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ABSTRACT

America is known to be a place where there are opportunities to move in and out of social and economic classes. What about people that live in an area of concentrated poverty? Typically, residents of a neighborhood where 20 to 40 percent of the population lives at or below poverty face extreme barriers to these opportunities for a better life. Historically, government at the local, state and federal level have attempted to solve or at least assist these issues of distressed neighborhoods, particularly through what is known as community development. By having more local knowledge, municipal governments have first hand access to address concentrated poverty but since every situation unique, it is difficult to prescribe a one-fits-all solution to each individual area of concentrated poverty.

Through a case study analysis of three areas of concentrated poverty in the Upstate of South Carolina including Greenville, Anderson and Spartanburg, this study investigates city government community development efforts and how it functions to address concentrated poverty. This research finds that there are similarities and differences in the dimensions and elements of the community development processes in the three cities resulting in three different outcomes.
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INTRODUCTION

Despite anti-poverty programs and plans at all levels of government, over a third of America’s poor live in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty (Gabe, 2009). Dealing with and getting through individual circumstances of living below the poverty line can be difficult enough, but families and persons that live in high poverty neighborhoods face additional burdens (Berube, Concentrated Poverty in America: An Overview, 2008). For example, it has been demonstrated that children living in impoverished neighborhoods are more likely to experience childhood mortality, adolescent pregnancy, learning disabilities, and school failure (Chun-Chung Chow, Johnson, & Austin, 2005). Living in concentrated poverty ultimately does not provide the same life opportunities for the poor as compared with the rest of the society.

Communities have been described as “the building blocks for a vibrant region” (Blackwell 2007). Often times, however, communities that experience high rates of poverty are isolated, disinvested and neglected. In order to ameliorate these neighborhoods, local, state and national governments have initiated community development programs and plans with the hopes of “building capacity to improve the quality of life among the residents of low and moderate income neighborhoods” (Ferguson, 65). Community development, even though it consists of a variety of strategies, methods, frameworks, principles and even definitions, is one way for municipalities to address concentrated poverty by “improving the economic, social and
cultural conditions of a neighborhood, integrating communities into the larger cultural fabric and enabling residents to contribute to progress” (Christenson 1980).

What is difficult is that every impoverished neighborhood might experience similar negative externalities like high childhood mortality or high school dropout rates, but they are all placed within different economic, social and political contexts. This in turn requires diverse and multi-dimensional responses that might not be generally applicable to all communities.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The goal of this chapter is to present a review of the literature relating to community development and poverty in order to have a better understanding how these two concepts relate. The findings of this literature review are later used to examine different municipality community development efforts that aim to address poverty stricken neighborhoods.

Community Development

The term community can be hard to pin down. From one perspective it is viewed as a place, face and space, meaning it is a geographic locale, a relationship between individuals and the built environment for living, working and political organizing (Leventhal, Brooks-Gunn, & Kamerman, 2008). Similarly, Christenson and Robinson view community as “1) people 2) within a geographical bounded area 3) involved in
social interaction and 4) with one or more psychological ties with each other and with the
place they live” (Christenson & Robinson, In Search of Community Development, 1980, 6). For Peterman, however, the boundaries of community are not so exact and in our
society today we are members of many different communities along different variables-
ethnicity, careers, religion, sexual orientation and common interests (Peterman, 2000).
Kretzmann and McNight view community as a group of people who perceive that they
are integrated by the same boundary. For the purpose of this paper, the place-based aspect
of community is important and is a part of the definition of community along with the
social interactions and psychological ties.

Community development is a term that can just as well be a vague, with multiple
interpretations. As Christenson and Robinson note, community development can mean
many different things to many different people from revitalization of a downtown area to
community beautification to economic growth (3). Below are attempts at defining
community development over the past 50 years:

United Nations, 1963: “the process by which the efforts of the people themselves
are united with those of government authorities to improve the economic, social
and cultural conditions, to integrate these communities into the life of the nation
and to enable them to contribute to national progress” (Christenson & Robinson,
In Search of Community Development, 1980, 10).

Roland Warren, 1978: “a process of helping community people analyze their
problems, to exercise as large a measure of autonomy as is possible and feasible,
and to promote a greater identification of the individual citizen and individual organization with the community as a whole” (Christenson & Robinson, In Search of Community Development, 1980, 10).

Christenson, 1980: “a group of people in a community reaching a decision to initiate a social action process to change their economic, social, cultural or environmental situation” (Christenson, Three Themes of Community Development, 1980, 12).

Keating and Vidal, 2004: “asset creation that improves the quality of life of residents of low and moderate income neighborhoods” (Keating & Vidal, Community Development: Current Issues and Emerging Challenges, 2004, 126).

HUD, 2010: “promoting integrated approaches that provide decent housing, a suitable living environment, and expand economic opportunities for low and moderate income persons” (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2010).

Therefore, when speaking of community development it is important to specify what exactly the term means in order to give the reader the appropriate knowledge and context of an article or a book. For this paper, community development refers and relates more so with the definition from the United Nations, in that community development is a process of both the people of a community and an outside entity to better the social, economic and cultural conditions in order to integrate with the community at large and to contribute
to the society. A reason for the complexity and diversity of community development is in part its history. Formulating over decades, with different approaches and principles, there has never been an overarching community development policy or standardization.

**History of Community Development**

Community development has had an evolving history and still to this day there is confusion about the nature of community development, how to approach it, practices, principles and theories. Even with historical roots from the Progressive Era of the early 19th century, community development did not become an institutionalized and formal concept until the 1950s (Phifer, List, & Faulkner, 1980). During the early 19th century, the United States experienced a huge immigrant influx to urban areas, which allowed cities to become overcrowded and unhealthy. Neighborhood settlement houses laid the foundation for place-based reforms by improving the physical environment of poor communities and providing services (O'Connor, 2008). The James Addams Hull House is an example of a settlement house that reformers set up as a community based social service center (Rubin & Rubin, 1992).

Under the Roosevelt administration in the 1930’s, the community development foundation was continuing to be built. After the Great Depression, the New Deal Era was a time of job creation through public works, specifically public housing. This initiative for public housing, however, ultimately resulted in slum clearance of poor and blighted neighborhoods (O'Connor, 2008). This New Deal era was the start of the welfare state. Saul Alinsky is an important influence during this era due to the fact that he developed
problem oriented community organizations and organized public protests (Rubin & Rubin, 1992).

With the end of World War II, the United States hit a huge suburbanization period due to the automobile, highway funding and homeownership subsidies (O'Connor, 2008). With “white flight” to the suburbs, many poor neighborhoods in the city were left behind and strapped for resources. In 1949, Congress enacted urban redevelopment legislation that got rid of blighted housing but in return usually offered no replacement for low-income residents. What was supposed to be in the name of urban renewal soon became known as “negro removal” (Keating W. D., Federal Policy and Poor Urban Neighborhoods, 1999).

Under a context of federal reform, citizen action, social protest and racial tension in the United States, the federal government led a War on Poverty with President Lyndon Johnson in 1964. During this time, programs and initiatives like the Model Cities, Community Action Program and Special Impact Program were introduced. The 1960s launched the beginning of grassroots activities with community development (Keating W. D., Federal Policy and Poor Urban Neighborhoods, 1999). It was during this time that many smaller neighborhood organizations grew in order to try and combat issues of inequality and poverty (Rubin & Rubin, 1992). However, despite great advances in nationally recognizing the inequalities and attempting to reconcile these differences, the programs of the Great Society of the 1960s can be seen more as a variety of programs and not a coherent policy on communities (O'Connor, 2008).
With the election of President Richard Nixon, the political climate of the United States became much more conservative and was known as the new federalism. Funding was cut back and even terminated for many community development programs like the Model Cities in order to give more power to the states. In 1974, Nixon introduced the Community Development Federal Block Grants that gave localities the discretion to decide where to allocate funding. This sudden break from the government created a large opening for community development corporations, also called CDCs to emerge.

Expanding on the conservative overtones of the 1970s, from 1981 to 1993 President Reagan and President Bush pushed a neoconservative agenda that aimed to cut social costs. This meant a severe cut in funding to poor communities and other social welfare programs (DeFillipis, 2008).

Again taking another sharp turn in 1990s, community development was affected by the administration of President Bill Clinton. Clinton enacted the Empowerment Zones, which were hoped to foster locally initiated, bottom up strategies “that connect(ed) the public, business and neighborhood sectors in community building partnerships for change” (O'Connor, 2008, 25). Even with these federal attempts to recognize the need for community development programs, Community Development Corporations (CDCs) began to flourish in the 1990s due to a decline in public sector support. Despite first appearing in the 1960s, CDCs and other non-profit organizations have grown exponentially in the past two decades and have become the “Shadow State” referring to
their provision of goods and services that were formally the responsibility of the
government (DeFillipis, 2008).

CDCs emerged in the 1960s as a new type of grassroots organization and were
controlled by community stakeholders including residents, business owners and clergy.
With the War on Poverty in the 1960s, the United States experienced a period of
activism, protest and unrest. These first generation CDCs got their start with the Equal
Opportunity Act’s Special Impact Program, the Civil Rights movement and churches
with an activist outlook. (Vidal, CDCs as Agents of Neighborhood Change: The State of
the Art, 1996) One of the first CDCs can be traced to Robert Kennedy’s tour of Bedford-
Stuyvesant in 1966, which ultimately led to the Bed-Stuy Restoration Corporation under
the Special Impact Amendment of the Economic Opportunity Act (Stoecker, 1997).

During the 1960s, CDCs launched projects on issues dealing with housing,
commercial projects and human services (Gittell & Wilder, 1999). The main focus of
these early CDCs, however, was job creation and economic development (Stoecker,
1997). By 1970, there were only 100 nationally recognized CDCs. Then in the 1970s,
CDCs doubled their growth and were rooted in neighborhood based advocacy and protest
dealing with issues of urban renewal, bank redlining and displacement of low-income
residents (Gittell & Wilder, 1999). The main focus shifted from economic development
to housing (Stoecker, 1997). By 1980, there were 1,000 CDCs in the United States
(Gittell & Wilder, 1999).
The 1980s saw a sharp decline in federal funding for community development projects and initiatives with the election of President Ronald Reagan (Vidal, CDCs as Agents of Neighborhood Change: The State of the Art, 1996). However, despite the funding cutbacks, CDCs experienced major growth after adopting more corporate style practices and having a variety of funding sources along with collaborating with a wide variety of entities (Gittell & Wilder, 1999).

By the end of the 1980s, CDCs had again doubled reaching around 2,000 around the nation. Following into the 1990s, CDCs continued to grow and federal grants including the Community Development Block Grant and HOME helped support CDC activities. Clinton’s Empowerment Zones and Empowerment Enterprises relied on CDCs to be the voice of communities’ needs (Gittell & Wilder, 1999). Today, CDCs are still heavily focused on housing production, renewal or rehabilitation but also try to blend this physical development with other community building activities like job training, youth programs and also human services like health care (Gittell & Wilder, 1999)(Vidal, CDCs as Agents of Neighborhood Change: The State of the Art, 1996).

Therefore, it should be apparent that community development in the broader, national focus has had an ever-changing history with federal policies shaping the actors, approaches and outcomes of the field. Each decade has influenced community development. What started as a mainly a physical development approach has now transformed to include the social aspects of a community and the idea of planning from the bottom up.
Frameworks of Community Development

Ever since the term community development was coined, scholars and practitioners have had varying opinions how to actually approach community development and what strategies are best to implement. Christenson found that in the 1970s, articles about how to approach community development had three main themes and frameworks that included the self-help, conflict and technical assistance approaches.

The self-help approach reflects the idea that the change agent takes an educational and/or organizational role in assisting people in learning how to handle their problems. The conflict approach also works to bring people together and organize but it emphasizes differences and confrontation between opposing sides. The change agent’s role with this approach is to organize people in order to show that they have the power to have a voice and change. Finally, the technical assistance approach is based on the idea that structure determines behavior. It is here that the change agent works for the community not with the community. The change agent’s role is to assess the community and recommend a feasible, economical and socially responsible way to ameliorate the situation of the community based on the rational information gathered (Christenson, Three Themes of Community Development, 1980).

In the beginning Christenson lays out his procedure when reading each article, which led him to his themes and frameworks. It is helpful that he gives the reader an idea of how he came to his conclusions. This analysis is somewhat limited because it consists of articles only from the Journal of the Community Development Society and not a broader
umbrella of community development journals. Despite these limitations the author does note that the purpose of the chapter is not to create an index of articles but to synthesize the content.

Sue Kenny has also identified what she calls “operational rationales” (286) or essentially the frameworks that planners work in. Kenny’s findings come from qualitative data from in-depth interviews with community organizations in Australia, Sweden, Russia and the United Kingdom. Again, the point with Kenny’s work is to synthesize a variety of information like with Christenson but she has retrieved her information in a different manner. Kenny finds that there are four frameworks including the charity, activist, welfare state and market frameworks.

The charity framework views philanthropic activities as solving social issues and often do not see their role as empowering the residents and the recipients do not view themselves as actually participating in change. The activist framework sees the solution to community problems being structural change and redistribution of resources by using political mobilization and advocacy. Community participation is very important in this framework. The market approach is centered on the ideas of self-help, competition, enterprise and private initiative. Incentives through market forces are seen to be the solution to social issues. And finally, the welfare state framework believes in the idea of standardized rights and obligations affect the structural features of a society. Government intervention and policy changes are critical to achieving equality. Even though Kenny’s studies do not focus directly on cases in the United States, they can still assist in
understanding different frameworks for community development worldwide (Kenny, 2002).

In examining the historical context of neighborhood organizing, Robert Fisher identifies three dominant approaches and believes the rich history of neighborhood organizing allows us to learn key lessons. He warns that neighborhood organizing cannot be limited to only contemporary concepts. Fisher distinguishes the social work, political activist and neighborhood maintenance as the three dominant approaches throughout the history of neighborhood organizing.

The social work approach dates back to the settlement movement in the 1880s. In this approach the organizer’s role is to be an enabler and advocate overcoming social conflict in order to provide social services and integration. The political activist approach is rooted in the Communist Party of the 1930s and also Saul Alinksky’s community organizing of the 1930s as well. This approach views mediation, conflict and challenges of the power structure as a way to fight against exploitation. The organizer is a mobilizer and educator that typically works with the working and lower class.

Finally, the neighborhood maintenance approach stems from the middle class resistance of neighborhood change and perceived threats during the late 19th century. With this approach lobbying and legal action are important in trying to maintain neighborhood status and deliver services. The organizer is view as a civic leader and elected spokesperson that addresses threats to property values and insufficient services usually for the upper to middle class (Fisher, 2008).
From this literature three main approaches for community development come forward.

1. **The political activist and conflict approach**: There are inequalities and disparities in the distribution of resources. Community development works to combat structural differences by mobilizing a community. With this approach, there are two opposing sides and the community developer works as an advocate and organizer. Community participation is critical in this approach.

2. **Self-Help/Market approach**: Market forces shape communities and it is up to competition, private enterprise and self-help for an area to change. The community developer takes the role of educating the community in how they can help themselves.

3. **Social Welfare**: There are social inequalities. Through the work of a community developer as an enabler and organizer, social services can be integrated into the community. There should be standardized rights that affect the structural aspects of a society. Sometimes, government intervention is necessary to achieve this.

All three of these authors illustrate that there are many different framework and approaches to community development. Community development cannot be defined to one single strategy or simplified to one way and one approach that work the best. Throughout history, in different cultural, ideological, political, economic and location
specific contexts, community development can take many different forms and include a variety of alternatives and strategies to best fit a situation.

**Neighborhood Plans**

One aspect of community development is neighborhood planning, which has existed in the United States for over a century to address a variety of social problems. It is defined as involving public, private and non-profit entities to focus on the physical character and social objectives of a subarea of a town or city that has distinguishable characteristics (Rohe, 2009). In addition, Peterman states that neighborhood planning is not just about developing plans but also is used to address inequities in order to change policies and programs that overtime have created uneven development. Rohe identifies six forms of neighborhood planning including the neighborhood planning unit, urban renewal, community action programs, community economic development, municipal neighborhood planning and planned unit development/traditional neighborhood development/transit oriented development mixture. Neighborhood planning has transformed over time from focusing on physical development to encompass broader social objectives.

It should be noted that there are sub area plans and neighborhood plans. Sub area plans are initiated at the municipal level with a decentralization of activities to the neighborhood. In comparison, neighborhood plans are developed by and for the community (Peterman, 2000). Currently in many local municipalities planners are involved and responsible for community development. One of a planner’s main
responsibilities is the preparation of plans including the comprehensive plan and subarea
plans, which include neighborhood plans. Neighborhood plans are a guide for future
development of the area and provide recommendations of how the area can improve. In
today’s practice of community development, municipalities often use neighborhood plans
as a tool for community development. These neighborhood plans usually start with an
analysis of the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities and threats. From there information is
gathered about natural environment features, existing land uses, zoning, circulation,
utilities, housing, community facilities, urban design features, general physical
conditions, history, demography, social analysis and economic base. All of this
information is then assessed, analyzed and integrated to create recommendations (Jones,
1990).

Rohe highlights four advantages of the municipal neighborhood plan: research shows
participating neighborhoods exert influence over decisions made about their local area,
research finds that neighborhood planning programs help build a sense of community due
to face to face interactions, it allows citizens to create their own plans rather than react
and it allows continuous participation by citizens and neighborhood groups rather than a
one time event or meeting. In contrast, Peterman notes that if the municipality initiates
neighborhood planning then it only requires minimal citizen participation and does not
lead to citizen control. Ultimately, he identifies four criteria for successful neighborhood
development:

1. Adequate and ongoing monetary resources and human technical resources.
2. Community development must be demand driven and not legislated by public officials.

3. Community leaders must build and maintain ties with public officials, experts and community organizations.

4. Relationship between community and government agencies must not be too friendly or confrontational.

Therefore, neighborhood planning, whether driven by the municipality or the neighborhood itself is a fine acting balance between many different actors, agendas and objectives. In order for neighborhood planning to make an impact, it is important to capitalize on the advantages seen by Rohe but also work on the weaknesses and criteria set out by Peterman.

Asset Based Community Development

Asset-based community development is a more recent approach in the community development field, founded and coined by John McKnight and Jody Kretzmann of the Institute of Policy Research at Northwestern University in the early 1990s. After two years of researching and analyzing a variety of successful accounts of grassroots community development in low-income communities of the United States, McKnight and Kretzmann ultimately created a new approach for the community development field with their book *Building Communities from the Inside Out: Asset-Based Community Development* (Mathie & Cunningham, Who is Driving Development? , 2003).
Mathie and Cunningham make the connection that asset-based community development is an approach, a set of methods for community mobilization and also a strategy for community driven development. They argue that the focus of public, private and non-profit agencies on a community’s needs, deficiencies and problems is the main issue of reaching out to low-income communities. By approaching a community from this aspect, McKnight and Kretzmann have found that residents become consumers of services and dependent upon the services of an outside institution. Through needs assessments rather than strength assessments, deficiency-oriented policies and programs are created and the weaknesses can ultimately be seen as the whole truth of the neighborhood (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). They note that the consequences of this approach can be devastating for poor communities in particular (Mathie & Cunningham, From Clients to Citizens: Asset-based Community Development as a strategy for community-driven development, 2003).

