

HOPE VI: A Study of Housing and Neighborhood Satisfaction

By

John Gilderbloom, Ph.D.

Michael D. Brazley, Ph.D., AIA

and

Zhenfeng Pan

School of Urban and Public Affairs

426 West Bloom Street

University of Louisville

Louisville Kentucky 40208

502 852-8557

Email: jgilde02@sprynet.com

Reprinted from Sustain: A Journal of Environmental and Sustainability Issues Issue 11
(Fall/Winter 2005)

ABSTRACT

How satisfied are residents with HUD's HOPE VI development? Despite the billions of dollars spent, very little is known about HOPE VI residential satisfaction. Residents stated that when compared to their previous housing and neighborhood, they have greater satisfaction with the HOPE VI development. The majority of residents surveyed stated that when compared to their previous environment, they have greater satisfaction with HOPE VI's housing and neighborhood. Residents expressed satisfaction with neighborhood schools, places of worship, public transportation, childcare, medical services, employment, housing, street lighting, cleanliness of area, adult and child recreation, location, and safety of neighborhood. These attitudes were consistent for both public housing and non-public housing residents. Residents did have concerns with adult and child recreational opportunities, with nearly half showing disapproval of these amenities.

INTRODUCTION TO THE PROBLEM

This paper evaluates resident's satisfaction with HOPE VI's Park DuValle Revitalization Project, Louisville Kentucky. The HOPE VI program is not another 'brick and mortar' project; but new and different because it involves physical and social planning to improve both resident and neighborhood. The physical planning portion of Louisville's Park DuValle HOPE VI Program involves: demolishing a existing public housing community of 1,116 families; building a New Urbanism Community of 1,273 families; relocating original public housing residents back into their neighborhood as both renters and homeowners; and attracting mixed-income non-public housing residents into the original neighborhood as both renters and homeowners.

The social planning portion involves providing public housing residents the opportunity to receive self-sufficiency services whether they move to HOPE VI replacement units, choose Section 8 housing, or choose traditional public housing. Services include but are not limited to case management, employment and career training, computer training, GED training, youth activities, childcare, family health services, and health insurance for children.

The importance of doing such a study is critical because of the enormous potential costs and/or benefits to: human capital; implications for research, theory, and public housing policy; and as a local economic development tool. The central questions addressed are: is HOPE VI achieving its stated objectives; and what is the impact of the HOPE VI environment on residential satisfaction.

NARRATIVE HISTORY OF HOPE VI

In 1989, the U.S. Congress, in the Department of Housing and Urban Development Reform Act, established the 'National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing' to study distressed public housing and make recommendations on how to better the situation by the year 2000. In 1992, the National Commission on Severely Distressed Public Housing completed their study, citing six percent (6%) of public housing (approximately 86,000 units) as uninhabitable (HUD, 2000).

Congress crafted legislation they thought would overhaul and "save public housing". Senator Mikulski, Chairwoman of the Appropriations Housing and Urban Development Subcommittee, introduced into fiscal year 1993 appropriations, \$300 million, for the funding of a public housing revitalization program that would demolish uninhabitable public housing, replacing them with renovated and new human scaled units, and providing social services to residents (Twohey, 2000, pp. 1279). The HOPE VI program proposed to demolish 115,000 public units, replacing them with 60,000 new or rehabilitated units; a shortfall of over 55,000 public housing units. The legislation for the Urban Revitalization Demonstration (URD) program was passed by Congress, has had annual appropriations until 2004 F.Y., and has become known as 'Homeownership and Opportunity for People Everywhere' (HOPE VI); a program creating mixed-income communities of hope. The HOPE VI program has five main objectives: (1) change the physical shape of public housing; (2) reduce concentrations of poverty; (3) provide support services to public housing residents; (4) maintain high standards of personal responsibility; and (5) form private/public partnerships for project completion.

MEASURES OF RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION

The measurement and operationalization of “residential satisfaction” is one of the goals of this study. Rosenbaum (1995) well-known study of residential satisfaction, the Gautreaux study, found that public housing residents preferred living in the suburbs than in inner city housing projects. It was also found that the closer relatives and friends are to the new housing, the more residential satisfaction will improve (Galster and Hesser, 1981; Hourihan, 1984). Kinsey and Lane (1983), contend that the amount of space of a dwelling unit directly relates to residential satisfaction. Hanna and Lindmood (1979) state that the number of rooms, size of home, inside and outside appearances, amount of storage, and utility cost were found to directly relate to residential satisfaction.

Rainwater (1966) argues that housing standards and i.e. satisfaction vary by social class in which the poor have a real concern with crime. Galster believes that the level of satisfaction a resident expresses on a survey is related to the apartment or house meeting expectations (Galster, 1985, 1987; Galster and Hesser, 1981). Galster (1987) contends that the elderly will experience greater satisfaction with their homes than younger homeowners.

