carpenters’ unions—supported the construction of a new border crossing. Michigan was hit especially hard following the 2008 recession with few infrastructure projects in the state. Organized labor supported the estimated 10,000 construction jobs that would be required to build the new bridge.

In sum, a powerful growth coalition emerged to support the construction of a new crossing. Curt Guyette, a reporter at the *Detroit Metro Times* who followed the NITC controversy for years, summarized this coalition best by describing a pro-bridge press conference in 2010:

There were Democrats and Republicans. There were a number of trade unionists as well as business interests ranging from the local Chamber of Commerce to Ford Motor Co. There was the African-American mayor of Detroit and white political power brokers from the other side of the Eight Mile divide. There were Canadians and Americans. All standing shoulder to shoulder as they joined in unison to praise the proposed bridge they said needs to be built between the Motor City and Windsor.

The current governor, Democrat Jennifer Granholm, and a few conservative members of the Legislature were there. Jim Doer, the Canadian Ambassador to the United States, was there as part as a far-ranging coalition that also includes the Michigan Association of Counties, the Canadian Auto Workers and the Ohio Senate. It was indeed, as one business publication covering the event reported, an "all-star lineup." (Guyette, 2010)

The coalition was not only impressive because of its breadth. The new crossing was a deeply desired infrastructure project, particularly by the Canadian federal government. Canadian authorities have called the proposed bridge their country’s most important infrastructure project, and they have offered to pay for Michigan’s share of the construction of the new bridge—up to \$550 million dollars (Gallagher, 2014). Likewise, Michigan Governor Rick Snyder endorsed the crossing. In a 2012 op-ed Governor Snyder wrote:

Detroit is the busiest commercial border crossing in North America with 8,000 trucks crossing the Ambassador Bridge into Canada each day, and all of that trade supports 257,000 jobs across Michigan. But unless we act now, those jobs could be in jeopardy because of our total dependence on the 83-year old Ambassador Bridge as the primary point of entry into our neighbor to the north. (Snyder, 2012)

Thus, a coalition that included the Canadian federal government, the Michigan Governor, and multinational companies came together to support the new crossing.

Although this coalition likely sounds unstoppable, as previously stated, the new bridge had a formidable opponent: Matty Moroun and his Detroit International Bridge Company. As Guyette went on to write in the same article on the bridge press conference:

But the fact that they had come together spoke volumes, not just about the importance of the issue but also about the power and influence emanating from one octogenarian billionaire — Manuel "Matty" Moroun, whose privately controlled Detroit International Bridge Company owns the Ambassador Bridge. (Guyette, 2010)

Moroun, who purchased the DIBC in 1979 (Detroit International Bridge Company, 2011), argued that a new crossing would result in a loss of 70% of his company's business. Thus, the Morouns had a lot to lose and a lot of resources that they were willing to spend on an investment that they could not simply relocate. Plus, they understood that in order for the growth coalition to secure its new bridge, they would require approvals from the United States, Canada, Michigan, and Ontario—some of which would require legislative support while others would require technical approvals. That meant that there were many “veto points” at which the new bridge could be voted down or held up in a committee. So the DIBC did what any company would do: it invested in multiple methods (including lawsuits, lobbying, and supporting a statewide ballot issue) to prevent, or at least stall, the construction of the new crossing. As Brian Masse, a member of the Canadian Parliament from Windsor and a vocal NITC supporter, summarized the effort: "When [Matty] wins, and everyone else loses."

Despite strong resistance from the Detroit International Bridge Company (DIBC), the plan to construct a new crossing moved forward, albeit slowly, over the course of more than a decade. In this final section of this chapter, I will briefly summarize the course of events that led a bi-national coalition to determine that a new crossing was not only needed, but that the best place for it to land would be Delray.

In the year 2000, the U.S. Federal Highway Administration, Transport Canada, The Ontario Ministry of Transportation, and the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) established the Border Transportation Partnership to “improve the movement of people and goods, while addressing civil and national defense and homeland security needs, across the United States and Canadian border within the region of Southeast Michigan and Southwest Ontario” (Michigan Department of Transportation, 2008). The Border Partnership began by conducting a Planning / Need and Feasibility Study to assess the state of border infrastructure between the two nations.

In January 2004, the Partnership released its Planning / Need and Feasibility Report, identifying “a long-term strategy to meet the needs of the transportation network serving the border between Southeastern Michigan and Southwestern Ontario” (URS & Canada-U.S.-Ontario-Michigan Border Transportation Partnership, 2004). It determined that additional infrastructure was needed, particularly in the region near Detroit, Michigan and Windsor, Ontario. After this, a new study was initiated to assess locations for a new crossing. This study, called the “Detroit River International Crossing,” evaluated eight locations, and it evaluated the possibility of “doing nothing.” During this period, public feedback was collected pertaining to all eight sites and environmental studies about the potential impact of the crossing were conducted on both sides of the border.

In March 2005, the Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) convened its first series of meetings of the Detroit River International Crossing Local Advisory Council to “review the Bi-national Partnership’s work” and to “provide thoughts” on the location of bridge crossings, plazas, and connections to I-75 (Michigan Department of Transportation, 2005). These meetings were held in Wyandotte, a comparably affluent and predominately white suburb south of Detroit, as well as in Delray. In interviews with residents and non-profit leaders who attended these meetings, I was told that Delray residents “knew” at that time, that, if it was built, the bridge was going to land in Delray and not Wyandotte. In fact, in 2003, when I did my Social Work internship in Southwest Detroit, I remember community leaders predicting that it would land in Delray even before the that study assessed the need for a bridge was concluded. Meanwhile, residents of Wyandotte were extremely organized in a NIMBY campaign to prevent the construction in their city. During some public meetings, Wyandotte residents testified that it would be best to put the bridge in Delray since it was already a devastated area. After residents submitted a petition with more than 30,000 signatures against the NITC, the Michigan Governor at the time, Jennifer Granholm, stated that the downriver site was an “impractical” option (Lefebvre, 2006).

Likewise, residents on the Canadian side of the River organized their own NIMBY campaign. One potential site would have required the railroad tunnel to be converted into a truckway that would run under the river, into downtown Windsor, and past the affluent southern part of the city. Residents and elected leaders organized, arguing that the required six lanes would create too much havoc in downtown Windsor (Lefebvre, 2006). One participant described how the NIMBY group had “signs all over the city, could produce 1,000 letters in a weekend, and they picketed too” (Arditti, 2012). Ultimately, the plan for an underground truck

highway was abandoned. Thus, political inequality contributed to the decision to put the NITC in Delray.

That left two potential sites in Delray, plus three in Windsor. Two of the three remaining Windsor sites were near its downtown and the third Windsor location was a comparatively rural area outside of Windsor called Brighton Beach. One reason that the group evaluating the bridge offered to explain why Delray was a potential site was that it represented the most affordable option. Delray sits at the most narrow part of the Detroit River which would reduce the size of the bridge required. Also, because property values are so low there, land acquisition costs would be much lower. In this way, economic inequality contributed to the decision to place the bridge in Delray.

As the two Delray sites were evaluated, some residents turned on each other with residents of both sites preferring to keep the bridge out of their part of the neighborhood. At that time, one of the proposed locations was in the southwestern part of the neighborhood, an area that contained less industry, fewer brownfields, higher residential density, and a higher proportion of white residents than the central or eastern parts. The other proposed site was located in the northeastern part of the neighborhood, which contained a higher proportion of black residents, as well as several brownfield sites in which factories left without properly remediating the land.

Some of the residents and stakeholders from the western side of the neighborhood, including leaders of a historically Hungarian Catholic Church, argued that if the new bridge landed in the central part of the community, then it could help to clean up some of the contamination. While racially neutral in its selection, the process did not acknowledge the legacy of placing LULUs in neighborhoods of color. When we continue to place LULUs in

neighborhoods where LULUs already exist, there is likely to be the unintended impact of reproducing environmental racism.

Finally, in December 2005, the Bi-national Study Team announced what residents had seen coming for years. The central part of Delray was identified as an “Area of Continued Analysis.” This meant that it was the preferred location to host the crossing, but additional studies would be required. MDOT issued a report stating:

It is recognized, given the nature and extent of land uses and development along the Detroit River, it will not be possible to avoid impacts on local communities. The goal of the Partnership is to avoid, minimize, or mitigate impacts to the greatest practical extent. (Michigan Department of Transportation, 2008)

In the next two years, 2006 and 2007, more public meetings were hosted by MDOT in Delray with the Local Advisory Council. Meetings took place in the City’s Recreation Center or Southwestern High School (both of which are now closed), where community members could “discuss the preliminary results of the analyses of potential impacts that a new bridge, plaza (where tolls are collected) and interchange may have” (Michigan Department of Transportation, 2008). In addition, in 2007, three workshops were held so that residential property owners could meet with MDOT’s real estate representatives to discuss the relocation process.

In the spring of 2008, the Bi-national Study officially announced that the northeastern section of Delray was the preferred location to host the NITC. The technical studies were completed, and now legislation would be needed to move the bridge project forward. One of the studies—the Federal Environmental Impact Statement--acknowledged that the NITC would contribute to environmental injustice in Delray because of the poverty and racial distribution of the host community and corresponding environmental impacts.

At that time, in 2008, the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition (CBC) was officially born. In the following chapter, I will explain more about how the community weighed its options concerning resisting the new crossing.



Figure 7. The Emergence of the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition. During an October 23rd, 2011 march sponsored by the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition, a boy carries a sign that reads “Build a bridge to a healthy community”. (Source: Amy Krings)

CHAPTER III

From NIMBY to Negotiation: Deciding to Pursue a Community Benefits Agreement

In 2011, a community-based organization representing the low-income, highly industrialized Southwest Detroit neighborhood of Delray organized its members to testify before the Michigan State Senate Economic Development Committee about the anticipated environmental, economic, and health impacts associated with hosting a new international bridge and border. If built, the controversial new bridge would connect interstates in Detroit with those in Windsor, Canada, streamlining international trade, and landing on the U.S. side in Delray. The proposed site involved the bridge landing on the U.S. side in the Detroit neighborhood of Delray.

One at a time, residents, faith and social service leaders, and business owners from within what was called the “take area” spoke about their fears associated with being displaced or living near a border crossing during the hearing. Homeowners argued that the bridge plan was already devaluing their property – a claim that they substantiated by rhetorically asking who would want to purchase a home with the noise, smell, and traffic of an estimated ten thousand trucks per day. Faith leaders spoke about the high rates of cancer, asthma, and other respiratory illnesses within the neighborhood - problems sure to be augmented by the steady stream of diesel emissions. Social service providers explained their difficulties with securing donations because the future of the neighborhood was so uncertain. During his testimony, Scott Brines, the President of the

Delray community organization, summarized: “These are the tolls that, if the new crossing is constructed in Delray, we will pay on behalf of the State of Michigan.”

Following the Delray testimony, several Committee and audience members expressed confusion about the Delray group’s collective decision to endorse the new crossing, on the condition that it include a community benefits agreement (CBA). This decision raises the question: Why, given their litany of concerns, were they not organizing to *oppose* the construction of the crossing in their neighborhood? After all, the Delray stakeholders could have allied with the owners of the Ambassador Bridge – who were well-resourced, highly motivated, and willing to exercise all tactics at their disposal to prevent this competitive crossing, including allying with the Delray stakeholders. As I sat in the chambers of the State Capitol taking field notes, I heard an observer behind me whisper: “*They are selling the health of their children.*”

A Methodological Note

To understand why the Southwest Detroit Community Development Coalition (CBC) was formed, and why it campaigned to conditionally endorse the NITC rather than opposing it, an examination of the area’s local history, political economy, and collective memory provides explanatory power. This helps to explain the seemingly paradoxical decision whereby a community coalition that sought to improve the neighborhood viewed the endorsement of a project that would lead to worse air quality and displace residents as its best option.

Prior to explaining the factors that motivated the Delray stakeholders, I want to emphasize that any decision can be motivated by many factors and not everyone within a coalition has to agree on a policy for the same reasons (George & Bennett, 2005). During the course of the bi-national studies (2000 – 2008) and then the CBA campaign (2008 – 2015), the factors that motivated stakeholders ebbed and flowed. Furthermore, this is not a quantitative

study in which I can “measure” these motivations and assess gradations and the levels of influence of each one, or how they ebbed and flowed over time. Instead, my work identified motivational factors—some of which only became apparent through fieldwork.

