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Since 1990, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has supported mixed-income redevelopment (MIR) strategies to address the problems of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods with traditional public housing structures. This study focused on two neighborhoods in Denver, Colorado, with more than 38% of the residents living in poverty, which are facing transit-oriented MIR in the coming years. Residents in both neighborhoods have engaged in formal planning processes and community organizing as a way to be prepared for the change.

The study posed three research questions: (1) what predicts a community's readiness for MIR, (2) what predicts resident involvement as community activists in neighborhood organizations, and (3) what are public housing residents' responses to the evidence of previous HOPE VI project outcomes and their perspectives on what is needed for transition and relocation success. A mixed methods design was used that included a quasi-experimental survey of residents in the two neighborhoods (n=387), in-depth interviews (n=25) of residents in one neighborhood where redevelopment is already underway, and the analysis of public artifacts and documents available during the study process. Residents participating in the survey were predominantly female (73%), Hispanic (44%) or African American (22%), and had incomes of less than $12,500 (76%). The majority of the sample resides in traditional public housing (66%), as well as those residing in redeveloped public housing (21%), low-income HUD subsidized apartments (11%), and neighboring houses (12%).

Research question one found that readiness for transit-oriented MIR can be predicted with social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and having a transition and/or relocation plan. Research question two found that involvement in neighborhood organizations can be predicted by resident awareness of neighborhood problems, resident activism, and their perception of their community's capacity for change. Research question three found that residents facing a MIR move are already distressed, if they are going to move want to move up, and require multisystem support. The research addresses the HUD goal to build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination. Implications for social work practice include the need to include both clinical supports and community processes to help prepare residents for change.
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Abstract

Since 1990, the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has supported mixed-income redevelopment (MIR) strategies to address the problems of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods with traditional public housing structures. This study focused on two neighborhoods in Denver, Colorado, with more than 38% of the residents living in poverty, which are facing transit-oriented MIR in the coming years. Residents in both neighborhoods have engaged in formal planning processes and community organizing as a way to be prepared for the change.

The study posed three research questions: (1) what predicts a community’s readiness for MIR, (2) what predicts resident involvement as community activists in neighborhood organizations, and (3) what are public housing residents’ responses to the evidence of previous HOPE VI project outcomes and their perspectives on what is needed for transition and relocation success. A mixed methods design was used that included a quasi-experimental survey of residents in the two neighborhoods (n=387), in-depth interviews (n= 25) of residents in one neighborhood where redevelopment is already underway, and the analysis of public artifacts and documents available during the study process. Residents participating in the survey were predominantly female (73%), Hispanic (44%) or African American (22%), and had incomes of less than $12,500 (76%). The majority of the sample resides in traditional public housing (66%), as well as
those residing in redeveloped public housing (21%), low-income HUD subsidized apartments (11%), and neighboring houses (12%).

Research question one found that readiness for transit-oriented MIR can be predicted with social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and having a transition and/or relocation plan. Research question two found that involvement in neighborhood organizations can be predicted by resident awareness of neighborhood problems, resident activism, and their perception of their community’s capacity for change. Research question three found that residents facing a MIR move are already distressed, if they are going to move want to move up, and require multisystem support. The research addresses the HUD goal to build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination. Implications for social work practice include the need to include both clinical supports and community processes to help prepare residents for change.
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Chapter One: Introduction

“America has always been strongest when we work in partnership to build communities that are vibrant, durable and inclusive” (President Barack Obama cited in Donovan, 2009, p. 1).

Concentrated urban poverty (CUP) neighborhoods are a social problem that requires public investment within various systems so that residents can meet basic social needs, improve quality of life and overcome barriers to self-sufficiency. This study focuses on two neighborhoods that are the target of interventions aimed to address the social problems caused by CUP. This chapter will begin by describing the problem of CUP neighborhoods and housing. Four recent responses to concentrated urban poverty will frame descriptions of the two communities. The responses include:

- The National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing,
- Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI): Evolving Policy Addressing Distressed People & Place,
- Choice Neighborhood Policy: A Collaborative Neighborhood Focus, and
- Contemporary Community Organizing.

The chapter will conclude by identifying three research questions focused on transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment (MIR), community organizing, and evidence-based transition and/or relocation planning which all have the potential to improve neighborhood and individual outcomes in communities of concentrated urban poverty (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Ohmer & Beck, 2006; Popkin et al., 2004).
**Statement of the Problem**

Historically the response to urban poverty in the United States has included a range of policies and interventions in areas such as public welfare, education and housing (Barusch, 2009). Policy-makers and others frequently describe CUP neighborhoods as undesirable social problems that also possess the potential for change. Residents of these neighborhoods often require public subsidies to provide housing and food, public-problem solving, and resource investment within the housing, educational, criminal and health systems, in order to meet basic social needs and overcome barriers to self-sufficiency. A range of interventions address urban neighborhoods with a concentration of poverty; the three that are the focus of this study are transit-oriented mixed income redevelopments (MIR), community organizing, and evidence-based transition and/or relocation planning. Each of these interventions have been found to improve neighborhood and individual outcomes (Berube, 2006; Foster-Fishman, Cantillon, Pierce, & Van Egeren, 2007; Joseph, 2006; Joseph, 2008; Ohmer & Beck, 2006; Popkin, Levy, Harris, Comey, Cunningham, & Buron, 2004; Theodus, Popkin, Guernsey, & Getsinger, 2010).

**Concentrated urban poverty.** Definitions of CUP neighborhoods include the following characteristics: varying concentrations of poverty ranging from very low (below 10%), to low (below 19.9%), moderate (20%-39.9%), and high (over 40%) poverty rates (Bishaw, 2005). Terms such as underclass or extreme poverty describe areas where people experience chronic poverty and are isolated from opportunities (Galster, 2005; Hardman & Ionnides, 2004). As of 2000, 18.5% of the United States population lived in moderate to high poverty areas, meaning CUP neighborhoods directly
affect nearly one out of five people in the United States (Bishaw, 2005; United States (U.S.) Census, 2000). Scholars debate whether concentrated poverty has increased or decreased in the last 10 years (Jargowsky & Yang, 2006; Kneebone & Berube, 2008a). Regardless, the historical antecedents of CUP and the contemporary results of CUP are rooted in policy and social patterns in American cities.

**Historical antecedents of concentrated urban poverty.** Historically, central city neighborhoods changed from what were once naturally mixed-income communities into neighborhoods that are concentrated by social class and race (Kaplan, Wheeler, & Holloway, 2004; Kunstler, 1993). Key themes relating the current dilemmas of community organizing and redevelopment of CUP areas begin with structural causes. These structural causes have had an impact on the practices and culture of blight and disinvestment in central city neighborhoods according to four themes: (a) segregation, (b) suburban sprawl, (c) population shifts, and (d) shifts in the economy. Each of these themes can assist in explaining the historic antecedents to the concentration of public housing in CUP neighborhoods, which resulted in blight and disinvestment in central cities.

State and local laws that authorized segregation in “separate but equal” structures legitimized by Plessy v. Ferguson (1896), enabled an era of racial segregation in the United States during the Jim Crow era (Wilson, 2009). The segregation of public schools, public space, public transportation, restrooms, housing and restaurants resulted in separate and inferior institutions, which systematized economic, educational, and social advantage and disadvantage within embedded institutional norms and practices (Wilson, 1999; Wilson, 2009).
Several key policies directly have had an impacted on people of color and created economic and racially segregated neighborhoods in the central city during the Jim Crow era including: redlining, the location of highways in and through central cities, urban renewal, and the federal government’s encouragement of suburban development (Wilson, 1996; Wilson, 2009). The legacy of racism through “separate but equal” institutions resulted in many modern problems experienced by disadvantaged minority individuals and communities (Wilson, 1999). Four specific trends contributed to blight and disinvestment in central city neighborhoods including:

- **Federal investment in suburbs**: The federal government encouraged the development of suburbs, housing developments and highways from the 1940s to the 1960s, which resulted in a White flight away from the central city to the suburbs, a pattern systemically supported through the Federal Housing Administration (FHA) and the Veterans Administration (VA) created in the 1930s and 1940s (Kunstler, 1993; Wilson, 1996).

- **Population shifts**: The systematic support of housing for White civilians and veterans occurred in the context of the Great Migration of African Americans to the north (1940-1970) because of limited opportunities in the south. The same practices and policies that made White flight to the suburbs seamless provided barriers and limitations for people of color. The FHA practiced redlining, which would not guarantee loans in older neighborhoods with immigrant and African American residents, while owners simultaneously would not sell to African Americans in the suburbs because of racially based deed restrictions, as well as predatory and sub-prime lending (Kaplan, 2004).

- **New Federalist shifts in the economy**: New Federalism began when Presidents Reagan and Bush cut federal funds to cities in the 1980s-1990s from on average 18% of a city budget to 6.4% (Wilson, 1996; Wilson, 1999). Cuts included funds for many of the services needed in CUP neighborhoods including: transit, publically funded jobs, job training, education, block grants, public works, as well as economic and urban development (Wilson, 1996; Wilson, 1999). New Federalism has been termed a laissez-faire form of racism that assumes that residents of CUP neighborhoods are responsible for their own economic outcomes and are therefore unworthy of state intervention because they lack motivation and work ethic (Wilson, 1999).

- **Restructured businesses**: The movement of jobs to the suburbs since the 1970s has resulted in declining opportunities in the central city (Wilson, 1999).
Since 1980 two-thirds of employment growth has occurred in the suburbs, which includes 70% of all manufacturing, wholesale and retail jobs (Wilson, 1999).

The legacy of “separate but equal” public policy enabled investment in White and middle-class communities and disinvestment in communities that were once naturally mixed-income, but have become low-income communities of color over time (Kaplan, Wheeler, Holloway, & Hodler 2004; Kunstler, 1993; Wilson, 2009). For example, in 2000 nearly 50% of all African American, Hispanic, and American Indian people lived in moderate to high poverty areas (Mathers & Rivers, 2006). In contrast less than 20% of White and Asian American residents lived in moderate to high poverty areas (Mathers & Rivers, 2006).

Recent studies of Concentrated Urban Poverty neighborhoods have identified neighborhood effects that have an impact on life chances, which result in distress, a lack of hope, and stigmatization of individual pathology (Boston, 2005; Crump, 2003; Keating, 2000; Popkin et al., 2004; Van Ryzin et al., 2001; Zielenbach, 2003). For example, living in an urban poverty neighborhood increases the chances of high school dropout, joblessness, teen pregnancy and idleness, single parents, and children living in poverty (Massey, Gross, Eggers, 1991; Mathers & Rivers, 2006). Residents themselves frequently describe drugs and alcohol, violence and crime, gangs, teen and single parent households as issues in their communities (Boston, 2005; Kelly, 2005; Kissane & Gingerich, 2004).

**Concentrated urban poverty housing.** CUP neighborhoods have many types of housing, but many contain a concentration of public housing units (Crump, 2002; Goetz, 2000). Public housing includes housing developments funded by Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and run by local housing authorities including traditional public
housing developments, Section 8 projects, and dispersed housing (HUD, 2007). In moderate to high poverty neighborhoods, public housing developments frequently take over, and drive up poverty levels with higher numbers of public housing units. Research documents the numerous problems in traditional public housing including: 1) poor physical design, 2) physical deterioration, 3) high vacancy rates, and 4) management problems (Crump, 2003; Kelly, 2005; Kissane & Gingerich, 2004; Van Ryzin et al., 2001; Zielenbach, 2003). This dissertation research focuses on two concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods with traditional public housing.

**Community Setting for this Study**

This study focused on two neighborhoods in Denver, Colorado that meet the definition of concentrated urban poverty. Located south and west of downtown Denver, the Sun Valley and La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhoods are separated by a north/south interstate and the Platte River. Figures A1-A8 show a map of the community and photos of the various housing types (see Appendix A). Both neighborhoods were the focus of a 2007 Resident Advisory Committee planning process, which resulted in six Key Focus Areas for change representing a combination of stakeholders’ goals (Denver Housing Authority, 2007). Although Sun Valley and La Alma/Lincoln Park both possess concentrated public housing and face transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment, the communities are different demographically.

The Denver Housing Authority indicated that in 1999 the two neighborhoods of contained different proportions of publically subsidized housing; Sun Valley contains 93.9% and La Alma/Lincoln contains 33.5% publically subsidized housing, which compare to only 6.6% in Denver, citywide (Piton, 2008). The average annual income
according to the 2000 Census in Sun Valley was $12,434 and in La Alma/Lincoln Park was $38,480, compared to $55,129 in Denver citywide. According to the 2000 Census Sun Valley is predominantly Hispanic (46.4%), other people of color (25.4%), African American (17.3%), and White (10.9%). La Alma/Lincoln Park is primarily Hispanic (52.5%), White (32.4%), other people of color (7.9%), and African American (7.2). Denver citywide is predominantly White (51.9%), Hispanic (31.7%), African American (10.8), and other people of color (5.6%). The economic and racial demographics of the La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhood point to the gentrification of the community, which began prior to the current transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment.

Sun Valley is the only neighborhood in the City and County of Denver containing over 40% of residents living in poverty (Piton Foundation, 2008). Housing in Sun Valley is divided among 324 public housing units, 106 non-profit project-based Section 8 units, and less than 27 privately owned houses (Piton Foundation, 2008). The first stop on the West Corridor light rail line currently under construction, arrives in Sun Valley.

Recently, a three-part series in a local newspaper documented the past, present and future of the Sun Valley neighborhood with extensive reporting (Griego, 2010a; Griego, 2010b; Griego, 2010c; Griego, 2010d), videos (Gaylord, 2010a; Gaylord, 2010b), and photography (Walker, 2010). The series highlighted the stories of neighborhood residents describing their community as isolated, by geography and development, and a lack of public political will to improve conditions. The series highlighted that the biggest skeptics of the planned transit-oriented redevelopment of the neighborhood are the current residents who have lived through numerous planning processes, including the
development of McNichols Arena and Invesco Field sports stadiums without seeing substantial improvements to their community.

In contrast the La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhood locates between two existing light rail stations. The North Lincoln public housing was redeveloped in 1996 and the South Lincoln public housing began a phased redevelopment in 2010. The historically Hispanic community boasts long-time relationships with local activist, Rudolpho ‘Corky’ Gonzalez and the Chicano movement (Bartels, 2009; Shikes, 2009). A history of activism and rallying around neighborhood causes has influenced neighborhood identity and self-determination (Bartels, 2009; Shikes, 2009). The South Lincoln community is within walking distance of the Santa Fe Arts District. City and housing authority planning in La Alma/Lincoln Park have focused on connecting the community to the regional transit-oriented development strategy, which includes improving connections between the existing light rail stop, the arts district, and the surrounding housing.

The Sustainability Initiative, comprised of Housing and Urban Development, the Environmental Protection Agency, and the Department of Transportation, awarded $10 million in American Recovery and Reinvestment Act funds to begin the South Lincoln Redevelopment (Steffen, 2009). The South Lincoln redevelopment is an example of transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment goals, which include improved transportation connections, income mixing, and environmentally sustainable building designs. In addition, Greenlee Elementary School in the La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhood received $752,172 in School Turnaround funds to focus on improving school performance, staff and literacy (Denver Public Schools, 2011). The Turnaround grant is an example of how the Department of Education also invests in the same
communities that the Sustainability Initiative invests in, in order to multiply the impacts of federal investments in central city transformation. The transit-focused mixed-income redevelopment plans for the South Lincoln and Sun Valley traditional public housing communities are consistent with national responses to concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods.

**Responses to Concentrated Urban Poverty Neighborhoods**

Nationwide, interventions designed and implemented, to have an impact on the problems identified in CUP neighborhoods, have included many types of direct service programs as well as community development services. Service programs include a wide variety of programs that often focus on addressing specific problems, such as mentoring for youth to prevent school dropouts, or health centers to provide low cost health services (Bloom, 2010; Kumanyika, 2006). Community development models of intervention can include redevelopment projects or community capacity building projects such as the Harlem Children’s Zone (Whitehurst & Croft, 2010). The focus on community level interventions has increased in recent years as community practitioners seek to increase resident participation and ability to address neighborhood problems like crime, blight, and unemployment (Ohmer & Beck, 2006).

This study focuses on building knowledge regarding three specific interventions currently in practice across the country in concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods: (a) transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment, (b) community organizing, and (c) evidence-based transition and/or relocation planning. The study focuses on establishing baseline measures for resident readiness for transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment and involvement in community organizations for the two communities.
without explicitly testing the efficacy of the interventions. These three interventions were chosen because they are currently, or could be, implemented in Denver, Colorado in the Sun Valley and La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhoods.

The first intervention considered is mixed-income redevelopment (MIR), which has become a predominant neighborhood intervention to address the problems of low-income neighborhoods. Mixed-income developments are a market-based urban redevelopment strategy, which have become a popular strategy to deconcentrate poverty in United States and Europe (Berube, 2006; Crump, 2003a; Fraser & Kick, 2007; Joseph, 2006; Joseph, 2008, Joseph, Chaskin, & Webber, 2007; Popkin et al., 2004; Vale, 2006). MIR uses low-income tax credits to integrate public housing residents through physical social mixing of a spectrum of income groups (Cisneros, 2009; Katz, 2009; Lees, Slater, & Wyly, 2008). Mixed-income developments often improve the quality, liveability, connectivity and marketability of affordable housing developments, particularly in industrial, infill and Brownfield developments, which are described by city planners as new urbanist design (Costigan, 2006; Deitrick & Ellis, 2004, Fraser, 2004, Joseph, 2006). The resulting investment in amenities including: transit, retail, fitness, computer labs, parks, play and meeting spaces, schools, libraries, police and fire stations, sanitation, infrastructure, and health clinics often attract higher income families, which are a vital component of the sustainability of the developments (Berube, 2006; Costigan, 2006; Fraser & Kick, 2007; Joseph, 2006; Joseph et al., 2007, Popkin et al., 2004; Zielenbach, 2003). Transit-oriented development (TOD) is a type of mixed income redevelopment that focuses on developing housing and retail within ¼ to ½ mile of transit stops, like light rail stations, to improve the local economy, and to build in connections to the regional economy (Baron, 2009).
TOD seeks to increase rather than decrease population density by maintaining low-income housing and drawing higher income housing (Baron, 2009). The contemporary focus on mixed income redevelopment and transit-oriented development has evolved over time through policy interventions that started with the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing.

**The National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing.** The process of understanding the best available evidence for collaboration in the transit-oriented development of HUD neighborhoods begins with understanding the history of public housing situated within neighborhoods concentrated with poverty. William Julius Wilson (1987) identified the impact of concentrating poverty on individuals, families and communities who became an “underclass” after generations of containment within segregated neighborhoods based on race and class (Lees et al., 2008). African American families in particular, experience concentrated poverty, through collective are geographic, social and economic isolation (Cisneros & Engdahl, 2009; Wilson, 1996). The most prevalent concentrated poverty often exists near the center of American cities.

Research and census data support Wilson’s theories that concentrated poverty has an impact on residents on both neighborhood and individual level outcomes. On a neighborhood level, poverty in concentration increases crime, which leaves residents living in lawless environments (Katz, 2009). Limited economic opportunities led to high unemployment rates, which can lead to alternative means of income such as drug sales (Katz, 2009). Lucrative drug sale businesses have been tied to violent crime and the crack epidemic since the 1980s (Katz, 2009). For example, Chicago media with an unknown data source stated that a public housing site in Chicago reported $45,000 in drug sales.
daily in Robert Taylor Homes, a home to 95.5% single mothers with an employment rate of 4% in the 1980s (Polikoff, 2009).

Concentrated poverty also has an impact on individual outcomes such as higher rates of unemployment (Wilson, 1996). Many social problems stem from both the current and historic reality of concentrated poverty. The social problems increase exponentially as the poverty rate for the area increases (Galster, 2005; Lees et al., 2008). For example, Sun Valley as a high poverty neighborhood has had an unemployment rate of 18-20% from 1990 to 2000, which is more than three times as high as Denver as a whole, where unemployment has averaged six to seven percent (Census, 1990; Census, 2000). As expected, Sun Valley also has about four times as high a violent crime rate per 1000 people than Denver on average between 1990-2007 (Denver Department of Safety, 2007). Similarly, La Alma/Lincoln Park, a moderate poverty neighborhood, had an unemployment rate of 11-16%, approximately double the unemployment rate of Denver (Census, 2000). Likewise the crime rates per 1,000 people are consistently near double Denver’s, and crime rates also mirror the decrease in poverty from approximately 1992 to 2007 (Denver Department of Safety, 2007).

On a surface level it appears that concentrated poverty has declined in recent years. However, from 1980 to 1990 just before the HOPE VI program began, areas of concentrated poverty grew in geographic size thus having an impact on the number of people affected by both direct poverty and by living near those living in poverty (Jargowsky, 1997). Denver, Colorado serves as an example of this trend, where highly concentrated poverty has decreased in recent years while moderate poverty areas have increased (Piton, 2008).
Demographics associated with moderate and high poverty areas display
distinguishably different life realities, as depicted by clear income disparities and class
segregation (Earls, 2000; Massey & Fischer, 2000). Data regarding demographic
differences in low, moderate, and high concentrations of poverty are startling.
Discrepancies in unemployment, education, and race illustrate the different life realities
of people living in moderate and highly concentrated poverty areas. Evidence suggests
that the worst conditions may exist for African Americans who frequently experience the
highest residential segregation among all groups. Unfortunately, as of the 2000 United
States Census, 75% of all African Americans still lived in highly segregated
neighborhoods while 90% of other races are not highly segregated (Massey & Fischer,
2000). The density of African Americans in areas highly concentrated by people living in
poverty exists in spite of mass migration by African American people out of high poverty
areas over the last several decades (South, Crowder & Chavez, 2005).

Books like There are No Children Here focused the public eye on one aspect of
concentrated urban poverty (Kotlowitz, 1992). Such publications described in detail how,
low-income families, frequently on welfare live in poorly constructed and maintained
buildings within the context of gangs and drug sales (Katz, 2009). Public housing
complexes warehoused people who were poor, who often had incomes that were 10% of
the Area Median Income, with incomes averaging $6,500 per year in 1990 (Katz, 2009).
As a result of such publicity, distressed public housing became a federal policy focus
(Polikoff, 2009).

Congress established the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public
Housing (NCSDPH) two years after another book published by William Julius Wilson
documenting concentrated poverty (1987). Congress worked to develop a practical evidence-based intervention solution until 1992 (Katz, 2009). The Commission included 18 members from the House of Representatives, the Senate, housing authority leaders, and other public and private advocates of public housing reform such as Richard Baron, a St. Louis private developer (Katz, 2009). Members actively sought insiders’ understanding of problems visiting public housing nationally in 25 cities over one and a half years (Katz, 2009).

The NCSDPH Report identified and defined public housing in need of redevelopment based on distress of people and place (Katz, 2009). Distress of people was identified by high vacancy rates, crime and drug activity that contributed to concentrated poverty (Katz, 2009). Associated social problems such as unemployment, teen pregnancy, single parents, elderly, dependence on public assistance and unemployment, which are the result of isolation from jobs because residents are isolated from jobs and self-sufficiency programs, have minimal educational achievement, and experience racial tensions (Crump, 2003a; Costigan, 2006; Katz, 2009; Keating, 2000; Vale, 2006). Residents identified living in unhealthy/unsafe communities that felt like warzones, typified by crime, vandalism and drugs (Katz, 2009; Popkin, 2009).

The NCSDPH Report identified distress of place as housing problems such as dilapidation, design and maintenance problems, high population density, public and private disinvestment, deferred maintenance, unsafe streets, and indifferent management (Crump, 2003a; Costigan, 2006; Joseph, 2006; Katz, 2009; Vale, 2006). Some have also criticized or labeled the distress of place as social engineering that warehouses people who are poor in undesirable parts of the city, isolated by physical barriers like rivers and
highways (Katz, 2009). High-rise buildings in superblocks without defensible space define poor design. For example buildings where built to such a large scale that young children played in areas not visible by any neighbors (Katz, 2009).

The middle-class and others who had the choice or opportunity to leave distressed places “voted with their feet” by relocating to the suburbs in the 1980s because they did not want to live next to public housing and the associated social problems (Katz, 2009; Lees et al., 2008). Many blame the occurrence of distress of place and people on the disinvestment in civic infrastructure, such as services, schools, and maintenance that came with deindustrialization and middle classes migration to the suburbs after World War II (Baron, 2009; Lees et al., 2008).

The NCSDPH Report recognized 86,000 of 1.3 million units of public housing as severely distressed (Katz, 2009). Addressing public housing problems therefore would require a large federal investment, which led to the Housing and Community Development Act of 1992 and the Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD), which led in turn to revising the Housing Opportunity for People Everywhere (HOPE) Program of 1990 (Cisneros, 2009; Library of Congress, 1992; Polikoff, 2009). URD became known as the HOPE VI Program, whose goal was the reduction of concentrated poverty and modernization of public housing stocks (Cisneros, 2009).

HOPE VI is a textbook case of Evidence-Based Practice (EBP) because of the focus on gathering resident perspectives, professional wisdom, and data regarding effective intervention programs (Gibbs, 2003). The NCSDPH gathered client perspectives, professional judgment of housing authorities and developers, and the best research evidence from the Baltimore’s Enterprise Foundation model for resident supportive
services in order to form a policy intervention aimed at transforming distressed people and place within public housing communities in concentrated poverty areas (Katz, 2009). Dialogue, case studies and conference presentations have informed ongoing evaluation of the HOPE VI policy and spurred further development. For example, ongoing evaluation identified a lack of resident outcome tracking, which did not begin until after the program initiation (Engdahl, 2009). The ongoing evaluation of resident and place-based outcomes has continued to steer future mixed-income redevelopment, which is a key component of evidence-based practice.

**HOPE VI: Evolving policy addressing distressed people and place.**

HOPE VI was a HUD Policy for 17 years (1992-2008) that invested $6 billion in HUD funds and leveraged $11 billion in additional public/private funds to revitalize the most distressed public housing in 248 housing projects within 131 Housing Authorities in 35 states (Donovan, 2009; Urban Land Institute (ULI), 2009). The program built 107,000 housing units and often included neighborhood improvements like community centers, recreation facilities, parks and trails, grocery stores, Boys and Girls Clubs, and Headstart (Donovan, 2009; Kelly, 2005; Van Ryzin et al., 2001).

HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros who visited public housing nationally, came to believe the NCSDPH may have understated the problem inherited by the HOPE VI policy. For example, when Cisneros visited a Baltimore public housing site with the city’s mayor, the housing authority police told them the building was not safe because it was not ‘swept’ and therefore they may be caught in the crossfire of a drug war (Cisneros, 2009). When Cisneros asked residents about their living conditions they reported delayed repairs and horrors such as gunshots, which resulted in a sense of
urgency to solve public housing problems (Cisneros, 2009). Bruce Katz, Cisneros’ Chief of Staff agreed that there was consensus that distressed public housing and concentrated poverty necessitated prompt action (Katz, 2009). HOPE VI is a place and people-based strategy credited to former HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros and the NCSDPH who sought to tear down and replace old housing stocks and build up communities for better outcomes like health, education and access to jobs (Donovan, 2009a; Donovan, 2009c; ULI, 2009).

**Process of HOPE VI evolving to address distressed people and place.**

The stages of HOPE VI policy evolved through a problem-solving process that intentionally created solutions outside the traditional public housing box (Cisneros, 2009). The Reinventing Government Movement, which encouraged bottom-up local solutions, influenced changes to “the way HUD did business” with evidence-based practices such as community policing to influence crime (Katz, 2009). The new way of doing business encouraged collaboration with public, private, and nonprofit organizations (Crump, 2003a; Fraser & Kick, 2007; Joseph et al., 2007; Kelly, 2005; Zielenbach, 2003). HUD collaborators seeking to reinvent HUD policy included housing authorities, developers, architects, as well as legal and financial experts, who designed a policy that allows local control of mayors partnering with public, private and nonprofit investment in strengthening communities (Cisneros, 2009). HOPE VI policy sought to re-conceptualize project design to encourage social mixing and changing neighborhood level factors in order to integrate public housing residents into the mainstream economy of cities (Katz, 2009). HOPE VI grants provide the initial funds and parameters for addressing concentrated poverty neighborhoods with public housing with the aim of creating a
catalyst project that begins neighborhood transformation process (Engdahl, 2009). The HOPE VI policy evolved over the 17-year intervention period to include several key components. The seven main stages in policy evolution are described below.

*Demolition of distressed public housing.* Under Secretary Cisneros, HOPE VI initially focused on demolishing the worst public housing developments, rebuilding severely distressed buildings, and replacing units one-for-one according to the requirements of a 1981 law (Katz, 2009). Critiques stated that simply replacing the buildings would result in the same isolation and poor outcomes (Cisneros, 2009).

*Deconcentrating poverty and breaking up crime patterns.* Deconcentrating poverty and breaking up crime patterns became explicit goals of the HOPE VI program, which aimed to transform CUP neighborhoods and address the uneven geography of opportunity for different social and economic groups (Donovan, 2009a; Polikoff, 2009; ULI, 2009). The program seeks to mix incomes and social characteristics to change the class makeup of neighborhoods segregated by both class and race (57% African American and 24% Hispanic nationally) (Crump, 2003a; Keating, 2000; Polikoff, 2009). As expected, the segregation resulted in disparate outcomes for people in these neighborhoods when compared with citywide findings in four categories: female headed households, high school drop outs, males out of work for a year, and those on public assistance (Polikoff, 2009). Therefore HUD acknowledged the need to address concentrated poverty (Polikoff, 2009). HOPE VI began simultaneously with the Moving to Opportunities program launched in 1992, which was a 10-year 5 city Demonstration Project that relocated the people of distressed public housing to communities with less
segregation by race and class where they had better employment and educational outcomes (Katz, 2009).

Redesigning public housing for social mixing. The change in the physical design of public housing is attributed to planning trends called new urbanism and transit-oriented development, which eventually became national models for urban revitalization (Calthorpe, 2009; Katz, 2009). The planning trends focus on three levels of physical design: (a) a regional focus on transit-oriented development as an opportunity to spur investment and creation of connections for residents of various incomes to a regional economy, jobs and services, (b) improving the neighborhood streetscape, services, transit, retail, fitness, computer labs, parks, play and meeting spaces, schools, libraries, police and fire stations, sanitation, infrastructure, and health clinics, and (c) building scale focused on the human scale that is walkable, encourages interaction in public space and shared amenities, in addition to create a clear delineation of defensible private spaces like housing with fenced off entryways (Baron, 2009; Cisneros, 2009; Costigan, 2006; Deitrick & Ellis, 2004; Fraser, 2004; Joseph, 2006). The designs reverse the trends of social engineering by rebuilding communities into attractive sites for reinvestment by home buyers who fit into a range of housing options, as well encouraging public and private investments which recreates a traditional neighborhood (Baron, 2009; Lees et al., 2008). Mixed-income redevelopments often attract higher income families, which are a vital component of sustainability of the developments (Berube, 2006; Fraser & Kick, 2007; Joseph et al., 2007; Joseph, 2006).

Mixed-financing. Changing financing rules for redeveloping public housing involved creating mixed-financing and asset-based management, which also encouraged private
and nonprofit management of public housing (Katz, 2009). In the early 1990s the private market sector influenced HUD to encourage free market dynamics, where only public investment had previously occurred (Cisneros, 2009). For example Richard Baron from McCormack Baron Salazar wrote a memo to HUD in 1993, stating that he had 30 years of experience transforming distressed urban neighborhoods (Baron, 2009). A dialogue followed, which described how HOPE VI policy could encourage private investment in redeveloping public housing that would change the social mix of the neighborhood (Baron, 2009; Cisneros, 2009). The use of low-income tax credits (LITC) from a 1986 policy therefore became possible because of the mix of very low, low and middle incomes in a development, this allowed a complicated leveraging private sector debt and bond markets in partnership with LITC and public housing subsidies (Cisneros, 2009; Katz, 2009). Creatively using both public housing subsidies and selling ten-year LITC to investors before construction enables the provision of housing for those at 60% of the Area Median Income (AMI) at lower rates than public housing, which adds a significant portion of the total financing needed to create mixed-income redevelopments (Baron, 2009). Mixed-financing creates a flexible yet complex set of rules for public-private partnership that can be negotiated locally, and allows housing authorities to form creative partnerships and enticing HUD rules that safeguard the practice of financial packages for mixed-income redevelopment (Baron, 2009). The Total Development Cost (TDC) policy, created through the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act of 1998, regulates the specifics of mixed-finance mixed-income redevelopments (Katz, 2009). The re-arrangement of policy and practice within the context of existing regulations creates a neoliberal political economy with a federal and local government favoring a free market,
privatization, public-and private partnerships, all of which favor a laissez faire business environment primed for major redevelopment of concentrated poverty neighborhoods (Lees et al., 2008).

Adding support services. Adding support services focuses on resident economic and social needs (Cisneros, 2009). HUD’s added emphasis in 1993 included improving the efficiency of support services like childcare, as well as resources for services like job training and educational services, which were aimed at improving life chances and quality of life of public housing residents (Zielenbach, 2003). Additional services were designed for residents described as hard-to-house to help them overcome or manage their multiple complex barriers to self-sufficiency (Fraser & Kick, 2007; Kelly, 2005; Popkin, Cunningham, & Burt, 2005; Van Ryzin et al., 2001). HUD therefore created the Community Supportive Services Division with a focus on clear outcome-oriented programs for evaluation by the Urban Institute (Cisneros, 2009). Baltimore’s Enterprise Foundation provided a model for development of resident supportive services, which focused on a comprehensive approach linking housing to support services like job training and employment, schools, and substance abuse treatment (Cisneros, 2009). A weakness in the support services plan was the reality that housing authorities were not experienced in service delivery, which required public and private collaboration to increase the chances of resident mobility (Cisneros, 2009; Katz, 2009). HOPE VI policy allows up to 20% of funding to be used for supportive services focused on improving health, family functioning, education and skills, which included programs focused on child care, youth services and job training (Katz, 2009). HOPE VI practice evaluation has found that the biggest challenge for traditional public housing residents is pre-move and
post-move counseling (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). Pre-move counseling includes health assessments, credit repair, financial literacy training, negotiating with landlords, and deposit assistance (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). Post-move counseling includes driver’s education and automobile ownership for residents relocated from efficient public transit, employment, childcare, and school counseling conducted by culturally competent case workers who seek to help residents stay in new housing and neighborhoods (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009).

**Ending one-for-one replacement.** The One-for-One Replacement Rule ended officially in 1995, formally allowing other temporary housing provisions of housing such as the use of Section 8 Vouchers and promises of the first right to return, which permanently changed within the policy in 1998 (Baron, 2009; Cisneros, 2009). The provision made intuitive sense, but residents reported having problems finding Section 8 housing without support services because they did not have experience with the private market (Cisneros, 2009).

**Resident engagement.** Developers and city planners shaped the HOPE VI policy with their experience redeveloping urban neighborhoods in a neoliberal economic market, which resulted in economic benefits that did not trickle down to current public housing residents. HUD approached engaging residents first in the form of training residents on the challenges and opportunities in redeveloping public housing, which was an attempt at a rational and transparent approach to resident engagement (Cisneros, 2009). Genuine resident civic engagement in the planning process, which allows residents a problem-solving voice in the process, was not often encouraged even though we are planning for the future of their communities (Polikoff, 2009). HOPE VI policy in reality requires a
low-level of resident involvement, which does not ensure the future redevelopment will balance the needs of low-income residents with those gentrifying the community (Keating, 2000). Residents who try to become involved may become disheartened if the forces driving change crowd out their needs and desires (Lees et al., 2008). HOPE VI initial outcomes match the goal to change the place, but outcomes yield mixed results in the merit of improving people’s lives. Resident outcomes were dependent on their place of relocation.

Susan Crowley, a social worker and the president and CEO of the National Low-Income Housing Coalition, provides an excellent framework to evaluate the HOPE VI policy based on intent, implementation and outcomes for those the policy was intended to benefit (Crowley, 2009). The intent of the HOPE VI policy evolved over time but essentially sought to deconcentrate poverty and break up crime patterns while alleviating the distress of place and people. The implementation and outcomes of those intents, like all social policies, had both successes and unintended consequences.

The most salient outcome of the implementation of HOPE VI was that the program became known for displacement/relocation (Crump, 2003a; Fraser, 2004; Lees et al., 2008). A strong critique of the policy focuses on the 72,000 households relocated during the seventeen-year length of the program, in which local housing authorities forced a significant number of people to move from their communities. The critiques highlight that HUD does not adequately oversee housing authorities inexperienced in provision of necessarily levels of services and support (Cisneros, 2009; Crowley, 2009; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). Return rates in studies range from 10-75%, where higher return rates are typically associated with rehabilitated rather than redeveloped housing (Popkin
& Cunningham, 2009). As a result, some residents benefited from the redevelopment, but for others the redevelopment had a negative impact on their outcomes. HOPE VI may have broken the “Do No Harm” principle of evidence-based practice, which seeks to provide evidence of a better future after the intervention, which was not within reach for many residents (Crowley, 2009).

Unfortunately, improving buildings and shifting people in space fails to repair the historic injustices tied to racial and economic segregation (Keating, 2000). Naturally, when people who are poor are forced to leave their neighborhood, poverty and crime rates drop and school performance improves simply because of the history of discrimination, unemployment, crime and poverty shifting in space (Crump, 2003; Lester, 2009). At the same time, relocation disrupts each households’ sense of “home,” which is a basic human need (Crowley, 2009). Families root themselves in a neighborhood, community and associations, and therefore relocation should be approached with caution (Crowley, 2009).

Relocated residents recollect their former social bonds and informal neighbors’ support in their old public housing neighborhoods with a sense of pain (Cisneros, 2009). Displaced residents feel alienated without the social ties that used to support them with day-to-day needs like childcare (Crowley, 2009; Keating, 2000). Crowley’s evaluation of the HOPE VI policy lifts up the view that, “poor people help each other.” At least in their old neighborhoods they knew everyone, which makes them sad to have left that familiarity (Crowley, 2009). The impacts of implementing resident relocation during HOPE VI have an influence on more than just residents’ individual feelings and
relationships. Displacing residents has an impact on access to services, neighborhood schools and neighborhood associations.

For example, residents uprooted during the implementation of HOPE VI experienced changes in schools and associations once or twice in a matter of a few years. These disruptions broke up the school year for children who were already frequently in poor performing schools. In addition, these disruptions had an impact on not only on the children who change schools, but also the old and new classrooms with mid-year adjustments to class rolls (Crowley, 2009). Efforts to plan relocation while school is out of session have been unsuccessful in many HOPE VI redevelopments as the demands of construction and demolition schedules take precedence over the needs of the current households. The most startling impact of the implementation of HOPE VI has been the rate of elderly African American female deaths. After relocation, this rate was twice as high, which may mean that the stress of moving exacerbated existing health problems, and the disruption of healthcare routines may have caused earlier deaths in people who were frail before relocation (Crowley, 2009). These perspectives highlight the personal impacts of implementation of HOPE VI programs on individual families. Combined, the critiques of public housing resident engagement, the number of residents relocated, and the lack of improved economic outcomes for relocated public housing residents bring the inclusivity and sustainability of the HOPE VI program into question.

**Choice Neighborhood Policy: Neighborhood focus with collaboration.**

Following HOPE VI, congress established the Choice Neighborhoods pilot program. The Choice Neighborhoods policy acknowledges the need for collaboration between many systems with the aim of transforming CUP communities into sustainable mixed income
redevelopments. The Choice Neighborhoods program seeks to continue and improve the evaluations of the HOPE VI. Beginning funding year 2010, $113 million will be available in year one, and $250 million in year two grants to communities, which is the highest amount of funding in HUD history (HUD, 2009). The program seeks to fund neighborhood level public, private, and nonprofit intervention partnerships that are likely to act as catalysts to neighborhood revitalization (Donovan, 2009a; Obama, 2009; Urban Land Institute (ULI), 2009; Roussell, 2009). As HUD has a history of isolated and monolithic public housing that traps residents in a cycle of poverty (Obama, 2009), Choice Neighborhoods seeks to “transform the way we do business at HUD,” by using better research, evaluation and accountability to make informed decisions that allow the most efficient use of funds (Donovan, 2009a).

The Choice Neighborhoods Policy is a comprehensive approach and strategy that supports transformative investments in low-income communities with a core of public housing (Obama, 2009; White, 2009). The goal is to create mixed-income communities in strategic places that enhance residential and business opportunities by rebuilding and strengthening current concentrated poverty communities (Obama, 2009). Choice Neighborhoods policy seeks to make federal policies that work with local innovative ideas and best practice, based on the philosophy that different communities need different solutions (Obama, 2009). For example, Denver is utilizing a mass transit build out called FasTracks to solve problems, create more livable communities, and improve the regional economy (Obama, 2009). Transit-oriented development and mixed-income communities both attract developers, businesses, residents with increased incomes, neighborhood problem-solving and investment if done well (Bellantoni, 2009).
The Choice Neighborhoods (CN) program builds upon Six Livable Community Principles. The principles highlight old ideas from social workers like Jane Addams who focused community building on the physical environment, health, education and access to economic opportunities (Price, 2009). President Obama showed support of these ideas when he said; “America has always been strongest when we work in partnership to build communities that are vibrant, durable and inclusive” (Obama cited in Donovan, 2009, p. 1).

Specifically, mixed-income redevelopment is an intervention aimed to transform concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods into sustainable communities, which are:

- safe, vibrant and have good schools, childcare, health care, public transportation, and retail, which results in a high quality of life (Alair et al., 2009; Donovan, 2009);
- have the ability to activate relationships to participate in neighborhood organizations that have capacity to solve neighborhood problems (Chaskin, 1999; Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kumpfer, 1997; Ohmer & Beck, 2006); and
- solve the problems of their families through association and systems partnership (McKnight, 1996).

However the distress experienced by public housing residents as a result of historic “separate but equal” institutions means that mixed-income redevelopment can become yet another opportunity for “the haves” to align public policy with their self-interests, such as creating mixed-financing policies that enable private developers to make a profit redeveloping public and affordable housing (Baron, 2009; Lees et al., 2008). Historically, United States society has been stratified in a matrix of domination that regulates the patterns and discriminatory practices of social institutions via schools, housing, employment, and other private and government institutions (Harding, 1993; Hill Collins, 2000). Groups whose identities intersect across many oppressed categories such as race,
gender and class have become permanent outsiders or bear durable inequalities throughout their lifetime or generations (Hill Collins, 2000; Tilly, 1998). This perspective is important to consider when creating new inclusive communities.

While initial mixed-income redevelopment evaluations showed gains in transformed-concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods as a place (Barrett et al., 2003; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009), early results indicate that the “have nots” did not and likely will not benefit from mixed-income redevelopment to the same extent as hoped for, unless changes take place (Crowley, 2010; Popkin et al., 2004; Popkin & Cunningham, 2002; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009; Tilly, 1998). In order to outline a framework that transforms the durable inequalities resulting from concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods into sustainable communities, one must define the key language in Housing and Urban Development strategic goal four. Key terms include the following words: inclusive, durable, sustainable, and social justice.

**Inclusive.** Housing and Urban Development and housing authority success building inclusive mixed-income redevelopments depends on a comprehensive set of factors. Inclusive processes consider, value and engage all mixed-income redevelopment stakeholders in transforming the social advantages and disadvantages embedded in housing, educational, and employment institutional laws, norms and practices (Treviño, Walker, Leyba, 2009; Wilson, 1999; Wilson, 2009). Describing inclusive excellence within the context of mixed-income redevelopments requires first taking stock of the most vulnerable stakeholders in concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods, which include the public housing residents and the surrounding homeowners. Table AH1
provides an example of analyzing the inclusiveness of a mixed-income redevelopment planning process.

**Durable.** The second term requiring a clear definition is durable, which essentially means stable and enduring change. Durable change results from a process of long-lasting systemic changes at the local and federal levels that bring concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods out of isolation, create categorical rewards for concentrated urban poverty residents that lead to equal opportunities, and adaptation to mixed-income communities (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Foucault, 1972; Tilly, 1998). Mixed-income communities can address the “separate but equal” institutions by socially mixing races and classes in historically disinvested in central city communities (Kunstler, 1993; Wilson, 1999; Wilson, 2009).

**Sustainable.** Sustainable communities use a multidisciplinary approach to create lasting change grounded in evidence-based practices (White, 2009). The core leadership structures of neighborhood institutions are key to effective community engagement (Crowley, 2009; Wood & Warren, 2002). Evidence-based supportive services such as intensive case management can lead to improved economic outcomes for families (Theodos et al., 2010). Sustainable wages and benefits require systemic change and coordinated building and neighborhood design that result in walkable, safe neighborhoods with access to high quality goods, services and institutions (Alair et al., 2009; Donovan, 2009; Housing and Urban Development, 2011a; ULI, 2009).

**Social Justice.** Social justice is the final phrase in need of further definition. The National Association of Social Workers (NASW, n.d.) defines social justice as providing equal economic, political, and social rights and opportunities for everyone. Social justice
may require resetting tables in a manner that allow the most vulnerable stakeholders of mixed-income redevelopments to take a central seat. The desired outcome is a collaboration between concentrated urban poverty residents with allies and advocates (who work as social workers, resident supportive services employees, city planners, reporters, employees of housing authorities and Housing and Urban Development) with the aim of building the capacity of current concentrated urban poverty residents and their children gain more from the mixed-income redevelopment of their communities. Without community organizing or other community-based interventions, public housing residents will likely continue to feel powerless, as one of many stakeholders of mixed-income redevelopment interventions. However, if a diverse coalition of citizens works together across race, class, gender and other identities in local organizations, then they can effectively create much needed change on behalf of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods (Wilson, 2009).

**Building sustainable, durable and inclusive Choice Neighborhoods.**

Healthy communities are safer, more vibrant and have good schools, childcare, health care, public transportation, and retail, which results in a higher quality of life (Alair, Roussell & Gilifillan, 2009; Donovan, 2009). First, the program seeks to create more transportation options near public housing, which are safe, reliable, and economical since most Americans spend over half of their income on housing and transportation combined. Second, CN the program seeks to provide equitable affordable housing that increases mobility and decreases housing/transportation cost, while increasing the quality of housing with amenities like sidewalks, which create the kind of community taken for granted in other neighborhoods (Bellantoni, 2009). Third, the program seeks to enhance
economic opportunities by improving access to employment and educational services. Fourth the program seeks to support the existing community through the principles of New Urbanist TOD, which maintain neighborhood identity through adding businesses and services within buildings that match the existing architecture and needs of the community.

Finally, the CN program seeks to coordinate policies and leverage investments with an interdisciplinary approach to community development that includes public, private and nonprofit collaboration working together rather than functioning in silos of work in low-income neighborhoods (Donovan, 2009). The federal Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities (IPSC) is comprised of HUD, the Department of Transportation (DOT), the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the Department of Education (DOE), which creates collaboration that speaks with one voice (Alair et al., 2009; ULI, 2009). For example, the IPSC links neighborhood revitalization to school reform and early childhood education (Alair et al., 2009). The interagency partnership intends to remove collaboration barriers (Alair et al., 2009). Current HUD Secretary Donovan stated that the IPSC, “will bring neighborhood partners to the table from public housing agencies and local government to community activists, nonprofit and private firms” (Donovan, 2009b). HUD funding priorities reflect this collaboration. Additional points on applications are awarded if proposals include collaboration with an early childhood component that uses best practices, community supportive services, and energy efficient/green design (White, 2009). If successful, CN and the IPSC will value communities and neighborhoods in a manner that enhances their unique character while making them healthy and walkable. This is important because neighborhoods are the
places people call home, and they provide stability and roots for families (Alair et al., 2009; Donovan, 2009). The federal Interagency Partnership for Sustainable Communities works to speak with one voice across many public systems, which could work hand-in-hand with community organizing processes, enabling public housing residents to speak with a collective voice as they collaborate with local public and private systems to implement mixed income redevelopment.

**Contemporary community organizing.** The final intervention for addressing concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods is community organizing. Community organizing assumes that the democratic processes in the United States is meant for all residents, but often bypasses those concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods and residents (Hercules & Orensteins, 2007). Consequently, community organizing emphasizes building the capacity and power of oppressed and marginalized groups to solve their own problems (Hercules & Orensteins, 2007; Rothman, 1995). Community organizing focuses on engaging those most affected by social problems through a leadership development and collective bargaining process (Hardina, 2002).

Saul Alinsky, the person credited with being the father of community organizing stated, “I tell people to hell with charity, the only thing you will get is what you are strong enough to get” (Hercules & Orensteins, 2007). Alinsky asserted that the problems of low-income communities, such as crime, are symptoms of powerlessness (Hercules & Orensteins, 2007). The community organizing problem solving process thus focuses on empowering low-income communities to identify common experiences and problems, build relationships with decision-makers, plus identify and negotiate solutions to problems (Brown, 2006). Specifically, community organizing focuses on building
relationships between those closest to the problems and those with the power to address problems (Brown, 2006). Organizing assumes that together those closest to problems and those with the power (via position, role, or resources) to address problems can move the world from the way it is to the way that they hope it will be (Brown, 2006).

In the 1930s, Saul Alinsky began organizing low-income neighborhoods with an institution-based strategy because he believed that residents involved in neighborhood associations, like churches and cultural institutions, could form a stable foundation for neighborhood activism that influenced the state and political society (Alinsky, 1969; Alinsky, 1971; Wood & Warren, 2002). Alinsky’s work in the Back of the Yards neighborhood of Chicago resulted in federal policy changes, such as the free school lunch program, which is still an important safety net for most low-income school children across the nation (Horwitt, 1989). Similarly, the largest faith and school-based community organizing networks formed in the 1970s-1990s have relied on similar institutionally based strategies, which have resulted in powerful community organizations (Wood & Warren, 2002). Current community organizers still frequently state that the most consistent institutions in concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods are churches and schools. Therefore most sustainable community organizing processes root themselves within the core leadership structure of existing neighborhood institutions.

Historically, the practice of community organizing has almost exclusively focused on community issues, research and creative social change using grassroots leaders. In recent years organizing work has shifted to include expert researchers, lawyers, facilitators, and lobbyists for technical assistance in the social change process (Baxmusa, 2008; Boyle & Silver, 2005; Elwood, 2006a; Elwood, 2006b; Kruzynski & Shragg, 1999; Pellow, 1999).
The theory of community organizing discusses organizing as a mechanism for empowerment, expanding the self-determination and power of indigenous leaders, as a means of ameliorating disempowerment and transforming systems (Baxamusa, 2008; Boyle & Silver, 2005; Cherry & Shefner, 2004; Elwood, 2006a; Elwood, 2006b; Pellow, 1999; Speer & Hughey, 1995).

Historically, the work of Saul Alinsky influenced a model of community organizing as a bottom-up social action approach which some have described as adversarial and confrontational of power structures (Boyle & Silver, 2005; Elwood, 2006a; Kathi & Cooper, 2005). The roles of organizing have shifted in recent years to increase community relationships and community power via university researchers, foundations, government, moderators, lobbyists, and lawyers, along with planning, technical assistance and logistical support, such as Geographic Information Systems specialists (Bazamusa, 2008; Boyle & Silver, 2005; Cherry & Shefner, 2004; Elwood, 2006a; Elwood, 2006b; Kruzynski & Shragge, 1999; Reid, 2000; Vilazor, 2005).

These relationships with experts shift the organizing process to a middle ground where those with additional power and knowledge to solve community problems work alongside grassroots leaders (Boyle & Silver, 2005). The shifting include building long-term “relationships of power” to gain access to resources, support and targets of change (Boyle & Silver, 2005; Elwood, 2006a; Pellow, 1999; Speer & Hughey, 1995). These changes are occurring in part due to governments’ shifting considerable problem-solving responsibility to local, private and nonprofit organizations (Boyle & Silver, 2005; Cherry & Shefner, 2004; Trattner, 1999). Foundations are investing in expert partnerships with
community organizing groups, which result in increased use of experts, technology, and best practices with measurable outcomes (Elwood, 2006a).

These trends also include governments, who have contracts with experts, which public servants often consider values-free, including: planners, city attorneys, public officials in other jurisdictions, consultants, and community-based organizations (Baxamusa, 2008; Elwood, 2006a). At times these relationships emphasize a minimalist focus on expedited processes that complicate the process for grassroots leaders, resulting in disconnection and disempowerment from decisions that impact them (Kathi & Cooper, 2005). Community organizing groups are often type-casted as using experiential knowledge-based techniques. Organizing groups are now reacting by focusing on the need for quantitative knowledge that supports and informs policy from the perspective of the people closest to community problems (Elwood, 2006b; Elwood, 2006a). Collaborating well in low-income communities requires an intentionally different approach that recognizes the power dynamics of low-income communities that are often both dominated by and isolated from vital subsystems.

The Focus of this Study

The Early Doctoral Student Research Grant and Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant that funded this research project focus on adding more relevant research to support Goal Four of the Housing and Urban Development 2010-2015 Strategic Plan. Goal Four seeks to, “build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination” (HUD, 2010, p. 31). Early evaluations report that HOPE VI interventions are successfully transforming concentrated urban poverty (CUP) communities as places, but often do not improve household economic outcomes. Community organizing and community organizations, as
resident engagement strategies, have the potential to moderate resident outcomes as they add another layer of people based intervention strategies to the HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhoods programs.

CUP residents frequently describe themselves as powerless as they are shuffled to other communities before mixed-income redevelopment occurs. Residents who see themselves as reliant on the charity of public housing are unlikely to see improved economic outcomes, but residents who see mixed income redevelopment as an opportunity to improve both the people and the place of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods, and engage in the change process accordingly, may become strong enough to get more out of the mixed-income redevelopment. Therefore, community organizing can help ensure that the HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhoods democratic processes, included in the mixed-income redevelopment of public housing communities, do not bypass current concentrated urban poverty residents. Given the policy of mixed-income redevelopment and outcomes for people in MIR communities four research questions have guided this study:

- What variables are associated with community’s readiness for mixed income redevelopment?
- What variables are associated with resident involvement as community activists in neighborhood organizations?
- What are public housing residents’ critical responses to previous HOPE VI movers’ outcomes?
- What are public housing residents’ best problem solving regarding better transition and/or relocation planning processes?
Overview of Study Chapters

The following six chapters will provide a theoretical framework for the study, describe the research methodology, and present the results of the study. Chapter two will describe the conditions surrounding public housing problems and the theory and research used to explain the social problem of concentrated urban poverty. The literature review will begin with a summary of the most common theories used to describe the need for mixed-income redevelopment. In addition, power and conflict and social collectivist theory will be reviewed as an overarching frame that gives voice to those with the least power in mixed income redevelopment (i.e. the public housing residents). A perspective on power and conflict is important because public housing residents live within a sociopolitical environment with many stakeholders, and the residents are generally vulnerable “have nots,” with the least amount of power.

Chapter three will describe the mixed methods research and knowledge building processes established in the quantitative survey and in-depth qualitative interview methodology of the study. Chapter four reports the quantitative survey measurement results. Specifically, exploratory factor analysis and confirmatory factor analysis results for all scales in the quantitative survey are reported. Chapter five reports the quantitative results for research questions one (predicting resident readiness for mixed income redevelopment) and two (predicting resident involvement in neighborhood organizations). Chapter six reports the qualitative results for all three-research questions, which include research question three (public housing residents’ critical responses previous HOPE VI movers’ outcomes and their best problem solving regarding better transition and/or relocation planning processes). Chapter seven synthesizes the study
findings with the intention of providing policy recommendations to Housing and Urban Development, implications for social work, in addition to highlighting study limitations.

**Researcher Perspective**

It is important to acknowledge the perspective of the researcher and author of this study; the author is a community organizer who started her community-based research career within the sociopolitical environment of transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment. As a result the author is passionate about resetting tables in a manner that allow the most vulnerable stakeholders of mixed income redevelopments to take central seat. The desired outcome is a collaboration between concentrated urban poverty residents with allies and advocates (who work as social workers, resident supportive services employees, city planners, reporters, employees of housing authorities and Housing and Urban Development officials) to build the capacity of current concentrated urban poverty residents and their children to leverage improved outcomes from the mixed income redevelopment of their communities. Without community organizing or other community-based interventions, public housing residents will likely continue to feel powerless, as one of many stakeholders of mixed-income redevelopment interventions. However, with a focus on building inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination, the Choice Neighborhoods program can “build communities that are vibrant, durable and inclusive [of their most vulnerable residents]” (President Barack Obama cited in Donovan, 2009, p. 1).
Chapter Two: Literature Review

“Exploitation, opportunity hoarding, emulation, and adaptation converge to favor such a social arrangement that… accounts for a major share of all durable inequalities” (Tilly, 1998, p. 59).

Introduction

As outlined in chapter one, the policy and program response to concentrated urban poverty (CUP) has predominantly has favored various models of mixed-income redevelopment (MIR). Four theories will be examined to explain why MIR is a common intervention to address CUP. The theories include social capital, social control, culture of poverty, and political economy of place. These theories surmise that low-income residents’ quality of life can be improved through physical, social, political and economic change (Fraser & Kick, 2007; Joseph, 2008; Popkin et al., 2004). Each of these theories will be briefly summarized as they set the stage for the MIR intervention in the two Denver neighborhoods that are a part of this study. Much of the recent research on MIR has been based on these theoretical explanations and this research, which has shown mixed results on individual and community outcomes, will be explored.

This will be followed by an overview of two theories that are presented as a basis for understanding community organizing and community engagement: power and conflict and social collectivist theories. Power and conflict theory will be presented in order to describe an overall narrative of disadvantage and distress caused systemically for concentrated urban poverty neighborhood residents (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Foucault,
Social collectivist theory will be presented in order to prescribe how resident engagement can transform the political economy of CUP communities (Gutierrez, Parsons, & Cox, 1998; Lee, 1999; Shera & Wells, 1999). In addition, the existing research on community organizing, community engagement and capacity for change will be presented. Together, the six theoretical frameworks and the existing research will be used to examine the current interventions to concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods with a high percentage of public housing. The chapter will be concluded with the three research questions of this study.

Theory Explaining the Need for Mixed-Income Redevelopment

The most common theories explaining concentrated urban poverty are sometimes controversial (Joseph, 2008), yet these theories commonly frame both the reason for and the research evaluating redeveloped traditional public housing neighborhoods. Each of these theories is briefly described below.

Social capital. Social capital theory as developed by Hanifan (1916) defines social capital as the accumulation of mutual relationships between people. Social capital was later was identified as bonding and bridging social capital (Portes, 1998; Putnam, 2000). Bonding social capital focuses on the social ties and supports that low-income residents provide for each other (Bowen, Martin, Mancini, & Nelson, 2000). The bonding social capital in low-income neighborhoods tends to be high for some residents, as they rely on each other for day-to-day supports (Curley, 2006). For example, public housing residents often exchange favors like childcare or borrowing milk or sugar.
Bridging social capital focuses on the relational ties that low-income families have with those outside their concentrated urban poverty neighborhood (Bowen et al., 2000). Social capital theory assumes that increasing the bridging social networks for low-income families with higher income families will increase access to information, opportunities and resources, which will then improve socioeconomic outcomes such as jobs (Fraser & Kick, 2007; Glaster & Joseph, 2006; Joseph et al., 2007; Joseph, 2008; Popkin et al., 2004; Santiago, 2006; Vale, 2006; Zielenbach, 2003). The hope is that through developing mixed-income communities, low-income families will develop more bridging social capital resulting in better socioeconomic outcomes. However, there is little evidence from HOPE VI evaluations indicating the formation of anything beyond superficial relationships across incomes, which have not resulted in information or jobs for low-income families (Joseph, 2006; Joseph, 2008; Joseph et al., 2007; Popkin et al., 2004).

**Social control.** Social control theorists assert that cohesion tends to be low in low-income neighborhoods because residents may not trust each other or share information and expectations (Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Concentrated urban poverty residents often experience higher crime rates, yet they frequently do not report or confront crime because they fear retribution, which results in social control by those committing crimes rather than the majority of residents (Kneebone & Berube, 2008a). CUP residents neither gain social control nor establish norms because they do not believe change is possible, so they do not get involved (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Obst, Smith, & Zinkiewicz 2002; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999). Mixing incomes is believed to shift informal social
control or collective efficacy, and therefore prevent and address problems as homeowners are more likely to maintain rules, accountability and norms (Joseph, 2006; Joseph, 2008; Joseph et al., 2007). The increased social control, which is often called collective efficacy, is believed to benefit cities and higher income residents, as well (Berube, 2006).

**Culture of poverty.** The culture of poverty theory purports that low-income residents have adapted to a different set of norms and values in response to generational poverty. The third theory applied to mixed-income redevelopment assumes a change in culture within a community will change low-income resident attitudes regarding education, work, health, respect for property, physical exercise, and sexual activity as a result of role modeling of self-efficacy (Glaster & Santiago, 2006; Joseph, 2006; Joseph et al., 2007; Popkin et al., 2004; Vale, 2006; Zielenbach, 2003). Neighborhoods are known to have an impact on the people who live in them, for example a concentration of people living in poverty can result in peer effects such as children doing worse in school, social control issues such as criminal activity, as well as stereotypes and issues with role models which can affect job stability (Kaplan et al., 2004). Behind this theory, an assumption of a culture of poverty, rather than an understanding of isolation from opportunity prevails (Joseph, 2006). This assumption results in little evidence of the theory beyond a decrease in obesity within HOPE VI communities where residents increase their physical exercise with communities they perceive to be safer (Crump, 2003a; Joseph, 2006; Joseph, 2008; Joseph et al., 2007; Popkin et al., 2004).

**Political economy of place: A sociopolitical lens.** The political economy of a place is described as the relationship between a location and public systems (Logan &
Moltoch, 1987). Political economy of place theory is used to explain the need to
deconcentrate urban poverty neighborhoods with mixed-income communities so that
higher income residents move into market rate housing and change the demand for and
investment in neighborhood infrastructure and services as they increase their: (a) resident
stability and leadership, (b) collective spending power, (c) civic participation, and (d)
political influence (Crump, 2003; Joseph, 2008; Joseph et al., 2007; Logan & Molotch,
1987). Social problems in these communities are understood as a direct result of these
four factors (Chaskin, & Webber, 2007; Crump, 2003; Joseph, 2008; Logan & Molotch,
1987). Again, there is no empirical evidence of this theory leading to any of the above
four factors beyond improving the physical quality of the neighborhood, the safety, and
the perceptions of privacy (Berube, 2006; Joseph, 2006).

**Resident leadership and stability.** First, resident leadership and stability is
assumed to be greater in higher income neighborhoods because CUP residents are more
frequently either transitional residents or generationally entrapped in communities where
economic and racial segregation creates and continues social problems (Kneebone &
Berube, 2008a). For example, CUP residents often experience higher crime rates, yet they
frequently do not report or confront crime because they fear retribution, which results in
social control by those committing crimes rather than the majority of residents (Kneebone
& Berube, 2008a).

**Spending power.** Second, spending power is assumed to attract retail and
commercial development in non-CUP neighborhoods (Logan & Molotch, 1987). City,
regional national, and global forces within both market and political arenas neglect and
marginalize urban poverty neighborhoods because of the low spending power of residents who are working poor or living below the poverty line (Kneebone & Berube, 2008a). As stated previously, businesses frequently fled CUP neighborhoods for better opportunities in the suburbs and near highway interchanges (Kneebone & Berube, 2008a; Kunstler, 1993). Retail and commercial development are expected to change again during MIR, but are expected not to benefit CUP residents given that higher income residents draw businesses to the community (Kneebone & Berube, 2000).

**Civic participation.** Third, civic participation and involvement is assumed to be higher if residents are affluent or own their home, which results in working within the system to vote and maintain the value in one’s property investments (Logan & Molotch, 1987). In contrast, CUP neighborhoods are typified as difficult to organize requiring grassroots community organizing entities to empower residents who are often unable to voice concerns regarding unacceptable, unavailable, and/or low quality services because their demand for resources cannot equally compete within the forces driving markets and politics. For example, resident participants in a collaborative planning process in one of this study’s neighborhoods, Sun Valley, stated that they would like to increase community involvement in civic life, which they anticipate will require partnership between local residents, foundations, and community-based organizations (City Planning Department, 2007).

**Influence.** Influence is assumed to be greater for those who work within the system through political connections, which contrasts with CUP neighborhoods who are vulnerable to physical and social disruption resulting in displacement or disruption of
routine (Logan & Molotch, 1987). For example, a group of residents in this study from the La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhood worked for more than two decades on a community development vision for the space near the neighborhood light rail station and were even mentioned in the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) application for funds to clean the site; however, the vision was replaced by a housing and market-oriented development in 2009 as the EPA instead collaborated with HUD and the Department of Transportation (DOT) to provide $10 million in federal Recovery Act funds to redevelop the Denver Housing Authority’s South Lincoln Homes in the contested space (Seigel, 2007; Steffen, 2009). The CUP residents in this example did not have the same ability to influence and leverage the needed political and financial investment in their vision. In contrast many systems working in collaboration at the city and federal levels influenced the development that will occur this year.

**Political economy of place example: development of public infrastructure.** The perspective of political economy of place theory is evident in the community context of this study. A city level example of political economy of place, in Denver, Colorado includes the more than 8 billion dollars currently being invested in central city rejuvenation and development of public infrastructure like rail access, the justice, civic and convention centers, and public housing redevelopment (Denver Infill, 2010; Flynn, 2010; Klipp Architecture, 2008; Metro Magazine, 2010; Robb, 2010; Steffen, 2009). The Recovery Act, HUD, the DOT, the Federal Transit Authority, the EPA, local authorities, and the Regional Transportation District have quickly invested large portions of the federal funding needed for local development (Rogoff, 2010). These funds are expected
to create jobs as well as shift businesses and housing to the central city with the transit-oriented development (Rogoff, 2010).

In summary, the four theories that are used to provide a rationale for mixed income redevelopment as the intervention of choice for concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods, have justified tearing down public housing developments. These communities have been replaced with new structures and a mixing of class groups that have improved the “place.”

**Research on Mixed Income Redevelopment for CUP Communities**

A critique of mixed-income redevelopment (MIR) theories can be explored by examining the research on the MIR strategies used to date. This will include a review of the HOPE VI outcomes at both the neighborhood level (i.e. changing the place) and at the resident level (i.e. changing the people).

**HOPE VI outcomes.** A review of the research on HOPE VI, the most researched mixed-income redevelopment initiative, includes three major findings: (a) how neighborhoods have changed in regards to the social problems identified in the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing, (b) the outcomes for residents, and (c) the numbers of residents in CUP neighborhoods that are displaced and/or relocated.

**Neighborhood change.** As a result of HOPE VI initiatives, the neighborhoods affected have shown improvements. Theorists and researchers argue that mixed-income redevelopments have an impact on the following factors, which provide empirical support for social control theory: (a) lower crime, (b) improved safety, (c) cleaner public spaces, and (d) increased property values and homeownership rates (Berube, 2006; Cloud & Roll,
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2009; Crump, 2003a; Joseph, 2006; Joseph, 2008; Joseph et al., 2007; Popkin et al., 2004). For example, the Park Avenue HOPE VI revitalization project in Denver, Colorado had a 27.4% decrease in overall crime between 2001 (pre-HOPE VI) and 2006 (post-HOPE VI) (Cloud & Roll, 2009). Denver’s overall crime rate decreased only 4% and ten control neighborhoods decreased only 6.8% during the same time period. Despite these outcomes, much of the research regarding MIR tells the privileged story of the middle class accessing desirable land and puts the working class and public housing residents backstage (Lees et al., 2008).

**Outcomes for residents.** A further examination of the outcomes for residents in CUP neighborhoods portrays a different story. Although mixed-income redevelopment is considered necessary because of the deterioration, disinvestment, and the correlated distress experienced by CUP residents, initial research and analysis illuminate that MIR may not effectively balance changing the structures of a neighborhood and addressing the needs of the residents. However, given that the studies are predominantly case studies and one panel study in five cities without rigorous methodologies such as randomized trials the research is cautiously genderalized.

First, the study of HOPE VI outcomes for residents who have been affected by redevelopment show very different results based on whether people remain in traditional public housing developments, move into the private market with Section 8 Vouchers, or remain behind in their current neighborhood (Popkin et al., 2004) (see Appendix B). For example, residents who move with Section 8 Vouchers at the time of redevelopment are more likely to experience financial hardship as seen in their struggle to pay their rent on
time and have money available to pay utilities and buy food (Barrett et al., 2003; Crowley, 2009; Popkin, 2007; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). Residents who move to traditional public housing communities tend to be residents facing multiple barriers and relocate away from the new but needed community amenities; as a result, they experience the least amount of benefits from the redevelopment (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009).

The Chicago Family Case Management Demonstration program is the only known HOPE VI supportive services model with improved economic outcomes at the household level (Theodos et al., 2010). The program focused on providing intensive case management to the entire family of HOPE VI movers, which included family members who were not on the lease but were involved in their day-to-day lives.