And homeowners expressed greater satisfaction than those living in apartments (Varady, Walker, and Wang, 2001; William Rohe and Michael Stegman, 1994, Gilderbloom and Appelbaum, 1988). Varady contend that the following factors explain variations in housing satisfaction thru direct or indirect effects: relocation counseling; perceived neighborhood safety; satisfaction with the housing search; location; median neighborhood housing values; living in a house; a high rent burden; welfare assistance; being unemployed (inverse); being divorced; being married (inverse); and age

(inverse)(Varady, Walker, and Wang, 2001, pp. 1299). Therefore efforts to treat 'housing satisfaction' as a simple dependent variable are a mistake (Birks and Southan, 1992, pp. 304).

Neighborhood satisfaction is also a complex and multidimensional process involving location and housing characteristics, safety, proximity of family and friends, and the emotional well being of the residents themselves (Galster and Hesser, 1981). Fried (1982) contends that characteristics such as age, education, income, social class, and household density have a direct correlation with neighborhood satisfaction.

SCATTERED-SITE PUBLIC HOUSING and RESIDENTIAL SATISFACTION

David Varady and Wolfgang Preiser use three quantifiers to define the term "scattered-site housing": (1) the number of units at the site, which may range from two to a few hundred; (2) structures, usually ranging from garden apartments, duplexes, townhouses, or single-family detached houses; and, 3) deconcentration of units away from high density, low-income minority populations (1998, pp. 190). Varady and Preiser's definition of scattered-site housing, and the HOPE VI program, are one and the same.

In 1987 Francescato, Weidemann, and Anderson, completed one of the most sophisticated and largest surveys to date on 'residential satisfaction in HUD assisted housing'. The survey covered 37 HUD housing developments including 10 public housing projects. "The authors found no relationship between satisfaction on the one hand and project height, size, and density on the other. The implication is that residents of scattered-

site housing are not necessarily more satisfied than are residents of traditional family developments” (Varady and Preiser, 1998, pp. 190).

Burby and Rohe (1989) argue that the deconcentration of public housing increases residential satisfaction and reduces the fear of crime. Research on the Gautreaux program in Chicago (Rosenbaum and Popkin, 1990; Rosenbaum 1993, 1995) proves that individuals in public housing benefit from scattered-site housing through better employment for adults and better educational opportunities for children. The results of the Gautreaux program also disprove the “culture of poverty model”, while providing legitimacy to the “geography of opportunity model” (Galster and Killen, 1995). Fisher (1991), Varady and Preiser (1998) contend that public housing residents who move to the suburbs in scattered-site housing are more satisfied than those residents who decided to remain in public housing.

Scattered-site housing is the model for the “geography of opportunity hypothesis”. Advocates argue that public housing residents living in scattered-site housing have higher levels of residential satisfaction; access to better schools and jobs; lessened fear of crime; and the cultural enrichment of exposure to more diverse populations (Burby and Rohe, 1989; Rosenbaum and Popkin, 1991; Rosenbaum, 1995; Rosenbaum and Harris, 2001; Rosenbaum and Popkin, 1990; Rosenbaum, 1991; Kingsley and Tatian, 1997; Briggs, 1997, 1998; Briggs, Xavier, Darden, and Aidala, 1999).

David Varady and Wolfgang Preiser’s study of housing satisfaction in public housing units, found that approximately three-fourths of the individuals living in scattered-site single-family detached homes, clustered scattered-site housing, and traditional public housing,

were satisfied with their homes (1998, pp. 201). Varady and Preiser argue that 'home satisfaction' is influenced by maintenance of the unit, the surrounding neighborhood, crime, neighborhood social interaction, resident involvement in decision making, and the quality of the home (1998, pp. 203). The research has proved that 'residential satisfaction' is based more on environmental influences than the home.

A NARRATIVE HISTORY OF PARK DUVALLE

African Americans first occupied the area in Western Louisville that is now known as 'Park DuValle' in the 1880's. The area was called 'Little Africa' and was thought to be the black section of Parkland, a Louisville suburb. In the late 1940s 'Little Africa' was razed by urban renewal and a public housing project built in 1952, named after educator and noted poet Joseph Cotter Sr. Another public-housing project, Lang Homes, was built in the same area a few years later in 1958 (Jones, 1999).

Cotter and Lang Homes established an enormous area of low-income housing for families that were both socially and physically isolated from the rest of the Park DuValle neighborhood. Cotter Homes had 620 apartments in 55 identically designed buildings on a 34-acre site. Lang Homes was comprised of 496 apartments in 63 identically designed buildings on a 41-acre site. The design and size of the public housing complex made it impossible to blend with the existing neighborhood; therefore, they became their own neighborhood of low-income residents.

