IMPROVING NEIGHBORHOOD PLANNING

INPUT IN CHAMPAIGN'S NORTH END

A HOUSING AND COMMUNITY

DEVELOPMENT WORKSHOP

UP 338-H

Fall 1982

Jeff Andreasen
Mary Blackstone
David Buschmann
Valerie Dehner
Dorothy Filusch
Joanne Hoagland
April Johnson
Terri Pandolfi
Sue Sykora
Julie Tintera
Douglas Weil
Clinton Yap

Instructor: Leonard F. Heumann

Improving Neighborhood Planning Input

in Champaign's North End

The goal of this workshop is to evaluate the past and current role

of citizen input in Community Development planning in the city of

Champaign, Illinois, and to propose ways to improve citizen input in

the future. The clients of this workshop are the citizens of Census

Tract 2, also known as the North End of Champaign. The major impetus

for involving these citizens in planning and upgrading of their neighbor-

hood, and the major funding source for community development activity in

the North End, has been the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG)

Program. Under this program, five target neighborhoods and neighborhood

advisory groups have been established by the city. The North End contains

two of these neighborhoods, the North East Area (NEA) and the University

Washington Area (UWA). After site visits, demographic analysis and

observation of organization meetings in all five target areas, we chose

to focus our analysis on the two North End areas and organizations

because: 1) they are the oldest organizations; 2) they have been the

target of the vast majority of CDBG spending over the past eight years

of the program and; 3) they are still the most in need of community

development funds of the five target areas in our opinion. We felt

these neighborhoods would provide the best and fairest test of the impact

of past CDBG planning and development efforts in Champaign, as well as

the best and fairest test of citizen input into planning and plan

implementation, and the establishment of permanent and independent

neighborhood planning organizations.

National Background to CDBG Spending and Citizen Participation

The CDBG program was launched with the 1974 Housing and Community Development Act. It marked a major shift in federal government funding policy away from categorical grants and aid programs to local communities, to the concept of revenue sharing (the "new-federalism") in the form of block grants which allow for more local planning flexibility (for overview see Ball and Heumann, 1977; Heumann, 1979; for actual act summary see, Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1974). Over the years since its inception the citizen participation element has grown in importance, and many theorists felt the CDBG program would be the catalyst for a new era of citizen participation in planning (see Department of Housing and Urban Development, 1977a and 1977b sections on citizen participation). However, CDBG was overly ambitious when comparing theory to funding and the quality of federal monitoring of the program (see NAHRO, 1977; Nenno, 1981). Also, along the way the program picked up conflicting goals; one to aid low and moderate income households the other to meet general community development needs (see National Citizens Monitoring Project, 1981). The result, has been less than effective citizen input into local planning, and a growing disinvestment of CDBG funds in lower income areas nation-wide. Nevertheless, there are some success stories, and CDBG funds have helped fund long-term, independent, incorporated, not-for-profit, neighborhood planning organizations. Recently, the Reagan Administration has proposed changes in the CDBG program that would expand its function further without expanding the funding, while reducing the already ineffective federal monitoring of the program goals, and almost eliminating all requirements

for citizen participation (see <u>Presidents Commission on Housing</u>, 1981;
Nenno, 1981; Nenno, 1982). With this national background we set class
research objectives for our evaluation of neighborhood planning in NEA
and UWA.

Workshop Objectives

One of the earliest findings of the workshop was that very little
evaluation exists either by the city, neighborhood groups or other workshops
on the affect of past CDBG program activity on the target areas, and the
quality of neighborhood planning organization in the target areas. We
wanted to conduct a type of evaluation that would be constructive and
provide concrete advice and support to the neighborhood organizations
and planning operations in the two target areas. The class realized
early on that this would be a different goal to fully realize in one
semester. There was a strong desire to provide "hard" data and analyses
that the neighborhoods and city could use to set better planning
priorities and get on with the business of the North End. There was
also the realization that without a careful evaluation of the neighborhood
organizations and their ability to plan and use "hard" data there was no
guarantee that any data or analysis we conducted would or could be imple-
mented by the neighborhood or even effectively defended and lobbied for
by the neighborhood at city hall.

Like many other workshops our final objectives and consequent
product represent a compromise. We divided into five teams. Three teams
conducted physical planning evaluations and two teams neighborhood
organization evaluations. The first physical planning evaluation covers
the CDBG activities conducted by the city to date to see if program goals

and spending match-up, and to see if CDBG programs effectively strengthen and use citizen input. The remaining two physical planning evaluation teams responded to the class goal to provide input with which the neighborhoods could improve their physical planning capabilities. There were many elements of neighborhood physical planning which could benefit from class research and analysis. The two that were chosen represent: 1) basic and high priority physical planning need areas; 2) projects that build upon findings from a planning workshop of last spring; 3) cover areas we found, from interviewing the city community development planners, are of high priority in the city's plans for the coming years, and 4) are areas where we felt neighborhood input is vital to the overall success of the programs.

We saw from the outset of our investigation that CDBG activities in Champaign are fairly typical of CDBG activity to date nation-wide. Most cities have failed to address the task of rehabilitating substandard rental housing and instead have concentrated their housing rehabilitation efforts on owner occupied structures. Champaign has also done this despite the fact that about half the structures in the North End are renter occupied. One reason the city has postponed a rental rehabilitation program is the fear that many substandard renter units will have absentee owners who will be hard to reach, even harder to persuade to cooperate in a rehabilitation program, and still harder to penalize if they don't cooperate or prevent from raising rents if they do cooperate. It was felt that if we knew the characteristics of the owners of rental property this vital program in neighborhood rehabilitation could be designed, and that if a sizeable number of owners were neighborhood residents or former

residents who are still part of the "Champaign black community," the
North End neighborhood organization could play a vital role in the design,
implementation and success of the rental rehabilitation program. Therefore,
one team has identified the owners of rental property by where they reside
and the number and condition of the units they own.

The task of the last team looking into physical evaluation of the
two target areas was to show local neighborhood planners the importance
of setting physical planning priorities and how to go about doing this.
From the outset of our analysis we discovered that residents saw no
logical reason for how or why the city chose some streets for improve-
ment projects and not others. While our analysis of the CDBG program
looked for an answer, we felt an easy yet important task was for the
neighborhoods to have their own plan and priorities for yearly program
spending. Therefore, a team of students, building upon a block by block
evaluation of housing, land use and capital improvements conducted by a
planning workshop last spring, assembled a number of variables and
created an objective evaluation scheme that would provide a comparative
rating for all blocks. The evaluation completed is only illustrative
since the neighborhood groups were not organized enough to direct this
project as a client would normally direct a consultant. The end product
shows the blocks where the highest priority needs are currently located
based on the measures chosen by the workshop. The neighborhood groups
can either accept the priority need blocks as found in this study, or
learn what input is needed to direct the work of future workshops or a
future subcommittee of the organization in developing their own
evaluation and priorities.

The evaluation of neighborhood organizations was divided into two teams, one analyzing the North End Area and the other the University Washington Area. The overall goals of these teams was to evaluate the past influence and accomplishments of these organizations, their current ability to represent the citizenry of the neighborhoods in planning matters and their future potential to function as an independent planning body. The teams proceeded to conduct these analysis in three phases. First, to interview the neighborhood organization leadership to get a history of activity, current needs, future goals, and basic organizational demographics (e.g. membership size, administrative structure, bylaws, incorporation, etc.). The second task was to interview other key leaders in the North End for this evaluation of the organizations and the ability of the organizations to represent the communities in the planning process. Finally, the teams conducted a short survey of local residents to see how well they knew the organizations, what they felt the organizations role should/could be, and what they collectively saw as the neighborhoods needs as compared to the organization leadership. The body of the report follows, presenting the five team reports in the order they were introduced here.

References

Ball, T. E. and Heumann, L. F., "An Analysis of the HUD Non-metropolitan
Community Development Program," Journal of the Community Development
Society, Volume 10, Number 1, Spring 1979, pp. 49-65.

National Citizen's Monitoring Project, "Community Development versus
   Poor Peoples Needs: Tensions in CDBG," The Citizens Report on
   Administrative Performance in the Community Development Block Grant
   Program. The National Citizens Monitoring Project, Washington,
   D.C., 1981.

National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials. "Second
   Year Community Block Grant Experience: A summary of Findings."
   Journal of Housing, Volume 34, Number 2, February, 1977, pp. 80-84.

Nenno, M. K., "The Presidents HUD Budget," Journal of Housing, Volume 39,
   Number 2, 1982, pp. 43-50.

Nenno, Mary K., "The Reagan Administration: Housing CD/Futures," in
   "Housing and Community Development Legislation," Journal in Housing,
   Volume 38, Number 11, December 1981, pp. 599-600.

The President's Commission on Housing: Interim Report, Presidents
   Commission, William F. McKenna, Chairman, Washington, D.C.,
   UPGPO, October 30, 1981.

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, "1981
   Legislative Changes in the Federal Housing Programs," Clearinghouse
   Review, Department of Housing and Urban Development, Washington,
   D.C., January 1982.

U.S.D.H.U.D. Summary of the Housing and Community Development Act of
   1974, Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1974.

U.S.D.H.U.D. Summary of the Housing and Community Development Act of
   1977, Washington, D.C., U.S.G.P.O., 1977a.

U.S.D.H.U.D. "Community Development Block Grants: Eligible Activities
Applications for Entitlement Grants, Urban Development Action
Grants," Federal Register, Volume 42, Number 205, Tuesday,
October 25, 1977b.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. EVALUATION OF THE CITY'S IMPACT ON

CENSUS TRACT 2 USING CDBG PROGRAMS

Characteristics of the Area

The area of Champaign chosen for study in Census Tract 2, located
in the northeast area of the City. The boundaries of this Census
Tract are Bradley Avenue to the north, University Avenue to the south,
Wright Street to the east, and First Street and the Illinois Central
Railroad to the west.

Of the 6.3 acres of land which comprise Census Tract 2, 10% of it
is vacant, 38% is used for residential purposes, and 28% is occupied by
streets. Twelve percent of the land is used for commercial purposes and
for parks, with the majority of commercial establishments located in the
southern part of the area.

At the beginning of the post World War II period Census Tract 2 was
clearly established as the area where the city's black population
resided and where most of the lowest income households resided. It was
also a self-contained and stable community. The neighborhood was
tightly-knit, with strong social controls between members. As residents
of the area became more affluent, they left to find more suitable housing.
Newcomers were more transient in nature and tended to come from the South
or from Chicago in search of jobs. Where the area once had five grocery
stores and several neighborhood schools only a "quik mart" remains. The
late 1960's brought the beginning of a great many planning changes to the
area. Of major impact to the community was the demolition of deteri-
orated houses, and the relocation of occupants, without replacement
of the housing and retention of the social infrastructure. While

demolition was scattered throughout the area there was also a concentrated renewal area called Oak-Ash. While most of the housing in this area was deteriorated beyond rehabilitation, the project frustrated local residents because the demolition proceeded without any concrete plans and prospects for redevelopment. The clearance effort, initiated by the City in 1973, are now complete, and the land stands vacant and idle. Oak-Ash has been cited by neighborhood citizens as a symbol of their political impotency, their inability to influence planning, and as a leading reason for the current low point in spirit.

In 1980, Census Tract 2 had 2214 residents, 94.3% of which were black. The area lost 19.2% of its population between 1970 and 1980, but this may be largely due to the clearing of the Oak-Ash site.

Census Tract 2 has the lowest income and the highest unemployment rate within the City of Champaign. In 1970, 32% of the families in Census Tract 2 had incomes below the poverty level, as compared with 7% City-wide. The area has a larger mean family size than the City, with the majority of the population being under 35 years of age. The mean education level of the area is 3.2 years less than that of the larger community.

According to a 1978 Regional Planning Commission report, there are 903 housing units in Census Tract 2, 61% of which were built before 1939. Nine percent lack plumbing and 43% are owner-occupied. Thirty one percent of all housing was found to be in standard condition, while 53% required minor or average rehabilitation. Fourteen percent was in need of major rehabilitation and 1% was scheduled for demolition. One area, labelled "distressed" by the City, exists between 2nd and 3rd Streets, and University and Washington Avenues. Total housing rehabilitation costs for the entire area were estimated in this report at approximately

2.2 million dollars.

A study of streets, curbs, and gutters conducted by a workshop class at the University of Illinois in Spring 1982, found that all but 23% of the streets were in satisfactory condition. These streets are primarily located to the southwest of the area, which is frequently prone to flooding. Overall, the streets in the area are concrete and appear to have been redone within the past five years. This same University class also found that 83% of the sidewalks in the area were in good condition, with only 5% listed as "failed."

The following report will examine the two major components of neighborhood viability: physical and organizational. The physical component of a neighborhood includes three categories: housing, land use, and capital improvements. The Community Development Block Grant program (CDBG) will serve as an introduction to the housing and capital improvement sections, and will present the overall goals and objectives the City of Champaign has demonstrated in the past through the allocation of funding for certain revitalization activities in Census Tract 2.

The organizational component is comprised of the results and analysis computed from a random sampling of neighborhood residents. It is meant to provide some idea of the type of organizational structure that now exists in Census Tract 2. Using the data from both the physical and organizational components of this study, we will then evaluate the resources of the area and make recommendations for a future course of action.

