Florida State University Libraries

Electronic Theses, Treatises and Dissertations | The Graduate School

2004

Planning to Reduce Worry: Designing an Intergenerational Planning Process to Lessen Relocation-Related Anxieties Experienced by Those Displaced in the Pursuit of a Hope VI Revitalization Grant

Dawn E. Jourdan

Follow this and additional works at the FSU Digital Library. For more information, please contact lib-ir@fsu.edu

THE FLORIDA STATE UNIVERSITY

COLLEGE OF SOCIAL SCIENCES

PLANNING TO REDUCE WORRY: DESIGNING AN INTERGENERATIONAL PLANNING PROCESS TO LESSEN RELOCATION-RELATED ANXIETIES EXPERIENCED BY THOSE DISPLACED IN THE PURSUIT OF A HOPE VI REVITALIZATION GRANT

By

DAWN E. JOURDAN

A dissertation submitted to the
Department of Urban and Regional Planning
in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of
Doctor of Philosophy

Degree Awarded:
Fall Semester, 2004

The members of the Committee approve the Dissertation of Dawn E. Jourdan defended on October 25, 2004.

Charles Connerly
Professor Directing Dissertation

Issac W. Eberstein
Outside Committee Member

Ivonne Audirac
Committee Member

Approved:

Charles Connerly, Chair, Department of Urban and Regional Planning

David Rasmussen, Dean, College of Social Sciences

The Office of Graduate Studies has verified and approved the above named committee members.

This dissertation is dedicated to the youth at McDaniel Glenn who have shown me that there is hope in HOPE VI.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study would not have been possible without the support of a number of very important people. Special thanks to the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development for providing me with an Early Dissertation Research Grant to formulate the basis for this dissertation. I would also like to thank Ray Luttery of the Atlanta Public Housing Authority for introducing me to housing authority staff and the residents of McDaniel Glenn. Of course, a study of this nature would not have been possible without the guidance of my dissertation committee: Charles Connerly, Ivonne Audirac, and Ike Eberstein. Many thanks to my colleague, Cecilia Giusti, for her willingness to comment upon multiple drafts of this study and to Kevin Gifford for his research assistance. Thank you all for your encouragement and thoughtful suggestions. In addition, I offer my continued love and gratitude to my father, Ray Jourdan, without whom this endeavor would not have been possible.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

List of Tables .... Page vi

Abstract .... Page vii

1. Introduction .... Page 1

2. HOPE VI and the McDaniel Glenn Planning Process. Page 6

3. Methodology.................................... Page 31

4. Grieving for a New Home Revisited............... Page 57

5. Intergenerational Participation as a Means
Of Reducing Grief .... Page 80

6. Advocates for HOPE VI – A Role for Advocacy
Planners in the Facilitation of HOPE VI .... Page 100

7. Conclusions .... Page 112

REFERENCES .... Page 121

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH................................ Page 128

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Survey Results of Housing Authorities...... Page 39

Table 2: Table of Open Codes........................ Page 48

ABSTRACT

While city planners have not typically sought the insights of children to inform planning practice, this is beginning to change. Planning activities involving children have cropped up across the country. Such initiatives include involving school-aged children in park design, neighborhood issues, and comprehensive planning activities, among others. The Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) has even set its sights on involving young stakeholders in certain planning processes. Specifically, HUD has begun working together with youth who reside in HOPE VI housing in order to discover their needs. After a national conference involving HUD officials and these youth constituents, efforts have been made by HUD to create planning committees made up of the residents of potential HOPE VI sites. HUD's goal has been to create planning committees which are intergenerational in nature. The primary function of these planning committees is to consider those issues arising in their communities and to make recommendations to HUD about how to appropriately respond to such issues.

These intergenerational planning committees are the first of their kind. They merit study because it is imperative that we learn how such participation by youth and adults affects levels of empowerment. This study describes and explains the interworkings of an intergenerational planning committee at the McDaniel Glenn public housing community in Atlanta by employing a grounded theory case study approach. The results of this case study reveal that participation by youth and adults in this sort of intergenerational planning process which is spearheaded by an advocacy planner reduces the pre-relocation grief effects

typically experienced by those who are displaced by urban renewal activities. The study further reveals the empowering effects that intergenerational participation may have on all planning process participants. These findings fill a void in planning scholarship and have both practical and ethical implications for the use of such planning strategies in practice.

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

To many, urban renewal is an ugly word, especially in the context of public housing. The term was first integrated into U.S. housing policy with the passage of the 1954 Housing Act. That Act, according to Mollenkopf (1983, p. 117), "allowed businesses, developers, and their political allies, who had little interest in housing, to use federal power to advance their own ends." As a result, with the inclusion of the term in the 1954 Act, urban renewal gained a reputation as a "slum clearance" or "Negro removal" statute, targeting for demolition and redevelopment of those neighborhoods inhabited by a community's poorest residents – most often African American. But rather than correcting for the absence of affordable and quality housing for the poor, such urban renewal efforts exacerbated the problem, destroying more homes than were ever rebuilt under such policies (Cullingworth and Caves, 2003). Due to the negative effects of such policies, urban renewal programs – at least in the forms in which they had previously been implemented – declined in the 1960s (Cullingworth and Caves, 2003).

Urban renewal is not a dead concept, however. Contemporary policies that seek to save decaying cities have taken other forms and, in many instances, been successful at regenerating business activities in previously abandoned areas. The effects of urban renewal programs on the City of Atlanta can easily be witnessed on the drive north from the Hartsfield-Jackson International Airport. Aggressive redevelopment efforts have

been ongoing in the city since the 1960s when Ivan Allen Jr., president of the Atlanta Chamber of Commerce, announced his "Six Points of Light" program. Allen promised the business community that efforts would be made to accomplish the following redevelopment objectives: "continued construction of expressways, urban renewal, a rapid-transit system, a major-league baseball stadium, a civic center/auditorium, and advertising for the city" (Keating, 2001, p. 88). With very limited exception, these promised redevelopment activities have been brought to fruition, significantly improving the image of a city that was once marred by urban decay.

Some argue, however, that these redevelopment efforts in downtown Atlanta have primarily been aesthetic, having little positive effect on the welfare of Atlanta residents. According to Keating (2001, p. 210): "Economic development programs have focused primarily on image-enhancing projects, not on the much more serious problems of lower-class underemployment and unemployment." In terms of housing, Keating (2000) contends federal housing programs for the poor have not lessened the effects of society's failure to deal with the unemployment issues. Rather, such programs have resulted in a shortfall in public housing stock which further hinders the success of those who live in places where poverty is concentrated and job opportunities few and far between.

The failure of traditional urban renewal programs to reach sought after results is not unique to Atlanta's experience. Across the country, urban renewal policies have resulted in the further racial and economic segmentation of society and the concentration of poverty (Spence, 1993). Spence (1993) argues that the solution to this dilemma is policies which seek to integrate the nonworking poor with the working poor (Keating, 2000, p. 385). According to Spence, it is unlikely that housing

policies which do not strive for integration will overcome the negative effects of urban renewal programs.

It is possible, however, that things are starting to change for some of Atlanta's poorest residents as a result of a modern "urban renewal" program known as HOPE VI wherein local public housing authorities compete for federal funds to assist with the redevelopment of distressed public housing communities, as more fully explained in the following chapters. With these funds, the AHA has converted some of the City's most poverty stricken and crime ridden neighborhoods into mixed income communities where neighbors are no longer segregated by race or income.

McDaniel Glenn, one of Atlanta's most distressed public housing communities, was awarded a HOPE VI grant for redevelopment in July 2004. The application for this grant received great support from City officials, the downtown business community, neighbors, and, most importantly, the residents of the public housing community. This begs the question, given the history of urban renewal programs, why would the residents of McDaniel Glenn consent to participating in a planning process that would result in the demolition of their homes so that, in the end, a few select residents could return to a community inhabited primarily by middle class renters and homeowners?

My research suggests the answer to this question lies in the planning process engaged in by the residents of the McDaniel Glenn public housing community with officials from the Atlanta Housing Authority (hereinafter known as the "AHA"). The planning process at McDaniel Glenn was extended beyond the preliminary meetings required by the statute. The meetings were highly attended and effectively engaged the residents in an on-going dialogue about current and future issues pertaining to the revitalization of McDaniel Glenn. The planning process brought

McDaniel Glenn youth and adults together to discuss issues of conflict and compromise between those groups. AHA officials also used this process to educate residents about existing and underutilized services, such as job training and HUD’s homeownership programs. Rather than seeking mere “tenant consultation,” as required by the HOPE VI statute, the AHA designed a participatory process that assisted with the organization and education of McDaniel Glenn residents.

Even at first glance, there is little doubt that the planning process for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn was unique. The outcome of this unique process was that the members of the intergenerational planning committee embraced the opportunity provided them by the AHA to make plans for the better living conditions and better lives. Unlike many of the urban renewal horror stories that are passed between planners, the residents of McDaniel Glenn showed an initial willingness to assist in the planning for the redevelopment of the site. Any grief the residents shared with regard to being relocated was lessened by existing safety concerns they had for themselves and their children.

Also, the residents, both the adults and the youth, were included in the planning process. Separate and on-going planning committees were established for both adult and youth residents so that they could fully share their ideas with AHA officials. Eventually, these planning committees merged to create an intergenerational planning committee, one in which their ideas could be jointly shared and deliberated on. At the end of the process, the members of the intergenerational planning committee expressed a sincere satisfaction with the fact that they had been asked to participate so fully in the planning process and a strong belief that their ideas would be included once the community was rebuilt.

In addition to unique aspects of the planning process, the housing authority's relationship with the residents of the affected area was highly contingent on key actors. A final factor is critical in understanding why the residents of McDaniel Glenn supported the AHA's bid for the redevelopment of the public housing community. The adult and youth residents at McDaniel Glenn, as well as his colleagues at the AHA, all cite the efforts of one planner for making the project successful. This planner acted as an advocate for the residents. He made sure that they knew about the meetings of the planning committee. He developed a rapport with the residents that made them feel comfortable sharing their ideas about the redevelopment. He recognized the importance of the ideas generated by community youth and established a separate planning group so that they could develop their confidence and later share their ideas with the adult members of the planning committee. Due, at least in part, to this planner's efforts, the members of the intergenerational planning committee were empowered to contribute the revitalization of their neighborhood, instead of having their futures dictated to them as the case may have been under past urban renewal efforts.

The overall aim of this study is to reveal how meaningful intergenerational resident participation in a planning process spearheaded by an advocacy planner under a modern "urban renewal" statute may stave off the bad reputation which typically adheres to such policies. It is my hope that this study of the participatory planning model employed by the AHA for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn can inform the efforts of other localities to engage in urban renewal programs that are more sensitive to the needs and desires of those displaced by such activities.

CHAPTER 2: HOPE VI AND THE MCDANIEL GLENN PLANNING PROCESS

As described more fully in Chapter 1, urban renewal efforts have abounded in Atlanta since the 1960s. These efforts have resulted in a number of large scale renewal projects, including the construction of an extensive highway network and rapid transit system, a major league baseball stadium, and a civic center. In many of these instances of urban renewal, the AHA was the condemning authority and driving force behind such efforts. However, as has been the case with many similar large scale urban renewal efforts, the availability of housing for the poor has been severely diminished and often eliminated as a result of such efforts to save dying downtowns. A related problem has been and continues to be: what happens to the urban poor as a result of such renewal efforts? The following discussion seeks to contextualize these questions within the realm of the HOPE VI program and with respect to the revitalization of McDaniel Glenn in particular.

A. A Brief History of U.S. Housing Policy

There has rarely, if at all, been a period in American history where urban housing supply and demand reached a point of equilibrium. Rather, there has always existed and continues to be a shortage of affordable housing for the poorest members of our society, be they part of the working class or perpetually unemployed.

Governmental concern regarding the housing situation was first expressed in 1880. That year, the federal government commissioned the first study of the national housing situation

(Fisher, 1959, p. 73). No official governmental action with respect to the findings of the study was taken until the First World War (Fisher, 1959, p. 75). However, the government was forced to enter the housing market during the war effort to provide shelter to factory workers (Radford, 1996, p. 37). During WWI, the federal government built units for more than 13,000 families and unmarried factory workers (Friedman, 1968, p. 96).

This intervention was followed by a period of prosperity during the 1920s. Federal housing programs did not emerge during this period. Rather, states took this responsibility upon themselves. For example, Massachussets passed a Homestead Act (FitzPatrick, 2000). The Homestead Act authorized the construction of a housing complex in Lowell to house the urban poor (FitzPatrick, 2000). This program was scaled down and terminated upon construction of twelve of the fifty promised homes (FitzPatrick, 2000).

At the same time, a number of private initiatives were instigated to deal with the problem of slums (Radford, 1996, p. 29). The most common initiative was referred to as "model tenements" (Friedman, 1968, p. 75). Motivated by the slogan "philanthropy and five percent," developers constructed a series of tenements to house the poor while earning a modest profit for investors (Friedman, 1968). These efforts, however, failed to serve the nation's poorest – those who were unable to pay any amount of rent (Friedman, 1968).

This period of prosperity was followed by the Great Depression. The Great Depression took its heaviest toll on the middle class, showing no visible signs of the housing crisis which would emerge at the conclusion of this economic low point (Friedman, 1968, p. 100). When the effects of the Depression started to ease, a dramatic drop in housing quantity was

revealed due to the fact that landlords had allowed properties to decay to the point where demolition was the only alternative (Friedman, 1968). Much of what had been previously considered affordable housing was gone, once again edging middle class Americans out of the housing market.

In an effort to correct the market's failure to provide housing for this sector of the population, the Public Works Administration began building housing in 1933 (Fisher, 1959, p. 86). However, the PWA's efforts were thwarted by a 1938 decision of the 6th Circuit Court in U.S. v. Certain Lands in the City of Louisville (Fisher, 1959, p. 86). As FitzPatrick describes: "The Court held that the creation of public housing was not a public purpose and the power of eminent domain could not be used to acquire land for these new homes"(FitzPatrick, 2000, p. 248). The federal government set about to circumvent the Court's decision by purchasing land and turning it over to State and local governments, along with federal funds, to construct much needed housing (FitzPatrick, 2000).

Government subsidy of public housing officially began in the 1930s with the enactment of the Housing Act of 1937 (42 U.S. 1437 (2000)). The 1937 Act, otherwise referred to as the Wagner Stegall Act, was premised on two goals: promotion of job creation and the slum clearance. The bill read:

> It is hereby declared to be the policy of the United States to promote the general welfare of the nation by employing its funds and credit, as provided in this Act, to assist the several States and their political subdivisions to alleviate present and recurring unemployment and to remedy the unsafe and unsanitary housing conditions and the acute shortage of decent, safe, and sanitary dwellings for families of low income, in urban and rural nonfarm areas, that are

injurious to the health, safety and morals of the citizens of the Nation.

United State Housing Act of 1937, 50 Stat. 888 (1937). Under the tenets of the 1937 Act, the federal government gave monies to private developers to build affordable housing rather than becoming a developer of housing itself (Green, 1994, p.690).

The 1937 Act was not an attempt to provide housing for America's poorest. This bill was designed to house the working poor, as evidenced by the comments of one of the bill's sponsors, Senator Robert Wagner, who stated: "There are some people whom we cannot possibly reach; I mean those who have no means to pay the rent . . . Obviously this bill cannot provide housing for those who cannot pay the rent minus the subsidy allowed" (Friedman, 1968, p. 109). Thus, the 1937 Act set out to house the working poor by giving them rent subsidies "to cover the shortfall between what they could pay and the market rent" (Poindexter, 2000, p. 661).

In spite of its dual purpose, the Act was widely criticized as socialist. As Representative Taylor of Tennessee charged, "The usual cries of socialism went up. The law was denounced as 'a scheme whereby a preferred few may live at the expense of the taxpayers of the nation through the instrumentality of Government paternalism" (Friedman, 1968, p. 105). The strong opposition to the Act was not the only factor that inhibited its success in providing public housing. The occurrence of World War II was the primary barrier to the success of the Act (Schill, 1993, p. 500).

If there had been a housing shortage for the working poor prior to the enactment of the 1937 Act, a housing crisis emerged upon the soldiers' return home. In response to the growing housing problem, Congress passed the Housing Act of 1949 (42 U.S.C. 1441 (1994)). Referred to as both a "blight removal"

program and "Negro removal," the 1949 Act sought to foster the construction of public housing, as well as to begin efforts to renew decaying urban neighborhoods (Derricotte, 1997, p. 694). Private developers were the intended driving force behind the 1949 Act (Poindexter, 2000, p. 662). The 1949 Act is best remembered for the leveling of entire neighborhoods in the name of slum redevelopment (Frug, 1999, p. 146).

One of the most remembered examples of slum clearance, pursuant to the terms of the 1949 Act, was the redevelopment of southwest Washington, D.C. In an effort to avoid piecemeal redevelopment efforts, local officials entered into a massive redevelopment scheme where poor and middle class families lost their homes. No efforts were made by local officials to engage neighborhood residents in the redevelopment scheme. As a result, the redevelopment became embroiled by litigation and the poster child for the negative effects of slum clearance in the media. Despite the controversy over this and other urban redevelopment projects like it, the law was very clear. In Berman v. Parker, 348 U.S. 26 (1954), the United States Supreme Court pronounced that the government had the power to condemn land for the purposes of redevelopment despite citizen opposition. Specifically, the Court held:

> It is within the power of the legislature to determine that the community should be beautiful as well as healthy, spacious as well as clean, well-balanced as well as carefully patrolled. If those who govern the District of Columbia decide that the Nation's Capital should be beautiful as well as sanitary, there is nothing in the Fifth Amendment that stands in the way.

Berman v. Parker, 348 U.S. 26, 33 (1954).

Public housing became a great source of political controversy again in the 1960s. Cities began building high rise

structures to house the poor (Friedman, 1968, p. 120). These buildings failed to meet the needs of the tenants living within them and resulted in the concentration of urban poverty and the issues that accompany it. The failure of public housing to meet the needs of residents led to "rent strikes, gross inequalities, rampant segregation, and the imminent collapse of many properties" (FitzPatrick, 2000, p. 431).

Three important legislative mandates were initiated in response the housing problems which emerged in the 1960s. First, an Executive Order was issued to end discrimination in public housing, though full integration is still not much more than a dream (Executive Order No. 11, 27 Fed. Reg. 11, 527 (1962). In addition, Congress passed the Equal Opportunity Act of 1962, devising the Community Action Program. The Community Action Program gave local residents a voice in urban redevelopment decisions (Derricotte, 1997, p. 694). It was the first federal housing policy to reflect the importance of community involvement in urban revitalization efforts.

Another product of 1960s housing policy reform was the passage of the Demonstration Cities and Metropolitan Development Act of 1966, frequently referred to as the Model Cities Program. This Act actually resulted in a step backwards in terms of citizen participation. The 1966 Act called for "widespread citizen participation" (McFarlane, 2001). In spite of this requirement, little participation actually occurred. As McFarlane (2001) surmises that planning processes became more cumbersome to the extent that local governments made an effort to comply with this participation requirement.

In the 1970s, the Model Cities Program was replaced by the Community Development Block Grant program. Under this program, citizen participation was again called for, but in a limited form (McFarlane, 2001). The participation requirement merely

called for the calling of public meetings to obtain citizen input on the application for CDBG monies and the use to which such federal funds might be put. Such input could be ignored by the local governing body so long as an effort was made to collect it.

A new alternative for public housing emerged in the 1970s with the creation of the Section 8 program. Enacted in 1973, this program allowed those were qualified to live in public housing to enter the housing market again with the assistance of a financial subsidy for rent. Subsidies went to developers for the creation of units and to tenants so they could afford to live in such units. This was the first program that really gave those living in public housing a choice about where and how they would live, an ultimate form of participation. The program continues today, only under a new name – the Housing Choice Program. The program remains an alternative to living in traditional public housing communities.

In 1979, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development began to require tenant consultation (Krislov, 1988, p. 1749). It was 1984, however, before public housing tenants earned the statutory right to participate in the redevelopment of the projects in which they lived (Krislov, 1988, p. 1749). This right to participate was codified as part of the 1937 Act through the Supplemental Appropriations Act of 1984, 42 U.S.C. 1437 (1984), in a provision entitled, "Domestic Housing and International Recovery and Financial Stability Act." Pursuant to Section 1437p(b)(1) of the 1984 Act, HUD was and continues to be prohibited from authorizing the demolition or sale of public housing assets unless a local public housing authority's application to do so "has been developed in consultation with the tenants and tenant councils . . . who will be affected by the demolition or disposition." The 1984 Act was

a major victory in terms of residents' rights to participate in the development and or redevelopment of the public housing projects where they lived.