HOPE VI OBJECTIVES - PARK DuValle

The first objective of HOPE VI 'change the physical shape of public housing' was accomplished at Park DuValle by demolishing existing public housing and building a New Urbanism community. The flat roof, concrete structural frame, non-load bearing concrete block wall design of public housing was transformed into human scale, wood framed, brick veneer walls, gable roof townhouses and single family detached homes. The HOPE VI residential development is based on three architecture styles found in Louisville; Victorian, Colonial Revival, and Craftsman. New urbanism argues that traditional architectural styles need to be part of the development for continuity. The HOPE VI development has traditional housing elements including front porches, front and rear yards, narrow streets, alleys, and walkable neighborhoods. HOPE VI has changed the shape of public housing.

The second objective of HOPE VI 'reduce concentrations of poverty' was accomplished by reducing residential unit count by approximately one half. Cotter Homes (public housing) averaged 17 dwelling units per acre. Lang Homes (public housing) averaged 12 dwelling units per acre. While Park DuValle's Oaks (phase I) averaged 8 dwelling units per acre and Park DuValle's 'The Village' (phase II) average 7 dwelling units per acre (Housing Authority of Louisville, 1998). The yearly income for residents in Cotter and Lang Homes averaged \$5,000/yr in 1994. While the mean income of the HOPE VI Park DuValle residents in 2001 averaged \$26,134 (Brazley, 2002). This study found that the median household income for the Park DuValle community has increased, serious crime was reduced, the housing stock was significantly improved, housing units per acre were reduced, the value of property increased, the neighborhood became livable again, and concentrations of poverty were reduced (Brazley, 2002).

The third objective of the HOPE VI program is to provide residents with support services

in the form of self-sufficiency programs. The self-sufficiency program, available to public housing residents, proposes to help families achieve and sustain self-sufficiency, encourage economic and community investment through employment, education, and human services initiatives.

The fourth objective of the HOPE VI program, maintain high standards of personal responsibility, began with President Clinton's 'One strike and You're Out' policy, keeping drug dealers and other criminal activities out of public housing. The HOPE VI program has a screening criteria in which residents must pass to live at Park DuValle. Park DuValle has some of the highest standards of personal responsibility requirements in the country; requiring criminal background checks, credit check, rental history check, employment/job training/family self-sufficiency, and housekeeping inspection checks.

The fifth objective of HOPE VI is to establish public/private partnerships for program completion. HUD's initial \$51 million grant, to the Park DuValle project, was leveraged into \$180 million of public-private funding. The public-private partnerships includes HUD, the City of Louisville, Housing Authority of Louisville, Community Builders Inc., University of Louisville, The Housing Partnership Inc., Louisville real Estate Development Co., Inc., PNC Bank, and National City Community Development Corporation. Thus the Park DuValle project has completed or is in the process of completing all of the major objectives of the HOPE VI program.

METHODOLOGY

The survey instrument used was a combination of HUD's HOPE VI Interim Assessment Neighborhood Resident Survey' with additional questions added by the authors to

measure residential and neighborhood satisfaction. The survey uses housing, neighborhood, and location characteristics; residential attachment and safety characteristics; and open-ended questions to decide if the satisfaction of the HOPE VI resident was enhanced.

The total Park DuValle population (Phase II), of three hundred twenty (320) households were contacted, resulting in the collection of one hundred seventy-seven surveys returned. Two of the surveys were removed for lack of completeness, leaving one hundred seventy-five surveys or 55% of the sample. The sample was divided into two groups, one group being public housing residents and the second group composed of non-public housing residents. Public housing residents had a total population of 69 families; we surveyed 86% of that population (59 families). One hundred and sixteen families of the non-public housing group were surveyed or 46% of their total population.

Analysis of Data

The surveys were collected, coded, and put into a statistical computer program. A frequency distribution of the survey was generated using criterion variables, location variables, background characteristics variables, safety variables, and residential attachment variables to interpret the data. The frequency distributions of selected variables are shown in the following Tables.

Frequencies of demographics are shown in Table 1. The demographics of the Park DuValle community as a whole, reveals that the majority of 'head-of-households', are African American females with a twelfth grade or higher education, two or more persons in the home, not in the public housing assistance program, has fulltime employment, owns an

automobile, and has a single marital status. The individual demographics of both the 'public housing sector' and 'non-public housing sector' are similar with a few exceptions. The majority of 'public housing' and 'non-public housing' families have single African American female head-of-households employed fulltime and owning a car. Exception includes the 'public housing sector' have greater households (more individuals) and less formal education than the 'non-public housing sector'. Yearly income for the public housing group ranged from \$7,000 to \$36,000 with median income equaling \$14,400 per year. The yearly income for the non-public housing group ranged from \$6,000 to \$70,000; median income for non-public housing residents was \$30,000 per year.