McKnight and Kretzmann respond with an alternative to this traditional approach, finding that policies and programs based on the assets, skills and capacities of residents is actually a way to help rebuild communities. This internally focused and relationship driven strategy is a way to mobilize residents for development purposes (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993). Two important aspects of asset based community development are that it involves a relocation of power from external agencies to the community and at its core is the focus on social relationships, which can be seen as social capital. It is believed that when social relationships are formed, goodwill and obligations are generated to create
networks, social norms and social trust (Mathie & Cunningham, From Clients to Citizens: Asset-based Community Development as a strategy for community-driven development, 2003). Ultimately, the social relationships formed are viewed as an asset and a way to leverage community development.

Asset-based community development is also a set of methods that allow a community to mobilize. With each locality, different methods might have to be used and so one definitive blueprint does not exist. Methods can include collecting stories of successes in the community, mapping community assets (connecting the strengths of the community), forming a core steering group, building relationships, convening a representative planning group and leveraging external activities, resources and investments.

And finally, it is also a strategy for community development. It is critical that asset-based community development does not look at just in mobilizing a community by linking its assets but more importantly it looks at connecting community initiatives to the macro environment and also promoting policies that are supportive and conducive to the initiatives.

Despite giving hundreds of different “stories” from across the nation of their experiences with community drive initiatives, McKnight and Kretzmann lack an explanation of how their research was completed, their methods of determining what is a successful initiative and what led them to their book in 1993. Without showing the path of how they got to their conclusions, it is hard to understand what their conclusions are based on. At the end of their book, however, McKnight and Kretzmann do acknowledge
the potential limitations of the asset-based approach, including parochialism and discrimination by local groups and associations, the lack of replicating specific local situations and de-emphasizing outside resources. By identifying these potential limitations, the reader is aware of aspects that might otherwise be overlooked.

Mathie and Cunningham also identify five challenges of the asset-based approach, some similar to those of Kretzmann and McKnight. First, due to the nature of the approach being inside to out, it is difficult to find a role for external agencies, which are still important. Second, the asset-based approach does not confront the issues of unequal power and the oppression and discrimination that can follow with it. Third, Mathie and Cunningham note that in different settings, there will be different qualities necessary for leadership roles within the community. McKnight and Kretzmann could have done a better job addressing this issue. Fourth, outside actors and forces like local institutions and agencies play in role in the capacity for communities to realize their assets. Whether or not an environment is conducive or not is important. And finally, the relationships between informal networks change over time.

The asset-based approach does not seem to address how the process will affect social relationships, patterns and networks and what will happen if the associations become institutionalized. Even though both Mathie and Cunningham are positive and support the asset-based community development approach, their bias is limited by being able to point out the weaknesses as well.
The asset-based approach, however, has become an approach that scholars, planners and professionals have taken interest in not only in the United States but also around the world. From giving opportunities to a marginalized community in the LaTrobe Valley of Victoria, Australia (Cameron & Gibson, 2005) to leveraging cultural assets of local immigrants to create unique economic development opportunities in Seattle, Washington (Carr & Servon, 2009), asset-based community development is now a visible break away from the typical needs assessment, community deficiency orientation of many community development entities including local governments.

**Integrating Asset-Based Community Development and Neighborhood Planning**

What is the balance between a local municipality and the community in driving development and ameliorating and revitalizing a neighborhood? Kretzmann and McKnight do not ignore the role of local governments. The issue is that local governments often view themselves “as the central actor in the process of local community building” (Kretzmann & McKnight, 1993, 367). Often, when resources are provided from municipalities it can dominate local neighborhood efforts to regenerate an area. Kretzmann and McNight believe that in order for asset-based community development to be achieved, local governments need to shift their role from identifying problems and establishing solutions to advancing community solutions instead.

Local government resources can best be used to identify local problem solvers and the assets of a neighborhood. The focus changes from asking how local residents can
participate in the government’s initiative but rather to how governments can assist local neighborhood efforts. Second, the local government should identify the local coalitions, associations and groups and seek to be a participant. And finally, third, local municipalities should be investing in the local economy instead of going outside the neighborhood.

As mentioned previously with Jones, municipal neighborhood plans typically do not follow these guidelines set by Kretzmann and McNight. A fundamental change in how local governments run, including their attitudes, motivations and actions would all have to be reoriented in order to allow community mobilization, building and revitalization. Overall, from the perspective of a municipality a synthesis and a balanced integration all three of the community development approaches previously laid out (political activist, market and social welfare) would be necessary to make effective changes in a neighborhood.

**Poverty in the United States**

Poverty in a broad sense is the lack of necessities including healthcare, shelter, food and safety. In addition to the idea of lack of necessities, the concepts of inequality and relative deprivation become very important in defining poverty even further. Every person in a society does not maintain and have access to the same resources necessary for life (Bradshaw, 2007). These concepts of necessities and inequality, however, can vary from cultures and geographical spaces. This is known as relative poverty, which is
looking at how people are poor in comparison to the average standards of a society (Rodgers, 2000). During the War on Poverty, the United States established what is known as a more objective definition of poverty because it statistically measures the annual income needed for a family or individual to survive. This poverty line or threshold allows the government to measure progress or lack of progress and creates a more empirical way to categorize poverty (Bradshaw, 2007).

Global entities like the World Bank and United Nations measure poverty by using absolute standards, indicating that people who live on less than two dollars a day, live in poverty and less than a dollar a day in extreme poverty. In examining just income levels, however, the idea and dimensions of poverty can be lost. As mentioned previously, poverty is not one-dimensional dealing with lack of income or economic deprivation. It is a much more complex term that “encompasses the lack of access to an education, basic healthcare or clean drinking water or to influence political processes and other factors that matter to people” (United Nations Development Programme). The United State’s measurement of poverty through the use of thresholds is criticized for the lack of regional cost adjustments, failure to include taxes and in-kind benefits, failure to examine employed vs. unemployed families, lack of reflecting change in family size, and no indication of the severity of poverty (Rodgers, 2000).

**Current Poverty Statistics in America**

As of 2009, the United States has 43.6 million people or 14.3% of its population living in poverty. This number is the highest since record keeping began 51 years ago and
reflects the Office of Management and Budget definition as a family of four living on $21,954 or less in 2009 (US Census Bureau, 2010). As it can be seen in Figure 1, there are disparities of poverty rates and numbers along many different variables like region, city boundaries, race and work experience. Typically, Blacks, Hispanics, people less than 18 years of age, non-citizens, non-full time workers, and residents inside the principal cities suffer from higher percentages of living in poverty (Figure 1). Additionally, according to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, on average 43.5% of American residents in city boundaries are classified as low to moderate income (defined as 50% to 80% of the median household income).
Table 4. Type of Family (continued). This table shows data using the first approach (race alone). The use of the single-race population does not imply that it is the preferred method of presenting or analyzing data. The Census Bureau uses a variety of approaches, information on people who reported more than one race, such as White and American Indian and Alaska Native or Asian and Black or African American, is available from Census 2000 through American FactFinder. About 3.5 percent of people reported more than one race in Census 2000. Data for American Indians and Alaska Native, Native Hawaiian and Other Pacific Islanders, and those reporting two or more races are not shown separately.

* Statistically different from zero at the 90 percent confidence level.

A 90 percent confidence interval is a measure of an estimate's variability. The larger the confidence interval in relation to the size of the estimate, the less reliable the estimate.

Note: Definitions of terms used in this report are available in the American FactFinder at www.census.gov/acs/www/definitionssi.html.

Figure 1: People and Families in Poverty by Selected Characteristics: 2008 and 2009 (Source: Current Population Survey, 2009 and 2010)
Causes of Poverty

There are two sides of the spectrum that try to explain the causes of poverty. At one end there are cultural/behavioral theories that blame the individual and on the other end are the structural/economic theories that stress the lack of equal opportunities for every American (Iceland, 2006)(Ropers, 1991) (Crain & Kalleberg, 2007). From the side of the cultural/behavioral theories, proponents emphasize what is known as the “culture of poverty” or the individual behavioral characteristics like poor motivation and negative attitudes that make it difficult for a person to meet their economic needs (Crain & Kalleberg, 2007).

From Social Darwinism in 1859 to Craniology of the nineteenth century, many theories exist that attempt to explain why poverty needs to be viewed as the failure on the individual level (Ropers, 1991). During the 1960s, Oscar Lewis and Daniel Moynihan argued that the idea of a “culture of poverty” existed. These men believed that the disorganization and pathology of lower-class culture perpetuated poverty through cultural transmission (Parrillo, 2011). More current literature comes from Myron Magnet and The Dream and The Nightmare in 1993. Magnet argues that people become poor because they lack the inner resources to seize opportunities and destitution of the soul (Rodgers, 2000). It is apparent that this perspective highly emphasizes the causes of poverty being personal inadequacies.

On the other end of the spectrum is the belief that poverty is a result of structural features or outside forces of our society. In general this incorporates limited economic
and political opportunities, changes in government policies and racial and sexual discrimination (Rodgers, 2000). More specifically, examples of blaming the system include poor quality public schools, residential segregation, discrimination in labor and lack of access to higher education (Crain & Kalleberg, 2007). In our society we have social stratification or what is known as the layering or hierarchy of people based on the unequal distribution of resources, power, or prestige (Parrillo, 2011). Economic forces contribute to determining overall levels of economic growth and inequality and social stratification along the lines of race, ethnicity, gender and culture can determine who in effect becomes poor.

Historically, discrimination, both de facto and de jure, has helped preserve social inequalities in the United States (Iceland, 2006). Minority groups in particular have struggled throughout time to gain equal access to resources. Advances have been made in the past 50 years, specifically with the passage of the Civil Rights Acts in 1964. In general the United States has an anomic society, meaning that we believe in the American Dream and pulling yourself up by your bootstraps but in the end there is a disconnect on how to actual obtain those goals (Vander Mey, 2010). Structural barriers exist in our society and that is what this end of the spectrum highlights.

As noted by Crain and Kalleburg, the causes of poverty do not lie absolutely on one end of the spectrum, whether it is the individual or the system. Instead it is a complex interaction between the two that allows for poverty to continue in the United States today.
Approaches to Combating Poverty

Due to the nature of poverty being diverse, complex and interconnected with its components, populations affected and the causes, how to actually ameliorate and address poverty is also a topic with many different opinions and approaches. It has been suggested that antipoverty policies and programs should not focus on the cause of poverty being the individual or the system but instead, frame policy by integrating both explanations (Crain & Kalleberg, 2007).

In general, the public, private and non-profit sector work to reduce the effects of poverty in the United States. All three sectors have different methods like advocacy, education, social work, legislation, direct service or charity, and community organizing. Many people might think of welfare as the government approach to poverty. It evolved from the Social Security Act of 1935 and provides both cash payment programs and also non-cash assistance programs. Welfare is debated, however, about whether it ameliorates poverty or actually perpetuates it. Some scholars argue that welfare does not play a meaningful role in preventing poverty because it actually contributes to the growing class of poor Americans (Rodgers, 2000). In 1984, Charles Murray’s controversial book *Losing Ground* claims that the welfare underclass is caught in a vicious cycle of poverty because they are content to live off of taxpayer dollars (Ropers, 1991). Even if somewhat extreme, it is apparent that welfare is not the perfect approach in addressing poverty.

John Edwards in the book *Ending Poverty in America* states that ending poverty requires policy and programs that are oriented and geared towards spurring better jobs,
creating higher incomes, creating prosperity through asset building and strengthening family and community. The problems of poverty cannot be understood and solved in isolation (Edwards, Conclusion: Ending Poverty in America, 2007). It is clear that antipoverty policies and programs are to be approached in a holistic manner by taking in structural challenges and also personal issues that contribute to poverty existing in our society.

**Community Development and Poverty**

Community development, even though consisting of a variety of strategies, methods, frameworks, principles and even definitions, is one way to meet the needs of people in communities that are less advantaged and live in poverty. As Ferguson and Dickens note, “Community development entails building capacity to improve the quality of life among the residents of low and moderate income neighborhoods (65).

As stated previously, communities are places, spaces and faces (Leventhal, Brooks-Gunn, & Kamerman, 2008). However, when a person or a family lives in a neighborhood of concentrated poverty, these three aspects might be different than those of a middle-income neighborhood where there are amenities like parks, community centers and high quality public schools. The dynamics change and the neighborhood no longer functions like it ought to. As Angela Blackwell states, “Communities are the building blocks for a vibrant, competitive region, and a region cannot thrive if some of its communities are neglected, disinvested and isolated…” (246).
Therefore, these concentrations of poverty that exist not only affect the individual but families, communities, cities, states and the entire nation. Blackwell calls for equitable development, which is when inclusion is connected with participation in local, metropolitan and regional planning and development. The realms of the poverty and community development overlap and it is critical that the planning profession addresses these impoverished neighborhoods and communities. Scholar Melvin Tumin frames the issue this way: poverty might always exist but that does not mean we have to live in a world of extremes (Vander Mey, 2010). This connection needs to be made that community development approaches can affect poverty and certain aspects of an impoverished neighborhood. As Dennis Keating writes, “The revitalization of urban neighborhoods, aided by public and private support, requires planning” (Keating, Krumholz, & Star, Revitalizing Urban Neighborhoods, 1996, 3).

Theories of Poverty and Community Development

Community development has attempted to address solutions to poverty and as Schiller notes, “Which view of poverty we ultimately embrace will have a direct bearing on the public policies we pursue” (Bradshaw 2007, 7). Bradshaw argues that anti poverty programs within the spectrum of community development efforts and implementations are designed based on the variety of causation theories. Bradshaw arrived at the theoretical perspectives after examining books and articles entailing poverty in America. The work was not done to complete a literature review on poverty because poverty is too complex and such a large issue that it would be nearly impossible to complete but to
generalize and build a ground theory about programs from the community development field that deal with poverty. This article does not go into detail about how many sources were used and it would make a stronger argument if more specificity were included, along with the limitations of this study.

Bradshaw identifies five main theories of what causes poverty and how in turn those are related to community development responses (Figure 2). These include the individual, cultural, political-economic structure, geographic and cumulative and cyclical theories. The individual theory contributes laziness, bad choices and incompetence as to what causes poverty because those who do not work hard are punished by competition. In return, community development approaches with this approach will avoid and counter efforts to individualize poverty like with drug rehabilitation centers or job training for low-income populations. The cultural theory views that the transmission of values and beliefs from generation to generation of a subculture that are dysfunctional and unsuccessful are the cause of poverty. Anti-poverty community development efforts will then work to change the culture by educating youth or build upon assets.

The political-economic structure identifies the systematic barriers present in societies that prevent poor people from access and success. Through community organizing and advocacy, this approach works to create policies that are inclusive. The geographic approach views poverty as a result of inequities concentrated in separate areas. Redevelopment and urban revitalization are community development approaches linked with this theory. And finally, the cumulative and cyclical theory views poverty having
many different factors interact to create a complex situation of the community crises leading to individual crises and vice versa. Community development approaches through this theory aim for comprehensive programs that target the individual and community and create linkages.

Bradshaw’s study of the connection of poverty and community development lays the groundwork into understanding how poverty and community development work together and also how they impact each other. Poverty and community development are both such two broad subjects that they might not be able to be formulated to fit into such neat categories as laid out in the literature. If anything, they are a combination and synthesis of the many different approaches.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Theory</th>
<th>What causes Poverty?</th>
<th>How does it work?</th>
<th>Potential Community Development responses</th>
<th>Community examples to reduce poverty</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Individual</td>
<td>Individual laziness, bad choice, incompetence, inherent disabilities</td>
<td>Competition rewards winners and punishes those who do not work hard and make bad choices</td>
<td>Avoid and counter efforts to individualize poverty, provide assistance and safety net</td>
<td>Drug rehabilitation, second chance programs, making safety net easier to access, use training and counselling to help poor individuals overcome problems</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Cultural</td>
<td>Subculture adopts values that are non-productive and are contrary to norms of success</td>
<td>Use community to the advantage of the poor; value diverse cultures, acculturation, and community building; alternative socialization through forming new peer groups</td>
<td>Head Start, after school, leadership development within subcultures, asset-based community development</td>
<td>Head Start, after-school leadership development within subcultures, asset-based community development</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Figure 2: Causes of Poverty and Community Development Responses (Source: Bradshaw, 2007)**

### A Look at Concentrated Poverty

It is critical to observe the linkage of poverty with place. Over time in the United States, impoverished families and persons have become concentrated in low-income neighborhoods. Living in concentrations of poverty has evidence of affecting a person’s well being in regards to economic and employment opportunity, health and mental health status, crime and safety, child behavior and development, and educational outcomes. Children living in impoverished neighborhoods are more likely to experience childhood...

Basically, these concentrated areas magnify the problems typically associated with poverty. Not only are residents who live in a concentrated poverty neighborhood at higher risk for the problems listed previously but also the neighborhood is also perceived as dangerous and usually becomes isolated (Wilson, 2007). Typically, these spatially, socially and economically isolated concentrations of poverty are defined as Census tracts where 20 to 40 percent of the population lives at or below the poverty line (Iceland, 2006). The Census tracts serve as a proxy for neighborhoods and comprise 2,500 to 8,000 people (Berube, Concentrated Poverty in America: An Overview, 2008).

Ghetto or barrio poverty is often used interchangeably with the term concentrated poverty due to the fact that African Americans and Hispanics tend to be the populations most affected. However, it needs to be noted that ghetto and barrio poverty are linked with racial, ethnic, and economic concentrations. Concentrated poverty, however, refers more definitively to neighborhoods with high poverty rates (Iceland, 2006).

**Historical Stance on Concentrated Poverty**

Due to the fact that the poverty population in the United States is very diverse and ranges from the young and the old, families, single mothers, rural residents, urban
residents, African American, and Hispanics it is easily labeled as complex and heterogeneous (Rodgers, 2000). Even the neighborhoods of concentrated poverty are not homogeneous because not every resident receives welfare or is unemployed contrary to society’s belief (Iceland, 2006). Poverty in America is therefore not traced to one historical timeline but is a synthesis of individual actions, cultural influences and public policies. Some scholars, however, have certain theories on the concentration of poverty, particularly in the urban cities. Iceland believes that concentrated poverty is a result of government policies, racial and ethnic discrimination, residential segregation, economic changes, employment dislocations, and movement to the suburbs.