The CDBG Program

The Community Development Block Grant Program (CDBG) is an entitlement program designed to eliminate blight and promote viable neighborhoods through physical, economic and social development.

In 1979, the Neighborhood Strategy Area Program (NSA) was included under CDBG to increase local government effectiveness. In these areas, public and private resources are used to revitalize neighborhoods through comprehensive and concentrated improvements. All of Census Tract 2 in Champaign, is an NSA, consisting of the Northeast Area (NEA) and the University-Washington Area (UWA).

Activities Eligible for Funding

A great many activities are eligible for funding under the CDBG program. Because we found the NEA and UWA neighborhood organizations were not familiar with the many eligible activities we list them here for future reference:

Acquisition of real property

Administration of the Program

Bolt locks

Capital Improvements

    street improvements

    lighting

    water quality

Clearance

Code Enforcement

Disposition of real property

Economic Development

    job training

    aid to small business

    downtown revitalization

Funding to incorporated neighborhood groups

Housing counseling

Interest subsidies

Loan Insurance

Management

Model Cities

     job opportunities

     income opportunities

     improving educational facilities

     reducing crime and delinquency

     physical environment improvements

     combatting disease

     social services

Neighborhood Development

     grants

     loans

     new construction

     flood protection

Neighborhood Facilities

     health

     welfare

     educational

     cultural

     social

     recreational

     new construction

     rehabilitation

Planning

Preservation of public and private structures

Public Facilities

    senior citizen facilities

    day care

    neighborhood facilities

Public Services

Rehabilitation of public and private structures

Relocation Assistance

Renovation of closed school buildings

Smoke detectors

Winterization

Eligible Applicants

There are also numerous applicants eligible for CDBG funds. Once again the neighborhood organizations were not aware of what constituted their eligibility for CDBG funds or the proceedure to undertake to secure funds. Therefore, the following summary is provided:

Eligible Applicants

    Business

    Cities

    Counties

    Neighborhood Organizations

The Funding Process

    Business - Authorized as of 1981 Amendments, procedure not out-
             lined.

    Cities   - Cities are allocated funds on a formula basis by the
             federal government, taking into account such factors
             as poverty, the percent of housing built before 1939
             and population decline. A designated amount is

subtracted for a special purpose fund and the balance appropriated on a 70/30 split between entitlement and non-entitlement areas.

Counties - Same as cities.

Neighborhood Groups -

1. The group must be incorporated to ensure legitimacy.

2. The group must be representative of the entire community consisting of a cross-section of the population.

3. All area organizations should be included to present a united front.

4. The group should decide upon the project which should be:

   reasonable

   a community need

   a CDBG eligible activity

5. Technical assistance and information may be obtained, though not required, on proposal writing.

6. The proposal is submitted to the CD office and to City Council, which has final approval.

CDBG Program Evaluation

Ten questions were developed with which the workshop attempted to evaluate the Champaign CDBG program. These are presented here.

- What have been the stated goals and objectives for the five neighborhood stragegy areas in the City of Champaign?

- Between 1975 and 1979, there were no changes in the goals or short-term objectives stated in the CDBG applications. They were as follows:

Long-Term Objectives

1. Conservation and Expansion of Housing Stock

2. Optimum Neighborhood Environment

3. Relocation Assistance

4. Social Services

5. Manpower Development

6. Coordination with Related Programs

Short-Term Objectives

1. Housing Rehabilitation

2. Public Housing

3. Acquisition, Demolition, and Relocation

4. Capital Improvements

5. Community Participation

6. Employment Opportunities

7. Community Development and Relocation Center

8. Weatherization of Homes

9. Development of Mini-Parks

The 5th year CDBG application (1979) proposed a three year "comprehensive strategy" under which six major objectives were defined:

1. To create a safe and healthy living environment for all citizens of Champaign through provision of necessary services, public facilities, and public works.

2. To maintain a reasonable standard of housing for all the citizens of the community by stimulating the private sector to provide for the needs of the middle and upper middle class and by extending rehabilitation grants and loans to low and moderate incomes.

3. To create job opportunities for all members of the community by promoting economic development.

4. To optimize neighborhood living conditions by eliminating incompatible land uses, providing neighborhood services and promoting different types of housing at varying price levels.

5. To revitalize the city's neighborhoods to the extent that all are attractive for long-term private sector investment, through balanced public investment in the neighborhoods of the City.

6. To achieve these objectives with support of the residents of the City and without causing any substantial harm to residents of areas in which Community Development action is taken.

The 5th year CDBG application also set five priorities for use of Block Grant funds during the following five month planning process:

Housing Improvements

1. Rehabilitation Grants

2. Acquisition of lots for construction of new scattered-site housing

3. Caulk-and-Paint program

4. Provision of fire protection through smoke detectors

5. Code enforcement and weatherization

Capital Improvements Projects

1. Installation of one sewer

2. Several streets and sidewalks to be reconstructed

3. Installation of street lighting

Acquisition and demolition of dilapidated structures with Relocation of residents

Planning and Engineering Studies

Landscaping and Screening of Incompatible Land Uses

- What has been done in Census Tract 2 since the inception
  of CDBG and at what cost?

Tables 1-4 represent all disbursements to Tract 2 since 1975. The
major areas of concern have been:

1. Acquisition, Clearance and Relocation in the Oak-Ash Area

2. Capital Improvements

3. Housing Rehabilitation

- What were city objectives for NSA's, especially, Tract 2?

Long Term Objectives (1979)

1. The elimination of substandard housing and expansion of the
   supply of standard housing.

2. The provision of adequate capital improvements.

3. The encouragement of new private investment.

4. The provision of environmental amenities comparable to those
   of other neighborhoods.

5. The coordination of CDBG with other plans.

6. The elimination of negative influences through demolition of
   dilapidated structures.

Short Term Objectives (1979)

1. To continue housing rehabilitation through loans and grants.

2. To demolish dilapidated structures.

3. To abate incompatible land uses through screening and landscaping.

4. To initiate and continue a street lighting program.

5. To make needed street improvements and vacate unused streets
    and alleys.

    - Were there goals for NEA and UWA individually which addressed
      the needs of each area? And, have they been accomplished?

NEA (1979)

1. Complete clearance of Oak-Ash . . . .   Accomplished

2. Redevelop Oak Ash through Urban Development

    Action Grants (UDAG) and, ...   Not Accomplished

    private funds for housing and

    recreational facilities . . . .   Not Accomplished

3. New Housing through public works and

    improvements (screening of tracks and

    other incompatible areas)

    Replacement of street lights, improvements

    in Oak-Ash . . . .   Accomplished

    Reopening of public housing project . . . .   Accomplished

4. Stimluate the creation of a new neighbor-

    hood commercial center . . . .   Not Accomplished

UWA

1. Increase the viability of bordering

    commercial strip through visual

    improvement, screening . . . .   Not Accomplished

2. Removal of three Commercial Structures . . . . .   Accomplished

3. Replacement of street lights and

    construction of new sidewalks as needed . . . . .   on-going incomplete

- What other funding sources have been used in Tract 2?

    - section 312 Below Market Interest Rate loans to
      owners and renters = $244,747

    - urban renewal revolving and subsidized loans =
      $139,557

    - motor fuel tax, general = $324,927

- How much money has been carried over from one year to the next?

Champaign has a good track record in this respect compared to other
cities. Since the programs inception, unobligated funds have been
carried over for only three years.

$$
\begin{array}{ll}
1976 - & \$\ 44,000 \\
1980 - & 296,552 \\
1980 - & 84,403
\end{array}
$$

These funds are not lost, but may reduce the amount appropriated to
the city for the following year. So far, there is no evidence of
this happening in Champaign.

    - Why are funds left unused?

        - projects may not be initiated or carried through on time

        - administrative delay in processing

          staffing problems

          time lag in bureaucratic approval

    - Considering the amount of money put into the area, why can't
      it be seen?

        - lack of a carefully laid out plan for improvement and
          impact

- much of the money went to land acquisition, clearance
  demolition and capital improvements which aren't as
  visible as such things as additional housing and land-
  scaping.

- What are the future development plans for Tract 2?
  Capital Improvements - 1982-1984
  NEA - street replacement for the Carver Drive Area
        Long range desire to redevelop Oak-Ash. No
        date or specific efforts.
  UWA - street lighting for the area bound by First,
        University, Wright streets and the Conrail tracks.
        No long range goals are indicated.

- How does the workshop evaluate this record?

This section has looked at CDBG allocations over the past eight
years and how that money has been used. Funding, for the most part,
has been spent in improving the infrastructure and clearing dilapidated
housing. Fewer funds went to housing rehabilitation. Confusion exists
on the part of residents as to how CDBG has benefitted their neighbor-
hoods, as related in the key informant and resident surveys, included
later in this report. This confusion can be explained by several
factors.

1. One, the Oak-Ash area, now cleared of deteriorated housing has
    not been redeveloped. This area is not currently serving any
    worthwhile function. Most of the money went to demolition and
    relocation, which does not build or improve residential blocks.
    Concurrently, there is a need in the neighborhood for additional

housing and community services such as grocery stores and drug stores. Oak-Ash redevelopment, in a manner beneficial to NEA residents, would serve to improve their perceptions of CDBG accomplishments.

2. Two, the last comprehensive plans made for the target areas was in 1979, the same year the City applied for a UDAG grant to build low and moderate income homes on the Oak-Ash site. The development objectives stated in that report were seemingly contingent on whether or not the area received the federal funding it sought. When the UDAG grant was denied, the City lacked explicit objectives or alternatives for development. Thus, the past three years of spending has been dedicated to spot clearance, weatherization and capital improvements on an "as needed" basis in a measure to appease everyone. This incremental approach toward development has replaced the goals of 1979, many of which were diverted by the housing recession, rising interest rates and other obstacles.

The lack of new long range city plans for the area can be attributed to changes in the CDBG requirements as of 1981. The focus of the program is now general development rather than targeted development. CDBG no longer requires that funds be spend in low and moderate income areas. In addition, the Section 8, Housing Assistance Program upon which NSA's are based, has been discontinued. As a result, residents can expect that less CDBG funds will be spent in NEA and UWA. Many of the projects or programs which may have been outlined, but not begun, may be eliminated. Thus, the responsibility of solving many current and future neighborhood problems will lie with the neighborhood

groups. This is not meant to imply that CDBG should be discarded as a resource. It does mean, however, that:

1. Monies should be used to get at the problems which still exist. For example, a high percentage of NEA and UWA housing units are rentals, and many are substandard. To date, no CDBG funds have been used to address this issue. This workshop addresses this issue in the next chapter.

2. The neighborhood groups must become more organizationally effective to leverage funds for the community and initiate problem solving techniques.

3. The neighborhood groups must establish a working relationship with CD staff to be involved in the neighborhood planning process initiated by the city.

Champaign CDBG spending is really quite typical of CDBG spending nationwide, and in one sense it is quite prudent. It makes sense to remove property that cannot be rehabilitated first--this is a health, safety and ascetic sore on the community that only depreciates the value of better housing. It also makes sense to modernize the stree infrastructure, before new development. However, the goal of all this clearance and infrastructure modernization is to finally improve the social infrastructure. This means rehabilitating substandard but repairable houses, infilling vacant land with new housing, commercial and recreation areas, and providing jobs and social service programs as needed. It is in this latter phase of CD programs that so many cities, Champaign included, seem to lack the funds, the planning, and the will.

Preliminary Recommendations

Use CDBG to its fullest extent by supplementing the funds with

neighborhood activities.   Venture capital may be obtained through CDBG to develop a neighborhood referral service:

city services - the organization could develop and maintain lists of current contact persons and phone numbers to call for information or complaints.

job clearinghouse/demand - maintain lists of contractors or other service providers who will work in the area.

job clearinghouse/supply - list area residents who have services to offer or are looking for work to match up neighborhood resources.

Other projects may include:

Neighborhood clean-up squads

Year-round babysitting pool referral

Aid to the elderly - outside jobs, cleaning, errands

Neighborhood crime watch

To be effective in attaining goals and marshalling resources the neighborhood group should;

Create a broad-based organization representing all community interests

Establish a working group to speak for the membership

Become incorporated

Increase membership and involvement by;

- soliciting help from churches and youth groups or schools

- door to door canvassing

- becoming involved in small scale, workable projects to keep members interested and involved, ready to go on to more difficult tasks

- initiate fund raisers to establish a revolving neighborhood fund

CDBG funds could be used to leverage other funds if the city were to allocate them for such things as <u>interest subsidies</u>. The subsidy would serve to reduce the effective monthly payment of the borrower, thereby expanding the pool potential borrowers, without reducing the payments to the lender. The borrower and the city, through CDBG funds, would pay a portion of the interest percentage. The loans would be made by the lending institution participating in the program. This type of subsidy could be effectively targeted through the neighborhood group which could screen potential borrowers and serve as liaison between residents and other parties involved.