Census data for the year 1999 on 'median family income' at the tract level was \$24,773. But 1990 census data at the tract level reveals 'family median income' to be \$4,999; and family mean income to be \$6,998. Abt Associates Inc. Interim Memo on HOPE VI (Buron, Handle, and Patrabansh, 2001) states, that at the time of relocation, Cotter and Lang public housing residents had median household incomes of \$5,016 per year. Statistics reveal that public housing residents, in the Park DuValle neighborhood, median income increased over \$9,000 in less than four years; from \$5,016 to \$14,400 between 1996 and 2000. The HOPE VI program helps to attract families of higher income into the area.

Table 1. Frequencies of Demographics

	Public Housing Resident				Total population		
	No		Yes		Count	Col %	
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %			
Male	14	12.1%	9	15.3%	23	13.1%	
Female	102	87.9%	50	84.7%	152	86.9%	
Other race	2	1.7%	0		2	1.1%	
African American	114	98.3%	59	100.0%	173	98.9%	
Education level							
	Less than high school	4	3.4%	7	11.9%	11	6.3%
	High school graduate	28	24.1%	33	55.9%	61	34.9%
	1-2 year community college	28	24.1%	14	23.7%	42	24.0%
	College graduate	56	48.3%	5	8.5%	61	34.9%
Household size	1	10	8.6%	6	10.2%	16	9.1%

		2	57	49.1%	4	6.8%	61	34.9%
		3	29	25.0%	15	25.4%	44	25.1%
		4	15	12.9%	7	11.9%	22	12.6%
		5	3	2.6%	1	1.7%	4	2.3%
		6	2	1.7%	0		2	1.1%
		8	0	0.0%	1	1.7%	1	0.6%
Employment status	Fulltime	104	89.7%	49	83.1%	153	87.4%	
	Part-time	8	6.9%	4	6.8%	12	6.9%	
	Unemployed	4	3.4%	6	10.2%	10	5.7%	
Do you own a car	Yes	67	57.8%	33	55.9%	100	57.1%	
	No	49	42.2%	26	44.1%	75	42.9%	
Marital status	Single	67	54.8%	39	69.6%	106	60.6%	
	Married	20	17.9%	6	10.7%	26	14.9%	
	Divorced	22	19.0%	8	14.3%	30	17.1%	
	Separated	5	6.0%	3	5.1%	8	4.6%	
	Widowed	1	1.2%	1	1.8%	2	1.1%	
	No Response	1	1.2%	2	3.6%	3	1.7%	
Median income			\$30,000		\$14,400		\$24,741	
Mean income			\$32,606		\$16,321		\$24,115	
No. of public housing residents=59		No. of non-public housing residents=116		Total N=175				

Table 2 measures the Park DuValle resident's level of satisfaction with various elements of their new neighborhood. The majority of residents as a whole were satisfied with the location of the following neighborhood elements: public transportation, schools, childcare, churches, employment, and medical services. Residents as a group were dissatisfied with shopping and entertainment.

Public housing and non-public housing residents differ significantly in their assessment of their satisfaction with schools and medical services. Table 2 shows that non-public housing residents have a greater level of satisfaction with schools than public housing residents. On the other hand non-public housing residents are more dissatisfied with 'medical services'

than public housing residents.

Table 3 measures the Park DuValle residents' satisfaction with their present housing as compared to their previous housing. As shown earlier 'home satisfaction' is based more on environmental influences than the home. All groups of residents (total population, public housing, and non-public housing) were satisfied with Park DuValle's: housing, street lighting, sidewalks, cleanliness, child recreation, adult recreation, and neighborhood in general. While the majority were generally satisfied, it should be noted that 47% of the residents were dissatisfied with adult recreation; and 41% dissatisfied with child recreation.