Finally, it is important to remember that there were divisions in how people thought about the project and its impacts. The most apparent differences were among residents—who would be relocated and who would be left behind—as well as between residents and nonprofit leaders. Finally, when I conducted my interviews, it was common for individuals—especially residents—to have mixed feelings about the NITC. In the course of a single conversation, respondents could talk about how much they love Delray and therefore wish the NITC would go away so that people could live in peace, and then later talk about the importance of securing a CBA. Thus, it is important to remember that there is not “one” Delray interest within this case. To think so would not only be inaccurate, but would run the risk of “essentializing” the Delray community (Young, 1990) into one unanimous like-minded group.

Campaign Selection: Why a CBA and not a NIMBY?

From the time the NITC was announced, it was understood that it would result in many hardships for people living and working in Delray. Families would have to move out of their homes, and some important cultural centers (among them the Saint Paul African Methodist Episcopal Church and First Latino Baptist Church) would be closed. Further, the people who did not live in the “take area” would be subjected to high levels of noise, traffic, and air pollution and their neighborhood would become even more isolated. Perhaps the greatest concern of all was that many residents did not trust the federal, state, or city governments to protect them from the impacts of the project.

I will argue in this chapter that although Delray stakeholders understood these risks, there were four dominant reasons that Delray stakeholders conditionally endorsed the NITC, despite the possibility of allying with the Detroit International Bridge Company (DIBC) in a NIMBY-style campaign.

First, the Delray stakeholders saw an unmatched hope that the state would invest in their neighborhood as part of the new bridge. The Michigan Department of Transportation (MDOT) commissioned and presented plans that included strategies for new housing, new business, and even tourist attractions, which were shared with the community. Residents hoped that their community would experience an increase in public services and other amenities that they could not expect otherwise.

Second, similarly, as time passed and Delray residents became more skeptical of state investment, they remained confident that alternative investment was not planned for their neighborhood. The neighborhood began its decline in the 1930s due to a combination of growing industry, declining public services, and residential flight. Many of the remaining residents became economically trapped in the neighborhood because their homes were worth so little as housing values declined. The new bridge represented an opportunity for residents from the “take area” to sell their homes and for those left behind to potentially benefit from new public and private investment that could accompany the new crossing.

Third, the Delray stakeholders were heavily influenced by the extent to which they considered the two opposing sides of the bridge debate to be trustworthy and accessible. I found that the Delray stakeholders did not trust the private owners of the Ambassador Bridge crossing and believed that allying with the Moroun family was the equivalent of “selling out.” Their ethical and moral sensibilities would not allow them to partner with the Morouns. In contrast, the Michigan Department of Transportation was meeting regularly with residents and partnering

with them to “vision” what resources might accompany the new bridge, including promises of new housing. Anti-Moroun sentiment, combined with the potential for new public investment from the state, pushed the Delray group into the “pro-bridge” coalition, where they remained, even though this alliance was tested over time. Furthermore, many of the nonprofit leaders that were part of the Community Benefits Coalition were economically dependent upon members of the pro-NITC coalition, which included the state, the auto industry, and other corporate funders.

Fourth, the Delray stakeholders quite simply believed that a bridge was going to be built in their neighborhood eventually, no matter what they did. As early as the year 2000, when the bi-national bridge study first began, Delray residents and local non-profit leadership believed that a new bridge would be built and that it would likely land in their neighborhood. When it was announced in 2008 that the bi-national group planned to move the project forward and that Delray represented the preferred host community, few residents were surprised. By that time, although they knew that Matty Moroun and the Detroit International Bridge Company (DIBC) would use every resource at their disposal to prevent the new crossing, residents believed that eventually – maybe in 20, 30, or even 40 years — the new bridge would be built. Thus, representatives of nonprofits believed that their best strategy was to get the best deal possible through collaboration, rather than trying to block the crossing.

Given these economic and political constraints, in 2008, Delray non-profit and elected leaders began to collectively organize the neighborhood and sympathetic organizations in pursuit of a CBA. They understood the harm that the neighborhood would incur as a result of hosting the new border crossing, but these factors combined to effectively “organize out” the potential of a NIMBY-style campaign. Thus, their best choice – while not a good one – was to support the construction of a new locally undesirable land use in the hope that its positive impacts would

outweigh its negatives, rather than to oppose it and allow the neighborhood to continue to die a slow death.

An Unmatched Hope for Revitalization

When the plan to build the NITC was first announced, many Delray residents felt strongly that they did not want to host another LULU. However, due to the long history of the City of Detroit and its planning department allowing for the construction of undesirable facilities in their neighborhood, many residents concluded that there was little hope for alternative, healthy investment—perhaps in the form of new housing or green jobs—in the community.

Since its forced annexation into Detroit in 1905, the relationship between Delray and the City has been tenuous and unstable. As described in Chapter Two, since 1955, the City of Detroit has largely instituted policies and development decisions as if Delray was solely an industrial zone, despite thousands of residents still living there. Examples include the placement of Interstate 75 near the neighborhood, as well as the placement and expansion of the region's wastewater treatment plant and the concentration of highly toxic factories there.

Therefore, while their preferred goal was to redevelop the neighborhood in a way that included small businesses, “green” jobs, and new housing, therefore also opposing LULUs like the NITC, this “ideal” outcome was viewed as politically and economically impossible. As a result, many residents saw the NITC as a “last chance” for an improved quality of life in the neighborhood. In public meetings, MDOT framed the NITC as a source for community development, contributing to this hope. For example, during an April 2006 NITC Public Meeting, one resident asked MDOT officials, “Who would purchase the land for redevelopment ... whether the bridge is built or not?” An MDOT representative responded:

If there were not a new crossing, investments in the area by MDOT would be limited or non-existent. If there were a new crossing, MDOT's investments would be much more

significant. The latter could include benefits for the community of Delray which will host the new crossing system”. (Public Meeting, April 2006)

Residents understood this reality and some began to advocate for the new bridge. One stakeholder said, “I’ve been working for 25 years to better Delray. It seems to me the DRIC [NITC] project is the best opportunity we have to do that” (Public Meeting, March 2006).

Likewise, a member of the Delray Community Council asserted that, “The MDOT effort looks great. MDOT has been working with the community. What the City has been doing, thus far, has not been working” (Public Meeting, March 2006).

In part, the trust in MDOT was driven by the degree of access and communication that residents had with the planning team. This was unlike anything they had experienced before with the state. For example, MDOT assigned a community liaison to organize monthly meetings with residents about the scope of the bridge project and its likely impact on the community. Between 2008 and 2010, residents were able to access information in a timely manner and began to consider the possibility of local investment associated with the bridge in their neighborhood. Furthermore, participants influenced the selection of sites where the road network would converge and a customs center was to be built (Gobert, 2010).

Michigan Department of Transportation representatives and urban planners asked Delray residents to imagine what they would like their community to look like with the new crossing. Unofficial, non-legally binding images of new homes and fresh streetscapes were created and put on display. One depicted residents walking with dogs along green pathways while children played in parks and people on bikes passed by, all with the bridge in the background.

In 2009, a plan was released to construct new housing in a higher-density part of the neighborhood, which would provide subsidized homes for residents who were going to be displaced and did not want to leave Delray:

The Delray Village will emerge as a neighborhood of choice for existing and new

residents relocated by the DRIC [NITC] and, as the market emerges, for those that earn a range of incomes. It will continue to uphold its values of diversity, commitment to community, and inter-generational living. New and rehabilitated homes surrounding Holy Cross Church will enhance the historic legacy of the Delray Neighborhood and Southwest Detroit. Quality green space, mixed-use retail, and traffic and streetscape improvements will promote sustainable development and a safe quality of life in Delray. Residents will benefit from a safer and sustainable community. (Capital Access & Michigan State Housing Development Authority, 2009)

There was also a 2010 plan that the CBC helped to create to address redevelopment in the entire neighborhood:

Implementation will transform the physical landscape of Delray into a neighborhood of choice for existing and relocated residents and prepare Delray for its economic recovery through land assembly that supports sustainable industrial, agricultural and commercial land use. (Capital Access, 2010)

The plan concluded decisively: “The plan is set. Now is the time to implement” √ (Capital Access, 2010).

There was talk also about how the state could potentially develop the largely abandoned historic Fort Wayne, a city-owned park that had fallen into disrepair. The Fort is home to barracks that were constructed in 1848, where soldiers were stationed in preparation for the Vietnam War and where the Tuskegee Airmen National Museum and several Native American Burial Grounds are still located. Residents and planners imagined what Fort Wayne could mean to the neighborhood if it was a viable tourist attraction: residents could have access to the Detroit River, and ice cream shops and other local businesses could even serve the tourists.

The Michigan Department of Transportation-sponsored meetings also considered ways to mitigate harm associated with the new crossing. Several ideas were discussed regarding how to improve Southwestern Detroit High School, which was closed in 2012. At the time, however, Southwestern was open and sat directly next to the planned customs plaza. One “benefit” discussed was that the NITC developer would install an air conditioning system within the school so that diesel emissions would not go into the classrooms on hot days. As for residents

whose homes would be required for the NITC, they would either be given fair compensation to move elsewhere, or they could have access to a subsidized new home that would be built in another part of the neighborhood. The goal was to retain stable residents while creating new infill housing that would increase Delray's density.

As described by Delray residents who participated in the Michigan Department of Transportation-sponsored local meetings, this time period was filled with hope and promise about what new "benefits" the bridge could bring to Delray. As Michigan State Senator and Chair of the Economic Development Committee Michael Kowall told me: "When MDOT first went [to Delray], [residents] thought they hit the lottery. MDOT promised them golf courses and swimming pools" (Kowall, 2011).

Toward the end of my fieldwork, optimism that MDOT would "save" the community began to wane. This was in part because the Bridge Deal was signed and Delray had less leverage than before. Starting in 2011, the governor's office was held by a Republican, and his administration was comparably skeptical of "setting a precedent" by including community benefits in a new development. This is one reason coalition members opted to pursue a community benefits agreement. The idea was that a CBA would legally bind the state to ensure quality-of-life provisions in exchange for hosting the new crossing.

A Way Out from Industrialism and Divestment

While hope for new investment in Delray declined during the course of my fieldwork, fear that the community was going to fall into greater disrepair without the new crossing grew. In an interview with a long-time Delray resident, I was told:

People need to understand that this bridge will happen and if it doesn't, the City of Detroit has no plans to help this area. Delray will become the wasteland of Detroit. This bridge is our way to improvement. (Williams, 2011)

Therefore, even if MDOT did not invest in the community, the NITC represented Delray's only shot at public or private investment.

In 2012, the City of Detroit, under the leadership of its former Mayor Dave Bing, introduced a plan to "right-size" the city, meaning that it planned to reduce services in areas like Delray low population density while concentrating services in higher density communities. In effect, the plan privileged services in neighborhoods that were comparably affluent and with a higher percentage of white residents (Detroit Works Long Term Planning Steering Team, 2012).

While most residents joked that the city had stopped serving them decades ago and therefore the plan would have no impact, nonprofit leaders began to note that foundations were following the city's lead, and therefore it was becoming harder and harder to raise funds. The leader of the only remaining neighborhood center in the area, Tom Cervenak, argued that impact of the plan was to evict residents through attrition, which was cheaper resorting to eminent domain.

The plan—and the further decline in public services that included the closure of Southwestern High School—only strengthened the belief that the bridge offered a way out – at least to those in the "take area" who were unlikely to be able to sell their homes otherwise. Notably, calls to expand the take area, to create a "buffer zone" around the new project and to take even more homes, grew louder and louder toward the end of my fieldwork in 2014 and 2015.

Coalition Politics

The fight over the New International Trade Crossing included two sides. The pro-NITC growth coalition included Canada, the Chamber of Commerce, craft unions, and multinational corporations. Opposition to the NITC was led by the owners of the Detroit International Bridge

Company (DIBC). Both sides of the NITC debate were interested in mobilizing and partnering with Delray neighborhood stakeholders. The Community Benefits Coalition opted to conditionally endorse the new crossing, thereby placing them tentatively on the “pro-NITC” side. This decision was driven, in part, by the politics of alliance building. Delray stakeholders were motivated to avoid a partnership with the DIBC, and they sought to leverage the benefits of allying with the pro-NITC side. Thus, rather than determining a goal first and then building alliances based on that goal, to some extent, preferences about their alliances influenced their goal.