II.   EVALUATION OF RENTAL

HOUSING OWNERS

The supply and condition of housing in the University-Washington
Area and the Northeast Area of Champaign is a continuing concern of
residents. A report completed in Spring, 1982 indicated that thirty-
one percent of all the housing in Census Tract 2 was in standard con-
dition, thirty-two percent in need of minor rehabilitation, twenty-one
percent in need of average rehabilitation, fourteen percent needing
major rehabilitation, and one percent of the housing in such poor
condition that it should be demolished. Consequently, about two-thirds
of all structures in these areas are in need of some type of rehabili-
tation work.[1]

Community Development Block Grant funds to address these rehabili-
tation needs have been limited to owner occupied housing to date.
However, the city has recently become aware of the large percentage of
substandard rental housing that has been previously ignored. Several
reasons explain the reluctance to address rental housing rehabilitation
needs. One, rental housing programs require working with landlords.
Unlike owner occupants, landlords may not even live in or near the
community and are, therefore, often difficult to contact. Such absentee
landlords may have little interest in improving the community and view
a rehabilitation program as an added expense for them. Thus, they may
be more difficult to work with than owner occupied residents.

Two, most rehabilitation programs will involve a subsidy--either
a grant or loan. This often appears to the community residents as a
"handout" to an absentee landlord. Few cities desire to incur these

negative feelings from the public. As a result rental rehabilitation

programs have been avoided at the cost of much-rental housing remaining

substandard. This section will examine the basic information necessary

to begin designing a rental rehabilitation program. This includes

determining where the rental structures are, who owns the rental

structures, and the condition of rental housing in the area.

Methodology

Data for this section was gathered by reviewing property tax assess-

ment records in the Champaign County Assessor's Office. The Real Estate

Assessment Book[2] provides information on the type of housing status:

owner occupied or renter occupied, number of units within the structure,

and the person or institution responsible for a parcel's property tax.[3]

For the purpose of this research that person or institution is called

the landlord for rental properties. In some instances a person's name

was listed with an institution (a management company or a bank) as the

party responsible for taxes. If an address could be located for these

persons, using a Champaign Area telephone directory, they were considered

the landlord. This was done to insure the most accurate profile of

area landlords.

The information gathered is reviewed below. For quick referral,

the information is divided as follows:

A.   How many owner occupied and rental structures are there in

     UWA and NEA?

B.   Where are the rental structures located? (See map one)

C.   How many units are contained in the rental structures?

D.   What are the categories of landlords by degrees of absenteeism?

     How many rental structures fall into each landlord category?

E.   What other details on area landlords are available from this data?

F.   What is the condition of the rental structures in NEA and UWA?

The implications of these findings are discussed following this summary.

A.   How many owner occupied and rental structures are located in
      UWA and NEA?

In total, four hundred and five housing structures are located in Census Tract 2. This is composed of one-hundred and eight-nine rental structures and two-hundred and sixteen owner occupied structures. These sums can be further broken down by neighborhood.

Two-hundred and thirty-nine structures, or fifty-nine percent of the total structures, are located in UWA. The other one-hundred and sixty-five, or forty-one percent, can be found in NEA. When only rental structures are considered the distribution changes slightly. Sixty-six percent of the rental structures, one-hundred and twenty-four, are in UWA while thirty-four percent - sixty-five rental structures - are in NEA. This information is summarized below.

TABLE ONE

Summary of Housing Location

	total number of structures	percent of total structures	number of rental structures	percent of total rental structures	number of owner occupied structures	percent of owner occupied structures
UWA	239	59%	124	66%	115	53%
NEA	166	41%	65	34%	101	47%
TOTAL	405	100%	189	100%	216	100%

B.   Where are the rental structures located?

As Table One indicates, the percentage of rental structures in each area is similar to each area's percentage of the total structures. This is further indicated on Map one. The rental structures are distributed all throughout the area rather than being concentrated on certain blocks. With a few exceptions, almost every block in Census Tract 2 contains at least one rental structure.

C.   How many units are contained in the rental structures?

As stated previously the Champaign County Real Estate Book delineates structures by the number of units within each structure. The following categories and number of structures within each cate-gories and number of structures within each category were found for UWA and NEA.

TABLE TWO

Rental Unit Composition

Number of Units per Structure	UWA		NEA	
	Number of Structures in each category	Percent of Total Rental Structures	Number of Structures in each category	Percent of Total Rental Structures
1	114	60%	63	33%
2	1	.5%	1	.5%
3-8	8	4%	0	0%
9+	1	.5%	1	.5%

In total, two-hundred and forty-seven rental units are located in Census Tract 2. This is only 1.31 units on average for each landlord. Therefore the typical landlord owns only one structure containing only one unit. Similar to total structure distribution, UWA has sixty-five

percent of all the rental units while NEA contains thirty-four percent.

D. What are the categories of landlords by degree of absenteeism?
    How many rental structures fall into each landlord category?

An "absentee landlord" is defined here as a person or persons
responsible for a dwelling unit who does not live on the premises.
Given this, the "degrees" of absenteeism - the distance of the landlord
from the rental property - can be determined.

Five categories of degrees of absenteeism were used for this
analysis. They include:

Category	Description
0	landlord lives within UWA or NEA.
1	landlord lives within the City of Champaign, but not in NEA or UWA.
2	landlord lives outside of the City of Champaign but within Champaign County.
3	landlord lives outside of Champaign County but within the State of Illinois.
4	landlord lives outside of Illinois
M	managed by a management company or a bank.

The number and percentage of landlords within each category was
determined and is shown in Table Three.

TABLE THREE

Landlord Composition

			Degrees of Absenteeism					
a.	numbers of students	Total	0	1	2	3	4	M
	Area							
	UWA	124	38	52	19	6	2	7
	NEA	65	18	29	9	1	1	7
	Total	189	56	81	28	7	3	14
b.	percent in each category							
	Area							
	UWA	.7%	.2%	.3%	.1%	.3%	.1%	.4%
	NEA	.3%	.9%	.2%	.5%	.5%	.5%	.4%
	Total	100%	29%	43%	15%	3.5%	1.5%	.8%

As shown, twenty-nine percent of all the landlords live in the
neighborhood, while another forty-three percent live in Champaign, but
outside of Census Tract 2. Therefore, seventy-two percent of all the
landlords reside in an area accessible to legal and/or social pressure
by the city staff or neighborhood organization. This is an important
factor for success in a rental rehabilitation program. Furthermore,
another fifteen percent reside in Champaign County, but outside the
City of Champaign - also reasonably accessible. Only fourteen landlords
are listed as management companies - a small percent of the total
number of landlords. An even smaller percentage of the total, five
percent, are in categories three and four. These categories constitute
the most inaccessible landlords - those who live outside the county and/or

state. It seems, then, that the problems related to working with absentee landlords would not be very prevalent in a rental rehabilitation program designed for Census Tract 2. Even if cooperation was not forthcoming from all of the landlords in categories 3, 4 and M (less than 13%), a rental rehabilitation program would have a substantial impact on the quality of life in census tract 2.

E. What other details on area landlords are available from this data?

Information relating to landlord location can indicate landlord involvement and interest in NEA and UWA. Twenty-one landlords of UWA and NEA properties were determined to be owners of more than one rental structure. These twenty-one persons[4], eleven percent of all the landlords, own eighty-seven rental units - about thirty-five percent of the total number of rental units in both neighborhoods.

Another detail on the landlords in these neighborhoods is the number of landlords who live on the same block as their rental property. Nineteen landlords, ten percent of the total, fall in this category. These landlords and those landlords owning multiple rental properties may have the most at stake in a rental rehabilitation program. Because these persons do have a larger financial or social investment in the area, it is important to contact them early in the program design stage. Their total cooperation is vital as their response to the program could provide an accurate assessment of general landlord cooperation.

F. What is the condition of the rental structures in NEA and UWA? How does this information compare to landlord absenteeism?

Housing condition was determined using the information gathered in Spring, 1982.[5] Those findings show about thirty-one percent of all housing structures are in standard condition. When looking at rental structures the percentage of standard structures decreases to twenty-two percent. This indicates a gap in the upkeep between owner occupied structures and rental structures. The condition of rental structures in NEA and UWA is further broken down in Table Four below. This information is crosstabulated with landlord degrees of absenteeism for each neighborhood and the total area.

TABLE FOUR

Housing Condition by Type of Landlord

a. NEA

| | Degrees of Absenteeism | | | | | | |
housing condition	0	1	2	3	4	M	Total
standard	3	1	1	0	1	2	8
minor rehab	7	5	1	0	0	2	15
average rehab	4	10	1	1	0	0	16
major rehab	4	5	6	0	0	3	18
demolish	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Public Housing	0	8	0	0	0	0	8

TABLE FOUR (continued)

b. UWA

Degrees of Absenteeism

housing condition	0	1	2	3	4	M	Total
standard	12	13	5	2	1	2	35
minor rehab	11	15	6	1	0	4	37
average rehab	9	15	6	2	1	1	34
major rehab	6	7	2	1	0	0	16
demolish	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Public Housing	0	1	0	0	0	0	1

c. Total

Degrees of Absenteeism

housing condition	0	1	2	3	4	M	Total
standard	(15) 8%	(14) 7%	(6) 3%	(2) 1%	(2) 1%	(4) 2%	(43) 22%
minor rehab	(18) 10%	(20) 11%	(7) 4%	(1) 5%	(0) 0%	(6) 3%	(52) 28%
average rehab	(13) 17%	(25) 13%	(7) 4%	(3) 2%	(1) 5%	(1) 5%	(50) 27%
major rehab	(10) 5%	(12) 6%	(8) 4%	(1) 5%	(0) 0%	(3) 2%	(34) 17%
demolish	(0) 0%	(1) 5%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(1) 5%
Public Housing	(0) 0%	(0) 5%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(0) 0%	(9) 5%

d. Total number and percent of substandard but rehabilitatable structures

Degrees of Absenteeism

housing condition	0	1	2	3	4	M	Total
minor rehab	(18) 34.6%	(20) 38.5%	(7) 13.5%	(1) 1.9%	0	(6)11.5%	(52)100.0
average rehab	(13) 26.0	(25) 50.0	(7) 14.0	(3) 6.0	(1)2.0	(1)2.0	(50)100.0
major rehab	(10) 29.4	(12) 35.3	(8) 23.5	(1) 2.9	0	(3)8.8	(34)100.0
total	136=100%	41=30%	57-42%	22-16%	5-4%	1-1%	10-7%

The rental structures in the average and major rehabilitation categories which are owned by landlords in categories zero and one would probably be the first to be targeted with rental rehabilitation funds. As shown in Table 4.d these owners should be easy to contact and would have the most difficult time avoiding legal and social pressures to comply with a concentrated code enforcement and rehab program. This group would therefore be the best candidates with which to initiate the program. Also, these categories of housing should be addressed first, if the most substandard units are the first consideration in the program. Since landlords in these categories account for almost 64% of the total units requiring average or major rehab the impact of upgrading. If the program is to begin on a smaller scale the minor rehabilitation category might be addressed first. These units should be substantial and the momentum of the program well established before the city would have to pursue the less accessable absentee owners of units requiring average or major rehab. Twenty-eight percent of landlords with substandard structures fall into the minor rehab category, over 73% of them reside in the North End or elsewhere in Champaign. The emphasis of the program will depend on the funds available, and the ability of the landlords to absorb some of the rehab cost.

Findings and Implications

In general the information on rental housing and landlords can be summarized as follows:

- Census Tract 2 has approximately as many rental structures as owner occupied structures.

- About three-fifths of all the housing structures are in

  UWA. This proportion is similar for rental housing.

- Seventy-two percent of the landlords live in Census

  Tract 2 or the city of Champaign.

- About one-fifth of the rental structures are standard.

  Another five percent are public housing. The rest of

  the rental structures are in need of some level of

  rehabilitation.

Knowing this basic information, some recommendations can be made
as to the type of rehabilitation program which is needed. Because
about forty percent of the rental structures are in need of average
or major rehabilitation, a subsidy type program (loan or grant) would
probably be most effective. A concentrated code enforcement program
would have to be employed simultaneously to insure that the funds are
applied to vital rehabilitation work and all units are brought up to
or above code.

A low interest loan program is recommended as the central subsidy
program for several reasons. First, it will not deplete the program
resources as a grant program would. Second, it would be the program
most likely to gain community-wide approval and support for the use of
CDBG funds; a grant program would appear to much as a "handout" to
landlords who in the past have profited from renting out substandard
units. A "high priority" grant pool might be created for select units
deemed critical to the success of the program and for landlords deemed
too poor to rehabilitate their units even with a low interest loan.

The neighborhood organization could have a vital role in this
program, helping to set priorities for which units and blocks to

rehabilitate first, and using their influence to bring social pressure to bare on landlords unwilling to cooperate with various phases of the program. There may be the need to get written guarantees from landlords to insure that rents would be set or remain at a reasonable level, affordable to current low and moderate income tenants after they have been rehabilitated. A fair market rent check may have to be made periodically over the life of the loan or grant. This is one area where the neighborhood organization might be able to provide a service. With some help from CDBG fund the neighborhood groups could even set up a permanent tenant landlord grievance board and monitoring program to assure rents are fair, housing remains at or above code, and tenants comply with lease agreements.

In summary, the initial landlords approached should be those who own structures in need of average or major rehab and who live in or near the neighborhood. By doing so, the greatest need would be addressed at the lowest administrative cost by involving those land-lords who are easiest to reach and most likely to be cooperative. Building on their cooperation and the skills learned in administering this phase of the program, the city staff should be better equipped to tackle more distant absentee landlords.