Table 4 asks residents to compare their Park DuValle neighborhood to their previous neighborhood. All groups of residents (total population, public housing, and non-public

Table 2. Satisfaction of Neighborhood

Satisfaction with the location of		Public Housing Resident				Total Population	
		No		Yes		Count	Col %
		Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Shopping	Very dissatisfied	44	37.9%	20	33.9%	64	36.6%
	Dissatisfied	35	30.2%	19	32.2%	54	30.9%
	Satisfied	35	30.2%	17	28.8%	52	29.7%
	Very Satisfied	2	1.7%	3	5.1%	5	2.9%
Public transportation	Very dissatisfied	12	10.3%	5	8.5%	17	9.7%
	Dissatisfied	13	11.2%	5	8.5%	18	10.3%
	Satisfied	69	59.5%	34	57.6%	103	58.9%
	Very Satisfied	22	19.0%	15	25.4%	37	21.1%
Schools *	Very dissatisfied	5	4.3%	7	11.9%	12	6.9%
	Dissatisfied	6	5.2%	7	11.9%	13	7.4%
	Satisfied	69	59.5%	36	61.0%	105	60.0%

Child care	Very Satisfied	36	31.0%	9	15.3%	45	25.7%
	Very dissatisfied	5	4.3%	5	8.5%	10	5.7%
	Dissatisfied	15	12.9%	6	10.2%	21	12.0%
Churches	Satisfied	75	64.7%	43	72.9%	118	67.4%
	Very Satisfied	21	18.1%	5	8.5%	26	14.9%
	Very dissatisfied	4	3.4%	3	5.1%	7	4.0%
Employment	Dissatisfied	1	0.9%	4	6.8%	5	2.9%
	Satisfied	75	64.7%	36	61.0%	111	63.4%
	Very Satisfied	36	31.0%	16	27.1%	52	29.7%
Medical services *	Very dissatisfied	17	14.7%	3	5.1%	20	11.4%
	Dissatisfied	27	23.3%	10	16.9%	37	21.1%
	Satisfied	57	49.1%	40	67.8%	97	55.4%
Entertainment	Very Satisfied	15	12.9%	6	10.2%	21	12.0%
	Very dissatisfied	9	7.8%	2	3.4%	11	6.3%
	Dissatisfied	25	21.6%	7	11.9%	32	18.3%
Entertainment	Satisfied	70	60.3%	36	61.0%	106	60.6%
	Very Satisfied	12	10.3%	14	23.7%	26	14.9%
	Very dissatisfied	26	22.4%	13	22.0%	39	22.3%
Entertainment	Dissatisfied	44	37.9%	23	39.0%	67	38.3%
	Satisfied	40	34.5%	19	32.2%	59	33.7%
	Very Satisfied	6	5.2%	4	6.8%	10	5.7%

No. of public housing residents=59 No. of non-public housing residents=116 Total N=175

* statistically significant at the .05 level

Table 3. Satisfaction of Housing

Satisfaction with present housing		Public Housing Resident Total Population					
		No		Yes		Total Population	
		Count	Col %	Count	Col %	Count	Col %
Housing	Very dissatisfied	9	7.8%	5	8.5%	14	8.0%
	Dissatisfied	5	4.3%	2	3.4%	7	4.0%
	Satisfied	68	58.6%	31	52.5%	99	56.6%
	Very Satisfied	34	29.3%	21	35.6%	55	31.4%
Street lighting	Very dissatisfied	2	1.7%	5	8.5%	7	4.0%
	Dissatisfied	10	8.6%	1	1.7%	11	6.3%
	Satisfied	69	59.5%	33	55.9%	102	58.3%
	Very Satisfied	35	30.2%	20	33.9%	55	31.4%
Sidewalks	Very dissatisfied	1	0.9%	5	8.5%	6	3.4%
	Dissatisfied	10	8.6%	2	3.4%	12	6.9%
	Satisfied	62	53.4%	32	54.2%	94	53.7%

Cleanliness	Very Satisfied	43	37.1%	20	33.9%	63	36.0%
	Very dissatisfied	1	0.9%	5	8.5%	6	3.4%
	Dissatisfied	8	6.9%	3	5.1%	11	6.3%
	Satisfied	59	50.9%	24	40.7%	83	47.4%
Child recreation	Very Satisfied	48	41.4%	27	45.8%	75	42.9%
	Very dissatisfied	10	8.6%	12	20.3%	22	12.6%
	Dissatisfied	38	32.8%	12	20.3%	50	28.6%
	Satisfied	49	42.2%	22	37.3%	71	40.6%
Adult recreation	Very Satisfied	19	16.4%	13	22.0%	32	18.3%
	Very dissatisfied	14	12.1%	9	15.3%	23	13.1%
	Dissatisfied	43	37.1%	17	28.8%	60	34.3%
	Satisfied	46	39.7%	25	42.4%	71	40.6%
Neighborhood in general	Very Satisfied	13	11.2%	8	13.6%	21	12.0%
	Very dissatisfied	1	0.9%	3	5.1%	4	2.3%
	Dissatisfied	9	7.8%	8	13.6%	17	9.7%
	Satisfied	80	69.0%	31	52.5%	111	63.4%
	Very Satisfied	26	22.4%	17	28.8%	43	24.6%

