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This research examines the application of HOPE VI, Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere, developments in Pittsburgh and New Orleans from 1990 to the present. HOPE VI is an initiative developed in 1992. The National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCSDPH) proposed a National Action Plan to eradicate severely distressed public housing. The recommendations of NCSDPH created the HOPE VI policy. The Commission recommended revitalization in three general areas: physical improvements, management improvements, and social and community services to address resident needs. The policy is unique compared to others as it is not specific to any one area, and gives an extended amount of time to monitor changes or lack of change, with very little penalty for housing authorities that do not achieve their goals.

Housing is a place where an individual thrives; it is the center of life for families and is a necessity. The deplorable conditions of public housing units have caused me to want to examine the reasons for these conditions and the proposed solutions, HOPE VI specifically. HOPE VI as a policy intends to create a solution for the housing crisis in America, by promoting new ideas, specifically mixed-income communities and resident self-sufficiency.

Poverty and public housing have been a growing concern for cities nationwide since the mid-to-late 1960s. Congress has enacted several policies to solve these problems, including attempts at improving both the physical structure of public housing units and the ability for residents to access self-sufficiency programs. By creating these policies, the federal government gave new and seemingly innovative tools to individual housing authorities and expected them to apply successfully to their unique situation. In theory, the application of each policy is equal across every public housing authority.
However, because of different needs and problems facing each housing authority, implementation of the policy is different across the nation. To measure success uniformly is difficult across HOPE VI sites. Because of differing goals at each housing authority, one authority may claim success at a time when another may not.

HOPE VI is a policy built on the premise that neighborhoods will change and become healthier if the residents have higher-quality housing and mixed-income neighbors. Social indicators allow for an examination of the condition of neighborhoods. Social indicators are a way to follow changes in a neighborhood without directly asking individual residents, who may change frequently or who may have skewed views of the conditions. There are a number of social indicators utilized to measure the character, healthiness and general well-being of a neighborhood, including the diversity of income, race, homeownership, employment levels, and educational attainment.

If HOPE VI has an impact on the neighborhood then there should be increased diversity in these social indicators. However, change can have multiple causes and effects in the neighborhood. For HOPE VI to be a successful policy it should be an important mechanism to create these changes in social and economic diversity. If the community has changed because of the creation of housing that is unaffordable or if neighborhoods continue to struggle, HOPE VI may be a less successful mechanism of creating a healthy neighborhood.

Two cities are the focus for this research. Pittsburgh and New Orleans are in some dimensions similar cities; however, they also have differences, as no two things are exactly alike. The cities are similar enough to allow for an ease of comparison however, these cities have differences significant enough to provide interesting results. The
differences are what the research is studying, the similarities point to why the two cities were chosen.

Pittsburgh and New Orleans are relatively similar in population size. Each city had periods of economic booms and busts. Their economic bases are similar in that both have a reduced industrial presence and rely on health sciences, research, education, and technology as means to attract business and residents. New Orleans has the ability also to attract a large tourist population each year, whereas Pittsburgh has a much more diverse business class, including banking and government agencies. In the course of research, these differences should not significantly influence the condition of each neighborhood. In this researcher’s experience, the differences in each city are not so severe that a basic comparison cannot be successful.

Both Pittsburgh and New Orleans also sprawl into the suburbs. As each city continued to grow, so did the flight of whites into suburbs. African Americans however, tended not to be as mobile as their white counterparts. African Americans tended to remain in the center cities and earn a lower wage. Because of this, public housing in each city is very important to inner-city African Americans, as it provides affordable, low-cost housing.

The socioeconomic conditions in each city are also quite different. New Orleans is overwhelmingly African American and poor and that poverty is more widespread. The majority of Pittsburgh’s population is white, with pockets of poverty and a higher income level. Because of these differences, the issues that each housing authority faces tend to be very dissimilar. Income levels and neighborhood appeal helped to shape the way HOPE VI developed in each city.
This research uses US Census data on neighborhoods and communities as a way of determining changes or lack of changes within the communities mentioned. This research determines whether a mixed-income community, a goal of HOPE VI, developed between 1990 and 2000.

HOPE VI began in 1992. The development in New Orleans began in 1996 and the development in Pittsburgh began in 1993. The data from 1990 provides background on the neighborhoods prior to HOPE VI, 2000 will allow for a picture of how the development has changed and is continuing to change as residents return, and the neighborhood adapts.

The specific goals of HOPE VI are used as tools to measure the type of successes and failures of this project in each neighborhood. The goals of HOPE VI (HUDa 2005) are as follows,

- Changing the physical shape of public housing,
- Establishing positive incentives for resident self-sufficiency and comprehensive services that empower residents
- Lessening concentrations of poverty by placing public housing in non-poverty neighborhoods and promoting mixed-income communities
- Forging partnerships with other agencies, local governments, nonprofit organizations, and private businesses to leverage support and resources.

Each goal can be examined and categorized in terms of either 1 community development and sustainability or 2 individual growth in public housing resident populations.

Throughout this research, the above distinction clarifies the decision to use certain social indicators as measures of accomplishment for HOPE VI. Community development has an assumption that the former residents will not all return to the revitalized community. Therefore, the individual that reaps the benefits of the new development is not necessarily the same individual who had resided in the former public housing units.
Examining growth in individual residents is one way of measuring those remaining in the neighborhoods who have directly benefited from the HOPE VI policy. Evaluating direct benefits to former residents is one of the main reasons for the research. The second reason this research is to evaluate how HOPE VI affects community sustainability.

Changing the physical shape of public housing is a community goal, one that will not directly enhance the lives of residents, but will improve the community sustainability. The physical attractiveness of the neighborhood increases and the environment of a mixed-use community is created. Increased self-sufficiency and empowerment of residents is a goal of the individual resident. Residents are able to increase their level of education, employment, income, and housing affordability with an increase of programs targeted to autonomy and independence. Lessening the concentration of poverty is also a community goal. Mixed-income communities are attractive to new businesses, residents, and move opportunity into the neighborhood. At the same time, the mixed-income communities may see decreasing the crime rates and less violence than have plagued low-income public housing developments. Although increased corporate involvement could be a community goal, this is not evaluated by this research project.

There are multiple questions surrounding HOPE VI. First, what defines success for HOPE VI? Second, what social factors are most important in determining success of HOPE VI? Third, did either New Orleans or Pittsburgh more successfully implement a HOPE VI project than the other did? Finally, will HOPE VI ever work effectively in reaching the specific goals set forth by Congress? The last question will allow for further research and a point of discussion. The hypothesis is that HOPE VI will positively affect the neighborhood studied. As the HOPE VI development begins operation, the
neighborhood should have an increase in the levels of income, racial diversification, home ownership, sustained residency, and business development.

As a side note, the research had intended to use data to look at similar cities as they applied the HOPE VI policy. However, because of the destruction caused by Hurricane Katrina in August 2005, the programs and focus of the Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO) have been on rebuilding their public housing structures to accommodate their displaced residents. The research will now focus on differences between the two cities from 1990 and 2000. Small trends may appear in the research that may indicate larger trends for the future; however, because the culture of New Orleans housing remains turbulent, there is no way of making policy recommendations or proposed changes for the future of the program.

**LITERATURE REVIEW**

Public housing has been spiraling into crisis for decades. When the government began to offer low-cost mortgages to the men and women returning from World War II public housing began to decline and continued a steady decline until the mid-to-late 1960s. The Housing Act of 1937 created public housing. Public housing was the answer to the lack of affordable housing for laborers and their families as well as the average American. Public housing had a very different character during this period. The families who resided in these communities were lower middle-class working families and were white. The developments were pleasant places where families could raise their children safely and without fear of violence or despair. The occupancy of public housing by white families continued until the early 1950s and 1960s.
The US Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) marketed public housing communities to white families as an affordable place and a nice community setting. With the loss of jobs in the inner-city neighborhoods and the fascination with the “good” life in the suburbs that was causing rapid sprawl in all of the major US cities, public housing became a place for the very low-income African American families who could not afford to follow the jobs and opportunities into the suburbs. These neighborhoods became places where drugs and violence were the norm. The physical condition of the developments also deteriorated making them undesirable to those who had options for housing, meaning they could afford to pay higher rents for a more “suitable” living arrangement. Because of this, along with other conditions in the upcoming discussion of neighborhoods and the African American struggle for affordable housing, segregation became almost insurmountable in these neighborhoods, affecting all things that encountered them, including the residents. After nearly forty years of conditions continuing to worsen, the Federal government created a commission to investigate the causes of this decline as well as to present possible solutions. The ultimate recommendation of the commission was the creation and implementation of HOPE VI, an initiative that began in 1993, with the first grants given in that year.

In order to understand the magnitude of a proposal such a HOPE VI, it is equally important to understand the neighborhood and the culture that was and is public housing developments. While the focus is on New Orleans and Pittsburgh, the following will include a discussion of public housing and neighborhoods to get a clear understanding of the epidemic of poverty that was infecting the country’s public housing.
Public housing developments are neighborhood settings that are self-sustaining in many areas of the country. Most have their own individual police department, rules, regulations, and governing bodies in the housing authority charged with monitoring every development that the authority maintains. The Public Housing Authority (PHA) has HUD guidelines to follow in terms of governing their public housing developments in order to receive funding. In most cases, the PHA is the city’s largest and most enticing property owner, because of the low rent and easy availability, not to mention the sheer number of available units at each PHA. With their large number of tenants, the PHA also have a significant amount of influence in shaping neighborhoods, which allows them to dictate the success or failure of inner-city living with the way in which they manage their units. The residents have a stigma attached not only to them but also to the idea of living in a public housing community. It is difficult to integrate these neighborhoods into the greater metropolitan area, creating segregation of poverty, violence, and poorly educated and unemployed individuals.

Public housing had been in crisis, not only in the neighborhoods as described previously, but also in terms of the developments themselves. When the shift began to occur from white middle-class residents to poor African American residents, so did a shift of accessing and residing in public housing units. Public housing authorities have the ability to determine who may live in their developments and how they will maintain their waiting lists. Because of this, in areas where there are a higher number of available units or where the population in need may be larger in numbers, they may have a less restrictive policy for leasing to new residents. For smaller PHAs, the crisis may have
increased their difficulty in having enough units available for all the residents. In smaller markets such as New Orleans or Pittsburgh, it is more difficult to provide housing to every person who is in need; therefore, they enact more stringent residency requirements that target specific groups to move into available units. As these units become more difficult to get into, the groups in need become poorer until the city’s poorest residents are the only ones who can access housing leading to further problems in the neighborhoods. The question then becomes why PHAs do not build new housing. In the late 1960s and early 1970s, Congress placed caps on the ability of PHAs to build new housing, thereby limiting the number of individuals served by public housing (Wyly and Hammel 2002). Therefore, the ability to serve individuals sufficiently ended in 1970, and the population in need continued to grow through the recessions of the late 1970s and 1980s and early 1990s.

**HOPE VI**

*HOPE VI as a Policy*

By providing not only physical revitalization but also the privatization of management and community supports, HOPE VI provides an opportunity for former residents to become acclimated to the community as well as to attract new residents. HOPE VI units become less of a temporary house and more of a home for residents, both returning and new, creating a much healthier neighborhood.

HOPE VI was created by the Departments of Veterans Affairs and Housing and Urban Development, and Independent Agencies Appropriations Act, 1993 (Pub.L. 102-389), approved on October 6, 1992 (HUDa 2005). HOPE VI began in the early 1990s when people began to shed their conservative views of investments and growth, with the
election of Bill Clinton in 1992 came an opening of the floodgates of reinventing government and an increase of risk taking (Wyly and Hammel 2002). The public resources of the government entities began to privatize and those that remained public followed a private sector operating model.

The HOPE VI programs benefit current public housing residents, residents of the revitalized public housing units, and communities surrounding the revitalized sites (HUDa 2005). HOPE VI is built on the dual idea of mixed-income living and lower densities of residents in a private-market setting (Wyly and Hammel 2002). Because of this, individuals who previously resided in public housing developments were now able to reside in private-market units at the same time they were still paying only 30% of their income towards rent, thus creating subsidized rental property in a healthy neighborhood. HOPE VI is an attempt to limit segregation and to open up neighborhoods to higher levels of homeownership and business creation. HUD began to privatize public entities as well as integrate mixed-income housing options, combining private-market rental with assisted rental and pushing towards social goals that are desirable to the public (Wyly and Hammel 2002).

One of the main components of HOPE VI is private investment. The PHA may have multiple developments in need of revitalization; however, they had to set priorities in order to revitalize each slowly and in the order that would provide the most assistance (HUDa 2005). PHAs also had to work towards securing private funding to receive grants from HUD when they requested proposals, therefore increasing the funds available. At the same time that the PHA bettered the image of the development among non-subsidized potential tenants (HUDa 2005).
The National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCSDPH) has a list of goals that each HOPE VI project should attempt to fulfill. The goals are:

1. To improve the living environment of public housing residents
2. To revitalize severely distressed sites
3. To contribute to the surrounding neighborhood
4. To decrease housing that concentrates very/low-income individuals
5. To create partnerships with local agencies for support and funding
6. To build sustainable communities (HUDa 2005).

To continue with the theme of each goal is contributing to the health of the community or the success of the individual, each of the above goals is discussed in the same way. The first and fourth goals focus on the success of the individual and are used to enrich the life of the resident. The other goals are focused on the health and sustainability of the neighborhood. Each of the remaining goals uses new residents as a way to improve the overall health of the neighborhood and to create a marketable community with broad appeal.

The literature that discusses HOPE VI is hopeful in language and typically projects HOPE VI in a positive light. The HOPE VI program is transforming lives, building communities and generating private investment (CLPHA 2005). Each PHA creates HOPE VI as an individual program. The community dictates the needs and priorities of each development for the PHA. Funding becomes very important in building these new developments or revitalizing older developments. In order to receive funding through HUD, the PHA must secure “match money”. HUD provides a limited amount of funding and the Federal Register, the government document that maintains requirements for every federal grant opportunity, (HUDa 2005), dictates limitations. From the same report, about $3 of private investment is made for every $1 of HUD money received by each PHA (HUDb 2001), therefore making private funding very important in the ability...
to create a complete project that will meet the established goals of HUD. The amount of funding varies based on the size of the project and the need of the PHA.

**Goals of HOPE VI**

There are six specific action steps outlined in the HUD documents and Notice of Funds Available (NOFAs) put forward in order to reach the goals set forth by the NCSDPH (Salama 1999; HUD 1996, 1997, 1998).

- Lessening the concentration of low-income residents in a neighborhood
- Creating partnerships for leveraging additional funds from alternate investors
- Implementing cost-effective plans
- Providing opportunities for family economic self-sufficiency
- Building sustainable units that include a physical design that blends into the urban landscape
- Ensuring that residents are involved in the planning and implementation of the HOPE VI development.

Ensuring that the PHA maintains certain standards at the same time that they are attempting to be cost-conscience is most difficult for HOPE VI projects.

The six concrete action steps help to accomplish the four goals outlined by NCSDPH. By providing action steps, the goals are accomplished with less friction and in a timely manner. Goals also become much easier to measure there are concrete things that each goal represents. The following outlines each goal and the role it plays in the completion of the HOPE VI development.

**Lessening concentration of poverty**

In order to rebuild on the site, a PHA demolishes the old development. The residents of the old development will be homeless without the assistance of the PHA during the rebuilding process. The lessening of the concentration of poverty is a community sustainability goal. The effect on the individual former residents is not a
focus for the HOPE VI development and cannot be measured utilizing individual social indicators. Relocation assists tenants in finding affordable housing while they are waiting for the development to be finished. HOPE VI understands that the concentration of nonworking poor families in neighborhoods has led to “social distress” (NCSDPH 1992). The relocation of tenants allows the HOPE VI project to disperse poverty evenly across different neighborhoods. Relocation assists in moving those who are able to live in private-market situations out of the development and into the private-market. By allowing tenants the opportunity to move into new neighborhoods, the project gives more units to the private-market (HUD 2005). Partnerships

NCSDPH released information in 1992 that indicated 86,000 public housing units were severely distressed. In order to fund the revitalization and demolition of these units, NCSDPH recommended that Congress spend $7.5 billion over 10 years to address the condition these distressed units (NCSDPH 1992). This goal is also about community sustainability. The partnership is not for the growth of the individual, but for the betterment of the community. Congress has required that the PHA leverage additional funding from other resources. The viability of the neighborhood and appeal to higher-income people becomes very important to leverage this additional capital. HUD and Congress have realized the opportunity for HOPE VI to attract investment in new mixed-income neighborhoods that have a low concentration of very low-income residents to attract new business for the improved target market (Salama 2002).