A program of this nature would have to be administered and organized by the City of Champaign, but the neighborhood groups presently in Census Tract 2 can play a big part in the program. At the very least, these groups have the knowledge to advise the city on how to concentrate the program where it is most needed and would be most effective, and can appeal to or lobby for those landlords who are their neighbors and have difficulty complying with the rehab program.

Our analysis concludes that there are eight blocks that should
be targeted for initial and concentrated rental rehabilitation because
the number of substandard units on these blocks are proportionally much
higher than anywhere else in the North End: These blocks are listed in
the Table 5, and on Maps 1 and 2 showing rental structures by housing
condition for the University-Washington and Northeast Areas
respectively.

TABLE FIVE

Blocks Recommended for Initial and
Concentrated Rental Rehabilitation

UWA

Church	Minor	Average	Major
200	3	4	
300	1	2	2
500	2	2	
Washington			
400	1	1	1
Oak			
500	4	4	

NEA	Minor	Average	Major
Tremont			
400		1	1
Eureka			
500		2	1
Sixth			
1100	1	2	1

References

1. Department of Urban and Regional Planning, UP 337, Community Planning Workshop, Land Use, Housing and Capital Improvements in the Northend, (Urbana: University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Spring 1982), p. 8.

2. Champaign County Assessor's Office, Real Estate Assessment Book (Urbana: Office of the Assessor, 1977).

3. The names and addresses of landlords of rental properties in Census Tract 2 are located in Appendix.

4. The names of these subgroups of landlords are listed in Appendix.

5. Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Spring, 1982, p. 8.

III.   AN ANALYSIS OF PHYSICAL NEEDS IN CENSUS TRACT 2

The purpose of this section of the report is to illustrate to the
neighborhood organization how they can proceed in determining the
physical needs of their area, prioritize these needs on a block-by-
block or subarea basis, and finally, address ways of ameliorating these
needs. Physical data and conclusions resulting from this section of
the report, are intended to complement and reinforce other approaches
within the overall study. A description of the methods, limitations,
findings and recommendations resulting from this physical analysis
follows.

Methods of Data Collection

A visual survey of each block in the study area was conducted.
Observations were recorded on a "working table" which cross-lists block
numbers with physical characteristics or what we will call "variables."
Eleven evaluative criteria and six strictly descriptive criteria were
assessed on each block. A description of each of the seventeen
variables used, can be found in the section of this analysis entitled:
Explanation of Variables.

The visual survey which we conducted, assessed the exterior of
structures and their immediate environment. The focus was, therefore,
on the 384 single-family structures in the area, rather than on
individual dwelling units. The unit used for data collection was the
"face-block." This type of block includes houses on both sides of a
street which face that street and bounded on each end by cross-streets.
Since all blocks were not of the same size and shape, two categories
(blocks with only one-to-four structures and blocks with greater than

four structures) were rated separately.

Data gathered by a previous workshop[1] was updated and built upon. Owner-renter composition data was derived from the previous section of this current report, and is described in that section. In addition, previous studies of the Oak-Ash area, including a market analysis[2] and a social impact assessment[3], provided further background information. After all data was assembled, totals and indices were computed, the results prioritized, and finally analyzed.

Explanation of Variables

Seventeen variables were studied. Six were "descriptive" variables and eleven were "scored" variables. A "descriptive" variable helps to characterize the block but no meaningful or objective score can be assigned. A "scored" variable is one that can be objectively scored and scores totalled so that the overall physical condition of blocks can be compared. We summed the 11 independent scored variables and came out with an "overall need" score; the larger the value, the more need for community development assistance exists on that block. These values can be found in Table 1 (because of its length Table 1 at the end of this team report). The numbers which accompany each variable type in the text that follows correspond to column numbers in Table 1.

1. Land Uses

This is a descriptive variable showing what type of land uses exist in the area: residential (R), industrial (I), commercial (C), or any combination of these.

2,3,4.   Owner-Renter Composition

This variable includes individual block statistics for the percent of rental units, the number of rental units and the number of owner-occupied units.

5.   Renter Index

This index weights blocks according to the number of renters: 0 points to blocks with less than 50% renters, 1 point to blocks with 50% to 90% renters, and 2 points to blocks with greater than 90% renters.

6.   Absentee Landlords

This is a descriptive variable. It indicates the number of absentee landlord per block.

7.   Absentee Landlord Index

This index weights blocks according to where the landlords reside: 0 points were given to blocks where greater than 50% of the landlords live within the neighborhood or city of Champaign; 1 point was given to blocks where greater than 50% of the landlords reside outside the city but within Champaign County; 2 points were given to blocks where greater than 50% of the landlords reside outside Champaign county.

8.   Vacant Lots, Condemned Structure

The number of vacant lots and condemned structures was determined for each block. Zero points were given to blocks with 0 to 1 vacant lot or condemned structure; two points were given to blocks with four or more vacant lots or condemned structures.

9.   New Construction, Public Housing

This is a descriptive variable which lists the number of

scattered public housing sites and number of new construction
projects.

10. Housing Rehabilitation Need

This value indicates the percent of houses on each block that
needs rehabilitation. These housing-rehabilitation need values
were first obtained from Professor Earl Jones' Urban Planning 337
Workshop at the University of Illinois. Through visual surveys of
each block, we updated and substantiated the results of Professor
Jones' project. We weighted this variable according to the percentage
of structures on each block needing rehabilitation: 0 points were
given to blocks with fewer than 30% of the structures needing
rehabilitation; 1 point to blocks with 30% to 60% of the structures
needing rehabilitation; 2 points to blocks with greater than 60%
of the structures needing rehabilitation.

11. Land Use Conflicts

This is a scored variable which looks at the degree of harmony
among the land uses on each block: 1 point was given to blocks
which had two or more different land uses.

12,13,14. Capital Improvements: Streets, Curbs and Gutters, Sidewalks

Each of these three variables were measured separately as
standard or substandard. The structural soundness and the level of
physical deterioration were the criteria used in determining whether
each variable was standard or substandard. If less than 50% of a
block was substandard in either of the criteria, the block received
0 points. However, if more than 50% of a block was substandard in
either of the criteria, the block received one point.

Street lighting was not used as a capital improvement variable

because most blocks in both neighborhoods have adequate lighting

except where the on-going city street lighting program is still in

progress (mainly in the University-Washington Area).

15. Open Space, Recreational Facilities

Zero points were given to blocks within walking distance

(5 blocks) to a large community park (Douglas Park). One point was

given to blocks where major barriers (busy streets, railroad tracts)

and/or large distances (more than 5 blocks) were required to reach

the park.

16. Traffic

This index correlates with the surrounding land uses. For

example, if a road led to a commercial area, it would have heavy

traffic. On the other hand, if a road is essentially used for

residential purposes, the traffic would be light. Naturally, heavy

traffic is perceived as a negative externality to the community

and a hazard to children. Therefore, streets with a high degree of

traffic were given one point.

17. Landscape, Litter, Maintenance

This is a scored variable which ranked the general environment

of each block. Zero (0) points were given to blocks that were ade-

quately maintained and had ample landscaping; one point was given to

blocks that had over-growth of vegetation, lacked general landscaping,

or had undesirable amounts of litter and junk.

Limitations of the Data

Due to limited time, client feedback and resources, this study

contains a number of compromises and should only be seen as illustrative

of a method for prioritizing physical need.

1.   The visual survey excludes an examination of each structure's
     interior physical characteristics.

2.   The survey looked at only seventeen of many potential variables.
     Future studies might also examine a block's drainage facilities,
     flooding, aesthetic quality, potential hazards, administrative
     and natural boundaries, the design and layout of streets and
     lots, and perhaps the extent and content of the resident's own
     destructive and creative attempts at changing the environment
     through activities like vandalism, graffitti, murals, and posted
     flyers.

3.   Attempts were made to make judgements of standard/substandard
     characteristics as objectively as possible. However, a certain
     degree of subjectivity is inescapable with this type of analysis.
     The real value of this analysis lies not in establishing rigid
     priorities for the community to follow, but rather in suggestions
     of potential methods and directions which the community might
     pursue in the future. Subjectivity in such an analysis is the
     right of a democratic neighborhood organization--not of a
     consulting group such as this class. The neighborhoods can
     profit most by conducting their own studies or dictating to
     consultants such as this class what variables and standards
     they wish analyzed.

4.   While we were gathering information for each block, we encountered
     a problem with odd-shaped and very-low density blocks. We attempt-
     ed to deal with these differences by using higher and lower
     density categories for blocks. Forty-six blocks (61%) fell into
     the "1-4 house" group, while twenty-nine (39%) fell into the
     "more than 4" group. Future approaches might address this
     problem by clustering small blocks into larger "study blocks,"
     or by re-drawing boundaries to create more homogeneous zones
     of physical need. The resulting units of analysis might better
     reflect "real" need, and therefore, lead to a more accurate
     set of priorities.

5.   Once variables are chosen, the major source of subjectivity
     comes from attaching different degrees of importance or weighting
     to different variables. In this study, housing rehabilitation,
     proportion of rental units, and degree of absentee landlordism
     were weighted more heavily than the other scored variables. Of
     the eleven scored variables we looked at, these three were deemed
     more significant because the affect of have the potential to
     affect the housing quality.

     Clearly, the neighborhood groups might want to use very different

weights, and the ultimate responsibility for choosing and weighting

variables that would be used in setting neighborhood planning priorities

lie with the neighborhood organization as <u>advised by</u> a planning

consultant, whether that consultant is a university planning class, a

professional planning office (possible hired with CDBG funds), or the

city's planning staff assigned to assist the neighborhood. Neither

the University-Washington or North East Neighborhood Organization was

organized enough to act in this capacity so this class went ahead and

made these value choice decisions based on the time and resource

limitations facing the class. It is not our objective that the neighbor-

hood organization adopt our final set of priorities out right. We

would rather they studied the findings and how the priorities were

ascertained and organize themselves to the point where they could

oversee a similar analysis done by some future planning consultant.

Hopefully, this report can be a first step in that direction. It

serves as <u>an illustration of the technical function a planning class</u>

<u>might provide</u> within a neighborhood organization's planning process.

Any analysis of physical need, should be seen in the light of

residents' perceptions of their overall needs. Studies of shopping

facilities or job creation activities may hold a higher priority in

the community. In itself, this physical needs analysis is simply a

planning tool, providing some of the information required by a

comprehensive assessment of all types of needs.

General Observations

1. More CDBG funds have been employed in the North East area than
   in the University-Washington area. Capital improvements, for
   example, are newer and more complete in the North East area
   while such improvements are only beginning to appear in the
   University-Washington area.

2. A great deal of CDBG resources have gone to removing the worst
   housing. Relatively little has gone to upgrading, maintaining,
   or replacing the housing infrastructure. The Oak-Ash relocation
   and clearance project is the most obvious example.

3. Both neighborhoods are now very low-density areas relative to other areas of Champaign/Urbana. There is an abundance of vacant property, much of it the result of demolition and clearance with no follow-up program to fill in the housing infrastructure. There are only 5 structures per block, on average, in the study area.

4. Except for those blocks near Douglas or Wesley Parks, there is a shortage of recreational facilities and parks in the study area. The need for such space and facilities is most severe in the University-Washington area.

5. Large tracts of land belonging to or adjacent to the railroad lines are vacant and poorly maintained.

6. Several residences are adversely affected by their close proximity to commercial, institutional, railroad lines, the Boneyard Creek and other non-compatable residential land uses. Parking lots, traffic, flooding and other side effects of these uses harm the residential character of the immediate neighborhood.

7. A survey of the area also points out what is missing from the area. The lack of supermarkets, restaurants, and other local services.

Priority Blocks

The total score, or sum of individual physical needs, for each block was computed. The maximum number of points possible on the most substandard block using the model described on the previous pages is 11. Blocks within the University-Washington area ranged from 0 to 11 and scores in the North East area ranged from 0 to 8. Block scores were ranked from greatest need--high priority to least need--low priority. Table 1 shows the overall evaluation form for all blocks; Table 2 and 3 show the total scores for each neighborhood and for the two categories of blocks, those with fewer than 4 houses and those with 4 or more.

In the University-Washington Area, 4 blocks were found to have the greatest overall need: 100 and 400 Washington, 500 Oak and 300 Fourth. Their respective scores were 11, 8, 11, 8. All 4 blocks are located near the railroad lines. Each block suffers from a multitude of

physical problems. Those blocks found to have the least number of physical problems include 500 South Columbia, 400 Third, 800 Wright and 400 Park. Their respective scores were 1, 1, 1, 2.

In the North East Area, 3 blocks were considered to have the greatest overall need: 500 Bradley, 800 Fourth and 400 Tremont. Their respective scores were 5, 5, 8. Similar to the blocks in the University-Washington area, these blocks are also located near the railroad lines and also the Oak-Ash area. The blocks with the fewest number of problems were 400 Beardsley, 400 Eureka and 800, 1000, 1100 Fifth. Their respective scores were 2, 2, 0, 2, 2. Most of these blocks are located in the north-central portion of the neighborhood. These blocks are close to Douglas Park, boast new capital improvements, and for the most part, contain well-maintained housing.