No. of public housing residents=59 No. of non-public housing residents=116 Total N=175

Table 4. Comparison to Respondents' Previous Neighborhood

New neighborhood compared to old ones	Public Housing Resident				Total Population	
	No		Yes		Count	Col %
	Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Much better place	63	54.3%	45	76.3%	108	61.7%
A little better	26	22.4%	8	13.6%	34	19.4%
About the same	21	18.1%	3	5.1%	24	13.7%
A little worse	5	4.3%	3	5.1%	8	4.6%
Much worse	1	0.9%			1	0.6%

No. of public housing residents=59 No. of non-public housing residents=116 Total N=175

housing) thought that their new HOPE VI neighborhood, Park DuValle, a 'much better place' to live; overall about seventy percent.

Table 5 measures residents' level of satisfaction with the locations of neighbors, relatives, and friends in relationship to their Park DuValle neighborhood. This Table also measures the residents' overall level of satisfaction with life (life in general). All residents, and group of residents, were 'satisfied' with the locations of: neighbors, nearness to relatives, friends in neighborhood, relatives in neighborhood; and satisfied with life in general.

Table 6 measures residents' level of satisfaction with neighborhood safety. Again, all residents, and groups of residents, were satisfied with: safety for children, visual access to kids, safety at home, safety in neighborhood, police protection, and traffic hazards.

Table 5. Satisfaction of Location

Satisfaction with location of		Public Housing Resident				Total Population	
		No		Yes		Count	Col %
		Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Neighbors	Very dissatisfied			3	5.1%	3	1.7%
	Dissatisfied	15	12.9%	6	10.2%	21	12.0%
	Satisfied	80	69.0%	36	61.0%	116	66.3%
	Very Satisfied	21	18.1%	14	23.7%	35	20.0%
Nearness to relatives	Very dissatisfied	2	1.7%	3	5.1%	5	2.9%
	Dissatisfied	19	16.4%	8	13.6%	27	15.4%
	Satisfied	64	55.2%	39	66.1%	103	58.9%
	Very Satisfied	31	26.7%	9	15.3%	40	22.9%
Friends in neighborhood	Very dissatisfied	3	2.6%	2	3.4%	5	2.9%
	Dissatisfied	12	10.3%	8	13.6%	20	11.4%

	Satisfied	87	75.0%	42	71.2%	129	73.7%
	Very Satisfied	14	12.1%	7	11.9%	21	12.0%
Relatives in neighborhood	Very dissatisfied	5	4.3%	3	5.1%	8	4.6%
	Dissatisfied	20	17.2%	10	16.9%	30	17.1%
Life in general	Satisfied	71	61.2%	38	64.4%	109	62.3%
	Very Satisfied	20	17.2%	8	13.6%	28	16.0%
	Very dissatisfied	3	258.6%	4	678.0%	7	4.0%
	Dissatisfied	7	603.4%	1	169.5%	8	4.6%
	Satisfied	77	6637.9%	33	5593.2%	110	62.9%
	Very Satisfied	29	2500.0%	21	3559.3%	50	28.6%
No. of public housing residents=59 No. of non-public housing residents=116 Total N=175							

Table 6. Satisfaction of Safety

Satisfaction with		Public Housing Resident Total Population					
		No		Yes		Count	Col %
		Count	Col %	Count	Col %		
Safety for children	Very dissatisfied	4	3.4%	4	6.8%	8	4.6%
	Dissatisfied	19	16.4%	8	13.6%	27	15.4%
	Satisfied	73	62.9%	33	55.9%	106	60.6%
	Very Satisfied	20	17.2%	14	23.7%	34	19.4%
Visual access to kids	Very dissatisfied	6	5.2%	4	6.8%	10	5.7%
	Dissatisfied	19	16.4%	6	10.2%	25	14.3%
	Satisfied	74	63.8%	38	64.4%	112	64.0%
	Very Satisfied	17	14.7%	11	18.6%	28	16.0%

Safety at home	Very dissatisfied	3	2.6%	3	5.1%	6	3.4%
	Dissatisfied	6	5.2%	5	8.5%	11	6.3%
	Satisfied	75	64.7%	31	52.5%	106	60.6%
	Very Satisfied	32	27.6%	20	33.9%	52	29.7%
Safety in neighborhood	Very dissatisfied	2	1.7%	2	3.4%	4	2.3%
	Dissatisfied	14	12.1%	3	5.1%	17	9.7%
	Satisfied	73	62.9%	41	69.5%	114	65.1%
	Very Satisfied	27	23.3%	13	22.0%	40	22.9%
Police protection	Very dissatisfied	5	4.3%	4	6.8%	9	5.1%
	Dissatisfied	12	10.3%	7	11.9%	19	10.9%
	Satisfied	68	58.6%	36	61.0%	104	59.4%
	Very Satisfied	31	26.7%	12	20.3%	43	24.6%
Traffic hazards	Very dissatisfied	6	5.2%	5	8.5%	11	6.3%
	Dissatisfied	21	18.1%	9	15.3%	30	17.1%
	Satisfied	68	58.6%	34	57.6%	102	58.3%
	Very Satisfied	21	18.1%	11	18.6%	32	18.3%