The longstanding antagonism between the DIBC / Moroun family and Southwest Detroit residents had a decisive impact upon the formation and goals of the CBC. Diverse individuals and groups in Southwest Detroit portrayed a common narrative of Matty Moroun as a selfish, untrustworthy neighbor who profited from their community’s misfortunes and ill health. As summarized in an anonymous 2005 comment at one of the bi-national study public hearings: “The owners of the current bridge do not care anything about the neighborhood. My perception is that they are trying to destroy it and, in a number of areas, they have been successful in this” (written comment, MDOT Public Meeting, 2005).

Stories abound in the neighborhood depicting Moroun as a slumlord who made money off of the community without investing back into it. During fieldwork, I repeatedly observed residents recounting the time the DIBC seized a public street to expand the Ambassador Bridge plaza, effectively putting a locally owned bait shop out of business. On other occasions, they told the story of how the DIBC seized a local riverside park to create space to expand the crossing. Stories from Windsor circulated about how the DIBC purchased homes where the Ambassador Bridge lands in Canada, only to board up the houses, devaluing neighboring

property and creating a ghost town. In a 2011 interview with a local pastor, who asked to remain confidential told me:

The DIBC doesn't care about anyone in the community [and we know this] because they have expressed that attitude throughout the years... [Their] concern for their neighbors and the community in which their bridge is, where they have benefited economically for many years, hasn't been too manifest. Is that a polite way of saying it? It's hard to see evidence of that concern." (Interview, 2011)

Even the *Toll Road News*, which was often sympathetic to the owners of the Ambassador Bridge, acknowledged the lack of trust that was placed in the DIBC.

The Ambassador Bridge Company has incurred huge ill-will on both sides of the border through the unattractive personalities of the owners, their breaches of contracts, engaging in unpermitted construction, and claims of a perpetual right to a monopoly. The bridge would probably have to be sold to less tainted owners for any such compromise to be struck. (Samuel, 2010)

In short, the image of Moroun as an exploitative, irresponsible neighbor has been widespread and deeply felt throughout Southwest Detroit.

Given this antagonistic relationship, Delray residents were faced with a dilemma in 2008 after the Environmental Impact Statement prepared for the proposed bridge acknowledged that its construction would contribute to environmental injustice in the area. Worse, plans to mitigate environmental harm within the region actually suggested that the NITC would *improve* air quality in Southwest Detroit because trucks would be able to pass more quickly through customs (idling for a shorter period of time) with two bridges rather than one. While that argument might have been true in the area around the Ambassador Bridge, Delray stakeholders scoffed at the notion that their air would improve with the arrival of an estimated 10,000 diesel trucks driving through their neighborhood each day.

Dissatisfaction with both the new bridge proposal as well as efforts to reduce its negative impacts led the CBC board to consider filing a lawsuit alleging that the Environmental Impact Statement did not adequately address environmental injustices. During CBC deliberations, the

DIBC along with some of the Detroit non-profits it supports, filed their own lawsuit under the auspices that they were suing to block the NITC in order to prevent environmental injustices in Delray. The lawsuit, of course, amused residents who live in close proximity to the Ambassador Bridge and have alleged that environmental injustices have resulted from DIBC practices for years.

As State Representative Rashida Tlaib told me in an interview, the Delray stakeholders received legal advice that if they filed their lawsuit, the courts would combine it with the lawsuit brought by the DIBC instead of considering their claims separately. In addition, lawyers for MDOT would likely instruct their client not to talk with the CBC, which could harm negotiations between the two parties. For these reasons, the CBC Board members decided not to file the lawsuit – despite their strong concerns about environmental injustice – because (1) they did not trust the DIBC and (2) they believed that they would be in a better bargaining position in the long run if they kept the lines of communication with MDOT open (Tlaib, 2011). Ultimately, the DIBC case was rejected but it created the odd dynamic – as described in my fieldnotes of the public hearing—in which the legal counsel from the Ambassador Bridge appeared to “defend” Delray against this proposed LULU while the residents and non-profits from the community appeared to support a project that would bring about pollution and displacement.

Nonetheless, some board members spoke out about how allying with the DIBC would compromise their morality—something they were not willing to do. One board member who represented an organization in Delray had a clause in his organization’s charter that said it would not ever accept money from the DIBC. Another board member’s organization accepted money from the DIBC to help build a new health center, and that person resigned from her position. Over time, the lack of trust and unwillingness to partner with the DIBC created a challenge for the CBC because when its needs were not addressed by the pro-NITC coalition, it did not have a

viable “exit option.” If CBC leaders implied that if their needs were not prioritized by the pro-NITC coalition they might align with the DIBC, their constituency would “freak out.” As the state representative for Delray, Rashida Tlaib, told me, “We couldn’t exactly just whisper to the neighborhood, ‘We’re not serious guys!’ People would have seen us as pawns or sell-outs”. Thus, the community’s history and collective memories of distrust of the bridge company deterred Delray’s residents from organizing in opposition to the new bridge.

Leverage and Constraints within the Pro-NITC Growth Regime

The political factors that led the Coalition to align with the pro-NITC coalition included a belief that Delray would have some leverage and influence among its allies. State Representative Rashida Tlaib, and her predecessor Representative Steve Tobocman, were able to convince state Democrats to withhold votes for the NITC unless the NITC bill included guaranteed benefits for the host community. This withholding was especially powerful because the Republican-controlled House and Senate were divided on this issue. Therefore, Governor Snyder understood that he could not pass the bill without Democratic support and he would not have that support without CBA legislation. In the next chapter, I will explain more about how this played out, but the point is that when members of the CBC were strategizing about how to respond to the NITC, they perceived that they had influence legislatively.

In addition to its pursuit of political leverage, the Delray response to the NITC was limited because of resource dependency. The CBC received financial and organizational support from pro-development nonprofits, including a coalition that was created to advance the shared interests of labor and industry, and was particularly interested in supporting CBA campaigns in Detroit. These funders supported the creation of sustainable industry and unionized jobs, and they viewed the proposed crossing as an opportunity to test the model of a CBA. The funders

provided fiscal support to the CBC, as well as technical support that included flying out representatives of a consulting group based in Los Angeles that had experience with securing CBAs in association with their port and airport. These funders would not have supported the Delray stakeholders if they had organized a NIMBY campaign to oppose the NITC.

Another way in which funders constrained the range of political goals and tactics available to the Coalition was that they chose the Coalition's fiduciary to be an organization called Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision. The executive board of Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision includes representatives from polluting industries located in the community, and the organization was developed to be a liaison between these industries and Southwest Detroit residents. Their tactics primarily included campaigns like increasing recycling or organizing tire cleanups, rather than pushing industry to reform its practices or lobbying the Environmental Protection Agency to increase regulations. Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision supported the goal of a CBA and encouraged the use of institutional tactics to pursue it – including letter writing, public testimony, and relationship building (tactics consistent with a CBA) – as opposed to civil disobedience, or NIMBY-oriented tactics that threatened to disrupt the NITC planning process. While I did not see evidence of Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision actively preventing the CBC from pursuing a comparably conflict-oriented strategy, tactics, or messaging – it was also clear it they did not encourage that approach and would have frustrated these efforts if they came about. Since Southwest Detroit Environmental Vision supervised the CBC's only paid organizer, some issues were non-starters.

These benefactor relationships with pro-business, pro-labor organizations help to explain both how the Coalition was able to organize and why it decided to conditionally support a new bridge.

It's Coming Anyway - Get the Best Deal Possible

Finally, in addition to the political relationships and economic constraints that shaped the strategy of the CBC, perhaps the easiest limitation to understand is that some residents and leaders simply did not think it could be stopped. As early as 2006, neighborhood leaders began to believe that it was better to negotiate than to be left out of the process. As community leader John Nagy told a reporter in 2006, "We don't want a bridge, but we're going to get a bridge, and I want to be on the front lines of negotiations. And if MDOT doesn't complete their project, we will be stuck with Matty Moroun" (Lefebvre, 2006). Similarly, during a 2011 town hall meeting, State Representative Rashida Tlaib asserted:

We said 'No!' when they tried to build the Steel Mill and it still came. We said 'No!' when they tried to build the Waste Water Treatment Plant and it still came. This time, instead of saying 'No!' and having the bridge built without reimbursement, we are going to negotiate and say, 'If you are going to build this bridge here, then you are going to compensate our people'. (Rashida Tlaib, Town Hall Meeting, April 16, 2011)

So the CBC board members made a strategic calculation: they would support the new bridge, but only on the condition that its financial backers provided something to Delray in the form of a community benefits agreement.

Over time, this line of thinking waxed and waned. Without question, CBC leaders never thought that their poor, politically marginalized neighborhood would be able to stop a bridge supported by the mighty NITC coalition. However, the DIBC used such a wide breadth of tactics to prevent or derail its construction—including beginning to build its own second span adjacent to its existing one—that the new crossing was not a “sure thing.” Nonetheless, the CBC leadership reasoned that it was likely that another bridge would be built and, therefore, the best they could do was to work for the best deal possible.

Many residents agreed with this logic, while the majority likely decided that the best they could do would be to wait until it was all resolved, believing that their participation would not

matter anyway. Some were willing to attend CBC meetings, mainly as a tool to gain information on the process, but few were interested in devoting time to organizing.

Discussion

Why would a neighborhood pool its limited resources to support something that other communities consider *harmful* to their residents' quality of life? This endorsement does not square with urban politics literature either. A prominent theme in urban political theory is that there is an inherent conflict between capital and community when it comes to land use decisions (Logan & Molotch, 2007). Capital wants to privatize and commodify land to promote its exchange value while community seeks to protect its use value. These conflicts are intensified over mega-projects, a type of locally undesirable land use that passes along negative externalities (air and noise pollution, for example) to the host community (Altshuler & Luberoff, 2003).

To fully understand why Delray pursued the CBA strategy, I argue that it is necessary to consider if and how some political choices are “organized out of politics.” In this case, while residents would have preferred to have private and public investment in their community that supports good health and sustainable business, they did not believe that new investment would happen. That belief, combined with an unwillingness to ally with some political actors, as well as the notion that they could not prevent the new construction anyway, culminated in the decision to endorse the CBA. In sum, the CBA represents a “second-choice” strategy.

This finding differs from previous CBA studies that take the community goal of “CBA” at face value, leading these studies consider an obtained CBA to be a “win.” Instead, this study suggests that while CBAs have the ability to bring investments to marginalized neighborhoods faced with undesirable development, it is necessary to use caution when interpreting their use because, under some conditions, they represent a moderated goal.

This finding may also inform our understanding of how economic inequality and environmental inequality are linked at the local level. By studying “non-decisions” that are made when contentious issues are avoided or sidelined rather than subjected to obvious and observable challenge (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962), we are able to consider how only some issues – particularly those that are comparably threatening to powerholders – are suppressed and prevented from entering the political process. This is the mobilization of bias – the confining of decision-making to safe issues (Schattschneider, 1960).

Ultimately, my findings call into question the nature of choice in the context of extreme inequality. It helps to explain why some host neighborhoods sometimes support seemingly unjust policies, blurring “perpetrator” and “community defender” in ways that might seem odd on the surface (Pellow, 2004).

During an interview with CBC President Scott Brines in 2011, I observed, “It almost seems as though there’s this trade-off between jobs and health, and that just seems like a terrible choice.” Brines responded:

It’s not much of a choice, is it? Yeah, so, it’s funny, that’s my biggest take on all of this. Why aren’t we just saying ‘No? No, we can’t afford it right now; we can’t afford the health issues.’ But there’s something inside of people that makes them say, ‘Gosh, we’ve been fighting this over and over for years – it never changes. But maybe this time it will’. (Brines, 2011)

The pursuit of a CBA is the CBC’s attempt to reconcile impossible competing demands, to use the few resources at its disposal to try to gain the best situation for stakeholders’ families and neighbors, to fight pollution and environmental degradation without giving up on the hope for future development.

CHAPTER IV

Access Denied: Obstacles to Community Benefits Agreements

As explained in chapter 2, Delray was chosen to host the new crossing, in part, because it had less political and economic power as compared to the other evaluated host sites. In chapter 3, I demonstrated how a legacy of industrialism and divestment, combined with unattractive allies and the perception of political powerlessness, influenced the Delray stakeholders' response to the new crossing, effectively removing a NIMBY campaign from their range of viable strategic responses.

