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Welcome to the second issue of our semi-annual newsletter. Our regular director, Hal Wolman, is on sabbatical this year, so I am acting as Director until his return.

The George Washington Institute of Public Policy – or GWIPP, rhymes with whip – carries out and facilitates public policy research at GW. The GWIPP faculty engage in both basic and applied public policy research of a wide topical and geographical scope. Contained within GWIPP is the Center for Washington Area Studies (CWAS) which, as the name implies, focuses on issues pertinent to the Washington area. Also contained within GWIPP is the State and Local Fiscal Policy Research Program, which helps GWIPP leverage our high level of expertise in state and local fiscal policy.

GWIPP is perhaps best known on the GW campus for our efforts to assist GW faculty in developing grant proposals to carry out policy research. We provide a range of research support services including the Policy Research Scholar program (p. 8). For more details on what GWIPP does and what GWIPP can do for you, see page 2.

Here at GWIPP it has been a busy half year. We just selected an excellent new crop of Policy Research Scholars (p. 8). In April we teamed with GW’s School of Public Policy and Public Administration, the Brookings Institution, and the Urban Institute to host a conference on Urban and Regional Policy (p. 7). Richard K. Green, the Oliver T. Carr, Jr. Professor of Real Estate Finance just took the helm of the Center for Washington Area Studies (p. 11). Julia Friedman, longtime Deputy Chief Financial Officer for the District of Columbia, recently joined our team of research professors.

Likewise our many projects are proceeding smoothly. Highlighted in this issue is a comparative case study of three urban bicycling systems (p. 4). This project is funded by the Active Living Research division of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation. Also highlighted is the project “What Happens after Manufacturing Jobs Disappear? Non-manufacturing Alternatives for Industrial Regions,” funded by the Sloan Foundation (p.3).

Starting with this issue we will profile a GW faculty member who has served as a Policy Research Scholar. There is no better person to kick off the series than Charis Kubrin, Associate Professor of Sociology and our first two-time Policy Research Scholar designee.

I invite you to read the newsletter and contact us with any questions, comments, or research ideas.

For more information on GWIPP please visit us online:

Events http://www.gwu.edu/~gwipp/events.htm
Publications http://www.gwu.edu/~gwipp/pubs.htm
Research http://www.gwu.edu/~gwipp/research.htm
Research Scholars http://www.gwu.edu/~gwipp/prs.htm
Research Services http://www.gwu.edu/~gwipp/grs.htm
Staff http://www.gwu.edu/~gwipp/staff.htm
External Funding Partners

GWIPP can call upon the skills of the full range of University faculty, as well as the talents of GW's graduate students serving as research assistants, to carry out research projects. Many GWIPP researchers have extensive experience in the academic, government, and nonprofit areas, and are well-suited to bring the strengths of each area to each project. GWIPP researchers have published extensively in their fields of expertise. Students — who themselves may have notable experience in policy research - are eager to learn from their academic mentors and often bring a fresh perspective to research projects.

GW Faculty

GWIPP provides a variety of useful resources for GW faculty interested in pursuing public policy research. We offer:

- The Policy Research Scholar program (for more detail see page 8), which offers targeted assistance for faculty members pursuing policy research;
- Help with putting together research teams by identifying and recruiting other faculty with similar interests or skills useful to the project;
- Help with transforming an area of research interest into a viable research concept;
- Assistance in identifying potential external funding sources that may be interested in that research concept, many of which already have a funding relationship with GWIPP;
- Help with constructing funding proposals, developing budgets, navigating the human subjects (IRB) process, and submitting the proposals;
- Help administering and managing grants once awarded.

GW Graduate Students

GWIPP hires many graduate students from across campus each year as research assistants on public policy research projects. Many employers look for graduates who have experience with funded or client-centered research. Students benefit from working closely with policy researchers on a wide range of current policy issues, learning firsthand how to design and implement research projects, and then conveying findings to a target audience. Some projects provide an opportunity to present research at conferences, submit articles for publication in academic journals, and can also provide useful background research for the student’s own research interests, including dissertation work.