While a victory in ensuring participation, the 1984 Act has been a source of much litigation. One of the primary reasons for the litigation associated with this act is the failure of the Congress to define what it meant by consultation. In Edwards v. District of Columbia, 821 F.2d 651 (D.C. Cir. 1987), the Federal Court of Appeals for the District of Columbia began a dialogue over this question. However, the Court of Appeals failed to provide a definitive answer to this question, instead deciding the case on another question, i.e. whether "de facto demolition" by neglect, rather than constructive demolition, required tenant consultation. Congress eliminated this distinction with the following statement:

> This provision is intended to correct an erroneous interpretation of the existing statute by the United States Court of Appeals for the D.C. Circuit in Edwards v. District of Columbia and shall be fully enforceable by tenants of and applications for the housing that is threatened.

(H.R. Conf. Rep. No. 100-426, 1987, p. 3469).

By the 1980s, the quality of existing public housing stock had significantly deteriorated (Note in Harv. L. Rev., March, 2003). So, too, had federal financial support for the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (Note in Harv. L. Rev., March, 2003). Congress set out to address this period of decline through the creation of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing. Following the Commission's investigation, it issued a report to Congress stating that at least 86,000 units of public housing were "severely distressed" (Nat'l Comm'n on Severely Distressed Pub.

Hous., Final Report of the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing 2 (Aug. 1992). The Commission urged Congress to authorize "a new partnership program among public housing authorities (PHAs), nonprofit organizations, the private sector, and residents to attract additional resources" (Abt Assocs Inc., 1996). Based on the findings of the Commission, Congress authorized the creation of the HOPE VI program[1]. (Abt Assocs Inc., 1996).

---

[1] HOPE VI was not the first version of this Act. HOPE I sought to provide grants to housing authorities in an effort to increase homeownership among residents of public and Native American Housing. The last time funding was sought under HOPE I was 1995. In 1988, the component of the Act that provided assistance to Native Americans was removed and reassigned to a separate HUD authorized grant program. HOPE II expanded the powers of this Act to provide grants to increase homeownership among residents of multi-family housing projects whose income was less than 80% of the median of those living in their area. HOPE III expanded the scope of the law to provide grants to provide opportunities for single-family home ownership to low-income families. No funding has been requested for the HOPE I through III programs since the 1995 fiscal year. The HOPE IV program was designed to combine Section 8 housing assistance with supportive services for the low-income elderly and to avoid premature entry to nursing homes. While a $9.9 million grant was originally awarded in 1993 for a pilot project under this version of the HOPE Act, further funding has not been requested. According to James Bovard, writing for the Ludwig von Mises Institute's monthly newsletter, *The Free Market*, there was never a program designated HOPE V. Congress skipped from IV to VI, for unknown reasons (HUD, 2001).

The evolution of Federal housing policy represents a process whereby new policy is created based on the failures of the past. Those engaged in the provision of public housing no longer seek to concentrate the urban poor in slum areas. They do not seek to use housing policy to clear out slums. Rather, housing policy advocates seek to find ways to integrate those who need housing assistance into communities. Part of the reason that the provision of public housing is less controversial and problematic than it was in the 1960s and 1970s is due, at least in part, to the fact that those charged with the provision of public housing have begun listening and calling for the participation of those who require such assistance. The HOPE VI program is the next step in the evolution of American housing policy, developed in such a way to avoid repetition of past mistakes and to include those who live in public housing in decisionmaking activities.

B. HOPE VI as a Tool for Urban Renewal and the Development of Urban Mixed Income Housing Communities

The housing crisis in America's cities reached a point of critical concern in the 1990s. As FitzPatrick (2000, p. 435) explains:

> Housing funds were stagnant between 1995 and 1998, and the number of units actually dropped by 66,000. At the same time, the government passed welfare reform which requires recipients to work, usually without any

> job training, forcing them to compete for unskilled, low paid jobs. While the economy is certainly robust and the evidence (while very suspect) does indicate that many families are getting jobs, housing remains a crucial concern. Even full-time work at minimum wage will not be enough to support a family and pay for decent housing. Housing costs will force families to remain in poverty and may well destroy any attempts are real self-sufficiency.

Congress recognized the call for housing policy reform and answered the call by creating a bi-partisan commission appointed by both the House and Senate to study the problem. The Commission issued its final report in 1992 and served as the basis for the HOPE VI program, as detailed more fully below.

The HOPE VI program, also known as the Urban Revitalization Demonstration program, was established as part of an appropriations act in 1993 (42 U.S.C. Section 1437 (2000)). According Popkin et al. (2004), the HOPE VI law was not based on legitimate evidence that the Act would bring about the changes sought. Rather, according to the authors, the law was based on a sense that a radical approach to housing policy was necessary to correct for the failure of previous governmental actions to deal with distressed public housing (Popkin et al., 2004). This legislative mandate seeks to deconcentrate poverty (Wilson, 1987). The major premise of the Act is to "improve lives by helping relocate to better neighborhoods or creating healthier communities at the same site" (Popkin et al., 2004, p. 387).

According to Salama (1999, p. 96), the initial HOPE VI program was a "patchwork quilt of evolving laws." Salama identifies three core pieces of this so-called patchwork quilt:

1. Elimination of federal preferences emphasizing the lowest income households for admission to public housing (U.S. Public Law 102-550).
2. Elimination of the one-for-one replacement requirement for demolished public housing units (U.S. Public Law 104-19).
3. Authorization to use public housing development funds and operating subsidies for projects owned by a private entity other than a PHA.

(Salama, 1999, p. 96). In its early years, HOPE VI came under review on annual basis, requiring an annual appropriation bill to extend this policy initiative. A more formalized version of HOPE VI was adopted by Congress in October 1998 (U.S. Public Law 105-276). The new act, known as the Quality Housing and Work Responsibility Act, guaranteed the permanency of HOPE VI. Pursuant to the terms of the Act, HUD annually issues a Notice of Funding Availability (NOFA) requesting that local public housing authorities submit applications for consideration. As detailed by FitzPatrick (2000, p. 437), these applications are reviewed based on the following criteria:

> level of obsolescence of the current project, consultation and cooperation with residents, density and income mix of the proposed project, leveraging of outside resources, family self-sufficiency plans for residents, size of the new development, and the need for funding.

Upon review of the applications submitted by local public housing authorities, HUD will award grant monies for the following purposes:

1. Improving the living environment for public housing residents of severely distressed public housing projects through the demolition,

rehabilitation, reconfiguration, or replacement of obsolete public housing projects (or portions thereof);

2. Revitalizing sites (including remaining public housing dwelling units) on which such public housing projects are located and contributing to the improvement of the surrounding neighborhood;
3. Providing housing that will avoid or decrease the concentration of very low-income families; and
4. Building sustainable communities

(42 U.S.C. Section 1437 (2000)).

While the Act has evolved over time, the general purpose has remained the same: to completely renovate the most distressed public housing stock, transforming it into mixed income communities (Epp, 1996). The resulting communities are different from those built as part of past public housing efforts in a number of ways. First, HOPE VI has been used to obliterate public housing high rises in favor of mixed residential compositions (Salama, 1999). In addition, the residents of these new communities are economically diverse, with a third or less of the residents living in units paid for with public housing subsidies (Salama, 1999). Through HOPE VI, HUD seeks to assist local public housing authorities with efforts to deconcentrate areas experiencing extreme poverty and to integrate new community residents racially and economically (Salama, 1999). The overarching philosophy of the HOPE VI program is that such integration will assist lower income residents in becoming more self sufficient, with the ultimate goal of turning public housing residents into homeowners (Salama, 1999).

Pursuant to the terms of the Act, local public housing authorities compete annually for HOPE VI grants. They file

extensive applications with HUD in an effort to justify their request for monies to either demolish entirely or revitalize existing properties that they have deemed "severely distressed." Severely distressed public housing is widely defined in the annual NOFA's released by HUD. The 2002 NOFA, published July 31, 2002, defined the term to include public housing that requires:

> Major redesign, reconstruction, or redevelopment; housing that is a significant contributing factor to the physical decline of, and disinvestment by public and private entities in, the surrounding neighborhood; housing occupied predominantly by families who are very low income families with children, are unemployed, and dependent on various forms of public assistance; or has high rates of vandalism and criminal activity; and housing that cannot be revitalized through assistance under other programs . . . because of cost constraints and inadequacy of available amounts.

HOPE VI is a relatively young Act. The success of this policy initiative is difficult to judge at this point, in part, "because there is no consensus on how to define success" (Popkin et al., 2004, p. 392). However, researchers have started to publish preliminary evidence of the effects of this Act on the lives of public housing residents and the neighborhoods where they reside. With respect to the vitality of neighborhoods where HOPE VI projects have been implemented, research suggests that this policy initiative has had positive effects (Popkin et al. 2004; Zielenbach 2002). According to Popkin et al. 2004, existing data indicates that those who have been relocated as part of HOPE VI revitalization efforts are ". . . now living in better housing in neighborhoods that are less

poor and have less crime than their original HOPE VI development" (p. 401). There is, of course, one major caveat to these finding of success. The same survey suggests those who have been relocated remain in racially segregated neighborhoods (Popkin et al., 2004).

There is some evidence, however, that the program has harmed the residents displaced by HOPE VI revitalization efforts (Popkin et al., 2004). According to Popkin et al. (2004, p. 392), a study prepared by the National Housing Law Project (2002) suggests:

> . . . that the program has targeted developments that were not truly distressed, that it has substantially reduced the amount of affordable housing in many cities, and that screening criteria have excluded many former residents from new mixed income developments. Further, these critics note that there is minimal information available to assess program performance, particularly data that would indicate how residents have fared during the transformation of public housing.

There is some evidence that the HOPE VI program is not living up to its general aspiration to return as many as possible of the displaced residents to the revitalized communities. The Tracking Survey revealed that while nearly 70% of respondents wished to return to the redeveloped communities very few of the residents actually got to (Popkin et al., 2004, p. 407). These findings are consistent with previous research efforts (Keating, 2000; Kingsley, Johnson and Pettit, 2003; Kleit and Manzo, 2003; Wexler, 2000).

C. Atlanta's Quest for HOPE VI Funds

The AHA has been hugely successful in securing HOPE VI funds for redevelopment within the metropolitan area. Six HOPE VI grants have been awarded to this housing authority, the most infamous of these being the redevelopment of both Clark Howell Homes and Techwood Estates. Located north of the City's central business district and near to both the Georgia Institute of Technology and the world headquarters for Coca Cola, these two public housing community became issues of concern when the City won the bid to host the 1996 Summer Olympic Games. HOPE VI monies were sought and secured for the redevelopment of these sites as housing and parking for the Olympic Games.

This first redevelopment effort by Atlanta was highly controversial. There remains debate over the projects' success. HUD gave the project a Blue Ribbon Best Practices Award. Others see the project as a tragedy (Keating, 2001). Keating describes the project as a bureaucratic abuse of time and money to crush resident opposition, with a mere 30 of the 1,000 resident families returning to the redeveloped site (FitzPatrick, 2000, p. 442). The real problem with this HOPE VI project, according to Keating, was its effects on residents. This site was converted in favor of those who could afford to live in luxury homes and to the benefits of Coca Cola, Georgia Tech, and numerous real estate speculators who made a fortune due to the conversion (FitzPatrick, 2000, p. 443). As FitzPatrick (2000, p. 443) summarizes,

> Public housing funds, HOPE VI funds, were used to tear down existing housing and push people out of their homes and further into poverty, all to assist in the

beautification of an area, with the largest benefit redounding to those least in need.

Despite the outcry that resulted from the HOPE VI grant for the redevelopment of Techwood, the AHA has continued to apply for and be awarded funds to redevelop other public housing communities within the City. These projects have been less controversial, or at least have received less national press than the Techwood project. Why? Housing authority officials suggest that the reason for their success in continuing to obtain HOPE VI funds, is due, at least in part, to the fact that they have learned from their past mistakes. The most telling lesson learned has been with respect to the involvement and treatment of those currently living in communities for which HOPE VI funds are being sought. The message was clear and repeated often: early buy-in to proposed projects not only reduces future battles between the public housing authority and the residents involved, but it also leads to the more successful revitalization efforts in the long run.

D. Seeking HOPE VI Funds to Redevelop McDaniel Glenn

The AHA's most recent efforts to redevelop the City's existing public housing stock has been to seek and obtain HOPE VI funding for the revitalization of the McDaniel Glenn housing community, located in an area of downtown Atlanta called Mechanicsville. The Mechanicsville neighborhood is comprised of 314 acres, 30 % of which are vacant or contain surface parking lots (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 39). The redevelopment of this site has been identified by the AHA as the final "piece to the puzzle" for the revitalization of the

Mechanicsville neighborhood (Executive Summary of HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 3).

The Mechanicsville neighborhood dates back to the turn of the century and is named after the railroad mechanics who lived there. Mechanicsville, a historically mixed income community, began to experience changes in composition in the 1960s. Some blame the 1968 construction of the McDaniel Glenn public housing community for the steady decline in population. According to AHA officials, "In the 10 years between 1960 and 1970, the time during which the McDaniel Glenn public housing community was constructed, the population of Mechanicsville dropped from 10,530 to 7,566, which represents a 28% reduction" (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40). By 2003, the population of Mechanicsville shrunk to 3,499, despite "a period of unprecedented growth in the rest of Atlanta" (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40).

The economic stability of the neighborhood further declined due to massive demolition in the area for the construction of both Interstate I75/85 and Turner Field. Ironically, the AHA, one of the public entities pushing for the redevelopment of this neighborhood, was the original condemning authority for the projects that led to the further decline of Mechanicsville.

Today, Mechanicsville lacks the racial and economic diversity it once experienced. According to the 2003 data, the population of Mechanicsville is 92% African American (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40). The estimated mean income of the households in the neighborhood is $10,502 - well below the national poverty line (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40). Eighty percent of households are led by women (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40). The median age of neighborhood residents is 26.9 years, much younger than both the Atlanta MSA (33.1 years) and the City of Atlanta (34.2) (HOPE VI Grant

Application, 2004, p. 40). Only 35% of those living within the neighborhood have finished high school (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40).

McDaniel Glenn fits neatly within these neighborhood demographics. Fifty percent of the population is under the age of 18 (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40). The median income of families in the public housing community is $7,323. Mothers head 60% of the households (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40).

Crime rates for "Part One Crimes" (homicide, rape, robbery, aggravated assault, arson, burglary, larceny, and auto theft) are high in Mechanicsville, especially at McDaniel Glenn. In 2001, the crime rate in Mechanicsville was 149 per 1,000 residents and 190.75 for McDaniel Glenn, both statistics higher than the citywide crime rate of 136.7 (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 41). As to the higher rate of crime in McDaniel Glenn, the AHA explains:

> The poor condition of the buildings and site at McDaniel Glenn, combined with the deficient site design (indefensible space and inadequate exterior lighting) and super block layout, creates safety and security problems that attract criminal activities. In fact, McDaniel Glenn has the highest incidence of crime among all AHA communities

(HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 41).

The neighborhood poverty and crime rates have a dramatic effect on the quality of the schools that serve the Mechanicsville youth. The neighborhood is served by five schools: one elementary school (Dunbar); two middle schools (Park and Price); and two high schools (Carver and Southside) – all of which were ranked in the bottom 50% of State schools by the Georgia Public Policy Foundation (HOPE VI Grant Application,

2004, p. 40). Fifty-two percent of the youth at McDaniel Glenn attend Dunbar Elementary, a school with such:

> serious problems that in 2000, the Enterprise Foundation applied for and was awarded a $125 million grant from the Annenberg Foundation to develop a comprehensive school reform model to improve the environment for the children in school, at home and within the larger community

(HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 40). Beyond poor academic performance, the Enterprise Foundation sought assistance from the Annenberg Foundation as a result of parental complaints about safety.

> Parents complain that they are afraid to let their children play in the area because of the drug traffic and used needles that are lying on the ground around the school. Older youth loiter on the front steps of the building in the evening and on the weekends. School officials frequently complain about disruptive behavior of adults who use the facility as a place of refuge from neighborhood crime, attempting to hang out on the premises to avoid involvement in local altercations between drug users and their suppliers

(HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 41).

Despite the economic instability of the neighborhood, this declining neighborhood has recently taken a turn. As the AHA described in its Executive Summary:

> Atlanta is experiencing one of the strongest rebirths of a major urban center in the country. Urban sprawl has resulted in an unprecedented interest in living in the city. Land in the city is at a premium, and well located land presents opportunity. Mechanicsville is less than one mile from the central business and

> government district. The neighborhood enjoys direct access to both of Atlanta's major interstates. These assets, combined with the recent resurgence of interest and investment in this in-town neighborhood, make the revitalization of McDaniel Glenn a most strategic redevelopment opportunity for the community, AHA and the City of Atlanta

(Executive Summary of Grant Application, 2004, p. 1). Unlike some of its other HOPE VI efforts, the redevelopment of the McDaniel housing community is not the catalyst for neighborhood redevelopment. Rather, it appears to be an effort to supplement redevelopment efforts spawned by the City of Atlanta.

Efforts by the City to revitalize the Mechanicsville neighborhood began in 1995 when the City successfully secured Section 108 and EDI funds in the amount of $5.65 million (Executive Summary of Grant Application, 2004, p. 4). These funds were dedicated to the construction of new housing, retail, and infrastructure in the area (Executive Summary of Grant Application, 2004, p. 4). With these funds, a number of blighted properties were condemned and demolished and gateways to the neighborhood were established in anticipation of the 1996 Olympic Games (Executive Summary of Grant Application, 2004, p. 4). During this period, SUMMECH built a 69 unit townhouse development and redeveloped 54 units of rental housing at Rosa Burney Manor, an infusion of capital in the neighborhood approaching $10 million (Executive Summary of Grant Application, 2004, p. 4).

Properties abutting the McDaniel Glenn housing community are also being redeveloped. The Atlanta Development Authority is building Toby Sexton Lofts, a $21 million adaptive reuse project that will provide 201 units of rental housing, adjacent to the McDaniel Glenn site (Executive Summary of Grant

Application, 2004, p. 4). In addition, private developers have recently completed Ware Estates and City Side Lofts, with the average sales price of $143,547. These private developments are yielding values near prices in Atlanta ($187,240) and in the Atlanta MSA ($155,789) (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 42). According to the AHA, "The Mechanicsville housing market is poised to explode with increased activity as savvy buyers look for more opportunities to live in-town and avoid lengthy commutes" (HOPE VI Grant Application, 2004, p. 42). Efforts to obtain the HOPE VI grant will perpetuate such redevelopment efforts.

E. The HOPE VI Planning Process at McDaniel Glenn

The necessary first step of applying for a HOPE VI grant for the redevelopment of any public housing community, including McDaniel Glenn, includes the formation of a planning committee to discuss and make recommendations with respect to the design of the Signature Community which will replace the existing development. Signature Community is the term used by the AHA to describe those traditional public housing communities that have been redeveloped using HOPE VI funds into mixed use and income communities. The HOPE VI Act states:

> Full resident involvement and community input are crucial elements of the HOPE VI Program. The spirit of the HOPE VI Program of full consultation and collaboration among the Grantee, affected residents and the broader community

(HUD, 2001). While HUD has not issued any implementing regulations with respect to HOPE VI, the notices of funding availability for the grant program require local public housing authorities to hold a series of training session and public meetings prior to the submission of grant applications (HUD, 2001). The same requirements are contained in HUD's form grant agreements for HOPE VI which provide that resident participation should be sought for the period beginning with the preparation of the application and running throughout the implementation process (HUD, 2001).

In the late summer months of 2003, the AHA served notice to the residents of McDaniel Glenn that the agency was going to hold a series of public meetings and workshops in an effort to secure a HOPE VI award for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn. At the first public meeting, AHA officials took nominations for a chair, vice chair, and secretary and established a planning committee of McDaniel Glenn's residents. All community residents were eligible to serve on the planning committee in a leadership or membership capacity. A formal vote was taken at the second public meeting for the election of planning committee officers. These officers served as the liaisons between residents and AHA officials during the participation process.

Interestingly, the HOPE VI law only requires a short life span for planning committees like the one at McDaniel Glenn. Such committees are structured to operate until the filing of the HOPE VI application by the local housing authority. At the suggestion of the planning committee, the AHA decided to extend the life of the planning committee at McDaniel Glenn. This group met once a month, beginning in August 2003 through the award of the grant in July 2004. While outside the scope of this particular study, the planning committee at McDaniel Glenn will continue to hold monthly meetings throughout the course of

the relocation period and subsequent return of the residents to the redeveloped Signature Community – a period that may exceed five years.

In addition to extending the life of the McDaniel Glenn planning committee, the AHA went a step further to increase the number of stakeholders participating in the planning process. The AHA has chosen to involve a special group of stakeholders in the planning process for the revitalization of McDaniel Glenn. Youth residents from ages 11-17 are being involved in a separate but parallel planning process.