No. of public housing residents=59 No. of non-public housing residents=116 Total N=175

SUMMARY OF DATA

Park DuValle's public housing was in a state of decline until the HOPE VI intervention. The neighborhood had high crime, high density, housing stock in disrepair, and declining family incomes. The Cotter/Lang population was one of the youngest and poorest groups of families when compared to other public housing authorities around the country. Before HOPE VI, the Park DuValle community was known as the most crime ridden and dangerous neighborhood in Louisville.

The HOPE VI Park DuValle Revitalization has sparked a surge in middle-class African American homes. Eighty percent of the heads-of-households have fulltime employment; and median yearly household income of about \$30,000. Most of these households are single African American females. Approximately one hundred percent of the heads-of-household have at least the equivalent of a high school education and live with two or more children.

Initial reactions to HOPE VI have been positive. When surveyed the majority of residents stated that they were satisfied with their Park DuValle neighborhood (schools, churches, public transportation, childcare, medical services, and employment). Residents were dissatisfied with shopping and entertainment in and around the neighborhood. The majority of residents were satisfied with their Park DuValle housing (housing, street lighting, sidewalks, cleanliness of area, neighborhood in general, and adult and child recreation).

Survey data reveals that residents think of Park DuValle as being their real home; residential satisfaction with 'the location of HOPE VI' and 'the safety of the Park DuValle neighborhood'. Survey data of the first two phases of the Park DuValle Revitalization Project revealed that residents are satisfied (pleased) with: housing, neighborhood, location, and safety. They are dissatisfied with shopping and entertainment. All in all, the majority (70 percent or greater) of residents of the Park DuValle HOPE VI project were satisfied with their homes and neighborhoods.

CONCLUSION

HOPE VI, so far, appears to be accomplishing its objectives: changing the physical shape of housing; reducing concentrations of poverty; providing support services;

establishing and maintaining high standards of community and personal responsibility; and forming partnerships. When residents compared their HOPE VI house and neighborhood to their previous residences levels of satisfaction were generally higher in almost every area. These attitudes were consistent for both former public housing and non-public housing residents.

REFERENCES

- Birks, D.F. and Southan, J.M. 1992. An Evaluation of the Rationale of Tenant Satisfaction Survey, *Housing Studies*, 7(4), Pp. 299-208.
- Brazley, Michael D. 2002. Dissertation: An Evaluation of Residential Satisfaction of HOPE VI: A Study of the Park DuValle Revitalization Project. University of Louisville, College of Business, Department of Urban Policy.
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza. 1997. Moving Up Versus Moving Out: Neighborhood Effects in Housing Mobility Programs. *Housing Policy Debate* 8, 1:195-234.
- Briggs, Xavier de Souza. 1998. Brown Kids in White Suburbs: Housing Mobility and the Many Faces of Social Capital. *Housing Policy Debate* 9, 1:177-221.

- Briggs, Xavier de Souza, Darden, Joe T., and Aidala, Angela. (1999). "In the Wake of Desegregation: Early Impacts of Scattered – Site Public Housing on Neighborhoods in Yonkers, New York." *Journal of the American Planning Association*. Vol. 65, No. 1, pp 27-48.
- Burby, Raymond J., and William M. Rohe. 1989. Deconcentration of Public Housing: Effects on Residents' Satisfaction with Their Living Environments and Their Fear of Crime. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 25, 1:117-41.
- Buron, Larry, Heather Handle, and Saty Patrabansh (Abt Associates). April 27, 2001. Interim Memo on HOPE VI Tracking (Retrospective) Study. Washington D.C.
- Fischer, Paul B. 1991. *Is Housing Mobility an Effective Anti-Poverty Strategy?* Cincinnati: Stephen H. Wilder Foundation.
- Francescato, G., S. Weidemann, and J. R. Anderson. 1987. "Residential Satisfaction: Its Uses and Limitations in Housing Research". In *housing and Neighborhoods*, eds. W. Van Vliet, H. Choldin, W. Michelson, and D. Popende. New York: Greenwood Press,
- Fried, M. 1982. "Residential Attachment: Sources of Residential and Community Satisfaction". *Journal of Social Issues* 38: pp. 107-119.
- Galster, G.C. 1985. Evaluating Indicators for Housing Policy: Residential Satisfaction vs. Marginal Improvement Priorities. *Social Indicators Research*, 16, pp.415-448.
- Galster, George C., 1987. *Homeowners and Neighborhood Reinvestment*. Durham, N.C.: Duke University Press.
- Galster, G., and G. Hesser. 1981. Residential Satisfaction: Compositional and Contextual Correlates. *Environment and Behavior*, 13, pp.735-758.
- Galster, George C., Sean P. Killen. 1995. The Geography of Metropolitan Opportunity: A Reconnaissance and Conceptual Framework. *Housing Policy Debate* 6(1): 7-43.
- Gilderbloom, J., and R. Appelbaum, 1988. *Rethinking Rental Housing*. Philadelphia, PA: Temple University Press
- Hanna, S., and S. Lindmood. 1979. Housing Preferences of Blacks and Whites in Montgomery County, Alabama. *Housing and Society* 6. Pp. 39-47.
- Houriham, K. 1984. Residential Satisfaction, Neighborhood Attributes, and Personal Characteristics. *Environment and Planning A* 15. Pp. 425-436.