Cost-Effectiveness

Because the PHA must provide matching funds in addition to the grant received by HUD, the PHA must begin to develop community relationship as well as begin to
work towards cost-cutting. The goal is also community sustainability: if the project has an over-inflated budget, the less likely continuation of subsidy becomes. Market-based rent becomes necessary to afford to pay for the program. The more inflated the budget becomes the more inflated the amount of “match money” necessary to meet the HUD requirement. To have a budget that exceeds expectations prolongs the amount of time that is necessary to complete the project and may in fact leave displaced individuals homeless or in crisis. Ensuring cost-effectiveness promotes the maintenance of timetables and the reduction of additional development and building times for completion.

Self-Sufficiency Programs

One of the most innovative ideas to come out of HOPE VI is the creation of supportive services for residents of developments. The goal is for the health of the individual who resides in the units and who receives a subsidy as well as those who have moved out of the neighborhood. The former residents have access to the services, as they are able to utilize them to help them with a transition to a new home if one should occur. Not only is the PHA building mixed-income communities but they are also building healthy neighborhoods. HUD produces a set of guidelines for community and resident involvement that describes what HUD expects these PHAs to accomplish with their residents (HUD 2005).

HUD adopts the idea that an environment alone cannot change the outcome of a person who lives in a community (von Hoffman 1996). HOPE VI provides for a complete social service method by allowing the resident to take part in a myriad of social
services. The social services are not mandatory but residents can take advantage of them if they feel it to be beneficial.

**Sustainable Development**

HUD challenges the PHA in their grant application to find ways to make the development blend more efficiently into the fabric of the community. This action step is for community sustainability. The old public housing developments kept their residents isolated from the urban space, whether through the location or the atmosphere (Salama 2002). Andrew Cuomo, former HUD Secretary, says that the new development should include usable sidewalks, lower-density buildings, streets that are accessible and allow traffic to flow through the development, and buildings that incorporate the neighborhood (Cuomo 1997). By allowing for these additions, the developments are less isolated and friendlier to individuals who do not reside in the neighborhood.

**Resident Involvement**

The PHA may not act in a vacuum, making unilateral decisions that will directly affect residents. This action step is for both community sustainability and for individual growth. The resident who is more involved in the process is more likely to remain than one who is not involved. The PHA must maintain resident councils. The resident council is abreast of all changes and allowed to provide input regarding decisions and choices. With these resident councils comes a set of guiding principles, which include collaboration with the PHA for a vision of development, regular communication and information-sharing, resident involvement in planning and implementation of the development process. If at any time, the resident does not feel included in the process or
if there is something that the resident does not understand, the PHA should provide
assistance to ensure that the resident’s questions are properly addressed (HUD 2005).

While HUD understands that not every resident is going to participate, the ability
to do so if a resident chooses is a very empowering tool. To be able to have input into
housing is something that is not available to most private-market renters. The education
is a morale boost or a marketing technique; either way it is highly effective.

**Neighborhood Sustainability**

**Neighborhood Impacts**

The “truly disadvantaged” describes the condition of the neighborhoods of the
ghetto poor in several works by William Julius Wilson including *When Work Disappears*
and *The Truly Disadvantaged* (Wilson 1987, 1996). Residential segregation has
decreased sharply since the 1970s except in the African American communities, in which
segregation remains high (Jargowsky 1996), thus causing unhealthy neighborhoods, as
poverty and racial segregation continue. An unhealthy neighborhood has a lack of viable
employment and socialization opportunities that make the unhealthiness of the
neighborhood flourish. The lack of viable employment leads to problems in the ghetto,
an increased number of single parent households, and an increase in individuals who are
welfare recipients (Wilson 1987). The only jobs that remained in the public housing
neighborhoods were low-paying. Low-paying jobs create an atmosphere of hopelessness
and add to the unhealthy neighborhood environment.

Robert Sampson relates the importance of studying a neighborhood, in “The
Neighborhood Context of Well-Being” (2003). Sampson is talking about the relationship
of health and the neighborhood in this article; however, he introduces the importance of a
neighborhood study. Sampson discusses social indicators such as migration, female-headed households, poverty, income, employment and education as “dimensions of socio-economic status” for communities (Sampson 2003). Sampson is introducing the importance of a neighborhood in a way that is similar to this research and he targets specific indicators that are also important to HOPE VI. This research is not creating something new but introducing the same theory to a new context. The importance of the neighborhood and the effect it has on other factors such as health and well-being, and in the case of this research the sustainability of the community itself.

An unhealthy neighborhood has more impact on an individual if that person lives there rather than works there. If the area is a commercial district, it may have less of an impact as an unhealthy neighborhood than one that is residential. People can avoid commercial districts. Because of this, a commercial district has less impact on the lives of people; you can get in and get out. A residential neighborhood is a place where you must conduct day-to-day life. For those who live there, getting in and getting out is not an option. A family does not simply buy or rent a house, but invests in it, and one of the main problems of public housing in the lack of community interest (Foley 1980). Housing is more than the physical structure it includes diverse factors such as health, security, privacy, neighborhood and social relations, status, community facilities and services access to jobs and control over environment (Foley 1980).

Higher-income individuals and families flee the inner-city. With them, the buffer between the effects of joblessness and the lack of role models for change is removed (Wilson 1987). Therefore, the cycle of poverty in these areas continues. The unhealthy neighborhood or social milieu reinforces an individual’s position in the labor force
(Wilson 1987). Individuals who utilize the services of a PHA typically are the underclass. By definition, their income generally must be less than $18,000 annually for one person in order to move into a public housing unit. An individual who lives in public housing has a very small income in order to buy the essentials of life, including food, clothing, and basic living needs, leaving little room for any additional needs, such as bus fare for job searches or attendance. Employers and other social networks do not want to come into inner-city developments, and the residents are unable to access them on their own.

Sociologist Suzanne Keller, in *The Urban Neighborhood: a Sociological Perspective* (1968), describes neighborhood sizes and the ideal number of residents in a neighborhood. Keller says that the neighborhood should consist of about 500 families or 2000 individuals (Keller 1968). (Approximately 2000 individuals are in each neighborhood studied in this research). Keller also describes a neighborhood as a physical space with an ecological place in a larger urban space distinguished by activities and natural geography of the space (Keller 1968). People with similar characteristics who live in close proximity to one another create the neighborhood according to Keller (1968).

**Race vs. Employment**

The idea of economic segregation is apparent in unhealthy neighborhoods. The lack of jobs and business opportunities lead to the segregation of individuals by their economic standing, forcing the poor to live with others who are poor. Someone who is in a minority is not always segregated economically. While middle-and high-class African Americans do not typically reside in unhealthy neighborhoods, they are often in close
proximity (Erbe 1975, Jargowsky 1996). Racial segregation tends to be less significant in a neighborhood, since individuals tend to differ more along class lines than race (Jargowsky, Erbe 1975, Farley 1977, 1991, White 1987). However, because the African American population is larger in most inner-city neighborhoods than whites, the middle, and lower classes live closer together. Many sociologists including Erbe, Jargowsky, Wilson, and others, believe that the close proximity of classes in neighborhoods leads African Americans to a trend of downward mobility, meaning African Americans tend to decrease in economic class through each generation (Erbe 1975, Jargowsky 1996).

The school of thought driven by Massey is one that focuses heavily on race and racial segregation. Massey, in *American Apartheid* (1993), discusses in detail the creation of an American apartheid, the judgment and understanding of a person has based on the color of their skin. Throughout the past several decades, white households would attempt to discourage or eliminate the opportunity of an African American family to move into a neighborhood that is white or that is middle-class (Massey 1993). By using techniques such as redlining, restrictive covenants, and neighborhood improvement groups, white individuals and families were able to force African Americans into few neighborhoods and isolate them (Massey 1993).

Massey does not describe the reasons for the social isolation of African Americans in any other way except in terms of race. He discusses the downfall of the neighborhood by discussing housing abandonment and poverty. If a house is abandoned, it acts as a magnet for unstable individuals and social problems such as crime, violence, litter, and drugs (Massey 1993). The white families are the ones who abandoned their properties to move into other neighborhoods, thereby leaving the African Americans to
live in unstable and unhealthy neighborhoods. Racism is the most prevalent cause of underclass conditions (Glasgow 1980). Glasgow goes on to describe the failure of systems in the US to combat racism and to assist African Americans out of poverty, an idea that Massey endorses. Massey indicates that Wilson’s focus on out-migration is a discussion of an inevitable process. The geographic concentration of African Americans is inevitable because of the racial segregation that occurred over several decades in the US (Massey 1993).

The school of thought driven by William Julius Wilson, as several of his works detail, including, *When Work Disappears and the Truly Disadvantaged*, discuss the transformation of the inner-city. Wilson describes the transformation as a place of mixed-income and thriving economies becoming places where residents are afraid to go outside. If people could move out of the community for something better, they would. He connects the decline of the neighborhood to the lack of job opportunities and the flight of the middle-class.

A lack of jobs, which grows out of a lack of educational opportunities, no social networks, and a lack of structure, creates the social climate of the ghetto (Wilson 1996). The stigma that is associated with the inner-city workforce and social stigmas create a lack of job opportunities and provide grounds for employers to avoid African Americans (Wilson 1996). If an African American cannot find work in the neighborhood their level of self-sufficiency is diminished, something HOPE VI attempts to correct.

The discussions of Wilson and Massey are important in looking at the conditions in a neighborhood. Each must be considered in looking at possible solutions. HOPE VI has a goal of providing mixed-income communities and lessening the concentration of
poverty. Without examining possible causes for the concentration of poverty, the solutions will have less effectiveness, as they may address concerns that do not cause poverty concentration.

The most important part of the housing development is the community: it is a part of the people, neighborhood, and social services that help to define the development (Foley 1980). Another reason that a healthy neighborhood is important is because it is the mantra of HOPE VI. It is known that having a nice living environment does not necessarily lead to good housing, but it takes several other factors, even if the housing is up to code physically. Housing does not mean provide everything that a person may need to survive (Foley 1980).

**Social Capital and Collective Efficacy**

Foley, Massey, Putnam, Sampson, Wilson and others have argued that the neighborhood defines the type of opportunities an individual may have available to them. Many individuals live, work, and socialize only with those who live in their development or in other developments that are in the surrounding neighborhoods. HOPE VI attempts to improve neighborhoods by including mixed-income residents. With mixed-income uses comes the promotion of change and interaction. In an unhealthy neighborhood, crime, violence and the lack of community space eliminates interaction. HOPE VI creates community space and in doing so creates a neighborhood that residents can be proud of and become a part of.

The lack of social interaction leads to a lack of collective efficacy. Because of a lack of collective efficacy among residents, the community is less likely to engage in
neighborhood-or community-building. The lack of efficacy leaves a jaded population who are willing to accept the unhealthy neighborhood rather than change it.

Robert Putnam has a similar theory in *Bowling Alone* (2000). Putnam discusses the lack of interaction in the American lifestyle and a trend towards solitary interaction with the family rather than socially engaging activities (Putnam 2000). Because residents had difficulty finding ways to change or lacked a desire to do so, HUD and Congress helped to stimulate change. The stimulation comes in the form of HOPE VI.

Individuals who live in disadvantaged neighborhoods have two problems: they not only live in poverty in their household, but poverty surrounds them in their neighborhood (Rankin and Quane 2000). The resident does not have the same chance for socialization and community involvement in positive activities that is in a healthier neighborhood. Civil society is an idea that local institutions such as businesses, schools, churches are the ties that bind (Tolbert, Lyson, Irwin 1998). Community organizations such as schools, churches, businesses, political, and social clubs are not in areas that are poor and unhealthy (Rankin and Quane 2000).

Robert Sampson and William Julius Wilson discuss race and community in their article “Toward a Theory of Race, Crime and Urban Inequality” (1995). In the article, Sampson and Wilson relate crime and race not only to one another but also to the neighborhood. They say that despite population changes in the neighborhood that the crime persisted regardless of who was living there. The neighborhood breeds crime. The ecological environment that whites and blacks live in feeds crime regardless of the individual characteristics of the area (Sampson and Wilson 1995). Therefore, the theory of HOPE VI to diversify the neighborhood and create a place of mixed-use and by
extension mixed race may help to eliminate the problems suggested by Sampson and Wilson. To eliminate the homogeneity of the community and break the environment of violence will help to eliminate the crime and violence associated with the area. The neighborhood appeal will also rise bringing with it more money and infrastructure.

Lack of social atmosphere is common in pre-HOPE VI neighborhoods. The schools, churches, stores, banks, and community organizations in unhealthy neighborhoods began to close or deteriorate to the point that the neighborhood had very few assets remaining to attract new residents who were not poor (Wilson 1987). Around the same time the social groups were leaving the neighborhood, the public housing developments were segregated for low-income African Americans.

Mark Granovetter in “The Strength of Weak Ties” (1973) endorses an idea of informal networks that promote change. All individuals have a network of primary contacts and bonds. These people are friends. Those individuals that are weaker contacts are acquaintances. Weaker ties create the informal networks of social capital and efficacy (Granovetter 1973). Information and interaction are through weak ties. Because few people interact in an unhealthy neighborhood, the informal network is severely disabled. If they do interact, the relationship is negative and not for the dissemination of information (Wilson 1987, 1996; Granovetter 1973).

Social capital, the ability to attract new and innovative resources, is lacking in an unhealthy neighborhood. The ability to make change out of nothing does not exist. Social capital attracts investors and residents alike into neighborhoods. Social capital can come in the form of resources such as buildings, green space, or infrastructure, as well as people. People no longer interact in informal organizations like bowling leagues, and
therefore information and connections are limited to those who are in their social network or those with whom they have strong social ties (Putnam 2000).

Lack of trust and obligation among individuals, families and the community supports the limited existence of social capital and efficacy. Because of this lack of understanding and trust, the feeling of alienation and being without assistance is perpetuated (Rankin and Quane 2000). In housing developments, the individual must work to find their own solutions rather than work collaboratively to obtain community-wide goals. With the implementation of HOPE VI, the neighborhood has tools to grow and develop. HOPE VI focuses on the creation of new economic and social opportunities (HUD 2005) for personal and community efficacy, therefore creating clear pathways for a healthier neighborhood.

Social capital and collective efficacy as the above authors describes lends directly to the health and sustainability of a neighborhood. HOPE VI tries to provide the necessary environment for these things to flourish. Prior to HOPE VI, the public housing communities were isolated, had very little contact with people or places outside of the development and were breeding grounds for crime and poverty. People rarely knew or interacted with their neighbors, unless the interaction was a negative one. HOPE VI intends to spark collective efficacy among new and former residents to make the neighborhood more attractive and inviting to others. With this increase in collective efficacy, the neighborhood can begin to build social capital that provides new opportunities in the community and surrounding city.
Gentrification and Mixed-use Communities

The idea of gentrification is typically one that connects to HOPE VI, the ability to turn around the unhealthy neighborhood and to begin to move towards mixed-income uses with high levels of diverse business ownership and strong community connections. This promotes self-sufficiency and more neighborhoods that are prosperous, two major goals of HOPE VI. Wyly and Hammel have three conclusions about gentrification and HOPE VI. Economic expansion over the last few decades has recreated the inner-city housing market. A mosaic of poverty and wealth has led to the reinvention of low-income housing. Moreover, changes to financing policy have allowed for an easier process of gentrification (Wyly and Hammel 2002).

During the 1970s, reinvestment in central business districts and inner-city neighborhoods began to grow enormously (Zukin 1987). The gentrification process utilized unhealthy neighborhoods to their advantage. Because of the seeming blank slate that existed in these neighborhoods, as nothing existed except for public housing developments, they were appealing to private investors. The investors bought pieces of the neighborhood and rebuilt them to suit their needs. By rebuilding these neighborhoods, developers added features that made them more appealing to wealthier residents, creating prosperous mixed-income neighborhoods.

In an unhealthy neighborhood, social capital is difficult to find. HUD was able to create social capital by providing funding to investors to move into a neighborhood. The neighborhood became appealing once there was infrastructure in place to bring more business and traffic. HOPE VI ensured that a neighborhood would promote use by not only the residents of the neighborhood, but of the city as well.
With the addition of public subsidies and private investment, the housing market flourishes and the neighborhood is a much more appealing and healthy place. Gentrification changes the social composition of a neighborhood and the housing stock for which residents have to choose from (Hamnett 1991). With HOPE VI, the former public housing residents have the ability to return to their neighborhood and affordable housing unit.

