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Newport, the best comeback city in America?

Who would have known it? Once known as Cincinnati’s toilet for gangsters, mob activity, prostitution, and gambling, Newport, Kentucky has become one of the greatest comeback cities in America. Newport was such a notorious den of corruption that then Attorney General Robert Kennedy brought national attention by cracking down on the illegal activity that made the city famous. Some forty years ago, Newport was once known as the “Sin Center” of the South, according to Time Magazine. Just before the highly acclaimed Newport Aquarium and Newport on the Levee opened a decade ago, the downtown was a depressed area, littered with sex-oriented businesses dominating historic Monmouth Street, the Main Street of Newport. It has since gone from vice to nice, and from hips to hip. How did this miracle happen?

In an urban world beset with defeat, here is a feel good story about how one small Ohio River city turned itself around with leadership, entrepreneurship, forward-thinking federally funding programs, and partnerships between non-profits, higher education, business, city government and neighborhood leaders. This resulted in destroying the out-of-date public housing, which had more negatives than positives, and replacing it with programs designed to lift folks out of welfare dependency with a second chance for education and job opportunities. Even a lucky few owned their own homes as part of the handshake between the federal government and the welfare dependent.

The city of Newport has shown not only the initiative to pursue federal housing grants such as HOPE VI, but also to pursue a wide range of opportunities to increase economic development in downtown Newport. Businesses in Newport’s downtown since HOPE VI are of higher quality than the 1990’s.

The federal public housing program originating from President Roosevelt’s New Deal and the urban renewal of the post-war period has resulted in poorly designed and constructed housing. This housing resulted in their deteriorating condition that destroyed urban communities and perpetuated a culture of poverty that contributed to an increase in crime, drugs, vandalism, and hopelessness.

HOPE VI is a bipartisan urban revitalization program created in 1992 by HUD that eliminates inadequate and poorly designed public housing that were products of the urban renewal style of the 1940s and 1950s. This old public housing was replaced with single family homes in mixed integrated communities. HOPE VI also provides self-sufficiency services to the residents of the community through local government and non-profit agencies.

HOPE VI played a role in improving the overall quality of life by reducing crime and increasing business and economic development in the downtown. HOPE VI also improved the quality of life of former public housing residents who participated in the Executive Summary
HOPE VI program and its Community and Support Services (CSS) program, and has contributed to the increase in property values.

We do not believe that crime is the only factor impacted by HOPE VI. However, we examine that the deconcentrating of the poor and the creation of greater economic opportunities has positively impacted the crime rate in Newport’s neighborhoods. As a result, overall crime in the four police districts in and around the old public housing decreased 19% from 2000 to 2007.

The site of the old public housing has been cleared to make way for an $800 million- $1 billion investment over the next 10-15 years. The Ovation development will offer a first-class, mixed use development, including retail, office, condominiums, a hotel, and additional lodging and entertainment and recreational amenities that are in close proximity to downtown.

The economic revitalization of Newport has occurred through property value changes in HOPE VI and non-HOPE VI neighborhoods. The HOPE VI areas have experienced a higher appreciation in property values, than those in non-historic and non-HOPE VI areas.

In trying to understand the relationship between HOPE VI's impact on Newport, we also must see Newport within the context of the larger regional economic and social forces, such as Cincinnati. Projects aimed at reinvigorating downtown Cincinnati, such as the museums and professional sports stadia for the Cincinnati Reds and Bengals, failed to renew downtown residential neighborhoods. Ultimately, Cincinnati’s loss has been Newport’s gain.

Newport has achieved the same result as cities such as Louisville or Nashville, but has fewer resources. Why is Newport working and not other cities? Much of that is the result of steady and consistent leadership over the last 16 years of Mayor Thomas Guidugli.

This consistency has enabled the mayor and his staff to set goals and implement a common sense strategy for revitalizing Newport by aggressively pursuing property acquisition on the riverfront for the Newport on the Levee development and the Newport Aquarium. These developments have attracted new businesses, tourists, and jobs and economic development in the downtown Newport, gave the city the ability to apply for the HOPE VI grant from the federal government, and emphasize police accreditation for the City of Newport police department as a priority to create a professional and progressive department.

Newport still has untapped potential to encourage civic engagement and economic development. One strategy is converting one-way streets to two-way streets. Converting one-way streets to two-way streets with parking, trees, and bike lanes to calm traffic, will make neighborhoods more livable for families, young urban professionals and the elderly, who want to live closer to medical care downtown.
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The purpose of this evaluation is to understand the impact of federal housing policy on the economic revitalization of communities and cities. This report aims to examine the impact of federal intervention programs like the Housing Opportunities for People Everywhere (HOPE VI) program on distressed and blighted communities. Newport is unique among HOPE VI grantees since the city with a population of 17,000 located along the Ohio River across from downtown Cincinnati and situated within the greater Cincinnati and Northern Kentucky metropolitan region, and is the smallest city in the United States to secure a federal HOPE VI grant. Even more unusual is that two-thirds of the residents are white. More specifically, how does Newport, Kentucky, use local, state, and federal resources from the public and private sector to renew, reinvent and revitalize its city and downtown?

This evaluation will examine whether the HOPE VI program in Newport has played a role in reducing crime and increasing business opportunities, economic development in the downtown, improving the quality of life of former public housing residents who participated in the HOPE VI program and its Community and Support Services (CSS), and contributing to the increase in property values. Bottomline: Has HOPE VI improved the quality of life in Newport?

HOPE VI is a bipartisan urban revitalization program created in 1992 by the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) that eliminates inadequate public housing that were products of the urban renewal style of the 1940s and 1950s, and demolishes and replaces the old public housing with homes in mixed-income communities by providing self-sufficiency services to the residents of the community through local government and non-profit agencies (Schwartz, 2006; Popkin, et al., 2004; HUD Manual, 1999; HUD, 2000).

With support from Congressional urban democrats, Jack Kemp, the Secretary for Housing and Urban Development during the first Bush Administration, passionately pushed for a federal program aimed toward homeownership for public-housing residents by using a combination of public and private dollars and the market to encourage homeownership, as well as the creation of tenant management organizations in public housing developments where tenants can have control over their own households (Marcuse and Keating, 2006: 152). Homeownership fits comfortably into a conservative, Republican Party philosophy of promoting personal responsibility and taking government out of the housing business (Marcuse and Keating, 2006: 152-153).

Attempts by the current Bush administration to reduce and eliminate funding for HOPE VI have made this report timely and important in documenting the impact of a federal housing program such as HOPE VI. This evaluation shows that the Newport program has been among the most successful in the nation. The best way to ensure livable and sustainable communities and revitalize distressed communities is through homeownership, partly because homeownership represents a family’s social status, and is also seen as an alternative to renting or living in public housing (Hayden, 2002). Homeownership is more advantageous than renting because homeowners can build up equity and enjoy certain tax exemptions from paying capital gains taxes (Bogart, 1998, 286). Purchasing and owning a home, as evidenced by the work of the Housing and Neighborhood Development Strategies (HANDS) and the Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods (SUN) programs in Louisville’s Russell neighborhood, not only improves one’s credit and helps build equity, but owning a home can boost a person’s confidence and create a sense of self and
The HOPE VI program has five important objectives: 1) change the physical shape of public housing, 2) reduce the concentration of poverty, 3) provide support services, 4) establish and maintain high standards of community and personal responsibility, and 5) develop partnerships between public and private agencies and organizations (HUD, 1999; HUD, 2000; Schwartz, 2006; Popkin, et al., 2000, 2004; Popkin, 2002; Gilderbloom and Hanka, 2006; Brazley and Gilderbloom, 2007; Gilderbloom, 2008).

From the inception of HOPE VI in 1992 through 2004, 558 grants have been administered, and 224 public housing projects have been demolished and redeveloped, resulting in more than $6 billion in total investment. HOPE VI projects have occurred in larger metropolitan areas such as New York, Chicago, and Los Angeles, but also in growing small-size cities such as Newport, Ky. HOPE VI is more than the physical demolition and redevelopment of distressed properties; it also provides social services to residents through Community and Supportive Services (CSS), the case management program of HOPE VI (Brazley, 2002; Varady and Preiser, 1998; Popkin, 2002; Turner, et al., 2006). This initiative supports the development of local strategies and programs to help public housing residents obtain employment, and provide training assistance through education, employment counseling, job training, household skills training, childcare services, transportation, substance-abuse treatment or counseling. Also included is homeownership counseling that will lead toward self-sufficiency and economic independence (HUD, 1999; Gilderbloom and Brazley, 2007; Gilderbloom, 2008; Gilderbloom and Hanka, 2006; Popkin, et al., 2004).

Besides changing the physical shape of the housing and providing support services, HOPE VI emphasizes personal and community responsibility through “community sweat equity” by instilling in residents that economic independence and self-sufficiency comes with an obligation and responsibility to give back to one’s community (Popkin, et al., 2004; HUD Report, 2000; Thompson, 2006). The HOPE VI program provides underserved communities with access to the social and economic capital necessary to create and revitalize neighborhood and community institutions, such as strong schools, businesses, and community organizations, which are the necessary building blocks for sustainable, stable, attractive, and livable communities (Brazley, 2002; Gilderbloom, 2008: 139).

The HOPE VI project in Newport attempts to deconcentrate poverty through the development of scattered-site housing, which is defined by Varady and
Preiser (1998) as the number of units on a site, anywhere between two and 300, the kinds of structures, which could be single-family homes, duplexes, and townhouses, and the extent of deconcentration away from “concentrations of low-income, minority populations” (1998: 190). The Housing Authority of Newport (HAN) has purchased sites in neighborhoods throughout the city and constructed single-family homes, duplexes and apartment units to rent or sell to former residents of the public housing area, or to potential homebuyers (Goetz, 2000; Varady & Preiser, 1998).

**Literature Review**

The intervention of the federal government in public housing began through the federal works program of President Franklin D. Roosevelt’s New Deal in the 1930s, with the passage of the Federal Housing Act of 1937 and the creation of urban renewal in 1949. It was in response to President Roosevelt’s battle cry to ameliorate one-third of the population ill-housed. The Housing Act of 1937 was a permanent government program that provided loans and subsidies to municipal housing authorities to eliminate slums and provide low-income housing. The federal government provided the loans, while local governments exempted the housing costs from personal and property taxes (Schwartz, 2006; Marcuse, 2001; Gilderbloom, 2008).

The Housing Act of 1949 (known as urban renewal) was a compromise between the liberal and conservative housing policy approaches. This act resulted in the clearing of more than 800,000 units through eminent domain by the federal government, which subsidized the difference between the project cost and the resale price and sold the land to private entrepreneurs and developers at reduced prices (Schwartz, 2006; Hartman, 1983; Marcuse, 2001).

Questions of housing affordability are important in liberal housing policy, because liberals make virtually no attempt to influence the cost structure of our market-dominated housing system (Hartman, 1983: 4). Housing affordability is becoming more of an issue, causing increasing concern, since many homeowners are increasingly paying a higher percentage of their incomes on housing (Hartman, 1983; Marcuse, 2001).

Conservative housing policy, on the other hand, favors the free market over government intervention. Conservatives favor local versus federal decision-making, no zoning regulations for development, and an ideology that stresses private property rights, efficiency, and individual effort (Marcuse, 2001: 720-723; Gilderbloom and Appelbaum, 1988). According to conservatives, solving the housing crisis comes from creating more housing through the market. If enough housing is created and brought to the market, vacancy rates will increase, the price of rent will drop, and there will be ample affordable housing. The greater the housing supply, the lower the rents, and the larger the market of available housing, the more competitive the urban area will be in attracting new growth (Gilderbloom, Ye, Hanka, Usher, 2007). Critics of free market, conservative housing policy suggest that the free market does not help provide affordable housing to the poor. Harloe (1985) argues “the problem is that the free market has, historically, been unable to provide housing at socially acceptable standards at a cost which is affordable by low-income households."

Much of the conditions of public housing in the 1950s were the result of the poorly designed and constructed housing units, and the lack of funding for maintenance and upkeep, which resulted in their deteriorating condition. More importantly, the architectural nature of early and relatively recent public housing developments, both low-rise “barracks” style housing and high rise buildings, were highly dense structures that isolated the residents from the surrounding streetscape with no access to transportation and social services, and lacked any outdoor exterior amenities and features (Schwartz, 2006: 108-111). The creation of LeCorbusier style high-rise concrete form apartment units instead of single-unit housing (i.e. Robert Taylor Homes and Cabrini Green...
in Chicago), and the lack of "defensible space" (Newman, 1973) caused public housing to become a target of crime, vandalism, and drugs, which helped contribute to creating and perpetuating the culture of poverty (Wilson, 1987).

More importantly, the plain ordinary, prison-like quality of public housing creates a sense of stigmatization for the poor and marginalized who are confined to living in these dwellings. This stigmatization is prevalent in the public housing in numerous cities such as St. Louis, New York, London, Paris, Chicago, Amsterdam, Havana, Louisville, and Newport.

Wilson (1987: 138) argues that the stigmatization and the traits of the culture of poverty "assume 'a life of their own' and continue to influence behavior even if opportunities for social mobility improve."

The late 1960s and early 1970s were seen as a favorable climate for liberal housing policy (Marcuse, 2001). The Housing Act of 1968 focused on specific targets aimed at the expansion of building low-income housing, low-interest loans and rental subsidies for low and moderate-income households (Marcuse, 2001: 727-728; Schwartz, 2006: 113). The Experimental Housing Allowance program launched in 1973 provided allowances for families to choose their own housing.

The Housing Act of 1974 created Community Development Block Grants (CDBG), which provided allowances to low-income households in the form of rental subsidies for residents to pay for the cost of a private rental unit or an apartment. This was followed by the introduction of vouchers in the 1980s by HUD that allows families to choose any kind of housing as long as it followed the program requirements, and if the landlord participated in the program (Varady and Walker, 2003: 18; Varady, Walker, and Wang, 2001).