Another finding of the impact of HOPE VI redevelopment on residents has to do with issues of social support. Residents who move with Section 8 Vouchers often report a loss of relational support, particularly in regard to access to friends or neighbors to help with childcare (Boyd, 2008; Curley, 2006). In addition some residents who have moved with Section 8 Vouchers to areas defined as opportunity neighborhoods have at times found that their new neighborhoods may not accept them or their children into the existing social networks of the neighborhood (Boyd, 2008).

For residents who stayed or returned to the MIR community, Graves (2010) found that the management practices included:

- Cues given to public housing residents not to interact with market rate tenants;
- Public housing children were not allowed to play in public spaces near the housing;
- Market rate tenants were treated differently (such as being given a plate of cookies by the management during a holiday).
As a result public housing residents were surrounded by market rate tenants, but marginalized by the implementation practices of the change initiative.

Finally, there have been some positive outcomes for residents at the personal level. For example, in HOPE VI communities there has been improved mental health of low-income residents and decreased obesity (Popkin et al., 2004). Interpersonally, there have been improved superficial relationships across incomes, however this has not resulted in information or jobs for low-income families (Joseph, 2006; Joseph, 2008; Popkin et al., 2004).

**Resident relocation.** The only Panel Study on the HOPE VI program found that 84% of residents were relocated (Popkin et al., 2004). This relocation process can be quite difficult for CUP community residents. Those who moved with Section 8 Vouchers need more assistance in planning to address their financial hardship, which is visible in their struggle to balance paying for rent on time while learning to pay utilities and buy food (Popkin, 2007). Residents who moved to other public housing need planning to address the evidence stating that they experience only a slight decrease in crime, as well as their continued lack of improvement on economic outcomes and housing quality as they live in neighborhoods only slightly less poor than their previous neighborhood (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). The residents who stayed behind in their original public housing neighborhoods experienced the least benefits at the end of the Panel Study as they too reported a continuation of two or more housing problems and no economic improvements; however remaining in the community they ought to benefit from the
supportive services brought into the transformed communities (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009).

The research on the HOPE VI intervention demonstrates the place-based benefits of the HOPE VI program; however the people-based aspects of the program require further development in order to balance the benefits to people and place. Economic and social outcomes for residents remained the same or became worse for many residents as a result of HOPE VI relocation. Dispersing residents to break up crime and concentrated poverty patterns therefore may have unintended effects on residents. In summary, HOPE VI had an economic impact on the redeveloped communities as a place, but those changes have not trickled down to residents. Therefore current mixed-income redevelopment practice in places like the South Lincoln redevelopment in Denver, Colorado have shifted from a dispersal strategy to a phased redevelopment strategy that enables residents to remain in the neighborhood during and after redevelopment.

**Theory and Research Explaining the Need for Community Organizing**

Experts with knowledge frequently define problems, make decisions, and explain information without asking ordinary people for their input or involvement, despite the impacts of these decisions on the lives of ordinary citizens (Soeng, 1996). An alternative to a top down model of mixed-income redevelopment is using community-organizing strategies for resident engagement. Power and conflict theory informs a community organizing intervention, which is described further by social collectivist theory.

Community organizing instead focuses on involving ordinary people to make choices, shape actions, and create knowledge by collectively tapping into their assets and asserting
their power (Alinsky, 1971; Foucault, 1982; Habermas, 1989). Power and conflict and social collectivist theories are useful to community organizing interventions because both theories identify that people in power do not give up power without the “have nots” increasing their power and demand for resources (Brown, 2006). Power and economic systems are ecosystems that adapt and seek equilibrium in the midst of competing interests and therefore can be influenced with the energy of “have nots” in large numbers (Gramsci, 1971). CUP residents therefore can mobilize to bargain, negotiate, and advocate for their self-interest by persuading those with legitimate power to act on their behalf (Blau, 1964; Weber, Gerth, Gerth, & Mills, 1991). Participation in political change therefore, is an act of agency, where individuals and groups exercise power to reconstruct organizations, rewrite the dominant narrative and create different categorical rewards with aims and objectives that benefit them (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Foucault, 1972; Tilly, 1998).

**Power and conflict theory.** Power and conflict theory contextualizes key concepts like power, conflict, and knowledge. Defining “haves” and “have nots” helps set the stage for the reasons public housing residents (as people) have not benefited from mixed-income redevelopment as much as the neighborhoods as a place have. Power and conflict theory also explains the need for research methodologies inclusive of public housing residents throughout the research process, so that they can help create knowledge that defines future interventions (Strand, Marullo, Cutforth, Stoecker, & Donohue, 2003). Seven assumptions will be highlighted briefly as they apply to concentrated urban poverty and mixed-income redevelopment, which include: (a) knowledge and resources,
(b) dominant political and economic systems, (c) maintaining silenced striated classes, (d) class analysis and consciousness, (e) resistance: knowledge and participation, (f) freedom and equity through revolution, and (g) chronic poverty and neoliberalism.

**Knowledge and resources.** Power is relative based on the ability of an individual or group to produce intended effects through money, information, and people (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Piven & Cloward, 1971; Soeng, 1996; Tilly, 1998). Freedom is only available to the most powerful who can participate in and benefit from the legal system that creates property rights and contracts, as well as creating formal and informal policies, procedures, and traditions that benefit the powerful economically (Hegel, 1894). To the powerful the state is a, “committee for managing the affairs of the whole bourgeois” that is both effective and efficient at accomplishing large returns that typically lean in favor of the health, wellbeing, wealth, standards of living, security, and protection of the powerful (Foucault, 1982; Marx & Engels, 1884, p. 221; Tilly, 1998). The law is an instrument of power that both masks and protects the privilege, profit, authority and trade of the powerful and is rooted in a belief of a rational linear progress in society (Foucault, 1982; Hegel, 1894). For example, wealthy development corporations helped define the knowledge that enables the use low-income tax credits (LITC) to finance MIRs in declining central city areas, which provide an efficient way to invest in and profit from MIR without any responsibility for executing the purpose of the tax credit (Cisneros & Engdahl, 2009).

Conflict therefore is inevitable in all of society, particularly for those who work to eliminate civil inequality, oppression and arbitrary privilege (Bourdieu, 1998; Gramsci,
Institutions can limit collective power by creating segregation, not addressing discrimination, and limiting the right to form unions or other means of bargaining that confront the wealth, power, privilege, and inequality of most societies (Tilly, 1998). Politics and societal institutions therefore become a dialectical struggle between the ethical and the political and the moral and the useful (Gramsci, 1971). For example, an interventionist state might acknowledge group conflict and protect the working class from the harmful effects of capitalism by allowing unions as bargaining agents (Tilly, 1998).

**Dominant political and economic system.** Since power is believed to be finite, or limited in duration, society is frequently formed with power at the top that actively seeks to maintain that power (Foucault, 1972). Political power at times becomes a social process by which “the haves” oppress the “have-nots” through a rational, centralized and institutionalized network of power that conditions citizens to behave as if the dominant system of society is normal (Foucault, 1982; Marx & Engels, 1848). The image of government is frequently one of responsive benevolence, answering questions, and solving problems; however as stated previously the values, rituals, and institutional favor are built into the system in an invisible manner (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Piven & Cloward, 1971). Economic power frequently results from trade, commerce, and colonization that develop factories and global markets (Marx & Engels, 1884; Nietzsche, 1901). The functions of political leaders are aligned with maintaining economic superiority and therefore focus on three key components: (a) hegemony, (b) balance between interests, and (c) state goals in laws and enforcement (Gramsci, 1971).
Hegemony. The political leadership of a society maintains the dominant views by creating a rational economic and social order that defines normal and abnormal in a common sense manner that maintains the status quo (Foucault, 1982; Gramsci, 1971). Education, mass production that benefits the ruling class, and localized power therefore become appendages to the political machine that maintain economic power (Foucault, 1972; Marx & Engels, 1884). Localized power enforcing the hegemony exists throughout all of society including: (a) families, (b) institutions that set traditions, laws, habits, and regulations, as well as (c) modes of enforcing localized power through threats, surveillance, and enforcement (Foucault, 1972). Ultimately political power functions to balance the various hegemonic interests in order to maintain power.

Balance between interests. Political power is continually organizing to solve problems through both overt and covert power and influence (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962). Covert influence includes the ability to set an agenda privately and overt influence includes the ability to initiate, decide, or veto an issue (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962). Relational power requires conflict, which can threaten, reward or penalize potentially powerful groups with boycotts and other tactics that address latent power like wealth, social rank, position, and corporations as instruments of power (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962). All groups can press for decisions and change, which reflect their values and the procedures that would benefit them, but they have to push through non-decision, preserving the status quo and other forces, influences and authorities that can resist change (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962).
State goals in laws and enforcement. The overt maintenance of power to benefit “the haves” is rooted in the political and economic functioning hand-in-hand where political systems dominate, direct and coercively enforce hegemony, equilibrium, and state goals through laws (Foucault, 1982). Punishment through the police, army, and legal system conditions and trains citizens and ultimately maintains law and order, while rewards like corporate legal privileges are maintained through nationalism and tariffs, which benefit generations that have “sacrificed themselves” (Foucault, 1982; Nietzsche, 1901).

Maintaining silenced striated classes. A structural and institutional analysis can get at the roots of categories of membership like privileged and dominated, which are maintained by the power structure by withholding power, knowledge and resources from “others” seen as distinct and nonmembers (Tilly, 1998). The self interest of ruling class is to preserve the status quo and docility of the lower class, which results in an ordered structure throughout society with the dominated who serve the economic interests of the dominators (Foucault, 1982; Piven & Cloward, 1971). For example, the dominated classes are paid just enough to consume the products sold by the haves, as well as reproduce to ensure repopulation of species who will continue consuming what the haves produce (Marx & Engels, 1884; Nietzsche, 1901).

Class analysis and consciousness. A class-consciousness can therefore identify and explain how urbanization, industrialization and deindustrialization have sharpened inequality by describing privilege within the context of social closure, which not only exclude less powerful from benefits but also exploits their labor, hoards opportunities, and creates an ideological hegemony that maintains group distinctions (Marx & Engels,
A class-conscious analysis articulates the culturally and structural inequalities as different streams in the same transactions for example the different outcomes based on rewards and advantages received by “haves” and “have nots” from the federal highway, housing, and economic policies (Tilly, 1998). Categorical groups of “haves” and “have nots” whether they be male/female, citizen/foreigner, married/unmarried, owner/worker, or owner/renter of housing share attributes like their relationship to the market and consumption ability and socially construct the probability that poverty and wealth will be transmitted from one generation to the next because of opportunities and beliefs about what is possible for any given individual or group (Tilly, 1998). “Have nots” therefore need to view themselves as more than a subordinated, ruled or represented peasant class that sells their labor like a commodity and therefore becomes an appendage to the machine (Gramsci, 1971; Marx & Engels, 1884; Piven & Cloward, 1971; Tilly, 1998).

**Resistance: knowledge and participation.** Power and conflict theorist assert the need to struggle to create a new order by and on behalf of the “have not” social actors as the means to develop the motivation, beliefs and behavior to create change (Bourdieu, 1998; Nietzsche, 1901; Piven & Cloward, 1971; Tilly, 1998). As the masses become aware of economic, social, and political realities through dialogue with others they raise their consciousness and can create collective working class goals that they can take action on, and therefore place demands for bettering conditions (Foucault, 1972; Gramsci, 1971). Participation in political change therefore is an act of agency, where individuals and groups exercise power to reconstruct organizations and rewrite the dominant
narrative and create different categorical rewards with aims and objectives that benefit them (Bachrach & Baratz, 1962; Foucault, 1972; Tilly, 1998). For example, the Chicago Family Case Management Demonstration project defined a set of residents as hard-to-house and therefore ineligible or unable to cope with a Section 8 Voucher alone when their neighborhood was redeveloped, which resulted in providing additional intensive case management and services (Theodos et al., 2010).

**Freedom and equity through revolution.** Revolt is honorable if “have-nots” are waging war on something that awakens others to act, but the risk of creating conflict is punishment to suppress the revolt (Nietzsche, 1901). Protest tactics are typically used only when they are the final recourse for a group of people who are angry because they did not get what they expected or see something as wrong, yet fixable (Piven & Cloward, 1971). For example, disorder occurred in some urban neighborhoods because of rapid changes caused urbanization, industrialization, and deindustrialization (Piven & Cloward, 1971). These changes, which created drastic job creation, then reduction, built frustration and a lack of control for “have-nots” (Piven & Cloward, 1971). Haves have gained sophistication in responding to mobilized groups of “have-nots” by using power placating tactics (Piven & Cloward, 1971). For example, during the War on Poverty era the Model Cities program appeased many mobilized groups by investing in particular cities while doing nothing for most cities (Piven & Cloward, 1971).

**Chronic poverty and neoliberalism.** Chronic and transient poverty must be understood within the context of the contemporary international dominant discourse of neoliberalism since the 1970s, which hides power and the cost of labor as corporations
relocate the means of production to international contexts (Bass, 1986; Bourdieu, 1998; Hulme & Shepard, 2003). Deregulation of international markets and production protects the interests of multinational corporations and removes any collective structures that are an obstacle to a free market including collective resistance and bargaining (Bourdieu, 1998). A neoliberal economic vision instead assumes that poverty exists because of obstacles to capitalism or distortion in market and therefore focuses on the easy to assist poor who need to be integrated into the global market (Hulme & Shepard, 2003). Land within a neoliberal narrative focuses on competition for the use of space and therefore needs to include multiple uses such as housing, services, and products. The people-based aspects of redeveloped public housing do not always fit well with a neoliberal vision, which seeks to privatize the public purse and therefore reduce public expenditure. These principles of power and conflict theory shed light on the sociopolitical environment leading to the powerlessness of public housing residents as “have nots.” Social collectivist theory can prescribe that through participation in neighborhood organizing, public housing residents can help identify neighborhood problems and act as activists, negotiating on their own behalf with the political structures.

**Social collectivist theory: Agency and empowerment.** Social collectivist theory focuses on power as the ability to act on behalf of oneself or group (Gutierrez et al., 1998; Pernell, 1986). The theory focuses on describing how vulnerable populations became disempowered and prescribes what is required to restore their power to solve problems personally, interpersonally, and politically (Gutierrez et al., 1998; Lee, 1999).
The themes of social collectivist theory will be highlighted as they relate to community organizing in CUP neighborhoods.

**Disempowerment and powerlessness.** Social collectivist theory asserts that oppressed populations become disempowered because they adapt to having a low level of political economy (Gutierrez et al., 1998; Lee, 2000; Shera & Wells, 1999). Power is the ability to carry out one’s will despite resistance, which usually is the reality for powerful groups based on economic class, position or prestige. Individual concentrated urban poverty residents can become a cog in a rational bureaucratic machine (Weber, 1991). CUP communities often feel powerless because they are economically insecure or disadvantaged and have different life chances since society orders laws, contracts, practices and social investments around the political and economic interests of capitalism (Blau, 1967; Habermas, 1981; Lee, 2000; Shera & Wells, 1999). Since CUP residents are isolated and disconnected geographically and socially, they bear the burden of physical and emotional stressors in isolation (Lee, 1999). As a result, they are further disempowered by the place they live, which lacks access, choice, information and resources (Cox & Parsons, 1994; Guitierrez et al., 1998; Lee, 1999; Shera & Wells, 1999). Historically, decisions have been made without CUP citizens’ involvement in order to maintain social order, which results in residents feeling silenced and continues their lack of political involvement (Habermas, 1987; Habermas, 1989; Lee, 2000; Shera & Wells, 1999). CUP neighborhoods frequently deteriorate and are not invested in over time, while the larger sociopolitical environment frequently changes. Therefore, those
seeking to create social change need time to build up enough strength to create change (Blau, 1967).

**Empowerment to act.** Social collectivists therefore assert that oppressed populations ought to work to restore their personal, interpersonal and political agency in order to gain control of their lives and the place where they live, since they are closest to the problems they face (Lee, 2000). Asserting personal power includes having efficacy to determine one’s own life course with a sense of freedom to act and make choices (Habermas, 1987; Lee, 2000; Guitierrez et al., 1998; Shera & Wells, 1999). Interpersonal power includes working with others to influence the groups’ outcomes and options (Guitierrez et al., 1998). Political power is the ability to struggle and act in order to influence the detached expert forces that drive political and economic systems such as rules, laws, regulations and practices (Guitierrez et al., 1998; Habermas, 1981; Weber, 1991).

**Restoring power.** As CUP residents see themselves as agents to influence change they can develop the skills, knowledge, and resources necessary to influence the sociopolitical structures that impact their lives (Guitierrez et al., 1998; Payne, 2005; Shera & Wells, 1999). Agency requires developing the thoughts, emotions and behaviors that operate from an authentic and collective resident voice (Guitierrez et al., 1998; Shera & Wells, 1999). Specifically, critical thinking can identify power and oppression to name how the personal is political, as the capitalist and bureaucratic interests are aligned (Lee, 2000; Shera & Wells, 1999; Weber, 1991). In other words, residents begin to view their problems through a sociopolitical lens that connects personal, interpersonal, and
neighborhood problems to local, state, national, and international institutions, policies and practices (Guitierrez et al., 1998; Lee, 2000). Oppressed groups gain power with others by learning and participating in activities that transform social structures through a process of activities like testifying, lobbying, writing letters and working with the news media (Cox & Parsons, 1994; Guitierrez et al., 1998; Lee, 2000).

Together CUP residents can develop the capacity to modify public and private conduct by becoming a force that gains wins through communication of anger and aggression that disrupts the status quo (Blau, 1964). As they gain a seat at the table with those in legitimate power or authority over rules, laws and regulations, they can bargain, negotiate, and advocate for their self-interest by persuading those with power or authority to act (Blau, 1964; Guitierrez et al., 1998; Lee, 2000; Shera & Wells, 1999; Weber, 1991). The ideal end result of social collective activities is redistributing resources in a manner that benefits current CUP residents and restores equilibrium among competing forces (Blau, 1964; Parsons, Cox, 1998; Shera & Wells, 1999).

Social collectivism and power and conflict theories offer a critique of social capital, social control, culture of poverty, and political economy of place. The following paragraphs likewise offer a critique of power and conflict and social collectivist theories.

Critique of theory explaining the need for community organizing. Power and conflict and social collectivist theory each have their strengths and weaknesses as identified by contemporary theorists like sociologists William Julius Wilson (2009) and Manuel Castells (2003), and feminist standpoint theorists Sandra Harding (1993) and Patricia Hill Collins (2000). Strengths and weaknesses will be briefly highlighted for
each theory. The main critique of power and conflict theory is that it ignores race and gender as parallel constructions in its analysis of power. Three main critiques of social collectivist theory are also evident including: (a) ignoring race and gender in its analysis of power, (b) postmodern alternatives to resistance, and (c) difficulty of gaining enough power. Together these critiques provide a well-defined set of obstacles to overcome in order to engage large numbers of public housing residents to collectively act collectively on their own behalf.

_Ignores race and gender in its analysis of power._ Power and conflict theory is frequently critiqued for the emphasis on class. Without class to structure society, racism and gender discrimination would still stratify society in a matrix of domination that regulates the patterns and discriminatory practices of social institutions via schools, housing, employment, and government (Harding, 1993; Hill Collins, 2000). Groups whose identities intersect across many oppressed categories like race, gender and class become permanent outsiders or bear durable inequalities throughout their lifetime or generations (Hill Collins, 2000; Tilly, 1998). For example, Black women frequently have unique standpoints from other identities because they are often at the bottom of the social and economic hierarchy (Hill Collins, 2000).

_Postmodern alternatives to resistance._ Socially collective processes require consciousness raising, criticizing knowledge and acting to deal with unjust institutions (Hill Collins, 2000). Social collectivists argue that change happens through collective human agency and action (Castells, 2003; Hill Collins, 2000). Social movements, while branded for marches and protests, have shifted to other postmodern alternatives of
resistance influence and agency (Castells, 2003; Hill Collins, 2000). Today using technology, issue focused coalitions, and Community Benefits Agreements (CBAs) have become somewhat normative collective activism alternatives to enable influence, compromises and wins for labor, housing or environmental causes in exchange for the agenda of the “haves” (Castels, 2003; Hill Collins, 2000). CBAs, social movements, and other collective agency therefore have a role in the conflict and transformation of urban areas (Castells, 2003). If a diverse coalition of citizens’ work together across race, class, gender and other identities in local organizations, they can effectively create much needed change on behalf of CUP neighborhoods (Wilson, 2009).

**Difficulty of gaining enough power.** A broad-based coalition, however, is difficult to develop, in terms of the magnitude of power needed to create change for communities that have been marginalized for decades (Wilson, 2009). As a result of defensive reactions and ghettoization, residents of CUP neighborhoods frequently have a defensive identity that reacts and demands respect for their neighborhood, resources, and communities rather than an identity that collectively competes for mainstream economic wins (Castells, 2003).

**Community organizing research.** Several decades of research on community interventions has resulted in established concepts, measures and known relationships between social cohesion, resident involvement, and neighborhood problems in CUP neighborhoods (Ohmer & Beck, 2006). Three key relationships have been found in the research on community organizing. First, a resident’s awareness of neighborhood problems, their belief that neighborhood organizations can solve problems, and the
closeness of their relationships predicts their individual and collective activism (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007). Second, a resident’s participation level and participation in decision-making are also known to impact their belief that neighborhood organizations can solve problems (Ohmer & Beck, 2006). Third, home ownership is known to predict resident involvement in neighborhood organizations (Winter, 1990). Despite key findings regarding resident involvement, community-focused evidence-based practice is one of the least developed areas of research; community intervention models and the changes they create are difficult to specify and evaluate with experimental or statistical controls (Ohmer & Beck, 2006).

Social cohesion is defined by Sampson, Raudenbush, & Earls (1997) as the willingness to act on behalf of collective good or collective efficacy. Social cohesion is a component of a community’s capacity for change (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007). Healthy communities have mechanisms in place for collective action when needed; strong relational ties predict individual involvement in solving neighborhood problems (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007). As described previously social cohesion tends to be low in low-income neighborhoods because residents may not trust each other or share information and expectations to gain social control and establish norms because they do not believe change is possible, so they do not become involved (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Obst et al., 2002; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999).

HOPE VI studies generally did not measure social cohesion or collective efficacy prior to redeveloping communities, which would enable policymakers to gauge the impact of redevelopment and relocation on community social capital that was either
preserved or destroyed (Keating, 2000). Discussion of HOPE VI policy tends to make several assumptions regarding collective efficacy such as (a) creating a mixed-income community may improve the collective efficacy or ability of a community to prevent and solve neighborhood problems (Berube, 2006; Costigan, 2006; Fraser & Kick, 2007; Galster & Santiago, 2006; Joseph, 2006; Joseph et al., 2007; Vale, 2006), (b) homeowners as longer term stakeholders in the community are likely to maintain rules, accountability, and norms (Joseph, 2006; Joseph, 2008; Joseph et al., 2007), and (c) mixed-income communities may lower crime and have cleaner public spaces resulting in improved mental health for residents (Berube, 2006). However recent studies have found that how mixed-income redevelopments are implemented can decrease the existing social cohesion of public housing residents whether they are dispersed to Section 8 units, relocated to other traditional public housing neighborhoods, or moved into the new mixed-income redevelopments.

Therefore a clearer depiction of the ways that low-income residents have adapted to create and rely on the social cohesion within CUP neighborhoods needs to be taken into account rather than assuming that residents should be dispersed to lower poverty neighborhoods. In addition, bringing higher income residents to public housing communities may not improve public housing residents’ lives if they are not included in defining, implementing and monitoring the community changes. Organizational collective efficacy is a logical factor to include in measuring the ability of neighborhood organizations to prevent and solve problems prior to redevelopment, during the change process, and after mixed-income communities have been created.
Implications for Evidence Based Practice in Transforming CUP Communities

While mixed-income redevelopment of CUP communities has resulted in some significant changes to distressed communities, the positive outcomes for residents, whether they are moved to new neighborhoods or remain or return to the CUP community, have been limited. An emerging process that enables capacity building and community involvement in decision-making is evidence-based practice (EBP), which HUD has begun to practice (Engdahl & Cisneros, 2009). EBP is a knowledge sharing process that seeks to balance three different perspectives: 1) the best available evidence, 2) professional judgment, and 3) client perspectives in order to create change for vulnerable populations (Edmond, 2009; Gibbs, 2003). The best available evidence of the HOPE VI program shows that:

- Concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods limit the opportunities and outcomes of low-income families (Boston, 2005; Kelly, 2005; Mathers & Rivers, 2006);
- Resident readiness for transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment can be predicted by social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and having a transition and/or relocation plan (Walker, 2009);
- Resident outcomes vary based on where residents move during HOPE VI redevelopments (Barrett, 2003; Popkin, 2007; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009); and
- Residents may require different levels of support to transition and relocate to new housing during redevelopment processes (Boston, 2008; Howard, 2010; Theodus et al., 2009).

Professional judgment regarding the HOPE VI program indicates public housing residents and their surrounding neighbors do not always benefit from the necessity of mixed-income policy created to tackle housing problems and the distress of residents
(Crowley, 2009). One perspective that can add to the literature on the process of redeveloping a community is understanding the community and resident readiness and capacity for change. HOPE VI policy analysis has strongly critiqued the resident engagement and community readiness for change aspects of MIR implementation (Cisneros, 2009; Crowley, 2009). Community capacity for change concepts and the related literature can help us with this.

Community capacity for change is a popular framework for funders like W.K. Kellogg Foundation and the National Institute of Health (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kumpfer, 1997). Community building initiatives seek to improve local willingness and ability to drive and implement change (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kumpfer, 1997). If residents are involved in planning, implementing, and sustaining change they are more successful and likely to accept change because they see change is needed, feasible and desirable (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kumpfer, 1997).

Residents need citizen participation to be ready for change. Readiness for change is reflected in strong relationships within their community, seeing neighborhood problems, believing change is possible and taking steps to address problems (Kumpfer, 1997). Community readiness for change can be measured based on individual residents’ readiness for change (Kumpfer, 1997). Foster-Fishman et al. (2007) in a previous study predicted community capacity for change based on social cohesion, collective efficacy, and individual and collective involvement in solving neighborhood problems, as well as the level of recognition of neighborhood problems. The study found that resident involvement in creating neighborhood change can be predicted by resident perceptions of
a community’s readiness for change as measured by social cohesion, collective efficacy, and the level of neighborhood problems (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007). If community readiness for change is linked to their involvement in defining problems, identifying viable solutions and implementing those interventions, then communities that are the most ready for change may benefit from collaborations that reflect the following evidence-based practice precepts:

- sophisticated knowledge and research on HOPE VI outcomes like economic hardship and a lack of social support for Section 8 movers;
- highly competent professional judgment and practice wisdom regarding resident engagement from resident supportive services employees and community social workers; as well as,
- local client perspectives, experiences and values regarding mixed-income redevelopment and transition and/or relocation planning that tailor solutions to meeting the needs of the highest-risk clients in the neighborhood (Kumpfer, 1997).

The sheer number of households relocated and the disparate outcomes for households in different household types, as HOPE VI programs rolled out, emphasize a greater need to focus on transition and/or relocation planning in future mixed-income redevelopment of public housing (Katz, 2009). Resident engagement, clear communication, and ensuring that HOPE VI benefits those experiencing the distress of public housing need to become a higher priority in the creation of mixed-income communities. The disparate and varying results for residents housed with Section 8 Vouchers, other traditional public housing, and those who remained behind prior to the completion of HOPE VI are a good starting point for transition and/or relocation planning, which go deeper than many of the basic needs that are assumed to be important in the months prior to and during the transition.
Residents who remained behind tended to be the hard-to-house who experience multiple barriers to self-sufficiency (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). Such barriers as mental or physical illness, substance abuse, having many children, lack of work experience or criminal backgrounds are problems that could be addressed within family systems (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). Support services could be designed to help residents overcome their barriers to self-sufficiency or realistic outcomes could be identified for public housing residents who are hard-to-house and unlikely to work or attend college. For example, if a resident is on disability and has young children, the parent should not be expected to work. Other mediating resiliency supports such as enrolling children in an early childhood development program could be provided in order to improve other household outcomes.

Since traditional public housing communities created neighborhoods dominated by institutions meeting the basic needs of many neglected households, the solutions to supportive services are likely not within system reform. Rather solutions may be within creating space and removing barriers in planning to make room for mediating community associations to meet these needs (Katz, 2009; McKnight, 1996). As a result these low-income communities could potentially overcome the dynamic of being consumers or clients of top-down system services, which creates a sociopolitical climate where citizens of these communities were often unable to collectively problem solve collectively, like healthy communities, in order to address and overcome neighborhood problems like crime, housing problems, unemployment, and struggling neighborhood schools (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; McKnight, 1996). The natural next step in improving community’s
readiness for change therefore, is to utilize the knowledge that comes from the missing sector of community life in traditional public housing communities: community associations and the community interventions they provide.

HOPE VI evaluators, city planners, residents, and community practitioners agree that engaging communities in a planning process helps prepare people for change (Fainstein, 2002; Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kumpfer, 1997; Urban Institute, 2010). Planning processes are often designed to engage individuals in a community; however, residents may also participate in planning processes as a group. As a result the predictors of involvement in neighborhood organizations will be described within the context of transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment.

Transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment. The problems associated with traditional public housing in the United States became apparent in the 1980s, which resulted in rethinking and rebuilding public housing in the 1990s through the HOPE VI program (Popkin et al., 2004). Mixed-income redevelopment has become the primary focus of both solving the problems associated with public housing and a regional opportunity surrounding light rail stops with transit-oriented development (TOD) potential (Calthorpe, 2009). United States central cities that once experienced isolation, lack of investment and deterioration have once again become prime real estate that draws interest and investment from several sectors (Lees et al., 2008). Collaboration between the public, private, and nonprofit arenas has created a new sociopolitical climate that has transformed public housing and has an impact on residents who were once isolated from mainstream society (Baron, 2009).
Engaging public housing residents in neighborhood change. Research regarding the effectiveness of replacing traditional public housing with mixed-income communities is promising on the neighborhood level, but inconclusive regarding the empowering effects on former residents (Polikoff, 2009). Much of the research focusing on neighborhood level interventions within the last 10 years focused on predictors of resident involvement in activism. For example, Foster-Fishman et al. (2007) have built on existing measures of neighborhood problems, individual activism, collective activism, neighborhood identity, and working together against crime (Chavez & Wanderman, 1990; Kieffer, 1984; Perkins, Florin, Rich, Chavis & Wanderman, 1990; Perkins & Long, 2002; Speer & Hughey, 1995). In addition, Ohmer & Beck (2006) have utilized and built on the knowledge of previous measures of organizational collective efficacy, participation level and participation in decision-making (Perkins & Long, 2002). In addition factors like home ownership are known correlates of resident involvement in neighborhood organizations (Winter, 1990).

The collective literature from the last 30 years provided the basis for defining three research questions focused on developing evidence-based practices for implementing large-scale change initiatives such as community organizing and mixed-income redevelopment. This study will describe the context of two Concentrated Urban Poverty neighborhoods facing transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment prior to implementation of the large-scale change initiatives. The study can help determine if the following relationships thought to exist within communities are also true for current CUP
residents facing transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment. Specifically the key themes include describing:

- Relationships between social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and solving particular community problems (like transition and relocation planning) on residents’ readiness for a major change initiative (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007);

- Relationships between neighborhood problems, social cohesion, neighborhood identity, activism, capacity for change and organizational collective efficacy on involvement in neighborhood organizations (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Keifer, 1984; Speer & Hughey, 1995);

- Relationships between resident participation level and participation in decision-making on organizational collective efficacy and involvement in particular neighborhood organizations (Ohmer & Beck, 2006); and

- Relationships between resident awareness of problems to be solved by previous HOPE VI movers (based on the housing type and location chosen) and resident expectations of their own transition and relocation planning.

**Missing components of MIR research.** The current mixed-income redevelopment research is missing key components. One missing segment of research exists at the intersection of resident participation in their low-income neighborhoods at the time of mixed-income redevelopment. One reason may be that the HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhood policies encourage several foci that complicate resident influence over their neighborhood decision-making. For example, mixed-financing requires housing authorities to be sophisticated in managing public-private partnerships that apply for federal funding while partnering with local and national foundations and developers, in order to finance mixed-income redevelopments. Choice Neighborhoods, the replacement policy initiative for the HOPE VI program, continues to invest in neighborhoods with a public housing core to create well-researched mixed-income communities (Donovan, 2009; Obama, 2009; White, 2009).
In addition, HOPE VI studies have not focused on key components that could provide important perspective for the national dialogue. Gaps in current research show the need for additional case studies rooted in power and conflict and social collectivist theories that better inform HUD, local housing authorities, and residents of current resident perspectives. Filling in these gaps may inform the discussion and policy making to include current resident perspectives much like the 18-month National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing process and the former HUD secretary’s visits to public housing. This study has attempted to fill these gaps. Findings from this study can then be integrated into the best knowledge and evaluation. Findings may expand HUD’s understanding of client knowledge, values, needs and perspectives regarding transition and/or relocation planning for current public housing residents.

Research Questions

The focus of this study is on two neighborhoods facing transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment. As previously stated, the research on mixed-income redevelopment and community organizing interventions is limited. As a result, three research questions are proposed that will focus on resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment, their involvement in neighborhood organizations, and residents’ responses to the outcomes of previous HOPE VI movers and the services they expect to need during transition and/or relocation planning. The research questions will be described below prior to defining the specific study methodology and hypothesis in the next chapter.

Research question one: Readiness for mixed-income redevelopment.
Healthy communities solve the problems of their families through association and
systems partnership (McKnight, 1996). Research question one asks whether social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and having a transition and/or relocation plan are associated with resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment. Research question one tests the theory that strong relationships between families, belief that the collective problems solving of neighborhood associations and solving specific neighborhood problems like having a transition and/or relocation plan can predict how ready current residents of traditional public housing communities are for mixed-income redevelopment. The hypothesis will be retained if social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and/or having a transition and/or relocation plan are associated with resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment. If resident participation in problem solving is an important predictor of readiness for change, then predicting resident involvement in neighborhood organizations is important knowledge to build.

**Research question two: Involvement in neighborhood organizations.**

Research question two asks what variables create a structural equation model with adequate model fit that predict resident involvement in neighborhood organizations (see Figures 1 and 2). Specifically a structural equation model will be built to examine the relationships between variables measuring individual resident perception of community capacity for change, readiness for change, resident involvement, neighborhood factors, and neighborhood commitment in predicting resident involvement in neighborhood organizations. The hypothesis for research question two states that current knowledge regarding resident involvement in neighborhood organizations may or may not result in a SEM with adequate model fit; however key findings may support or refute findings from
previous studies when applied to low-income neighborhoods facing mixed-income redevelopment. The null hypothesis states that no significant paths will result from a SEM predicting resident involvement in specific neighborhood organizations. The SEM will be built based on existing knowledge that can be explained in six steps (see Appendix C).

Figure 1. Structural Equation Model 1.
Research question three: Evidence-based relocation planning. Research question three is included in the design of open-ended resident interviews, asking them to respond to previous HOPE VI outcomes for residents and what supports they expect residents will need to have more economically and socially sustainable outcomes, which will build knowledge for evidence-based resident supportive services in the South Lincoln redevelopment transition and relocation planning process.
Chapter Three: Methodology

“Learning by inquiry provides an opportunity to reflect on past sources of information and then act on what works” (Roberts-Degennaro, 2008, p. 395).

The methodology section of this study will be written in an explanatory style to make the report as understandable as possible to residents, practitioners, and policy makers who may read the report. Accordingly, the methods section will include more information than is typical of the methods section of a dissertation.

The study methods include the following six steps:

1. Statement of the research questions and hypotheses;
2. Explanation of the overall study design;
3. Description of the sample for the qualitative and quantitative portions of the study;
4. Definition of the study context and how the sample was derived;
5. Explanation of the procedures for data collection and measures; and
6. Statement of data analysis techniques.

The methods section chapter is a guide to understanding the subsequent measures and results chapters.

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Research Question One: Readiness for Mixed-Income Redevelopment. Research question one asks whether social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and possession of a transition and/or relocation plan predict resident readiness for mixed
income redevelopment. The hypothesis will be retained if social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and/or possession of a transition and/or relocation plan predict resident readiness for mixed income redevelopment. If resident participation in problem solving is an important predictor of readiness for change, then predicting resident involvement in neighborhood organizations is important knowledge on which to build.

**Research Question Two: Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations.**

Research question two asks what variables create a Structural Equation Model (SEM) with adequate model fit that predicts resident involvement in neighborhood organizations (see Figures 1 and 2). The hypothesis for research question two states that current knowledge regarding resident involvement in neighborhood organizations may or may not result in a SEM with adequate model fit. However, key results may support or refute findings from previous studies when applied to low-income neighborhoods facing mixed income redevelopment. The null hypothesis states that no significant paths will result from a SEM predicting resident involvement in specific neighborhood organizations.

**Research Question Three: Evidence-Based Transition/Relocation Planning.** Research question three asks how residents facing a HOPE VI redevelopment initiated move respond to an evidence-based practice conversation regarding transition and/or relocation planning. Evidence-based practice exists at the intersection of data, professional wisdom, and participant knowledge (Gibbs, 2003). The hypothesis is that current transition and relocation planning emphasizes the use of data and professional wisdom, which does not adequately account for key resident knowledge, values, and experiences, and realities. Therefore, asking residents about their knowledge, values,
experiences, and realities regarding transition and relocation planning can help develop an evidence-based practice framework that includes professional wisdom, data, and resident perspectives. The resulting framework can then be used to inform future transition and relocation planning within an evidence-based practice approach.

The use of in-depth interviews with public housing residents combined with surveys from a larger group of residents initiates a knowledge-building process of “learning by inquiry [which] provides an opportunity to reflect on past sources of information and then act on what works” (Roberts-Degennaro, 2008, p. 395). The use of in-depth interviews can provide a rich description of different ways to view transition and relocation planning within the context of more generalizable survey findings describing the shared perspectives of the larger community (Netting & O’Conner, 2008). Research questions one and two utilize a mixed methods design with a survey and in-depth interviews. The following section will elaborate on the mixed methods research process.

Together the three research questions test new ideas and improve evidence-based decision-making used by local organizations to create inclusive and sustainable transit-oriented mixed income communities (HUD, 2010, Goal 4E: Strategies 1 and 2). Research question one explored existing survey data to determine if social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and possession of a transition and/or relocation plan predict resident readiness for mixed income redevelopment. The in-depth interviews described, in current public housing authority residents’ own words, why the model successfully predicts their readiness. Research question two explored the existing survey data to determine which variables create a Structural Equation Model (SEM) with adequate model fit that predicts
resident involvement in neighborhood community organizing, community development and Local Resident Council organizations. The second round of in-depth interviews, in which residents described why they are or are not involved in neighborhood organizations, elaborated survey data. Research question three explored the findings of previous research on resident outcomes and the need for supportive services. The level of case management support has varied based on residents’ membership in either a thriving, aging and distressed, or high risk households during transition and/or relocation planning in order to determine how residents facing a HOPE VI move respond to an evidence-based practice conversation regarding transition and/or relocation planning (Barrett, 2003; Popkin, 2007; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009; Theodus et al., 2010).

**Mixed Methods**

The study used a mixed methods design to develop theory and knowledge with a more holistic representation of interest from interpretive and empirical perspectives (Clark & Creswell, 2008). Interpretive perspectives in this study include in-depth qualitative interviews with residents resulting in the development of common themes. The empirical perspectives of this study include quantitative surveys resulting in a depiction of common culture and values. Research questions one and two have a concurrent triangulation design, which requires collecting all quantitative data, qualitative data, and artifacts separately and then comparing them in an iterative process in the final stage of data analysis (Clark & Creswell, 2008). A figure depicting the survey design and three research questions illustrates the data collection, analysis, and comparison process.
(see Figure 3). All research question results are synthesized in an iterative process.

Chapter seven provides a final synthesis.

**Figure 3.** Mixed Methods Design. The stages of data collection, data analysis and the related research questions are depicted. Quantitative and qualitative data was collected and analyzed separately. Then the final stage of analysis for research questions one and two included a synthesis of the quantitative and qualitative findings. The capitalization of QUAN and QUAL represent the equal, but separate weight given to the empirical and interpretive ways of building knowledge. QUAN = Quantitative, QUAL = Qualitative.

The research methods for this research project intersect empirical, interpretive, and transformative research methodologies to balance rigor with decolonizing research methodology (Clark & Creswell, 2008; Tuhiwai Smith, 2008). The major data collection method was a 333 question survey. Survey measures have numerous strengths and weaknesses (Royse, 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005). Survey strengths include:
• wide use of surveys in social sciences because surveys are efficient, quick, and convenient, work well as face-to-face interviews, even when surveys require long interviews and can describe and explain frequency of characteristics, thoughts, feelings, behavior, and sensitive questions for large groups of people on topics that only individuals can answer for themselves (Singleton & Straits, 2005);

• results of surveys can be used to make generalizations to a population as well as guide planning, decision-making and policy and commonly have good response rates, including 67% participation in central city neighborhoods (Singleton & Straits, 2005); and

• standardization, replication, and validation of surveys provide the greatest control over error and bias in sampling (Grove et al., 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005).

Surveys also have numerous weaknesses including the following scientific and practical issues:

• creating a survey restricts the content respondents can provide, requires that researchers anticipate possible extraneous variables, and this makes determining causality difficult without at least two data collection points (Singleton & Straits, 2005);

• surveys are hard to change once started and administering surveys also tends to be more expensive because of the need to recruit, train, and supervise interviewers (Royse, 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005);

• participants can also refuse to answer particular questions and therefore researchers have to deal with missing data (Grove et al., 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005);

• surveys have numerous possibilities for error including interview or interviewee caused errors and sampling errors (Grove et al., 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005). In some situations, the interviewer may not follow the protocol, or the interviewee may not recall the answer to a question, or may answer in a socially desirable way rather than responding truthfully (Grove et al., 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005).

Although surveys can provide a summary description of a population on key variables, their challenges require research methods to address problems with missing data and the inherent error in the data collection process.
In an effort to minimize some of the inherent weaknesses of surveys developed from theory alone for this study, a pilot testing process invited residents to participate in creating the survey instruments. The practice of pilot testing to obtain participant responses and input is aligned with decolonizing methodologies. Decolonizing research methodologies focus on oppressed groups explaining their common experience and envisioning an ideal future as politically involved people focused on their right to participate in decision-making processes, which often includes maintaining their culture, values, and relationships (Tuhiwai Smith, 2008). The study used a pilot test as a starting point for discussion with residents about important concepts to measure and test with established survey measures used within concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods when possible. Resident feedback suggested the survey focus on the following survey topics:

- Community readiness for change concepts such as readiness for a mixed income and a mixed-use neighborhood (including a focus on building a range of public, affordable, and market rate housing near retail, services and transit connections), working together against crime, and organizational collective efficacy (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Ohmer & Beck, 2006; original measures);

- Community capacity for change such as social cohesion (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Obst et al., 2002);

- Citizen participation in neighborhood organizations including: participation level, participation in decision-making, individual activism, and collective activism (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Ohmer & Beck, 2006; Parsons, n.d.; Speer & Peterson, 2000). Residents requested specific neighborhood organizations be included in the survey, which included a newly forming community development group with members from the Denver Housing Authority – Local Resident Council and Project WISE called Helping Us Grow Stronger (HUGS); and

- Resident identified goals and problems to address as identified in the key focus areas for change identified in the 2007 Resident Advisory Committee process, such as crime and safety concerns and improved transition and/or relocation
Residents suggesting cutting the following scales because they were either redundant, recently used in other research (by the Annie E. Casey Foundations – Making Connections – Denver initiative or the Denver Housing Authority surveys), or they did not find the scales fit their interests. The following scales were cut from the survey including:

- Social cohesion subscales focused on neighborhood collective efficacy and bonding social capital (Barret, Geisel, & Johnson, 2004; Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kleit, Carlson, Kutzmark, 2003; Making Connections – Denver, n.d.; Ohmer & Beck, 2006; Popkin & Cunningham, 2002);
- Influence (Making Connections – Denver, n.d.; Obst et al., 2002);
- Hope (in the next year I think conditions on my block will improve) (Foster-Fishman et al. 2007);
- Neighborhood leadership (Foster-Fishman et al. 2007);
- Household size;
- Employment barriers;
- Health barriers;
- Job training; and
- Locus of control (Barret, Giesel, Johnson, 2004).

Research participants described concepts that have not yet been captured empirically within the context of the transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment of communities with traditional public housing, which were used to create new measures. For example, residents suggested asking questions on the following topics

- Comfort living next door to someone with a criminal record; and
- Giving second chances to family members who committed crimes.
A description of the study context is next.

**Study Context**

This study focused on two Concentrated Urban Poverty neighborhoods facing transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment are described next. The quantitative component is a quasi-experimental panel survey of 387 households with a 36% response rate, from residents living in two public housing neighborhoods in west Denver, which had a possibility of being redevelopment in conjunction with transit-oriented development (TOD) of light rail stops at the time of the surveys. The population of interest for the study encompassed residents of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods with a high concentration of public housing who are facing transit-oriented redevelopment. Two Denver, Colorado neighborhoods, Sun Valley and La Alma/Lincoln Park, are in the sampling frame because they were both recently involved in a Resident Advisory Committee (RAC) planning process that included a collaboration of residents and neighborhood organizations, a local foundation, and various city departments. Although both neighborhoods participated in the same RAC process, the communities are different demographically. Sun Valley has more publically subsidized housing, a lower annual income, and more people of color than both La Alma/Lincoln Park and Denver citywide (see Table 1). The redevelopment of the La Alma/Lincoln Park -- South Lincoln site began in October 2010 and the redevelopment of the Sun Valley site may occur as soon as 2015.
Table 1. Population Demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sun Valley</th>
<th>La Alma/Lincoln Park</th>
<th>Denver Citywide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publically Subsidized Housing (Piton, 1999)</td>
<td>93.9%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>$12,434</td>
<td>$38,480</td>
<td>$55,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>46.4%</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
<td>31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other People of Color (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>17.3%</td>
<td>7.2%</td>
<td>10.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
<td>32.4%</td>
<td>51.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this study, funding guidelines regulated resident contact. At the time of the survey, the study population included two heavily researched neighborhoods and many vulnerable populations. Taking into account these overly burdened populations, development of data collection procedures and measures focused on sensitivity to this particular context.

In order to minimize the burdensome nature of neighborhood research on vulnerable populations (Foster-Fishman, 2007), the interview team did not pursue a higher response rate. Because the residents were currently involved in the planning processes, they had already taken part in numerous surveys and interviews. Contacting residents beyond three
attempts was not pursued during the qualitative and quantitative data collection phase. At the time of this survey the Denver Housing Authority also interviewed South Lincoln residents regarding the redevelopment of their neighborhood. The Annie E. Casey Foundation -- Making Connections-Denver survey asked similar questions over the previous 10 years in both neighborhoods. Local police and health surveys had also occurred at multiple points during the previous year. A similar quantitative study on resident readiness and capacity for change yielded a 30% response rate. The detailed data collection procedures and measures are next.

**Procedures for Data Collection and Measures**

This researcher collected the survey data used for the study with a Housing and Urban Development - Office of University Partnerships, Early Doctoral Student Research Grant (EDSRG) in 2008-2009. However, methods described here include improved analyses. Thirty resident leaders pilot tested the quantitative survey in the spring of 2009. The pilot test reliability of the measures (alpha=.76-.99) and resident feedback forms guided the creation of the final quantitative survey instrument (Spring 2009). Completion of all surveys occurred between the spring and summer of 2009. The survey design was influenced by the 25 in-depth interviews conducted as a part of the EDSRG grant, which resulted in a major study theme focused on resident perceptions of the lack of genuineness of collaboration during the Resident Advisory Community (RAC) process (Walker, 2009). These themes will be brought forward in the conclusion of this dissertation as they are relevant to developing an evidence-based mixed-income redevelopment practice.
The Housing and Urban Development - Office of University Partnerships, Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant (DDRG) in 2010-2011 funded a second round of data collection. The DDRG data was a qualitative component that included 25 in-depth semi-structured interviews with South Lincoln participants completed in December 2010 through January 2011. In addition, artifacts collected included Resident Advisory Committee (RAC) documents, community organizing documents, South Lincoln Redevelopment Steering Committee and community meeting documents, the Master Plan for the South Lincoln Redevelopment, and press regarding the organizational work and redevelopment planning processes in the La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhood with a particular emphasis on the community pool renovation planning process. Collection of all artifacts occurred between 2007 and 2011. This included the period between the initial RAC intervention (throughout 2007), the submission of a HOPE VI application to HUD to fund the South Lincoln Redevelopment (Spring 2011), and the continued Sun Valley planning processes (ongoing in 2011). The two research grants funded hiring resident and social work student surveyors, interviewers, and transcribers, which enabled the researcher to spend more time improving the study via resident and professional feedback. A description of the resulting quantitative and qualitative sample, demographics, and measures are provided next.

**Quantitative Sample.** The quantitative sampling frame used to represent the sample and make generalizations about the population included all 1,048 households in the study area including: all public housing residents, nearby redeveloped or renovated low-income housing, and surrounding privately owned houses in the Sun Valley and La
Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhoods. Surveyors knocked on all doors at least three times at various times and days of the week in an effort to contact all 1,048 households in the sampling frame (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Surveyors posted flyers on each door prior to door knocking to inform residents of the study and prepare them for the door knocking process to collect surveys. Residents were also informed of the availability of a $10 gift card to a local grocery or department store to compensate them for their time.

Surveyors tracked completed surveys with notes on 20 sample sheets containing all addresses. Surveyors noted the date of each door-knocking attempt, whether the household agreed or refused to participate, the survey number and any additional comments (such as the language spoken by the household). An average of 36% of addresses participated per sample sheet (n=20). Interviewers identified households speaking languages other than English (Spanish, Vietnamese, Cambodian, and Somali-Mai Mai) by door knocking; translators then returned to these households to conduct the survey. A translator created a written survey in Spanish only, because the Somali Mai Mai language is not a written language and the number of households was below 20 total for all languages besides Spanish. Additionally a limited supplemental translation budget provided by Metro Organizations for People did not enable more than one language to be translated in writing. Survey interviews took place in homes and lasted about 35-45 minutes. Descriptions of the resulting sample demographics are next.

**Quantitative Sample Demographics.** The quantitative survey sample resulted in 179 surveys from Sun Valley and 208 surveys from La Alma/Lincoln Park. The Sun Valley sample represents the population as a whole, as 94.3% of the respondents live in
HUD subsidized housing and less than 6% live in houses. The respondents closely matched the neighborhood demographic of 93.9% government subsidized housing (see Table 2). The average income in Sun Valley according to the 2000 U.S. Census is $12,434 and the range of income for the sample was predominantly $0-12,500 (85.5%). The Sun Valley survey sample matched the U.S. Census percentages for race/ethnicity within 5%, which included: Latino/a, Hispanic, Chicano or Mexican American (46.4%), African American/Black (22.7%), Asian (9.7%), Multiracial (8%), White (7.3%), Other (4%), and Native American or American Indian (1.1%). The gender for the sample was 75% female and 25% male. The language spoken was: English (85.5%), Vietnamese (8.9%), Somali (3.4%), and Spanish (2.2%).

Table 2. Quantitative Survey Sample.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Sun Valley (Sample)</th>
<th>La Alma/Lincoln Park (Sample)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Publically Subsidized Housing (Piton, 1999)</td>
<td>93.9% (94.3%)</td>
<td>33.5% (82.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Income (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>$12,434 (85% $0-12,500)</td>
<td>$38,480 (68.9% $0-12,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispanic (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>46.4% (46.4%)</td>
<td>52.5% (40.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other People of Color (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>25.4% (22.8%)</td>
<td>7.9% (19.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>17.3% (22.7%)</td>
<td>7.2% (20.9%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White (U.S. Census, 2000)</td>
<td>10.9% (7.3%)</td>
<td>32.4% (18.4%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The La Alma/Lincoln Park survey sample frame focused on the public housing authority portion of the neighborhood and one neighboring street of houses located across the street from an already redeveloped housing authority property (North Lincoln) and the soon to be redeveloped South Lincoln site. Therefore, this sample also represented the public housing portion of the neighborhood and those living in the nearest houses (similar to the Sun Valley sample). The Denver Housing Authority reports that entire La Alma/Lincoln Park consists of 35.5% subsidized housing, but the survey sample resulted in 82.9% public housing residents. Specifically 37.6% of the sample from the redeveloped low-rise and mid-rise public housing at North Lincoln, 45.2% of the sample from the traditional public housing at South Lincoln, and 17.1% of the sample from the neighboring houses. The average income in La Alma/Lincoln Park is $38,480, but the predominant range of income in the sample was $0-12,500 (68.9%), which represents the emphasis on public housing residents. The race of the sample potentially over sampled African American, Native American and mixed race residents and under sampled White and Hispanic residents when compared to the neighborhood as a whole (see Table 2). The gender for the sample was 71.1% female and 28.9% male. The language spoken was: English (88.2%), Spanish (6.6%), Somali (2.8%), Cambodian (1.4%), and Vietnamese (.9%). The topics of the survey and the specific survey measures are described next.

**Quantitative Measures.** The survey consisted of 333 questions designed to answer research questions one (readiness for mixed income redevelopment) and two (resident involvement in neighborhood organizations) as well as provide data additional baseline data future studies (see Appendix D). Ten previously established measures were
used for several key concepts. Additionally, this study developed eight new measures.

The established measures included: social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, participation level, participation in decision making, neighborhood problems, individual activism, collective activism, neighborhood identity, collective efficacy: working together against crime, and home ownership (see Table 3). The development of the new measures will be described in detail below, which included: transition and/or relocation plan, readiness for mixed income redevelopment, housing problems, crime tolerance: comfort next door, crime tolerance: second chance, length of time in public housing, preference to remain in neighborhood and resident involvement in community organizations.

Table 3. Established Measures.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Previous Alpha (Pre-Test Alpha)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social Cohesion (Obst et al., 2002) | • Several established measures of social cohesion and trust have been developed (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Obst et al., 2002; Ohmer & Beck, 2006; Sampson & Raudenbush, 1999)  
• Generally measure a similar concept focused on common interactions like visiting with neighbors, exchanging favors and asking advice of neighbors.  
• Obst, Smith and Ziakiewicz (2002) combined the various social cohesion and trust measures (Brown et al., 1986; Buckner, 1988; Cameron, 2000; Chavis et al., 1986; Glynn, 1981; Lalli, 1992; Skjaeveland et al., 1996).  
• As a result Obst et al. (2002) proposed a possible measure, social cohesion that may capture more aspects of the construct since it combines several existing measures on social cohesion and psychological sense of community. | .85 (.97) Good-Excellent |
| Organizational Collective Efficacy (Ohmer, 2006; | • Eight-item organizational collective efficacy scale  
• Asks questions about the likelihood that a neighborhood association could accomplish tasks | .99 (.99) Excellent, but possibly a repetitive scale |
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Reliability/Validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perkins &amp; Long, 2002)</td>
<td>such as: reduce crime, improve physical conditions, or develop and implement solutions to neighborhood problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level (Ohmer &amp; Beck, 2006)</td>
<td>• Created an eleven-item scale with excellent reliability from three existing scales regarding citizen participation in organizations in the last year (Perkins &amp; Long, 2002; Perkins, Florin, Rich, Wanderman, &amp; Chavis, 1990; York, 1990).</td>
<td>.9 (.95) Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in Decision Making (Izhaky &amp; York, 2000)</td>
<td>• Is a one item variable in which residents identify the highest level of participation in decision making they had in the last year.</td>
<td>n/a (n/a)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007)</td>
<td>• Is a nine-item scale with two subscales where residents rate the degree to which their neighborhood experiences housing problems and crime.</td>
<td>.74 (.77-.84) Fair-Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Activism (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007)</td>
<td>• Is a three-item scale asking if anyone in their household talked with others regarding neighborhood problems in the last year.</td>
<td>Not reported (Not pre-tested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Activism (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007)</td>
<td>• Is a four-item scale asking if anyone in their household attended neighborhood meetings in the last two months.</td>
<td>Not reported (.78-.85) Fair-Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Identity Obst, Smith &amp; Zlakiewicz, 2002)</td>
<td>• Items from psychological sense of community scales that include urban identity concepts such as fitting in to one’s neighborhood and being reminded of one’s past by their neighborhood (Buckner, 1988; Kieffer, 1984 cited in Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Lalli, 1992).</td>
<td>Not reported (Not pre-tested)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Efficacy: Working Together Against Crimes (Foster-Fishman, 2007)</td>
<td>• Is a three-item scale with excellent reliability asking residents how much they believe they can address various crimes.</td>
<td>.9 (.9) Excellent</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Measures. The results of the pilot interviews and Resident Advisory Committee (RAC) process in 2007 in both study neighborhoods guided the creation of several new measures. The RAC process was a social planning process that added to the Station Area Planning processes that focused on outreach to public housing residents through neighborhood organizations and a foundation that funded their work. The RAC process included meeting every two weeks for six months to educate residents about transit-oriented development, mixed-use, and mixed-income development. The result of the RAC process included 12 Key Focus Areas (KFA) for Change. The KFAs included these four: transition and/or relocation plan, questions about new urbanism, transit-oriented redevelopment, and creating mixed-income neighborhood. Two new survey scales included items from four KFAs. Three additional scales including: problems with the current housing stock, with crime, and the need to give those who have committed crimes a second chance to live in public housing were identified by residents and housing authority staff.

Several additional individual demographic items were also included in the survey such as neighborhood, length of time in public housing, preference to remain in the neighborhood, resident involvement in community organizations, and poverty levels. The final survey instrument was developed via a pilot test with 30 resident leaders in the study neighborhoods. Current resident leaders’ suggestions, such as adding individual
items to existing scales, and assessing scale reliability (alpha=.473-.95) were used to make revisions to the scales. The residents developed additional scales in the pilot test phase of survey development. Scales developed during the pilot test phase were not pretested. The design of these measures is consistent with a transformative emancipatory perspective in mixed methods design because residents are creating future knowledge and framing of issues important to them (Clark & Creswell, 2008). Each of these measures is described below.

Transition and/or Relocation Plan. The items included in the transition and/or relocation plan scale are basic rights provided by the Federal Uniform Relocation Act of 1970 and Key Focus Areas for change identified by residents (not pretested). The Federal Uniform Relocation Act of 1970 protects basic resident rights. The law requires a minimum 90 days written notice of relocation, provision of relocation advisory services to displaced tenants and owner occupants, logistical assistance, reimbursement for moving expenses, and payment for added cost of renting or purchasing comparable replacement housing (HUD, 2005). Reimbursement for moving expenses and payment for added cost of rent recognize resident desire for financial assistance. The themes of the transition and/or relocation plan in South Lincoln focused on the ease of transition for residents. RAC recommendations included: maintaining youth services (like tutoring and professional support), a relocation concierge (to assist with utility and cable hook ups and moving arrangements), packing and moving assistance for those with physical limitations, and moving expenses paid for all moves (if relocated and moved back). The resident role in the South Lincoln plan therefore was to maintain social connections and
work together to solve problems. For example, creating an assets map of current resident leaders and participating in DHA transition and/or relocation meetings. Together the scale items represent current rights of residents regarding transition and relocation, and items representing new concepts advocated for by residents in the 2007 planning processes.

Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment. Resident language in early qualitative interviews regarding whether they agreed with the assumptions of mixed income redevelopment were used to create a 14-item scale. Assumptions included: their neighborhood being low-income and/or segregated, openness to neighborhood change, and comfort living in a mixed income neighborhood (pretest alpha = .842). Additional items from the Key Focus Areas for change scales that focused on new urbanist redevelopment were also included.

Housing Problems. Fourteen specific questions regarding resident housing problems were asked based on common problems listed in the literature and additional pilot test items including: rats or mice, cold during winter, hot during summer, and dark and unsafe outside after dark (pretest alpha = .932).

Crime Tolerance: Comfort Next Door. Seventeen original items asked residents how comfortable they were living next door to someone who had committed specific crimes like public intoxication, receiving stolen goods, drug use, and violent offenses (not pretested).

Crime Tolerance: Second Chance. Three original items asked residents how many chances they suggested the housing authority give a child under 18 years old, over 18, or
a spouse of partner to live in public housing if he or she had a criminal history (not pretested).

Length of Time in Public Housing. Is a one-item variable that asked the total length of time residents had lived in public or private low-income housing.

Prefer to Remain in Neighborhood. Is a one-item variable that asked residents where they hoped to live in the future (1=stay in neighborhood, 0=other neighborhood).

Involvement in Community Organizations. Is a seven-item original scale asking residents if they participate in specific community organizations such as Metro Organizations for People (MOP), Front Range Economic Strategy Center (FRESC), Local Resident Council (LRC), and Project WISE.

As stated previously the qualitative interviews were designed to elaborate on the quantitative findings. Because the Denver Housing Authority - South Lincoln neighborhood redevelopment processes started during the qualitative phase of this research study, the qualitative sample frame exclusively included South Lincoln residents only.

Qualitative Sample. The sampling frame for qualitative interviews included all 254 South Lincoln households because South Lincoln was undergoing mixed income redevelopment during the data collection stage. A purposive sample was intentionally sought to include a diverse group of residents according to various demographics in order to increase the generalizability of the study findings. All households were notified via a flyer delivered to each door that contained information that an interviewer might be knocking on their door to see if they were eligible for the study. Residents were told
about the topics of the interview but were not given the eligibility criteria on the flyer.

The screening criteria included: involvement in neighborhood organizations; household factors (number of bedrooms in the unit, length of time in the neighborhood, commitment to staying in the neighborhood); socioeconomic and demographic factors (employment and benefits, education, race/ethnicity, age, gender); and criminal history. These demographics were important because different groups may have had various perceptions or problems to be solved during transition and/or relocation planning. Prior to recruiting participants each demographic category was clearly defined.

Resident involvement in neighborhood organizations was defined as attending activities sponsored by one of the following organizations in the last two years:

- Local Resident Council,
- South Lincoln Redevelopment Steering Committee,
- South Lincoln Redevelopment Community Meetings,
- FRESO,
- Project WISE,
- Metro Organizations for People,
- Denver Inner City Parish,
- or La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association.

Specifically, any resident identified as an officer of one of these organizations was automatically considered to be involved in neighborhood organizations (such as a Local Resident Council President, Vice President, Secretary, Treasurer, or Sergeant-at-Arms). Residents who were not officers but had attended three or more meetings or two or more activities of these organizations were asked to participate. For example, a resident may
have attended two of three Project WISE activities (such as mentoring, counseling, and leadership) or two out of four MOP activities (1-to-1 meeting, Local Organizing Committee – community meeting, research action, or a public action). Or the resident had attended three or more Local Resident Council or other meetings in the last two years.

Residents who had attended neighborhood organizations, but had not met the officer, two activities, or three meetings were not interviewed because their level of involvement may not have been consistent enough to report meaningful information from the perspective of a resident involved in neighborhood organizations. Residents who had not attended any of the neighborhood organizations were “not involved” and were asked to participate. See Table 4 for a description of the other important tracking categories to ensure residents in the sample varied according to the selected demographics.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of bedrooms in the unit</td>
<td>1, 2, 3, 4, or 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time in the neighborhood</td>
<td>Less than 5 years, 5-10, over 10 years</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to staying in neighborhood</td>
<td>Want to stay, not sure, want to move</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident employment and benefits</td>
<td>Employed, not employed with benefits (Temporary Assistance to Needy Families (TANF), Social Security Insurance (SSI), Social Security Disability Insurance (SSDI), Unemployment), not employed without benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident education</td>
<td>No High School Diploma or General Equivalency Degree (GED), High School Diploma or GED, at least some trade school or college</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/Latina/Mexican/Chicano, African American/Black,</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Next, an eight-step process was followed to select the purposive sample described below (see Table 5).

*Table 5. Steps to Determine Eligibility for Qualitative Sample*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Assigned each address in the neighborhood a household number 1-254.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Randomly selected the order that each address would be contacted to prescreen for eligibility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Determined the desired number of households that would match the ratio of the percentage of each of the important demographic factors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Knocked on each door in the sample in the order randomly selected by group and determine if the resident was or was not involved in neighborhood organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Invited the resident to participate in the study if they matched the desired sampling criteria. The interviewer knocked on the doors of each group at various times of the day and days of the week until the desired number of households per group that was and were not involved in neighborhood groups were selected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>In order to get a representative sample of all demographics, the interviewer tracked the demographics listed above for each household selected. When the total sample of the interviews did not vary across the following eleven demographics (involvement in neighborhood organizations, number of bedrooms in the unit, length of time in the neighborhood, commitment to staying in the neighborhood, employment and benefits, education, race/ethnicity, language, age, gender and criminal history) after completing 12 interviews, the interviewer...</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
consulted with the researcher to identify addresses from the 2009 survey sample that matched the various demographics that were missing from the sample. The demographics that were underrepresented were noted on a revised sampling sheet, which included: households involved in the Redevelopment Steering Committee, FRESC, Project WISE, and those not involved in neighborhood organizations; 5 bedroom units; those who lived in the neighborhood for all three lengths of time; those who want to stay in the neighborhood; households with the various employment and benefits demographics; households with the various educational backgrounds; households which included Latino/a, African American, Asian, African or Mixed ethnicities; households of various age groups (18-30, 31-40, 41 to 50, 61 to 70, 71 or older); households including various genders; and those with no felony convictions within the household.

Then the interviewer knocked on the doors of the 2009 survey participants who matched the missing demographic variables in the order that they appeared on the randomly assigned order for door knocking.

The process was repeated until 25 interviews were selected with a purposeful sample.

**Qualitative Sample Demographics.** The qualitative participants represented a heterogeneous sample as designed (n=25). The participants lived in a variety of household sizes including: one-bedroom (17%), two-bedroom (54%), three-bedroom (17%), four-bedroom (4%), and five-bedroom (4%). Seventy-six percent of the residents interviewed participate in neighborhood organizations and 24% were not involved. The neighborhood organizations included: Local Resident Council (60%), Community Redevelopment Meetings (60%), the Denver Inner City Parish (36%), La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association (24%), Redevelopment Steering Committee (16%), Project WISE (16%), FRESC (12%), and Metro Organizations for People (4%). Length of residency varied among those who lived in the neighborhood fewer than five years (68%), 5-10 years (12%), or 10 or more years (20%). The majority of residents wanted to stay in the neighborhood after redevelopment (64%), some were unsure of whether they
want to stay or move (20%), and the smallest percentage were sure they want to move away (16%).

Resident demographics regarding employment and education also varied. About half of the residents interviewed do not work and receive benefits (52%), and an even percentage work or do not work without benefits (24%). The largest percentage of residents interviewed had no High School Diploma or General Equivalency Degree (GED) (40%), the next largest portion of residents had a high school diploma or GED (36%), and about ¼ of residents had some college (24%).

The largest percentages of residents interviewed were Latino/a (44%). The next largest groups of those interviewed were African American (24%), Caucasian (16%), Native American (8%), or of Mixed Race (5%). All interviews were conducted in English. However two interviews were conducted with households in which English is a second language to African dialects and one interview was conducted with a resident who spoke Spanish as their first language. The age of residents also varied: 18-30 (16%), 31-40 (36%), 41-50 (16%), 51-60 (20%), 61-70 (8%), and 71 years or older (5%). The majority of those interviewed were female (75%) and one-quarter were male. Finally, 16% of residents interviewed had at least one felony conviction within the household and the remaining 84% had no felony convictions. All residents interviewed were asked the same set of questions regardless of their household demographics.

**Qualitative Measures.** Qualitative interviews lasted from 45 minutes to one hour and 45 minutes. The interview guide included 30 semi-structured questions asked by two
Master of Social Work trained interviewers. The goal of the interview guide was three-fold:

- Present the quantitative results of research question one and ask residents why they think their existing relationships, belief that local organizations can get things done on behalf of residents, and possession of a transition and relocation plan could predict resident readiness for mixed income transit-oriented development,

- Ask residents why they are or are not involved in neighborhood organizations in order to develop the Structural Equation Model that predicts resident involvement in neighborhood organizations,

- Explore resident responses to an evidence-based practice (EBP) conversation regarding transition and relocation planning.

The detailed interview guide (see Appendix E) and the six figures used to present the data to residents are provided in the appendix section (see Appendix F-K). The topics of the interview included resident readiness for change, residents’ existing relationships with neighbors, involvement in neighborhood organizations, transition and relocation planning, and discussion regarding ideal or opportunity neighborhoods. Examples of interview questions are included in Table 6.