In this chapter, I utilize a political ethnographic methodology to examine power dynamics within the Delray CBA campaign, particularly during the years of 2011 – 2012. My data is complemented by interviews with six of the seven members of the Michigan State Senate Economic Development Committee, including its chair, as well as the lead lobbyists for the pro-NITC Coalition (Tom Shields) and the head of the anti-NITC group, the Michigan Chapter of Americans for Prosperity (Scott Hagerstrom).

In 2011 - 2012, the CBC strategy was to organize community members, to build a coalition, and to partner with their State Representative to require any new bridge legislation to include a provision that the developer would negotiate a CBA with the neighborhood. In 2010, the NITC bill was debated in the State House Transportation Committee and in 2011 it was

debated in the State Senate Economic Development Committee. In both years, the bridge bill was not taken up for a floor vote, thus killing the bill. By tracing the Delray campaign for a bridge bill that included local investments, I shed light on the actors who intentionally and unintentionally undermined the Delray campaign. I introduce three categories of actors that, while not necessarily opposed to CBA legislation, created obstacles for the Delray group, effectively acting as policy-making “gatekeepers.” These categories include: (1) groups that unconditionally *opposed* the proposed development; (2) groups that unconditionally *supported* the proposed development; and (3) groups that viewed the host community as a “competitor” in efforts to secure their own concessions. By manipulating, tokenizing, and minimalizing the host community’s concerns about local impacts of the proposed bridge development, these groups contributed to legislators’ decisions to block a CBA bill.

Setting the Agenda

Community benefits agreements emerge from negotiations between a developer and the local coalition. However, in many cases, developers have been incentivized to negotiate with local groups, in part because the city requires them to do so in order to gain necessary public approvals and / or subsidies. Given that CBAs are negotiated within contextualized environments rather than based upon a standardized law, their strength varies.

In the case of the New International Trade Crossing, legislative approval was needed from the elected bodies representing Canada, Ontario, and Michigan. Approval was not required from the US federal government, although a host of federal agencies such as the Coast Guard had to give their approval.

In 2011, a bill to approve the construction of the NITC was placed in the Michigan State Senate Economic Development Committee. This committee, composed of seven legislators –

two Democrat and five Republican – represented a potential “veto point” within the bridge debate. In other words, even though elected bodies from Canada and Ontario approved the bridge deal, if Michigan did not approve it as well, the NITC would not come to pass.

The task given to the Economic Development Committee was to decide if the NITC bill merited a vote on the floor of the entire Senate. In this way, the committee possessed agenda-control powers (Cox & McCubbins, 2005), enabling it to block legislation from going up for a vote. For eight months, the merits of the NITC were debated. As reported in an editorial in the Detroit Free Press:

Ongoing hearings convened by state Sen. Mike Kowall, R-White Lake Township, who chairs the Senate Economic Development Committee, seem calculated to perpetuate the bridge controversy rather than to dispel it. The hearings have left many with the erroneous impression that the accusations Moroun levels in his ubiquitous prime-time TV spots have yet to be answered definitively; in fact, those distortions have long since been refuted. (Editorial, 2011a)

Thus, State Senator Kowall and the Committee were effectively stalling – even potentially blocking the NITC.

Within that context, the CBC was working to leverage its limited power and influence. At that time, their main message was that they supported the NITC, on the condition that it included a legally binding CBA. Thus, they opposed any bill that would allow for the NITC that did not include a clause with explicit community protections. In the following section, I analyze the power dynamics that unfolded within this context, contributing to the Senate Economic Development Committee voting against the joint NITC-CBA bill. I demonstrate how both the anti-NITC coalition and the pro-NITC coalition, under some conditions, undermined the Delray strategy. Finally, I argue that competitor groups—who also wanted to control concessions associated with the crossing—decreased the host community’s power and influence.

Groups that Unconditionally Oppose the Development

With any new development, there may be groups that oppose it, such as business owners who oppose new competition or public health and environmental activists who oppose negative impacts associated with the development.

In the case of the Community Benefits Coalition and the proposed new bridge crossing, without question, Manuel “Matty” Moroun and the Detroit International Bridge Company (DIBC) have been the most motivated and forceful opponents of the New International Trade Crossing. The Morouns own the Ambassador Bridge, located two miles from the site of the proposed new bridge, and their total revenue is estimated to exceed \$1 billion per year, including \$60 million per year from tolls and \$15 million per year in gas and duty-free sales (Fitch & Muller, 2004; Muller, 2012).

The DIBC has a strong economic incentive and the resources necessary to operationalize nearly every method of political influence available so as to block the new crossing. For example, according to data collected by the Michigan Campaign Finance Network, between the years of 2007 – 2011 the Moroun family made nearly \$800,000 in political contributions to Michigan legislators – both Democrats and Republicans – who would vote on the new crossing (Robinson, 2012); \$1.5 million to state and congressional candidates in the 2009 – 2010 election cycle alone (Christoff & Gray, 2011). Their biggest donation was given on September 28th, 2011, the same day that Michigan State Senate Economic Development Committee held a hearing at the State Capitol about the local health impacts associated with the NITC. That day, Matthew Moroun, son of Matty, made a \$100,000 political contribution to the Michigan State Republican Party (Berfield, 2012). In addition to donating to key legislators and political action committees, the DIBC has sought to block the NITC by running a series of advertisements created to influence public opinion against the new bridge proposal, and they have donated to nonprofit organizations that also oppose the NITC.

The DIBC has resources available to target many Michigan constituencies with anti-NITC political frames. One frame that appeared in several advertisements played up animus toward Detroit targeting conservative voters. This frame linked the NITC with the CBA proposal, and then characterized the CBA as a form of Detroiters' greed, corruption, or entitlement. For example, an ally of the Bridge Company, the Michigan Chapter of Americans for Prosperity, framed the CBA as "welfare by another name" (Bell & Gallagher, 2011; Sledge, 2011) sent a mailing to their constituency with an image of dollars swirling into a toilet bowl, along with a photo of a street sign for the city limits of Detroit. Its text characterized CBAs as yet another example of hardworking Michiganders wasting their money by bailing out irresponsible or corrupt Detroiters. Similarly, the DIBC sent a mailing to Michigan voters with a picture of dilapidated homes in Delray with the caption "More of your money for Detroit? Don't let the politicians give away more pork projects and 'special give aways' for the new bridge" (Egan & Gallagher, 2012). Critics and residents decried this mailing, stating that it stoked "anti-Detroit sentiment", and played upon racial and class animosity. Nonetheless, the damage was done. The CBC did not hold have access to the same resources as the DIBC and thus struggled to frame the CBA as an "ethical" policy that would protect the poor, as opposed to an "unethical" policy that would line the pockets of lazy Detroiters. This frame influenced and gave political cover to Republican State Senators who received financial support from the DIBC and voted against the NITC.

At the same time that the DIBC and Americans for Prosperity framed the CBA (and thus the NITC) as a bad deal for Michigan, the DIBC advanced another frame intended for a different constituency group. In this case, advertisements were purchased that featured a Delray resident who opposed the NITC because she wanted to protect her community and her home. The problem? No one on the CBC Board, including lifelong residents of Delray, had ever seen or

met this woman. This frame aimed to portray Delray residents as the victims of the NITC, thus motivating voters to oppose the NITC due to its abuse of vulnerable citizens. While this frame could have helped the CBC, to an extent, members of the CBC Board also thought it misrepresented their position and minimized the voices of the people impacted by the NITC.

Later, Americans for Prosperity tried to mobilize Delray voters by going door to door suggesting that they were going to have their homes taken without fair compensation. Later still, their members posted fake eviction notices on residents' doors – attempting to demonstrate what “could” happen if the bridge landed in Delray (Hagerstrom, 2011). Again, critics and residents decried the tactic. In response, the Bridge Company – which acknowledged a relationship with Americans for Prosperity – condemned the flyers. Americans for Prosperity, however, defended them saying:

Obviously some people were quite upset by it. If you read the actual copy, it's fairly non-controversial in my opinion. We actually quoted directly from the legislation itself. (Sledge, 2011)

In a way, the flyers served to unintentionally advance the CBA campaign. After months of the CBC of trying to get its message into the media, the controversy about the flyers demonstrated that Delray was at risk of being exploited by the DIBC and the pro-NITC coalition (Editorial, 2011b).

Americans for Prosperity were unsuccessful in their efforts to mobilize a strong community-based NIMBY campaign. Nonetheless, local NITC opposition was still supported by the DIBC, which paid protesters – a practice known as “astroturf” organizing – to show up at public hearings about the NITC. In 2010, a group that was lead by Detroit Pastor Horace Sheffield spoke out against the NITC. Pastor Sheffield acknowledged that he had taken advertising dollars from Moroun to support his radio show, but stated that these donations were not the reason he opposed the crossing (Sledge, 2011). In CBC meetings during interviews,

CBC members stated that after the 2010 hearings, members of Sheffield's group apologized to Delray residents, saying that "they didn't know" what the campaign was about and that they were simply told that they could make \$40 by showing up.

In 2011, a new group emerged in opposition to the NITC: The New Black Panther Party. Consistently, Minister Shabazz and his members arrived at the State Capitol in Lansing on chartered buses with professionally made signs, some of which said, "Save Delray." Yet, despite this signage, the group had a highly contentious relationship with the Delray residents. On several occasions I watched as Delray residents and members of the New Black Panther Party got into verbal arguments over who had the "right" to speak for Delray. Furthermore, the New Black Panther Party complicated the CBC campaign by offering Democratic State Senators political cover to say that they opposed the NITC because of objections within the host community.

The most problematic fight for the Delray group happened immediately following the failed vote in the State Senate Economic Development Committee. A few members of the New Black Panther Party began to taunt Delray's State Representative Rashida Tlaib as she was interviewed by a reporter. Some of the men from the Delray delegation spoke up to defend her, accusing the Minister Shabazz of being paid off by Matty Moroun. A Pastor from Delray stepped up, saying, "I know this man – it's about money." Minister Shabazz replied, "I deserve to get paid – what have you done?" calling the Delray Pastor an "Uncle Tom" for supporting the "Governor's Bridge." As voices were raised, many television and newspaper cameras pointed in the direction of the fight. This scene played on the news and ultimately damaged the Delray stakeholders' ability to position themselves as "respectable" and "trustworthy" in the eyes of Lansing politicians.

To be clear, it is possible that the Michigan Chapter of Americans for Prosperity and the New Black Panther Party truly did oppose the NITC and that the money they received simply amplified their voices. For his part, Minister Shabazz acknowledged that he has accepted thousands of dollars from the Bridge Company, but said that his organization has used that money to do good work in the community and to compensate supporters for their time. As he told a reporter: "You know what these poor Negroes did? They went and they bought groceries.... I'm not ashamed of that" (Sledge, 2011).

While none of these acts are illegal, the members of the CBC assert that their voices and interests – belonging to people who will have to bear the burdens associated with the new crossing – have been drowned out because the DIBC has been so successful in framing the debate on the NITC in ways that diluted the CBC's message and damaged their credibility.



Figure 8. Oppose the Bridge. This bus dropped off members of the New Black Panther Party at Cobo Hall on the day that Michigan and Canada representatives signed the bridge agreement. (Source: Sian Dowis)

Groups that Unconditionally Supported the New Development

The second category of actors that have complicated efforts to pass CBA legislation includes groups that unconditionally *supported* the NITC. The groups in this category stood to benefit from the jobs and investment associated with the development, and as a result, ignored or downplayed negative impacts on the host community. Multinational corporations, the Canadian federal government, organized labor, and Michigan Governor Rick Snyder were among the NITC's strongest supporters. While not necessarily opposed to guarantees of host community protections, if the CBA threatened to stall or block NITC legislation, in some cases, members of this group tried to coopt community members, minimize the NITC's negative impacts, and deprioritize the importance of the CBC's claims.

