A HISTORY OF CUED

By Ronald C. Kysiak

Dedicated to the memory of Ed deLuna and Andy Bennett, two men who left their mark on urban development professionals everywhere.

A few weeks ago you expressed interest in the formation of the 1990s CUED, which we proposed as a concerted effort by cities to wrest the lead in industry and attract it. Please excuse the delay in answering you but I see in the building next to us sprouting is our building and put us out of business for a time.

These were the first two paragraphs of a letter dated February 10, 1966, which went to 39 big city mayors and their development professionals. The letter was written by Ed deLuna, the director of economic development for the city of Baltimore.

Little did deLuna know that this letter was the beginning of what was to become the National Council for Urban Economic Development, and little did he know that his, bold, literal and figurative, were to be the watchwords of urban-economic development throughout the next 35 years.

For it was in the mid-sixties that people like Ed deLuna, Ken Fry, Tom Kelly, Paul Zimmerman, Mel Roebuck, and Andy Bennett realized that something was going very wrong with our nation's cities. deLuna, Fry, Kelly, Zimmerman and Roebuck were responsible for public sector economic development in Baltimore, Milwaukee, Jersey City (Newark, and Cleveland, respectively. Bennett was the chief of urban projects for the Economic Development Administration, a lending agency, concentrating primarily on rural economies, which grew from an agency originally formed to fight poverty in Appalachia.

What deLuna and Bennett sought to the attention of their professional peers was the rapidly rising incidence of industrial flight out of the central cities to the surrounding suburban ring. The 1960s CUED was deLuna's idea of forming a loose-knit group of like-minded city development chiefs to trade information on how to keep industries expanding within cities.

And the 1960s CUED? It stood for Helping Urban Business, a function that was to take on even more serious overtones in the following months as the Watts ghetto exploded in frustration. The following year would be worse with Tampa, Newark, Detroit, Atlanta, Cincinnati and more than a dozen other cities struck with rioting, looting, and arson. Little did the urban professionals who were to meet later that spring in Baltimore know that an epistle of violence was soon to set off past among urban business and industrial centers. Within days of these "civil disturbances," industries began looking for ways to get out of cities, deterring cities, whether they were directly affected by the violence or not.

Our Changing Cities, Our Changing Nation

The National Council for Urban Economic Development (CUED) was founded in 1967 by a handful of professionals testing a new approach to urban revitalization—using public resources to leverage investments in our nation's cities. Today, public-private partnerships are an essential part of the urban development picture and CUED is recognized as the leading national organization serving economic development practitioners. CUED is marking its 50th anniversary this year in serving the nation's most knowledgeable economic development professionals. This article celebrates CUED's origins and evolution throughout 55 years of service to the economic development field.
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A year and a half later, in October 1968, deLao was to write his fellow HUD members that his office was busy brokering sales of businesses between those seeking to leave Baltimore's center and those wishing to buy in. There were far more offers in and than there were takers.

HUD Council

That first letter in early 1966, called those that had shown interest in staff a club to a meeting in Baltimore in April. Some to others had responded positively to deLao's first request in fall 1965. Using the president of the Balti-
more (City Council), DeSchaffer as the official organizer, deLao invited then secretary of HUD, Robert Weaver, as well as the Ford, Rockefeller, and Carnegie Foundations to the meeting. DeSchaffer went on to become one of Baltimore's most advocated mayors, and is now governor of Maryland.

Rod Westover remembers that first meeting in Baltimore; "I was working for the Greater Cleveland Growth Associa-
tion, sort of a Chamber of Commerce, when I went to Baltimore at Amy Benten's invitation. Cleveland visit a tough town, but when I get to what was supposed to be the best hotel in Baltimore. I was floored. It was in terrible shape, but look at Baltimore now, look at the changes in its downtown and harbors". Rodin is now senior vice presi-
dent of Forest City Development and in charge of the Research Park at RIT in Canoerber, Massachusetts.