In addition to liberal and governmental interventionist policies like rental subsidies and Section 8 vouchers, the literature criticizes the liberal policy of rent control. Much of the literature opposes rent control because it interferes with the landlord’s ability to respond to the market, which reduces profitability and discourages new construction, resulting in a deteriorating housing stock (Gilderbloom, 2008: 69; Gilderbloom and Appelbaum, 1988).

Conservatives such as Milton Friedman (1946) argued that high rent ceilings caused “haphazard and arbitrary allocation of space, inefficient use of space, retardation of new construction...” (Friedman and Sigler, 1946).

**HOPE VI Impacts**

Much of the literature suggests that the impact of HOPE VI across the country has been mixed. Resi-
dents who relocate into HOPE VI neighbor-
hoods are living in better and safer communities
(Thompson, 2006). One of the success stories
of the HOPE VI program is the transformation
of Chicago’s public housing, which called for the
demolition of 51 high-rise public housing build-
ings and several hundred middle- and low-rise
units, eliminating 14,000 units and relocating
6,000 families. These were replaced with 6,100
mixed-income units and 9,500 senior citizens’
rehabilitated units at a cost of $1.5 billion
(Popkin, et al., 2000: 918-919; Brazley, 2002;
Thompson, 2006).

However, critics have complained that HOPE VI
has removed and demolished more affordable
housing units than what is later being put in
their place, resulting in hundreds and thousands
of displaced public housing residents. The lit-
erature cites that more units will be replaced
(95,100) than the number of units being demol-
ished under HOPE VI (between 88,500 and
94,500), only half (approximately 48,000) of
these units are equivalent to public housing,
where residents receive enough subsidies to
support their households (Schwartz, 2006: 118-
119; Turner, et al., 2007: 4). The rest of the
units are aimed at market-rate homeownership.
However, Gilderbloom (2008: 116) states that
out of the 115,000 units that will be demolished
under HOPE VI, just 60,000 new or rehabili-
tated units will replace the old units, resulting in
a shortage of 55,000 public-housing units.

The General Accounting Office (GAO) estimated
in 1999 that 61 percent of the original public
housing residents would return to new HOPE VI
developments (Schwartz, 2006: 121). However,
Popkin, et al. (2004: 28-30) found that just 19
percent of the public housing residents will return
to live in a HOPE VI development. Of the 1,273
households who lived in the Cotter and Lang
public housing projects in Louisville’s Park
DuValle neighborhood, just 150 households
planned to live in the new HOPE VI development
(Brazley, 2002; Brazley and Gilderbloom, 2007:
439; Gilderbloom, 2008: 124).

Section 24 of the Quality Housing and Work
Responsibility Act of 1998 (QHWRA) excused
HOPE VI program from the requirements of re-
placing the units one-for-one, which has
resulted in the replacement of only about one
affordable unit for every five destroyed
(Williams, 2003).

The literature also addresses the importance of HOPE
VI in eliminating the culture of poverty and racial segre-
gation that has plagued the older model of public hous-
ing projects, where many poor minority populations
were concentrated in these developments (Wilson,
1987; Massey and Denton, 1993). The Civil Rights Act
of 1964 ended the restricted racial covenants. The
creation and expansion of public housing, from urban
renewal in the 1960s through the 1980s despite direct
government opposition to segregation, had reinforced
segregation through deliberate racial practices, such as
redlining, exclusionary zoning, and the creation of mas-
sive public housing projects in low-income areas, which
occurred as a result of opposition by neighborhood and
community groups wanting to keep public housing out
of their neighborhoods (Wilson, 1987: 38; Calhoun,
1994). This racial segregation in public housing has
contributed to high concentrated poverty, violent crime,
limited employment opportunities, racial and institu-
tional discrimination, and the "ghettoization" of African Ameri-
cans (Wilson, 1987; Brazley, 2002: 21). Massey and Denton (1993: 87) argue that de facto

Furthermore, removing public housing residents from
their dwellings through scattered-site housing as a way
of deconcentrating poverty removes the sense of iden-
tity the residents have towards the public housing in
which they live. Residents have used identity as a way
to affirm their attachment to a particular place, such as
public housing. Thus, the demolition of the public hous-
ing through HOPE VI can be seen as an attack on their
identity, and the potential displacement from their public
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housing dwellings would ultimately disrupt friendship ties and social networks (Gotham, 2003: 730).

**Scattered-site public housing**

Much of the failure of public high rise housing projects, as seen in the example of the Robert Taylor Homes and Cabrini Green in Chicago and the Pruitt Igoe housing development in St. Louis, results from the physical shape of public housing, its isolating and segregating effect from the rest of the community, the “not-in-my-backyard” attitudes from residents who want to keep poor public housing residents out of their communities, and the location of public housing in relation to basic services, schools, and employment opportunities.

According to Dreier, et al. (2001: 21), place matters because where you live has a powerful effect on the choices and opportunities and the quality of life of the citizenry of the area. In order to deconcentrate poverty, people must move from areas of high concentrations of poverty into more affluent areas, and that moving the poor to more affluent areas would reduce the gap between rich and poor and increase the likelihood of economic integration (Dreier, et al, 2001: 224-225). Through government intervention, creating new localities that would deconcentrate poverty, promote economic integration, and empower the underclass will improve the lives of the poor and marginalized.

Scattered-site housing, as seen in HOPE VI and other public housing initiatives, has produced high levels of neighborhood satisfaction among former public housing resident, reduced crimes, provided better employment opportunities for adults and more educational opportunities for children, improved social interaction among neighborhood residents, and reduced the cost burden of housing (Goetz, 2000; Varady and Preiser, 1998; Brazley, 2002; Popkin, et al., 2000).

Varady and Walker (2003) argue that the use of housing vouchers (tenant-based subsidies) has helped deconcentrate poverty in some areas by improving the quality of life of former public housing residents by moving them into neighborhoods that have higher mobility, better schools, and safer neighborhoods. However voucher recipients in Chicago are living in poorer areas with more drugs and crime than their former public housing accommodations (Varady and Walker, 2003).

Also, residents relocating to deconcentrated minority areas have experienced difficulty in making the transition to their new housing, either by adjusting to a new housing environment, overcoming fears of discrimination in predominantly white areas, the lack of affordable housing, the lack of public transportation in the suburban areas, and landlords unwilling to accept vouchers (Varady and Walker, 2003; Popkin, 1999; 2000). The most vulnerable public housing residents that experience the greatest social problems, such as substance abuse and domestic violence, may not qualify for assistance from HOPE VI and Section 8 vouchers, or receive any assistance on the private market (Popkin, et al., 2000: 933-934).

Although studies have shown that HOPE VI has significantly eliminated concentration of poverty, very little has been done to reduce the large racial concentrations in many of these new developments (Brazley, 2002; Kingsley, Johnson, Petit, 2003; Gilderbloom, 2008). Many of the HOPE VI projects are built on the old public housing sites, which reinforces the residential segregation in these public housing developments by failing to integrate in the larger community, as is the case with the HOPE VI program in the Park DuValle neighborhood in Louisville (Brazley, 2002; Gilderbloom, 2008: 119). Today, just two white residents live there among the 1,273 households. In the relocation of residents in Chicago’s public housing projects, many of these residents located to neighborhoods that were 90 percent

---

**A History of HOPE VI in Kentucky**

Eight grants have been rewarded to housing agencies in the state for the demolition, rebuilding or revitalization of public housing:

- Lexington-Charlotte Court (1998)
- Lexington– Bluegrass/Aspendale (2005)
- Louisville–Clarksdale I (2002)

The literature also focuses on the costs associated with HOPE VI developments. The average median cost per development is $160,400, of which 37 percent is covered by HUD funds and 25 percent of the funding comes from private sources (Turner, et al., 2007: 16). The average cost of a mixed-construction and rehabilitation development is $165,800, and the median rehabilitation development cost is $131,800, while the median costs for medium size metropolitan areas is 172,800 (Turner, et al., 2007: 16-18).

In the HOPE VI development in Louisville’s Park DuValle neighborhood, the average cost per housing unit is $169,000, but will drop to $139,000 when all 1,273 units are built (Brazley and Gilderbloom, 2007: 440; Gilderbloom, 2008). In a comparable neighborhood, Louisville Central Development Corporation built units for two- or three-times less than the HOPE VI units, including a three-bedroom, one-bathroom units for $49,500, in Louisville’s Russell neighborhood (Gilderbloom and Mullins, 2005; Brazley and Gilderbloom, 2007: 439-440; Gilderbloom, 2008: 126).

Also, HOPE VI funding has an economic multiplier and leveraging effect. According to a 2001 GAO Report, for every $1 of federal funds spent on HOPE VI, $1.85 comes from other public and private sources (GAO Report, 2002). With the approximately $6 billion spent on HOPE VI since 1993, approximately $11.1 billion in local public and private funds have been leveraged throughout the United States (GAO Report, 2002).

Residential Satisfaction

The literature shows several studies on whether public housing residents benefit from HOPE VI and experience greater residential satisfaction and have improved the quality of life. George Galster (1987: 93) defined residential satisfaction as “the perceived gap between a respondent’s residential needs and aspirations and reality of the current residential context” (See Brazley, 2002; Varady, Walker, and Wang, 2001).

Susan Popkin, et al. (2000) studies the impact of the Gautreaux housing project in Chicago and Michael Brazley’s (2002) study of Park DuValle in Louisville measures the neighborhood and residential satisfaction of the residents, and shows that the majority of the lives of the residents of the Cotter and Lang housing projects were improved as a result of HOPE VI (Brazley, 2002; Brazley and Gilderbloom, 2007; Gilderbloom, 2008). Of residents that left their old public housing project among HOPE VI projects, 63 percent of the residents report that their new housing is in good or excellent condition, and most say that their new neighborhoods have less poverty than their previous neighborhood (Popkin, 2002: 3).

Varady and Preiser (1998: 201) found that three-fourths of the individuals surveyed in single-family, scattered-site units, and three-fifths in clustered scattered-site units are satisfied, while just a third of the residents in traditional developments were satisfied.

These high levels of satisfaction result in environmental factors other than the home, such as the quality of the home, maintenance of the home or unit, the surrounding neighborhoods, the
presence of crime or not, residential involvement by residents in their neighborhoods, and their involvement in the decision-making process in their neighborhood or community (Varady and Preiser, 1998: 201-203).

Varady, Walker, and Wang (2001:1298) also examined the relationship between relocation and housing satisfaction, and found that residents who moved to a nearby housing development were just as likely to be satisfied as those who moved much farther away. Receiving moderate relocating counseling also helped improve housing choice and housing satisfaction.

HOPE VI Self-Sufficiency Program

Another part of the HOPE VI program is the case management program known as the Community and Supportive Services (CSS). CSS was formed in response to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, which helped residents find jobs and transition to better jobs as a means to self-sufficiency through proper counseling and providing information about relocation opportunities, which is a mandatory component of the HOPE VI CSS program. (Kingsley and Corvington, 2000: 4-6; Gilderbloom and Hanka, 2006).

Self-sufficiency services like CSS are an important holistic and comprehensive approach that not only helps residents find and maintain employment and relocate to another housing development, but also addresses the needs of residents with physical and mental disabilities, older adults and senior citizens, as well as individuals who experienced domestic violence, substance abuse, and those with criminal records and poor credit (Popkin, 2002; 2004).

Approximately $714 million has been budgeted by HUD to CSS programs, which has provided direct services to 45,000 residents, resulting in a median cost of $7,620 per resident (Popkin, et al., 2004: 38; Turner, et al., 2007: 16).

Urban Economic Development

Cities have a very important function in our economic system as important agents of economic development. Cities, for the most part, are pivoted on an economic logic that emphasizes that a city must maximize its economic advantage and maximize its wealth by being competitive (Savitch and Kantor, 2002). Because of a city’s structural constraints with capitalism and federalism, cities must be competitive with other cities for economic development (Kantor, 1996). Since cities must compete in the economic marketplace to enhance their bargaining position and maximize their advantage, cities, large or small, must engage in developmental policies aimed towards promoting economic growth (Peterson, 1981; Molotch, 1976; Logan and Molotch, 1987).

These policies are pursued by the growth machine, particularly by business and political elites, in developing the right political and economic conditions for the success of the city’s growth machine (Logan and Molotch, 1987). Much of the growth pursued by the business and political elites, according to Logan and Molotch (1987: 84), are by local circumstance, where “declining cities experience problems that might be erased by replacement investments.”

Cities such as Chicago, New York, and Los Angeles, and smaller or medium-size cities such as Newport, are all guided by the principles of the growth machine (Peterson, 1981; Kantor, 1996; Logan and Molotch, 1987). Different cities have
different resources to bargain for certain developmental outcomes. New York will compete with London and Tokyo and use its bargaining position to bring about development, while cities such as Louisville, Raleigh, N.C., Memphis, Tenn., or Newport, have fewer local resources and must do more to be competitive and bring business and economic development. Through its leadership, a city can use its local autonomy and its economic resources to push these development policies in a strategic manner that are consistent with the resources they have at its disposal (Savitch and Kantor, 2002: 167-168).

Florida (2002, 2005) argues that the most effective development strategy in the post-industrial world is developing cities and localities that have a creative class. In order to entice economic development and urban growth and attract this creative class, cities must develop amenities, which are non-produced public goods and non-market transactions that do not have an explicit price and are restricted to a specific territory that distinguishes it from other territories (Clark, 2002: 497, Green, 2001: 65-66). Florida's analysis measures a positive significant relationship between amenities and the skill level and educational attainment of the workforce (2005: 77). If cities commit the resources to bring highly-skilled and knowledge-intensive jobs, then those who are employed by these industries are more likely to live in areas with high levels of amenities (Florida, 2005: 77).