I initially chose Atlanta as the site for this study because of the uniqueness of the AHA's decision to involve youth in the planning process. The involvement of youth in the HOPE VI planning process for McDaniel Glenn was not initially sought. Rather, it was a consequence of the first public meeting involving the residents and AHA officials. AHA officials described the first meeting of the planning committee as packed with people. Many parents brought their children. The most likely reason that they brought their children was that there was no one to care for them at home.

The youth in attendance seemed interested in what was going on at the meeting and attempted to voice their ideas. They were silenced by their parents. Possible reasons for the hushing of the children's opinions were concerns by the parents that their children did not really understand what was going on. This is where one of the AHA officials came up with the idea of involving youth in the planning process. Previously employed by the AHA to work with youth, this housing authority official strongly believed that the youth at McDaniel Glenn knew what was going on, that they were going to have to move, and decided to include them in the planning process.

While I initially chose to study the participatory process undertaken at McDaniel Glenn because of the youth involvement, it became clear that the uniqueness of the planning process at McDaniel Glenn transcended the issue of youth participation. As a result, I expanded the parameters of my study in an effort to address a broader issue: Does participation in the planning process for the redevelopment of a public housing community lessen the pre-relocation grief experienced by participants? Two subsequent questions emerged: does intergenerational participation on a planning committee or the presence of an advocacy planner contribute to the reduction in pre-relocation grief. These questions are answered in the chapters that follow.

CHAPTER 3: METHODOLOGY

A. Overall Approach and Rationale

The research design for this study underwent many revisions before data collection efforts commenced. It began as a qualitative case study of a unique planning process involving youth and adults as members of an intergenerational planning committee. As the literature revealed, the phenomenon to be studied was unique. Previous research efforts had only begun to focus on the participation activities which involved homogeneous groups of adults or youth. This study was to be one of the first of its kind in that the phenomenon of focus was to be on intergenerational planning process wherein adult and youth members of a public housing community have come together to plan for the redevelopment of their community. Due to the uniqueness of the phenomenon, a single case was chosen for study. At the time, no similar processes were available for comparison in Atlanta, the selected city, or in other public housing communities in the U.S.

B. Evolution of Research Questions

What drew me to Atlanta and, more specifically, McDaniel Glenn was the uniqueness of the intergenerational planning

process that had been underway at the site for more than six months before I began data collection efforts. Initially, I intended to focus solely on relationships between the youth and adult participants and their perceptions of such participatory efforts. In my research prospectus for this dissertation, I proposed the following research questions: How do the youth and adult members of the planning committees perceive their participation? Do perceived participation levels of youth and adult members of the planning committee match actual participation levels, as gauged by the researcher's own observations?

As originally designed, this study would have provided new and useful knowledge about perceptions of and actual participation by youth and adult members of a planning committee, adding to existing literature which hypothesizes about the opportunities of bringing adult and youth stakeholders together to deliberate about and propose solutions for dealing with urban problems which are of mutual interest to both groups. However, further investigation into the planning process undertaken by the AHA at McDaniel Glenn led to additional and intriguing questions related to the proposed study of the intergenerational planning committee. It became evident early on that this study would fail to fully comprehend the true uniqueness of the intergenerational planning process going on at the site without beginning with a broader lens. That broader lens required the development of a research methodology which would explain why residents, both adults and youth alike, were experiencing a low level of anxiety about the prospect of being displaced if the HOPE VI grant was awarded to the AHA for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn. As a result, I decided to study the possible reasons for this low level of anxiety despite the real threat of tenant displacement from McDaniel Glenn.

The question became how best to study a unique phenomenon without becoming encumbered by the rigidity of the original research questions. The answer to this dilemma lay in adopting a grounded theory approach for this particular qualitative case study. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 23), "a grounded theory is one that is inductively derived from the study of the phenomenon it represents." In choosing to employ the grounded theory approach, this meant rejecting the traditional rational approach to research which involves crafting a research question and gathering data to prove the theory upon which the research question was based (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). With grounded theory, the authors' contend, "one begins with an area of study and what is relevant to that area is allowed to emerge" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). In this case, the area of study was the intergenerational planning committee. What emerged was a much richer understanding of that phenomenon, as well as the much broader context in which said planning committee operated. In its final form, this case study attempts to address the following questions: (1) Does participation in the planning process for the redevelopment of a public housing community lessen the relocation grief experienced by participants; (2) Does participation on the intergenerational planning committees contribute to the grief reduction experienced by the youth and adult residents; and (3) Has the presence of an advocacy planner contributed to the reduction of relocation-related grief among the members of the intergenerational planning committee at McDaniel Glenn.

While not intentional, many of the methodological characteristics of this study mirror some of the characteristics of the research designs employed by Marc Fried and Herbert Gans, two scholars whose work has provided a detailed description of the effects of displacement by urban renewal efforts. Fried set

out to study the effects of relocation on the working class residents of Boston’s West End.[2] He developed an index to measure the grief effects of relocation at two points in time: the point at which the residents learned they would be displaced and two years after the displacement. I was unaware of Fried’s work prior to commencing this study. At that time, I was not aware that the issue of relocation grief would become relevant to my study. While I did not employ the index developed by Fried, many of the questions I would eventually ask interviewees focused on the anxiety the residents felt about being displaced from McDaniel Glenn. In this way, the data that I collected at McDaniel Glenn is useful in building on the understanding of relocation effects generated by Fried’s work.

It is important to note two key limitations of my study, as compared with Fried’s work. First, my case study of McDaniel Glenn does not seek to be all encompassing. I did not attempt to interview all community residents, or even a broad sample of said residents in the way that Fried did. Rather, my study only discusses the grief effects borne by the residents of McDaniel Glenn who served as members of the intergenerational planning committee. It is likely that those who were unwilling or unable to participate in the planning process may be suffering grief effects different in nature to their counterparts who actively participated. In addition, my study departs from the model established by Fried in that it only represents a series of pre-location interviews with respondents. My future research agenda will likely include a series of post-relocation interviews with some of the members of the planning committee for the purposes of comparison. Given the nature of the HOPE VI program, I hope to expand on the research design proposed by Fried and later

[2] The particulars of Fried’s study are more fully described in Chapter 4 of this dissertation.

conduct a final series of interviews with those members of the planning committee who will eventually return to the revitalized housing community on the McDaniel Glenn site.

In terms of research design, this case study is much more in line with the work of Herbert Gans. In The Urban Villagers (1962; 1982), Gans conducted a study of a slum in the West End neighborhood in Boston. He assumed the role as participant observer from the proximity as a neighborhood resident. His research was fueled with the desire to understand the dynamics of slums and what differentiates the poor from the working class in these neighborhoods. He gathered data through the following methods: use of neighborhood facilities; attendance at neighborhood meetings; informal visits with neighborhood residents; formal and informal interviews of the residents; use of informants; and through observation.

Like Gans, I embarked on this research project to gain a better understanding of the ways in which youth and adult members could participate jointly in a participatory planning project. Unlike Gans, I was unable to move into the community studied nor was I of the same race of those I studied. Because of these differences, I entered the site for my first visit thinking that I would be able to remain a mere observer. I departed from this initial meeting realizing that these differences would prevent me from being a mere observer. The residents were keenly interested in the reasons for my presence and immediately began inquiring about my intentions. My explanation of the research interests that led me to McDaniel Glenn generated an interest among the residents. I received a warm welcome into the McDaniel Glenn community.[3] I was invited

[3] Gans attributes the depth of the data he was able to collect to the fact that he was of the same race of his research subjects.

into residents' homes for dinner and conversation. I was asked specific questions regarding my opinions of the AHA's efforts to obtain HOPE VI funding for redevelopment. At this early stage in the research, it became imminently clear that the success of this study depended upon my participation in the community.

I employed many of the same data collection techniques Gans used. I attended the meetings of the intergenerational planning committee. I interviewed residents, both formally and informally. I relied on informants, particularly the president of the adult planning committee, the co-chairs of the youth planning committee, and AHA officials, in order to stay abreast of community issues. I also reviewed meeting agendas and the application for the HOPE VI grant jointly filed by the AHA and community residents. Like Gans, the qualitative data I collected serves as the basis for my findings and the discussion that follows.

C. Selection of Phenomenon and Site of Study

I identified the subject of this study, i.e. the intergenerational planning committee at McDaniel Glenn, after coming across an article about a HOPE VI-related youth initiative sponsored by HUD. In 2001, as a part of its HOPE VI initiative, the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development invited 150 young residents from 31 HOPE VI communities to attend a national youth conference in Washington, D.C. According to U-C Berkley researcher, Deborah McKoy,

---

This was not the case with respect to my work at McDaniel Glenn. Despite this difference, race did not seem to be a significant barrier to my welcome into the community.

> The conference idea was first conceived at a regional HUD meeting in Dallas last June, when a group of residents were sitting together with housing officials discussing ways of improving the relocation process. One of the key challenges facing many HOPE VI communities is continuing to keep residents actively engaged in their community during the demolition and development phase. For many families the greatest issue is their children's needs as their lives are often turned upside down having to move schools, find new friends and places to hang out – nearly everything a teenager looks to for a sense of place and safety.
>
> "Our kids need to do more than play midnight basketball … ain't no one knows how this place functions – or should function – like our kids, you should be asking them not just us how our new places should look!"

Pursuant to a subsequent directive from Former Deputy Assistant Secretary Eleanor Bacon and Director of Social and Community Services Ron Ashford, the National Youth Leadership by Design Conference was held in Washington, D.C. in January 2001.

According to McKoy, the goals of this conference were three fold:

> (1) provide youth living in HOPE VI communities with basic skills and knowledge of the planning and design process to make informed suggestions about how their communities should be changed; (2) provide a forum to conduct a "charrette process" engaging youth from around the nation in the actual design and model building process to bring their ideas into physical

representations; and (3) share these powerful and innovative visions with each other and youth at home.

At that conference, HUD personnel and Berkley researchers from the School of Landscape Architecture led the youth participants through a number of community visioning activities, including: walking tours, mapping exercises, the development of narratives, and model building. The ultimate product of these exercises was the creation of action plans that could be implemented by the youth, with the assistance of their sponsoring housing authorities, upon return home.

According to conference sponsors, the conference was successful in inspiring the youth and the relevant housing authorities to imagine a multiplicity of ways that young people might be involved in the planning and development of their HOPE VI communities. One of the many initiatives inspired by this conference was an interest by local housing authorities to place youth on HOPE VI planning committees. These planning committees are official oversight committees intended to bring key community stakeholders together to provide guidance of HOPE VI revitalization.

Each HOPE VI community is required by HUD to have a planning committee that meets bi-annually, at a minimum. Traditionally, these planning committees have been composed of adult residents of HOPE VI communities, as well as school districts, social service agencies, nonprofit agencies, as well as other relevant stakeholders. These planning committees are advisory, meaning that they are not vested with decisionmaking authority. Rather, they serve as advisors to the local housing authorities. They provide advice on issues identified by the housing authorities, as well as the residents of the HOPE VI community which the serve. The primary focus of the

deliberations of these planning committees is on issues related to the redevelopment process. One of the primary topics these planning committees are often asked to discuss and report on is the issue of relocation of individuals from traditional public housing to HOPE VI communities.

As a result of the HUD-sponsored national conference, youth are now being included on these planning committees and subcommittees thereof. The following table identifies those public housing authorities that have sought to or are in the process of seeking to include youth on these planning committees.

Table 1: Survey Results of Housing Authorities Involving Youth in Planning Activities

HOUSING AUTHORITY	YOUTH ON PLANNING COMMITTEES	YOUTH ON SUBCOMMITTEES	PROPOSED BUT NOT IN PLACE
Chattanooga	Yes	Yes	
Atlanta	No	Yes	
D.C.	No	No	
Seattle			X
Wilmington, DE	Yes	Yes	
Oakland	Yes	Yes	
Albany	Yes	Yes	
Tacoma	Yes	Yes	
St. Louis	No	Yes	
Spartanburg	No	Yes	
Tampa			X
Kansas City	No	Yes	
Jacksonville			X

The information in this table was collected as a result of a short email survey, conducted by a HUD organizer of all

conference participants. Prior to my request for a list of sites involving youth on planning committees, HUD had not been tracking the level of youth participation in HOPE VI planning processes.

Based on the responses from the surveyed housing authorities, the HUD organizer suggested Atlanta as a possible site for study, providing the following justification for the selection of the Atlanta:

- Multiple HOPE VI sites and separate planning committees attached to each;
- Housing Authority shows a real commitment to the youth based HOPE VI initiative;
- Proximity to researcher;
- Well studied Housing Authority – availability of data and a population that is accustomed to being studied; and
- Availability of meeting minutes of past meetings of the task forces.

The HUD organizer described the proposed research project as something that would be highly useful to Atlanta, a housing authority who appears to be committed to involving young people in the planning process. In addition to all of these very practical reasons for selecting to study the activities of the AHA, follow-up interviews with the other housing authorities who had responded to the HUD organizer's email indicated that these agencies were in the early phases of contemplating how to engage youth in such processes. None of the agencies had, at the commencement of this study, created intergenerational planning committees wherein the youth and adults came together to discuss future redevelopment activities. In Atlanta, the idea for youth participation had been institutionalized with the planning process for Centennial Place. The intergenerational planning

committee at McDaniel Glenn marked the next evolution for the AHA in planning with youth. With the assistance of HUD personnel, the AHA granted me access to study the HOPE VI planning process at McDaniel Glenn.

D. Building a Grounded Theory Study that Goes Beyond Mere Description

Many challenge the validity of reliance on the grounded theory approach for building social scientific theory. While most would agree with the usefulness of the approach in attempting to describe unique phenomenon, some researchers would challenge the approach's ability to generate theory. Certainly, data obtained using the grounded theory approach is rich in its ability to describe a particular phenomenon like the intergenerational planning committee. It is often upon such descriptions that quantitative research is formulated. Grounded theory need not end in description. Rather, the data gathered in such studies must be conceptualized and interpreted in order to build theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

In order to be more than a mere description a unique planning process, this case study, like other similar studies, required the development of "a systematic set of procedures to develop an inductively derived grounded theory about a phenomenon" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 24). Like all research, the first procedure of grounded theory involves choosing a research problem (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). Research problems typically avail themselves to research because

they have been (1) suggested or assigned; (2) revealed by reading the technical literature in a particular field; or (3) a manifestation of personal or professional experience (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

In the case of this study, the second and the third methods of revelation are appropriate. As a graduate student, I served as a guardian ad litem for an 8 year old child who had been removed from her home and placed in foster care. The court instructed me that my job was to study the facts of the case, to read all relevant documents, and to interview all related parties. Upon completion of my review, I was to inform the child of the recommendation I would make to the court. I did my job and everything went smoothly until I attempted to explain my recommendation to the young girl and she said, "That's not what I want. Aren't you going to ask me?"

I learned an invaluable lesson from that client. It is this. Young people are highly cognizant of what is occurring in the world around them. Based on their observations and experiences, these young people have strong opinions about how their lives may be improved by changes to both the physical and social environments they inhabit. Often, their ideas will mirror those of their parents, teachers, and neighbors. In many instances, however, young people's suggestions for change reflect an ingenuity and creativity unparalleled by their adult counterparts.

This particular experience, along with some other interactions with youth, spurred my interest in the ability of youth to contribute to their own well-being, as well as the vitality of the communities where they reside. As a doctoral student, I began familiarizing myself with literature which highlighted the role of youth in planning practice. I came

across the particular youth-based initiative which is the focus of this study in an article published in an on-line magazine.

The second procedure of the grounded theory approach, not unlike that associated with the scientific method, is the formulation of a research question (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). As previously explained, the research questions upon which grounded theory studies are based are much broader. According to Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 38), "the research question in a grounded theory study is a statement that identifies the phenomenon being studied." The phenomenon studied here is the intergenerational planning committee. However, a more detailed investigation of said planning committee revealed a much more revealing research question. That is, why was the AHA willing to create such a planning committee and extend its term of participation beyond statutorily mandated guidelines. From this lens, it became possible to look beyond the members of the intergenerational planning committee to develop a fuller understanding of why such a project was being undertaken by an agency that is not known for its commitment to citizen participation.

Data collection is the next procedural step of the grounded theory approach (Strauss and Corbin, 1990). There are many sources and methods available for the collection of qualitative data. This study was built on data collected from document review, by interview, through questionnaire, and via observation.

As the phenomenon of study was the intergenerational planning committee, I wanted to attempt to understand the operations of this informal governing body. The planning committee was created in August 2003. The group worked with AHA officials from August 2003 to January 2004 in developing an

application for the receipt of funds from HUD for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn. While not statutorily mandated, the intergenerational planning committee continued to meet through July 2004 to discuss the status of the grant application, as well as issues associated with the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn. The grant for redevelopment was awarded by HUD in July 2004. While the AHA made a commitment to continue convening the intergenerational planning committee through the relocation and redevelopment phases of the project – a period which may exceed five years – the scope of this study is limited to the period prior to the award of the HOPE VI grant in July 2004. The reason for this limitation is based on the function of the planning committee. From August 2003 through July 2004, the purpose of the committee was planning for the redevelopment of the entire site. Following the award of the grant, the focus of the group switched to the relocation of individual families. Community redevelopment is no longer the planning committees' focus. In addition, a new team of AHA officials assist with relocation, further ending the continuity of the planning process. The post-award endeavors of the planning committee are disconnected from their pre-award activities and seemingly less relevant to the phenomenon being studied.

I learned of the intergenerational planning committee long after the group had commenced its efforts. I did not begin to attend meetings of the planning committee until February 2004. My knowledge of the planning process prior to that date was gained through interviews with planning committee participants and AHA officials, as well as through the review of a meticulous set of minutes from those prior meetings prepared by AHA staff.

I conducted semi-structured, open-ended interviews with the youth and adult members of the intergenerational planning committee, as well as AHA staff. The youth participants were

interviewed both individually and in groups to keep the attention of the participants and in an effort to derive the highest quality of data possible. Thirty youth were interviewed between February and July 2004. Adult participants were also interviewed individually and in small groups. In total, 25 adult members of the planning committee were interviewed. Eight AHA officials availed themselves to me for interview during that same period. In most cases, I had the opportunity to interview participants, especially key AHA officials, multiple times during my visits to the site.

While somewhat unstructured, the topics discussed in my initial interviews of planning committee members and staff focused on two sources. First, many of my questions were derived from my own reading of the HOPE VI statute, as well as scholarly literature about the HOPE VI program. The interviewees were willing to clarify and elaborate on these questions in an effort to further develop my understanding of the HOPE VI process and how Atlanta adhered to or deviated from those norms. My second wave of questions was derived from my review of the minute meetings from August 2003 through January 2004. These questions more specifically focused on what had occurred at the early meetings of the intergenerational planning committee.

Another very rich source of data for this study was the Executive Summary for the HOPE VI grant application. Even though the grant application had been filed in January 2004, I was denied access to a copy of this document until July 2004, after the grant had been awarded. It was within the AHA’s authority to deny such permission during that period. Understanding the usefulness of such information to me, AHA officials, along with legal counsel, arranged for me to review the Executive Summary for the HOPE VI grant application. In

short form, this document detailed the planning process, as well as the redevelopment plan crafted jointly by AHA officials and the members of the intergenerational planning committee. I later obtained and reviewed a copy of the full application submitted to HUD.

In addition to interviews and document review, I had a unique opportunity to have many of questions for the youth answered by questionnaire. I had not intended to collect data for this study by questionnaire, nor was a formalized questionnaire ever prepared. Due to travel delays, I was not able to attend a special meeting of youth members of the planning committee which had been set up to give me the opportunity to conduct a group interview. Rather than canceling the meeting, the AHA official who typically led meetings of the youth asked that I forward my questions to him via email. Believing that he would conduct an ask-and-answer session with the youth, I sent the AHA official over thirty questions. When I arrived in Atlanta the following day, I was given approximately 25 questionnaires containing the questions I sent and the answers of the youth participants. Many of the young people who filled out the makeshift questionnaires attended another meeting on the day of my arrival, giving me the opportunity to further discuss their answers with them.

I also attended the meetings of the intergenerational planning committee from February to July 2004. I was welcomed to these meeting by both committee members and AHA officials. I did not actively participate in these meetings. I was allowed to sit quietly and take notes in the back of the auditorium where the meetings were held. As time passed and the members grew more comfortable with my presence, I was often asked questions about HOPE VI. Rather than answering those questions myself, I referred those who asked to the appropriate AHA staff

members or passed such questions along when the members where too shy to ask themselves. The youth members of the planning committee remained interested in my presence throughout, often joining me in the back row seats of the auditorium and asking about the notes I took. I allowed them to look at my notes and comment on the things I had written down.

As with any qualitative case study, the amount of data collected can be overwhelming. Rather than waiting to analyze all the data at the end of the collection period, I engaged in data interpretation beginning in the early stages of this research project. The method of analysis I employed throughout was coding. Strauss and Corbin (1990, p. 61) describe coding as "the process of analyzing data." Three types of coding are typical in grounded theory research: open, axial, and selective. Researchers of this school may employ one or all of these methods throughout the course of a study. I employed both open and selective coding.