The Baltimore meeting was a success through neither HUD Secretary Weaver nor the foundations attended, and additional cities were asked to join what then became known as the HUD Council. DeLao's office continued to finance and market the informal organization, and generated additional meetings that year in Washington, Pitts-
burgh, and Chicago. Finally on April 20, 1967, almost a year to the day after that first HUD meeting in Baltimore, the Helpless Urban Business Council was formally incorporated as a not-for-profit, professional economic development organi-
sation in Minneapolis, Wisconsin. Its first officers were de-
Lao as president, Peg, Zimmemar and Louise Thomason of Toledo as vice president, and Mel Roseneck as treasurer. They were in business.

As a distance echo of today, the original bylaws of the Council stated unambiguously that its number one objective was to "develop an urban policy for economic development." It continued membership in cities of over 250,000 popula-
tion, but reduced that requirement over the next five years to smaller cities sought to join. An article by deLao in another organization's newsletter as the Council's formation 101 years are needed in organization is stand up and battle for them... cities are where the action is, the contrast, the diversity, the appeal to every type of person, the excite-
ment, the contacts, the services, the glamour spots, the markets, the up sports and essential facilities, the battle and battle at the, the business, the lawyers, the engineers.

Pretty strong stuff—but the early HUD members had one thing in common. They primarily loved cities. That first year saw some 15 cities join as HUD members. The HUD Council stated that its primary reason for existing was "industrial and commercial problems of the central cities, with a major emphasis on industrial development."

The organization did not then know that the city economies would soon have to turn on a very much different from industry, and industrial plants ways the most viable indica-
tion of economic health. The HUD Council wanted to retain and expand its presence within city borders.

In 1967, public sector urban economic development or-
ganizations were a rarity, though the few in the central cities that summer generated the formation of many task forces and city agency with the responsibility of assessing the damage done to business confidence by the disturbances. deLao and others urged these new entities to join the Council and carry the urban message to business.

At the same time, Lyndon Johnson had announced that he would not run again. A Republican, Richard Nixon, was set to challenge the Democrats to undo the perceived mistakes of the Great Society. The founders of the HUD Council believed that unless they could attract federal policy, the cities were not going to get much help from Washington. In his defense, Richard Nixon won. And to impact policy you needed research and staff, and that meant money.

By summer 1967, at the urging of EDA official Andy Russell, deLao and others joint together a proposal to EDA for funding the Council. At that time, the Council had reduced its minimum population requirement per mem-
bership to 100,000 to as cities asked to join. On October 30, 1967, the HUD Council met in Washington and developed a list of urban problems it wanted to tackle. The list included mass transportation, tax incentives, downtown, preserving industrial land, Intrastate industries, tourism, and "regio-
networks." The HUD began to grow.

In June 1969, EDA granted the Council $31,693 over a two-year period to support "technical assistance, informa-
tion, and research."—the first of many EDA grants which grew in number and size throughout the 1970s. HUD searched for and found its first executive director, John Johnson, director of the Urban League of Government. Johnson was paid the private sum of $7,500 and took space in Baltimore next door to deLao. In the infancy of economic development funding, was the federal government did not know how much of "real match." The total amount the Council had to come up with to match the $31,693 was $21,500. But deLao had difficulty in even finding that amount as he formed his colleagues with a series of men seeking deals.

By early 1969, some 23 cities were HUD members, with others expressing interest. HUD's initial conference was held in Philadelphia that year, registration cent was $25. deLao was mayor for his third term.

In 1970, the Council elected Paul Zimmerman, Chicago Mayor Richard J. Daley's economic development head, as its second president. At the same day, the group formed a new executive director, Joe Overstreet, a Philadelphia plan-
er and economist, and moved one office to Philadelphia. It was the middle of Richard Nixon's first term and the end of Vietnam was only a year or two away. The cities were still simmering then the violence of the late 60s got the admin-
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Ep de la Garza served as the first president of the HUB Council, when he was Bolivar's director of economic development. Inaugurated on April 20, 1977, the Council was originally delved into as forming a local-based group of stakeholders for city development which to trade information on how to push initiatives across within cities.

