

EXHIBIT B

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF MARYLAND**

CARMEN THOMPSON, *et al.*,

Plaintiffs,

v.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF
HOUSING AND URBAN
DEVELOPMENT, *et al.*,

Defendants.

Civil Action No. MJG-95-309

**DECLARATION OF DR. STEFANIE DeLUCA
IN SUPPORT OF SETTLEMENT AGREEMENT**

1. I am an Associate Professor of Sociology at the Johns Hopkins University and an Associate at the Hopkins Population Center. A significant part of my research focuses on the relationships between family dynamics, neighborhoods and housing mobility, and their implications for public policy. I hold a Ph.D. in Human Development and Social Policy from Northwestern University.

2. Based on my research studies and familiarity with the social science literature on housing opportunity, I think that the key feature of the proposed settlement—the continuation and expansion of the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program launched under the Partial Consent Decree (PCD)—will provide the opportunity for an improved quality of life and well-being for Baltimore families, as well as the potential for expanded educational opportunities for their children. Moreover, it could serve as a model for policy-makers nationwide on effective ways to overcome the harmful effects that living in high-poverty, minority-concentrated neighborhoods can have on children and adults.

3. In 2006, I submitted an expert report to assist the Court in understanding the benefits of including a residential mobility program, where poor families move to opportunity-rich communities via housing vouchers, as part of the remedy in this case. Docket No. 774. I also testified before this Court in 2006. In my expert report and testimony, I summarized social science research establishing that moving to neighborhoods with lower segregation, lower poverty, and lower crime can improve economic and other outcomes for families, over the long term.

4. Since 2006, I have continued to study the effects of residential mobility programs in Baltimore and elsewhere, and I have co-authored and published several articles on my research findings in peer-reviewed journals and made presentations to policy-makers and advocates, including staff at the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). Some of my future research involving *Thompson* families will be supported by HUD in conjunction with other research partners. I also have received research grants from entities including the Annie E. Casey Foundation, the Abell Foundation, the National Science Foundation, the William T. Grant Foundation, and the U.S. Department of Education. This research has included both quantitative and qualitative components. For example, for three summers, my students and I conducted field work with poor families in Mobile, Alabama, seeking to learn about the residential mobility decisions of poor renters, both those with Housing Choice Vouchers (also known as Section 8 vouchers) and those who are unassisted. Similarly, we have conducted 150 in-depth field interviews with Baltimore families who participated in the Moving to Opportunity (MTO) program, generally in the homes and neighborhoods in which they live, as well as another 150 interviews with the children of these families as they reach adulthood.

5. I am very familiar with the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program that was established under the PCD. Since its inception, I have received and analyzed administrative data from the Program. During the summer of 2012, my students and I have conducted more than 100 in-depth interviews with participants and applicants in their homes. We have also observed workshops and voucher briefings in the offices of Metropolitan Baltimore Quadel and interviewed its staff.

6. My preliminary research findings regarding families who participate in the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program provide powerful support for the continuation of this Program through the proposed Settlement. Early results from my research show that *Thompson* families have moved to neighborhoods that are dramatically different from the neighborhoods where they previously lived and where most very low-income African-American families in the Baltimore Region live: their new neighborhoods are characterized by lower poverty and higher employment, educational attainment, and household income. These demographic markers are significant because they are associated with increased economic and educational opportunity for families. Thus, one way to measure the dramatic impact of a *Thompson* Voucher on family opportunity is to compare the neighborhood from which the family came to the neighborhood to which it moved.

7. We looked at data from 1,830 families who moved between 2002 and 2010 through the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program.¹ These families came from communities where on average 30.2% of their neighbors were living below the poverty level and 16% were

¹ Stefanie DeLuca and Peter Rosenblatt, *Increasing Access to High Performing Schools in an Assisted Housing Voucher Program*, in *Finding Common Ground: Coordinating Housing and Education Policy to Promote Integration* (2011).

unemployed. Just 13.3% of the baseline neighborhood population held a bachelor's degree, and the median household income was \$30,676, compared to 31.1% and \$65,005 for the Baltimore Region as a whole. Finally, the baseline neighborhoods had a high concentration (80.2%) of African-American residents.

8. The neighborhoods to which *Thompson* families moved look very different. These neighborhoods have lower poverty (12.3%) and lower unemployment (6.2%), with rates similar to the Baltimore Region averages. They also have a higher concentration of bachelor's degrees (37.9%), and a median household income of \$65,584, more than twice the average income in the baseline neighborhoods. The current neighborhoods (as measured between one and nine years after moving, depending on when families signed up for the program) are less segregated, with an average population that is 66.9% white and 25% African-American, compared to 17.14% white and 80.2% African-American in the baseline neighborhoods.