Certain cultural and social amenities, such as arts, professional sports franchises, shops and restaurants will attract a highly diverse group of people, such as minorities, gays, and bohemians, and a highly educated, highly skilled workforce in information technology, the arts, and music that will bring a critical mass of people into a city or neighborhood to promote growth (Florida, 2002; 2005; Clark, 2002: 497-498). Also, many civic leaders believe that having these amenities will bring middle-class "free-spending visitors" which will help generate investment, increase local tax revenues, and have a multiplier effect in the retail and hospitality sectors (Eisinger, 2000: 317). These amenities can attract businesses in the downtown, and bring tourists and patrons with the disposable income to spend at the shops, entertainment, and dining establishments in and around the downtown area.

Amenities such as historic preservation also have contributed to an increase in capital and economic development in cities. Richard Florida (2002) and Donovan Rypkema (2006) have argued that a powerful relationship exists between historic preservation and economic development. According to Rypkema (1994), historic preservation creates jobs and serves as an incubator for small business development and private investment. Historic preservation allows for adaptive reuse of buildings, develops mixed income households, reduces vacancy rates, increase property values, and spawns future rehabilitation (Rypkema, 1994: 63-70). Also, historic preservation enhances and promotes active community participation through “public/private partnerships” or the main street programs, which can occur at the neighborhood, local, or regional level (Rypkema, 1994: 51).

Local, state, and federal resources can be used to preserve historic structures and neighborhoods, such as federal and state tax credits, historic zoning overlays, soft second loans, grants for facade restoration, the presence of historic preservation offices for towns and cities, allowing adaptive reuse of historic structures, a regulatory design review process for alterations to buildings located within historic districts, and providing educational opportunities to historic property owners (Gilderbloom, House, and Hanka, 2007).

Critique of the Literature: The Need for a New Sustainable Neighborhoods Theory

Much of the literature emphasizes the success of urban economic development strategies and federal housing policies such as HOPE VI. However, little research has focused on the impact of HOPE VI on the overall economic development strategy of a city, and much of the literature has focused, including U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
(HUD) studies, on many of the successes in the larger metropolitan areas, such as Chicago, Atlanta, San Antonio, New York, Seattle, Columbus, Ohio, and Baltimore (Salama, 1999; Popkin, et al, 2004; Schwartz, 2006; HUD, 1999; HUD, 2000), and less on the medium-sized and smaller cities, such as Newport. Smaller cities should not be ignored or go unnoticed, because a city, large or small, must maximize their competitive advantage to bring business and economic development to transform the city into an economic engine.

This report employs a variety of quantitative and qualitative research techniques that use multiple sources of data to measure the impact of HOPE VI on the economic development of Newport. Many great studies of social sciences have used a variety of qualitative and quantitative research techniques (Molotch, 1976; Wilson, 1987; Logan and Molotch, 1987; Florida, 2002; 2005; Gilderbloom and Appelbaum, 1988; Savitch and Kantor, 2002).
This evaluation will consist of a case study on the impact of the HOPE VI program on the economic revitalization of Newport. A case study, according to Orum, Feagin, and Sjoberg, relies on “the examination of a single instance of a phenomenon to explore the hows and whys of a problem” (1991: 121). Case studies are an effective qualitative research method that employs the use of research questions and several data sources to understand a particular entity or social phenomena, such as an organization, community, or social group in its entirety (Shutt, 2004: 420). The case study improves external validity and permits the observer to “assemble complementary and overlapping measures” of a wide variety of data, such as diaries, newspaper reports, correspondences, and personal interviews that can be used to cross check and validate observations as well as claims based on a particular observation (Feagin, et al., 1991: 19).

The case study has many advantages because observations of social phenomena can be done by studying them close at hand; this method also provides multiple sources of information studied over a prolonged period of time. This use of a case study provides a richness and depth of the HOPE VI community that can illuminate and address the broader social context by analyzing the interrelationship of all participants and stakeholders in the community (Shutt, 2004; Babbie, 2004).

Quantitative Statistical Analysis
Since we do not assume or project that the HOPE VI program exclusively caused the economic rise of Newport, we want to measure the impact of HOPE VI on other factors of the city’s economic revitalization. We have collected data between 2000 and 2007 from the beginning to the end of the program from the U.S. Census Bureau, U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), Brighton Center, Inc., and the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN). Property valuation data was collected from the Campbell County Property Valuation Administrator (PVA) that measures the impact of the HOPE VI on the increase in median property values in the HOPE VI neighborhoods of the city, and non-HOPE VI neighborhoods in the city.

Crime data from the Newport Police Department has been collected from 2000, the year before the HOPE VI program began through December 31, 2007 to measure the impact of crime, using the four police districts (Districts 2A, 2B, 2C, and 4A) that encompassed the Housing Authority of Newport’s (HAN) old public housing development. These four districts are located in the west and northwestern portions of Newport.

In order to measure and evaluate the impact of HOPE VI on economic development and business development in the city and the central business district, business startup data was obtained from the City of Newport’s Division of Licensing and Occupations.

In addition, weekly and monthly economic reports were obtained from the annual Polk City Directory volumes, provided from the city’s office of Economic Development through the Campbell County Public Library. The businesses were crossed referenced with the 2000 businesses from the September 2001 Newport Kentucky Polk City Directory. The list compiled from these reports was checked against data of currently operating businesses and determined to be either a currently operating business or a failed or relocated startup.

In the qualitative portion of the analysis, we conducted a series of qualitative face to face interviews with the former public housing residents through door to door and telephone interviews. We have also conducted individual interviews with key stakeholders and Newport community leaders, including Mayor of Newport, Tom Guidugli; Denise Govan, Director of the Family Center at Brighton Center; Captain Howard Niemeier, Administration Services Division Director for the Newport Police Department; Joseph Condit, Executive Director of the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN); George Darnell, the Housing Authority of Newport’s HOPE VI coordinator; and Karen Majors, Senior Project Manager for Corporex, the developer of the Ovation project in Newport, along with everyday people such as residents, store clerks and baristas. Nearly all of the Community and Support Services (CSS) goals were met or exceeded by Brighton Center. The results can be viewed in Appendix B of the report. Below is a discussion of the results.

II. Methodology

Methods used in this HOPE VI assessment

- Case Study
- Quantitative Statistical Analysis
- Survey
- Qualitative Interview
- GIS analysis

Crime data from the Newport Police Department has been collected from 2000, the year before the HOPE VI program began through December 31, 2007 to measure the impact of crime, using the four police districts (Districts 2A, 2B, 2C, and 4A) that encompassed the Housing Authority of Newport’s (HAN) old public housing development. These four districts are located in the west and northwestern portions of Newport.
In 2001, the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN) contracted Brighton Center for supplemental social services during the federal HOPE VI project. HAN granted $2 million of the total $28.4 million budget for Brighton Center. These funds supported the operations of Brighton Center’s Community and Support Services (CSS) program from 2000 through June 30, 2007.

During the initial stages of the contract, Brighton Center conducted an extensive 18-page, person-to-person survey on the existing situation of 179 residents. The survey intended to recognize each household’s strengths and weaknesses in order to tailor programs to fit their unique needs over the course of the five-year program.

Since Brighton Center had not exhausted the funds allotted it in the budget by the 2005 scheduled conclusion of CSS, the contract was extended until June 30, 2007.

As the Community and Supportive Program concluded, 99 previously case managed individuals and families were transitioned into other programs to ensure service continuity. The demographics are as follows: 23 families are inactive, 76 families are active consisting of 135 family members – 78 of these family members are over 18 (65 adults, 8 seniors, and 5 young adults), 57 of them are under the age of 18 (7 high school students, 8 middle-school students, 32 elementary students, and 10 children aged 0 to 5).

CSS, which is the case-management program for all HOPE VI programs, was formed in response to the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation Act of 1996, which helped residents get jobs and stay employed by using training and services as a means to greater self-sufficiency. Also, post-employment training assists individuals in obtaining better jobs (Kingsley and Covington, 2000, p. 4; Brazley, Ye, and Gilderbloom, 2007).

The CSS program in Newport is a public/private partnership established by the Housing Authority of Newport and Brighton Center, Inc. Brighton Center is within walking distance to most of the HOPE VI sites as well as to affordably priced residential neighborhoods and the existing Housing Authority in Newport. Brighton Center provides a one-stop shop for families in need of assistance and does this in a community-center atmosphere. Brighton Center offers a comprehensive continuum of programs and services that are available to CSS families, such as credit counseling, employment training, youth activities, GED classes, home and car ownership, budgeting, family health services, health and childcare services.

Employment

At the time of the assessment in November 2000, 22 of the 179 CSS participants were employed (three part-time and 19 full-time). Figure 3-1 tracks the employment trend during the program. In Year 1 (July 1, 2001 - June 30, 2002) there were 122 employable residents and 64 percent of them were employed. In Year 2, there were 95 employable residents and 81 percent were employed. In Year 3, there were 89 employable residents and 86 percent were employed. In Year 4, there were 74 employable residents and 49 percent were employed. In Year 5, there were 72 employable residents and 63 percent were em-
ployed. In Year 6, there were 66 employable residents and 70 percent (46 residents) were employed.

The figure on this page shows the breakdown of the employed CSS participants by tenure. In the first year, 29 residents were employed for three consecutive months and 13 were employed for one year. In the second year, 53 residents were employed three consecutive months, and 31 were employed for one year. In the third year, 61 residents were employed three consecutive months and 32 were employed for one year. In the fourth year, 55 residents were employed three consecutive months and 36 were employed for one year. In the fifth year, 19 residents were employed three consecutive months and 27 were employed for one year. In year 6, the final year of the CSS program, 17 residents were employed three consecutive months and 29 were employed for one year.

According to Denise Govan, Family Center Director for Brighton Center, one of the biggest factors for the decrease and increase in employment was the high turnover rate with residents. The sharp drop in the percentage of employable residents was the result of employable families being evicted from their homes. When the families are evicted, they are not counted and pulled out of the equation. Many of these residents that were evicted were employed. Despite the fluctuations and the sudden decreases in years 2 and 3 of the program, 46 of the 66 employable residents, or 70 percent, that continue to remain in the program are employed at the end of year 6, compared to 22 of the 179 employable residents (12 percent) at the time of the initial assessment in November 2000.

### Credit Counseling Classes

All HOPE VI participants were notified about credit counseling opportunities provided by Brighton Center. When participants showed interest in the credit counseling class, they were screened by a motivational interview which assesses their individual intentions. Pre-tests and post-tests were given to individuals who participated in the classes in order to track general knowledge attainment, and the overall effectiveness of the content of the credit counseling class.

The two top credit issues among participants are home ownership and car ownership. Another common credit counseling issue is high levels of debt which can be difficult to address. Of all the program participants, 62 total individuals have had their credit report pulled, 12 continue the process of resolving credit issues, and 38 families have fully resolved their serious credit issues.

### Housing Options

Of the original 201 households, 10 households have since purchased homes, 26 have moved to the South-site of the Housing Authority; nine used their Section 8 voucher in Newport and 14 households used their vouchers elsewhere (three households moved to Cincinnati; one to Ohio; two to Wilder; one to Kenton County; five to Covington, of which two are Brighton Property tenants; one to Hebron and one to Highland Heights). Also, two households moved to senior facilities in Newport; 20 have an unknown address, five have signed out of the program, 51 have been evicted, three have died, and 37 have relocated on their own.

Also, 28 individuals have completed the “Yes You Can” classes, a first step toward homeownership, while 41 individuals are working on financial literacy in the Money Matters classes offered through credit counseling services.
Center for Employment Training

Nine residents have completed Brighton Center’s Center for Employment Training (CET). Nine are working full time and seven with full benefits.

Post-Secondary

Out of the residents who are pursuing post-secondary education, two residents have graduated from a post-secondary college (Southwestern and Cincinnati State), and one has completed the Job Corps program. One resident is currently attending Northern Kentucky University and is on the Dean’s List. Also, three are attending Gateway, and one is attending Alice Lloyd College.

High School/ GED

The HOPE VI Community Learning Center and the Newport Adult Learning Center offer adult-education classes that have been attended by 46 residents. The Test of Adult Basic Education (TABE) has been taken by 56 residents, of which 27 have increased TABE scores since the program’s inception. Of the 41 residents who did not have a high school diploma, 13 have earned their GED since the program’s inception, and six are working toward their GED: 30 residents have taken and passed the practice GED test.

Youth Activities

Brighton Center has offered youth programs as alternative extra-curricular activities. These programs have provided supplemental skills to targeted youth. Girl Scout Troop #702 was formed in June 2003 and had the regular participation of 21 girls in the program. Also, 34 girls attended a Girl Scout Day Camp in summer 2006. Eight youth have completed the Youth Career Paths Program, where each participant has gained valuable skills that will assist them in the job market. A total of 12 children have graduated from the Youth Leadership Development program, where they have gained skills in community service, positive self-image and positive peer interaction. Right now, two youth are enrolled and nearing graduation.

Health

Brighton Center contracted Summit Behavioral Health to serve 25 residents on site by counseling individuals on a wide range of issues. In total, 29 individuals received some type of counseling/therapy service.

Brighton Center partnered with a local dentist to provide services for four CSS participants. These residents had major dental repair including complete dental extractions and replacement dentures. Lack of dental care plagues a large percentage of the individuals and families in the low-income community. For these particular residents, there new smiles have increased their confidence to move forward towards their self sufficiency goals. Of the four residents who received dental care, one is attending Gateway Technical College and entering her second semester, one is on her third semester at NKU and has been on the Deans list all three semesters, and one is maintaining a full time job for the first time. Not only has the dental care for these four residents been a huge health benefit to them, it has also increased their self-esteem and occupational marketability.