After World War II, the Housing Act of 1949 restarted public housing projects in the United States by appropriating the production of 810,000 new housing units over the span of five years (Hoffman 1996). Public housing projects were viewed necessary with the huge influx of four million African Americans into the North and Midwest between 1940 and 1970 (Halpern 1995). Realizing the possibility of extreme neighborhood change within white suburbs, local governments paired with developers, real estate agents and white residents to build public housing units in order to “locate, solidify and hold minority ghettos in place” (Halpern 1995, 58). This overt discrimination preserved the racial division (Iceland, 2006). While low-income housing projects were located in the cities, federal funding for highway construction and also mass transit contributed to the acceleration of suburbanization of the middle and upper classes, also known as white
flight. In addition, tax and infrastructure policies often directed growth to the suburbs (Iceland, 2006).

Due to the fact that most of the low-income population could not afford high rents and were also denied access to white neighborhoods, it left them no choice but to live in the public housing projects. With so much opposition by white residents, these projects were often bound to being located in slums or areas that were separated by physical boundaries like highways or railroads (Halpern 1995). As Arnold Hirsch describes the old high-rises in Chicago as “vertical ghetto supplemented for the old,” it was the same for many cities across the United States and most visible in New York, Chicago, Philadelphia and St. Louis (Hirsch 1998, 10).

The Public Housing Act of 1949 originally aimed to support the working poor and the housing shortages of the time. However, under the Brooke amendments of 1969, 1970 and 1971, changes in eligibility and preference made public housing serving those with the greatest needs (Quercia 1997). The Brooke amendment of 1969, for example, put a ceiling on rents at 25% of a tenant’s income, nearly making it impossible for Public Housing Authorities to have any operating budget. Shortly by the 1960’s, public housing was not viewed as a temporary home for people moving on up but as a poorhouse within the inner city for African Americans (Hoffman 1996). In the act of physically separating public housing from other environments and creating an institution-like quality, public housing soon became stigmatized as islands of despair and poverty (Epp 1996).
1970 marked the end of the great Black migration to the North. Due to transportation making it easy for workers to live outside the city and also to industries gradually moving to the suburbs, migrants were not interested in the pull of downtown manufacturing jobs. Therefore, the population of downtown neighborhoods began to change. During the 1970s, jobs became heavily concentrated in the suburbs, leaving the communities inside the city limits in a tough spot (Wilson, 2007).

The spatial mismatch and skills mismatch hypotheses attempt to explain the situation of the concentrated poor in urban areas. The spatial mismatch hypothesis proposes that an increase in the concentration of the inner-city poor is directly related to jobs moving to the suburbs and the decline of low-skill manufacturing jobs in general. The skills mismatch hypothesis on the other hand proposes that with this decline of the manufacturing sector and the rise of the service economy, there is a lack of well paying jobs that match the skills of inner city residents (Iceland, 2006). Overall, however, concentrated poverty can be seen as the combination of industrial decline, a shrinking tax base, urban sprawl and racial tensions allowed these inner city neighborhoods to take on a pattern of what seems to be irreversible decline (Keating W. D., Federal Policy and Poor Urban Neighborhoods, 1999).

It is apparent that throughout time the outcomes faced with concentrated poverty are persistent—distressed housing, limited resources, lack of accessibility to basic resources, education and health concerns - all of which are negative externalities bearing down on those who already live below the minimum to survive. Concentrated poverty has
remained a challenge and issue to address in the United States, even with unique situations in each locale.

**Concentrated Poverty Today**

Jargowsky found in looking at Census data that the number of poor people living in high poverty neighborhoods within U.S. metropolitan areas doubled from 1.9 million to 3.7 million from 1970 to 1990. He also found that the number of Census tracts defined as high poverty also rose drastically and by 1990, 18 percent of the poor lived in poverty neighborhoods compared to 12 percent in 1970. These statistics indicate a fundamental change in where the poor lived by concentrating in low-income neighborhoods. However, between 1990 and 2000, Jargowsky found that the overall number of people living in poverty neighborhoods dropped 15 percent from 4.8 million to 3.5 million in both metropolitan and non-metropolitan areas. Additionally, Native Americans, Hispanics and Blacks experienced higher concentrations of poverty in 2000 (Figure 3) (Berube, Concentrated Poverty in America: An Overview, 2008).

Despite these positive trends of the 1990s, the economic challenges of the 2000s have caused a possible reversal of these findings. Research analyst, Elizabeth Kneebone, found that both the central city and suburbs saw an increase in high poverty working communities between 1999 and 2005. Midwest and Northeast metropolitan areas experienced a significant increase in concentrated poverty while the Western metropolitan areas saw a sharp decrease in the first half of the decade. In addition to Kneebone’s findings, a congressional research service report found that in 2003 34.8
percent, or more than one third, of America’s poor lived in neighborhoods of concentrated poverty. More telling is looking at the racial differences. Poor ethnic and racial minorities are more likely to live in areas of concentrated poverty. In 2008, 52.9 percent of poor African Americans and 47.5 percent of poor Hispanics lived in areas of concentrated poverty, while only 18.8 percent of poor non-Hispanic whites did (Gabe, 2009).

More recently in the United States, immigration, even though not a new experience is changing the face of concentrated poverty. Immigration from Latin America and Asia has allowed for the foreign born population to more than triple in size totaling around 35 million. Due to a variety of factors including discrimination, cultural differences and lack of resources and opportunities, the foreign born populations usually result in comprising a large and disproportionate share of the poor. The Hispanic population in particular has grown in many areas across the United States. In cities like Los Angeles, Miami, New York and Chicago, the changes in population demographics are obvious (Berube, Concentrated Poverty in America: An Overview, 2008).

Also, it is important to highlight that in 2005, Hurricane Katrina tore the covers off of the disparities of today’s society and the social challenges we face in the United States. Images and videos of Katrina’s effects gave a sobering and powerful picture of concentrated poverty and the unequal hardships that residents faced. In New Orleans, 38 percent of city population lived in poverty neighborhoods, with African Americans experiencing a concentrated poverty rate of 43 percent. The African American population
made up 84 percent of the population living below the poverty line. Even though devastation was widespread, the high poverty neighborhoods of New Orleans bore the brunt of destruction. Many of the poor residents did not have access to evacuate and their homes were located in the flood prone parts of the city (Katz, 2006).

![Concentrated poverty by race and ethnicity](image)

**Figure 3: Concentrated poverty by race and ethnicity** (Source: Berube, Concentrated Poverty in America: An Overview, 2008)

### Addressing Concentrated Poverty

The challenges of concentrated poverty are often interrelated and interconnected making policymakers struggle and sometimes compete with multiple approaches and visions on how to tackle poverty neighborhoods. More broadly, there are federal and state policies in place that attempt to address concentrated poverty including Temporary
Assistance for Needy Families, Head Start, food stamps, Earned Income Tax Credit, Social Security, Medicare, disability insurance, unemployment insurance and workers’ compensation. Even though these policies can be viewed as valuable in approaching poverty, concentrated poverty and all that it encompasses needs to be addressed specifically (Berube & Erickson, Learning From Concentrated Poverty in America: A Synthesis of Themes From the Case Studies, 2008).

Figure 4 shows that structural factors are the main causes of concentrated poverty, which is then in effect a contributing factor to issues like drug use and violent crime. Steinberg notes the importance of understanding these structural factors that lead to concentrated poverty and that concentrated poverty cannot be severed from its root causes. If it is cut off from the structural forces, concentrated poverty will not be addressed correctly. Neighborhood initiatives therefore, cannot be focused on just the problems that plague the neighborhood itself but for the city as a whole. It is critical to note that there are certain priorities and mixture of issues within a specific locale but it
still important to frame the neighborhood initiative within the broader social forces (Halpern, 1993).

Often it is debated whether the solution to concentrated poverty is to ameliorate the conditions of a neighborhood or to remove or lessen the concentration of poverty-stricken neighborhood residents. Scholars like Steinberg and Goetz argue that concentrated poverty cannot be treated as a self-sustaining independent factor. After extensively researching Moving to Opportunity body of literature, Goetz found that “The scattering of poor people in itself, accomplishes little” (Steinberg, 220). In his studies, Steinberg finds that people who are displaced from low-income neighborhoods actually become worse off than before because they actually move from one high poverty neighborhood to the next. By dispersing residents of a high poverty neighborhood, it is more difficult for the poor to mobilize and put political pressure on a municipality to address the issues of concentrated poverty. Jargowsky argues as well that ghetto dispersal, mobility strategies, and enterprise zones do little to change the economic and social structures that lead to geographic segregation and fragmentation in metropolitan areas even though they attempt to connect the poor with employment and life opportunities.

Contrarily, Douglas Massey and Nancy Denton argue that racial discrimination is one of the most critical factors that has led to the continuation of concentrated poverty. In order to attack racial discrimination, Massey and Denton view housing as an outlet in which minorities have regional mobility. Both scholars view minorities as trapped in inner-city ghettos and that programs that attempt to alleviate poverty will not do as much
as an expanded range of policies against racial discrimination (Keating & Krumholz, Future Prospects For Distressed Urban Neighborhoods, 1999). This is important when addressing concentrated poverty, whether dispersal is viewed as the best way to improve concentrated poverty.

Berube and Erickson identify three strategies to address the challenges of high poverty neighborhoods that should be viewed as interrelated and unable to stand alone. First, improving the neighborhood is a strategy that focuses on place-based provision of community based affordable housing and business enterprise. Second, it is important to expand opportunities with a people-based focus by creating ways for residents to have equal access to quality jobs and education. Last, transforming the neighborhood is a place-based and people-based strategy that aims to alter the socio-economic mix of concentrated poverty to create communities that are attractive to a wide range of populations. The Brookings Institute notes failures and weaknesses of each of these strategies and emphasizes that strategies should integrate place-based and people-based policies that are tailored to local assets and needs. Every poverty stricken neighborhood might have similar overarching themes but are placed in different economic, social and political contexts, which requires diverse and multi-dimensional responses.

A particular aspect of a place based strategy deals with increasing homeownership rates. After World War II, homeownership became the main form of tenure and has since been actively fostered by successive American governments (Knox, 2005). Homeownership is viewed as possibly stabilizing length of tenure of the current
residents, property values, physical condition of properties and the social conditions in
the neighborhood (Rohe 1996). From the Real Estate Corporation and Center for Urban
Policy Research, it has been found that there are five stages of neighborhoods from
healthy and viable (stage one) to unhealthy and nonviable (stage 5). Stage one is desired
for all neighborhoods and typical has an owner occupancy rate of 90%. Once a
neighborhood is in stage three (clear decline) it is hard to turn back and revitalize the
area. At this point, typically 50-69 percent of the residents are homeowners (Farris,
2009). Increasing homeownership is therefore an important place based strategy to
address when attempting to address a distressed neighborhood.

Similarly, the Enterprise Foundation highlights three strategies to combat
concentrated poverty. The Foundation believes that enhancing access to opportunity for
low-income families, rebuilding and reinvesting in sustainable ways and ensuring
meaningful decision-making role for low-income people are ways to address the
challenges of neighborhood poverty (Harvey, 2005).

The Urban Land Institute identifies five general principles for revitalizing low-
income neighborhoods after visiting eight different neighborhoods across the United
States. First, cities must address the communities’ full range of needs and assets
comprehensively. Revitalization should occur within a long-term, comprehensive
community plan that sets clear goals and a vision for a neighborhood. In order for the
revitalization effort to be comprehensive, a variety of public and private players will have
to coordinate. The city can act as the facilitator. Also, in order for neighborhoods to have
a sense of ownership with revitalization, the plans must come from the bottom up. Resources and efforts should be concentrated in specific target areas that are of a manageable size. And, finally, revitalization of a low-income neighborhood is a long-term, ongoing process that requires the commitment of leadership of the public and private sector (Suchman, 1994).

Finally, Carolina Reid emphasizes three main principles to address concentrated poverty. First, understanding a neighborhood is vital in understanding the local community development challenges that will be faced. Neighborhoods and their issues vary across the United States. Citizen participation is one key way to get a more tailored approach when addressing neighborhoods with concentrated poverty and it is important to involve them in the beginning of the planning process. Second, public-private partnerships make it possible to mobilize all the different parts of addressing concentrated poverty with neighborhood leaders, CDCs, intermediaries, the private sector and government. Finally, third, strategies need to be place and people based, meaning that it needs to support resident and link them to services but also connect a neighborhood to a regional context (Reid 2006).

Therefore, from these different sources of literature, addressing poverty at the municipal level can be generalized into three main principles:

1. Efforts to ameliorate concentrated poverty should integrate **place based** and **people based** strategies. This means that community development efforts of the city should support residents by linking, expanding and
enhancing opportunities while also providing services that connect the neighborhood to the larger regional environment. This principle allows for the neighborhood specifics to be identified but also allows the larger social and structural forces to be recognized as well.

2. Cities need to involve citizens from the beginning of the planning process. It is important that residents of neighborhoods are placed in meaningful decision making roles and that the plans come from the bottom up.

3. Partnerships between the city, neighborhood leaders, CDCs, non-profits, the private sector and different institutions are integral in making an anti-poverty program or strategy comprehensive. These public-private partnerships allow mobilization of all the different areas involved in addressing concentrated poverty.

Case Study

The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative

The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative (DSNI) was started in 1984 with a vision of creating a sustainable urban village. DSNI incorporates the Roxbury and North Dorchester neighborhoods of Boston and is only two miles from downtown. In the early 1980s, neighborhood residents protested the mixed-use redevelopment proposals of the City of Boston that would more than likely result in displacement and gentrification (Rubin R., 2008). This initiative was created by the residents and now is a collaboration
of non-profit organizations, community development corporations, and institutions serving the neighborhood, governments, businesses and corporations (Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, 2010). As of the year 2000, the Dudley Street neighborhood population was 24,000 with 27 percent of the residents falling below the federal poverty line of $17,029 for a family of four and 62 percent falling below the Family Economic Self Sufficiency line of $37,591.

DSNI in collaboration with technical expertise of planning consultants developed a comprehensive revitalization plan, which was used as a blue print for the City of Boston’s 2004 Roxbury Strategic Master Plan. In 1999, the City of Boston agreed to a Memorandum of Understanding, which DSNI and the neighborhood at large will participate in every state of planning for city sponsored projects within the neighborhood (Rubin R., 2008). The DSNI focuses on three main areas: sustainable and economic development, community empowerment and youth opportunities and development. Activities and programs include a Resident Development Institute, Dudley Youth Council, GOTCHA Youth Jobs Collaborative, Dudley Neighbors, Inc (DNI), and a sustainable development committee.

What stands out about DSNI is that it is the first and only community based non-profit in the United States that has received eminent domain authority over property within its boundaries. The City of Boston granted eminent domain authority over a 60-acre area of vacant land and also created a partnership with DSNI on the public-owned vacant land. DSNI established a community land trust to ensure community land
ownership, permanence and affordability. Overall, however, when DSNI was established, there were over 1300 acres of vacant land. As of 2008, half of these parcels have been transformed to affordable homes, schools, community centers, community gardens, parks, playgrounds and greenhouses (Rubin R. , 2008)(Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative, 2010).

By receiving the authority of eminent domain from the City of Boston, the neighborhood acquired valuable assets, set criteria for development and had a place at the table to decide in the planning and development of the community. DSNI is an example of how communities and local governments can collaborate in a partnership to achieve the mission of the community and in way that gives the power to the residents of the neighborhood. The City of Boston recognizes the benefits of the DNI land trust and it is hoped to be used as a model throughout Boston (Rubin).

The DSNI exemplifies all three principles in that it is place based and people based, it has high citizen participation and the public-private partnerships are crucial to the efforts of changing the neighborhood.

1. **Place based and people based strategies**: DSNI integrates both of these strategies. It is place based by focusing much of its efforts in providing and maintaining affordable housing in the area through the Dudley Neighbors, Incorporated, which is a community land trust. It also incorporates people based strategies by focusing on youth development. Both the Dudley Youth
Council and the GOTCHA Youth Jobs Collaborative attempt to expand the opportunities of the youth in the Dudley Street neighborhood.

2. **Citizen involvement**: The residents of the Dudley Street area came together originally to revive their dilapidated neighborhood. The plans are resident driven and even when the City of Boston became involved, the residents maintained an important decision making role in the renewal of the neighborhood. The city has not dominated and hushed the voice of the people.

3. **Public-private partnerships**: Even though the focus is always on the residents of the neighborhood, DSNI recognizes the importance of relationships both inside and outside of the neighborhood, including the City of Boston, non-profits, CDCs, religious institutions, banks, corporations and foundations. Without these partnerships with different agencies, departments and institutions, the efforts of DSNI would be futile.

The Dudley Street Neighborhood Initiative provides an excellent example of the three highlighted strategies for local municipalities to address run down, distressed neighborhoods. It represents the balance of power between the city and the neighborhood and a comprehensive approach in order to truly regenerate the situation of the Dudley Street area.
Analyzing Community Development Programs

In order to further analyze and evaluate community development programs at the municipal level, Gittell and Vidal’s conceptual model of community development provides a theoretical framework to explore real life examples. This model depicts the key elements, relationships, complexities and decisions involved in a community development program. Gittell and Vidal do not intend for this model to be viewed as static and linear but instead highlight the dynamic and interactive character of community development programs. The model has five main parts: 1) Program or Organizational Design and Implementation Attributes 2) Intermediate Outcomes 3) Long-Term Measurable Outcomes 4) Local Context and 5) External Agents. (Figure 5) Gittell and Vidal view these five dimensions key to community revitalization.