Wyly and Hammel use the term “designer neighborhoods” as a means to describe the result of HOPE VI and gentrification (Wyly and Hammel 2002). In these neighborhoods, housing is much more visually appealing, modern, and updated; stores, schools, churches, and social agencies become more visible. The individuals involved in the gentrification process must find the neighborhood or area gentrified appealing (Hamnett 1991).

One thing that may promote the appeal of a neighborhood is a large rent gap. Neil Smith’s idea of rent gap is that the amount of rent paid for a property is less than the value of the property (Smith 1987). If the neighborhood has a large rent gap and is appealing, the gentrification process is lucrative for investors. Gentrification helps to raise the tax base of communities, allowing politicians additional funding in their districts, giving the developer the support of the government official (Zukin 1987).

Gentrification connects to HOPE VI because both are attempting to increase the presence of a middle-class population in the inner city. Gentrification lays the groundwork for attracting private investment, a major source of funding for HOPE VI projects. The SuperNOFA, HUD’s major funding announcement and grant, dictates that a PHA provide leveraging and financing from private investors to complete their HOPE
VI development (HUD 2005). If gentrification is beginning or in progress in a neighborhood, the neighborhood is less of a risk for investors, allowing HOPE VI access to financing with less hesitation by every funding source, HUD, city government, and private investors.

HOPE VI and gentrification answer the concerns of Wilson, Massey, and others. Individuals and families who move into these neighborhoods bring with them jobs, a work ethic, intact households, and education or educational goals. Because of this, they also repair the social buffer in unhealthy neighborhoods.

**Critique of HOPE VI**

While many scholars, Wyly, Hammel, Salama, and Cuomo as mentioned previously believe that HOPE VI is an effective policy in some cases, others believe HOPE VI has improvements to make. The critiques are important because they provide an alternative view of HOPE VI as well as possible changes to the current policy. Among the major critiques are the following. The PHA is not doing enough to implement the policy. The length of time for completion leaves the residents without affordable housing for extended periods. While in the end HOPE VI may help to create a viable, healthy mixed-income community, in the short run HOPE VI may be creating more problems than solutions.

---

1 As a side note and example, the neighborhood being studied in the city of New Orleans has been driven almost solely by gentrification. The neighborhood has been on the outer edges of gentrification in the neighboring warehouse district for almost a decade. That neighborhood is now attracting upper middle-class young professionals with sleek apartments and designer services such as spas and restaurants. The neighborhood of study must find a place between the gentrified neighborhood and the low-income neighborhood that it is sandwiched between, HOPE VI is meant to be the solution to this need, by providing a mix used space to accommodate the surrounding areas. In addition, the neighborhood was able to gain funding with the addition of a Wal-Mart. The Wal-Mart is not a typical big box but is a store designed to blend into the neighborhood. It looks like the other large buildings in the area and utilizes muted colors and designs. All to cater to the needs of the new ‘gentrified’ community.
While some claim success in HOPE VI and see it as the program to save the future of public housing, critics including Gotham point to several alarming statistics to say that the program is failing. Of the sites that were to receive grants and make several improvements, only eleven had begun any kind of redevelopment (Gotham 2001). Of those eleven sites, none had made capital improvements and many of the HOPE VI projects had demolished sites but very few had offered new housing for the displaced residents (Gotham 2001). HOPE VI does not work, but something should happen in order for the downtown and inner-city area to grow into something more than blight in the city's (New Orleans) tourist destinations (Gotham 2001).

As the above literature suggests, the picture of HOPE VI is not always one without flaws, and while it is obvious that HUD attempts to avoid these problems, they still exist because there is not a national plan for HOPE VI. HOPE VI is a good project on paper; however, application becomes difficult in practice (National Housing Law Project 2002). There are several problems, including the very definition of severely distressed public housing, and the worsening need for affordable low-income housing, limited resident participation, exclusion of PHA families from HOPE VI, and the lack of data on outcomes (National Housing Law Project 2002).

The process seems to be arbitrary in addressing what developments are distressed and which are not. Standards do not seem to exist to measure this in each city, let alone at the national level. In many cases, the location of the development is enough to make it distressed, as certain neighborhoods are more profitable than others are (National Housing Law Project 2002). Leveraging can be a problem because in order to be appealing to developers the site must be near a strong real estate market or redevelop
weaker sites and target moderate-income tenants, eliminating low-income residents (Salama 2002). This lack of a set of standards is the major theme of this research. If there are no standards to measure what development should be considered for HOPE VI, then measuring the success or failure of the project becomes even more difficult. The research is designed to look at the social indicators of the neighborhood and to determine how severely distressed it is and success of HOPE VI.

HOPE VI is an initiative that is still having difficulty meeting goals and faces the threat of budget cuts every fiscal year by President George W. Bush. One of the most important flaws is the lack of one for one replacement of units. There are not enough units available for every tenant to return to a subsidized property. Therefore, life-long residents live in new units that are not as affordable as their previous subsidized homes in public housing. While HOPE VI is a good program on paper the application varies when put to each individual development, of which there have been 124 that have used HOPE VI funding, each with a different method (Wyly and Hammel 2000). The two cities that are being studied each have unique experiences in relation to HOPE VI and housing. The following two sections will detail the housing situation in each city and will provide information on the implementation of HOPE VI and impact on the neighborhoods.

---

2 According to HUD, only families who are at 30% of the Area Median Income (AMI) will receive a unit in these new developments (National Housing Law Project 2002). The exclusion argument is also referring to displacement. For every 100 residents displaced, only 70 units were affordable for very low-income, 50% of the AMI or less. For residents who are extremely low-income, 30% of AMI or less, only 40 units are available out of 100 to them. Individuals who are low-income, 80% of AMI or less does not have the same level of difficulty in returning to the development, as they are more likely to be able to afford the private-market rent (PMR), and 30% of their income is much closer to the PMR (National Housing Law Project 2002, HUD 2005). Sufficient data eliminates the additional concerns with facts to support or dispute claims.
Housing

Housing in each city is not an isolated issue. Housing encompasses several areas of life including education, employment, income, poverty and race. This section will describe the situations found in both cities that affect housing and the development of HOPE VI. The background provided will help to illuminate the differences and similarities in both cities as well as the goals they hope to accomplish with each HOPE VI development. Beyond the goals, a discussion of the trials and tribulations of each city is outlined.

Housing in Pittsburgh

Pittsburgh is a city known for smoke stacks and steel mills of the past and hospitals and universities of the present. The city of Pittsburgh has 91 neighborhoods and each neighborhood has a different flare and feeling. The residents of each neighborhood take on an identity that is associated with that neighborhood. About 40% of residents say the neighborhood suits them perfectly and they rate their community a perfect 10 and a perfect place to live (HUD Dept. of Commerce 1997). The remainder of the population does not share that feeling of perfection. The report does not indicate the percentage of individuals who find their neighborhoods to be a five or less, which would indicate below average; however, the conditions of public housing developments may warrant a response of less than five in some neighborhoods.

The median household income for individuals who rent their units in the Pittsburgh area is $17,600 (HUD DOC 1997). The income limit for an individual to reside in public housing is $31,000 and $18,000 to obtain a Housing Choice Voucher (HACP 2005). Therefore, the median income is well within the guidelines for an
individual to move into public housing, making it appear as if public housing may be one predominant place of residency within the city of Pittsburgh.

The Housing Authority of the City of Pittsburgh (HACP) is the PHA that is responsible for changes to the city’s public housing developments. HACP operates 6,444 public housing units and 3,371 Housing Choice Vouchers, 173 Section 8 Moderate Rehabilitation, 390 Section 8 New Construction and 444 HOPE VI units (HACP 2003). The HACP is by far the largest property owner in the city of Pittsburgh. Because of this, HACP has a large number of tenants and can influence a great number of people’s lives.

HUD has detailed four goals for HACP (HUD 2003):

1. Preserve and Protect HACP successful housing stock
2. Transform distressed stock through strategic replacement in existing Pittsburgh neighborhoods
3. Enable low-income families to become active participants in the nation’s economy
4. Shift HACP from a real estate operating company to a real estate asset management company

These goals are similar to the goals for HOPE VI developments and are the guidelines for HACP operations.

HACP was not alone in their effort to turn around public housing. In 1993 Tom Murphy, a former CDC director, was elected mayor. Mayor Murphy made public housing his personal mission. He appointed himself as chairperson of HACP, and appointed several individuals from the CDC to positions of authority within HACP. He also appointed two residents to the HACP board (Metzger 1996). Mayor Murphy was devoted to increasing the quality of public housing in Pittsburgh. Pittsburgh is behind only five other cities in measuring the number of public housing units in comparison to the total housing stock (Metzger 1996).
Pittsburgh has the highest number of residents living in poverty according to the 1990 Census. Of 50 comparable cities, Pittsburgh has the highest poverty rate among African Americans 18-64, the lowest labor force participation among African American males, the highest percentage of female-headed households, and the third highest black teenage male unemployment rate (Metzger 1996). These statistics help to show why Pittsburgh may have several unhealthy neighborhoods.

The neighborhood where the HOPE VI development is located is Terrace Village, a section of Pittsburgh that is wedged between Oakland, the healthcare and education hub, and the Hill District, an African American neighborhood. The name of the development is Oak Hill previously named Allequippa Terrace. Allequippa Terrace has a mixed history of slums for steel and ironworkers in the 1910s and 1920s to a largely African American center of crime, drugs, and poverty. In 1993, HACP submitted a grant application in response to the NOFA for HOPE VI developments to rehabilitate Allequippa Terrace. In 1993 HUD awarded HACP $31,564,190 for revitalization and in 1996 $8,140,000 for demolition. HACP utilized the Allequippa Terrace Resident Council and Beacon/Corcoran Jennison (B/CJ) as partners to build Oak Hill. B/CJ is the property manager and developer. Oak Hill is a model development for B/CJ and they describe the development as a thriving mixed-income, mixed-use community that includes townhome and garden-style apartments for renters and homeowners (B/CJ 2005). B/CJ also discusses the importance of resident involvement and economic self-sufficiency.

Oak Hill has both market-rate and subsidized units. As of 2002, the market rent for a studio unit was $535-620 for the smallest unit and for the largest unit, a 3-bedroom
The market rent is $1395-1495 a month (Oak Hill 2001). The resident is responsible for electric in apartments and electric and gas in townhomes (Oak Hill 2001). Oak Hill also provides information on the subsidized rental amounts. In the summer of 2002, Oak Hill had forty-three 1-bedroom, ten 2-bedroom apartments, eleven 2-bedroom townhomes, and twelve 3-bedroom townhomes as subsidized units available (Oak Hill 2002). The average rent is 30% of the tenant’s income. Units will have a utility subsidy as well, to assist the tenant in paying utility bills each month (Oak Hill 2002).

Oak Hill residents have a different view of the success of the redevelopment. Their responses to a survey conducted by the University of Pittsburgh’s School of Social Work indicate that some residents preferred the neighborhood before HOPE VI and that a few would rather that the development were not revitalized (Yamatani 2002). However most residents are pleased with the changes and have concerns only when they feel the management company is not treating them appropriately (Yamatani 2002). There are services that many residents appreciate such as the food bank, the summer day camp, and the annual trip to Kennywood. However, there are also services from the same survey that residents found to be less than helpful, such as quilting classes, poster contests and drug/alcohol prevention.

Overall, Pittsburgh seems as if it has a relatively successful HOPE VI development. The previous conditions of the unhealthy neighborhood provide a legitimating factor in revitalizing the neighborhood. The response of the residents and developers seems to be positive.
Housing in New Orleans

New Orleans is a city of culture, history, and uniqueness. New Orleans has neighborhoods, and each has a history; however, the neighborhoods tend to blend more than the neighborhoods in Pittsburgh. The city has a colorful history with influences from the Spanish and French, as well as a strong Southern history of slavery. New Orleans is one of the largest port cities in the US, behind New York and Houston. Millions of people come into the city annually and cause a desire by locals to preserve the history that is New Orleans.

Housing in New Orleans is as unique as the city. There are 188,251 households in New Orleans; of those 54% are renters. The average wage needed to afford a 2-bedroom unit is $10.95; a minimum-wage earner can afford no more than $268 a month for rent (NLIHC 2004). Fair market rent in New Orleans is $586 a month, nearly $300 more than a minimum-wage earner can afford. Because of this public and affordable housing is very important for New Orleans residents.

Housing Authority of New Orleans (HANO) has less than 10 white and minority residents, and 8,898 African American residents (HANO 2005). Public housing in New Orleans is segregated. The neighborhoods surrounding these developments are such that create apprehension in residents who are not African American. In many cases, residents are violent towards individuals of another race. These figures do not include totals from St. Thomas or Desire developments because they were demolished as HOPE VI developments.

HANO has been a troubled housing authority for many years. According to a GAO report (2003), in 1996 HANO entered into a cooperative arrangement with the City
of New Orleans in order to correct the problems that HANO had been experiencing. The problems persisted in 2002, and at that time, HUD stepped in and took control of HANO’s operations and management. HUD officials work on the day-to-day management and decision-making processes and redevelop HANO’s housing stock (GAO 2003).

HANO and public housing in New Orleans have faced significant problems. HOPE VI should be an opportunity to correct some of the problems and to begin to attract diversity into public housing developments and neighborhoods. HOPE VI did not have an easy road in New Orleans. Because of the city’s history, many groups, including the preservation society and historical groups were upset because of the plans for the HOPE VI development in and near the historical Warehouse and Upper Garden districts.

The development has gone slowly. The former development is St. Thomas in the Upper Garden district of New Orleans. St Thomas had 1510 units located in the gentrified Warehouse district (HANO 2005). St. Thomas was full of crime and violence, with shootings and other violent crimes frequent in the community. St. Thomas was the opposite of the surrounding community, which is a white neighborhood and is quiet (Gotham 2001). In October 2001, HANO demolished St. Thomas. New Orleans received $25,000,000 for revitalization in 1999 and $3,501,085 for demolition in 1999. The total budget for the project was $320,540,772 from various sources, including private investors and HUD. The HOPE VI development is called River Gardens, and the first residents returned in late 2004 (HANO 2005).

The development included plans to develop a Wal-Mart® Super Center with the new housing options. Vendors, historians, and residents were upset over the Wal-Mart
development because of nearby Magazine St., a shopping and cultural area where many residents shop and own businesses. There were several obstacles for the HOPE VI development in New Orleans. In 2001, Historic Restoration Incorporated (HRI) announced development plans with the Wal-Mart included, and opposition began to rally against the development (Elliot, Gotham, and Milligan 2004).

HRI began their quest to convince residents, politicians, and community groups of the need and desirability of the HOPE VI development, including Wal-Mart. HRI claimed that Orleans parish tax dollars were going to surrounding parishes as residents went to shop at the Wal-Marts there (Davis 2004). HRI also discussed that if Wal-Mart were not developed there would be fewer affordable units, as the developer would not be able to afford the property without the private-market rent (Elliot et al. 2004).

Wal-Mart is an economic and commercial development. However, it directly influences the housing debate in that it is to be an attraction for other businesses and developers. One of the most important things about HOPE VI is the connection to community agencies and businesses as well as capital investment. Wal-Mart has been building in inner cities with more frequency.

Because River Gardens is recently completed, resident reaction and community response is nearly impossible to determine. However, 32 completed units opened in November 2004, with building continuing to meet the goal of 1,238 new units on the site of the former St. Thomas. The private-market rent for the units will be $720-800 for a one-bedroom and $1250-1350 for a three-bedroom. Information is not available for the rent and utility responsibility for a subsidized unit; however, the rent portion can be no more than 30% of the tenant’s monthly income (HANO 2005). River Gardens has a look
of old-time New Orleans, with plantation-style verandas, large airy walkways, and open streets for neighborhood involvement. Near the community is a luxury condominium development that is attracting higher-income individuals and families into the neighborhood. River Garden has high expectations and may help public housing residents to fit into the neighborhood more easily than when they lived in St. Thomas.

**Conclusions**

The literature review provides insight into the types of sociological concerns that surround HOPE VI. The re-building of a neighborhood must take into consideration several factors. Collective efficacy, social capital, gentrification, neighborhood impacts, the nature of public housing, and race are just a few of the many factors that play a part in the development of a neighborhood. Each of these is important to the HOPE VI neighborhood. HOPE VI must have each of these in order to have a successful implementation.