Suggestions for Improvement

The "prioritization of physical needs on a block-by-block basis," in conjunction with other indicators of need, might lead to a guideline for future improvements. It suggests specific blocks which might be the focus of initial investment of resources. We feel a high priority effort should be made to put the large amount of vacant, under-maintained land to some use. Vacant lots, railroad property and other under-used land should be used to alleviate the need for parks and recreational facilities in some areas. Other vacant property needs to be put to housing use either scattered site public housing or, if and when it becomes eligible under CDBG, new city subsidized private construction of low and moderate income housing. In the meantime, the neighborhood organization might find other uses for these sites within a city program to lease them from current owners

such as fresh fruit and vegetable gardens. At the very least a program of better clean-up, and maintenance is needed.

Another high priority activity should be the demolition of condemned structures and the adaptive use of vacant structures. Codes dealing with excessively overgrown vegetation and other maintenance problems need to be more strictly enforced.

References

1. Department of Urban and Regional Planning, UP 337, Community
    Planning Workshop: Land Use, Housing and Capital Improvements
    in the North End, (Urbana: University of Illinois, Spring 1982).

2. Urban Programming Corporation of America, Land Utilization
    and Market Ability analysis of Oak-Ash Neighborhood, (St.
    Louis, Missouri: April 1980).

3. Colleen Connelly, Social Impact Assessment of Visual Quality:
    Oak-Ash Neighborhood, UP 387-S (Urbana: University of Illinois,
    May 11, 1982).

IV.   EVALUATION OF NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS:

UNIVERSITY-WASHINGTON AREA AND

NORTHEAST AREA

It is the purpose of this section to portray some of the basic
planning needs and desires of the University-Washington and the Northeast
areas as perceived by the residents. As part of this task, this section
will also identify how well the neighborhood organizations represent
and serve the needs of their areas by comparing the accomplishments,
plans and goals of the neighborhood organizations with the views of the
residents, key figures and group representatives.

Resident Surveys: University-Washington Area and Northeast Area

Methodology

In order to gather a representative viewpoint without inter-
viewing everyone, a random sample survey of the residents of both
the University-Washington and Northeast areas was conducted. A
25 percent sample of residents for both areas was determined and
the corresponding number of blocks needed to yield this percentage
was identified. The blocks in the areas were numbered, then the
sample of blocks was chosen from the total. Door-to-door inter-
views were conducted of residents of these randomly selected
blocks. A total of 22 blocks and 183 respondents were surveyed. We
attempted to interview one adult (persons 18 years or older) from
each household.

The survey used to interview the residents can be found in
Appendix   . The primary purpose of the resident survey was to
assist the teams in determining what UWA and NEA residents thought
were the more significant problems in their area, how they felt

about the area, the degree of their awareness and participation in the respective neighborhood organizations, and the general characteristics of the sample population.

In order to determine specific needs, residents were first asked to name three things that needed to be done to make both the neighborhood and the block better places to live. Not only were needs defined, but the were given in priority order and were specified as to the geographic area in which they existed.

The third and fourth questions asked the resident to rate both their block and overall neighborhood as a place to live, given five possible answers ranging from "Excellent-wouldn't want to live anywhere else" to "Very bad". Responses to this question would assist us in determining the effect that the previously stated area problems had on an individual's overall outlook on his or her environment.

The residents were then asked to specifically define the four boundaries which make up the perimeter of their perceived neighborhood. With this information the analysts hoped to gain a better understanding of where specific problems lie in the mind of the residents, and why some problems were not included in the broader question of neighborhood need. It was also anticipated that this answer could help us determine how active the respondent is, and thus how knowledgeable he or she is of the immediate area.

Question six was asked to determine the neighborhood organization's effectiveness in publicizing their existence. The final section of the survey was concerned with finding out certain characteristics of the sampled population. Such traits included owner/ renter status, length of residence, age, sex, and race of the

respondent. The resients were also asked if they were the head of the household and, if not, what their relation to the head was.

Upon the completion of the resient surveys, crosstabulations of the findings were conducted. Crosstabulating is a statistical measure of interrelationships between variables. In this case, the variables used were the questions and information gathered from the survey itself. These variables included the respective neighborhoods, the perceived needs of the neighborhoods and blocks, and the residents' owner/renter status, age, and length of residence. These tables include both actual responses totals and column percentages.

All crosstabulations used are in Appendix   .

Limitations

While sample sizes for each neighborhood were adequate in statistical terms for overall comparisons, the great number of variable disaggregations attempted mean taht the numbers in subcategories get very small and can distort reliable analysis. In order to alleviate this problem, a larger sample size could have been surveyed for each of the two populations, or the number of variables could have been reduced and generalized. In either case, sacrifices would have been made; either time requrements of compilation of survey responses would have increased, or accuracy in determining specific needs would have been forfeited. In any case, it should be remembered that these figures were drawn solely from the sampled population, and do not necessarily reflect the opinions of the entire population of the neighborhoods.

Expected Results

We felt that the most important control variables to be cross-analyzed with all other variables for determining neighborhood needs and group efforts would be the two neighborhoods themselves, and owner/renter status of the resident. Prior to the analysis, several expectations of the data outcome were anticipated, specifically in these areas. Based on the findings from the key informant interviews we hypothesised that we would find significant differences between respondents in the two neighborhoods, by length of residence, and between owners and renters. The following text list the anticipated differences.

Neighborhood Crosstabs

1). The Northeast area would have relatively more respondents who want area clean-up/beautification because of recent problems with trash in vacant lots, especially Oak-Ash.

2). The Northeast area would see greater need to curb crime in the area due to the presence of housing projects, like Bradley Park and Mount Olive Manor.

3). The Northeast area would indicate greater need for jobs and commercial infill due to both recent publicity of Oak-Ash as a potential area of commercial activity, and the high unemployment in the projects.

4). The Northeast area respondents would indicate more housing problems.

5). The University-Washington area respondents would express more need for social/leadership variables due to their comparatively weaker neighborhood organization.

6). The University-Washington area respondents would express greater need for improvements of streets and street-related variables, due to the fact that C.D.B.G. capital improvements have been concentrated in the Northeast Area for the past 8 years.

Length of Residence

1). Long-term residence would show a greater response rate overall than newer members to the neighborhoods.

2). Long-term residents would be more likely to have heard of the neighborhood groups.

3). Long-term residents would be more likely to be positive about the neighborhood and stress beautification, over more fundamental housing needs.

4). Long-term residents would be more concerned about Oak-Ash simply because they are more knowledgeable of the changes it has had on the community.

Owner/Renter Status

1). Owners would be more concerned about housing and beautification variables than would renters.

2). Renters would be more concerned about unemployment issues than owners.

3). Owners and renters would be equally concerned about crime.

4). Owners would be more concerned about the physical infrastructure and capital improvements due to the positive effects of such improvements on property values.

5). Owners would be more concerned about Oak-Ash than renters in that the owners have probably been in the area longer and witnessed the effect of the demolition and relocation on the social infrastructure changes in the area.

The following section is the analysis of the resident survey. As the reader will see, most of the differences between the Northeast area and the University-Washington area we expected were found to exist in the analysis. Overall, the most startling findings are the great similarities in perceived needs in the North End between neighborhood strategy groups, short- and long-term residents, and owners vs. renters. Another major overall finding is that the typical resident knows little or nothing about the presence of the neighborhood groups.

General Characteristics

A total of 166 door-to-door interviews were completed--67 from

the University-Washington are, 83 from the Northeast area, with 17
total refusals. Of those surveyed, there was a higher proportion
of renters in the Northeast area, 45.2 percent, than in the University-
Washington area, 39.4 percent. In both areas, more than 52 percent
of the residents surveyed had lived in the areas for a period of
eleven or more years. However, University-Washington had twice
the number of newer residents (0-2 years length of residency) with
22.7 percent, as compared with the Northeast area with 11.0 percent.
When asked how they would "rate" their neighborhoods, a high propor-
tion of residents were satisfied with their neighborhood. Eighty-
three percent of the surveyed residents were satisfied with the
Northeast area as a place to live, and 82.7 percent of the University-
Washington residents with their area. Those satisfied with their
neighborhood as a place to live rated it either excellent, very
good, or O.K..

In each area, a majority of the residents were unaware that
a neighborhood group existed--for the Northeast area, 71 percent
of the surveyed residents did not know that a neighborhood organi-
zation existed and 62 percent of the University-Washington resi-
dents were unaware that an organization existed in their neighbor-
hood. Very little recognition of the organization's existence by
the residents would indicate that these organizations have not
played an instrumental role within the areas--they have not
employed the resources or effectively addressed the problems of
the neighborhoods; they have not sought high visability for their
organization, its activites or projects, nor have they actively
recruited new members.

Survey Results

Differences Between Neighborhoods on Responses to "What
Can Be Done To Improve Your Neighborhood, Block?"

These first questions were indended to provide the neighbor-

hood groups with information regarding what residents perceive to

be the most pressing needs in the area. The responses were divided

into categories of general concern (such as Housing, Streets, Crime,

Clean-up, etc.), as shown in Table I.

Table I

NEA		UWA	
Category	Responses	Category	Responses
Housing	42 (12.8%)	Housing	57 (20.8%)
Streets	73 (22.2%)	Streets	83 (30.3%)
Crime	38 (11.5%)	Crime	31 (11.3%)
Clean-up	67 (20.4%)	Clean-up	56 (20.4%)
Flooding	2 (0.6%)	Flooding	26 (9.5%)
Jobs/Retail	51 (15.5%)	Jobs/Retail	0 (0.0%)
Social		Social	
Leadership	4 (1.2%)	Leadership	0 (0.0%)
Other	52 (15.8%)	Other	21 (7.7%)

There was a great similarity in the responses dealing with crime,

social leadership, and clean-up. However, residents from University-

Washington Neighborhood Strategy Area (N.S.A.) were much more likely

to mention housing and street improvements as major concerns than

those from the Northeast N.S.A. These two responses accounted for

51.1%) of the total responses in University-Washington N.S.A. and

only 35% in the responses from residents in the Northeast N.S.A.

This may reflect the completion of a substantial public works

improvement program which was sponsered by the city through Community

Block Grant funding in the Northeast N.S.A., and which has only

recently been expanded to include other areas in the North End and

elsewhere in Champaign. The presence of the Oak-Ash redevelopment

site and extensive stop clearance in the Northeast N.S.A. caused

many more responses pertaining to vacant lots to come from residents

in the Northeast N.S.A. Responses pertaining to this issue accounted

for 15.5%) of the total for the Northeast N.S.A., while there were

none in University-Washington N.S.A. This reflects the higher

visibility of Oak-Ash and other vacant lots to the residents of the

Northeast N.S.A. as a symbol of the community's problems. These

differences will be examined in more detail in the following section.

The first questions asked of respondents were "What can be

done to improve the neighborhood?" and "What can be done to improve

your particular block?". These questions were intended to reveal

issues of major concern to the residents which are present at the

neighborhood and block levels. As could be expected, when problems

were associated with the entire North End, they were mentioned almost

equally by residents of the two neighborhood strategy areas. One

notable exception was the Oak-Ash redevelopment issue, which was

mentioned only in the Northeast area (see Table II).

Table II

Issue	NEA	UWA
Rehabilitate or Replace Occupied Substandard Housing	4.5%	95.5%
Better Street Lighting	30.8%	69.2%
Pave Fifth Street	100.0%	0.0%
City Clean-up Effort	78.3%	21.7%
Unemployment	94.5%	5.5%
More Retail Stores	100.0%	0.0%
Develop Oak-Ash	100.0%	0.0%

The issues mentioned at the block level revealed more clear differences betweeen the needs in each area; however, the reponses for the two N.S.A.'s were generally very similar. This may indicate that the residents of the two N.S.A.'s agree on basic needs which are felt throughout the entire North End of Champaign. A need for better sidewalks is an example of an issue which affects all of the residents in the North End regardless of which N.S.A. they live in. In our sample, 53.7% of the responses which mention better sidewalks as an important problem came from residents of University-Washington N.S.A., with the remaining 46.3% of these responses coming from residents in the Northeast N.S.A. (see Table II). However, there are several issues which were mentioned much more frequently in one N.S.A. than in the other. These issues represent needs which are felt more drastically in one N.S.A. than in the other. They are problems which are concentrated in one area, and therefore must be considered to be of higher priority to that neighborhood.

All of the references to unemployment as a major concern came from residents in the Northeast N.S.A. (see Table II). The existence of Bradley Park and Mount Olive Manor, two low-income subsidized federal housing projects, plus local public housing in the Northeast N.S.A. and the frequent loitering of unemployed people in the Oak-Ash lot and on 4th street could be responsible for the higher recognition of unemployment as a major problem by residents of the Northeast N.S.A. The residents of University-Washington N.S.A. may be concerned about unemployment generally (as are most people), but they are not reminded of it constantly like the residents of the Northeast N.S.A. who pass by Oak-Ash, Bradley Park, and Mount Olive

Manor.