In 2011, as the seven members of the Michigan State Senate Economic Development Committee prepared to vote on the NITC, pro-bridge advocates understood that securing a majority of four votes would be difficult due to the DIBC's heavy lobbying. Three Republican legislators, including the Committee's chair, were not going to vote for the NITC under any circumstances—with or without a CBA. The two remaining Republican Senators had been influenced by the DIBC's framing of the CBA and were unwilling to vote for the NITC bill if it included legally binding community protections. The two remaining members of the committee – both Detroit Democrats – stated that they would not vote for the NITC unless the bill included CBA provisions. Thus, the CBA became a wedge issue. Pro-NITC lobbyists knew that they could not get the four votes they needed unless they were able to convince the Democrats to vote for the NITC, without a CBA.

Under these conditions, the pro-NITC coalition that had until then be relatively supportive of the Delray community began to shift its messaging. Pro-NITC lobbyists did this by presenting three arguments. First, they told members of the CBC as well as the Democratic

Senators that without the new bridge, Delray would have no hope of revitalizing itself – thus the NITC would benefit Delray. Second, they asked CBC leaders to endorse the bridge bill without an accompanying CBA, promising to help secure community benefits later in the political process. And third, they told elected officials that there really was not a great need to pursue a CBA because the bridge already contained benefits in the form of federally required mandates.

As explained by MDOT’s Communications Director Jeff Cranson, "It is expected that the NITC project, as well as other unique resources and infrastructure in Michigan will catalyze the creation of one or more transportation, distribution and logistics hubs that will spur long-term economic growth and job creation in economically disadvantaged Detroit" (Sands, 2014).

Similarly, on the day that the NITC deal was signed, the political director for the Michigan Regional Council of Carpenters told me:

The pollution [in Delray] is bad... and this is something I’ve told the citizens of Delray – Without a bridge, there will be no benefits. There are federal guidelines with regard to community development projects of this size. I think in order to be able to foster this project we’re gonna have to lean on the federal guidelines absent a wholesale community benefits agreement”. (McCreary, 2012)

CBC leaders, on the other hand, weren’t buying this logic. They did not believe that the bridge – by itself – would improve the neighborhood’s economy, nor did they believe federally mandated environmental protections were comprehensive enough to adequately address the unique environmental and health impacts that the host community would experience. In addition, they were skeptical that pro-NITC business leaders would help them negotiate for benefits after the bridge bill had passed. This skepticism was attributed to years of hosting heavy industry with limited local accountability or investment. Thus, the CBC leadership came to be at odds with members of the pro-NITC coalition because they would not endorse the new bridge without the inclusion of a CBA, and they asked the same of their Democratic representatives.

When it came time for the State Senate Economic Committee to vote on the NITC, two bills were advanced. The first vote was for the NITC without a CBA. The three Republicans who opposed the NITC voted against it, as did the two Democrats. That bill was voted down. The second vote was for the NITC with a CBA. Again, the three Republicans who opposed the NITC voted against it, and this time the two other Republicans voted “no” as well. Thus, the Committee utilized its agenda control power to prevent the bill from going to the floor of the Senate for a vote – effectively blocking its passage.

Following the failed vote, the “alliance” that had existed between the pro-NITC coalition and the CBC shifted. Some members blamed Delray for blocking the most important infrastructure project in North America. Others were more savvy. They didn’t blame Delray – they saw Delray as a scapegoat. After all, both Republicans and Democrats took money from the DIBC. They argued that Delray and the CBA were simply an excuse used by at least one of the Democratic Senators to support the DIBC in a way that would not place them at odds with their constituents. It’s impossible to know what the legislators “true” motivation was, but I can say that in several interviews with the Democratic Senator in question, I was told, “Just follow the money – always follow the money” (Smith, 2011).

As the CBC began to regroup, it was clearly demoralized. Some Delray residents who wanted to move blamed the CBC for being a pawn of Matty Moroun’s. Yet the majority – at least of those who came to CBC Community Meetings – agreed that the NITC would not be beneficial to the neighborhood without a CBA. They agreed with their state representative, Rashida Tlaib, who described the pro-NITC coalition this way:

It’s almost like [the pro-NITC coalition members] want everybody to die off, to just trickle off, for us to be quiet, to just ‘Shhhh’. ‘This is great for the city, shhhhh.’ ‘This is great for the state.’ But, what about the people who have to live next to this bridge for decades, decades to come? What about them? What about the increase in kids that are going to have asthma? What about the fact that we’re not going to have anybody left in that area? And what are you going to have? You’re going to have an infrastructure that

looks so gorgeous next to decay of human rights, of people just living next to this thing. It's just not the right thing. It's the un-American thing to do. (Graham, 2012)



Figure 9. Support the Bridge. On the day that the NITC bridge deal was signed, representatives of organized labor were there with “Support the Bridge” signs to support the NITC.

In this photo, CBC board member Tom Cervenak asks the NITC advocate to change his sign to read “Support the Bridge – And a CBA”. (Source: Amy Krings)

Groups Competing to Secure Their Own Unique Benefits

In 2012, Republican Governor Rick Snyder went around the Legislature, signing a deal with Canadian Prime Minister Stephen Harper to build the NITC. That bill alluded to a need for community protections, but did not include any guarantees. At that time, a third category of actors began to become more prominent in challenging the CBA campaign. Members of this third group sought to obtain their own unique benefits associated with the crossing. When they viewed the host community's demands as being in competition with their own, they were incentivized to undermine the Delray campaign and / or to lobby for their demands to be prioritized above those of the host community.

During the course of the Delray campaign, there were instances of neighboring community groups, non-profits, and even faith leaders asserting that they – not the host community or the CBC – were the most appropriate recipients of benefits associated with the bridge development. However, the entity that was most effective in controlling the distribution of local benefits associated with the NITC was the Detroit Economic Growth Corporation, a quasi-governmental economic development organization that works closely with the City of Detroit. The Detroit Economic Growth Corporation advocated to be the primary representative of any money intended for local groups and, in doing so, marginalized the CBC.

There are several factors that shaped the competitive dynamic between the CBC and the Detroit Economic Growth Corporation. Fundamentally, they had different visions regarding both appropriate decision-making authority as well as the ideal nature of investment in Detroit. The Community Benefits Coalition advocated for local control and local improvements, reasoning that the host community would bear the greatest costs associated with the development and, therefore, they deserved targeted investments. The CBC sought to improve “use values” within Delray by promoting sustainable development, such as parks, trees, and affordable housing.

In contrast, the mission of the Detroit Economic Growth Corporation is to grow the economic base of the city and it thus seeks to transform land into its highest possible “exchange value.” The Detroit Economic Growth Corporation perceived that Delray’s highest and best use was as an international trade hub because of its riverfront location, proximity to the interstate system, and – soon – international border crossing. The Detroit Economic Growth Corporation argued that by repurposing the land and focusing on large-scale transportation and industrial investments, the city’s economy would benefit over the long term.

As the NITC vote was unfolding, the City of Detroit, in collaboration with several foundations, was in the midst of creating a development framework for the city (at that time called the Detroit Works Project and later called Detroit Future City). Part of this strategy included reducing public services in low-density neighborhoods like Delray while targeting investments in higher density neighborhoods. In 2012, Mayor Dave Bing expressed this logic in an interview about plans for low-density neighborhoods:

I don’t have enough money to invest in your neighborhood. I would prefer to refurbish homes in the more stable neighborhoods and get you all to move and have a better quality of life. You can be safer. You can have the bus service. You can make sure your trash and garbage is going to be picked up like it ought to be. Police, fire, schools, you name it—all of the things that make up a good community, that’s where I want you to move. Now, if you want to stay where you are, that’s your choice. But you do need to understand you’re going to be at a disadvantage by not coming to the core of the city. (Yeoman, 2012)

Thus, the Detroit Economic Growth Corporation, Mayor Bing, and the Planning Commission supported the notion of local investments associated with the NITC, but wanted to control where and how the money was spent. The City made it clear to the Snyder Administration that any negotiations concerning a CBA needed to come through its office and, furthermore, a representative of the Mayor’s office made it clear that the city would no longer support housing in Delray (Henderson, 2012).

Similarly, in 2014, when the State purchased public land owned by the City in order to assemble the customs area, Delray received support from the City Council, but not the Mayor or Emergency Manager, in arguing to have some of that money reinvested in the host community.

The CBC felt completely undermined by the City. Having previously secured a promise from the State for new housing in Delray to facilitate resident relocation, the City was now stating that it would not support this development. Thus, the City and Detroit Economic Growth Corporation played a gatekeeping role in preventing the CBC from being able to reach a position in which it could negotiate for a community benefits agreement.

Discussion

The case of the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition demonstrates how actors may intentionally or unintentionally act as “gatekeepers” by complicating efforts to secure CBA legislation. Opponents of the development may negatively frame the CBA to block or derail the project itself; supporters of the project may seek to placate or manipulate the host community so that its efforts to pursue the CBA do not stall the project; and groups that seek their own benefits and concessions may compete with the host community to establish themselves as the best or most appropriate beneficiary of local control and investments.

This finding matters for a number of reasons. First, it contributes to literature that evaluates CBAs as a policy tool to promote equitable development. Within the existing literature, nearly every study examined the success of CBAs by drawing their sample from campaigns that were able to compel the developer to negotiate. While this sampling procedure can identify power dynamics within a truncated sample, communities that do not organize or that organize but are not able to get to the negotiation table, are under-studied and rendered invisible.

In contrast, because I examined a CBA campaign at a much earlier point, I was able to identify some of the conditions under which interest groups may intentionally or unintentionally undermine, tokenize, or manipulate residents of the host community in their efforts to secure community investments. Furthermore, I demonstrate that in order to obtain a CBA, host communities must navigate a political landscape that is far more complex than a binary debate between the developer and host community. In sum, this finding suggests the need to exercise caution when evaluating the viability of CBAs as a policy tool to systematically protect the low-income neighborhoods that are targeted to host development projects.

CHAPTER V

The Promise and Limitations of Local Organizing for Equitable Urban Development

After eight years (2000 – 2008) of uncertainty and waiting while Delray was assessed as a potential host for the NITC, four years (2008 – 2012) of unsuccessfully campaigning for a CBA through the Michigan State Legislature, and three years (2012 – 2015) of waiting for the United States and Canadian representatives to complete their federal approvals, the process of finally buying land to build what is now called the Gordie Howe International Bridge has slowly begun. After fifteen years of public meetings, testimonies, and promises that the bridge would come soon, Delray residents, faith leaders, and business owners have grown used to a feeling of uncertainty and skepticism relating to whether and when the NITC will land in their neighborhood.

This drawn out process has had many impacts on the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition and its CBA campaign. First, people are tired of meeting. This makes it incredibly hard for the CBC staff and board members to mobilize residents, to develop leaders, and to build a powerful grassroots organization. Nonetheless, there were opportunities for the CBC to take on smaller issues that were comparably winnable (pressing the city to tear down abandoned homes and pressing the waste water treatment plant to prevent raw sewage from spilling into the street are two that come to mind), perhaps institutionalizing Saul Alinsky's practice principle of starting small, getting a win, and taking on bigger issues over time (Alinsky, 1971; Bobo, Kendall, & Max, 2001). On the other hand, the idea of mounting additional

campaigns – beyond the CBA campaign – may have felt like a drain on limited resources, rather than a mechanism to gain power and political efficacy.

Another impact is that as the fifteen years passed, Delray continued to lose public services – including the closure of Southwestern High School and Rademacher Community Center – and many homes were lost due to scrapping and arson. The population continued to decline, and more people who could afford to leave grew tired of waiting for the NITC and moved out. Frankly, some members even died – a reality in any campaign – although it was hard not to feel that death and chronic illness among members was not premature, in part due to the high rates of contamination.

Among residents and business owners who remain in Delray, many felt trapped. First, it was unclear what the boundaries of the NITC take area would be, so some residents did not know if they would be bought out, or if they would have an international border crossing across the street when all was said and done. Likewise, residents were told that they would not be compensated through eminent domain if their home was not their principle residence. So year after year, they waited. Many did not want to continue to invest in their homes, knowing that it was unlikely that they would make their investment back. So people like resident Mario Hernandez waited to fix their roofs, paint their walls, or even plant flowers in the yard.

Some business owners experienced similar anxiety. CBC Board Member Julie Ebsch attended MDOT meetings, public hearings, and Committee meetings at the State Capitol for more than a decade – still unsure if her business was in the take area and, if so, what that would mean for her company. Following a community meeting I spoke with Don Graham, who owns a funeral home that is located where the interstate will need to be widened. He told me that the delay is similar to “knowing that you have cancer and waiting to die”.