The necessity of collective efficacy and social capital allows for pride and involvement of the resident in the fate of their community. The crime rate is reduced and the number of residents who are interacting with one another in a social context is increased. Social capital allows for the residents of the neighborhood to have the ability to influence the decision-making bodies to support their causes and needs. HOPE VI is built on this idea. The neighbors reside in a mixed-income community and help each other to maximize their individual abilities and overcome their place on the social ladder.

Gentrification provides an atmosphere that attracts residents and businesses of higher income levels. The neighborhood is attractive to people who are looking for upscale city living. Businesses begin to take interest in the neighborhood because the
client base supports their products. The mixed-income living in a gentrified neighborhood allows middle and upper class individuals to feel more comfortable in the neighborhood and feel as if they belong. The low-income individuals have something that they can learn from to be able to fit into the neighborhood comfortably.

The nature of public housing reduces the ability for gentrification and social capital to flourish. Public housing is a stigma and that stigma prevents growth and development. It becomes very important for public housing to be developed as a more inviting place to live. HOPE VI accomplishes this by demolishing or renovating the public housing development to make it more inviting.

Race and crime go hand in hand for most of the authors in the literature reviewed. Race is important because it is the most obvious divider of people. A person can determine a person’s race by looking at them making it easier to discriminate and form opinions. The mixed-income communities built by HOPE VI also focuses on creating a mixed-used environment, one that allows for diversity of the neighborhood and residents. The discrimination based on race forces people to make choices they may not make in normal conditions. HOPE VI provides a normal condition to equalize the playing field.

HOPE VI allows for a possible solution to the problem presented by the authors throughout this literature review. Mixed-income, mixed-use communities provide a leveling to neighborhood to overcome the inadequacy found in most public housing developments. HOPE VI is not perfect, as some authors have described, however it is establishing a template of ways to begin to move forward. The critiques allow room for improvement as nothing is perfect. However, HOPE VI provides opportunities to overcome some of the racial disparity, poverty, and violence plaguing public housing.
HOPE VI is a well thought out policy. This research is attempting to review the implementation process to see if HOPE VI has the impact it was created to accomplish.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

HOPE VI utilizes goals from several different agencies. The National Coalition for Severely Distressed Public Housing (NCSDPH) released general goals that served as recommendations for HUD and Congress. Each of these goals has been previously described in this research as either community-based or individual-based. Community-based will be for sustainability and health of the neighborhood. The goal or action step does not focus on the displaced residents, but on what the neighborhood effect will be. The individual-focused goal or action step helps to promote and develop the growth of the individual resident. As stated previously, the goals of the NCSDPH are:

- Changing the physical shape of public housing (Community),
- Establishing positive incentives for resident self-sufficiency and comprehensive services that empower residents (Individual),
- Lessening the concentrations of poverty by placing public housing in non-poverty neighborhoods and promoting mixed-income communities (Community),
- Forging partnerships with other agencies, local government, non-profit organizations, and private business to leverage support and resources (Community),
- To improve the living environment of public housing residents (Both),
- To revitalize severely distressed sites (Community),
- To contribute to the surrounding neighborhood (Community),
- To decrease housing that concentrates very low and low-income individuals (Community),
- To create partnerships with local agencies for support and funding (Community),
- To build sustainable communities (Community) (HUD, 2005).

Each of these goals has action steps created by HUD to assist in the creation and implementation of policy to ensure success of the HOPE VI development. The action steps assisted in choosing which goals to incorporate into the research as well as to
determine the appropriate social indicator for each goal. The action steps include but are not limited to:

- Lessening the concentration of low-income residents in a neighborhood (Individual)
- Creating partnerships for leveraging additional funds from alternate investors (Community)
- Implementing cost effective plans (Community)
- Providing opportunities for family economic self-sufficiency (Individual)
- Building sustainable units that include a physical design that blends into the urban landscape (Community)
- Ensure that residents are involved in the planning and implementation of the HOPE VI development (Individual).

These goals will establish the frame for this research as well. Each goal has several social indicators that measure the effectiveness of HOPE VI in accomplishing their objectives.

The research will utilize two different methods of reviewing social indicators and determining the success of HOPE VI as a policy. The first is a descriptive review of the social indicators to determine changes experienced between 1990 and 2000. The data collected from the 1990 Census serves as a baseline for the neighborhood. 1990 is the year closest to the date HOPE VI became policy. Data from the 2000 Census serves as a measurement of HOPE VI’s effects in each city and is the most recent data available. The second method is controlled demographic projections. This method will utilize the Census data to perform projections to determine the age structure and population of the city and neighborhood between 1990 and 2000. The projection will help to determine whether the city and neighborhood changed in similar ways from 1990 and 2000 in terms of age and population.

The research uses the Census tract to define the neighborhood. The tract level provides data at the 100% characteristic level, asking every question to everyone, as well
the sample characteristic level asking only a sample of individuals. The block group asks every question to every person\(^3\). This research utilizes the census tract. The researcher determined that the tract level provided adequate information that encompasses the majority of the neighborhood being studied. The tract level allows for the examination of key factors by age and race, as well as providing a large enough area to determine trends.

The research collects data for the city as well as the neighborhood for all sources. The purpose of collecting data for both the city and the tract is to ensure that the changes were due to HOPE VI and not a general trend that occurred citywide. If the city experienced similar growth or decline, HOPE VI may have little impact on the factor being measured and is less important to neighborhood change.

**Research Goals**

*Descriptive Review of Indicators*

The following goals are the ones chosen for this research, because they have the most social indicators and can be measured uniformly across the Census data from 1990 and 2000. The choice of each goal does not indicate that it is more or less important than any of the other goals; simply that it is most effective in this research. Additional research in the future may allow for review of other goals, if appropriate. The social indicators with each goal will be labeled either as a community goal, individual goal, or in limited cases both. The indicator will be explained as a way to understand the research and the focus of the development.

\(^3\) Block groups are a collection of census blocks within a census tract, sharing the same first digit of their four-digit identifying numbers. Census Tracts are small statistical subdivisions (averaging about 4,000 persons) of counties generally have stable boundaries and, when first established, were designed to have relatively homogeneous demographic characteristics. [http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/mso-01icdp.pdf](http://www.census.gov/prod/2001pubs/mso-01icdp.pdf)
Changing the face of Public Housing

Social indicators will not be used to measure the changing face of public housing, as the physical shape of public housing is not something that is influenced by social factors. The public housing units have changed physically because they were demolished at the onset of HOPE VI. The question for research is in what way have the new units changed. For the purpose of this research, the definition for the physical shape is the number of subsidized and private-market units available, the type of structure created the availability and type of land use and the existence of community space.

The data will be available from the housing authority in both cities to determine the changes made to the housing development due to HOPE VI. The data collected is to examine if the development is incorporated into the neighborhood or if it is isolated.

The data for this goal is a community sustainability issue. The number of private-market versus subsidy-based rental units helps to describe the level of mixed-income use in the community. HOPE VI approaches mixed-income use as a key factor to neighborhood health, growth and sustainability.

Positive incentive and self-sufficiency

The second goal establishing positive incentives and self-sufficiency for residents is measured using Census data. The indicators of positive incentive and self-sufficiency have several sources. Table 1 will indicate where the information is located within the Census and will summarize the impact on the research.

The first indicator will be the number of residents who recently moved into the neighborhood. The indicator is one of community sustainability. If the resident has been
in the unit for a long period, that resident benefits from change and is able to maintain their place in the HOPE VI development. Long-term residents will indicate the number of people who are invested in the neighborhood and who are most effective for raising social capital and collective efficacy.

Another indicator will be the number of individuals who are collecting welfare or another type of subsidized assistance. The indicator is one of individual empowerment. If an individual is collecting welfare or a subsidy, the person is less likely to flourish if new and innovative opportunities are presented, as the residents are not able to sustain the increase of business in the area. The gap between those that receive wages and are able to sustain themselves independently and those who are not grows, eliminating the goals of a mixed-income community to incorporate everyone into the neighborhood equally.

Another indicator that goes hand in hand with subsidized assistance is the number of individuals and families who are considered impoverished. Subsidized income typically leads to poverty conditions, as an individual or family cannot receive a subsidy if they are above 200% of the poverty line. This is an individual indicator. If the individual is living in poverty, their choices are reduced and their ability to move towards self-sufficiency is greatly impeded. An individual that is trapped in poverty feels disconnected from their community and is less willing to make significant changes to their situation. Gentrification does not blend with poverty; it is very difficult to survive in a gentrified neighborhood as you try to move out of poverty.

Coupling with poverty is the number of female-headed households in the neighborhood or community. Traditionally, a high number of female-headed households indicate a high level of poverty. A woman is less likely to achieve self-sufficiency if she
has children, especially under the age of five, who need her attention. The woman is forced to make choices that are best for her children, ignoring the long-term effect of the decision. This is an individual issue as well. Women cannot become self-sufficient if they do not have options. The lack of self-sufficiency leaves them few options and causes negative problems in the community, including violence and crime. In an environment such as this social capital and collective efficacy, become non-existent.

The next indicator is the number of people who attained higher education. College or higher education indicates that the individual is moving towards creating better opportunities and higher levels of self-sufficiency. The indicator is for individual empowerment because with increased education comes increased income and job availability. If the individual has a higher level of education and therefore income, the person will have more resources to utilize, as neighbors are able to afford to invest in the area.

The final indicator will be employment. If the neighborhood has, an increase in individuals employed from 1990 to 2000 an increase of self-sufficiency is indicated. The employment rate will assist in relating who is working, looking for work or unable to work. The indicator is also of individual sustainability, which goes hand in hand with education. If a large proportion of residents are working, they have attained some level of self-sufficiency and focus on investing in their community rather than focusing on how to make ends meet in their daily lives. Thus enhancing social capital and making them increasingly capable of living in a gentrified community.
Lessening the concentration of poverty

The third goal, lessening the concentration of poverty and an increase of mixed income, is measured using Census data. Table 2 will provide a summary of the Census data used and the impact each of these indicators will have on the overall research. Lessening the concentration of poverty relates directly to Massey, Wilson, Sampson, and Putnam’s discussion of social capital and collective efficacy. Lessening the concentration of poverty also reduces the occurrence of violence and crimes. By introducing mixed-income residents, those remaining in poverty have someone to role model their behavior after in order to better themselves and their families.

The first indicator is family income in the neighborhood. If HOPE VI is successful, income in the neighborhood should increase overall for all residents, regardless of race. The indicator is of community sustainability. If the family income has increased, the individual is less likely to rely on a subsidy for assistance in paying their rent. The family therefore is able to live where they want and can invest in the neighborhood they want to live in rather than the one they have to live in, allowing for a greater feeling of efficacy within their neighborhood.

Another social indicator is family size. The size of the family used in conjunction with income will indicate what a family can afford in terms of housing. If the family is large with little income, they are more likely to require a subsidy. If the large family can only find a unit in a housing development, they are more likely to live in poverty. The indicator is individual-based. Empowerment occurs because a family size that is manageable is one that allows for community involvement and efficacy. This is not to
indicate there is an ideal family size but more that there is an ideal family size for the family income.

The next indicator is racial diversity. HOPE VI will increase the amount of racial diversity in the neighborhood if successful. While race does not directly relate to poverty, public housing typically has female-headed, poor, African American families. If there is an increase in racial diversity, there should be a decrease of the concentration of poverty within the neighborhood. Racial diversity is a community sustainability indicator. Racial diversity brings a different atmosphere to the neighborhood. Having several groups of people provides for different ideas and new approaches to building sustainable housing and neighborhoods. The relationships that may exist in a diverse neighborhood may not as easily exist is a homogenous neighborhood where everyone is the same and no one gets along. A diverse neighborhood is one where social capital can grow and neighbors can begin to work together and become exposed to other types of people.

The next indicator is poverty. The number of households in poverty as well as the number of children in poverty is important to measuring the decrease in the concentration of poverty. This indicator is one of community sustainability. If the community is unable to move residents out from poverty, mixed-income use will not burgeon and the community will become what it had replaced in public housing. Mixed-income communities rely on a majority of people being above the poverty line in order to maintain sustainability and invest in the future of the community, typically through gentrification.
The next indicator is the percentage of income paid towards rent each month. Rent paid each month can indicate poverty because if a person is paying more than 30% of their income towards rent the unit is less affordable. The lack of affordability would indicate that more individuals are receiving subsidies and are below the poverty line according to HUD. Ideally, a person should not pay more than 30% of their income for rent, regardless of assistance. The indicator is both of individual growth and community sustainability. If the individual can pay 30% of their income, either their rent is less expensive or their income is high enough to sustain paying higher rent amounts.

Community sustainability is encouraged through either subsidy or affordable private-market rent. Affordability is essential in maintaining a neighborhood. Once rent gets unaffordable, the neighborhood is less appealing and residents move.

The final indicator will be the question asking about homeownership vs. being a renter. If the person is a homeowner, they have committed to residing in the neighborhood and providing stability. The homeowner also must prove the ability to afford the home upon purchasing. A homeowner typically would not receive a subsidy and would be paying private-market mortgage rates independent of the housing authority. The development should include a few homeowners to promote mixed-income uses for the development. The indicator is community-based. Home ownership is better in the end for an individual; however, public housing residents do not own their home. The community is more sustainable if many residents own their home as they have committed to the well being of the community and its continued growth.
**Population Projection Method**

The US Census provides population worksheets that enable the user to look at trends in the changing population by entering data regarding age, sex and in some cases race to determine migration patterns and changes that occur in census locations. John Weeks, a leading analyst for populations, defines a population projection as “a calculation of the number of persons we can expect to be alive at a future date given the number now alive and given reasonable assumptions about age-specific mortality and fertility rates” (Weeks 2002).

The US Census uses Population Analysis Spreadsheets (PAS), which provide projections and analysis of Census data in various terms. This research uses the following worksheets within the analysis: population pyramid, a migration worksheet and MOVE-POP. Each helps to provide a graphic representation of the population and age structure found in both cities and both neighborhoods. The spreadsheets are visual representations of age ratios and sex ratios that establish what the population should look like in the future and what it looks like right now.

The first spreadsheet is pyramid and it describes graphically the age ratio for residents in the neighborhood and in the city. A large number of children or elderly indicate a high fertility or birth rate and high mortality rate. The base is wider and tapers to the top in this scenario. In the US, the pyramid is more of a rectangular shape, where the numbers of births and deaths are similar. Ages 15-64 is the typical range for people who considered capable of independent living.

The next spreadsheet describes migration. The worksheet will exhibit the trend of migration for the city and the neighborhood between 1990 and 2000. A high outward
migration indicates that people have been moving out of the city or neighborhood throughout the ten-year period. Migration is important as it describes the trend of people moving in and out of the area. If both city and neighborhood have had a loss or gain of population, the variables remain constant. If one or the other had significant migration, then HOPE VI may be significant in the area and the indicators become more difficult to compare.

The final spreadsheet is for population projections. Based on the population pyramid and migration spreadsheet, this spreadsheet is able to project the age ratio and sex ratio to describe what the future population would look like. This worksheet is most important because it helps to relate what should happen in the city and the tract. Projections can help in making comparisons across the cities and tracts. The projection can be compared to what did happen to determine the demographic trend for each city and neighborhood.

The population projection worksheets are important to this research for several reasons. The first being that there are several sets of comparisons, each relating to the individual city or neighborhood being compared to another city or neighborhood. By making the population projections, it becomes easier to hold certain elements constant if each area has similar population trends. Each neighborhood is compared to the city it is found in as well as the other neighborhood. Each city is compared to the neighborhood and the other city. Each of those comparisons is made in 1990 and 2000. Because of the number of comparisons made, the population worksheets provide ways to ensure that each have similar trends and are not radically different from one another skewing the results.
The second reason the projection worksheets are important is without them there is no way to describe the population outside of the descriptive Census data. The worksheets provide graphic representations of the structure of the population and allow for a snapshot of what the city and neighborhood look like without getting into the specific social indicators.

Both methods of analysis, descriptive research and population projection provides different perspectives on the same areas. The descriptive research gives specific portrayals of social indicators and trends. The population projections provide a description of the population as it is and as it should be. Each allows the research to discuss trends of HOPE VI as well to allow for variables such as age and sex to be held constant.

