

LANDLINES

Newsletter of the
Lincoln Institute of
Land Policy
March 1997
Volume 9 • Number 2

Urban Land as Common Property

ALICE E. INGERSON

In recent years, politicians, lobbyists and voters in the United States have often seemed polarized over where to draw the line between private and public rights in land. Common property, defined as group- or community-owned private property, straddles that line.

Most recognized common property is in natural resources, and most recognized commons are rural people in developing countries. But the concept of commons might also apply to some aspects of urban land in the United States. At the least, common property theory may help U.S. policymakers understand what is at stake in debates about land rights.

At Voices from the Commons, the June 1996 conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property in Berkeley, California, the Lincoln Institute assembled a dozen U.S. researchers and practitioners to discuss these new forms of commons, some of which are described in this article:

- land trusts and cooperatives
- incidental open spaces
- housing, including group homes, gated or common-interest developments and the use of urban public property by the homeless
- converted military bases

Property Rights and Land Use Strategies

Economist Daniel Bromley and legal scholar Carol Rose have proposed independent but roughly compatible schemes for classifying property regimes.

INSIDE THIS ISSUE

4 Research Contracts

6 Brownfield Redevelopment

7 Order Form

Land Trusts and Limited-Equity Cooperatives

Much of land's market value depends on whether it contains important natural resources, is located in a thriving community, or has access to services and infrastructure provided by government. The nineteenth-century American philosopher Henry George argued that all these values were created by something other than private action, and should therefore be captured for public use through taxation. In recent years, land trusts and other groups have experimented with distributing the costs and benefits of land development in much the same way as proposed by Henry George, but through new forms of land ownership rather than taxation. Some of these experiments include limited-equity cooperatives and land trusts such as Boston's Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative. The Dudley Street project has made the land in an inner-city redevelopment area the common property of a nonprofit group, while allowing private ownership of homes and other buildings.

Using similar arguments, groups such as the Connecticut-based Equity Trust have dedicated the "social increment" in property values—the increase in land prices as a neighborhood recovers from blight, or a small town grows—to social purposes. For example, the portion of a home's sale price that is due to the increase in land values rather than housing construction costs is used to subsidize the purchase price for the next homeowner.

Bromley focuses on the form of land rights, while Rose focuses on management strategies:

PROPERTY IN LAND	
<i>Bromley</i>	<i>Rose</i>
1. private	property rights
2. state	keep out
3. nonproperty	do nothing
4. common property	right way

Option 1 on each of these lists is classically private property. The owner's rights are exclusive, and the owner decides what to do with the land. Option 2 is often associated with public land, in the sense that government owns it and decides what, if anything, can be done and who can do it on the land. Option 3 is the situation often lamented as "the tragedy of the commons," in which the land is owned by no one, and everyone therefore has both access and incentives to abuse it. Despite the "tragedy of the commons"

language, this option is better described as "open access," "unowned" or "non-property." Option 4 is most often associated with common property, defined as private property owned and managed in a specific "right" way by a group of people.

There is not a perfect correspondence between Rose's strategies and Bromley's categories. "Keep out" as a strategy may apply to either private or group-owned property as well as public lands—wherever the main strategy is to restrict access to a defined group, or to no one. The "right way" strategy may apply to "nonproperty" as well as commons—if anyone, and not just members of a specific group, can use the resource simply by following the prescribed rules of use. Nevertheless, putting Bromley's and Rose's lists side-by-side suggests that the distinguishing feature of common property may be assigning

Urban Land
continued on next page

Urban Land

continued from page 1

land both to a specific group of people and to prescribed uses.

Most urban land in the United States is defined as either private or public property. Yet such land may be more like common property than is usually recognized. Zoning and environmental regulations, for example, do not allow private landowners to do anything and everything with “their” land. Those aspects of land use that affect the community’s quality of life or shared environment are managed almost like common property.

What Makes a Successful Commons?