Progress by the numbers

2 college graduates
9 Center for Employment Training graduates
12 Youth Leadership Development graduates
13 GEDs earned
21 Girl Scouts
27 increased TABE scores

For more information about program goals and progress, see Appendix B, page 65.
Ongoing Outreach Efforts

CSS developed an incentive plan to encourage the remaining HOPE VI families to successfully relocate. Individuals or families who have had no contact with a CSS staff person were offered a $50 gift certificate to meet with a specialist at least two times to develop a service plan or discuss the family's relocation plan. Since this plan was implemented in August 2005, 22 families have developed a service plan. In addition to developing these plans, a family may receive additional incentives by completing the following goals:

- Participants who attend a town meeting or group education session (such as the weatherization class held in November) will receive a $10 gift certificate.
- Those who complete the “Money Matters” program will receive a $50 gift certificate.
- Residents who begin financial counseling will be awarded a $25 gift certificate for each session (estimated that 2-3 sessions may be needed).
- Those completing the “Yes, You Can! Classes” will receive a $50 gift certificate.
- Once residents have completed Money Matters and/or Yes, You Can! classes and begin to pay down existing debt, CSS will double the individual’s payment to the creditor each month until either the debt is paid, the program ends, or funds are exhausted (ex. Resident pays $50 toward a debt and CSS will pay $100).
- Residents who purchase a home will be awarded a $500 shopping spree to be used for home furnishings and household wares.

Overall Project Effectiveness

Brighton Center has sponsored quarterly HOPE VI Community Task Force meetings to encourage community and organizational support. In addition, monthly town meetings were held for residents in the CSS program to keep them informed of current developments. Since October 2002, more than 70 residents have attended the monthly town meetings. Meetings were discontinued in April 2006 because many of the residents of HAN’s north-site relocated prior to its demolition on June 30, 2006.

A total of 34 of the 34 scheduled supportive services programs have been utilized. The HAN currently provides home maintenance classes that are given by HAN maintenance supervisor upon purchase of a home. All 10 homeowners have completed this class. A total of 27 of the 34 (79 percent) support service participation goals have been completed or exceeded. 32 of the 34 (94 percent) support service programs have met or exceeded 50 percent of the original participation goals. Nine of the 35 (29 percent) participation goals have been exceeded by over 100 percent. The only goals that did not meet expectations were the goals associated with the Center for Employment Training (CET) such as the career training program, completing the CET program, CET participants obtaining full-time employment, and full-time employment for 9 months, and CET participants being offered health insurance; HAN providing basic home maintenance to residents; and participating in the Northern Kentucky University (NKU) entrepreneurship center for small business. The success of meeting the participation goals is surprising in light of the decreases in families eligible for HOPE VI because of evictions or moving out of the area.

Brighton Center’s CSS is a unique program. As one of the most comprehensive agencies in the Northern Kentucky and Greater Cincinnati area, and quite possibly one of the most comprehensive in the country, Brighton Center offers a continuum of more than 36 program services. To learn more about these services, consult Brighton Center’s Web site at www.brightoncenter.com. Brighton Center has a solid track record of building solid relationships with its families and staying connected and involved with them. The programs and their administrators are a true benefit to all of the participating individuals and families.
HOPE VI residents were generally satisfied with the programs and housing made available to them. We have used a survey research instrument that measured the resident’s overall satisfaction of the program services provided to them through the HOPE VI case management services from Brighton Center, Incorporated in Newport. Denise Govan, the Family Center Director of Brighton Center, and Mary Kitts, the Brighton Center Community and Supportive Services (CSS) Caseworker, provided us a list of 100 CSS families, which represents the number of families active in the CSS program as of June 4, 2007. The list consisted of names of all CSS families with and without telephone numbers and their mailing addresses.

The survey’s six-point scale ranges from strongly agree, agree, neutral (neither agree nor disagree), disagree, strongly disagree, and no answer. The first section consisted of questions aimed at understanding the overall neighborhood and residential satisfaction of the HOPE VI residents with respect to the programs and services offered by Brighton Center’s Community and Supportive Services (CSS) and the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN), and whether these programs and services have improved the quality of life for the individuals and families who participated. The survey was a combination of original questions, as well as questions taken from previous academic studies (Brazley, 2002; Gilderbloom, 2008).

This section also measures the changes in the residents’ satisfaction of their neighborhood, and the overall health of the neighborhood over the last seven years from the inception of the HOPE VI program in 2000 through 2007 at the end of the CSS program, including whether there are more recreation activities for adults and children, more public transportation opportunities available, and better educational and employment opportunities in my new neighborhood, and as result of the programs offered by CSS.

The survey also asked questions on community residents and safety and community activity, including social capital, which Putnam (2000: 19) defined as “connections among individuals- social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them.” For Putnam, social capital is important for a community because individuals and groups benefit for their contact and involvement in social networks, which includes higher levels of involvement and participation in groups.

Our survey also asks questions on safe and affordable housing, including questions on whether or not the residents felt their community is clean and the houses in the neighborhoods are well-maintained, whether there’s a presence of crime and drugs in the neighborhood, and whether or not the residents felt there were enough opportunities for safe and affordable housing, such as subsidized, Section 8, and market-rate housing.

Questions pertaining to training and vocational opportunities, level of education, presence of drugs, lack of affordable child care, and the confidence in the local housing market are important factors towards measuring and predicting the success of self sufficiency.
programs (Ryzin, Ronda, and Muzzio, 2001; Brazley, 2002; Santiago and Galster, 2004; Kleit and Rohe, 2005; Brazley and Gilderbloom, 2007).

The surveys were administered throughout the month of June 2007. In addition, we submitted a study amendment request form to the Human Subjects Protection Program office at the University of Louisville on June 4, 2007 to update and amend our initial approval of our HOPE VI study in 2002. We received approval from their office the following week on June 11, 2007. The majority of our interviews were conducted over the telephone, because it is more economical. Surveys not administered over the telephone were done in person at Brighton Center or through home visits. Respondents were guaranteed anonymity so they could be candid. Responses were kept private.

All CSS participants, regardless of having a working telephone number or current mailing address, were notified by Brighton Center staff to stop by Brighton Center headquarters to complete the questionnaire. Door-to-door interviews were conducted in Newport on June 25, 2007 with families who live in the south site of the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN) public housing project. The north-site of the public housing projects towards the Ohio River and floodwall were demolished. All the families had moved out and relocated to the south site or other areas around Newport as of September 30, 2006. The door-to-door interviews were conducted by the group who had an address, where some had a telephone number, but most of those we reached going door-to-door did not. Out of these residents we could not reach door-to-door and in-person, we did telephone follow-up calls and returned to Newport two weeks later to complete interviews we did not get before in the previous attempts.

The survey was administered and completed by 54 out of the 100 families, resulting in a response rate of 54 percent. Our aim was to get a 50 percent response rate, since conventional wisdom dictates that at least 50 percent is needed in order to publish the findings in a journal. (Gilderbloom, Rosentraub and Bullard, 1987). Indeed while some scholarly articles are published below the 50 percent response rate, we believe that 50 percent is our personal gold standard, which is what we used in this evaluation. On the list of 100 families provided to us, 17 families were considered unknown or missing-in-action (MIA), meaning Brighton Center had no current contact information from them, such as a mailing address or telephone number.

Our survey was approximately six pages in length and was divided into six sections consisting of 55 statements using a six-point scale and five open-ended questions in the demographic section of the survey, which asked the respondents their age, race, level of education, number of persons living in the household, and monthly household income. The results of the survey were manually inputted using an internet software survey program (See Appendix C for Survey).

The demographic data is shown in the tables on the side.

### Employment Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Full-time</td>
<td>8 15.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part-time</td>
<td>3 5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, looking for work</td>
<td>9 17.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed, not looking for work</td>
<td>33 62.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Marital Status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single</td>
<td>25 46.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>9 16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Divorced</td>
<td>6 11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Separated</td>
<td>10 18.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Widowed</td>
<td>4 7.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Do You Own A Car?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>24 45.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>29 54.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Do You Own A Bicycle?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>#</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>15 27.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>39 72.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The majority of the families have a single white female as head of the household with a mean age of 44 years old. Each household has five or fewer persons. The majority of the residents do not own a car or a bicycle. The majority of the residents have only a high school diploma and most of the residents are unemployed and not looking for work. A significant portion on disability or receiving Social Security. The median household income is $643 per month, or roughly $7,716 per year.

**Survey Response Analysis**

In terms of neighborhood satisfaction, the overwhelming majority of respondents felt that the Housing Authority of Newport and the Brighton Center CSS have helped to improve their situation. These agencies, according to our analysis, are doing a good job and ultimately have improved the quality of life for the residents. When asked if residents had an opportunity in the future to move out of their current neighborhood, a majority answered that they would wish to move. This may indicate that residents seek to improve their current situation, find a permanent home that they may someday own, or simply relocate to a different neighborhood or community.

Those who would prefer to stay in their current neighborhood and purchase their home may do so because the families are in a favorable financial situation to be able to purchase and own a home. These respondents could have strong community ties and identify with their current neighborhood or they may have uncertainty about where they would move if presented with the opportunity.

Overall, residents have pride in their communities where a majority of residents have attended festivals and/or meetings in their community. However, a large majority of residents do not belong to a community organization or group. The lack of participation in a civic or community group or organization may be attributed to the decline in social capital in a community, which is defined as “connections among individuals—social networks and the norms of reciprocity and trustworthiness that arise from them” (Putnam, 2000:19).

Social capital is important for a community because individuals and groups benefit from their contact and involvement in social networks. High levels of social capital result in higher levels of civic involvement from individuals who are involved in civic activities. Social capital has internal effects, which are the qualities that the citizens gain from participation in local and neighborhoods affairs, such as civic-mindedness, cooperation, and public-spiritedness (Putnam 2000, 338-342).

This lack of involvement is the result of breaking ties with their old neighborhood or community, and the reality that civic involvement does not take priority over fulfilling a family’s immediate and basic needs. Many families in CSS work and others are on disability, which will impact whether or not that family and the family members are involved in the community.

In terms of community safety, the overwhelming majority of survey respondents agree that diverse people from different backgrounds and cultures reside in their neighborhoods, and that they relate well with their neighbors. A significant number of respondents with children feel comfortable allowing children to play outside. Residents also feel safe in their neighborhoods on points of adequate street light at night and police presence. Although residents perceive more drugs in their neighborhoods than in 2000, the majority of residents feel that gun violence and graffiti has decreased in their neighborhoods.

According to the survey, residents believe their community is clean and houses in their neighborhoods are well-maintained. Residents agree that
there are more opportunities for safe and affordable housing, such as subsidized, Section 8, and market-rate housing.

Brighton Center’s Community Support Services (CSS) have improved residents’ job skills, educational opportunities, and employability by helping the residents develop resume and interview skills. In terms of the childcare services and programs offered by Brighton Center, many of the families responded with “no answer.” Although Brighton Center offers various childcare opportunities, many respondents had no children, and thus would not need these services. Overall, the majority of the residents are satisfied with services which help gain employment and improve education, but more importantly, an overwhelming majority of respondents agree that Brighton Center’s CSS has improved their quality of life.

Many of the residents expressed comments about their experiences in Brighton Center’s CSS. The comments were very positive and complimentary of the programs at Brighton Center and the Housing Authority of Newport. Mary Kitts and Sharon Stantzell, the CSS Caseworkers in the Brighton Center, received much praise. Their work with the program ended on June 30, 2007, but their impact on these residents is tremendous. One respondent said:

“Other than being concerned about individual financial matters, they were also concerned about a person’s welfare and well-being. I enjoyed working with them, 5 stars.”

Another respondent said:

“I appreciate the people that have helped me along the way. Mary Kitts at the

Brighton Center was very good and helpful. I appreciate everything Brighton Center has done over the years for me!”

One respondent said:

“Is there anything you can do to get more time in the program? Some people have more issues than four years or 7 years will fix. Everyone is sad to see Mary go. People get health issues or other things that get them stuck. Mary is more than a social worker. She’s a friend, like a family member. Mary would take me to appointments. She looks out for me. I don’t see why CSS has to end.”

The CSS program has had an enormous and profound impact on the lives of individuals and families where they gained value to help them become better workers, employees, parents, and citizens. One participant reflected on her experienced with Brighton Center CSS:

“This program changed me and it should be able to continue to help people become independent. It helped me get educated and taught me about safety. I love the program; love the people I worked with... My kids enjoy just getting to be kids. No one can steal their bikes because they’re in their yard... They have a house now, and they need to share it with other kids who don’t have a house. They invite other at-risk kids over all the time, and the kids really enjoy being able to do that. I hope they (people in the program) get something more from this or something similar. There’s so many who need this, who this can help them. Everyone around here is trying to get by and is going about it the wrong way. Now that I know the way I try to get out there and help people do things the right way.”

Summary of Survey Data

Overall, the participants in the Brighton Center’s CSS programs and the HOPE VI housing project are satisfied with the services HAN and Brighton Center have provided. They agree that both agencies are doing a good job. The residents overwhelming agree that they have more educational and employment opportunities, especially from Brighton Center. Residents’ lives are better because of the Housing Authority of Newport and Brighton Center providing the services, the skills, tools, and self-esteem to be able to move out and
become employable and productive members of their community. These families took classes to learn how to manage credit and debt, and learning how to be stronger people and citizens. The programs and services provided by HAN and CSS have given these families the opportunity to own their home and become stakeholders in the community, and help them turn around the very community in which they live.
According to the terms of the contract signed by U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) and the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN), the 325 units agreed to in the contract should be completed by June 2009. Of the 325 total units, 192 of them are rental units and the remaining 133 units are homeownership units. The 192 rental units are more than the 150 agreed upon between the housing authority and HUD after HAN submitted a revised revitalization plan to change the total. Of the 133 homeownership units, 65 of them are the Second Mortgage (CIPP) units, and the remaining 68 homeownerships units (new construction and historic rehabilitation) are being developed by HAN.

All of the 201 families who were living at the old Newport Housing Authority north-site were relocated as of June 30, 2006. The demolition of the north-site housing units was completed on November 30, 2006. The offices of the Housing Authority, once located at the north-site, have been relocated to a newly-renovated historic building on 30 East 8th Street near Monmouth Street.

The Corpus Christi Apartments project is a 20-unit nine percent Low Income Housing Tax Credit (LIHTC) and the development was completed on January 15, 2006. All twenty units will be tax credit (50 percent of AMI), and are designed for senior living. The units range from 628 to 767 square feet and have remained at 100 percent occupancy since they opened thanks to a marketing plan instituted by the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN), who also acts as the property manager.