He felt that "Cities needed an organization to stand up and battle for them. . . . Cities are where the action is, the center; the diversity, the appeal to every type of person, the environment, the contact, the services, the climate, the parks, the beaches, the shopping, the schools, the hospitals, the doctors, the engineers." 1

The expression and Congress had developed a "Model Cities" program to paddy angry mayor and favor city residents.

Though HUB had a grant from EDA, it was never able to get any HUB funding until about 10 years later. Model Cities was not designed as an economic development program and few practitioners got to apply those funds to development strategies. In some cases, Model Cities funds financed neighborhood organizations which used their new found financial and political muscle to oppose city economic development projects as being racist and doing little to help the plight of the ghetto.

Zimmerman remembers those days as raw and exciting: "We were jotted together by our need to step businessmen from leaving the city. We had to build something, and we had no one else to talk to. The middleweights among us deferred to our East Coast brethren, but we all believed in the same gospel. CEUD made economic development a true profession in those days and we were rapidly being recognized as a force in urban areas."

CEUD—A Move to Washington

As the 1973 elections brought Richard Nixon back for a second term, the HUB Council realized its name was too limiting, since crucial cities and some urbanized counties had recently joined its ranks. On December 16, 1973, the HUB Council became the Council for Urban Economic Development and was immediately christened Quad-EA, much to the distress of its future executive directors and staff. The name was agreed upon in its offices of New York Mayor John Lindsay's development era. Ken Patton.

The CEUD board also decided that it needed to have a strong presence in Washington if it was to continue to speak for the cities. Federal policies had already developed Model Cities, with little CEUD input, and the organization felt it needed to get its ideas across to the administration. Unfortunately its current executive director chose not to make the move. In November 1972 CEUD got one of its founding members, Ken Fry, commissioner of city development for Milwaukee, to agree to take the job.

Fry was an early proponent of the need for a federal urban policy. As one of the nation's first public sector directors of economic development, Fry had worked with his mayor, Henry Meyer, to lobby for direct federal funding of urban programs, especially those aimed at the still ascending ghettos of major cities. In working for one of the more powerful and articulate big city mayors of that time, Fry was a logical choice to head up the fledgling urban organization. "It gave me a chance to articulate the beliefs I had. We were a group of true believers in those days, my only regret is that we didn't stay with our national urban initiative long enough to do the job."

With Fry's leadership, newly elected executive director, CEUD landed a second EDA grant of $100,000 in 1972, which paid for new offices and some staff support. In those days, CEUD had about 30 members, but only some 30 of them were paying dues. After all, if it had a federal grant to handle their money problems, didn't it? With yearly EDA technical assistance grants, mostly through the direct intervention of Mort Buhl, EDA's technical assistance head, CEUD began to make its presence known in Congress. It began generating technical reports, newsletter, on-site case studies, and direct technical assistance to specific cities like Detroit, St. Louis, Allentown, Pennsylvania and Kansas City.

CEUD also began its current tradition of putting on a major, yearly conference in Washington, recruiting high ranking federal officials and urban academics as featured speakers—a risky event in those days. Its first big meeting in 1973 generated almost $23,000 in profit. CEUD was starting to roll.

During these early years in Washington, CEUD took advantage of office space and administrative services of a sister organization, the National League of Cities (NLC) The executive director of this organization, as well as that of the U.S. Conference of Mayors, on CEUD's board. This arrangement continued until 1976 when CEUD was a grant competition over NAC, resulting in CEUD's breaking free of both entities and going it alone.