Elinor Ostrom has identified two prerequisites for successful common property regimes: the system must face significant environmental uncertainty, and there must be social stability in the group of owners/users. As Ostrom puts it, commoners must have “shared a past and expect to share a future.” They must be capable not just of “short-term maximization but long-term

Incidental Open Spaces

Vacant lots, old cemeteries and partially buried urban streams raise a host of questions about managing urban landscapes as commons. Groups seeking to reclaim or use such incidental urban open spaces must often persuade private owners to let them use and help to maintain the land. Some geographers and planners have remapped cities’ neglected, and in practice often “unowned,” open spaces.

Groups such as the Waterways Restoration Institute in Berkeley, California, have built on this research to help low-income city residents uncover and restore forgotten streams and their banks, turning them from neighborhood eyesores into neighborhood treasures. The process increases residents’ appreciation of the interdependence between the city and nature, which they often think of as exclusively suburban or rural.



RUTHERFORD H. PLATT, UNIVERSITY OF MASSACHUSETTS AT AMHERST

VACANT LOTS OFFER OPPORTUNITIES TO RECLAIM URBAN OPEN SPACES FOR NEW NEIGHBORHOOD USES.

reflection about joint outcomes.”

Environmental instability and social stability are usually associated with rural places. Rural landowners face the random risks of droughts, floods and plagues, and are known—accurately or inaccurately—for their sense of community.

Do these requirements exist in the urban United States? Perhaps. Environmental instability is easy enough to find, if “environment” is defined as social and economic as well as physical. For many inner-city residents, depopulation, gentrification, or plant and base closings are just as random and devastating as floods or plagues. The social stability of these neighborhoods may be largely involuntary, created by economic and racial barriers to mobility. But some community activists also see human knowledge, social relationships and the land itself in such places as “social capital,” which can be mobilized for development through new forms of ownership.

Pros and Cons of Common Property

Most scholars who have written about common property have seen commoners as political and economic underdogs. A classic example is villagers defending their traditional forest grazing grounds against timber companies or government foresters who want to prohibit grazing to protect tree seedlings or prevent erosion. But commoners may also be prosperous or even highly privileged. For example, many

gated or “common interest” communities attempt to wall in high home values and wall out social and economic diversity.

Commoners are by definition conservative. To preserve their shared resources, they must exclude or expel anyone not willing to follow their land use rules. They must also keep individuals from taking their share of the proceeds and “cashing out” of the system. Although less comfortable than the stereotype of downtrodden commoners who share and share alike, exclusionary commons may be preferable to either privatization or state control.

But in practice, both these options may speed up resource exhaustion. Private owners may extract the maximum cash value from their land as quickly as possible, rather than preserve resources for their own or anyone else’s future use. “Keep out” signs may not keep local people from extracting resources unsustainably from government lands—in fact, hostility toward a distant government may encourage such behavior.

Economist William Fischel has applied this implicit comparison to U.S. local governments’ primary dependence on land-based (property) taxes. He sees all residents in a jurisdiction as commoners who share an interest in maximizing local land values. Fischel argues that California’s Proposition 13 was exactly the equivalent of turning a village commons into a national park. By restricting local property taxes and giving state government a

stronger role in school funding, Proposition 13 transferred “ownership” of the schools from face-to-face communities to a distant government.

From the taxpayers’ perspective, this upward transfer of responsibility changed their schools from a local “commons,” with strong norms about the “right way” to finance and use education, into state property, which local residents almost saw as nonproperty. As a result, the quality of California schools was leveled across local jurisdictions, but it was leveled down rather than up. Education was exhausted rather than managed sustainably.

New Commons

A few experimental forms of land ownership and management in the U.S.—including land trusts, neighborhood-managed parks, community-supported agriculture and limited-equity housing cooperatives—explicitly avoid the extremes of private or public property. All these “new” forms of common property fit Carol Rose’s description of “right way”: to foster or protect specific land uses or groups of users.