Consult the GWIPP website (www.gwu.edu/~gwipp) for more information about the type of projects in which GWIPP is engaged. Contact Garry Young (YoungG@gwu.edu) if you are interested in research assistant opportunities with GWIPP.
The continued loss of manufacturing jobs in the U.S. is a well-known and well-studied phenomenon that continues to be a concern to business, labor, elected officials and policymakers at all levels of government, and researchers. Yet we know relatively little about what happens in places that have lost manufacturing jobs. Have other jobs filled the vacuum, or is there a net loss of employment? If other jobs have replaced manufacturing jobs, what sectors have they been in, and how do wages in sectors that have gained jobs compare to wages in the manufacturing sectors where jobs have been lost? What steps have the public sector, business and other sectors taken to change the industry, technological, and/or product mix of the metropolitan area economy, and how effective have those steps been?

The project is an 18-month research effort funded by the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation to examine what has happened in currently or formerly manufacturing-dependent regions that lost a significant portion of manufacturing jobs between 1990 and 2005. Specifically, we are interested in whether new jobs have been created to replace lost manufacturing jobs, the nature and type of the new employment that has been created, and whether public policies and public-private strategies have influenced industrial transitions in these regions.

The project involves both quantitative and qualitative analysis. The quantitative portion of the project will use Bureau of Labor Statistics data to identify what kinds of non-manufacturing jobs have replaced lost manufacturing jobs, what industries new jobs are created in and how wages in these new industries compare to wages in the manufacturing sector. It will describe the patterns of manufacturing job loss and non-manufacturing job gain (or, in a few cases, loss) that occurred in these areas.

The qualitative portion of the project will involve case study research, including site visits, of eight metropolitan areas. The goal of the qualitative portion of the project is to identify the steps government, business, and other private sector actors have taken to change the industry, product, technological, and/or skill mix of the metropolitan area economy, and how effective those steps have been. Site visits will allow the study team to interview local leaders of public and private sector institutions, universities, research organizations, community organizations, unions, newspapers and other relevant organizations. Additional research will then examine various policies...Continued on p.12
Bicycling Politics and Policy in Three Washington, DC Area Counties

Policies related to bicycling sit at the nexus of many of the most crucial issues that urban areas face. These include transportation, urban planning and design, the environment, health, parks and recreation, and even crime (with the increasing popularity of bike-mounted police patrols). The quality of bicycling facilities varies dramatically from community to community in the United States.

The Active Living Research division of the Robert Wood Johnson Foundation funded Royce Hanson and Garry Young to study how and why biking facilities differ in three neighboring urban counties: Arlington and Fairfax, in Virginia, and Montgomery, in Maryland. Arlington features one of the best overall biking systems on the nation’s East Coast with a comprehensive, well-connected, highly integrated, well-mapped and signed system of shared-use paved trails, bike lanes, bike routes, and other biking assets such as workplace showers for biking commuters. While there are signs of change, the overall biking system in Fairfax County is sporadic and lacks connectivity. There are few bike lanes or roads otherwise designed for safe biking. Fairfax has a limited bike route system and lacks a comprehensive bikeways map. Across the Potomac, Montgomery County, Maryland also has developed an elaborate bikeway system, though without Arlington’s level of connectivity and integration. Because these three jurisdictions have many common attributes—a well-educated and affluent population, progressive governments, strong public finances, and an active and engaged citizenry, they provided an excellent opportunity to explore why a change in local transportation policy received such different responses.

To carry out their comparative case studies GWIPP researchers analyzed plans, regulations, budgets, administrative memoranda, maps, design and engineering specifications, photographs, and other documentary materials. They interviewed a very wide range of people who were involved in the development and implementation of biking policies, including public officials and citizen activists, to provide information about the political process and insight into the factors that produced particular outcomes.

A few of the study’s general conclusions or lessons regarding biking policy and politics include: 1. Leadership: Grassroots pressure or interest group politics fails to explain why biking systems vary so much across the counties. County leadership committed to biking as a...Continued on p.12
The following is a sampling of ongoing research projects at GWIPP. GWIPP Research covers topics such as Economic Policy Studies, Homeland Security, Land Use, Planning and Growth Management, Policy Research Methods, Social Policy, State and Local Fiscal Policy, Urban Policy, and Washington Area Studies. For a complete set of GWIPP research projects please visit the GWIPP website http://www.gwu.edu/~gwipp/research.htm.