*Table 6. Qualitative Measures.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Example of Question</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for mixed-income redevelopment</td>
<td>Are you ready for your neighborhood to change? Explain.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social cohesion</td>
<td>How do you feel about your neighbors? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in neighborhood organizations</td>
<td>Why are you involved (or not involved) in neighborhood organizations?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Opportunity neighborhoods</td>
<td>What is an ideal neighborhood for your household? Why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relocation supports</td>
<td>What kind of support would you need to make a Section 8 Voucher (enables resident to select a housing unit in the private market and receive a HUD subsidy for the apartment that requires them to pay one-third of their</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Housing Authority transition and/or relocation plan

After thinking through all of these topics, what can the Denver Housing Authority build into their plan to provide the support your household needs during the transition and relocation process?

The interview guide and figures were created in collaboration with the lead interviewer, Denver Housing Authority – Resident Services Staff, residents of the Denver Housing Authority - South Lincoln – Local Resident Council, and members of Metro Organizations for People - Sun Valley Coalition, as is consistent with the emancipatory design of the study. The interviewer first asked residents about their knowledge of the interview topics, then added data from existing studies focused on resident outcomes and HOPE VI transition and/or relocation. The interviewer restated questions in the language used by resident whenever possible. For example, the interviewer might have phrased a question in the following manner, “Before you stated that you think people involved in neighborhood organizations are just focused on promoting their own self-interest. How do you think this belief impacts how ready or not ready you are for neighborhood redevelopment?” Residents participated in the data analysis, as a result of these questions. For example, by asking residents their perspectives on study variables, then directly asking them to describe, in their own words, why the study findings might be true, resident interpretations were analyzed in the final results.

Analysis

As stated previously the quantitative and qualitative data analysis was conducted separately, then synthesized in order to balance the final discussion chapter of the study.
The quantitative analysis steps are outlined in-depth. Then, the qualitative analysis methods are briefly outlined.

**Quantitative Analysis: Factor Analysis.** Prior to conducting statistical analysis such as multiple regression and Structural Equation Modeling validity and reliability of measures must be established. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) begins with a data-driven analysis that reduces items on each scale and identifies the most parsimonious (or simple) representation of a given construct. EFA results combined with substantive theory provide the basis for conducting a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA), which must begin with the hypothesized number of factors, item loadings and correlations resulting in adequate model fit (Kline, 2005). A split-half sample technique is used in this study (n=387) because of the adequate sample size for CFA is 100-200 cases. The split-half technique included using a random half of the sample to conduct the EFA (n=194) and the other half of the cases to test the specified model via a CFA (n=193) (Kline, 2005). The split-half technique establishes internal and construct validity without using the same data set to both explore and confirm scale validity. The Random Between function in the Excel software identified survey numbers that represented half of the total sample by inserting the =RANDBETWEEN(1,387) command in a column in the rows equal to half the total sample size. Two dummy variables in the SPSS software to notate whether the case was to be used for the EFA or CFA analysis.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis.** Principal Component Analysis (PCA) for each scale to identify the underlying factor structure when individual items are allowed to load on a number of sub-factors (Costello & Osborne, 2005). PCA is a data reduction
technique that helps eliminate and select items that represent correlated groupings of items (or components) that account for the greatest amount of variance possible without unnecessarily cutting items (Costello & Osborne, 2005; O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998; Tabachnic & Fidel, 2007). Starting with at least 4-10 items per variable is ideal within EFA (Hair et al., 1992; O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). The number of components, rotation, item loadings on components, and internal consistency are key aspects of EFA methodologically as they determine how initial items load on the latent component. Each of these aspects was defined below and applied to the study in the measurement chapter.

Preliminary Tests. Three preliminary analysis helped determine the factorability of scales and correlations between subscales including: the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy, Barlett’s Test of Sphericity, and a Component Correlation Matrix before selecting the most appropriate rotation (Obst et al., 2002).

Therefore, scales were tested with KMO, Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity, and a Component Correlation Matrix before selecting the proper rotation.

KMO is a measure between zero and one that is interpreted as the degree to which the components will account for an adequate amount of the variance (Friel, 2009). Specifically, according to Friel a KMO measure of .49 or below means the items “do not factor” and measures of .5 or above “do factor” (Friel, 2009). If the KMO test indicates that the items will not factor because there is a .49 or below result then the scale will not be analyzed.

Bartlett’s Test of Sphericity tests for the statistical significance of a chi-square measure, interpreted as rejecting the null hypothesis that the factors are noncollinear if
the p-value is significant (or retaining the hypothesis that the factors are collinear) (Friel, 2009). Varimax rotation was used if Bartlett’s test was not significant. Promax rotation was used to allow the most rigorous methodological approach that accounted for correlations among factors if Bartlett’s test indicated collinearity and the correlations between factors were greater than .4 for any two components then (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007).

A Correlation Matrix is a table where variables are aligned both as rows and columns in order to show the correlations between two variables (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). Promax rotation was a more appropriate rotation than Varimax rotation if any of the components in the Correlation Matrix were .32 or .4 or above the components confirmed the collinearity of the components unless substantive reasons were provided for Varimax rotation (Obst et al., 2002; Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007).

**Number of Components.** Practical professional judgment based on the usefulness of components determined the number of components. Eigenvalues represented the variance of all items accounted for in a factor (representing a subscale), which provided an initial estimate of the number of components by identifying the number of factors with an eigenvalue greater than one (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Scree plots were the best tool to determine the number of factors (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Scree plots graph Eigenvalues on the y-axis and the number of components on the x-axis and provide a visual representation of the possible number of components above the point of “the elbow,” which demarked the point at which the slope of the line flattens out (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Scree plots may require
running the analysis with the number of factors preset with numerous alternatives to
determine the “cleanest factor structure,” to provide a result with three or more items
loaded on each component, the least amount of cross-loading and items loading at .3 or
above (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Hair, Anderson, Tatham, & Black, 1992; O’Leary-
Kelly & Vokura, 1998).

*Rotation.* The EFA analysis could be conducted with the appropriate rotation once
the number of components is determined. If more than one factor emerged then a
decision had to be made regarding using Promax or Varimax rotation, which are the most
common rotations used to provide the most parsimonious and interpretable solution of the
components (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Promax and Varimax rotation have been found
to produce substantively identical results in some studies; however conservative
methodological approaches either run both rotations or establish criteria to determine
which rotation to use (Sampson, Raudenbush, Earls, 1996). For example, Obst et al.
(2002) first determine if the scale will adequately factor and if correlations between
factors are greater than .4.

If only one component emerges for the construct solutions will not be rotated. This
practice often results in less interpretable solutions when more than one component
emerges (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Promax Rotation is an oblique rotation used with
larger samples, which rotates solutions and may provide better, faster and simpler
estimates of true factors when factors are correlated (O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998;
Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Fewer studies used Promax rotation to avoid unrealistically
constraining items, given that social science concepts of interest tend to be related
(Costello & Osborne, 2005). For example, Social Cohesion and Sense of Community factors may be correlated (Perkins & Long, 2003; Wilkinson, 2007).

Varimax rotation is an Orthogonal rotation, which simplifies factors by rotating the solution so that components are uncorrelated (high correlations are made higher and low correlations are made lower) (Costello & Osborne, 2005; O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998; Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). Varimax rotation is the most frequently used rotation because it maximizes the variance and therefore provides the easiest to identify solutions (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). Varimax rotation is consistent with the majority of previous studies with the constructs of interest including: U.S. Census data (Boyd, 2008; Wilstrom & Loeber, 2000), Multidimensional Measure of Neighboring Scale (Skajaeveland, 1996), Sense of Community (Brodsky, O’Campo, & Aronson, 1999; Obst, Smith, and Zinkiewicz, 2002; Prezza, Ameic, Roberti, & Tedeschi, 2001; Speer, 2000), and Social Disorganization (Warner, 2007).

*Item Loadings on Components.* Factor scores for individual items were interpreted like regression coefficients between the individual items and the latent component. Items loaded on the component with the highest factor score and were retained only if the score is .32 or above (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). The researcher determined item loadings, but generally are considered excellent if .71 or above, very good at .63, good at .55, fair at .45, and poor at .32 (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). If the component has other items that load at .5 or above items that cross-load at .32 or above on more than one component may be dropped (Costello & Osborne, 2005). The subscale is given a substantive label if the scale contains three or more items once items are selected for each component,
although ideal scales will contain five or more items good loadings (.5 or above) (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Chronbach’s alpha score can be used in conjunction with the internal consistency of the individual and combined subscales to provide the overall measure of reliability.

Internal Consistency. Internal consistency is a measure of the degree to which components measure the same construct. Specifically, internal consistency represents the percent variance in an indicator variable explained by a latent component (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Together the components (or subscales) account for a given percentage of the covariance explained by the whole scale (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Factors that explain 50% or more of the variance in a latent factor will be retained in order to seek the most parsimonious (or fewest) factor structures without eliminating components with potentially useful factor structures (Garson, 2010).

The main strengths of EFA are that it enables grouping of individual items into parsimonious scales and subscales representing latent variables, and that measurement error is included in the analysis. The main weaknesses of EFA are that interpretation can be difficult and it is driven more by data than substantive considerations. The rotation with the highest percentage of variance explained was selected as the best factoring of items for this study. The number of factors and percent of total item variance explained was reported for each scale according to each rotation method. A Confirmatory Factor Analysis was then conducted in order to provide a more rigorous selection of individual items representing the latent constructs.
Reliability measures the internal consistency of a measure if tested with the same subjects at more than one time; however, given the single survey cross sectional design a Chronbach’s Alpha score determined reliability. Chronbach’s Alpha is a statistical test that measures the intercorrelation of individual items representing a latent construct (Gliem & Gliem, 2003). A Chronbach’s Alpha score provides a statistic between zero and one, which represents an interpretable score of internal consistency with adequate reliability if .49 or below unacceptable, .5 to .59 poor, .6-.69, acceptable to questionable if .7-.79, good if 8-.89, and excellent if .9 or above (Gliem & Gliem, 2003; O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). Chronbach’s Alpha scores of .95 or above may reflect redundant items on the scale and are therefore not parsimonious. Once internal consistency is established for a scale through EFA and Chronbach’s Alpha score, a CFA can be conducted to determine the convergent validity. Convergent validity measures how much individual items in a scale are correlated with the items in a similar scale (O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). The convergent validity of a scale can be tested with an Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in order to establish the number of subscales, which can then be confirmed with a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). In this study measures of participation in decision-making, home-ownership, length of time in public housing, and preference to remain in neighborhood each had only one question; therefore, EFA is not an appropriate analysis. The factor structure of the remaining scales was analyzed with EFA starting with the established measures, and followed by EFA with original measures.
**Confirmatory Factor Analysis.** Conducting a Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) assesses both theory and construct validity (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). Construct validity determines the degree that a measure represents what it aims to measure and is determined through a combination of scale reliability, content, criterion, and convergent validity, which will be defined later (O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). CFA requires the number of factors, the specific item loadings, and correlations to be defined a priori (Kline, 2005; O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). Likert scales which ask participants for their responses in a strongly agree to strongly disagree format are technically discrete (categorical) variables, but may either be treated as ordinal (rank order) scales that are not expected to be normally distributed, or use Weighted Least Squares (WLS) (Tabachnick & Fidel, 2007). WLS is a more robust method to be used with samples of more than 200 with CFA so that related items are considered more important in the final solution (Brisson & Usher, 2007). Given the split-half sample size of just below 200 (n=193) scales will be treated as if ordinal. CFA uses Structural Equation Modeling (SEM) and therefore factors require at least three items per one factor-model and at least two items per two or more factor model. Higher order latent variables also require at least three first order factors. One indicator is fixed at one when conducting hybrid (measurement and analysis models) or multi-group models (test for differences by gender, organization, or income). Model fit indexes, modification indexes, and factor loadings provide information to identify the most parsimonious and valid model and therefore require specific specification of methods.
**Model Fit.** All scale CFAs required an adequate or reasonable model fit for RMSEA (<.10) and acceptable model fit for CFI (.9-1) (Hair et al., 1998; Browne & Cudeck, 1992; O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998).

**Modification Indexes.** Modification indexes provided by the Mplus software guided deleting items and/or adding correlations until acceptable RMSEA and CFI model fit indexes resulted. Because CFA can result in many equivalent models modification decisions needed to be supported by substantive reasoning, which maintained or improve the content validity (O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). Content validity is the first professional assessment that a scale generally contains items discussed in the literature related to that substantive topic (O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). Citing professional literature establishes key components to include as individual scale items, which can establish content validity. During the final selection of scale items key substantive content in the latent constructs will be argued to establish content validity.

**Factor Loadings.** Unstandardized factor loadings are interpreted as regression b-weights or the direct effect of factor on the indicator (Kline, 2005). The error variance is a measure of what is not explained or accounted for by the factors (Kline, 2005). Standardized factor loadings are interpreted like standardized regression weights (Beta-weights) (Kline, 2005).

**Validity.** Convergent validity is evidence that a measure is related to what it seeks to measure theoretically and is represented by high-standardized loadings on factors (Kline, 2005). Discriminant validity is evidence that a measure is not related to different factors and explores if a scale differs from a scale measuring a different concept (Kline, 2005;
O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). Convergent and discriminant validity were explored by creating a correlation matrix for subscales with the subscales hypothesized to be different from the latent construct when a different scale was available. When correlations between factors is higher than .85 convergent validity is represented (Kline, 2005). When the correlations between factors is lower than .85 discriminant validity is represented (Kline, 2005); in other words a factor has poor discriminant validity if correlations between factors is greater than .85 (Kenny, 1998). Testing the correlation of scales with other scales known to be substantively different can provide additional evidence of discriminate validity. For example discriminant validity is tested for three scales including: crime tolerance: comfort next door and crime tolerance: second chance and were hypothesized to be substantively different than working together against crime. Similarly, resident involvement in community organizations was hypothesized to be substantively different than participation in decision-making: I take no part at all.

Criterion validity explores how much a latent variable correlates with an established measure, which was not be tested in this research project because the length of the survey did not permit asking similar constructs.

**Quantitative Analysis: Data Screening.** Prior to data analysis such as Multiple Regression and Structural Equation Modeling initial familiarity with data determines if data meets the assumptions of each analysis via comprehensive testing (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). If any variables have any common problems, then they must be addressed prior to the final analysis (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Common assumptions include
normality, linearity, multicollinearity, and the handling of missing data (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007).

**Normality definition and how screened.** Multivariate analysis typically have better solutions when data is normally distributed (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Skewness and kurtosis are the best indicators of normality. Skewness is the degree to which the mean is at the center of the distribution; positive skew has a mean to the left of center with a tail to the right; negative skew has the mean to the right of center and a tail to the left (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Kurtosis reflects the peak or flatness of a distribution; skew is normal if it is zero, too peaked if above zero and too flat if below zero (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Non-normal kurtosis can underestimate variance; however, the impact of non-normal skew disappears with samples over 100-200 (Waternaux, 1976).

SPSS frequencies estimate skew, kurtosis, and can superimpose a normal distribution over a histogram (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Regression and SEM analysis do not require normality screening because the differences between error residuals and the predicted and obtained scores of independent variables can be graphed to determine if they are symmetrically distributed (m=0) (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). SEM analysis does assume normality; a general rule is that a kurtosis of greater than 10 is a problem (Kline, 2005).

**Linearity definition and how screened.** Linearity is the degree to which two variables produce a straight line when graphed because they generally go up or down together (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Linearity is required for a regression because the
analysis is based on testing linear relationships (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Curvilinear relationships indicate a potential moderator impacting the linear relationship between two variables (Kline, 2005). Homoscedasticity and heteroscedasticity are two measures of linearity. Drawing a scatter plot with a line between the variables can test linearity (Kline, 2005).

**Homoscedasticity definition and how screened.** Homoscedasticity is a linear relationship with a greater concentration and distribution of data toward the middle of the line in the form of a bulge (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Homegeneity of Variance means that the error residuals between two variables are correlated, which can lead to over rejecting significance (Kline, 2005).

**Heteroscedasticity definition and how screened.** Heteroscedasticity is a non-linear relationship that results in a triangle shaped scatter plot which indicates additional variation at some point in the relationship between the two variables (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Levine’s test of homogeneity of variance can determine if heteroscedasticity exists between two variables, which can then either be analyzed with more strict alpha levels (p=.05 for normal violations and p=.025 for severe violations) or transformed (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007).

**Multicollinearity definition and how screened.** Multicollinearity exists when variables are linear ally correlated (.7 or above) or highly correlated (.9 or above) and are therefore redundant measures (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Variables that are correlated or highly correlated can be combined or deleted to reduce multicollinearity (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Multicollinearity diagnostics including Tolerance and VIF are available.
Tolerance is equal to 1-R-Squared, which detects a multicollinearity problem if tolerance is less than .1 (Cohen et al., 2003). VIF is 1/tolerance, which is a problem if VIF is greater than 2.5 (Cohen et al., 2003).

**Missing Data.** Missing data resulting from item nonresponse is likely a result of cognitive functioning, privacy, memory recall, and survey length, and may have impacted sample bias, power, and reliability (Schafer & Graham, 2002). Determining whether data is missing by design (such as only public housing residents being asked a question), Missing at Random (MAR) or Missing Not at Random (MNAR) can address sampling bias resulting from missing data; however no firm guidelines are available to test whether missing data is random or nonrandom (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Data that is not missing at random is problematic because the participants’ attitude on the missing variable may be related to an attitude on another variable. Therefore data was explored to determine the type of missing data prior to deciding how to handle missing data (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007).

**Missing Completely at Random (MCAR).** Data that is missing completely at random where missing data is not depended on observed data or on missing data and is therefore ignorable (Kline, 2005; Rubin, 1976; Schafer & Graham, 2002). MCAR cannot be tested therefore the data will be tested to determine if the data is Missing at Random or Missing Not at Random (Schafer & Graham, 2002).

**Missing at Random (MAR).** Data that is missing at random if missing is not related to observed data and therefore is ignorable (Kline, 2005; Rubin, 1976; Schafer & Graham, 2002). T-tests can run to justify missing at random (MAR) assumption. For example if
the total number of cases is 387 and 50 cases are missing the independent variable (such as social cohesion) then T-test will compare 50 missing cases to the 337 cases of the dependent variable (such as readiness for mixed income redevelopment). If the relationship is not significant then it can be assumed there is no difference between missing and not missing and therefore the data can be assumed to be Missing At Random and imputed (Schafer & Graham, 2002).

*Missing Not at Random (MNAR).* Data is not ignorable because the missing variable may be related to the dependent variable (Rubin, 1976; Schafer & Graham, 2002; Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). MNAR can be tested by creating a dummy variable to see if there is a mean difference in the missing data and other important variables in the analysis (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Cases or variables can be dropped if issues are identified with the sample or a subsample (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). For example, if residents who skipped questions related to organizational collective efficacy are on average less ready for mixed income redevelopment then the cases could be dropped in order to decrease the likelihood of error using maximum likelihood to impute the missing organizational collective efficacy items (Schafer & Graham, 2002).

Including all cases and variables in all analysis by imputing missing values is ideal because imputing missing values can maximize power and reliability. Specific methods proposed to impute missing data and the reasoning for the decision needs to be clearly defined in advance. Assuming an absence of MNAR then the missing items were imputed using maximum likelihood estimation in the Mplus software using the FML default in order to increase the power by utilizing all survey cases and available information prior to
conducting the regression and SEM analysis (Schafer & Graham, 2002). FML was determined as a good choice for this data set because the scale items were missing less than 1% to 13% of the data and maximum likelihood can easily handle 10-30% missing values assuming the model is specified well. FML estimates missing data in several steps by creating several random samples (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Three to five random samples are typically adequate (Rubin, 1996). ML is a good choice to handle missing data because it is efficient with large samples, uses all available data, assumes data is MAR, and the technique maintains sample variability (Schafer & Graham, 2002; Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). FML calculates the log likelihood of an expected (guess of missing data) and observed data over several iterations using the EM algorithm to compute estimates in a covariance matrix (Schafer & Graham, 2002). The standard error variances are calculated by subtracting covariance value from one (Schafer & Graham, 2002). Since imputing missing data has the potential to change the factor structure of scales the methods will include two factor analysis steps that can be compared before making final decisions regarding factor structure.

Specifically, the EFA and CFA analysis were conducted without imputing missing data and then will be conducted again with missing values imputed. The first EFA and CFA analysis were conducted with a list wise deletion by coding all missing variables as -9 and then deleting all missing cases for each analysis assuming that the number of cases is 150 or greater. The EFA and CFA were then conducted with the imputed data set in order to determine if handling the missing data impacted the sampling bias, power, and reliability.
**Quantitative Analysis: Regression.** A logistic regression model was built to test the hypothesis of predicting resident readiness for mixed income redevelopment with social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and possession of a transition and/or relocation plan. The first step in the model building process began by determining whether or not the three scales individually predicted readiness for mixed income redevelopment at a statistically significant level. The second step in model building involved identifying the preferred model. The third step of model building involved one final set of analysis conducted in order to test the causal ordering of the independent variables and dependent variable, which will determine if the hypothesized the model had a better fit. The log-likelihood ratio test as well as AIC and BIC model fit indexes were used to compare four additional models with the reverse causal ordering. If the model fit indexes for the preferred model were better than all other possible causal ordering of variables and all assumptions were met, then the preferred model was retained. The regression model assumptions included: independence of errors and homoscedasticity (tested by plotting the standardized residuals and standardized predicted y-values, which should result in a non-linear relationship), normality of error mean (will also tested for the standardized residuals), skewness and kurtosis should be within normal ranges, and error mean (should equal zero, which indicated that this error term assumption was also met). The methods for the Structural Equation Model, which is a similar statistical method, will be defined next.

**Quantitative Analysis: Structural Equation Model.** The individual scales tested in the EFA and CFA process established a hybrid model with both measurement
models and analyzed paths or relationships between latent variables (Bollen, 1989; Kline, 2005). The same model building steps and model fit indexes provided for the CFA and regression model building processes were used to determine the best model fit. The SEM model was built with three additional steps:

1. A CFA model was built, which correlates all latent variables.

2. Then the correlation paths were replaced with directional arrows (regression lines). Two initial models are proposed Model One draws casual arrows where significant predictive relationships found in previous literature (see Figure 1) and Model Two had latent second order variables suggested in previous literature (see Figure 2) (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007).

3. A Model Three called the Middle Model was constructed based on the significant findings from Model One and Model Two.

**Qualitative Analysis.** The constant comparative method of qualitative analysis was used for all questions in five steps (Glaser, 1965; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Silverman, 2006). First the researcher created codes in the participants’ language (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Spencer, Ritchie, & O’Conner, 2003) and then compared codes across interviews until key themes emerged with representative quotes for each theme (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; LeCompte, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Spencer, Ritchie, & O’Conner, 2003). Then an inter-rater reliability and consultation occurred to ensure that the in vivo themes/codes were valid and reliable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Silverman, 2006). Next, all interviews were analyzed with the in vivo codes identified to represent common themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994). The discussion chapter synthesized and analyzed the interviews according to the theory presented in chapter two (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003), quantitative findings from chapter five as well as implications for Housing and Urban Development and social work.
Chapter Four: Measurements

As described in depth in the methodology chapter, Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) and Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) confirmed the validity and reliability of the 10 existing measures and eight new scales. The scales suggested by residents in the pilot test are from four seminal studies focused on community capacity for change, resident participation, social cohesion, and home ownership; however the scales have not all been studied together in the context of communities facing transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment. Specifically the measures were used in the following contexts:

- Foster-Fishman et al. (2007) have built on existing measures of neighborhood problems, individual activism, collective activism, neighborhood identity, and working together against crime in the context of a community’s capacity for change (Chavez & Wanderman, 1990; Kieffer, 1984; Perkins & Long, 2002; Perkins, Florin, Rich, Chavis & Wanderman, 1990; Speer & Hughey, 1995);

- Ohmer & Beck (2006) have utilized, and built upon the knowledge of previous measures of organizational collective efficacy, participation level and participation in decision making (Perkins & Long, 2002);

- Obst, Smith, and Ziakiewicz (2002) propose an alternative measure for social cohesion that was used instead of the measure used by Foster-Fishman et al. (2007) because it may capture more aspects of the construct with improved reliability and face validity since it combines several existing measures on neighborhood cohesion; and

- Home ownership is a single item question that may be correlated with resident involvement in neighborhood organizations (Winter, 1990).

Several original measures were created, as is consistent with the emancipatory design of the study. The key focus areas for change identified by the Resident Advisory
Committee (RAC) process in 2007, a qualitative evaluation of the RAC process in 2008, the pilot test survey in 2009, and consultation with housing authority staff influenced new scale creation. Three different themes emerged from these interactions.

First, the RAC process identified 12 key focus areas for change that identified several problems with the current housing stock, crime and safety, as well as transition and relocation planning that does not take into account existing social networks (City & County of Denver, 2007). These three key focus areas for change created three additional scales including: housing problems, neighborhood problems, and transition and relocation plan.

In addition to crime and safety concerns, the need to give those who had committed crimes a second chance to live in public housing came up in both the 2008 qualitative interviews and the survey pilot test in 2009. The housing authority staff agreed that determining eligibility criteria for public housing residents in mixed income redevelopments is a challenge. Therefore two new crime tolerance scales were created including crime tolerance: comfort next door and crime tolerance: second chance.

Finally, residents suggested that the survey focus on developing community readiness for change concepts such as readiness for a mixed income, mixed-use, and a transit focused neighborhood (including a focus on building a range of public, affordable, and market rate housing near retail, services and transit connections), which required creating three new readiness scales (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Ohmer & Beck, 2006).

Resident suggestions as well as assessing scale reliability influenced scale revisions. Given the emancipatory design process, the new scales likely have face validity.
according to residents and professionals who helped create the questions, yet reliability and validity must be established for the new and existing scales within the context of the change initiative proposed for the two neighborhoods.

An EFA and CFA were conducted on all scales, since none of the measures have been used in neighborhoods facing transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment. All scales were analyzed first with all missing items excluded and then with missing items excluded. Table H1 provides a brief description of each established scale. The methods section provides a detailed description of new measures. A detailed list of the scale items is available in Table R1. The EFA and CFA methods will be briefly reemphasized prior to reporting results. Then the psychometric properties of the major study variables establish that assumptions for regression and Structural Equation Modeling are met. When possible a comparison with the final factor structure was described within the context of current measurement development literature. The factor analysis process began with the EFA results, which were used as a starting place in the CFA process.

**Exploratory Factor Analysis of Established Measures**

The Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) process for each measure was reported first with the missing values deleted in the SPSS software and then differences for the results when missing values were imputed in the MPlus software. The results of both models were then used as potential factor structures in the Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) stage.

The EFA process included competing preliminary tests to ensure the scale will factor well as well select the proper rotation including: the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO)
Measure of Sampling Adequacy (.5 or above considered acceptable factoring), Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (if significant then use Promax rotation), and a Component Correlation Matrix (if components correlated at .32 or above then use Promax rotation) (Friel, 2009; Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007; Zinkiewicz, 2002). The number of components will be determined based on the eigenvalues above one as well as the number of components indicated by the point below the elbow where the slope flattens out on the scree plot (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Hair et al., 1992; O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998; Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Item will be retained if they load at .32 or above on a component (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Factors that explain 50% or more of the variance in the latent factor will be retained (Garson, 2010). Reliability will be reported with a Chronbach’s alpha score, which will be considered acceptable if above .6 (Gliem & Gliem, 2003; O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). A summary descriptive statistics table for the missing items excluded is provided in Table S1. A narrative description of the EFA for each measure was described below starting with social cohesion and neighborhood identity.

Social cohesion and neighborhood identity. The KMO test indicated that the social cohesion scale will factor (KMO=.92). Promax rotation was used because the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (p<.001), Component Correlation Matrix (items Components one and two, one and three, one and five, two and three, and two and five are correlated above .4), and substantive reasoning indicate that the components are correlated. Five components had eigenvalues above one, but a two-component structure was chosen for the following four reasons: (a) the scree plot indicated a two component structure, (b) the
scales are correlated, and (c) five or more items are ideal and some of the components have less than five items, and (d) 50% of the variance was explained in the two components, which is a more parsimonious factor structure (Costello & Osborne, 2005; Garson, 2010).

The two-component and 20 item model explained 49.9% of the variance in the latent factor. Component one explained 42.3% of the variance with 13 items (2-5, 8-12, 15, and 17-18) and Component two explained 7.6% of the variance with seven items (1, 6-7, 22-23, and 29). Items 13, 14, 20, 21, and 24-28 were dropped because load low on the two components. Item 19 was dropped because it closely cross-loaded on both component one and two and both subscales have more than five items over .5 (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Specifically the items on component one loaded at .643 or above, which is considered very good and the items on component two loaded at .607 or above which is considered good (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Component one is substantively described as Social Cohesion, which has excellent reliability (alpha = .935) and is normally distributed (m=3.11-3.71, sd=.896-1.198, skew = -.905- -.075, and kurtosis=-.003-1.034). Component two is substantively named neighborhood identity, which has good reliability (alpha = .843) and is normally distributed (m=3.12-3.42, sd=1.059-1.281, skew = -.555- -.146, and kurtosis=- 1.141 - - .448).

An alternative factor structure was created with a Varimax rotation, which changed item 23 in Component one and items 14, 19 and 26 in Component two. As a result the alternative structuring for these four items was considered in the CFA stage based on modification indexes. The EFA with missing values imputed also indicated a two-
component structure in the Scree Plot. Component one contained 13 items (2-5, 8-12, 15, and 17-18) and Component two contained twelve items (2, 4-5, 8-12, 15, 17-19).

Organizational collective efficacy. The KMO test indicated that the organizational collective efficacy scale will factor (KMO=.922). No rotation was used because the scree plot with both methods indicates a one-component structure and the scale contains one eight item component with initial eigenvalues above one emerged accounting for 69.78% of the total item variance. The items load at .794 or above for missing excluded and .73 or above for missing imputed, which is considered excellent (Tabachnic & Fidel, 2007). The scale is normally distributed (m=3.29-3.57, sd=1.064-1.203, range=1-5, skew=-.883 - -.559, kurtosis=-.455 - .433), and the reliability is excellent (alpha=.937).

Participation level. The KMO test indicates that the participation level scale will factor (KMO=.914). Participation level was rotated with Promax because the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (p<.001), Component Correlation Matrix indicates a correlation above .32 (r=.651), substantive reasoning indicate that the components are correlated, and the Varimax rotation did not provide a different factor structure. Two components have eigenvalues above one, which matches the evidence of a two components structure in the scree plot with both methods. Participation level factored into two components that together explain 77.51% of the variance in the latent factor with all 11 items. Component one explains 65.79% of the variance in the latent factor with four items (38-41). Component two explains 11.72% of the variance in the latent factor with the remaining seven items (42-48) with missing values excluded. The item loadings for both component
load at .759 or above, which is considered excellent with the missing values excluded methods (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007).

The EFA with missing values imputed the item loadings are .534 or above, which is lower but still above the .32 cutoff. Item 44 was added to a list to consider dropping because it cross-loads highly on both components and is substantively vague with the missing excluded methods (helped organize activities other than meetings) (Costello & Osborne, 2005). Similarly item 41 cross loads during the missing imputed EFA therefore the item may be dropped because the item is also substantively vague (done work for the organization outside of meetings) or the appropriate loading will be explored in the CFA process. Component one is substantively labeled participation level: attend and Component two is labeled participation level: core leader, which both have excellent reliability (alpha=.908 and .944 respectively) with both methods. The participation level: attend subscale is normally distributed (m=1.7-2.24, sd=1.07-1.32, skew=.672-1.371, kurtosis=-.696-.949) with both methods. The participation level: core leader subscale has items that may deviate from normal, which may be explained based on the fact that most study participants did not participate at the core leader level and therefore those who did are frequently outliers (m=1.42-1.69, sd=,939-1.161 skew= 1.434-2.47, kurtosis=1.015-5.645) with both methods.

**Neighborhood problems.** The KMO test indicates that the neighborhood problems scale factors (KMO=.882). The neighborhood problems scale was rotated with a Promax rotation because the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (p<.001), Component Correlation Matrix (all components are correlated above .32), substantive reasoning
indicate that the components are correlated, and the Varimax rotation did not provide a different factor structure. The housing problems and crime scale factor structure includes three components that explain 72.23% of the variance in the latent factor with all scale items according to the components with Eigenvalues above 1 as well as the scree plots with both methods. Component one explains 50.35% of the variance with 9 items (50-58). Component two explains 12.32% of the variance with 5 items (59-63). Component three explains 9.56% of the variance with three items (64-66). All component items load at .733 or above, which is considered excellent (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Component one is substantively named crime and disorder, which has excellent reliability (alpha=.947) and is normally distributed (m=2.67-3.36, sd=1.191-1.367, skew=-.383-.420, kurtosis=-1.293-.770). Component two is substantively named property issues, which has good reliability (alpha=.845) and is normally distributed (m=2.4-2.82, sd=1.129-1.274, skew=.104-.691, kurtosis=-1.195-.312). Component three is substantively named traffic safety issues, which has excellent reliability (alpha=.925) and is normally distributed (m=3.16-3.41, sd=1.312-1.335, skew=-.386-.014, kurtosis=-1.256-1.073). The results with missing values imputed are identical.

**Individual activism.** The KMO test indicates that the individual activism Scale will factor (KMO=.75). A Promax rotation was used because the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (p<.001), Component Correlation Matrix (above .32), substantive reasoning indicate that the components are correlated, and the Varimax rotation did not provide a different factor structure. The factor structure of individual activism includes two components that together explain 55.03% of the variance in the latent factor, which is
indicated with two eigenvalues above one as well as a scree plot that confirms a two-component structure. Component one explains 38.08% of the variance with four items (67-68, 72-73). Component two explains 16.95% of the variance with three items (69-71). The items load at .589 or above, which is considered good (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Component one is substantively named individual activism: relational, which has questionable reliability (alpha=.66) and may deviate from normality (m=.12-.23, sd=.324-.424, skew=1.269-2.379, kurtosis=-.394-3.702). Component two is substantively named individual activism: influence, which has questionable reliability (alpha=.667) and may deviate from normality (m=.07-.15, sd=.248-.355, skew= 2.013-3.539, kurtosis=2.075-10.641). The deviation from normality may be a reflection of the low level of individual activism in the sample.

**Collective activism.** The KMO test indicates that the scale will factor (KMO=.801). Promax rotation was used because the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (p<.001), Component Correlation Matrix (Components one and two and one and three are correlated above .32), substantive reasoning indicate that the components are correlated, and the Varimax rotation did not provide a different factor structure. Three components have eigenvalues above one, but the screeplot indicates a two factor structure. The initial factor structure of collective activism indicates a three-component solution, which together explains 61.55% of the latent factor. Component one explains 38.43% of the variance with five items (76-80). Component two explains 12.93% of the variance with three items (81-83). Component three explains 10.19% of the variance with two items. A two-component solution will be used because Components one and two together explain
51.36% of the variance and Component three only utilizes two items. As a result item 75 will be considered for inclusion with factor two in the final solution and item 74 will be cut (Garson, 2010). The item loadings for component one are .634 or higher, which is considered very good. The item loadings of Component two are .709 or above (very good) without item 75 and poor with item 75 therefore the item will be cut from the final solution (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Component one is substantively called collective activism: meetings, which has acceptable reliability (alpha=.734). Component two is substantively called collective activism: actions, which has good reliability (alpha=.8). Collective activism: meetings and collective activism: actions are normally distributed (m=.13-.53, sd=.338-.5, skew=-.128-2.203, kurtosis=-2.008-2.887 and m=.19-.26, sd=.395-.448, skew=.177-.179, kurtosis=.477-.986 respectively).

**Individual and collective activism.** Since the individual and collective activism scales factored only middling to meritoriously and the concepts are substantively similar the scales were explored with missing values imputed. A two-component structure was identified and given the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity and Component Correlation Matrix with a .473 correlation between components a Promax rotation was used. Component one includes 13 items (68, 72, 73 as well as 74-83) with all items loading at .41 or higher, which is above the .32 cutoff (alpha=.959). Component two includes three items (69-71) with all items loading at .447 or higher (alpha=.916). Therefore including all of the items from the individual and collective activism scales together results in more reliable factors than when the scales are factored individually.
**Collective efficacy: Working together against crime.** The KMO test indicates that the scale will factor (KMO=.922). One component has an eigenvalue over one, which indicates a one-component structure; however the Scree Plot with missing values imputed suggests a one to two-component structure. Collective efficacy: working together against crime has one component that explains 68.72% of the variance in the latent construct with all nine items. All item loadings are .539 or above (fair); however all items are .714 or above if item nine is not included with missing values excluded (excellent) and .326 or above with missing values imputed (poor) (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). A two-component structure with missing values imputed also cuts item 93, and has a second component for items 91 and 92. Therefore, a one-component structure is retained because components ideally need three or more factors. The reliability of the scale is excellent (alpha=.94) and is normally distributed (m=1.76-2.27, sd=.734-.8, skew=-.502-.424, kurtosis=-1.354--1.061).

**Exploratory Factor Analysis of Original Measures**

**Transition and/or relocation plan.** The KMO test indicates the scale will factor (KMO=.853). The transition and/or relocation plan scale has one component with an eigenvalue above one, which explains 68.7% of the variance with all six items. The items load at .373 or above, which is poor however without the final item the items load at .787 or above (excellent) with the missing items excluded (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). The items load at .334 or above if item 99 is excluded based on the missing items imputed methods and therefore the item (Create a new neighborhood by redeveloping DHA) will be excluded. Substantively the question may have included measurement error based on
non-Denver Housing Authority residents reporting that they did not know what DHA stood for. The scale reliability without item 99 is good (alpha=.858) and may vary from normal distribution (m=3.93-4.24, sd=.756-.894, skew=-1.795- -1.035, kurtosis=1.268-5.073) because the average resident participating in the survey agreed that a transition and/or relocation plan is important.

**Readiness for mixed-income redevelopment.** The KMO test indicates that the scale will factor (KMO=.769). Promax rotation was used because the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (p<.001), Component Correlation Matrix (Components one and two are correlated above .32), and substantive reasoning indicate that the components are correlated. The scale has five components with eigenvalues above one, but the scree plot indicates a three-component solution with both methods.

With the missing values excluded the readiness for mixed income redevelopment scale has three components, which explain 52.2% of the variance. Component one explains 28.25% of the variance with seven items (105-110, 112). Component two explains 12.85% of the variance with six items (99-104). Component three explains 11.1% of the variance with four items (111, 113-115). Item 116 was cut because the item loading was below .32; however it loaded similarly on Components two and three. The items load at .45 or above, which is considered fair (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007).

Component one is substantively named readiness for mixed income, which has good reliability (alpha=.858) and a normal distribution (m=3.39-4.18, sd=.679-1.09, skew=-1.254 - -.341, kurtosis=-.508-2.679). Component two is substantively named readiness for new urbanism, which has acceptable reliability (alpha=.734) and a normal distribution
Component 3 is substantively named readiness for change, which has questionable reliability (alpha=.612) and may vary from normal distribution because residents in the sample generally agree that they are ready for new urbanism (m=4.11-4.25, sd=.756-.906, skew=-1.809-.946, kurtosis=.447-4.327).

The three components with missing items imputed and a Promax rotation provide a slightly different factor structure. Component one includes four items (101-103, 110), component two includes six items (104-109), and Component three includes two items (113-114). The reliability for component one is poor (alpha=.545), component two is fair (alpha=.731) and component three is good (alpha=.859).

The Varimax rotation with missing items imputed results in a different 3 component structure. Component one is comprised of seven items (99, 101-102, 104-106, 114) and has reliability (alpha=.675). Component two contains three items (100, 102, 113) and has reliability (alpha=.416),, and Component three (103, 107-110, 115, 116) and has reliability (alpha=.640).

Therefore the component structures are inconclusive with the differing EFA methods. As a result the CFA process will include analyzing the competing factor structures identified by the EFA with missing values included and imputed, as well as previous conceptualities of the scale that included a three component scale with items 105-108 as component one (reliability=.680), items 102-104 as component two (reliability=.695), and Key Focus Area for Change items 2.15, 5.4, 5.5 and 10.4 as Component three (reliability=.9) (Walker, 2009).
**Housing problems.** The KMO test indicates that the scale will factor
(KMO=.856). The Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (p<.001), Component Correlation Matrix
(all are correlated above .32), and substantive reasoning indicate that the components of
Housing Problems might be correlated therefore a Promax rotation was used. The scale
has three components with eigenvalues of one or higher, but the scree plot, number of
items per component, and substantive reasoning indicate a two-component model is a
better fit. The housing problems scale factors into two components that together explain
53.44% of the variance in the latent factor. Component one explains 44.9% of the
variance with 7 items (120-125). Component two explains 8.54% of the variance with
seven items (117-119, 126-130). The items factor at .429 or above, which is considered
poor therefore items may be dropped during the CFA stage of analysis to create a more
parsimonious model (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Component one is substantively named
housing problems: structural, which has an acceptable reliability (alpha=.759) and is
within the range of a normal distribution (m=1.44-2.83, sd=.913-1.295, skew=-.488-
1.887, kurtosis=-1.654-2.069). Component two is substantively named housing problems:
maintenance, which has good reliability (alpha=.877) and is within the range of a normal
distribution (m=1.45-1.87, sd=.919-1.114, skew=.888-1.894, kurtosis=-.655-2.173). The
two-component structure included Component one with seven items (120-126) and
Component two (117-119, 127-130).

The EFA rotation with missing values imputed resulted in either a one or ____
component structure. The one component structure included all items except item 118
(rats or mice), which included items with .483 or higher item loadings. Component one is
substantively named housing problems, which has an acceptable reliability (alpha=.877) and has a similar mean as the missing excluded method (m=1.4-2.7).

**Crime tolerance: Comfort next door.** The KMO Test indicates that the crime tolerance scale will factor (KMO=.878). A Promax rotation was used because the Barlett’s Test of Sphericity (p<.001), Component Correlation Matrix (Components one and two and one and three above .32), Substantive Reasoning indicate that the components are correlated, and the Varimax rotation trimmed two substantively important items. The crime tolerance scale explains 75.31% of the variance in the latent construct with three components. Three components were selected because the eigenvalues are greater than one for three components, the scree plot indicates two to three components and three components substantively makes sense. Component one explains 52.53% of the variance with nine items (136-144). Component two explains 15.98% of the variance with five items (145-149). Component three explains 6.80% of the variance with three items (133-135). The items load at .71 or higher, which is considered excellent (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). Component one is substantively called tolerance for disorder and drug crimes, which has excellent reliability (alpha=.951) and is within a normal distribution (m=2.06-3.28, sd=1.912-2.528, Skew=.456-1.682, kurtosis=-1.542-.219). Component two is substantively called tolerance for abuse and violent crimes, which has good reliability (alpha=.878) and may vary from a normal distribution as most survey participants are not comfortable with domestic violence, neglect of children, physical abuse of children, sexual abuse of children, or other violent offenses (m=1.23-1.97, sd=.931-1.81, Skew=1.773-4.886, kurtosis=1.815-25.406). Component
three is substantively called tolerance for minor crimes, which has good reliability (alpha=.863) and is normally distributed (m=3.95-5.44, sd=2.152-2.528, Skew=-1.076 - .013, kurtosis=-1.676 - -.319).

The factor structure with missing items imputed had different results, which included a three Component solution for both the Promax and Varimax rotation. Component one included items 133 and 134 and had item loadings of .903 or above (alpha=.946), Component two included items 143-149 and had item loadings of .468 or above (alpha=.953), and Component three included items 135-141 which had item loadings of .611 or above (alpha=.959) with a Promax rotation. Component one included items 133 and 134 and had item loadings of .956 or above, Component two included items 142-149 (alpha=.959) and had item loadings of .548 or above, and Component three included items 135-141 which had item loadings of .751 or above with a Varimax rotation.

**Crime tolerance: Second chance.** The KMO Test indicates that the crime tolerance: second chance scale will factor (KMP=.639). The scale has one component with an eigenvalue above one, which matches the scree plot depiction of one component with both methods. The crime tolerance: second chance scale has one component that accounts for 80.49% of the variance in the latent factor, which has three items (148-150). The items all load at .841 or above, which considered excellent for the missing excluded values and .701 or above for the missing imputed values (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). The substantive name for the component is crime tolerance: second chance, which has good reliability (alpha=.877) and is normally distributed (m=2.34-2.74, sd=1.12-1.15, skew=-.196 - .248, kurtosis=-1.389 - -1.358).
**Resident involvement in community organizations.** The KMO test indicates that the Resident Involvement in Community Organizations scale will factor (KMO=.766). The scale has two components with eigenvalues above one, but the scree plot and only one item loading on Component two indicate a one-component solution. Resident involvement in community organizations has one component, which explains 39.77% of the variance with seven items. The item loadings are .448 or above, which is considered fair (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). The scale is acceptably reliable (alpha=.725) and the scale may differ from a normal distribution on two items (involvement in HUGS and FRESC) (m=.08-.29, sd=.246-.455, skew=.936-3.574, kurtosis=-1.136 – 10.892).

The missing imputed methods resulted in either a one or two-component solution. The two-component solution included items 2-4 and 7 as Component one with items loading at .575 or above (alpha=.892) and Items 1 and 5-6 as Component two with item loadings of .649 or above (alpha=.387). The one component solution included all items with all items loading at .469 or above.

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Established Measures**

As stated in the methods section the Confirmatory Factor Analysis process will be assessed with model fit, modification indexes, and factor loadings. The model fit will be considered adequate or reasonable for RMSEA if <.1 and acceptable model fit for CFI if between .9-1 (Browne & Cudeck, 1992; Hair et al., 1998; O’Leary & Vokura, 1998). Modification indexes will be used as guides for deleting items or adding correlated error terms until acceptable RMSEA and CFI model fit indexes result if the suggested changes fit substantive reasoning (O’Leary-Kelly & Vokura, 1998). Standardized factor loadings
were interpreted like standardized regression Beta weights (Kline, 2005). A summary table of the CFA results provides the number of items in the scale or subscale, the items retained, the model fit, and Chronbach’s Alpha with missing data excluded (see Table N1) and missing data imputed (see Table O1). A narrative description for the number of items in the scale or subscale, the items retained, the model fit, item normality, and Chronbach’s Alpha is described below. A visual depiction of each scale is also provided in Appendices R through AD.

**Social cohesion/trust.** The original social cohesion scale had 29 questions, which were used in several studies that will be tested separately for the social cohesion and neighborhood identity scales. The best factor structure for the social cohesion scale was determined based on the missing data excluded (RMSEA=.077, CFI.963) and missing data imputed methods (RMSEA=.096, CFI=.901), in addition to an alternative factor structure identified by Walker (2009). The best factor structure for social cohesion was the factor structure defined in Walker (2009), which resulted improved model fit for the missing data excluded model (RMSEA=.069, CFI.966) (see Appendix P).

The final eleven items were selected after trimming according to modification indexes the remaining questions adequately covered key content for the construct including: three items regarding sense of community (items 6, 8, and 10), two items for socializing (2, 11), trust (4, 14) and favors (5, 9) and one item regarding social ties (1) and engaging in collective action (7) (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007). The resulting reliability for the social cohesion scale was excellent (alpha=.937), which is improved
from the factor structure proposed via the EFA process (alpha=.926). The social cohesion scale resulted in trimming the following item: 3, 12, and 15-18.

**Organizational collective efficacy.** The EFA factor structure for organizational collective efficacy scale provided a starting place for the CFA, which resulted in a 6 item factor structure with adequate model fit and good reliability (alpha=.883) (see Appendix Q) for both the missing excluded (RMSEA=.097, CFI=.98) and missing imputed methods (RMSEA=.082, CFI.983).

Modification indexes and substantive reasoning were follow to trim two items: 31) get people in the neighborhood to help each other more and 36) improve the business district in the neighborhood. The items were trimmed because they both had correlated error terms with item 34 (get people in the neighborhood to know each other more. The substantive reasons include:

- in interviews many residents made jokes about item 36 saying “what business district?” which indicated that the question did not fit the reality of their neighborhoods and therefore they could not envision residents improving a virtually non-existent business district; and

- persuading residents to help each other more is not directly tied to a group of residents solving neighborhood problems together (i.e. substantively the question feels more individual like social cohesion more than something a formal group might do to solve problems together).

The remaining six questions address key problems the neighborhoods could address together including: improving physical upkeep of housing, persuading city for better services, reducing crime, getting people to know each other, increasing affordable housing, and developing and implementing solutions to neighborhood problems.

**Participation level.** The CFA results with the missing data excluded resulted in a 2 factor structure with adequate model fit for participation level (RMSEA=.056,
CFI=.992). Factor one included items 38-41 which has excellent reliability (alpha=.943) and Factor two including items 42-48 which also has excellent reliability (alpha=.954). Item 45 (work completed outside of meetings) was correlated with error for the second component and therefore the item was deleted because it was substantively redundant. Item 48 (actively participate in discussions) was also cut because the error term was correlated with other item error terms and may not be substantively necessary item.

The CFA results with the missing data imputed resulted in a slightly different two factor solution with excellent reliability for factor one (alpha=.958) and factor two (alpha=.925). Item 41 (work for the organization outside of meetings) was also cut in the missing imputed model; however item 48 (actively participate in discussions) was retained in the factor structure. The resulting model fit was adequate (RMSEA=.075, CFI=.985) and excellent reliability (alpha=.944) (see Appendix R).

**Neighborhood problems.** The CFA for the missing data excluded method resulted in a model with adequate model fit (RMSEA=.098, CFI=.919) and excellent scale reliability (alpha=.98). The scale included the subscales with factor 1 including items 58-65 which have excellent reliability (alpha=.932), factor two including items 59-63 which has good reliability (alpha=.857) and factor 3 including items 55-57 which have excellent reliability (alpha=.909). Three items were cut because of their correlation with other item error terms. For example, item 57 (gangs) was highly correlated with several other error terms. Items 60 (drug dealing) and 61 (drug use) had correlated error terms, which substantively makes sense therefore the correlation was added to the CFA model.
The three factors were substantively named crime and disorder, property maintenance, and traffic safety.

The CFA results with the missing data imputed resulted in a slightly different model with adequate model fit (RMSEA=.077, CFI=.939) and good scale reliability (alpha=.892) (see Appendix S). The three subscale are the similar including items 50-54 as representing property maintenance, which has poor reliability (alpha=.692) and items 55-57 traffic safety, which has fair reliability (alpha=.795). Items 58-65 represented the crime and disorder subscale, which has excellent reliability (alpha=.902). Items 60 (drug dealing) and 61 (drug use) had correlated error terms, which substantively makes sense therefore the correlation was also added to the CFA model with the missing imputed method. Item 66 prostitution was also included in the crime and disorder subscale and the issue with correlated error terms for gangs was not present in the missing imputed model therefore item 16 was included in the crime and disorder subscale.

Activism. The CFA results with the missing data imputed for the individual and collective activism scales resulted in a four-factor structure with adequate model fit (RMSEA=.08, CFI=.901). Factor one included items 67, 68, 72, 73, and 77, which had fair reliability (alpha=.746). Factor two included items 69, 70, 71, 74, and 75, which had poor reliability (alpha=.696). Factor three included items 81, 82 and 83, which had good reliability (alpha=.835). Factor four included items 78, 79, and 80, which had poor reliability (alpha=.655). The four factors together had good reliability (alpha=.88).

The CFA with the missing items imputed resulted in a different solution with two factors and a single item representing the highest level of involvement (see Appendix T).
Factor one was similar to Factor two in the missing items excluded model, which included items 69 (Talked to a religious leader or minister to help with a neighborhood problem or with a neighborhood improvement), 70 (Written or had someone help me write a letter to the editor of a newspaper, newsletter or magazine), and 71 (Wrote a letter or made a phone call to influence a policy or political issue), which represent activities representing individual activism. Factor one has excellent reliability (alpha=.92). Factor two included items 68 and 72-83, which represents collective activism items such as talking to groups causing problems, getting together with neighborhoods to solve problems, attending meetings, filling out surveys or signing petitions. The reliability for Factor two is excellent (alpha=.964). A third single item asking about the resident’s highest level of involvement was also included to create a factor structure representing activism as a latent construct, which resulted in an adequate approaching good model fit (RMSEA=.062, CFI=.967) and excellent reliability (alpha=.953).

**Neighborhood identity.** The CFA results with the missing data imputed resulted in items 1 (strong ties in neighborhood), 6 (a lot in common), 7 (we’re planning something), 22 (agree on what’s important), 23 (really fit in), and 29 (care what my neighbors think about my actions), which had an adequate model fit when included in a two-factor structure with social cohesion with items (2, 4-5, 8-11, 15, 17, and 18) (RMSEA=.096, CFI=.901). The reliability for the neighborhood identity factor was good (alpha=.826).

The CFA for the missing data imputed included items 16 (quite similar), 21 (remind me of my past), 22 (agree on what’s important), 23 (really fit in), 24 (get along well), 26
(neighborhood a part of daily life), and 28 (glad to be a resident), and 29 (care what my neighbors think of my actions), which resulted in an adequate approaching good model fit (RMSEA=.061, CFI=.966) and fair reliability (alpha=.749) (see Appendix U).

**Collective efficacy: Working together against crime.** The CFA results with the missing data excluded resulted in a one-factor model including all nine items (85-93) with adequate model fit (RMSEA=.082, CFI=.985). The one-factor however includes correlated error terms between all of the items. The CFA results with the missing data imputed resulted in an eight item model without any correlated error terms and adequate model fit (RMSEA=.083, CFI=.982) (see Appendix V). The only item trimmed from the model include item 93 (call police to report crime and safety concerns), which was suggested by a resident in the pilot testing stage and not included in the original scale. Therefore, the item was cut and the scale remained consistent with the original scale, which has excellent reliability (alpha=.918).

**Confirmatory Factor Analysis: Original Measures**

**Transition and/or relocation plan.** The CFA results with the missing data excluded resulted in a six-item factor with adequate model fit (RMSEA=.099, CFI=.964) and good reliability (alpha=.821). The results matched the EFA Promax rotation solution. An alternative factor structure as defined in Walker (2009) also has adequate model fit (RMSEA=.092, CFI=.991) with a four item structure that includes items 94-97.

The CFA results with the missing data imputed resulted in a five-item structure, which resulted in adequate model fit (RMSEA=.078, CFI=.988) (see Appendix W). The item that was cut is item 99 (create a new development by redeveloping DHA) was
deleted because of modification index results as well as the knowledge that the inclusion of the DHA acronym in the question resulted in some potential measurement error because participants did not know that DHA stood for Denver Housing Authority. Given that the improved model fit indexes for the CFA model with missing data imputed the five-item factor structure was selected, which has excellent reliability (alpha=.959).

**Readiness for mixed-income redevelopment.** The CFA results with the missing data exclude resulted in a three factor structure consistent with the EFA Varimax rotation, which resulted in adequate model fit (RMSEA=.068, CFI=.962) and good reliability (alpha=.823). Factor one included items 105-108, which had good reliability (alpha=.875). Factor two included items 102-104, which had good reliability (alpha=.804). Factor three included items 113-115, which had fair reliability (alpha=.719). Seven items were trimmed from the factor structure including items 109-112 and 114 from factor one, items 99-101 from factor two, and item 111 from factor three.

The CFA results with the missing data imputed resulted in a factor structure similar to the Promax rotation for the EFA model with missing data imputed, which resulted in an adequate model fit (RMSEA=.07, CFI=.95) and fair reliability (alpha=.779) (see Figure AD1). Factor one includes items 102-104 and 111, which represent the construct readiness for change and has fair reliability (alpha=.722). Factor two includes items 105-110, which represents the construct readiness for mixed income and has fair reliability (alpha=.725). Factor three includes items 114 and 115, which represent readiness for new urbanism and has good reliability (alpha=.897).
The factor structure proposed by Walker (2009) was also analyzed in order to determine if the model provides better model fit indices and reliability, which resulted in good model fit (RMSEA=.027, CFI = .994) and better reliability (see Figure AD2). Factor one includes items 102-104, which represent the construct readiness for change and has good reliability (alpha=.804). Factor two includes items 105-108, which represents the construct readiness for mixed income and has good reliability (alpha=.875). Factor three includes items 113-116, which represent readiness for new urbanism and has fair reliability (alpha=.719). As a result the factor structure chosen was consistent with Walker (2009).

**Housing problems.** The CFA results with the missing data excluded resulted in two similarly adequate factor structures with two subscales each; however the error terms in both factor structures were correlated for four to six items. The EFA Varimax factor structure resulted in less correlated error terms and therefore was selected as the better model (RMSEA=.073, CFI=.908). Factor one included items 120-128, which resulted in fair reliability (alpha=.78). Factor two included items 117-119 and 129-130, which resulted in fair reliability (alpha=.727). The error terms for unsecure windows and unsecure doors were corrected, as well as rats/mice and roaches, which makes substantive sense.

The CFA results with the missing data imputed resulted in a single factor with 12 items adequate approaching good model fit (RMSEA=.063, CFI=.941) and good reliability (alpha=.892) (see Appendix Y). Item 125 (mice or rats) was trimmed from the model based on modification index recommendations. The item was deleted.
substantively because a known difference with housing problems with mice was discovered at one housing site during the survey process, which resulted in a difference in the item between groups based on housing location.

**Crime tolerance: Comfort next door.** The CFA results with the missing data excluded resulted in a two-factor solution with adequate model fit (RMSEA=.1, CFI = .942) with excellent reliability (alpha=.939). Factor one included items 135-144, which has excellent reliability (alpha=.943). Factor two includes items 145-149, which have good reliability (alpha=.895). Several error terms are correlated however they substantively make sense such as drug use and marijuana sales, marijuana sales and other drug sales, other drug use and other drug sales, as well as physical and sexual abuse of children, neglect and physical abuse of children which all substantively make sense.

The CFA results with the missing data imputed resulted in a three-factor structure with adequate model fit (RMSEA=.086, CFI=.972) and excellent reliability (alpha=.968) that was closer to the EFA Promax solution (see Appendix Z). Factor one includes items 143-147, which are substantively related to violence, abuse and neglect and has excellent reliability (alpha=.946). Factor two includes 140-142, which are focused on drug use and drug sales and has excellent reliability (alpha=.91). Factor three includes items 133-139, which generally focuses on crime and disorder, which has excellent reliability (alpha=.955). Three sets of items have correlated error terms, which substantively make sense including: marijuana sales and marijuana use as well as the physical abuse of children with the neglect of children and the sexual abuse of children.
**Crime tolerance: Second change.** The CFA results with the missing data excluded and missing imputed models resulted in retaining the three item structure which had good model fit (RMSEA=.000, CFI=1) and good reliability (alpha=.892) (see Appendix AA).

**Resident involvement in community organizations.** The CFA results with the missing data excluded resulted in one factor structure that included all items with good model fit (RMSEA=.043, CFI=.99) and fair reliability (alpha=.793). The error terms for the Local Resident Council (LRC) and the Resident Council Board (RCB) and Helping Us Grow Stronger (HUGS) are correlated, which makes sense because the LRC officers attend the RCB meetings and many of the LRC leaders are also involved in HUGS.

The CFA results with the missing data imputed was similar to the missing data excluded factor structure except item 153 (HUGS) was deleted in order to create a more parsimonious factor structure with good model fit (RMSEA=.04, CFI=.997) and poor reliability (alpha=.697) (see Appendix AB). The error terms for items 155 (LRC) and 156 (RCB), which makes substantive sense because the LRC officers attend the RCB meetings as representatives of their neighborhood in regional meetings.

Once the EFA and CFA the process were complete for both the missing data excluded and missing data imputed models, a final decision was made for the factor structure for each measure. Final decisions (for items included for each measure) were based on several factors including: model fit (CFI & RMSEA), reliability (Chronbach’s Alpha), substantive reasoning, and the normality of scale items as described below.
Summary of Data Set and Data Screening

The psychometric properties of the major study variables with the whole data set with missing data excluded was provided for each variable in order to establish that assumptions for regression and Structural Equation Modeling are met. Potentially problematic variables or items will be identified in order to highlight any non-normal data that may create problems in the model building and testing. The sample number with no items missing on the scale, the mean, standard deviation, range of possible responses as well as skew and kurtosis are presented in Figure 7. When possible either a comparison with the final factor structure is described within the context of current measurement development literature or discriminant validity is established (see Table AC1).

Table 7. Psychometric Properties of Major Study Variables. The following includes the number of households, range, as well as the range for individual items in each scale for means, standard deviation, reliability, skewness, and kurtosis when missing values were deleted. The following abbreviations were used: SC=Social Cohesion, OCE=Organizational Collective Efficacy, PL= Participation Level, NP= Neighborhood Problems, Act= Activism, NI=Neighborhood Identity, PL=Participation Level, TRP= Transitional and/or Relocation Plan, RMIR= Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment, HP= Housing Problems, CTCND= Crime Tolerance: Comfort Next Door, CTSC= Crime Tolerance: Second Chance, Inver= Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Range</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Actual</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>3.2-3.7</td>
<td>1-1.2</td>
<td>.931</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.8-.3</td>
<td>-.85-.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>3.3-3.6</td>
<td>1-1.2</td>
<td>.913</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.9-.6</td>
<td>-.45-.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1.5-2.3</td>
<td>1-1.4</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>.6-2.3</td>
<td>-.9-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>2.4-3.4</td>
<td>1-1.2</td>
<td>.935</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.5-.6</td>
<td>-1.3-.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Act</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>.06-.6</td>
<td>.2-.5</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>-.2-3.6</td>
<td>-2-11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI</td>
<td>338</td>
<td>3-3.7</td>
<td>1-1.2</td>
<td>.742</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.7-.07</td>
<td>-1.1-.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PL</td>
<td>356</td>
<td>1.5-2.3</td>
<td>1-1.4</td>
<td>.944</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>.6-2.3</td>
<td>-.9-4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>3.9-4.2</td>
<td>1-1.4</td>
<td>.883</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-1.4-1</td>
<td>1.6-3.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMIR</td>
<td>297</td>
<td>3.8-4.3</td>
<td>.7-1.2</td>
<td>.807</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-1.8-.7</td>
<td>.04-.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HP</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>1.5-3</td>
<td>1-1.2</td>
<td>.866</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>-.7-1.7</td>
<td>-1.7-1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTCND</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>1.2-5.6</td>
<td>.9-2.5</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>1-7</td>
<td>-1.3-5</td>
<td>-1.7-26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTSC</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>2.3-2.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.867</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>1-4</td>
<td>-.17-.33</td>
<td>-1.2—1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inver</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>.1-.3</td>
<td>.3-.4</td>
<td>.706</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>.8-2.8</td>
<td>-1.3-6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter Five: Quantitative Results

All quantitative and qualitative data results are reported separately, then compared in an iterative process in the final stage of data analysis, as is consistent with Concurrent Triangulation Design (Clark & Creswell, 2008). The steps of reporting results will include:

1. Chapter five will present the quantitative results for research question one, which explored predicting readiness for mixed income redevelopment with social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and possessing a transition and/or relocation plan (regression) and research question two, which explored predicting involvement in neighborhood organizations;

2. Chapter six will present the qualitative results that elaborate on the quantitative findings for research questions one and two as well as presenting the results of research question three, which explored an evidence-based practice approach to transition and/or relocation planning.

3. Chapter seven will synthesize and discuss the findings from the three research questions.

The step-by-step model building process for research questions one and two are reported below. All models met statistical assumptions.

Research Question One: Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment

The regression model to explore predicting resident readiness for mixed income redevelopment was developed in four model-building steps. Step one determined whether or not social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and having a transition and/or relocation plan each statistically significantly predicted resident readiness for mixed income redevelopment. Step two tested the preferred model that predicted readiness for
mixed income redevelopment with each of the three variables while controlling for the other variables. Step three tested the causality of the preferred model by reversing the order of the independent and dependent variables. Step four compared the results from steps three and four in order to situate the preferred model within the context of the competing models with different causal ordering.

**Step 1.** The first step in the model building process determined whether or not the three scales individually predict readiness for mixed income redevelopment. Each of the scales did predict readiness for mixed income redevelopment (see Table 8).

Table 8. Regression estimates of relationships between social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, transition and/or relocation plan, and readiness for mixed income redevelopment: Standardized coefficients, significance levels, and r-squared.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Path</th>
<th>SC→RMIR (Model 1)</th>
<th>OCE→RMIR (Model 2)</th>
<th>TRP→RMIR (Model 3)</th>
<th>Full Model (Model 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SC→RMIR</td>
<td>.332*** (.11*)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.36*** (.13*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE→RMIR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.324*** (.111*)</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.367*** (.135**)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRP→RMIR</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.712*** (.507***)</td>
<td>.7*** (.535***)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05

Social cohesion explains 11% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment, which leaves 89% unexplained (p<.05) (Model 1). Organizational collective efficacy predicts 11.1% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment (p<.05), which leaves 88.1% unexplained (Model 2). Finally, having a transition and/or relocation plan explains 50.7% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment (p<.001), which leaves 49.3% unexplained (Model 3). Step two predicted readiness for mixed income redevelopment while controlling for the other independent variables.
**Step 2.** The second step in model building involved identifying the preferred model (Model 4). Based on multiple regression analysis resident perception of social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and having a transition and/or relocation plan together explain variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment with good model fit (CFI=.937, RMSEA=.047) (see Table 8 & Figure 4).

![Figure 4](image)

*Figure 4. Regression Model Predicting Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment CFI=.937; RMSEA=.047; AIC=27087.903; Chi-Sq.(486)=894.92***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05*

Social cohesion explains 13% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment (p<.05) when controlling for organizational collective efficacy and having a transition and/or relocation plan, which leaves 87% of the variance unexplained. When social cohesion goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed income
redevelopment goes up by .36 standard deviations. Organizational collective efficacy predicts 13.5% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment when controlling for social cohesion and having a transition and/or relocation plan (p<.01), which leaves 86.5% of the variance unexplained. When organizational collective efficacy goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed income redevelopment goes up by .367 standard deviations. Having a transition and/or relocation plan explains 53.5% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment when controlling for social cohesion and organizational collective efficacy, which leaves 46.5% of the variance unexplained (p<.001). When having a transition and/or relocation plan goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed income redevelopment goes up by .73 standard deviations. Together the three variables explain 80% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment, which leaves 20% of the variance unexplained. Together when the three independent variables go up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed income redevelopment goes up by 1.457 standard deviations. Whereas the results of step two indicate statistically significant results with good model fit, the causal relationships between the variables cannot be claimed without testing the competing models in step three.

**Step 3.** The third step of model building included one final set of analysis in order to test the causal ordering of the independent variables and dependent variable. Each of the alternative models is explained below. Model five explored organizational collective efficacy as the dependent variable. Model six explored social cohesion as the dependent variable. Model seven explored having a transition and/or relocation plan as the
dependent variable. Each model is explained and then compared with the preferred model (Model four).

**Model 5.** Social cohesion explains 10.1% of the variance in organizational collective efficacy (p<.01) when controlling for readiness for mixed income redevelopment and having a transition and/or relocation plan, which leaves 89.9% of the variance unexplained. When social cohesion goes up by one standard deviation organizational collective efficacy goes up by .36 standard deviations (p<.001). Readiness for mixed income redevelopment predicts 13% of the variance in organizational collective efficacy when controlling for social cohesion and having a transition and/or relocation plan (p<.05), which leaves 87% of the variance unexplained. When readiness for mixed income redevelopment goes up by one standard deviation organizational collective efficacy goes up by .319 standard deviations (p<.001). Having a transition and/or relocation plan explains 6.1% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment when controlling for social cohesion and readiness for mixed income redevelopment (p<.05), which leaves 93.9% of the variance unexplained. When having a transition and/or relocation plan goes up by one standard deviation organizational collective efficacy goes up by .247 standard deviations (p<.001).

**Model 6.** Organizational collective efficacy explains 10.1% of the variance in social cohesion (p<.001) when controlling for readiness for mixed income redevelopment and having a transition and/or relocation plan, which leaves 89.9% of the variance unexplained. When organizational collective efficacy goes up by one standard deviation social cohesion goes up by .319 standard deviations (p<.001). Transition and/or
relocation plan predicts 6.4% of the variance in readiness for mixed income redevelopment when controlling for organizational collective efficacy and having a transition and/or relocation plan (p<.05), which leaves 93.6% of the variance unexplained. When having a transition and/or relocation plan goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed income redevelopment goes up by .253 standard deviations (p<.001). Readiness for mixed income redevelopment explains 13.5% of the variance in organizational collective efficacy and having a transition and/or relocation plan (p<.05), which leaves 86.5% of the variance unexplained. When readiness for mixed income redevelopment goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed income redevelopment goes up by .657 standard deviations (p<.001).