This model incorporates the three strategies previously mentioned of anti-concentrated poverty programs being place-based, people-based, involving residents and forming partnerships. First, one long-term measurable outcome is physical and housing development which is a place-based strategy. However, it also includes people-based outcomes of enhancing employment opportunities and resident human capital. Second, this conceptual model emphasizes citizen involvement as well. The intermediate outcomes all deal directly with resident capacity, commitment and control. And finally this model also highlights partnerships with bridging support from the public, private and non-profit sectors to enhance network capacity, the support and commitment to community development by the private and non-profit sector under local context and
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listing all external agencies (Vidal and Gittell, 1998). This model provides a framework for the research, highlighting the complexities of community development and all it entails.
• **Program or Organizational and Implementation Attributes**
  o Geographic and population target
  o Mission and goals or strategic focus
  o Governance
  • Board, staff, and community (resident) influence
  o Funding
  • Public, non-profit or private sources
  • Periodic or dedicated
  • Matching or direct
  o Staff capacity and orientation
  • Professional training
  • Prior experience

• **Intermediate Outcomes (enhancement of commitment, capacity, and control)**
  o Resident commitment
  • Interests in and loyalty to community
  • Relationships among residents (i.e. levels of trust and cooperation)
  • Vision for community
  o Resident capacity
  • Leadership
  • Financial, technical, and political know-how and wherewithal
  o Organizational capacity
  • Board development and orientation
  o Activities and “spin-offs”
  • Implementation of plans
  o Staff development and orientation
  • Technical know-how (staff)
  o Network capacity (i.e. bridging with the support community)
  • Public sector, nonprofit, private sector
  • Financial, technical, and mentorship relations
  • Realization of mutual gains
  • Resident and neighborhood control
  • Influence of development processes and outcomes
  • Power relations with support community

• **Long-Term Measurable Outcomes**
  o Physical housing and development
  o Employment and business development opportunities
  o Enhancement of resident human capital
  • Training and educations
  • Human service provision

• **Local Context**
  o Socioeconomic conditions
  o Trust and cooperation among residents
  • Race and class relations
  o City policies
  o Political culture
  o Level and quality of community development activities
  • Competency and capacity of community-based organizations (e.g. CDCs)
  o Nonprofit and private foundation resources and commitment to community development
  o Private-sector support of community development

• **External Agents**
  o Federal agencies and programs
  o State agencies and programs
  o National and regional intermediaries

---

Figure 5: Conceptual Model of Community Development (Gittell and Vidal, 1998)
Conclusion

From this literature, it should be apparent that the relationship between poverty and community development is complicated. They are interconnected and intertwined, so that there is no simple solution to solving our society’s social ills. The approaches and strategies identified in the literature, however, provide a strong foundation to examine concrete examples of community development throughout the United States.

Therefore, Vidal and Gittell’s conceptual model for community development will be a tool to compare community development programs of local municipalities that deal directly with neighborhoods of concentrated poverty. It will highlight similarities and differences among the five dimensions, which ultimately can show what conditions are necessary in each municipality and the Upstate to achieve its community development goals. This leads to research of answering: When specifically looking at the Upstate of South Carolina, how do municipal community development programs in the Upstate compare when addressing an impoverished neighborhood? What dimensions of the community development programs are similar and what dimensions are different? What factors appear to be the most significant in achieving the desired goals of each municipality?

METHODOLOGY

The objectives of this research are to distinguish how community development efforts address distressed neighborhoods, to designate what factors and dimensions of
community development efforts are significant when addressing distressed
neighborhoods, and in general to have a clearer understanding of the relationship between
concentrated poverty and community development. In order to achieve these objectives, a
descriptive, qualitative comparative analysis was completed. Babbie defines qualitative
analysis as “the nonnumeric examination and interpretation of observations, for the
purpose of discovering underlying meaning and patterns of relationships” (2007, 378).
This study is a case-oriented analysis, which is an analysis that aims to understand
several cases by examining the details. The following sections outline the case study unit
of analysis, data collected, the method for collecting data, threats to validity and
reliability and strategies to counter these threats.

Unit of Analysis

This study focused specifically on Anderson, Greenville and Spartanburg’s
community development efforts at the city level. All three of these cities receive federal
Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funding and are the three largest
municipalities in the Upstate of South Carolina (Table 1, Table 2). The CDBG is an
annual grant to entitlement cities, counties and states to develop viable urban
communities. It was used as a criterion to incorporate the idea of using community
development as a tool to address concentrated poverty.
Table 1: Upstate Population (Source: U.S Census, American Community Survey 2005-2009)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Population</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greenville</td>
<td>59,249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartanburg</td>
<td>39,385</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anderson</td>
<td>26,634</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2: Federal Block Grant Funding (Source: U.S Department of Housing and Urban Development, 2010)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NAME</th>
<th>CDBG10</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AIKEN</td>
<td>$234,444</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANDERSON</td>
<td>$781,908</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHARLESTON</td>
<td>$1,155,953</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMBIA</td>
<td>$1,348,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FLORENCE</td>
<td>$364,792</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GREENVILLE</td>
<td>$1,131,458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ROCK HILL</td>
<td>$518,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SPARTANBURG</td>
<td>$820,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summerville</td>
<td>$244,699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUMTER</td>
<td>$406,018</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to be more specific and obtain more detail, the study’s unit of analysis was designated neighborhoods for each municipality – the Green Avenue neighborhood in Greenville, the West Anderson neighborhood in Anderson and the Forest View neighborhood in Spartanburg.
The neighborhoods were ultimately chosen based upon three criteria:

1. Area of concentrated poverty (census tract of poverty rate between 20 and 40 percent)
2. City community development efforts having been initiated and established in the area, with completion of activities
3. Staff recommendation: At the beginning of the research, city staff involved in the respective community development departments was contacted in regards to emphasis neighborhoods due to the fact that they have considerable first hand experience and knowledge about the area. The staff was asked about projects completed or near completion in order to get more localized information.

Data Collected

Qualitative analysis is not only able to discover patterns but it also involves a continuing interplay between data collection and theory (Babbie 2007). For this study, Vidal and Gittell’s conceptual model of community development was used as a theoretical framework in order to compare the municipality programs as to what interventions they have done, how they have implemented their plans, with whom they work with and for, and results they have seen. This model depicts the key elements, relationships, complexities and decisions involved in a community development program. Gittell and Vidal do not intend for this model to be viewed as static and linear but instead highlight the dynamic and interactive character of community development programs.
The model has five main parts (Figure 5):

1) **Program or Organizational Design and Implementation Attributes**: This refers to distinct objectives and strategic choices that can influence intermediate outcomes and achievement of long-term goals. For example, the geographic and target population affect the basic mission of community development efforts and in return the mission can affect the selection of the target. Governance, funding and staff capacity are also included in this dimension.

2) **Intermediate Outcomes**: Intermediate outcomes include community commitment, capacity, loyalty to the community, and levels of trust and cooperation as well as resident control. Intermediate outcomes directly affect long-term outcomes and also individually impact the effectiveness and success of the interplay of each other.

3) **Long-Term Measurable Outcomes**: These are results from community development efforts that are tangible and sustainable. Even though they are typically easier to measure in comparison to intermediate outcomes, they are harder to achieve. Examples include increased quality of life for an area and employment opportunities.

4) **Local Context**: Community development activities are affected by and are also influenced by the local context, which includes socioeconomic characteristics, network relations, resident relations, local policies and the political culture. The local context can strongly influence the program design and therefore, is critical to examine.
5) **External Agents**: This dimension addresses aspects of community development outside of the local context and includes federal and state agencies, along with national intermediaries.

Each municipality’s community development efforts within the designated neighborhoods have been examined along these five dimensions, making it an embedded, multiple case study.

**Methods for Collecting Data**

There were three sources of data: interviews, documents and archival records. The main source of data came from interviews with city staff involved in the designated neighborhood redevelopment areas and also neighborhood residents. The interview questions were derived from and framed by Vidal and Gittell’s conceptual model of community development (Appendix A). Interviews were conducted to the following city employees involved in a community development project:

- Erin Fann, Business Development Manager of Anderson
- Willie Day, Housing and Community Development Director of Anderson
- Ginny Stroud, Community Development Administrator of Greenville
- Wayne Leftwich, Community Planner of Greenville
- Wes Corrothers, Neighborhood Services Director of Spartanburg
- Mitch Kennedy, Community Services Director of Spartanburg
These city employees were chosen based upon their experience with and knowledge of each particular project for the individual municipalities. Initial phone calls and emails to community development department heads provided the information necessary to decide on the best persons to interview.

Interviews were also conducted with a neighborhood resident from each of the designated community development projects in order to provide an alternate point of view about each city’s activities and outcomes. During the interviews conducted with city staff, recommendations and contact information for active, neighborhood residents in each community were passed along. The residents interviewed were:

- Naomi Rustikova, Green Avenue Civic Association President, Greenville
- Nancy Alexander, long-time resident and leader of West Anderson, Anderson
- Willa Reeder, long-time resident and leader of Forest View, Spartanburg

Gittell and Vidal’s conceptual model also guided the resident interviews but were more focused on resident commitment, resident capacity and network capacity, all of which are a part of intermediate outcomes (Appendix B). All documents have been kept in a case study database, including interview notes, initial recruitment emails, documents and archival records, and research site letters. This case study database increases the reliability of the research by providing documentation of research procedures (Yin 2009).

Documents were also used to collect additional data about elements of Gittell and Vidal’s model including mission and goals, funding sources, and activities. These documents included the Green Avenue Master Plan, the 2010-1015 Consolidated Plan,

Finally, archival records of the 2000 U.S. Census were also utilized in data collection, specifically for neighborhood population characteristics and socioeconomic characteristics. Having multiple sources of data is one way to increase construct validity (Yin 2009). Table 3 summarizes the data sources for the various elements of this study.
Table 3: Research Database

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sources of Data</th>
<th>Anderson</th>
<th>Greenville</th>
<th>Spartanburg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PROGRAM OR ORGANIZATIONAL AND IMPLEMENTATION ATTRIBUTES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission and Goals or Strategic Focus</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Green Avenue Master Plan</td>
<td>2008-2009 Spartanburg Annual Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Plan 2010-1015</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Neighborhood Report Card</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Capacity and Orientation</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>INTERMEDIATE OUTCOMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Commitment</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Capacity</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Avenue Master Plan</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Plan 2010-1015</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Report Card</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LONG TERM MEASURABLE OUTCOMES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical housing and development</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Green Avenue Master Plan</td>
<td>2008-2009 Spartanburg Annual Action Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Consolidated Plan 2010-1015</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Neighborhood Report Card</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and business development ...</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of human capital</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>LOCAL CONTEXT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic conditions</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Census</td>
<td>Census</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and cooperation</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City policies</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political culture</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level and quality of community development activities</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit and private foundation resources/commitment</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector support</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>EXTERNAL AGENCIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agencies and programs</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agencies and programs</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and regional intermediaries</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
<td>Interview</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Analyzing the Data

After compilation of the data from both the documents and the interviews, the next step was to then analyze each dimension of Vidal and Gittell’s conceptual model of community development for Anderson, Greenville and Spartanburg. Understanding each dimension helps explain where the city is today with each community development project and how they have reached their outcomes. Then after individual examinations and treating each city as a separate case, a cross-case synthesis was conducted between the three municipalities. This analysis of the entire collection of similarities and differences of the Gittell and Vidal’s model dimensions enabled the study to draw cross-case conclusions about how Upstate South Carolina municipalities address distressed neighborhoods through community development and what outcomes this has produced.

In order to summarize the descriptive analysis of Anderson, Greenville and Spartanburg, a Boolean algebraic truth table was developed for each city’s project. Boolean algebra uses two conditions: true (or present) and false (or absent) under which a certain outcome is produced (Ragin 1987). The data collected from the interviews and documents about specific community development efforts in the municipal neighborhoods were used to indicate whether certain elements of the conceptual model of community development were present or absent for each project. The number one (1) represents elements of Gittell and Vidal's conceptual model of community development that have been determined as being present and zero (0) represents elements that have
been determined as absent from the community development process. These numbers then create what is known as a truth table.

Each column on the truth table shows a different combination of values of the independent variables, which are the varying dimensions identified in Vidal and Gittell’s model. Each column is also assigned an output value, where one (1) is considered a success and zero (0) a failure. Success in this study for the output variable differed from municipality to municipality because it was based on if the community development departments achieved their goals. Ultimately, this truth table provides a summarization of the varying dimensions that existed or that were absent and if they led to success. This table was used to help identify patterns of conditions that are significant in addressing distressed neighborhoods through community development in the Upstate of South Carolina.

CASE STUDIES

This section provides a complete and detailed look at each of the municipal case studies - Greenville, Anderson and Spartanburg. This provides a framework for not only determining what dimensions of Gittell and Vidal’s model are present or absent but also which elements are significant and critical to the community development process. The wording in italics represents the views of the residents interviewed so as to keep separate from the data collected from city staff, documents and archival records.
Greenville, South Carolina – Green Avenue

Program or Organizational and Implementation Attributes

Geographic and population target

The Green Avenue neighborhood is physically bound by the Norfolk Southern Railroad to the East, Anderson Street to the West, Layfayette Street to the South, and Vardry Street to the North. According to the 2000 Census, there are over 630 residents and 280 housing units. The target population is racially comprised as follows: 87.6% African American, 10.8% White, 1% other.
Figure 6: Green Avenue Map
Figure 7: City-Scale Map of Green Avenue
**Mission and goals**

The overarching goal is revitalization of the Green Avenue neighborhood. More specifically, according to the Green Avenue master plan, the mission is “to create a vibrant neighborhood welcoming a variety of housing types and designs, an array of household sizes, ages and a mix of incomes.” In order to achieve this goal, emphasis is placed on increasing home ownership and rehabilitating the deteriorated, blighted existing properties and infrastructure.

**Governance**

The Community Development Division is a branch of the Economic Development Department of the City of Greenville. It is comprised of city staff that work under City Council, which has final approval. This division works closely with the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development and has certain requirements that the division has to follow including community involvement in plans and programs. The Community Development Advisory Committee is also an integral part to community development efforts within this division. This committee “advises the Community Development Division Staff in planning, development, implementation, and assessment of all projects funded or proposed to be funded through the Community Development Block Grant and HOME Programs.”

**Funding**

A large source of funding comes from the Community Development Block Grant and HOME federal grant money. Every year the United States’ Congress appropriates the
amount of funding for cities across the nation. Since 1992 the City of Greenville has been allocated $7,034,555 in HOME funding and since 2001 it has received $12,288,537 in CDBG funding. Additionally, in 2009 the City of Greenville was awarded $5 million in Neighborhood Stabilization Funding (NSP) from the South Carolina State Housing finance and Development Authority.

The Green Avenue plan is also funded by local dollars from the Capital Improvement Plan. This money can come from a variety of sources including the sewer fund, the C-Fund (gas tax), and the Rental Rehabilitation Revolving Loan. Separate from the Capital Improvement Plan is the Community Improvement Program of Greenville that gives grants or loans to homeowners so that they can fix up their property. Below details budgeting from the original Green Avenue Master Plan and how the city hoped to fund projects within the Green Avenue area (Figure 8).
Infrastructure:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (budgeted)</td>
<td>$228,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Fund (budgeted)</td>
<td>82,877</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Rehabilitation Funds (budgeted)</td>
<td>50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Rehabilitation Funds</td>
<td>53,528*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-Fund</td>
<td>130,617**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CIP</td>
<td>130,618***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$676,582</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rehabilitation:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Rehabilitation Revolving Loan</td>
<td>$490,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (2002-2003)</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (2003-2004)</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (2004-2005)</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (2005-2006)</td>
<td>87,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$840,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Site Acquisition:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Budget Category</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (budgeted from 1994-2002)</td>
<td>$254,832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District Repayment</td>
<td>208,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOME Funds for CHDO (budgeted)</td>
<td>73,048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (2002-2003)</td>
<td>352,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (2003-2004)</td>
<td>498,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (2004-2005)</td>
<td>489,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CDBG (2005-2006)</td>
<td>489,869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>$2,385,237</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8: Original Green Avenue Master Plan Budget (Source: City of Greenville)

Staff capacity and orientation

The Community Development Division has staff of eight that comes from a variety of fields and backgrounds. Employee backgrounds and experiences include finance and banking, city planning, public administration, business, construction and economic development. Everyone plans together and then is involved at different points of the plan based on what stage the project is in and where certain expertise is necessary. The staff is
comprised of two AICP certified Planners. Mr. Wayne Leftwich has his masters in City Planning from Clemson University and Mrs. Ginny Stroud has her Bachelor of Arts in Business Administration and masters in Social Work. However, what is most important is that the staff is capable of working with people and understands how to get things accomplished.

**Intermediate Outcomes**

**Resident commitment**

From the city’s perspective there is a huge sense of loyalty and commitment to the neighborhood and preserving history. It is a very old and self-sufficient neighborhood with a strong neighborhood association, the Green Avenue Civic Association. Recently it has seen a bit of a revival with a new president and new residents becoming involved. Historically, the Working Benevolent Hospital was located in Green Avenue and was the first hospital to provide care to African Americans in Greenville. Many of the life-long residents approached City Council about revitalization and so there is a huge sense of commitment to the plan.

Along with this commitment is a sense of urgency and obligation to make sure the plan is implemented. As a whole, it is a close-knit neighborhood with strong relationships that is seeing some changes as new homes are built and new families come in. There is a potential tension between old residents and new residents. Tension does exist, however, between the law-abiding residents and the law breaking residents of the neighborhood.
Usually crime tends to be sourced to people from outside the neighborhood that set up in vacant lots.

The residents envision more home ownership opportunities and this has always been the case. They want to see their neighborhood as a healthy, thriving community like it was in the past with different types of families. Parks, playgrounds and safe streets are desirable along with the neighborhood participating in city politics as a cohesive unit.

From the residents’ perspective, the people in the neighborhood are very loyal to each other. All of the special focus neighborhoods are fiercely loyal to their geographic area. As far as loyalty to the city, some residents feel used and abused. The neighborhood has been left with uncompleted projects and so they do not see consistency in terms of the long term.

The neighborhood has what is known as the “old guard.” They know each other very well and trust each other because they have a bond. If a person wants to get involved, he or she has to get their approval. The “old guard” will decide if they follow the lead of the new neighborhood association President. It is a small group of older women typically that are involved. There are also those other residents that will get involved only if there is a direct benefit for them.

The residents’ vision is individual and fragmented because most people work two to three jobs, which create obstacles to getting to know your neighbor and getting involved. The goal is to work on how to get people involved and also how to improve the
neighborhood. Residents don’t want gentrification but do want mixed income. The $80,000 homes from the non-profits do not add value to the neighborhood.

**Resident Capacity**

Residents can take leadership roles within the Green Avenue Civic Association (GACA). It has been revamped with new fresh faces. They are the point of contact for the city, non-profits and developers and also have to provide an approval for plans. The GACA has tried to complete small revitalization efforts with grant money including a marker at an intersection in the neighborhood.

Residents have been involved in the master planning process and therefore, have been educated on the political process of how they can be involved. Overall, the residents are fairly savvy. They understand what it takes to revitalize the area. More importantly, they understand that it takes time. It took time for the neighborhood to deteriorate and so it takes time to revitalize. They know enough to ask the right questions and to get information.

*The residents are not really the leader type. The “old guard” used to play a leadership role but now they don’t do it as much. In terms of control, the city has worked hard to engage the community but ultimately the city still makes the decisions. As a broad generalization, the typical resident is a hard working, blue-collar worker. The “old guard” is more educated. They are the pioneers of historical African American communities. They were activists but are now 80 years old. Their children and grandchildren are making ends meet rather than getting involved in political awareness.*
Organizational Capacity

Neighborhood organization capacity is improving. It is limited because the residents are working people just like the rest of us. Also, in the past the neighborhood seemed to be stagnant. However, with a new president and new residents they are in a good place. The city is attempting to do capacity building efforts with Greenville Dreams and United Way.