All of the references to a lack of adequate retail shopping facilities in the North End also came from residents of the Northeast N.S.A. (see Table II). This was expected to occur because the residents of the University-Washington N.S.A. are much closer to the retail stores on University Avenue than are residents of the Northeast N.S.A. In addition, the limmited shopping facilities provided by the one-block commercial strip on Fourth Street, which is most accessible to residents of the Northeast N.S.A., are not adequate enough to provide for the needs of the consumers in the area. The consumer needs of the residents of the Northeast N.S.A. should be accomodated by stores which offer a larger variety of merchandise within the immediate neighborhood. The residents should not be forced to go out of their neighborhood for essential items. The stores which currently exist on Fourth Street are physically deteriorating; perhaps they should be replaced or modified to meet a wider range of consumer needs.

Seventy-eight percent of the references to the lack of "city clean-up" activities came from residents in the Northeast N.S.A. (see Table II). This was expected in part because of the poorly cleared and landscaped appearance of the Oak-Ash vacant tract and other cleared lots.

All of the references to "pave Fifth Street" as a major concern came from residents in the Northeast N.S.A. (see Table II). This was predicatble because the stretch of Fifth Street which requires re-paving is almost entirely within the boundaries of the Northeast N.S.A. For some reason this stretch of road was excluded from the street, street light, and sidewalk improvement program that the city

sponsored under the Community Development Block Grant program in the North End. Substantial street re-paving is currently being undertaken in the University-Washington N.S.A. usine C.D.B.C. funding. In the past many street lights were installed and other improvements and other improvements have been made in the Northeast N.S.A.

As previously mentioned, all of the references to the "redevelopment of Oak-Ash" as a major concern came from residents in the Northeast N.S.A. (see Table II). Oak-Ash is a constant remineder that the city is capable of clearance, but new construction is far more difficult. Considering the financial "crunch" currently bein experienced by the city, the Oak-Ash issue may not be dealt with in the near future. The neighborhood group must be patient with the city until funds are found to finance the redevelopment. This provides the neighborhood group time to expand their membership and consider any resident proposals for redevelopment so that they will be able to better represent the opinions of residents when the city eventually reconsiders the issue. One proposal has been to relocate existing stores and attract new retail stores to the Oak-Ash site. This would serve to meet consumer needs within the neighborhood and create jobs. However, the city recently conducted a market and feasibility study of the proposal which concluded that the move would cost $750,000, all of which would have to be raised privately.

Nearly seventy percent of the references to "better street lights" as a major concern came from residents in the University-Washington N.S.A. This was expected because of the large number of street lights installed in the North End to date under the city's Community Development Block Grant program; most have been in the

Northeast N.S.A. Since redevelopment funds are currently being spent in the University-Washington N.S.A. for this purpose, it is assumed that this perceived need will soon be ameliorated.

Almost ninety-five percent of the references to "rehabilitation or replacement of occupied substandard housing" as a major concern came from residents in the University-Washington N.S.A. This was expected because of the concentration of deteriorating housing near the railroad tracks along the northern boundary of the N.S.A. Much of the deteriorating housing in the Northeast N.S.A. has already been demolished, and the resulting vacant lots are often of greater concern.

Comparison of N.S.A.'s on "What Can Be Done By The Neighborhood Group To Improve The Neighborhood?"

This question was intended to give the neighborhood groups an impression of what the residents believe the groups should be doing to remedy some of the problems mentioned in the previous section. The reader should be advised that many of the respondents to this question had never heard of either group. As can be seen in Table III, the responses in general were very sparse, and very similar in each N.S.A., with one exception. There is a much higher percentage of responses from the University-Washington N.S.A. which indicates that there is a need for more social leadership in the neighborhood. Broadly defined, social leadership, as used here, means residents willing to take a stand on local issues, and the leadership which draws other residents together to discuss and attempt to resolve problems. This may indicate that the neighborhood group in the University-Washington N.S.A. should publicize its efforts and try to become more visible in the community.

Table III

NEA		UWA	
Category	Responses	Category	Responses
Housing	7 (14.4%)	Housing	7 (10.4%)
Streets	6 (12.2%)	Streets	7 (10.4%)
Crime	8 (16.4%)	Crime	7 (10.4%)
Clean-up	15 (10.5%)	Clean-up	15 (22.4%)
Flooding	0 (0.0%)	Flooding	7 (10.4%)
Jobs/Retail	1 (2.0%)	Jobs/Retail	1 (1.5%)
Social Leadership	6 (12.2%)	Social Leadership	18 (26.9%)
Other	6 (12.2%)	Other	5 (7.5%)

The responses will now be aggregated by how long the respondent has been living in the neighborhood, and owners and renters.

Length of Residence

As is shown in Table IV, the pattern established in the overall responses by neighborhood continue to hold when the sample is disaggregated by length of residence. Zero to five years will be considered short-term residents; six or more years will be considered long-term residents. The responses from the University-Washington N.S.A. are more concentrated in street and housing improvements, while the responses from the Northeast N.S.A. are more dispersed throughout the categories, and especially on the Oak-Ash issue. There is virtually no difference in the area of improvements identified by short- and long-term residents in the University-Washington sample. In the Northeast N.S.A., short-term residents are more concerned with street and clean-up issues, while long-term residents are the ones concerned with the development of Oak-Ash.

When asked "What Could The Nieghborhood Group Do To Improve The Neighborhood?", twice as many long tenure residents made any suggestions when compared to shorter tenure residents (see Table V). This may indicate that residents who are more familiar with

Table IV

Category	NEA		UWA	
	0-5 years	6 + years	0-5 years	6 + years
Housing	9 (10.0%)	30 (13.0%)	22 (24.0%)	36 (20.0%)
Streets	28 (30.0%)	43 (18.0%)	31 (33.0%)	55 (30.0%)
Crime	15 (16.0%)	31 (13.0%)	13 (14.0%)	19 (10.0%)
Clean-up	26 (28.0%)	45 (19.0%)	14 (15.0%)	41 (22.0%)
Flooding	1 (1.0%)	2 (1.0%)	5 (5.0%)	19 (10.0%)
Jobs/Retail	7 (7.0%)	41 (18.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Social Leadership	0 (0.0%)	2 (0.5%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Other	8 (9.0%)	40 (17.5%)	8 (9.0%)	13 (7.0%)

Table V

Category	NEA		UWA	
	0-5 years	6 + years	0-5 years	6 + years
Housing	4 (25.0%)	2 (5.0%)	4 (17.0%)	4 (9.0%)
Streets	2 (12.5%)	5 (15.0%)	2 (9.0%)	5 (11.0%)
Crime	5 (31.3%)	3 (9.0%)	2 (9.0%)	4 (9.0%)
Clean-up	1 (6.2%)	13 (38.0%)	6 (26.0%)	6 (13.0%)
Flooding	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (9.0%)	5 (11.0%)
Jobs/Retail	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (2.0%)
Social Leadership	3 (18.8%)	6 (18.0%)	5 (20.0%)	13 (28.0%)
Other	1 (6.2%)	4 (12.0%)	2 (9.0%)	8 (18.0%)

the area feel more qualified to make suggestions than those of
shorter tenure. In both N.S.A.'s the short-term residents felt housing
issues could be addressed by the neighborhood groups. In these N.S.A.'s
crime was mentioned three times more often by short-term residents.
The older residents were more concerned with clean-up in the North-
east Area; this was a concern of newer residents in the University-
Washington Area. Most suprising is that almost no one felt the
neighborhood groups could successfully address the Oak-Ash issue.

Owner or Renter

As is shown in Table VI, the responses to "What Can Be Done To
Improve The Neighborhood and Block?" were generally very similar
between groups. Owners and renters show consist needs in this

category. However, there are a few issues on which owners and
renters show different preferences. The beaurification/clean-up
issue is an example of an issue on which the opinions of owners and
renters differ. In the Northeast N.S.A. renters have demonstrated
a stronger commitment to the clean-up issue. This is contrary
to our expectation that owners would be more concerned about the
clean-up and beautification of the neighborhood due to the adverse
effects that poor private maintenance could hve on individual
property values. In the University-Washington N.S.A. owners are
more concerned about clean-up and crime than renters. The responses
obtained from the two N.S.A.'s are otherwise similar.

Table VI

Category	NEA		UWA	
	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters
Housing	26 (16.0%)	25 (15.0%)	43 (28.0%)	30 (28.0%)
Streets	31 (19.0%)	30 (18.0%)	40 (26.0%)	28 (26.0%)
Crime	24 (15.0%)	24 (14.0%)	19 (12.0%)	17 (16.0%)
Clean-up	28 (18.0%)	45 (26.0%)	39 (25.0%)	16 (15.0%)
Flooding	4 (3.0%)	6 (4.0%)	10 (7.0%)	15 (14.0%)
Jobs/Retail	28 (18.0%)	21 (12.0%)	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Social Leadership	3 (2.0%)	4 (2.0%)	2 (1.5%)	0 (0.0%)
Other	15 (9.0%)	16 (9.0%)	1 (0.5%)	1 (0.5%)

As is shown in Table VII, the responses to "What Can The
Neighborhood Group Do To Improve The Neighborhood?" were also
generally very similar between owners and renters. In the responses
from the University-Washington N.S.A. there was practically no
variation between the responses of owners and renters. The situ-
ation with the responses from the Northeast N.S.A. is slightly
different. Over twice as many owners were concerned with occupied
substandard housing and associated housing problems in the Northeast
N.S.A. as renters. Similarly, over twice as many owners suggested

that the neighborhood group attempt to provide social leadership as
renters in the Northeast N.S.A. This preference could reflect a
pride that is incumbent in ownership which heightens the owners'
awareness of the appearance of the neighborhood and the political
position and strength of their representatives. According to the
results of this survey, the residents are willing to accept and
participate in any well-organized effort to establish goals for the
community and act on them. The neighborhood groups must make an
effort to reach these residents.

Table VII

Category	NEA		UWA	
	Owners	Renters	Owners	Renters
Housing	5 (16.0%)	2 (9.0%)	4 (11.0%)	2 (8.0%)
Streets	3 (10.0%)	3 (14.0%)	4 (11.0%)	3 (12.0%)
Crime	3 (10.0%)	5 (23.0%)	4 (11.0%)	3 (12.0%)
Clean-up	7 (24.0%)	8 (36.0%)	6 (17.0%)	7 (26.0%)
Flooding	0 (0.0%)	0 (0.0%)	3 (9.0%)	2 (8.0%)
Jobs/Retail	1 (3.0%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (3.0%)	0 (0.0%)
Social Leadership	7 (24.0%)	2 (9.0%)	10 (29.0%)	8 (31.0%)
Other	4 (13.0%)	2 (9.0%)	3 (9.0%)	1 (7.0%)

Summary

The preceding analysis demonstrates that there are issues on
which the neighborhood groups should address seperately despite a
high degree of similarity between the responses of the residents in
the two N.S.A.'s. Many of these problems are local in character,
such as Oak-Ash, and should be resolved in part by residents who are
immediately affected by the problem. Other issues are common to
residents in both N.S.A.'s, and may provide an excellent opportunity
for the neighborhood groups to cooperate. A private clean-up/beauti-
fication program is an example of such an issue. It was also dis-
covered that there is a much higher demand for social leadership

in the University-Washington N.S.A. than in the Northeast N.S.A.
This indicates that the University-Washington group should attempt
to publicize their activities more, try to make a concerted effort
to attract new membership, and provide a recepticle for the unmet
need for leadership in their neighborhood. Although there is also
a high degree of similarity between the N.S.A.'s on the responses of
owners vs. renters and new vs. older residents, there are some
differences which provide the neighborhood groups with information
about the specific needs and expectations of each particular set
of residents. This information could be crucial to understanding
the needs of these residents and trying to plan for the fulfillment
of these needs in the future. The neighborhood groups may be able
to attract more of each type of resident into their organization if
they have a better understanding of the residents' perceived needs.
Only when this understanding is gained can either group claim to
be truly representative of the residents in their areas.

Key Figures: University-Washington Organization

In addition to the door-to-door surveys of residents, interviews
were also conducted with key figures and groups within each neighbor-
hood. Four key figures were identified and interviewed for the University-
Washington area and five for the Northeast neighborhood. Table VIII presents
the names of the persons identified in the key informant surveys. The
following text summarizes the views of these key informants in the order
shown in the table.

Purpose

Since there has been no effort to define the purpose of the
group, the individuals interviewed had different ideas of what the

Table VIII: Key Informant Interviews

Within And Outside the U.W.A. Neighborhood Organization

Key Figures Within the Organization

Minnie Miller	-	President
Lucy Gray	-	Secretary
Morris Clark		
Louis Tanner		

Key Figures Outside the Organization

Jackie Bonner	-	Program Director of the Boy's Club
Carrol Downs	-	Champaign Mental Health Clinic
Sylvia Ronsdale	-	Empty Tomb
Sister Betty	-	Mercy Hospital

organization was created to do. One view was that the organization is there to advise the City of the situation in the neighborhood and to monitor what the City does about neighborhood problems. Another person interviewed included the idea that the group itself is supposed to do "something" about neighborhood problems. A different person saw the group's purpose being to bring concerned residents together to discuss neighborhood problems.

Different ideals lead to different perceptions about how well the group has functioned. One set of people thought that the group has been very effective in bringing City staff to their meetings and getting them to listen to their concerns. They believe that the group has done all that it can do and that the rest of the effort would have to come from the City. Another member criticized the group's effectiveness in terms of involving the community and deciding on long-range goals.