Members of CEUD's board testified regularly before the House Public Works Committee and its key member, Rep. John Bickert, and its Economic Development subcommittee chair chaired by Rep. John Blatnik. CEUD worked closely with congressional staff to develop new, creative legislation to help America's cities. Senate legislation, like the National Development Bank, was torpedoed by agency jealousies; others were more successful, like EDA's Title I and Title X public works initiatives, Title IX revolving loan funds, and 3025a planning grants, which helped build economic development staffs in cities throughout the country.
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In 1994 CUED, for the first time, received a foundation grant. The Ford Foundation provided $400,000 for general support, with no strings attached. EDA's grant jumped to almost $500,000 that year as CUED hired more staff, generated white papers, provided on-site technical assistance, and contracted with government departments and congressional staff on never and more creative urban legislation.

"It was astonishing at the time we made in urban federal policy," said Pry. "Robert Humphrey was our champion and we had friends on both sides of the aisle." CUED soon became known as the organization that could get you into the homeownership business, and membership began to grow. Ken Patton became CUED president in 1992. He worked the Hill relentlessly, harnessing committees on the need for even more federal programs aimed at helping cities weather the economic storms begun by the urban riots of the late 60s.

Patton remembers, "We actually wrote a national urban policy which became the Carter economic program when he came into office. We believed that the way to save cities was to rebuild the urban economies. In 1971, using our friends in Congress, we finally got an amendment through which allowed EDA to work with urban areas."

"After Carter took over," recalls Patton, "he hired a number of CUED staff people to help run his development agencies. One theory of our efforts was how much of this real growth in urban policy happened in the Nixon years. I have to attribute that to our efforts of teaching a man to be a fisherman rather than giving him fish—a strategy which sounded very Republican. In essence, we believed that it was better to deal with the consequences of unemployment at the front end by keeping it from happening, than by waiting to deal with its effects." By 1978, CUED was receiving over $400,000 per year in grants, primarily from EDA. It was the prominent urban economic development organization in the U.S. and boasted nearly a thousand members. It held regular receptions in congressional crisis rooms and had powerful congressmen and senators as regular guests, as well as urban celebrities such as Bella Abzug. Jimmy Carter had become President. He had a commitment to cities that ran deep. Tom Kiley, New Jersey development chief, had been named CUED president a year earlier and sought to keep the administration feet to the fire of urban revitalization.

"I remember meeting with President Ford's newest nominee for the head of EDA, Vinny Reed Madsen, a former major league baseball player. He came from a rural background and didn't know a lot about cities. But when we talked, I told him it didn't make any difference if you were poor and out of a job in Hoboken or rural Georgia; it was the same thing. He never forgot that discussion and he became a strong supporter of CUED."

It was in 1979 that Pry, his health failing, left CUED, creating a vacuum that caused EDA to express concern. At risk was most of CUED's federal support, and there was no unanimity on the board as to the kind of executive director the organization needed. Some wanted a technocrat who would provide CUED with instant credibility in Congress and could help set the "big picture" goals of the organization. Others wanted someone more involved in the grassroots business, since CUED members had come to depend upon the organization to help them access the new federal programs.

In summer 1979, Jim Petersen, then EDA Midwest Regional Director in Chicago and a former Republican legislator from Illinois, was named to the post by a narrow margin of the board. The split vote did not give Peterson much comfort, but he resigned his federal post and took over CUED's reins in September after having been assured by EDA that everything would be resolved.

Impact on Federal Funding and Policies

It was during the late 1970s that CUED, working with the Carter administration, had its greatest impact on federal funding and policies. It also expanded its training and community advisory services, visiting over 20 cities to provide help and advice. It embarked on an ambitious research agenda, including training up its first major study, begun under Pry in 1975, for HUD. This study entitled the "Community Economic and Manpower Development Linkages Study" pointed out the need to integrate the newly founded Community Development Block Grant program (CDBG) and the Comprehensive Employment and Training Act (CETA) legislation.

A year later, HUD funded CUED to undertake a seminal work in economic development research, a 21-case study book called "Coordinated Urban Economic Development," which documented successful local economic development strategies, programs, and projects throughout the country. This study helped establish economic development as a legitimate function of local governments in conjunction with the private sector and earned CUED a respected place in the economic development research community.