HAN also received an award from the Newport Historic Preservation Committee on the Corpus Christi project. According to George Darnell, the HOPE VI coordinator for HAN, Corpus Christi was submitted in a national historic renovation competition by Cole and Russell Architects, the architectural firm who designed Corpus Christi.

As of last year, all of the homes in Liberty Row, owned by the Newport New Millennium Housing Corporation have been completed. All 14 homes have been built (13 newly constructed and one rehabilitated homes). Construction on the Liberty Row Housing project (39 rental units) began in January 2007. At the time of reporting, HAN has completed seven of the rental units on Roberts Street, with full occupancy since going online in September 2007. HAN acts as the developer and property manager on this project. Like Corpus Christi, this development is a nine percent LIHTC development, and is scheduled to be completed by the end of summer 2008.

Also, HAN and Brighton Center received an 811 Grant for the development of housing for persons with disabilities, which they used to develop 12 units. The housing for persons with disabilities is developed for families that have a disabled member, and not solely for those families that have a disabled head of household.

The map on the opposite page shows properties scheduled for completion as of March 2008 according to HAN.

The Housing Authority of Newport will also develop and manage an 18-unit, non-tax credit funded scattered-site project called Central Housing. Construction on the twelve historical rehabilitation units began on May 14, 2007, of which 6 have been put online, and all are either rented or assigned to prospective tenants, while the 6 new construction units (the three duplex units) had just been through the bidding process and construction will begin in June 2008. Once again, HAN will act as its own developer and property manager on this project which should be fully completed by the early fall of 2008.

HAN continues to plan and will soon have closings on the 103-unit, scattered-site, City-Wide development and will act as developer and property manager of this project. The Housing Authority recently procured Ohio Capital Corporation, a non-profit affiliate of Ohio’s State Financing Agency, as financial advisor. Ohio Capital will assist HAN with the development using a four percent LIHTC which also entails a four percent bond financing deal. Construction on this development is scheduled to begin in March 2008 and be completed in the summer 2009.
HAN has received the final approval letter from HUD for the HCRH (HOPE VI Constructed or Rehabilitated Homes) Homeownership project; it is a 54-unit project that will construct new and rehabilitate existing homes within the city limits of Newport. 20 new construction units will be built in the Southern Hills area, and 23 new construction and 11 rehabilitated units will be built in the City Basin area. These newly constructed and rehabilitated homes will be sold to families who can qualify for the HCRH soft second mortgage loan, earn up to 80 percent of the average median income (AMI), and satisfy all other criteria per HCRH program guidelines. Families who are recipients of Housing Choice Voucher certificates are also eligible to purchase one of these homes, according to George Darnell, HOPE VI coordinator for the Housing Authority of Newport. To-date, 14 homes have been built and are owned and occupied at the Liberty Row site; 15 homes at the Liberty Housing site are under construction and scheduled for completion in Summer of 2008; the 8 units at the Saratoga site are underway, scheduled for completion in late summer of 2008, and the 11 rehabilitation units at the Hamlet Street site are scheduled to begin in September of 2008, which brings the total to 68 HCRH homeownership units plus the 65 CIPP homes.

According to Darnell, “buyers of the HCRH homes will be eligible for either the HCRH soft second mortgage financing (up to $35,000.00) or the CDBG grant soft second mortgage financing ($40,000.00). The HCRH/CDBG subsidy will be evidenced by a promissory note, where the homebuyers pay no periodic payment on current principal or interest on the soft second mortgage loan as long as they own their home for a minimum of 5 years (HCRH) or 8 years (CDBG), and after that 5 or 8 years, the loan will be forgiven at a rate of 20 percent per year (HCRH) or 12.5 percent per year (CDBG). After the 5 or 8 years, the loan will be forgiven. The Housing Authority of Newport (HAN) is a developer of the HCRH Homeownership project, and is currently bidding out the project to multiple builders in multiple phases.

In addition to HCRH, the Community Investment Partnership Program (CIPP), HAN’s other soft-second mortgage program assists qualified low and moderate-income homebuyers, which includes the general public, HAN residents, and housing voucher program participants per the CIPP guidelines (Housing Authority of Newport, 2007).

To date, HAN has provided forgivable loans to 65 low and moderate-income homebuyers who have purchased homes throughout the City of Newport. The CIPP program began with over $1.6 million, and now, the program is closed, having closed its 65th loan in November of 2007. This program has been very successful. Since the development agreement was signed on September 30, 2002, and the resubmitted schedule was approved by HUD on August 1, 2003, HAN has only completed a portion of its commitment to HUD and the City of Newport, with over 103 units not completed or even begun construction as of summer 2007. According to the agreement, all of the $28 million of HOPE VI Grant must be committed/or used by the end of December 2008. Of the 192 rental units agreed to, 89 units have been completed with another 103 units ready to start in the spring of 2008. Of the homeownership units, 29 units are complete, with 8 units under construction at Saratoga Street, and another 11 close to starting construction.
Seven of the eight phrases have been completed, with the eight phase ready to begin. The slow progress by the Housing Authority of Newport to acquire property, construct or rehabilitate the homes has been a result of the regulations, procedures, and approval process through Newport’s Historic Preservation office. The difference between the Historic Preservation Office’s timetable of negotiating the purchase of property and the approval of the designs, and HAN’s timetable towards completing the early phases of the project delayed the rehabilitation of existing housing and the construction of new housing units.

The Newport HOPE VI Project was approved by HUD in 2000, with a goal set by HAN to complete the project by June 30, 2009. Per HAN, they are on schedule to meet this deadline. However, there were several obstacles to HAN’s project that were not required by other HOPE VI projects. Because units were not being built back on the original public housing site, HAN planned to acquire properties scattered throughout Newport. This allows tenants and buyers to live in various neighborhoods throughout the City of Newport. The acquisition of property was a four year process which included demolition, environmental abatement, site preparation, and in some cases relocation of sellers and tenants. Many of these neighborhoods were located in areas that were labeled to be historically significant by the Kentucky State Historic Preservation office. As a result, HAN spent significant time in negotiating purchasing property for preservation and for reaching agreements for historic approval of designs. The remaining properties were demolished for construction.

In 2006, the Housing Authority of Newport decided to become the developer of the projects. This changed allowed HAN to reduce the cost of construction and related costs. It also allowed for reducing costs that would otherwise be paid to an outside developer. As a result, there was a significant increase in construction time for current projects, with the City Wide Project prepared to finish on or before June 30, 2009.
VI. Property Values

The economic revitalization of Newport has occurred through property value changes in HOPE VI and non-HOPE VI neighborhoods. The Saratoga Street and the Liberty Row housing development represent the neighborhoods with a high concentration HOPE VI development properties. The East Row Historic District and an area in Southwest downtown Newport was chosen to represent the non-HOPE VI areas for comparison. The East Row District was chosen to help evaluate the effects of historic preservation districts on property values, while the Southwest Downtown area was recommended by the Housing Authority of Newport as an area of similar composition and value to the HOPE VI areas.

Information from the Campbell County Property Valuation Administration was used to study the change in property values from 2000 to 2007. ArcMap shapefiles were provided for the lots in the study by the PVA. Training was provided on how to use the public information on the PVA’s Web site (www.campbellipva.com)

Assessed values were used to determine property values for the years of 2000 and 2007. These happened to be assessment years for the areas in question, and therefore, most lots were assessed in those years. For those that were not assessed in those years, the assessed values for the closest previous year were used. Lots not assigned a property identification number will be listed in the data as 0, and therefore, the data is skewed slightly downward.

These tables show that property values are significantly higher in HOPE VI neighborhoods (126 percent) vs. non-HOPE VI neighborhoods (81 percent). While the historic preservation districts are the same age as the non-regulated areas, the architecture details, size, and the quality of life in the neighborhoods is greater. This has an important benefit to homeowners who benefit from significantly higher property values. In the case of Newport, property values have increased more than 100 percent over the past seven years. However, the quality of life doesn’t explain it all. The assurances of historic preservation have helped to protect homes from homes being defaced or demolished.
Saratoga: HOPE VI Neighborhood

Over the seven-year study period, the median gain in property value was $124,750, while the median percentage gain was 162 percent. Property values in the Saratoga area range from $5,000 on at 620 Saratoga Street empty lot to $2,896,865 at a commercial property also known as Watertower Square at 601 Washington Street. The median property value in 2007 was $148,750, compared to the median property value of $124,000 in 2000. Only two lots experienced a loss in value: 630 Washington Avenue and 639 Dayton St. The majority of properties (79) experienced at least a doubling of the assessed value. All HOPE VI properties experienced a minimum of a 100 percent increase in value.

The property value results can be viewed on the map below. The area identified as the HOPE VI Saratoga area runs from 7th Street in the north to 6th Street in the south and contains both sides of the border streets. The east side of Saratoga Street makes the eastern border, and the western side of Washington Street is the western border. It is just east of downtown and is in the historic district. This area includes 118 property lots, 11 of which are HOPE VI properties as of June 2007.

Liberty Housing: A HOPE VI Neighborhood

Over the 7-year study period, the median gain in property value was 89 percent. In that period, nine properties lost value; five were a result of improvements being torn down in preparation for redevelopment, and two were subdivided from another lot. The majority of these property value increases occurred in or near the HOPE VI developments. Increases in percentage property-value change decreased as you move farther from the new housing. The houses removed to make room for HOPE VI housing were of low quality, so the mid-range housing put in its place resulted in a large increase in value.
The map below shows the areas identified as Liberty Housing, which includes the Liberty Row I and Liberty Housing (Liberty Row II) developments of the HOPE VI program and surrounding areas. This area runs from the west side of Patterson Street in the west to the east side of Central Avenue in the east. The northern border is the south side of West 7th Street, and the southern border is the north side of West 9th Street. This area is just west of the Central Business District. There are 310 property lots in this study area, 67 of which are HOPE VI properties. In the study area assessed property values range from $1,700 on a small undeveloped lot at 706 Central Avenue, to $1,547,650 at the Brighton Center Family Center at 799 Ann Street. The median property value was $49,000 in 2007, while the median property value in 2000 was $25,273.

East Row: No HOPE VI, historic district
Over the past seven years, gain in property values increased 83 percent. There are 56 properties in this study area, and no HOPE VI lots. Values in the area range from $10,800 at an empty lot at 319 E. 6th St., to $925,000 at the Mansion Hill property at 302-304 E 3rd St. The median property value was $159,250 in 2007, compared to $67,500 in 2000. While all properties experienced an increase, the improvement was slightly more pronounced in the blocks that were entirely residential. Some of the homes are now going for $500,000 in some areas of the East Row Historic District, compared to $40,000 to 80,000 a decade ago.

A portion of the East Row Historic District is represented in the map on the preceding page. The study area runs from the south end of 3rd Street...
in the north to the north end of 6th Street in the south. The east border is the west side of Washington Street, and the west border is the west side of Overton Street.

**Southwest Downtown: No HOPE VI, no historic preservation**

Values increased an average of $23,968, and the median percentage gained was 73 percent. Southwest shows moderate increases in property values. This sample includes 112 lots, none of which are HOPE VI properties. The least expensive lot is worth $10,800 at 932 Brighton St., and the Northern Kentucky Headstart property at 502 W 9th St., a $1,187,600 property. The median property value is $49,500 in 2007, and the median value in 2000 was $28,360. Only one property in this area lost value, but more than two-thirds of the properties (68 percent) experienced moderate gains of up to 100 percent.

The map on the next page shows changes in property value for an area of southwest downtown Newport that is similar to the Saratoga and Liberty Row and Liberty Housing developments, according to George Darnell, HOPE VI coordinator for the Housing Authority of Newport. This area runs from Lowell Street in the west to Brighton Street in the east, and from 9th Street in the north to 12th Street in the south.
Comparing the study areas

A GIS comparison was undertaken to determine if the presence of historic preservation districts have had an effect on property values. According to the table below, property values increased at higher rates in terms of total value in HOPE VI neighborhoods than in comparable areas without HOPE VI. Saratoga, with both HOPE VI properties and historic preservation showed the largest increase in value.

The presence of new HOPE VI housing has a positive impact on surrounding property values. Saratoga experienced nearly twice the median value by percentage. While total dollars increase was higher in the East Row, the median housing value increased more dramatically than Saratoga Street. Although public housing has moved in, the lowest property values increased and improved the value of the low quality housing. A similar pattern with HOPE VI properties can be seen in the areas outside the historic district. The median value increase at a faster rate, and the percentage increases in Liberty Housing I/II outpaces that of Southwest Downtown.

The bar chart below shows trends in property value increases for the study areas. Neighborhoods with either HOPE VI or historic preservation, such as East Row and Saratoga, experienced higher appreciation than those without. Considering the aforementioned downward skew in HOPE VI areas due to demolition before reconstruction, it can be determined that housing values in HOPE VI neighborhoods show a higher rate on appreciation than in similar neighborhoods.

Liberty and Southwest both show a dramatic peak in the middle and a gradual decline before and after. The difference is that Southwest Downtown is more heavily weighted toward the low end. Saratoga

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>HOPE VI</th>
<th>Saratoga</th>
<th>Liberty</th>
<th>East Row</th>
<th>Southwest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Range High (2007) | $2,896,865 | $1,547,650 | $925,000 | $1,187,600 |
| Range Low (2007) | $5,000 | $1,700 | $10,800 | $10,800 |
| Median (2007) | $148,750 | $49,000 | $159,250 | $49,500 |
| Mean (2007) | $111,734 | $57,839 | $198,632 | $63,158 |
| Median (2000) | $24,000 | $25,273 | $67,500 | $28,360 |
| Mean (2000) | $52,547 | $31,888 | $108,724 | $39,430 |
| Mean Change | $58,973 | $28,848 | $92,380 | $23,968 |
| Median Percent Change | 162% | 89% | 83% | 73% |
| Mean Percent Change | 428% | 160% | 116% | 89% |
Saratoga and East Row have a more level percentage of increases before falling off, but also have several properties that increased as well. Saratoga is more level, and appears to echo the path of the East Row. In the case of each dyad, the HOPE VI neighborhoods have more properties with higher rates of increase than their non-HOPE VI counterpart.