PROJECT: The Property Tax in Fifty States: Property Tax Policy Roundtable; and Data Compendium
INVESTIGATORS (Property Tax Policy Roundtable): Michael Bell, David Brunori, Joe Cordes, Richard Green, Hal Wolman, and Garry Young (GWIPP)
(Data Compendium): Pat Atkins, Nancy Y. Augustine, Lori Metcalf, Charlotte Kirschner, Manish Kumar, and Bing Yuan (GWIPP)
FUNDER: Lincoln Institute of Land Policy

This two-part project is a collaborative multi-year undertaking by Lincoln and GWIPP to promote research in the areas of property tax policy and administration. As a follow-up to the 2005-06 pilot project, a data collection team is compiling and classifying a wide range of material that characterizes property tax structures and processes in all fifty states to produce a "Data Compendium of State Property Tax." The compendium will be available as a data set, and researchers will be able to perform simple queries through an interactive web site. Key results will be presented in a series of tables, patterned after the biennial Significant Features of Fiscal Federalism, produced by the Advisory Commission on Intergovernmental Relations (ACIR) through 1994. Plans are being made to update the compendium annually. The second part of the research effort entails several research projects, culminating in a roundtable scheduled for October, 2007. See page 4 for details.

PROJECT: TANF-SSI Interface Project
INVESTIGATOR: Michael L. Wiseman and Katrina Connolly (GWIPP)
FUNDER: Administration for Children and Families

Researching the interaction between two means-tested cash assistance programs, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) and Supplemental Security Income (SSI), at the individual, state and federal levels is the focus of this project. Poor individuals with some level of disability often receive TANF while applying for SSI. TANF federal work requirements conflict with SSI federal requirements for proof of inability to work, which places individuals and states in difficult positions. We are developing a joint proposal for the Office of Family Assistance (administers TANF) and the Office of Disability and Income Security Programs (administers SSI) to improve the TANF-SSI interface.

PROJECT: Local School Referendums: Their Determinants and Impact on Property Values
INVESTIGATORS: Garry Young, Richard Green, David Brunori, Pam Blumenthal (GWIPP)
FUNDER: National Center for Real Estate Research

A critical component to education finance in the United States is the requirement that school-related financial arrangements must receive direct voter approval in most school districts. The referendum requirement applies most commonly to the sale of bonds for capital improvements, but extends well beyond bond issues. The results of school referendums potentially have major consequences for house values in school districts, because both taxes and school quality are capitalized to a substantial extent into property values. Yet, we have very little concrete knowledge about school referendums and their various effects. This project is directed towards answering a range of key questions related to school referendums and to the effect of referendum passage and failure on property values.
A transatlantic team headed by Clarence Stone, Research Professor, GWIPP; and co-directed by Hal Wolman, Director, GWIPP, and Niels Ejersbo, the University of Southern Denmark, held a workshop at the Bellagio Research and Study Center in Italy in November of 2006. The purpose of the workshop was to design a comparative analysis of policy interventions for the transformation of urban neighborhoods. The conference is to be followed by a study spanning eighteen cities across eleven countries. The aim of the project is to advance our understanding of how neighborhood transformation initiatives actually work in practice, with particular attention to the mix of government-sector and civil-society arrangements and how they vary in form, scope, and degree of calibration.

Employing a comparative case-study approach, the study is to extend over a period of three years, two years for field research and a third year for the comparative analysis. Interim meetings and reports are to take place along the way. A sub-group met in Seattle at the April 2007 UAA conference, with a similar session to follow at the APSA conference in Chicago at the end of the summer. An initial set of reports is planned for the meeting of the European Consortium for Political Research, scheduled for Pisa, Italy, in September, 2007.