Open coding is most common and most labor intensive. When employing open coding, a researcher looks at every piece of data collected and attempts to engage in a process of "breaking down, examining, comparing, conceptualizing, and categorizing data" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 61). As explained by Glaeser and Strauss, open coding involves categorizing "all relevant data that can be brought to bear on a point" (Glaeser and Strauss, 1967, p. 101). I open coded the data collected from my review of the meeting minutes and my initial interviews with members of the planning committee and AHA officials. In this data, I searched for reoccurring concepts and themes to analyze. More than fifty concepts emerged from the initial process of open coding. They are listed below:

Table 2: Table of Open Codes

1. Researcher's First View of Community
2. Security Issues at McDaniel Glenn
3. Researcher's Description of Meeting Place
4. Incentives Used by AHA to Get People to Attend Meetings
5. Positive Attitudes Held by McDaniel Glenn Residents About the Proposed Project
6. Negative Attitudes Held by McDaniel Glenn Residents About the Proposed Project
7. Residents' Perceptions of the Current State of McDaniel Glenn
8. Mentions of Youth by Residents of McDaniel Glenn
9. Location of the Site in Relation to the Rest of the City
10. Stature of the Planning Committee's Chairwoman
11. Level of Group Interaction Engaged in at Meetings of the Planning Committee
12. Significance of the Sign In Sheet to Members of the Planning Committee
13. HUD/AHA Conditions on Residents for Return to Signature Property
14. Residents Feelings About the Planning Process
15. Monthly HOPE VI Update
16. Residents Concerns Relating to Credit
17. HUD/AHA Qualifying Factors for Housing Choice
18. Residents Interest in Homeownership
19. Continued Maintenance of McDaniel Glenn While Awaiting the Grant
20. Reuse of Demolished Materials
21. What a Mixed Income Community Looks Like
22. Residents Responses to Viewing the Grant Application
23. Concerns Raised by Residents Relating to Relocation Issues
24. Role of Case Manager in Relocation
25. Purposes of Planning Committee Meetings Beyond HOPE VI
26. Youth Perception of HOPE VI Grant
27. Youth Concerns About the HOPE VI Process
28. Concerns Raised by Youth and Adult Residents About the School
29. Unnamed
30. Youth Priority List for Attributes to be Contained in the New Design for McDaniel Glenn
31. Youth Demands for Future Planning Related Activities
32. Continued Advisement by AHA about Status of Grant Application
33. Youth Concerns Regarding Relocation Issues
34. Youth Questions About Housing Choice
35. How the Planning Committee at McDaniel Glenn Was Formed
36. Who Runs Planning Committee Meetings

Table 2: Continued

37.	Planning Committee Membership
38.	How AHA Give Notice of Planning Committee Meetings
39.	Origin of the Idea to Involve Youth in the Planning Process
40.	Separate Meetings for the Youth
41.	Feelings About Ability of Youth to Contribute to the Planning Process
42.	Residents Role and Attitudes about Site Design for Redeveloped McDaniel Glenn
43.	Relocation Options Available to Residents
44.	Timeline for the Project
45.	Impediments to Return to Signature Properties
46.	Persuasive Techniques Employed by AHA to Garner Support for HOPE VI Application
47.	Structure of Youth Planning Committee
48.	Familiar Relationship Between Youth and Adult Planning Committee Members
49.	Researcher Describes Completed Signature Properties
50.	Identification of Stakeholders for HOPE VI Proposals and Projects
51.	Systematic Efforts to Make Up for Lost Housing Opportunities
52.	AHA's Feelings About the Participatory Model Created for HOPE VI
53.	Efforts to Make McDaniel Glenn New Urbanist
Description of Mechanicsville Neighborhood	

As is most often the case with the open coding process, a researcher will generate far more codes that will likely be relevant for a particular study. The second phase of the coding process involves a "weeding," if you will, of the data. The purpose of this weeding activity is to identify the themes which have emerged from data collection effort. This process is typically referred to as selective coding. As defined by Strauss and Corbin, selective coding is "the process of selecting the core category, systematically relating it to other categories, validating those relationships, and filling in categories that need further refinement and development" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 116). During the selective coding process, the researcher seeks to find the similarities between

the open codes. Where there is overlap or a relationship amongst the data, new codes are formed – selective codes. Often, researchers will return to the field of study to gather additional data to further flesh out the themes that emerged from the open coding process, as was the case with this study. It is important to note that data which does not fall within these new selective codes is not discarded. Rather, it is archived for future use in the on-going study or for future research endeavors.

In the case of this study, three core categories emerged. The first core category related to the youth and adult participants' feelings about moving away from McDaniel Glenn in order for the redevelopment to take place. The following open codes were relevant to this selective code:

2, 5, 6, 7, 9, 13, 18 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 39, 40, 41, 43, 45, 46, 48.

The second core category which emerged involved the participants' attitudes about participating on the intergenerational planning committee. Below is a list of the open codes relevant to this selective code:

3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8,10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 45, 46, 47, 48, 52.

The final key concept centers on the role of one particular AHA official's role in facilitating the participatory process of the committee. These open coded categories informed this particular selective code:

14, 15, 25, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 47, 52.

Collectively, these core categories describe the richness of the phenomenon being studied.

Beginning with the open coding process, a series of theoretical and factual memoranda were developed to more fully describe the data within each of the codes. These memoranda sought to provide a detailed analysis of the data and to connect the data to existing and relevant theoretical perspectives. The memoranda also served as a useful mechanism for determining what additional data was necessary to reach the point of saturation on each topic. During the months of April through July 2004, the primary focus of my interviews and observations was to fill in any gaps in the data already collected. Upon reaching the point of saturation, I turned my attention from coding to the data analysis that appears in the subsequent chapters of this dissertation.

E. Criteria for Evaluation of the Soundness of Research Findings

Four tests are commonly relied upon in social science research in order to assess the quality of research designs (Yin, 1994, p. 32). These include: construct validity, internal validity, external validity, and reliability (Yin, 1994, p. 32). Construct validity involves "establishing correct operational measures for the concepts being studied" (Yin, 1994, p. 33). Yin states:

> To meet the test of construct validity, an investigator must be sure to cover two steps: Select the specific types of changes that are to be studied (in relation to the original objectives of the study)

and demonstrate that the selected measures of these changes do indeed reflect the specific types of change that have been selected.

(Yin, 1994, p. 34). Internal validity involves "establishing a causal relationship, whereby certain conditions are shown to lead to other conditions, as distinguished from spurious relationships (Yin, 1994, p. 33). External validity pertains to "establishing the domain to which a study's findings can be generalized" (Yin, 1994, p. 33). With respect to reliability, a researcher must demonstrate "that the operations of a study—such as the data collection procedures can be repeated, with the same results" (Yin, 1994, p. 33). While some qualitative researchers contend that these tests are inappropriate for judging qualitative research, Strauss and Corbin (1990) contend that these conventions should be retained in modified forms.

According to the authors, "in a grounded theory publication, the reader should be able to make judgments about some of the components of the research process that led to the publication" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 252). They provide the following evaluative criteria for judging such studies:

Criterion 1: How was the original sample selected? What grounds?

Criterion 2: What major categories emerged?

Criterion 3: What were some of the events, incidents, actions and so on that pointed to some of these major categories?

Criterion 4: On the basis of what categories did theoretical sampling proceed? That is, how did theoretical formulations guide some of the data collection? After the theoretical sampling was done, how representative did these categories prove to be?

> Criterion 5: What were some of the hypotheses pertaining to conceptual relations and on what grounds were they formulated and tested?
> Criterion 6: Were there instances when hypotheses did not hold up against what was actually seen? How were these discrepancies accounted for? How did they affect the hypotheses?
> Criterion 7: How and why was the core category selected? Was this collection sudden or gradual, difficult or easy? On what grounds were final analytic decisions made?

(Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 253). While many of these questions were answered in this chapter and the preceding one, greater detail will be spent answering the rest in Chapter 6. The authors caution, however, that the criteria should be read as guidelines, not "hard and fast rules" (Strauss and Corbin, 1990, p. 257).

F. Methodological Critique

The previous sections of this chapter provide a comparison of the methodology employed in this study with the work of Fried and Gans. Similar in form to the work of these two scholars, the single case study methodology employed in this study yields a rich description of a participatory process at a particular site – McDaniel Glenn. The value of this study goes beyond mere description. The data collected provides useful insight into questions regarding the absence of grief or anxiety-related effects suffered by the McDaniel Glenn residents who will most certainly be relocated as a result of the AHA's successful

application for HOPE VI monies, proposing at least two reasons that grief may be low at this particular housing complex: participation by residents on an intergenerational planning committee and the presence of an advocacy planner to facilitate the planning process for the revitalization of McDaniel Glenn. It would have been difficult to garner the type and detail of information gathered with the single case study approach using any other research methodology.

Some limitations, however, may be attributed to the methodology employed. This study is limited by time and scope. As to time, the research period was relatively short, running from August 2004 through July 2005. While this time period matched perfectly with the grant application cycle, I did not gain the longitudinal knowledge to the extent captured in the work of Fried and Gans. My study did not begin with a pre-planning process measure of the anxiety levels experienced by the residents of McDaniel Glenn prior to the commencement of the planning committee's efforts. Further, unlike Fried's study of the grief effects of relocation, this study does not capture post-relocation grief effects. The residents had not yet been relocated from the premises of McDaniel Glenn at the conclusion of my study. Therefore, the discussion of grief effects in my study centers on how a planning process, which convened for less than one year, impacted the feelings of anxiety that the residents may have experienced at the beginning of the planning process. This measure has value in its own right, but still limited.

The measure of grief is also limited in scope. The participants in my study are all members of the intergenerational planning committee or AHA staff. I did not have the resources to seek the insights of residents of the McDaniel Glenn housing community who did not participate in on

the planning committee. This is not problematic in terms of my measures of participation and empowerment levels experienced by the participants of the planning committee. However, it does limit the grief measure. This study offers no comparison in grief levels experienced over time by participants and non-participants where Fried's study did. In the end, it is difficult to tell whether the reduction of grief in the planning process is a result of selection effects or a consequence of actual participation. There exists, however, some proof that the participating residents' grief was reduced, as evidenced by the type of questions and participation that occurred over time. Early on, the residents exhibited physical signs of excitement and anxiety, asking many redundant questions about the relocation process. Over the course of the study, the nature of the meetings changed. They became social events wherein the residents willingly engaged with much enthusiasm in the planning of the new community.

These strengths and limitations should be kept in mind when reviewing the study which follows. Further research endeavors will be designed to correct for these and other limitations.

CHAPTER 4: GRIEVING FOR A NEW HOME REVISITED

A. Urban Renewal and the Displacement of People

For decades, the urban core of our Nation's cities has been declining. This decline is the result of the fact that economic prosperity has allowed the upper and middle classes, mostly white, to move away from the urban core. The jobs held by members of these classes have followed them to suburbia, leaving the poor, mostly African American, to continue to inhabit the urban core. As Marris explained, "the central city is losing not merely its population but its functions" (Duhl, 1963, p. 116). This concentration of poverty has led to the further decline of downtowns.

The term urban renewal refers to those policies and programs which attempt to correct for the effects of the decline of central cities. The aims of urban renewal policies are fourfold: restructuring the tax base, defense of the quality of culture, restoration of racial integration, and tackling the social problems of slum areas. The tax base of a city is often devastated as a result of the flight of people and jobs from the urban core. One of the primary goals of urban renewal policies is "to attract back into the city those who will provide the highest revenue and the best custom, and revive the prestige of urban life" (Duhl, 1963, p. 117). In addition, urban renewal policies attempt to restore the cultural integrity and racial diversity of dying urban cores.

Urban renewal programs also seek to tackle social problems associated with slum areas (Duhl, 1963, p. 118). Describing

the potential positive effects of urban renewal for slum dwellers, Robert Weaver contends:

> . . . it is just at the moment that a family has been uprooted, has been provided through relocation assistance with the means of establishing a new home, and has been brought into contact – some for the first time, and many for reacquaintance – with the social agencies of the community, that miracles can be accomplished (Duhl, 1963, p. 118).

While the aims of urban renewal appear to be in the public's interest, such programs are often highly criticized. Two of the primary concerns of those who do not support such efforts are (1) urban renewal programs often benefit the interests of developers; and (2) such programs often destroy the neighborhoods where there exist strong social ties. Both concerns have been raised in the context of HOPE VI. With respect to the second concern, anti-urban renewal proponents and housing advocates alike have long suggested that the displacement of people is the dastardly effect of urban renewal programs. As Gans explained in *The Urban Villagers* (1965; 1982):

> Even so, displacement remains an uncivilized process. People are still losing familiar neighborhoods and old neighbors; the developers, eager to start demolition and reconstruction, often force the displaced to move out quickly; and inexpensive relocation housing is harder to find than ever (Gans, 1982, p. 385).

The history of urban renewal is often depicted by an abundance of before and after pictures. The "before" pictures often include photographs of bulldozers leveling entire neighborhoods, usually slums, in the name of urban development. The after pictures typically contain photographs of high end

developments that cater to the shopping and housing needs of the wealthy.

B. Grief: An Effect of the Displacement of People by Urban Renewal

These images of urban renewal have been accompanied with many social science accounts of the negative effects of such activities on the populations who have been displaced from these areas. Hebert Gans profiled the displacement of a group of Boston's West Enders in his renowned work, *The Urban Villagers.* Marc Fried accomplished a similar task in *Grieving for a Lost Home.* In his work, Fried argued that those displaced by urban renewal activities manifest symptoms of grief. According to Fried,

> These are manifest in the feelings of painful loss, the continued longing, the general depressive tone, frequent symptoms of psychological or social or somatic distress, the active work required in adapting to the altered situation, the sense of helplessness, the occasional expressions of both direct and displaced anger, and tendencies to idealize the lost place (Duhl, 1963, p. 151).

Fried's measure of grief centered on a series of questions developed by Dr. Jason Aronson. These questions included:

- Did you feel sad or depressed when you moved?
- Describe how you felt?
- How long did these feelings last?

- How did you feel when the building was torn down? (Duhl, 1963).

Responses to these questions were given a score of 1 to 4 and the score were summed (Duhl, 1963). The coded responses were divided into three general categories of grief: minimal, moderate, and severe (Duhl, 1963). Fried employed this measure of relocation-related grief to assess the feelings of the working class residents of a slum in the West End of Boston with respect to being displaced by an urban renewal project slated for the neighborhood (Duhl, 1963). For his study, he conducted pre-relocation interviews with 473 women from households in the city (Duhl, 1963). He conducted post-relocation interviews with 92 % of the women interviewed prior to relocation and with 87% of the men from those households (Duhl, 1963).

Fried suggested that the first step in determining the level of grief and/or loss experienced by those who are displaced as a result of urban renewal is in defining the meaning of the area (Duhl, 1963). In this context, the definition of meaning relates to physical space and the social ties that exist within it (Duhl, 1963). According the Fried, a resident's grief response is a function of his or her "prior orientations to the area" (Duhl, 1963, p. 154). Pursuant to this theory of grief, the more an individual knows about and experiences in an area, the higher his or her grief response will be (Duhl, 1963). In the case of Fried's study of the West End, the grief response was high given the fact that the families displaced from the neighborhood had lived there for lengthy periods and had the opportunity to develop strong social networks with their neighbors.

Loss of social ties, contends Fried, is a strong indicator of grief. In his study of the West End, Fried conducted a series of pre-location interviews which asked individuals their

feelings about their neighbors. Comparing those pre-location interviews with measures of grief developed following the relocation, Fried found that seventy-six percent of the women interviewed experienced "severe grief reactions" (Duhl, 1963, p. 158).

Fried presents readers with a set of four case studies to further exemplify his theoretical argument: (1) the Figella family; (2) the Guiliano family; and (3) the Borowski family; and (4) Palucia family. From these case studies, Fried defines three prototypes of grief responses. The Figella family represents the first prototype, representing strong pre-location and post-location grief. According to Fried, this prototype was most representative of the grief responses of the majority of families in his study of the West End. He described the family as "typical of a well-adjusted working-class family" (Duhl, 1963, p. 162). When interviewed prior to relocation, the Figella family had numerous positive things to say about the spatial layout of their neighborhood: "It's comfortable, clean, and warm" (Duhl, 1963, p. 161). While post-relocation interviews of the Figella family revealed little spatial inconvenience, i.e. the patriarch of the household continues to work at the same place and a new home was purchased, the Figella's grief response is more of a product of social ties that were severed as a result of the relocation. Interviews with the family indicated unwillingness to attempt to forge new social ties with neighbors because doing so ". . . would imply forsaking the remaining fragments of continuity which was central to their conceptions of themselves and of the world" (Duhl, 1963, p. 162).

The Guiliano family represents the second prototype for grief associated with relocation. According to Fried, the Guiliano family is very similar to the Figella family. However,

the Guiliano family exhibited very limited pre- or post-relocation grief. Perhaps the main difference in these prototype families relates to pre-location feelings about the spatial makeup of the area. In an interview with Fried, the matriarch of the Guiliano family described the neighborhood as follows:

> For me it was too congested. I never did care for it . . . too many barrooms, on every corner, too many families in one building…The sidewalks are too narrow and the kids can't play outside.

(Duhl, 1963, p. 163). While Mrs. Guiliano did express some pre-relocation grief with respect to losing her friends in the neighborhood, her desire for better housing and a higher quality neighborhood helped her overcome this grief. Based on this prototype, Fried conjectures that the desire for social mobility may be effective in moderating the pre- and post-relocation symptoms of grief (Duhl, 1963, p. 163). As explained more specifically by Fried:

> Mr. Guiliano is prepared for and Mrs. Giuliano clearly desires discontinuity with some of the central bases for their former identity. Their present situation is, in fact, a transitional one which allows them to reintegrate their lives at a new and higher status level without too precipitate a change

(Duhl, 1963, p. 164).

Fried's third prototype is depicted in the experience of the Borowski family. The grief symptoms of this family, according to Fried, are masked by their ". . . active efforts to deal with the present" (Duhl, 1963, p. 165). Fried refers to the family as the "overadjusters."

The fourth and final prototype for relocation grief is the Paliuca family. This family experienced very few symptoms of

pre-location grief, but manifested severe symptoms post-location. Mrs. Paliua, when interviewed about the quality of life in the West End stated: "I don't like it. The people…the buildings are full of rats. There are no places to play for the children" (Duhl, 1963, p. 166). Despite spatial and social concerns about the West End neighborhood, the Palicua's have not been able to adjust to relocation. Fried provides an enlightened explanation for this family prototype. He says:

> It may be that families with such initial difficulties, with such a tenuous basis for maintaining a sense of continuity under any circumstances, suffer most acutely from disruption of these ties

(Duhl, 1963, p. 166). Fried offers concern that families like the Palicua's might carry their relocation grief with them into future situations, leaving them incapable of being satisfied with life in new neighborhoods based on some falsely idealized past (Duhl, 1963).

Based on these prototypes of grief, Fried surmised that relocation leads to "intense personal suffering despite moderately successful adaptation to the total situation of relocation" (Duhl, 1963, p. 167). Fried called on those associated with relocation efforts to "face the realities of the effects of relocation on working-class residents of slums and, on the basis of knowledge and understanding, that we learn to deal more effectively with the problems engendered" (Duhl, 1963. p. 167).

C. Application of Fried's Grief Effects on Relocation Resulting from the Use of HOPE VI Funds in Atlanta

Fried's work has been built upon by a number of scholars. All agree that relocation has some negative effects on those who are displaced by urban renewal projects. What varies in this continued scholarship, however, is the level of grief experienced by residents. For example, Fellman's (1970) study of displacement in the Brookline-Elm neighborhood of Cambridge, Massachusetts demonstrates that not all displaced residents feel negatively about being relocated. Fellman's interviews with neighborhood residents revealed that a quarter of the respondents were positively anticipating the relocation, and nearly a third reported that they would generally like to move (Fellman, 1970). Fellman suggested that those who thought positively about the move were mobile and saw relocation as a chance to find a better neighborhood (Fellman, 1970). Here, the mobile residents saw urban renewal as an opportunity (Fellman, 1970). These findings were reinforced by a study performed by Klienhaus in 2003. Klienhaus found that the housing conditions of the displaced were improved as a result of displacement, further suggesting that relocation can be a great opportunity if properly executed (Kleinhaus, 2003).

While some scholars have suggested the positive benefits of relocation, others have provided counter evidence. Specifically, Rubenstein (1988) suggests relocation is a lose-lose endeavor. He points out that moving residents can destroy social relationships, and not moving them leads to a further concentration of the ghetto. His study of relocation of Baltimore shows that while relocation is useful in moving

residents into financially better neighborhoods, such efforts do little for racial integration (Rubenstein, 1988).