Goals

No explicit goals have been set by the organization. The members' personal goals can be summarized as: "maintaining and

upgrading the neighborhood". This goal was generally defined in terms of getting City projects in capital improvements and housing rehabilitation with Community Development Block Grant money. The absence of common goals was clear when one person interviewed emphasized widespread community involvement and another mentioned wanting to keep the group small and intimate.

Role

All the organization members that were interviewed see the organization's role as communicating the neighborhood's concerns and needs to the City and waiting for the City's response. The concerns voiced by the group are all related to the City's activities under the Community Development Block Grant program or to problems associated with code enforcement and zoning. Some members want to see the group become less passive in their dealings with the City and push their demands.

Needs

Most of those interviewed believe that the organization needs new members with new ideas. They believe that many residents are interested in these issues but don't want to take the next step to participation. Within the group of people that they have now they would like to see more cooperation among members and more frequent meeting held. One member thought that the group should develop an ability to apply pressure to the City in order to make staff more responsive to the neighborhood's priorities. This person thought that fundraising is important for group projects but other members don't want to involve their organization with money. This one member also suggested that the group should find out what shape

the residents want the neighborhood to take in the future and find
some focal issue to involve people in and with which to build the
momentum of the organization.

Needs of the Neighborhood

As the first response to "What could be done to improve the
neighborhood?", those members of the organization interviewed said:
Housing; sidewalks, beautification and neighborhood unification.
The second and third responses to that question included: Housing;
sidewalks; clean-up of the junk in yards; curbs; streetlights;
beautification and enforcement of codes.

Key Figures: Outside University-Washington Organization

It appears that service organizations in the University-
Washington neighborhood, for the most part, have never heard of
either the University-Washington or the Northeast groups. One
organization's director had heard of the group and received their
flyer because he lives in the area. Like the majority of residents,
he has never been to a meeting and does not know what the group
does. This result is not suprising since the group has not made
any effort to publicize or coordinate its actions with another
organization's or even with the Northeast group. They have not
tried to gain resources (i.e. money, people) or support from groups
that deal with similar problems.

Key Figures: Northeast Organization

Purpose

Up to this point, it is apparent that the organization has
not been effective in meeting its goals or in organizing the

Table IX: Key Informant Interviews

Within And Outside the N.E.A. Neighborhood Organization

Key Figures Within the Organization

Norman Bigham   - President
Lola Weatherspoon   - Vice President
Erma Bridgewater   - Secretary
Richard Bigham
Abdul El-jamaal

Key Figures Outside the Organization

Lorraine Cowart   - President of Bradley Park Tenants Assoc.
Roy Williams   - Consultant
Nathaniel Banks   - Afro-American Culture Center

neighborhood. The individuals within the organization seem to have focused upon the development of Oak-Ash as their primary concern, regardless of the fact that our surveys show that the area's residents are more concerned with other problems. One informant did mention a clean-up project undertaken in the past, targeting one particular area, but the project ultimately failed. No other project seems to have been attempted. All other informant responses went back to Oak-Ash.

Goals and Roles

Mention was also made of increaseng membership, but no concrete plan or idea of how to go about it was mentioned. The leaders would like to be the representatives of a large constituency, eventually meeting the city on equal terms and having more input on any major decisions dealing with the North End. The leadership feels its contact with the city has increased lately, with the introduction of a city official who has been helpful to them. There should be concern that the group is becoming even more dependent upon the city than it already is. The leadership seems not to

have any qualms about this relationship, nor do they see any contradiction with their long-range hope of being an equal advisary with the city.

Needs of the Organization and Neighborhood

The leadership does seem to be aware that they do need help, at least in finding out what resources they have access to and how to utilize them. The informants are able to name people within the community that have some possibly useful skills that could be of some help; however, the impression we received was that these individuals had not been contacted.

There also seems to be a lack of communication between group members. Some group members are not kept informed and are unaware of current plans. We were also informed that a steering committee meets once a week to discuss new proposals, yet we have since heard that the steering committee does not meet "every" week.

Every informant did seem optimistic that they could accomplish something. Their positive attitude could be their best asset, along with good ideas of what they would like to see done. What is lacking is someone who know how to operationalize their goals. No one seems to know what to do first, where to start, and what is needed. There are a couple of newer, younger members who have new ideas, and hopefully they have the "push" and leadership ability to get the organization moving in the right direction.

Key Figures: Outside Northeast Organization

The perception of the Northeast organization from key informants outside the group gives us a different sort of insight as to how effective the group has been. Each different view is important

dues, nor does it make attempts to raise funds. Whatever it needs, it looks to the City to apply. Money to an organization is a most vital resource--it determines the scope if not the number of projects/activities the group undertakes. Since its beginning, the University-Washington organization has been involved in only two projects--two neighborhood clean-up drives. The last clean-up drive, however, had very little participation. Its other energies are spent on keeping abreast of the City's Community Development Block Grant projects within the neighborhood. The organization relies heavily on the City of Champaign for its financial resources, its publicity for meetings (flyers), and implement their projects (e.g. city trucks used in clean-up drives).

It appears that there has not been any concerted effort to recruit and involve new residents in the organization. With small and unrepresentative membership, it becomes impossible for the organization to know the needs of the rest of the community. With a small membership and a lack of direction from their "leaders", the organization cannot expect to grow in resources, influence, and activites what will change the condition of the neighborhood. An organization depends on its leadership to determine its focus, visability, and effectiveness, and to contribute a substantial amount of time and energy to its cause. At this time, there is no clear and present leadership in the University-Washington neighborhood.

The University-Washington organization was initiated by the City of Champaign and has been supported and virtually led by it. At this time, the purpose it serves is as an information tie-line to the City. There appears to be no immediately pressing problems

block clubs have dissolved.

At this time, the majority of the surveyed residents of the University-Washington area (62 percent) were unaware a neighborhood group even existed in the area. This fact alone can tell a great deal about the organization itself--it has low visibility within the area, its projects or activities are on a very small scale, what projects or activities it does initiate only appeal to a small proportion of the residents, it makes little or no effort to publicize these activities, and it has not actively recruited new members. In order to become an effective and viable organization, these things must be done.

The very inactivity of the University-Washington group seems to be a priority goal of some key "leaders" who have expressed a desire to keep the group "informal and unstructured". It is not suprising then, to find the organization possesses no by-laws, no written statement of purpose and no committees.

Goal-setting is essential to an organization--it is an explanation of why the organization exists. The University-Washington organization has no clearly defined or written goals. In fact, it appears that the leaders and key figures in the organization have varying opinions of the purpose and function of the organization.

Membership in the organization has remained fairly constant since its beginning. The membership presently stands at approximately 20 members, "10 of whom may attend meetings semi-regularly". Those who are members of the organization are not representative of the community overall--especially the young and renters. The meetings have been poorly attended, due to lack of interest and/ or unawareness of the organization on the part of the area residents.

The University-Washington neighborhood group does not collect

to take over this function.

By-Laws

The University-Washington Group has no by-laws.

Committees

The University-Washington Group doesn't use committees. The objective is to have everyone work together on what they can do and what they have time to do. All activities of the organization are meant to be voluntary and the structure informal.

Dues

No dues have ever been collected by the organization.

Purpose

The organization's pupose is to keep the City aware of the situation in the neighborhood and to see that the city continues to maintain and improve the neighborhood. No explicit statement of purpose or goals has been put together by the group.

Effectiveness of the University-Washington Neighborhood Organization

The University-Washington neighborhood organization was initiated approxiamtely five years ago by the City of Champaign in accordance with a federal mandated requirement under the Community Development Block Grant program. Before this time, individual block clubs had existed in this area and were perceived as "pressure groups" by some of the residents. Some of the activities these block clubs had undertaken were the planting of trees, a clean-up drive, opening communications with the City, pressing the City to remove abandoned, substandard houses and the creation of a neighborhood play area/ tot lot. With the creation of the neighborhood organization, the

in determining the strengths and weaknesses of the group, and as
a guide to what needs to be done.

It is important to note that only one person interviewed was
positive about the group. This person thinks the group has poten-
tial, but needs direction. As a whole, the key informants agreed
that Oak-Ash is the main concern for the North End, but the group
needs to become stronger in order to get anything done. They see
Oak-Ash as an immediate goal, while the group's future goal should
be to become the "voice" of the North End.

The negative responses came from people who have been involved
directly with North End problems for a number of years; the positive
respondent has not been involved with the North End for very long.
The negative respondents have been involved with another local
organization which has been more effective and is definitely more
organized. The impression given is that the Northeast leadership
can do nothing to help their own organization or any other. One
respondent even went so far as to say the organization is a "puppet"
of the city, is unable to organize the neighborhood around a
central issue, cannot administer a program on a day-to-day basis,
or have any impact or input on city policies.

The unfortunate conclusion to this is that the very dynamic
and organized people that the organization needs are very negative
about the organization and want nothing to do with it. This
negative perception severly handieaps the group's effort and puts
more emphasis on the need of the group to prove it can be successful.

The following section summarizes the major demographic characteristics
of the two neighborhoods based on interviews and documents provided by
the president or secretary. Characteristics analyzed are: origin of the

organization, size of the membership, meetings, by-laws, committees, dues, and purpose of the organization.

Organization Demographics: University-Washington Area

Origin

The University-Washington organization was formed, on the initiative of the City staff, approximately five years ago (1977). The staff had mistakenly read into the legislation a requirement for Neighborhood Strategy Area citizens' groups. Organizing has been part of the neighborhood for about fifteen years in the form of block clubs. The block clubs have been dexcribed as "pressure groups". It appears that, at the start of the Community Development Block Grant program in Champaign, these block clubs became the new University-Washington organization.

Membership

The organization is made up of about 20 people, with the same 10 people consistently attending meetings. The age of members ranges from 40 to 75, with a little less than half the members over 60. All but four of the members are homeowners. Most of the group are also members of Bethel A.M.E. Church (where the group meets) and Salem Baptist Church.

Meetings

Meetings are held on the first Monday of every month at the Bethel A.M.E. Church at 7:00 p.m. The December meeting was cancelled because it was mutually fogotten. Meetings are not held from January to March because of weather. Formerly, the Community Development staff attended meetings, but their new budget will allow them to sponsor only three meetings a year. The City prints notice flyers for the meetings it sponsors. The organization doesn't plan

around which the neighborhood group can or wants to rally. The organization has become too dependent on the City for its resources and at the same time, has done nothing to strengthen itself from within by their own initiative. What will happen now that the mandate for citizen participation in the form of neighborhood organizations are no longer federally required?

Organization Demographics: Northeast Area

Origin

The Northeast Area neighborhood group began its functions in 1975. It came about through a mandate from the Community Development Block Grant program for Champaign's Community Development department to divide up neighborhoods into target areas for community development projects.

Membership

The average turnout for a neighborhood meeting is about ten to twelve. For the most part, these same people attend regularly and all are members. Most are 60 years of age or older with about one or two members around the age of 40. These people all live within a ten block radius of their meeting place, the Douglass Center on Fifth and Park streets. All of the members are homeowners and have lived in the area since before the Oak-Ash clearance began, approximately 15 years ago.

Meetings

The group meets every second Thursday of each month through December, at which time, they shut down until March of the next year. During the three months that we have been observing this group, however, the group has met only once.

By-laws

The Northeast group is the only neighborhood group in Champaign
that is incorporated. A charter was drawn up in 1976 that states
the group's purpose and by-laws. Copies are held by Champaign's
Community Development department and the members of the group.

Committees

There are no formal committees within this group. However,
an ad hoc sub-group has formed for the purposes of gathering
information on the redevelopment of the Oak-Ash area. This group
is called the Northeast Area Community Development Corporation and
it functions primarily as a steering committee for the neighborhood
group with regard to the redevelopment issue.

Dues

Although they do not presently collect dues, the group used
to collect dues of $1 a month.

Purpose

According to the charter of the Northeast Area Development
Corporation, the general purposes of the neighborhood group are
as follows:

> 1). To promote the general welfare of the residents
> of the Northeast area, and
> 2). to promote development of social, economic, and
> physical resources of the area, in particular,
>> a). to improve the quality of housing
>> b). promote the economic development of the
>> Northeast area,
>> c). to promote the beautification of the
>> Northeast area.

Effectiveness of the Northeast Neighborhood Organization

The Northeast Area Nieghborhood Group began to function in
1975 when the City of Champaign, through a mandate from the
Community Development Block Grant program, divided up the City

into neighborhood strategy areas for community development projects. By the suggestion of the city, the neighborhood group drew up a charter for incorporation, naming itself, the Northeast Area Community Development Corporation. The validity of this charter is questionable because it does not display a signature by a recorden from the State's Attorney General's office. Nevertheless, under this charter, there are listed by-laws and a board of directors, as well as general purposes of the organization.

Presently in the Northeast area, 71 % of the surveyed residents have not heard of the organization. This large figure is indicative of the group's effectiveness.

In terms of goal-setting, the Northeast Area Development Corporation charter established an initial set of goals which have remained over the years. From information obtained through conversations with key informants within and outside the organization, accomplishment of these goals has yet to be realized. Attempts have been made toward fulfillment of the objectives through redevelopment proposals for the cleared area known as Oak-Ash, and proposals to turn the Lawhead School into a museum. Goal-setting is only one problem on the part of the neighborhood group that inhibits the realization of these projects. Since the inception of the group there has been no charter revision. Goals and purposes, to be effective, need to be assessed and reassessed and strategies for implementation need to be incorporated into task related goals. The neighborhood group, however, has submitted another proposal (see Appendix   ) relative to the Oak-Ash redevelopment project to the community development director, and some long- and short-range objectives have been asserted within the

proposal.