- Housing Authority of Louisville. 1998. Revitalization Plan; Existing Site Conditions; Predevelopment Activities; Revitalization; Self-sufficiency and community Building Workshop; and Homeownership Units. Louisville, Kentucky.
- Jones, Michael L. 1999. The Rebirth of Park DuValle. Louisville Magazine (November 1999), published by Louisville Magazine, Louisville, Kentucky. Pp. 51-57.
- Kingsley, G. Thomas, and Peter Tatian. 1997. Housing and Welfare Reform: Geography Matters. Paper presented at the Policy Research for Housing. Washington DC, July.
- Kinsey, J., and S. Lane. 1983. Race, Housing Attributes, and Satisfaction with Housing. *Housing and Society* 10. Pp. 98-116.
- Rainwater, L. 1966. Fear and the House-as-Haven in the Lower Class. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 32:23-31.
- Rohe, William and Stegman, Michael. Spring 1994. The Effects of Homeownership on the Self-Esteem, Perceived Control and Life Satisfaction of Low-Income People. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, Vol. 60, No.2. American Planning Association, Chicago, IL.
- Rosenbaum, Emily and Laura E. Harris. 2001. Residential Mobility and Opportunities: Early Impacts of the Moving to Opportunity Demonstration Program in Chicago. *Housing Policy Debate*, Volume 12, Issue 2. Fannie Mae Foundation. Washington D.C.
- Rosenbaum, James E. 1991. Black Pioneers- Do Their Moves to the Suburbs Increase Economic Opportunity for Mothers and Children? *Housing Policy Debate* 2(4):1179-213.
- Rosenbaum, James E., and Susan J. Popkin. 1990. Economic and Social Impacts of Housing Integration. Evanston, IL: Northwestern University, Center for Urban affairs and Policy Research.
- Rosenbaum, James, and Susan Popkin. 1991. Employment and Earnings of Low-Income Blacks Who Move to Middle Income Suburbs. In *The Urban Underclass*, edited by Christopher Jencks and Paul Peterson. Washington D.C.: Brookings Institution.
- Rosenbaum, J.E. 1993. Closing the Gap: Does Residential Integration Improve the Employment and Education of Low-Income Blacks? in L.B. Joseph (Ed.) *Affordable Housing and Public Policy: Strategies for Metropolitan Chicago*, pp. 223-228. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago, Center for Urban Research and Policy Studies.

- Rosenbaum, James E. 1995. Changing the Geography of Opportunity by Expanding Residential Choice: Lessons from the Gautreaux Program. *Housing Policy Debate* 6, 1: pp. 231-69.
- Twohey, Megan. 2000. Chicago Hope. *National Journal*, Washington D.C., pp. 1279.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 2001. Census of Population: 2000. Vol.1, Characteristics of the population. Part--: Kentucky. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington, DC.
- U.S. Bureau of the Census. 1991. Census of population: 1990. Vol. II, Characteristics of the Population. Part --: Kentucky. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development. 2000. HOPE VI: Community Building Makes a Difference. U.S. Government Printing Office, Washington D.C.
- Varady, D. P., and Preiser, W.F.E. 1998. Scattered-Site Public Housing and Housing Satisfaction. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. 64(2) (Spring) pp. 189-207.
- Varady, David P., Carole C. Walker, and Xinhao Wang. 2001. Voucher Recipient Achievement of Improved Housing Conditions in the US: Do Moving Distance and Relocation Services Matter? 2001. *Urban Studies*, Vol. 38, No. 8, 1273-1304. Pp. 1299.