A CBC Board Member who helped create the organization in 2008 told me that one of the most important things that she learned about CBA campaigns – and what she wanted people considering pursuing a CBA to know – was that there has got to be a way to negotiate at the beginning of the project. In megaprojects like the NITC, the delays involved take too much of a toll on the neighborhood and result in a loss of power and energy over time.

Finally, the process contributed to residents and CBC members becoming more and more resigned to the notion that their neighborhood would never be a healthy, residential community again. Eventually, somehow and someday, the neighborhood was going to host a large bridge project. There were just too many powerful forces that desired it. So even if Matty Moroun and the Detroit International Bridge Company were able to block bridge legislation, they would only stall it – not prevent it. Thus, as State Representative Rashida Tlaib explained to me, “delay” is even worse than having a bridge when it comes to the health of the community. Over time, it caused many residents to lose interest in a CBA, preferring the bi-national authority to “just build it” so that they could move on with their lives.

The Nature of Power in the Construction of Locally Undesirable Land Uses

Since the late 1980s, there has been a growing recognition of the disproportionate share of undesirable development placed in low-income communities of color, and the resulting racial and class disparities in environmental contamination exposure and health impacts (Bryant, 1995; Bullard, 1993; McGurty, 1997; Mohai & Bryant, 1992). In response, neighborhood-based mobilizations for environmental justice have emerged as an important force in urban politics around the world (Auyero & Swistun, 2009; Checker, 2005; Newman, 2011). Many of these localized campaigns fight for procedural and distributive benefits associated with the development, ranging from local accountability and decision-making authority to relocation

assistance to concentrated investments such as traffic routing, public services, and local hiring agreements.

One policy tool, a community benefits agreement (CBA), aims to mitigate harm associated with urban development while sharing the benefits of anticipated positive outcomes (Baxamusa, 2008; Gross, 2008; Gross et al., 2002; Janis, 2007; LeRoy, 2009). As noted in earlier chapters, a CBA is a contract negotiated between a developer and a coalition of local groups that typically include community-based, labor, and environmental organizations. Rather than resulting from environmental rules or regulations, they typically emerge from bilateral negotiations between the developer and local CBA coalition. Thus, for a community to secure a CBA, it must have enough power and leverage to successfully compel the developer to negotiate, to bargain for concessions, and ultimately to ensure that the developer's promises are kept.

Given that CBAs are negotiated within highly contextualized environments rather than based upon standardized regulations, their strength – and thus their ability to reduce environmental health disparities – varies. In order to understand the factors that influence CBA strength, nearly all of the extant literature draws its sample of cases from neighborhoods that are in the process of or have successfully completed a CBA negotiation. Yet no existing research has examined the power dynamics that shape a community's ability to compel the developer to negotiate in the first place. This omission holds pragmatic, empirical, and theoretical implications. First, pragmatically, groups that cannot have their issues placed on the policy-making agenda are effectively blocked from bringing their issues to fruition (Cox & McCubbins, 2005). Empirically, by ignoring unsuccessful communities, evaluations of CBAs are likely to be positively biased. It seems logical that the same communities that cannot get to the negotiation table are also the least powerful and, potentially, the most vulnerable to environmental injustices. Finally, in terms of the development of theory, the study of a “non-event” allows for the

examination of the ways in which power operates to reinforce inequality – in this case environmental inequality – by silencing or ignoring people and places that are often invisible.

In order to address this empirical gap, this study utilized a political ethnographic methodology to examine power dynamics within a Southwest Detroit community-based CBA campaign in which organizers and residents unsuccessfully mobilized to secure a CBA in exchange for hosting a new bridge and international border crossing. By entering the community at an earlier policy-making stage than existing studies of CBAs, I am able to demonstrate how political and economic inequality contribute to environmental inequality.

First, I demonstrated that Delray was chosen to host the new border crossing, in part, because its land was comparably affordable and it was comparably less politically powerful than most affluent areas that were also considered. Thus, given that it was understood that the NITC would contribute to air pollution, truck traffic, and noise, thereby potentially provoking a NIMBY response, Delray's economic divestment and political marginalization made it attractive to planners as a site of least resistance.

Second, I argue that the decision to pursue a CBA, as opposed to a NIMBY campaign, resulted from the belief that the community did not have sufficient power to successfully block the new crossing. As a result, a NIMBY campaign was organized out of the political arena. Furthermore, not only did the CBC stakeholders believe that “there was no alternative,” meaning that the NITC was coming and they needed to get the best deal possible; they also believed that “there was no alternative” for the neighborhood itself. Delray began its decline in the 1930s, and for decades lost population and city services – over time isolating its residents from the rest of the city and surrounding them with heavy industry. Given that there was a perception that no alternative, healthy investment would be coming to the neighborhood, the NITC offered an undesirable option that was still viewed as being better than nothing.

Finally, I identified three categories of political actors that, at times unintentionally, frustrated the Southwest CBA campaign. These categories include: (1) groups that unconditionally *opposed* the proposed development; (2) groups that unconditionally *supported* the proposed development; and (3) groups that viewed the host community as a “competitor” in efforts to secure their own unique influence or investments. By manipulating, tokenizing, and minimizing the host community’s concerns, these groups acted as gatekeepers, creating obstacles to local efforts to secure the CBA.

In sum, by examining three phases of the land use decision-making process, all of which occur prior to CBA negotiations, I conclude that CBAs involve a complex array of actors, beyond the previously emphasized binary relationship between a developer (or the growth regime) and the host community, because I revealed previously unexamined mechanisms through which environmental inequalities are reproduced at the local level.

Alternatives: Accountable Development and Environmental Equity

Previous empirical work found that CBAs can advance the economic well-being of the host community (Baxamusa, 2008; Gross et al., 2002; Lucas-Darby, 2012; Parks & Warren, 2009; Saito, 2012; Salkin & Lavine, 2007). While, my findings do not contradict this body of work, they do call for caution in this interpretation. A community benefits agreement can be an innovative way to secure local investment – when a community is able to access one. However, because power is required to secure a CBA, this policy tool is out of reach for neighborhoods like Delray.

Rather than ending the story there, I want to pose some ideas about alternative approaches to prevent environmental injustice and promote equitable development. First, I want to be clear that I do not think we should give up on local organizing or even, under some

conditions, CBA campaigns. Almost all transformative social change and social justice work historically has been the product of organizing and mobilization of local communities (DeFilippis, Fisher, & Shragge, 2010). Hopefully this study will inform future campaigns as residents, organizers, and their allies plan their strategies and seek out allies.

However, at the same time, I want to be clear that in communities like Delray the fight to obtain a CBA is not fair. If we do not acknowledge that fact, we may unintentionally blame communities like Delray for their failures. This is not to say that the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition did not miss out on political opportunities, but I do not think that if they had just “pulled themselves up by their collective bootstraps” they would have a CBA today. Therefore, in conjunction with local organizing, I would like to suggest the following policies as worth exploring if our goal is to systematically protect neighborhoods like Delray from becoming sacrifice zones.

What would Canada do?

Given that the bridge lands in Delray as well as in a suburb of Windsor, perhaps the first place to look is to our northern neighbor. (Although, in this case, Windsor is actually to the south of Detroit.)

In Windsor, the residents, businesses, and faith institutions located near the new bridge have already been relocated. One of my research assistants was able to attend a meeting in Windsor, held by a group comparable to Delray’s Community Benefits Coalition. The primary concern on the agenda that night was the safe relocation and protection of the wild grass near the bridge. When the research assistant asked organizers about relocated businesses, she was told that they—as well as a relocated church—were pleased with their offers and found them to be generous.

At the time of the writing of this dissertation, the Delray CBC has taken on the argument that the Canadian investments should be a model for comparable investments in Southwest Detroit. As reported by the Detroit Free Press:

More than 300 acres of green space and recreational trails were added to the Herb Gray Parkway corridor to address quality of life concerns. In addition to a sound barrier, the green space and trails help protect residents from noise and pollution by creating distance from the traffic. (Guillen, 2015)

Time will tell if this will happen.

When my research team and I went to Windsor to interview Canadian Member of Parliament Brian Masse, who represents the impacted area as well as the neighborhood where the Ambassador Bridge lands, we asked him about his leverage in pushing for local investments. He told us: “Well, they took my leverage away because they gave me pretty well everything I asked for” (Masse, 2012).

We asked why he thought the bridge-building process has been so much more favorable in Canada than in the United States, a difference that he emphasized had to do with campaign financing. He told us that Canada – like the United States – previously had campaign rules that allowed lobbyists to contribute heavily to both liberals and conservatives, thus influencing the political agenda. However, the rules changed and now there is a cap of \$1,200 that can be donated to political campaigns. As he told us:

Not to say that any particular politician was bought off but there was quite a close affiliation between the Ambassador Bridge and the Liberal Party.... Now you can give \$1,200 to an electoral candidate and \$1,200 to a party. So you have a limited scope of influence in my opinion. Because I noticed some of the work that you were doing that some American politicians were almost receiving, I think some were receiving a thousand dollars a month.... (Masse, 2012)²

2

When he says “some of the work that you were doing...”, M.P. Masse is referring to data that my research team and I collected to determine who the Moroun family was donating to, and how much they were giving. This request was made by Delray residents. They also asked us to find out what properties in Delray are owned by companies that Moroun controls. Our findings were presented at a CBC Town Hall Meeting in which Masse was invited as a guest speaker.

Thus, M. P. Masse concluded that one reform could be to decrease the legal amount of political donations in the United States.

Furthermore, he stated that Canada has implemented rules that limit the total amount of money that can be spent on campaigns.

We have caps on how much you can spend on electoral campaigns. It's based on the population so mine is approximately – in Windsor West – is around \$80,000. So, and I represent about 130,000 people, 3/5 of the city of Windsor. So if somebody can be bought off or influenced by \$1,000 then you're probably not in a thing. Ya know, it's... made it more difficult for influence elements on politicians (Masse, 2012).

All of these differences culminate in a different set of priorities for elected officials in the two countries.

I have to make sure that I raise funds... it's part of what we have to do to get reelected ... but it doesn't become like in Washington and Lansing where they have to become funding machines, it becomes a preoccupation... of the job. And you can't fault them... If you want to win, you need money. My campaign, when I first got elected, we were, I was elected in 2002 and the party, the NDP was polling at 13%, nationally. So we needed to make sure we had a fully funded campaign to compete. It's just a reality. So that's what's happening, I think, in your situation (Masse, 2012).

Thus, he argues that the system of U.S. election rules creates incentives for politicians to be “funding machines,” thus prioritizing the interests of their donors (like the Ambassador Bridge Company) rather than the poor (like Delray residents). Perhaps a donation system more similar to Canada's would reduce the relationship between economic inequality and political inequality.

Health Impact Assessment

In addition to changing the “rules of the game” as they pertain to elections, public health advocates and environmental justice groups have pushed for policies that prioritize the health of residents of host communities. For example, some advocates call for a human health risk assessment.

Health impact assessments (HIAs) have been conducted in Europe and Australia for many years. In recognition that many policies, plans, and projects... have important

health implications, groups in the United States have started to conduct HIAs in the last ten or so years to evaluate and support the consideration of health in decision making processes. Health impact assessment may be defined as “a combination of procedures, methods and tools that systematically judges the potential, and sometimes unintended, effects of a policy, plan, program or project on the health of a population and the distribution of those effects within the population”. (Larsen et al., 2014)

During my fieldwork, I observed community advocates joking that the NITC’s Environmental Impact Statement gives more attention to the health of fish in the Detroit River than to the health of residents.

The Cumulative Measures of Contamination

Another reform could be to change how pollution and contamination are measured. Currently, there are limits to how much pollution a facility can emit. However, sacrifice zones frequently contain many contaminating facilities – and there are no limits to the cumulative emissions. Further, this policy does not measure for synergism—or how chemicals interact with one another (Checker, 2005). If there were rules that limited cumulative pollution in concentrated areas, it is possible that the NITC would not land in Delray because the neighborhood is already so highly impacted.