9. Equally dramatic are the changes in educational opportunity available to *Thompson* families in their new neighborhoods. In their neighborhoods of origin, children of *Thompson* families attended schools where less than half the students were proficient or better in math, and just over half were proficient or better in reading. Those numbers jump to 68.9% proficient in math and 76% proficient in reading at the local schools in the families' new neighborhoods. The caliber of teachers also improved, with just 36.4% of classes in the schools of origin taught by qualified teachers compared to 74.8% in the new schools. Not surprisingly, the old schools also had a high poverty rate, with 82.7% of students eligible for free or reduced-price lunch. That rate is 50% lower in the new schools attended by *Thompson* children.

10. In addition to increased educational opportunity, *Thompson* families report positive interactions in their new neighborhoods and schools. The following case studies

illustrate key benefits of *Thompson*. Names have been altered to protect the confidentiality of research interviewees.

a. “Shelly” is a 33-year-old resident of Towson who has four kids between the ages of 5 and 18. As a result of her *Thompson* voucher, she has been living in Towson for about five years. She feels her current neighborhood is vastly different from the dangerous places she lived as a child. She remembers that her mother kept her and her siblings inside the house to keep them safe from violence and the drug trade. Shelly loves the quiet atmosphere and the helpful and friendly neighbors in her current neighborhood. Shelly’s family has become highly integrated into their new community: at first, she had a hard time letting her kids outside to play, but as she has grown to know and like the neighbors, she has become comfortable allowing her children to play outside. Initially Shelly was worried about being the only black family on the block. Yet now, she has developed close friendships with some of her neighbors, including a white woman, who she refers to as her “sister,” who lives next door. Neighbors in her current neighborhood help each other: during a power outage, amidst very hot summer weather, a nearby family with a power generator invited Shelly and her children to spend time in their cool air-conditioned living room. She says that the neighbors also watch out for her kids. Shelly now feels comfortable allowing her children to walk to Towson Mall; her kids love to play outside in their yards. Shelly also feels that the schools in Towson are positively affecting her children.

b. During interviews, young people shared their own positive feelings about school and neighborhood changes resulting from *Thompson* moves. For example, “Kieondra,” an 11-year-old girl about to start 6th grade, described being “terrified” of the neighborhood where she lived and went to school prior to her family joining the *Thompson* program. She described hearing gun shots as a young child. By contrast, she describes her current neighborhood in Anne Arundel County as “quiet and peaceful”; she says it’s a place she feels safe. Kieondra loves talking about her school in Anne Arundel County, where she has lived for the last five years; she says she met tons of new friends when she moved to the county for first grade. She has loved her elementary school. She was proud to show off her school work and happily described all of the parks and places she goes with friends in her new neighborhood. She says quite simply that she loves everything that her community in Anne Arundel County has to offer and has cut ties with negative influences from her old neighborhood in the city. Kieondra has also really liked meeting people of “different races and nationalities” at her schools in the County. She also has started to learn to play the violin and trumpet thanks to a music program at her elementary school. Kieondra explains that people in her new community help each other; for example, she described helping neighbors carry heavy grocery bags.

c. “Whitney” is a 41-year-old mother of six children between the ages of 5 and 18. She moved to Carroll County about two years ago and is incredibly happy with the neighborhood and the opportunities it provides for her children. She lives in a picture-perfect home with freshly painted walls in soft colors, large windows with light,

big family areas, and a sprawling green backyard with a play structure on it. She feels that her children's teachers are highly committed; moreover, the teachers involve her in her children's education by communicating with her daily, and by providing homework which she works on with her kids. Whitney's 10-year-old son, who was deemed to have special learning needs and who had suffered lead poisoning as a young child, has particularly thrived with the extra support given to him by the Carroll County schools. Whitney was frustrated with the city school that her child attended prior to the family's move because she felt that administrators wanted to unnecessarily hold him back a grade: Whitney saw his strengths and abilities at home and wondered why his teachers didn't see the same at school. His Carroll County school gave him extra support, and soon after moving he started receiving high grades. He is doing so well now that the school is even suggesting that he no longer needs an IEP (individual education plan).

d. Whitney's older son (18 years old, now living on his own) frequently tells her how happy he is that she is now doing so well. *Thompson* has given Whitney the financial support to stay in a beautiful house, with ample space for her children to play. Previously, it was always a struggle to make ends meet and find a safe place for her family to live; as a result she had to move her family frequently. She says that she's "the most stable she's ever been" as a result of *Thompson*.

e. Whitney is well integrated into her neighborhood and describes close relationships with the other families who live on her block. When she first moved in, each family came to her house one by one to introduce themselves and welcome them to the street. The mothers on her block all watch out for each other's children; the children play freely outside and the mothers talk to each other daily and wave at each other from lawn chairs set up in front yards. Whitney is thrilled that her children have places to play and that they have developed close friendships with the neighbor children.