These experiments with property rights and responsibilities raise questions that few researchers, either on urban development or on common property, have yet addressed. For example, should local and state officials help to remove regulatory barriers to group ownership of land, or support new criteria for mortgage financing of group-owned land?

There are also long-standing legal objections to “perpetuities”—trying to tie the hands of future owners about how to use their land. To avoid these objections, land trusts must sometimes seek special legal exemptions, or even change state property laws. The long-term costs and benefits of common property experiments, however, may depend less on the initial distribution of land rights than on shifting local politics and economic conditions. Finding answers to these questions will require close collaboration between researchers and practitioners.

Alice E. Ingerson, director of publications at the Lincoln Institute, earned her Ph.D. in cultural anthropology, for research on the politics of rural industrialization in Portugal. She moderated the session “Is There an Urban Commons in the U.S.?” at the Voices from the Commons conference.

Housing

For the elderly, single-parent households and many low-income families, detached single-family housing is either inappropriate or priced beyond reach. Yet traditional land use regulations, grounded partly in concerns about property values, favor single-family housing. Advocates of privatization often argue for converting common property into private ownership to promote reinvestment or increase property values. Organizations serving the homeless, such as San Francisco’s HomeBase, see this argument applied even to traditionally public areas such as doorways, parks and bus benches to discourage the homeless from occupying these spaces.

Some researchers and practitioners have also proposed to manage the housing stock as a whole as a form of common property, both to meet needs not met by single-family detached housing and to encourage neighborhood reinvestment. Cornell’s Patricia Pollak, for example, has examined the sources of opposition to, and the consequences of, converting some single-family homes into group quarters, accessory apartments and elder cottages. Many home and business owners who oppose these land uses in interviews, expecting them to depress property values, are ironically unaware that their neighborhoods already contain such alternative housing.

FYI

COURSES

Municipal Open Space Conservation: Preparing and Funding Successful Projects, May 9, Orlando, FL

PUBLICATIONS

Blakely and Snyder, “Fortress America: Gated and Walled Communities in the United States,” 1995. Working Paper. \$10 plus shipping and handling.

Korngold, “Private Land Use Controls: Private Initiative and the Public Interest in the Homeowners Association Context,” 1995. Working Paper. \$5 plus shipping and handling.

REFERENCES

Steve Barton and Carol Silverman, *Common Interest Communities: Private Governments and the Public Interest* (Berkeley, CA: Institute of Governmental Studies Press, 1994).

Daniel Bromley, *Environment and Economy: Property Rights and Public Policy* (Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, Inc., 1991).

William A. Fischel, *Regulatory Takings: Law, Economics, and Politics* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1995).

Elinor Ostrom, *Governing the Commons: The Evolution of Institutions for Collective Action* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 1990).

Carol M. Rose, “Rethinking Environmental Controls: Management Strategies for Common Resources,” *Duke Law Journal* 1991, no. 1 (February 1991), pp. 1–38.

Converted Military Bases

For each base closed, the federal government offers planning funds to a single organization. That organization must represent the entire local community affected by the base closing, from public to private interests and across political jurisdictions. Researchers including Massachusetts Institute of Technology’s Bernard Frieden are studying how diverse base communities are being forced to create at least temporary “commons” structures to receive federal grants.

Few bases have completed the conversion process yet, so it remains to be seen whether these temporary structures will become permanent. In the Oakland-San Francisco area, however, the Earth Island Institute’s Carl Anthony and others on the East Bay Conversion and Reinvestment Commission consciously considered long-term group or community ownership of some base lands as a way to meet regional needs for housing, open space and jobs.

Researchers Investigate Land and Tax Policies

4

The Lincoln Institute awards research contracts to encourage and support investigations that contribute to the body of knowledge about land and land-related tax policies. A number of recently funded projects are listed below, representing the kinds of work being undertaken in each of the Institute's three program areas.