Despite the predicted decline in grief effects experienced by displaced persons overall, the grief effects predicted by Fried appear to remain high amongst certain populations of people. According to Heller (1982), certain people are more prone to experience grief effects including: children and the elderly, those in poor physical health, the mentally ill, women, and the economically poor. Relocation has had significant grief effects on African American communities, according to Fullilove (2001). Fullilove (2001) presents evidence that relocation grief triggers the onset of illnesses and aggravates existing conditions. In addition, as a result of relocation efforts, many African Americans have found new homes in poorer neighborhoods which expose residents to disease causing factors (Fullilove, 2001).

Fried's work has been built upon by a number of scholars. All agree that relocation has some negative effects on those who are displaced by urban renewal projects. What varies in this continued scholarship, however, is the level of grief experienced by residents. For example, Fellman's (1970) study of displacement in the Brookline-Elm neighborhood of Cambridge, Massachussets demonstrates that not all displaced residents feel negatively about being relocated. Fellman's interviews with neighborhood residents revealed that a quarter of the respondents were positively anticipating the relocation, and nearly a third reported that they would generally like to move (Fellman, 1970). Fellman suggested that those who thought positively about the move were mobile and saw relocation as the change as a chance to find a better neighborhood (Fellman, 1970). Here, the mobile residents saw urban renewal as an opportunity (Fellman, 1970). These findings were reinforced by

a study performed by Klienhaus in 2003. Klienhaus found that the housing conditions of the displaced were improved as a result of displacement, further suggesting that relocation can be a great opportunity if properly executed (Kleinhaus, 2003).

While some scholars have suggested the positive benefits of relocation, others have provided counter evidence. Specifically, Rubenstein (1988) suggests relocation is a lose-lose endeavor. He points out that moving residents can destroy social relationships, and not moving them leads to a further concentration of the ghetto. His study of relocation of Baltimore shows that while relocation is useful in moving residents into financially better neighborhoods, such efforts do little for racial integration (Rubenstein, 1988).

Despite the predicted decline in grief effects experienced by displaced persons overall, the grief effects predicted by Fried appear to remain high amongst certain populations of people. According to Heller (1982), certain people are more prone to experience grief effects including: children and the elderly, those in poor physical health, the mentally ill, women, and the economically poor. Relocation has had significant grief effects on African American communities, according to Fullilove (2001). Fullilove (2001) presents evidence that relocation grief triggers the onset of illnesses and aggravates existing conditions. In addition, as a result of relocation efforts, many African Americans have found new homes in poorer neighborhoods which expose residents to disease causing factors (Fullilove, 2001).

Keating and Flores relied on the work of Fried to analyze the effects of grief with respect to HOPE VI redevelopment in public housing communities in Atlanta. With Flores, Keating wrote: "destruction of a poor community is an event whose pain and suffering should have taught succeeding generations to

practice more humane forms of redevelopment" (Keating, 2000, p. 37). The sad reality, according to Keating and Flores, is that this lesson was not learned by the Atlanta Housing Authority with respect to the redevelopment of Techwood with HOPE VI funds.

Atlanta first applied for HOPE VI funds in order to redevelop Techwood Homes. The redevelopment of Techwood was plagued by controversy. One of the largest sources of controversy was the human consequences of the redevelopment effort. The analysis conducted by Keating and Flores reveals that the residents of this public housing community experienced, as detailed by Fried, pre- and post-location grief.

The residents' grief response, like that experienced by those displaced in the West End of Boston, stems, at least in part, from the fact that the residents of Techwood Homes did not support efforts to revitalize the community in which they lived (Keating and Flores, 2000, p. 37). Keating and Flores cite the longevity of residence as evidence of the Techwood Homes residents' social ties. An average residency rate at Techwood Homes was nearly eight years before the properties were redeveloped (Keating and Flores, 2000).

Also building on Fried, Keating and Flores provide ample evidence that the cost of relocation for those living in Techwood Homes were borne by the residents living there. Due to national legislation, the displaced residents of Techwood Homes were entitled to moving costs and housing assistance. However, Keating and Flores point out that very few of the residents of Techwood Homes actually received the assistance to which they were entitled. Why? The authors' cite the residents' exodus from the housing project prior to the award of the HOPE VI grant. This occurred because the HOPE VI program only pays relocation costs to those who move during the three month

relocation period, a period commencing upon the award of the HOPE VI grant.

As highlighted by Keating and Flores present compelling evidence that few of those who have been relocated during the redevelopment period have been able to return once construction is complete. With respect to Techwood Homes, only 76 of the more than 1,100 residents of the revitalized complex were able to return (Keating and Flores, 2000). There are a number of reasons that the original residents did not return to the redeveloped community. First and foremost, Keating and Flores cite higher rents as one reason prohibiting the return of some residents. Also, the contract between the local public housing authority and the developer hired to execute the revitalization provides that the developer may establish screening criteria for those apply to return to the public housing units in the Signature communities. These criteria often include: criminal history and credit checks, income requirements, employment or willingness to enter job training programs, among others. These criteria are one of the major barriers to reentry to the signature communities (Keating and Flores, 2000).

Efforts, or at least promises, were made with respect to the return of residents to Centennial Place following the redevelopment of Techwood Homes. These efforts failed, however, since only seven percent of the displaced occupants were able to return (Keating and Flores, 2000). The authors argue that this occurred because the tenants were encouraged to move away from Techwood Homes prior to the award of the HOPE VI.

The lack of citizen participation changed with the passage of the HOPE VI statute which requires the local housing authority to consult with citizens during the planning and redevelopment process. Further, pursuant to the NOFAs, citizen participation is now one of the factors HUD considers when

reviewing applications for HOPE VI funds. In spite of these factors, Keating and Flores (2000, p. 304-5) argue:

> Although each of the plans developed in the 1990s professed the primacy of resident participation, tenant involvement was not influential in any of the three planning processes. At the conclusion of the first planning process, the PATH planners misrepresented survey data and inaccurately reported that more than one-half of the residents wanted to leave. The resident survey data, for the most part, was not tallied or released until after the residents voted on the plan, so the data could not have affected the plan, informed the residents of the extent to which their opinions were shared by others, or served as the basis for resident evaluation of the plan. Residents were never asked to vote on the second plan, so the data could not have affected the plan, informed the residents of the extent to which their opinions were shared by others, or served as the basis for resident evaluation of the plan. Residents were never asked to vote on the second plan, the Phillips/Bradfield plan, and the Housing Authority in its determined efforts to empty the development was so successful that only twenty-six families remained at the time of the vote on the Glover plan. The manipulation of the residents throughout the three planning processes parodied promises of engagement, empowerment, and influence.

The lack of participation and the absence of the opportunity to return to community from which residents had been dislocated are all likely reasons that the residents of Techwood suffered the type of grief described by Fried. However, the fact that

relocation occurs as a part of HOPE VI redevelopments does not serve as exclusive evidence that relocated residents will suffer both pre- and post-relocation grief. The pattern of reaction to relocation is not the same across all redevelopment efforts. Rather, the level of relocation grief experienced by displaced persons varies based upon a number of factors, including the physical and social quality of neighborhoods from which individuals are being displaced, among others. In this case, symptoms of grief experienced by members of the intergenerational planning committee at McDaniel Glenn are minimal, if not absent. The following section attempts to describe some of the factors which may have lessoned the pre-location grief symptoms experienced by the residents of McDaniel Glenn.

D. The Absence of Grief Symptomology as a Result of the Pending Relocation at McDaniel Glenn

One might expect, given the evidence provided by both Fried and Keating, that the residents of McDaniel Glenn would experience grief, either pre- or post-relocation or both, as a result of the displacement they will face as a result of HUD's award of a HOPE VI grant for the redevelopment of the community. However, among the adult and youth members of the planning committee very little pre-location grief symptomology is present. Instead, the residents express a general positive outlook about the pending relocation. This outlook grew, in

both the youth and adult planning committee members, over the course of months of participation.

At the first meeting of the youth planning committee, the young residents came to the meeting, as one boy described, "to see what was going on." While their curious natures may have drawn them to the meeting, the youth came to the first meeting not knowing what to expect. One young woman explained: "I thought they were bringing us together to tell us where we were being moved to. I didn't know that they'd ask us what we wanted and where we wanted to live. I liked that part." AHA staff would later explain that the youth were quiet at those first meetings of the youth planning committee. One AHA official stated: "It wasn't until the youth understood that we were there to find out what they wanted that they started warming up and sharing their ideas with us. When they realized that, they began to share their thoughts more freely."

It did not take long before the original anxiety manifested by the youth was replaced with a desire for knowledge and an enthusiasm for participation. After a few meetings with AHA staff, the youth members of the planning committee expressed a large degree of excitement about the changes associated with receiving a HOPE VI grant. All of the youth suggested that they would like to live in a HOPE VI community with responses ranging from "probably" to "yes" to "YES! YES! YES!" The youth provided numerous and varied responses of why they believed it would be a good thing to live in a HOPE VI community. Several of the youth suggested that living in a HOPE VI community would be preferable to their current living environment because it would be peaceful and quiet. According to their accounts, McDaniel Glenn is never a tranquil community. Residents often socialize in the early hours of the morning in the courtyards between residences. This keeps many of the youth from being able to sleep.

Personal safety is another reason the youth cited for their absence of grief. The youth stated that they are not often allowed to play outside at McDaniel Glenn without adult supervision. According to one young woman, "There's a lot of crime going on." Confrontation with local drug dealers is the primary basis for the youths' and their parents' concerns about unsupervised play outdoors. As one young man noted, "I want to live in HOPE VI because it will keep kids from having to be around drugs." The youth strongly believe that the screening requirements imposed on prospective tenants of signature communities would prevent drug and other criminal activities from returning to new McDaniel Glenn.

Beyond the absence of peace and personal safety, a number of youths suggested that they would like to live in a HOPE VI community is because of the ways such communities look. As one young woman surmised, "it will look better, not junky." The same young woman hoped that the residents of a signature community would not be identifiable as public housing residents and further stigmatized by society. Another said, after viewing a neighboring signature community, "I want to live in HOPE VI because it will look neat and have no drug dealers." The same interviewee, as reiterated by a number of her peers who had also seen a neighboring signature community, suggested that the design element they most liked about HOPE VI was a swimming pool.

Uniformly, the youth said they did not have any concerns about the HOPE VI process. I asked them specifically about concerns they might have about moving away, and there was only one. For these young people, their major social tie to the Mechanicsville neighborhood is the school they attend. Paul L. Dunbar Elementary School is located on site at McDaniel Glenn. It has been ranked "the worst performing elementary school in

the city of Atlanta." Based on this academic unit's poor performance, the Enterprise Foundation and the Annenberg Foundation have both made a large financial grant to the school to improve the physical environment, as well as the educational curriculum. These two grants total approximately $20 million. The Annenberg Foundation seeks to keep the school open during the relocation period.

Despite the elementary school's poor performance, the youth residents of McDaniel Glenn expressed their desire to stay enrolled in the same school system during and after the completion of the relocation process. The youths' desire to stay in the same school system was tempered with respect to Parks Middle School. Based on the youth's concerns about Parks Middle School, the AHA authority has made the revitalization of Parks an integral part of the HOPE VI application.

At my last meeting at McDaniel Glenn, I had the opportunity to talk with the youth about the award of the grant. To them, the award of the grant was perceived as a reward for all of their hard work. While few had begun thinking about the implications of the impending relocation, the group remained steadfast that revitalization would make McDaniel Glenn better in the long run. Most hoped to return to the revitalized community. Perhaps the most commanding evidence that participation had reduced grief effects for the youth members of the intergenerational planning committee was their stated willingness to participate in similar planning processes in the future, as more fully discussed in the following chapter. To them, the planning process was informative, fun, and validating and an experience worth repeating. This suggests that participation by youth in planning processes may be a meaningful way to reduce the fears and concerns that this group of stakeholders may have with respect to relocation.

From their first meeting with the AHA about the possibility of seeking HOPE VI funds to revitalize McDaniel Glenn, the members of the adult planning committee expressed higher degrees of grief regarding the impending relocation than the community's youth. At the first meeting, the adults asked a number of questions focused on relocation: When will we be moved? Where will we be moved? Who will pay for us to move? Do we have any choice about where we will be moved? While AHA staff took a great deal of care in answering these questions when first asked, the residents asked the same questions at multiple meetings. As AHA staff later explained: "It was expected. People were more worried about what was going to happen to them than what might later happen to McDaniel Glenn. We tried to ease their concerns but it took a lot of time. We had to be patient with them, answer their questions even if they had already been asked, and make sure our answers were consistent so that they would begin to trust us."

Over time, the adults' attitudes shifted from anxiety-related to concerns to excitement regarding the move and the revitalization effort. Between August and December 2004, the adult residents began to shift their attention to the design of the Signature Community and away from relocation concerns. This shift is a likely by-product of the AHA's efforts to reduce their anxiety about the move through the provision of a consistent and open stream of communication.

After the merger of the separate adult and youth planning committees, there is some evidence that grief levels rose again. The increase was gradual, following the submission of the grant application in January 2004 and ending with the award of the grant in July 2005. While the members of the intergenerational planning committee had been generally participative and excited about the possibility of the opportunities of living in a HOPE

VI community during the grant planning phase (August 2003-January 2004), they became impatient to learn whether the grant had been awarded with each passing monthly meeting of the planning committee. The first question asked by residents and answered by AHA officials at every meeting was: has the grant been awarded yet? The primary reason such interest was focused on this question because the residents had been educated by AHA officials that the award of the grant would trigger the relocation period. Residents anxiously awaited the relocation period, understanding that they and the case managers assigned to them, would only have a short time to locate housing following the grant's award.

Ironically, most of the grief experienced with respect to when the grant award would be made and the relocation period commenced fell on AHA officials. As one official explained: "Since we filed the grant application with HUD, I often feel anxious about attending meetings of the planning committee because I do not have any new information to share with them. I know that they want to find out when they will have to move." Upon HUD's announcement of the award of the HOPE VI grant for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn, the AHA officials passed the information on to the residents immediately, rather than waiting for the next monthly meeting of the planning committee. The AHA official's relief in sharing the information was almost as great as the members' excitement that the grant had been awarded.

Despite their concerns with respect to relocation, few of the residents had begun to explore housing options prior to the award of the grant. This lack of motivation to search might appear to be some evidence of grief – a fatalistic belief that the housing authority will, as it has in the past, shuffle them wherever there is available space. An alternative explanation

is available, however. AHA officials repetitively educated planning committee members not to move until the grant had been awarded and a contract between the AHA and HUD fully executed. The reason for this instruction, as explained by AHA officials, is that funds for relocation would only be made available to those who moved during the official relocation period. In addition, AHA officials educated the members of the planning committee that only those who moved during the relocation community would be eligible for return to the signature community upon completion.

The adult residents of McDaniel Glenn echoed the youths' concerns about the schools asking questions like: What happens to the school? Where will the kids go to school during the relocation period? The AHA officials, while lacking immediate answers to these questions, assured the residents that they had learned from past HOPE VI projects that they must work closely with the school board in making such decisions. A similar scenario existed with the Capital Homes redevelopment, wherein the massive relocation of families caused the school to be shut down for lack of pupils. AHA officials stressed their commitment not to repeat past mistakes with respect the closure of the school during the relocation period. In addition, AHA officials have expressed a strong desire to link those who qualify to use the housing choice program to remain in the Mechanicsville neighborhood during the relocation period so that the students can remain in the same school district.

Interviews with members of the youth and adult planning committees fail to provide strong evidence of the grief symptomology hypothesized by both Fried and Keating. There are likely numerous explanations for this absence of grief. One explanation goes to the situation upon which Fried's theory rests. Fried's hypothesis is that displacement from slums

causes grief in working class residents. While McDaniel Glenn fits neatly within Fried's slum classification, it is not inhabited by the working class. Unemployment is high at McDaniel Glenn. Most families are subsidized solely by government benefits. The residents do not own their own homes. Lacking employment or the prospect of homeownership at McDaniel Glenn or in the Mechanicsville neighborhood, families have limited spatial ties to the community.

Social ties appear to be greater. Most of the members of the planning committee have close friends in the community. However, the strength of such social ties is tempered by negative experiences that the members have had with others in the neighborhood. To reiterate, the sale and usage of drugs is prevalent at McDaniel Glenn. The residents, specifically the youth, have daily negative interactions with drug dealers that station themselves at the four corners of the McDaniel Glenn property. Getting away from these activities seems to outweigh the neighbors' pre-relocation grief effects of being separated from neighbors and friends. This may indicate that negative social interactions may counteract the expected findings of grief for those who await relocation.

Another explanation for the absence of the grief in this situation is within the law. When the families in Fried's study of the West End were displaced, the law did not require the condemning authority to assist with relocation. However, the passage of the Uniform Relocation Act of 1970 ensures the provision of assistance to families who are relocated pursuant to urban renewal efforts. Such aid includes locating a new home within the location of the family's choice and the payment of moving expenses. Therefore, those displaced by HOPE VI-related renovations are not left without a safety net.

In addition, HOPE VI offers a couple of features that likely alleviate grief effects. First, it presents additional housing options to those who have been, for all practical purposes, stuck in traditional housing. During the relocation process, residents are provided counseling and assistance which allows them to qualify for the use of the housing choice program. While waiting lists for Section 8 housing are often long, those displaced by HOPE VI renovations are given the opportunity to move to the top of the list. The Section 8 program enables the residents to determine where they would like to live, often allowing them to remain in the same neighborhood if opportunities exist.

Also, those who live in communities which are redeveloped using HOPE VI funds are given priority, provided that they qualify, for return to the signature community. While it takes approximately five years to complete such efforts, residents who favored the neighborhood from which they were displaced may have the opportunity to return. A number of the members of the youth and adult planning committees have expressed their desire to return to the signature community once completed. For one woman, the opportunity to return to the newly improved McDaniel Glenn is quite satisfying. As she explained, "I've lived in the neighborhood my whole life. I've lived here since they opened. I love it here and can't wait to come back to the community. This community will be so much better when this old place is torn down and cleaned up."

Not all of those who wish to return to the redeveloped McDaniel Glenn will be allowed to return and the members of the planning committee remain cognizant of the fact. AHA officials have stated that they will work with the members of the planning committees to develop a list of standards upon which applications for return will be judged. Such standards will

include: credit checks, maintenance history, and criminal history. Other standards might include giving priority to those who lived at McDaniel Glenn the longest or those who participated most vigilantly in the planning process. Given the length of the redevelopment process, the residents who wish to return have multiple years to work to correct any deficiencies that might otherwise prevent their successful return.

This study provides some evidence that Fried's theory about relocation associated grief does not hold true in all instances of urban renewal projects where residents are displaced. The data reveals that pre-relocation grief is minimal for the planning committee residents because they are overwhelmed by the problem of drugs and crime which seems to have overrun the McDaniel Glenn community and threatened the safety and well-being of community residents. In addition, this study reveals that, unlike the Techwood redevelopment, citizen participation and the opportunity to return to the redeveloped community, if desired, may also reduce the hypothesized effects of pre-relocation grief.

CHAPTER 5: INTERGENERATIONAL PARTICIPATION AS A MEANS OF REDUCING GRIEF

A. An Introduction to the Role of Youth in Urban Planning

While Fried's study focused on the grief effects experienced by adults who were relocated as part of urban renewal efforts, his theory may easily be extended to young residents of displaced communities – those residents below the age of emancipation. Like their adult counterparts, the lives of youth are undoubtedly interrupted by relocation efforts. Displacement for them means severance from social ties which are important to them, including: friends and neighbors, schools, churches, and playgrounds, among other neighborhood amenities that are typically important to the young. At first glance, it appears that the grief effects of relocation may be unmanageable for youth. Yet, this group of public housing residents appears to be seemingly resilient. Their resilience is likely a product of a number of factors, including their concerns about the public housing communities where they currently reside.

Prior to assessing the grief effects that relocation will have on the youth residents of public housing, it is imperative to understand the pre-location conditions experienced by them. With respect to public housing communities, there is little question that youth face ". . . stresses from the dangerous environment, substandard housing, and often chaotic family situations" Popkin et al., 2004, p. 405). They attend

segregated and substandard schools where their substandard academic performance is par for the course (Popkin et al., 2004). The youth living in public housing are often caught in the crossfire of the gang violence that that plagues their communities (Popkin et al., 2004). Collectively, these conditions have led to a high incidence of mental and physical problems suffered by the youth residents of public housing (Popkin et al., 2004). These social, environmental, and economic limitations could be overcome, according to Popkin et al., (2004, p. 406), "if children and their families relocate to safer neighborhoods and better and safer schools. . ."

Ideally, the HOPE VI program is an appropriate mechanism to accomplish relocation of public housing families to better neighborhoods. The program provides a level of choice and opportunity that has not existed for families under past housing initiatives. Under HOPE VI, families have the freedom to choose the neighborhood to which they will relocate. This decision is particularly important to youth. As Clampet-Lundquist (2004, p. 416) explains: "A neighborhood can shape a child's world in numerous ways, and by choosing a neighborhood, a parent chooses the schools, streets, social ties, and recreational activities children will have access to."