The area in our study that we would expect to see the greatest appreciation would be Saratoga because of its location in a historic district, but it also benefits from the HOPE VI program. The presence of HOPE VI has the greatest positive effect on the median and mean numbers, which is caused by an increase in property value on the properties in the neighborhood with the lowest values, and a more uniform increase across all properties. Compared to similar neighborhoods, trend data shows that the presence of HOPE VI magnifies the increases in property values. The mean values of the historic district are higher than in other non-historic neighborhoods in the city of Newport.

Perhaps the best news for Newport is that its central area has seen an increase in property values and the tax base in all areas. Efforts to improve the housing stock have been successful in raising property values, resulting in an average 198 percent appreciation across our study area. This increase in tax base, combined with a solidifying commercial district should fuel Newport’s emergence as a major player in the Cincinnati Metropolitan Areas and the region area for years to come.
As part of our evaluation, we were asked by the federal government to examine crime patterns before and after HOPE VI. In certain aspects, it is naive to believe that crime would be impacted by just one federal program. Yet what we are examining in this evaluation is whether the deconcentration of the poor and creation of greater economic opportunities can positively impact a small neighborhood. There are many factors that impact crime, so it is hard to isolate exactly the forces at play. This analysis provides our best effort to answer these questions.

We were asked to compare crime statistics from 2000 to 2007 in HOPE VI and non-HOPE VI areas. Crime statistical data was collected from the Newport Police Department from 2000 to 2007 in cooperation with Captain Howard Niemeier, Administrative Services Coordinator for the department. Crimes are recorded by type of offense. From 2000 to 2007, 10 types of criminal offenses occurred in the four precincts of interest in this study, Districts 2A, 2B, 2C, and 4A.

These police districts are located just west of Monmouth Street in Newport, and are the districts of interest for this evaluation. The map on the next page shows relative location of these districts. These four districts are located in the west and northwestern portions of Newport. The old north-site housing units of the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN) are located in District 2A. The boundaries of District 2A are the Riverwalk to the north, the floodwall and Licking River to the west, 5th Street to the south, and Columbia Street to the east. This district is primarily residential and once included the former HAN north-site public housing. The remaining residents vacated the north-site on June 30, 2006. This site is currently a large vacant lot, but is slated for development.

District 2B is immediately to the east of District 2A, which includes the Levee, Campbell County Courthouse and the northern section of the Central Business District. District 2C and 4A are immediately south of District 2A and 2B. District 2B and 2C are non-HOPE VI areas, while the current Newport public housing areas are located in both Districts 2C and 4A. District 4A includes much of the new HOPE VI developments such as Liberty Row and Liberty Housing and the Brighton Center Family Development Center.

The figure below shows the percentage change in crimes by offense category. Personal crimes are crimes with victims, while property crime involves the theft or damage to property. Crime dropped 19 percent overall in the four districts. Personal crimes dropped 54 percent and property crime fell 37 percent. Drug violations grew by 12 percent. However, the national trend from 1996 to 2005 was a larger...
growth of 16 percent according to the Bureau of Justice Statistics.

Changes in crime were not uniform across the four police districts. Precincts 2A (old public housing) and 4A (HOPE VI development in neighborhood) experienced dramatic population shifts due to HOPE VI. It would not be surprising to see a drop in 2A with an accompanying increase in 4A. However, crime dropped overall in both precincts.

The chart below shows the change in overall crime rate by precinct. The largest drop was in 2C, fueled by a 97 percent drop in shoplifting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Precinct</th>
<th>2A</th>
<th>2B</th>
<th>2C</th>
<th>4A</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Change in crime rate</td>
<td>-40</td>
<td>-12</td>
<td>-42</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three of the four districts (2A, 2B, and 2C) experienced a decrease in crime, while District 4A (HOPE VI area) experienced virtually no increase in crime (three percent). That District 4A showed virtually no increase instead of a drop may reflect the expected influx in population into new housing instead of any real shift toward higher crime. The amount of HOPE VI housing represent only a small portion of the total housing in that district. Precinct 2A (old public housing) showed an expected sharp decrease, because the Housing Authority of Newport’s north-site residents have been displaced after the public housing was demolished in 2006. The neighborhood is now mostly empty blocks.

The heavy decrease in 2C (non-HOPE VI area) is higher than expected. The closing of the old public housing site on the north site in 2006 reduced the area police patrol on a regular basis, allowing for more focused enforcement, so the large drop is more remarkable than the actual number.

### Crimes by type

Crimes were divided into three categories. Personal crimes include aggravated assault, simple assault and robbery. Property crimes include burglary, shoplifting, vehicle theft, theft from a building, theft from a vehicle and theft other. Drug violations were considered separately since there is no direct harm to other persons or property.

Total property crimes and personal crimes dropped in all precincts, but drug violations decreased in two precincts, stayed the same in one, and increased in District 4A. Property crime dropped by 132 total violations, personal crimes dropped by 68, and drug violations increased by 13 offenses.

#### Personal Crime

The figure below shows the drop in total crime among personal crimes. Aggravated assault
dropped in every precinct. Given the population shift, a drop in all personal crimes should be expected in 2A, however, simple assault and robbery increased in that district. Newport Police Officer Bill Johnson said that assault calls to the north public housing site were regular, rowdy and centered on Slaughter Lane and Bonner Court. Since the north site has been removed, there has not been a similar spike in other areas, but he said the south site's Chestnut Street in 2C receives regular visits from police. So far, there have been only a couple of flare-ups in the south site since the north site was closed. The south site has experienced less criminal activity and is much more calm than it once was, said police. In July 2007, Newport Police Officer Steve McElroy said there hadn’t been any fights in the south site since January. In previous years, police officers would receive regular calls to locations in the north and south sites, where groups of people, as many as 10 would be engaged in a physical altercation. McElroy said: “We didn’t get these 10-15-minute breaks to stand here and talk between calls before. Before, on night shift, you were living down there, but that’s not the case anymore. It’s dead by 11 on a Friday night now. That’s new.”

Robbery increased overall, but much of the increase was experienced in District 4A. Johnson said juveniles stealing bicycles is the top problem with robbery in the area, which is relatively calm in recent years. Reports of robberies in District 2B experienced an increase likely due to the Levee serving as a site of opportunity with tourists and easy access to city, county and state lines. However, the crime rate at the Levee has been relatively low. Crime experienced in the tourist area have been juveniles stealing inexpensive jewelry during the day and intoxicated tourists on night shift, Johnson and Niemeier said.

Drug Violations
The figure below shows the change in total drug violations from 2000-2007 in the study area. Drug violations increased in two of the four precincts. The two most northern precincts, 2A and 2B showed modest drops, while 2C had virtually no change, and 4A showed an expected increase.

The largest increase was in 4A with 29 more violations recorded in 2007 than in 2000. The increase of these crimes could be associated with the idle Thriftway Supermarket property and parking lot, a venue conducive for drug trafficking, the location of the Campbell County Detention Center, and the West End Industrial area. Heavier patrolling and enforcement of a high drug-traffic area on Ann Street between 8th and 9th Streets near Brighton Center also may factor into the increase in the projections. Johnson identified the area as the block to purchase crack cocaine and marijuana in the city. The location of this heavy drug area may present a future problem for HOPE VI participants who are struggling with substance-abuse issues and may be living nearby in Liberty Row.

<table>
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<tr>
<th>Change in Drug Violations 2000-2007</th>
</tr>
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<tr>
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</tr>
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</table>
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Property Crime

Vehicle theft showed a slight increase in all precincts, and the only property crime to show any significant increase across precincts. Theft from vehicle also increased in two precincts. This may be an indication of more targets of opportunity brought into the area from visitors to The Levee. Consistent decreases in Theft from building, and burglary show promising trends. The large decrease in shoplifting is brought on by a dramatic decrease in precinct 2C. The figure below shows total crime change among property crimes.

![Changes in Property Crimes 2000-07](chart.png)
Overall Analysis and Conclusion

The crime data illustrates that the overall crime in all four districts decreased from 2000 to 2007. The north site public housing is gone and crime is down, according to both statistical data and accounts from police. The figure below shows the change in total crime in all categories across the precincts.

The basic assumption about the districts was formed by assessing the population movement and residents’ location concentrations. Crime reports were expected to shift from 2A, the former HAN public housing site, into the other three districts since the residents from the north site were displaced in 2006.

District 4A (HOPE VI development) has experienced virtually no increase in overall crime (three percent). Although many residents moved out of District 2A (the old public housing site), the presence of large vacant properties have become breeding grounds for drug activity and other crimes. In the long term, a $1 billion retail, condominium, and office complex named Ovation will be built in the site vacated by the north site, and crime should be expected to decrease. Niemeier said, “When the housing on the north site was there, we saw an increase in domestic crimes, but now, the increase in crime has been drug-related.”

Police officers Niemeier and Johnson both said they viewed the HOPE VI housing developments as a boon to the community. Design improvements of HOPE VI housing should help police do their jobs. Although crime has remained steady, Niemeier said:

“HOPE VI has had a minimally positive effect thus far. The north site housing that has been torn down has experienced a lower crime rate, but overall, it's been a minimal effect. Nonetheless, the HOPE VI program is definitely going to have an impact, but it's going to take some time to realize that. In the long term there's going to be a positive impact. One of the aspects of the program is moving them out of their neighborhood and teaching them to be good citizens. You're getting people to be good, productive people, to be homeowners. You're going to see a drop in crime. It just takes some time.” The HOPE VI crime numbers provide a hint of positive outcomes using a quasi-experimental design analysis.
In trying to understand the relationship between HOPE VI’s impact on Newport, we also must see Newport within the context of the larger regional economic forces. It is difficult to isolate and sort out the net impact of those forces. Failing to examine Newport’s relationship to Cincinnati paints an incomplete picture of the economic and social dynamics of the area.

In recent years, Cincinnati has attracted noteworthy educational, entertainment, and recreational amenities. Of special note is the critically acclaimed Cincinnati Modern Art Museum, the National Underground Railroad Museum, the state-of-the-art Great American Ballpark for the Cincinnati Reds, and the adjacent Paul Brown Stadium for the Cincinnati Bengals. These projects were aimed at reinvigorating the residential life of downtown Cincinnati, but they failed to renew downtown residential neighborhoods using new urbanist and Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods theory.

While the severity of the urban race riots in Cincinnati in 2001 might have been exaggerated by the intense media coverage, there is a perception that Cincinnati is in decline. Movies such as Traffic showed an unflattering picture of Cincinnati as being stark, dangerous and hopeless. In addition, the regrettable engineering decision to convert two-way streets to one-way streets, specifically on Vine Street in Downtown Cincinnati, reduced commercial businesses by 40 percent and has further contributed to the decline of downtown Cincinnati (Walter, Kulash, and McHugh, 2007: F-2/5).

The power structure of Cincinnati, including the Mayor, City Council and the University of Cincinnati, failed to address urban problems, put together effective partnerships, and refused to embrace workable urban solutions. Leadership was backward and not forward-thinking such as its counterparts in Louisville, Indianapolis, Chicago, and Newport. Cincinnati’s loss has been Newport’s gain. Cincinnati was known to lose many of the amenities that Newport now has, including the Newport Aquarium. Also, the region’s international airport located in Northern Kentucky, has become a huge economic loss to Cincinnati and a big economic gain for Northern Kentucky.

As we note these regional processes, the leadership of the mayor of Newport played a significant role in the city’s revitalization and produced a tremendous recovery from the city’s checkered past. The charismatic, aggressive mayor for the past 16 years, Thomas Guidugli, has pushed for and competed with Cincinnati for many of these amenities, which resulted in the development of Newport on the Levee and the Newport Aquarium. These amenities and local points of interest have attracted new businesses, tourists, and jobs, which has resulted in economic growth in downtown...
Newport. Mayor Guidugli did not have a power elite pushing for a city of production over a place to live. Although Mayor Guidugli had never heard of Jane Jacobs, considered the dean of urban writers, he had an uncanny, non-bookish street sense of allowing this small riverboat town to think big. From the gut, the mayor has a keen sense of how cities grow or decline.

Mayor Guidugli has developed an aggressive agenda to develop Monmouth Street in downtown Newport from 3rd Street to 12th Street, in the heart of Newport’s Central Business District (CBD). Monmouth Street, which is a one-way thoroughfare that goes one-way north ending at the entrance of Newport on the Levee, includes a Graeter’s Ice Cream on Fourth and Monmouth, which relocated after closing in downtown Cincinnati, and the expansion of the Mammoth Café on Monmouth Street near 5th Street. The mayor also pushed for the relocation of the Housing Authority of Newport’s office at 9th and Monmouth Streets, the relocation of the City of Newport building at 10th and Monmouth and the Campbell County building at 11th and Monmouth. All of these relocations totaled approximately $17 million in development on Monmouth. The Marx Cromer building, which was originally a tawdry sex club, then became too expensive for the city and HAN. The property was sold to a private developer, and has resulted in a $9 million investment on 9th and Monmouth Street. Unlike many other river cities such as Louisville and Cincinnati, which have elevated freeways cutting the cities off from the riverfront, this is largely absent in Newport.

Although much of the revitalization of the city was a result of Mayor Guidugli’s leadership, there were other key players who made significant contributions to the economic development of Newport, such as Laura Long, economic development director for the city in the 1990s and through the construction of the Levee in 2002, James Parsons, the city manager, Phil Ciafardini, the city’s finance director, and Robert Yoder, Main Street coordinator and city planner in Newport, and also, a commitment by the Newport Police Department to become accredited and professionalized to keep the city safe.