It is relatively easy to get people in the room but as far as mobilizing the community, it is difficult to do. Now the neighborhood is complacent, with a used and abused feeling around.

Activities and “Spin offs”

In 2000, the city worked with the neighborhood to create a neighborhood master plan in order to understand the residents’ vision. It was hard to bring partners to the table and so the implementation timeline is off by several years. Phase I, Genesis Court, was completed in 1995 with 22 single-family homes. Currently, the City of Greenville is finishing Phase II at Washington Heights with 18 affordable, single-family homes. The city has acquired a lot of property and has worked with non-profits to build affordable housing. In the next year, a large infrastructure project dealing with new storm water and road systems will also be complete. The city planned for a Phase III near Greenville High School but there has already been a lot of activity happening there from projects dealing with Pendleton West. Therefore, there are no plans to go forward with Phase III but instead analyze the situation and see what is needed in the near future.
Network Capacity

For anything to happen in the neighborhood, there at least has to be a letter of approval from the neighborhood association President. Also, since anything has to go in front of City Council or the Planning Commission regarding changes to the neighborhood, residents have opportunities to attend hearings and voice their opinions. Ultimately, however, they determine what kind of development they want to see.

As far as the city’s organizational capacity, it is very much community driven. They are involved with the community in smaller meetings and have close contact with the neighborhood association.

Some residents disagree with the fact that the city acquires vacant properties, demolishes properties and then turns them over to non-profits. This translates into putting roofs up and filling them with people. They don’t teach the necessary skills and it is creating a long-term issue. Overall there is not very much control by the residents.

Long Term Measurable Outcomes

Physical Housing and development

The infrastructure was outdated and therefore the city replaced and upgraded certain systems in order to initiate redevelopment. Detention ponds, underground drainage, stormwater management, and sewer lines were given a complete overhaul. In 2005, improvements were made to Jenkins Street, Nelson Street, McLeod Street and Cleo Street. The city is also completing infrastructure improvements on Lincoln, Lafayette,
Casey, Nelson and Anderson Streets as well as the intersection of Green, Nelson and McLeod Streets. The cost is approximately $1.2 million and the work will be completed in September 2011. Improvements include replacing storm water and sanitary sewer lines, installing detention to support new residential development, constructing sidewalks, adding curb cuts, stop signs and crosswalks, realigning intersections, extending streets so that they are not dead ends, installing streetlights, and planting trees along these streets (Figure 9).

The city has acquired 100 properties, demolished 70 substandard housing units that were dilapidated and rehabilitated 35 homes. Phase I consisted of 22 single-family homes constructed on Genesis Court and was completed in 1995. Quinn-Satterfield and Tower Real Estate Development have constructed 18 homes in Green Avenue during Phase II (Figure 10). These homes are being sold to owner-occupants and range in price from $95,000-$135,000. Down payment assistance is available to income-qualified buyers.
Figure 9: Infrastructure Improvements in Green Avenue (Source: City of Greenville)
The City of Greenville, South Carolina proudly announces
Washington Heights

Tower Development Group
Proudly announces the
Washington Heights
development as part of the
City of Greenville’s
Revitalization & Master
Planned Community. The area
formerly known as Green
Avenue was once home to the
more prominent members of
the community. In the 1920’s,
this community was home to
teachers, ministers,
professionals and
entrepreneurs*.

With the revitalization
underway, the neighborhood is
3 blocks from the St. Francis
Hospital System, 2 blocks from
the new Greenville High
School, 2.5 blocks from
Greenville Drives, the minor
league baseball team stadium,
and 2.5 blocks from
Downtown Greenville.

In 2002, the city of Greenville
adopted a master plan to
revitalize surrounding
neighborhoods. The downtown
revitalization of Greenville is
currently underway, and now is
home to bustling shops,
decadent and thriving
restaurants and wireless parks
for all to enjoy.

*Source: Green Avenue Neighborhood
Revitalization Strategy

Figure 10: Example of Housing Construction in Green Avenue (Source: City of Greenville)
Employment and business development opportunities

This is considered the weakest part of the plan from city staff. The city has purchased a lot of commercial properties in the middle of the neighborhood because these properties were associated with loitering and crime. All of these properties have been demolished. The city is therefore focused on redeveloping housing and not commercial. This is what the residents want and also the market is not there for small business development. If the city were to implement more business development, the neighborhood would need more homes. There are job opportunities along the major corridors right outside of the neighborhood including Pendleton Street and Augusta Street.

Enhancement of human capital

SHARE is a local community action agency that provides job training for residents. The Ladder Program focuses on job training and is throughout the whole city. This was a big component raised by the residents. The Key Program provides assistance to first time homebuyers. It provides counseling, training and education. The Greenville County Human Relations Committee also provides homeowner education. At the Juanita Butler Community Center there are study buddies for after school students. For these programs, residents are either recruited by the city or the program themselves. These programs have enhanced human capital and redevelopment has provided more opportunities for homeownership.
Local Context

Socioeconomic characteristics

According to the 2000 Census, the median household income is $14,331 and per capita income is $9,293. 48% of the area does not have a high school diploma and 41.6% live below the poverty line. 59% of the housing stock is renter occupied and 41.5% of the residents are in the labor force. In comparison to the City of Greenville, the Green Avenue neighborhood has a significantly lower median household income and per capita income in addition to a much higher percentage of the population living below poverty at 42% compared to 16% citywide. The neighborhood also has a higher percentage of renter occupied housing units at 59% compared to 53% citywide (Figure 11).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Green Avenue</th>
<th>City of Greenville</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>56,334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>11.00%</td>
<td>62%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>88.00%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>24,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$14,331</td>
<td>$33,144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$9,293</td>
<td>$23,242</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Population Below Poverty</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>59%</td>
<td>53%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11: Green Avenue vs. City of Greenville Data (Source: U.S. Census Bureau)
**Trust and cooperation among residents**

The trust has varied over time and deals directly with resident expectations of the city. Between 2000 and 2001 the master plan was created. It set out a five to 10 year completion period but it has taken longer. The city has tried to communicate the challenges and to not make promises it cannot keep. They want to be realistic with residents. As the residents know more and feel safer by getting rid of blighted properties, the trust improves. However, there are some in the neighborhood that do not trust the city at all.

*Even if residents do trust the city, they would not go out on a limb for the city. There have been times when nothing has come of a project. They don’t distrust the city on the whole but they do distrust the police. Ginny Stroud has made a lot of efforts and residents do take her word but if she asked them to do a lot, they would not go the extra mile.*

**City policies**

City Council promoted a challenge to focus on special emphasis neighborhoods like Green Avenue. It acts as the Community Development Division’s charter and thus policies have a tremendous influence on how this division operates. Everything from timing and funding is impacted by policies. City Council believes in revitalization and has been very supportive. It has taken time to pull together the resources.

**Political culture**

The City of Greenville has the amenities of a larger city but keeps the charm of a smaller city. It provides opportunities for people to be involved and so within the politics
there is a lot of public participation that can sway political decisions back and forth.
There is a certain pressure to keep the aspect of the small town charm. This pressure has not affected the special emphasis neighborhoods too much.

The City of Greenville is also a relatively conservative community. The city is more progressive than Greenville County and community development is better received within the city limits. The city has had a history of valuing neighborhoods and revitalization.

External Agents

Partnerships work to fill the gaps.

Community Based Organizations

The Allen Temple AME church is located within the neighborhood and they have a functioning Allen Temple Community Development Corporation. They have helped complete 15 affordable rental units. Also the Green Avenue Civic Association is the specific neighborhood association that works within the Green Avenue neighborhood.

Federal Agencies and programs

The Community Development Division receives federal funding for the Green Avenue projects and therefore had to comply with Department of Housing and Urban Development regulations.
**State agencies and programs**

The State Housing Finance and Development Authority helps funds larger portions of many different projects. The city acts as the seed money.

**National and regional intermediaries**

The Greenville County Human Relations Commission provides housing counseling so that if a tenant has an issue with his landlord, they can provide advice on the tenants’ rights and how to proceed. The Upstate Homeless Coalition has assisted in the completion of two affordable rental units.

**Non-profit and private foundation resources and commitment**

Homes of Hope is a non-profit that has built two affordable rental houses in the Green Avenue neighborhood in conjunction with Greenville Mental Health. United Way of Greenville has also been involved by providing down payment assistance to support home ownership along with free tax programs. Project Care has assisted in the development of two affordable housing units. Other non-profits have volunteers that come and help paint homes and put on new roofs during certain city events like Paint the Town.

**Private sector support**

Quinn Satterfield Builders and Tower Real Estate have worked with the city to build affordable housing in the Green Avenue area. The city is able to sell Quinn Satterfield the land and they then build and sell the home within an affordability range.
Anderson, South Carolina – West Anderson

Program or Organizational and Implementation Attributes

Geographic and population target

The West Anderson redevelopment area is bound by Whitner Street to the North, Murray Avenue to the East, Sanders Street to the West and Old Burdine Road to the South. According to the 2000 Census, the total population of this area is 1,791 with 998 housing units. The population is racially comprised as follows: 77% African American, 22% White and 1% other.
Figure 12: West Anderson Map
Figure 13: City-Scale West Anderson Map
Mission and goals

The mission of the Neighborhood and Transit Services Division during 2010 was to provide quality public transportation, neighborhood, business, and economic development revitalization through holistic Community Development programs for the citizens of Anderson. This is the mission for the whole entire division and it is applied to all the variety of focus area neighborhoods that the division works with. The Division does not have one specific goal with the Westside Redevelopment Area.

In 2009, the City of Anderson developed the Anderson Neighborhood Revitalization Implementation Plan in conjunction with Asset Properties Disposition, Inc. West Anderson is recognized as focus area neighborhood in the plan, which provides a framework and foundation for strategies to address the weaknesses and threats of the focus area neighborhoods. This implementation document is an overarching vision of the focus area neighborhoods as well as overarching holistic approach to the revitalization of the focus area neighborhoods. Even though the plan provides clear goals including protecting and enhancing the quality of existing house stock, maintaining or increasing homeownership, gaining control of abandoned and foreclosed properties, protecting property values and neighborhood character, improving pedestrian connectivity, and improving public transit for the focus area neighborhoods in general, it does not specifically outline goals for the Westside community.
**Governance**

City Council establishes policies and then the City Manager is the superior for all employees. The Neighborhood and Transit Services is one division of the City of Anderson that has three departments: business development, housing and community services and economic and community development. There are division heads and department heads.

**Funding**

The bulk of funding comes from HUD due to the fact that Anderson is an entitlement city. Being an entitlement city is based on a national formula and every year the allocations can be different. Anderson does not have to compete for the funds but they receive what Congress passes for their budget. The State Housing and Finance Development Authority also helps fund projects through Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) funding. In 2009, the City of Anderson was allocated $2,173,087 in NSP funding. Additionally, certain earmarks from congressman or senator occasionally are used for certain projects. Since 2001, it has been allocated $8,421,969 in CDBG funds (2.07% of SC CDBG funding since 2001) as well as $1,944,847 in HOME funding.

In 1990s there were federal budget cuts and so it affected how they could work with neighborhoods. In 1996, the city wanted to borrow $2 million for Downtown revitalization for a total of $3 million borrowed (1 million allocated to neighborhoods). However, this means that every year the federal money allocated to the neighborhood redevelopment is cut by one third and it will not be paid off until 2017. Every year, even
if the money allocated is different (even if it is less) they still keep the same amount – it is not proportional.

The Neighborhood Revitalization Implementation Plan highlights funding source opportunities for the City of Anderson. The funding recommendations include grants and loans from federal agencies, non-profits and private foundations.

**Staff capacity and orientation**

Mr. Day has been working in community development since 1978 and is currently getting his masters. Erica Craft has been with Anderson since 1996 and works with the Economic and Community Development part of the process. Erin Fann has been with Anderson for four years and has brought a lot to the table. The other staff has many years of experience as well (20 to 30 years).

**Intermediate Outcomes**

**Resident commitment**

There are a lot of older, retired people in the neighborhood and it is an aging population. There are some younger people getting involved but the neighborhood wants more. The city thinks with that development at the intersection of Murray Avenue and Franklin Street could attract young blood to the area. The residents are tight knit and active. Dr. Thompson holds a monthly community meeting. There is a lot of positive interaction between residents.
When the city first started working in West Anderson they had community meetings because they were mandatory. Instead of the opinions of the residents, they instead made plans based on their expertise. But the city realized that resident involvement is necessary. The plan is their vision and their vision needs to be included.

All of the residents look out for one another. They want to see the neighborhood clean and the yards looking good. A couple residents go to meetings but nothing is getting done. There are “slum lord” landlords that do not care about their property and the homes. More people need to be involved and it sometimes feels that nothing is ever going to get done. The appearance of the neighborhood makes people not want to come in and also attracts people from outside of the neighborhood to come in and commit crimes. The residents need to be out there cleaning one street up at a time. The city could help their cause. When there is a dirty/unkempt yard, it not only devalues that property but also surrounding properties in the whole neighborhood. People should be proud of the neighborhood. There are too many channels that people have to go through for things to change. Landlords need to be held responsible. Homeowners typically take care of their property.

Resident Capacity

There is a certain local political knowledge due to Mrs. Beatrice Thompson from City Council being so active. As far as other knowledge, it is unknown. People involved with the community center are astute.
There are not many leaders within the neighborhood. There are two people that regularly go to the neighborhood meetings but the leadership would have to come from the younger residents. More men need to step up to the plate because they provide strength. People are smart and know that things can change but when they don’t see things happening they can get discouraged. Some people say, “Why should I care?”

Organizational Capacity

The residents organize well. Many are retired and so have the time to commit. They do come together on the dates that are slated but outside of that, they don’t really get together. If there were a need, they would be able to mobilize quickly, especially with Dr. Thompson.

In terms of the city, it acts as facilitator and handles the logistics. Everything is money driven. They make it happen. Due to the number of people involved in the redevelopment process it takes a lot of organization and the city staff provide that (City council, neighborhood groups, etc).

Residents of the Westside community do not organize well. They have a meeting but that does not mean anything is being done. The residents should be tackling one property at a time. There are some rental properties that cause issues and residents want to be able to sit on their front porch and not have to worry.
Activities and “Spin offs”

The city first looked at West Anderson in 1989. They received CDBG funding and during this time politics was driving it. Politicians wanted the Neighborhood and Transit Services Division to move to a new area once they were finished in one neighborhood to show what was being done and that things have happened in their community. At that time it was a citywide program and so once the city knew the budget and how much money was allocated to Anderson, they could decide what they were capable of doing. They had to prioritize needs. The focus has always been housing rehabilitation and development but it is tough to fully accomplish what they have designed and would like to do with a limited budget.

The Neighborhood Revitalization Implementation Plan recommends that in one to three years the City of Anderson should designate the Westside Conservation Overlay District, as well as focus on the West Whitner Street and Murray Avenue/Frankline Street gateways. The plan also recommends that in three to five years the city should then turn to the Westside Community model block and the West Whitner model block since they provide opportunities for residential development. Currently, these recommendations have not yet seen any fulfillment or progress.

Network Capacity

The residents have a lot of control, especially with Dr. Thompson because they have a lot of trust in her. They look to her for guidance in their community. She does not get any pushback. They discuss everything together. The Westside Community Coalition is a
point of contact. One resident is on Neighborhood Task Force and another is a part of the CDC board, so they are engaged in boards.

*If things were changing/happening in the neighborhood, residents would have a lot of control but right now since there is not anything going on, there is no control to be had.*

**Long Term Measurable Outcomes**

*Physical Housing and development*

They have built first time homebuyer homes in order to help stabilize the area. There are a high number of rental properties. Originally, the city built homes on scattered sites in a piecemeal fashion. Today, the Neighborhood and Transit Services Division is instead trying to do housing redevelopment more in bulk. In the past year, the NSP funding was used to acquire and rehabilitate foreclosed units and up for resale to qualified first time homebuyers. Since 1989, the Division estimates that they have constructed and/or rehabilitated between 50 to 75 properties. Currently, five single-family rental homes are being constructed through the Nehemiah Community Revitalization Corporation.

The city has also improved drainage and street infrastructure. Some areas flooded very badly and they have improved that. A community center has been built in the area (that is not on the Neighborhood and Transit Services funding) that was once an old high school. Beatrice Thompson Park, which is located in the Westside community, has also seen improvements.
Employment and business development opportunities

There are no employment opportunities but the Neighborhood and Transit Services division is working on the intersection of Murray and Franklin. It is the gateway to the neighborhood and would like to revitalize it and get site control. There might be opportunities there for commercial, residential, business at this intersection (Mixed Use).

Enhancement of human capital

The city has not directly provided human services but the Westside Community Center is located in the neighborhood and has a strong presence. Within the community center there is a DHEC office, YMCA daycare, South Carolina State University office, AnMed clinic, Police office, and a public library. Within the area there is also a soup kitchen. The Neighborhood Revitalization Implementation Plan recommends having homeownership centers in each focus area neighborhood to provide homebuyer education, counseling and a listing of homes. This has not been initiated.

There is no advertising about the Community Center and so residents are unaware of what it offers.

Local Context

Socioeconomic characteristics

In the West Anderson Redevelopment Area, the median household income is $17,613, while per capita income is $13,303. 23% of the population lives below the poverty line and 37% of the housing units are renter occupied. 15% of the residents are in
the labor force but unemployed. In comparison to the City of Anderson, West Anderson has a significantly lower per capita income and median household income. Additionally, the percentage of population living below poverty is slightly higher than the city at 23% compared to 21% citywide. In terms of renter occupied housing units, the city actually has a higher rate at 46% compared to 37% found in West Anderson (Figure 14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>West Anderson</th>
<th>City of Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>1,791</td>
<td>25,236</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>63%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>998</td>
<td>10,065</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$17,613</td>
<td>$27,716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$13,303</td>
<td>$18,577</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Population Below Poverty</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Trust and cooperation among residents

The trust is better now than it used to be. It is not as much the mentality “us vs. them” as it was in the past. Before there was a certain apathy level due to broken promises. Now the residents feel a certain level of trust because the city has followed through. They understand that certain things cannot be done because of the current economic struggle. Meetings are also held more regularly and so there is more opportunity for engagement
with residents. The Neighborhood Task Force also allows city staff to see active residents on a more regular basis. Community involvement is a part of their process now where as before it wasn’t. There has been a lot of progress.

There is a lack of cooperation. Neighbors have to ask neighbors to clean up their yards. Even though they are not $100,000 homes they should still look nice. The change would have to come from the residents wanting to have a cleaner neighborhood.

City policies

Council sets policies, so it affects them directly. It is their job to put together the administrative process.