There are at present 10 to 12 members of the organization, all of whom attend the monthly meetings on a regular basis. These members, all of whom are homeowners and over 60 years of age, with the exception of one or two, are not representative of the overall community make-up. Firstly, the membership is small and does not represent the young and the renters in the neighborhood. With increased membership, increased representation of the varying views within the neighborhood could contribute to increased influence and successful activities for the community.

Leadership is vital to any organization for direction and for representing the concerns of its members. The leadership, therefore, must be forceful and persistent, constantly bringing key neighborhood issues before the citizenry. The leadership in the Northeast organization has lacked direction, dynamics, and persistence in purusing its goals of promoting the general welfare and development of neighborhood resources. This is validated in the community's ignorance to the existenct of the neighborhood organization. Nevertheless, the organization has good ideas, and has recently shown some consistency and perciverance in bringing the issue of Oak-Ash redevelopment before the city. The leadership could be more effective if it could devote more time and energy to the interests of the organization.

The neighborhood group does not presently collect dues, nor is there any knowledge of a fundraiser being planned or having previously been implemented. Money is a vital resource; and the city is not the only place to find it. Despite providing the group with funds, a fundraiser is a way to get publicity and increase membership.

The Northeast Area neighborhood organization has been stagnant since its inception. One reason could be attributed to the city's lack of interest in true citizen involvement in the community planning process. On the other hand, the neighborhood group, because it has failed to incorporate the above mentioned criteria for viability, has allowed itself to reflect the interests of the city by demonstrating little self-initiative. Conversations with key figures within the organization indicate that the neighborhood group wants more involvement but it lacks the time and direction to assert its desires. The organization has to demonstrate a stronger composition in terms of goals, leadership, membership, and resources. If not, its existence should be questioned.

Recommendations

Throughout this paper we have disucssed some of the environmental conditions and problems existing in the University-Washington and the Northeast Area neighborhoods, what Community Development Block Grant money has done to alleviate these conditions and problems, and the activities of the neighborhood groups established under the Community Development Block Grant program.

In general, the present situation doesn't reflect very much success. There have been scattered improvements made in the area, but they have never been comprehensive enough to make a strong impact on the area. The Community Development Block Grant program money has gone into piecemeal projects and into fewer project areas than claimed in the federal applications. Recently, a great deal of money has gone unused. The University-Washington and Northeast Area neighborhood groups have had a minimal advisory function

in this function in this program, giving advice that is only
sometimes heeded and just as often not.

Some changes are going on in the Community Development Block
Grant program. Thises changes will affect the neighborhod organi-
zation's effectiveness and their ability to fulfill their purpose.
That is why we feel that now is the time for the organizations to
make some choices about their future. The choices (and deciding
not to change at all is one of them) are in the hands of the organi-
zation's leadership. In this section, we want to make some recom-
mendations that we would like the groups to consider as possiblities.

Every year since 1979 the city of Champaign's Community
Development Block Grant entitlement money has decreased in both
relative and absolute terms. Recently, the Reagan Administration
has made some further changes in the program. Now this decreasing
amount of funds has fewer restrictions as to how it can be used.
It no longer has to be targeted to specific areas. Additionally,
if neighborhood groups were ever considered as part in the planning
of Community Development Block Grant expenditures by the federal
government, they certainly are not now. What we foresee happening
in Champaign in the next few years as a result of all these changes
is less and less money being spent in the University-Washington
or the Northeast Area and the neighborhood groups being cut off
from what little consultation they were receiving from the City.

If the City is no longer required to concentrate its effort
north of University, there is a good chance it won't. One sure
way to keep Community Development Block Grant funds in the North
End, is for the neighborhoods to build a louder, stronger, and
consistent voice that will be heard in City Hall.

The two North End neighborhood groups functioned in a fashion that met Community Development Block Grant requirements during the time that the City came to them for suggestions. The situation isn't the same when the people have to go to the City and demand to be heard. The only kind of organization that the City might have to consider listening to is one that is broad-based and represents many interests in a united front; one that counts a large number of people as supporters. The needs of people in the University-Washington and the the Northeast areas may not be alike, they may not be interested in accomplishing exactly the same things, but the question now is, what is the most effective form of organization for getting anything accomplished? From talking with the two groups, an outright merger appears too radical and will cause more confusion than solidarity. We are suggesting that the two neighborhood groups remain separate but appoint group members as well as other local leaders to one overall North End steering committee. That committee would decide what kind of approach is needed to bring about positive changes in the neighborhood, and address the city council, manager and community development office with one voice.

The central element to making this possible is organization. Bringing two groups of twenty people together will not create an effective organization of none has existed before. The job of organization-building is the responsiblity of each of the two groups.

Some of the members of the University-Washington group have mentioned that they don't want to build their organization. They want to keep it informal, without much structure and acting as an information link to the City, relying on the City for support. It

is our feeling that the City's need for that kind of information will end very soon, along with any reason for the City to support the group. However, the results of our survey show that a large number of residents want some kind of social leadership in the neighborhood. They want someone, some group take up a leadership role and show them that it would be worthwhile for them to get involved. This is the role the residents want an organization to play, one that the present organization has not fulfilled.

We hope that both neighborhood organizations build their group size, make them more effective and prepare themselves for acting on the neighborhood's behalf. We have put togehter a list of ideas to hwlp in organizing. It is only a list of suggestions that come out of the experience of other neighborhood groups and grassroots organizations. All of the steps to be discussed and more are set out in outline form in Appendix   .

Assess Community Conditions and Problems

Gathering your own data on community conditions and needs is very important. The data gathered by other groups, like the City, may be very different from what you see when you walk around the neighborhood. What are important factors to look at for one group may not be for another. An earlier part of this paper gave one view of physical conditions in the neighborhoods and suggested a method that organizations could use to do that assessment themselves.

The organization whould work on finding out what the residents want and need and what they want the organization to do. Starting out with the needs of residents, rather than from what activities are eligible under Community Development Block Grant

is the only way to build legitimacy and support for the organization.

Organizational Needs: Recruiting and Involving Members

The organization should actively recruit new members to expand the numbers and types of people in the organization. The more people in the organization, the more activites it can take on, the more representative it is and the stronger it is. Members could be recruited through:

- church networks
- social events, block parties
- personal contact, going door-to-door, intro-
  ducing the organization
- door-to-door mailings, a newsletter to
  describe the organization's activites
- provide carpools and child care at meetings
  to make it easier for people to attend

Having people go door-to-door is one of the best ways to recruit new members. All the possible responses from people should be thought out by the volunteers in advance so that they are not taken by surprise. Volunteers should have printed information about the organization and many reasons to give the residents on why they should join the organization. The organization could also develop a block leader network as a foundation for membership drives and other activities. That person is the organization's representative to the residents on the block. In the University-Washington area organizing began on the blocks and it may still be the best place to start.

The only way people will maintain interest in the organization as if they are involved in the organization's activities. All of the members of the organization should be involved in some aspect of organizing. There should be different types of involvement, from bringing refreshments to going to City Council, so that people can

do what they are most comfortable with.

Information Networks and Resources

The organization should look into making full use of all the resources in the community. Examples are the information networks within and among churches, the experience and support of other organizations, wkilled people and professionals in the community and the information-gathering ability of the University. The Bethel A.M.E. Church now provides a place that the University-Washington group can meet. Most churches have their own printing machinery for Sunday bulletins. Maybe the church would let the organization do printing at a reduced cost. Maybe musicians would donate their talents to block parties. There are many creative ways to use what exists in the community.

The organization whould get in touch with the established support network that exists for neighborhood groups. (A list of addresses in appended to the end of this section).

Leadership

The future of the organization may rest very heavily upon the type of leadership it has. The leadership of the organization needs to take a broad view of the possible issues that the organization could take on, the resources it could make use of and the kinds of working relationships it could have with other organizations. Leaders have to be dynamic. They provide the focus and direction of the organization. They have to be committed to the group and to involving others in running the group. The leadership of the organization needs to be representative and open to change, with new leaders always being encouraged. The perception of a closed leadership will keep people away from the group.

Fundraising

The goals of fund-raising are self-sufficiency and independence.
Money itself is neutral, only the choices of how to get and spend
money have values attached. If the group believes that spending
money on the neighborhood is a good cause, then so is raising it.
Fundraising proves that the organization has people supporting it.
It gives you a chance to meet more potential members. A successful
fundraising activity is good publicity, and it opens the door to
other sources of funds. The group should start out small with
garage sales, bake sales, dues, and carnivals. A book with more
ideas is The Grassroots Fundraising Book: How to Raise Money in
Your Community. It is available through the University of Illinois
library.

Money is also available for funding the activities of incor-
porated neighborhood organizations under the Community Development
Block Grant program. Specifically, "grants to neighborhood-based
nonprofit organizations or local development corporations to carry
out a neighborhood revitalization or community and economic develop-
ment or energy conservation project".

Organizational Structure

The organization should draw up a constitution and by-laws.
By-laws are rules on how organizations conduct business. They
include a description of the organization's purpose, membership
rights and qualifications, election and voting procedures, officers'
terms and responsiblities and rules for amending the by-laws. There
aren't set formulas for developing by-laws. It might be useful
to look at how other neighborhood organizations, like Jeff Vander-
Lou in St. Louis, have set up their by-laws. Drafting these would

help the group make decisions about what kind of organization it wants
to be.

The organization whould elect officers and set up committees.
It should decide who is responsible for certain tasks and hold them
accountable for accomplishing them. Minutes and records should be
kept to keep the organization from being descredited. The group's
structure should give people a sense of belonging and participation,
but it should also keep the organization on track and make sure that
things get done. There is nothing wrong with a level of structure
and formality that makes it possible for people to get things done
for the neighborhood.

Goals and Strategy

The organization should involve all members in carefully
deciding on goals and priorities for the organization. It should
then decide on a series of actions which are aimed at achieving
those goals. This strategy gives the organization direction in
what it does.

Relationship with the City-Independence

For the near future, the Community Development Block Grant
program is a good target for the organization. The program still
has a lot of unkown elements. In adddition to the organization doing
its own investigation of why the City doesn't finish what it starts,
the organization should find out what money is really available
and what different things it can be used for. The City of Champaign's
Community Development Block Grant applications for the past few
years have mentioned using money for jobs creation programs. No
such program has been under-taken. Unused and misused Community
Development Block Grant money can be a starting point for lobbying

the City. Both neighborhood groups, and hopefully the one
steering committee, should develop a good working relationship
with the Community Development Department. This is especially
important at this time because the present Community Development
Directore is very receptive to having the groups give input. How-
ever, he would rather have one group, representing both areas,
presenting ideas.

Working through Community Development Block Grant is a good
approach to take in the short run. Still, for the same reasons
mentioned at the beginning of this section, in the future the
organizations should plan to beocme independent of the Communidty
Development Block Grant program and move their issues and activities
beyond it. The group should move toward solving the problems of
the neighborhood independently through alternative facilities and
services.

Incorporation (for how to incorporate, see Appendix   )

The University-Washington organization should incorporate to
gain credibility and official recognition. This kind of corporation
has a nonprofit, tax-exempt status which makes fundraising easier.
Contributers can deduct their donations on their income tax returns.
Grants are easier to obtain if the organization is incorporated.
The organization can also qualify for special mailing rates.

Incorporations is also an issue for the Northeast Area
organization. Looking at their incorporation documents on file at
City Hall, it was noticed that the required signature from the
Secretary of State's office was missing. If there is an error,
that organization should check their documents to make sure that
they are legally incorporated.

Recommended Activities and Projects

The very first projects undertaken to build the organization should be winnable, highly visible, have a high level of interest in them in the community, involve a lot of people, be fun and build the membership and momentum of the organization. These projects should be specific and short term. The North East organization might have to, for the moment, shift its focus away from the Oak-Ash redevelopment and to smaller local projects with which to build their membership. The Oak-Ash issue has not mobilized residents' support of the organization and the organization can't move forward on that issue without resident support. Oak-Ash is a large scale, long term project. The Northeast organization does not have sufficient resources and power in the city to win this issue at the moment. They cannot obtain the resources they need with the level of organization that they have now.

While the limitations of the organization should always be kept in mind, it is important not to underestimate what people, members and residents, are capable of doing. The organization should keep a file on all the projects it is involved in. This is so that the person who leads the next clean-up campaign will know exactly what to do, when to do it and how much time, effort and money is involved. The file should detail the results of the activity and any problems that were involved.

Beautification Program/"Beautiful Block" Contest:

Appoint one person on each block to be rewponsible for publicizing the contest and encouraging people to participate. Set up a check list of characteristics that make up a beautiful

Boneyard Clean-Up (University-Washington)

Contact and bring together all the people who live along the Boneyard in this neighborhood. All city agencies have denied responsibility for maintaining it. Encourage the residents to devise cooperative solutions that they could do themselves, or to organize into a group that could pressure the right agency to come up with solutions.