Historically, economic development in the region has been located in Cincinnati adjacent to Newport. Much of Newport’s existence has been tied to the economic fortunes of Cincinnati. Many Cincinnati residents have made the choice to move to Newport and surrounding cities in the metropolitan area. Newport and its amenities provide the convenience of living in downtown Cincinnati, but on a safer and smaller scale. Finally, preservation of historic housing has also been a key anchor in the renewal of Newport.

**Job Creation and Growth**

The labor force in Campbell County Kentucky and the City of Newport has grown over the past 20 years. In 1980, the workforce consisted of 36,472 workers. By 2000, the workforce had increased by approximately 10,000 workers to 45,176. In 2005, the workforce was 46,425. The unemployment rate for Campbell County has decreased over the past 20 years. In 1980, the unemployment rate was 6.7 percent, in 1990 the rate was 5.2 percent, and in 2000 the rate was 3.9 percent (USA Counties). In 2005, the unemployment rate increased to 5.6 percent; this was slightly higher than the national average unemployment rate (5.1 percent), but it was slightly lower than Kentucky’s unemployment rate of 6.1 percent (Fed stats).
A major economic development project in Newport was the Levee, a multi-purpose retail and entertainment complex built in 2002 that features shopping, specialty restaurants, comedy clubs, nightclubs, an AMC Multiplex Cinemas, and the Newport Aquarium, and a new 250-room hotel is being built adjacent to the former IMAX Theater on the Levee.

The Levee is strategically placed at the foot of the Taylor-Southgate Bridge and caters to tourists visiting the entertainment, educational, and sports amenities in downtown Cincinnati, and is within walking distance to Newport’s downtown and the historic district. The Levee has generated economic renewal in a dying downtown area. In the first half of 2007, 23 percent of the new businesses in Newport were located on Levee Way in front of the Levee and the Newport Aquarium.

Newport on the Levee received enormous subsidies to build the development. There is no real estate tax for the first 25 years, and there are rebates on the state sales tax. According to Michael Whitehead, Licensing Occupation Administrator for the City of Newport, the area where the Levee is located has received more revenue than before the Levee was built, but projects of this magnitude require subsidies from the government, or these projects would never happen.

Although certain aspects of the Levee have been successful, such as the increase in restaurants and entertainment venues, the revenue generated from the Levee has not been as great as projected. The revenue generated by the Levee has barely made up for the revenue generated from StarKist Foods when their corporate offices relocated to Pittsburgh from Newport in 2000.
Despite the contributions of the Levee to downtown Newport, the Housing Authority of Newport’s HOPE VI project has gradually rebuilt rundown residential and public housing properties, which has influenced the rise in property values. This rejuvenation of the neighborhoods to the east and west of downtown Newport has helped reduce blight and crime while improving the pedestrian and business environment. A 24-hour city is generally correlated with a safer city. More people on the streets means fewer opportunities for crime to occur, while more deserted streets mean more opportunities for crime. That Newport is improving its neighborhoods while neighboring communities struggle is a selling point for new businesses who want a prime location within downtown Newport, which is conveniently within sight distance of downtown Cincinnati.

In addition, Monmouth Street has experienced a slow increase in pedestrian traffic and business and economic activity through downtown Newport as a result of the Levee. Pedestrian traffic down Monmouth and York Streets has enticed new small businesses and franchises into the area. Whitehead said the overflow effects form the Levee have been minimal, and consumers have not been as willing as city officials hoped to cross Third Street and patronize Monmouth Street businesses.

New condominiums and lofts have opened, and plans have been revealed for a new $1 billion entertainment, retail, and residential complex called Ovation to be built over the next 10-15 years on the old public housing site. All of the development inspired a 2007 summer soundtrack of construction.

**Moving on up**

It’s not just the bottom floors of downtown Newport that have come alive with the poundings of hammers. The Marx Cromer Building, originally slated to be part of HOPE VI, became too expensive for the city to develop, but private developer Middle Earth developed the former sex club into 41 lofts running from $825-1,400 a month. It was more than half full by February. The Cookie Jar, a bakery in Newport for 80 years is also developing two market-rate lofts. These aren’t the only residential properties to open on the upper floors of downtown businesses. The addition of downtown residents will improve safety by putting people on streets more hours of the day.

**Downtown Businesses by category**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adult Entertainment</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Church/Community Orgs.</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entertainment</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hotel</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipal</td>
<td>31%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Government</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restaurant</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Commercial services are the most prevalent among downtown businesses.
tion and revitalization throughout the downtown and neighboring communities.

Businesses by Category

According to our findings, 50 percent (138 of 264) of businesses cross-referenced are still operating.

Newport Central Business District by lot in 2007

Downtown Newport
Lot use
- Adult Entertainment (2)
- Church/Community Orgs. (16)
- Entertainment (10)
- Hotel (1)
- Industrial (9)
- Municipal (14)
- Other Government (20)
- Parking Lot (25)
- Residential (364)
- Restaurant (34)
- Retail (50)
- Service (72)
- Vacant (96)
- Warehouse (2)
- Wholesale (2)

Sources: Campbell County PVA, City of Newport
in downtown Newport. These businesses have been operating downtown for seven years or longer. After conducting informal interviews with approximately 30 business owners, a considerable portion of these businesses and in some instances, 50 years or longer, have operated in downtown Newport for 10, 20, and in some instances, 50 years or longer.

The staying power of business in downtown Newport can be explained by several factors, such as the small specialized lot of businesses in downtown Newport and alternative modes of transportation, such as walking and public transportation, which provide options for residents and visitors to navigate downtown Newport. Also, some businesses in downtown are located on historic properties, which are well maintained under the City of Newport’s strict regulations. Downtown Newport has a long-standing “Main Street” image which includes locally owned and operated businesses which have evolved over time to offer a wide array of goods and services.

Most of the new business were in retail or service, but restaurants and retail are becoming a bigger part of the downtown mix.

Hooked on a building
When Arthur Leech moved to Newport, he fell in love with a beautiful old house a block from the Levee (Cincinnati Enquirer, 2007). Leech had run a fine dining establishment in Jackson, but saw a real opportunity to restore the old house into a vibrant lunchtime spot, and opened Steamboat Bagels on Oct. 21, 2007. “I wanted to maintain the building’s regional, homey feel,” he said. He did so through historic preservation, supporting a local artist by painting a mural on the walls, and through a name that has historical context. The name also gives homage to the previous owner, who worked on the recreational steamboat, The Delta Queen.
The chart on the previous page shows the breakdown of business by category in Downtown Newport in 2007, and the map on the previous page shows the same information geographically. The business categories include retail, industrial, restaurant, entertainment, adult entertainment, residential, parking lots, municipal, other government and community-based or church organization. Categorization was done by using PVA economic development and visual data. The map also shows vacant building lots, which represent both positives and negatives. Vacant buildings are locations for business opportunity and growth, but also attract crime and are often visually unappealing.

The most successful businesses in downtown Newport are the printing companies because they provide a service for downtown Cincinnati businesses. Retail businesses are less successful, because of the lack of frontage parking encourages businesses to be successful from the support they receive from patrons who live and can walk to the business. Whitehead said the percentage of people below the poverty line can directly affect the kind of businesses located nearby. People will often shop at the Newport Shopping Center when they shop in Newport.

**Business startups**

Businesses in Newport’s downtown since HOPE VI are of higher quality than the 1980's, where Newport has gone from “vice” to “nice.” A decade ago, Monmouth Street was a strip known for its adult entertainment and pawn shops. Many of these businesses have left and new family-friendly developments have moved into the area, including the retail and service industries, which represents the overwhelming majority of new businesses, as seen in the figure on the previous page. Steamboat Bagels and Graeter’s Ice Cream have moved into restored historic buildings. Vacant areas previously not being used by existing businesses are creating new business opportunities, such as a bar/restaurant adjacent to The Syndicate, which is now a separate new business. A yoga studio, bicycle shop, running store and community theater are some of the new businesses that have brought new stores and have found the location to be beneficial. Jobs in banks, auto shops, antique stores, and coffee shops are now a few blocks away from HOPE VI developments and public housing. Whitehead said the resources Newport has put into removing the adult entertainment establishments has laid the foundation for the development of future development in Downtown and the Central Business District of Newport.

**From hips to hip, from vice to nice**

Long known throughout Cincinnati for its entertainment industry, the creation of Newport on the Levee marked the first time Newport became a player in the area for entertainment for the whole family. An article from Time Magazine in 1961, heralds Newport as a “Sin Center.” The image an the industry persisted until recent years. However, today, the strip clubs are mostly gone from downtown Newport (one remains). In the place are new industries such as Reser Bicycle Outfitters, above, The Kula Center yoga studio and a smattering of coffee shops and restaurants.

While these new job opportunities may or may not represent an increase in income, they do offer residents a chance to develop skills that transfer to other fields. The tamer atmosphere has brought renewed interest in downtown investment, including the development of upscale condominiums. In the past 10 years, Newport’s downtown changed from a neglected stretch to a small-business incubator.

Since 2001, business startups have been tracked using data collected from the City of Newport Economic Development Office. In the City of Newport,
66 new businesses were recorded in 2001; 85 new businesses were recorded in 2002 and 101 in 2007. On average, 76 new businesses were established annually from 2001 through 2006, resulting in an 11 percent average annual increase. The following table shows the percentage change in business start-ups from the inception of the HOPE VI project through December 31, 2007.

To further examine how this growth affected downtown, additional analysis was needed. Data on startup businesses in the CBD was collected from weekly and monthly economic reports from the city’s Department of Finance and Administration. These reports list new business licenses awarded during the period, business transfers were marked and excluded. A total of 84 businesses opened in Newport’s downtown, excluding law firms.

When businesses are established in a community the chances of success are extremely low in the first 1-2 years. After the second and third year of operation, the chances of success increase with each consecutive year of operation. A business’s first-year chance of failure is 85 percent; the second year is 70 percent; third year is 62 percent; and in the fifth and sixth years the chances of failure are approximately 50 percent (USA Today, 2006). There are many reasons why businesses fail. A few of the reasons can include a poor business plan, a weak local economy, bad location and poor advertising techniques.

Bob Yoder, Main Street Coordinator for the City of Newport, reported that 14 new storefronts opened in the downtown “Renaissance” in 2007, and only four storefronts closed. With these new stores, Yoder claims “a significant visual jump in the sense of a lot of new businesses on the street.”

In 2007, a $250,000 grant helped to partially fund 12 building façade improvements for the downtown area to stimulate new business. Each eligible business recipient received a maximum of $20,000, with a required minimum match of 50 percent. Many of the businesses spent far more than that on their improvements.

The map on the opposite page shows successful business startups in the CBD. The majority of new businesses were retail and were located toward the south and central areas of Monmouth Street. New service establishments were dispersed, and new restaurants mostly were located near the Levee or on Monmouth Street likely attempting to capture some of the Levee pedestrian traffic.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Name</th>
<th>Façade Grant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Monmouth Street Lofts</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Steamboat Bagels</td>
<td>$2,020.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>649 York-Vacant</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JerZee’s Pub &amp; Grub</td>
<td>$14,654.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cricket/Beauty/Tax Prep</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewel King</td>
<td>$2,874.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Footlighter's Inc.</td>
<td>$10,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miller Imprints</td>
<td>$4,940.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Global Business Solutions</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NKY Homes for Sale</td>
<td>$4,331.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graeter’s</td>
<td>$1,179.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marx Cromer Lofts</td>
<td>$150,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total:</strong></td>
<td><strong>$250,000.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Brian Lagory, owner of startup JerZee's Pub and Grub on Monmouth Street mentioned the Levee as a factor in his decision to locate there. Also, an existing liquor license at the establishment and ease and knowledge of laws in Kentucky factored in as well as the rent and the building itself. “Look at the design of these buildings,” Lagory said. “The way they are built, you’re either going to have an entertainment venue or a specialty store.”

Newport Central Business District by tenure, type and lot in 2007

Sources: Campbell County PVA, City of Newport
Lagory was one of 12 downtown property owners to receive façade improvement grants in 2007. These grants were made possible by Newport’s affiliation with the Kentucky Renaissance in Main, the state’s version of the Main Street Program. It makes money available for matching grants for façade improvements and through various other methods of historic preservation, economic restructuring and marketing. Newport has also qualified as a Preserve America community, a national endeavor aimed toward encouraging historic preservation. It is awarded to communities that have shown strengths in partnerships, civic commitment and economic efforts in preserving community heritage.

“The Newport Downtown Renaissance District has seen incredible growth in the last couple of years,” Main Street Director Bob Yoder said. “Buildings that have sat vacant for years have been rehabbed and are being used for retail, restaurants, professional offices and market-rate housing. In 2007, alone we had 29 new businesses open in the district and saw the completion of 51 Market-Rate loft style apartments downtown.”

In the summer of 2007, the construction on Monmouth announced that those efforts were being realized.

By the beginning of this year Cincinnati media began to take notice of the burgeoning new business district. On Jan. 11, 2008, the Cincinnati Business Courier ran with the headline: “Levee gets glory, but Monmouth the historic gem.” In the article, writer Lisa Biank Fasig admits to being drawn to Newport to live because he was “sold on the promise of revival.”

Then on Feb. 22, 2008, the Cincinnati Enquirer reported that restored buildings attract businesses and declared downtown Newport the hub of the hip. The article focuses on the increase in office jobs in the city. Since the beginning of 2008, five companies have opted to move in or grow in downtown Newport. It adds about 20 new jobs in downtown Newport, including jobs in software companies and graphic design.

Locally owned businesses sustain the local economy more effectively than big-box corporate chains. When big corporations think about locating in cities, governments often use subsidies to attract new businesses. Subsidies or steep discounts are provided by the government with funds generated from tax dollars. For example, Wal-Mart Distribution Center, planned and built in Hopkinsville, Ky., was granted tax rebates and property tax breaks equal to more than $15 million. In another example, a London, Ky., Wal-Mart Distribution Center was granted state tax credits and infrastructure subsidies $13.3 million (Mattera and Puriton, 2004: 27). Although distribution centers are located in rural areas and pay more than their retail counterparts, it can gain leverage in setting a low wage rate for
area employees if it’s a large distribution center and the only one located in the area (Mattera and Purlton, 2004: 29).