Political culture

City Hall is supposed to be non-partisan. However, the overall atmosphere is risk adverse and so therefore, they take things slow. In Brown v Board of Education and the term deliberate speed was used and that is how the city functions. They take their time in making decisions. They examine everything before they put it out there.

External Agents

Any partnership or strategic alliance that helps, enhances, augments or contributes to goals in the community (physical or social) would be the consummate partner. Three years ago City Council made neighborhood redevelopment and housing a priority. Before, the division acted by themselves and it was hard to function as an island. Just now they are moving into the strategic alliance arena. They see the usefulness with
partnerships. The Neighborhood Task Force has people from all different sectors – banking, community residents, church leaders, housing authority, real estate, school district, etc. It is important to have a holistic approach for complete neighborhood revitalization – physical, social, economical, and recreational. Since new at forming partnerships, they would consider in the future any kind of partnership that could help and there is potentially a lot of opportunity.

Community Based Organizations

The Neighborhood and Transit Services Division works with the Westside Community Coalition.

Federal Agencies and programs

The Neighborhood and Transit Services Division receives funding from the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

State agencies and programs

The Neighborhood and Transit Services Division receives funding from the South Carolina State Housing Finance and Development Authority.

National and regional intermediaries

As far as regional/national intermediaries, LISC, the Ford Foundation and NeighborWorks are potential partnerships for the future, once the Anderson Neighborhood and Transit Services Division is recognized.
Non-profit and private foundation resources and commitment

Some non-profits have helped with housing development, including the Nehemiah Community Revitalization Corporation. This non-profit has constructed five single-family rental homes and hopes to build four more on McCulley Street in the Westside Community. United Way has also helped community groups do projects on homes.

Private sector support

N/A

Spartanburg, South Carolina – Forest Park

Program or Organizational and Implementation Attributes

Geographic and population target

This neighborhood is physically bound by Collins Avenue and Conley Street to the North, Everette Street to the West, Woodview Street to the South and High Street to the East. There are over 250 residents and 120 housing units according to the 2000 Census. The neighborhood is racially comprised as follows: 98% African American, .7% White and .7% other.
Figure 15: Forest Park Map
Figure 16: City-Scale Forest Park Map
Mission and goals

The goal is to stabilize the entire area by retaining an active neighborhood and building comparable, affordable housing. There was a middle class that lived in Forest Park around 25 years ago but now these residents are lower middle class. New housing should compliment existing housing and become a part of the neighborhood fabric. Gentrification and downgrading to cheaper homes should be avoided.

Governance

Originally the city entered a development agreement with the Spartanburg Housing Authority. The city’s role was to acquire, demolish and provide support and funding. The Housing Authority was to act as the developer. However, the Spartanburg Housing Authority does not have the capacity to fulfill that role and so the city has created a new development agreement with the Spartanburg Housing Development Corporation. Neighborhood Services is a division of Community Services and is the party mainly responsible for neighborhood redevelopment. Within Neighborhood Services, there are different focus areas including Housing, Community Relations and Code Enforcement.

Funding

The projects within Forest View are mainly funded by HOME and CDBG federal funding because the city is identified as an entitlement city. Since 2001 Spartanburg has received $8,632,383 in CDBG funding (2.12% of SC CDBG funding since 2001) and since 1994 has received $6,184,344 in HOME funding. Also, some funding was acquired though the national Recovery Act from the federal government. There used to be funding
from HOPE VI but that is no longer available. There is an opportunity for support from the South Carolina Department of Housing Finance Development Authority with NSP funding due to the fact that Spartanburg was allocated $2,000,000 in 2009. However, there are no community development corporations in the neighborhood to apply for this funding.

**Staff capacity and orientation**

Wes Corrothers serves as a coordinator and oversees all of the activities involved with redevelopment with a focus in financing and funding qualifications. He makes sure that a project is valuable. There is also an in-house engineer, homeownership counselor and a paralegal. Other experience and background include rehabilitation and construction. Mitch Kennedy, the Community Services Director, acts as a manager of the whole department and people involved in the process. He is a generalist that coordinates and strategizes to complete projects.

**Intermediate Outcomes**

**Resident commitment**

The residents are very interested in redevelopment and have thus far signed off on the direction the city is currently going in. They are on board with the progress. Generally, it is a close-knit community and they know how to come together. Many of the residents have resided there for a long time and so there is a sense of cohesion. Residents envision
a mixed income neighborhood with safe homes. It is an older community with many retirees and so it is desirable that younger families move into the area.

Homeowners in the area are typically very loyal. Many of the homeowners are retired and when their children become adults they move somewhere else. The residents would like to see a livable and attractive neighborhood. A middle class, inspiring, African American community built Forest Park. Now, the goal would be to have residents’ children return to Forest Park by providing attractive, affordable housing. Additionally, the neighborhood should be clean and safe.

**Resident Capacity**

One City Council member is from Forest Park, which provides a critical link to city politics. There are also opportunities for residents to become involved through the Forest Park Neighborhood Association and the Citizen Advisory Committee. There are new individuals leading the effort of revitalization.

Residents can participate in the Citizen’s Advisory committee. It is almost as if everyone is equal, which is unique. The residents themselves initiate many of the projects. There is also a planning committee in the neighborhood that examines plans and works out the kinks. It is then submitted to the neighborhood at large to get feed back. This is unique because residents know what is going and are at the planning table. Politically, the neighborhood is home to a State representative and a City Council member. These two residents are grassroots leaders that are informed about various federal, state and city resources.
Generally, residents understand the power of voting and creating change through collaboration and partnerships. Technologically, several residents are gifted and able to use computers well. Many homes, however, do not have access to a computer. This neighborhood has residents that worked as resident nurses, resident technicians, surgical technicians, educators, military officers, police officers, business owners and managers.

Organizational Capacity

The city has done a good job communicating with residents and has educated the residents about events and meetings. Public input has always been important. Originally, the development agreement with the Spartanburg Housing Authority was a promise that was underserved. The city has addressed its mistakes made in the past and is re-engaging with the community. There is also a Citizen Advisory Committee that gathers every other month. This is an opportunity for the city to build residents’ capacity and knowledge about dealing with zoning and redevelopment projects.

The residents organize very well. The Forest Park Neighborhood Association is strong and very active. There is also a planning committee within the neighborhood that meets with the city and acts as a voice for the residents. This area has accomplished a lot socially, especially compared to other neighborhoods. Their organizational capacity is high because of the cross section of people.

The residents organize very well but there is always room for improvement. They like to see improvements. If people were upset about certain issues, it is believed that they would be able to share it and be heard.
Activities and “Spin offs”

Community Services provided data about the Forest Park area to City Council and they decided to prioritize it as a redevelopment area. At the beginning the city hired a consultant to evaluate the properties in the neighborhood and architects to determine if there were any historical places to salvage. The plan has been start/stop since the start. In 2006, it was in the acquisition phase. The city was to assemble, demolish and relocate residents and then pass it on to the Spartanburg Housing Authority (SHA) to develop the properties. However, the SHA experienced financial issues and so the process was delayed. The city was able to form a new partnership with the Spartanburg Housing Development Corporation to take the place of SHA. More recently they have worked with the neighborhood to create master plans and have the financing in place. The more recent housing development is up for bid for a developer.

Network Capacity

Any plans have to go through a public process, which involves meetings with the neighborhood. The city goes to them to get their feedback and wants citizens involved in every step. The residents have influenced the pace of the project and the city will not proceed without an agreement by the residents.

It is not 100% but overall there is great control. The projects that the residents bring to the table and initiate, the neighborhood has more control. With other projects that they would like to see the city’s involvement, they have to wait in line. In the city’s Strategic Plan there is a boundary where Forest Park is not included. Therefore, they are not on
the agenda of the city. However, they are not completely left out because they have seen progress.

Long Term Measurable Outcomes

Physical Housing and Development

The entire site is clear. By the end of spring they hope to have three houses completed with energy star appliances. This would finish redevelopment of High Street, which is the entryway to the neighborhood. Two years ago, four homes were built and sold between $95,000 and $105,000. The plan is for a total of 41 homes to be built but banks are not lending and it is not a smart time to build a large amount of homes (Figure 17).

In terms of infrastructure the city received $250,000 of stimulus money from the Recovery Act to complete infrastructure repairs. This money allowed them to repave existing roads, realign Piedmont Street, put in a curb and gutter along High Street, build a new alleyway parallel to Collins Avenue, and install existing utilities underground. The neighborhood residents received money from the Neighborhood PRIDE grant to put a marker in place at the entranceway of the neighborhood.
Employment and business development opportunities

When the city bids out the current proposal, they want developers to look to the surrounding area for new hires. This would allow for more respect and higher security. The infrastructure projects also created one job. Other than that, however, employment and business development has not been emphasized.

Enhancement of human capital

A portion of the federal money allocated to the city goes to Public Services. Human services involved in this department include Big Brother and Big Sister, the Urban League, COLORS (after school art program) and Partners for Active Living. There is also the CC Woodson Community Center that recently had $6 million invested into it to renovate the facility. In terms of human services, they market the whole region, not just specifically Forest Park. The area around Forest Park has had about $20 million invested into it – retail, schools, etc. Forest Park is a neighborhood that does not sit alone but is a part of the South side.

Local Context

Socioeconomic characteristics

The median household income for this area is $30,078 with the per capita income being $15,318. 19% of the population lives below the poverty line and 2% of the residents in the labor force face unemployment. Approximately 52% of the households
are renter occupied. Piedmont Street had the highest crime rate per capita than any other neighborhood in North Carolina and South Carolina.

In comparison to the City of Spartanburg, Forest Park has a slightly higher median household income and lower percentage of population living below the poverty threshold. However, the neighborhood has a higher percentage of renter occupied housing units at 52% compared to 50% citywide and a lower per capita income at $15,318 compared to $18,136 citywide (Figure 18).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Forest Park</th>
<th>City of Spartanburg</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total Population</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>39,407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>47%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0.70%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>15,949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median household income</td>
<td>$30,078</td>
<td>$28,735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per Capita Income</td>
<td>$15,318</td>
<td>$18,136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage of Population Below Poverty</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Renter Occupied Housing Units</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18: Forest Park vs. City of Spartanburg (Source: U.S. Census Bureau)

Trust and cooperation among residents

Trust is being rebuilt between residents and the city. It is getting reestablished to get back on track. The city has recommitted to the residents after money became a problem.
Trust that had been previously built with residents was hurt when the SHA agreement did not work out. The city wants the residents to be ambassadors of the area.

*The level of trust between residents is very strong, especially between those that have been in Forest Park for a long time and are homeowners. Many residents attend the same church and job sites. As far as trust with the city, residents have to trust city staff. It can be improved with increased communication and collaboration. At first, the need for a city intervention was not as great. But now, over the past 10 to 12 years the Neighborhood Services division has been a major bridge due to the leadership of Mitch Kennedy.*

**City policies**

City policies have helped Forest Park become a priority but in return they have made other neighborhood envious.

**Political culture**

The city is supportive. Spartanburg is an old mill village and in need of updating. Most of the city initiatives go to areas that are not served. Generally there are limited resources. The city is concerned about its citizens but there are not enough resources to reach everyone. Also, some people do not understand what Community Services does because there is a negative perception towards affordable housing. Projects completed by the SHA are often associated as public housing not affordable housing. Leaders, however, do see the value of redevelopment.
External Agents

Partnerships are needed to be successful and they provide professional expertise.

Community Based Organizations

The city works closely with three community based committees and organizations – the Forest Park Neighborhood Association, the Citizens’ Advisory Committee and the Neighborhood Planning Committee.

Federal Agencies and programs

The Neighborhood Services Division receives federal funding from HUD.

State agencies and programs

The city received funding from the South Carolina State Housing Finance Development Authority.

National and regional intermediaries

N/A

Non-profit and private foundation resources and commitment

The Spartanburg Housing Development Corporation does not build homes but they manage developers involved in the project. The Spartanburg Housing Authority also has played a role in Forest Park redevelopment. The CC Woodson Community Center provides community support for the Forest Park area.
Private sector support

Outside private consulting firms and developers have been used in the process.

RESULTS

The following section highlights the strengths and weaknesses of each municipality’s community development efforts using Gittell and Vidal as an organizational and theoretical framework. (+) indicates a strength, (-) indicates a weakness, and (n) indicates an item that is neutral in that it is neither positive nor negative but still significant in the community development process.

Greenville, South Carolina – Green Avenue

Program or Organizational and Implementation Attributes

Geographic and population target

(+) The geographic and population target is clearly defined.

(n) The target population is second of the three municipalities in number of residents and housing units.

(n) The target population is predominately African American.
**Mission and Goals**

(+) The goals are clear in creating a vibrant neighborhood, specifically through home ownerships and rehabilitating and demolishing blighted properties.

(+) The Community Development division has collaborated with Green Avenue residents to create the Green Avenue Master Plan. Spartanburg and Anderson do not have such a document.

(+) Greenville’s Community Development Division has produced long term-measurable outcomes with over 40 single-family homes constructed, 100 acquired properties, 70 demolished substandard, dilapidated housing units and 35 rehabilitated homes. Though the plan is not perfect, the Community Development Division has actively worked to increase home ownership and get rid of blight in the neighborhood and thus has been designated a one (1) in the Boolean summarization (Table 4).

(-) The focus is on physical development, with little emphasis on human capital.

**Governance**

(n) The Community Development Division’s role is a part of the Economic Development Department and is guided by the Greenville City Council.

(+) The City has formed a variety of relationships to assist in the community development process but ultimately leads the progress of projects.
**Funding**

(+) Since 2001, the City of Greenville has been awarded the most CDBG funding of the three municipalities. On average the City of Greenville receives $1,536,067 in CDBG funding per year compared to $959,153 in Spartanburg and $935,774 in Anderson.

(+) Since 1992, the City of Greenville has been allocated the most HOME funding of the three municipalities. On average the City of Greenville receives $390,808 in HOME funding per year compared to $386,521 in Spartanburg and $216,094 in Anderson.

(+) In 2009, the City of Greenville received the most NSP funding of the three municipalities.

(+) Outside of federal funding, the City of Greenville has funding sources from private businesses and non-profit organizations including Project Care, Upstate Homeless Coalition, Allen Temple CEDC, Homes of Hope, Greenville Mental Health, and Tower Real Estate.

**Staff Capacity and orientation**

(+) With a staff of eight, the Community Development Division has a variety of backgrounds and experience to apply to the project.
Intermediate Outcomes

Resident Commitment

(+) The residents show a huge sense of loyalty and commitment to the neighborhood and to each other.

(+) The Green Avenue neighborhood has a rich history of being a self-sufficient, strong community.

(+) The residents also show a commitment to the city’s plan for the area.

(+), It is a close-knit neighborhood with strong relationships.

(+), Residents have guided the plan by wanting home ownership opportunities.

(+), The “old guard” has known each other for a long time and therefore, trust each other.

(-), Some residents feel used and abused by the city with incomplete and broken promises.

(-), It is unsure how far the residents would really go for the city.

Resident Capacity

(+), The Green Avenue Civic Association has a strong presence in the neighborhood.

(+), Lately, the neighborhood association has seen a bit of revival with a new president and new residents becoming involved.

(+), Any plan has to be approved by the Green Avenue Civic Association.
(+) The residents were involved with the master planning.

(+) Residents are educated on the political process how they can be involved as well as the revitalization process.

(+) The Green Avenue Civic Association has completed small revitalization efforts.

(+) The city has worked hard to engage the residents.

(-) Some residents feel that the city ultimately makes the decisions.

(-) The “old guard” is aging and therefore, cannot lead as much.

(+) The “old guard” is very educated and was a pioneer of African American communities.

(-) The younger generations are not as active because they are working to make ends meet.

**Neighborhood Organizational Capacity**

(+) Organizational capacity within the neighborhood is improving due to a new neighborhood association President and new residents.

(-) Organizational capacity within the neighborhood is limited because most residents work and do not have time to dedicate.

(-) It is difficult to fully mobilize the neighborhood due to a complacent, used and abused feeling.
**Activities and Spin Offs**

(+) Since 1995, the city has continually made progress and completed housing and infrastructure development projects.

(-) In the beginning it was difficult to bring partners to the table and therefore, this pushed the implementation timeline off schedule.

(+ ) The city has tried to address the blight and crime by acquiring and demolishing many properties.

(-) Some residents disagree with the city handing properties over to non-profits to develop the land because it doesn’t teach the necessary skills.

**Network Capacity**

(+ ) It is required to at least get a letter of approval from the Green Avenue Civic Association for any plans/developments.

(+ ) Residents can attend council or planning commission meetings to voice opinion.

(-) It is felt by residents that overall they do not have as much control as the city perceives, especially when property lots are handed over to non-profits for development.

**Long Term Measurable Outcomes**

**Physical housing and development**

(+ ) Extensive infrastructure (roads, sewer, stormwater, trees, lighting, sidewalks) improvements have been completed.
(+) 22 single-family homes were constructed in Phase I at Genesis Court.

(+) 18 single-family homes have been constructed in Phase II.

(+35 homes have been rehabilitated, 100 properties acquired, and 70 substandard housing units demolished.

(+ When examining the total number of properties rehabilitated and/or constructed in proportion to the total number of housing units, Greenville has addressed 26.8% of the properties in the neighborhood, which is the highest of the three municipalities.

**Employment and business development opportunities**

(-) Business development and employment have not been addressed in the Green Avenue Master plan or included in any phases of development.

(-) Commercial properties have been associated with loitering and crime in the neighborhood and therefore, have been demolished and not rebuilt or addressed.

(+) Job opportunities exist along major corridors right outside of the neighborhood limits.

**Enhancement of human capital**

(+ The City of Greenville provides opportunities to enhance human capital through a variety of citywide programs including SHARE, the Ladder Program, and the Key Program.

(+ The city partners with the Greenville County Human Relations Committee to provide homeowner education.
The Juanita Butler Community Center within Green Avenue also provides opportunities to enhance human capital.

**Local Context**

**Socioeconomic characteristics**

(-) The target population has the lowest median income of the three municipalities.

(-) The target population has the highest percentage of residents living below poverty of the three municipalities at 41.6%.

(-) The target population has the highest percentage of renter occupied housing of the three municipalities at 59%.

**Trust and cooperation among residents**

(-) The trust among residents with the city is varied and improves as projects are completed.

(+ ) The city has tried to better communicate with residents and to not make promises it can’t keep.

(-) Residents would not go the extra mile for the city.

**City Policies**

(+ ) City Council supports redevelopment and acts as the Community Development division’s charter.
(+) Policies have a tremendous influence on how the Community Development division operates.

**Political culture**

(+) Community development is better received within the city limits.

(+) The city has a history of valuing neighborhoods and revitalization.

(+) Overall, there are many opportunities for public participation and this can sway political decisions.

(n) There is pressure to keep the small town charm while also providing the amenities of a larger city.