**Model 7.** Social cohesion explains 6.1% of the variance in having a transition and/or relocation plan (p<.05) when controlling for organizational collective efficacy and readiness for mixed income redevelopment, which leaves 93.9% of the variance unexplained. When social cohesion goes up by one standard deviation transition and/or relocation plan goes up by .247 standard deviations (p<.001). Organizational collective efficacy predicts 6.4% of the variance in having a transition and/or relocation plan when controlling for social cohesion and readiness for mixed income redevelopment (p<.05), which leaves 93.6% of the variance unexplained. When organizational collective efficacy goes up by one standard deviation having a transition and/or relocation plan goes up by .253 standard deviations (p<.001). Readiness for mixed income redevelopment explains 53.5% of the variance in having a transition and/or relocation plan when controlling for social cohesion and organizational collective efficacy (p<.001), which leaves 46.5% of
the variance unexplained. When readiness for mixed income redevelopment goes up by one standard deviation having a transition and/or relocation plan goes up by .732 standard deviations (p<.001).

**Step 4.** Step four found that the hypothesized chosen model has the same model fit as the models with the reverse causal ordering (CFI=.937, RMSEA=.047). As a result, the decision regarding whether to retain or reject the null hypothesis is inconclusive with the model fit results alone. The final model was selected based on logic and theory; however an outside factor (not included in the modeling) may cause the relationships between the four variables (Kline, 2005). As explained in-depth for Models 4 through 7 above, Model 4 explains more of the variance than Models 5 and 7 and therefore Model 4 is the preferred model if the qualitative results support the model. Therefore the qualitative results will confirm a logical argument for retaining one of the models or will identify possible outside factors that could influence the model results. In addition to exploring competing models, the regression model must also meet all statistical assumptions such as the Independent of Errors, Homoskedasticity, and normality as defined in the methods section.

**Regression assumptions.** All assumptions for the multiple regressions were met. The Independence of Errors and Homoskedasticity assumptions were tested by plotting the standardized residuals and standardized predicted y-values, which resulted in a non-linear relationship (p < .001). The Normality and Error Mean were also tested for the standardized residuals. The skewness and kurtosis are within normal ranges (see Appendix AC). The error mean equals zero, which indicates that this error term
assumption is also met. As a result the quantitative results for research question one can confidently be interpreted as reported above. Research question two will follow a similar model building process.

**Research Question Two: Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations**

The Structural Equation Model process that predicted resident involvement in neighborhood organizations was an iterative model building process for two hypothesized models (see Figures 1 & 2). Figure 1 displays casual arrows where previous literature reported significant predictive relationships. Appendix C explain Figure 1 in six testable steps. Specifically, Structural Equation Model One explored the previous literature in the following steps:

1. Explored the predictive relationship between neighborhood problems, collective efficacy and social cohesion with individual and collective activism (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007);

2. Explored the predictive relationship between social cohesion and organizational collective efficacy (Speer & Hughey, 1995) as well as whether neighborhood identity moderates the relationship between social cohesion and organizational collective efficacy (Keiffer, 1984);

3. Explored the predictive relationship between participation level and participation in decision making on organizational collective efficacy (Ohmer & Beck, 2006) as well as the predictive relationship between organizational collective efficacy and involvement in neighborhood organizations;

4. Explored the predictive relationship between home ownership and involvement in neighborhood organizations (Winter, 1990);

5. Explored the predictive relationship between individual and collective activism and involvement in neighborhood organizations;

6. Explored the predictive relationships between individual activism and readiness for change as well as readiness for change and housing problems on involvement in neighborhood organizations (Foster-Fishman et al.; 2007).
While Structural Equation Model One tested the previous relationships between the variables of interest, Model Two tests higher order latent constructs (see Figure C1). Specifically Model Two tests whether the following higher order latent constructs predict involvement in neighborhood organizations including: community capacity for change, community readiness for change, resident involvement, neighborhood factors, and neighborhood commitment. Each of the latent constructs represent three or more of the study measures as operationalized below:

- Community capacity for change: social cohesion, participation level, and participation in decision-making;
- Community readiness for change: organizational collective efficacy, readiness for change, neighborhood problems, housing problems, and collective efficacy: working together against crime;
- Resident involvement: individual and collective activism;
- Neighborhood factors: neighborhood identity, crime tolerance: second chance, and crime tolerance: comfort next door;
- Neighborhood commitment: home ownership, length of time in the neighborhood, and prefers to remain in neighborhood.

Neither Model One nor Model Two resulted in statistically significant predictive relationships with adequate model fit as hypothesized; however significant relationships were identified in the iterative Structural Equation Model building process, which resulted in four alternative models with adequate model fit. Each of the alternative models will be substantively explained prior to reporting results.

Model 1a explores the direct relationships between neighborhood problems, activism, and resident involvement in neighborhood organizations (see Figure 5), which is based on the work of Foster-Fishman et al (2007). Model 1b and 2 are Mixed Models, which
build on the results from the originally hypothesized Models One and Two. Model 1b explored the predictive relationships between neighborhood problems, social cohesion, neighborhood identity, activism and organizational collective efficacy and involvement in neighborhood organizations, which is based on the work of Foster-Fishman et al (2007) and Speer & Hughey (1995). Finally Model 2 explored the predictive relationships between neighborhood problems, activism, and community capacity for change and involvement in neighborhood organizations, which is based on the latent constructs of Foster-Fishman et al. (2007). The results of each of the models will be reported, which will include testing alternative causal models for Alternative Models 1a, 1b, and 2.

Figure 5. Structural Equation Model Predicting Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations (Model 1a)
CFI = .926; RMSEA = .029; Chi-Sq.(733) = 964.851***
Significance Levels: *** p ≤ .001; ** p ≤ .01; * p ≤ .05; ns = p > .05
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Model 1a. Model 1a resulted in neighborhood problems predicting activism, which then predicted involvement in neighborhood organizations (see Figure 5). The model has good model fit (RMSEA=.029, CFI=.926). Neighborhood problems consisted of three sub-scales, which included property maintenance, crime and disorder, and traffic safety. Activism included three subscales including individual activism, collective activism, and highest level of involvement. Neighborhood problems explained 11.3% of the variance in activism, which leaves 88.7% unexplained. When neighborhood problems goes up by one standard deviation activism goes up by .337 standard deviations. Activism explained 59.4% of the variance in involvement in neighborhood organizations, which leaves 40.6% unexplained. When activism goes up by one standard deviation involvement in neighborhood organizations goes up by .594 standard deviations.

Alternative causal models with the same model fit were tested that include the following models:

• Involvement in neighborhood organizations predicting activism, which predicts neighborhood problems

• Involvement in neighborhood organizations and activism predict neighborhood problems

• Involvement in neighborhood organizations and neighborhood problems predict activism

• Neighborhood problems and activism predict involvement in neighborhood organizations

Model 1b. Model 1b resulted in neighborhood problems and social cohesion predicting activism, social cohesion and neighborhood identity predicting organizational collective efficacy, and activism and organizational collective efficacy predicting
involvement in neighborhood organizations (see Figure 6). The model has good model fit (RMSEA=.021, CFI=.914). Neighborhood problems explained 7.5% of the variance in activism when controlling for social cohesion, neighborhood identity, and organizational collective efficacy, which leaves 92.5% unexplained. When neighborhood problems goes up by one standard deviation, activism goes up by .275 standard deviations. Social cohesion explains 14.9% of the variance in activism and organizational collective efficacy when controlling for neighborhood problems and neighborhood identity, which leaves 85.1% unexplained. When social cohesion goes up by one standard deviation, activism goes up by .173 standard deviations. When social cohesion goes up by 1 standard deviation, organizational collective efficacy goes up by .339 standard deviations. Neighborhood identity explains 12.4% of organizational collective efficacy when controlling for neighborhood problems, social cohesion and activism, which leaves 87.6% unexplained. When neighborhood identity goes up by one standard deviation, organizational collective efficacy goes up by .353 standard deviations. Activism explains 40.4% of the variance in involvement in neighborhood organizations, which leaves 59.6% unexplained. When activism goes up by one standard deviation, involvement in neighborhood organizations goes up by .636 standard deviations. Organizational collective efficacy has a statistically non-significant impact on the variance in involvement in neighborhood organizations.
The following alternative model resulted in a similar model fit. The alternative model indicated involvement in neighborhood organizations predicting activism and organizational collective efficacy, activism predicting neighborhood problems and social cohesion, and organizational collective efficacy predicting social cohesion and neighborhood identity (RMSEA=.021, CFI=.915). A future survey could determine causal ordering by testing the impact of these variables on each other over time.

**Model 2.** Model 2 resulted in neighborhood problems predicting activism and activism and community capacity for change predicting involvement in neighborhood
organizations (see Figure 7). The model has good model fit (RMSEA = .022, CFI = .905). Neighborhood problems included four subscales that added housing problems to the previous three subscales. Community capacity for change included organizational collective efficacy and the two participation level subscales. Neighborhood problems explains 12.5% of the variance in activism when controlling for community capacity for change, which leaves 87.5% unexplained. When neighborhood problems goes up by one standard deviation, activism goes up by .354 standard deviations. Activism explains 34.5% of the variance in involvement in neighborhood organizations when controlling for community capacity for change, which leaves 65.5% unexplained. When activism goes up by one standard deviation, involvement in neighborhood organizations goes up by .587 standard deviations. Community capacity for change explains 32.8% of the variance in involvement in neighborhood organizations when controlling for community capacity for change, which leaves 67.2% unexplained. When community capacity goes up by one standard deviation, involvement in neighborhood organizations goes up by .587 standard deviations.
Figure 7. Structural Equation Model Predicting Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations (Model 2)
CFI= .905; RMSEA= .022; Chi-Sq.(2129)=2543.878***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05

The following alternative models resulted in similar model fit. The alternative models indicated:

- Involvement in neighborhood organizations predicting community capacity for change and activism, community capacity for change predicting activism, and neighborhood problems predicting activism (RMSEA=.023, CFI=.904)

- Involvement in neighborhood organizations, activism, and community capacity for change predicting neighborhood problems (RMSEA=.023, CFI=.902)

**Final Model Selected.** Based on quantitative criteria Models 1a and 2 are the top two models. Model 2 has an overall greater explanatory power based on the percent of
variance explained and the standard deviation increase in the dependent variable (see Table 9).

Table 9. Structural Equation Model estimates of relationships between neighborhood problems (NP), activism, neighborhood identity (NI), participation level (PL), social cohesion (SC), organizational collective efficacy (OCE), neighborhood problems revised to include housing problems (NPr), and involvement in neighborhood organizations (Inver): Standardized coefficients, significance levels, and r-squared. Community capacity for change (CCC) included two participation level scales and organizational collective efficacy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Structural Path</th>
<th>First Order (Model 1a)</th>
<th>First Order Model Building (Model 1b)</th>
<th>Higher Order Model (Model 2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Coefficient ($r^2$)</td>
<td>Coefficient ($r^2$)</td>
<td>Coefficient ($r^2$)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NP $\rightarrow$ Activism</td>
<td>.337*** (.113)</td>
<td>.275*** (.075*)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPr $\rightarrow$ Activism</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.354*** (.125*)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism $\rightarrow$ Inver</td>
<td>.594*** (.353)</td>
<td>.636*** (.404***)</td>
<td>.587*** (.345***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC $\rightarrow$ Activism&amp;OCE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.173** (.149**)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NI $\rightarrow$ OCE</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.353*** (.124**)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCE $\rightarrow$ Inver</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.053 (.003)</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC $\rightarrow$ Inver</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.572*** (.328***</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Significance Levels: *** p ≤ .001; ** p ≤ .01; * p ≤ .05; ns = p > .05

If model fit indices (CFI, TLI, WRMR) and parsimony (based on the number of free parameters) solely informed model choice then Model 1a would take precedence (see Table 10). Model 1a tells a simpler story in that resident awareness of neighborhood problems predicts their involvement in activism, which then predicts their involvement in neighborhood organizations. Model 2 tells a more complex story that captures more of the variance in resident involvement in neighborhood organizations. Specifically Model 2 repeats the neighborhood problem, activism and involvement in neighborhood organizations story while adding an additional component to the story regarding the community capacity for change based on resident participation level and resident beliefs regarding their organizational collective efficacy. In other words Model 2 explains that:
(a) if residents perceive neighborhood problems and participate in activism then they are more likely to involve themselves in neighborhood organizations and (b) if residents believe that neighborhood organizations can effectively solve neighborhood problems and they participate in solving those problems together then they are more likely to involve themselves in neighborhood organizations.

Table 10. Structural Equation Model Fit Comparison.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Chi-Square</th>
<th>Free Parameters</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1a</td>
<td>.926</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>733</td>
<td>964.851***</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 1b</td>
<td>.914</td>
<td>.021</td>
<td>2485</td>
<td>7424.137***</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>.905</td>
<td>.022</td>
<td>2211</td>
<td>6557.247***</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Therefore, the final model selected is Model 2 because the model explains more of the total variance and results in a higher total increase in involvement in neighborhood organizations when accounting for neighborhood problems, activism and community capacity for change. The model fit indices are not the highest among the three models, but they are good (RMSEA=.022, CFI=.905).

Model 2 is the preferred model indicating a relationship between neighborhood problems, activism, community capacity for change and involvement in neighborhood organizations. However the current methodology cannot determine causal ordering.

**SEM Assumptions.** All assumptions for the Structural Equation Models were met. The Independence of Errors and Homoskedasticity assumptions were tested by plotting the standardized residuals and standardized predicted y-values, which resulted in a non-linear relationship (R2 < .001). The Normality and Error Mean were also tested for the standardized residuals. The skewness and kurtosis are within normal ranges. The error mean equals zero, which indicates that this error term assumption is also met.


**Synthesized Model**

A summary of the statistical model synthesizing research questions one and two demonstrates that the relationships between variables remains when controlling for the other variables in the models (see Figure AW1) (CFI=.901, RMSEA=.024). The statistical results from research questions one and two will therefore be synthesized to determine whether predicting resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment and resident involvement in neighborhood organizations creates a statistically significant model with adequate model fit. The full blended model that combines research questions one and two and includes the community capacity for change construct does not have adequate model fit (CFI=.86, RMSEA=.045). The revised blended model that combines research questions one and two with the crime tolerance scales does have adequate model fit (CFI=.901, RMSEA=.024) (see Figure AW1). All independent variables predict readiness for mixed-income redevelopment or involvement in neighborhood organizations. The variance explained by each study variable and the standard deviation change in one variable as another increases is explained in order to the amount of variance explained.
Figure A1. Summary of research questions one and two synthesized.

Possessing a transition and/or relocation plan explains 59.4% of the variance in readiness for mixed-income redevelopment when controlling for social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and activism, which leaves 40.6% of the variance unexplained. When having a transition and/or relocation plan goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed-income redevelopment goes up by .771 standard deviations (p<.001).

Activism explains a total of 48% of the variance in readiness for mixed-income redevelopment and involvement in neighborhood organizations, which leaves 52% of the variance unexplained. When activism goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed-income redevelopment goes up by .218 standard deviations and involvement in
neighborhood organizations goes up by .61 standard deviations (p<.001). Social cohesion explains a total of 29.8% of the variance in resident perceptions of neighborhood problems, organizational collective efficacy, and readiness for mixed-income redevelopment when controlling for possessing a transition and/or relocation plan and activism.

When social cohesion goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed-income redevelopment goes up by .421 standard deviations, organizational collective efficacy goes up by .212 standard deviations and perception of neighborhood problems goes down by .19 standard deviations (p<.001).

Organizational collective efficacy explains 10.4% of the variance in readiness for mixed-income redevelopment when controlling for social cohesion, possessing a transition and/or relocation plan, neighborhood problems and activism, which leaves 89.6% of the variance unexplained. When organizational collective efficacy goes up by one standard deviation readiness for mixed-income redevelopment goes up by .322 standard deviations (p<.001).

Perception of neighborhood problems explains 7% of the variance in activism when controlling for social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and transition and/or relocation plan, which leaves 93% unexplained. When perception of neighborhood problems goes up by one standard deviation activism goes up by .264 standard deviations (p<.001).
Conclusion

In summary, the results for research question one, which explored whether social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and possessing a transition and/or relocation plan found that 80% of the variance in readiness for mixed-income redevelopment can be explained by the hypothesized model. The null hypothesis stated that none of the independent variables would predict readiness for mixed-income redevelopment therefore the null hypothesis is not retained. The results for research question two, which explored variables predicting resident involvement in neighborhood organizations found that 67.3% of the variance in resident involvement in neighborhood organizations can be explained with model two. The null hypothesis stated that none of the variables would predict resident involvement in neighborhood organizations therefore the null hypothesis is not retained.

Mixed-income redevelopment policy and practice is shifting from dispersing residents prior to redevelopment (as required with the HOPE VI program) to phasing redevelopment in a manner that allows residents to move from their existing unit into a redeveloped unit within the neighborhood. The South Lincoln redevelopment is being implemented with a phased approach. Mixed-income redevelopment of a community assumes that future residents will value change that addresses concentrated urban poverty neighborhood problems, mixes incomes, and creates a walkable community. Community level interventions such as resident involvement in neighborhood organizations that work together to plan and implement the change therefore might be important. As a result, the frameworks created with research questions one and two might be useful to mixed-
income redevelopment planning and resident engagement processes. If residents will benefit from sustainable neighborhood changes then they may benefit more if they are ready for change and involved in implementing those changes. Together the results of research questions one and two and the qualitative results described in chapter six will be used to create an evidence-based mixed-income redevelopment practice framework in chapter seven.
Chapter Six: Qualitative Results

As stated in the methodology chapter twenty-five interviews were conducted with the La Alma/Lincoln Park Denver Housing Authority – South Lincoln residents who varied across several demographics (see Appendix AD). The interview guide focused on asking residents to provide a rich description of their readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment and their involvement in neighborhood organizations (see Appendix E). In addition the qualitative interview guide presented residents with information from existing studies focused on resident social and economic outcomes reported in HOPE VI evaluations (see Appendices K-Q).

The qualitative analysis for all research questions was conducted using the following constant comparative method in five steps (Glaser, 1965; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Silverman, 2006):

1) Analyzed the first eight of the 25 interviews (SL 1, 3, 4, 6, 8,13, 17, and 19) to create codes in the participants’ language (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Spencer, Ritchie, & O’Conner, 2003);

2) Then compared quotes across the eight interviews until key themes and definitions emerged with representative quotes for each theme (see Appendices AE-AG) (Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; LeCompte, 2000; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Spencer, Ritchie, & O’Conner, 2003);

3) Held an inter-rater reliability consultation on March 10, 2011 to ensure the validity and reliability of those themes/codes (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Silverman, 2006). The initial percentage of agreement for all raters was 91.7% (agreement on 11 of 12 quotes) based on coding a three-page sample section of South Lincoln interview 19. With discussion the percentage of agreement reached 100%;
4) Then compared codes across the remaining interviews to finalize key themes and quotes that represent the common themes (Miles & Huberman, 1994); and

5) Conducted a final stage of analysis comparing the resulting qualitative key themes with existing theory (power and conflict, social collectivist, and political economy of place), research (on HOPE VI redevelopments and involvement in community organizations), and the quantitative findings (Lewis & Ritchie, 2003).

The qualitative results for each individual research question are reported next. First, results for research question one, which focused on predicting readiness for mixed-income redevelopment are presented. Then results of research question two, which focused on predicting resident involvement in neighborhood organizations are presented. And finally, the results of research question three, which focused on resident responses to the existing data regarding transition and/or relocation planning.

**Research Question One: Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment**

Analyses of qualitative themes for research question one were organized according to the key quantitative findings. As stated in chapter five, research question one results found that social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and having a transition and/or relocation plan are associated with resident readiness for mixed income redevelopment. The following qualitative themes are used to describe, in current public housing authority residents’ own words, why each of the dependent variables in the regression model successfully predicts their readiness for mixed income redevelopment. Final qualitative themes are organized according to each quantitative variable (readiness for mixed income redevelopment, social cohesion, organizations collective efficacy, and having a transition and/or relocation plan). The following three subscales organize readiness for mixed income redevelopment.
Readiness for transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment. Readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment encompassed three subscales in the quantitative portion of the study: readiness for change, readiness for mixed income, and readiness for new urbanism. Readiness for change included three items: I am ready for change, I want my neighborhood to change, and I will help my neighborhood change. Readiness for mixed income included areas like: I am comfortable living near people of other incomes, I am comfortable living near people of other races, I am comfortable living near people who speak other languages, and I am willing to live in a multicultural neighborhood. Readiness for new urbanism included areas like: it is important to design the neighborhood with walking in mind, it is important to have bus/light rail connections to services and healthcare, and it is important to have businesses on the first floor of some housing buildings. Qualitative themes for each readiness subscale are summarized below.

Readiness for change is represented by the six themes presented in Table 11.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I'm ready</td>
<td>Residents are ready for change that will help them improve their lives and address some of the social and physical neighborhood problems.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Afraid of the bad elements so change would be better</td>
<td>Residents that do not feel safe in the neighborhood because of gang members and homeless people gathering look forward to change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be good for the community</td>
<td>Residents describe the redevelopment as a means to improve the living standards, vacant lots, and draw much needed services (computer lab, child care facility, and library) and affordable retail into the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s going to be nice</td>
<td>The physical changes to the neighborhood and investment in the people will make the community nicer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Is it going to…? Residents have questions about whether the planners will design the neighborhood with their needs in mind.

People don’t like it because…. Some residents consider the neighborhood their home and they do not expect to feel comfortable in the newly developed neighborhood.

Readiness for mixed income is represented by the four themes in Table 12.

Table 12. Resulting themes from the readiness for mixed income category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It doesn’t matter.</td>
<td>Several residents stated that creating a mixed-income community will not have an impact on them because the community already contains a mix of incomes or they have previously lived in mixed-income neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living next door to someone who made more money would be a good change.</td>
<td>Some residents describe how living next door to a middle class person is something they look forward to because it might motivate the adults and children of the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are trying to make this a better area… especially for the children.</td>
<td>Many of the neighborhood children are born and raised in public housing and therefore mixing incomes will help socialize them to see what they can aspire to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel judged.</td>
<td>Residents expressed concern that the new higher income adults and children might judge public housing residents particularly when something goes wrong in the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Readiness for New Urbanism is represented by the three themes in Table 13.

Table 13. Resulting themes from the readiness for new urbanism category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The living arrangements are better than here, but if I had my options and the opportunity arises.</td>
<td>Some residents prefer the mix of businesses and residential near the light rail over the current public housing use only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They are not large enough… the children are confined.</td>
<td>Many residents described concern that the higher density units will be too small for their household and as a result will have an impact on where the children can play, as well as their parent’s mental health.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
It’s just a little easier not to disturb anyone when you have your own roof over your head. Residents expect that the dense housing will result in tension between neighbors because of the children disturbing the neighbors as they play.

Each theme is highlighted with a subheading below, which includes a description of the theme and a quote representing the themes.

**Readiness for Change.** Many of the residents talked about being open and ready for the change in the South Lincoln community.

*I’m ready.* One of the most frequent themes from South Lincoln residents is that they are ready for change. Residents describe the journeys they have taken to get to their current public housing placement and where they hope to be in the future. For example one mother said,

> You know, I just came out of a transitional housing that I was in for like two and a half years, I was fighting to get in here. I mean if it’s going to better improve my child’s surroundings and her lifestyle then I’m ready for it. Before she gets older and then we’re not stable…. I just want to stabilize.

Since the redevelopment is happening in phases, some residents feel like they can plan ahead and get away from some of the problems in the neighborhood. The current problems of the neighborhood are one of the main reasons residents say they are ready to move. For example, one resident said:

> Personally, for me, I’m ready to move out. I don’t like living here. They’ve got these trains, all the black soot, and diesel exhaust. The wind comes out of the west and plasters everything here. You can run your hand across and you get black soot on everything and you know my kid’s breathing this everyday. And I’m breathing it and it just can’t be healthy. Personally I’m ready to move.
The reasons residents are ready for change extends beyond problems with the physical environment of their neighborhood to social problems in the neighborhood.

Afraid of the bad elements so change would be better. Residents who are upset by the neighborhood problems and the resulting safety concerns are also ready for change. Several residents described not feeling safe or secure in the neighborhood. They have seen people hang around the neighborhood and leave evidence that they do not value the community such as breaking newly planted trees or leaving used condoms and syringes. Residents described the neighborhood as a slum where people do not care about their homes, gangsters gather, and an informal homeless camp is a permanent fixture nearby. Residents also described that people pass through from the light rail and neighboring service providers such as an alternative school and a service provider that works with people who are homeless. As a result many residents state that they are ready for a shift in neighborhood demographics, increased security, and secure building design because they are hopeful that the changes will weed people out. For example, one participant said:

I’m kind of looking forward to it because the people like maybe the gang members… I think it would push them out of here. Hopefully that would help with that. Then it would be for days like this [when it is snowy], it would be wonderful to just walk across the street and get something. ‘Cause I don’t drive in the snow.

It would be good for the community. Several residents describe the redevelopment as a means to improve the living standards, vacant lots, and draw much needed services (computer lab, child care facility, and library) and affordable retail into the community. For example, one participant said:

I think it’s nice. It gives everybody and opportunity of different things to see. They’re talking about they’re helping to get rec centers in there, like a computer
lab like they had at the north Lincoln’s so you could do your resumes or look for jobs... They were talking that they might even have a day care center in there.

Another resident described her excitement about drawing new retail to the area, “I think that storefronts are a good idea because everything around here is centrally located, it’s just getting to it quickly and then the corner store here doesn’t have anything and 7-11 charges $2 for a banana.” Other residents simply state that they think the change will be nice.

*I think it’s going to be nice.* Residents who are excited for change identify the need for neighborhood change because they have outdated housing and jobs. They discussed their involvement in creating the plans for change and their hope that they might be able to find work implementing the changes. They were also hopeful that physical changes to the neighborhood and investment in the people of the neighborhood might help people appreciate the community more. One participant noted “I think it’s better. There’ll be jobs for people around the neighborhood. And then it’s a little bit easier for people to get to places, like there’s closer stores and stuff. That’s be better.” While residents described the things they like about the redevelopment, they also expressed many questions about the future of the neighborhood.

*Is it going to…?* Some residents still have questions about whether the planners will design the neighborhood with them in mind. For example, will the community be designed for seniors with disabilities, will there be duplexes with front and back doors for public housing residents, and will there be washers and dryers in the units? The following quote from December 2010 sums up this point:

I want to have a front and a back door accessible to the outdoors... Because I hang my clothes up, I don’t do the dryer. I hang ‘em up and the sun does its job but I
guess some of the units have dryers... And also I have a dog and right now I’ve got a broken ankle. It makes it easier to get my dog outside. This has been broken since April. They’re going back in on the 10th to do surgery. I don’t know how long I’ll be in this condition, but I need a front and a back door that’s exposed to the outside. Not to a hall or locked corridor.

In essence residents describe the desire to keep the row home or duplex neighborhood design with improved amenities like washing machines. As a result of the plan to build more housing units in the neighborhood with a higher density of people some participants stated that current residents do not like the proposed changes.

*People don’t like it because…. Residents who are not ready for change focused on the neighborhood as it is as their home and they do not expect to feel comfortable in the newly developed neighborhood. This theme is apparent in the following quote from a senior citizen in the community:

I don’t like it, I think it’s something I am not use to you know I don’t think I would be comfortable with it… just a lot of traffic and a lot of different people you know it is not going to be neighborly. Like it is now, we are all neighbors, I think everybody knows each other. If they are going to bring a business into the neighborhood we have to live next door to or over the businesses and I am not comfortable with it. See I been here too many years and I am used to this. I am old I am old fashion okay, but I am comfortable. Like a lot of things happened around here, which don’t bother me none. I got shot at one time, through the door not me, the bullet came and hit the end of that thing and ended up in the closet. It was at 2:00 in a morning. I didn’t even know it happened. I just thought one of my things hanging have fell. It scared me… I think it is better the way it is now. I am used to it. I don’t believe they are going to build big buildings and businesses together in the neighborhood. I am not comfortable with it... I always been a Westsider.

She continued describing her experience historically in the community in the following quote:

I noticed that there is a lot of homes that are being knock down rebuild and everything in the neighborhood, but that happened when I was living here before. I lived right there 10th and Navajo when they built the housing, so I came right back after I was flooded out on Alameda… I am not ready. I keep saying every
day, my grandson says how you going get this voucher when you move? I keep saying I am not going to move. I am not leaving!

In summary, a number of residents are ready for change seeing the potential for neighborhood improvement, while others are uncertain or do not want the change.

**Readiness for Mixed Income.** Others however were either neutral or were negative toward the change and how that might affect their lives.

*It doesn’t matter.* Several of the study participants said that changing the housing authority property to a mixed income development does not matter to them. Many residents perceive their neighborhood as mixed income already because of the proximity of single-family homes. Other participants stated that they have lived in a variety of housing types throughout their lives including houses and public housing. Some participants see themselves as temporarily low income. Consequently, they appreciate the notion that low-income families will be less conspicuous in the redevelopment. For example, one resident said “well that is not the big thing to me because I have my own bills like those people I don’t know how they get bill money, just work myself. It’s fine to me.” And another resident said, “now as long as they don’t bother me, I don’t care.” Other residents stated that living in a mixed income neighborhood would be a good change.

*Living next door to someone who made more money would be a good change.* Some residents describe how living next door to a middle class person is something they look forward to. One participant commented on this change:

That’s good just because a lot of the stuff that’s going on around here. People are afraid to call the police and when you are actually invested in your property and your neighborhood then you’re not scared to call the police and make complaints and stuff like that. Then you can live comfortably and you don’t have to worry
about the guys that are hanging out next to your house that you can’t do anything about.

Other residents believe that living next door to higher income residents might motivate public housing residents to go back to school or get a better job. Another participant summed this up:

Well I think it’s going to put more money in the neighborhood and hopefully it will put more incentive into people that are no income. I think that mainly the people that are working will help the people that aren’t working get jobs. Because there’s going to be that one on one contact with people that are working.

These comments illustrate that residents do believe that the ability of the residents to weed out residents who cause neighborhood problems and the likelihood that they will find a job will increase if their neighborhood includes more middle class residents and homeowners. Some residents believe this change will be especially helpful for the children in the neighborhood.

_They are trying to make this a better area… especially for the children._ Many study participants state that neighborhood children are born and raised in public housing and therefore mixing incomes will help socialize them to see what they can aspire to. Some residents genuinely believe the change is focused on improving the community. The one resident summed up this point:

I have an understanding, a better understanding of what they are trying to do. You know they are trying to make this a better area. They’re not trying to kick us out and say well, this is gonna be for the rich bitches because it’s close to downtown, which a lot of places did. They kicked a lot of people out of their apartments and stuff because they wanted to redevelop it and make it to where rich people, the upper class and middle class could afford it. And screw the lower class, even though they needed to be there kind of thing. I saw that when I worked downtown for 7-11 downtown.
Since some residents believed the redevelopment of their community would benefit them, they participated in the planning process and worked to dispel rumors that the Denver Housing Authority residents will be relocated in favor of higher income residents. Another resident noted “I had voted for it so it could be for everybody not just the low-income residents living here.” Yet, other residents fear that changing the income mix in the neighborhood may result in judgment from new residents.

*I feel judged.* Several residents expressed concern that the new higher income residents in the neighborhood might make the public housing residents feel judged. One resident explicitly discussed classism when they stated:

Cause sometimes you know there are people who, there’s a lot of people that discriminate against people that live in low-income housing that never had housing and it would be interesting to see if it makes a difference to people. Not just race but income people, you know there’s lots of people that make more money than us.

Other residents described feeling like the judgment might come from the interactions between the children public housing and market rate tenants. For example:

I don’t agree with that too much because you know the kids if they have more income, they’re going to have more than our children. With the lower class that don’t have as much money. The kids are going to want everything or want more because they see this other kid has brand new stuff and we get used stuff most of the time… Kids these days kind of rub that stuff in… I don’t want my child to face that. Like if we can’t afford it and they’re going out to eat every day or whatever. It’s just kind of like a prejudice thing that’s what I’m concerned about.

Others described a sense of jealousy that the new residents will have more, like the following quote “I feel uncomfortable because everybody wants to you know, like have more things. You know, like, driving a new car, and…and…just have more progress you know. So I not, I not feel comfortable.”
Other residents describe a concern that more subtle discrimination will occur. For example, they express doubt that higher income residents will want to live near particular ethnic groups, activities, or public housing residents. The following quote illustrates this point “at the same time… are the upper class residents gonna be staying in the same ‘hood when they see certain things happening… maybe certain ethnic groups hanging out… will they stick around?” Another resident stated the same concern:

There may be some objections with people with higher incomes living next to what they perceive as public housing… some people probably have not moved into some places… because of their proximity to public housing. They may not want to have their families or children with them. There may be childless couples and single people who have less objection to that.

Another resident stated that when something goes wrong in the neighborhood, they expect conflicts to arise across income groups. For example, will residents blame public housing residents when problems arise? One public housing tenant said “other people paying a flat rate and then there is something that will go wrong in the apartment… some will say how come you get to pay that much.” Residents have different perceptions of what a mixed-income environment will be like. Some welcome the possibilities it might create like increased safety and more opportunities. Others perceptively recognize that cross class interactions might be difficult.

**Readiness for New Urbanism.** Most residents’ reactions were similarly mixed in their readiness for a new urbanist style neighborhood. Residents generally agree that they would enjoy the conveniences of living near a transit-oriented development, but they would rather live in a setting where they have a lower population density.

*The living arrangements are better than here, but if I had my options and the opportunity arises.* Some residents prefer the mix of businesses and residential over the
current public housing use only. In addition most residents describe their desire to live close to the light rail. One resident, who really likes the vision for the future of the neighborhood, said:

But as far as the living arrangements that’s better than here… mixing the business with residential… I kinda like ‘em… I’ve noticed small one’s around the Denver area and I like that idea as far as living there… I think I would prefer living above a business.

Other residents said that if the opportunity arose they would rather become a homeowner within walking distance of the light rail. For example one resident said “I’ve not made my mind up although I may consider being closer to 10th and Osage. I’ve also considered if I can maybe get into some home ownership someplace nearby.” While some residents are interested in living in the mixed-use community, a significant number of residents expressed concern about the multifamily building style housing in the neighborhood.

They are not large enough… the children are confined. Many residents described concern that the higher density units will be too small for their household and will, therefore, limit the opportunities for children to play outside within view of their parents. The following two quotes summarize this perspective:

For children … there’s no outside … play areas … the kids around here they enjoy getting out and playing basketball … and in a little area like that you are kinda confined to … I guess you could always substitute that for gyms and stuff …”

I kind of don’t like it because, this one she likes to jump around a lot. I wouldn’t know, your neighbors might be complainers. Then you get in trouble because your child is making too much noise.

Another resident described how the higher density multifamily apartments would impact her mental health “yeah, you never know who’s your neighbor. And then if
there’s too much noise and stuff like that and I’m claustrophobic I need to be able where, I’m right here and I could run outside.” Similarly several residents specifically describe that it’s easier not to disturb their neighbors if they have their own roof over their head.

*It’s just a little easier not to disturb anyone when you have your own roof over your head.* A few residents mentioned the various reasons why they prefer to have their own roof over their head such as: the noise their children make which might impact the businesses below. The following two quotes illustrate this one point. One resident stated this fact directly:

> Flats would be fine if that was the only option, but I prefer it not ‘cause I have kids. And it’s just a little easier not to disturb anyone when you have your own roof over your head.

> I wouldn’t want to live above a business because it be making a lot of noise and all that to the business down under. They might want to go to complaining and all that, you know. Not saying that there would be a lot of noise. But just in case. You know. I don’t think that’s cool.

Another resident described the experience of living in a multifamily transitional housing apartment, which is as closely as she imagined the future housing in the neighborhood:

> I’m praying and hoping that when they do this building that there is going to be enough space for the amount of people that they gonna bring here and children… When I lived over there we had arguments. I would see neighbors arguing just out the doors peeking out… so a lot of times I would get up early in the morning and get my clothing done because I knew they would fight. That’s what I am worried about. There was only two washers and two dryers so that was pretty hectic.

In summary, many residents see advantages to their neighborhood becoming a mixed-income community. They are ready for this change. Others however have concerns. The include feeling confined in a more dense development where their children might disturb neighbors in multifamily apartment buildings.
**Social cohesion.** While the increased density and mixed-use buildings have the potential to cause tension, the increased density could also impact the social cohesion of the neighborhood. Therefore, describing the current relationships in the neighborhood was important. Participants in the study described their relationships with their neighbors in positive, neutral and negative terms. The positive ways they described their relationships included three themes: some neighbors are good, we come together and we exchange favors. Residents who described social cohesion in neutral terms said that they keep to themselves. Residents who described negative aspects of their relationships with their neighbors said that some neighbors could be troublesome. One participant summed this up:

Some are good neighbors and some can be troublesome because they can be noisy. In addition the police are here quite a bit. There are a lot of calls and sometimes even the fire and paramedics. A number of neighbors probably have problems taking care of their personal affairs.

The five social cohesion themes are described in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some neighbors are good</td>
<td>Neighbors that work, take care of their yards, are quiet, help each other, and attend the Local Resident Council meetings are good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We come together</td>
<td>Some of us go to community classes, help each other with problems, make referrals, or decorate for the holidays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We exchange favors</td>
<td>Some residents created a pattern of exchanging favors like buying each other milk, exchange movies, or watch each other’s kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pretty much keep to myself</td>
<td>I like to keep my personal business to myself except for talking to one or two neighbors or family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14. Resulting themes from the social cohesion category.
Some neighbors can be troublesome. Neighbors that are noisy, have police contact, and do not take care of their personal affairs are troublesome and I do not establish a relationship with them.

Some neighbors are good. Most residents talked in depth about their good neighbors. Good neighbors are people that work, take care of their yards, are friendly yet quiet, get along well with others, help each other, and attend the Local Resident Council meetings. For example the following quotes paint a picture of good neighbors from six different residents’ perspectives:

The building I live on they’re pretty good. Everybody tries to take care of their front yards and they’re pretty quiet, they go to work… they live in very close proximity and they’re good neighbors.

I got a thing for crossing streets because of things that happened. I feel, I seen the cars… and I’m like, OK I’m a gonner.’ They actually stopped to help me. See, in here, I just feel safe.

Another neighbor in the back she fixes me a lot of food she thinks I should eat more… I even share my newspaper he takes on Thursday, Friday Saturday and Sunday and he takes the newspaper so he doesn’t have to buy.

In the summer, I go out a lot. I sit down and everybody says “Hi”… If I see my neighbors, I’ll say hi and they’ll say hi or they wanna borrow sugar or something like that. We do that.

I have just one neighbor. Me and him just help each other. He’s a nice guy. He’s a disabled guy.

Oh, they’re very nice. When I first moved in here, they right away came and talked to me and welcomed me to the neighborhood. Asked if I needed anything and I could come and ask them. Like right now, I don’t have a phone. She lends me her phone, if she’s not home the lady across the way here, if it’s an emergency I borrow it but I don’t like to ask too much. Yeah and we just talk. You know, some grown-up conversations because I’m with the children all day.

Therefore good neighbors are helpful when needed, but generally take care of themselves and their property. Some neighbors come together more intentionally.
We come together. Several residents described how they get to know each other better by working together on activities. For example, they said some of us go to community classes, help each other with problems, make referrals, or decorate for the holidays. The following quotes from seven different residents described the various ways they come together:

Some of the girls and I go to the community classes… the hoop class, the cooking classes. My neighbor across the street is really nice… the cooking class was like teamwork… it was fund and we got to know each other better.

I like to find out more about the community and what resources they have like the holidays are coming up if they need help as far as getting the community together and help decorating.

Tomorrow we have a party. I go, drink coffee… I can’t wait to go Wednesday… There we gonna come together and we’ll see a neighbor, as she’s been having problems. I can go see, ‘are you OK?’ Take bread. You know, maybe what I did, some tacos, you know, something where we come together.

I don’t ask them too many questions but most people that I talk to are pretty much coming to the meetings or they ask questions.

My neighbor next door is Asian and my neighbor next door is Spanish… across the street is from Iran and he fixes my car… I was telling him about the… program called the Bridge.

I have a handicap friend. He comes with me once in a while… he’s kind of old and needs somebody to talk to.

May we have like a block party or… Or potlucks or… You know, um… I like to go to this park down the street, but that gazebo’s always dirty… Some body needs to clean it up for their community service.

Residents come together to help each other cope with life, plan for neighborhood change, and make sure everyone has enough to eat or to celebrate the holidays.
We exchange favors. A few residents described how they created a pattern of exchanging favors like buying each other milk, exchange movies, or watch each others kids. For example one resident said:

Like if I need, when I need some milk or something they help me, they buy me some milk, they go to the store or they give me money to go buy a gallon of milk. And I return the favor when I get money and they ask what they need for the baby or something... if the neighbor’s boys are outside you know we always making sure they okay and you know . . . they are good. So like we watch each other’s kids.

Another resident described a more intense commitment her neighbor has made to her grandchild “my neighbor’s keepin’ my grandbaby right now… I just kept up for five years and I got tired of uh, keeping her, so…My neighbor’s keeping her right now.”

These are the sort of patterns of exchanging favors that have the potential to disrupt residents’ day-to-day lives if they are relocated without consideration for the ways that their favor exchanging helps them manage their daily lives. Other residents will likely have minimal impact to their social networks if they are relocated because they tend to keep to themselves.

I pretty much keep to myself. Many of the residents basically keep to themselves in the neighborhood. For example they said that they like to keep their personal business to themselves except for talking to one or two neighbors or family. The following six quotes help illustrate why residents keep to themselves:

I like to keep my business to myself.

I am to my self actually so I talk to one or two.

I have a lot of brothers and sisters. I’d rather do with them then try and ask somebody for stuff. I’d rather ask them… I just don’t want to bug nobody. They got things to do. She’s got a job. They got kids that go to school.
I don’t know them really.

I don’t associate with them too much. They’re friendly on just a hello and how are you type basis... I wouldn’t take any of them to dinner... This really isn’t a place where I look for those type of friends.

I have no problem with me or my neighbors. I don’t talk to all of them but I don’t have any problems with any of them.

Residents describe a tendency to stay private perhaps because they are meeting their needs within their own families or social networks outside of their neighborhood. Some residents may keep to themselves because they see domestic disputes and gang fighting therefore do not want to get involved in order to stay safe. As a result the troublesome neighbors in the community may have helped create a keeping-to-myself culture in the neighborhood.

Some neighbors can be troublesome. Several participants described how some neighbors have been noisy, have police contact, and have not taken care of their personal affairs and are defined as troublesome. As a result, residents do not establish a relationship with these types of neighbors. The following five quotes describe residents’ unfiltered descriptions of their troublesome neighbors:

Friendly except sometimes when they get rowdy.

In the wintertime everybody’s inside, you know. But in the summertime, it’s when everybody’s out and when there’s like fights and everything… people see stuff and they don’t say nothing… I think there’s some around here but it probably only starts when they’re drinking… They get all crazy.

The other ones, most of the people there are drinking and… they just party too much. So … It’s hard to trust them.

Honestly? They’re all pigs. They all drink all day. And do drugs all night. And then sleep all day… it’s like they don’t have a life… the majority of the people around here, they’re just bad news.
They get loud just like any type of apartment complex. There’s a lot of foul language, which I prefer not to hear, but what can I do. We just kind of keep to ourselves.

Other residents described how they change their behavior in order to avoid individual troublesome neighbors, such as this quote:

Well, like in here, I could change uh…but I like this street. I like to be here most times fine. But I have trouble with the guy there. When we park in front his house he yell to people say, “move your car” sometimes before he was waking me up to move my car. But it was ok to not getting trouble with that many people so I just ok. Sometimes I park in the street.

As is evident in these themes, the current relationships often include neighbors coming together, exchanging favors, and being friendly. At the same time social cohesion is jeopardized by troublesome neighbors.

Social Cohesion Predicting Readiness for Transit-Oriented Mixed Income Redevelopment. The negative, positive, or neutral relationships that residents have with their neighbors therefore has an impact on how ready they are for a large scale neighborhood change initiative like transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment. Two main themes explained this connection in the South Lincoln neighborhood, which include how they have kept to themselves and focused instead on the other things or how residents talk with each other about neighborhood change and how they want to stay to benefit from the change. Social cohesion then can be, described within the context of predicting readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment with the two themes in Table 15.
Table 15. Resulting themes from social cohesion predicting readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My neighbor and I were going back and forth… I want to stay for myself</td>
<td>Residents have dialogued (during spontaneous daily interactions) about all of the meetings, planning and preparation for the change, which has helped them be prepared for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t see what the big deal is, I got other things to think about</td>
<td>Some residents described their focusing their mental capacities on becoming independent so that they do not need to rely on public assistance as the neighborhood is redeveloped.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

My neighbor and I were going back and forth… I want to stay for myself. Some residents described how they have dialogued (during spontaneous daily interactions) about all of the neighborhood meetings, planning and preparation for the change, which has helped them be prepared for change. Some of these residents also described the desire to stay in the new development in order to experience the improved environment and convenience. For example one resident explained how informal conversations with neighbors lead to discussing and making sense of all the community meetings and preparations to become ready for neighborhood changes when she said:

There’s clotheslines in the back and [my neighbor] was asking me what are you thinking about it… I said it was a good thing … because when you see people improve themselves you want to improve yourself… she said well I don’t think it’s going to work… will you still be living here? She said most likely… we were just going back and forth… I said I’m kinda looking forward to it but it’s a big change. I think it’s a good thing that we will be ready for it you know… all of this preparation. And them talking, having meetings.

Other residents who are not as involved in the community meetings discussed how they learned of the neighborhood plans from their neighbors:

Because not everybody knows what’s going on. I could ask my neighbors, “What was the meeting about?” Take two seconds, go across the street and sit there, I tell them ok I’ll be back, ok watch my kids for me so I could go sit there for the hour.
The process of talking with their neighbors about the community change made some residents think about how hard moving would be on them personally. One neighbor described the impact of moving on her meeting her needs by exchanging favors with neighbors:

It would probably be hard because it’s hard to make friends as it is. When moving someplace and then you have to move away and you’re not sure if you’re going to stay friends with them or not. And with the help and support like my neighbor needs something, we ask each other all the time milk, sugar, like that. We help each other out if someone doesn’t have it.

Another participant described how she hoped the relocation plan would allow her to remain near a good neighbor by moving people in groupings:

I’m kind of hoping that we can stay neighbors close by of each other. I’m close to this one next door. I help her a lot. She tries to help me too but I like to be here for her. She’s older and stuff. And she’s a really nice lady.

Another resident described the same experience regarding wanting to stay on a particular block because of the convenience and there are less troublesome neighbors:

I don’t want to move nowhere. I want to stay right here on this corner right here... Cause it’s just much quicker. The Light Rail’s right here. The kids can go outside in the back and play you know. And then this part of the neighborhood is no trouble...You know, so I would love to stay right here.

To some residents existing relationships with neighbors are very important and may have an impact their readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment.

_I don’t see what the big deal is; I got other things to think about._ For some residents the impending move was described by their focusing their mental capacities on becoming independent, so that they do not need to rely on public assistance as the neighborhood is redeveloped. The following quote sums up this point:

I don’t see what the big deal is. You just getting’ new apartments... I don’t think it’s a real big thing where you know it’s something that you really have to put
your mind to something… Some people get emotional over stuff like this. Because they be worried about what I am gonna do, and you know, stuff like that. That’s why you plan ahead. I mean I plan ahead, ‘cause I – there’s a backup plan… My backup plan is to get my catering business started so that way I cannot depend on no kind of assistance…. What we talk about in the meetings, it stays in the meeting. I don’t go outside and go flounder off and talk to people about it. But at the meeting, we have discussions amongst each other and then that’s it. I mean I don’t really be like, ‘girl, what’d you think?’ No, no. ‘Cause I got other things to think about.

Residents who do not see the redevelopment as a big deal see the possibility of maintaining connections after they move. Other residents state directly that:

I don’t bond with any of the neighbors here. I pretty much stay to myself. When I’m gone nobody’s going to miss me and I’m not going to miss anybody.

Therefore while relocation will disrupt some residents’ daily social supports and social cohesion, other residents do not expect moving to have an impact on their social supports.

**Organizational collective efficacy.** Residents’ belief that organizations can get things done on behalf of residents elicited different perspectives. Three themes emerged regarding residents’ belief that neighborhood organizations can get things done on their behalf. One group of residents said that they have never really seen the neighborhood organizations change anything. Another group of residents stated that they were able to change things to some extent. And a final group stated that they do have their concerns, speak up and listen, which they attribute to their ability to have organizational collective efficacy in the neighborhood groups where they gather. Another group of residents stated that they have not really seen any neighborhood change that resulted from the community organizations. The following themes in Table 16 were created from resident participants’ perspectives.
Table 16. Resulting themes from the organizational collective efficacy category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ve never really seen them change anything</td>
<td>Some residents describe problems as either something that can be resolved with a phone call to the police or personal problems and therefore neighborhood problems are not something a neighborhood organization can address.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We were able to do it to some extent</td>
<td>Involved residents describe problems that they have solved together, as well as problems that those in power decide despite neighborhood objections.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do speak up and I do listen; I have my concerns</td>
<td>Involved residents describe attending meetings to listen and speak up when they have concerns. Residents describe problems teenagers create that result in consequences for unrelated households.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I’ve never really seen them change anything. “I never really had a problem they could address… I’ve never really seen them change anything,” said one resident interviewed.

Another resident described how she does not see the need to solve neighborhood problems in meetings when she said:

I haven’t been having any problems… They talk about what goes outside their house. But if you are in your home, and you mind your own business, you don’t have to run across that problem… but if I do, I call the police, and be like, ‘hey, what took you so long? … And hear their responses.

Therefore some residents describe problems as either something that can be resolved with a phone call to the police or personal problems, and therefore neighborhood problems are not something a neighborhood organization can address.

Other residents describe frustration with talk about change without any noticeable results. For example, a third resident said:

I wanted to know what was going on you know. I wanted to find out what was going on and a guy that lived here said they’re really kind of interesting. So I went a couple of times and then they say what’s going to happen and then it doesn’t happen. I’ve seen a lot of things that they say they’re going to do and then
they don’t do it. It’s kind of not up to my expectations about the things they should be covering.

Similarly another resident, when asked if neighborhood organizations can get things done on behalf of residents, asserted:

Sure they can. But I think right now they’re just too worried about the redevelopment. You see them doing a lot of work around here it puts the question in my mind, you know they talk so much about redevelopment and tearing things down but they spent so much money putting in sod two years ago. And then they’re redoing the lawn irrigation. You know I just wonder why are they spending the money doing this stuff when they’re going to redevelop it anyhow in a year and a half. They’ve been saying a year and a half for about six years... That’s when I lost some of the faith on going to the meetings. There’s a lot of talk.

Consequently residents who attend some meetings and then do not see the changes that are talked about implemented get skeptical about whether the information in those meetings is accurate or not. Other residents stated that they could not answer questions about whether neighborhood organizations can get things done or not because they have never been to a meeting. In contrast, residents who have been to meetings describe the lived experience of trying to work together on behalf of residents to solve problems with some success.

We were able to do it to some extent. Involved residents describe problems that they have solved together, as well as problems that those in power decide despite neighborhood objections. The problems that they have solved together include helping residents with personal needs (accessing clothing), accomplishing long term goals (jobs, going back to school), meeting common needs (childcare, keeping the recreation center open, safety at public events, arresting troublemakers), as well as physically maintaining the neighborhood (through neighborhood cleanups, tree plantings, community gardens).
Residents regularly describe the ability of neighborhood organizations to meet their needs in phrases like, “to some extent,” “I think it’s possible,” or “yeah they can help.” The changes residents describe success with are frequently self-help and community development type changes. Resident leaders in community organizations expressed doubt regarding whether they had the organizational collective efficacy to impact the larger problem solving and planning processes in the neighborhood. For example, one experienced resident leader said:

To some extent… An occasional neighborhood cleanup. We’ve had a tree planting. We’ve had community gardens… we were able to keep the Rec Center open for a couple more years… we were able to do it. The Parks and Rec just went ahead with whatever they wanted to do in terms of redeveloping the aquatic area with hardly any neighborhood input. In fact over neighborhood objections.

Despite an awareness that their neighborhood group can only influence change to some extent, they still assert that they do speak up regarding their concerns.

_I do speak up and I do listen; I have my concerns._ Involved residents describe attending meetings to listen and speak up when they have concerns. Residents describe problems teenagers create that result in consequences for unrelated households. For example one participant described a concern she has in-depth:

I do speak up and I do listen… I have my concerns… There has been a lot of teenagers that stayed outside my house and then I was getting into trouble because all these beer cans and bottles were broken on the side between the Bridge and I was getting blamed for that because it was in my lawn, so I finally went to the manager and I explained to him I would appreciate if you have a camera or someone to look out there. This is on my property, but why should I have to pick it up every night that they are here?”

The resident described her experience of a day-to-day problem she experiences and the process of speaking up to the manager during a community meeting. She described how she does not think it is fair that others litter on her property and that the management
expect her to clean up after them. She discussed the process of suggesting a solution to
the problem such as installing a camera or having someone monitor the problem. Other
residents explain the connection between solving problems in community meetings and
their readiness for transit-oriented redevelopment.

**Organizational Collective Efficacy Predicting Readiness for Transit-
Oriented Mixed Income Redevelopment.** The five themes in Table 17 are
described in order to describe the relationship between organizational collective efficacy
predicting readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you go to meetings it’s been my experience that there’s been positive results</td>
<td>Residents who regularly attend meetings describe a clear sense of what is expected of them, the opportunities and decisions they will face, and responsibility for implementation of the neighborhood change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Want to be informed about what types of changes are going to be made and how things will affect us as a family</td>
<td>Some residents feared being tossed from their housing like a child’s toy and therefore came to meetings to learn the reasons for the redevelopment and the realities they can expect to face.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think we had influence on… which has helped me get ready for change</td>
<td>Residents described seeing their suggestions in neighborhood plans, which helps them plan for the change and increases their willingness to participate in implementing the changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They might not be bothered with that right now</td>
<td>We send out flyers for meetings, but a lot of residents don’t attend because they might be enduring a personal hardship or are set in their ways.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Independent planning processes by authorities</td>
<td>At times the various planning processes are conducted independently; residents try to integrate knowledge they have gained to ensure the different planning processes are moving towards a common vision but are unable to convince the various decision makers to do what will be</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
best for the future of the community.

If you go to meetings it’s been my experience that there’s been positive results.

Residents who regularly attend meetings describe a clear sense of what is expected of them, the opportunities and decisions they will face, and responsibility for implementation of the neighborhood change. One resident described the effect of attending meetings on her excitement for the neighborhood changes when she said “I’m looking forward to this… I’m trying to encourage people to go, but you can’t push anybody to go to a meeting.”

Two other residents described how going to community meetings is productive when they noted:

If you do go to ‘em, it’s been my experience that there’s been results, positive results… the more you know about what is expected of you… what’s offered, the more educated you are, the more educated other people are, the better decisions, the more smooth, the more communication that’s out there, the easier it is to implement them both. To make a decision.

They always said come to the meetings… It just became second nature and we try to get other people to come… you have to be concerned about what’s going on in your community… sometimes they offer little gift cards… we go on little trips… I enjoy the social aspect of it, that’s why I go.

Another resident described how they assumed that not going to meetings would result in not being ready for the neighborhood change when they pointed out:

If you’re involved in community and you’ve given to that positively then it should work just the opposite of that… it shows that you want to get involved. That you are ready to accept some responsibility and maybe go a little further than the next guy in bettering your community.
Thus resident beliefs regarding whether or not neighborhood organizations can get things done on behalf of their community impacts how ready they are not neighborhood change.

Want to be informed about what types of changes are going to be made and how things will affect us as a family. At the same time, some residents are involved in neighborhood organizations specifically because they have self-interest regarding how the neighborhood changes will impact their household. Some residents feared losing their housing during the redevelopment and therefore came to meetings to learn the reasons for the redevelopment and the realities they can expect to face. For example, one mother stated:

I was worried about where I am going to be placed. What are they going to do with the development plan? What are they going to do with the South Lincoln homes? Why did they want to throw them down? Why do they want to renew them? That got me thinking so what happens with me and my son. Where do we go from here because I don’t want to say OK well we’ll be moving just thrown like a tossed toy so I want to be aware of whether it’s going to be convenient for me and my son.

Another resident emphasized the desire to have some control over her new home placement when she stated her wish for the housing authority to:

Let us know we have choices. We could go to section eight, we could you know, like giving us all the choices we got and if we need help moving, they pay somebody, you know pay him to help us move… And you know they’re letting us know the choices we do got… well they let our resource lady know and she lets us know for our meetings.

Therefore resident self-interest in neighborhood organizations is to ensure that the transition and/or relocation plan is clear. One resident expressed concern that if the current planning and communication in the neighborhood is not clear, that the future communication also might not be clear. The following quote illustrates this point:
It just seems like they should have it all planned out because they got a pretty good grant to do all this so it seems like they should be a little more organized. I’ve seen a lot of things transpire here that were not thought out very well.

*I think we had influence on… which has helped me get ready for change.* In contrast with this quote, other residents who are more involved with neighborhood organizations talk about how attending meetings has helped prepare them for the neighborhood changes. Residents described seeing their suggestions in neighborhood plans, which helps them plan for the change and increases their willingness to participate in implementing the changes. One fairly new resident in the neighborhood said:

I asked about that. I suggested that… it would be more convenient to have a bank… or maybe an ATM or teller… have some retail… cleaners… convenient stores… eateries… coffee shops, little sandwich shops… townhomes.

Residents who met regularly to discuss neighborhood problems frequently discussed safety concerns and solutions that could be implemented without getting people riled up. For example a resident who lived through a previous relocation for redeveloped housing and is very involved said:

I think we maybe had a little influence getting designated bicycle paths or bicycle striping on the streets… I have also worked with the police in the different organizations… with respect to getting police patrols and getting reports on what’s going on in the neighborhood. Hopefully to reduce crime in the neighborhood… Well it’s definitely helped me get ready for change. I know what’s going on to plan a little more accordingly. The majority of the people, just about all of them that live around here now know there may be some changes coming so they may have to move to a new unit or something, but they aren’t doing anything until they actually get a notice to do something. To know what’s coming up in the next three or four years, five years.

Other residents directly discussed their fear of changes and their resignation about needing to be ready for relocation whether they want to move or not. Yet, at the same time they stated that with the new investments perhaps more residents would get involved
in community organizations to improve neighborhood safety. In a sense residents are stating that with outside investment, they may have the hope required to get involved in maintaining neighborhood improvements.

*They might not be bothered with that right now.* Other residents directly stated that they cannot imagine some residents having the time, energy or ability to get involved in community problem solving. They noted that they send out flyers for meetings, but a lot of residents do not attend because they might be enduring a personal hardship or are set in their ways. A newer resident in the neighborhood who planned to move away before the redevelopment said:

Don’t mess with them. Let them be until they come to you because they might be going through some hardship. They don’t want to be disturbed because they can’t take that... If I was a disturbed person like this woman, or some of these people up on here, then I wouldn’t want nobody to bother me. I would just wait… These old ladies around there… they’re mean… They don’t really want to talk to you… They’re set in their own way… I wouldn’t bother nobody unless they come to me with it.

Residents who do not have interest in neighborhood organizations often would not comment on the topic of organizational collective efficacy. For example, one resident said, “I have nothing to say about it because I never joined any of them.” The following two residents explained that residents who are not involved might not be ready for neighborhood change:

I think the people aren’t ready because they don’t want to be bothered. They don’t want to have to move. They don’t want to have to move back.

I don’t think they’re ready for the redevelopment because they’re not ready for rules. They’re not ready for… Because if they build nice, there’s gonna be more rules that there is now. And they don’t care.
Consequently, residents who either do not want the changes in rules or expectations that are established within their current public housing community, or are unable to think about moving, in essence are not involved in neighborhood processes to plan for change as a way of avoiding facing change.

Independent planning processes by authorities. Simultaneously residents involved in the many planning processes in the past have pointed out a similar denial of the future in ‘silod’ planning processes. At times, the planners conduct various planning processes independently; residents try to integrate knowledge they have gained to ensure the different planning processes are moving towards a common vision, but are unable to convince the various decision makers to do what is best for the future of the community. The following quote illustrates this point:

Myself and other residents have had our run-ins with Parks and Recreation in terms of their facilities… Their plans will not keep up with the expanded neighborhood. They’re doing their planning independently and might be going in another direction. Different then what we’re doing. Basically they want to downsize… facilities and reduce their operating costs meanwhile we’re going to have more needs in the neighborhood and a fair amount of additional population… As far as Parks and Rec are concerned we’ll need more space. For instance they have a swimming pool here that they want to take out and put in a smaller one. The one we have is already fairly crowded in the summertime. Larger Facilities… the streets, the infrastructure and so forth. RTD could also add additional connections and public transportation.

As a result some residents described feeling invaded by outsiders or duped by planning processes that told them only the appealing part of the story and not the whole truth.

Transition and/or relocation plan. In contrast other residents learned through the planning processes that they can confidentially complain to the housing authority that has the job of ensuring residents follow the rules and regulations. Most residents trust the
neighborhood organizations in collaboration with the housing authority, as the agency charged to maintain rules and regulations, to develop a fair transition and/or relocation plan. The four themes in Table 18 explain resident reactions to the transition and/or relocation plan.

Table 18. Resulting themes from the transition and/or relocation plan category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s a good plan</td>
<td>Residents describe agreement with having a plan that clearly outlines the relocation plan and stages the move dates throughout the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to have options and be independent</td>
<td>Residents describe a desire to be given longer than 90 days notice of the need to move in order to make the best possible move such as Section 8 or home ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfully I have already thought about it. I’ve planned.</td>
<td>Residents describe thinking through neighborhoods that are convenient, safe, and whether they can put their name on a list for their priority areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social supports</td>
<td>A few residents mentioned that they wish the relocation plan focused more on acknowledging their social supports.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I think it’s a good plan. Residents describe agreement with having a plan that clearly outlines the relocation plan and stages the move dates throughout the neighborhood. For example, one resident imagined the phased relocation in comparison with what it would be like to move all 254 households at once “I think it’s a good plan not to move everyone at once, it’ll be a mess.”

Other residents stated that they believe the relocation plan is adequately thorough when they said “I think that’s a good plan... it states out plainly what the steps are going through… to get back.” Residents expressed relief that the transition and/or relocation
plan included financial assistance and did not require two or more moves of residents.

The following two quotes illustrate these points:

I heard if they move us they’re gonna help us with that.

Don’t move me around a lot. I mean… I wouldn’t mind it if I had to move and then move back, but I don’t want to move far, like Quigg Newton. You know that would just be totally out of my… I wouldn’t be able to get around.

In essence residents were stating that getting financial assistance for the move and not being moved multiple times helps them be as independent as possible.

**I want to have options and be independent.** Residents also described a desire to be given longer than 90 days notice of the need to move in order to make the best possible move such as Section eight or home ownership. Being independent and choosing among options may require giving residents more time to plan. One gentleman noted:

Prior to the 90 days… if they said all of the sudden I had to move in 90 days they would be talking to my attorney. Maybe several months or six months before… depends on if I can get home ownership or whatever… maybe up to a year.

Some residents noted that they do not believe they can make choices about where they would choose to move until they can compare the new development with their other options. One resident said “I won’t be able to tell you cause I don’t know the ways, like what’s it gonna look here in that area or how are they going to look on that side, which side I would like better.” The residents who expressed the need for more time and the ability to compare their options may require more time to make decisions as the move approaches.

**Truthfully I have already thought about it. I’ve planned.** Other residents expressed that they have already thought through their own relocation process.
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Residents describe thinking through neighborhoods that are convenient, safe, and whether they can put their name on a list for their priority areas. For example residents made the following comments:

Truthfully I have already thought about it. I’ve planned… All the options… I don’t trust any area completely… but being close to downtown Denver is a plus for me.

I am wondering can we put our name on a list that they can go by when it is time?

They tell me, they ask me where I live you know, my address. And they show me, ok you, you are here. So, that part is gonna be the last. They said probably you can stay longer because it’ll be the last part and then maybe you’re gonna have more choices to stay, like in the same area and just move to a different house.

Different households have different things to consider regarding their move options. For example, one parent said the most important things to consider for their household is “the environment where there are openings and if it is convenient for me close to my schooling and my sons schooling.”

Other residents have heard a lot of the neighbors consider Section 8 housing, but do not think the option is realistic:

Everybody’s gonna want Section 8. And they said they gonna start with that corner part over there. I’ll bet you nobody even wants to live over here. They all, everybody that I’ve talked to, said they want Section 8. And I’m like you guys are nuts. You guys are going to be paying out of your butts in utilities. But it’s gonna make it easier for people like me -Clear ‘em out of here and then - I know a lot of people that have been in shelters you know, that need permanent housing.

In essence many of the quotes for this theme involve residents thinking about their own household’s preferences for the transition and/or relocation plan.

**Social supports.** Other residents talked more collectively about the relocation plan. A few residents mentioned that they wish the relocation plan focused more on acknowledging their social supports. For example, one woman said “I don’t really like it
because there starting with us first and you know I have a sister who lives right here way over there and we all help each other. So what am I going to do if…?”

Others described the desire for the coordination of pre- and post-move addresses, as one resident said “I don’t know. Like I said before, give us all a number and put us back basically the way we were before. Number us all and keep us all together the same. Unless they want to move.” Hence considering existing social supports within the relocation planning would help residents be more ready for the redevelopment. Residents are clearly thinking about the transition and re-location plans. They are concerned how these plans will affect their lives, their preferences for Section 8 or moving back to the current locations, and how new locations will or will not benefit their family life.

Transition and/or Relocation Plan Predicting Readiness for Transit-Oriented Mixed Income Redevelopment. The main concern residents consistently brought up was fear about where the Denver Housing Authority would place their family. Specifically, the five themes in Table 19 summarize the residents’ description of the relationship between transition and/or relocation planning and readiness for transit-oriented redevelopment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am ready, but I am kind of scared because I am not sure where they are going to place me and my family</td>
<td>Many residents are concerned that they may not qualify for the redeveloped housing, may be moved to another location that is less convenient for their daily lives, and that they may lose the supportive community they currently experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel like they’re putting forth the effort… it definitely doesn’t make you</td>
<td>Some residents express confusion regarding money being spent on neighborhood improvements they do not value rather than the maintenance requests they make that are</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
feel very powerful.

I’m telling people they should stay

Getting the message out, being informed, being made aware

Where they put me until I get on my feet, that’s where they’re gonna put me

not addressed. As a result residents feel frustrated and do not believe they have much influence over their own transition and relocation.

Involved residents who are committed to the neighborhood have encouraged other residents to plan to remain in the community during and after the redevelopment.

Some residents expect to be formally informed about important community facts whether they remain in the neighborhood or are temporarily displaced from the community.

Other residents do not expect much control over where they are housed because of their dependence on public housing.

I am ready, but I am kind of scared because I am not sure where they are going to place me and my family. Many residents are concerned that they may not qualify for the redeveloped housing, may be moved to another location that is less convenient for their daily lives, and that they may lose the supportive community they currently experience.

The following three quotes summarize this theme:

I am ready but I am kind of scared because I am not sure where they are going to place me and my family. My son goes to West High School. He is a student there and he likes the school. I like it here because it is closer to downtown. It is convenient for me and the community people have been great with me… it’s just wondering if you will be approved.

I’m just too happy with the shuttle because it’s a skip-and-a-hop to the eastside. Then I think, if I was to move to Quigg Newton, God, I would have to take two buses just to get to the eastside.

It’s making an impact, making me ready for it you know. I don’t know when it’s going to happen but I want to be just ready to go and come back. That’s my plan I’m hoping they let me do that plan. Just go somewhere for a while until it’s done and then put me back.
Consequently residents report that they believe they are ready for change and at the same time they are happy with the proximity of the current neighborhood to the light rail, downtown and neighborhood schools.

*I don’t feel like they’re putting forth the effort… it definitely doesn’t make you feel very powerful.* The lack of investment by the housing authority in their day-to-day requests makes many residents doubt the likelihood that the housing authority will consider their needs in the actual relocation plan. Some residents express confusion regarding money being spent on neighborhood improvements they do not value, rather than the maintenance requests they make that are not addressed. As a result residents feel frustrated and do not believe they have much influence over their own transition and relocation. Three participants illustrated this point with these examples:

They put rocks over there, but they won’t give me a new screen door. I just don’t feel like they’re putting forth the effort to make people feel comfortable here already. And then for us to feel like we’re going to have a say in a redevelopment or the relocation. It definitely doesn’t make you feel very powerful when you can’t even ask for a new screen door. They said they are not going to move for like another two years but how come I can’t get a new screen door? I like my screen door to close. I would like numbers on my house but they won’t do it but they’re buying rocks. That’s just frustrating to me.