Land Values, Property Rights and Ownership Program

We study how the actions of stakeholders in both private and public sectors produce land values and distribute rights to land. We are also interested in how to develop methods to measure land value. This program area touches upon the larger issues of property rights, the operations of formal and informal land markets in creating and distributing land value, and methods for both recovering the costs of public investment in land and distributing the wealth gained from land.

Land Into Cities

H. James Brown, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
To use survey data to address urban expansion and development patterns based on the actions of land owners in the Boston metropolitan area.

Land and Property Markets

Stephen K. Mayo, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
To research land and property markets in the United States and the interactions of those markets within the broader economy.

Public Development of Publicly Owned Lands

Lynne Sagalyn, Columbia University, Graduate School of Business
To examine strategies adopted by cities to use public lands, including the trade-offs involved, structural factors, risks, and accountability.

Informal Land and Housing Markets

Omar Razzaz, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Urban Studies and Planning
To study informal land and housing markets with an emphasis on developing countries in order to determine the gaps in the current body of research.

Formal and Informal Mechanisms in Housing Production in Developing Countries

Ayse Pamuk, University of Virginia, School of Architecture

To study the importance of private arrangements made in informal land markets, using Trinidad and Tobago to assess the consequences of a restrictive regulatory environment.

Land Policy and the National Economy in Japan

Koichi Mera, University of Southern California, School of Urban and Regional Planning

To study the effects of market fundamentals and speculative behavior of land values, and to isolate the effect of government intervention in the market.

Urban Land Markets in Latin America and the Caribbean

Martim Smolka, et al., Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

To compare and analyze the state of the art of urban land markets in twelve Latin American countries.

Land Affected by Residential Housing Markets

Erminia Maricato, University of Sao Paulo, Faculty of Architecture and Urban Planning
To examine the low-income housing crisis in Brazil and, in particular, the role of land in developers' decisions to build high-income vs low-income housing

Taxation of Land and Buildings Program

We are interested in the special nature of taxes on real property, particularly those based on market value. We address the economic effects of such taxes, including their legal structure and interpretation with regard to valuation. We are also interested in political aspects of implementing property taxes as instruments of fiscal decentralization. Research in this program area provides practical assistance to policy-makers dealing with existing tax systems, and also explores current tax reform efforts around this country and overseas.

Property Tax Appraisals and the Reuse of Inner-City Properties

Emil Malizia, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Department of City and Regional Planning

To document the discrepancy between market value and assessed value for a sample of commercial properties in North Carolina; to explain how appraisal methods may lead to overvaluation; and to explore ways to modify appraisal methods to eliminate this impediment to the reuse of inner-city commercial properties.

The Two-Rate Tax: The Amsterdam New York Experience

Donald Reeb, University of Albany, Department of Economics

To study the introduction and repeal of a two-rate property tax on land and buildings in Amsterdam, New York.

Land Taxation: Implications for Local Revenue and Development Gains

Nathaniel Lichfield, University of London, and Owen Connellan, University of Glamorgan, Centre of Research in the Built Environment

To study the ways in which land taxation has been used to recover value increases due to public development.

Legal Study of Value Capture in Colombia

Maria Clara Verjarano, National Planning Department, Colombia

To report on valorization in Colombia, including a description of developments since 1979, an evaluation of current functioning, and prospects for future changes and reform.

Property Tax Study in the Czech Republic and Slovak Republic

Gary Cornia and Phil J. Bryson, Brigham Young University, Marriott School of Management

To study property tax systems in the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic, comparing the countries' evolution during economic transition.

International Survey on Property Taxation in Transition Economies

Joan Youngman and Jane Malme, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

To compile comparative case studies on the development of property taxation in transition economies, including problems encountered in developing tax policies, laws, administrative arrangements, and valuation methods.

For information about the Institute's research proposal process, visit our Web site at <http://www.lincolnst.edu/lincoln> or email your inquiry to help@lincolnst.edu.