**External Agents**

(+) The city partners with two private sector businesses, one regional intermediary, one state agency, one federal agency, two community-based organizations, and five nonprofits.

**Key Findings**

These strengths and weaknesses highlight the dimensions of the conceptual model of community development that have been significant in the process of redevelopment in the Green Avenue neighborhood. From the Green Avenue case study, key findings about what is important in the community development process include:
1. Forming a variety of partnerships is key to not being limited in resources as well as being able to make continuous progress. By working with non-profits, private businesses, state agencies, federal agencies, and community based organizations, the Community Development Division is able to follow through with the planned phases of revitalization.

2. Policies and the surrounding political culture accommodate community development efforts. The Community Development Division works in a supportive environment that also allows for progress to be made in an efficient and effective manner.

3. Setting and documenting clear goals and plans in conjunction with residents are key to resident commitment and ultimately, revitalization. The City of Greenville worked with residents to create the Green Avenue Master Plan and has involved resident opinion and decisions through the course of redevelopment. This has allowed for residents to be a part of the process and to be committed in some way to the plan.

4. Physical redevelopment like with housing and infrastructure are clear, identifiable, tangible results that show progress. Even though physical development is not the only aspect that should be emphasized it displays in a very effective way that the plans are being implemented. Trust can be built and relationships can grow knowing that promises are kept.
5. It is important to have opportunities for resident leadership and participation. The Green Avenue Civic Association provides such opportunities and allows residents to voice their opinion and be heard.

6. Educating residents and clearly communicating expectations and promises about redevelopment are critical in building trust with the residents as well as building capacity.

7. Providing opportunities to enhance human capital is crucial to expanding resident capacity. By partnering with organizations that provide education and training on subjects like homeownership, residents can be empowered about the changes in their neighborhood.

8. Economical burdens can limit resident commitment. In Green Avenue, the younger generations are making ends meet and cannot allocate time to participating in revitalization plans.

9. Close-knit relationships among residents and loyalty to the neighborhood enhance resident commitment and allow the city to more effectively work with residents.

Anderson, South Carolina – West Anderson

Program or Organizational and Implementation Attributes

Geographic and population target

(+) The geographic and population target is clearly defined.
(n) The target area is the largest in number of residents and housing units.

(n) The target population is predominately African American (77%).

**Mission and Goals**

(-) There are no specific goals and master plan for West Anderson. Neighborhood redevelopment goals are instead very general and applied citywide with no details and neighborhood tailored goals.

(-) Being that the Neighborhood and Transit Services Division has a very broad, wide-sweeping goal, it is hard to measure specificities for the West Anderson redevelopment area. Generally, there have been genuine efforts by the city to address West Anderson but unfortunately, it has not done so in a holistic manner. Physical redevelopment has been the main focus and therefore, enhancement of human capital, business and employment opportunities and partnerships have not been emphasized. Even though the Neighborhood and Transit Service Division has made huge strides in public outreach and beginning the process of building partnerships, it has still been designated a zero (0) in the Boolean summarization due to limited success but with hopes of future progress (Table 4).

**Governance**

(n) The Housing and Community Services department is under the Neighborhood and Transit Services Division and is guided by the decisions of Anderson’s City Council.
Funding

(-) Of the three municipalities, Anderson has received the lowest amount of CBDG and HOME funding since 2001.

(-) The Neighborhood Services department is in debt to HUD for downtown revitalization. No matter what the city is allocated every year, the neighborhood redevelopment funding is cut by one-third and this loan will not be paid off until 2017.

Staff Capacity and orientation

(+) With a staff of nine, the Neighborhood and Transit Services Division has a variety of backgrounds and experience to assist in redevelopment.

Intermediate Outcomes

Resident Commitment

(-) West Anderson is an aging population with not many young people involved.

(+) It is a tight knit and active community with a lot of positive interaction.

(+) Dr. Thompson is an integral part to community involvement being that she is a member of City Council.

(+) There is a lot of positive interaction between residents.

(+) The city works more directly with residents now than they did in the past.

(-) Only a few residents attend the monthly community meetings.
(-) Not all residents are responsible and committed to the neighborhood.

(-) The neighborhood appearance makes people not want to live there and also attracts crime.

**Resident Capacity**

(+) The residents are equipped with local political knowledge and how to make changes.

(-) There are not many leaders in the neighborhood.

**Neighborhood Organizational Capacity**

(+) Many residents are retired and have time to commit.

(+) The city is able to organize and facilitate the logistics well.

(-) The residents can meet together but cannot mobilize as a whole to make a difference.

**Activities and Spin Offs**

(n) The city first looked at West Anderson in 1989 because politics was driving neighborhood redevelopment.

(-) It has been tough to fully accomplish what they have designed and want to do because of limited funding.

(-) Needs have to be prioritized due to the lack of funding.
Network Capacity

(+ ) Residents have some control with Dr. Thompson and also the Westside Community Coalition

(+ ) The Westside Community Coalition acts as a point of contact and a part of the redevelopment process.

(-) It is felt that since there is not many activities going on currently, it is hard for residents to have a voice and any form of control.

Long Term Measurable Outcomes

Physical housing and development

(+ ) Around 50 homes have been built and rehabilitated to stabilize the area and lower rental occupied rates.

(-) When examining the total number of properties rehabilitated and/or constructed in proportion to the total number of housing units, Anderson has addressed only 5% of the properties in the neighborhood.

(+ ) Infrastructure improvements have been completed as in Greenville and Anderson.

(+ ) Improvements have also been made to Beatrice Thompson Park in the neighborhood.

Employment and business development opportunities

(-) Employment or business development opportunities have not been addressed in the West Anderson neighborhood.
(+) The city is looking into redeveloping the intersection of Murray and Franklin to create opportunities for commercial, residential and business.

*Enhancement of human capital*

(-) The city has not directly provided human services to the West Anderson community.

(+) The Westside Community Center has a strong presence in the area.

(-) Residents, however, are unaware of the services provided by the Westside Community Center due to a lack of accessible information and advertising.

*Local Context*

*Socioeconomic characteristics*

(n) The target population has the second highest median household income of the three municipalities at $17,613.

(n) The target population has the second highest percentage of residents living below the poverty line of the three municipalities at 23%.

(+) The target population has the lowest percentage of renter occupied housing units at 37%.

*Trust and cooperation among residents*

(+) The trust with the city is improving due to the city following through with its promises.
(+): The city engages more with residents.

(-): There is a lack of cooperation among residents.

City Policies

(+): City Council supports neighborhood revitalization.

(n): Policies directly affect how this division operates.

Political culture

(-): Progress is slow due to a risk adverse atmosphere and not wanting to make a mistake.

External Agents

(-): It was only three years ago that City Council made neighborhood redevelopment and housing a priority. Before this designation, the Neighborhood and Transit Services division acted alone with zero partnerships.

(-): The city works with one neighborhood based organization, one federal agency, one state agencies, zero national or regional intermediaries, two non-profits and zero private sector businesses.

Key Findings

These strengths and weaknesses highlight the dimensions of the conceptual model of community development that have been significant in the process of redevelopment in the West Anderson neighborhood. From the West Anderson case study key findings about what is important in the community development process include:
1. Setting specific goals, timeline and plans are absolutely critical to the entire process – resident commitment, implementation attributes, and long-term results. Anderson approaches community development on a citywide scope and this inhibits continuous advancements. Specific plans and goals allow residents and planners to be on the same page, to create strategies, to have something to work towards and to have a framework to base their actions upon.

2. A lack of partnerships can equal limited resources and therefore limited activities. Being that Anderson has just recently started to form partnerships, they have had a severe limitation in what they are able to do not only in West Anderson but also in other focus area neighborhoods.

3. The political culture can severely affect the progress of community development. Due to the risk adverse nature of the City of Anderson, it is tough for the Neighborhood and Transit Services division to make any huge advances.

4. A lack of cooperation and commitment from residents can significantly affect the community development process. Only a select few residents are involved in the revitalization process and therefore as a whole, they are not all on the same page. By not having an overwhelming sense of urgency from the community, this can affect how the city works.

5. Additionally, a lack of leadership can also hinder redevelopment. Dr. Thompson is the clear leader of the area but it takes more than one resident to make a change.

6. Even though only a handful of residents are involved with the West Anderson Coalition, it provides an opportunity for residents to be a part of the process.
Spartanburg, South Carolina – Forest Park

Program or Organizational and Implementation Attributes

Geographic and population target

(+) The geographic and target population is clearly defined.

(n) The Forest Park neighborhood is the smallest in number of residents (250) and housing units (120).

(n) The target population is predominately African American (98%).

Mission and Goals

(+) There are clear and set goals for the Forest Park neighborhood of retaining an active neighborhood through housing development.

(+) Although only in the second development phase of constructing 41 new affordable homes in the Forest Park neighborhood, Spartanburg has been successful in acquiring and demolishing properties, working with the residents and by the end of the spring of 2011 will have developed a total of seven affordable homes. Funding is allocated both to the physical redevelopment of the area, along with human services and thus Spartanburg has been designated a one (1) in the Boolean summarization (Table 4). If it continues to progress as it has over the past couple years, it will ultimately reach its goals.

(-) There is no overall documented neighborhood Master Plan like Greenville has developed.
(-) The focus is mainly on physical development, with no attention to human capital.

**Governance**

(n) The Neighborhood Services is a part of the Community Services Department and is led by the decisions of Spartanburg City Council.

(-) The Spartanburg Housing Authority, a partner in the redevelopment, was not able to fulfill promises financially, ultimately hurting the city’s community development efforts.

(+ ) The city was able to create a new partnership with the Spartanburg Housing Development Corporation.

**Funding**

(+ ) The City of Spartanburg ranks second of the three municipalities in terms of CDBG and HOME funding.

(+ ) The City of Spartanburg has partnered with the Spartanburg Housing Development Corporation to assist in funding housing redevelopment.

(-) The city ultimately has limited funding resources.

**Staff Capacity and orientation**

(+ ) With a staff of nine, the community services department has a variety of experiences and backgrounds (homeownership counselor, paralegal, engineer, finance coordinator) to assist in redevelopment efforts.
Intermediate Outcomes

Resident Commitment

(+) The residents are supportive of the city’s plan for redevelopment in Forest Park.

(+) It is a close-knit community with a sense of cohesion and long-time residents.

(-) The neighborhood needs younger leadership in the area.

(-) Many children of long-time residents move out of the neighborhood once they are adults.

(+) The residents have a clear vision of revitalizing the neighborhood to what it once used to be as a clean, safe and aspiring area.

Resident Capacity

(+) The Forest Park Neighborhood Association has a strong presence in the community and is very active.

(+) One City Council member lives in Forest Park.

(+) The Citizen’s Advisory Committee and Neighborhood Planning Committee are both ways for residents to be involved.

(+) Residents are politically and professionally educated and equipped to create change.

(+) The Forest Park residents initiate many projects.

(+) Forest Park was historically a middle-class, educated neighborhood.
**Neighborhood Organizational Capacity**

(+) The city has done a good job communicating with and educating residents.

(+) The residents organize well and have accomplished a lot socially, especially compared to other neighborhoods in Spartanburg.

**Activities and Spin Offs**

(+) The city collaborated with the neighborhood to create the master plan.

(-) The plan has been start/stop since the beginning.

(-) The Spartanburg Housing Authority experienced financial issues and the process was delayed.

(+) The city has entered a new development agreement with the Spartanburg Housing Development Corporation to take the place of SHA.

(+) The city continues to work with the neighborhood to modify or create plans.

(+) The most recent housing development is up for bid for a developer.

**Network Capacity**

(+) The city values the residents’ participation and opinions.

(+) Any plans have to go through a public process of meeting with the Forest Park residents.

(+) The residents have influenced the pace of the project.
(+) The city will not proceed without an agreement by the residents.

(+) There is some form of control for residents.

Long Term Measurable Outcomes

Physical housing and development
(+) Four homes have been built and sold between $95,000 and $105,000.

(+) The site has been completely cleared for construction.

(+) The city plans to build three more homes by the end of March to complete redevelopment of the High Street area and all together the city expects to construct 41 new homes.

(+) The city has completed extensive infrastructure improvements, similar to Anderson and Greenville.

(-) When examining the total number of properties rehabilitated and/or constructed in proportion to the total number of housing units, Spartanburg has addressed 6% of the properties in the neighborhood.

Employment and business development opportunities
(+) The city is requesting that with the construction of new homes that developers will look to the surrounding area for new hires if needed.
(-) Business development and employment opportunities have not been fully addressed in the Forest Park redevelopment.

**Enhancement of human capital**

(+) The City of Spartanburg allocates federal money to public services that enhance human capital like Big Brother/Big Sister, COLORS, Urban League and Partners for Active Living.

(+) CC Woodson Community Center is nearby and has recently had $6 million invested into it.

(+) The area around Forest Park has had about $20 million invested into it with schools, retail, etc. Forest Park is a neighborhood that does not sit alone but is a part of a greater urban fabric.

**Local Context**

**Socioeconomic characteristics**

(+) The target population has the highest median household income of the three municipalities at $30,078.

(+) The target population has the lowest percentage of residents living below the poverty line of the three municipalities at 19%.

(-) This neighborhood has the second highest renter-occupancy rate of the three municipalities at 52%.
Trust and cooperation among residents

(+) Trust is improving between residents and the city because the city has recommitted to the residents after the SHA agreement fell through.

(+) Trust among residents is very strong, especially with long-time homeowners.

(+) Over the past 10 to 12 years the Neighborhood Services division has been a major bridge between the community and the city.

City Policies

(+) Policies are supportive in making Forest Park a priority.

(+) Policies directly affect how this division is able to operate.

Political culture

(-) There are not enough resources.

(+) The City of Spartanburg is generally supportive of community development.

(-) There are some negative perceptions towards affordable housing.

(+) Political leaders do see the value of redevelopment.

External Agents

(+) The city works with one community based organization, one federal agency, one state agency, zero national/regional intermediaries, two non-profits, and a variety of outside, private sector consulting firms and developers.
Key Findings

These strengths and weaknesses highlight the dimensions of the conceptual model of community development that have been significant in the process of redevelopment in the Forest Park neighborhood. From the Forest Park case study key findings about what is important in community development include:

1. Partnerships are critical. The new agreement with the Spartanburg Housing Development Corporation has been crucial in allowing the city to move forward with housing redevelopment plans for Forest Park.

2. Leadership and participation opportunities for residents make a difference and provide some control. The Forest Park residents can become involved through many outlets – the Forest Park Neighborhood Association, the Citizen Advisory Committee and the Neighborhood Planning Committee. With these three opportunities, residents can have a direct say in how they want to see development in their neighborhood.

3. Strong resident commitment can assist the redevelopment process. There is an overwhelming sense of commitment to the city’s plan and this allows for the city to move forward in an effective and efficient manner.

4. Resident relationships affect the intermediate outcomes. The Forest Park area is full of long time residents that have built relationships, trust and loyalty over the years. Therefore, they can easily mobilize and influence the community development process.
5. Educated and informed residents can positively contribute to the process. Forest Park residents are active in the planning and implementation process due in part to the fact that they are educated politically, technically and professionally.

6. Clear goals involve clear communication between city and residents and can make a huge difference in the process. Even though there is no official master plan document, the city is in constant contact with the residents regarding plans and visions.

**Summarization**

The limitations and accomplishments of each city’s community development efforts have been summarized with two different charts, Table 4 and Table 5. Table 4 uses Boolean algebra where each input variable has been designated a one (1), which means the dimension is present, or a zero (0), which equals absent. The dash (-) means that the one or zero was not applicable. The output value for each city is equivalent to whether or not the community development programs have succeeded and therefore, one (1) equals success is present and zero (0) equals success is absent. Success has been defined as city departments meeting the set and defined goals for each neighborhood.

The Boolean summarization highlights the similarities and differences between the three municipalities. Since Greenville and Spartanburg both were assigned ones (1) for an output value, the dimensions that were present for both of these municipalities but absent in Anderson are:
1. Mission and goals
2. Resident commitment
3. Resident capacity
4. Activities and spin offs
5. Network capacity
6. Enhancement of human capital
7. Trust and cooperation
8. Political culture
9. Level and quality of community development efforts
10. Private sector support

Other similarities appear due to the fact that all three municipalities do not have employment and business opportunities as a long-term result and thus were all assigned a zero (0). Additionally, the dimensions found present in all three municipalities include:

1. Target/geographic population
2. Governance
3. Funding
4. Staff capacity
5. Physical development and housing
6. Policies
7. Non-profit resources
8. Federal agencies
9. State agencies

When examining differences, the national/regional intermediary is the only element present for Green Avenue. Furthermore, organizational capacity is only present in Forest Park. It should be emphasized that Table 4 simply highlights the similarities and differences between Greenville, Anderson and Spartanburg. It demonstrates relationships and linkages but by no means explicitly stating causal relationships. It allows for the similarities and differences to be examined using the literature and a reference to where community development processes stand in the Upstate of South Carolina.
Table 4: Boolean Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status of Project/Plan</th>
<th>Greenville - Green Ave.</th>
<th>Spartanburg - Forest Park</th>
<th>Anderson - West Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Will finish Phase II in one year; is close to completing additionally infrastructure improvements; 40 new homes will be built with the completion of Phase II; will reassess and reanalyze once Phase II is finished to decide whether or not to begin Phase III.</td>
<td>Plan on building 41 new homes in the neighborhood; 4 homes are finished; 3 more are expected to be built by March to complete High Street; completed infrastructure improvements.</td>
<td>No activity right now and no set goals for the future; rehabilitated and developed homes in the area; completed infrastructure improvements.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Organizational Design</th>
<th>Greenville - Green Ave.</th>
<th>Spartanburg - Forest Park</th>
<th>Anderson - West Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic and population target</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission and goals or strategic focus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Intermediate Outcomes</th>
<th>Greenville - Green Ave.</th>
<th>Spartanburg - Forest Park</th>
<th>Anderson - West Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Resident Commitment</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Capacity</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Long-Term Measurable Outcomes</th>
<th>Greenville - Green Ave.</th>
<th>Spartanburg - Forest Park</th>
<th>Anderson - West Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Physical and housing development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and business opportunities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of resident human capital</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Context</th>
<th>Greenville - Green Ave.</th>
<th>Spartanburg - Forest Park</th>
<th>Anderson - West Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and cooperation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City policies</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political culture</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level and quality of community development activities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit/private foundation resources /commitment to community development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector support</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External Agents</th>
<th>Greenville - Green Ave.</th>
<th>Spartanburg - Forest Park</th>
<th>Anderson - West Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Federal agencies/programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agencies/programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and regional intermediaries</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of elements present</th>
<th>20/22</th>
<th>20/22</th>
<th>9/22</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Output/Success</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 5 is similar to the Table 4 but gives a more in depth look of each city’s efforts by using a sliding scale. Table 4 depicts just similarities and differences, whereas Table 5 highlights strengths and weaknesses. Five (5) represents that the condition is present and strong, three (3) represents that the condition is present but moderate, one (1) represents that the condition is present but weak and zero (0) represents that the condition is absent. Instead of only designating whether a condition is absent or present, this table allows the reader to have a better understanding to what degree the condition is present. Elements that are designated as a zero in Table 4 have the possibility to be present in Table 5, specifically with the City of Anderson, in order to demonstrate that the dimension is not completely void in the case study. Ultimately, however, these elements are not strong enough to be considered present for the Boolean summarization.