Buffer Zones

Currently, in an effort to prevent eminent domain abuse, there are rules that the government can only purchase land that is needed for the footprint of a project. Therefore, there are people in places like Delray who cannot be bought out – even if they live across the street from the new border plaza. Thus, the CBC has always argued for the need for some buffer zone around the NITC. They, like some public health advocates, argue that establishing buffer zones between residential developments and factories, major roadways, and other LULUs would limit

the incidence and severity of pollution-related ailments, such as asthma, impaired lung function and development, and cardiovascular disease.

As Delray has become more industrialized and less residential, the CBC has floated the idea of transforming all of Delray into a buffer zone. In part, this is because of the recognition that the city plans to continue concentrating industry there, while reducing services to residents (Detroit Works Long Term Planning Steering Team, 2012). In the future, it is possible that the CBC will be able to negotiate to move everyone out, potentially by trading homes in Delray with homes that the City owns through tax foreclosure.

Citywide Community Benefits Ordinance

In Detroit, a coalition has emerged to pursue a citywide ordinance requiring the negotiation of community benefits agreements whenever a large-scale development receives public land or tax incentives. This would eliminate the need for local coalitions to convince a developer to negotiate with them – and allow the host community to leverage its power within the negotiation itself.

Although the citywide proposal has received support from some elected officials, the State legislature strongly opposes this law, and has tried to proactively pass legislation that would prohibit city governments from requiring CBA negotiations. Furthermore, the Detroit Economic Growth Corporation opposes the bill (T. Walsh, 2014) and the *Detroit News* referred to it as a “Shakedown Tax” (Editorial, 2014). The citywide campaign has since stalled.

Change the System

Until there is equal enforcement of environmental legislation, the ability to negotiate or control development within host communities, and access to clear and honest information about toxins produced and health impacts, we will have environmental injustice (Austin & Schill, 1991; Bryant, 1995). While changes to election and environmental law could help people who live in neighborhoods like Delray, there are prominent environmental justice advocates who suggest that “to truly prevent environmental justice, we need policies that eradicate poverty, racism, and disease; all other efforts are stopgaps” (Bryant, 1995; Dominelli, 2012)



Figure 10. What About Delray? On the day that the bridge deal was signed, Delray residents stood out front of Cobo Hall with handmade signs like this one. (Source: Amy Krings)

Figure 11. Delray is Our Home. On the day of the bridge signing, CBC board member Debra Williams encouraged community members to stay involved and to stay hopeful. She frequently quoted The Bible in community meetings, asking residents to stay committed. She would tell them, “Stay informed, keep fighting, and maintain integrity. And it can be hard to beg—but it is what it is. The Bible tells us, 'Be not weary in well doing: for in due season we shall reap, if we faint not.'”. (Source: Amy Krings)





Figure 12. Keep Your Promises. Leadership and members of the Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition. (Source: Amy Krings)

APPENDIX

The following is a selection of the people that I interviewed. I am not including everyone, as some respondents are confidential.

CBC Board Members

- [Scott Brines
- [Alex Burke
- [Pastor Kevin Casillas
- [Tom Cervenak
- [Michael Christopher
- [Bill Teasley
- [Debra Williams

The CBC lead organizer

- [Simone Sagovac

Southwest Detroit Community Stakeholders:

- [Maria Finn
- [Don Graham
- [Mario Hernandez
- [Vincent Martin
- [John Nagy
- [Joe Rashid
- [Frank Rodriguez
- [Gregg Ward

Six of the seven members of the Michigan State Senate Economic Development Committee

- [Chair Mike Kowall (Rep)
- [Vice Chair Dave Hildenbrand (Rep)
- [Tupac Hunter (Dem)
- [Virgil K. Smith (Dem)
- [Mike Nofs (Rep)
- [Geoff Hansen (Rep)

Elected Officials

- [Michigan Lieutenant Governor, Brian Calley (Rep)
- [Michigan State Senate Majority Leader Randy Richardville (Rep)
- [Michigan State Senate Minority Leader Gretchen Whitmer (Dem)
- [Delray's State Representative Rashida Tlaib (Dem)
- [Delray's State Senator Coleman Young II (Dem)
- [Michigan State Senator Hoon-Yung Hopgood (Dem)
- [Windsor's Parliament Representative Brian Masse

Journalists and Bloggers

- [Ed Arditti

[Jack Lessenberry
[Joel Thurtell

Anti-NITC Activist

[The Michigan Director for Americans for Prosperity, Scott Hagerstrom

Pro-NITC Lobbyist

[Tom Shields

References

- Abonyi, M. H., Horvath-Monrreal, M., & Southeast Michigan Regional Ethnic Heritage Studies Center. (1975). *Touring ethnic Delray*. Detroit: Southeast Michigan Regional Ethnic Heritage Studies Center.
- Alinsky, S. (1971). *Rules for radicals*. New York: Vintage Books.
- Almeida, P., & Stearns, L. (1998). Political opportunities and local grassroots environmental movements: The case of Minamata. *Social Problems*, 45(1), 37-60.
- Altshuler, A., & Luberoff, D. (2003). *Mega-projects: The changing politics of urban public investment*. Washington, D.C.: Brookings Institution Press.
- Austin, R., & Schill, M. (1991). Black, Brown, Poor & (and) Poisoned: Minority Grassroots Environmentalism and the Quest for Eco-Justice. *Kansas Journal of Law & Public Policy*, 1 (69).
- Auyero, J., & Swistun, D. A. (2009). *Flammable: Environmental suffering in an Argentine shantytown*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bachrach, P., & Baratz, M. S. (1962). Two faces of power. *The American Political Science Review*, 56(4), 947-952.
- Baxamusa, M. H. (2008). Empowering communities through deliberation: The model of community benefits agreements. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 27(3), 261-276.
- Been, V. (2010). Community benefits agreements: A new local government tool or another variation on the exactions theme? *The University of Chicago Law Review*, 77(1), 5-35.
- Bell, D., & Gallagher, J. (2011, October 20). Senate panel may give bridge vote another try today. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://archive.freep.com/article/20111020/NEWS06/110200516/Senate-panel-may-give-bridge-vote-another-try-today>.
- Berfield, S. (2012, May 3). Matty Moroun, Detroit's Border Baron. *Bloomberg Businessweek*. Retrieved from <http://www.bloomberg.com/bw/articles/2012-05-03/matty-moroun-detroits-border-baron>.
- Berkman, L. F. (2004). The health divide. *Contexts*, 3(4), 38 - 43.
- Bobo, K., Kendall, J., & Max, S. (2001). *Organizing for social change: Midwest Academy manual for activists* (3rd ed.). Santa Ana, CA: Seven Locks Press.
- Bryant, B. (Ed.) (1995). *Environmental justice: Issues, policies, and solutions*. Washington, D.C.: Island Press.
- Bullard, R. D. (1993). *Confronting environmental racism: Voices from the grassroots*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Cain, C. (2014). Negotiating With the Growth Machine: Community Benefits Agreements and Value-Conscious Growth. *Sociological Forum*. 29(4), 937-958.
- Capital Access. (2010). *Delray Neighborhood Stabilization and Revitalization Plan Submitted to: Southwest Detroit Community Benefits Coalition and People's Community Services of*

- Detroit*. Retrieved from Philadelphia, PA:
http://www.michiganbusiness.org/cm/Files/Public-Notices-Requests-for-Proposals/2013_Logistics_Supply_Chain_Study/MEDC_Delray_Revitalization_Plan.pdf
 Capital Access, & Michigan State Housing Development Authority. (2009). *Delray Neighborhood Stabilization: Planning and Implementation Strategy Update*. Retrieved from
<http://www.partnershipborderstudy.com/pdf/DelrayCommunityPresentationNov1809.pdf>
- Caro, R. (1974). *The power broker: Robert Moses and the fall of New York*. New York: Vintage Publishing.
- Chavis, B. (1993). Foreward. In R. Bullard (Ed.), *Confronting environmental racism: Voices from the grassroots* (pp. 3 - 5). Boston: South End.
- Checker, M. (2005). *Polluted promises: Environmental racism and the search for justice in a southern town*. New York: NYU Press.
- Christoff, C., & Gray, K. (2011). Powerful Moroun family pours \$1.5 million into political races. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from
<http://archive.freep.com/article/20110426/NEWS06/104260404/Powerful-Moroun-family-pours-1-5-million-into-political-races>
- Cox, G. W., & McCubbins, M. D. (2005). *Setting the agenda: Responsible party government in the US House of Representatives*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crenson, M. A. (1971). *The un-politics of air pollution: A study of non-decisionmaking in the cities*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press.
- Dahl, R. (1961). *Who governs?: Democracy and power in an American city*. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Darden, J. T., Hill, R. C., & Thomas, J. (1987). *Detroit: Race and uneven development*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.
- DeFilippis, J., Fisher, R., & Shragge, E. (2010). *Contesting community: The limits and potential of local organizing*. New Brunswick, NJ: Rutgers University Press.
- Detroit Works Long Term Planning Steering Team. (2012). *Detroit Future City: Detroit Strategic Framework Plan*. Retrieved from: http://detroitfuturecity.com/wp-content/uploads/2014/02/DFC_ExecutiveSummary_2ndEd.pdf
- Dominelli, L. (2012). *Green social work: From environmental crises to environmental justice*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Dreier, P. (2009, September 20). Good Jobs, Healthy Cities. *The American Prospect*. Retrieved from: <http://prospect.org/article/good-jobs-healthy-cities>
- Editorial. (2011a, October 20). The big stall: Critics try to swamp bridge proposal by distorting truth. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from
<http://www.freep.com/article/20110626/OPINION01/106260478>
- Editorial. (2011b, June 8). Inexcusable scare tactics have no place in bridge debate. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.freep.com/apps/pbcs.dll/article?AID=2011106080314>
- Editorial. (2014, October 11). City shouldn't pass a shakedown tax. *The Detroit News*. Retrieved from <http://www.detroitnews.com/story/opinion/editorials/2014/10/11/benefits-agreement-detroit-development/17056019/>
- Egan, P., & Gallagher, J. (2012). Moroun's latest Proposal 6 flyer stokes anti-Detroit sentiment. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from
<http://archive.freep.com/article/20121103/NEWS15/121103029/Moroun-s-latest-Proposal-6-flyer-stokes-anti-Detroit-sentiment>
- Elkin, S. L. (1987). *City and regime in the American republic*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

- Faber, D. R., & Krieg, E. J. (2002). Unequal exposure to ecological hazards: environmental injustices in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 110(Suppl 2), 277.
- Farley, R., Danziger, S., & Holzer, H. J. (2000). *Detroit divided*. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- Fenno, R. F. (1978). *Home Style: House Members in Their Districts*. London: Longman Publishing.
- Fitch, S., & Muller, J. (2004). The Troll Under the Bridge. *Forbes Magazine*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/forbes/2004/1115/134.html>
- Flores Dewey, O., & Davis, D. E. (2013). Planning, politics, and urban mega-projects in developmental context: Lessons from Mexico City's airport controversy. *Journal of Urban Affairs*, 35(5), 531-551. doi:10.1111/juaf.12012
- Frug, G. E. (2001). *City making: Building communities without building walls*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gallagher, J. (2014, August 18). Can anything stop construction of the new bridge to Windsor? *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from: <http://archive.freep.com/article/20140818/BUSINESS06/308180006/NITC-bridge-Windsor-Snyder-Moroun>
- Galster, G. (2012). *Driving Detroit: The quest for respect in the motor city*. Philadelphia, PA: University of Pennsylvania Press.
- Gans, H. J. (1982). *The urban villagers: Group and class in the life of Italian-Americans*. New York: Simon and Schuster.
- Geddes, B. (1990). How the cases you choose affect the answers you get: Selection bias in comparative politics. *Political Analysis*, 2(1), 131-150.
- Gee, G., & Payne-Sturges. (2004). Environmental health disparities: A framework integrating psychosocial and environmental concepts. *Environmental Health Perspectives*, 112(17)1646-1653.
- George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2005). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Gershenson, S. (2012, December 9). What About Delray? The Past and Future of Detroit's Forgotten Neighborhood. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/suki-gershenson/what-about-delray-the-pas_b_1950962.html
- Gobert, J. (2010). *Environmental justice, community benefits and the right to the city: The case of Detroit*. Justice Spatiale | Spatial Justice. Retrieved from http://www.jssj.org/archives/02/media/dossier_focus_vt6.pdf
- Goss, K. A. (2010). *Disarmed: The missing movement for gun control in America*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gotham, K. F. (1999). Political opportunity, community identity, and the emergence of a local anti-expressway movement. *Social Problems*, 46, 332.
- Graham, L. (2012, August 17). Bridging the border: Living with a new bridge. *Michigan Radio*. Retrieved from <http://michiganradio.org/post/bridging-border-living-new-bridge-part-5>
- Gregory, S. (1999). *Black Corona: Race and the politics of place in an urban community*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Gross, J. (2008). Community benefits agreements: Definitions, values, and legal enforceability. *Journal of Affordable Housing & Community Development*, 17, 35.
- Gross, J., LeRoy, G., & Janis-Aparicio, M. (2002). *Community benefits agreements: Making development projects accountable*. Washington, DC: Good Jobs First and the California Public Subsidies Project.