Land Use and Regulation Program

We focus on the process, plans and policies that affect the development of land, especially in urban "fringe" areas most at risk from changing land uses. We also investigate issues around the reuse of vacant and underutilized land and the preservation of land. While we are interested in the economically efficient use of land, we take a more comprehensive perspective for evaluating land use and its regulation. We seek to understand how the development, reuse and preservation of land affect other public values and goals, such as access to land, the character of society and the quality of life.

Regulatory Barriers to Reuse of Urban Brownfields

George W. Liebmann, Law Office of George W. Liebmann, Baltimore, Maryland
To propose a model ordinance to remove barriers to reuse urban land so greenfield development is not the path of least resistance for residential and commercial developers.

Growth and Spread of Vacant and Underutilized Land, and Land Value Depression

Alex Anas, Department of Economics, and Barry Lentnek, Jean-Claude Thill and Elizabeth Kent, Department of Geography, State University of New York at Buffalo
To study vacant and underutilized land within old rust-belt cities.

Vacant Land in Latin American Cities: The Case of Buenos Aires

Nora Clichevsky, National Council of Scientific and Technical Research, Argentina
To study informal land markets and regulation in Latin America and examine the steps government can take to manage informal markets in legal, territorial-environmental, and economic terms.

Comparative Analysis of Vacant Land in Urban Areas in Western Europe

Barry Wood and Patsy Healy, University of Newcastle-upon-Tyne, Department of Town and Country Planning
To analyze the extent of vacant land, its likely causes and possible remedies in the Netherlands, France, Italy and the U.K.

Public Policy and 'Sprawl': Implications of Existing Development Patterns

Patricia Burgess and Thomas Bier, Cleveland State University, College of Urban Affairs
To study the policy implications of sprawl development adjacent to Cleveland.

Growth Patterns in Florida, Texas, and California

Benjamin Chinitz, Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and Florida Atlantic University
To investigate three fast-growing states to understand the forces that account for their wide variations in growth patterns.

State Growth Management

Patricia E. Salkin, Albany Law School, Government Law Center
To examine growth management initiatives in those states without state-level policies.

Limitations on Development Impact Exactions as a Means to Limit Social Policymaking

James E. Holloway and Donald C. Guy, East Carolina University, School of Business
To analyze the U.S. Supreme Court's takings jurisprudence and evaluate the effect of development exactions on land use policymaking.

European Sustainable Communities: An Exploratory Study

Timothy Beatley, University of Virginia, School of Architecture
To produce local and regional case studies on sustainable initiatives in Denmark, Sweden, Germany, and the Netherlands.

Rent and Sustainable Development

Fred Harrison, Centre for Incentive Taxation, Ltd., and Galina Titova, Russian Academy of Sciences, Centre for Ecological Security
To investigate implications for sustainability of increased reliance on land tax, using Russia as a case study.

Environmental Conflicts Linked to Land Use Changes

Francisco Sabatini, Catholic University of Chile, Institute of Urban Studies
To discuss environmental conflicts stemming from the distribution of positive and negative externalities produced by new land uses in the Santiago metropolitan area, with comparisons to the U.S. and Canada.

Costs and Benefits of Metropolitan Employment Deconcentration

Wim Wiewel, Great Cities Institute, and Joe Persky, Department of Economics, University of Illinois at Chicago
To conduct an overview of employment and firm location decisions within metropolitan areas and a cost-benefit analysis; to review the effectiveness of various policies aimed at reducing deconcentration.

Impact of Housing-Related Tax Expenditures on Residential Land Use within the Metropolitan Area

Joseph Gyourko, University of Pennsylvania, Real Estate Department, The Wharton School, and Richard Voith, Federal Reserve Bank of Philadelphia
To study how federal tax policy related to housing has influenced the nature of urban form in general and residential land use intensity in the Philadelphia metropolitan area in particular.