The Bellagio Study and Conference Center is owned and operated by the Rockefeller Foundation. The Center is located on scenic Lake Como, and hosts workshops and small conferences, as well as month-long residences for individual scholars and artists. Located in the small town of Bellagio, the Center is noted for its isolation from the hustle (and hassles) of modern life. Accommodations lack television, but the Center is connected to the wider world by telephone, the internet, and a winding road (not a special delight for those with a tendency toward motion sickness).

Participants in the project, in addition to Stone, Wolman, and Ejersbo include: Mehdi Allal, the Sorbonne; Sophie Body-Gendrot, the Sorbonne; Michèle Breuillard, the University of Lille; Susan Clarke, University of Colorado; Bas Denters, University of Twente; Masa Djordjevic, Open Society Institute in Budapest; Magda Gorczynska, University of Warsaw; Martin Horak, University of Western Ontario; Peter John, University of Manchester; Pieter Jan Klok, University of Twente; Tomas Kostelecky, Institute of Sociology, Czech Academy of Science; Daniel Kübler, University of Zurich; Tamila Lankina, De Montfort University; Vivien Lowndes, De Montfort University; Karen Møssberger, University of Illinois at Chicago; Jeffrey Sellers, University of Southern California; Robert Stoker, George Washington University; James Svara, Arizona State University; Pawel Swianiewicz, University of Warsaw; Pieter Tops, University of Tilburg; Julien Van Ostaijen, University of Tilburg; Melanie Walter-Rogg, University of Stuttgart.
Urban and Regional Policy and Its Effects

The Brookings Institution, GWIPP, the GWU School of Public Policy and Public Administration, and the Urban Institute sponsored a joint conference on Urban and Regional Policy and Its Effects in Washington, DC on March 29-30, 2007. Papers were commissioned for the conference and will be published as a book by the Brookings Institution Press. The conference is expected to be the first in a series of annual or biennial conferences and publications similar in spirit to the Brookings-Wharton conference and Brookings-Wharton Papers on Urban Affairs. The Urban and Regional Policy and Its Effects conference focuses more directly on policy and is aimed at a wider audience than the Brookings-Wharton series.

Each conference and book volume will commission papers analyzing responses to six key policy challenges or goals that most local communities face: (1) growing a competitive economy through industry-based strategies, (2) building human capital, (3) creating quality neighborhoods for families, (4) growing the middle-class, (5) managing the spatial pattern of metropolitan growth and development, and (6) governing effectively with the goal of informing scholars and practitioners about the state of knowledge related to the effectiveness of select policy approaches, reforms or experiments on key social and economic problems facing cities, suburbs, and metropolitan areas. The second conference in this series is scheduled for June, 2008.

Property Tax Roundtable

The Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and GWIPP will co-sponsor a Property Tax Policy Roundtable on Friday, October 5- Saturday, October 6, 2007 in Washington, DC. Invited participants will prepare and present research papers. The Roundtable is intended to produce a series of papers that help inform the discussion of major property tax policy issues in the United States.

The general theme for this year’s Roundtable is “Erosion of the Local Property Tax Base: Trend, Causes, and Consequences.” Increased reliance on residential property to generate tax revenue, coupled with soaring property values in many parts of the country in the last decade, have placed pressure on local officials to respond to concerns about higher property taxes. The result has been erosion of the property tax base through a variety of devices designed to relieve residential property tax burdens (e.g., tax and expenditure limitations and circuit breakers) and to accomplish other social and economic purposes through property tax exemptions or abatements (e.g., local economic development incentives). The papers/chapters will provide

...Continued on p.12
Program Description

The Policy Research Scholar program is a critical part of GWIPP’s effort to encourage and facilitate public policy research at George Washington University. In an annual competition GW faculty submit proposals for policy-based research they hope to develop. Those selected are given the title of Policy Research Scholar and serve in that capacity for a one year period. Each Scholar is required to develop their project during the year and submit a proposal for external funding. GWIPP provides each Scholar with a variety of resources. These include $8,000 for summer stipend or course releases. Additionally the GWIPP staff help the Scholars find identify potential funders, develop the proposals, construct budgets, navigate the human subjects review process, submit proposals, and administer the grants once funded.

Scholars have come from many departments within the Columbian College of Arts and Sciences and from all the campus Schools, Medicine excepted. They have worked on a wide range of policy-related projects, producing an exceptional body of research.