And then another thing, I don’t know who plans the maintenance around here but I would imagine it would be the maintenance supervisor. They tore this up, now it’s a cesspool. It’s a mosquito breeding ground. The kids around here used to all go out there and all play and the parents could watch them. Other kids would come from other areas of the projects to come play. Well now they’ve got it fenced off and it’s all muddy. That’s poor planning. In the rocks. I mean when he’s like “Oh, we made it nice for you back there.” I’m like “Oh really? You did the wrong thing. Putting rock back there. That was, that’s stupid. You’re just asking for problems.”
So, the visible changes to the neighborhood like improving the grass, rocks, and playgrounds in the neighborhood while not repairing screen doors makes residents doubt the housing authority will have their best interests in mind in the future.

*I’m telling people they should stay.* Many residents are loyal to the neighborhood, plan to stay and are telling others they should consider staying. Involved residents who are committed to the neighborhood have encouraged other residents to plan to remain in the community during and after the redevelopment. The following three quotes illustrate this point:

I’m telling people they should stay in the area… so if they want to best bet would be stay at North Lincoln or I’ll stay here at South.

I like here. Here is better for everything. I drive the kids up there to 13th and Gilpin and it’s maybe not far. It’s on my way to work but what I mean is if I can move to a different place, like north Lincoln, if they finish my building, if I live in an old house and they finish the building, I can come back in.

When he said we would have the option to come back I was like, I want to come back. I want my spot back. I’ve already got my mind set that hopefully that will be one of my options... No ’cause right now I’m happy where I’m at. I’m not in the middle of all, like all the bad stuff that happens is at that end of the block. I’m fine right here, I’m keeping my sobriety and I’m trying to…this is my own little safe haven right here.

Some residents want to stay in the neighborhood because the community is convenient to their established lives and they are having success with stabilizing their lives.

*Getting the message out, being informed, being made aware.* Participants who have a focus on helping others be ready for change assert that the best way to keep residents stable is to help them be more aware of the transition and/or relocation plan. Some residents expect to be formally informed about important community facts whether they
remain in the neighborhood or are temporarily displaced from the community. If residents are kept informed about the progress of neighborhood changes, then that might assist them in making decisions about whether to return to the community or not. For example, one resident said “Well, like I said, I’m ready for the change and that maybe it probably bring more people in the neighborhood and see how the neighborhood is.”

*Where they put me until I get on my feet, that’s where they’re gonna put me. Other residents are more resigned to being placed wherever the housing authority has an available unit for their household. These residents do not expect much control over where they are housed because of their dependence on public housing. Yet, they mention concerns particularly for large families in current five bedroom public housing units who will need help building relationships with landlords willing to house families of six to eight people. The following three quotes illustrate some residents’ resignation to living wherever they are allowed to given their current income:*  

Where they put me until I get on my feet, that’s where they’re gonna put me… [I prefer] a townhome or a home… it doesn’t matter as long as there’s enough room. As long as there’s enough bedrooms.

We all make sacrifices… You can’t be picky… if this is not going to work for me then I need to go find another way to make more money or whatever so I can be closer to what I need to be closer to.

According to my career… if you don’t have a very decent job you are not going to go because me by myself I would have to struggle so I am going to go according to where I am at that time.

Thus residents acknowledge that clear communication and a concrete transition and/or relocation plan would be ideal, yet they acknowledge that their lives are unpredictable enough that they realistically will need to plan based on where their lives are at the time of the actual move.
Research Question Two: Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations

Research question two explored what factors predict resident involvement in specific neighborhood organizations. The neighborhood organizations included:

- Metro Organizations for People, which is a community organizing group affiliated with the People Improving Communities through Organizing national network,
- Project WISE, which works with women to achieve their personal goals while also advocating in their community,
- Helping Is Grow Stronger (HUGS), which is a resident driven self-help group,
- The Front Range Economic Strategy Center (FRESC), which focuses on improving opportunities for responsible economic development and public investments on behalf of Colorado residents,
- Denver Housing Authority – Local Resident Council and Resident Council Board, which are locally elected groups sponsored by Housing and Urban Development. The following description is from the federal legislation defining the role of the resident council:

  The role of a resident council is to improve the quality of life and resident satisfaction and participate in self-help initiatives to enable residents to create a positive living environment for families living in public housing. Resident councils may actively participate through a working partnership with the Housing Authority to advise and assist in all aspects of public housing operations (HUD, 2011b).

- Other community organizing and social change efforts such as the Denver Inner City Parrish, which provides a food bank, social gatherings, meals, and advocacy for residents.

The analysis of the qualitative results for research question two included themes organized in Table 20 by the dependent variable (involvement in neighborhood organizations) and each independent variable in the final Structural Equation Models.
Table 20. Resulting themes from the involvement in neighborhood organizations category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project WISE</td>
<td>Some of the women took me to a meeting where we talked and supported each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Resident Council</td>
<td>I go to the council meetings where we talk about the redevelopment, crime, and maintenance issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Organizations for People</td>
<td>I have been to a MOP action before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Inner City Parish</td>
<td>Us seniors meet up at the parish for coffee and meals throughout the week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Community Meetings</td>
<td>The redevelopment meetings are the ones when they talk about what the buildings are going to look like around here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Steering Committee</td>
<td>I am involved with the steering committee. We see the building designs and community meeting plans before the open houses and larger community meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neighborhood problems and activism themes are presented in Table 21.

Table 21. Resulting themes from the neighborhood problems and activism category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You’re going to have to deal with what’s going on right now because you don’t have any other options</td>
<td>Public housing residents have to deal with safety issues (like teenagers who are loud, disrespectful, throwing trash, fighting, dealing drugs, people clustering in dark areas, and other issues) because of the no snitching culture of the neighborhood and the managers not addressing issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We are activists</td>
<td>Some residents join together to advocate for more security to address safety and quality of life issues like violence, domestic violence, and loud music played at night.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participation level, social cohesion themes related to involvement in neighborhood organizations, as well as new themes also emerged from the resident conceptualization of the factors related to their involvement in neighborhood organizations (resident self-interest and moderating organizations) are then presented.

**Neighborhood problems: You’re going to have to deal with what’s going on right now because you don’t have any other options.** The neighborhood problems related theme had one main experience, which is that residents are told they have to deal with neighborhood problems because they do not have any other options. Ten of the interviews provided elaboration on the experience residents have with neighborhood problems. One participant in the study described the sense of powerlessness she and other residents have over neighborhood problems in the following quote:

Last year I asked the old manager if I can get transferred because I had a big problem with the neighbors that lived behind me. They were a gang related neighbor and they were bothering my kids, so I got involved and me and the mother said this is not working, so I did go to the office and ask, ‘what is possible can I get a transfer?’ and they said, ‘to where?’ and I says, ‘to North Lincoln’ and she said, ‘no.’ I said, ‘oh God!’ She says, ‘you’re gonna have to deal with what is going on right now and see what happens because according to how my rent is getting paid.’ I told her, ‘what other options do I have?’ She says, ‘you really don’t have any,’ so I kind of stuck it out and then after all they were evicted.’

In essence, residents describe the relationship between having to deal with safety issues and the “no snitching” culture of the neighborhood, which is compounded by the housing authority manager not addressing issues.

Specifically, public housing residents have to deal with safety issues like: teenagers who are loud and other people being disrespectful, throwing trash, fighting, dealing drugs, clustering in dark areas, hearing gun shots, theft (of their children’s’ toys, their
pets, and their car stereos), and other issues establishing neighborhood expectations regarding maintaining property and relationships. For example one mother described an incident just days before:

The other day there was like gunshots it sounded like right outside my door. I just put my child down on the middle of the floor and it really scared me because I’m a single mother and it’s just me and my child. So it’s kind of scary.

When residents try to address problems on their own they often feel defeated. For example, a couple of residents discussed issues with children not being supervised, which leads to rough play and ineffective attempts to problem solve with the parents of the children involved. The communication problems also extend beyond public housing residents with each other, to residents with the various systems in their day-to-day lives. One parent who has a physical disability discussed numerous examples of ineffective communication with the school regarding which accessible door would be unlocked so that they could pick their child up from school. In addition, this same family talked about a lack of clear signage regarding parking resulting in hundreds of dollars in parking tickets. The individual also discussed the humiliation they felt when they fell trying to carry groceries into the family housing unit, and then crawled without assistance, as housing authority maintenance workers watched.

The distress residents experience extends into their housing units, as well. For example, the noise and soot from the nearby rail yard and the combination of older housing stocks with Honeywell thermostats result in drafty, cold and soot covered living spaces. The following three quotes elaborate on this experience:

What I don’t like about these places is that they’re always cold. I have to put my daughter in two sets of clothes just to be in the house. My bones hurt a lot and then and then some of these people I notice have their oven doors open and that’s
dangerous. …we could go spend our winters [next door] until it’s time to come home and go to bed and get in the blankets… They really don’t care. My mom even got a letter statement from her doctor. Her feet are always frozen, frozen. She wears like three pairs of socks and she’s still cold. And them heaters that they got now, I know they got to have ‘em, but…They do not keep us warm up in here.

I think one good thing about moving us out of here is these places are very cold. They’re very cold…When, when the doors shut, it sounds like the windows open. That’s how bad it is.

They’ve got these trains, all the black soot, and diesel exhaust. The wind comes out of the west and plasters everything here. You can run your hand across and you get black soot on everything and you know my kid’s breathing this every day. And I’m breathing it and it just can’t be healthy.

Residents describe how quickly they adapt to an environment that does not confront problems effectively. As a result of the experiences residents have with the no snitching culture, their advocacy for themselves with the housing authority manager and other systems in their lives, it is ineffective. A few residents suggest the need for outside professionals to act as mediators with neighborhood problems:

Police or security. It doesn’t have to be police but a security person like going around. Sometimes the 10 or 15 year olds run around, past their curfew, running around, throwing rocks at windows, then they run and you know just doing stuff. They’re supposed to be inside. So, I think they’d be good for security… these kids gotta learn how to start respecting property and stuff.

In essence, the experience of neighborhood problems by many residents leaves them feeling like they need assistance addressing neighborhood and housing problems.

**Activism.** Another group of residents described themselves as activists for the community, which is in direct contrast to the residents who have adapted to the neighborhood problems.

**We are activists.** Some residents join together to advocate for more security to address safety and quality of life issues like violence, domestic violence, and loud music
played at night. For example, one grandmother in the neighborhood described her experience as an activist:

I already told the manager this couple are gonna kill themselves one of these days. And what happens? … This guy hit this girl. Punch, not hit. I don’t just hearsay or over complain… but when someone is screaming… and I almost lost one of my grandsons that I raised. They stabbed him because he refused to give a cigarette. I’ve always said we need more security. When something like that happens I am going to be an activist. What I went through nobody should. That’s my number one when we did these meetings: We need more security. People have their music playing until two, three, five, eight o’clock in the morning. We want to sleep with the windows open.

Another resident described her experience of having a Women Infant and Children professional in her life tell her that she should be a protester. Residents acknowledge the power of coming together to act on problems they have in common. For example, one resident said:

I like joining them… I think it is a time for people when they can’t go to one person or contact one person, it’s to get into a group and discuss how you feel about certain things and which things are gonna be helped. I think that more people are coming and say it’s doing something. It’s drawing people.

Residents acknowledge that if neighborhood problems are going to be addressed then they need to take an active role within their neighborhood organizations. One final interview elaborates on this theme:

FRESC was a good relationship. So was Project WISE, United Way… especially the leadership. Because a lot of folks don’t want – they leave it to somebody else. And my thought on that is you just can’t depend on somebody else. And you have to get in there, too.

Residents acknowledge that they become activists for their community because someone needs to be a champion for the neighborhood that can help overcome neighborhood problems.
**Participation level.** Most residents interviewed stated one of the two themes in

Table 22 regarding resident participation level in neighborhood organizations.

**Table 22. Resulting themes from the participation level category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot of people don’t get</td>
<td>Many residents get meeting notices, but do not participate in neighborhood meetings due to apathy (don’t care, not interested) or personal issues (fear of people, panic attacks at meetings, unable to speak up in</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>involved</td>
<td>meetings, have a lot of children to care for) therefore everyone assumes they do not need help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to know what’s</td>
<td>Residents describe the desire to be informed and pass information on to their neighbors regarding manager goals, housing authority plans, and city plans in order to know whether they will need to move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happening and pass the</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>information along</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A lot of people don’t get involved.** At least 10 of the 25 interviews stated that a lot of residents do not get involved in neighborhood organizations. Many residents noted that they get meeting notices, but do not participate in neighborhood meetings due to apathy (don’t care, not interested) or personal issues (fear of people, panic attacks at meetings, unable to speak up in meetings, have a lot of children to care for). Some study participants assume apathy is the main reason there are often only eight residents at neighborhood meetings. The following quote highlights this:

> From what I see stepping outside, they don’t care. You just see it in the way people act and dress, they don’t care. If they actually utilize the community organizations around here, they could benefit from it. I know how to utilize all that stuff if I need stuff or I need stuff done or I’m running behind on groceries or diapers or stuff like that, there’s places that will help you with that kind of stuff.

Another resident leader described the experience of trying to recruit others for meetings, “we tell people: go to the meeting. Find out. People say, ‘I’m not interested’ or ‘I have a lot of kids.’ Two uninvolved residents described for themselves why they are apathetic about participating in neighborhood organizations in the following quotes:
I didn’t really get anything out of that meeting. That’s why I never went back.

I got no choice but to go with the flow.

Involved residents expressed concern that people will assume that all residents who do not get involved in meetings are apathetic and must not need help. One Local Resident Council leader summed up these points when she said:

I know one thing, a lot of people don’t get involved. They don’t go to meetings. I guess they don’t care what’s going on. They don’t like to get involved, so everybody thinks they don’t need help.

Uninvolved residents describe their experience of trying to be involved with neighborhood organizations. One participant when asked about the one meeting she attended in the last two years said:

I don’t remember what it was about completely. I had a panic attack during it. I wanted as much information as we could get about, whether or not I had to move. If I never walked outside this door, any of these doors I would be fine. I’ll go up and talk to someone afterwards if they’re alone… but I don’t stay for very long to talk to anyone because truthfully I’m terrified of people.

Residents’ personal issues therefore put them at risk for being uninformed about neighborhood problem solving and the benefits of being involved in neighborhood organizations.

*I like to know what’s happening and pass the information along.*

Involved residents describe the desire to be informed and pass information on to their neighbors regarding manager goals, housing authority plans, and city plans in order to know whether they will need to move. Many residents expressed worry and concern regarding the redevelopment of the neighborhood and whether current residents will be relocated or have new opportunities. The following six quotes summarize these perspectives:
To know what’s going on at that site to put my input because my neighbors don’t know what’s going on.

I wanted as much information as we could get about, whether or not I had to move.

To know what’s happening, what’s changed, the manager’s goals, or what’s new… I pass it on to the people that can’t go.

I wanted to know what was going on… What exactly the city’s plans were and… if they were taking input from the residents… I got knowledge of their planning… they really gonna have us transitioning and where we’re gonna be transitioning to.

So I can see what’s going on. Just to be informed. Especially if people want you to make decisions about what you want your neighborhood to look like, it’s important.

To see what’s going on. To see what they say about the change...To see what they had to say about the building they’re making.

A few residents explained that they had the talents, skills, and experience to voice their opinions and keep track of the redevelopment process. These residents are the most involved in attending meetings and sharing information with their neighbors.

**Social cohesion.** Residents reported two themes when asked about the correlation between their existing relationships with neighbors and their involvement in neighborhood organizations, which are presented in Table 23.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am involved because of my neighbors</td>
<td>Residents describe encouraging each other to attend meetings through flyers, informal invitations, as well as sharing information about and tasks to run meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to be active and around people</td>
<td>Some residents are involvement in neighborhood organizations because they enjoy having something to do.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Both themes elaborate on how existing relationships with neighbors are connected to involvement in neighborhood organizations.

**I am involved because of my neighbors.** Residents describe encouraging each other to attend meetings through flyers, informal invitations, as well as sharing information about and tasks to run meetings. The following quote summarizes this theme:

> My neighbors are involved in it and I ask questions because when I heard that they were going to throw down the South Lincoln project I said, ‘what are they going to do with this property? Where do we go from here? Are they just going to throw us out?’ … I was very concerned, very worried, so that’s why I’ve been coming to meetings… at times I participate in serving the snacks after the meetings. I even had my daughter helping one time. I just like to be involved within the community to see what would start for us… I come for pretty much all the meetings they have over there… They sent flyers or I do call the housing authority staff… I see them when I am outside and I will say you going to the meeting tonight or do you know when the next meeting is?

Some residents attend meetings because of their neighbor’s invitations and the chance of winning a gift card as motivations to attend. The following quote highlights this fact:

> “my neighbor makes me go to the reconstruction meetings… I went to a couple of meetings… I actually won a gift card.”

Two other residents discussed their willingness to go along to meetings only if a neighbor invites them:

> Probably if I had a neighbor who said, “Do you wanna go,” I’ll probably go cause I wouldn’t wanna say no. So I’d be like “Okay, let’s go.” Cause I don’t like to say no to anything so, you know, I’ll go or I’ll join up.

> A friend took me. One of my friends was like “Do you want to go to see what’s going on?” And I thought, “Okay, I have nothing to do” so I went. And I didn’t go again ‘cause if somebody doesn’t like come in and try to “Come on, let’s go,” I’ll be like, I won’t go.
Residents describe not only getting information about neighborhood changes or meetings, but the ways their neighbors also help them navigate the various systems in their lives to meeting their needs. The following quote elaborates on this experience:

She was talking to me about them so we were planning on starting to go to those things but we just haven’t. She’s the one that takes and shows me the little tricks around here. You can’t go hungry around here. You could eat at this church or you could eat at this church.

Resident involvement in neighborhood organizations is directly linked with the invitations and encouragement they get from their neighbors to become involved.

**I like to be active and around people.** Some residents are involved in neighborhood organizations because they enjoy having something to do and people to interact with and learn from. The following quote summarizes this theme “I can’t remember why I started. I like to be around people. They’re seniors. There’s people my age but mostly seniors. I like to be active.”

Participating in neighborhood organizations is a way to make friends and be social for some residents, such as the women who stated:

When I first moved here I really didn’t know that many people and I was happy to move here so I could start meeting people… The first lady I met… she started taking me to meetings and I joined a meeting group called the WISE women… they had a parent meeting… we started a little group called HUGS – Helping Us Grow Stronger… when I first went there I was so happy ‘case I had something to do… it was a social thing for me. I enjoyed going to the meetings all the time, interacting with other women, learning new things… about our community… that’s why I got involved with the LRC because of the ladies I used to go to the meetings with… she was running for President… and then another lady was running for… we used to go to the meetings together… so I kind of met both of them through that and then we was all on the HUGS board together, so we were just interacting with people and communicating with them and so it’s like they said well go ahead and run for the position… I guess I could… so I went for it.
Participating in meetings therefore helps meet the social and relationship needs of residents.

**Additional themes.** Two additional themes resulted from the qualitative analysis that focused on themes outside of the structure created by the quantitative portion of research question two, which are presented in Table 24. The first theme is labeled self-interest because many residents described that they are involved in neighborhood organizations because being involved benefits their family.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self-interest: I am involved because it benefits my family</td>
<td>Several residents describe being involved in neighborhood meetings because it directly benefits their family (won a gift card, improve safety, builds resume, get support and recognition, network for future employment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderating organizations: I got more information from the Inner City Parrish</td>
<td>Several residents describe the Inner City Parrish as an organization that provides food, resources, and a place to socialize with neighbors, as well as get information about what is happening in the community and how to get involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**I am involved because it benefits my family.** Many residents describe a desire to attend meetings so that they can know how to begin planning and how much time they have before they will need to move. One participant said,

> I mean they don’t pay rent here where I stay at, so right now I’m concerned about my family.

Several residents describe being involved in neighborhood meetings because it directly benefits their family. Examples given by residents included that they won a gift card, improved safety, built their resume, got support and recognition, and they
networked for future employment. The benefits to families include meeting immediate needs like resources for celebrating the holidays as described below:

    The LRC president lets us know what’s going on at the Parish and at the think about the Christmas presents Christmas party they’re having. And you know, like update us cause sometimes they have like a Halloween Party at the Rec Center. People don’t give out flyers and she keeps us up on things. This is happening at the Parish or at the Rec Center. And they let her know to let us parents that have kids at the place know that they’re having the Christmas… go pick Christmas presents.

    Other residents described their hopes that the neighborhood changes might help meet more long term needs like education for their children. Resident self-interest is a motivating factor for getting involved in neighborhood organizations, because involved residents get information that helps them plan for the future and meet immediate needs.

    **Moderating organizations: I got more information from the Inner City Parish.** Several residents describe the Inner City Parish as an organization that provides food, resources and a place to socialize with neighbors, as well as get information about what is happening in the community and how to get involved. One resident described the link between getting an immediate need met at the Inner City Parish and their passing on information about neighborhood changes:

    I was going to the food bank the Inner City Parrish one right across from West High and they gave me some resources as far as clothing and that’s how I knew about what is going on. So when I transferred here I got more information from the Inner City Parish.

    Another resident mentioned that, “Inner City’s real good. If they can’t help you, they’ll give you a number.” The Inner City Parish was not originally listed in the quantitative survey of neighborhood organizations, but residents frequently mentioned it as another group focused on creating social change and advocacy. Therefore the Inner
City Parish is either an important neighborhood organization to add to the list or explore as a mediating or moderating organization.

**Research Question Three: Evidence-based Transition and/or Relocation Planning**

Research question three focused on presenting residents with a summary of HOPE VI evaluations in order to dialogue with residents about how to improve financial and social outcomes for residents living in redeveloping neighborhoods. The themes for research question three are organized according to the main discussion points in the interview guide, which included:

- Relocation Supports
- Screen Criteria
- Chicago Housing Authority Groups and Supports
- Section 8 Financial Hardship
- Section 8 (or moving) and Social Support
- Ideal Neighborhoods
- Choosing Ideal Neighborhoods
- Resident Navigator
- Choice Today and Problems to Solve
- Denver Housing Authority Transition and/or Relocation Supports.

Each of these themes is described below and include a supporting quote from the residents.
Relocation supports. Residents describe moving as a process, a chore and a traumatic experience where they leave everything that is familiar for someplace unfamiliar with added stress from moving expenses. When asked directly what supports they might need from the housing authority to successfully relocate and transition to their new housing they reported the themes in Table 25.

Table 25. Resulting themes from the relocation supports category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 for the moving process if I stay with DHA and $2,000 if I move out completely</td>
<td>Residents describe from their experience how much it costs them to move given the fact that they frequently do not have a driver’s license, credit card, someone to help watch their children, and/or the ability to carry their own belongings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don’t know what types of support people will need… because everybody’s different…</td>
<td>Each household has unique supports and needs such as dealing with releasing transcripts that are inaccessible due to default financial aid payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A packet saying what’s in the area</td>
<td>Several residents requested packets of information that provide a summary of resources in neighborhoods they could move to including: bus and train routes, schools, grocery stores, hospitals, childcare, resource centers, after school programs, senior centers who provide rides to activities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need to get it together financially/ can I get into self-sufficiency?</td>
<td>Many residents described the need to work towards financial stability, the reasons for their financial hardships and immediate needs such as dental work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Things change all the time unless you are a steady person</td>
<td>Residents described reasons for their inability to meet their goals such as health, mental health and relationship changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help finding a place</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Together these themes summarize resident perceptions of their financial and logistical support needs. Resident responses highlight that public housing residents have varying experiences regarding the types of support they might need, but most residents experience frequent changes because their lives are not completely stable or self-sufficient. The following summaries of the themes and supporting quotes will elaborate on these themes.

**$1,000 for the moving process if I stay with DHA and $2,000 if I move out completely.**

Residents describe how much it costs them to move given the fact that they frequently do not have a driver’s license, credit card, someone to help watch their children, and/or the ability to carry their own belongings. Therefore the most frequent theme mentioned is they need help with the actual moving process physically, mentally, and logistically. The following quote summarizes these themes:

When I moved from 13th and Grant they gave me $500. The only problem with that is to move all of the stuff I had, and to rent a truck and the people to help me cause I can’t lift over a certain amount of pounds… it cost me more than the $500 they gave me. I had to have a friend who had a driver’s license, so I had to pay them for the use of them going to the U-Haul place and getting the U-Haul and putting it on their credit. I had to give them extra money for that. And then I had to pay for the U-Haul and the rental of it and the mileage and the gas and everything. And then I had to pay some friends to help me… all while I was going to chemotherapy and radiation… but my friend who was in the same apartment complex as me, they gave him $1,500 to move completely. You know, stay out of DHA, but that $1,500, most of it, he had to find an apartment. He had to pay for it, first and last month’s rent, plus the moving expenses… it was unrealistic. $2,000 would have been better to move out of DHA completely. I’d say a thousand for staying with DHA… think about it my friend who has three children. One is in kindergarten or first grade and the other two are 3 years old and younger. She’s got her bedrooms to pack away, plus watching her children and making sure they don’t get hurt.
Another resident described the lack of social ties with others who have vehicles to help with a move, which results in the need for financial support to move:

Paying your phone bill would be a good help… I have family and friends but as far as the transportation because I have no vehicle. My father was my transportation – he had a truck so I depended on him, so it has been really tough without him. I am probably going to need one of those rental-moving trucks.

Residents elaborated on their personal reasons for experiencing moving as a chore and a traumatic experience without the self-sufficient tools to rent or borrow moving equipment, move or rely on their previous social supports that are not currently available to them.

_I really don’t know what types of support people will need… because everybody’s different._… Some residents identified the need for someone who can provide resources through a local office. Each household has unique supports and needs such as:

- dealing with releasing transcripts that are inaccessible due to default financial aid payments.
- trying to find work with a felony,
- support navigating medical systems,
- legal support with immigration paperwork as well as finding and paying for childcare,
- support in influencing her son,
- support with meeting immediate needs like dental work,
- financial resources to ensure they do not bring bedbugs to the new apartment, and,
- support ensuring they have a habitable unit and are utilizing available programs like Section 3 jobs.
Each of these themes is briefly described below. The following quote summarizes the issue with releasing transcripts:

I have student loan debts… being away from that stuff for so long it’s like you forget who do you contact to get help… with that… besides getting a fulltime job… we can’t take your college credits because the school is holding on to them for non-payment of tuition or something like that. Personally that’s what I need help with… releasing transcripts… I’m kind of stuck… I gotta get a job… that’s the horrible side of it… I just need help with that.

Another resident described their experience of trying to find work with a felony:

One of the first questions you asked me is do I have a felony, which I do. I’ve got a couple of them. Back when I was a lot younger I did some pretty crazy stuff but you know it comes back to haunt me when I try to get a good job. I’ve got all kinds of knowledge and all kinds of experience doing different things. Nobody will hire me right now because of my disability, but hopefully that will get better. And my main concern is my background now.

A third resident described the need for support navigating medial systems:

I think with Denver General, what is their name now? I go to Saint Anthony’s. I never go there and now Saint Anthony’s is going move and I am having problem with my insurances still… I can’t take care of my medication.

A fourth resident needs legal support with immigration paperwork as well as finding and paying for childcare:

I been having a hard time to find a daycare for her. And I talked to somebody in her school. And they supposed to help me… my lawyer told me that I need to get a job… And then I had to apply for my resident card. That costs money. I think legal problems. Assistance with legal, legal assistance.

A fifth resident asked for support in influencing her son:

I want him to go to school, I want him to get a small career… There’s somebody probably out there that can get through to him. That’s the most important thing to me, I mean, that help would be towards my son.

Another resident described her situation and barriers to overcome:

I can’t afford nothing else. I’m on a tight budget as it is. I have to do this breathalyzer thing for my car. I have a lot of things I’m trying to take care of still.
It’s still a process for me because I’ve been clean and sober for about three years now so it’s still a work in process, trying to keep my license and get my life together.

A final resident mentioned that he needs support with meeting immediate needs like dental work when he described, “I do need dental work bad, but that’s because of the financial.” As is evidenced by these stories, many personal issues are forefront in in resident’s minds, more immediately than moving.

Households with bedbugs will need extra funds to wash and treat all of their belongings so that they do not transfer bedbugs with their belongings to their new unit. The following quote summarizes one resident who angrily described her experience with bedbugs:

You all don’t think about this… the bureaucrats and shit don’t think of this shit… we’ve got bed bugs here… in the development… I’m gonna transfer all the bed bugs to that apartment complex… include the cost of making sure all my shit is washed and cleaned, taken care of so I cannot have to worry about that… those don’t come cheap… Who are you gonna blame when you get bedbugs?... You got to be realistic about that shit, but the bureaucrats, they don’t think about that crap. I bet you 10 to 1 I’m the only one who’s ever brought that up.

Residents relocated temporarily to another unit within the neighborhood expressed concern that the unit may not be properly maintained (appliances, windows, doors, paint). Residents described the need to have a concrete plan to successfully execute a move within the 90 days guaranteed by the Relocation Act of 1970.

As a result of the unique circumstances, residents describe the need to work with someone on setting and implementing personal goals with motivation and incentives for meeting those goals. One resident described her perception of her neighbors:

I’ve talked to people… it just seems like they have no idea on how to get on up out of here… When I was young nobody sat down and told me what it takes to really succeed in life. Sit down and help me choose some goals, set some goals.
And I think probably, if we did that, I think it would help me greatly… implement some kind of a program… make it more accessible… maybe leaving a flyer… maybe an incentive by reducing rent… a lot of people have the ability to do well… they’re just shiftless for some reason. They don’t have the ambition, but they have the intelligence.

Changes in resident financial outcomes will likely require individualized case management in order to overcome each household’s barriers. For example, one resident who has successfully utilized supportive services asserted that many residents are unaware of the opportunity for Section 3 jobs, which could give them hope to upgrade their skills for a particular vocation. The HUD Act of 1968, Section 3 focuses on resident training and employment (HUD, 2011a). Section 3 encourages job training, employment, and contracts for services, construction, administrative and management positions for public housing and low-income individuals on projects tied to federal funding.

**A packet saying what’s in the area.** Several residents requested packets of information that provide a summary of resources in neighborhoods they could move to including: bus and train routes, schools, grocery stores, hospitals, childcare, resource centers, after school programs, senior centers who provide rides to activities. One resident when asked what supports could be provided to her said, “probably a resource list.” The following three quotes elaborate on what residents hope would be in a resource packet:

A handout saying… where to catch the buses… or trains… what schools are in the area… high schools… grocery stores, hospitals… a packet saying what’s in the area.

Resources like school and I guess choices as to where you’re going… Yeah because if I was to leave I would go to Westridge and that’s because my daycare’s right there and my daughter goes to Eagleton and my son goes to Braun. So it’s right there where I need to do things.
Like the neighborhood, how’s the neighborhood... Like crime and safety, like what’s in the neighborhood, like the railroad or the station... And, um, stores.

Residents have particular systems in mind when they think about the neighborhoods they might want to move to. Knowing more about the transportation options, schools, medical facilities, daycares, and stores that are in the community will help residents make decisions within the minimum of 90 days of relocation planning time mandated by federal laws.

_I need to get it together financially/can I get into self-sufficiency?_

Many residents described the need to work towards financial stability and the reasons for their financial hardships. One resident leader talked about being the only person in his family to be in public housing and stated, “I need to get it together financially.” Other residents discussed the need for supports they need to become more self-sufficient including dealing with child support and finding a job:

classes… flyers… food and clothing assistance. I might need a rental. I am having a little problem right now as far as my child support doesn’t come in and there are times it and that’s why I am putting of going back to school… can I get into self-sufficiency?”

Just to find a job and daycare and uh… I mean… And I’ll be fine. I mean I can be in that program in the Section 8. I can be able to pay my own bills.

Some residents have high hopes that they can become self-sufficient, but have not become self-sufficient without support to do so. Common problems residents experience are barriers to their self-sufficiency such as missing child support payments, medical needs that are not able to be met with Medicaid such as dental care, and finding work and childcare as single parents.
Things change all the time unless you are a steady person. Residents described reasons for their inability to meet their goals such as health, mental health and relationship changes. One resident summarized this theme when she said she needed support to:

Pay for my rent in case I have a hard time trying to find a job… because things change all the time unless you are a steady person… You know, this week it could be all good. Next week, it’d be something wrong, and you need to get a hold of your case manager but you can’t see your case manager but every now and then. I don’t think that’s cool.

Another resident described her desire to stabilize her mental health:

I’ve got depression a lot so I’m trying to find the right stabilizing, so I can be ready and just live a normal life. My anxiety and all that. It kind of keeps me… I get nervous.

The distress that residents experience therefore might be rooted in how their health and mental health impact the stability of their lives from week to week.

Help finding a place. A few residents described the need for support finding a place to live. They described the challenges they face finding the time and means to find housing since most do not own a car and many have children to care for. One resident said, “probably finding a place with little ones. It’s kind of hard.” Residents described how challenging it is to look for housing by navigating public transportation in unfamiliar areas. Residents also described that when they do not have a cell phone to call landlords and tell them that the buses are running behind schedule they frequently miss meetings, which makes carefully selecting ideal housing difficult.

Screening criteria. Residents described four main themes regarding their expectations for screening criteria in the redeveloped neighborhood, which are presented in Table 26.
Table 26. Resulting themes from the screening criteria category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good tenant</td>
<td>Residents state that those who are good tenants should be allowed to qualify for new units, which included paying rent on time, no regularly documented issues with the police (violent crimes against people, theft, drug sales) or maintenance (noisy, housekeeping issues, property damage, conflicts with neighbors).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you’re gonna move people out and rebuild it, put them back in there… They should probably be the first ones</td>
<td>Residents describe their sense that current residents should have the first right to move into the new units.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial difficulties… you’re jobless</td>
<td>Residents describe the need to continue public housing for those who need help working towards established jobs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Be clear about the guidelines and have a plan for who can’t move back.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these three themes is described with supporting quotes from the resident interviews.

**A good tenant.** Residents state that those who are good tenants should be allowed to qualify for new units, which included paying rent on time, no regularly documented issues with the police (violent crimes against people, theft, drug sales, drug addictions), or maintenance or housing complaints (noisy, housekeeping issues, property damage, conflicts with neighbors). In sum those who should be able to stay are, “the ones that always pay their rent. Take care of their business,” or, “a good tenant… pay your rent on time, not have a background with the police.” And the people who should not be allowed
to return are, “the drug dealers, the hookers, the stealers, the liars...You know, people like that.” One resident summarized these points when they said:

Everybody has been pretty well screened. If you look at their performance and their process, if there is any complaints against ‘em. Certain families’ kids are destructive. They break the sprinklers. I’m sure that they’re aware of it by now… but I think incident reports would be the biggest thing to look at… recent criminal activity… crimes against, violent crimes, maybe crimes against children are vital… getting feedback from the office… the maintenance people… these people selling crack have a lot of weirdoes coming to their house… a lot of people bring a different bike every day to their… you know they see stuff. They know what’s going on… people are the eyes and ears of the community.

Another resident suggested documenting and weeding out households that are not using public housing to stabilize their lives or get on their feet when they said:

Residents that have had the police at their house more than once. I mean, I could see we have the police at your house. Like I had the police here but my baby had a seizure. It was an emergency like that. But uh…Especially like right here where I live in the summer. It’s really, really party central back there. You know, and for families like us who don’t party, that’s a nuisance. For the Fourth of July, they partied for three days. ‘Til three, four in the morning. And it’s like if you got money to party that long. What are you doing living here? …Kick ‘em out. Like I always said, how come when you’re in public housing, they don’t have you um, like on a UA’s you know? Find out what people are all about you know. You could weed out the people real fast that way.

Most residents expressed opinions about who should not be allowed to return to the new development based on expectations for respectful and responsible behavior in the present and future.

*If you’re gonna move people out and rebuild it, put them back in there... They should probably be the first ones.* Other residents describe their sense that current residents should have the first right to move into the new units. One resident summed this point up “I guess if you’re gonna move people out and rebuild it,
put them back in there… They should probably be the first ones… Unless you offer them a different deal.”

Residents who experience the disruption of the redevelopment believe they ought to have the option to move into one of the new units or choose their housing option. The following quote emphasizes this perspective:

We have priority rights to come back if we wanted to come back. If we wanted to stay wherever they put us, we can do that too. I guess if they’re going to put you in an old unit, that ain’t right.

Participants in the study defined fairness as having a clearly defined set of expectations about options residents can choose from, which includes moving in to a redeveloped public housing unit.

Financial difficulties… you’re jobless. Residents describe the need to continue public housing for those who need help working towards established jobs. Some residents however described expectations for residents to be working on themselves by working on personal goals, going to school or being employed. The following quote shows resident expectations:

I am not very choosy with people… I don’t know their outcomes… trying to complete their goals… need help… I don’t like to say too much but just trying to keep their unit that are not trying to make themselves better.

Residents describe their expectation that public housing residents are not self-sufficient, but that they are also trying to improve themselves or their households.

Be clear about the guidelines and have a plan for those who can’t move back.

Residents described the need to have clear criteria established by the Local Resident Council that requires that residents work towards moving into new units if they are
making progress towards their goals. Residents expressed concerns for those with criminal records because they have a hard time qualifying for housing, which can perpetuate the reasons they get involved in crime. One advocate of other residents said:

I’m not gonna say no criminal record, ‘cause, that’s unrealistic… I wouldn’t want someone who’s from like alcohol, drugs, rape, murder to be living near kids… the trouble makers… like I know there’s people in this apartment complex who have been written up for not… some of those people are the ones that need the most help… it seems hard for them to find something on their own because of all the background checks… other hurdles that you have to jump… what are you gonna do with… throw ‘em into the streets? It’s kind of defeating the purpose cause they get involved in crime… they’re trying to make it, they’re desperate. I mean I don’t see that working at all… unless you have an alternative… a plan for them to move… A Plan B that’s just as tight as Plan A… communication… that’s why we were talking about these programs are so important.

Another resident described that expectations around criminal records ought to focus on not having a recent pattern of criminal behavior or a clear demonstration of a commitment not to commit crime. The following quote summed this point up:

I’d say the ones that are non-felons but then again I know that people can change. I’ve done it so you can’t just put it on all of them so I don’t know. It would be kind of hard to say who. Definitely no child molesters or no drugs there. Depending on what they got their felon for too… A year limit…Yeah because people don’t change overnight. I would have to say at least three to five years. So you can see a change in them. If it’s going to be for real.

According to residents Local Resident Councils can be the group that helps define expectations about housing options for those with criminal records. The majority of residents however expressed clear expectations of who they would not want to move back into the new development.

**Chicago Housing Authority groups.** As stated previously, the Chicago Family Case Management Demonstration program is the only known HOPE VI supportive services model with improved economic outcomes at the household level (Theodos et al.,
The program focused on providing intensive case management to the entire family of HOPE VI movers, which included family members who were not on the lease but were involved in their day-to-day lives. Residents were statistically clustered into three different categories that defined the type of supportive services provided for each group (see Appendices O & P).

Group One was called striving for self-sufficiency because they worked at least intermittently and had good physical and mental health. Group Two was called aging and distressed because they often experience poor health and mental health, had less than a high school education, may be caring for children or grandchildren, and may struggle with substance use. And Group Three was called high risk because they have characteristics of both Group One and Two.

Prior to grouping residents supportive services staff had a 50% engagement rate, which was increased to 90% using the guidelines of the three typologies. Group One met with their case manager once or twice a month in order to work towards self-sufficiency. Achieving self-sufficiency is not often an attainable goal for Group Two therefore they are the least likely to meet with a case manager; however they were sometimes willing to meet once per month. Group Three was more likely to want to meet with a case manager once a week in order to address physical, mental health and substance use barriers to self-sufficiency. Group Three is at risk for becoming Group Two, but with supports they may be able to take steps towards self-sufficiency.

The common factor that residents of this study associated with all three of the Chicago Housing Authority groups is that residents are low income. However, residents’
responses to the categorization of people and the services they might need during a transition and/or relocation process varied. The top three responses to the three Chicago Housing Authority groups are defined in Table 27.

**Table 27. Resulting themes from the Chicago Housing Authority Groups category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Missing Groups</td>
<td>Residents identified several missing groups including single fathers and immigrant families.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’s not much you can call them.</td>
<td>Many residents were not comfortable grouping residents or giving them a label based on common demographics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sounds like my neighbor</td>
<td>Residents acknowledged that the CHA groups describe their neighbors and the situations they face with accuracy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these three themes, including residents’ quotes are provided below.

**Missing Groups.** Many residents responded to the three categories of people with strong beliefs about groups of people who are not represented. The possible additional groups include:

- Younger parents on TANF because they cannot find work during the recession,
- Single fathers,
- Seniors who are mobile with moderate to poor health conditions like arthritis and diabetes,
- Residents who need supportive communities and services because they have been incarcerated because of non-payment of child-support or choices they made because they could not find work, and
- Public housing residents include immigrants from very different cultures who need someone to work with them who understands their culture and needs.

The first three additional groups mentioned by residents are described here. First, residents believe a group that is not represented is younger parents who are on TANF, but looking for work and not having luck because of the recession. Residents responded to
the categorization in Group One (striving for self-sufficiency) with frustration. Some residents believe that the striving for self-sufficiency group has much younger residents:

I think the fact that it’s not represented is a little pissy. Cause my friend is 23… the younger kids who have kids and families… they should be represented… most of the women in the younger category, you know, from like 18 to like late 20’s… they’re mostly on TANF. They’re not working at all… trying to find jobs… just not having any luck because of the recession.

Participants also assert that their friends and family living in public housing work hard, but cannot get support beyond public housing even though they are struggling to make ends meet. The following quote describes this experience:

My sister she works every day. She can’t get food stamps. She can’t get no Medicaid. She can’t get any of that. I mean she’s a lot more direct, like she works. She doesn’t get no help. I mean she pays almost nine hundred in rent. I don’t know there are some people that are here that do work and don’t get none of this stuff. I mean I don’t know if that’ll be the fourth group.

As a result some residents felt that the description of group one as receiving benefits is not an accurate reflection of their experience of working hard, not being able to make ends meet, and not being eligible for benefits.

A second group that residents described as being demographically different and in need of different kinds of supports is single fathers. The following quote describes the experience of one single father living in South Lincoln:

Me and the guy next door and the guy next door to him are all single fathers. There’s one over here, there’s several of them around here... Have you ever heard of the organization it’s new its called Moms Like Me or something like that? Mom’s can have a group and they all get together and talk and share... It’s like, I wonder if I could attend that, but its like nah probably not... It’s a lot more common thing then it used to be. It used to be that dad’s just ditched the old lady and the kid and start all over and do whatever. These day’s it’s a pretty big turnaround. I got custody of my daughter from Human Services. They said I’m one of the first men that actually went through with it all. But they’re saying it’s becoming more common. I see it happening because several of us here. I don’t know if they just isolate us all here or if they’re all through the project or what,
but...I tell you people around here don’t know how to raise children. I’m not saying I’m perfect but my daughter’s good. Everyone who sees her says she’s just so well behaved. But there’s other techniques and I’d like a parenting class. It’s interesting to see how other single men raise their kids. Especially having a daughter. You know how hard it is? As she transfers from diapers to potty training going to a restaurant? I’m not going to take her into the men’s room to change her. I can’t take her into the men’s room to go potty. I definitely can’t take her into the ladies room and I can’t send her in there by herself. That’s really hard... Now you’re starting to see unisex bathrooms and still they put changing tables in the men’s room and to me that seems kind of odd. I’m not going to take my daughter into the men’s room to change her. Guys standing around taking a leak or whatever. I don’t think that’s a safe thing. There’s just not alternatives for men in situations like that like there are for single moms. It’s a challenge.

He asserted that many of the community development style interventions for single mothers would be useful to implement specifically for single fathers so that they have a place to find support for their daily struggles as parents.

Third, many seniors described aspects of their experience that are not included in the Chicago Housing Authority groups. They assert that many residents living in public housing are single and are mobile with moderate to poor health conditions like arthritis and diabetes, as described in this quote:

We have a fair amount of seniors, but they have physical disabilities... modest to poor health. They still get around... arthritis, diabetes, mobility effects some of them. You could probably pull out a group that would be older. Mostly seniors, they’re single. Their kids are long gone... a former parent... not involved in child rearing... senior single families or single households.

Residents describe this group as being left out of public benefits they need to survive. For example one person sitting in the room while their adult child completed the interview said:

You got your people between 45 and 55 no kids, they can’t get help, they can’t get SSI, they’re not qualified, they’re not old enough. They don’t make enough money, but they can’t get no assistance. That’s another assistance area that they need to figure out, too. They got that gap there to where you have to be 65 before you can get social security or disability. Yeah you got a group and they need more
help then what they’re getting here. This is where they actually get in to it to where they can get assistance to where they can at least get a place to live. They’re as bad as me. I got bad hips. I’ve been in a car accident. I’ve worked throwing newspapers before because I can’t find a job. You can’t make enough to even…like I would have to try to save for three months to try to find a place to live and just so I can pay just enough for rent and then hope I have enough to have pay utilities plus the rent. You know so there’s no place I can…I can’t make it.

Residents therefore experience distress and an inability to be self-sufficient in their 40’s and 50’s and are also unable to qualify for public benefits because of they do not meet the eligibility requirements for TANF, disability, or SSI. As a result, many residents displayed both verbal and nonverbal signs of discomfort with the Chicago Housing Authority categorizations of people (physically backing away or crossing their arms as the interviewer read the groups) because they did not see themselves, their families, or their neighbors represented in the three groups. One resident said, “I feel bad for these people,” but most residents advocated for other groups of people they think this study excluded.

**There’s not much you can call them.** Many residents were not comfortable grouping residents or giving them a label based on common demographics. “I don’t belong any of the groups,” was a common response. Another typical answer was, “I think Group One, Two, Three… it’s okay like that.” Another resident said, “I wouldn’t know how to name the groups. Nobody like should put you below nobody or above somebody so I wouldn’t name them… I think that’s why A, B, C or One, Two, Three. I think that’s more fair.”

**Sounds like my neighbor.** Other residents thought the description of the Chicago Housing Authority groups fit their neighbors accurately. As an interviewer read the demographics for groups, one resident said:
Sounds like my neighbor... the people across from me, they’re Africans, there’s a mom and a dad there and a bunch of kids and the people that are next to them, there’s a older black man and his wife but she died last year and then they have children and yeah its kind of similar.

Another resident described a similar reaction. “There’s somebody in here with all those things.” And a third resident said “like there’s a single female, head of household; there’s grandparents that are taking care of their grandkids, they’re at home with the grandparents; and there’s the three groups around here.” While some residents feel the groups do not represent them or their neighbors, other residents do believe that groups of residents in South Lincoln do fit the Chicago findings. As a result, the interviewers asked residents to elaborate on what about the three groups they can relate to, as well as what sorts of services each of these groups might need during transition and/or relocation planning. Next, I will address their reactions to each of the three groups.

**Group One.** Residents described group one with one theme: young families trying to get things done on their own. A summary of this theme is provided in Table 28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Young families trying to get</td>
<td>Some residents describe group one as those who try to take care of themselves by taking care of their mental health and working, but they have financial hardship because they are caring for children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>things done on their own</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Young families trying to get things done on their own. Some residents describe group one as those who try to take care of themselves and their mental health. They are trying to get on their feet by working. Group one has financial hardship because they are often caring for children or have low paying jobs. One resident explained, “often I’m working
and I’m considered low-income.” Another resident explained how she fit into Group One:

Sadly to say… I have a young child… I started working before he was born… I had him and I stopped working ’cause I have to take care of him fulltime… I’m a female head of household… I try to keep my mental health up… we do have hardships paying for utilities… food… I think it’s pretty much on point.

Residents described the desire to have supports for themselves as members of group one who need support and structures to help them find better paying work. They mention all of the redevelopment projects that could:

Hire the guys from around here. The ones that want to work. You know, if on their first two days, they show they don’t want to be there, don’t have them then. You know, let it be from within here.

In addition, they describe the need for more resources, education, and support finding better paying jobs, which is illustrated in the following quote:

I think that people in Group One need to have more resources, maybe more of an education. They’re sitting here with a high school diploma. You can’t get anywhere with a high school diploma. You’ve gotta’ know something or you’re going to be working at McDonalds. Which isn’t necessarily a bad thing if you get in management they make pretty good money.

Other residents describe neighbors who are attending school and seem to have their lives together on the surface, but they have observed patterns they are concerned about:

I’ve seen a couple of girls that are going to school and gone through three cars. And it’s beyond… Is she going to school? Her third car? It was a pretty car. Wrecked it. Drinking. Partying. You go two on top. They look like it’s together, but it’s really not.

Group One therefore may be a mix of people who are balancing working, educational attainment, as well as talking care of themselves and their children. As a group they are all working towards self-sufficiency, but may have barriers to maintaining long-term work that pays a sustainable wage.
Group Two. Residents described three themes in response to the Group Two description, which are defined in Table 29.

Table 29. Resulting themes from the Chicago Housing Authority Group Two category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income older families</td>
<td>Low-income seniors are often working, but unsure if they can enjoy their retirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been there and done that and want my privacy</td>
<td>Many seniors have already worked and raised their children and now want to have privacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Group Two themes are defined below.

Low-income older families. Residents described Group Two as low-income seniors who are often working, but unsure if they can enjoy their retirement. One resident described that this group of residents might enjoy the independence of starting a small business:

Less than half of them have a high school diploma? They’re older at age 57 they’re not really going to go back and get into college. They’re receiving SSI, obviously they’re disabled. I think people in this group would be primed for their own small business. Because they’ve lived longer they’re older, they’ve got more experience, and they’re on set income, which no one likes to be. So I think those people would be more likely to start a business.

Residents focused on describing the experience of approaching retirement and still having dreams of homeownership and business ownerships, but not being sure if those dreams are possible as they retire in a struggling economy.

Been there and done that and want my privacy. Many seniors have already worked and raised their children and now want to have privacy. One resident explained:

Well I fit in there. We’re not ready to be put away… I keep my house clean… I got this past… I raised my grandchildren, I raised my kids. I been there and done that. Now I made it… and I want my privacy… [and] a good Parish senior place… to go drink coffee.
In essence, residents in Group Two have spent their lives taking care of themselves and their family members and now as they retire they simply want to take care of themselves, their public housing unit, and enjoy their lives.

**Services for Group Two.**

*Need assistance.* Residents in the second group may need day-to-day help and companions in the form of social services and animal assisted services. One resident stated, “They are old. So they are sick and they need help with everything.” One resident described how to do a needs assessments for Group Two:

Work with the social service agencies here. As to what these needs are, people in this group the social service help is going to be more intense. They might have to let some of the social services departments take the lead and work with these people and inform the Denver Housing Authority how they can help them.

Other residents made their best guess regarding the relocation assistance that group two might need:

They’re gonna need a lot of help. Cause some of them don’t have families or kids that are willing to come help them move or… You know they need a lot more support. Some might need a case manager to go in there and help ‘em pack. Or show ‘em how to pack. Or just get them motivated to pack.

A third resident suggested ongoing outreach to the seniors “there is help there to knock on doors. Are you OK? Do you need food? ... have a school person that would take this senior that’s disabled, that’s sick, a bag of groceries.”

And a fourth resident suggested utilizing animal assisted programs to help seniors have companions:

Some of the mental and physical handicap people need animals… assistance animals…some of them need help getting hooked up with programs that have people come to help them out on a day-to-day basis… they don’t know how to get that kind of help.
While residents assert they want their independence, living independently in their public housing unit may be more possible over the long term if some sort of social services agency assesses each household and determines how to best provide assistance to group two households.

**Group Three.** Residents described group three according to the three themes presented in Table 30.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting older and need help</td>
<td>Residents who identify with group three services that help maintaining their health and support raising adult children who will need to live with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small distressed families</td>
<td>Some group three members are not working at all and may have a hard time coping with depression and/or emotional, physical and sexual abuse.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Services: Support person</td>
<td>Residents in group three need support to overcome the cycles they have endures, so that they can educate themselves and make changes for their children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these themes is described in-depth below.

**Getting older and need help.** Residents who identify with group three stated that the group is getting older and needs help maintaining their health, as well as support raising adult children who will need to live with them. “We get help,” one resident explained, while another resident said:

I would say number three because I am 47 so I am getting older… my son is going to be with me for a long time… I do have health problems… I do take medications… depression… sometimes I have to meet with my doctor every month for things that I’m going through so that’s one thing I need as far as Medicaid my medical bill some stuff that what I need help with, too.
Some Group Three residents who had difficulty distinguishing whether they fit best into group two or three, decided they fit into group three because they are young and get help.

Small distressed families. Some group three members are not working at all and may have a hard time coping with depression and/or emotional, physical and sexual abuse. Residents in Group Three need support to overcome the cycles (poverty, abuse, low education attainment) they have endured, so that they can educate themselves and make changes for their children. One resident explained:

Been there and done that. Well because I’ve got a lot of health issues that I’m trying to deal with. I’m not working or anything but I am on TANF. I’m not very educated; my last grade I completed was 8th.

Two residents explained how they need a living arrangement that takes into account their physical and mental health:

I wish I had one level because the stairs they’re really. I’ve got asthma and stuff. The air thing is not working; it makes my breathing actually worse. Having to go to the restroom so much. I use the restroom like every 10 minutes. I get claustrophobic sometimes. Like sometimes when I’m outside I feel like I can’t breathe. I sleep on the couch. I got my bed and stuff up there but I’m just more comfortable right here on the couch. I’m scared somebody might try to break in a window or something. I’m just a worry bug.

They don’t have flats here. And I’m looking for a flat unit ‘cause I have diabetes, and I’m starting to get dizzy -- like I get dizzy spells. And I would hate to be trying to come down the stairs with one of my little kids - I tried the other day, and I had to sit down with him and go down on my butt. If they had more, like a townhome, I got these guys running up and down the stairs for me. But ideally I need a flat.

Therefore resident distress based on physical and mental health may impact the types of housing that are ideal to manage their symptoms.
Residents in the third group consistently mentioned that they might need someone they can talk to in order to help them decide where to move. One resident said “somebody you could talk to. Like a social worker or something like that… they could help you decide where to move… more or less a support person.” Residents in the third group might need one-to-one support or support groups (educational and job training) to hear motivating success stories. Residents in the third group might need places where they can have conversations with other adults on their level about parenting and resources. Residents in Group Three identified the support they need to impact their teenagers in the following two quotes:

Helping them to make sure these people have, and they don’t have food stamps, give ‘em names and places to get food. If they need help with their grandchildren and stuff, give em the help they need… even their grandchildren, some of them are older and they still haven’t completed their education, help em do that… Some of these grandparents are, well they’re taking care of their grandchildren. Sometimes these grandchildren take advantage of grandparents and stuff. Helping them get their grandchildren on track… teaching the older kids how to be responsible. That’s what I want for my child but he don’t listen.

They should make one of the apartments into a place where there’ll be police officers… speak to all these kids, any kids, teenagers… help them get that gang mentality out of their head. You know, like these programs where you could take these kids to, with the permission of their parents, to jail…the morgue… Cause there was a problem… especially in the Denver Housing, it’s not only here, with the gangs… help these people stop saying they’re Eastside, they’re Westside, and stuff like that, and teach them how to get along, cause we all live in the same community…cause there’s 20 something year olds and… that’s important cause a lot of times kids are dying, a lot of these kids are in and out of hospitals, fighting and they don’t get it through their head that it’s not good to keep fighting. They think it’s cool, it’s not.

Residents in Group Three therefore need support, not necessarily to change their economic outcomes, but instead to influence the life chances of their children and grandchildren. Group Three is getting older, their families are distressed, and they need a
support person who can help their children and grandchildren focus on setting educational and vocational goals, so that they do not become the next generation to absorb the troublesome aspects of street culture of some traditional public housing communities.

**Section 8 hardship.** When interviewers presented residents with data regarding previous financial hardship that resulted for residents who moved from redeveloping public housing to Section 8, they came up with the seven common themes presented in Table 31.

**Table 31. Resulting themes from the Section 8 Hardship category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you are not ready for it, don’t do it</td>
<td>Some residents recommend that Section 8 Vouchers be used cautiously because of the risk of losing vouchers and ending up back on a wait list for transitional or public housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need more help than they give</td>
<td>Many residents are aware that they could not afford the additional bills required in a Section 8 unit (electricity, gas, water, and trash) and still purchase other necessities (phone, hygiene and cleaning supplies, food, clothing, and personal items).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t mind Section 8 if everything was guaranteed</td>
<td>Some residents would prefer Section 8 units, but fear they might lose their housing without the assistance of the housing authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cushioning time</td>
<td>Some residents suggest the need for financial support from the housing authority to ease into education, employment and additional bill paying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make Section 8 classes mandatory</td>
<td>Many residents suggest the need to classes that reiterate the key aspects of Section 8 housing that are different from public housing such as the need to pay heat/utilities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Either they should not qualify or the housing authority should help them | Many residents highlight the importance of addressing common financial struggles for Section 8 residents by creating a monthly energy allowance, making energy
pay those utility bills

efficient appliances mandatory, as well as referrals to the LEAP program.

Another triangle with three parties involved – the resident, the landlord and DHA.

Residents describe the responsibilities of the landlords (winterize the property), housing authority (help with services) and residents (know what they can afford).

Each of these themes are described below.

If you are not ready for it, don’t do it. Some residents recommended that

Section 8 Vouchers be used cautiously because of the risk of losing vouchers and ending up back on a wait list for transitional or public housing. One resident who lived in

Section 8 housing said:

I say don’t get into it if you can’t afford it. ‘Cause I’ve been on Section 8 and it’s cool and you can pick your own spot, but you do have extra bills. And you got to do your deposits so… it’s a lot of responsibility if you’re not ready for it, don’t do it.

Residents stated that they cannot afford Section 8 if they do not have a job. The following five quotes explain their financial realities:

My friend’s mom she gets Section 8 and I know that she goes through trouble paying her light and gas and everything and all of that and oh the rent you know because they got to pay rent.

I don’t think it is. I’m not working and I don’t have an income. I couldn’t get in to paying a large amount right now. My rent right now is $89. I make $308 a month. That’s all I’ve had coming in for the last year.

I don’t think I’d be able to afford it...I only get 300 for TANF. Plus if I had to put 200 down on that, I’d have to use the other for the light and gas and then where am I going to get gas or toiletries?

I wouldn't want to do Section 8 housing necessarily... because of the responsibility. I have five children and I’m on a fixed income. I get TANF and SSI for the dude in the helmet. I mean because I just got in to the TANF, my rent’s already went up to 442 so right now I’m trying to make sure I can afford everything as far as like diapers. Just being able to stay within a budget. And
being able to still have the things that I need… I just don’t think that it’s smart to jeopardize my housing just because I need a house.

Section 8 for me right now is not an option because I’m not working, I can’t work. I’ve got job offers but I can’t take them because of my ankle... Right now if I had to move I would want to move to another Denver Housing location where I don’t have to fear moving three or four, six months down the road. That would be my concern because I don’t want to move my daughter from this school to another school and then to another school. I just don’t want to do that. I want her to go to a school where she’s going to stay and make friends all the way through. Then if the time comes where I’m comfortable and I’ve got a job I’m comfortable that it’s going to be there, then I would consider getting into a more permanent structure like Section 8 or some kind of housing like that. When it’s not a concern that I’m not going to be able to make my rent or something.

Making a move to Section 8 is a lot of responsibility for residents as demonstrated by this quote:

I think that with the Section 8 voucher it’s a lot of responsibility to make sure people are informed; like how easy it would be to lose your housing. Versus staying in permanent housing because in permanent housing, the lights and heat and stuff like that is paid for. But in Section 8 you have to put the utility bill in your name. If the neighborhood requires you to pay for trash, you have to pay that. It’s a lot of responsibility.

In essence residents clearly outline that the utilities become the resident’s responsibility when they move into a Section 8 unit and therefore they should not make the choice to move with a Section 8 Voucher unless they are confident they will have and keep a job.

**I need more help than they give.** As stated above, many residents are aware that they could not afford the additional bills required in a Section 8 unit (electricity, gas, water, and trash) and still purchase other necessities (phone, hygiene and cleaning supplies, food, clothing, and personal items). One resident stated, “I need more help than I could get. More help than they give… I know that’s not feasible. They would not be
able to give me all the help that I need.” Another resident explained what she would need help paying for:

If you live in Section 8 Housing like I did… I had to pay for my electricity myself, my cable, my rent, my phone bill. All by myself. Now I understand doing it on a budget, from what the government gives you on TANF especially since TANF only gives you $364. How are you supposed to pay your rent… your utilities ‘cause depending on where you move depends on whether or not you have to pay for gas, water, and electricity plus trash. I mean you got be realistic about those things… And I am. I’m very realistic. That’s why I don’t want Section 8… ‘Cause I know damn good and well I can’t afford to pay for my electricity, my gas, my water, the trash. Plus the electric and rent and cable and phone and buy shampoo, conditioner, soap, deodorant, laundry soap, dish soap, toilet paper, you know. Dog food, cat food, cat litter.

Residents suggest a time period where the housing authority helps residents transition into paying the utility bill:

It’s probably Denver Housing’s responsibility to help. At least maybe say probably fifty percent… Probably say a year or two to get ‘em so in the case they get stuck okay just go talk to the manager to see what a good meeting could come out.

Residents acknowledge that while Section 8 sounds ideal, they know that accepting a voucher is not an economically sustainable option for them. The following two statements summarize residents who state they do not want Section 8 for financial reasons:

I don’t want Section 8. Uh, it’s just to me it’s much more problems. It’s just ain’t there a law so you have to pay your water and your trash and stuff like that. I’m on a fixed income. I’m just good right where I’m at. I don’t want to move into something and then I turn around and I can’t turn on my lights.

Because right now it’s like no possibility. If I could, that would be the only thing that I would need, more money.

Many residents would need another source of funds in order to afford Section 8.
I wouldn’t mind Section 8 if everything was guaranteed. Some residents would prefer Section 8 units, but fear they might lose their housing without the assistance of the housing authority. One resident said, “I wouldn’t mind Section 8 if everything else was guaranteed. If I can be guaranteed I won’t lose my electricity, my gas, the water, the roof over my head.” Another resident described the reality of making decisions regarding housing when one has a disability:

Right now I’m disabled. So I like the convenience of the location here. If I had to take the light rail, it’s right there. I can take the wheelchair and just go and get on the train. I know that if I get into some neighborhood and I can’t get around, that’s going to be a problem for me. So I’m not really interested in a Section 8. Another thing I wonder about a Section 8 is if you get in a Section 8 and something happens -you lose your job, you lose your house? Here in the Denver Housing, I lost my job obviously; they lowered my rent if I got on TANF. They didn’t say well you gotta move, you’re not working, you’re not holding up your end of the agreement. That’s what I’m worried about right now.

Residents like that public housing is guaranteed regardless of whether they lost their job:

Yeah but Section 8 you know is good but if you lose your job you’re out. I like Denver Housing because it’s on a fluctuating scale based on your income and if lose your job, they work with you. And I don’t know how Section 8 is when those kinds of things happen.

Residents know themselves and the economic climate well enough to know that Section 8 is risky for them unless payments for their housing and utilities are guaranteed.

A cushioning time. Some residents suggest the need for financial support from the housing authority to ease into education, employment and additional bill paying. A resident with a concrete sense of this need said:

A cushioning time… maybe a month or two months… for them to really get theirself together to pay maybe a portion of their utilities… get it in their mind and start really planning… there’s more responsibility like paying utilities, dealing with the landlord… that’s more of a push, ‘hey you need to really starting
thinking of getting out of public housing instead of just staying there… improve their job skills… getting educated.

Other residents thought that the housing authority could chip in to pay utilities for a couple of years when they said, “DHA could have some kind of maybe a half pay rate on [utilities] within a year or two.” Residents acknowledge that they may need a prompting from the housing authority to begin taking responsibility for old utility bills before they can accept a Section 8 voucher. This statement is summarized in the following quote:

I mean that would definitely be helpful if that’s what they’re going to do, give them at least…I don’t know, some people are highly irresponsible. Give them at least a three to six month period that they know they’re going to move to Section 8 housing so that way they can start getting all their stuff in order. The public service, if you haven’t paid and you have a thousand dollar public service bill, start paying that down before you move to Section 8 housing. Don’t say “I’ll take my voucher” then move and then they can’t turn on their lights. Then what? Just preparing them.

The cushioning time therefore includes the time period before accepting a Section 8 Voucher and after.

**Make Section 8 classes mandatory.** Many residents suggested the need to take classes that reiterate the key aspects of Section 8 housing that are different from public housing such as the need to pay heat/utilities. One resident suggested:

Maybe the Section 8 classes and make those mandatory and make them at least eight classes long so that they can reiterate and reiterate and reiterate what they’re trying to teach these people about moving in to Section 8 housing. That way they don’t lose their housing because you live in housing like this its permanent and it’s easy for a lot of people not to do anything.

Another resident suggested that these classes be housed in a supportive services department:

Maybe having a special program within the relocation program department that deals with getting people ready for Section 8... Just something like that so that people would understand to make sure they have the information that it’s a lot of
responsibility. I mean I would love to move into a Section 8 house, I’d move way out but it’s a lot of responsibility.

Other residents suggested finding someplace to use the Section 8 voucher where the utilities are included or other ways to focus on creative ways to pay utility bills and budget.

Either they should not qualify or the housing authority should help them pay those utility bills. Many residents highlight the importance of addressing common financial struggles for Section 8 residents by creating a monthly energy allowance, making energy efficient appliances mandatory, as well as referrals to the LEAP program. The following quote explains one resident’s genuine perspective on the Honeywell thermostat installed in her public housing unit:

A couple of years ago they put in these freakin’ energy saver heater things… I think they should be mandatory in all houses and apartments. I think there should be leeway to a certain amount of electricity… We’re given so much electricity allowance here each month. If you go over, you’re responsible for it… I think that’s the way it should be with Section 8… that would help the water, the electricity, the gas is all included in my rent. Now I don’t expect that to be the same way with Section 8, ‘cause it’s not feasible, but I do think to a certain degree it should be included in the Section 8. Not all of it, but I’d say Section 8 households should be responsible for 35 to 50% but no more than 50%... then I wouldn’t lose it because I couldn’t keep up with the bills.

Another resident explained their perspective that the housing authority could cover utility bills of residents is temporarily moved into a Section 8 unit while their public housing unit is redeveloped. The following quote illustrates this perspective:

Since Denver Housing is like moving us, or whoever gets Section 8, I think Housing should be responsible for utilities while we stay there, while this is done... it should be covered... I think the length of the time, well, good thing this is done, now if the person wants to go ahead and stay there, in Section 8, then I guess it’s their responsibility. But while this is going on, I guess Housing should take care of it.
Some residents believe that the housing authority ought to take on more responsibility for residents who struggle to pay their utility bills.

Another triangle with three parties involved – the resident, the landlord and DHA. Residents describe the responsibilities of the landlords (winterize the property), housing authority (help with services) and residents (know what they can afford). Section 8 residents need referrals to social workers and organizations that can support them if they lose their job suddenly. One study participant suggested that if residents take responsibility they can work to conserve energy:

I think it’s the resident’s job to save energy costs. Don’t leave things on all the time. Unplug things if you’re not using it. It’s just constantly using power while you’re not using it. Like your phone chargers, unplug it.

Another South Lincoln resident suggested the housing authority working with the resident to set expectations regarding utility usage, which includes the following perspective:

I think they should work together. I think they should set a limit say you exceed this many kilowatt-hours you pay the difference.

If the landlord, the resident and the housing authority worked together on taking responsibility for Section 8 utility bills, then the burden of Section 8 financial hardship could be shared.

Section 8 moving and social support. When asked about the support they would need to move with a Section 8 voucher or to a new public housing community residents brought up the themes in Table 32.
Table 32. Resulting themes from the Section 8 moving and social support category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ll have to adjust</td>
<td>Moving to a Section 8 unit would require starting over in terms of meeting neighbors, blending in to the community, and participating in neighborhood organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Financial help</td>
<td>Most residents recognize the need for help financially to move into a Section 8 unit, which may come in the form of a loan or help with a deposit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decide who’s going where and doing what</td>
<td>Provide focal points for relocations and means for residents to talk with neighbors both before and after moves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take into consideration changes in commute</td>
<td>Most residents indicated the need to have Section 8 units near transportation hubs that will enable convenient access to work, school, and recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They should have places for meeting people</td>
<td>Residents who move with Section 8 Vouchers may lose the day-to-day social supports they have such as having their children walk home with a neighbor and be cared for them until they get home. Therefore some residents suggest the need for organizing ways to meet new support people.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of the five themes is described in-depth below.

**I’ll have to adjust.** Moving to a Section 8 unit would require starting over in terms of meeting neighbors, blending in to the community, and participating in neighborhood organizations. They state that they will have to adjust, particularly in regards to the social aspects of the neighborhood. One resident said, “you have to blend into the community, you can’t go in with the attitude you might carry around here.” Other residents said they would either have to start all over or stay involved with the South Lincoln neighborhood. Residents describe the need to reach out, knock on neighbors’ doors and ask for assistance.
Financial help. Most residents recognize the need for help financially to move into a Section 8 unit, which may come in the form of a loan, LEAP assistance to pay their utility bill, or help with a deposit. This theme was discussed at length in the previous section.