Politics of Megaprojects

Alan Altshuler and David Luberoff, Harvard University, Kennedy School of Government
To examine the place of large-scale transportation (and, secondarily other public infrastructure) investment in urban land use and development politics, including analysis of the Boston Central Artery/Third Harbor Tunnel.

Consensual Approaches to Land Use Decisionmaking

Lawrence Susskind, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Department of Urban Studies and Planning, and Marshall Kaplan, University of Colorado at Denver
To develop an evaluative framework around mediation and other forms of consensus building and dispute handling in land use cases.

NEWS AND NOTES

H. James Brown, president of the Lincoln Institute, has been named a member of the Board of Directors of the Land Reform Training Institute in Taiwan. He taught in LRTI's urban land development training session in November 1996.

Paul James has joined the Institute as network administrator.

Stephen K. Mayo is a visiting fellow at the Lincoln Institute through September 1997 to research policies that influence the performance of urban land and property markets. He is on leave from the World Bank, where he has been principal economist in the Urban Development Division since 1990.

Joan Youngman, senior fellow of the Lincoln Institute, presented her paper "Three Questions on the Taxation of Telecommunications Property" at the Conference on the Taxation of Telecommunications and Electronic Commerce, which was held in Boston in November 1996. The conference was sponsored by the Federation of Tax Administrators, the Multistate Tax Commission, the National Conference of State Legislatures and the National Tax Association. The paper is reprinted in *State Tax Notes*, December 30, 1996. Youngman also wrote the property tax section for the sixth edition of the classic casebook, *State and Local Taxation: Cases and Materials*, by Walter Hellerstein (West Publishing Company, 1997).

Lincoln Courses and Policy Report Explore Brownfield Redevelopment

6

Brownfields are abandoned, idled or under-used industrial and commercial facilities where expansion or redevelopment is complicated by real or perceived environmental contamination. The definition is broad and can cover an entire industrial zone or a single abandoned building, a massive hazardous waste dump or spillage from a corner dry cleaning shop. By some estimates, there are as many as 450,000 brownfields scattered nationwide—a land mass that, if assembled, would equal the acreage of the city of Los Angeles.

On Friday, April 11, in St. Louis, the Lincoln Institute will present a conference to explore the significance of brownfield reclamation within the context of overall metropolitan planning and development. This course, titled “Brownfields and Greenfields: Reconnecting the City to Its Region,” is the second Institute-sponsored course on this topic; the first was held in Cleveland in March 1996.

The Institute is also publishing a new policy focus report, titled *Risks and Rewards of Brownfield Redevelopment*, based in large part on the Cleveland course, with additional material gathered by author James G. Wright. The report is part of the curriculum for the St. Louis course and is available separately. (See order form on page 7.)

According to Wright’s report, America’s failure to recycle old industrial sites has emerged as a major concern in recent years, but the brownfield phenomenon is just gradually being well understood. “We fear these brownfields, with their specter of cancer-causing toxins and heavy-metal time bombs,” he writes, “and our fears are spelled out in strict environmental regulations designed to force anyone ever associated with the property to pay for the cleanup.” Some sites do present direct public health hazards, but in most cases the more serious threat is to the economic health of the host city due to lost jobs, abandoned industrial sites and the expansion of blighted neighborhoods.

Brownfields cannot be viewed solely as a problem for the inner cities or older suburbs in which they are located, however. Bypassing a brownfield as a site for



BEFORE THE ABANDONED BURNSIDE STEEL PLANT IN CHICAGO WAS CLEARED FOR REDEVELOPMENT, IT PRESENTED A HAZARD TO THE COMMUNITY. A RELATIVELY INEXPENSIVE CLEANUP RESTORED CONFIDENCE, AND AN ADJOINING FACTORY HAS SINCE EXPANDED ONTO THIS SITE.