2007-2008 Cohort

The eight Policy Research Scholars who commence their term in Fall 2007 constitute the seventh cohort of Policy Research Scholars. The scholars making up the cohort are:

Maggie Xiaoyang Chen, Assistant Professor of Economics and International Affairs
Ana Fostel, Assistant Professor of Economics
Joel Kuipers, Professor of Anthropology & International Affairs and Human Sciences
Frederic Lemieux, Associate Professor and Director of Police Science
Kristin Lord, Associate Dean for Strategy, Research, & External Relations (ESIA)
Holger Schmidt, Instructor in International Affairs and Political Science
Ronald Weitzer, Professor of Sociology
Alyssa Zucker, Assistant Professor of Psychology and of Women’s Studies

For more information about GWIPP’s Policy Research Scholar program, consult the GWIPP website (www.gwu.edu/~gwipp) or contact Garry Young at YoungG@gwu.edu or 202-994-6494.
Charis Kubrin: The Second Time Around

Associate Professor of Sociology, Charis Kubrin, is the first two-time designee in GWIPP’s Policy Research Scholar program (PRS) and praises the program: “the support that I received from GWIPP was absolutely instrumental to the success of my research projects.” A member of the faculty at George Washington University for seven years and recently elected President of the District of Columbia Sociological Society, Kubrin was selected as a Policy Research Scholar in 2002 and 2006. GWIPP sponsors this program to facilitate public policy research throughout the university. In an annual competition, several GW faculty are awarded $8,000 for summer stipend and/or course release, as well as staff assistance to identify additional funding, submit grant proposals and administer the projects once funded. Kubrin comments, “the program infrastructure really works. In fact, I have every intention of applying again in the future.”

In 2006, Kubrin received support for her project, “Explaining Suicide in the U.S.: Incorporating Firearm Availability in Macro-Level Research.” In partnership with Tim Wadsworth from the University of New Mexico, Kubrin examines gun availability over a ten year period to help understand patterns of suicide at the city level. They argue that “firearms are likely a key component of the spatial, temporal, and demographic patterning of suicide, and that directly incorporating firearm availability into causal models may provide greater insight into patterns of U.S. suicide rates.” In the end, Kubrin intends the project to inform public policy regarding gun control and suicide prevention. The PRS scholarship awarded her a stipend for the summer of 2006, which allowed her to develop grant proposals. The project has already received a grant of $25,000 from the Joyce Foundation and she is seeking additional funding from the American Foundation for Suicide Prevention and the Harry Frank Guggenheim Foundation.

Kubrin’s project from 2002, “Predicting Who Re-offends: The Neglected Role of Neighborhood Context in Recidivism Studies,” won her first Policy Research Scholarship from GWIPP. This study examined the role of neighborhood socioeconomic status in causing ex-offenders to recidivate, controlling for individual-level characteristics like race and gender. Kubrin and colleague Eric A. Stewart of the University of Missouri, St. Louis, found that prisoners returning to economically disadvantaged neighborhoods recidivate at a greater rate than those who return to more affluent neighborhoods. She believes that “the PRS’s programs financial support allowed me the time necessary gather and clean the data, and the administrative support to find the big money necessary to complete the project.” Funding for the full study was provided by the Smith Richardson Foundation, the National Consortium for Violence Research, and the American Sociological Association/ National Science Foundation.

As the only two-time awardee of the program, Kubrin offers special insight into its merits, “Literally from cradle to grave on my projects, GWIPP staff has been incredible; in fact, in both cases they have alerted me to funding sources that I would have otherwise missed.”