Jim Petersen remembers that "when Carter's new deputy assistant secretary for economic development, Bob Hall, took office, he spent three days at CUED getting..."
briefed on the condition of urban economies and existing federal, state, and local programs. Briefed by CUED staff experienced in the ways of Washington grantmanship, Hall soon approved a three-year grant for CUED, giving it, for the first time, the luxury of long range planning and programming."

Says Peterson, "During that time we formed advisory groups to HUE, EDA, and even the White House relative to program development and evaluation, CUED met regularly with the secretaries of Commerce and HUD, and had close relationships with Carter's two special assistants for domestic policy and state and local relations, Ike E臊andt and Jack Watson. We were perfectly positioned," remem-
bered Peterson, "to become the urban spokesman with Carter coming in. CUED had a hand in every urban economic development program to come out of HUD or EDA at that time."

Wait D'Alessio, then head of the Philadelphia Industrial Development Corporation, became CUED president in 1975. D'Alessio brought with him an urban smoothness matched with big city savvy and represented CUED before dozens of congressional hearings, national conferences, and federal briefing sessions. Now President of Latz & Bask, a Philadelphia mortgage brokerage house, D'Alessio remembers the late 1970s as "a time of innovation... it was almost a competitive situation between HUD and EDA as to who could deliver the best economic development pro-
grams to cities."

"In fact," says D'Alessio, "there was no CUED confer-
ce I remember when Bob Embry of HUD, in his laid back and laconic way, explained a new HUD development initia-
tive, and George Karou of EDA, went bananas. George rushed back to EDA, burnt the midnight oil, and reap-
peared the next day with a new EDA program to top that of HUD. This was also a time when big city mayors like Henry Maier of Milwaukee, Tom Mooney of Columbus, and Don Schaeffer of Baltimore would sit with us to work out our federal urban strategies."

"But the greatest value of CUED in those days was that it was a meeting place; its members were always willing to share information on how to get things done."

Working Effectively With the New Policies

But all of CUED's federal access was about to end. Ronald Reagan took over the White House in 1981. At that time, CUED had a membership in excess of 1,200, many of whom joined during the previous three years as CUED's effectiveness in dealing with grants, providing training, and assisting local development entities became well known.

The new administration immediately targeted EDA for termination and prohibited public funding to Private Inter-
et Groups (PIGS), such as CUED, without top level review. Though there was great political pressure, CUED stayed out of the storm of protests made by other national organizations over the EDA decision, and attempted to find a way to work with the new policies.

In 1981, CUED elected Ron Kynik to succeed D'Alessio. Kynik, formerly economic development director of Milwau-
kee, had moved to New Haven, Connecticut, in the same capacity. He and a core of board members held firm against getting into a major confrontation with the new administration. Rather, they recommended a professional detachment from the politics and a hard push to return what feeling they could to cities, and to CUED itself.

CUED's quiet discussions with the new administration paid off as EDA continued to receive congressional support which allowed it to fund CUED, though on a slowly diminish-
ing basis. But CUED's days of access to the White House were over, as well as its prominence role as the designer of urban economic development policy.

With the administration's efforts to get out of the economic development business and shift development assistance back to the states, CUED began looking to form state chapters to help its members more effectively lobby for state-wide programs. It also directed its staff to seek other forms of support to replace anticipated federal funding cuts, such as increased community advisory services.

Interestingly enough, while many urban development practitioners were becoming the withdrawal of the federal government from direct economic development funding, the administration and Congress unintentionally created the most effective urban development program to come out of Washington since the New Deal. Faced with a deepening recession and climbing interest rates, Congress passed the tax act of 1981 which created accelerated depreciation schedules for rehabilitated buildings; doubled tax write-offs in some cases, such as historical structures.