MARK FARINA

BROWNFIELDS AND GREENFIELDS: RECONNECTING THE CITY TO ITS REGION

Friday, April 11, 1997
in St. Louis, Missouri

COURSE HIGHLIGHTS

- ▶ review contrasting perspectives on the significance of brownfield reclamation in the context of regional land use planning
- ▶ learn new techniques for analyzing public records on real estate transactions, demographic changes, tax values and other data to form effective brownfield strategies
- ▶ examine creative approaches used by the public and private sectors to finance brownfield cleanup and redevelopment projects
- ▶ use a case study of Chicago’s experience in linking brownfield redevelopment with ongoing industrial revitalization

Faculty:

JONATHAN BARNETT, professor of architecture and director of the Graduate Program in Urban Design at the City College of New York

THOMAS BIER, director of the Housing Policy Research Program at Levin College of Urban Affairs, Cleveland State University

DONALD IANNONE, director of the Economic Development Program and the Great Lakes Environmental Finance Center at Cleveland State University

JOHN KUHNS, assistant commissioner for industrial development in Chicago’s Department of Planning and Development

JAMES G. WRIGHT, author of *Risks and Rewards of Brownfield Redevelopment*

Call
800/LAND-USE
for a complete
course brochure
or use the
order form to
register.

economic development means abandoning extensive urban infrastructure and replicating it at great cost in a less developed suburban area. This process contributes to increased sprawl as core city areas are left vacant while jobs and people move to greenfields on the urban fringe.

Fear of liability for cleanup is seen as a major impediment to urban revitalization. Federal, state and local governments have addressed the unintended consequences of regulation, but their efforts have not prompted a renaissance in urban industrialization. Many policymakers now recognize that environmental problems are often easier to surmount than are complex social problems, local zoning laws, bureaucratic delays, the realities of the real estate market and the needs of modern manufacturing. Any efforts to recycle brownfields must take these barriers into account.

Yet there are brownfield success stories. In Chicago, a relatively inexpensive cleanup of an abandoned steel plant prompted expansion of an adjoining factory, creating 100 new jobs. In Denver, a \$20 million cleanup of a brick yard contaminated by radioactive slag and heavy metals failed to clear the way for revitalization until the Environmental Protection Agency promised not to hold a new user liable for past contamination. A major retail store now occupies the site.

Creating more success stories will take time, money and creativity. It is clear that no single solution can overcome all regulatory and economic barriers. Systemic changes, as well as a broad array of tools applied in specific cases, are required. Basic regulatory reform must start at the federal level with congressional action to amend the existing Superfund law and create permanent brownfield redevelopment strategies. Other initiatives include:

- **Financing:** The Superfund trust, which has collected about \$4 billion per year through a petroleum products tax, could be tapped to also pay for redevelopment. The Clinton administration has also proposed tax credits for brown-field cleanup, and many state and local governments are considering creative financing that would allow cleanup and redevelopment costs to be recovered through tax increment financing or special improvement districts.

Registration/Order Form

- Check here for publication order:

Risks and Rewards of Brownfield Redevelopment, by James G. Wright

Price: \$14 per copy, plus \$3.50 shipping and handling within the U.S. for one copy; \$.50 s/h for each additional copy. Call for discounts on bulk orders and for international shipping and handling costs.

- Check here for course registration:

Brownfields and Greenfields: Reconnecting the City to Its Region

April 11, 1997, Embassy Suites Hotel, St. Louis. Tuition: \$165.

Phone 800/LAND-USE (526-3873) or 617/661-3016 x126 for publications or x127 for courses

Fax 800/LAND-944 (526-3944) or 617/661-7235

Mail Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 113 Brattle Street, Cambridge, MA 02138-3400

Form of Payment (prepayment required for all publications orders):

- Check, payable in U.S. funds to Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
 Purchase Order / Warrant, with documentation attached (for course registration only)
 Credit Card: Visa MasterCard American Express

Number _____ Exp. Date _____

Cardholder Name _____

Name _____

Job Title _____

Organization _____

Street Address _____

City _____ State _____ Zip _____

Country _____

Phone _____ Fax _____

Email _____

Please fill in the above information exactly as it appears on your mailing label (on the back of this form), unless you wish to make changes or you are not yet on our mailing list. For changes, please check here , write in the correct information, and enclose the incorrect information so we can update our records. Please type or print clearly. Thank you.