In Kubrin’s most recent work, she has examined the intersection of music, culture and social identity, particularly as it applies to rap music and minority youth in disadvantaged communities. She is also co-editor of Crime and Society: Crime, 3rd Edition (2007) and co-author of Privileged Places: Race, Residence and the Structure of Opportunity (2006). In April of this year, she will spend three months as a visiting fellow at the Centre for Criminology at Oxford University.
Dylan Conger, a 2006-2007 George Washington Institute of Public Policy Scholar and Assistant Professor in the School of Public Policy and Public Administration, was selected for the Changing Faces of America’s Children—Young Scholars Program by the Foundation for Child Development. The Foundation for Child Development (www.fcd-us.org) is a national private philanthropy dedicated to promoting the well-being of children. Conger's proposal, entitled “Time to English Proficiency among Young English Learners,” investigates how long it takes students to become English proficient and how the time to proficiency varies according to students’ background characteristics (e.g. country of origin), the grade at which they enter school, and the type of English instruction they receive. The Foundation will support Conger's work over the next two and one-half years.

Greg Squires, Professor of Sociology and a former GWIPP Policy Research Scholar, was recently elected to the Governing Board of the Urban Affairs Association for a three-year term beginning 2007.

Recent Research Scholars in Print


Quickly into a conversation with Richard K. Green, the new director of the Center for Washington Area Studies (CWAS), you are impressed with his passion for his interests, interests that roam through local political happenings and his economic research. Talk with him about his background, and you find that his credentials as a community advocate are bona fide by virtue of his NYC-born progressive roots. Like his accent, you find he moves between two worlds: his formative years as a Midwesterner in LaCrosse, Wisconsin, and his very early years in NYC. He locates the middle ground between the two by disavowing his connection to the generic Midwest in favor of the unique political climate of Wisconsin. “I consider myself from Wisconsin,” he says. “Wisconsin has a tradition of progressivism that I identify with. It is a tradition that resonates with me.”

The University of Wisconsin has the Wisconsin Idea, as he describes it, a belief held within the university community that the boundary of the campus is the boundary of the state, and a belief that he is, in a word, passionate about. For twelve years, as professor of Real Estate and Urban Land Economics at the University of Wisconsin-Madison, he was able to practice this belief. “Faculty there were expected to engage in community service,” he explains.

While in Madison, he practiced this community service. During his years there, he was on the Board of Directors of the Dane County Natural Heritage Foundation and was the chair of the Wisconsin Housing Policy Task Force. He was also a member of the Dane County Task Force on Redevelopment, the City of Madison Fiscal Review Task Force, the City of Madison Plan Commission, the Governor’s Task Force on the Credit Crunch, the Madison Mutual Housing Authority Financial Review Task Force, the Secretary of Administration’s Task Force on “Reinventing Wisconsin Government,” the Midwest Economy Advisory Roundtable for the Federal Reserve Bank of Chicago, the Madison CDBG Commission, and the Wisconsin Real Estate Curriculum Council.

“The position at CWAS appealed to me for that same reason.” Richard explains. “When I initially moved to Washington [D.C.] and George Washington University, this Wisconsin idea still meant something to me, that what happens in the boundaries of the Washington metropolitan area should matter to the University. The University should do whatever it can for the community...I said to myself, for these reasons, “This is a new job you will like.” Richard mentions the Rappoport Center for the Study of Boston as an example of a model for CWAS to emulate under his leadership.

...Continued on p.12
Continued from Manufacturing Jobs p.3

and strategies by which government, business, and/or civic institutions sought to replace lost manufacturing jobs with new jobs in non-manufacturing industries.

The research will culminate in a series of reports and presentations. Two policy-oriented papers are expected to be published by Brookings. One paper will help state and local leaders understand the nature and magnitude of the manufacturing job losses and non-manufacturing job gains that their regions have been experiencing. The second paper will report the case study findings and provide lessons about ways in which state and local leaders can influence the kinds of service industry jobs that replace disappearing manufacturing jobs in their regions.

Brookings will use its existing network of media outlets to disseminate the research. The study team will also give presentations of research findings at professional and academic meetings to disseminate the findings to other researchers in economics, political science, urban studies, and related fields.

Continued from Biking p.4

component of the transportation system proved most vital; 2. Citizen Input: While grassroots pressure did not directly lead to the successes in Arlington and Montgomery, grassroots support helped sustain them. Montgomery and Arlington cultivated and institutionalized citizen input; 3. Planning: Generally speaking Arlington planned and built, Montgomery planned and partially built, while Fairfax never planned and only idiosyncratically built; 4. Windows of Opportunity: Arlington especially took advantage of opportunities to build their system. Fairfax and Montgomery both had similar opportunities but failed to take advantage of them; 5. Developers: The lack of conventional developer interests in the highly urban Arlington made it much easier for the county to build a system.