Urban centers were filled with old, rundown or empty buildings in those days. It didn't take long for developers to find them. With the newly created Urban Development Action Grant Program (UDAG), to provide additional eq-

uity through grants, central cities witnessed a massive physical renewal. This renewal was tied to leveraged public dollars, private investment, and a proliferation of tax-shelter syndications which built everything from hotels, to festival marketplaces, to convention centers—whether the market
needed them or not. The Enimony, who under Carter had created the UDAG program, was no longer in HUD, but his successor, Steve Hollinger, operated the program efficiently as Congress continued to fund it over the objections of the administration.

Jim Hanula, elected CUED president in 1982, brought with him a background in public service in Long Beach and private development with the Virginia Peninsula Development Corporation in Virginia. Hanula, along with Kaynak, had been a major architect of CUED's strategy to remain neutral in the fight between the Reagan administration and Congress over EDA.

"We needed to get over the bump of the administration and become more self-sufficient," said Hanula. In those days almost 70 percent of CUED's funding came from federal sources. Now City Manager of Long Beach, Hanula recalls how he tried to simulate CUED staff and others to the coming market driven realities of urban redevelopment. "I was really going by the seat of my pants management, cities had all kinds of properties which could be creatively leveraged to provide sources of funding and new development. UDAG was not the answer; it was a subsidy, not market-driven."

The Practitioner's Changing Role

That first four years of the Reagan presidency did not impact urban economic development as much as had been feared since many programs had multiple-year funding and a great deal of inertia in congressional support. In addition, many cities were facing a strong current of renewal because of the administrators' real estate tax policies. But in 1986 saw Reagan's re-election and an amended tax law, which urban programs began to be (totally dismantled) or reduced to a shadow of their past size. UDAG was funded at a level just above the annual average, CEDA became TEAA, and funds for development and employment flowed out of the political control to the private sector and states; UDAG diminished yearly; EDA was restricted to maintenance grants, and new initiatives; reverse funding was cut back and made subject to state provisions; and public works grants become more difficult to get and resulted greater local governmental pressure than ever before.

Gary Conley, development director for Mayoral Inc., in Cleveland, took over CUED's presidency in 1984 and felt the heat on the housing decade. "We knew we had a huge problem in moving toward a more market-oriented approach. We were losing our members as federal funds dried up."

The board decided to have a retreat in 1986; it was an attempt to learn the way the practitioner's job had changed and how to best support him or her. Reulla Conley, "Once we disposed of our external argument—that being whether CUED should keep the U for urban—we got down to business and developed a game plan. It was plain; we were going to have to move toward becoming much more of a membership-driven organization."

During this period the CUED board decided to create a joint research arm with Northwestern University to undertake basic research in economic development. This new entity, called NCI Research, was to look at long-term economic development issues and provide ominous information for practitioners. Jim Peterson added to head up this new, Illinois-based entity which began to research basic economic development positions of the Hinesian, the agglomeration of regional economies, and other broad-based economic issues.

Peterson left CUED at the time to head up NCI and the board launched a search for a new executive director to carry out its new mandate.

The board was still looking in June 1986 when Tom Blanchard, executive director of the Greater North Carolina Corporation, was elected CUED's president. Membership continued to drop as CUED staff was downsized. EDA made the elimination federal support. Blanchard had joined CUED in 1979 under an EDA 302 planning grant. Like many others, the EDA 302 program provided new practitioners with access to CUED and its array of publications and peer support.

Blanchard remembers, "Our newly elected mayor, Vince Thomas, was a great fan of CUED. He told me he used the base he found in CUED literature to devise their development policy for North Carolina."

"By the time I came on board as president," says Blanchard, "CUED had still not fully adjusted to becoming a member-supported organization. At two or three-fifths of our budget was still federal money. We were trying, but we just couldn't divert fast enough." That summer the board hired Jeff Pliske, current CUED executive director, and former HUD official in the Reagan administration, involved in managing the CEDG and UDAG programs.

"In 1986-1987 we made a major change in CEDG's orientation, away from federal program advocacy and more towards a market-driven operation. We founded up our conferences and tried to respond more to what members wanted. Jeff Pliske brought his background in marketing with him and it helped a lot."