DATA

The data presented in this research illustrates the differences and similarities in each neighborhood and city as it relates to the HOPE VI project. The data presents situations in each neighborhood and city and provides a baseline for determining success or failure for HOPE VI. Each indicator is used in relation to the goals established by HUD for HOPE VI. If this data is not included and if specific indicators are not examined success or failure is arbitrarily assigned. The baseline model allows the research to look at data in a realistic way.

The research relies on data from the Census about the chosen social indicators. The Census is performed every ten years and the data is compiled in several different ways. As mentioned previously, the 100% characteristic is the “short form” and contains questions asked of every household in the US. The questions include information such as
sex, age, race, etc. The sample characteristic is the “long form” and is asked of one out
of six households in the US. The questions on the long form include income, migration,
employment, education, home value, rent amount, etc. (Census 2006a).

The Census data uses several different descriptions of a geographic area, for the
purpose of this research the census tract is used when discussing a neighborhood. The
tract provides data on an area large enough to cover the HOPE VI development as well as
small areas outside of the development. To use anything larger would distort the results
based on data that is not just the development, making the neighborhood larger than it
needs to be. To use any area smaller than the tract would cause for the specific answers
of the person to be gathered, eliminating the anonymity of the neighborhood and making
it difficult to get a large enough picture for neighborhood trends (Census 2006a).

The Census uses different methods to present the data in each geographic area.
For this research, data comes from two sources, Summary File 1 (SUMMARY FILE 1)
and Summary File 3 (SUMMARY FILE 3). Summary File 1 contains data collected
from all people or household units such as race, age, sex, and homeownership. Data in
Summary File 1 is available to the block level and has been collected at the tract level for
this research. All other data for this research has been collected from Summary File 3.
Summary File 3 contains data from the sample characteristics and is available to the
block level. Data from SUMMARY FILE 3 is used at the tract level for this research
(Census 2006a).

Data is collected from the Census website using quick tables, the way in which
Summary File data is made available for easy review. The raw data is tabulated and
compared to produce the descriptive social indicators for each geographic area being
studied. The Summary File 1 data is used to complete the population projection models for the baseline of what the population did look like and what it should have looked like. Demographic change can then be determined as to how dramatically the neighborhood changed due to HOPE VI.

**ANALYSIS**

The analysis of the data will be descriptive and population projection based. There will be comparison between the neighborhood data from 1990 and 2000 as well as a comparison between trends in both the city and neighborhood during this time. The application of HOPE VI may have caused changes in trends, however based on the data it was a small change and may be better examined in the future. In addition, with the impact of Hurricane Katrina remaining unknown, it is difficult to determine trends for New Orleans. The following analysis is to determine slight trends as well as to suggest further research for the future in both the cities and with the HOPE VI policy.

The analysis mirrors the three main goals of HOPE VI that have been the focus of this research. The identification of each goal, as well as the social indicators compared first across the neighborhood in 1990 and 2000, followed by the comparison of the same indicators for the city, and the trends found in both are examined to determine if the trends in the neighborhood can be attributed to HOPE VI.

The raw data collected from the Census in 1990 and 2000 can be located in tables four through thirteen. Both the descriptive method as well as the population projections uses the raw data for completion. Throughout the analysis, tables will be mentioned if there is an important note from the raw data that has an impact on the description or the
projection. The data was used to complete calculations and can be located at the source using the Appendix.

**Descriptive**

In general, the two neighborhoods and two cities are well matched in terms of the social and economic indicators used throughout this research. The neighborhoods are moving towards economic and social stability equivalent to that of the cities and indicate that HOPE VI may be a success in the neighborhoods. It is important to look at the data because the social indicators related here as well as others to be used in the future allow for a comparison of what the neighborhood used to look like, what it should have looked like and what it looks like today.

The goals of HUD have been instrumental to this research. The most significant improvements should be within the racial divides, the income levels, and employment/educational attainment. For housing factors, the most significant improvement should be affordability and percent of income paid towards rent in order for HOPE VI to be considered a success in the neighborhood and at reaching goals.

When reviewing the data, the percent change is what is compared for each area. The raw number of each is not relevant when discussing trends. The percentage is presenting the change in the neighborhood while eliminating the impact of any change in number of people surveyed in each year. A significant increase or decrease in the number responding to the survey question will be included as well.
Improving the physical housing units

Public housing in both neighborhoods have been demolished. There were not structural corrections to the existing buildings as may be found in other HOPE VI projects. The goal of the demolition was to create a mixed-income community. There were 182 Low-income Housing Tax Credit units created in the River Gardens community of New Orleans. In addition, there were 107 subsidized units for returning residents and 626 private-market units. 68.4% of the units are for non-subsidy residents in River Gardens. In Oak Hill, there were 462 Low-income Housing Tax Credit units and 170 private-market units. There were no units included that have a traditional public housing subsidy. 73% of the units have a subsidy attached to them in Oak Hill (Table 3 Housing Developments).

Creating the mixed-income community helps alleviate the crime and violence in that plagued the neighborhoods as well as to encourage gentrification. By demolishing the units, a new neighborhood can be created and marketed to a diverse population. Congress intended HOPE VI to relieve the tension that builds in neighborhoods with public housing units as well as to relief the burden neighbors and residents feel trying to maintain a unit that is 50 years old. Starting with a fresh building is an attempt to create a fresh start for the neighborhood.

Increasing Self Sufficiency

Self-sufficiency provides residents the ability to chose where they want to reside and allow a neighborhood to flourish because the neighborhood becomes a home and a community whether than a place to live for a short time until something better comes up.
A self-sufficient resident is also able to contribute financially to the neighborhood because they have more disposable income and the ability to make choices without considering the effect the choice will have on their subsidy or assistance. Many of the self-sufficiency indicators are individual based, because self-sufficiency begins with the tenant. The community may experience residual effects but the individual experiences the major effects.

The first social indicator is migration. Migration is a community sustainability goal. It creates more stability within a neighborhood that attracts individuals and families and encourages long-term residence. HOPE VI should make the neighborhood more attractive, provide multiple services and create a place for resident self-sufficiency to grow. If HOPE VI fails, the community is not providing places for people to become involved and have the desire for civic engagement and therefore they feel more inclined to move on after a short period of time (Table 5).

|Table 5 about here|

In the New Orleans neighborhood, 539 households out of 1088 (49.5%) resided in the same house in 1985 as they resided in 1990. From the 2000 data, 438 households out of 1765 (24%) resided in the same house in 1995 as in 2000. There is a loss of 25.5% between 1990 and 2000 in net migration, meaning more people moved out then who moved in.

In the city of New Orleans, there were 100,329 households out of 188,235 (53.3%) residing in the same house in 1990 as 1985. From the 2000 data, there are 256,551 households out of 451,739 (56.8%) who resided in the same house in 1995 and
2000. There is a gain in the number of residents who remained in their house from 1990 and 2000 of 3.5%. The trend indicates that there is a positive migration within the city between 1990 and 2000.

Between New Orleans and the neighborhood, a difference in the number of residents that remained in their units exists. In the city of New Orleans, there was an increase in the total households and the number of households who remained long term. This trend indicates greater stability. In the neighborhood, there was an increase in the number of overall households, however a decrease in the number of residents who remained in the units over the long term. The displaced residents are not receiving the services that HOPE VI offers because they are no longer in the neighborhood. HOPE VI may provide for a new neighborhood, but it is not creating an environment in the tract that promotes long-term residency or growth of social capital in the neighborhood. Overall increases in New Orleans residents outside of the tract explain any growth in the neighborhood.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, there were 766 households out of 1528 (50.1%) residing in the same house in 1985 as they resided in 1990. From the 2000 data, 453 households out of 1,141 (48.5%) resided in the same house in 1995 and 2000. The difference is 1.6%. The net migration was negative, however by a very small margin.

In the city of Pittsburgh, there were 100,531 households out of 153,483 (65.5%) who resided in the same house from 1985 to 1990. From the 2000 data, there were 179,957 out of 316,760 (56.8%). There is a loss in the number of households remaining in their houses of 8.7%. The trend in the city is an increase in the number of households; however, they are not the same households who resided in the city in 1990.
Between Pittsburgh and the neighborhood, there is a difference in the number of residents who moved into the area overall. Pittsburgh had an increase in the number of households within the city, regardless of where they lived, where the neighborhood had a decrease in the number of total residents overall. The percentage of households who remained in their houses between 1990 and 2000 decreased in both the city and the neighborhood. The trend is that there are more people moving into the city and less moving into the neighborhood.

HOPE VI did not provide for an environment that makes the residents want to place down roots and help to grow the community in either neighborhood. The neighborhood remained a transitional place to live similar to what is found in public housing developments. HOPE VI has done little to add to social capital and gentrification.

The next indicator is the number of residents who receive a subsidy for their source of income. The source of income indicator is one of individual empowerment. The individual empowerment comes from the ability not to have to rely on the government to provide monthly income. More than that however, is the ability to earn more than the minimum cost of living and to be able to earn the money necessary for maintaining a household of your choice rather than maintaining the house that you are forced to take. HOPE VI should provide diversity in residents and provide opportunities to secure employment in a variety of fields (Table 9).

In the New Orleans neighborhood, 1,088 households answered the question of income source in 1990. Of those, 852 (78.3%) received wages as their source of income.
Of the same 1,088, 196 (18%) received SSI and 40 (3.7%) received DPA. The neighborhood had little reliance on government subsidy prior to the HOPE VI development. In 2000, 735 households responded to the question of income source. Of those, 395 (53.3%) received wages, 164 (22.2%) received SSI and 132 (17.9%) received DPA. There was a reduction of wage earners in the neighborhood between 1990 and 2000 of 25%. The decrease in wages indicates that HOPE VI has provided diversity in an area in which they were hoping to have a high percentage of the population receiving wages. HOPE VI had the opposite effect in this neighborhood than what is intended.

In the city of New Orleans, 188,235 households responded to the question of income source in 1990. Of those, 157,740 (83.3%) received wages, 19,953 (10.6%), and 10,541 (5.6%) received DPA. In 2000, 188,365 responded to the question of income source. Of those, 142,744 (75.8%) received wages, 14,637 (7.8%) received SSI, and 10,196 (5.4%) received DPA. The trend was a reduction of 7.5% of individuals who received wages from 1990 to 2000.

In the city of New Orleans and the neighborhood, there was a reduction of the number of wage earners between 1990 and 2000. However, the trend is a much larger reduction in the HOPE VI neighborhood. HOPE VI had no impact in the neighborhood in increasing the number of wage earners who moved into the area. In fact, there was an increase in the dependence on government subsidy following HOPE VI’s implementation by 25%.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, 1,528 households responded to the question of income source in 1990. Of those, 1,019 (66.7%) received wages, 171 (11.2%) received SSI and 338 (22.1%) received DPA. In 2000, 642 households answered the question
regarding income source. Of those, 277 (43.1%) received wages, 228 (35.5%) received SSI and 93 (14.5%) received DPA. There was a reduction in wage earners between 1990 and 2000 of 23.6%. There was an increase in the number of residents receiving SSI, meaning more residents have a disability and may not be able to work to receive wages. The trend is indicating that there was a reduction of wage earners after the implementation of HOPE VI, an effect opposite of what the goal indicates.

In the city of Pittsburgh, 153,483 households responded to the question of income source in 1990. Of those, 122,786 (80%) received wages, 21,948 (14.3%) received SSI, and 8,749 (5.7%). In 2000, 143,752 households responded to the question of income source. Of those, 104,142 (72.4%) received wages, 8,977 (6.2%) received SSI, and 7,916 (5.5%) received DPA. The trend was a reduction of wage earners by 7.6% between 1990 and 2000.

In the city of Pittsburgh and the neighborhood, there was a reduction of the number of wage earners in both the city and the neighborhood. While the city had a small reduction, the neighborhood had a reduction of nearly 24%. The reduction occurred despite the implementation of HOPE VI and occurred at a much higher rate than that of the surrounding city. HOPE VI failed to have an impact on the number of people who rely on a subsidy.

If HOPE VI is successful, income source should be wages. Because in both neighborhoods, the number of wage earners decreased, HOPE VI was not effective in either neighborhood. HOPE VI for this indicator did not promote social capital or collective efficacy. People were not making connections and working together, but are
rather sitting isolated and collecting a subsidy without the interaction of others on a daily basis.

The next indicator is the number of female-headed households in the area. The indicator is an individual empowerment issue. Female-headed households must be taken in conjunction with poverty. Traditional public housing residents tend to be living in poverty, and be African American and female-headed households. Intact families typically provide two incomes, making it easier to sustain a home. If the woman has resources to replace what is lacking from being a two-parent household, she will become more able to take care of her family independently and raise herself out of poverty. HOPE VI should provide these resources and by doing so decrease the number of female-headed households to be replaced with intact families (Table 7).

| Table 7 about here |

In the New Orleans neighborhood, 1,085 responded to the question regarding family characteristics in 1990. Of those, 777 (71%) indicated they are a female-headed household. In 2000, 707 households responded to the question of family characteristics. Of those, 482 (68.7%) indicated that they were a female-headed household. The trend is that there was a decrease in the number of female-headed households by 2.3% in the neighborhood following the implementation of HOPE VI.

In the city of New Orleans, 190,229 responded to the question of family characteristics in 1990. Of those, 32,339 (17%) indicated they were a female-headed household. In 2000, 188,438 responded to the question of family characteristics. Of those, 58,604 (31.1%) responded that they were female-headed households. The trend in the city is an increase of female-headed households by 14.1% from 1990 to 2000.
In the city of New Orleans, there was an increase in the number of female-headed households. In comparison, the neighborhood had a decrease in the number of female-headed households from 1990 to 2000. The trend in the city is an increase while in the neighborhood it is a decrease, indicating that HOPE VI may have affected the number of female-headed households and by extension the level of poverty in the area.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, 1528 households answered the question regarding family characteristics in 1990. Of those, 702 (45%) were female-headed households. In 2000, 627 households responded to the question of family characteristics. Of those, 242 (38.6%) indicated they were a female-headed household. The trend is a decrease in the number of female-headed households by 6.4%.

In the city of Pittsburgh, 155,310 responded to the question regarding female-headed households in 1990. Of those, 15,531 (10%) responded that they resided in female-headed households. In 2000, 143,550 households responded to the question of family characteristics. Of those, 31,581 (22%) responded that they reside in a female-headed household. The trend is an increase in the number of female-headed households in the city by 12% from 1990 to 2000.

In the city of Pittsburgh, there was an increase in the number of female-headed households. In comparison, the neighborhood had a decrease in the number of female-headed households from 1990 to 2000, indicating that HOPE VI may have had an affect on the number of households who were female-headed as well as living in poverty, as the city had a different trend than that experienced in the neighborhood.

The next indicator is poverty. Poverty is a community sustainability issue, but it is also about individual empowerment. HOPE VI should provide opportunities to live in
affordable housing as well as work towards personal goals. For HOPE VI to be successful it should decrease the number of former public housing residents in poverty as well lead to as fewer overall households living in poverty in the new community (Table 10).

In the New Orleans neighborhood, 3,843 households answered the question regarding poverty in 1990. Of those, 3,319 (86%) were living in poverty. In 2000, 702 households were examined for poverty. Of those 371 (70.3%) were residing in poverty. The number of households in poverty decreased between 1990 and 2000, indicating HOPE VI may have influenced poverty levels in a positive way. The trend was a decrease of 15.7% for the number of households in poverty. If the trend continues, the neighborhood may have very little poverty after HOPE VI has been implemented and established for several years.

In New Orleans, there were 119,516 families in 1990 that were evaluated for poverty. Of those, 32,616 (27%) were below the poverty line. In 2000, 188,251 households were evaluated for poverty. Of those 26,988 (23.7%) live below the poverty line. The overall poverty rate has dropped by 3.3% from 1990 to 2000 for all families. In the city of New Orleans and in the neighborhood, there was a decrease in the number of households in poverty. The trend is for poverty to be decreasing in the area regardless of the application of HOPE VI. The city saw a general trend of decreasing poverty, therefore making the decrease in the neighborhood less significant.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, 1,049 families were evaluated for poverty in 1990. Of those, 786 (74%) were living in poverty. In 2000, 627 households were
evaluated for poverty. Of those, 178 (28%) reside in poverty. The trend is a decrease in the number of families and female-headed households living in poverty from 1990 and 2000.

In Pittsburgh, there were 88,044 households evaluated for poverty in 1990. Of those 14,615 (16%) were living below the poverty line. In 2000, 143,739 households were evaluated for poverty. Of those 11,228 (7%) live below the poverty line. The overall poverty rate has dropped by 9% from 1990 to 2000 for all households.