- Guillen, J. (2015, September 22). \$1.4B Windsor highway could set tone for new bridge. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.freep.com/story/news/local/michigan/detroit/2015/09/22/gordie-howe-bridge-windsor-delray/72570636/>
- Guyette, C. (2010, December 15). When Matty wins, we all lose. *Metro Times*. Retrieved from <http://metrotimes.com/news/when-matty-wins-we-all-lose-1.1077410>
- Haas, G. (2002). Economic justice in the Los Angeles Figueroa Corridor. In L. Delp, M. Outman-Kramer, S. J. Schurman, & K. Wong (Eds.), *Teaching for Change: Popular Education and the Labor Movement*. Los Angeles, CA: UCLA Center for Labor Research and Education.
- Janis, M. (2007). Background on community benefits agreements: The process, the projects, and the prospects for the future. In Annie E. Casey Foundation (Ed.), *Community benefits agreements: The power, practice, and promise of a responsible redevelopment tool*. Baltimore: Annie E. Casey Foundation.
- King, G., Keohane, R., & Verba, S. (1994). *Designing social inquiry: Scientific inference in qualitative research*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Klug, T. (1999). *Railway Cars, Bricks, and Salt: The Industrial History of Southwest Detroit Before Auto*. Retrieved from http://old-delray.com/documents/Southwest_Detroit.pdf
- Laing, B. Y. (2009). Organizing community and labor coalitions for community benefits agreements in African American communities: Ensuring successful partnerships. *Journal of Community Practice*, 17(1-2), 120-139.
- Larsen, L. (2009). *The pursuit of responsible development: Addressing anticipated benefits and unwanted burdens through community benefit agreements*. Retrieved from University of Michigan Center for Local, State, and Urban Policy: <http://closup.umich.edu/working-papers/9/the-pursuit-of-responsible-development-addressing-anticipated-benefits-and-unwanted-burdens-through-community-benefit-agreements/>
- Larsen, L., Sherman, L. S., Cole, L. B., Karwat, D., Badiane, K., & Coseo, P. (2014). Social justice and sustainability in poor neighborhoods: Learning and living in Southwest Detroit. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 34(1), 5-18.
- Lavelle, M., & Coyle, M. (1992). Unequal protection: The racial divide in environmental law. *National Law Journal*, 15(3), S1-S12.
- Leavitt, J. (2006). Linking housing to community economic development with community benefits agreements: The case of the Figueroa corridor coalition for economic justice. In P. Ong & A. Loukaitou-Sideris (Eds.), *Jobs and economic development in minority communities*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press.
- Lefebvre, B. (2006, May 24). The battle of the bridge: Distrust of Moroun has Delray residents rallying behind a public span. *Metro Times*. Retrieved from <http://www2.metrotimes.com/news/story.asp?id=9236>
- Lerner, S. (2010). *Sacrifice zones: The front lines of toxic chemical exposure in the United States*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- LeRoy, G. (2009). Community benefits agreements: A strategy for renewing our cities (Los Angeles, California). In M. P. Pavel (Ed.), *Breakthrough communities: Sustainability and justice in the next American metropolis*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Logan, J. R., & Molotch, H. L. (2007). *Urban fortunes: The political economy of place*. Oakland: University of California Press.
- Logan, J. R., Whaley, R. B., & Crowder, K. (1997). The character and consequences of growth regimes: An assessment of 20 years of research. *Urban Affairs Review*, 32(5), 603-630.

- Lucas-Darby, E. (2012). Community benefits agreements: A case study in addressing environmental and economic injustices. *The Journal of African American History*, 97(1 2), 92-109. doi:10.5323/jafriamerhist.97.1-2.0092
- Luce, S. (2004). *Fighting for a living wage*. Ithaca, NY Cornell University Press.
- Luloff, A. E., Albrecht, S. L., & Bourke, L. (1998). NIMBY and the hazardous and toxic waste siting dilemma: The need for concept clarification. *Society & Natural Resources: An International Journal*, 11(1), 81-89.
- McGurty, E. M. (1997). From NIMBY to civil rights: The origins of the environmental justice movement. *Environmental History*, 2(3), 301-323.
- Medoff, P., & Sklar, H. (1994). *Streets of hope: The fall and rise of an urban neighborhood*. Cambridge, MA: South End Press.
- Meyerson, H. (2006). No Justice, No Growth; How Los Angeles Is Making Big-Time Developers Create Decent Jobs. *The American Prospect*. Retrieved from <http://prospect.org/article/no-justice-no-growth>.
- Michigan Department of Transportation. (2005). *Detroit River International Crossing Study Local Advisory Council Meeting Minute Notes*. Retrieved from <http://www.thepixelwarehouse.com/detroit/pdf/LAC - Mar 2005 - Notes.pdf>
- Michigan Department of Transportation. (2008). *Detroit River International Crossing Study Frequently-Asked Questions (FAQs) By Topic Area*. Retrieved from
- Mohai, P., & Bryant, B. (1992). Environmental injustice: Weighing race and class as factors in the distribution of environmental hazards. *University of Colorado Law Review*, 63(1), 921-932.
- Mollenkopf, J. (1989). Who (or what) runs cities, and how? *Sociological Forum*, 4(1), 119-137.
- Molotch, H. (1976). The city as a growth machine: Toward a political economy of place. *American Journal of Sociology*, 82(2), 309-332.
- Muller, J. (2012, November 7). When Even a Billionaire Can't Buy a State Law. *Forbes*. Retrieved from <http://www.forbes.com/sites/joannmuller/2012/11/07/when-even-a-billionaire-cant-buy-a-state-law/>.
- Mulligan-Hansel, K., & LeRoy, G. (2008). Community benefits: An idea on a roll! *Neighborhood Funders Group Reports*, 15(1), 4-5.
- Newman, A. (2011). Contested ecologies: Environmental activism and urban space in immigrant Paris. *City & Society*, 23(2), 192-209.
- Ocejo, R. E. (2012). *Ethnography and the city: Readings on doing urban fieldwork*. London: Routledge.
- Parks, V., & Warren, D. (2009). The politics and practice of economic justice: Community benefits agreements as tactic of the new accountable development movement. *Journal of Community Practice*, 17(1-2), 88-106.
- Pellow, D. N. (2004). *Garbage wars: The struggle for environmental justice in Chicago*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Peterson, P. E. (1981). *City limits*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Popper, F. J. (1991). LULUs and their blockage: The nature of the problem, the outline of the solutions. In J. Dimento & L. Graymer (Eds.), *Confronting regional challenges: Approached to LULUs, growth, and other vexing governance problems* (pp. 13 - 27). Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Pulido, L. (1996). *Environmentalism and economic justice: Two Chicano struggles in the Southwest*. Tuscon, AZ: University of Arizona Press.
- Saito, L. T. (2012). How low-income residents can benefit from urban development: The L.A. Live community benefits agreement. *City & Community*, 11(2), 129-150.

- Salkin, P., & Lavine, A. (2007). Negotiating for social justice and the promise of community benefits agreements: Case studies of current and developing agreements. *Journal of Affordable Housing and Community Development Law*, 17(1/2), 113-144.
- Salkin, P., & Lavine, A. (2008). Understanding community benefits agreements: Equitable development, social justice and other considerations for developers, municipalities and community organizations. *UCLA Journal of Environmental Law & Policy*, 26, 09-04.
- Samuel, P. (2010). Michigan senate leader says: No \$s on DRIC bridge, no vote. *Toll Road News*. Retrieved from <http://tollroadsnews.com/news/michigan-senate-leader-says-no-s-on-dric-bridge-no-vote>.
- Sands, D. (2014, September 17). Long-rumored International Bridge finally appears to be gaining traction in Delray. *Detroit Metro Times*. Retrieved from <http://www.metrotimes.com/detroit/long-rumored-nitc-finally-appears-to-be-gaining-traction-in-delray/Content?oid=2247650>.
- Sanyal, B. (2005). Planning as anticipation of resistance. *Planning Theory*, 4(3), 225-245.
- Schattschneider, E. E. (1960). *The semi-sovereign people: A realist's view of democracy in America*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Schatz, E. (2009). *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power*. Chicago: University Of Chicago Press.
- Simmons, L., & Luce, S. (2009). Community benefits agreements: Lessons from New Haven. *WorkingUSA*, 12(1), 97-111.
- Sledge, M. (2011, November 18, 2011). Detroit Bridge Battle Pits City Residents Against Each Other. *HuffPost Detroit*. Retrieved from http://www.huffingtonpost.com/2011/11/18/detroit-bridge-pits-city-residents_n_1100314.html?page=1
- Snyder, R. (2012, June 15). Why we need a new bridge now. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.freep.com/article/20120615/NEWS06/120615055>
- Srinivasan, S., O'Fallon, L. R., & Dearry, A. (2003). Creating healthy communities, healthy homes, healthy people: Initiating a research agenda on the built environment and public health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 93(9), 1446-1450.
- Stoecker, R. (2010). *Defending community: The struggle for alternative redevelopment in Cedar-Riverside*: Temple University Press.
- Stone, C. N. (1989). *Regime politics: Governing Atlanta, 1946-1988*. Lawrence, Kansas: University Press of Kansas.
- Storey, K., & Hamilton, L. C. (2003). *Planning for the impacts of megaprojects*. New York: Springer.
- Sugrue, T. (2005). *The origins of the urban crisis: Race and inequality in postwar Detroit*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sze, J. (2007). *Noxious New York: The racial politics of urban health and environmental justice*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.
- Tanner-White, K., & Lam, T. (2010, June 20). Database: Toxic ZIP code rankings. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.freep.com/article/20100620/NEWS06/100619021/?appSession=169121870492172>
- The University of Michigan Urban and Regional Planning Program. (2007). *A Local Response to the Detroit River International Crossing: Recommendations to Guide a Community Benefits Agreement*. Retrieved from http://taubmancollege.umich.edu/pdfs/student_work/planning/DelrayCommunityBenefitsAgreement.pdf

- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA). (1998). *Guidance for Incorporating Environmental Justice in EPA's NEPA Compliance Analysis*. Retrieved from Washington, DC. Retrieved from http://en.openei.org/wiki/EPA_-_Guidance_for_Incorporating_Environmental_Justice_Concerns_in_EPA%27s_NEPA_Compliance_Analyses.
- URS & Canada-U.S.-Ontario-Michigan Border Transportation Partnership. (2004). *Planning / Need and Feasibility Study Report*. Retrieved from http://www.partnershipborderstudy.com/pdf/a_PNFStudyReport_FINAL_updatedpgnumbers.pdf.
- Walsh, K. C. (2009). Scholars as citizens: Studying public opinion through ethnography. In E. Schatz (Ed.), *Political ethnography: What immersion contributes to the study of power*. Chicago: University of Chicago.
- Walsh, T. (2014, October 7). DEGC chief to council: Don't derail Detroit's recovery. *Detroit Free Press*. Retrieved from <http://www.freep.com/story/money/business/columnists/tom-walsh/2014/10/07/detroit-development-ordinance/16857551/>.
- Wolf-Powers, L. (2010). Community benefits agreements and local government. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 76(2), 141-159. doi:10.1080/01944360903490923
- Wolf-Powers, L. (2012). Community benefits agreements in a value capture context. In G. K. Ingram & Y.-H. Hong (Eds.), *Value capture and land policies* (pp. 217-228). Cambridge, MA: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy.
- Yeoman, B. (2012, April 30). The death and life of Detroit. *The American Prospect*. Retrieved from <http://prospect.org/article/death-and-life-detroit>.
- Young, I. M. (1990). *Justice and the politics of difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.