By 1988 most of what the Nixon and Carter administrations had put in place to facilitate urban economic development had been dismantled or dismantled. CUED quickly opposed each decision, but at the same time tried to work with administration professionals in EDA, HUD, Labor, and Transportation, commenting on legislation where it could, effecting meetings between its members and federal bureaucrats who could.

Pliske moved to reduce CUED's expenditures as federal grants continued to shrink. Just as cities had to lighten their belt, so too did CUED. The board continued its series of retreats, trying to clarify CUED's role in a substantially changed world. Those retreats were led by Marilyn Swartz Lloyd, head of the Boston (linked with Development Corporation) and soon to be elected CUED's first female president in 1988.

Out of these retreats came a clearer vision of CUED's mission: Continued liaison with federal agencies, enhanced training for CUED members, access to and distribution of published information affecting development professionals, less advocacy, more practitioner support through increased number of technical conferences, and an orientation towards private/public partnerships.

In 1989, CUED and NCI parted ways as board members.
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It was CURD that made the case for public intervention in the development process back in the late 60s and established the professionalism of the economic development practitioner. And it is CURD today that is still helping practitioners learn what they need to know in order to do their jobs better.

Looking Ahead

Today, CURD has about half the number of staff it had in the early 1980s—and it’s had to reduce its resources. "CURD has been able to continue to maintain a high level of services to its members while experiencing shrinking revenues," says Criss. "We now spend much of our time focusing on the cutting edge of development issues and then bringing them to the forefront in our publications, cost-recovery, and technical reports. Issues such as the structural underclass, the effect of the global economy on local economies, technology transfer, and university/business linkages are all examples of issues CURD brought to its members in a疱 of very short order."

And what of CURD’s future? Says Criss, "CURD will always have a strong future in communicating information needed by its members to do their jobs in a more professional manner. But what I would like to see is CURD spending more time on the issues just over the horizon, the kind that come and hit you square in the face before you know it. Some of these are telecommunications and its impact on the global economy, technology transfer and development and its effect on job creation and location; changes in the work force, such as increased longevity; and other urban dynamics which will require a federal policy response. When that time comes, CURD should be ready to give our counsel, whether it’s listened to or not."

Working closely with other organizations, CURD continues to speak for the urban economic development practitioners—though a number of its members are now from rural areas. And it continues to talk with Congress and federal officials, most recently on the benefits of CURD funds in supporting economic development projects. CURD continues to work for legislation which can help its members do their jobs quicker, smarter, and more efficiently. And CURD still is a partner with EDA on a number of hefty.

But CURD today spends most of its time and resources in providing its members with the latest information on techniques and programs dealing with broad and other economic development issues such as business retention, organizing for development, strategic planning and creative financing. It produces an expanded Development newsletter, a quality journal in Commentary, and an international economic development report. It also continues to publish technical reports and surveys, such as a salary survey for development professionals, and a major organizational survey of 35 metropolitan area cities. Says Jeff Pafumi, "Our greatest asset is our stock of publications going back 20 years or almost any subject dealing with economic development."

Looking back to 1967 when Ed Deluca was too busy fighting fires, both figuratively and literally, to get his invitation letter out the door, CURD has had a major impact on the way our nation’s cities have developed. This includes the legislative and professional programs practitioners find in their toolboxes today: CIDG, HUD 108, SBA 505, 104 development corporations, EDA revolving loan funds, industrial revenue bonding, public-private partnerships, business incubation, OEOPs, community development corporations, MESSBUs, enterprise zones, and other private and public programs now known by many different names.

It was CURD that made the case for public intervention in the development process back in the late 60s and established the professionalism of the economic development practitioner. And it is CURD today that is still helping practitioners learn what they need to know in order to do their jobs better. It is probably no accident that the most recent CURD Members survey lists business retention as its highest priority. That something Ed Deluca would have understood really too well.