11. Based on my research regarding families who have participated in both the regular Housing Choice Voucher program and in residential mobility programs, it is my view that the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program, which was launched under the *Thompson* PCD and will be continued under the proposed Settlement Agreement, is well-designed to help families who choose to participate access opportunity and improve their lives.

12. First, the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program includes extensive counseling and housing search assistance to identify units in communities of opportunity and to explain the benefits of living in those communities. This support is critical. Research with families who move with traditional Housing Choice Vouchers demonstrates that, without such assistance,

families often lack information about both available housing in communities of opportunity and face a variety of constraints in accessing housing in those communities. Having never experienced living in those communities, they also lack concrete information about the differences in school quality, safety, economic opportunity, and health risks.

13. Second, because the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program is regionally rather than jurisdictionally administered, it allows families to move freely within the Baltimore Region. This feature removes the artificial constraint of jurisdictional boundaries, and the administrative burden of applying for a voucher transfer, that limit mobility for families in traditional voucher programs.

14. Third, the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program allows families longer search time to find and secure appropriate housing units. Short search times, common in the traditional Housing Choice Voucher program, can lead families to make panicked decisions about housing, such as choosing the first available unit, which may not be adequate to meet the family's needs, for fear of losing the voucher.

15. Finally, the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program provides locationally targeted vouchers to be used in communities of opportunity. It is my understanding that the settlement will refine the locational targeting by using the multi-factor process for identifying communities of opportunity identified by the Kirwan Institute. In contrast, experience with Section 8 families shows that recipients of traditional Housing Choice Vouchers remain concentrated in high poverty, segregated neighborhoods and do not access economic or educational opportunity.² We

² Stefanie DeLuca, Philip M.E. Garboden, and Peter Rosenblatt, *Why Don't Vouchers Do a Better Job of Deconcentrating Poverty? Insights from Fieldwork with Poor Families*, Poverty & Race Research Action Council, 21(5): 1 (2012). See also Kathryn Edin, Stefanie DeLuca, and Ann Owens, *Constrained Compliance: Solving the Puzzle of MTO's Lease-Up Rates and Why*

know from interviews with recipients of vouchers under residential mobility programs launched under *Hill v. Gautreaux*, 425 U.S. 284 (1976) and the federally sponsored MTO program that families express a preference to live in a community of opportunity once they have experienced it firsthand.³

16. The benefits of the *Thompson* mobility program are consistent with findings from other mobility programs,⁴ as well as my own research following families who participated in the residential mobility program launched under *Gautreaux*. Those studies demonstrate that mobility vouchers improve locational outcomes for many families over the long term.

17. Recent research following the *Gautreaux* families, who received vouchers enabling them to move from public housing in Chicago to privately owned homes in majority white communities, provides a powerful example. More than 3,500 *Gautreaux* families moved to communities of opportunity in the Chicago suburbs between 1976 and 1998. These communities were less segregated, safer, and more affluent than the communities from which the families relocated. While critics assumed that many families would choose to return to their home neighborhoods after their initial move, we found that a majority (57%) still lived in the Chicago suburbs an average of fifteen years later and less than 30% returned to the city.⁵ The families' current neighborhoods were comparable to those in which they had initially been placed, and differed from their neighborhoods of origin in that they had lower poverty, lower

Mobility Matters, *Cityscape: A Journal of Policy Development and Research* 14(2): 181-194 (2012).

³ Edin et al., *Constrained Compliance* (2012).

⁴ *Id.*

⁵ Stefanie DeLuca and James E. Rosenbaum, *If Low-Income Blacks Are Given a Chance to Live in White Neighborhoods, Will They Stay? Examining Mobility Patterns in a Quasi-Experimental Program with Administrative Data*, *Housing Policy Debate* 14: 305-346 (2003).

crime, higher mean family income, and lower concentrations of African-American residents. We also found that *Gautreaux* mothers who moved to areas that had a relatively low concentration of African-American residents and were more affluent achieved economic self-sufficiency. In particular, they spent more time employed and less time receiving public assistance. Docket No. 774 (Testimony of Stefanie DeLuca) at 12.

18. In addition to these quantitative measures of success, *Gautreaux* mothers reported qualitative improvements in their sense of control over their lives. For example, navigating the transition to suburban living and learning to interact with neighbors of other backgrounds and races allowed some women to realize they could successfully tackle other life changes, such as returning to school, as well.⁶ For these women, a major change in environment also brought about a change in life outlook and increased their social capabilities.