In the city of Pittsburgh and in the neighborhood, there was a decrease in the number of households in poverty and the number of female-headed households in poverty. The trend is for poverty to be decreasing in the area regardless of the application of HOPE VI. The city saw a general trend of decreasing poverty, which would make HOPE VI less of a factor in the decrease of poverty in the neighborhood.

HOPE VI was effective in that it did not increase the number of households residing in poverty for both neighborhoods. The success however is limited because the city also saw a decrease. The neighborhood however had improvements in poverty and therefore could experience an increase in gentrification opportunities and community interaction. People have more freedom to pursue their community goals rather than pursuing an income to support their family.

The next indicator is education. Education is an individual self-sufficiency issue, as the more education a person has the more independent they can become. Education leads to employment in higher-paying positions. With those higher-paying positions comes the independence not to be reliant on a government subsidy and access to broader
choice of housing. HOPE VI, if successful, should increase the number of individuals who received at least some college (Table 12).

In the New Orleans neighborhood, in 1990 there were 1,283 residents age 25 and over. Of those 142 (11%) had completed their education for at least a bachelor’s degree. In 2000, there were 1,031 residents age 25 and over. Of those 82 (8%) had completed enough education for a bachelor’s degree. The trend is a decrease in education of 3%. A decrease in education indicates a decrease in employment potential, which in turn lowers income, leading to decreased self-sufficiency.

In the city of New Orleans, there were 303,683 residents over the age of 25 in 1990. Of those, 135,968 (44%) had completed enough education for at least a bachelor’s degree. In 2000, there were 300,568 residents age 25 and over. Of those, 154,013 (51.2%) had completed enough education for their bachelor’s degree. There was an increase of 7.2%, making the residents more employable and increasing their level of self-sufficiency.

In the city of New Orleans and neighborhood, there is a trend of increase in the attainment of education. The increase in education in the neighborhood is impressive, however cannot be related strictly to HOPE VI. The city having a similar trend indicates that education was growing throughout and is not isolated to the neighborhood specifically.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, there were 1,649 residents over the age of 25 in 1990. Of those, 324 (19%) had completed enough education for at least a bachelor’s degree. In 2000, there were 722 residents over the age of 25. Of those, 233 (32.3%) had
completed enough education for at least a bachelor’s degree. The trend indicates an increase of 13.3%. The increase in education leads to increased employment and more income, therefore an increase in self-sufficiency.

In the city of Pittsburgh, there were 244,808 residents age 25 and over in 1990. Of those 93,016 (37%) have completed enough education for at least a bachelor’s degree. In 2000, there were 218,813 residents age 25 and over. Of those, 106,174 (48.5%) had attained enough education for a bachelor’s degree. The trend is an increase in educational attainment of 11.5%.

In the city of Pittsburgh and the neighborhood, the trend was an increase of educational attainment. Therefore, again, while the neighborhood has had an increase education that may have come from neighborhood improvements due to HOPE VI, there may be additional causes as well. The trend in the city indicates that overall education was increasing even in neighborhoods that had not redeveloped with HOPE VI.

Education is a social indicator that is not linked directly to neighborhood health or thought of immediately as something that leads to greater self-sufficiency. Education is uniquely important because it provides social environments and the ability to interact with others in a non-social environment as well as with people who may have different views. Not only is the person’s marketability increased but so is their ability to work with groups to gather and disseminate information. A college campus is similar to a neighborhood and is the best picture of a community HOPE VI is emulating. An increase in the number of higher educated residents provides the goals of HOPE VI a good base for growth and expansion.
The final indicator is employment. Employment is an individual empowerment indicator. If a person is employed their choices increase, as they have the ability to earn more or less money dictated by their needs, not by their subsidy. If HOPE VI is successful, the number of employed residents will increase throughout the community (Table 11).

For the New Orleans neighborhood, there were 461 residents out of 1,892 (24%) who were over the age of 16 and in the workforce in 1990. In 2000, there were 535 residents out of 1,546 (34.6%) who were over the age of 16 and in the workforce. There was an increase of 10.6% between 1990 and 2000. This increase indicates an increase in the number of able-bodied residents who were working in the neighborhood. An increase in employment indicates an increase in self-sufficiency after HOPE VI.

In the city of New Orleans, there were 222,381 residents out of 375,171 (59%) who were over the age of 16 and in the labor force. In 2000, there were 213,819 residents out of 370,138 (57.8%) who are over the age of 16 and in the labor force. There is a decrease of 1.2%. This again indicates that there are fewer people in the labor force and therefore more individuals relying on a subsidy for their monthly income, a drop in self-sufficiency.

In New Orleans and the neighborhood, there is a difference in the trend of employment. In the city, there were fewer able-bodied individuals in the workforce between 1990 and 2000 by 1.4%. In the neighborhood, there was an increase of 9.4%. The trend indicates that HOPE VI had an impact on the neighborhood and the way in
which the residents earn their income. The increase in employment indicates a more self-sufficient population residing in the neighborhood than in the city.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, 838 residents out of 2,238 (37%) were over the age of 16 and in the labor force in 1990. In 2000, there were 282 residents out of 814 (34.6%) who were over the age 16 and in the workforce. There was a decrease of 2.4% between 1990 and 2000, indicating that the number of people who are able to work and are working has decreased. An increase in the reliance on a subsidy is also indicated as the level of self-sufficiency decreases in the neighborhood.

In the city of Pittsburgh, there were 187,601 residents out of 304,280 (61%) who were over the age 16 and in the labor force. In 2000, there were 161,182 residents out of 275,396 (58.5%) age 16 and over who are in the labor force. There is a decrease of 2.5%. This again indicates that there are fewer people employed and more people receiving some sort of government subsidy. They are less self-sufficient.

In Pittsburgh and the neighborhood, there is no difference in the trend of employment. Both the city and the neighborhood suffered decreases in their level of employment. HOPE VI had very little impact in the neighborhood to overcome the trend of the city. Employment has decreased and government reliance has increased.

Employment provides several opportunities beyond higher income. Employment provides informal social networks that carry over into the neighborhood. Networking opportunities provide additional opportunities and resources to continue growth and stability. HOPE VI should increase the number of working adults and encourage interaction to promote a networking and mentoring environment between residents.

*Lessening the concentration of poverty*
Income, family size, and race are the basis of poverty. The type of housing and
affordability helps to delineate the concentration of poverty in one area or another.

HOPE VI intends to greatly reduce or eliminate poverty in order to promote a highly
marketable neighborhood and resident base. If poverty is less concentrated, the levels of
crime, violence, and racial disparity is also reduced providing a safer and healthier
community. The most important part of the neighborhood is the resident interaction. If
the residents do not want or are unable to interact, the neighborhood breaks down and
becomes a place to live in, destroy and from which to move on. Most indicators of this
goal are community sustainability based. The individual benefits, but the real question is
of the ability for the community to grow and flourish.

The first indicator is income. In this area, income has been determined by the
Census. The inflation rate has been measured using the “Inflation Calculator” from the
Department of Labor (DOL 2006). If HOPE VI is successful, the median income in the
community will increase. HOPE VI is not directly related to income, but provides
opportunity to find a job and use services that would allow for a higher median income
(Table 9).

In the New Orleans neighborhood, the median income for the area in 1990 was
$4,999. Adjusting for inflation, that is equivalent to $6,586 in 2000. The actual median
income in 2000 for the area was $8,594. There was an increase of $2,008 in the
neighborhood between 1990 and 2000.

In the city of New Orleans, the median income for the city in 1990 was $18,477.
Adjusting for inflation, that is equivalent to $24,344 in 2000. The actual median income
in 2000 was $32,338. There was an increase of $7,994 for the city between 1990 and 2000.

In the city of New Orleans and the neighborhood, the trend was an increase in income between 1990 and 2000. HOPE VI implementation in the area did not have an impact that can be attributed solely to the policy. The city had an increase and therefore the effects in the city may exist in the neighborhood.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, the median income for the area in 1990 was $5,770. Adjusting for inflation, that is equivalent to $7,602 in 2000. The actual median income for 2000 was $7,417. There was a decrease of $185 from 1990 to 2000, using 2000 dollar values.

In the city of Pittsburgh, the median income for the city in 1990 was $20,747. Adjusting for inflation, that is equivalent to $27,335 in 2000. The actual median income in 2000 was $28,588. There was an increase form 1990 to 2000 of $1,253

In the city of Pittsburgh, the trend was that income increased. In the neighborhood, however, the trend was for income to decrease. Because of this, HOPE VI has negatively affected the city. There is a reduction in income, not significantly; however, income has nonetheless decreased after the implementation of HOPE VI.

HOPE VI did very little in either neighborhood to increase income, in fact in the Pittsburgh neighborhood; the income decreased indicating a higher level of poverty and additional people who are not able to maintain adequately their households. HOPE VI was not successful for this social indicator meaning that poverty may still be concentrate in the area removing the ability for gentrification to take place. If people have
experienced a decrease in their income, they are less able to support any growth in the neighborhood.

The next indicator is family size. Family size is an individual empowerment indicator. The higher the number of family members, the more money the family uses for basic support and is taken away from non-essential endeavors. If the family size has decreased, the income necessary to support the family is reduced. Fewer family members to provide for allows more time to devote to community engagement and personal growth. HOPE VI, if successful, would reduce the average family size residing in the neighborhood. Fewer children exist because residents are working professionals who are less likely to have as many children at a younger age (Table 6).

In the New Orleans neighborhood, the average family size in 1990 was 3.5 people in 1,085 households. In 2000, the average family size was 4.3 people in 702 households. The average family sized increased by .8 people from 1990 to 2000.

In New Orleans, the average family size in 1990 was 2.6 people in 188,235 households. In 2000, the average family size was 3.2 people in 188, 251 households. The average family sized increased by .6 people from 1990 to 2000.

The trend in both the city of New Orleans and the neighborhood was an increase in the average family size. HOPE VI had no impact on slowing the trend of family size increase in the neighborhood. Family size is important in dictating poverty levels because of the number of people the income must maintain. The higher the number of family members the thinner the income must be stretched.
In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, the average family size in 1990 was 2.3 people in 1,528 households. In 2000, the average family size was 2.9 people in 627 households. The average family size increased by .6 people from 1990 to 2000.

In Pittsburgh, the average family size in 1990 was 2.4 people in 153,483 households. In 2000, the average family size was 3 people in 143,739 households. The average family size increased by .8 people from 1990 to 2000.

The trend in both the city of Pittsburgh and the neighborhood was for an increase in the average family size. Again, HOPE VI had no impact on the rising average family size in the neighborhood. Had HOPE VI been effective the average family size would have decreased in the neighborhood regardless of city trends.

HOPE VI in order to be successful should have decreased family size despite the rise in the family size in the city. Family size is not something that can be measured uniformly as each family has an ideal size and no one can dictate, however with income decreasing in the Pittsburgh neighborhood, an increase in family size makes it harder for a family to make ends meet and support its self. The increase in family size coupled with the decrease of income indicates a higher concentration of poverty as more people are living in poverty conditions.

The next indicator is racial diversity. As mentioned previously, African Americans tend to be more impoverished and segregated than other races. For community sustainability, there needs to be racial diversity. The neighborhood should be appealing to many different people to provide for different ideas and opportunities. Isolation creates feelings of hopelessness and the community suffers. HOPE VI should reduce the racial isolation to be successful (Table 8).
In the New Orleans neighborhood, in 1990, 96.9% of the population was African American or 3,688 people out of 3,807. Also in 1990, 2.7% were white or 103 people out of 3,807. In 2000, 2,433 (95.4%) people out of 2,551 are African American. There are 88 (3.4%) who are white. There was a decrease in the number of African Americans between 1990 and 2000 by 1.2%. The trend is to have a predominantly African American neighborhood which HOPE VI has had no impact in correcting, eliminating any racial diversity and in a sense diversity of any kind.

In the city of New Orleans, in 1990, 290,892 people out of 469,938 (61.9%) were African American and 164,008 (34.9%) are white. In 2000, 325,947 people out of 478,473 (68.1%) are African American and 135,156 (28.2%) are white. There was an increase in the number of African Americans in the city by 6.2%.

In both the city of New Orleans and the neighborhood, the number of African Americans increased. For HOPE VI to be successful, the number of African Americans and whites should become more evenly distributed. However, the number of African Americans is disproportionately higher in the neighborhood than the city, therefore indicating that HOPE VI was not successful in bringing racial diversity.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, in 1990, 3,460 people out of 3,523 (98.2%) were African American and 39 (1.1%) people were white. In 2000, 1,174 people out of 1,250 (93.9%) were African American, 77 (6.2%) are white, and 28 (1.9%) are of another race. There was a decrease in the number of African Americans by 4.3%, however more than 90% of the population is African American. The trend indicates that HOPE VI has had no impact on bringing diversity to the neighborhood.
In the city of Pittsburgh, in 1990, 102,395 people out of 369,879 (25.8%) were African American and 266,683 (72.1%) were white. In 2000, 93,904 people out of 334,563 (28.1%) are African American, 230,266 (68.8%) are white, and 10,393 (3.1%) are of another race. There was an increase in the number of African Americans by 2.3% between 1990 and 2000.

In both the city of Pittsburgh and the neighborhood, the number of African Americans increased. Again, HOPE VI was unsuccessful at bringing diversity into the neighborhood. Had HOPE VI been successful, the neighborhood would have been more closely matched to the city or at least more evenly distributed across races.

Race is an indicator that can cause some frustration with many people. There is no correct and perfect mix of races, however there should not be a huge part of the population of one race while the other is under-represented or non-existent. HOPE VI is successful if the races become more evenly distributed and diverse. HOPE VI failed miserably in both neighborhoods. While the city saw increases in African Americans, the overwhelming number of African Americans in each neighborhood makes the failure of HOPE VI very apparent. With this indicator more than any other, HOPE VI should have made improvements because there was almost nowhere to go but up. Public housing is traditionally black, to have the HOPE VI remain in a large majority black means that HOPE VI has had no effect and in fact is perpetuating an already deplorable situation. Gentrification, social capital, and collective efficacy has been shown to fail in black neighborhoods. HOPE VI should have had more of an impact than this.

The next indicator is poverty. In this instance, poverty is a community sustainability issue. If the neighborhood is impoverished, new people will not move in
and those who live there are less focused on the future of the area. They live there out of
necessity and not choice, as it is the only place they can afford. For HOPE VI to be
successful it will reduce if not eliminate poverty in the community and provide affordable
housing (Table 10).

<Table 10 about here>

In the New Orleans neighborhood, 3,843 households answered the question
regarding poverty in 1990. Of those, 3,319 (86%) were living in poverty. In 2000, 702
households were examined for poverty. Of those 371(70.3%) were residing in poverty.
The number of households in poverty decreased between 1990 and 2000, indicating
HOPE VI may have influenced poverty levels.

In New Orleans, there were 119,516 families in 1990 that were evaluated for
poverty. Of those, 32,616 (27%) were below the poverty line. Of those, 23,479(51%)
were living below the poverty line. In 2000, 188,251 households were evaluated for
poverty. Of those 26,988 (23.7%) live below the poverty line. Of those, 19,847(33%)
were below the poverty line. The city did not have an increase in the number of those
households living in poverty. The overall poverty rate has dropped by 3.3% from 1990 to
2000 for all families.

In the city of New Orleans and in the neighborhood, there was a decrease in the
number of households in poverty. The trend is for decreasing poverty in the area
regardless of the application of HOPE VI. HOPE VI may have decreased the number of
residents living in poverty however; the city also saw a general trend of decreasing
poverty.
In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, 1,049 families were evaluated for poverty in 1990. Of those, 786 (74%) were living in poverty. In 2000, 627 households were evaluated for poverty. Of those, 178 (28%) reside in poverty. The trend is a decrease in the number of families living in poverty from 1990 and 2000.

In Pittsburgh, there were 88,044 households evaluated for poverty in 1990. Of those 14,615 (16%) were living below the poverty line. Of those, 10,148 (38%) were living below the poverty line. In 2000, 143,739 households were evaluated for poverty. Of those 11,228 (7%) live below the poverty line. Of the total households, 74,104 were female-headed. There was not an increase in the number of those households living in poverty. The overall poverty rate has dropped by 9% from 1990 to 2000 for all households.