However, studies reveal that youth are likely to experience grief as a result of relocation. According to Popkin et al. (2004), HOPE VI relocation may threaten school performance amongst a group of children who have a high incidence of special needs. As Popkin et al. explain, "Given that many of these children already have a high risk of problems, a very real concern is that, rather than helping them attain self-sufficiency, the stress of relocation may make them even more vulnerable" (Popkin et al., 2004, p. 406). The question

becomes: is self-sufficiency a possibility for those young people who are relocated as part of a HOPE VI initiative?

I contend that the answer to this question is yes. However, the youth residents of public housing are not likely to develop this so-called self-sufficiency through actions taken on their behalves by policymakers or their parents. Rather, the answer to this question lies in educating the youth about the possibilities of relocation and allowing them to participate in the planning processes for such efforts.

This idea that youth should be invited to participate in planning processes is not a recent fad. Rather, it is a product "of the changing conception of youth in society" (Checkoway et al. 1995, p. 134). In the 19th century, society perceived youth as "little adults," treating them as regular workers during the Industrial Age (Checkoway et al., 1995, p. 134). Twentieth century youth were considered "victims of urban-industrial society" and the government took on the responsibility of protecting this special class of seemingly powerless individuals (Checkoway et al., 19__, p. 134). Many policymakers, including city planners, continue to operate under this assumption, i.e. that it is part of their job to make decisions for the youth in an effort to protect them.

There exists, however, a more modern conception of "youth as resources" (Kurth-Schai, 1988). This new view is based on the following perspective, as outlined by Harry Spence, a court appointed receiver for the City of Chelsea, Massachusetts:

> [Young people] are much more sophisticated than their older generation. They've grown up in a multicultural atmosphere and see a shared future with each other, whereas the latter is still trying to overcome these

> changes. . . Something special and important is happening. It's time to think in larger terms. What happens when a community begins to say everyone is a citizen and a participant, not just people over 18 or 21 – everyone is a participant – and it begins to take them seriously? How does that begin to change the world?

(quoted in *The Boston Globe Magazine*, 9 Feburary, 1994). This revised conception of the role of youth in society emerged from the work of Kevin Lynch. In the early 1970s, urban designer Kevin Lynch introduced the planning profession to the proposition that understanding the child's experience of urban environments was critical component of city planning (Lynch, 1977). In a study sponsored by UNESCO, Lynch assembled research teams in Argentina, Australia, Mexico, and Poland "to help document the human costs and benefits of economic development, by showing how the child's use and perception of the resulting micro-environment affects his life" (Lynch, 1977, p. 1). The purpose of the research was to inform city planners' conceptions and misconceptions of the environment and suggest some long-term public policies that would enhance the child's experience in the urban environment (Lynch, 1977). Lynch's insights are groundbreaking in the sense that he suggests the inclusion of the child in the planning process, a change from modern practices wherein planners assume they know what children want and, alternatively, what is best for them.

With some minor exceptions, Lynch's work lay dormant for nearly twenty years. Some suggest that the reason for this period of dormancy was the progressive nature of Lynch's ideas (Chawla, 2001). Malone contends that the renewed interest in the role of the child in the city is, at least in part, a by-

product of the sustainable development movement (Malone, 2001). According to Malone,

> The principles of sustainable development clearly demand that the simultaneous achievement of environmental, social and economic goals should meet the needs of the present generation without compromising those of future generations (World Commission on Environment and Development, 1987)

(Malone, 2001, p. 7).

The renewed interest of involving children in planning practices has also been heralded by the Convention of the Rights of the Child (CRC) (Malone, 2001). The CRC defines the well-being of children as an indicator of sustainable development practices. According to Malone, the link between the child and sustainability has been documented in a number of important declarations, including "the Plan for Action that resulted from the World Summit for Children and the Rio Declaration and the action plan of Agenda 21, both endorsed at the Earth Summit in Rio de Janeiro in 1992" (Malone, 2001, p. 7). The Children's Rights and Habitat Declaration, presented by UNICEF at the United Nations Conference on Human Settlements in Istanbul in 1996, also highlights the role of children in the context of sustainable development. The report states:

> Children have a special interest in the creation of sustainable human settlements that will support long and fulfilling lives for themselves and future generations. They require opportunities to participate and contribute to a sustainable urban form

(UNICEF, 1997, p. 28). The recognition of children by the International development community as an indicator of

sustainable development has brought the health and well-being of young people to the forefront of policymaking and international aid.

In light of the new attention being paid to the importance of youth participation in planning processes, a few researchers have begun instituting smaller scale studies to examine the ability of young people, of various ages, to engage in planning-related activities and the empowering effects of such participation. This research has informed the planning profession with invaluable information about play patterns (Depeau, 2001); access to local environments (Tranter & Pawson, 2001); preferred land use patterns (Talen & Coffindaffer, 1999); and empowerment (Breitbart, 1995; Speak, 2000; and Salvadori, 2001). Collectively, this research reveals that young people are typically empowered by participating in these activities. That is, the youth participants in planning processes generally express feelings of personal empowerment from the mere invitation to participate in such processes and policymaking activities, thereby deriving a sense of power from said interactions (Rocha, 1997, p. 37). Furthermore, youth experience "positive psychosocial results" as a result of such participation, including: open-mindedness (Wilson, 1974); personal responsibility (Conrad and Hedin, 1982); and social and civic competence (Newmann and Rutter, 1998).

Existing scholarship in this field provides a preliminary look at the manner in which children and young people are able to participate in certain types of planning activities, but does not attempt to conceptualize either the actual or perceived levels of participation by the youth and adults who serve as members of a joint planning body. This study describes said levels of participation and the resulting empowering effects of

such participation, offering a model for the universal development of intergenerational governing bodies.

I assess the following questions with respect to the level of participation engaged in by youth and adult members of the intergenerational planning committee:

- the level of perceived participation experienced by youth and adult members of the planning committee;
- the level of actual participation exercised by both adult and youth members of the planning committee, as observed by the researcher and public housing authority organizer; and
- how participation in the intergenerational planning process reduces grief..

B. Actual and Perceived Participation Experienced by the Youth and Adult Members of the McDaniel Glenn Planning Committees

After what I had learned from HUD regarding its HOPE VI Youth Initiative, I went to Atlanta expecting that someone at the AHA was working directly with HUD to formulate ways to involve youth in HOPE VI-related planning processes. To my surprise, I learned that the idea to involve youth in planning processes in Atlanta had come from within the agency. There, youth have been involved in planning for two HOPE VI grant applications. A small group of young people were involved with the planning for the redevelopment of Capitol Homes. No information is available about such activities and the staff members who led those activities are no longer with the AHA.

However, the activities of the youth are well documented with respect to the McDaniel Glenn grant application.

The involvement of youth at McDaniel Glenn was not initially sought by the AHA. Rather, it was a consequence of the first public meeting regarding the grant application. AHA officials described the first meeting of the planning committee as "packed with people." Many parents brought their children. As explained by AHA staff, the most likely reason that the adult residents of McDaniel Glenn brought their children to the meeting was that there was no one to care for them at home.

The youth in attendance seemed interested in what was going on at the meeting and attempted to voice their ideas. They were silenced by their parents. AHA officials explained that a possible reason for the parents' hushing of the children's opinions were concerns by the parents that their children did not really understand what was going on. This is where one of the AHA officials came up with the idea of involving youth in the planning process. Previously employed by the AHA to work with youth, this housing authority official strongly believed that the youth at McDaniel Glenn knew what was going on, that they were going to have to move, and decided to include them in the planning process.

Rather than involving them in the process set up for the adult planning committee, this AHA official expressed his belief that the youth, ages 11 through 18, would speak their minds more freely in the absence of their parents or guardians. Initially, separate meetings were held with the youth at McDaniel Glenn. At the first youth meeting, AHA officials explained to the youth the purposes of HOPE VI funding and what transpires when a grant is awarded. They answered a number of questions regarding relocation, timeline, schools, and return to the Signature communities. The youth elected two co-chairs to run the

planning committee and to serve as liaisons with AHA officials and the adult planning committee.

At the second meeting, the youth worked with AHA officials to create a priority list of things they would like to see at the redeveloped site. Their list was as follows:

1. An after school program;
2. Green space;
3. Mentoring/Teen Clinic/Youth Counselors;
4. Closer bus stop;
5. Security gate to keep the drug dealers out;
6. Jobs program;
7. Sylvan Learning (learned about from the commercials);
8. Pest control;
9. Sewage;
10. Pool/ball courts/playground;
11. Heat and central air;
12. snack and soda machines;
13. closer grocery store;
14. laundry and hookups;
15. assigned parking.

This list was presented by the co-chairs to the adult planning committee. It is clear from the accounts of the youth participants, the members of the adult planning committee, and AHA officials that the youths' ideas were warmly received. This is a survey of the responses that I received when I asked how the members of the youth planning committee responded when asked what they thought about sharing their ideas with the members of the adult planning committee:

- It was fun;
- Good, it was nice;
- I think I don't mind answering and sharing questions.

- Said what I wanted;
- I really don't share ideas;
- It was good because we talked about what we would want to have- a gate with cops at it.
- I feel it was okay to share my ideas of the adult planning committee.
- Great.

Generally, their responses to this first instance of joint participation were positive. This is due, at least in part, to the way the youth perceived that the members of the adult planning committee responded to their ideas. With respect to the issue of the adults' responses, this is what the youth had to say:

- With a good questions;
- They could use them someday;
- Told me the things I asked them in a way I understand;
- I told them I wanted patios. They said sure;
- Good. That they are great ideas;
- I want a nice community. They agreed;
- They agree with me so I felt happy;
- They respond nice to my question;
- They respond in a nice way;
- They respond that's fantastic;
- We might can do that;
- They was glad;
- They said it was great.

Subsequently, I asked them how the adults' responses made them feel. They replied:

- Happy;
- Happy;

- Like I can talk to the more about my community;
- Very happy;
- Pretty;
- Awesome;
- Good;
- They response made me feel great;
- They responses made me feel very excited;
- Good;
- Their response made me feel great;
- It makes me feel great.

Based on their experiences, the youth made a number of requests to AHA officials at the end of the second planning committee meeting. These requests included: an opportunity to tour a HOPE VI community; participation in the naming of the site; writing a letter of support to HUD to ensure receipt of the grant. Most importantly, the youth stressed that they wanted the opportunity to continue meeting so that they might stay apprised of the status of the HOPE VI grant application for McDaniel Glenn. AHA officials continue to work to honor these requests.

During the grant application process the youth planning committee did not continue to meet with the same frequency as the adult planning committee. AHA officials contend that fewer youth meetings were held because of the complexity of scheduling meetings due to the numerous extracurricular activities in which the youth are involved. Youth participation was not deterred by the lack of youth-specific meetings. Instead, five to ten of the members of the youth planning committee began attending the meetings of the adult planning committee. With rare exception, the youth remain silent, but attentive at these meetings, reserving their questions for the AHA officials, either before

or after the regularly scheduled meetings of the adult planning committee.

This observation was confirmed by the youth when I asked them if they believed they would have been able express their ideas so completely during the planning process in joint meeting with the adults. While a few of the youth said that their participation level would not have changed in the presence of the adult members of the planning committee, the majority of youth suggested that this would not be acceptable because they would have been "shy," or "uncomfortable."

One or both of the co-chairs of the youth planning committee were present at most meetings of the adult planning committee. The male co-chair stated that he was always present due to his own interest and also because his grandmother is the chair of the adult planning committee. Cognizant of the fact that some of the youth have expressed some discomfort about attending meetings of the adult planning committee, including the female co-chair of the group, AHA officials frequently reminded members of the adult planning committee not to discourage the youth from attending or participating in such meetings. AHA officials would frequently welcome the youth to the meetings, requesting a round of applause from the members of the adult planning committee in support of the youths' efforts.

For many of the youth, their enthusiasm and interest in the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn resulted in their willingness to transcend their concerns about attending the meetings of the adult planning committee. As time went on, youth attendance at the adult meetings grew. So, too, did the willingness of the youth to speak at such meetings. The more the youths' confidence in their ability to make contributions to the planning process grew, the more willing their adult counterparts

were to listen to them. This mutual and respectful relationship took many months to form, but, in the end, it did.

This mutual relationship was threatened by a group of "outsiders" to the planning process just prior to the award of the grant by HUD. As previously described, meetings of the planning committees are open to interested parties, not just the residents of McDaniel Glenn. Members of the Mechanicsville Neighborhood Association (MNA) were in attendance at the June 2004 meeting of the adult planning committee. Their attendance was unexpected by both AHA officials and the residents in attendance at the meeting. Immediately upon their arrival, the members of the MNA began questioning the youth and adult residents in attendance. As HUD officials later described, the residents perceived that the members of the MNA were trying to take over the planning process, in spite of the fact that the planning for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn had been successfully completed for many months.

The presence of these "outsiders" had a number of effects on the planning process. Their aggressiveness caused the youth in attendance at the meeting to flee. The youth members of the planning committee would later tell HUD officials that their departure was not meant to be a sign of disrespect. One HUD official recounted: "They just felt uncomfortable with all the focus on them and from people they didn't know." The reticence of the youth to share their ideas with the "outsiders" is not surprising. It is important to remember that the youth were dissuaded from participating by their parents in the beginning of the planning process. Not until AHA officials crafted a youth planning committee did the youth begin sharing their ideas for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn. Gradually, the youth began attending meetings of the adult planning committee, mostly for the purposes of staying informed about new developments.

Active participation by the youth at meetings of the adult planning committee began in the spring months of 2004, nearly eight months after the process began.

Actual participation by the youth at meetings of both the youth and adult planning committees is evidence of the empowerment effects of such participation and validation. The fact that the youth fled from the June 2004 meeting should not be taken as evidence of waning levels of empowerment; rather, such evidence serves to indicate the importance of the bond of trust and respect built between youth and adult planning committee members. From the perspective of the youth, the presence of the "outsiders" threatened the integrity of the bond. Instead of joining together with their adult counterparts, the youth voluntarily left the meeting. It is likely that the youth dismissed themselves from the situation given their adult counterparts' response to the "outsiders."

The actual and perceived levels of participation by the members of the adult planning committee grew overtime, as well. As AHA officials recount: "In the beginning, the members of the planning committee sat quietly and listened intently to the information shared with them by the AHA. They had to be asked to share their opinions." Once asked to help design the new community, the members of the adult planning committee became more active participants. By early fall, the members were fully engaged in the planning process for the new community. Despite the fact that it took some time for the adults to fully engage in the participatory process, they consistently attended planning meetings during the course of this study, from fall 2003 to spring 2004.

The adults were less emphatic with respect to their perceptions of their own participation in the planning process.

When asked why they attended the meetings, the adults cited the following reasons:

- I hope to get into the new community;
- I want to know when we got to move;
- I am interested in the homeownership program they are always talking about;
- I want my kids to live in a better place;
- It's interesting;
- I want to be prepared when they tell me we have to move;
- I want to come back to McDaniel Glenn when it's done and nicer.

For the majority of adults, concern about relocation was what initially attracted them to participation on the planning committee. Overtime, however, other issues like homeownership or the ability to return to the redeveloped community became the primary reason that the member continued to attend.

The members of the adult planning committee all noted their surprise at the level of the contribution made by the youth. Many of the members mentioned their surprise about the astuteness of the youth's contribution after their first presentation to the committee. One member said: "I had no idea that they paid so much attention or knew so much about the community." Another member said, "They should be involved in the planning. They face the same problems we do. This program will help them too. It will give them opportunities they don't have now." While never officially invited to merge with the adult planning committee, a de facto merger resulted when members of the youth planning committee began to attend meetings on a consistent basis. The creation of this intergenerational planning committee falls within the top rung of the modified

hierarchy of participation, as presented by Hart (1992). The integration of the two committees, while informal, was child-initiated.

The members of the adult planning committee had a somewhat different response to the presence of the "outsiders." Like the youth, many of the members of the adult planning committee began silent and non-participative. A few of the members of the adult planning committee interacted with the members of the MNA. These representatives of the adult planning committee asked the members of the MNA where they had been throughout the entire planning process. They chastised them for showing up at the end with the expectation that their concerns would be considered by the planning committee.

The hostility with which the members of the MNA were met did not dissuade them from participating. The president of the MNA shared her vision for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn with those in attendance. Most of her comments were directed to AHA officials, indicating her belief that AHA was charged with the planning of this project, not the residents serving on the planning committee. AHA officials listened carefully to the comments offered by the outsiders. However, as they later explained, they too felt uncomfortable by the presence of the "outsiders" and their decision to participate so late in the planning process. In addition, the AHA officials indicated their discomfort in the way that the MNA president addressed her comments to them, rather than the residents. Prior to this meeting, the AHA officials had expressed their belief that control over the planning committee had shifted from themselves to the members of the committee. Both the "outsiders'" disregard of the members of the planning committee and the members' response to the "outsiders'" presence challenge that belief.

The data clearly shows that the members of the intergenerational planning committee at McDaniel Glenn are satisfied with their participation. While each group of participants, adult and youth, had varying reasons for participating, in the end, the members agreed that participation was a valuable, educative, and validating experience. A bond has been formed by the members of the intergenerational planning committee and the group appears to be committed to seeing the process through to completion. It is possible that this bond between members is so strong because of the way the intergenerational planning committee evolved. It was not forced. Rather, the joint group came together organically after each learned about the HOPE VI process and their role in it.

Actual participation levels, gauged by my own observations, mirror the participants' perceived commitment to the planning process. The best evidence of commitment is the high level of attendance of the participants. Nearly as many participants who started the process followed it through the planning phase of the HOPE VI grant application process. Attendance sheets were always filed with at least twenty-five to thirty names, always the same. Attendance did not appear to vary to any significant degree by the residents' role in the process. Youth and adult planning committee members attended with the same frequency as those who were not in leadership positions. Why the high attendance here when one of the greatest challenges to citizen participation is commitment? The answers are varied in this case. Many of the residents continued to attend the meetings to learn about the redevelopment and the impending relocation. The majority of residents also cited their belief that they would be given preference to move back into the redeveloped community as a result of their efforts. The youth also suggested that they continued to attend the meeting to remain in contact with the

AHA official who originally included them in the planning process. To them, this person is more than a meeting facilitator; he is a friend and mentor. The meetings were also viewed, by some, as a social gathering of like-minded residents where neighbors could reconnect and share an evening meal together.

As time passed, the participants became more comfortable asking questions and challenging the ideas of others. In the early stages, the members merely listened and asked questions of the AHA officials. Overtime, they learned that they could challenge the ideas of their neighbors and of the AHA officials. They began to deliberate with each other, requiring less and less moderation by the AHA officials. So, too, did the members of the planning committees learn to reach compromises on details where they originally disagreed. The members' trust of AHA officials increased overtime and friendships developed between them. The award of the grant application was a shared victory for the planning committee members and their AHA allies, erasing many years of contempt these residents had carried about employees of the AHA.

Participation on the intergenerational planning committee has educated and empowered youth and adult participants and improved relations between the public housing community and the AHA. These factors have led to the reduction of any pre-relocation grief experienced by those who will be relocated in the near future so their existing community can be revitalized. The members of the committee have offered total support to the plan for redevelop and are armed with ample skills to identify alternative housing for themselves and their families. The committee members appear to be satisfied with their efforts and many wish to return to the community, if possible, upon its

completion. To some, being relocated quickly means that they can move back into the new signature community even sooner.

It is important at this point to identify one limitation of this study. This study ends with the award of the HOPE VI grant for the revitalization of McDaniel Glenn. At the end of this study, the residents, working with AHA staff and the project's developer, have prepared a plan for the Signature community that will sit on the old McDaniel Glenn site. At the conclusion of this study, the residents had not begun to relocate and the land had not been cleared for redevelopment. The point of this diversion is that there is no guarantee that the plan prepared by the residents will be built as discussed. The final contract for redevelopment is between the AHA and the developer. The members of the planning committee are not parties to this contract and, as such, have no legal standing to enforce the design they suggested. Thus, while the adult and youth members of the planning committees might feel that they have been allowed to make a valuable contribution to the process upon the award of the grant, there is no guarantee that their suggestions will be placed in the final plan. They must trust that the AHA has acted in good faith as their partner in the early planning stages for the redevelopment effort and will continue to do so as the process continues. Further study is necessary to determine whether the new development, when completed, will live up to the expectations of the residents.

This study again reveals the value of youth contributions to the planning process. The intergenerational planning committee is highly participatory and child-initiated. The contributions of both youth and adult participants are apparent to observers and to the members themselves. The intergenerational planning committee at McDaniel Glenn, in its formation and operation, should be considered a model for

equalitarian participatory processes involving youth and adults in the way that it contributes to the reduction of pre-relocation grief. Further research is necessary to evaluate what factors contribute to the successful intergenerational participation efforts and whether or not such planning committee can be created or must evolve over time.