Decide who’s going where and doing what. Residents suggested that the housing authority provide focal points for relocations and means for residents to talk with neighbors both before and after moves. The following quote elaborates on this theme:

Maybe make one of the public housing sites like a focal point for relocation, make it like you can go here or you can go here and people can talk back and forth with their neighbors and just decide who’s going where and doing what.

Other residents suggest that residents leave their phone number with those in the neighborhood that they want to stay in touch with; “you can always leave a number.

Take into consideration changes in commute. Most residents indicated the need to have Section 8 units near transportation hubs that will enable convenient access to work, school, and recreation. One resident who sometimes works and enjoys utilizing recreation facilities said:

Well if they have a job or work that they’re doing, they have to take in to consideration how that changes their commute. If they have a car in terms of driving or if they’re taking public transportation, that could effect the rates. For example, in my case if I’m just using my bicycle and public transportation, another neighborhood might not be as convenient in terms of getting to various types of work that I might be able to line up… what’s available in terms of Parks and Rec facilities.

Therefore transportation options and commuting to an unknown future job are important to some residents.

They should have places for meeting people. Residents who move with Section 8 Vouchers may lose the day-to-day social supports they have such as having
their children walk home with a neighbor and be cared for them until they get home. Therefore some residents suggest the need for organizing ways to meet new support people “I think they should have places…meetings for people that are in group one group two. People like that.” Residents state that if they expect to need the support of the community, then they should stay involved in neighborhood organizations. Therefore housing authorities can help residents meet others if they want to improve the sustainability of resident moves.

**Ideal neighborhood.** Residents’ defined their ideal neighborhoods according to the themes presented in Table 33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Convenient</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods allow residents to walk out of their home and access needed resources within three to five blocks or a two-minute walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have access to grocery stores with good deals, fruit stands, and a shopping center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have good school performance with active Parent Teacher Associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for kids</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have programs for children such as supplemental education (tutors and after school programming) and affordable childcare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have churches, clinics, libraries, mentoring, and opportunities to make friendships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations and services</td>
<td>Adequate recreation facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duplexes</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have duplexes or single-family homes with adequate interior space and your own roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous relationships with neighbors</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have quiet and friendly people who know each other and where adults are not afraid to redirect kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low crime rate, drugs and gangs</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have low crime rates and are well lit and have no dark corners or alleys.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A yard</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have a space of your own outside where you can grow vegetables, plants or flowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have or have good connections to fast food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well designed, built and up kept</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods are well designed (transit, bike lanes, sidewalks) that are built for low maintenance, and maintained (clean, in good repair).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to elaborate on what public residents hope for in a neighborhood, each of these themes is further described here.

**Convenient.** Over half of the residents interviews stated that ideal neighborhoods allow residents to walk out of their home and access needed resources within three to five blocks or a two minute walk. Since the South Lincoln neighborhood is located next to an existing light rail stops residents describe their current neighborhood as ideal in terms of convenience. One resident said, “I like living here. It’s convenient. You got stores, you got the light rail, got downtown.” Residents describe the need for good transportation connections and a good school within walking distance.

**Stores.** Ideal neighborhoods have access to grocery stores with good deals, fruit stands, and a shopping center. Residents vary in their preferences on specific stores, but they frequently mention local grocery stores like King Soopers and Albertsons, as well as department stores like Kmart and Walmart. Residents express a preference for stores they
can either walk to or access from the light rail. One residents when asked what store she wants access to said, “mostly King Soopers or Albertsons. They have better deals than Safeway does.”

**School.** Ideal neighborhoods have good school performance with active Parent Teacher Associations. When thinking about where they would like to live parents frequently said, “It’s not only my decision… I would find whatever would be the best school.”

**Programs for kids.** Ideal neighborhoods have programs for children such as supplemental education (tutors and after school programming) and affordable childcare. Many residents mentioned that they rely on after school programs to help their children keep up and catch up in school. Study participants frequently mentioned how crowded the Bridge Project is because the organization meets the need for tutoring and homework help, as well as setting a vision to graduate and attend college or trade school.

**Community Center Organizations and services.** Ideal neighborhoods have churches, clinics, libraries, mentoring, and opportunities to make friendships. Ideal neighborhoods have a good resident council or neighborhood organization that meets to keep residents informed and discussing problems with city officials and public servants. One resident described in-depth what their ideal community would be like:

School nearby… church… clinic… library… a clean park where the kids can go and play and hang out… a community center… programs for kids and for the adults and for the elderly… maybe program that can bridge elderly and kids together… having a store… fruit stands outside… lower class size schools… supplemental educations… tutors to improve the test skills… we have a lot of immigrants and if English is not their first language… takes more time for them to master certain subjects… transportation connections in plain English… childcare… a place for [seniors] to make friendships… a little get together place…
Where they don’t have to deal with kids running by them almost running them down… duplexes work good… especially if you’ve got kids they like to form friendships. Single homes really stay to themselves… courteous relationships… not afraid to speak to the neighbor… adult walks by and can’t even tell them, ‘hey you guys need to stop doing that… a safe place to play… run… maybe a little mentoring… school help program that’s not so small because they have one there it’s called the Bridge Project and it’s really crowded.

In essence residents want neighborhoods that have healthy civic systems within the community, which build relationships at the individual level and come together to meet needs and solve problems at the community level.

**Adequate recreation facilities.** Ideal neighborhoods have a clean park with a playground and a pool. One resident said their ideal neighborhood would have, “adequate recreation facilities… bike lanes and of course adequate roads… And playgrounds.”

Many residents complained about how children cannot play in the South Lincoln playgrounds because they are under construction. The inaccessible playgrounds lead to children being destructive in the neighborhood:

> They tore three of them out and they blocked this one off. Kids have absolutely nowhere to play. Then they get mad because they’re stealing stuff and you know they’re running through the grass, tearing up trees, there’s nothing for them to do. In Denver Housing here everyone has kids. Well I’d probably say 90%.

Residents distinguish between recreation facilities for adults and those that are designed for children in the following quote:

> I think a rec center is good and if it’s child oriented but they need a rec center for adults. Somewhere where adults can go and participate, even in with the kids you know. But it’s all based on kids really. They have a gym here if you want to get a membership but just adults getting together if even going for a fishing trip or a hiking trip or just organizations that can put that kind of stuff together. I think that would be good for any community.

Expectations for recreation facilities can be quite specific for some residents including the following three quotes:
A park, a swimming pool… activities, a center for the kids to keep them out of trouble. A movie thing where they could go watch movies. But not too expensive.

Close to the park I would like it. I like if they could go there to ride their bike in summer.

You know what I would really like if there would be a little skating rink or something. Or even just a roller skate one just for kids you know? I took my daughter one time for the first time when she was two years old. She was actually on them skates. I was like wow! I can’t afford to go way out there and then my car is breaking down right now. My engine light is on and I’ve got a wire hanging down. I can’t go nowhere.

Resident hopes for recreation facilities include recreation centers, senior centers, pools, playgrounds, places to watch movies, and skating facilities.

**Duplexes or single-family homes.** Ideal neighborhoods have duplexes or single-family homes with adequate interior space, at the ground level, an individual front and back door, and your own roof. This theme will not be explained in-depth because many residents provided reasoning for their housing preferences in the readiness for new urbanism category of research question one.

**Courteous relationships with neighbors.** Ideal neighborhoods have quiet and friendly people who know each other and where adults are not afraid to redirect kids. One resident described their ideal relationships with neighbors:

I think where everybody gets along with everybody. If I need something I’d go ask my neighbor, but that’s only if I was that kind of person. I think neighbors help living off each other. You know help each other out, watching out.

Many residents described their surprise when other residents say hello or are friendly in their current neighborhood, but most state they would like to live in a neighborhood where people are friendly.
**Low crime rate, drugs, and gangs.** Ideal neighborhoods have low crime rates and are well lit and have no dark corners or alleys. One parent said that they would like a low crime neighborhood for their family to live in so that they do not have to worry:

> The first one that I’m worried about is safety. Safety of the kids. Cause that’s the first thing I think about when something bad happens in the neighborhood. Cause there’s a lot of kids all over. Whenever something happens… A store… robbery or something. And there’s a lot of police around.

Another resident described the kind of quiet and safe neighborhood she hopes for in the future:

> I’d like to live somewhere peaceful quiet, somewhere my daughters can play you know feel safe outside just that not having to worry about anything. Here I don’t let them go outside because like there’s a lot of kids that are bad around here and people are shooting and I would like to live somewhere where it’s calm. Somewhere where I know I’ll be safe outside. I won’t be looking around and have to worry about them and somewhere well we feel protection.

A neighborhood with a low crime rate would enable parents to allow their children to play outside without worrying about their safety.

**A yard.** Ideal neighborhoods have a space of your own outside where your children and pets can play. The following quote explains this desire:

> They want yards for the kids... Fenced in yards where kids can play. If they want to get a pet they got a place for their pets to run around. That’s the reason why they prefer houses. Here it’s like you don’t got no place where you can let your dog run around you know. You have dogs in a common area or people just let their dogs run loose or whatever. Cats and that are all running all over the place... I think they should have like a dog run.

Ideal neighborhoods also space where you can grow vegetables, plants or flowers.

The next two quotes describe resident desires to garden at home:

> A yard… I could till it. A small little area and grow some tomatoes… a couple of plants… a head of lettuce or two… okra maybe… just a little space of your own… maybe a little front yard where I could put some roses and some flowers.
I’d love to have my own yard... Yeah. Front yard, backyard, something I can maintain. I’ve got a front yard back yard here, but ever since I moved in they’re talking about moving everybody out. I’d like to plant flowers in here I think it would look nice but I’d get it all done and they’d say ok it’s time for you to move.

Residents also describe that they expect having their own yard may decrease the theft of their belongings:

I like a yard. I have chairs, but I can’t put outside because when I wake up they always steal the chair. They put on top but I say don’t take this bike outside and it was my new bike. It’s good to have a yard.

Overall residents describe the desire to have a yard where they can recreate, garden, and store belongings that they use outside.

**Fast food.** Residents also describe ideal neighborhoods have or have good connections to fast food. Examples of fast food requests include McDonald’s, Burger King, Carl’s Junior and Starbucks. One resident suggested, “A hamburger stand or something cheap. Cheap like you don’t have to spend no 10 dollars a plate.” Residents mention fast food as an option to eat out that is affordable with their incomes.

**Well designed, built and up kept.** Ideal neighborhoods are well designed (transit, bike lanes, sidewalks) that are built for low maintenance, and maintained (clean, in good repair). Residents mention the nearby redeveloped North Lincoln development as an example of a what appears to be a well-designed and maintained public housing community from the outside:

North Lincoln is new. They look really nice. They look like they’re well maintained. And I know that they’ve got some parking within the block itself. I don’t know if everybody’s got a spot or not.

Other residents describe their hopes that the inside of the housing units are easy to maintain:
Yeah I mean it’s easy to maintain. It’s hardwood floors. There’s no carpet so I’m not going to stain the carpet.

Residents expect that the ideal future housing units will be well designed and maintained.

_Choosing ideal neighborhoods._ When interviewers presented residents with data demonstrating the residents often do not choose opportunity neighborhoods with Section 8 vouchers, they provide three suggestions to help residents choose ideal neighborhoods as described in Table 34.

Table 34. Resulting themes from the Choosing Opportunity Neighborhoods category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Walk around</td>
<td>Many residents suggested having residents go on tours of schools and neighborhoods to identify whether the area is clean, safe, friendly, well-resourced, and organized relationally.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put the information out there</td>
<td>Residents requested concrete tools to get information to residents such as more accessible meeting times, packets explaining types of neighborhoods, and check lists they can take with them as they explore neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit them down and talk</td>
<td>Many residents believe they would choose neighborhoods that provide more opportunities if somebody sat down to ask them what they need, scouted out neighborhoods, and provided information that could provide a greater chance for their family to succeed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these themes is described below.

_Walk around._ Many residents suggested having residents go on tours of schools and neighborhoods to identify whether the area is clean, safe, friendly, well-resourced, and organized relationally. “Walk the neighborhood…,” one resident said, “that’s what I
did when I first got here. I just walked around.” Residents expect that if they walk around the neighborhood they will get a sense of the neighborhood:

resources at that time and new resources whatever can help me at that time… how well kept… do people get along, do they help one another rake or if an elderly person needs help.

They also mention that they would tour the neighborhood schools to “see how the teachers are acting… make sure the teachers know what they’re teaching… make sure it’s clean and that the school is safe, playground is safe. I want to know if there’s any pedophiles in the neighborhood.” Residents described previous experiences that helped them decide that their housing unit would be ideal. One resident described why she chose the particular South Lincoln unit that she chose. She repeated what she said to herself as she was agreeing to accept her current unit:

I’m not going to really have no problems. Cause I know my office is right there. And I’m not gonna be doing anything to get myself in trouble or let anybody in here get me in trouble. So it’s basically [being next to] the playground, the office, [I think I’ll be fine]. I don’t know what it is, this was the quietest part.

When residents walk around the neighborhood they can get a sense of the neighborhood culture and proximity to the resources they will need.

**Put the information out there.** Residents requested concrete tools to get information to residents such as more accessible meeting times, packets explaining types of neighborhoods, and check lists they can take with them as they explore neighborhoods. “Give somebody a checklist so they can take it with them,” one resident stated. Another resident stated, “just put the information out there… a packet telling them what type of neighborhood,” they are considering moving to. Another resident said, “They might not know what they are getting themselves into. And then they’re not gonna be successful
with their home because the area has a problem.” As a result residents request concrete data on the neighborhood such as crime statistics:

The CIA ratings. I mean how good it is, how bad it is. I don’t want to move nowhere where there’s trouble... I don’t want to move next to a drunk or a drop doping or a dope dealer and stuff like that you know... I wouldn’t want that cause it’s a lot of trouble.

Residents may require support from a supportive services staff regarding resources and problems that may come with the housing unit they select.

**Sit them down and talk.** Many residents believe they would choose neighborhoods that provide more opportunities if somebody sat down to ask them what they need, scouted out neighborhoods, and provided information that could provide a greater chance for their family to succeed. Many residents grab housing that is cheaper or choose areas that their friends and family have scouted for them, which results in choosing bad areas. One resident explains why residents do not choose opportunity neighborhoods:

It is true. They wanna first like move into neighborhoods that are just like ours. They’re probably scared to move into an Opportunity Neighborhood. But I guess if people talk to them and explain about these neighborhoods, the Opportunity, you know, like this is good for you and stuff. You know, they explain to them, “Well this is a better neighborhood.” I think just with a little talk, they would get the Opportunity Neighborhoods first.

Another resident stated:

You could sit them down and go OK, these are the up-and-coming neighborhoods… get some information about what type of neighborhood, what type of schools they need for their children.. know what you gotta do… sit down and talk like how we’re talking right now.

Residents explained that most residents do not think about neighborhoods in terms of opportunities, which the following quote elaborates on:
I think for people to look for stuff like that, they have to be taught. Cause usually when - I see when people are moving, they’re just looking for a space you know. Enough for their kids, but they’re not asking the right questions or they’re not um…They’re not interested in getting to know their community.

As a result residents do express an openness to dialogue about choosing the best neighborhood for their family.

**Resident Navigator.** When introduced to the concept of a resident navigator South Lincoln residents identified the five themes in Table 35.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Meet once a month , every other month, or every three months unless there’s problems or issues with the family and then once a month</td>
<td>A lot of residents stated that they would utilize regular support from a resident navigator and that they would utilize the opportunity to call them when something arises in between those regular meetings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supports</td>
<td>Many residents identified that a resident navigator could provide resources like food and bus tokens.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having someone give me feedback would make me feel better about making choices</td>
<td>A resident navigator could help residents think through options and as a result improve their judgment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having that counselor always doing a check up</td>
<td>A resident navigator could help provide statistics for the community such as drug, violent and sex crimes in the community, so that a resident is aware of those dangers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There’ so much I could be doing, but I don’t know how.</td>
<td>A lot of residents might have a lot of questions and a lack of direction, but don’t want to admit it and therefore a resident navigator could help them see what needs to happen.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these themes is described below.
I’m all for sitting down… Meet every other month or every three months unless there’s problems or issues with the family and then once a month. A lot of residents stated that they would utilize regular support from a resident navigator and that they would utilize the opportunity to call them when something arises in between those regular meetings. Most public housing households are families with day-to-day responsibilities to think about and therefore they could use support with planning and executing their move (identifying opportunity areas for the family, visiting options, find a place, getting boxes, packing tape, and newspapers, packing, and someone to help children with homework during the transition). Some residents however indicated that they prefer to be more independent, “I would not want to have to answer to anybody,” said one resident.

Supports. Many residents identified that a resident navigator could provide information (referrals for mental health support, connections to jobs, childcare openings and applications), resources (food, bus tokens), and supports (groups to address depression, filling out maintenance requests). A resident navigator could provide information:

Because some people, they don’t understand someone to physically explain it to them. Sometimes they get a paper, “ok it says this” or “that” and you explain it to them some more. They just don’t understand all the details of what you are saying on all the papers. A lot of people get it better verbally.

Many residents expressed concerns regarding the time it takes to get support. The following quote explains this experience:

Maybe see what help or what helps with something. I guess it would be to make sure they get the help and won’t have to wait so long because I know there’s a lot of people that wait and wait to get the help and all that.
A resident navigator therefore could provide supports that residents need, but are unable to currently access efficiently.

_Having someone give me feedback would make me feel better about making choices._ A resident navigator could specifically help residents think through options and as a result improve their judgment. One resident explained:

That would be great to have somebody like that. I need somebody to give me a little feedback on what decisions and what options I could have… it would make me feel better making choices… I would have better judgment on some options with giving me which choices I can make better.

Many residents face dilemmas that they could more confident face if they had someone to help them think their options through.

_Having that counselor always doing a check up._ A resident navigator could help provide statistics for the community such as drug, violent and sex crimes in the community, so that a resident is aware of those dangers. Residents expect that they will face problems where they could use support. For example, one resident expects that, “people who have been here for generations and say they move to Section 8 housing and they can’t afford their light bill. They’re kicked out the program.” And, as another resident explained how having someone to check on them would be helpful:

That’ll be good because usually when you don’t see somebody or talk to them you just give up there’s no help. It’s so hard for people to go get some information and help. Most of us don’t understand really what help there is and what we can get. I think it be good.

As new problems arise residents expect that knowing someone will reach out to them or answer the phone if they call for support gives them more confidence to make positive change in their lives.
There’s so much I could be doing, but I don’t know how. A lot of residents might have a lot of questions and a lack of direction, but don’t want to admit it and therefore a resident navigator could help them see what needs to happen. A community leader explained:

I think a lot of people like you were saying don’t have any direction… A lot of people don’t want to admit it… Things change… you might have a question. Well who’s even out there to accept this voucher? … Maybe they don’t know that you have to have so many fire alarms or guardrails or a screen… and they had their hearts set on a house that doesn’t have that. That’s gonna be rejected. A navigator would be able to say, ‘if you’re looking for Section 8, here’s what you know has to happen’.

Another resident described the experience of not knowing where to turn for support:

I’m at home and I think, wow, there’s so much things I could be doing but I’m… I don’t know how to go about getting out of… I mean getting to certain resources or getting any help ‘cause I know it’s out there, but I’m like how do I contact these people?

Less residents stated that they have confidence about navigating their options and would prefer to contact be the one reaching out.

Choice today and problems to solve. After presenting participants in the study with the various outcomes of HOPE VI studies, interviewers asked all residents what housing location choice they would make today and what problems they anticipate that they would need to solve. When asked about the specific problems residents might need to address with different housing choices some residents replied that, “wherever you go there’s going to be something.” The four themes in Table 36 resulted from the interviews.
Table 36. Resulting themes from the Choice Today and Problems to Solve category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If you’re gonna move, you want to move up</td>
<td>Residents acknowledge that they could be moved to a location that is the same or worse, but they prefer to move to a better housing unit and neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any time you have construction there’s safety</td>
<td>If residents choose to stay in the neighborhood through the redevelopment they will have to deal with road closures, new people coming in to work, and possible dust and asbestos exposure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to get Section 8 housing, but I</td>
<td>Many residents have their hearts set on Section 8, but they do not have jobs, degrees, or the supports necessary to get there.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean look at reality…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Lincoln</td>
<td>Residents identify the neighboring public housing that is already redeveloped as an opportunity with a computer lab and programming for the children.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Starting over and getting along with</td>
<td>Residents acknowledge that they may not be accepted by their new neighborhood, as some residents have lived there a long time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>neighbors</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these common themes is described below.

**If you’re gonna move, you want to move up.** Residents acknowledge that they could be moved to a location that is the same or worse, but they prefer to move to a better housing unit and neighborhood. One resident stated this fact bluntly:

If you’re gonna move, you want to move up. You don’t want to just make a lateral move. You don’t want to move somewhere that could be worse… And then starting over, it’s getting accepted by the new neighborhood. I think it’s harder to slip into somewhere that a lot of those people have been living there a long time. I think you’d be looked at as, oh, here comes those Lincoln Park people. It’s just a negative label put on you right away. We’re this group and you’re Lincoln Park and all that shit. It’s kinda like a gang-involved thing.

Another resident expressed concern about having to move multiple times given that living in South Lincoln has been her most stable housing:
For me, I don’t want to have to move somewhere and then move back. I’ve lived here four years. This is the longest I’ve lived anywhere. I’m not real thrilled about moving out of where I’m at now unless it’s a better place and I’m definitely not thrilled about having to move again after that.

Residents therefore want to make the best possible move when it is time for them to relocate without having to make a second move.

**Any time you have construction there’s safety issues.** If residents choose to stay in the neighborhood through the redevelopment they will have to deal with noise, road closures, new people coming in to work, and possible dust and asbestos exposure.

One resident identified most of these safety concerns:

Well any time you have construction there’s safety issues. Especially when there is children around… Shit requires fences and they watch it a lot more closely than when I was going up. I remember how we got into buildings, and its lucky that we never seriously hurt ourselves… but I still think it’s dangerous for kids… the dust… asbestos… the exposure to that. You got road closure… people coming in for work, so you have a lot of new people in the neighborhood… looking for parking.

Another resident identified potential problems with construction noise:

The noise I think… Well, it’s pretty much not too bad now with what’s going on across the way, but I think it’s going to be louder when they knock everything down.

Regardless of the safety risks many residents identified that they would like to stay in the neighborhood through the redevelopment and move directly into a new unit in the neighborhood as demonstrated by the following quote:

Probably to stay here… Stay here until one’s done… Probably just the noise and the construction. Hopefully they don’t cut the wrong lines and have power outages.
The stability, familiarity and opportunity presented in the South Lincoln redevelopment has resulted in many residents hoping to remain in the neighborhood through the phased redevelopment.

*I would like to get Section 8 housing, but I mean look at reality.* Some residents describe affordable housing options within the context of all resources available to them including rent, utility and food assistance. Many residents have their hearts set on Section 8, but they do not have jobs, degrees, or the supports necessary to get there. Other residents express the desire to buy a house, but they are unsure of their health, employment and the economy, which results in fear regarding making these choices. The following three residents described this experience:

I would like to get Section 8 housing, but I mean look at reality… I don’t have a job… I don’t have any type of degree… so it’s like I need the public housing support but sometimes Section 8 is a lot better than state of the neighborhood… utilities would be the main thing… the water bill… if I had support with a daycare I definitely could get a job.

I prefer a house, but I can’t, like I said, I can’t handle it right now.

My first choice would be Section 8 home. That would be great, but if that didn’t work out I would like to move to North Lincoln… I still have my heart set on Section 8.

Despite the facts regarding economic hardship for many HOPE VI movers to Section 8 many residents are still hoping for Section 8. The presentation of data regarding resident financial hardship outcomes did cause some residents to cautiously hope for a Section 8 Voucher.

*North Lincoln.* Residents identify the neighboring public housing that is already redeveloped as an opportunity because it is familiar and has a computer lab and
programming for the children. The following three quotes represent residents’ thinking about North Lincoln:

I would take North Lincoln. I like that area because they have the computer lab in there. They have the area for the kids.

I would take North Lincoln. They are nice apartments from outside. I’ve seen some from inside and they are really nice apartments. Of course, I’d like an apartment over there, but our apartments are gonna be newer, you know, but for the moving, while I wait, it would be nice to be in North Lincoln if they have two bedrooms.

The first option would be like to live in North Lincoln for a while, if there’s a two bedroom. And my second choice would be like, if North Lincoln doesn’t accept me, it would be to another South Lincoln until everything’s done.

Several residents stated that they would choose to stay in either North or South Lincoln because the housing is new, the neighborhood is familiar, and the services they need for themselves and their children are present.

**Starting over and getting along with neighbors.** Residents acknowledge that they may not be accepted by their new neighborhood, as some residents have lived there a long time. Residents describe the need to get along with neighbors regardless of where they move. One resident stated:

And then starting over, it’s getting accepted by the new neighborhood. I think it’s harder to slip into somewhere that a lot of those people have been living there a long time. I think you’d be looked at as, oh, here comes those Lincoln Park people. It’s just a negative label put on you right away.

Regardless of where residents choose to move they will have to start over in a new housing unit and get to know new neighbors. As residents consider their new start they provided some final words of advice to the housing authority staff.

**Suggestions for South Lincoln transition and/or relocation plan.** After discussing previous HOPE VI evaluations participants in the study discussed four
common themes they would suggest to the Denver Housing Authority regarding the
South Lincoln development’s transition and/or relocation plan. The themes are defined in
Table 37.

Table 37. Resulting themes from the Denver Housing Authority Transition and/or
Relocation Supports category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Look at every person as a human being and see what they need</td>
<td>Residents describe the desire to have someone help them meet personal needs such as access to dental work or acknowledging that a felony charge may have been a misunderstanding, which might improve their self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A navigator</td>
<td>Some residents describe the need for a navigator who can help them make decisions and find the housing they are hoping for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expense of moving</td>
<td>Residents describe the need for financial assistance to change utilities and hire a mover with a truck.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody you could turn to and get an answer</td>
<td>Residents have questions about how the move will impact their daily lives, such as how they will do their laundry, but they are told that no one knows the answer or that they should attend a meeting to find out. As a result, they would like to have someone available who can answer these questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security… Somebody walk around once in a while.</td>
<td>Residents describe the need for management to walk around the neighborhood to see the fighting and littering so that they do not need to always be reporting issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Each of these themes is described with residents’ quotes.

**Look at every person as a human being and see what they need.**

Residents describe the need for the housing authority to conduct outreach to the residents to let them know the eligibility criteria and supportive services available. Most residents expressed the desire to choose where they move to in order to live somewhere they are familiar and comfortable with. Residents describe the desire to have someone help them
meet personal needs such as access to dental work or acknowledging that a felony charge may have been a misunderstanding, which might improve their self-esteem. For example, one resident stated:

Look at every person as a human being and see what they need… my teeth are rotten and there’s a lot of people in this neighborhood in my community that have the same teeth as me. Better or worse, but I think it would be a good self-esteem thing and they would be able to go look for a job. I’ve been turned down on jobs because of my teeth. I was a lunchroom manager for a few years. I could do customer service, I could do administrative assistant, but they’re not going to hire me because of my teeth.

Residents describe the need for the following specific supports, which vary by household:

- Give me the opportunity to pick housing location and type,
- A day care program that is designated for public housing residents,
- Budgeting support,
- Adults who genuinely care about their children and can help tutor them in certain subjects,
- Support to go back to school,
- Housing Authorities could organize activities to help residents meet each other and establish playmates for their children,
- Dealing with the consequences of a felony.

For example, one resident said,

My husband… has a felony… it was a misunderstanding… we never even lived in public housing before the incident… he got arrested… and that’s what brought us down to this point of me and my kids living separated from him… the housing manager… said… if he’s been convicted of a felony he can’t live in with you guys… all of the sudden this happens and we get thrown in the system… I can’t support my kids on my own… I’m used to having help, so they said there’s public housing available… so that’s how we got to here… I know this couple that lived close to us… they’ve had domestic violence… she reported to the police, but he still lived in the apartment with her… it was a little bit unfair to the rest of us because I said how can he live there and he’s broken her windows multiple
times… he’s receiving unemployment benefits and they slide by… we never did anything, but you know we have to abide by the rules… when it’s violence you don’t know if the guy will snap one day and break your window for helping the person out.

As a result of a business related misunderstanding this resident is now living in public housing without her husband whom she relies on to care for her family. She and many other residents interviewed express the desire to be treated by the housing authority with personalized respectful support that looks at their whole situation and helps them find the best available housing in a neighborhood that will provide opportunities for their family to succeed.

Another example given by a resident focused on both childcare for younger children and respectful support for older children as follows:

It’ll be nice… for the housing development to have day care for ages up to four… ‘cause it’s really hard to get a job if you have really young kids within one to four because they don’t have Headstart… budgeting… a mentoring adult that could just call around and ask how the kids are doing in school… do you guys need help with certain subjects… I guess one subject became really difficult for him so his self-esteem just went totally down and he said I can’t make it so he dropped out of school… somebody that genuinely cares about students success… nobody ever asks them… why you guys hanging around here? Why aren’t you guys in school? There’s no one, even the school liaison is like… truancy police… like in SWAT gear.

Essentially, residents are asking for someone to help them navigate the various systems in their lives so that they can overcome today’s struggles that have the power to define their futures if interventions do not happen at key moments in their lives.

A navigator. Some residents describe the need for a navigator who can help them make decisions and find the housing they are hoping for (whether that included a unit with a bigger closet or a Section 8 unit). Two residents described the need for someone to help their household make decisions:
maybe a navigator… I think I’ve pretty much opened my eyes to what’s going on, what their plans are, and what type of information they need to better the neighborhood.

that we can have somebody like you come and help us make that decision… I am still deciding what is good for my son.

Other residents express openness to work with a resident navigator due to their current circumstances, such as this gentleman:

I talked to the manager here… he said I should go over here and talk to this lady. He said she’ll get you steered in the right direction. And she’ll help you get…I’ve had job offers and TANF requires that I go look for a job, so I go look for a job offers. But then they see this boot and say we can’t hire you. That’s what I told him. I want to go meet with this lady over here and find out what they have to offer. I just don’t think this is the right time. Maybe I’m wrong, I don’t know.

Many residents are open to talking with a resident navigator who can help them meeting their goals during the transition and/or relocation.

The expense of moving. Residents describe the need for financial assistance to change utilities and hire a mover with a truck. Some residents recognize that they are unsure whether or not they will be able to move themselves because their health and/or their social support varies, as evidenced by the following two quotes:

Getting the actual manpower to move. Hopefully I’ll be healthy. If I’m healthy I can move myself. If I’m not healthy then I’m going to need help. That’s going to be an issue.

My son wouldn’t be able to help me with the move. He’s tired because of his back and his legs. My brother in laws very sick. Too. …it would have to be somebody to help me.

The expense of moving may be unpredictable or higher for some households because they may need to hire a full service mover.

There are so many questions… and nobody has answers…Somebody you could turn to and get an answer. Residents have questions about how the
move will impact their daily lives, such as how they will do their laundry, but they are
told that no one knows the answer or that they should attend a meeting to find out. As a
result they would like to have someone available who can answer these questions.
Residents describe the desire to have a clear time frame regarding when they will likely
need to move. The following quote summarizes this theme:

There is so many questions and nobody has answers. Are there gonna be available
plugs for washers and dryers. Are there gonna be washers and dryers? … How far
are we gonna have to go to do our laundry? … You could call the office and ask
‘em, but they’re gonna tell you, try to attend a meeting. I don’t know, we don’t
know. So if you had somebody that you could turn to and get an answer that
would be excellent. Because going through the system, and calling up, and getting
put on hold for 45 minutes and then you have the wrong part of they give you
another number. It’s just so frustrating. It makes you want to scream. If you have
somebody that you could have access to that’d be excellent… and some come of
time frame, that would be nice.

Providing a point person to answer residents’ common is one clear request of the
housing authority by the residents. Residents’ ability to prepare for and become ready for
the change requires answers to simple questions like washer and dryer hookups or
facilities.

**Security… Somebody walk around once in a while.** Residents describe the
need for management to walk around the neighborhood to see the fighting and littering so
that they do not need to always be reporting issues. The following two quotes highlight
the experience of residents that leads them to ask for security:

Security… Somebody walk around once in a while. See what’s up… Cause every
so often one side getting the corner, the other one running out into the street.
Fighting, throwing stuff… Come see what’s happening. We don’t have to be all
the time, ‘Hey they fighting over here’.

Yeah. Cause the security would be passing every so often so the residents would
all be more like “Oh we shouldn’t do this or, you know.
Another resident elaborated on what they hoped the security people might look for and address:

Cause then they could watch, they could watch every day. Have somebody in the office watching the tapes and see people who have too much traffic. The people that have…That way they can weed out all the drug dealers out and all the crime and all that out of here. It’s really - It’s bad when you’re standing there with your kids watching a kid play basketball and you see a drug deal right in front of your face. And then they’re nonchalant about it like “What did I just do?” You know, they looking around. They know they did bad. There’s kids standing right there. Don’t you have any shame? Keep your business to yourself. You don’t want me saying nothing about don’t let me see it And especially for the girls that move in here and they’re single. And they’re - the kids or dudes or whatever. The drug dealers that hand around here, they prey on them girls. They do. They prey on them. They see they’re single. They’re weak. They could just use them you know.

Residents request for security will improve the safety of the neighborhood and help establish a different culture regarding what behaviors will not be tolerated in the neighborhood. The next chapter will synthesize the quantitative results from chapter five and the qualitative results from chapter six.

Conclusion

The qualitative results elaborate on the quantitative findings of research questions one and two. This study assumes that community engagement through community organizing and community development is a viable strategy for changing the people and place of neighborhoods. The qualitative results confirm social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, possessing a transition and/or relocation plan, identifying neighborhood problems, and acting as activists all help prepare residents for neighborhood level change. Research question three adds the story of different levels of resident readiness that are linked to their complicated lives that need individual interventions. Residents have ideas about and can articulate the types of support they want from the housing authority and
other mediating organizations that are trying to engage them. Organizations like Project WISE that focus on both personal goals and advocacy in their community may provide an ideal fit for residents articulated needs (Project WISE, 2006). Interviews elaborate reasons why residents get involved in neighborhood organizations and help professionals understand the complexity of families needs as we redevelop their neighborhoods.
Chapter Seven: Discussion

“If you are going to move you want to move up” (South Lincoln resident, 2011).

Chapter seven provides a synthesis and discussion of the study findings. The chapter reviews the results of the three research questions and discusses these results in the context of trends in urban redevelopment of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods. Implications for social work practice, recommendations to Housing and Urban Development, study limitations, and a conclusion will follow.

Developing an Evidence-based Mixed-income Redevelopment Practice

The Department of Housing and Urban Development has a goal to redevelop traditional public housing to create communities that are durable, inclusive, socially just, and sustainable (Donovan, 2009). Developing an evidence-based mixed-income redevelopment strategy is one component of the process of creating such communities. This study posed three research questions in order to contribute to the existing knowledge on the transformation of concentrated urban neighborhoods. The goal of this study was to combine available literature, professional wisdom, and the perspectives and values of concentrated urban poverty (CUP) residents. The results of the three research questions of this study contribute to the development of an evidence-based mixed-income redevelopment practice framework that addresses the distress of both place (the infrastructure of CUP communities) and the distress of people (the multiple issues experienced by residents in public housing). The findings from research questions one
and two support the research on resident engagement and propose a role for community
engagement in concentrated urban poverty communities that face mixed-income
redevelopment. The findings from research question three identify the needs and
perspectives of residents who face the change and redevelopment of their neighborhood.

The role of community engagement. Research questions one and two address the
components necessary to engage residents in a redevelopment process that considers their
needs and perspectives. Based on the findings of this study this section will provide an
overview of resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment, resident involvement in
neighborhood organizations, and then present an integrated framework for resident
readiness and involvement in neighborhood organizations.

**Resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment.** Research question
one asked whether social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and possessing a
transition and/or relocation plan predicted resident readiness for mixed-income
redevelopment. Readiness for mixed-income redevelopment was conceptualized with
three subscales: readiness for change, readiness for mixed-income and readiness for new
urbanism. A multiple regression analysis of resident perception of social
cohesion, organizational collective efficacy and having a transition and/or relocation plan
together explained 80% of the variance in readiness for mixed-income redevelopment.
This finding confirmed the work of the Foster-Fishman et al. (2007) and Kumpfer et al.
(1997) and their studies on readiness for change. This study situates readiness for change
in the context of a communities facing mixed-income redevelopment. This result suggests
that mixed-income redevelopment, as a response to concentrated urban poverty could
benefit from a focus on maintaining social cohesion and empowering neighborhood organizations to collaborate with systems to solve neighborhood problems such as transition and/or relocation planning (Kumpfer et al. 1997).

The qualitative findings from the study interviews elaborate on the results of the multiple regression analysis. Residents who described less cohesive relationships in the neighborhood also described having other things to think about, which was in direct contrast to residents who experienced higher levels of social cohesion and dialogued about neighborhood changes with other residents. Residents believed that organizations could help them learn about the types of proposed changes and how these changes would benefit their family. More involved residents believed that if they participated in meetings then there were positive results, such as having an influence on neighborhood planning, which helps them prepare for change. Residents described transition and/or relocation planning as an important process that can demonstrate the effort the housing authority is investing in improving residents’ lives. However, residents did not perceive that there was a substantial effort on the part of the local housing authority to invest in current housing problems residents have identified, and therefore they did not feel powerful regarding transition and/or relocation planning. Some residents were resigned to accepting whatever housing was offered to them, while others felt ready for change but were fearful about where they would be placed.

Resident involvement in neighborhood organizations and meetings therefore has the potential to create space to dialogue about neighborhood changes and problems, such as transition and/or relocation planning. Resident participation in community engagement
processes can be an important step in helping prepare residents for mixed-income redevelopment, which may result in better resident outcomes. This finding is similar to the model used by the Chicago Housing Authority, where an intensive case management program prepares residents for a change process at the household level (Theodos et al., 2010). The result of the emphasis on including residents in planning and implementation of mixed-income redevelopments may ensure adequate preparation to benefit from these neighborhood changes.

*Resident involvement in neighborhood organizations.* Research question two asked what variables create a Structural Equation Model (SEM) with adequate model fit that predicts resident involvement in neighborhood organizations (see Figures 1 & 2). The purpose of the question was to test previous knowledge regarding predictors of involvement in neighborhood organizations within the context of two communities facing transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment. The three possible structural equation models with adequate model fit and significant paths resulted from a model building process.

Model 1a resulted in neighborhood problems predicting activism, which then predicted involvement in neighborhood organizations (See Figure 5). The model explains 59.4% of the variance in involvement in neighborhood organizations. Model 1b resulted in neighborhood problems and social cohesion predicting activism, social cohesion and neighborhood identity predicting organizational collective efficacy, and activism and organizational collective efficacy predicting involvement in neighborhood organizations (see Figure 6). The model explains 40.4% of the variance in involvement in
neighborhood organizations. The final model (Model 2) indicated residents will be involved in neighborhood organizations, if they perceived neighborhood problems, were involved in activism, and believed that neighborhood organizations had the capacity to effectively solve neighborhood problems (see Figure 7). The model explains 67.3% of the variance in involvement in neighborhood organizations.

Three aspects of the qualitative findings elaborate on the quantitative findings for research question two. First, residents acknowledge that if neighborhood problems are going to be addressed then residents need to take an active role in solving those problems, which is modeled in Models 1a, 1b, and 2. Second, residents were involved because of their informal relationships with their neighbors. This finding is indirectly modeled in Model 1b, where social cohesion predicts activism which predicts involvement in neighborhood organizations. Third, residents participated because they liked to know what was happening. For example they noted an interest in whether they would have to move, what the manager’s goals were, what the city plans were, and if housing authority staff were taking input from residents. This component of resident participation is captured in the quantitative Model 2 where participation level is an aspect of community capacity for change, which predicts involvement in neighborhood organizations. In summary, residents were involved in neighborhood organizations because of the neighborhood problems that motivated activism, their existing relationships with neighbors, and their self-interest regarding how the redevelopment would benefit their family, both in planning for how to meet immediate needs and for the future. Identifying neighborhood problems and getting involved in activism, as well as social cohesion
predicting activism, support the previous findings of Foster-Fishman et al. (2007). The self-interest component of the model is supported in previous literature on community organizing, but has not been modeled here (Speer & Hughey, 1995). The variables predicting resident involvement in neighborhood organizations overlap with the variables that predict readiness for change in the context of mixed-income redevelopment (including social cohesion and organizational collective efficacy) and therefore the results of research question one and two were combined to create an integrated model of resident engagement and readiness for change.

**An integrated model of engagement and change preparation.** Research questions one and two tested whether predictors of readiness for change and involvement in neighborhood organizations held up in the context of transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment. Statistical synthesis found that readiness for mixed-income redevelopment and involvement in neighborhood organizations covary (or change together), but do not predict each other. Four factors predict readiness for mixed-income redevelopment in the synthesized model including

(a) social cohesion, which was operationalized as formal and informal positive neighboring relationships in the qualitative interviews;

(b) activists who address identified neighborhood problems, which was identified in the quantitative and qualitative data. Residents state that they are activists, but a lot of people do not get involved in neighborhood organizations, which supports the latent construct that includes both activism scales and participation level one (attend and participate in discussions);

(c) organizational collective efficacy, which was identified in the quantitative and qualitative data; and

(d) possessing a transition and/or relocation plan. Components of a plan as described by residents interviewed included the importance of clear communication regarding the timing of moves, addressing current housing issues.
problems, and focusing planning on current household needs like education, health and mental health.

Resident participation in activism predicts both their readiness for mixed-income redevelopment and their involvement in neighborhood organizations and therefore collective activism is a key variable in building sustainable mixed-income redevelopments that change the people and the place. The findings from Foster-Fishman et al. (2007), Kumpfer et al. (1997), were confirmed in this study. In addition, the literature focused on identifying neighborhood problems and participation in activism as a key components of community readiness for change is confirmed in the context of readiness for mixed-income redevelopment (Chilenski, Greenberg, & Feinberg, 2007; Feinberg et al., 2002; Hawkins, Catalano, & Arthur, 2002; Plested, Edwards, & Jumper-Thurman, 2005).

Since the mixed-methods results for research questions one and two resulted in a statistically significant model, a new framework for sustainable community engagement practice components that focus on resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment as a large scale change initiative was created (see Figure 8). The framework is an integrated model of engagement and change preparation for concentrated urban poverty residents and supports the importance of an intervention that focused on engaging people in the process of change. Durable and inclusive sustainable communities during mixed-income redevelopment planning and implementation take into account the role these five variables play in predicting resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment. The four factors identified in Figure 1 are the same variables that predict readiness for mixed-income redevelopment in the statistical model that integrates research questions one and
two. The statistically integrated model is supported by the combined structural equation model outcomes from research question one, as well as models 1a, 1b, and 2 from research question two. The qualitative findings elaborate on the integrated structural equation model to create three resident typologies that describe resident readiness for change.

**Figure 8.** Factors predicting readiness for mixed-income redevelopment, which confirm the importance of community-level engagement components to prepare and engage residents for sustainable changes to concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods.

Based on the analysis of survey data completed in the two concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods in Denver, social cohesion and activism are both important factors in predicting resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment and involvement in neighborhood organizations. In the context of this study, the problems that were identified by residents pushed them into activism. This finding is supported by power and conflict theory that explains that unless those without power, come together collectively
to increase their power and act, the people with power will not respond to their problems (Blau, 1964; Brown, 2006; Weber, Gerth, Gerth, & Mills, 1991). In essence, concentrated urban poverty residents will only get what they are strong enough to get, as Saul Alinsky asserted (Hercules & Orensteins, 2007). Together, existing resident relationships, their belief that neighborhood organizations can identify and act to solve neighborhood problems, as well as possessing a transition and/or relocation plan predicts resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment and therefore may also help improve resident outcomes because residents are more prepared to benefit from mixed-income redevelopment. Residents who perceive these four factors (social cohesion, addressing neighborhood problems through activism, organizational collective efficacy, and possession a transition and/or relocation plan) as present in their lives and neighborhood are more likely to be ready for change. Resident existing social cohesion, identifying neighborhood problems, and being willing to act as activists also predict resident involvement in neighborhood organizations. Therefore resident involvement in neighborhood organizations and resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment covary and confirm the important factors of resident engagement.

Mixed-income redevelopment helps address concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods as a place, but resident engagement strategies, including community organizing, can help change people. Those implementing mixed-income redevelopments may ask themselves how residents get ready for large scale change initiatives. The results of this study and practice wisdom argue that residents who come together to identify problems and work together to solve them with their neighbors and the various systems
involved will become more ready for the neighborhood changes. HOPE VI evaluators, city planners, residents, and community practitioners agree that engaging communities in a planning process helps prepare people for change (Fainstein, 2002; Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kumpfer, 1997; Urban Institute, 2010). Community-building initiatives seek to improve local willingness and ability to drive and implement change (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kumpfer, 1997). Residents involvement in planning, implementing, and sustaining change can increase resident success and acceptance of change because the need, reasonableness and desirability of change (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007; Kumpfer, 1997). Residents need citizen participation in order to develop neighborhood identity and cohesion. Strong relationships within the community, identification of neighborhood problems, belief that change is possible and taking steps to address problems all reflect readiness for change (Kumpfer, 1997). Therefore involving residents in community engagement processes are important factors to consider when planning transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment because they prepare residents for change through a community intervention like the Chicago Housing Authority intensive case management prepares residents for a change process at the household level. Residents vary regarding their level of readiness, which was apparent in both the quantitative survey and the qualitative interviews.

**Resident readiness for change typologies.** Residents have complicated needs before mixed-income redevelopment moves and therefore if they are going to move, they want to move up. Readiness for change relates to multiple factors in people’s lives, and planning for change needs to take into account the different responses residents may
have. The qualitative elaborations of research questions one and two revealed three typologies of people including those who are ready for change, those who are neutral, and those who are against the mixed-income redevelopment of their neighborhood. The paragraphs below describe these three types.

Engaged and change ready. Some residents who participated in the study were positive about change and ready. They saw the transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment process as a means create a more sustainable community where they can either walk to or ride the light rail to businesses, jobs, and services that they need in their daily lives. Residents who felt positively about the neighborhood changes saw their ideas reflected in the master plan for the neighborhood. In essence, residents who are ready for change are open to the improved political economy of place that will result in higher quality housing and regional connections through the light rail to jobs and retail. Residents who are higher on the readiness for mixed-income redevelopment scale are also higher on the social cohesion, activism, organizational collective efficacy and transition and/or relocation scales.

Cannot be bothered with neighborhood organizations or change. Other residents were more neutral about the change or stated that the neighborhood changes did not matter to them, which may reflect a resignation to being acted upon. They expressed more of a “wait and see” mentality about the changes and where they see themselves in the future. Resigned residents did not request additional support from the systems in their lives. Instead they described how they cope with the reality of their lives in the present, such as one resident interviewed who stated her day starts with a drink in the morning. Others
described a focus on keeping up with their doctor’s appointments and taking care of their children and grandchildren. The distress expressed by these residents may not have been a lack of personal self-efficacy as much as apathy and hopelessness about their future, resulting in a sense that they could not be bothered with thinking about moving and therefore did not voluntarily accept the need for additional assistance or services. These residents do however have fragile lives with multiple barriers. Whether they move or not, they likely need supports to improve the quality of their lives. Residents who are neutral on the readiness for mixed-income redevelopment scale are also neutral on the social cohesion, activism, organizational collective efficacy and transition and/or relocation scales.

Against change. The third group of residents was against the change. They frequently could not imagine moving, either because they have lived in their unit for decades, or because of personal reasons to fear moving, such as severe mental health needs or having just stabilized as a family after being homeless or moving out of transitional housing. Residents who are low on the readiness for mixed-income redevelopment scale are also low on the social cohesion, activism, organizational collective efficacy and transition and/or relocation scales.

 Resident self-interest. Regardless of their readiness for change most residents who participated in the study expressed an interest in hearing more about the redevelopment and how the changes might have an impact on their family. Different residents asked similar questions such as:

- How realistic is it that my family or neighbor will come back into the type of housing we want?
• Will we fit in within the new community?
• Will the new unit have a washer and a dryer?
• Where will my life and finances be at the time of my move?
• Will Section 8 be a viable option for my family? What can the housing authority do to make sure I do not experience financial hardship?
• What are the chances that my family can move into one of the new townhouse style units in the community?

In essence mixed-income policy, although necessary because of housing problems and the distress experienced by residents, has not always benefited public housing residents and their surrounding neighbors. HOPE VI and Choice Neighborhood Policy as well as the community readiness for change literature, provide an important framework for understanding collaboration in the transit-oriented development of Housing and Urban Development neighborhoods. The HOPE VI intervention frames the distress of people and place by highlighting the importance of creating mixed-income communities free of distress based on current housing, personal or management problems. The Choice Neighborhoods policy emphasizes collaboration that addresses the ‘silod’ nature of both systems involved in creating mixed income communities, and using multiple and simultaneous different community intervention models such as social planning, community organizing, and community development. Based on the findings of this study community readiness or capacity for change focusing on existing social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, activism, and transition and/or relocation planning can enhance change. These factors represent a community’s ability to solve problems and predict their readiness for mixed-income redevelopment and involvement in neighborhood organizations. Community organizing is an example of an intervention that
can effectively engage residents who are high on social cohesion, activism, organizational collective efficacy and transition and/or relocation scales. Interventions that can engage residents who are neutral to low on these scales and also low on the readiness for mixed-income redevelopment scale will be described after discussing the results of research question three, which provides a richer description of the context of their lives. The qualitative interviews also provided an explanation of the complexity of organizational collective efficacy in the context of mixed-income redevelopment, which is similar to resident descriptions of the complexity of their lives at the household level.

**Complexity of Organizational Collective Efficacy.** The in-depth interviews and artifacts of this study bring to light the complexity of organizational collective efficacy in the context of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods. The ongoing struggle regarding the La Alma Recreation Center reveals residents’ ongoing efforts to define and implement a neighborhood vision within mixed-income redevelopment (see Appendix AH). An eco-map describes resident processes with the City and County of Denver since 1972 to meet the recreational needs of La Alma/Lincoln Park residents (see Figure AI1). Eco-maps display the relationships between a person, family or community within the context of the type of relationships they have with the various systems and associations in their lives (Hartman, 1978; McGoldrick, Gerson, & Shelenberger, 1999). Eco-maps describe relationships as strong and mutual, mutual, stressed, unidirectional (meaning that one person or group has influence on or power over another), or cut off.

Activists of the La Alma/Lincoln Park neighborhood began working together in 2009 to fight the privatization of their recreation center and closure of their library. Activists
spent 2010 working to align the 2007 Resident Advisory Committee goal to expand the neighborhood pool to meet future demand with the increased population density planned within the mixed-income redevelopment. Residents’ frustrations with ‘siloed’ planning processes undertaken by the Parks and Recreation Department and Denver Housing Authority caused residents to doubt the effectiveness of both the 2007 Resident Advisory Committee and their own organizational collective efficacy to influence neighborhood decision-making. As a result, those most experienced with advocating through community organizations reported disillusionment regarding their organizational collective efficacy. Resident leaders reported low organizational collective efficacy because of the ‘siloed’ nature of the planning. In some cases, those most skeptical of mixed-income redevelopment were the residents who are the most involved in planning processes. This may be an indicator of the lack of political economy of neighborhood organizations composed of concentrated urban poverty residents within the sociopolitical environment of larger drivers of mixed-income redevelopments. Neighborhood organizations in both neighborhoods from this study held mayoral candidate forums in 2011. These forums may be a reflection of resident leaders’ increased awareness that their self-interest in neighborhood level changes needed to be acknowledged and valued by the mayor as the top leader in the city (FRESC, 2011; Luning, 2011a; Luning, 2011b).

Residents of the two neighborhoods in this study demonstrated strong social cohesion, activism to address neighborhood problems, and collective participation in important meetings, yet they doubted their own organizational collective efficacy in the present and the future transition and/or relocation planning. Collaborations focused on
building durable and inclusive sustainable communities may need to focus on improving communication in the current decision-making within the community, in order to build resident trust in future decision-making and change processes.

**Resident-driven transition and/or relocation planning.** Research questions one and two identified how to engage residents to help them get ready for change. Research question three identified more in-depth information on the reality of the lives of residents and therefore some of the reasons why resident engagement and the change process can be so challenging. Research question three focused on public housing residents’ critical responses to previous HOPE VI movers’ outcomes, and their best problem-solving regarding better transition and/or relocation planning processes. The existing research shows that mixed-income redevelopment changes concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods as a place (decreasing crime rates, increasing property values and tax income, and improving walkability), but resident outcomes do not improve as much and depend on whether they move to another traditional public housing neighborhood (similar outcomes), with Section 8 (economic hardship, some decreased crime impacting mental health), or into mixed-income developments (less is known). This study focused on providing improved people based problem solving and interventions.

**Balancing investment in people and place.** Previous HOPE VI program development and evaluations focused on the pragmatics of public-private partnership and mixed-financing in order to create the means of transforming concentrated urban poverty communities as a place. The Theodus et al. (2010) study and the results of this study describe the complicated needs of distressed concentrated urban poverty residents as
people. A greater focus on people might include future development of the Choice Neighborhoods program and evidence-based interventions to stabilize public housing residents’ lives and help them “move up” (see Figure 9).

![Diagram showing the relationship between the complicate needs of distressed concentrated urban poverty residents as people and the transformation of concentrated urban poverty communities as a place through mixed financing and public-private partnerships.]

*Figure 9.* Durable and inclusive sustainable communities balance interventions that address the distress of people and place.

Concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods are a social problem in need of a public response because of the distress of people and place (Katz, 2009). HOPE VI policy and research define place-based distress as housing dilapidation, design and maintenance problems, high population density, public and private disinvestment, deferred maintenance, unsafe streets, and indifferent management (Crump, 2003a; Costigan, 2006; Joseph, 2006; Katz, 2009; Vale, 2006). The people-based distress includes dealing with crime and drug activity, unemployment, teen pregnancy, single parents, minimal educational achievement, dependence on public assistance, and unemployment (Costigan, 2006; Crump, 2003a; Katz, 2009; Keating, 2000; Vale, 2006). Mixed-income redevelopment of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods therefore presents an
opportunity to transform both the people and the place of traditional public housing developments (Katz, 2009).

Planning a change process on the household level requires recognizing the distress of families pre-move and therefore planning for different types of individual support needed. Household supports can be provided individually or within community-level interventions such as community development, community organizing, or community-based research processes to create durable and inclusive mixed-income redevelopment planning and intervention components. Community-level interventions can also drive the planning and policy-making processes (see Figure A12). The resulting social planning and interventions could include the best available knowledge for developing a culturally competent framework for mixed-income redevelopment practice that take into account the distress of families pre-move.

Taking into account the distress of families pre-move. One study participant said, “things change all the time unless you are a steady person.” The complicated needs of residents are there whether mixed-income redevelopment happens or not. These needs are exacerbated because of the decisions they need to make because of mixed-income redevelopment. Moving is a stressful time for anyone and many public housing residents already life highly stressful lives. An eco-map represents the distress families face pre-move (see Figure 10).
Study participants highlighted eight types of distress:

- Relationship changes: death of partner, incarcerated partner or adult child, or escaped abuse or domestic violence;
- Health, mental health, or substance use issues that have an impact on regular work, education or community involvement;
- Inability to walk up stairs because of medical issues;
- Difficulty navigating medical, dental, and mental health systems;
- Relationship to job market: vulnerable to a layoff, felony friendly jobs;
- Job offers but lack of childcare for long hours;
- Pressure of financial requirements of: criminal or driving charges, defaulted school loans; and
• Lacking financial resources to manage bedbugs according to integrated pest management guidelines.

Public housing stabilizes the many types of distress residents experience and provides them peace of mind for the times when their lives “fall apart.” Residents believe that housing authorities need to take into account the distress of families pre-move.

While residents described wanting to “move up,” they will likely need intensive multisystem case management based on the types of distress they described to stabilize the problems they face, set goals for improved financial outcomes, and motivate implementation of those goals. Moving out of public housing or into Section 8 may not be a viable option for some residents. Other residents cannot move out of public housing or into Section 8 without individualized support before, during, and after the move to address their many pressures. Some residents suggested incentivizing Section 3 jobs to motivate public housing residents to train for work in services, construction, management, and administration of the future neighborhood investments. All residents described wanting to make the best possible move upon relocation, and they hoped to stabilize their lives without an additional move.

Study participants also described the distress experienced by their children, which is represented in another eco-map (see Figure 11). Public housing children and teens have adapted to their neighborhood, school, and recreational opportunities. Moving would disrupt their attachment to the interventions at work in their lives such as Individualized Education Plans, behavioral management plans as well as friends, neighbors, and the support and care of after school programs. Parents therefore weigh the best possible move
for them as adults with the best possible move that will maintain their children’s support systems.

Residents described three key areas to sustainable mixed-income redevelopment, which could ensure that durable and inclusive changes could occur for residents (see Figure AI3). Resident stability needs to be the primary focus as public housing provides a safety net for residents whose lives are not stable. Residents prefer to set both individual and collective goals to address systemic issues, so that they can move into higher quality housing, improved communities, and attain more successful economic outcomes.

Figure 11. Distress of public housing children facing a mixed-income redevelopment move.
Focusing on resident stability and systemic issues together produces a greater chance of improving resident outcomes in meaningful ways.

The items in the transition and/or relocation plan scale provide basic interventions currently in practice during mixed-income redevelopment moves such as providing logistical and financial supports for moves. Resident participants in the qualitative portions of this study identified the need to balance the people-based interventions for those who remain in public housing versus Section 8 movers in order to be ready to benefit from the mixed-income redevelopment (see Figure 12).

**Figure 12.** Example of resident-driven community-based research regarding sustainable transition and/or relocation planning.

Based on the data, residents who stated they wanted to stay in the new mixed-income redevelopment or move to traditional public housing, could benefit from (a) multisystem individualized case management, (b) security in the form of housing managers, police, or security guards walking around the neighborhood in order to shift the culture, social
control, and expectations of neighborhood behavior, and (c) coordinated planning that takes into account resident needs for high quality housing, transportation, recreation, education, childcare, and employment.

The individualized case management could help residents address the complicated problems they need to solve at the household level, much like the Chicago Housing Authority intensive case management demonstration program. The coordinated planning could improve economic outcomes for households who identified the need for extended hour childcare facilitates that could be included in the South Lincoln Master Planning and implementation process. Then parents could accept jobs that require them to work long days without losing their jobs because they have to pick their children up from childcare by the close of business hours. The end result could mean improved economic outcomes for parents who are supported to work with the peace of mind that their children are cared for. Similarly coordinated security to address crime and safety problems through private security guards hired by the new home owners association in the neighborhood could alleviate some of the pressure public housing residents, public housing managers and the police department experience addressing crime and safety issues. Other HOPE VI developments such as New Columbia in Portland, Oregon have addressed security problems in this manner.

Residents who want to move with Section 8 vouchers stated the need for: (a) realistic screening regarding their financial capacity to move without financial hardship, including providing referrals for safety nets, (b) a cushioning time when the housing authority provides financial preparation for the move and financial support after the move, (c)
utility assistance through programs such as the Low-income Energy Assistance Program (LEAP) and on-going financial support or a systematic focus on addressing of the efficiency of Section 8 housing utilities from the housing authority, and (d) logistical support to find housing that meets household needs including housing, transportation, recreation, education, childcare, and employment. Together these four solutions identified by residents can provide proactive planning, safety nets, and resident preparation that may reduce the financial hardship experienced by Section 8 movers.

Groups of residents and types of supports needed. The in-depth interviews presented residents with HOPE VI outcomes including the Chicago Family Case Management Demonstration program outcomes, which is the only known HOPE VI supportive services model with improved economic outcomes at the household level (Theodos et al., 2010). The program focused on providing intensive case management to the entire family of HOPE VI movers, which included family members who were not on the lease but participated in residents’ day-to-day lives. Residents were clustered statistically into three different categories that defined the type of supportive services provided for each group (see Appendices O & P). The South Lincoln and Sun Valley demographic comparisons with the CHA groups are available in Figure A14.

This study asked participants to respond to the three categories without the group names given by Theodos et al. (2010), which included: Group One (striving for self-sufficiency), Group Two (aging and distressed), and Group Three (high risk). The social workers who conducted the interviews in this study noted that most residents physically changed their demeanor when asked to respond to categorized groups. Specifically, one
resident said, “I feel bad for these people.” Most residents identified with the groups or advocated for other groups of people they thought this study excluded. Residents in this study collectively created new names and descriptions for these groups in their own language. Group names included: Group One (young families trying to get things done on their own), Group Two (low-income older adults), and Group Three (small distressed families). Participants also identified additional missing groups in the Chicago Housing Authority study such as single fathers and immigrant families, which will be explained as additional typologies. These typologies can help in discussing the types of support available for public housing residents facing a move. Each of these groups is described below, which confirm the typologies identified by the Chicago Housing Authority case management demonstration program, but changed the language to frame the typologies how residents describe themselves and the supports they need at the micro (household), meso (community and organizational) and macro (policy and government systems) levels to experience sustainable changes as residents of concentrated urban poverty communities.

Young families trying to get things done on their own. Group one residents are those who try to take care of themselves and their mental health. They are trying to get on their feet by working, but they have financial hardship because they are often caring for children or work low paying jobs. They may have stopped working to care for young children. They experience financial hardship and may have received public benefits in the past, which are likely to end soon. Therefore, they need more resources to improve their chances for better paying jobs. Residents describe some of
their neighbors as “looking like it’s together” because they are in school and can find jobs, but they described how they may still drink and party. Group one therefore may be a mix of people who balance work, educational attainment, and taking care of themselves and their children. As a group they are all described as working toward self-sufficiency, but may have barriers to maintaining long-term work that pays a sustainable wage that may be personal or systemic. Residents in this group fit with the Theodos et al. (2010) description of Group 1 (Striving for self-sufficiency); however resident solutions to problems include more systemic solutions to problems such as improved safety nets and proactive planning to provide sustainable employment opportunities.

**Low-income older adults.** Residents described group two as low-income seniors who often work, but are unsure if they can enjoy their retirement. They still have dreams of homeownership and business ownership, but they are not confident those dreams are possible as they plan to retire in a struggling economy. They often have extensive life experience and may be role models for self-sufficiency as they hold Section 3 or other jobs. They describe their grown children asking them when they plan to move out of public housing, but given their experience of an unstable job market and economy they fear dependence on their children should they lose their job without public housing as a safety net. As survivors of distress they worry about all of the “what if’s.” They frequently act as community leaders who work with the housing authority to identify and solve problems. Group two residents describe the desire and potential to be independent, but given their place in the struggling economy and their proximity to retirement age without meeting their goals of home and business ownership they have set more realistic
goals that include relying on public housing. Residents in this group described a different reality than the Theodos et al. (2010) Group Two (Aging and distressed) description. In essence they requested opportunities to remain in the neighborhood to act as community leaders with the support of safety nets that allow them to take risks with affordable home ownership or small business start-ups.

**Small distressed families.** Group three members may not be working at all and some have a hard time coping with depression and/or emotional, physical and sexual abuse. Group three residents need support to overcome the cycles of poverty, abuse, poor health, and low education attainment that they have endured. With support they may be able to improve their lives and make changes for their children. The following descriptions depict the small distressed family type:

I’ve got a lot of health issues that I’m trying to deal with. I’m not working or anything, but I am on TANF. I’m not very educated; my last grade I completed was 8th. I left home when I was just a kid because of all the abuse.

I wish I had one level public housing unit because I have a hard time with the stairs. I’ve got asthma, diabetes, and anxiety. I have to go to the restroom every 10 minutes, but I have a hard time getting up and down the stairs to the bathroom. I also get claustrophobic sometimes especially when I’m outside. I feel like I can’t breathe. The last time I went out was to go to a community meeting about the redevelopment and I had to leave because I had a panic attack.

I sleep on the couch. I got my bed and stuff up there, but I’m just more comfortable right here on the couch. I’m scared somebody might try to break in a window or something. I’m just a worry bug.

They don’t have flats here. And I’m looking for a flat unit ‘cause with my diabetes, I get dizzy spells. And I would hate to be trying to come down the stairs with one of my little kids. I tried the other day, and I had to sit down with him and go down on my butt. If they had a one-story townhome, I could stop asking my kids to run up and down the stairs for me. Ideally I need a flat.
As described by these residents, distress based on physical and mental health may have an impact on the types of housing that are ideal to manage their symptoms. Like the Theodos et al. (2010) Group Three residents are likely to benefit from multi-systemic case management to stabilize parent coping and focus on children’s opportunities and outcomes as the most realistic plan to break generational poverty cycles.

Small distressed families could be engaged with alternative interventions like the intensive case management model of the Chicago Housing Authority. The Pathways to Housing community-based research project is an example of an approach that could effectively engage households in a manner that focuses on stabilizing their own health (Henwood, Dunn, & Weinstein, 2011; Pathways to Housing, 2011). The program focuses first on housing residents with mental health and substance abuse issues. The community-based research intervention focused on engaging residents in a process to identify how they can focus on improving their self-care. Participants in the study described the lack of purpose and direction in their lives, which improved with attention to addressing their physical and mental health. Engaging residents in a community-based research process helped the professionals in their lives understand their histories and needs. Some resident described how they self-medicate with drugs and alcohol because they are more affordable and available than the medications that manage their health and mental symptoms. The research process included residents in the process of studying recovery in the context of their housing and mental health needs, which builds practice knowledge and transforms their social support and self-care.
**Missing Groups.** In addition to the three types of residents identified from the interview data, residents also identified groups of people who they believed had additional needs. These groups included:

- Younger parents on TANF because they could not find work during the recession;
- Residents who need supportive communities and services because of incarceration due to non-payment of child-support or choices they made because they could not find work;
- Single fathers; and
- Immigrants from very different cultures who need someone to work with them who understands their culture and needs.

Typologies for single fathers and immigrant families are described here because more than one resident mentioned them. In general residents described the need for more community development focused interventions for these groups, which includes mutual aid support to improve parenting, conflict management, decision-making, and capacity for involvement in neighborhood organizations.

*Single father typology.* The following single father typology is a summary of the single fathers in the study. The single fathers in the study describe themselves as more common than they used to be. Their children behave well, but fathers requested a support group where they could discuss the challenges of single parenting such as parenting techniques, finding childcare that would work with jobs requiring evening work and overtime. With support most single fathers believed they could parent their children and work.

*Immigrant family typology.* The following immigrant typology summarizes the immigrant families in the study. Many immigrant families who participated in the study
have lived in public housing for fewer than five years. They frequently speak a language other than English as their first language. Prior to immigrating they often worked and may have owned a house. The family size of immigrant families varied from single parents with one child to large households with many children. Their children enjoy school, but sometimes they have problems with other children. When they attempt to resolve these conflicts with the children, their parents and the housing authority management, they frequently fail to resolve them. Immigrant families attend neighborhood meetings sometimes, but they are hesitant about asking questions because they fear the embarrassment of not being understood. Immigrant families sometimes request advice from friends and professional helpers in their lives regarding relocation, so they can be assured that they are choosing a neighborhood with a good bus routes, schools, stores, and parks for their children to play.

**Implications for Social Work Practice**

The findings of this study support building a people focused evidence-based mixed-income redevelopment framework through social work community and policy practice. Community-based research can inform future mixed-income redevelopment and Choice Neighborhoods program evaluations, which can then inform evidence-based mixed income redevelopment practice. Social work civic engagement and advocacy practice through multisystem case management, community organizing, and community development can also inform policy advocacy for evidence-based mixed-income redevelopment.
Social workers work with public housing residents in a variety of settings. Multidisciplinary theoretical perspectives drive the field of social work, which includes daily practice as well as policy analysis, development, and research. This research project focused on three aspects of social work including: (a) developing a model explaining resident readiness for mixed-income redevelopment as a large-scale change initiative, (b) developing a model predicting resident involvement in community organizations, and (c) evidence-based mixed-income redevelopment practice through documenting resident responses to the best available data on resident outcomes after a HOPE VI move. Implications for social work theory, practice, policy, and research that result from the findings of this study are presented below.