Continued from Conferences p.7

overall background on recent property tax trends, examine several of the important responses to the real (or perceived) increasing importance of residential property, estimate the extent of property tax base erosion and its effects, and consider other topics related to property tax base erosion. A compendium on conference papers will be published by the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and is expected to be available in early 2008.

Continued from Green p.11

Just a few months into his new position, he is enthusiastic about his agenda for CWAS, stressing three initial subjects. CWAS will investigate education issues, “they are vital for the District.” It is likely that a first educational project will involve research on charter schools, he says, “because it is a tradition of the Center to be looking at charter education.”

Second on the agenda is transit. He calls it “a ridiculously important issue in this community – and not just because I like my ride in on Metro to work.” It is also a difficult service to manage. Studies in the past make it clear that, from a cost-benefit measure, it makes no sense to operate public transit. Transit is a service populated by both public and private firms, thus public transit faces expectations that it should be self-sustaining like private companies. Yet Metro runs a deficit. Thus one problem for
Metro is the public expectation that it will be self-sustaining, when operating costs are all that can be expected to be recovered. “This fiscal deficit is a fact, but this is not the issue,” Richard says. The issue is the measurement of benefits, whose measurement today may stop short of capturing all the possible benefits that accrue to communities locally and globally when they have good public transit systems. “Maybe benefits need to be measured more broadly, that is what we will be examining,” Richard says.

Then he mentions land use issues for the area. He observes that people are experiencing either expensive costs for housing or long commutes for work, and he will be looking for methods for the Center to have an impact on those quality of life issues. To these subjects he will bring his economic training and his analytic mind. He knows the types of projects that intrigue him most. “I am always looking for correlations in things. When I see them, I wonder about them. I wonder if they are going to hold up. I want to see if they will survive, or if they are more spurious.” He recalls a project in Wisconsin that typifies his curiosity. At the time of this project, it was his opinion that Madison, Wisconsin had terrible airline service. He mentions, “I wanted to show this to the airlines. . . .but, additionally, this was naked self-interest, because I was living in Madison at the time.”

He approached his objective with an elegantly simple comparison: airplane boardings per capita in 1990 for the hundred largest cities plotted against population growth for 1990-2000. “The correlations popped up remarkably. No matter my regressions or how I control for it, it always makes a really strong correlation.” His research determined that one standard deviation increase in boardings per capita would produce a 13 percent increase in decadal population growth. His conclusion was that what canals and railroads were to communities’ vitality in the nineteenth century, airports are in the cities of the twenty-first century.

While Associate Dean for Graduate Programs, Oliver T. Carr Chair of Real Estate and Finance, and Professor of Finance at The George Washington University before becoming CWAS Director, Richard’s major academic research focus was housing markets. His 2003 book was *A Primer on U.S. Housing Markets and Housing Policy* with Stephen Malpezzi.

Would he ever desire to turn off his economic approach to everything? No, he says. “All of us are trying to make sense of a complicated world. The study of economics enables you to use powerful tools to sift through the evidence. We still may get it wrong, but we get it less wrong than other approaches.”

He continues that economics is an approach that works well with people. “Human beings readily respond to incentives. Historically, it is part of our humanness. If you want to alter human behavior, you provide incentives; these could be pecuniary incentives. If you want people to behave in a certain way, you reward the behavior you want,” he explains.

He provides an example. In Wisconsin in the 1990s, the power plants were struggling financially and, at the time, they did not want to invest in more infrastructure, though household demand was increasing. The alternative was to induce people to reduce their energy consumption. They offered a very large rebate to households who would buy an energy efficient refrigerator. “Then what did people do,” Richard asks, “do you know?” Not being an economist, I had no idea. I was the perfect foil for the rest of the story, and would not spoil the ending by knowing it. “Why, people bought an energy efficient refrigerator all right,” he reports, “but they also kept the old one. It became their beer fridge.”