Important differences from the Boolean summarization emphasized in Table 5 include:

1. Physical housing and development: Previously in Table 4 all three cities received ones (1) because they have all made physical changes to the community fabric with housing rehabilitation and development as well as infrastructure improvements. However, they have done so in varying degrees. Greenville has seen the most long-term measurable results by impacting 26 percent of the total properties in the Green Avenue neighborhood either through rehabilitation or construction and has thus been designated a five (5). Spartanburg and Anderson follow behind with smaller proportion of
properties impacted (six percent and five percent respectively) and are each therefore designated a three (3).

2. Non-profit resources: Originally in Table 4 all three municipalities were assigned ones (1) because they all have partnered with non-profit organizations over the course of revitalization. Greenville has formed partnerships with over five non-profits to help them move forward, while Spartanburg has teamed with the Spartanburg Housing Development Corporation to make their projects possible. Anderson has sporadically partnered with non-profits but has not had anything consistent and thus given a one (1).

3. Funding: All three municipalities have funding in place but Greenville by far has the most funding resources, with Spartanburg and Anderson falling short.

4. Network capacity: In the Boolean summarization, both Spartanburg and Greenville were designated a one (1) for network capacity. However, Table 5 shows that Greenville has attempted to bridge the gap with supporting communities like non-profits as well as the neighborhood residents. Spartanburg has also worked hard to engage residents but does not have as many partnerships as Greenville.

5. Resident Capacity: This dimension refers to leadership and technical, political knowledge. Due to the fact that Forest Park has three ways to become involved in the revitalization process through the neighborhood association, the planning committee and the citizens advisory committee, the residents
have the capacity to be a part of the redevelopment process. In Green Avenue, the main outlet for leadership opportunities is with the Green Avenue Civic Association.

6. Trust and cooperation: Again, Spartanburg and Greenville were both designated ones (1) for trust and cooperation but Table 5 depicts that there is greater trust and cooperation in Spartanburg. Green Avenue’s residents have strong, trusting relationships as do Forest Park but in Forest Park it is felt that the residents actually cooperate with each other and can mobilize to make a change if needed.

Greenville and Spartanburg both totaled significantly higher sums than Anderson out of 110 points possible. Discussion of key elements of Gittell and Vidal’s conceptual model of community development follows to examine why these three cities scored different for both the Boolean summary chart and the sliding scale summary chart.
Table 5: Alternative Summarization

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program or Organizational Design</th>
<th>Greenville - Green Ave.</th>
<th>Spartanburg - Forest Park</th>
<th>Anderson - West Anderson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Geographic and population target</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mission and goals or strategic focus</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Governance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Funding</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Capacity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intermediate Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Commitment</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resident Capacity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Capacity</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network Capacity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long-Term Measurable Outcomes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical and housing development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment and business opportunities</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhancement of resident human capital</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Local Context</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Socioeconomic conditions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trust and cooperation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City policies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Political culture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level and quality of community development activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-profit and private foundation resources and commitment to community development</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private sector support</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>External Agents</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Federal agencies/programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State agencies/programs</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>National and regional intermediaries</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Possible</strong></td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>95</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Key Findings

Key characteristics relevant to the dimensions of Gittell and Vidal’s conceptual model of community development have become apparent through the interviews, documents and records that can help explain what makes for a more effective and successful community development effort at the city level as with Greenville and Spartanburg. Below are recommendations on how community development programs might improve their work based on the case studies of this research. They include:

Program or Organizational Design and Implementation Attributes

1. Tailor mission and goals to a specific geographic area and/or target population.
   This provides a framework for redevelopment and the ability to understand what the community development efforts are aiming for.

2. Work with the residents to create a vision, goals and master plan. Additionally these items should be documented so that the plans can continuously be reevaluated as to whether desired outcomes are being produced.

3. Clearly communicate with residents so as to not over promise and under fulfill expectations. This builds trust and cooperation between residents and city staff and also exposes the community development program to the local knowledge and experiences that the residents have from living in the neighborhood.

4. Have an experienced and knowledgeable staff focused on issues of community development as well as the capability to work with a variety of stakeholders.
Understanding the literature and theory is important, but so is being able to communicate effectively with people from different backgrounds.

5. *Create and outline clear roles with staff.* Collaboration among the division and also with other city departments is important to smooth operations in the community development process.

6. *Expand funding sources.* Funding should come from a variety of sources so as to not rely on only federal money. More funding means more resources to work in communities and ultimately the ability to get things accomplished.

**Intermediate Outcomes**

7. *Phase activities so that they are continuous.* It is critical that activities are as constant and continuous as possible in order to keep momentum and support positive.

8. *Build upon the strengths of relationships and resident loyalty if it exists in an area.* A neighborhood with a rich history and long-time residents can provide a very positive element to the community development process due to the fact that there is already a certain level of trust and friendship but also that the residents know what their neighborhood once was and what they would like to see.

9. *Educate residents about the revitalization process to build resident capacity.* This can assist in setting expectations and allow residents to engage in opportunities of participation.
10. *Engage the residents to bridge the gap between staff and residents, especially with resident leaders.* The more contact and communication that is had with residents, the better the process. This can ease barriers of the “experts” versus the “residents” and allow for interests to be heard.

11. *Allow some form of control to be in the hands of the residents.* Resident opinions and values should not be overlooked but should instead feel a part of the decision making process.

**Long-Term Measureable Outcomes**

12. *Integrate the enhancement of human capital into the program to compliment physical development.* Focusing on housing and infrastructure alone does not provide a holistic approach. Instead it can empower residents and provide them the tools to their new built environment.

13. *Make physical changes to the neighborhood.* Physical redevelopment, although not the single most important long-term outcome, is still crucial in residents being able to see progress and can actually impact factors like homeownership and blight.

14. *Do not disregard business and employment opportunities.* Listen to what is needed and wanted by the residents but do not overlook the possibility for people based strategies.
Local Context

15. *Form a variety of partnerships with non-profits and the private sector.* When acting alone, it can be nearly impossible to accomplish everything that is desired.

16. *Educate citizens citywide (or in a broader context) about redevelopment.* A progressive political culture is key in getting things done. If too risk adverse, progress can be slow and highly affect the process. Therefore, education can help break barriers of misunderstanding and stereotypes.

17. *Form working relationships with those that dictate policies.* In most cities, City Council directly affects how community development departments operate. Therefore, it is critical that City Council not only supports community revitalization but also takes action to make it a priority.

18. *Build trust with the residents.* Trust is important among residents but also between residents and city staff. Building relations allows for more mobilization and opportunities to move forward.

19. *Utilize neighborhood associations.* A strong neighborhood association where residents can act on their values and opinions provides a positive outlet and opportunity for neighborhood leadership.

External Agents

20. *Outside of the local context, form partnerships with state and federal agencies as well as regional intermediaries.* This is important in accumulating more resources.
The conceptual model of community development provided a basic framework that was useful to identify the key characteristics of the three neighborhood programs. It is a model that can be used in a variety of ways and is practical in obtaining information about community development efforts. At times, many of the elements overlapped and the interview questions were ordered more in terms of theme rather than the exact five elements presented by Gittell and Vidal. This limited repetition and wasting time during the interviews. The overlapping of the elements, however, is logical, since all of the elements are interdependent of each other and not exclusive.

Just like Gittell and Vidal note that the conceptual model of community development is not meant to be static of linear like a mathematical equation, these key findings depict the same concept. From different geographical locations to distinctive makeup of community residents, there are many factors and faucets that make the issue of using community development to address distressed neighborhoods complex and without a one-fits-all solution. However, Gittell and Vidal do note that the elements they present in the conceptual model of community development “depict a set of relations among key elements of program experience” (1998, 23). These elements were included in the model to convey what have been viewed as significant in community development initiatives. Therefore, these key findings, albeit that they cannot be applied to every distressed community across the United States, do provide insight into how the elements of Vidal and Gittell’s model interact and an example of what is actually happening in municipalities in the Upstate of South Carolina.
In order to achieve the previously outlined recommendations for community development programs, strategies have been developed for agencies when working in distressed neighborhoods. Again, this plan of action is not meant to be a static, linear solution for agencies as with the dimensions of Gittell and Vidal’s conceptual model of community development. Instead they are general strategies taken from the case studies of Greenville, Spartanburg and Anderson to achieve positive, long-term, sustainable redevelopment.

First in the plan of action is preparation. Before working with neighborhoods, agencies themselves need to be ready as much as possible. Funding should be secured so that the agency can approach a neighborhood with the resources to achieve desired results. Typically, funding should come from a variety of sources so as to not be dependent on only one source. Agencies can also be prepared by having the appropriate training, experience and up to date knowledge of community development issues. The agency should be staffed with a wide variety of experiences and knowledge in order to produce a holistic approach.

Second, agencies need to engage with the target population to understand the neighborhood’s strengths and weaknesses as well as the residents’ vision. This can involve meetings with residents, surveying the physical properties, setting up neighborhood committees and hosting workshops. Constant contact and communication with residents allows the agency to have a better understanding of what are threats and what are assets so as to create a plan or program that reflects the community’s desires.
The more engaged, educated and involved the neighborhood residents are, the more the agency can effectively redevelop the area.

Finally, after preparing and engaging with the residents, the agency needs to focus on long-term results. Each area might be different in what is wanted specifically but generally agencies should emphasize housing, economic enterprise and resident empowerment. Number, type and design of housing units may vary but increasing homeownership is one tool that is viewed as being effective in addressing distressed neighborhoods. Long-term results also need to include bringing or expanding job opportunities or small-business enterprise within the area. Additionally, empowering residents through job training, homeownership counseling and education about revitalization is also important. These three steps can be used in conjunction with the recommendations can aid community development efforts so that more neighborhoods are holistically revitalized.

**Discussion of Results**

From the literature review, it was found that three main themes for addressing concentrated poverty included: 1) place-based and people-based strategies, 2) citizen involvement and 3) public-private partnerships. These elements tie in well with Gittell and Vidal’s conceptual model of community development. Gittell and Vidal stress that the interaction among the organization design and implementation attributes, external
agents and local context all lead to a set of intermediate outcomes, which ultimately influence more substantial long-term outcomes.

The external agents and local context reflect the importance of public-private partnerships, the place-based and people-based strategies mirror the significance of organization design and implementation attributes and the citizen involvement is similar to the intermediate outcomes. Therefore, when examining Greenville, Spartanburg and Anderson’s community development efforts, the varying elements have led to three different community development programs and outcomes in each of the municipalities.

The City of Greenville appears to be able to move forward with the Green Avenue Master Plan due to the fact that the Community Development Division has addressed the three themes from the literature review. It has

1. Set clear goals of home ownership but also provided opportunities to enhance human capital.
2. Worked with the Green Avenue residents in the planning and development processes and utilized the residents’ capacity and commitment and
3. Built a variety of partnerships with non-profit organizations, for-profit businesses, community-based organizations and regional intermediaries.

These three principles have interacted well with each other to produce strong intermediate and long-term outcomes.
The City of Spartanburg, similar to Greenville but on a smaller scale has been able to progress in the Forest View master plan. It too has addressed the three themes from the literature review because the Community and Neighborhood Services Division has

1. Set clear goals to retain an active Forest Park neighborhood, while also connecting residents to opportunities for human capital enhancements.

2. Has actively worked with the residents during the redevelopment process by valuing their opinions and utilizing the residents’ skills and knowledge and

3. Established partnerships with non-profit, governmental and private sector agencies to help them achieve their goals.

It should be noted that both Greenville and Spartanburg’s efforts are not perfect:

- The goals and missions reflect an emphasis on physical development and thus should encompass a more holistic approach
- The enhancement of human capital is provided at a citywide level and not directly targeted toward the specific neighborhoods

With this being said, however, these community development programs are at a point of being able to move forward and have witnessed both intermediate and long-term outcomes.
Anderson’s Neighborhood and Transit Services Division is currently at a standstill. Improvements have been made toward redeveloping the Westside community but the presence of the three elements is not as strong in Anderson as they are in Greenville and Spartanburg. Overall, the division has

1. Not set clear goals and mission for the Westside redevelopment area, limiting place and people-based strategies to one general idea of revitalization.

2. Worked to increase interaction with residents to have more open lines of communication and involvement with the plan but resident control and leadership are still limited.

3. Not established partnerships with outside agencies, ultimately inhibiting the plan from making progress.

The City of Anderson has made many strides to improve community development efforts and has made progress by rehabilitating and developing homes. However, since the three main themes are not as prominent or absent, the outcomes and current status of the plan have been affected. Therefore, the three cases studies reflect what was found from the literature review and that certain elements are needed for community development to be successful.
CONCLUSIONS

As expected, these three Cities – Anderson, Greenville and Spartanburg – are in three very different places in terms of their community development efforts within each specific neighborhood. Gittell and Vidal note that the conceptual model of community development conveys the key elements of community development. Dimensions might change from one localized area to another, producing varying outcomes as well. This model is not a one size fits all solution but the cross case synthesis of the three city level community development departments has highlighted that if some elements are absent or very weak, then the dimensions are not able to interact and interplay in a manner that produces intermediate and long term outcomes. Therefore, it is critical that city departments utilizing community development programs and plans to address distressed communities be aware and recognize that theory and practice should interplay during design and implementation. Often theory can be overlooked because the practicalities of the real world receive priority but theory allows for efforts to be evaluated and thus produce more effective and efficient processes to achieve desired outcomes.

It should be highlighted that this study is limited. The terms community, community development and poverty are all very complex and multifaceted concepts. This study is not intended to find key characteristics of how community development and distressed neighborhoods across the entire United States interact but just to highlight how in three specific neighborhoods of Upstate South Carolina, that the dynamics of addressing low-income, high-poverty geographical areas seemed to show a pattern of significant
elements that need to be present in order for progress to be made. It was understood from the beginning that this study would not solve the intricate issues of our nation’s social inequities but instead would hope to provide a small piece of the bigger picture.

This study is also limited in three main ways. First, the interviews focused mainly on city staff in Greenville, Anderson and Spartanburg. The residents’ point of view did help balance out the data collected from city staff but in order to be more objective, additional interviews could be completed with neighborhood residents, leaders and community organizations. Additionally, to improve the reliability of this research more interviews could also be completed with city staff in each municipality and other municipalities of the Upstate of South Carolina. Finally, data was collected through documents and archival records but a key source of data was collected through the nine interviews, which ultimately is more subjective and open to opinion.

Further research should investigate more thoroughly the element of resident control, resident capacity and general resident opinions of community development efforts in Anderson, Greenville and Spartanburg. This study primarily focused on each city’s approach in the specific neighborhoods. However, being that resident involvement is one of the critical elements of community development found from the literature review and from the cross-case synthesis, it deserves more in-depth research so that not only city community development departments can be aware of residents’ point of views but also to achieve intermediate and long-term outcomes more effectively and efficiently. Future questions to address should include: 1) What are ways to build residents’ capacity to
make a change in their neighborhood? 2) How much control is needed to be in the hands of the residents and how much are cities willing to let go of their power? 3) How can cities help mobilize communities? and 4) How can communities build trust and cooperation among residents?

Finally, future research should also address the issue of local context from Gittell and Vidal’s conceptual model of community development. Only a handful of questions were directly related to this subject but from all three case studies, it appears to be a key element of how community development departments are able to operate in distressed neighborhoods. Further research should look specifically more in depth to the political culture and city policies. Questions to be addressed should include: 1) Does the city’s political party affiliations affect the progress of community development efforts? 2) How much support is needed and what type of support is needed for community development efforts? and 3) What political environments are more supportive of community development?
Appendix A

City staff interview questions:

Agency/Program Attributes

a. What is the geographic and target population of the plan/program?
b. What is the agency’s mission and goals?
c. How is the program governed? (board, staff, community influence)
d. How is the program funded? (periodic or dedicated, matching or direct, public, private or non-profit)
e. What is the professional experience and technical training of the staff in regards to this program?
f. What is or has been the agency’s organizational capacity during the plan formulation and implementation?

Implementation

a. How has the plan/program been implemented or how is the plan expected to be implemented? (Chronology of activities)

Outcomes

a. What has physically changed in the neighborhood since the plan or program has been implemented including housing?
b. What kinds of business and employment opportunities exist for residents or how has it changed?
c. What kinds of training and education are included in the plan/program? Are there other kinds of human services have been provided in the area?
   i. Are they viewed as enhancing the human capital of the neighborhood?

Perceptions and Characteristics of the Neighborhood

a. What is the overall sense of interest in and loyalty to the community by the residents?
b. What kinds of relationships exist between residents?
c. What is the residents’ vision of the community?
d. What kind of leadership roles do residents take?
e. What is the financial, technical and political knowledge of the residents?
f. What level of trust and cooperation exist among residents?
g. To what degree do residents and the neighborhood have control in the program/plan?

h. What is the socioeconomic status of the neighborhood in which the agency is working?

i. What is the level of internal neighborhood organizational capacity? (residents, CDCs)

4. Local Context

a. How do local municipality policies influence the plan/program?

b. What is the political culture of the city?

Partnerships

a. Does the plan/program include partnerships with the private, non-profit and other public sectors? If so, please describe.
   1. Does the program receive technical, financial or any other kind of help/advice/support from outside sources beyond community development funding?
   2. Do other community-based organizations also work within the neighborhood? If so, what is their capacity and quality of activities?
   3. How do the non-profit and private sectors support your community development efforts?
   4. What federal agencies or programs are involved with this program/plan?
   5. What state agencies or programs are involved with this program/plan?
   6. What national or regional intermediaries are involved with this program/plan?
Appendix B

Resident Interview Questions

Perceptions and Characteristics of the Neighborhood

a. What is the overall sense of interest in and loyalty to the community by the residents?
b. What level of trust and cooperation exist among residents and also with the City?
c. What kinds of relationships exist between residents?
d. What is the residents’ vision of the community?
   a. What are the goals and mission for the neighborhood? Has it changed over time?
e. What kind of leadership roles do residents take?
f. To what degree do residents and the neighborhood have control in the program/plan?
g. What is the financial, technical and political knowledge of the residents?
h. How well does the neighborhood organize together? (residents, CDCs)
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