Study findings support social work ecological perspectives to describe public housing residents within their environment as evidenced by the eco-maps represented in Figures 4 and 5. The consistent distressed and one-way relationships in residents’ lives indicate the importance of creating strong and mutual relationships through community development programs such as tutoring at an afterschool program, individualized education and behavioral planning within schools, Section 3 jobs, public and affordable housing, and self-help focused supports among residents. Resident activists in the study indicate the importance of identifying and helping to implement neighborhood solutions, but those who are most involved indicate that improving organizational collective efficacy will require an intentional building of bridging social capital so that those in power implement neighborhood-based solutions. As a result, social work theories of community change need to include more emphasis on organizational collective efficacy.
This study confirms the Chicago Case Management Demonstration Program finding that change is a process (Howard, 2010); however the study demonstrates that change is also a community level change process where collaboration with public, private, and nonprofit systems helps to prepare residents for change. The study confirms the importance of organizational collective efficacy, but questions remain regarding how to make bridging social capital work through organizations such as the housing authority Local Resident Council, Project WISE, FRES, and Metro Organizations for People. Building power, organizational collective efficacy, and bridging social capital will require a coordinated effort from the social work field to link program evaluation with civic engagement and advocacy in a manner that can drive the evidence-based practice of mixed-income redevelopment. Social work education can add to the curriculum evidence-based mixed income redevelopment by adding readings and class sessions that focus on the best available data on place and people based outcomes of the HOPE VI program in both policy and community courses.

Residents of concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods who are facing mixed-income redevelopment can build knowledge and interventions that are rooted in their experiences, the best available data, and professional wisdom. Knowledge building can include community-based research, like this study, that can help develop improved data to base understanding on how to improve resident outcomes with improved policy and practice. For example, a community-based research process to address African American and White disparities in breast cancer mortality in Chicago provided a guide to an integrated and efficient means to link resident engagement and policy change as drivers
of practice (Gehlert, 2011). This National Institute of Health sponsored study engaged more than 500 Chicago residents in a participatory process that led to statistically significantly identification of social and environmental risk factors for breast cancer (Gehlert, Sohmer, Sacks, Miniger, McClintock, and Olopade, 2008). Practitioners and politicians used the study results to change state level policy and hospital level practice in order to decrease inherent discrimination in breast cancer detection (Gehlert, 2011). The community-based research process and findings from this study could be used in a similar manner to drive housing authority staff understanding of the distress experienced by public housing residents pre-move in order to create interventions that drive change processes at the individual and community levels in order to improve resident outcomes during mixed-income redevelopments.

Additional implications of this dissertation study for future social work research include the need to examine study variables by group. Group analysis requires different data screening (Tabachnich & Fidel, 2007). The data from research questions one and two could have been analyzed by organization, income and gender because previous literature has found differences in social cohesion and empowerment measures by gender (Peterson & Hughey, 2004) and suggested further study by income and specific organizational involvement (Ohmer & Beck, 2006). A multi-group analysis could be conducted for each scale to determine if any specific scale factoring differs (or is invariant). Factor loadings could be set as equal to one group to determine if any groups are invariant, which will be indicated by a significant chi-square difference test (Brisson & Usher, 2007). If no significant chi-square difference tests result, then measures are
strong across the various groupings, which is conceptual confirmation of a reliable construct across groups. Differences between groups could be used as moderators in future Structural Equation Modeling of neighborhood organizational involvement and/or readiness for mixed-income redevelopment. The supports needed for Section 8 movers could also be studied more in-depth using quantitative methodology in a national panel study in order to determine the best direction to take federal policy to address Section 8 financial distress.

**Recommendations to Housing and Urban Development**

The Doctoral Dissertation Research Grant that funded this research project stated that there is insufficient relevant research to support Goal Four of the Housing and Urban Development 2010-2015 Strategic Plan. Goal Four seeks to, “build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination” (HUD, 2010, p. 31). Goal Four acknowledges the link between the place that families live and the hoped for self-sufficiency outcomes that they are likely to achieve (Boston, 2005; HUD, 2010; Kelly, 2005; Kissane & Gingerich, 2004; Mathers & Rivers, 2006). The 2010-2015 strategic plan to implement Choice Neighborhoods as a signature initiative can improve life chances by building sustainable change with anchor institutions, assistance and programs to solve problems where concentrated poverty, public housing and racial segregation exist (HUD, 2010). Specifically Goal Four seeks to:

- Preserve community assets such as stores, schools, parks, and health care (Sub-goal 4A);
- Utilize economic development to develop jobs including Section 3 employment (Sub-goal 4A);
• Encourage coordinated planning for location efficient communities that are safe, walkable, transit-oriented, and mixed income (Sub-goal 4B);

• Include participation from groups historically excluded (low-income people of color) to design communities that meet their needs (Sub-goal 4C); and

• Build the capacity of government and nonprofit organizations to inform innovative planning and community development implementation (Sub-goal 4E).

The following sections highlight findings according to each of these five sub-goals as a means to building sustainable communities for current public housing residents facing transit-oriented mixed-income redevelopment.

Preserve community assets. The City and County of Denver and Denver Housing Authority planning processes identified several assets in the Sun Valley and La Alma/Lincoln Park communities, which are rooted in the amenities of the place (City and County of Denver, 2011a; City and County of Denver, 2011b; Denver Housing Authority, 2011). This study identified several other assets. The primary asset identified by the neighborhood residents is the people who currently live in the community. Residents value themselves, the social cohesion and supports they have developed, and the organizations they participate in within their communities. As the planning for the mixed-income redevelopment progressed, the South Lincoln residents worked with city planners and consultants to identify a phased redevelopment approach that would enable residents to only move once from their current unit to a redeveloped public housing unit in the neighborhood. “I’m telling people they should stay,” was the response of one involved resident in the community planning processes who enjoys being around people and participates in neighborhood organizations.
The second asset to preserve is the community engagement process and organizations in South Lincoln that helped residents identify needs and prepare individual residents for change. Each household however, had their own reasons for why they might want to stay or move away from the neighborhood. Some residents’ benefited from their involvement in community organizations such as the Denver Inner City Parish, Bridge Project, and Project WISE and therefore they hoped to stay in the neighborhood. Other residents had developed Individual Education Plans and/or behavioral plans for their children in schools outside of the neighborhood and therefore they may have wanted to move to another public housing community closer to that school. Therefore, some residents have already adapted to the assets of other communities as a Department of Education Turnaround Grant transforms their community school.

Regardless of each household preference to stay or move to another community, most residents agreed that having public and affordable housing near light rail is a third asset that needs to be preserved because the majority of public housing residents rely on public transportation. Therefore the convenience of public transportation connections to health care, services, schools and stores via the light rail is a key asset to public housing residents.

The fourth asset of the community is the current row home style of public housing. Many residents prefer the lower density neighborhood and having their own roof over their head because it is easier not to disturb neighbors and keep an eye on their children while they play outside. Many residents believe the South Lincoln redevelopment will not preserve their preferred housing type.
Develop jobs. The second HUD sub-goal addressed via topics mentioned within the in-depth interviews of this study is the development of sustainable employment. Participants in the study mentioned several components of economic development focused on employment. First, some residents requested support to find and retain higher paying jobs. Residents vary in the supports they will need regarding employment including:

- addressing job readiness through focusing on completing General Equivalency Degree, high school, certificate programs or college education;
- job training and assessments to help them select viable career paths;
- clothing assistance to access professional clothing for job interviews;
- a computer lab and classes to develop resumes, write cover letters, and access online job applications and e-mail; and
- dental care to address self-esteem issues related to missing and infected teeth.

One resident who currently holds a Section 3 job, asserted the need to conduct better outreach to raise resident awareness of this employment program that helps prepare residents for the neighborhood changes. Other residents, who have been unable to find work for years, within an economic recession, identified the need for a systematic organization of higher paying jobs available during the neighborhood transformation or accessible by the light rail. Several residents also identified the need for back up plans for those who lose jobs because they experience the labor market as unstable. As a result more intentional links between transition and/or relocation planning and employment safety nets may be a necessary component of employment planning, including helping residents navigate systems as needed with: unemployment, disability, Temporary
Assistance for Needy Families (TANF), Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), Child Care Assistance Program (CCAP), and other programs.

Encourage coordinated planning. The third theme resulting from several in-depth interviews includes the need for coordinated planning of public housing, affordable housing, and affordable home ownership with recreation, employment, childcare, security, and transportation planning. As described previously, seemingly ‘siloed’ planning processes took place in the community. The South Lincoln Master Planning process focused on increasing the population density. The 2007 Resident Advisory Committee focused on renovating the recreation center to meet future demand; however the Parks and Recreation department chose to renovate and downsize an already heavily used pool. As a result residents who are support the mixed-income redevelopment project in general have lost hope that their community has the capacity to identify and implement solutions to other community needs such as childcare and security.

Participation from community to meet their needs. The fourth HUD sub-goal addressed by this research is participation from the community to meet their needs. Healthy communities solve the problems of their families through association and systems partnership (McKnight, 1997). Research questions one and two confirm the importance of residents’ beliefs about organizational capacity for change stems from their belief that they can effectively solve neighborhood problems because of their engagement in solving those problems together. Resident beliefs in this study regarding their collective ability to influence change on their own behalf on average range from neutral to likely. Residents who believe that neighborhood organizations can have an impact on
their behalf describe an active role as they speak up and listen regarding their concerns. Residents who are neutral about the ability of neighborhood organizations to get things done on their behalf describe never seeing any evidence that these neighborhood groups have met their goals. The most negative descriptions came from those involved residents who had a difficult time influencing those making decisions to the extent that they would prefer. Involved residents state that from their experience involvement in neighborhood organizations has resulted in positive outcomes. Their involvement in decision-making within organizations makes them feel as if they have some influence over the process and in the least helps them access information about how neighborhood changes might have an impact on them.

Build capacity of organizations to inform innovative planning and implementation. The fifth HUD sub-goal addressed by this research is building the capacity of organizations to inform innovative planning and implementation. Public systems, nonprofit organizations, foundations, and universities can work together to inform and implement solutions to complex social problems. The phased redevelopment of South Lincoln is an example of innovative planning ideas that came from residents within the public, nonprofit, and foundation collaboration in the 2007 Resident Advisory Committee. The implementation of Phase One has begun in South Lincoln, which has the potential to build the trust and capacity of local residents, the housing authority, and contracted developers to implement the phased redevelopment. If residents are going to benefit from remaining in the neighborhood through the redevelopment process, they may need more intentional supportive services to create changes in their household.
outcomes. A program such as the multisystem case management approach of the Chicago Housing Authority can work as an ally to the change process (Urban Institute, 2010). The process helps build the capacity to plan and implement compassionate and effective solutions to improve the economic outcomes of HOPE VI movers (Urban Institute, 2010).

The findings of this study suggest that the innovative, compassionate, and effective solutions for contemporary HOPE VI movers might include a more systematic approach to housing, jobs and transportation planning as well as evidence-based planning to address Section 8 material hardship. More effective housing, jobs and transportation planning might include using walkability and transit scores or Geographic Information Systems mapping to help residents identify ideal communities for their household that have transit connections to the important subsystems in their lives such as a school with a particular kind of programming for a special needs student or a particular set of medical services for a family member with an illness. As with the Chicago case management approach, South Lincoln residents asserted that they need a multisystem approach to case management as each family has different challenges, opportunities, and potential systems in their lives.

Residents of this study spent a significant amount of time explaining that they do not feel powerful based on personal experience with the major systems in their lives. To think about and plan for the future, residents need to experience a sense of self-efficacy in the present with simple tasks such as filling out a maintenance request for a new screen door and successfully seeing the housing authority maintenance team complete the job.
Without creating new experiences in the present, residents will continue to feel powerless during the relocation process.

This study was about the future, but today’s frustrations regularly moved into the forefront of the conversations. Residents essentially phrased that, “if you want to know what I think about the future, I need to tell you what happened this week or this month.” The frustrations about today’s problems is also linked to a sense that they cannot get answers to their questions about the future.

Developing social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and participation by public housing authority residents in neighborhood organizations and decision-making is a complex task. While most public housing residents do not regularly participate in neighborhood organizations at the level of decision-making almost half (47.8%) of residents surveyed claimed involvement in neighborhood organizations in some way (n=185). Residents report different reasons for their involvement in neighborhood organizations such as “I am involved because of neighbors,” and, “I like to be active and around people.” As a result they come together whether their reasons are to meet social or personal need at Denver Inner City Parish, to address a neighborhood problem at a Local Resident Council meeting, or to organize systematic solutions to common problems through Project WISE, Metro Organizations for People or FRESC. As long as residents come together in neighborhood organizations, they can reconstruct the dominant narratives and negotiate for categorical rewards or political solutions that can benefit their currently distressed lives.
Capacity building for residents through neighborhood organizations partnering with the housing authority will require clear and transparent communication that the redevelopment is about both buildings and people. Many residents simultaneously describe their expectation that the redevelopment is primarily about replacing old housing units and their hope for apartments that stay warmer and keep them safe from the neighborhood deficits such as rail yard soot and crime. As described previously, resident needs extend beyond needing a safe place to live, into a variety of individual experiences of distress. The future of current and future life chances of residents in South Lincoln and other transit-oriented mixed income redevelopments is dependent on the ability of multiple systems in their lives to improve their life chances by building sustainable change with anchor institutions, assistance and programs to solve problems where concentrated poverty, public housing and racial segregation now exist.

**Limitations**

Limitations for this study are briefly summarized in order to guide study generalizations and application to social work and Housing and Urban Development practice. The main study limitation is that the study was conducted in only two neighborhoods, within one city that have undergone an extensive amount of planning and collaboration to prepare for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment. Seven specific limitations were identified for the study.

First, due to having a response rate of less than 50% for the survey, results can be interpreted only from those who participated in the survey rather than generalized to the whole neighborhood. In addition the La Alma/Lincoln Park survey had a narrower
sample frame than the neighborhood as a whole, which only allows the survey to be
generalized to those who participated in the survey from North Lincoln, South Lincoln
and the houses on Mariposa Street.

Second, several of the survey measures are new and although the study found strong
psychometric properties for these scales, continued testing needs to be done to establish
these measures as good measures for concentrated poverty residents confronted with
transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment. Third, Transit-oriented development and
public housing redevelopment in particular has not been well studied. This study
identified important concepts for new urbanist transit-oriented redevelopment of public
housing. The downside is that this study just begins to qualitatively describe how
residents respond to the early information on important concepts such as possessing a
transition and/or relocation plan.

The fourth and fifth limitations relate to the impact of poor reliability and missing
data on the models. The impact of the reliability of scales, which ranged from excellent to
poor, on the models is unknown. Although surveys can provide a summary description of
a population on key variables, their challenges require research methods to address
problems with missing data and the inherent error in the data collection process.
Participants can refuse to answer particular questions and therefore researchers have to
deal with missing data, which was the case particularly with questions related to crime
and safety (Grove et al., 2004; Singleton & Straits, 2005).

Sixth, the researcher conducted the qualitative portion of this study in only one public
housing neighborhood facing transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment, which
already had a light rail stop, therefore the qualitative findings may not be generalizable to
neighborhoods without existing light rail stops. Finally, the last identified limitation of
the study relates to language translation. The quantitative survey provided written
translation into Spanish, but only verbal translation into Vietnamese, Cambodian, and
Somali due to budgetary and language constraints. The qualitative version of the study
was conducted with three South Lincoln residents for whom English was a second
language; however, the interview was conducted in English without a translator therefore
more nuanced clarification regarding interview topics could not be completed for these
interviews.

Conclusion

Residents’ critical responses to the best available data on HOPE VI outcomes tied to
transition and/or relocation planning can serve as examples of effectively engaging
residents through community development, community organizing, and community-
based research. Public housing residents experienced decades of systemic isolation and
disinvestment. As long as there are “haves” and “have nots” those realities will not
change without an integrated focus on place and people-based change. Political economy
of place theory assumes that current concentrated urban poverty residents do not have
money or political capital to steer needed changes. Macro level policy solutions to
transform concentrated urban poverty neighborhoods as places while moving residents to
lower poverty and less segregated neighborhoods leaves key community level
intervention components out of the equation. Healthy communities identify and solve
problems in collaboration with real people impacted by problems, neighborhood
organizations, and public systems (McKnight, 1997). Public housing residents facing mixed-income redevelopment of their community can change their outcomes if they use their common self-interests to build power.

This study confirms the following three hypotheses: (a) resident readiness for mixed income redevelopment can be predicted with social cohesion, organizational collective efficacy, and transition and/or relocation planning, (b) resident involvement in neighborhood organizations can be predicted by their awareness of neighborhood problems, their activism to address problems, and their capacity for change (participation level and organizational collective efficacy), and (c) public housing residents’ critical responses previous HOPE VI movers’ outcomes can result in problem solving regarding better transition and/or relocation planning processes.

Evidence-based mixed income redevelopment is a natural framework for social work. Concentrated urban poverty residents know their problems and professionals, with the use of the best available data, know how to address those problems (Payne, 2011). Social work practices can help develop evidence-based mixed-income redevelopment to create sustainable and inclusive communities that include multi-systemic case management, community development, community organizing, and policy setting regarding jobs, transit, childcare. The best available data on previous HOPE VI outcomes can guide collaborative critical thinking about solutions with residents, researchers, and community practitioners. This study highlights the importance of community interventions in developing sustainable large-scale evidence-based community change initiatives.
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Appendix A: Study Maps and Images of Housing Types

Figure A1. Map of study neighborhoods: Sun Valley and La Alma/Lincoln Park.
Figure A2. DHA: Sun Valley Homes.

Figure A3. Mercy Housing: Decatur Place.

Figure A4. Sun Valley Houses.

Figure A5. DHA: South Lincoln.

Figure A6. Lincoln Park Houses.

Figure A7. DHA: North Lincoln Midrise.

Figure A8. DHA: North Lincoln Low-rise.
Table B. HOPE VI Outcomes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percent of Residents</th>
<th>Section 8 Voucher</th>
<th>Other Traditional Public Housing</th>
<th>Remain in Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The largest portion of residents (43%) who participated in the panel study moved into the private market with Section 8 Vouchers.</td>
<td>The second largest group (22%) moved to other traditional public housing</td>
<td>The Panel Study found only 16% of residents remained in their original communities nearing the end of the study, which left another 84% of residents relocated (Popkin et al., 2004).</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Neighborhood Crime**

Neighborhood safety generally improved. At baseline the panel study showed 78% of residents indicated issues with crime, which resulted in an overall 47% decline over the course of the study (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009).

As a result residents shifted from 78% to 31% fearing of crime in their neighborhood, which likely decreases anxiety, stress and social isolation.

Residents who moved to other public housing found only a slight decrease in crime from 78% to 50% fearing crime, which indicates they are still impacted by crime to a much greater degree than Section 8 residents (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009).

**Neighborhood Poverty**

Residents generally moved to they live in Neighborhoods only
neighborhoods with lower concentrations of poverty (Barrett, Grisel, & Johnson, 2003). Both comprehensive studies found that residents moved from neighborhoods with an average concentrated poverty rate of over 40% to neighborhoods with a concentrated poverty rate less than 30% concentration of poverty with unemployment rates that were 5% lower (Sard & Staub, 2008; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009).

Neighborhood Race

The racial makeup of the neighborhoods residents move to result in minimal progress, because concentrated race was not explicitly addressed in the policy (Polikoff, 2009). For example, the Panel Study found that 60% of residents moved to racially segregated areas (Popkin & Cunningham, 2002).
| Economic Outcomes | Financial hardship and a lack of success transitioning to private market emerged as the primary barrier to families who used Section 8 Vouchers (Gibson, 2007). Residents continuing to live in public housing report late rent payments however residents who were moved experience greater financial distress as they pay a higher proportion of their income towards rent and utilities including: 1) 40-50% of residents in private units report having to choose between paying rent or going without food or utilities, 2) nearly half of Section 8 residents had trouble paying utilities compared to only 8% of residents in public housing, and 3) sixty-two percent of Section 8 residents reported having trouble paying for food compared to 47% in public housing (Barrett et al., 2003; Crowley, 2009); | Residents in other traditional public housing report the same economic outcomes (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). Residents who stayed behind also report no economic improvements and tended to be the hard-to-house who experience multiple barriers to self sufficiency like mental or physical illness, substance abuse, having many children, lack of work experience or criminal backgrounds (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). |
Popkin, 2007; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009).

| Housing Problems | In the original housing more than half of the residents reported two or more housing problems such as mold, broken plumbing and cockroaches, which decreased to one-quarter with their Section 8 unit (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). | No improvement in housing quality (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). | 60% of residents who stayed behind reported two or more housing problems at baseline and during the third wave of data collection (Popkin & Cunningham, 2009). |
| Other | In a Portland case study two-thirds of HOPE VI recipients indicated a greater satisfaction with their new neighborhoods (Gibson, 2007). Critiques question whether the benefits of lower crime, improved housing quality, and housing satisfaction balance out the cost-benefit ratio for residents given Section 8 Vouchers, especially as longer-term outcomes are unknown. | The residents who stayed behind in their original public housing neighborhoods experienced the least benefits at the end of the Panel Study. |
Appendix C: Structural Equation Model 1 and Model Building Steps

Figure C1. Step 1 of Structural Equation Model 1. Foster-Fishman et al. influence on SEM.
Figure C2. Structural Equation Model 1 Step 2. Adds additional variables and relationships from existing literature.
Figure C3. Structural Equation Model 1 Step 3. Adds additional variables and relationships from Ohmer & Beck, 2006.
Figure C4. Structural Equation Model 1 Step 4. Adds additional variables and relationships from Winter, 1990.
Figure C5. Structural Equation Model 1 Step 5. Adds Individual and Collective Activism to Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations.
Since Foster-Fishman did not have significance in the way they measured Hope for Change and Neighborhood Problems, two new scales were created for Change Ready and Housing Problems.

*Figure C6. Structural Equation Model 1 Step 6.*
Appendix D: 2009 Survey

Neighborhood ____________
Survey Number ____________
Consent and Survey Number Listed on Interviewers Sheet? _____

Thanks for agreeing to participate in this survey! I will ask you a series of questions about change, neighborhood problems, your involvement in the neighborhood, your personal goals, demographics, and your opinion regarding Key Focus Areas for change. The survey is voluntary. You can choose not to answer some questions. It is estimated take about 30 minutes of your time. Do you have any questions before you begin?

The first question is:
1a) Which of the following best describe your residence type? (Please circle the one that best describes the housing type.)
   - Public Housing
   - Private Low-income Apartment Rent
   - Own home
   - Section 8
   - Homeless
   - Other ________
   - Don’t Know
   - Refused

1b) If you are in low-income housing, which location? (Please circle the one that best describes the housing location.)
   - North Lincoln
   - South Lincoln
   - Sun Valley Homes
   - Decatur Place
   - Other
   - ________ (explain)

Please rate how much you agree that each statement accurately portrays the current condition of your neighborhood block. (Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = Strongly Disagree, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) I feel a strong sense of ties with the other people who live in my local neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) If I need a little company, I can contact a neighbor I know.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) A feeling of fellowship runs deep between me and other people in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) If I need advice about something I could ask someone from my local neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I often help my neighbors with small things or they help me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I have a lot in common with other people who live in my local neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) If the people who live in my local area were planning something, I’d think of it as something we’re doing rather than something they’re doing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) The friendships and associations I have with other people in my local neighborhood mean a lot to me.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Question</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) If I don’t have something I need I can borrow it from a neighbor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) I have made new friends living in my local neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) I often visit my neighbors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) If I feel like talking I can generally find someone in my local neighborhood to chat to.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) I find it difficult to form a bond with other people who live in my local neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) I feel loyal to the people in my neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) I chat with my neighbors when I run into them.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) I am quite similar to most people who live in my local neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) I borrow things and exchange favors with neighbors.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18) I have friends in my local neighborhood, who are part of my everyday activities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19) My neighbors and I want the same things from our local neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20) I don’t feel a sense of being connected with other people who live in my local neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21) Lots of things in my neighborhood remind me of my past.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22) I think I agree with most people in my neighborhood about what is important in life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23) I really fit in to my local neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24) The people who live in my local neighborhood get along well.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25) I rarely visit other people in my local neighborhood.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26) My local neighborhood is a part of my everyday life.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27) People in my local neighborhood do not share the same values.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28) In general I’m glad to be a resident of my local</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
29) I care what my neighbors think of my actions.

Social cohesion/ties (alpha = .76-.97) (Foster-Fishman, 2007, Obst, Smith & Ziakiewicz, 2002)

Next I will ask you about existing neighborhood problems. How much do you agree or disagree that your neighborhood experiences the following problems with housing and crime? (Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = Strongly Disagree, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Vacant, abandoned, or boarded up homes/buildings are a problem in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Lack of property maintenance is a problem in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Lack of yard maintenance is a problem in my neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Litter or trash on sidewalks and streets.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Litter and trash from events in the neighborhood</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Traffic safety problems such as cars speeding.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Traffic safety problems such as cars not watching for children.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Traffic safety problems such as cars not obeying stop signs or lights.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Racial incidents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Crime and disorder</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Drug dealing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Drug use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) People drinking alcohol</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Vandalism including graffiti on buildings and walls</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Youth hanging out and causing trouble.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Gangs/gang activity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Prostitution</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Neighborhood housing and social problems (alpha = .77) and crime (alpha = .84) (Foster-Fishman, 2007, Making Connections-Denver)

Comments

(Where these problems are occurring and question number referring to)
It is common to have the following housing quality issues in older buildings. How true are the following statements about your housing quality: (Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = Not true, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Quality Issues</th>
<th>Not true</th>
<th>Somewhat true</th>
<th>true</th>
<th>very true</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Peeling paint or broken plaster</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Plumbing needs repairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Rats or mice</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Cockroaches</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Cold during the winter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Hot during the summer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Buildings shifting/doors won’t close</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Has an unsecured mail slot</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Has unsecured windows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Has unsecured doors</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Is dark and unsafe outside after dark</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Screen Doors need repairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Walls in the bathroom need repairs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Needs Other Major Repairs (list)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing problems scale (Alpha = .932) (Original questions based on qualitative interviews)

How much to you agree or disagree with the following statements? (Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = Strongly Disagree, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither Agree or Disagree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) My neighborhood is predominately low-income.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) My neighborhood consists predominately of people of color.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) My neighborhood is segregated based on race.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) I am open to my neighborhood changing.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) I want my neighborhood to change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) I will help my neighborhood change.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) I am comfortable living near people of other incomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) I am comfortable living near people of other races.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) I am comfortable living near people who speak other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

366
10) I am willing to live in a multicultural neighborhood. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | REF
11) I am willing to live in a neighborhood that is mixed income. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | REF
12) I believe residents with lower incomes will benefit from living near more residents with higher incomes. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | REF
13) I believe the redevelopment of South Lincoln and/or Sun Valley is necessary. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | REF
14) My household would like to stay in the neighborhood if it is redeveloped. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | DK | REF

Readiness for mixed income assumptions scale (Alpha = .842) (Original questions based on qualitative interviews)

Are you involved with any of the following neighborhood organizations working on community organizing or other social change efforts? (Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = Yes, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Metro Organizations for People <em>(which is known by the following names – Sun Valley Coalition; Voices Heard at West High School; Youth Organizing at the Bridge Project; Parent Organizing at West High School, etc.)</em></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Project WISE</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) HUGS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) FRESC</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Denver Housing Authority – Local Resident Council</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Denver Housing Authority – Resident Council Board</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Other community organizing and social change efforts? If yes, What is the name of the group?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Involvement in neighborhood organizations scale, (Not pretested) (Original questions based on qualitative interviews)

What is the highest level of involvement you have in these local neighborhood organizations? (Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = I take no part at all, etc.)
1) I take no part at all.
2) I am just beginning to get involved.
3) I play a passive role.
4) I participate in relaying information.
5) I carry out various tasks at the instruction of the staff and/or board.
6) I participate in planning, decision making, and implementation.
7) I am a full partner in planning, decision making, and implementation.

Participation in decision making *(Ohmer & Beck, 2006)*

Have you or anyone in your family participated in any of the following activities in the last year? (Please circle Yes, No, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Spoken to a politician (like a city council person, representative, or school board member) about a neighborhood problem or improvement.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Talked to a group causing a problem in your neighborhood.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Talked to a religious leader or minister to help with a neighborhood problem or with a neighborhood improvement.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Individual activism/ Sociopolitical participation, behavioral empowerment (Foster-Fishman, 2007, Speer & Peterson, 2000, Parsons, n.d.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4) Written or had someone help me write a letter to the editor of a newspaper, newsletter or magazine.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Wrote a letter or made a phone call to influence a policy or political issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Had an in-depth, face-to-face conversation about an issue affecting your community.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Got together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize a neighborhood improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Attended a neighborhood watch or block watch meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Attended a citizens’ committee or local political group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Attended a meeting of a block or neighborhood group.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize neighborhood improvement.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Read a flier or received a phone call about a community meeting.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Filled out a community survey.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Signed a petition.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Attended an event promoting information about community services.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Attended a public meeting to press for a needed change.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Attended a meeting to gather information about a neighborhood issue.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collective action, behavioral empowerment (alpha = .78-.85) (Foster-Fishman, 2007, Speer & Peterson, 2000, some original questions)

The following are things these neighborhood organizations might try to do. For each one, indicate how likely it is that one of these local neighborhood organizations might accomplish that goal. (Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = Very Unlikely, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Goal</th>
<th>Very Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Very Likely</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Improve physical conditions in the neighborhood like cleanliness or housing upkeep.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Get people in the neighborhood to help each other more.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Persuade the city to provide better services to people in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Reduce crime in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Get people who live in the neighborhood to know each other.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Increase decent, affordable housing in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Improve the business district in the neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Develop and implement solutions to neighborhood problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Organizational collective efficacy (alpha = .99) (Ohmer & Beck, 2006)
What *degree of control do neighborhood residents have to work together and address* the following neighborhood problems? *(Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = No control, etc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No Control</th>
<th>Some Control</th>
<th>A lot of Control</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Reduce drug dealing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Deal with gangs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Reduce public drunkenness</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Deter fights</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Decrease violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Deter domestic violence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Decrease drug use</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Form a neighborhood watch</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Call police to report crime or safety concerns</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work together to address crime scale *(alpha = .9)* *(Foster-Fishman, 2007, and some original questions)*

We would like to know what kinds of things *you have done with local neighborhood organizations*. *In the past year, how often have you:* *(Please circle number representing the answer, 1 = never, etc.)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Almost Never</th>
<th>Once in a while</th>
<th>Fairly Often</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Attended organizational functions and activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Actively participated in discussions.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Attended meetings of the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Done work for the organization outside of meetings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Served as a member of a committee.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Served as an officer or a committee chair.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Helped organize activities (other than meetings).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Tried to recruit new members for a neighborhood organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Tried to get people out for meetings and activities.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Served as a representative of the organization to other community groups.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Worked on other activities for the organization.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Participation level *(alpha = .95)* *(Ohmer & Beck, 2006)*
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Next I will ask you a series of demographics questions to help us understand basic information about your household. We are asking these questions in order to see if these characteristics about residents change in the coming years. (Please circle the best answer.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) What is your age in years?</th>
<th>_________ (insert age in years)</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2) What is your race/ethnicity?</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Asian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) What is your highest level of education?</td>
<td>Junior High</td>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>High School Graduate or GED</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Do you have children?</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) What is your annual income in dollars?</td>
<td>0-12,500</td>
<td>12,501-25,000</td>
<td>25,001-37,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The following questions are regarding your employment history.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) Are you currently employed?</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>If Yes proceed to answer 6a) and 6b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If No proceed to answer 7.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6a) What type of employment do you have:</td>
<td>Nursing or other medical fields</td>
<td>Business or clerical</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>Housekeeping or Janitorial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6b) How many hours do you work?</td>
<td>20 or fewer hours</td>
<td>21 to 30 hours</td>
<td>full-time (31 to 40 hours)</td>
<td>more than full-time (41 or more hours)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7) Do you currently receive any of the following benefits?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) TANF</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) SSI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) SSDI</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Social Security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Unemployment Insurance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Child support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Workman’s Comp</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8) The following are indicators of financial hardship. In the past year how often has your household: 
(Please circle the best answer, 1 = Never, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Sometimes</th>
<th>Often</th>
<th>Regularly</th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) Been late on rent or had money issues with landlord or mortgage lender</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Had difficulty paying rent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) Have a repayment agreement with the housing authority or mortgage company</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) Had rental application denials</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) Been unable to pay my electric or phone bill</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) Gone without phone service</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>g) Worried about being evicted</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h) Worried about not having enough money to buy food</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>i) Rely on food stamps to eat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>j) Rely on food banks to eat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Financial hardship Scale (Alpha = .909) (Original questions)

The next section asks about your 5-year goals for your household regarding housing, employment, education, and benefits.

1) Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Public Housing</th>
<th>Private Low-income Apartment</th>
<th>For Rent, own home or Section 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) In the future where do you want to live:</td>
<td>North Lincoln</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Within current Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Please check the best answer)</td>
<td>South Lincoln</td>
<td>Other (explain)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sun Valley Homes</td>
<td>Other_</td>
<td>(Please Explain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other_</td>
<td>(Please Explain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Don’t Know</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>Refused</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) Where? (Please check the best answer)</td>
<td>Denver Housing Authority</td>
<td>Private low-income</td>
<td>For Rent, own home or Section 8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>North Lincoln</td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Within current Neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>South Lincoln</td>
<td>Other (explain)</td>
<td>Other</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sun Valley Homes</td>
<td>Other_</td>
<td>(Please Explain)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Other</td>
<td>Other_</td>
<td>(Please Explain)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) Employment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Nursing or other medical fields</th>
<th>Business or clerical</th>
<th>Retail</th>
<th>Housekeeping or Janitorial</th>
<th>Daycare</th>
<th>Restaurant</th>
<th>Retired</th>
<th>Other (please describe)</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a) What type of employment do you hope to hold in 5?</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
b) If you hope to be employed in 5 years, how many hours per week do you hope to work? 
(Please circle the best answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>20 or fewer hours</th>
<th>21 to 30 hours</th>
<th>full-time (31 to 40 hours)</th>
<th>more than full-time (41 or more hours)</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

3) Education

What is the highest level of education you hope to attain in 5 years? 
(Please circle the best answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Junior High</th>
<th>Some High School</th>
<th>High School Graduate or GED</th>
<th>Professional Certificate</th>
<th>Some College</th>
<th>Associates Degree</th>
<th>Bachelors Degree</th>
<th>Masters Degree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

4) In five years, do you plan to rely on the following to pay your living expenses including rent or mortgage? (Circle all that apply)

- TANF  - SSI  - SSDI  - Social Security  - Unemployment Insurance  - Child support  - Workman’s Comp
- Employment Income  - Aid to Needy and Disabled  - Private Pension  - Welfare Refugee Assistance
- Colorado Old Age Pension  - Aid to Blind  - Financial Aid  - Personal Assets  - VA Death and Disabled
- Active Military  - Other. What? __________

What is your gender?  
Male  Female  Transgendered  Don’t Know  Refused

Next I am going to ask your opinion of the Key Focus Areas for change that a group of your neighbors developed. How important are the following key focus areas to you and your household? (Please circle the best answer, 1 = strongly disagree, etc.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to…</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Have neighbors that recognize the strengths of the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have neighbors that maintain the strengths of the community.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Have neighbors with a diversity of backgrounds.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Have neighbors with a diversity of incomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Have neighbors with a diversity of interests.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Maintain the cultural identity of the neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Have the neighborhood be family friendly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Have the neighborhood be youth friendly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Have the neighborhood be senior friendly.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Key Focus Area 1 - Cultural Diversity
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Focus Area 2 - Public Safety</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to have…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Have recreation activity in the neighborhood for all ages.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have playgrounds in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Have parks in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Have neighborhood residents keep eyes on street.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Have an active community response to make change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Have police relationships with the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Have police commitment to the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Have police commitment to the homeless in the community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Have a safe community meeting space.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Have a multi-purpose Community Center with meeting rooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Have a multi-purpose Community Center with childcare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Have a multi-purpose Community Center for seniors.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Have the multi-purpose Community Center building be fully accessible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14) Consider pedestrian safety.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15) Design the neighborhood with walking in mind.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16) Increase the police bike/foot patrols.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17) Empower residents to actively support a safe environment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Focus Area 3: Land Use &amp; Economic Opportunity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is important to have…</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1) Increase affordable home ownership opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have individual family house rentals available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Have individual family house ownership available.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Have rentals available for many families within one building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Have ownership opportunities for many families within one building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Have rentals available for those with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Have home ownership available for those with disabilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Have affordable housing options for low to moderate-income residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Have small business opportunities for residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Have services that the community needs in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Have shopping in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Have educational services in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Have senior services in the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Key Focus Area 4 - Transition &/or Relocation Process**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Recognize the residents need to maintain social connections if moved from the neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Provide financial assistance if residents moved from neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Provide logistical assistance if residents moved from the neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Identify a relocation plan if residents moved from the neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Allow DHA residents the right to return neighborhood.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Key Focus Area 5 - What do the Buildings Look Like & How are they Connected to Transit? |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to...</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Have townhomes.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have apartments.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Have bus/light rail connections to the arts district.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Have bus/light rail connections to services.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Have bus/light rail connections to healthcare.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Have bus/light rail connections to downtown.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Have safe access to the bus/light rail.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Consider the entrances to buildings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Consider the character of the buildings.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
10) Have a noise study.  
11) Have a traffic safety study  
12) Work with other environmental protection efforts within neighborhood.  
13) Do periodic “state of the environment” reviews.  
14) Provide recycling bins for residents.  
15) Educate residents in how to maintain the environment and conservation.

Key Focus Area 6 - Environmental Health & Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to…</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Affordable home ownership for low-income families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have affordable rental opportunities for low-income families.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Have safer housing that is up to standards.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Maintaining the number of DHA units.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Maintain the number of bedrooms in DHA.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comment – what is a decent sized bedroom?

Focus Area 7. Balance mixed-income housing opportunities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to…</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Have four-story youth center.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have a youth center with programs affordable for neighborhood residents.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Have centrally located skate park.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Have centrally located tennis court.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Have centrally located basketball court.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Have centrally located swimming pool.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Redevelopment the river as a public space.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Focus Area 8. Recreational Amenities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>It is important to…</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Resolve major flooding problems (example Lakewood Gulch in Sun Valley).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Have driveways accessible for service vehicles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Clean up soil and water pollution in tanks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Have good visible unit numbering.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Resolve issues with Excel.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Increase availability of trash-recycle receptacles.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Increase frequency of trash clean up.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Have a quick response to vandalism.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
9) Have better maintenance & repairs for playgrounds.  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Focus Area 9. Safe and Healthy Environment

It is important to...

1) Keep the family housing near the school.  
2) Strengthen the schools.  
3) Create a new neighborhood by redeveloping DHA.  
4) Have businesses on the first floor of some housing buildings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Focus Area 10. Neighborhood Character and Community Building

It is important to...

1) Have a grocery store.  
2) Have discount family retail.  
3) Have restaurants.  
4) Have medical services.  
5) Have a library.  
6) Have a post office.  
7) Have job opportunities for residents.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Focus Area 11. Services and Jobs

It is important to...

1) Increase resident participation in the community.  
2) Have more activities for children.  
3) Have more activities for teens.  
4) Have more family oriented events.  
5) Have an environmentally conscious neighborhood design.  
6) Have environmentally conscious services like recycling.  
7) Maintain the community garden.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Focus Area 12. Community Activities and Involvement
When public housing is redeveloped residents often debate about whether to allow those criminal histories in the new development. The next set of questions asks whether you are comfortable living next door to someone who committed specific crimes. If you are comfortable living next to them we would like you to answer how recent the conviction might be. (Please circle the best answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) A parking ticket</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) A driving ticket</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) Public intoxication</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>4) Receiving stolen goods</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>5) Check fraud</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>6) Vandalism</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>7) Theft under $500</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>8) Burglary</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>9) Marijuana Use</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>10) Other drug use</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>11) Marijuana Sales</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>12) Other drug sales</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>13) Domestic Violence</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>14) Neglect of children</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>15) Physical abuse of children</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>16) Sexual abuse of children</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>17) Other violent offenses</th>
<th>Not comfortable</th>
<th>Comfortable if (10) years or longer ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if 5-9 years ago</th>
<th>Comfortable if current conviction or parole</th>
<th>Comfortable if current charges</th>
<th>DK</th>
<th>REF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

If a family member of a leaseholder is released from jail or prison should they be allowed to live in the public housing unit under the following circumstances? (Please circle the best answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1) A child under the age of 18</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Give 1 strike and you’re out</th>
<th>Give 2 strikes and you’re out</th>
<th>Give 3 strikes and you’re out</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2) A child over the age of 18</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Give 1 strike and you’re out</th>
<th>Give 2 strikes and you’re out</th>
<th>Give 3 strikes and you’re out</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>3) A spouse or partner</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Give 1 strike and you’re out</th>
<th>Give 2 strikes and you’re out</th>
<th>Give 3 strikes and you’re out</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments

Second chance for family member with criminal history scale (Not pretested) (Original questions)
DHA RESIDENTS ONLY:

1) Sometimes redeveloped neighborhoods provide new services for residents. Does anyone in your household: (Please circle the best answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a. Have a physical disability?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Have a history of substance abuse (drugs or alcohol)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c. Struggle with depression?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d. Have other mental health problems?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Housing based services scale (Alpha = .71) (Original questions based on qualitative interviews)

Sometimes qualifying for redeveloped public housing requires a new screening, which results in current public housing residents with certain demographic factors or histories not passing the new screening. We want to ask about these factors now, so that we are aware of the reasons people might be at risk for losing their public housing if the neighborhood is redeveloped. We will use the data to inform community organizing and advocacy work for your neighborhood, but will not provide individual case management for your household. Please remember your answers are confidential and will not be linked to your name.

Has anyone in your household: (Please circle the best answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1) Ever broken a lease?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2) Belonged to a gang?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3) Been involved in domestic violence or other violence in neighborhood?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4) Had drug related charges or arrests?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5) Had loud parties or history of disturbing neighbors?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6) Been charged with a felony?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7) Been charged with a felonies for more than one incident?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8) Had language barriers</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9) Had property damage/housekeeping issues</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10) Had unauthorized guests in home</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11) Considered public housing your last resort (i.e. without it you would be homeless)?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12) Never rented or owned an apartment or house on the private market?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13) Expect to house more than 6 people in your apartment?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td>REF</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hard-to-house scale (Alpha = .473-.955) (Original questions based on based on Popkin research)

What is the total length of time you have lived in public or private low-income housing? (Please circle the best answer)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Less than 5 years</th>
<th>5-10 years</th>
<th>More than 10 years</th>
<th>Whole life</th>
<th>Don’t Know</th>
<th>Refused</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

Additional Comments: ________________________________
Please flip through the survey and ensure no pages were accidently skipped.

Were all pages completed?
___ yes    ___ no (if no please complete the accidently skipped pages before giving the gift card).

Thank you for your time! Which $10 gift card would you like – ___ King Soopers or ___ Walmart?
(check the one chosen)
Appendix E: Qualitative Semi-structured Interview Guide

Thirty questions to be asked of 25 residents by a Master of Social Work trained interviewer who will consciously build on each resident’s knowledge/experience throughout the interview using paraphrasing (ex. Before you stated that… how do you think that impacts…).

a) Your neighborhood is currently in the process of transit-oriented development, which means that within one-quarter to one-half mile of the 10th and Osage light rail stop buildings will be constructed where public housing is now with stores on some first floors along 10th Avenue with housing a variety of housing above in buildings with one-five, three-five, five-six, seven-nine story buildings. What are your thoughts regarding this sort of development in South Lincoln?
   - Have you ever lived above a business before? If yes, how did it work out? If no, how would you feel moving into an apartment above a business?
   - Would you prefer living above the businesses along 10th Ave or would you rather be down the block?

b) The South Lincoln development will be a mixed income redevelopment, which will focus on building housing for and attracting middle and upper income residents to South Lincoln to rent or buy apartments, flats and townhouses in the same space as public housing. What are your thoughts on mixing incomes and housing like this in South Lincoln?
   - How comfortable would you be living next door to someone who makes more money, drives a nice car, or kids have nice clothes, games, shoes, etc. and you may just getting by?

c) Are you ready for your neighborhood change? Explain. (Prompt with examples if necessary: we need new buildings, we need better bus connections, or we need to address gangs and drugs)

d) How do you feel about your neighbors? Why?
   - How do you describe your relationships with your neighbors? For example, do relationships come easy (where you chat with neighbors, feel similar, and have friends) or are relationships hard (don’t trust anyone, don’t get involved)? Why?

e) Last summer, when we were in the neighborhood doing surveys with residents we found that some residents being ready or not ready for change might be connected to their current relationships in the neighborhood (Walker, 2009) (see Figure F1). How do you think your relationships with your neighbors’ impact how ready or not ready you are for neighborhood redevelopment? (OR Before you stated… about relationships, how do you think that impacts how ready or not ready you are for neighborhood redevelopment?...)
f) Have you attended any of the following neighborhood organizations in the last two years: Local Resident Council (LRC), Resident Council Board (RCB), Project Wise, FRESC, Metro Organizations for People (ex. West High School student or parent organizing), HUGS, Denver Inner City Parish, or the La Alma/Lincoln Park Neighborhood Association? [If no, then may ask about community based organizations like the Bridge Project, Catholic Charities – Head Start parents meetings, Munchkins, neighborhood meetings with the police, South Lincoln Redevelopment meetings, etc.]

g) Why are you involved (or not involved) in neighborhood organizations? (examples: I like the leadership training, being involved helps me have a voice, etc.). Go through each organization they are involved in OR if they are not involved ask:
- have you heard of these organizations?
- if someone invited you to one of these organizational meetings would you go?
- have you ever been involved in these types of organizations? If yes, what happened? Why they are not involved in them now?
- are their barriers to your getting involved in these organizations that could be addressed?

h) If you are involved in neighborhood organizations how do you describe your involvement (give examples – attend, speak up, recruit other residents, officer)?

i) What do you get out of being involved or not involved (give examples - keeps my voice heard in the community, keeps me aware of what is going on, develops confidence and job skills, helps me network, etc.)?

j) Do you feel neighborhood organizations can get things done on behalf of residents (example: reduce crime, develop and implement solutions to neighborhood problem, etc.) (see Figure F1)?

k) Last summer, when we were in the neighborhood doing surveys with residents we found that resident beliefs about neighborhood organizations can getting things done on behalf of residents’ may impact how ready or not ready they are for neighborhood redevelopment (Walker, 2009) (see Figure F1). How do think your beliefs about neighborhood organizations getting things done on behalf of residents’ impacts how ready or not ready you are for neighborhood redevelopment? (OR Before you stated… about neighborhood organizations, how do you think that impacts how ready or not ready you are for neighborhood redevelopment?)

l) Most neighborhood redevelopment requires residents to move and therefore the Relocation Act of 1970 defines resident rights (see Appendix G). Examples of resident rights include assistance with moving expenses such as transferring your phone bill and being offered another habitable housing unit either with a Section 8 Voucher, a North Lincoln unit, another unit in South Lincoln, or moving to another traditional public housing unit in another neighborhood. Your relocation counselor will inform you of three
options for your household based on what is available when you need to be redeveloped (Popkin et al., 2004). For example, Section 8 turnover is low, so not everyone will be offered a Section 8 Voucher. We are curious what kinds of additional support you might need if you moved to each of these different housing types and why.

- Do you think you would need or want any additional support for yourself (or your neighbors) to move to another neighborhood with a Section 8 voucher? Why? [examples I would need help finding a Section 8 unit, school, medical, dental, etc.]
- What if you moved to a North Lincoln?
- What if you moved to old South Lincoln unit?
- What if you moved to a new unit in South Lincoln?
- What if you moved to another traditional public housing unit in another neighborhood (like Westwood, Westridge, Quigg Newton, Sun Valley)?
- What if you moved to another mixed income public housing unit in another neighborhood (like Park Avenue or Curtis Park [Atzlan Park, Trimble Place, Glen Arm St and Blake Street Flats]?)

m) We have created a list of pros and cons for each housing type you might choose (Appendix N). Studies have been conducted with other public housing residents who were relocated that may provide ideas for the types of problems you might face based on the housing location you choose. Next I will provide a quick description of the outcomes for residents who moved to each housing type. [When possible state, “their have been studies that match your opinion of the supports that you might need. Did you also know that if you move to (insert housing type) you might need to consider… What additional supports could address these problems?”]

- Section 8 (for example – pay rent on time for six times, look at Xcel bills for the unit to budget appropriately, utilize the LEAP program in newsletters, reach out to case managers for referrals, etc.)
- Redeveloped public housing
- Remained behind in neighborhood
- Another traditional public housing unit
- Mixed income redevelopment unit

n) The screening criteria (or rules) that determine who can and cannot move back to mixed income redevelopments like the South Lincoln are often stricter.

- What residents should be allowed to come back to the South Lincoln Redevelopment? (Prompts: involved residents have said that residents should be involved in community or working towards self-sufficiency) Why?
- Who should not be allowed to move back? (Prompts: involved residents have said that those moving back should not have a history of negatively impact other residents through violence or abuse, etc.)

o) Last summer, when we were in the neighborhood doing surveys with residents we found that having a transition and/or relocation plan is the most important thing that
determines how ready or not ready residents are for neighborhood redevelopment (see Figure F1).

- For example, keeping relational supports in mind during relocation planning might include making sure seniors live close to their doctor or making sure families live near friends, family and people who can help with childcare;
- or determining screening/eligibility criteria for those who can move into the new development and being clear up front what the housing options for those who don’t meet the screening criteria are.
- or that the South Lincoln redevelopment will be phased to decrease the displacement of residents.
- How do you think having a transition and/or relocation planning impacts how ready or not ready you are for neighborhood redevelopment? (OR Before you stated… about transition and relocation planning, how do you think that impacts how ready or not ready you are for neighborhood redevelopment?) [prompt on each category they brought up, as well as relational support, screening criteria, and phasing related questions/concerns they might have]

p) In Chicago they are beginning to believe that residents who live in public housing communities belong to one of three groups (see Appendices O & P), which the Denver Housing Authority staff and previous survey indicate might match residents in South Lincoln. [Talk vaguely about the typologies (describe the percentage in each group in Chicago to give an idea of where people fell before and the types of support they found helpful) – use story examples when necessary]. Do you relate to these groups?
- Do either Group One, Two, or Three describe your family? If yes, which one sounds like your family and why? If not, how would you describe your family?
- Are their any groups in South Lincoln who are not represented in these groups?

q) These groups were created by a researcher. We are wondering what someone in the community would name these groups. What would you name group 1? Group 2? Group 3? (and any other groups they added?)

r) Now that you have thought through different groups of people and the supports they might need, does that information change what supports you might need during the transition and relocation planning process? How?

s) Two-thirds of Group One wanted Section 8 Vouchers; however previous studies have shown that residents who move with Section 8 Vouchers are twice as likely to experience financial hardship making rent, food and utility payments (Barrett et al., 2003; Crowley, 2009; Popkin, 2007; Popkin & Cunningham, 2009; Theodos et al., 2010). Is this information surprising or new to you?
- Is it the Denver Housing Authority or the resident’s responsibility to ensure utilities are affordable in a Section 8 unit? Why?
t) In what ways do you find relational support in the neighborhood (OR repeat, you said you receive support from the neighborhood…) If you all were selected in the Section 8 Lottery, how do you feel this would impact you?
- Residents who move with Section 8 Vouchers often report a loss of relational support when they move with Section 8 Vouchers, particularly in regards to access to friends or neighbors to help with childcare (Boyd, 2008; Curley, 2006). What can be done for South Lincoln residents to decrease the impact of losing relational support (assuming they get help from their neighbors now)?

u) What kind of support would you need to make a Section 8 Voucher successful for you?

v) What is an ideal neighborhood for your household? What neighborhood is that (what place)? Why?

w) One term for an ideal neighborhood is “opportunity neighborhood.” Opportunity neighborhoods have less people living in poverty, less segregation based on race, better schools, good grocery store, connections to transit, etc (Donovan, 2009). Families in Group One often do not choose to move to lower income and less segregated neighborhoods described as “opportunity neighborhoods,” particularly on their first move (Boyd, 2008) (see Appendix Q). What qualifies as a good neighborhood/service you would choose in terms of a:
- store (King Soopers, Walmart, Dollar Store, etc.)? Why?
- school? Why?
- transportation? Why?
- childcare? Why?
- neighborhood for kids? Why?
- neighborhood for seniors? Why?
- housing? Why?
- neighborhood support/relationships? Why?

x) Can anything be done to help residents choose opportunity neighborhoods when they move with Section 8 Vouchers the first time?

y) What services do you hope the housing authority includes for supporting second group?

z) What services do you hope the housing authority includes for supporting the third group?

aa) Chicago Housing Authority Group Three residents who met with their resident navigator more often (once per week at their home or in the community rather than an office) had better results than other HOPE VI neighborhoods (see Appendices O & P) …
those results included better economic outcomes and relational supports… Would you be open to this kind of support if it meant your family might be better off financially or relationally? Why or why not?

ab) After thinking about your housing options, what would you choose today (i.e. what do you hope is available for your household)?

ac) What do you expect are the problems you will need to solve in this type of housing? Why?

ad) After thinking through all of these topics, what can the Denver Housing Authority build into their plan to provide the support your household needs during the transition and relocation process? What would be the most useful to your household? [Get to an evidence based practice summary/essence like, “I would need a resident navigator that would help me choose housing that would not create financial hardship through utilities” OR “I would need help selecting an opportunity neighborhood, which I hope looks like this…” OR “I would need help making sure I qualify to move back into the redevelopment…” etc.]
Appendix F: Research Question One Results from 2009 HUD Report

Figure F1. Research Question One Results from 2009 HUD Report. These results used different methods, but were used in the 2010 Qualitative Interviews because the final results with the new methods were not yet available. Residents were presented with these findings in the South Lincoln and Sun Valley Local Resident Council Meetings.

Residents identified reasons they believe the model works including: (a) they want to see improvements, (b) they can talk to each other (including residents and counselors), (c) they easily get along instead of being separate, (d) they would like to see connections to businesses with the light rail, (e) they prefer mixed income neighborhoods over low-income neighborhoods only, (f) they would like to see recreation facilities and services maintained, but current cuts have required residents to organize to demand services continue, (g) public housing could be redeveloped or eliminated which would effect residents, so they organized to ask for more services, (h) residents have questions about how the transition and/or relocation plan can work if they want to move to Section 8 but have outstanding bills with Xcel Energy, and (i) residents identify the need to both prepare themselves (job training) and have more information about the redevelopment (where will the units be and what will be around it).
Appendix G: Resident Rights Designated by Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970

Uniform Relocation Assistance and Real Property Acquisition Act of 1970 defines resident rights that have been described by the Denver Housing Authority as including the following items for South Lincoln Residents:

- Assistance with moving expenses such as transferring your phone bill, moving assistance for packing and moving your belongings, etc.
- Being offered another habitable housing unit either with a:
  o Section 8 Voucher,
  o North Lincoln unit,
  o another unit in South Lincoln (temporary old unit or new unit),
  o or moving to another traditional or mixed income public housing unit in another neighborhood.
- Your relocation counselor will inform you of three options for your household based on what is available when you need to be relocated.
- 90 day written notice of need to move.
## Appendix H: Housing Options Pros and Cons

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing Option</th>
<th>Example Pros</th>
<th>Example Cons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Section 8 Voucher</strong></td>
<td>- Freedom to move away from public housing development&lt;br&gt; - Transferable voucher to other Housing Authority locations&lt;br&gt; - Can move to opportunity neighborhoods&lt;br&gt; - Tend to move to lower crime neighborhoods</td>
<td>- Economic hardship for residents who have to pay rent on time to private landlord, pay utility bills, and buy food&lt;br&gt; - Residents tend not to move to opportunity areas until second move&lt;br&gt; - May experience isolation regarding connections to family, childcare, etc.&lt;br&gt; - May increase commute time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>North Lincoln unit</strong></td>
<td>- Remain in neighborhood&lt;br&gt; - Redeveloped housing unit already built&lt;br&gt; - Close to college campus&lt;br&gt; - Established community</td>
<td>- Further from new services and retail to be build near the 10th and Osage stop</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Another unit in South Lincoln (temporary old unit or new unit)</strong></td>
<td>- Can stay in existing neighborhood and maintain social connections&lt;br&gt; - Can keep same schools, medical care, and transportation&lt;br&gt; - Improved neighborhood investment in transit connections, retail, and services on site</td>
<td>- May need to wait longer for a redeveloped unit or may need to move a second time&lt;br&gt; - May hear construction noise for 5-7 years&lt;br&gt; - May need to be flexible regarding the impact of construction (ex. street closures)&lt;br&gt; - New services may take time to develop, whereas a new neighborhood may have those services already in place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Another traditional public housing unit in another neighborhood</strong></td>
<td>- Can move sooner and reestablish life in a similar environment</td>
<td>- May experience similar or worse neighborhood resources, transportation connections, crime, etc.&lt;br&gt; - least change experience by other resident movers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix I: Overview of Chicago Housing Authority Groups, Supports and Outcomes

- Similar profiles and service needs
  o Profiles resident’s (or head of household’s):
    ▪ housing,
    ▪ physical health
    ▪ mental health,
    ▪ self-efficacy,
    ▪ education,
    ▪ employment
    ▪ income,
    ▪ public assistance,
    ▪ criminal activity,
    ▪ demographic characteristics.
  o Outcomes
    ▪ 90% engagement by pairing group with level of support needed (compared to 50% previously)
    ▪ Better connections to services needed when they were needed
    ▪ Only study with better economic outcomes for residents
    ▪ Included whole family (beyond household)
Appendix J: Chicago Housing Authority Three Groups, Supports and Outcomes

- Group 1 (40%)
  - Working (sometimes off and on work)
  - High School Diploma
  - Average age 42
  - Have children (50%)
  - Female headed household (78%)
  - Good mental and physical health
  - Receive food stamps
  - Hardship paying utilities and food
  - Meet with case manager 1-2/month

  - Example Story:

Sharon, a woman in her late 40s is proud of the challenges she and her family have overcome. Sharon has lived in public housing most of her life, growing up on the South Side of Chicago and with her mother and siblings. She had her first child when she was a senior in high school but managed to stay in school and receive her diploma; she now has five children ranging in age from 15 to 32. After high school, Sharon got married and moved into her own apartment in Wells/Madden; she is still married, although her husband does currently not live with her. Three of Sharon’s daughters have graduated from high school and are now adults with their own homes.

Although Sharon has tried to provide a stable life for her children, she has faced many challenges, including struggles with drugs and alcohol. She has held a series of part-time jobs, but often found it difficult to earn enough money to balance the bills and child care. She has held her current job for a number of years, but worries about making ends meet and would like to find another part-time job to increase her income.

When Wells/Madden closed, Sharon opted to take a voucher and is now living in a newly rehabilitated house on the South Side. Although it was her long-time home, she was glad to leave Wells behind; she had become increasingly concerned about the violence and drug trafficking and worried about her 16-year-old daughter, who frequently got into fights with other girls. Although the family’s new home is far from friends, it is within walking distance of Sharon’s part-time job. Her daughters are happy and are attending a new school close by and making friends; Sharon has had more difficulty adapting to the new community and, even though she believes the move was good for her family, still has concerns about drug trafficking and crime (Theodos et al., 2010, p. 12).
Group Two (20%):

- Older (average age 57)
- More single people, and more men (32%)
- Care for children or grandchildren (25%)
- Poor health
- High levels of depression, anxiety, physical ailments (cardiovascular disease, asthma, arthritis, diabetes, and severe mobility impairments)
- Receive SSI
- Less than ½ High school diploma or GED
- Most have not worked in decades
- Substance use may be a struggle
- Achieving self-sufficiency is not an attainable goal
- Similar demographics as homeless populations, but stably housed in public housing as their last resort
- Least likely to meet with case manager (maybe 1/mo)
- Example story

Martin, a 65 year-old man, and his 15-year-old developmentally delayed son, Andrew, relocated from Wells/Madden to a smaller CHA development on the far South Side. Martin grew up in public housing; his family was very close and he says he had a happy childhood. He dropped out of school after 8th grade because he had to work in his father’s trucking business. Martin got married and had his first child when he was 18, and now has six children; he was married for 46 years, but now is divorced. Andrew’s mother died in 2006, leaving Martin as his sole caregiver.

Martin has many health problems; he is diabetic, has asthma and congestive heart failure, had lung cancer a few years ago, has a serious drinking problem, and recently began using cocaine again. Even so, Martin says he is very concerned about staying healthy so he can care for his son, so he exercises (he says he has lost 100 pounds) and sees his doctor regularly. He and Andrew get by on Social Security what Martin makes selling things at the local flea market.

Taking care of Andrew is difficult for Martin. Andrew cannot read or write well, has trouble communicating, and is often picked on at school. Martin worries constantly about Andrew, and often wonders what will happen to Andrew if he dies. Martin’s main hope is that he will live long enough to see Andrew graduate from high school and move into an independent living program (Theodos et al., 2010, p. 13).
Group 3 (40%): have characteristics of both groups
  - Older than strivers, but younger than aging and distressed (48 years old)
  - Most have children
  - Meet with case manager frequently
  - May have serious physical and mental health challenges
  - High rates of poor health, obesity, depression, anxiety, and substance use
  - Employment low (but twice the rate of aging and distressed)
  - Most receive public assistance (SSI, food stamps, TANF)
  - Mostly female headed (95%) families (64%) with larger households (3.5 people or 2-3 kids)
  - At risk of becoming aging and distressed, but with supports may improve
  - Example story

Jasmine is a severely depressed 35-year old single mother raising four children while coping with domestic violence and substance use. Growing up, Jasmine lived with her mother, step-father, and three siblings on the South Side of Chicago. Jasmine had a troubled childhood, and says her parents were both emotionally and physically abusive. She struggled in high school and dropped out her senior year, but eventually completed her GED.

Jasmine has continued to face serious challenges. She developed a serious, yet preventable, health condition that went untreated and eventually left her nearly blind. Her disability and limited education made it difficult to find work. Jasmine moved into the Dearborn Homes because her disability payments did not allow for her to provide for herself and her newborn son. After moving to public housing, she became severely depressed, and says that she used drugs and alcohol to help her cope with her pain.

Jasmine and her four children have recently moved out of the Dearborn Homes and into another public housing development, but their situation remains precarious. Jasmine’s new boyfriend has become dangerously abusive; she says he is putting her and her children’s lives in jeopardy. Her substance use problems have also gotten worse, and the Department of Children and Family Services recently required her to complete a three-month residential treatment program for alcohol addiction and domestic violence. While she was in treatment, her children were placed in foster care. After she completed the program, she regained custody on the condition that she attend weekly parenting classes. Despite her many problems, Jasmine says she believes that with the support of her case manager and her family, she can overcome her struggles with addiction and mental illness (Theodos et al., 2010, p. 14).
Opportunity neighborhoods have:
- Less people living in poverty,
- Less segregation based on race,
- Better schools,
- Good grocery stores/retail,
- Connections to transit (Donovan, 2009)
## Appendix L: Items Used in Study Scales

### Table L.1. Items Used in Study Scales.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Social Cohesion & Neighborhood Identity | 1) I feel a strong sense of ties with the other people who live in my local neighborhood.  
2) If I need a little company, I can contact a neighbor I know.  
3) A feeling of fellowship runs deep between me and other people in my neighborhood.  
4) If I need advice about something I could ask someone from my local neighborhood.  
5) I often help my neighbors with small things or they help me.  
6) I have a lot in common with other people who live in my local neighborhood.  
7) If the people who live in my local area were planning something, I'd think of it as something we're doing rather than something they're doing.  
8) The friendships and associations I have with other people in my local neighborhood mean a lot to me.  
9) If I don’t have something I need I can borrow it from a neighbor.  
10) I have made new friends living in my local neighborhood.  
11) I often visit my neighbors.  
12) If I feel like talking I can generally find someone in my local neighborhood to chat to.  
13) I find it difficult to form a bond with other people who live in my local neighborhood.  
14) I feel loyal to the people in my neighborhood.  
15) I chat with my neighbors when I run into them.  
16) I am quite similar to most people who live in my local neighborhood.  
17) I borrow things and exchange favors with neighbors.  
18) I have friends in my local neighborhood, who are part of my everyday activities.  
19) My neighbors and I want the same things from our local neighborhood.  
20) I don’t feel a sense of being connected with other people who live in my local neighborhood.  
21) Lots of things in my neighborhood remind me of my past.  
22) I think I agree with most people in my neighborhood about what is important in life.  
23) I really fit in to my local neighborhood.  
24) The people who live in my local neighborhood get along well.  
25) I rarely visit other people in my local neighborhood.  |
26) My local neighborhood is a part of my everyday life.
27) People in my local neighborhood do not share the same values.
28) In general I’m glad to be a resident of my local neighborhood.
29) I care what my neighbors think of my actions.

Organizational Collective Efficacy
30) Improve the physical conditions in the neighborhood like cleanliness of housing upkeep.
31) Get people in the neighborhood to help each other more.
32) Persuade the city to provide better services to the people in the neighborhood.
33) Reduce crime in the neighborhood.
34) Get people who live in the neighborhood to know each other.
35) Increase decent affordable housing.
36) Improve the business district in the neighborhood.
37) Develop and implement solutions to neighborhood problems.

Participation Level
38) Attended organizational functions and activities.
39) Actively participated in discussions.
40) Attended meetings of the organization.
41) Done work for the organization outside of meetings.
42) Served as a member of a committee.
43) Served as an officer or a committee chair.
44) Helped organize activities (other than meetings).
45) Tried to recruit new members for a neighborhood organization.
46) Tried to get people out for meetings and activities.
47) Served as a representative of the organization to other community groups.
48) Worked on other activities for the organization.

Highest Involvement
49) What is the highest level of involvement you have in these local neighborhood organizations? ([1] I take no part at all; [2] I am just beginning to get involved; [3] I play a passive role; [4] I participate in relaying information; [5] I carry out various tasks at the instruction of the staff and/or board; [6] I participate in planning, decision making, and implementation; and [7] I am a full partner in planning, decision making, and implementation.]

Neighborhood Problems
50) Vacant, abandoned, or boarded up homes/buildings are a problem in my neighborhood.
51) Lack of property maintenance is a problem in my neighborhood.
52) Lack of yard maintenance is a problem in my neighborhood.
53) Litter or trash on sidewalks and streets.
54) Litter and trash from events in the neighborhood.
55) Traffic safety problems such as cars speeding.
56) Traffic safety problems such as cars not watching for children.
57) Traffic safety problems such as cars not obeying stop signs or lights.
58) Racial incidents.
59) Crime and disorder
60) Drug dealing
61) Drug use
62) People drinking alcohol
63) Vandalism including graffiti on buildings and walls
64) Youth hanging out and causing trouble.
65) Gangs/gang activity
66) Prostitution

Individual Activism
67) Spoken to a politician (like a city council person, representative, or school board member) about a neighborhood problem or improvement.
68) Talked to a group causing a problem in your neighborhood.
69) Talked to a religious leader or minister to help with a neighborhood problem or with a neighborhood improvement.
70) Written or had someone help me write a letter to the editor of a newspaper, newsletter or magazine.
71) Wrote a letter or made a phone call to influence a policy or political issue.
72) Had an in-depth, face-to-face conversation about an issue affecting your community.
73) Got together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize a neighborhood improvement.

Collective Activism
74) Attended a neighborhood watch or block watch meeting.
75) Attended a citizens’ committee or local political group.
76) Attended a meeting of a block or neighborhood group.
77) Gotten together with neighbors to do something about a neighborhood problem or to organize neighborhood improvement.
78) Read a flier or received a phone call about a community meeting.
79) Filled out a community survey.
80) Signed a petition.
81) Attended an event promoting information about community services.
82) Attended a public meeting to press for a needed change.
83) Attended a meeting to gather information about a neighborhood issue.

Collective Efficacy:
84) Reduce drug dealing
85) Deal with gangs

396
Working Together Against Crime

86) Reduce public drunkenness
87) Deter fights
88) Decrease violence
89) Deter domestic violence
90) Decrease drug use
91) Form a neighborhood watch
92) Call police to report crime or safety concerns

Transition and/or Relocation Plan

93) Recognize the residents need to maintain social connections if moved from the neighborhood.
94) Provide financial assistance if residents moved from neighborhood.
95) Provide logistical assistance if residents moved from the neighborhood.
96) Identify a relocation plan if residents moved from the neighborhood.
97) Allow DHA residents the right to return neighborhood.
98) Create a new neighborhood by redeveloping Denver Housing Authority.

Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment

99) My neighborhood is predominately low-income.
100) My neighborhood consists predominately of people of color.
101) My neighborhood is segregated based on race.
102) I am open to my neighborhood changing.
103) I want my neighborhood to change.
104) I will help my neighborhood change.
105) I am comfortable living near people of other incomes.
106) I am comfortable living near people of other races.
107) I am comfortable living near people who speak other languages.
108) I am willing to live in a multicultural neighborhood.
109) I am willing to live in a neighborhood that is mixed income.
110) I believe residents with lower incomes will benefit from living near more residents with higher incomes.
111) I believe the redevelopment of South Lincoln and/or Sun Valley is necessary.
112) My household would like to stay in the neighborhood if it is redeveloped.
113) It is important to design the neighborhood with walking in mind.
114) It is important to have bus/light rail connections to services.
115) It is important to have bus/light rail connections to healthcare.
116) It is important to have businesses on the first floor of some housing buildings.
Housing Problems
117) Peeling paint or broken plaster
118) Plumbing needs repairs
119) Rats or mice
120) Cockroaches
121) Cold during the winter
122) Hot during the summer
123) Buildings shifting/doors won’t close
124) Has an unsecured mail slot
125) Has unsecured windows
126) Has unsecured doors
127) Is dark and unsafe outside after dark
128) Screen Doors need repairs
129) Walls in the bathroom need repairs
130) Needs Other Major Repairs

Crime Tolerance: Comfort Next Door
131) A parking ticket
132) A driving ticket
133) Public intoxication
134) Receiving stolen goods
135) Check fraud
136) Vandalism
137) Theft under $500
138) Burglary
139) Marijuana Use
140) Other drug use
141) Marijuana Sales
142) Other drug sales
143) Domestic Violence
144) Neglect of children
145) Physical abuse of children
146) Sexual abuse of children
147) Other violent offenses

Crime Tolerance: Second Chance Door
148) A child under the age of 18
149) A child over the age of 18
150) A spouse or a partner

Resident Involvement in Community Organizations
151) Metro Organizations for People (which is known by the following names – Sun Valley Coalition; Voices Heard at West High School; Youth Organizing at the Bridge Project; Parent Organizing at West High School, etc.)
152) Project WISE
153) HUGS
154) FRESC
155) Denver Housing Authority – Local Resident Council
156) Denver Housing Authority – Resident Council Board
157) Other community organizing and social change efforts?
   If yes, What is the name of the group? __________________

Home Owner 158) Yes, No
### Appendix M: EFA Descriptive Statistics Summary for Missing Excluded

**Table M1.** EFA Descriptive Statistics Summary for Missing Excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>% Var.</th>
<th>Sample N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Possible Range</th>
<th>Skew</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42.3%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.1- .9</td>
<td>-.003-</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Identity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.1-.6</td>
<td>-.4-</td>
<td>.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.9-</td>
<td>-.5-</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level: Attend</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>65.8%</td>
<td>183</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>.7-.4</td>
<td>-.7-.9</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level: Core Leader</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>181</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>1.4-2.5</td>
<td>1.01-</td>
<td>.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Crime and Disorder</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.4%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.4</td>
<td>1.3--</td>
<td>.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Property Issues</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>.1-.7</td>
<td>1.2-</td>
<td>.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Traffic Safety Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>-.4-</td>
<td>1.3-</td>
<td>.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Activism: Relational</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.1%</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>.1-.2</td>
<td>.3-</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>1.3-2.4</td>
<td>-.4-3.7</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Activism:</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.9%</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>.1-.2</td>
<td>.2-</td>
<td>0-1</td>
<td>2.01-</td>
<td>2.1-</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action: Meetings</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38.4</td>
<td>.1-.5</td>
<td>.3-.5</td>
<td>-1.2-.2</td>
<td>-2.01-.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Action: Actions</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>.2-.3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.2</td>
<td>.5-.9</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Together Against Crime</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>1.8-.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>-.5-.4</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition &amp; Relocation Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>68.7</td>
<td>3.9-.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-1.8-.5</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Mixed Income</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>3.4-.7</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.3-.5</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>2.6-4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-1.3-.7</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for New Urbanism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>4.1-.8</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.8-.4</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Problems: Structural</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>44.9</td>
<td>1.4-.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>-.5-.9</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Problems: Maintenance</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>1.5-</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.9-.9</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Disorder and Drug Crimes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>52.5</td>
<td>2.1-2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>.5-.1</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for Abuse and Violent Crimes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>1.2-2</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.8-.9</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance for</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>3.9-</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.1-.7</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minor Crimes</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.3-</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tolerance:</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Second Chance</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>.1-.3-</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident involvement in community organizations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>.1-.3-</td>
<td>.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix N: CFA Descriptive Statistics Summary for Missing Excluded

**Table N1. CFA Descriptive Statistics Summary for Missing Excluded.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. Items</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 14</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Identity</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16, 21-24, 26, 28, 29</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30, 32, 33, 34, 35, 37</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level: Attend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38, 39, 40</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level: Core Leader</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42, 43, 44, 46, 47, 48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.944</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Crime and Disorder</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>58-66</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Property Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Traffic Safety Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Activism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69-71</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Activism</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>68, 72-83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Together Against Crime</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85-92</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition &amp; Relocation Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94-98</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Mixed Income</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>105-109</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102-104, 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for New Urbanism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114-115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Mixed Income</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>105-108</td>
<td>.994  .027</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102-104</td>
<td>.804</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for New Urbanism</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113-116</td>
<td>.719</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems (1 scale)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117-118, 120-124, 126-130</td>
<td>.941  .063</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Property Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-54, 58</td>
<td>.91   .061</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Crime &amp; Disorder</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>59-66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Traffic Safety</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Housing Problems</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117-118, 120-124, 126-130</td>
<td>.951  .086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Tolerance: Violence, Abuse, &amp; Neglect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>143-147</td>
<td>.951  .086</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Tolerance: Drug Use &amp; Sales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140-142</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>1  .000  .892</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Tolerance: Crime &amp; Disorder</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133-139</td>
<td>.955</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Tolerance: Second Chance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>148-150</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident involvement in community organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>151-152, 154-157</td>
<td>.997  .04</td>
<td>.697</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix O: CFA Descriptive Statistics Summary for Missing Imputed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>No. Items</th>
<th>Items</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>Alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1-2, 4-11, 14</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Identity</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16, 21-24, 26, 28-29</td>
<td>.966</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>30, 32-35, 37</td>
<td>.983</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level: Attend</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>38-40</td>
<td>.985</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.958</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level: Core Leader</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42-48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Crime and Disorder</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>58-65</td>
<td>.939</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Property Maintenance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>50-54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems: Traffic Safety Issues</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>55-57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.795</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individual Activism</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>69-71</td>
<td>.967</td>
<td>.062</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collective Activism</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>68, 72-83</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.964</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level of Involvement</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Together Against Crime</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>85-92</td>
<td>.982</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition &amp; Relocation Plan</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>94-98</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>.959</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Mixed Income</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>105-110</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>102-104, 111</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.722</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for New Urbanism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>114-115</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.897</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Score</td>
<td>Range</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>E</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Mixed Income (Walker, 2009)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>105-108</td>
<td>.994</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.875</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Change (Walker, 2009)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>102-104</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for New Urbanism (Walker, 2009)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>113-116</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Problems (1 scale)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>117-124, 126-130</td>
<td>.941</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Tolerance: Violence, Abuse, &amp; Neglect</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>143-147</td>
<td>.972</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Tolerance: Drug Use &amp; Sales</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>140-142</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Tolerance: Crime &amp; Disorder</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>133-139</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crime Tolerance: Second Chance</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>148-150</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident involvement in community organizations</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>151-152, 154-157</td>
<td>.997</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.697</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix P: Measurement Model Representing Social Cohesion

Figure P1. Measurement Model Representing Social Cohesion
CFI=.966; RMSEA=.069; AIC=5188.679; Chi-Sq.(44)=124.544***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix Q: Measurement Model Representing Organizational Collective Efficacy

**Figure Q1.** Measurement Model Representing Organizational Collective Efficacy
CFI=.983; RMSEA=.082; AIC=2566.542; Chi-Sq.(9)=20.441*
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix R: Measurement Model Representing Participation Level

![Diagram of the measurement model](image)

**Figure R1.** Measurement Model Representing Participation Level
CFI = .985; RMSEA = .075; AIC = 3815.982; Chi-Sq.(26) = 53.767***
Significance Levels: *** p ≤ .001; ** p ≤ .01; * p ≤ .05; ns = p > .05
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Appendix S: Measurement Model Representing Neighborhood Problems

Figure S1. Measurement Model Representing Neighborhood Problems 3 Factor Model
CFI=.939; RMSEA=.077; AIC=7822.21; Chi-Sq.(115)=247.26***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix T: Measurement Model Representing Activism

Figure T1. Measurement Model Representing Activism
CFI=.967; RMSEA=.062; Chi-Sq.(118)=203.959***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix U: Measurement Model Representing Neighborhood Identity

Figure U1. Measurement Model Representing Neighborhood Identity
CFI=.966; RMSEA=.061; AIC=8287.869; Chi-Sq.(20)=48.457***
Significance Levels: *** p<=.001; ** p<=.01; * p<=.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix V: Measurement Model Representing Collective Efficacy:
Working Together Against Crime

Figure VI. Measurement Model Representing Collective Efficacy: Working Together Against Crime
CFI= .982; RMSEA= .083; AIC=1937.772; Chisq(16)=35.881
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix W: Measurement Model Representing Transition and/or Relocation Plan

Figure W1. Measurement Model Representing Transition and/or Relocation Plan
CFI=.988; RMSEA=.078; AIC=3161.699; Chi-Sq.(5)=16.058*
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix X: Measurement Model Representing Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment

Figure X1. Measurement Model Representing Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment
CFI=.95; RMSEA=.07; AIC=9122.899; Chi-Sq.(51)=147.239***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Figure X2. Measurement Model Representing Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment Walker (2009) Factor Structure
CFI=.994; RMSEA=.027; AIC=4044.933; Chi-Sq.(41)=46.636 ns
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix Y: Measurement Model Representing Housing Problems

Figure Y1. Measurement Model Representing Housing Problems 1 Factor Model
CFI=.941; RMSEA=.063; AIC=5786.526; Chi-Sq.(66)=740.289***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Figure Y2. Measurement Model Representing Neighborhood Problems 4 Factor Model with Neighborhood Problems

CFI=.91; RMSEA=.061; AIC=13590.571; Chi-Sq.(372)=639.639***

Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05.
Appendix Z: Measurement Model Representing Crime Tolerance: Comfort Next Door

Figure Z1. Measurement Model Representing Crime Tolerance: Comfort Next Door
CFI=.951; RMSEA=.086; AIC=8121.417; Chi-Sq.(84)=195.4***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix AA: Measurement Model Representing Crime Tolerance:

Second Chance

Figure AA1. Measurement Model Representing Crime Tolerance: Second Chance
CFI=1; RMSEA=.000; AIC=1179.132; Chi-Sq.(0)=0***
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix AB: Measurement Model Representing Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations

**Figure AB1.** Measurement Model Representing Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations
CFI=.997; RMSEA=.04; Chi-Sq.(8)=10.932
Significance Levels: *** p≤.001; ** p≤.01; * p≤.05; ns= p>.05
Appendix AC: Final Summary of Study Measures.

Table AC1. Final Summary of Study Measures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Normal distribution</th>
<th>Reliability for study (existing literature)</th>
<th>Comparison with existing scales and/or discriminant validity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Cohesion</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent alpha=.931 (.85-.97)</td>
<td>The final social cohesion scale included five items from multidimensional measure of neighboring (Skjaeveland et al., 1996), four items from neighborhood cohesion instrument (Buckner, 1988), and two items from in-group ties subscale (Cameron, 1998).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Collective Efficacy</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent alpha=.913 (.99)</td>
<td>The final scale trimmed two items from Ohmer &amp; Beck (2006).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation Level</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent alpha=.944 (.9)</td>
<td>The scale trimmed two items from the Ohmer &amp; Beck (2006) conceptualization, which also had excellent reliability (alpha=.99).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Problems</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Excellent alpha=.935 (.77-.84)</td>
<td>The scale is similar to the five item Foster-Fishman conceptualization of housing problems (alpha=.77) and four item crime (alpha=.84); however the reliability is higher in this study is higher housing problems (alpha=.877) and crime (alpha=.907). This study added five items to the crime scale as conceptualized by the Making Connections survey (Making Connections-Denver, n.d.). In addition a third subscale was added that includes traffic safety problems (alpha=.763).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Item 70 (wrote a letter to a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
alpha=.883 newspaper) had high kurtosis (11.1), which would be lowered to 3.7 if the item was trimmed. Trimming item 70 would also result in lowering the skew from 3.6 to 2.1, which would have fairly minimal impact on the reliability (alpha=.879). Item 70 was included in the analysis of this study because the impacts non-normal skew disappear in samples over 100-200 (Waternaux, 1976); however future analysis may consider removing the item if similar kurtosis is found. The scale included a different factor structure than previous Individual and collective activism (Foster-Fishman et al., 2007), behavioral empowerment (Speer & Peterson, 2000) (alpha=.78), and also included a couple of items from Parsons (n.d.), and a couple of new items, which resulted in improved reliability.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Neighborhood Identity</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>alpha=.742 (not reported)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

The scale includes items from five existing scales which builds on the new conceptualization of ties and friendship (Obst et al., 2001) including: two items from the neighborhood cohesion instrument (Buckner, 1988), two items from the urban identity scales (Lalli, 1992), two items from the sense of community index (Chavis et al., 1986), two items from the strength of group identification scale (Brown et al., 1986), one item from in-group ties subscale (Cameron, 1998). The reliability of the neighborhood identity scale is lower than the scales identified by Obst et al (2001), but may offer an alternative conceptualization. Participation Level. The
| Topic | Participation Level Scale | Reliability | Kurtosis | skew | Conceptualization
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transition and/or Relocation Plan</td>
<td>The kurtosis is higher than can be confidently called normally distributed (1.6-3.7). The skew is well within the range that can be analyzed with a Structural Equation Modeling framework and therefore the items are retained in the scale (Kline, 2005).</td>
<td>Good alpha=.944</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>well within range of 1.6-3.7</td>
<td>The conceptualization identified by the residents in the Resident Advisory Committee process as key focus area 4: transition and/or relocation process is confirmed as a reliable and valid conceptualization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Readiness for Mixed Income Redevelopment</td>
<td>The kurtosis is higher than can be confidently called normally distributed (.04-5.1). Three items on the readiness for new urbanism scale have the potentially non-normal skew including items 113 (design the neighborhood with walking in mind), 114 (connections to services and health care), and 115 (having business on the first floor of some housing buildings).</td>
<td>Good alpha=.807</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>well within range of 1.6-3.7</td>
<td>The readiness for mixed income assumptions scale is reliable and valid when including additional items from the Key Focus Areas for change such as designing the neighborhood with walking in mind, having bus and light rail connections to services and health care, as well as having business on the first floor of some housing buildings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
services), and 115 (connections to health care), which is the result of overwhelming agreement among survey participants that these items are important. The skew is well within the range that can be analyzed with a Structural Equation Modeling framework and therefore the items are retained in the scale (Kline, 2005).

Housing Problems | Yes | Excellent alpha=.866 | The housing problems scale as conceptualized based on the Resident Advisory Committee process and qualitative interviews (Walker, 2009) resulted in a reliable and valid scale.

Crime Tolerance: Comfort Next Door | The skewness (-1.3-5) and kurtosis (-1.7-26.5) were much higher than can be confidently considered normally distributed. The last four items (neglect of children, physical abuse of children, | Excellent alpha=.94 | The correlation matrix for Working Together Against Crime and Crime Tolerance: Comfort Next Door was created in order to create a discriminate validity comparison, which resulted in correlations of .058-.253) therefore the concepts are different as expected.
sexual abuse of children, and other violent offenses) have a very high kurtosis (5.5-26.5), which may mean that residents are much less comfortable living next door to people who have been charged or convicted of crimes that are related to violence and abuse of children. The crime tolerance: comfort next door scale had been used in this study. The scale therefore may provide better results if the last four items were excluded from the scale, which would result in a kurtosis range that is 1.5 or lower with similar reliability (alpha=.944). The items were retained in this analysis since the impact of skewness disappears with samples over
100-200 and the concepts are substantively important.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The Crime Tolerance: Comfort Next Door</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Excellent alpha=.913</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The scale was reliable and valid scale as conceptualized. The working together against crime scale and crime tolerance: comfort next door scale correlation matrix was analyzed to determine if the concepts are different as expected, which resulted in correlations of .056-.191 which confirms the construct validity of the scale. The crime tolerance: second chance scale resulted in a reliable and valid scale as conceptualized.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Involvement in Neighborhood Organizations</th>
<th>The item indicating that residents are involved in FRESC results in a high skew (2.8) and kurtosis (6.2). If the FRESC item is deleted the scale has skew (.8-.17) and kurtosis (-1.3-1) values that can be considered normally distributed. The skew is well within the range that can be analyzed with a Structural Equation Modeling framework and</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The scale was compared with the participation in decision making scale to confirm the conceptual difference, which resulted in correlations of .107-.32 therefore the scales are conceptually different. The involvement in neighborhood organizations scale resulted in a reliable and valid scale as conceptualized.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
therefore the items are retained in the scale (Kline, 2005).
**Appendix AD: Qualitative Demographics**

*Table AD1. Qualitative Demographics.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Categories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number of bedrooms in the unit</td>
<td>1 (17%), 2 (54%), 3 (17%), 4 (4%), 5 (4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Involvement in organizations</td>
<td>Involved (76%), not involved (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Length of time in the neighborhood</td>
<td>&lt; 5 (68%), 5-10 (12%), over 10 years (20%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commitment to staying in neighborhood</td>
<td>Stay (64%), not sure (20%), move (16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident employment and benefits</td>
<td>Employed (24%), Not employed with benefits (52%), Not employed without benefits (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident education</td>
<td>No High School Diploma or GED (40%), Diploma or GED (36%), at least some trade school or college (24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race/ethnicity</td>
<td>Hispanic/Latino/a (44%), African American (24%), Caucasian (16%), Native American (8%), Mixed Race (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>18-30 years old (16%), 31-40 (36%), 41-50 (16%), 51-60 (20%), 61-70 (8%), and 71 years or older (5%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>Male (25%), female (75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Criminal record</td>
<td>At least one felony conviction within household (16%) or no felony convictions within household (84%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix AE: Qualitative Results for Research Question One

Table AE1. Resulting themes from the readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I’ll fit in to the mix of people</td>
<td>Some residents describe themselves as they expect future market rate tenants to be (hard workers who want to live close to downtown and would use the Light Rail and neighborhood retail).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I moved out sooner, I wouldn’t have to worry about it all</td>
<td>Some residents described avoiding the need to be ready for change if they make their own choices about where to move before redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It’s just a little easier not to disturb anyone when you have your own roof over your head</td>
<td>Some residents describe concern about the multi-family buildings based on previous experiences and their perception of the impact of higher density on daily living (particularly for their children).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be good for the community</td>
<td>Some residents describe the redevelopment as a means to improve the living standards, vacant lots, and much needed neighborhood retail.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m planning on getting ready. I’m not really ready now.</td>
<td>Some residents describe the tasks and personal improvements they hope to complete in order to be ready for neighborhood level change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AE2. Resulting themes from the readiness for change category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s going to be nice</td>
<td>Residents who are ready for change identify the need for neighborhood change and their involvement in creating the plans for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People don’t like it because…</td>
<td>Residents who are not ready for change focus on the neighborhood as it is as their home.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ll probably be gone</td>
<td>Some residents have a plan to move away from the neighborhood before the changes begin.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is it going to…?</td>
<td>Some residents still have questions about whether the neighborhood will be designed with them in mind. For</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
example, will the community be designed for seniors with disabilities.

Afraid of the bad elements so change would be better

Residents who are impacted by the neighborhood problems and the resulting safety concerns are ready for change.

I need to…

Residents identify tasks they need to complete before they are literally ready to move such as getting rid of furniture that will not fit in a smaller unit.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are trying to make this a better area</td>
<td>Some residents genuinely believe the change is focused on improving the community and therefore dispel rumors that they will be kicked out in favor of higher income residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>That’s a great idea especially for the children</td>
<td>Many neighborhood children are born and raised in public housing and therefore mixing incomes will help socialize them to see what they can aspire to.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living next door to someone who made more money would be a good change</td>
<td>Living next door to higher income residents might motivate public housing residents to go back to school or get a better job.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Will the upper class choose to live here or stick around when…</td>
<td>Residents express doubts that higher income residents will want to live near particular ethnic groups, activities, or public housing residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It doesn’t matter</td>
<td>Residents perceive their neighborhood as mixed income already because of the proximity of single-family homes and with the redevelopment it will become less apparent who the low-income families are.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When there is something that goes wrong…</td>
<td>residents expect the differences in publically subsidized and market rate rents/mortgages to become an issue when problems arise.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table AE4. Resulting themes from the readiness for new urbanism category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They are not large enough</td>
<td>Residents describe concern that the higher density units will be too small for their household.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The children are confined</td>
<td>Many residents described concern that the higher density units will limit the opportunities for children to play outside within the view of their parents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The living arrangements are better than here</td>
<td>Some residents prefer the mix of businesses and residential over the current public housing use only.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If I had my options and the opportunity arises</td>
<td>Some residents describe their desire to live close to the light rail and/or become a homeowner.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AE5. Resulting themes from the social cohesion category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some neighbors are good</td>
<td>Neighbors that work, take care of their yards, are quiet, help each other, and attend the Local Resident Council meetings are good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some neighbors can be troublesome</td>
<td>Neighbors that are noisy, have police contact, and do not take care of their personal affairs are troublesome and I do not establish a relationship with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I pretty much keep to myself</td>
<td>I like to keep my personal business to myself except for talking to one or two neighbors or family.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We come together</td>
<td>Some of us go to community classes, help each other with problems, make referrals, or decorate for the holidays.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t see the one’s that work</td>
<td>Residents describe a neutral relationship with residents who work because they do not see or interact with them.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AE6. Resulting themes from social cohesion predicting readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My neighbor and I were going back and forth</td>
<td>Residents have dialogued (during spontaneous daily interactions) about all of the meetings, planning and preparation for the change, which has helped them be prepared for change.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I don’t see what the big deal is, I got other things to think about

Some residents described their focusing their mental capacities on becoming independent so that they do not need to rely on public assistance as the neighborhood is redeveloped.

I want to stay for myself

Other residents have described the desire to stay in the new development in order to experience the improved environment and convenience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table AE7. Resulting themes from the organizational collective efficacy category.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Theme</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ve never really seen them change anything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We were able to do it to some extent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do speak up and I do listen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have my concerns</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AE8. Resulting themes from organizational collective efficacy predicting readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment category.

| Theme | Definition |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| If you go to meetings it’s been my experience that there’s been positive results | Residents who regularly attend meetings describe a clear sense of what is expected of them, the opportunities and decisions they will face, and responsibility for implementation of the neighborhood change. |
| I think we are getting invaded here | Some residents described feeling invaded by outsiders or duped by planning processes that told them only the appealing part of the story and not the whole truth. |
| Want to be informed about what types of changes are | Some residents feared being tossed from their housing like a child’s toy and therefore came to meetings to learn |
going to be made and how things will affect us as a family

Then at times I don’t see anything and they say they are waiting to see what’s going to happen

I think we had influence on… which has helped me get ready for change

The housing authority’s role is enforcement… and a lot of the residents were not aware of that

They might not be bothered with that right now

Myself and other residents have had run-ins with…

Residents meet to discuss safety concerns and solutions that can be implemented without getting people riled up, but at times they talk about addressing problems without seeing any real change.

Residents described seeing their suggestions in neighborhood plans, which helps them plan for the change and increases their willingness to participate in implementing the changes.

We are learning that we can confidentially complain to the housing authority who has the job of ensuring residents follow the rules and regulations.

We send out flyers for meetings, but a lot of residents don’t attend because they might be enduring a personal hardship or are set in their ways.

At times the various planning processes are conducted independently; residents try to integrate knowledge they have gained to ensure the different planning processes are moving towards a common vision but are unable to convince the various decision makers to do what will be best for the future of the community.

**Table AE9. Resulting themes from the transition and/or relocation plan category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to have options and be independent</td>
<td>Residents describe a desire to be given longer than 90 days notice of the need to move in order to make the best possible move such as Section 8 or home ownership.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think it’s a good plan</td>
<td>Residents describe agreement with having a plan that clearly outlines the relocation plan and stages the move dates throughout the neighborhood.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Truthfully I have already thought about it. I’ve planned.</td>
<td>Residents describe thinking through neighborhoods that are convenient, safe, and whether they can put their name on a list for their priority areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
With Section 8 I think families of large sizes should have priority. Large families in current five bedroom public housing units will need help building relationships with landlords willing to house families of six to eight people.

Table AE10. Resulting themes from transition and/or relocation plan predicting readiness for transit-oriented mixed income redevelopment category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am ready, but I am kind of scared because I am not sure where they are going to place me and my family</td>
<td>Many residents are concerned that they may not qualify for the redeveloped housing, may be moved to another location that is less convenient for their daily lives, and that they may lose the supportive community they currently experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t feel like they’re putting forth the effort… it definitely doesn’t make you feel very powerful.</td>
<td>Some residents express confusion regarding money being spent on neighborhood improvements they do not value rather than the maintenance requests they make that are not addressed. As a result residents feel frustrated and do not believe they have much influence over their own transition and relocation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m telling people they should stay</td>
<td>Involved residents who are committed to the neighborhood have encouraged other residents to plan to remain in the community during and after the redevelopment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Where they put me until I get on my feet, that’s where they’re gonna put me</td>
<td>Other residents do not expect much control over where they are housed because of their dependence on public housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Getting the message out, being informed, being made aware</td>
<td>Some residents expect to be formally informed about important community facts whether they remain in the neighborhood or are temporarily displaced from the community.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix AF: Qualitative Results for Research Question Two

*Table AF1.* Resulting themes from the involvement in neighborhood organizations category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project WISE</td>
<td>Some of the women took me to a meeting where we talked and supported each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Resident Council</td>
<td>I go to the council meetings where we talk about the redevelopment, crime, and maintenance issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metro Organizations for People</td>
<td>I have been to a MOP action before.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denver Inner City Parish</td>
<td>Us seniors meet up at the parish for coffee and meals throughout the week.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Community Meetings</td>
<td>The redevelopment meetings are the ones when they talk about what the buildings are going to look like around here.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Redevelopment Steering Committee</td>
<td>I am involved with the steering committee. We see the building designs and community meeting plans before the open houses and larger community meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table AF2.* Resulting themes from the neighborhood problems category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>You’re going to have to deal with what’s going on right now because you don’t have any other options</td>
<td>Public housing residents have to deal with safety issues (like teenagers who are loud, disrespectful, throwing trash, fighting, dealing drugs, people clustering in dark areas, and other issues) because of the no snitching culture of the neighborhood and the managers not addressing issues.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table AF3.* Resulting themes from the activism category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>We are activists</td>
<td>Some residents join together to advocate for more security to address safety and quality of life issues like violence, domestic violence, and loud music played at night.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table AF4. Resulting themes from the participation level category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A lot of people don’t get involved</td>
<td>Many residents get meeting notices, but do not participate in neighborhood meetings due to apathy (don’t care, not interested) or personal issues (fear of people, panic attacks at meetings, unable to speak up in meetings, have a lot of children to care for) therefore everyone assumes they do not need help.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to know what’s happening and pass the information along</td>
<td>Residents describe the desire to be informed and pass information on to their neighbors regarding manager goals, housing authority plans, and city plans in order to know whether they will need to move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to contribute my skills and talents</td>
<td>A few residents explained that they had the talents, skills, and experience to voice their opinions and keep track of the redevelopment process.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can ask questions that address my concerns</td>
<td>Many residents expressed worry and concern regarding the redevelopment of the neighborhood and whether current residents will be relocated or have new opportunities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AF5. Resulting themes from the social cohesion category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I participate because I make friends</td>
<td>Some residents are involvement in neighborhood organizations because they enjoy having people to interact with and learn from.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I like to be active and around people</td>
<td>Some residents are involvement in neighborhood organizations because they enjoy having something to do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am involved because of my neighbors</td>
<td>Residents describe encouraging each other to attend meetings through flyers, informal invitations, as well as sharing information about and tasks to run meetings.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AF6. Resulting themes from the self-interest category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am involved because it benefits my family</td>
<td>Several residents describe being involved in neighborhood meetings because it directly benefits their family (won a gift card, improve safety, builds resume, get support and recognition, network for future employment).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>So I can decide what I want</td>
<td>Many residents describe a desire to attend meetings so that they can know how to begin planning and how much time they have before they will need to move.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table A7. Resulting themes from the moderating organizations category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I got more information from the Inner City Parrish</td>
<td>Several residents describe the Inner City Parrish as an organization that provides food, resources, and a place to socialize with neighbors, as well as get information about what is happening in the community and how to get involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix AG: Qualitative Results for Research Question Three

### Table AG1. Resulting themes from the relocation supports category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,000 for the moving process if I stay with DHA and $2,000 if I move out completely</td>
<td>Residents describe from their experience how much it costs them to move given the fact that they frequently do not have a driver’s license, credit card, someone to help watch their children, and/or the ability to carry their own belongings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We’ve got bedbugs in this development… I’m gonna transfer all the bed bugs to that apartment complex… unless that’s included</td>
<td>Households with bedbugs will need extra funds to wash and treat all of their belongings so that they do not transfer bedbugs with their belongings to their new unit.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’m all for someone sitting down… about one month six months before</td>
<td>Most public housing households are families with day-to-day responsibilities to think about and therefore they could use support with planning and executing their move (identifying opportunity areas for the family, visiting options, find a place, get boxes, packing tape, and newspapers, pack, someone to help children with homework).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moving is a process… a chore…and … a traumatic experience…</td>
<td>Residents describe leaving everything that is familiar for someplace unfamiliar with added stress from moving expenses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>they have no idea on how to get on up out of here… and have a better life</td>
<td>Residents describe the need to work with someone on setting and implementing personal goals with motivation and incentives for meeting those goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don’t know what types of support people will need… because everybody’s different…</td>
<td>Each household has unique supports and needs such as dealing with releasing transcripts that are inaccessible due to default financial aid payments.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A packet saying what’s in the area</td>
<td>Several residents requested packets of information that provide a summary of resources in neighborhoods they could move to including: bus and train routes, schools, grocery stores, hospitals, childcare, resource centers, after school programs, senior centers who provide rides to activities.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Some residents identified the need for someone who can provide resources through a local office.

Many residents described the need to work towards financial stability, the reasons for their financial hardships and immediate needs such as dental work.

Residents described reasons for their inability to meet their goals such as health, mental health and relationship changes.

Residents relocated temporarily to another unit within the neighborhood express concern that the unit may not be properly maintained (appliances, windows, doors, paint).

Residents described the need to have a concrete plan to successfully execute a move within the 90 days guaranteed by the Relocation Act of 1970.

Many residents are unaware of the opportunity for Section 3 jobs, which could give them hope to upgrade their skills for a particular vocation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A good tenant</td>
<td>Residents state that those who are good tenants should be allowed to qualify for new units, which included paying rent on time, no regularly documented issues with the police (violent crimes against people, theft, drug sales) or maintenance (noisy, housekeeping issues, property damage, conflicts with neighbors).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I’m not gonna say no criminal record, ‘cause, that’s unrealistic some of those people are the ones that need the most help… they’re trying to make it, they’re desperate… I don’t see that working at all… unless you have an alternative… A Plan B.

Residents expressed concerns for those with criminal records because they have a hard time qualifying for housing, which can perpetuate the reasons they get involved in crime.

If you’re gonna move people out and rebuild it, put them back in there… They should probably be the first ones

Residents describe their sense that current residents should have the first right to move into the new units.

Financial difficulties… you’re jobless

Residents describe the need to continue public housing for those who need help working towards established jobs.

Step-by-Step Criteria to be able to get back in to South Lincoln

Residents described the need to clear criteria established by the Local Resident Council that requires that residents work towards moving into new units if they are making progress towards their goals.

| Table AG3. Resulting themes from the Chicago Housing Authority Groups category. |
|---------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------|
| **Theme** | **Definition** |
| They are all low income | The common factor associated with all of the groups is that residents are low income. |
| Missing Group: The younger kids who have families should be represented | Residents believe a group that is not represented is younger parents who are on TANF, but looking for work and not having luck because of the recession. |
| Missing Group: Single Senior Households | Many seniors living in public housing are single and who are mobile with moderate to poor health conditions like arthritis and diabetes. |
| Missing Group: Coming out of the correctional system | Residents identify residents who need supportive communities and services because they have been incarcerated because of non-payment of child-support or |
choices they made because they could not find work. Public housing residents include immigrants from very different cultures who need someone to work with them who understands their culture and needs.

Missing Group: Language barrier

There’s not much you can call them. Many residents were not comfortable grouping residents or giving them a label based on common demographics.

---

**Table AG4. Resulting themes from the Chicago Housing Authority Group One category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>They look like it's together, but it’s really not</td>
<td>Some residents describe neighbors who are attending school and seem to have their lives together, but they have noticed they party a lot and have experienced issues like multiple car crashes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Young families trying to get things done on their own</td>
<td>Some residents describe group one as those who try to take care of themselves by taking care of their mental health and working, but they have financial hardship because they are caring for children.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table AG5. Resulting themes from the Chicago Housing Authority Group Two category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low-income older families</td>
<td>Low-income seniors are often working, but unsure if they can enjoy their retirement.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been there and done that and want my privacy</td>
<td>Many seniors have already worked and raised their children and now want to have privacy.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

**Table AG6. Resulting themes from the Chicago Housing Authority Group Three category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Getting older and need help</td>
<td>Residents who identify with group three services that help maintaining their health and support raising adult children who will need to live with them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small distressed families</td>
<td>Some group three members are not working at all and may have a hard time coping with depression and/or emotional, physical and sexual abuse.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A cycle of change, for not just the person, but the whole family. Residents in group three need support to overcome the cycles they have endures, so that they can educate themselves and make changes for their children.

**Table AG7. Resulting themes from the Section 8 category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have a problem with the landlords</td>
<td>Some residents express concern with Section 8 landlords who have the freedom to sell the unit or may have different expectations regarding privacy.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Puttin’ down this address takes the wind out of your sail</td>
<td>Some residents want to live in a Section 8 unit in order to escape the stereotypes that employers have towards public housing residents.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table AG8. Resulting themes from the Section 8 Hardship category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make Section 8 classes mandatory</td>
<td>Many residents suggest the need to classes that reiterate the key aspects of Section 8 housing that are different from public housing such as the need to pay heat/utilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I need more help than they give</td>
<td>Many residents are aware that they could not afford the additional bills required in a Section 8 unit (electricity, gas, water, and trash) and still purchase other necessities (phone, hygiene and cleaning supplies, food, clothing, and personal items).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wouldn’t mind Section 8 if everything was guaranteed</td>
<td>Some residents would prefer Section 8 units, but fear they might lose their housing without the assistance of the housing authority.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A cushioning time</td>
<td>Some residents suggest the need for financial support from the housing authority to ease into education, employment and additional bill paying.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you are not ready for it, don’t do it</td>
<td>Some residents recommend that Section 8 Vouchers be used cautiously because of the risk of losing vouchers and ending up back on a wait list for transitional or public housing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Either they should not qualify or the housing</td>
<td>Many residents highlight the importance of addressing common financial struggles for Section 8 residents by</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

443
authority should help them pay those utility bills creating a monthly energy allowance, making energy efficient appliances mandatory, as well as referrals to the LEAP program.

Another triangle with three parties involved – the resident, the landlord and DHA.

Residents describe the responsibilities of the landlords (winterize the property), housing authority (help with services) and residents (know what they can afford).

If something happens… who can I call?

Section 8 residents need referrals to social workers and organizations that can support them if they lose their job suddenly.

---

**Table AG9. Resulting themes from the Section 8 (or moving) and Social Support category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Decide who’s going where and doing what</td>
<td>Provide focal points for relocations and means for residents to talk with neighbors both before and after moves.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I’ll have to adjust</td>
<td>Moving to a Section 8 unit would require starting over in terms of meeting neighbors, blending in to the community, and participating in neighborhood organizations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wouldn’t want a last minute slam</td>
<td>Residents regularly describe fear that they would be informed of the need to move last minute particularly with a Section 8 voucher, which requires time to find the best housing option.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources and services for kids</td>
<td>Most parents expressed concern regarding finding good schools and after school programs that would enable their children to finish school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Take into consideration changes in commute</td>
<td>Most residents indicated the need to have Section 8 units near transportation hubs that will enable convenient access to work, school, and recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information available for residents to find safe and comfortable housing</td>
<td>Most residents expressed concern about having resources to access safe (low crime with safe places for kids to play and walk to school) and comfortable housing with access to transportation, childcare, health care, services, food banks, and work force services. Together the safe and</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
comfortable housing can decrease isolation. Most residents recognize the need for help financially to move into a Section 8 unit, which may come in the form of a loan or help with a deposit.

Residents who move with Section 8 Vouchers may lose the day-to-day social supports they have such as having their children walk home with a neighbor and be cared for them until they get home.

Since many residents do not own cars they need someone to show them neighborhood resources such as where the Laundromat, grocery store, mom and pop stores, schools, and churches are.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Convenient</strong></td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods allow residents to walk out of their home and access needed resources within three to five blocks or a two-minute walk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stores</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have access to grocery stores with good deals, fruit stands, and a shopping center.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adequate recreation facilities</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have a clean park with a playground and a pool.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have good school performance with active Parent Teacher Associations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for kids</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have programs for children such as supplemental education (tutors and after school programming) and affordable childcare.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A yard</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have a space of your own outside where you can grow vegetables, plants or flowers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Center</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have churches, clinics, libraries, mentoring, and opportunities to make friendships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizations and services</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have duplexes or single-family homes with adequate interior space and your own roof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theme</td>
<td>Definition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Courteous relationships with neighbors</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have quiet and friendly people who know each other and where adults are not afraid to redirect kids.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well designed, built and up kept</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods are well designed (transit, bike lanes, sidewalks) that are built for low maintenance, and maintained (clean, in good repair).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good neighborhood organizations</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have a good resident council or neighborhood organization that meets to keep residents informed and discussing problems with city officials and public servants.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have or have good connections to fast food.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low crime rate, drugs and gangs</td>
<td>Ideal neighborhoods have low crime rates and are well lit and have no dark corners or alleys.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table AG11. Resulting themes from the Choosing Opportunity Neighborhoods category.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Some people just stay in the past. They’re scared.</td>
<td>Many residents grab housing that is cheaper or choose areas that their friends and family have scouted for them, which results in choosing bad areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sit them down and talk</td>
<td>Many residents believe they would choose neighborhoods that provide more opportunities if somebody sat down to ask them what they need, scouted out neighborhoods, and provided information that could provide a greater chance for their family to succeed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Put the information out there</td>
<td>Residents requested concrete tools to get information to residents such as more accessible meeting times, packets explaining types of neighborhoods, and check lists they can take with them as they explore neighborhoods.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk around</td>
<td>Many residents suggested having residents go on tours of schools and neighborhoods to identify whether the area is clean, safe, friendly, well-resourced and organized relationally.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table AG12. Resulting themes from the Services for Second Group category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Make ‘em alive again</td>
<td>Residents in the second group can get out of their shell and increase their happiness and self-sufficiency if they are more involved in their community.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Need assistance</td>
<td>Residents in the second may need day-to-day help and companions in the form of social services and animals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building a building for their needs</td>
<td>Residents in the second group may need a building of their own, which does not have kids making noise or running through.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To me this group looks like, “I give up”</td>
<td>Residents in the second group sound to some residents like they have given up and do not want to make any changes or improvements in their lives.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AG13. Resulting themes from the Services for Third Group category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Support person</td>
<td>Residents in the third group might need someone they can talk to that can help them decide where to move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation and training</td>
<td>Residents in the third group might need one-to-one or educational and job training support groups to hear motivating success stories.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good support group with others in the same situation</td>
<td>Residents in the third group might need places where they can chitchat with other adults on their level about parenting and resources.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table AG14. Resulting themes from the Resident Navigator category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There’ so much I could be doing, but I don’t know how.</td>
<td>A lot of residents might have a lot of questions and a lack of direction, but don’t want to admit it and therefore a resident navigator could help them see what needs to happen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Know what is going to happen</td>
<td>A resident navigator could help residents look for a place and know what to expect at various steps in the process.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
If I need your assistance I would call you. Some residents explained that they will ask for help if they need it and therefore they would assume a professional through something was wrong with them if they provided regular support.

Meet once a month, every other month, or every three months unless there’s problems or issues with the family and then once a month A lot of residents stated that they would utilize regular support from a resident navigator and that they would utilize the opportunity to call them when something arises in between those regular meetings.

Supports Many residents identified that a resident navigator could provide resources like food and bus tokens.

Having someone give me feedback would make me feel better about making choices A resident navigator could help residents think through options and as a result improve their judgment.

Having that counselor always doing a check up A resident navigator could help provide statistics for the community such as drug, violent and sex crimes in the community, so that a resident is aware of those dangers.

I’d be up for it... it’s my upbringing and train of thought A resident navigator would work for residents who need help improving themselves, maintaining change, or metaphorically climbing out of and staying out of the holes in their lives.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wherever you go there’s going to be something</td>
<td>When asked about the specific problems residents might need to address with different housing choices some residents replied that they will have to solve problems regardless of where they move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Any time you have construction there’s safety issues</td>
<td>If residents choose to stay in the neighborhood through the redevelopment they will have to deal with road closures, new people coming in to work, and possible dust and asbestos exposure.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If you’re gonna move, you want to move up</td>
<td>Residents acknowledge that they could be moved to a location that is the same or worse, but they prefer to</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Starting over  move to a better housing unit and neighborhood.
Residents acknowledge that they may not be accepted by their new neighborhood, as some residents have lived there a long time.

I would like to get Section 8 housing, but I mean look at reality… Many residents have their hearts set on Section 8, but they do not have jobs, degrees, or the supports necessary to get there.

North Lincoln Residents identify the neighboring public housing that is already redeveloped as an opportunity with a computer lab and programming for the children.

Have a job and move towards… but my kids… Residents expressed conflicts between what is an ideal neighborhood for the parents (near where they grew up or work) versus the children (could stay in their current school).

I feel like a gypsy Some residents describe feeling like they move a lot.

Taking care of your housing Residents describe the need to take care of their housing regardless of where they move.

Get along with the community Residents describe the need to get along with neighbors regardless of where they move.

Looking at how much I can afford Residents describe affordable housing options within the context of all resources available to them include rent, utility and food assistance.

Home buyers Some residents express the desire to buy a house, but they are unsure if their health, employment and the economy which results in fear.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Security… Somebody walk around once in a while.</td>
<td>Residents describe the need for management to walk around the neighborhood to see the fighting and littering so that they do not need to always be reporting issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The expense of moving</td>
<td>Residents describe the need for financial assistance to change utilities and hire a mover with a truck.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Table AG16. Resulting themes from the Denver Housing Authority Transition and/or Relocation Supports category.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Getting to know neighbors</th>
<th>Housing Authorities could organize activities to help residents meet each other and establish playmates for their children.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is so many questions…</td>
<td>Residents have questions about how the move will impact their daily lives, such as how they will do their laundry, but they are told that no one knows the answer or that they should attend a meeting to find out. As a result the would like to have someone available who can answer these questions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>…and nobody has answers.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somebody you could turn to and get an answer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A timeframe…</td>
<td>Residents describe the desire to have a clear time frame regarding when they will likely need to move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Look at every person as a human being and see what they need</td>
<td>Residents describe the desire to have someone help them meet personal needs such as access to dental work or acknowledging that a felony charge may have been a misunderstanding, which might improve their self-esteem.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>has a felony…</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Day care for the kids…</td>
<td>Residents describe the need for a day care program that is designated for public housing residents.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budgeting</td>
<td>Residents describe the need for budgeting support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mentoring adult</td>
<td>Residents describe the need for adults who genuinely care about their children and can help tutor them in certain subjects.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A navigator</td>
<td>Some residents describe the need for a navigator who can help them make decisions and find the housing they are hoping for.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Go to school</td>
<td>Residents describe the need for support to go back to school.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Make community meetings mandatory</td>
<td>Some residents wish the housing authority would require residents to attend meetings, so that they can be informed about the coming changes.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Give me the opportunity to pick.</td>
<td>Most residents expressed the desire to choose where they move to in order to live somewhere they are familiar and comfortable with.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Residents describe the need for the housing authority to conduct outreach to the residents to let them know the eligibility criteria and supportive services available.
## Appendix AH: Artifacts

*Table AH1.* Example of analyzing inclusiveness from the Resident Advisory Council (RAC) process from 2007.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Five aspects of the RAC process were inclusive including: | • Welcoming to members of diverse groups as evidenced by the outreach plan and sign in sheets with institutional affiliations;  
• Conducted assessment of climate through the EDSRG project;  
• Food purchased reflected the preferences of the attendees;  
• Efforts were made to include as many stakeholder groups as possible, but some participants felt placated by the process rather than genuinely engaged; and  
• Efforts were made to address unfulfilled promises made in previous planning processes. For example, ongoing efforts are being made in the present to build sidewalks promised by the Stadium District planning processes. |
| Six aspects of the RAC process were not inclusive including: | • Residents regularly asked whether the planning process was wasting their time. Some residents felt the process was a political sandbox to busy them with dreaming of an unrealistic future while important decisions were being made regarding their community.  
• The process did not have awards that recognize individuals for their contributions to diversity and inclusiveness; however, the Planning Board acknowledged the lengths the city planners went to provide language translation, childcare, and food for meetings.  
• The process did promote opportunities for all to come together and make contributions, but residents were left out of meetings focused on planning the process, which required community-based organization (CBO) staff to speak on behalf of residents. CBO staff members are trained not to do for others what they can do for themselves, so the process created contentious relationships  
• Hidden and unofficial culture regarding concentrated urban poverty residents were highlighted when one key joke about marijuana from a city planner was made in reference to the South Lincoln community’s lack grass, which caused a great deal of tension that was confronted by community-based organizational staff. The significance of this moment was confronted, but not addressed in a manner that repaired the harm.  
• The RAC process did not have a structure or procedure for addressing climate issues. CBO staff members were expected to address these concerns as advocates, who then helped create a process within meetings. However, in-depth interviews indicated issues that resident participants had with the “neutral facilitator” |
that made them feel disrespected. No evaluations for feedback on these sorts of climate issues were built into the process; and
• Efforts were made to be professional; however statements made in the in-depth interviews by professionals indicated disrespect that was not handled during the process. Interviews also indicated tension between city planning and Office of Economic Development staff.

Summary of analyzing inclusiveness.

The intricacies of inclusivity are beyond the scope of this research project; however clear definitions of inclusivity and professional wisdom regarding inclusivity within the context of mixed-income redevelopment are necessary. Previous research by this author during phase one of the Early Doctoral Student Research Grant (EDSRG), evaluating the 2007 Resident Advisory Committee in the two neighborhoods of this study can be used as an example of more inclusive and less inclusive aspects of mixed-income redevelopment planning processes (Walker, 2009). Several main themes resulted from 25 in-depth interviews with residents, community-based organizations staff, foundation staff, the Resident Advisory Committee facilitator, and public employees. These main themes were analyzed within the culture and climate framework of the University of Denver Inclusive Excellence Toolkit (see Table AH2). Further explanation of these inclusivity issues using the inclusive and empowering approach of Stout (1996) is provided in Table AH3. Specifically, Table AH3 provides definitions and explanations regarding how language, assumptions of knowledge, and logistics create invisible walls in consensus building processes. Inclusive planning processes and developments therefore seek to pay attention to the invisible aspects of all interactions in order to create more effective interactions.
Table AH2. Climate and Culture of Resident Advisory Committee of 2007. The following chart demonstrates the climate and culture aspects of an inclusiveness framework from the previous mixed-income redevelopment planning processes in the neighborhoods of this study. The observations highlighted in this tool were reported in the Early Doctoral Student Research Grant (EDSRG) report sent to Housing and Urban Development in 2009 (Walker, 2009). Twenty-five in-depth interviews were conducted with residents (public housing and houses), community-based organizations staff (FRESC and Project WISE), foundation staff (Making Connections-Denver), the Resident Advisory Committee facilitator (National Civic League), and public employees (city planners, Office of Economic Development, and Parks and Recreation staff).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Climate and Culture</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Evidence of completion (e.g., numbers, documents, programs, etc.)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A. Is the climate for inclusiveness of the unit welcoming to members of diverse groups?</td>
<td>Homeowners, public housing residents, Denver Human Services employees, youth center employees, faith-based institution employees, etc. participated.</td>
<td></td>
<td>Sign in sheets with institutional affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Do residents, staff, consultants, community-based organization staff, and members of the public from different backgrounds feel welcome in working, participating, and visiting our unit?</td>
<td>Residents regularly asked whether the planning process was wasting their time. Some residents felt the process was a political sandbox to busy them with dreaming of an unrealistic future while important decisions were being made regarding their community.</td>
<td></td>
<td>EDSRG (Walker, 2009)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
C. Has our unit conducted a diversity climate assessment or survey?  
Indirectly through the Early Doctoral Student Research Grant (Walker, 2009).

D. Are the traditions and celebrations of the unit inclusive?  
The food purchased reflected the preferences of the attendees.

E. Do we have annual awards that recognize individuals for their contributions to diversity and inclusiveness?  
No however the Planning Board acknowledged the great lengths the city planners went to in order to provide language translation, childcare and food for meetings.

F. Does the unit foster and support affinity groups? (e.g., Faith-based institutions, community development and community organizing groups, etc.)  
Efforts were made to include as many stakeholder groups as possible, but some participants felt placated by the process rather than genuinely engaged.

G. Does our unit also promote opportunities for all residents, staff, and consultants to come together as one unit and have significant contact and interaction with each other?  
Residents were left out of meetings focused on planning the process, which required community-based organization (CBO) staff to speak on behalf of residents. CBO staff are trained not to do for others what they can do for themselves, so the process created contentious relationships.
H. Does the “hidden” or unofficial culture support diversity in our unit? [You could have a culture that expresses the value of diversity and simultaneously have an unofficial culture filled with racist, sexist, and heterosexist jokes, behavior, and traditions.]

I. Do staff, administrators, and residents have an active role in maintaining and improving the climate for diversity?

J. Does our unit have the organizational structures and procedures for addressing departmental climate issues? (e.g., bias response protocol, educational campaign, etc.)

One key joke from a city planner in reference to the South Lincoln community’s lack grass tied to marijuana caused a great deal of tension that was confronted.

Efforts were made to address unfulfilled promises made in previous planning processes. For example, ongoing efforts are being made in the present to build sidewalks promised by the Stadium District planning processes.

CBO staff were expected to address these concerns as advocates, then help create a process within meetings. However, in-depth interviews indicated issues resident participants had with the “neutral facilitator” that made them feel disrespected. No evaluation for feedback on these sorts of climate issues were built into the process.
K. Is the relationship between public staff and community-based organization staff positive and respectful?

Efforts were made to be professional; however, statements made in the in-depth interviews by professionals indicated disrespect that was not handled during the process.

Interviews also indicated tension between city planning and Office of Economic Development staff.
Table AH3. Invisible walls that influence the climate of mixed-income redevelopment planning. The social work student who conducted the majority of surveys and in-depth interviews used in this study developed a description of the unspoken dynamics that create the ineffective aspects of social planning interactions with concentrated urban poverty residents (Bershok, 2010).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theme</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Training</td>
<td>Stout (1996) believes that constant training of staff needs to occur to for an organization to continue to stay inclusive and empowering. Chicago Housing Authority reported that all service connectors in the Chicago Case Management Demonstration Program were required to utilize the a framework that included human rights, a strengths based, change theory, and empowerment to inform their direct practice with residents (Howard, 2010). Stout states that trainings should incorporate individuals confronting their own class and race roles, questioning their right to be involved and clarifying their own expectations. As trust and respect play important roles when integrating into a new neighborhood or population, one needs to work on building bridges, which Stout identifies as being painful work at times (1996). She argues for this reason training should be ongoing to support the needs of the workers. Stout (1996) also believes that communication and team building need to be priorities so that there is trust between workers. Training around issues related to oppression, racism, sexism, homophobia, and internalized oppression are also critically important (Stout, 1996). This training should also incorporate education on the invisible walls that exist as barriers that separate people on a class and education level. In community organizing, these invisible walls prevent organizers from gaining a true client/member/resident perspective, and will often create power differentials that make it difficult for residents to participate in the process. If empowerment is based on allowing people to gain power over things that matter to them and to have equalized relationships with others, these invisible walls can prevent empowerment from occurring. There are several invisible walls that have the most impact on empowerment: language, assumption of knowledge, and logistics.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Language     | Stout (1996) believes that language is probably the biggest barrier that keeps people apart. She goes on to state that languages exist between different classes and educational levels, not just between languages of ethnicity (Stout, 1996). The manner in how an individual chooses his or her words is often based on education, and therefore class privilege exists (Stout, 1996). “When you are speaking in a language outside of your own, it is much harder to communicate. It is a barrier to feeling powerful” (Stout, 1996, p. 123). Therefore, language is one way that individuals can be disempowered. A resident was interviewed to understand this issue in the context of the South Lincoln project confirmed that the manner in |
which language is used could either help or hinder in the development of relationships with residents and their willingness to engage with the service integration process (Resident interview by L. Walker, personal communication, May 14, 2010).

Stout (1996) offers suggestions in how to best engage with individuals around language barriers. The first advice is to simplify the message (Stout, 1996). Her experience as an organizer is that a simplified message works in all communities regardless of class and education level. People respond to messages that are easy to understand and that they are able to process quickly. Also important is to use local language (Stout, 1996). The best way to do this is to get the community invested in providing feedback that would allow for educational material to be developed that the entire community could respond to. Stout (1996) also wants people to consider the language used in meetings as it is often done through an educated language. Terms such as strategy may not be understood when compared to a term such as plan. She has also had meetings where organizers uses an educational forum to explain terms that are often utilized in certain types of fields (Stout, 1996). The example she provided was that they created a “People’s dictionary for development”, which allowed everyone to understand technical concepts and words that are often used in presentations and educational materials (Stout, 1996). This is important for this proposed intervention as the “complicated nature of new urbanism design, mixed-financing, and collaboration make understanding the process difficult even for well informed professionals, which sets residents up for an unequal playing field for conversations and meetings” (Walker, 2009, p. 15-16).

While neither Stout nor the resident who was interviewed address the connection between language and culture, this author believes that this intersection must be considered and addressed in regards to the South Lincoln neighborhood because it is multi-cultural. On top of any class or educational language discrepancies existing between residents, organizers, and service providers, language barriers also exist in that many residents do not speak English as their first language. Culture plays a role in how we choose words and differences between country of origin and interplay with interpretations vocally or in written form can change the meaning of what is being communicated.

Stout (1996) also believes that assumption of knowledge is another invisible wall that should be addressed. This relates to language in the sense it is important when designing educational material and planning meetings. Not only is a “people’s dictionary” of terms important in regards to the language one uses, but it also helps in educating individuals and not
assuming that terms, history, or other knowledge are known by everyone. Stout (1996) points to her own education to acknowledge that subjects that may be common knowledge and taught in public school systems in higher class areas may not be incorporated into the educational systems everywhere. Stout (1996) states that to assume someone has knowledge often means that the person may feel ashamed to ask further questions, or if he or she does, that people will often reply with shock, which can further embarrass and disempower people.

**Logistics**

Stout (1996) states that another invisible wall to empowerment can be logistics. Deciding when and where to hold meetings is incredibly important as it may not be at times or places that are accessible by community members/residents. Other logistics that people may not be aware of is how an organization makes a decision or reaches consensus (Stout, 1996). Educating individuals about how the system works helps to empower people to participate more fully in the process. This will be important during the collaboration phase of this model so that community members/residents feel as if they can participate. While other collaborators will more than likely be full-time paid employees of an organization and meeting during the day time working hours is the easiest, this may not work for community members/residents who work or have other activities scheduled into their day during working hours. Meeting times and education about the system also become very important when service connectors engage the community by means of holding meetings or offering educational workshops. It will be important to offer these activities at varying times to meet the residents’ needs.
Figure AH4. South Lincoln Phase 1 Live Image April 20, 2011 (OxBlue Construction Camera Service, 2011).
“Although funding is not yet certain for this phase, we have work to do to ensure we are ‘ready to go’ to receive funding that we’ve applied for, and continue pursuing other funding opportunities. We are looking forward to hearing your questions and the issues important to you for Phase II” (Personal Communication with Kimball Crangle, 2011, p. 1).
South Lincoln Redevelopment
Reurbanización de South Lincoln

meeting: 6:00-7:30, Tuesday, May 3, 2010
dinner will be served at 5:30-6:00
La Alma Recreation Center
1325 West 11th Avenue

Come join DHA in the design of **Phase II** of the South Lincoln Redevelopment! This phase will include the design and construction of 93 units and the plaza on 10th Avenue. Come learn about this phase and share your ideas!

Venga y unase al DHA en la Fase II de diseño del Re-desarrollo Sur de Lincoln. La Fase II incluirá el diseño y la construcción de 93 unidades de vivienda y la Plaza en la Avenida 10. Venga, aprenda y comparta sus ideas!!!!

Questions? - please contact:
Kimball Crangle, email: kcrang@denverhousing.org, phone 720-932-3132; or
Lynne Picard, email: lpicar@denverhousing.org, phone 720-932-3052
Figure AH6. South Lincoln Phase 2 image from redevelopment community meeting May 3, 2011. “Phase II is beginning and DHA is once again looking to the community for ideas and feedback on the design/build of up to 93 units of housing including ground floor retail, artist studio space and street improvements on 10th Avenue” (Personal Communication with Kimball Crangle, 2011, p. 1).
South Lincoln Resident Advisory Committee Issues with City/DHA/CBO Responses 12-05-07

**Green** – Opportunity in plan concepts (Physical Design Elements)
**Orange** – Opportunity in redevelopment scenarios (DHA policies/programs/behaviors)
**Blue** – Share with appropriate agency/individuals (DPS/DPD/DPL)
**Violet** – Resident ownership/opportunity (Fellow neighbors behaviors)

**Key Focus Area 1 - Cultural Diversity**

**Issue 1: Neighbors – Recognizing and maintaining strengths of community**

1. Expand recreation center (La Alma) to meet future growth/demand
   Plan has provided for potential expansion, will set meeting to review and discuss with Denver Parks & Rec for their future planning efforts
2. **Schools: Greenlee K-8 and West High School - more after-school and cultural programming for students, expanded/upgraded programs to attract enrollment**
   Will set meeting to review and discuss with DPS
3. **Families who have built economic opportunity through social networks and carefully crafted ways to access childcare, education and employment must remain in their community to continue their success path**
   DHA will pursue an alternate approach to relocation to avoid/minimize the effects of the process. This approach will be reviewed openly with the RAC if redevelopment is to occur.

*Figure AH7. La Alma Key Focus Areas for Change document from the 2007 Resident Advisory Committee (RAC). The first item identified by resident stakeholders in the RAC process was to “expand recreation center (La Alma) to meet future growth/demand,” which had a built into the document the intent to “set meeting to review and discuss with Denver Parks & Rec for their future planning efforts” (Denver Housing Authority, 2007, p. 1).*
Figure AH8. La Alma Pool Before Construction (Denver Housing Authority, 2011).
Figure AH9. La Alma Pool Renovation: Public Workshop 1 Flyer (Denver Parks and Recreation, 2010a).
Design Concept Presentation for the La Alma Lincoln Park Pool Renovation Project!
When: Meeting is Wednesday, February 10th from 6 p.m.-8 p.m.
Where: La Alma Recreation Center, 1325 West 11th Avenue.

Who: Denver Parks and Recreation
What: Denver Parks and Recreation will be presenting the design concept for the La Alma Lincoln Park Swimming Pool and Spray ground, a part of the "Better Denver" bond program approved by residents in 2007. Based on community input from the first public meeting and additional sessions with community groups a working concept design has been developed. So please join us as and provide feedback as we share the concept design for the La Alma Lincoln Park Pool Renovation Project.

Why: Denver Parks and Recreation adopted the Game Plan, its 50-year vision for Denver Parks and Recreation, in 2005. One of the four guiding principles for DPR is equity throughout the system. Through the voter-approved Better Denver and focusing CIP funds in other areas, residents throughout the City will enjoy improvements in their neighborhood recreation center.

The City of Denver’s $550 million voter-approved Better Denver Bond program works to improve, preserve, renovate and create amenities that touch citizen’s lives- including roads, libraries, parks, recreation centers, child care sites, hospitals, public safety, City buildings and cultural facilities.

For more information, please contact Matt Wilgenbusch at matt.wilgenbusch@denvergov.org

Posted on Friday, January 29, 2010

Figure AH10. Public Workshop 2: Design Concept Presentation for the La Alma Pool Renovation Project (Denver Parks and Recreation, 2010b).
Figure AH11. La Alma Recreation Center Design Concept. A rendition of the La Alma pool renovation plans were visible in the back of the room in August 2010 during the Denver Housing Authority - South Lincoln - Local Resident Council meeting. A resident of the community stood up during the meeting to express frustration regarding the ‘siloked’ nature of Denver Housing Authority and Denver Parks and Recreation planning processes. The Resident Advisory Committee of 2007 identified the need to expand already crowded recreation facilities, but Parks and Recreation decided to decrease the size of the pool (360 Design, 2010).
Figure AH12. La Alma Pool and Pool House Renovation Bid Requests (Denver Public Works, 2010).
Neighbors At Odds With Parks Over La Alma Rec Center
by Paul Kashmann
We’ve been working with the Globeville neighborhood for decades, trying to boost attendance and programming at their (recreation) center,” said Judy Montero, City Councilwoman from Denver’s District 9.

“I was working for (former Councilwoman) Debbie Ortega when it was first closed down, and we’ve been at it again since I’ve been in office.”

As The Profile headed to press, a contract was being finalized to turn the operation of the Globeville Recreation Center over to a non-profit organization run by former center director Boogie Mondragon. “The point is, it was the community’s decision,” said Montero. “They had faith that an outside operator could give them services the city could not. They said, ‘We want this’ – and my job is to honor what they want.”

The Denver Department of Parks and Recreation had hoped to form a partnership with another non-profit, the Boys & Girls Club of Metro Denver, to operate La Alma Recreation Center, 1325 W. 11th Ave., but neighbors in that community are not on board with the city’s plans. Nor is Councilwoman Montero.

“I really believe with all my heart it is a colossal mistake to continue to push the idea of transitioning La Alma. There is going to be resistance from the community until it is resolved that La Alma remains under Parks and Recreation. They’re just not having it.” La Alma (meaning, “The Soul”) Recreation Center was opened in 1972 after years of efforts by a group of Chicano activists demanding the city provide better recreation facilities to the west Denver community, which surrounds the South Lincoln Park Homes, a 270-unit public housing project built in the early 1950s.

“The thing about the La Alma situation,” said Montero, “is there was no community input into the future of the Center. That’s what has people upset, and rightfully so. By nature of the neighborhood, you have two generations of activists involved – one who fought to get it built in ’72 – and the other fighting now to keep it open.
“The neighborhood is at a very good turning point,” Montero explained. “Denver Housing Authority just received $10 million from HUD to begin the first senior housing phase of the South Lincoln Park Reconstruction that will more than triple the amount of housing on the site, to some 900 units. We’ve got the Santa Fe Dr. Art District becoming ever more active, a new light rail stop at 10th and Osage, Denver Health and the Auraria campus nearby. Parks and Recreation moved too fast, and now the community has lost trust that they have their best interests at heart.”

DPR spokesperson Jill McGranahan agrees that the city moved too fast with its plan to transition La Alma from Parks and Recreation management to an outside agency. “We agree that we have not done enough outreach at La Alma,” said McGranahan. “We formed a Recreation Center Task Force in 2008, and one of their recommendations was to transition 12 centers to outside providers. The public reacted strongly and told us to not just focus on those centers, but to evaluate all 29 facilities.

“As a result of that process, with the need to make cuts in this year’s budget, we came up with four centers that we recommended for transition. Three of them – Globeville, Johnson and College View – have been talked about for years – they were on the 2008 list – but La Alma was new to the discussion. Needing to move quickly with budget decisions, we fast-tracked La Alma without a public process in advance.”

Following much public outcry, the city has “pulled La Alma out” of the immediate plans for transition, “and funded it for nine months,” according to McGranahan. “What we are now looking at is forming a Community Advisory Committee (CAC), as we should have done first. We will look to that group to give us input on what programming and amenities they feel are needed at the La Alma Recreation Center. Then we will go out with a Request For Proposal (RFP) to potential service providers, and work with the CAC to determine who that partner should be.

“We know the neighborhood is afraid we are going to give them less than they’ve been getting, but our goal is not to reduce services or operations, but to find someone to increase programming at La Alma,” McGranahan concluded.

Both sides in this dispute seem to have the same goal, providing much needed services to the neighborhood residents. The dispute is how best to deliver on those promises. “The other centers being transitioned were victims of low attendance, and brought little revenue into the city,” said Montero. “La Alma, on the other hand, is heavily used – it’s 10th out of the 29 Denver recreation centers. Obviously, it’s bringing in revenue.” Montero expresses frustration that “the reason for privatizing changes constantly. At first they said the Center was not being utilized. Then when we showed them it was, it changed to something else.”

McGranahan said that La Alma was chosen “because there is a need for improved
services, and an outside provider came to us with a proposal to assume operations.”
Dean Sanchez is a longtime La Alma resident, and active member of La Alma Community Action Group. He is not swayed by the city’s claims that providing adequate services at La Alma requires relinquishing city control of the center.

Sanchez sees predicted population increases in all age groups as evidence that a full-service center is essential to the community’s well-being. “We the community, the city, and the Department of Parks and Recreation need to look past the city’s economic crisis and budget gaps, and look towards the future. With (this) neighborhood growing at an incredibly fast rate, we need to plan for the future. The need for a recreation center, as well as an improved pool, is not only evident, it is necessary.”

“I don’t believe in privatization,” said Montero. “The center belongs to the neighborhood, to the taxpayers who support it. They have the expectation that we own the center, will maintain it and will offer quality programming.”

McGranahan would like to “take the term ‘privatization’ off the table. In a private business the public has no say. For partnerships to work there has to be an advisory group. Whatever operating partner would be brought in would be meeting the needs of the community as determined by the CAC. The community would basically be the board of directors for the center.”

Dispelling the idea that the city is picking on low income areas for privatization, McGranahan said that the new center slated to open this year at Central Park Stapleton would be a candidate for an outside operator as well. “It will go out for RFP because it makes sense. It’s a brand- new facility, and someone else might be able to offer more than we can due to our budget restrictions.”

While the dispute rages on as to who will run the show at La Alma, a design process has begun on how to spend some $2 million in 2007 Better Denver bond money allocated to improvements to the outdoor pool that is adjacent to the Recreation Center. The city’s oldest pool is one of only two Olympic-size swimming facilities in Denver’s system, and is in dire need of repair and improvement.

Pool users would like to see it connected in some way to the center to make access and management of the pool more convenient and efficient. The consultant team hired to guide the process presented plans to remove the 50-foot pool and replace it with a 25-meter lap pool and another pool for family recreation. Public reaction has been mixed. While many want to see the Olympic-size pool remain, others are excited about the water slide and other amenities proposed in the new plans.

A second public meeting focusing on the swimming pool renovation plans had not been scheduled at press time.
For information, call La Alma Community Action Group at 720-495-5200 or email statesidedenver@gmail.com. Contact Denver Parks and Recreation by calling 311

*Figure AH13.* Neighbors at odds with Parks over La Alma Rec Center (Washington Park: The Profile, 2011). The April 2011 online edition of The Profile featured a story regarding the continued struggle to expand the La Alma Recreation Center pool according to the 2007 Resident Advisory Committee Key Focus Areas for Change rather than downsize the facilities.
Figure AH14. Denver Parks and Recreation Hearing - Dean Sanchez Testimony. The above video clip testimony of the chair of the La Alma Community Action Group at the La Alma Recreation Center from December 10, 2009 provides a context for the resident frustrations with the decision-making processes regarding neighborhood recreation facilities (Denver Direct, 2009).
Appendix AI: Sustainable Mixed-income Communities are Durable and Inclusive

Figure AI. Eco-map of resident experience La Alma Recreation Center pool renovation process, as an example of “we accomplished neighborhood goals to some extent.”
Figure A12. The role of community and people-based interventions in mixed-income redevelopment social planning.
Figure A13. Resident perspectives on the foundations of sustainable mixed-income redevelopment.
Figure A14. South Lincoln and Sun Valley residents compared with the Chicago Housing Authority Case Management Demonstration program. Denver Housing Authority residents are demographically similar to the Chicago Housing Authority groups two (aging and distress) and three (high risk). The South Lincoln residents are estimated to have 17-25% or resident in group one (striving), which leaves 75-83% of residents who are either in the group two (aging and distressed) or group three (high risk groups) who might benefit from case management and improved neighborhood services. The ages of South Lincoln residents include 56% of residents estimated to be between 19-39 years old, 31% between 40-59 years old, and 14% between 60-83 years old (Denver Housing Authority, 2009; Theodos et al., 2010; Walker, 2009). Therefore the majority of residents surveyed are well within the age brackets that may benefit from better assessment indicating the level and types of case management that may benefit their household during the next five to seven years in order to work to improve their self-sufficiency outcomes.