CHAPTER 6: ADVOCATES FOR HOPE VI – A ROLE FOR ADVOCACY PLANNERS IN THE FACILITATION OF HOPE VI

A. Introduction

This study began as an attempt to better understand a unique planning process which engages adults and youths in an effort to plan for the redevelopment of a traditional public housing community in Atlanta using HOPE VI funds. Early coding practices revealed leadership was key in the development and implementation of this process. My initial interviews with members of the intergenerational planning committee, as well as AHA officials, kept drawing my attention back to the particular efforts of one AHA official – charged with spearheading the planning process for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn. This individual's efforts were integral to the formation of the intergenerational planning committee, the overall satisfaction of the planning committee members with the process, and likely contributed to the low levels of grief experienced by McDaniel Glenn residents.

At the suggestion of planning committee members and his colleagues at the AHA, I began to monitor the habits of this planner in order to develop a better understanding of his leadership style. This planner's behavior fits neatly within the classification of advocacy planner, as further described below. What is interesting here, however, is that the HOPE VI program is flexible enough to permit advocacy planning. In this case, it appears that the presence of an advocacy planner has

been helpful in the reduction of grief experienced by relocating residents.

B. The Emergence of Advocacy Planning – A Rejection of the Rational Planning Model

For decades, many of those engaged in the field of urban planning have been enticed by the belief that "scientific planning should guide societal change" (Throgmorton, 1996, p. 23). Why? The primary reason that scientific planning, or rational planning as it is called within the profession, is so attractive to planning professionals is because it provides a formulaic way to make policy recommendations in situations seemingly complicated by politics and a whole host of other factors. Many planners believe that scientifically based recommendations and the decisions which result from them best reach the "truth." Those who ascribe to the principles of rational planning accept three fundamental assumptions: (1) it is possible for planners to specify goals that represent society's values; (2) planners may rely on lawlike scientific policies to achieve these goals; and (3) a central authority will implement and enforce such policies (Throgmorton, 1996, p. 24).

While attractive in theory, the rational planning model has been, at least in part, abandoned in both scholarship and planning practice. The primary reason cited for this abandonment has been the failure of the model to account for the effect of politics in decisionmaking. No matter how scientific,

the recommendations of planners to local governing bodies are highly scrutinized. As a result of this understanding of the importance of politics in planning, even those who would still classify themselves as rational planners have adopted the slogan: "think scientifically but act politically" (Throgmorton, 1996).

Advocacy planning, also referred to as equity planning, emerged in the 1960s as a rejection of rational planning and the notions that city planning is apolitical and that a plan prepared by a city agency is adequate to express the interests of the entire community (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994). As Clavel (1994, p. 146) more fully describe:

> Advocacy planning began in response to political practices that combined a superficial pluralism with the effective exclusion of the poor and minorities, and also in response to a professional culture that was monolithic in its devotion to the physical plan, the independent planning commission and a not easily accessible public interest.

The bases for the rejection of the rational planning model were more fully detailed by Paul Davidoff in his article 'Advocacy and Pluralism in Planning.' There, Davidoff explained that planners could, by targeting underserved groups, "contribute to a more inclusive pluralism" (Clavel, 1994, p. 146).

C. Characteristics of the Advocacy Planner

Krumholz and Clavel (1994) set out to determine what it means to be an advocacy planner in a series of interviews they conducted with twenty-five practicing advocacy planners. Their interviewees were primarily white men from middle class backgrounds. While varying in approach, the data collected from these interviews suggests that equity planners are individuals with an "interest in equity, justice, and fairness" that goes back to childhood (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994, p. 227). Krumholz and Clavel's study reveals that the majority of those interviewed carried the social activism they practiced in the 1960s forward into their professional careers. These planners use their positions in local government bureaucracies to deliberately seek to redistribute power, resources, or participation to poor and working class residents (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994).

As to the character of advocacy planners, Krumholz and Clavel (1994, p. 228) contend that they are "remarkably persistent and energized." Their conversations with these advocacy planners did not unearth feelings of burnout. Rather, the advocacy planners tended to exude a high level of excitement about their work. According to the authors, it is "an excitement that most of us do not ordinarily experience at work" (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994, p. 228). Advocacy planners appear to be personally fulfilled by their efforts to improve the lives of those whose interests they serve (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994, p. 228).

In order to accomplish their goals, advocacy planners tend to disregard "the informal rules of planning bureaucracies"

(Krumholz and Clavel, 1994, p. 228). Instead of merely consulting with local interest groups, advocacy planners are invariably involved in organizing them (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994, p. 228). They help such groups devise and carryout action plans. In addition, advocacy planners also deal actively with the media. They rely on the media as a tool to assist in the education of the public and to develop support for egalitarian policies (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994, p. 229).

Most important, perhaps, is the advocacy planner's belief that their job involves more than "problem solving" (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994, p. 229). Advocacy planners often ascribe to the view that a large function of their work is to educate the local citizenry about the importance of their participation in local governance (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994). While advocacy planners may adhere to the philosophy that one person can make a difference in politics (Krumholz and Clavel, 1994), they would contest arguments that they, alone, have made the difference for disenfranchised communities. Advocacy planners are coalition builders and often attribute the success of such endeavors to the labors of loosely allied interest groups.

D. HOPE VI Permits Advocacy Planning

Modern U.S. housing policy shows signs of policymakers' understanding of the possible value of advocacy planning in meeting the needs of those who live in housing subsidized by the Federal government. Housing statutes, such as HOPE VI, are, by their very nature, egalitarian and oriented toward meeting the

housing needs of some of America's poorest residents and the neighborhoods in which they inhabit. HOPE VI Act allows local public housing authorities to submit plans to redevelop severely distressed public housing communities for the good of the residents which inhabit them as well as community neighbors. While revitalizing these deteriorating public housing communities may have positive communitywide effects, the plans for such projects are neighborhood focused. In Atlanta, AHA officials have stated their hope that the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn will be beneficial not only for the residents of the public housing community, but for development prospects in the area. By its very nature, the application process for the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn is advocacy oriented.

Despite its advocacy orientation, the redevelopment process could be carried out relying on traditional rational planning methods. This is not the case with the planning process for McDaniel Glenn. Citizens of all ages are being asked to engage in a long term planning process to ensure that the end result is driven by their desires. Why is this level of engagement being sought? One of the explanations for the advocacy orientation of this planning process is the principal planner and facilitator of this project who sees it as his personal mission to ensure that the residents are "not only listened to, but heard."

A product of public housing himself, the advocate planner knows what the public housing experience is like, spending some of his youth in a housing project in Atlanta. Unlike the advocacy planners interviewed by Krumholz and Clavel, this particular planner is African American. He is young and his social activism is not a product of his involvement in the social movements of the 1960s. He is a new breed of advocate planner that seeks to help those living in public housing gain power over their living situations because of his own

experiences, as well as his religious background, among other contributing factors. This planner knows the challenges that the disenfranchised face in their efforts to seek better lives. Armed with this knowledge, the advocate planner has sought to build a planning process that not only collects resident input about the redevelopment, but inspires participating residents to consider how such participation might lead them to live more independent and fulfilling lives. The advocate planner is solely responsible for efforts to reach out to the elderly residents living in the Martin Luther King, Jr. Towers and for creating a separate planning process to educate and collect input from youth residents about the redevelopment of McDaniel Glenn. His colleagues attribute the design of the participation program to his efforts.

The residents of the McDaniel Glenn community seem to recognize that the advocate planner has gone beyond his call of duty. They describe him as "honest," "good hearted," and "committed to the project." According to the planning committee chairwoman, the efforts of this advocate planner have improved her view of the public housing authority. Ironically, the residents are unaware that the advocate planner has been responsible for crafting a participatory process that is much more inclusive and long-term than required by the AHA. The advocacy planner has never tried to leverage the planning process by sharing this information with the residents. The members of the youth and adult planning committees are not surprised, however, that the advocate planner has gone beyond that which is required of him due to the consideration he has shown to them throughout the process.

While the process is clearly facilitated by the strong advocacy efforts of one planner, he would likely credit his team, "the front end team," for the zealous advocacy of the AHA

on behalf of the residents of McDaniel Glenn. There is little doubt that the other members of the front end team support the advocate planner's agenda. To the extent that they offer technical advice, they work consistently to ensure that their advice is the advisory basis for the decisions rendered by the members of the planning committee. Most notably, the front end team acts as staff for the members of the planning committees instead of as decisionmakers for the AHA. They have established themselves in such a way that residents have come to trust and respect the guidance provided their guidance. The dedication of the front end team seems to have inspired the full and continuous participation of the members of the adult and youth planning committees. Attendance of both groups remains high after more than six months of meetings.

Whether or not the efforts of the front end team are representative of the view of the AHA as a whole is not transparent. Interestingly, no member of the team or the AHA has been able to identify the origin of the decision to increase the public meeting period. AHA staff is quick to point out that their efforts to create an inclusive and responsive planning process have the support of executive director, Renee Glover. Glover most likely supports such a process as a result of her early experiences in developing a plan for the revitalization of Techwood Homes. Given the contested nature of that redevelopment plan, Glover likely learned the value of expanding the role of citizen participation as a consensus building process.

The main issue of concern with advocacy planners is burnout. Commitment at the level necessary to organize the disenfranchised at the grassroots level is time consuming and often the results of such efforts are slow in revealing themselves. However, like the advocacy planners interviewed by

Krumholz and Clavel, this planner shows no sign that his energy is waning. Instead, he shows frustration that he cannot do more. It is the nature of this planner's job to lead planning committees through the first phase of the planning process which ends with the award of the HOPE VI grant. Once a grant is awarded a new set of individuals are charged with relocating residents and working with the developer during the construction phase of the redevelopment. Thus, the relationship built by the advocate planner is somewhat weakened, according to the planner himself, by his inability to follow the project through to its completion with the same level of attention. While the advocate planner expresses his belief that the relocation team can do a good job, he often worries that the bond he has developed with the members of the intergenerational planning committee will be threatened by his absence from the continued process.

Rather than removing himself totally from the next phase of the redevelopment process, the advocate planner diligently works to maintain an open channel of communication with those AHA officials charged with the next phase of the redevelopment and the members of the planning committee. To his satisfaction, the planner is able to keep abreast on developments within the community. However, such activities are time consuming and require that the advocate planner work additional hours to ensure the fluidity of the on-going process in the midst of beginning new efforts to redevelop public housing communities in Atlanta using HOPE VI monies. At some point, the advocate planner's workload may preclude this level of follow up and he will be left to make a decision about his participation in projects after the grant award stage. Until then, it is likely that his commitment to the assisting the disenfranchised will continue.

E. Advocacy Planning Contributes to the Reduction of Grief

When Fried conducted his study of the West End, he asked residents who learned they would be relocated how the relocation made them feel. Most of those interviewed revealed that they felt some level of sadness or anxiety about the impending relocation. In the case of the West End, the residents were working class people who participated in the private housing market. Neighborhood conditions were reportedly habitable and safe. The residents did not ask for the urban renewal that was slated to occur nor were they consulted about the impending effort to rehabilitate neighborhood conditions. Rather, they were told by city officials that they would have to relocate so that revitalization could occur. The residents were unable to organize with enough force to discourage the city from clearing the West End neighborhood. They did not have an advocate, from the neighborhood or the city, to help protect their interests.

This scenario did not repeat itself with the rehabilitation of McDaniel Glenn. There is little doubt that the situation was different. Rather than being a working class neighborhood, McDaniel Glenn is a public housing community. The residents are predominantly African American and poor. They do not own their homes. Their neighborhood is unsafe and crime ridden. When members of the AHA posted notice about their intentions to work with the residents of McDaniel Glenn to secure a grant for HOPE VI funds to revitalize the site, many residents expressed an interest in assist the housing authority to carry out this task.

Support for the HOPE VI grant application grew in McDaniel Glenn overtime. At first, the focus of the residents' questions

was the impending relocation. Where would they be moved to? When would it happen? Would they get assistance from the AHA to move? They experienced high levels of anxiety. Noting this anxiety, AHA officials worked to provide ample information to the residents about the purposes and interworkings of HOPE VI. These officials took the residents' anxieties into account and worked to develop a long term and educative planning process that would provide the residents of McDaniel Glenn a forum where they could voice their concerns and ideas about the community which would replace the existing one.

The residents, both youth and adult, found an advocate from the AHA during the grant application process. They placed their trust in this person, sharing their thoughts and concerns freely. The advocate from the AHA worked diligently to validate the residents' input and such efforts seemingly reduced the anxiety originally shared by the residents. Upon news of the receipt of the grant, the members of the intergenerational planning committee celebrated that their efforts would lead to the revitalization of their neighborhood. While many continued to perceive displacement as an inconvenience, most were excited about the opportunity for redevelopment made possible by the plan. Some had begun exploring housing options available, despite the fact that relocation efforts would not begin for more than six months. More than half of the members of the intergenerational planning committee shared an interest in returning to the redeveloped community upon completion. The residents' comments suggest that the efforts of the advocacy planner were key in curbing the negative effects typically felt by those being relocated as part of urban renewal initiatives.

F. Conclusion

The HOPE VI program is clearly flexible. It allows housing authorities to develop unique planning processes that can potentially stave off some of the grief effects traditionally associated with relocation. In the case of McDaniel Glenn, one planner in particular worked to educate and include community residents, adults and youth, in the planning process. His efforts appear to have reduced the residents' initial concerns about relocation, empowering them to take their futures in their own hands. The question remains: will these reduced grief levels continue once the planning process ends and the relocation phase ends? Future research is necessary to address this question.

CHAPTER 7: CONCLUSIONS

This study began with the assertion that the term "urban renewal" carries with it a highly negative connotation. For some, this negative response is predicated on the fact that most urban renewal efforts have been led by developers and businesspeople interested in "physical rejuvenation," rather than "social change" (Teaford, 1990, p. 12). There is no doubt that the redevelopment of Atlanta's urban core has been, and to some extent continues to be, spawned by the downtown business elite with specific interests in the rejuventation of Atlanta's central business district (Stone, 1976; 1989; Keating, 2001). In their efforts to attract people and businesses back to the downtown, business elite encouraged local government officials to focus their efforts on the "black area south of the business district..." (Stone, 1989, p. 39). The primary goal of Atlanta's urban renewal efforts has always been and continues to be focused on the "eradication of the slums" (Teaford, 1990, p. 105). Even the earliest urban renewal efforts carried out in the 1940s and 1950s seemed to focus on rehabilitating those things, such as urban slums, which served as constant reminders of urban decay (Teaford, 1990). Then, as now, the AHA has been a major facilitator of such efforts to renew the southside slums of the city (Stone, 1989).

I believe that this research endeavor stands to challenge the belief held by Fried and carried forward by others that all urban renewal programs, like HOPE VI, should be viewed with similar disdain. This study has revealed a case where at least the beginning stages of the urban renewal process for the Mechanicsville neighborhood in Atlanta has sought to solicit

more than citizen input. Here, the AHA has designed a planning process that also seeks genuine citizen support for its endeavors to revitalize the McDaniel Glenn public housing community.

With this case study, I set out to describe a particular and unique phenomenon and to interpret what I found in the context of existing planning theory. The results of this study reveal how the participatory planning process developed by the AHA housing authority may have helped the adult and youth residents of McDaniel Glenn overcome the feelings of grief typically associated with urban renewal projects, such as HOPE VI-related revitalization efforts. While each chapter contains specific findings with respect to the application of existing theory to this case study, the purpose of this conclusion is to discuss some overarching issues which contextualize said findings.

One of the first conclusions that is apparent from this study pertains to the relevance of grounded theory as a research methodology for planning scholarship. Grounded theory is not a common methodological approach to studies in urban planning. Most planning scholarship adopts a somewhat positivist approach, even that which is qualitative. Most research in the field is driven by research questions which seek to test causal relationships between a given set of variables. This type of research has served the field well, yielding results that often serve as the basis for new or modified local policies directed at improving the human experience with the built and natural environment.

With all of its benefits, this type of research does not fit all important questions in the field of urban planning. Due to the complexity of urban problems, other research methods are often necessary to discover the heart of such problems and the

interrelated variables involved. Qualitative studies, such as case studies, are becoming more commonplace in urban planning research. Researchers in the field have come to understand the usefulness in collecting narrative data to describe and explain urban phenomena which are difficult to capture in traditional empirical studies.

Despite the continuing emergence of qualitative research methods in planning scholarship, few researchers employ the grounded theory approach to planning research. There are many reasons that grounded theory has not caught on in planning scholarship, the most significant of which is the difficult in generalizing from such studies and in replicating the results.

I chose to employ grounded theory in this study, first and foremost, because of the uniqueness of the subject. The intergenerational planning committee formed by the residents of McDaniel Glenn and the AHA is currently one of a kind. While a number of planning scholars, as well as some in related disciplines, have hypothesized about the potential for youth and adults to engage together jointly in a planning process, few such processes exist. As such, the grounded theory approach allowed me to look at this particular phenomenon. While a traditional case study design might have allowed me to engage in the study of the intergenerational planning committee alone, such a methodology would have failed to assist with the discovery of the larger context in which the planning committee operates.

Driven initially by a very limited set of research questions, I broadened the lens of the study in order to contextualize the activities of the intergenerational planning committee within the realm of urban renewal. This larger perspective allowed me to discover that the residents of McDaniel Glenn demonstrated a surprising lack of grief in spite

of the impending threat of relocation. Many factors may have contributed to this unanticipated reduction of grief. As confirmed by recent HOPE VI related studies, current conditions in McDaniel Glenn are in a poor enough state that residents perceive relocation as a potential opportunity. In addition, the planning process at McDaniel Glenn has been educative, informing residents about the housing opportunities available to them outside their current residence.

There are two factors that are likely attributable to the reduction of grief symptoms experienced by members of the planning committee during the intergenerational planning process at McDaniel Glenn, including: the intergenerational planning committee and the presence of an advocacy planner. Unlike any of the HOPE VI communities that have been studied, the AHA designed an unparalleled planning process for McDaniel Glenn. AHA officials have created a planning process that is equally welcoming to the youth and adult residents of the public housing community and is continuous, providing planning committee members with the opportunity to stay informed and active in the decisionmaking process with respect to the development of McDaniel Glenn. While this study lacks the presence of comparison groups, participants and non-participants, the data do show that over time the focus of the participants' questions evolved from attention on relocation related issues to active engagement in planning of the Signature Community. The advocacy planner helped design a planning process that was educative and empowering. As a result of this newly gained knowledge, they fear the impending relocation less.

A second unique factor with respect to McDaniel Glenn is the presence of an advocacy planner. Residents have sought information and solace from the AHA planner charged with facilitating the planning process. While many AHA staff members

have contributed to the development and execution of this planning model, there is little doubt that one employee, in particular, has demonstrated a steadfast commitment to organizing and advocating for the residents of McDaniel Glenn. This culture of advocacy may or may not be unique to Atlanta – no such data exists for compassion – but has been critical to the development of a planning process that is humane.

While this case study is rich in detail and explanation with respect to the particular planning process undergone in Atlanta, it is limited in terms of representativeness and generalizability, issues pertaining to the external validity of the study. While other housing authorities across the country are required to engage in citizen participation during the grantwriting phase of the HOPE VI application process, these processes vary widely depending on agency time, resources, and commitment to engaging citizens in such processes. It is likely that process developed by the AHA is far more participatory than that employed by other housing authorities since the AHA has far exceeded the statutory requirements for participation for its HOPE VI planning committees. This study could serve as a benchmark for future research to ascertain the scope and peculiarities of the participatory processes undertaken by other housing authorities who seek HOPE VI funding and the effects of such processes on the participants and on the success of housing authorities in obtaining HOPE VI funds.

On a related issue, it is keenly important to note that, in terms of citizen participation, the AHA is doing much more than it is required to do by statute. The AHA has committed itself to continuing the McDaniel Glenn intergenerational planning committee until those residents who wish to return to the Signature community do so – a period that may reach five years. This extended planning process represents a large commitment of

time and resources. Many housing authorities are unable or unwilling to make such a commitment and this fact alone makes this case unique.

The results of this study might lead readers to believe that the HOPE VI statute's mandate of resident participation will result in plans that reflect their desires. This is not the case, however. Unfortunately, the Act lacks the "teeth" to enforce these participation requirements (National Housing Law Project (NHLP), June 2002, p. 17). The report prepared by the National Housing Law Project indicates that the Act fails to live up to its participation goals because HUD has failed to create implementing regulations to enforce such requirements (NHLP, June 2002). Instead, what participation is done is due to requirements in NOFAs and grant agreements (NHLP, June 2002).