- **Information:** Lack of knowledge delays redevelopment, making some projects cost-prohibitive. Simply adding environmental information about properties to geographic information systems or keeping an inventory of known or suspected brownfield sites can speed remediation and reuse.
- **Regionalization:** Few cities have the resources to address brownfield revitalization without help from surrounding communities. Various proposals involve shifting the financial burden to suburban areas, with payback in the form of decreased sprawl development in greenfields on the urban fringe.
- **Prevention:** Changes in tax laws would allow industrialists to save for future remediation costs, and emerging sustainable development strategies may reduce the amount of contamination produced in manufacturing, making brownfields a phenomenon of the past.

Much more information is needed about known and potential brownfield sites, the risks and rewards involved in recycling them, and the local and regional implications of their redevelopment. Through its research, education and publications programs, the Lincoln Institute is engaged in that process.

Course Calendar

April

11
Brownfields and Greenfields: Reconnecting the City to Its Region
St. Louis, MO

21-May 16
Program on Fiscal Decentralization and Financial Management of Regional and Local Governments
(cosponsored with Harvard University International Tax Program)
Cambridge, MA

May

9
Municipal Open Space Conservation: Preparing and Funding Successful Projects
Orlando, FL

Recent Publications

Myron Orfield, *Metropolitica: A Regional Agenda for Community and Stability*, 1997. Lincoln/Brookings Book.

Henry Diamond and Patrick Noonan, *Land Use in America*, 1996. Lincoln/Island Press Book.

Scott Faber, *On Borrowed Land: Public Policies for Floodplains*, 1996. Policy Focus Report.

Charles Fausold and Robert Lilieholm, "The Economic Value of Open Space," 1996. Working Paper.

William Fulton, *The New Urbanism: Hope or Hype for American Communities?* 1996. Policy Focus Report.

Gerrit Knaap, Lewis Hopkins and Arun Pant, "Does Transportation Planning Matter? Explorations into the Effects of Planned Transportation Infrastructure on Real Estate Sales, Land Values, Building Permits, and Development Sequence," 1996. Working Paper.

Dwight Young, *Alternatives to Sprawl*, 1995. Policy Focus Report.

For more information, call our toll-free number: 800/LAND-USE (526-3873), option 1 for courses, option 2 for publications.



Lincoln Institute of Land Policy
113 Brattle Street
Cambridge, MA 02138-3400

ADDRESS CORRECTION REQUESTED

Non-Profit Org.
U.S. Postage
PAID
Boston, MA
Permit No. 57852



The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy is a non-profit and tax-exempt educational institution established in 1974. Its mission as a school is to study and teach about land policy, including land economics and land taxation.

Integrating the theory and practice of land policy and understanding the forces that influence it are the major goals of the Institute.

The Lincoln Institute is an equal opportunity institution in employment and admissions.

Land Lines is published six times each year.
Copyright © 1997

Lincoln Institute of Land Policy, 113 Brattle Street, Cambridge, MA 02138-3400
Tel: 617/661-3016 **Fax:** 617/661-7235
Email: help@lincolninst.edu
World Wide Web: <http://www.lincolninst.edu/lincoln>

Editor

Ann LeRoyer

Director of Publications

Alice E. Ingerson

President

H. James Brown

Chairman of the Board

Kathryn J. Lincoln

Design

DG Communications

Information Graphics

Annie Bissett



PRINTED ON
RECYCLED PAPER USING
SOY-BASED INKS