In the city of Pittsburgh and in the neighborhood, there was a decrease in the number of households in poverty. The trend is for poverty to be decreasing in the area regardless of the application of HOPE VI. The city saw a general trend of decreasing poverty, which would make HOPE VI less of a factor in the decrease of poverty in the neighborhood.

The final indicators are housing characteristics. The housing characteristics are affordability and ownership of the unit. Housing characteristics are the backbone of this research. Housing is HOPE VI. While the other indicators talk about the health of the neighborhood, these characteristics talk about the direct impact of HOPE VI. In all other areas HOPE VI may have provided an environment for change; in housing characteristics it is the change. If HOPE VI is successful, it increases the level of affordability and increases the number of homeowners (Table 5).
In the New Orleans neighborhood, 1,088 households responded to the housing characteristics question in 1990. Of those, 855 (78.6%) paid less than 30% of their income towards rent or mortgage and 40 (3.7%) owned the home they live in. In 2000, 702 households answered the question of housing characteristics. Of those 407 (58.9%) pay less than 30% of their income towards rent/mortgage and 47 (6.7%) own the home they live in. There was a 19.7% decrease in households living in affordable units and a 3% increase in homeowners in the neighborhood. The affordability decreased and there was a slight increase in the number of homeowners. HOPE VI was not successful in this neighborhood.

In New Orleans, 188,235 households responded to the housing characteristics question in 1990. Of those, 67,200 (35.7%) paid less than 30% of their income towards rent or mortgage and 73,412 (39%) owned the home they live in. In 2000, 188,251 households answered the question of housing characteristics. Of those 47,689 (47.5%) pay less than 30% of their income towards rent/mortgage and 74,407 (39.5%) own the home they live in. There was an 11.8% increase in households living in affordable units and a .5% increase in homeowners in the neighborhood.

In the city of New Orleans, the trend between 1990 and 2000 was for affordability and homeownership to increase dramatically. However, the trend in the neighborhood was for the affordability to decrease and for the homeownership also to increase, however not as dramatically as the city. HOPE VI would create more affordable units and have a higher number of homeowners had it been successful. Because the affordability...
decreased, people of lower incomes are living in the area and the number of subsidies has been decreased, as subsidies guarantee affordability.

In the Pittsburgh neighborhood, 1,528 households responded to the housing characteristics question in 1990. Of those, 999 (65.4%) paid less than 30% of their income towards rent or mortgage and 76 (5%) own the home they live in. In 2000, 627 households answered the question of housing characteristics. Of those 453 (48.5%) pay less than 30% of their income towards rent/mortgage and 83 (13.2%) owned the home they live in. There was a 16.9% decrease in households living in affordable units and an 8.2% increase in homeowners in the neighborhood. The affordability decreased and there was a slight increase in the number of homeowners. HOPE VI was not successful in this neighborhood.

In Pittsburgh, 153,483 households responded to the housing characteristics question in 1990. Of those, 56,482 (36.8%) paid less than 30% of their income towards rent or mortgage and 47,580 (31%) own the home they live in. In 2000, 143,739 households answered the question of housing characteristics. Of those 35,411 (51.5%) pay less than 30% of their income towards rent/mortgage and 66,598 (46.3%) owned the home they live in. There was a 14.7% increase in households living in affordable units and a 20.5% increase in homeowners in the neighborhood.

In the city of Pittsburgh, the trend was also an increase in affordability and homeownership between 1990 and 2000. In the neighborhood, the trend was a decrease in affordability and a slight increase in homeownership. Again, had HOPE VI been successful, the level of affordability would have increased and the homeownership would
have been more evenly distributed. HOPE VI failed in the neighborhood and had a negative trend compared to the city after the implementation of the policy.

HOPE VI should have made housing affordable and promoted a good mix of homeowners and renters in the community. In neither Pittsburgh nor New Orleans did this occur. A public housing development has all renters; HOPE VI has potential for both renters and homeowners and appeals to potential homeowners in the neighborhood. This did not occur in either neighborhood. The number of homeowners and affordability is important to promote long-term residency. If a person finds a nice affordable unit or decides to purchase a home, they are more likely to stay in the neighborhood.

Homeownership assumes responsibility in its very nature and affordability indicates that the income of the neighborhood supports rent of a certain amount. Again, HOPE VI has failed to meet goals that would promote social capital and collective efficacy. There is no connection to the neighborhood, if the resident does not decide to remain there for the long term.

**Projections**

The data in this section is analyzed using population projections. The population projections are a way to describe how the city and neighborhood had looked in 1990; the way it would have looked had the conditions from 1990 continued and what it does look like in 2000. The most important part of the data is the neighborhood projections between 1990 and 2000 where HOPEVI should have an impact. HOPE VI would be successful if the neighborhood did not progress as projected from 1990 to 2000. There should be more people in the neighborhood and the ages of those people should be more evenly distributed across all age ranges.
These population projections serve as a final methodological tool that provides a different perspective on the success or failure of HOPE VI. The projections are providing a constant for the neighborhood by looking at what happened in the city in that period and judging the amount of growth that has or has not occurred. Comparing that information to the neighborhood provides an idea of the change or lack of change in the neighborhood.

The neighborhood changes dramatically for the negative if there are a large increase in the number of children in the neighborhood, a reduction in the number of total residents, or an increase in the number of females residing in the neighborhood. The impact is negative if any of these occur because each would indicate a strain to the family structure to maintain their household. If the number of children increases while the number of adults between the age of 15 and 64 decrease or remains the same, it becomes difficult to provide adequately for every child. In addition, if migration decreases or remains constant, the population then begins to age in place. This aging population raises issues of elderly care that becomes burdensome to those individuals who are forced to meet their needs. An increase in the female population with a constant or decreasing male population would indicate an increase in female-headed households. A female-headed household as described previously has difficulty in maintaining their family, straining their resources.

HOPE VI affects the neighborhood population by attracting new residents, most of whom are single in the age range of 25-50. If the residents have a family, they may have one or two children. Having individuals or small families residing in the neighborhood is important to HOPE VI because they typically have more disposable
income and are more willing to become involved in community organizations as they have fewer family obligations. The population projection should indicate a growth in the number of residents age 25-50 in the neighborhood. The 25-50 year old age group is most heavily relied upon to earn wages and support those who are unable to support themselves. Having more residents in this age range than those outside of this age range reduces the burden experienced in the neighborhood to support residents.

The age range is key to success in HOPE VI. The young professional is the target population for HOPE VI communities who are able to establish the groundwork for gentrification, neighborhood expansion and social capital. Without a significant increase in this age range at the same time that the number of children is constant or growing, HOPE VI is less than effective. An increase in the number of children typically indicates an increase in family obligations. The family has more activities that each child is involved in, therefore leaving less time to focus on the rebirth and rebuilding of their community. When a parent’s attention is spread across several children who need their attention and care on a daily basis, in addition to the parent’s work and household responsibility, the neighborhood will usually come last to the family. HOPE VI grows because of neighbor interaction. If every household has several children, the isolation that HOPE VI is targeting becomes as significant as it was in public housing.

The data presented below is presented in a way that mirrors the development of the necessary components of MOVE-POP, the projection worksheet. The pyramid will provide a visual representation of the population and establish what the neighborhoods and cities looked like in both 1990 and 2000. The migration worksheet provides information on how the neighborhood and city residents migrated in or out of the area.
These two pieces of information coupled with fertility and mortality will be used to project what the population should have looked like in 2000 based on 1990 trends in MOVE-POP.

The first piece of data is population pyramids. The pyramid serves as a graphic representation of the age/sex structure in the neighborhoods and city. The pyramid should be rectangular shaped indicating a near equal fertility and mortality rate with near equal numbers of males and females. The population pyramid also provides dependency ratios, which indicate the number of dependents in the area. The pyramids also provide very specific information regarding the age sex ratios. The information contained in this worksheet provides comparisons between males and females and across age groups. The ideal pyramid would include an equal number of males and females, indicating a high number of two-parent households and equal burden sharing and providing for the family. In addition to the sex ratio, the age range discussed of 25-50, the target for HOPE VI should be equal to or larger than all other age groups combined. Ideally, the pyramid is a perfect rectangle. Both men and women across all sexes have near proportional representation in the area studied.

The data from the pyramid is analyzed using a term called the dependency ratio. The dependency ratio is determined by dividing the number of individuals who are outside of the 15-64 year old age range by the number who is in the age range. The dependency ratio determines the number of individuals each person has to support with their income. The average US city has a dependency ratio of about .55. A third world country traditionally has a dependency ratio well above .70. The third world country has a high fertility and mortality rate. The high fertility and mortality rates are the basis for
the pyramid. The base (fertility) is large and it tapers quickly to the top (mortality)
forming a pyramid. Up until recent decades, the pyramid shape represented all fertility
and mortality around the world. Today it continues to represent third world countries.
Developed countries have more of a rectangular shape as the fertility and mortality rates
slow with development (Weeks 2002). The rectangular shape is what the neighborhood
is striving for with the application of HOPE VI.

The following data is for 1990 for each city and neighborhood. In tract 81.01
(New Orleans), there were 3,807 people and there are more women than men (Graph 1
New Orleans Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid 1990). The dependency ratio is 1.11. A
dependency ratio this high indicates that there are on average more than one person who
is dependent, or outside of the 15-64 age range compared to those who within that range.
This makes it very difficult for the independent ratio to support themselves, their family,
and their other obligations as well as focus on the neighborhood. More men than women
indicate a higher likelihood of female-headed households.

<Graph 1 about here>

In tract 510 (Pittsburgh), there were 3,513 people and there are more women than
men (Graph 2 Pittsburgh Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid 1990). The dependency ratio
is .87. This is also a very high dependency ratio. The ratio of dependent to independent
residents is nearly one to one. Every independent resident in the age range of 15-64 has
at least one dependent. The ratio is higher than it seems because not every person
between 15 and 64 is in the work force earning an income.

<Graph 2 about here>
In New Orleans, there were 484,674 people and the number of males and females are nearly equally distributed (Graph 3 New Orleans Age/Sex Pyramid 1990). The dependency ratio is .51. The dependency ratio is typical for an American city. Each independent resident age 15-64 is responsible for about one half the number of people as in the New Orleans neighborhood.

In Pittsburgh, there were 333,524 and the number of men and women were nearly equally distributed (Graph 4 Pittsburgh Age/Sex Pyramid 1990). The dependency ratio is .53. Again, this dependency ratio is typical to an American city. The independent resident is responsible for about half the number of dependents as compared to the Pittsburgh neighborhood.

The data from 1990 indicates that the cities each had a well distributed population across both sexes and were able to maintain a manageable level of dependence. It is important to maintain this level of dependence because when the dependency ratio increases it becomes more difficult to support the family financially.

In the neighborhoods prior to HOPE VI both were above third world levels in their dependency ratios, meaning that both had more people who were dependent than are typically found in third world countries. As an example, Weeks uses Nigeria as an example of a third world country with a traditional pyramid shaped age/sex ratio. In Nigeria, the dependency ratio is .92 according to Weeks. Nigeria is one of the highest fertility nations in the world (Weeks 2002). The New Orleans neighborhood had more people who were dependent than who were working to support the family. Worse than
having more dependents than independents, the New Orleans neighborhood has a higher fertility and mortality rate than the highest third country. Because of this, their resources are being exhausted by proving food, clothing, and shelter to their family. The residents have no expendable income to use for any other purpose. HOPE VI should correct this statistic in 2000 if successful. The Pittsburgh neighborhood is not quite as dismal; however, they do have a very high dependence rate as well. The Pittsburgh neighborhood is nearly equal to the Nigerian situation in terms of fertility and mortality. Not good, but better than the New Orleans neighborhood at this time. In addition, the number of females far out number the number of males, meaning there are more female-headed households in the neighborhood, causing greater financial strain, and typically an increase in poverty. HOPE VI should correct these issues.

The next dataset developed is on migration. The neighborhood should be attracting new residents with the implementation of HOPE VI. The HOPE VI development’s goals intended to provide new housing options for people who did not reside in the neighborhood previously. These migration data sets as presented below are used to complete the projection worksheets. These data sets are collected form the city and the neighborhood from 1990 and 2000 to determine inward or outward migration.

For New Orleans, there were 1,617 residents age 10 and older who moved into or out of the tract at any given period (Graph 5 Migration in the City of New Orleans). The data is collected by entering 1990 data for both the city and the tract in to the worksheet as well as by entering the 2000 data for the same.

<Graph 5 about here>
For Pittsburgh, the net migration for the tract is 2,123 people age 10 and over between 1990 and 2000 (Graph 6 Migration in the City of Pittsburgh). The cities each experienced a loss of net migration between 1990 and 2000, indicating that people are moving out of the city.

The population pyramid and migration programs assist in the completion of the population projection worksheet, MOVE-POP (Census 2005). MOVE-POP is useful to determine how the community should have changed over time. The comparison helps determine the way the city and neighborhood is growing. HOPE VI should promote growth and changes to the age/sex ratio. Growth should be stimulated and the changes should represent an increase in the number of independent residents and a decrease of female-headed households. If the projections and the actual outcomes are similar, the demographics of age, sex, and household size holds constant when discussing the descriptive social indicators mentioned previously.

The data below represents the population projections for the neighborhood and city from 1990 to 2000. The trend dictates the base line for what HOPE VI accomplished in the neighborhood. If the projection indicates that the population did not change in a significant way, but the actual values show that it did, HOPE VI is successful. The city data helps to control the neighborhood, if the city had a similar trend as the neighborhood HOPE VI may not be the reason for any change.

For tract 81.01 (New Orleans) the projected population in 2000 is 3,284 people, with 1,321 males and 1,963 females. For tract 510, the projected population for 2000 is 2,223, with 861 males and 1,362 females. For New Orleans, the estimated total
population for 2000 is 500,834 with 232,693 males and 268,141 females. For Pittsburgh, the estimated total population for 2000 is 312,985, with 149,275 males and 163,710 females.

The projected figures for each city and neighborhood for 2000 are included below. This data represents population growth trends most likely to have occurred in the absence of a HOPE VI plan. In tract 81.01, there should have been 3,284 people in 2000, with more females than males (Graph 7 New Orleans Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid Projected 2000). The dependency ratio would have remained 1.03.

<Graph 7 about here>

In tract 510, there would have been 2,223 residents with more females than males (Graph 8 Pittsburgh Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid Projected 2000). The dependency ratio would have been .87.

<Graph 8 about here>

In New Orleans, there would have been 500,834 residents, with a nearly equally distributed population of male and female (Graph 13 New Orleans Age/Sex Pyramid Projected 2000). The dependency ratio would have been .56.

<Graph 9 about here>

In Pittsburgh, there would have been 312,985 residents, with a near equally distributed population of male and female (Graph 14 Pittsburgh Age/Sex Pyramid Projected 2000). The dependency ratio would have been .53.

<Graph 10 about here>

The neighborhoods and cities would not have changed in any significant way between 1990 and 2000 using projection data. With the implementation of HOPE VI, the
neighborhood dependence levels and male/female distributions should begin to look similar to those found in the city.

The following data provides information about what actually happened in the neighborhoods and cities in 2000. If HOPE VI is successful the data will reflect a decrease in the dependency ratios from third world levels to the levels found in the United States.

In tract 81.01, there are 2,481 individuals with more females than males (Graph 11 Tract New Orleans Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid 2000). The dependency ratio is .76. Although the dependency ratio remains high, it has decreased significantly indicating that the population is more evenly distributed across age categories. The graphic representation shows the sex ratio and the disproportionate number of females to males.

<Graph 11 about here>

In Tract 510, there are 1,238 people with more females than males (Graph 12 Pittsburgh Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid 2000). The dependency ratio is .69. Again, like the New Orleans neighborhood, the dependency ratio has gone down to near normal levels. It remains higher than it should be, however the residents is more evenly distributed across the age groups. The sex ratio remains disproportionate with more women than men.

<Graph 12 about here>

In the city of New Orleans, there are 484,674 residents near equally distributed across sexes (Graph 13 New Orleans Age/Sex Pyramid 2000). Of that total, the ratio of dependent to working age is .51.
In the city of Pittsburgh, there are 333,524 residents with a near equal distribution of sexes (Graph 14 Pittsburgh Age/Sex Pyramid 2000). The dependency ratio is .53.