19. Emerging evidence from our current research following *Thompson* families suggests that the Baltimore Housing Mobility Program has worked a similar change in outlook, increasing families' expectations about what is possible for them. The following cases are illustrative.

a. The *Thompson* program has provided "Mary's" family with access to Columbia's high quality schools; the program has also allowed Mary, who is 41 years old, to establish financial and residential stability. Mary is now buying a home with the help of the *Thompson* home buyers program; she expects her sons to graduate from Columbia schools and to stay on the school honor roll. Mary's trajectory is striking: she lived in a shelter prior to joining the *Thompson* program. She chose Columbia for her family because of its schools: she had researched online and found that Columbia students boasted the highest MSA scores. Within a year of moving with the help of *Thompson*, she acquired a stable job in the pharmaceutical industry near her home (after leaving her previous job). Hard work, financial planning, and the financial assistance

⁶ James E. Rosenbaum and Stefanie DeLuca, *What Kinds of Neighborhoods Change Lives? The Chicago Gautreaux Housing Program and Recent Mobility Programs*, *Indiana Law Review* 41: 653-662 (2008).

from a *Thompson* voucher has enabled Mary to save money. Mary is actively working on purchasing her own home.

b. Her sons are thriving and her 12-year-old has received special commendations for attaining one of the highest scores on the MSA math test in Howard County. Mary also maintains heightened expectations of her children's school. Upon enrolling her sons in Howard County schools, Mary was impressed by its resources. Her son's prior city schools "didn't have the books or the supplies to provide for the kids." By contrast, she feels her sons now "have all the equipment that they need," including fully-equipped science labs.

c. "Brittney" (32 years old) feels that *Thompson* is enabling her to live in a way that allows her high-school and middle-school aged sons to have the childhood she never had. *Thompson* has enabled her to find stability and envision an entirely different future for her sons than what she has known before. Brittney was forced into risky activities—including selling drugs—in order to survive and support her younger siblings at age 12 when her father died and her mother became addicted to drugs. Soon after, she found herself in an abusive relationship with her children's father. Through the *Thompson* voucher program, she first lived in Baltimore County and then she moved two years ago to Columbia. Though she has only been in her current neighborhood for two years, her sons have forged friendships with neighborhood children. For Brittney, the *Thompson* program has allowed her to be around and appreciate "different cultures." Having lived in Baltimore County and Howard County, her sons now also appreciate this too; they see themselves living in places with racial and ethnic diversity (especially her younger son) even as they go off on their own in the future. Racial diversity is now something they value and expect. Brittney is now taking college classes online through the University of Arizona and pursuing a degree in accounting.

20. Recent studies from the MTO program have also shown that moves to lower poverty neighborhoods can improve physical health and emotional well-being. Researchers who looked at families roughly a decade after they moved through the MTO program found that those families enjoyed significantly better health outcomes.⁷ Specifically, MTO families had lower rates of obesity and diabetes than their counterparts who did not move.⁸ Other studies have

⁷ Lisa Sanbonmatsu et al., *Impacts of the Moving to Opportunity for Fair Housing Demonstration Program after 10 to 15 Years* (2011).

⁸ Jens Ludwig et al., *Neighborhoods, Obesity and Diabetes – A Randomized Social Experiment*, *New England Journal of Medicine* 365: 1509-1519 (2011).

shown lower rates of depression.⁹ More generally, researchers have found a striking increase in self-reported well-being among families that moved, equivalent to earning an additional \$13,000 per year.¹⁰

21. Studies of the MTO program have also shown that moving to low-poverty neighborhoods reduces exposures to numerous stressors endemic to high-poverty neighborhoods. This reduction in stress can lead to important mental health benefits. In particular, during qualitative interviews, MTO experimental movers have reported greater feelings of satisfaction with the neighborhood and home aesthetics of their new environments. MTO experimental movers also report gains related to the social fabric of their neighborhoods. They find new sources of “collective efficacy” and neighborhood social cohesion—situations in which neighbors look out for and help one another. Importantly, experimental movers find themselves feeling safer and less exposed to violence and crime. Movers even feel a greater sense of personal pride and self-efficacy; respondents express a desire to “improve themselves” in part because they are surrounded by neighbors doing “positive things.” Overall, they report a sense of satisfaction and enhanced quality of life. As compared to their previous neighborhoods, respondents feel that their new environments are safer and better for raising children.¹¹

22. In sum, I support the proposed Settlement because it will continue a program that is enabling families who want to change their lives to access an improved quality of life and expanded opportunity. I look forward to continuing to follow these families and to evaluating

⁹ Jens Ludwig et al., *Neighborhood Effects on the Long-Term Well-Being of Low-Income Adults*, *Science* 337 (6101): 1505-1510 (2012).

¹⁰ *Id.*

¹¹ Kristin Turney et al., *After Moving to Opportunity: How Moving to a Low-Poverty Neighborhood Improves Mental Health among African-American Women* (2012).

the long-term impact of moving to opportunity on their lives and well-being.

I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Stefanie DeLuca', written over a horizontal line.

Dated: November 16, 2012
Baltimore, Maryland

Stefanie DeLuca, Ph.D.