NHLP argues that the grant agreements are insufficient to bring about the type of participation called for in the Act. The main problem in allowing such agreements to govern participation is in the lack of power vested by such agreements in the rights of third parties to enforce the terms of the contracts. These agreements are between the HUD, the local public housing authorities, and the developer who will build such projects. The residents are not a party to such contract. As such, they have no legal recourse to challenge the terms or implementation of such agreements. As aptly explained in the NHLP report: "In other words, they spell out resident and community participation rights, then deny the possibility of enforcing those rights" (NHLP, June 2002, p. 19).

The NHLP report contends that similar problems exist in relying on NOFA's to guide resident participation (NHLP, June 2002). While these guidelines spell out participation requirements, the residents' right to participate terminates with the filing of the grant application by the local public

housing authority. The problem with this, according to the NHLP report, is that plans change (NHLP, June 2002). A 1996 HUD report revealed the extent of this problem: many … HOPE VI plans have changed considerably since the initial application … Some [public housing authorities] have abandoned their original plans altogether and are in the process of developing new ones" (Abt Assocs., et al, July 1996).

In order to better serve the residents of public housing, as the AHA has done with the residents of McDaniel Glenn, the HOPE VI law should be amended in two ways. First, the law should extend participation requirements beyond the grant application period. This change would ensure increased sensitivity and information to displaced residents, reducing the anxiety and grief associated with relocation. Further, displaced residents, as a class, should be added as a third party to contracts between the AHA and developers. As a party to such contracts, residents would be able to challenge revisions to redevelopment plans that are inconsistent with the efforts of planning committees. Without these legislative revisions to the HOPE VI law, resident participation and empowerment will vary significantly by both housing authority and proposed revitalization effort.

This study also uncovers a new and critical group of true beneficiaries of the HOPE VI program – youth, debunking stereotypes of youth as "victims of poverty," "problems of society," "alienated from community," disengaged from democracy" (Checkoway et al., 2003). Rather then attempting to free them from these cultural stereotypes and to engage youth in decisionmaking, policymakers at federal, state, and local levels appear to continue adopting policies that they believe to be in the best interest of the youth in an effort to "save the children" or "defend their rights" (Checkoway, et al., 2003).

They do not solicit input from the youth because they assume that the youth do not care or, in the alternative, are not mature enough to legislate for their own welfare. From this practice, it is easy to come to the conclusion that youth have been written off as incompetent (Checkoway et al., 2003).

Checkoway et al. (2003) questions: "what would happen if society viewed young people as competent citizens?" Checkoway et al. suggests that policymakers should begin viewing youth as competent citizens and themselves as their allies in democratic processes. The authors state:

> Despite obstacles faced in low-income areas, the youth can join together, organize groups, plan programs, and participate in decisions that affect their lives. They are exceptional in their efforts, and reflect emerging multicultural movements by young people arising in communities of color.

This is exactly what the AHA has done. From the very first meeting of the residents of McDaniel Glenn, AHA officials have reached out to the community's youth. A special planning process was developed in an effort to inform the youth about HOPE VI and to solicit their ideas about the new community. The youth participated with informed enthusiasm, able to talk in great detail about HOPE VI and their ideas. To them, HOPE VI is more than a housing policy. It is an opportunity which gives them "hope" for better lives in the future. So moved by the opportunities associated with this revitalization effort, the youth overcame their apprehensiveness and became active members at planning committee meetings which had once been reserved primarily for adult participants.

Not only did the youth participate in the planning process, they were empowered by it. While this concept is often measured by the empowerment which one person gives another, an alternative measure sees empowerment as a power that is "present

or potential resource in every person or community" (Checkoway et al., 2003). According to Checkoway et al. (2003), the key to this alternative prospective of empowerment is that people recognize and act upon these powers. This notion of empowerment is exemplified by the Wizard in the Wizard of Oz when he says of the gifts sought by Dorothy, the Tin Man, the Scarecrow, and the Lion: "I don't know why people always ask me for what they already have." Here, the youth came to recognize the inherent value of their contributions and that recognition was validated by AHA officials and the members of the adult planning committee. Their efforts were validated by the adult planning committee's willingness to merge into an intergenerational planning committee. Together, the members came to recognize the value of their contributions and to embrace a collective hope that the revitalization of McDaniel Glenn would be beneficial not only for themselves, but for future generations of tenets.

This case study of the pre-award planning process at McDaniel Glenn provides a useful model of a participatory process that reduces grief effects, encourages continuing resident participation, and empowers residents. By choosing to adopt a similar model, it is likely that public housing authorities, as well as other redevelopment agencies, may stave off the negative effects traditionally associated with the displacement of people as a result of urban renewal policies. Perhaps in doing so, "urban renewal" will no longer be a dirty word.

REFERENCES

Abt Associates, Inc. (1996). *An historical and baseline assessment of HOPE VI.* Retrieved October 7, 2004 from http://www.huduser.org/publications/pdf/hopevi_vol1.pdf

Arnstein, S. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 35*(4), 216-224.

Breitbart, M. (1995). Banners for the street: Reclaiming space and designing change with urban youth. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 15*(1), 35-49.

Burns, D., Hambleton, R., & Hoggett, P. (1994). *The politics of decentralisation.* London: Macmillan.

Chawla, L. (2001). Putting young old ideas into action: The relevance of growing up in cities to Local Agenda 21. *Local Environment, 6*(1), 13-25.

Checkoway, B., Pothukuchi, K., and Finn, J. (1995). Youth participation in community planning: what are the benefits? *Journal of Planning Education and Research,*14(2), 134-139.

Checkoway, B., Richards-Schuster, K., Abdullah, S., Aragon, M., Facio, E., Figueroa, L., et al. (2003). Young people as competant citizens. *Community Development Journal, 38*(4), 298-309.

Checkoway, B. (n.d.). *Adults as allies.* Retrieved October 7, 2004 from http://www.wkkf.org/Pubs/YouthED/Pub564.pdf

Clampet-Lundquist, S. (2004). HOPE VI Relocation: Moving to new neighborhoods and building new ties, *Housing Policy Debate,* 15(2), 415-447.

Clavel, P. (1994). The evolution of advocacy planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 60*(2), 146-150.

Conrad D. and Hedin, D. (1982). The impact of experimental education on adolescent development. *Child and Youth Services,* 4:57-76.

Cullingworth, J. B. and Caves, R.W. (2003). Planning in the USA: Policies, issues and Processes. London: University of Sheffield.

Davidoff, P. (1965). Advocacy and pluralism in planning. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners, 31*(4), 331-338.

Depeau, S. (2001). Urban identities and social interaction: A cross-cultural analysis of young people's spatial mobility in Paris, France and Frankston, Australia. *Local Environment, 6*(1), 81-86.

Derricotte, C. (1997). Poverty and property in the United States: A primer on the economic impact of housing discrimination and the importance of a U.S. right to housing. *Howard Law Journal, 40*(3), 689-708.

Duhl, L.D. (Ed.) (1963). The urban condition: People and policy in the metropolis. New York: Basic Books.

Epp, G. (1996). Emerging strategies for revitalizing public housing communities. *Housing Policy Debate,* 7(3), 563-588.

Fellman, G. and Brandt, B. (1970). Neighborhood a highway would destroy. *Environment and Behavior,* 2(3): 281-301.

Fisher, R.M. (1959). *Twenty years of public housing: Economic aspects of the Federal program.* Westport, CT: Greenwood Press.

Fitzpatrick, M.S. (Summer 2000). Note: A disaster in every generation: An analysis of HOPE VI: HUD's newest big budget development plan. *Georgetown Journal on Poverty Law & Policy,* 7, 412-448.

Friedman, L. (1968). *Government and slum housing: A century of frustration.* Chicago: Rand McNally.

Frug, G. (1999). *City making: Building communities without building walls.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fullilove, M.T. 2001. Root Shock: The Consequences of African American Dispossession. *Journal of Urban Health-Bulletin of the New York Academy of Medicine,* 78(1): 72-80.

Gans, H. (1962). The urban villagers. New York: Free Press of Glenncoe.

Gans, H. (1985). The urban villagers. New York: Free Press of Glenncoe.

Glaeser, B. & Strauss, A. (1967). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research.* New York: Aldine De Gruyter.

Green, S. (1994). The public housing tenancy: Variations on the common law that gives security of tenure and control. *Catholic University Law Review, 43*(3), 681-743.

Hart, R. (1992). *Child's participation: From tokenism to citizenship.* London: UNICEF International Child Development Centre.

Hart, R. (1997). *Children's participation: The theory and practice of involving young citizens in community development and environmental care.* London: UNICEF Earthscan Publications.

Heller, T. (1982). The effects of involuntary residential relocation – a review. American Journal of Community Psychology, 10(4): 471-492.

Hibbing, J.R. & Theiss-Morse, E. (March 1996). Civics is not enough: Teaching barbarics in K-12. *Political Science and Politics, 29*(1), 57-62.

Innes, J. & Booher. (1999). Consensus building as role playing and bricolage: Toward a theory of collaborative planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 65*(1), 9-26.

Keating, L. (2001). *Atlanta: Race, class, and urban expansion.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Keating, L. (2000). Redeveloping public housing: Relearning Urban Renewal's immutable lessons. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 66*(4), 384-397.

Keating, L. and Flores, C.A. (2000). Sixty and out: Techwood homes transformed by enemies and friends. *Journal of Urban History*, 26(3): 275-311.

Kingsley, G.T., Johnson, J., and Pettit, K. (2003). Patterns of Section 8 Relocation in the HOPE VI Program. *Journal of Urban Affairs.* 25(4): 427-447.

Kleinhaus, R. (2003). Displaced but still moving upwards in the housing career? Implications of forced residential relocation in the Netherlands. *Housing Studies,* 18(4): 473-499.

Kleit, R.G. and Manzo, L.C. (2003). To Move or Not to Move: Determinants of Resident Relocation Choices in HOPE VI. Presented at the joint meeting of the Association of Collegiate Schools of Planning and the Association of European Schools of Planning, Baltimore. July.

Krislov, M. (1988). Ensuring tenant consultation before public housing is demolished or sold. *Yale Law Journal, 97*(8), 1745-1764.

Krumholz, N. & Clavel, P. (1994). *Reinventing cities: Equity planners tell their stories.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Kurth-Schai, R. (1988). The roles of youth in society: A reconceptualization. *The Educational Forum*, 53:113-132.

Lawrence, F. (Ed.). (1989). Ethics in making a living: The Jane Jacobs conference. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

Lynch, K. (1977). *Growing up in cities: Studies of spatial environment of adolescence in Cracow, Melbourne, Mexico City, Salta, Toluca, and Warszawa.* Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press.

Malone, K. (2001). Children, youth, and sustainable cities. *Local Environment, 6*(1), 5-12.

McFarlane, A.G. (1999). Race, space, and place: The geography of economic development. *San Diego Law Review, 36*(2), 295-354.

McNeish, D. (1999). *From rhetoric to reality: Participatory approaches to health promotion with young people.* London: Health Education Authority.

Mollenkopf, J. H. (1983). The Contested City: Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press.

National Housing Law Project. (June 2002). *False HOPE: A critical assessment of the HOPE VI Public Housing Redevelopment Program.* Retrieved October 7, 2004, from http://www.nhlp.org/html/pubhsg/FalseHOPE.pdf

Newmann, F.M. and Rutter, R.A. (1988). The effects of high school community service programs on adolescent social development: Evidence of program effects. *Journal of Adolescent Research,* 3:65-80.

Peattie, L. (1994). Communities and interests in advocacy planning. *Journal of the American Planning Association, 60*(2), 151-153.

Poindexter, G.C. (Spring 2000). Who gets the final no? Tenant participation in public housing redevelopment. *Cornell Journal of Law and Public Policy, 9*, 659-683.

Popkin, S.J. et al. (2004). The HOPE VI program: What about the residents?, *Housing Policy Debate,* 15(2): 385-414.

Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The collapse and revival of American community.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Radford, G. (1996). *Modern housing for America: Policy struggles in the New Deal era.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Rocha, E.M. (1997). A ladder of empowerment. *Journal of Planning Education and Research, 17*(1), 31-44.

Rohe, W.M. and MOUW, S. (1991). The politics of relocation - The moving of the crest street community. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 57(1): 57-68.

Rubenstein, J.M. (1988). Relocation of Families for Public Improvement Projects - Lessons from Baltimore. *Journal of the American Planning Association,* 54(2): 185-196.

Salama, J. (1999). The redevelopment of distressed public housing: Early results from HOPE VI projects in Atlanta, Chicago and San Antonio. *Housing Policy Debate, 10*(1), 95-142.

Salvadori, I. (2001). Remove a fence, invite chaos?: Children as active agents of change. *Local Environment 6*(1), 87-91.

Schill, M. (1993). Distressed public housing: Where do we go from here? *University of Chicago Law Review, 60*(2), 497-554.

Speak, S. (2000). Children in urban regeneration: Foundations for sustainable participation. *Community Development Journal, 35*(1), 31-40.

Spence, L.H. (1993). Rethinking the social role of public housing. *Housing Policy Debate, 4*(3), 355-368.

Stone, C. (1976). *Economic growth and neighborhood discontent: System bias in the urban renewal program of Atlanta.* Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Stone, C. (1989). *Regime politics: Governing Atlanta.* Lawrence: University of Kansas Press.

Strauss, A. and Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Grounded theory procedures and techniques.* London: Sage.

Talen, E. & Coffindaffer, M. (1999). The utopianism of children: An empirical study of children's neighborhood design preferences. *Journal of Planning Education Research, 18*(4), 321-331.

Teaford, J.C. (1990). *The rough road to renaissance: Urban revitalization in America.* Baltimore: The Jonhs Hopkins University Press.

Throgmorton, J.A. (1996). *Planning as persuasive storytelling: The rhetorical construction of Chicago's electric future.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Tranter, P. & Pawson, E. (2001). Children's access to local environments: A case study of Christchurch, New Zealand. *Local Environment, 6*(1), 27-48.

Treseder, P. (1996). *Empowering children and young people.* London: Save the Children.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (1999). *Hope VI: Building communities, transforming lives.* Retrieved October 7, 2004, from http://www.huduser.org/publications/pdf/hope.pdf

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2001, June 18). *General guidance on community and resident involvement.* Retrieved October 7, 2004, from http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/hope6/css/guidance/cfm.

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2001). *FY 2001 Revitalization grant agreement, article XIII(A)(1).* Retrieved October 7, 2004, from http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/hope6/grants/fy01/rev_agreement.pdf

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2001, February 26). *Notice of funding availability: Revitalization of severely distressed public housing (HOPE VI revitalization and demolition), fiscal year 2001.* 66 Fed. Reg. 11, 638, at IV(C)(1)-(2), Retrieved October 7, 2004, from http://www.hud.gov/offices/pih/programs/ph/hope6/grants/fy01/nofa_01.pdf

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2000, December 5). *Section IV: HOPE I, II, and III Youth Build Programs.* Retrieved October 7, 2004, from http://www.hud.gov/sec4.cfm

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. (2002, July 31). *Notice of funding availability for revitalization of severely distressed public housing: HOPE VI revitalization grants, fiscal year 2002.* 67 Fed. Reg. 49, 766.

Wexler, H.J. (2000). HOPE VI Market Means/Public Ends. Working Paper Series PM. Yale University.

Wilson, T.C. (1974). An alternative community-based secondary school education program and student political development. *Doctoral Dissertation. University of Southern California, Los Angeles.*

Yin, R. (1994). *Case study research: Design and methods.* Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

EDUCATION

2001 – 2004
Florida State University
Tallahassee, FL
P.h.D. in Urban Planning

1996 – 2000
University of Kansas
Lawrence, KS
Dual Degree in Law and Urban Planning

1992 – 1996
Bradley University
Peoria, Illinois
Bachelor of Science in Urban Affairs and Theatre Arts

Fall 1994 Hull University
Hull, England
Semester Abroad

PROFESSIONAL EXPERIENCE

Legal Experience

Holland & Knight LLP
05/00-08/01
Associate
Assist with the representation of numerous local government clients in the areas of planning and zoning, litigation and real estate matters.

Craft Fridkin & Rhyne
05/98-02/99
Law Clerk
Create internal policies for and review development proposals brought before the Jackson County Tax Increment Financing Commission.

Freilich Leitner & Carlisle
05/97-04/98
Law Clerk
Provide research assistance in preparation for litigation and the presentation of expert testimony on various land use law-related issues.

Planning Experience

1000 Friends of Florida
02/02-present

Planning and Legal Advocate

Assist with the preparation of a Best Management Practices Manual pertaining to the protection of Florida springsheds; Review questions of Florida law pertaining to issues of administrative procedure, land use, and the environment.

Gould Evans Goodman & Associates 09/99-04/00

Planning Intern

Participate in the drafting of comprehensive plans and zoning regulations; Review questions of Missouri law on issues pertaining to land use and zoning.

Peoria County Planning and Zoning 05/95-09/96

Planning Intern

Assist with various current planning projects, including the review of site plans and the preparation of an ordinance regulating cellular towers.

Teaching and Research Experience

Texas A & M University
01/04-present

Lecturer/Assistant Professor

Research:

Study the reduction of grief effects experienced by those relocated as a result of urban renewal; Special focus on the ways in which citizen participation, especially amongst the young, can reduce such effects.

Teaching:

Teach Land Use Law and Legislation; Historic Preservation Law; Land Development Law; and Planning History and Theory.

Florida State University

08/02-12/03

Research and Teaching Assistant

Research:

Provide research assistance to Dr. Charles Connerly for the preparation of his book on the effect of the civil rights movement on planning in Alabama; Participate in the creation of a Campus Ecology Plan for the University of Belize in Belmopan.

Teaching:

Teach Introduction to Urban Planning to Florida State University undergraduates; Guest lecturer on legal research methods for master's level Plan Implementation course.

The Transportation Center

08/96-05/00

Research Assistant

Serve as assistant editor of a transit publication; Create instructional video pertaining to paratransit vehicle inspections.

University of Kansas School of Urban Planning

01/99-12/99

Teaching Assistant

Assist Professors Strauss and Swearingen-White in the preparation and instruction of an undergraduate environmental law course.

University of Kansas School of Law

01/99-05/99

Student Instructor

Instruct first year law students in the preparation and presentation of appellate arguments.

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS

- Early Dissertation Research Grant from HUD (2004)
- National Semi-Finalist at the Environmental Moot Court Competition Sponsored by Pace Law School (1998-99)
- Bradley University's Acting Student of the Year (1996)

- National Finalist in Persuasive Speaking and Duet Interpretation (1995–1996)
- Speech and Theatre Merit Scholar (1992–96)
- Jay Janssen Oratorical Scholar (1992–93)

VOLUNTEER ACTIVITIES

- Advocate: Assist the American Planning Association's Amicus Committee with the Preparation of Appellate Briefs for Nationally Important Land Use Cases
- Director: Member of the Board of Directors at the Tallahassee Little Theatre
- Mentor: Opening Doors for Children
- Actress: Benefit Production of "The Vagina Monologues"
- Legal Advocate: Indigent Criminal Appellants in the 7th Circuit Court of Appeals
- Juvenile Advocate: CASA Project of Jackson County

PUBLICATIONS AND CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS

- Dawn Jourdan, "Grieving for a Lost Home?: A Case Study of How Participation in an Intergenerational Planning Process Lessened the Pre-Relocation Grief Effects of Experienced by the Youth and Adult Residents of the McDaniel Glenn Public Housing Community in Atlanta. Presented at the ACSP Conference, Portland, October 2004.
- Dawn Jourdan, "Mending Fences: Resolving Neighbor Disputes With Squatter Settlements in Belize," Presented at Pace University, NYC, April 2004 (published in conference proceedings October 2004).
- Dawn Jourdan, "What Planners Should Know About the Law." Panel Organizer and Moderator at the ACSP Conference, Baltimore, 2002.
- Dawn Jourdan, "Increasing Youth Participation in the Planning Process." Presented at the ACSP Conference, Baltimore, 2002.
- Dawn Jourdan, "Creation of an ERP Program in the Florida Panhandle," Foresight (Summer/Fall 2002).

- Patricia Weaver and Dawn Jourdan, "Vehicle Maintenance Handbook," (May 1997).

- S. Mark White and Dawn Jourdan, "Neotraditional Development: A Legal Analysis," Land Use Law and Zoning Digest (August 1997).

- Patricia Weaver, Stephanie White and Dawn Jourdan, "Kansas Coordinated Transit Handbook Update," (May 2000).

REFERENCES

- Charles Pattison, 1000 Friends of Florida, Executive Director

- Dr. Walt Peacock, *Texas A & M University, Associate Professor*

- Dr. Charles Connerly, *Florida State University Department of Urban Planning, Department Chair and Professor*

- Dr. Stacey Swearingen White, *University of Kansas School of Urban Planning, Associate Professor*

- Ms. Elizabeth Garvin, HNTB, Planning and Legal Consultant

- Dr. Eric Strauss, Michigan State University Department of Urban Planning, Department Chair and Professor