HOPE VI should create a neighborhood converges towards the population distribution of the overall city, in shape and age structure. The neighborhood should have a low dependent ratio and should have fertility and mortality rates that are near equal to one another. Such demographic shifts towards the general demographic structure of the constituent cities would mean that these neighborhoods are not burdened with families unable to support themselves because of the high number of dependents. One important goal established by HOPE VI is to equalize the playing field and remove some of this burden from the families, allowing them the freedom to pursue other goals. As the above data shows, HOPE VI did not create a better place, but in fact allowed the problem to continue. In order to achieve a healthy population structure, HOPE VI should also encourage a near equal number of males and females. From the data presented above, HOPE VI decreased the prevalence of female-head of households in each neighborhood. Even so, neither neighborhood is close to the average range for US cities in general or these two cities specifically.

CONCLUSIONS

The overall conclusions for HOPE VI are mixed. The program has solid goals and is making progress in addressing the needs of the residents. However, implementation seems to be hit or miss. The neighborhoods do not seem to be clearly improving as would be expected if HOPE VI had been a major success.
There aspects of community that HOPE VI has clearly not improved. One area is racial diversity. Clearly, there is a need to encouragement of racial diversity, perhaps by getting informed groups to determine what would make the neighborhood more appealing to other household types in terms of race, education, employment, and income. By allowing for community and resident input on these subjects HOPE VI would have an increased chance for success by catering to the residents it is trying to attract.

The federal government’s support for HOPE VI is mixed. President Bush has attempted to eliminate HOPE VI from the housing budget for the past three years. The Senate, however, supports HOPE VI and continues to fund it. Of those in the housing field, the reaction is also mixed. The principle of HOPE VI and the goals the policy has are sound; the execution is not.

Several issues are not addressed within this research. The scope is meant to address neighborhood changes and not social or political reaction. The neighborhoods have had a physical change in the properties within it; however, they do not have the social changes that have been measured through various indicators that would build a healthy neighborhood.

HOPE VI has failed to create healthy neighborhoods. Physical change does not necessarily bring healthy neighborhoods; however, it may set the scene for change. The same can be said for HOPE VI in general. Although money has been spent to change the physical structure, there is no evidence this has resulted in a better social climate in these neighborhoods. More needs to be done for HOPE VI to accomplish its goals quickly and with great success. It has not been shown with this research.
We know what HOPE VI should be; we know what it is not. What we do not know is how to fix the problems. This research has shown that HOPE VI is ineffectual in changing neighborhood conditions. Residents do not see an improvement great enough to commit to make changes to their neighborhood. The federal government wants to zero out or eliminate funding for it. This indicates that Hope VI is a failed policy. HOPE VI has the potential to be great and has the right fundamental ideas to make important sociological changes. However, we now know that HOPE VI breaks down between its conception and execution. A significant reason for this breakdown is that the community cannot change if the residents are not involved and if the residents do not care about community development. In both neighborhoods in Pittsburgh and New Orleans, this was the case. The residents did not care about nor were involved in community development.

One reason for this is lack of community engagement is that HOPE VI shows a fundamental lack of concern as to how the former public housing residents fit into a gentrified community, and how these residents sustain themselves while waiting to return home. To bring someone into a neighborhood that is gentrified and diverse when the resident is used to seeing poor black faces will create personal insecurity, and isolation. These feeling can be overwhelming and often lead to a retreat from community involvement. The government and HUD seem to be unaware or uncaring of this fact. An additional factor creating this civic disengagement is that HOPE VI provides few mechanisms for ownership for former residents. People do not understand the policy therefore are less open to moving into it, and those remaining are the former residents who cannot make changes to their situation with what they have.
A future research endeavor could follow a cohort of former housing development residents through a new city and community to monitor their progress over time as HOPE VI is implemented and established in their former neighborhood to determine their experience. It would also be beneficial to return to Pittsburgh and New Orleans to determine if the initial trend indicators have changed or if the trends continue. If so, the new neighborhood will resemble the former public housing development, only millions of dollars more expensive and a hundred times more alienating.
### Table 1.
A Summary of Social Indicators for the HOPE VI Goal of Positive Incentive and Self Sufficiency: US Census 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Impact on Community or Individual</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td>Residence in 1985 and 1995 (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 2, DP2; Census 2000 Summary File 4, DP2)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Number of new residents and those who have invested in the city/neighborhood long term</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income Source</td>
<td>Income source (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 3, DP4; 2000 Census Summary File 4, DP3)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Source of income to determine the necessity of a subsidy and level of financial independence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>% living in poverty (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 3, DP4; Census 2000 Summary File 4, DP3)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Number of residents living in poverty relate the level of independence and the ability to sustain new community investment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed Household</td>
<td># Female-headed Household (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 1, DP1; Census 2000 Summary File 1, QTP10)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Female-headed Households have less income and tend to live in poverty more often, indicating less of an ability to sustain household</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td># people 25 and older who completed at least some college (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 3, DP4; Census 2000 Summary File 4, DP2)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Provides information on the marketability of resident and their ability to get a higher paying job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td># people 16 and older who are able to work (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 3, DP3; Census 2000 Summary File 4, DP3)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>Provides information on the number of individuals capable of working and who do work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 2.

A Summary of Social Indicators for the HOPE VI Goal of Lessening the Concentration of Poverty because of HOPE VI: US Census 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Impact on the Community or Individual</th>
<th>Concepts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Income</strong></td>
<td><strong>Family Income</strong> (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 3, DP4; Census 2000 Summary File 4, DP3)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>Higher income leads to less poverty and ability to sustain neighborhood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Family Size</strong></td>
<td><strong>Family Size</strong> (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape, PO17A; Census 2000 Summary File 4, QTP10)</td>
<td>Individual</td>
<td>The larger the family the higher the income needs to be to provide basic needs adequately</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Race</strong></td>
<td><strong>Race of family</strong> (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 1, DP1; Census 2000 Summary File 1, QTP5)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>The concentration of any race promotes like thinking and in many cases coupled with poverty an increase of violence</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Poverty</strong></td>
<td>% residing in poverty (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 3, DP4; Census 2000 Summary File 4, DP3)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>If many people reside in poverty in one neighborhood there is a high concentration and less opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% rent paid</strong></td>
<td><strong>Contract rent and median income</strong> (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 1, DP1; Census 2000 Summary File 1, QTH1)</td>
<td>Community and Individual</td>
<td>Affordable units provide for the ability to use resources for other purposes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeownership</strong></td>
<td><strong>Owner occupied</strong> (Source: 1990 Census Summary File Tape 1, DP1; Census 2000 Summary File 1, QTH1)</td>
<td>Community</td>
<td>A high number of homeowners indicates investment in the neighborhood and high levels of collective efficacy</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3. 
Subsidy Details of Housing Developments after the Application of HOPE VI: 
Housing Authority New Orleans and Housing Authority City of Pittsburgh, 2006

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans Number of Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Pittsburgh Number of Units</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Income Housing Tax Credit</td>
<td>182</td>
<td>19.8%</td>
<td>462</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subsidized (Section 8 Voucher)</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>11.7%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair Market Rent Based</td>
<td>626</td>
<td>68.4%</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>915</td>
<td>99.9%</td>
<td>632</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: HANO and Oak Hill Management (2006)
### Table 4.

**Household Size for All Geographic Areas: US Census, 1990 and 2000**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans Neighborhood</th>
<th>Pittsburgh Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188,251</td>
<td>143,739</td>
<td>702</td>
<td>627</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>484,674</td>
<td>334,563</td>
<td>2,551</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188,235</td>
<td>153,483</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Population</strong></td>
<td>496,938</td>
<td>369,879</td>
<td>3,807</td>
<td>3,523</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.
Housing Characteristics: Migration, Affordability, Homeownership: US Census
2000 and 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans Neighborhood</th>
<th>Pittsburgh Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2000</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migration (Same house in 1995)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>256,551</td>
<td>250,867</td>
<td>438</td>
<td>453</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>56.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>48.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>484,674</td>
<td>496,938</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability (&lt; 30% income)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>47,689</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>299</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>74.4%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>58.9%</td>
<td>38.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Homeownership (Own home reside in)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>74,407</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>39.5%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>13.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>188,251</td>
<td>188,235</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans Neighborhood</th>
<th>Pittsburgh Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Migration (Same house in 1985)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>250,867</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>855</td>
<td>999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>78.6%</td>
<td>65.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total residents</td>
<td>496,938</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>1,088</td>
<td>1,528</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affordability (&lt;30% income)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Count</td>
<td>67,200</td>
<td>73,412</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total households</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 6.

**Average Family Size: US Census, 2000 and 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans Neighborhood</th>
<th>Pittsburgh Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>2000</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td><strong>2.9</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>188,251</strong></td>
<td><strong>143,739</strong></td>
<td><strong>702</strong></td>
<td><strong>627</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1990</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td><strong>2.3</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td><strong>190,229</strong></td>
<td><strong>155,310</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,085</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,528</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 7.

**Total Number of Female-headed Households: US Census, 2000 and 1990**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans Neighborhood</th>
<th>Pittsburgh Neighborhood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female Headed Households</td>
<td>58,604</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31,581</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>482</td>
<td>68.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>242</td>
<td>38.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Female Headed Households</td>
<td>129,834</td>
<td>68.8</td>
<td>111,969</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>220</td>
<td>31.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>385</td>
<td>61.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188,834</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>143,550</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>702</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>627 (100)</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Count</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Headed Households</td>
<td>32,339</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>15,531</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>777</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>702</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non Female Headed Household</td>
<td>157,890</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>139,779</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,085</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>826</td>
<td>54.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>190,229</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>155,310</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,528</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 8.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>325,947</td>
<td>68.1</td>
<td>93,904</td>
<td>28.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>135,156</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>230,266</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17,310</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10,393</td>
<td>3.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>478,413</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>334,563</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American</td>
<td>290,892</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>102,395</td>
<td>25.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>266,683</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>266,683</td>
<td>72.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>15,038</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>801</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>469,938</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>369,879</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 9


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$32,338</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>$28,588</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>75.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>72.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>142,744</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>104,142</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social</td>
<td>14,637</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8,977</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>10,196</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7,916</td>
<td>15.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>20,788</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>22,717</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188,365</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>143,752</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>$18,477</td>
<td>83.8</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>157,741</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>122,786</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>19,953</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>21,948</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Welfare</td>
<td>10,541</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>8,749</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 10.

Total Number of Households Living in Poverty: US Census, 2000 and 1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>26,988 14%</td>
<td>11,228 7%</td>
<td>371 52%</td>
<td>178 28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Poverty</td>
<td>161,263 86%</td>
<td>132,453 93%</td>
<td>331 48%</td>
<td>449 72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>188,251 100%</td>
<td>143,739 100%</td>
<td>702 100%</td>
<td>627 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1990

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
<td>Count %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poverty</td>
<td>32,616 27%</td>
<td>14,615 16%</td>
<td>843 86%</td>
<td>786 73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Poverty</td>
<td>86,900 73%</td>
<td>73,429 84%</td>
<td>128 14%</td>
<td>263 27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>119,516 100%</td>
<td>88,044 100%</td>
<td>971 100%</td>
<td>1,049 100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 11.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2000</td>
<td>213,819</td>
<td>57.8</td>
<td>161,182</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>535</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>282</td>
<td>34.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out of labor force</td>
<td>156,319</td>
<td>42.2</td>
<td>114,214</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>1,011</td>
<td>63.4</td>
<td>532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>370,138</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>275,396</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,546</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>814</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>222,381</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>187,601</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>461</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>838</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Out of labor force</td>
<td>152,790</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>116,679</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>1,431</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>1400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>375,171</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>304,280</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,892</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2,238</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate percentage
Table 12.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s degree or higher</td>
<td>154,013</td>
<td>51.2</td>
<td>106,174</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>233</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree or less</td>
<td>146,555</td>
<td>48.8</td>
<td>112,639</td>
<td>51.5</td>
<td>949</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>300,568</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>218,813</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,031</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
<th></th>
<th>New Orleans</th>
<th></th>
<th>Pittsburgh</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s Degree or higher</td>
<td>135,968</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>93,016</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate’s degree of less</td>
<td>167,715</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>151,792</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>1,141</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>1,325</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>303,683</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>244,808</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,283</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1,649</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Note: Numbers in parentheses indicate percentages

Table 13.
Summary Description of Hypothesis and Social Indicators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Improvement/Decline</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Orleans and</td>
<td>New Orleans</td>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pittsburgh</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Migration</td>
<td></td>
<td>High number of out migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordability</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Homeownership</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Size</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Family size increased</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female-headed</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Household</td>
<td></td>
<td>There was a decrease in racial diversity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td>Decline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>Decline</td>
<td>Improvement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Graph 1: New Orleans Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid 1990

Source: Census 1990 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet
Graph 2: Pittsburgh Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid 1990

Source: Census 1990 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet
Graph 3: New Orleans Age/Sex Pyramid 1990

Source: Census 1990 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet
Graph 4: Pittsburgh Age/Sex Pyramid 1990

Source: Census 1990 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet
Graph 5: Migration in the City of New Orleans

Source: Census 1990 and 2000 PAS CSR-MIG Worksheet
Graph 6: Migration in the City of Pittsburgh from 1990 to 2000

Source: Census 1990 and 2000 PAS CSR-MIG Worksheet
Graph 7: New Orleans Age/Sex Pyramid Projected 2000

Source: Census 2000 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet, data collected from MOVE-POP worksheet
Graph 8: Pittsburgh Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid Projected 2000

Source: Census 2000 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet, data collected from MOVE-POP worksheet
Graph 9: New Orleans Age/Sex Pyramid Projected 2000

Source: Census 2000 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet, data collected from MOVE-POP worksheet
Graph 10: Pittsburgh Age/Sex Pyramid Projected 2000

Source: Census 2000 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet, data from MOVE-POP worksheet
Graph 11: New Orleans Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid 2000

Source: Census 2000 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet
Graph 12: Pittsburgh Neighborhood Age/Sex Pyramid 2000

Source: Census 2000 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet
Graph 13: New Orleans Age/Sex Pyramid 2000

Source: Census 2000 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet
Graph 14: Pittsburgh Age/Sex Pyramid 2000

Source: Census 2000 PAS PYRAMID Worksheet
APPENDIX

Variable Names and Definitions

Calculation of variables from raw Census data to usable research data:
**All Census data can be retrieved at www.census.gov

Migration

For each area, the number of people who lived in the same house in both 1985 and 1995 was used as well as the Census given number of households asked. The percentage was calculated by the Census. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 3 Table DP2. For 2000 data, see Summary File 4 Table DP2.

Income Source

For each area, the number of people who collected each source of income out of the total number who responded. Census percentage and data used. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 3 Table DP4. For 2000 data, see Summary File 4 Table DP3.

Female-Headed Household

For each area, the number of families who responded that they were female-headed out of the total number of families who responded. Census percentage and data used. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 1 Table DP1. For 2000 data, see Summary File 1 Table QTP10.

Poverty

For each area, the number of people who collected each source of income out of the total number who responded. Census percentage and data used. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 3 Table DP4. For 2000 data, see Summary File 4 Table DP3.

Education

For each area, the numbers of people age 25 and over were manually added. The number who responded to the education question indicating at least some college or higher. The number of some college or higher was divided by the number of people 25 and over for the percentage. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 3 Table DP2. For 2000 data, see Summary File 4 Table DP2.

Employment
For each area, the numbers of people age 16 and over were manually added. The number who responded to the employment question indicating they are in the work force was divided by the number of individuals 16 and older for the percentage. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 3 Table DP3. For 2000 data, see Summary File 4 Table DP3.

Income

For each area, the Census given median income was used for this question and the total households who answered the question. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 3 Table DP4. For 2000 data, see Summary File 4 Table DP3

Family Size

For each area, the Census average family size was used and the total households who answered the question. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 1 Table PO17A. For 2000 data, see Summary File 4 Table QTP10.

Race

For each area, the number of African Americans and white people as reported by the Census, all others were manually added for the other category out of total responding to question. Census percentage used for AA and W. Other total divided by total respondents. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 1 Table DP1. For 2000 data, see Summary File 1 Table QTP5

Housing Characteristics

Homeownership: For each area, the number of people who own their home out of the total number who responded. Census percentage used.

30% income: This indicator had several sources. First, the median income of the area was collected, that income was divided by 12 to get a monthly average. The monthly average was multiplied by 30%. The 30% mark was used to determine affordability for the area. The approximated 30% income was used to examine the cash rent response. All those falling below the approximated 30% income was added together to get the total for affordability. The total was then divided by the total of respondents to find the percentage. For 1990 data, see Summary File Tape 1 Table DP1. For 2000 data, see Summary File 1 Table QTH1.
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