Local establishments with local owners keep the revenue and profits in the community, as opposed to big business where profits leave the city (or state) and have a muted benefit to the local community. Locally owned businesses are linked with local buyers and local suppliers, creating a strong interlocked network (Rocky Mountain, 2005: 2). A study conducted for the City of Austin noted that for every $100 spent at a big-box corporation, $13 returns to the community, compared to $100 spent at a local business that return $45 to the community (Civic Economics, 2002: 3). The aforementioned aspects of local business in the community increase the quality of life and provide security for citizens.

Conclusion

The city of Newport has shown the initiative to pursue funding opportunities not just for housing, such as HOPE VI, but also to help improve its downtown through opening new businesses. The result of these commitments is coming to fruition by offering new opportunities to public housing residents at a time when the city of Newport is prepared to meet the challenges of an improving and diversifying economic base.
IX. Future Development Plans

Developer Corporex, in collaboration with architect HOK, have laid plans for a proposed $800 million redevelopment of Newport’s riverfront at the confluence of the Ohio and Licking Rivers that will be seen as a “community we wish to leave for our children and grandchildren.” (Ovation Powerpoint, 2007). Over the next 10-15 years, the Ovation property will offer a first-class, mixed use development, which includes approximately 300,000 to 500,000 square feet of large and small retail space, approximately 1.5 million square feet of office space, including a signature office space, 1,000 housing units, a hotel, and additional lodging and entertainment, recreational, and educational amenities, including a post office, and hiking trails and riverfront parks and increased access points across the Ohio River into Cincinnati (Ovation Report, 2006).

The mixed use high rise buildings in the Ovation development will attract young professionals and families with single family homes, town homes, including the construction of 726 condominiums located in various mid-to-high rise structures, and 192 senior housing units. This development brings amenities within close proximity to housing making city living convenient. The Ovation will include transportation amenities, including more bus and trolley lines that will link the city with the rest of the region.

Ovation will include office space to accommodate various types of business. The dispersed office park will include five office buildings and is expected to create approximately 5,000 jobs. The office park will include one 25-story office building, two ten story buildings, and two one-story office buildings on the perimeter of the property.

Out of the approximately $800 million investment in the Ovation project, the annual economic activity generated from the project through Northern Kentucky will be $42 billion over 30 years, including $7.9 billion during the construction phase and $1.7 billion annually, $1.08 billion of that is the total annual direct impact of the Ovation investment, and $646 million is the total indirect impacts per year (Ovation Report, 2006). Throughout the 10-year construction period of the Ovation property, 926 jobs will be created. In addition, the Ovation development and its properties will employ approximately 6,700 direct and indirect jobs to be created from Ovation business (Ovation Report, 2007: 2).

The Ovation development aims to receive $36.6 million in tax revenue each year, $17.5 for the city of Newport, over $14 million for the state, and over $5 million for Campbell County. Over the next 30 years, Ovation estimates to generate $428 million in fiscal revenues for the city of Newport, $209 million in revenues for the state, and $127 million in total revenues for Campbell County, Kentucky, (Ovation Report, 2006: 23-24). This adds up to almost $1 billion in total tax revenue as a result of this development.

When the Housing Authority’s north site was removed, this field of telephone poles remained.
Another economic development project in Newport is the SouthShore is a riverfront development less than a mile from downtown Cincinnati by the developer Capital Investment Group, in collaboration with the architect, Pappageorge/Haymes Ltd. This development will include three 20-story buildings with condominiums, an office tower, a marina, and parking garages. SouthShore will target middle-to-high income individuals and families into the downtown Newport area. Ryan Wyrick with the City of Newport’s Economic Development Office has stated that the riverfront developments were made possible by the HOPE VI federal grant and the removal of the dilapidated public housing. In addition, he emphasizes that these current projects optimize the utilization of riverfront property which will bring money into the local economy, specifically tax revenue, which will pay for public goods, such as fire and rescue, police, and schools.

The Newport Pavilion, developed by Bear Creek Capital. The Bear Creek Capital located between Memorial Parkway and Carothers Road near Interstate 471, is not on the riverfront, but provides important amenities for individuals and families, including a grocery store, home improvement mega-store, and a big-box retail store.

Conclusions
The City of Newport, according to Mayor Tom Guidugli, is achieving the same result as cities such as Nashville, but with fewer resources. Why is Newport working and other cities are not? Much of that is the result of steady and consistent leadership of Thomas Guidugli, the Mayor of the city of Newport. Guidugli will complete his third and final term and 16 years in office as Mayor of Newport.

However, a $800 million development will soon break ground, capitalizing on the site’s great view.
Newport at the end of 2008. The political stability and strong leadership in the Mayor’s Office and the city government through constant commission board members has enabled the mayor and his staff to stay focused on the goals and implement a common sense strategy for revitalizing Newport by aggressively pursuing property acquisition on the riverfront for the Newport on the Levee and the Newport Aquarium, apply for the HOPE VI grant from the federal government, and increased police accreditation for the City of Newport police department. Also, Newport has less bureaucracy than Cincinnati with respect to obtaining permits, licenses, and tax rebates.

The stability and leadership gave a small community like Newport the ability to pursue a city agenda, and not be wrapped in the undermining political culture and the inefficient bureaucracy that plagues Cincinnati and its government. Newport has all of the amenities, but without all the problems and misfortunes. Many developers have done business with Newport more easily than Cincinnati, because Mayor Guidugli makes himself available “night or day or morning is important when someone is in town,” which according to the mayor, “if someone is going to be in town and want to see the community, and meet with you for breakfast at 7 in the morning or that night at 12 midnight, I think that says something for the aggressiveness and the ability to make things happen.”

After assessing the HOPE VI project in Newport, KY the broader picture of a growing city has emerged. Newport has the untapped potential to encourage civic engagement and economic development. The following points are proposed as areas for improvement by means of effective city planning and community development.

The South Shore Condominiums already have opened, drawing a rising young middle class to the Kentucky side of the Ohio River.
One-way to Two-way Streets

There are considerable benefits for urban areas to have an efficient network of roadways which accommodate commuters and other modes of transport, such as walking, public transit, and biking. In this case, one-way verses two-way streets pose questions for the City of Newport to consider with regards to urban economic development and city planning.

A key strategy to renewing downtown historic neighborhoods is converting one-way to two-way streets. Oppressive two-or-more-lane downtown one-way streets help kill neighborhoods and small businesses. We need to convert these one-way ghetto makers into two-way streets with parking, trees, and bike lanes to calm traffic and make neighborhoods more livable for families, young urban pioneers, and the elderly, who want to live closer to medical care downtown (Gilderbloom and Hanka, 2008).

One-way streets pose many threats for pedestrian and motorist safety, make city streets seem less safe, disproportionately impact poor and minority neighborhoods, hurt downtown businesses, reduce the property values of homes, and negatively impact the environment and contribute to global warming. Conversions to two-way streets have already happened in more than 100 cities around the United States.

These one-way streets also constitute a kind of “environmental racism,” where speeding motorists on one-way streets increase the levels of exhaust, noise, and pollution. One-way streets are predominately located in older downtown neighborhoods in minority, poor and working-class neighborhoods. Engineers claim that “one-way” is the best way because it moves traffic quicker, but they don’t understand the sociological, ecological and economic impacts of a one-way street.

One-way streets have hurt downtown commercial businesses. For instance, on Vine Street in Cincinnati, 40 percent of the businesses closed after conversion from a two-way to a one-way street. Businesses wishing to relocate in an area will be less likely to locate on a one-way street. Well-known Louisville restaurateur Peng Looi chose not to locate a new restaurant in downtown Newport because of the presence of one-way streets and the negative impact it would have on his business and storefront exposure.

One-way streets also create greater opportunities for crime in urban areas. Having one way traffic reduces overall use, allowing for negative vacuums to be created.

If the streets are converted to two-ways, the traffic will slow down, giving greater balance of traffic flow in the morning and afternoon. Slower traffic increases people activity on and around the street, and enables pedestrians...
and motorists to safely interact with the streetscape and activity around them (Gilderbloom and Hanka, 2008).

One-way streets also lower property values. Identical historic homes are valued less if they are located on busy one-way streets where traffic goes faster and lacks the steady flow of a two-way street. Real estate 101 tells us location, location, location, or more plainly, don't buy the house across from the X-rated movie house, the glue factory or a fast and furious one-way street. Many downtown neighborhood groups are demanding conversion of one-ways to two-ways as part of their neighborhood plans. Similar efforts can be made on York and Monmouth Streets through downtown to spark or maintain urban renaissance.

You cannot find three-and four-lane one-way streets in suburbia, as it decreases housing appreciation and quality of life. We are not arguing that two-way streets alone are the panacea for all our urban ills. Indeed, there are one-way streets that work, such as the world famous crooked Lombard Street in San Francisco. However, it is undeniable that transforming one-way streets to two-way streets is one of many proven ideas within a new urbanist agenda that revitalizes and reinvents our historic downtowns and neighborhoods.

The cost of going from one-way to two-way streets would easily be recaptured in increased taxes on homes and business growth. This would reinforce the movement from the suburbs to downtown, and also would move people to invest in these neighborhoods as places to live. Reduced crime also saves the city money in police expenditures. It would also significantly reduce the foreclosure rates in these neighborhoods.

Two-way streets should be at the heart of a city's downtown development strategy. Neighborhoods become more sustainable, livable, and prosperous because of two-way streets. Cities like Miami, Dallas, and Minneapolis are reverting back to two-way streets, which have resulted in a larger influx of upwardly mobile residents to their cities, yet Newport has not taken proper action to use this planning tool to help save and enhance our downtown neighborhoods. Since HOPE VI properties are in
close proximity to the CBD, the community residents are more likely to benefit from optimal economic growth in the area. One argument holds that one-way streets stifle business patronage because of "intricate and often confusing one-way street networks" (Walker, Kulash, and McHugh, 2007).

The revitalized downtown Newport has become an entertainment district surrounded by residents and workers. Those who live or work near Newport’s CBD benefit from "a rebalancing of downtown roadways [in order] to make them safer and friendlier again for all modes of travel" (Walker, Kulash, and McHugh, 2007). One-way streets foster the reinvention of the downtown by converting empty factories into loft housing, creative economy of art and computers while convincing people in the suburbs to "live, work, and play" in downtown. Newport needs to be more forward-thinking and convert downtown one-way streets to two-way streets.

Making the City Accessible

Newport should continue its efforts to be accessible where the elderly and disabled can "live in place." This can happen with curb cuts, ramps, rails and bike lanes which will allow the elderly and disabled to live here for the rest of their lives. Side-walks should be well maintained, houses should be built that have universal accessibility. According to AARP creating a walkable city will extend the life span. Related to issues of disability and elderly access are bike lanes that will also benefit them along with the able bodied community. The creative class wants bike lanes including shower room for bikers and bike rental facilities. Rutgers University Professor John Pucher shows that for every hour of biking, you can add on another hour of life, or can increase a person’s lifespan from 2 ½ to 4 years. In Holland 80% of the people ride bikes and the weather is similar to Newport. One of the reasons why Santa Barbara, Davis, Chicago, and Amsterdam are such desirable places is the vast networks of bike lanes. We save on health-cost pay-outs because people are healthier. People who ride bikes are smarter and happier, and we cut down on commute times, have less dependence on foreign oil, and cause less pollution on the environment.

Enhance park options

Newport on the Levee is an entertainment option for those with disposable income, but for those unable to take advantage of these options, city government should offer entertainment options. An entertained citizenry is a well-behaved citizenry. Parks are most essential to the impoverished, who have fewer entertainment options and typically lack the suburban backyards of more wealthy residents. Adding pocket parks and greenways in HOPE VI areas gives children and adults options for recreation and entertainment and an area for socializing and mobilizing. In addition, with the increase of condominiums and lofts in the Newport area, more residents will not have access to suburban backyards, further necessitating the need for a community backyard in Newport.

Improve River Amenities

The Licking River is a prime property for alternative living spaces such as house boats, docks, and summer homes. This is a proven strategy from Sausalito, Calif., to Amsterdam in the Netherlands. This type of unique living will attract a group of individuals and families looking for a life near the water with the modern convenience of city life. As the infrastructure improves in areas near the river, more interest will be generated and these alternative living accommodations will become more feasible in the mind of the public.

Historic City

The historic districts within the city limits of Newport are well maintained and show higher property
value increases compared with other areas of the city. Newport would benefit from extending the historic classification to the entire city. By using the same historic designation, the city can better regulate redevelopment and new building while preserving the city's culture and small hometown atmosphere. In turn, more properties would benefit from increased property values over the long term.

Reduce or Eliminate Billboards
Billboards are eyesores in residential areas. Not only are billboards intrusive on properties, they can obstruct a clear view of traffic, and attract nuisances such as birds and vandalism. A billboard above a house in a residential area devalues a house.

All of these negative effects caused by billboards decrease property value and deter potential home buyers, business owners, and investors. Ideally removal of all billboards in the city would be best, especially in the residential areas or at the very least, reduce the size of these urban eyesores. Smaller billboards of the size of 4 feet by 8 feet on city properties an be an income generator for the city as has been done in Amsterdam.

Capitalizing on Cincinnati
As Cincinnati forgoes opportunities to grow and create new amenities in the urban landscape, Newport can capitalize on those foregone opportunities. Newport can watch and listen for Cincinnati’s current, planned, and passed-on developments, and then act accordingly. Newport will stay in tune with the latest developments in Cincinnati and be aware of its competition across the Taylor-Southgate Bridge. If Cincinnati’s development plans are conducive to Newport’s participation, the city would be wise to collaborate, plan, and connect with Cincinnati whenever possible.

For example, Cincinnati plans to extend the bike and pedestrian trail along the Ohio River Bridge to Newport. Newport plans to compliment this development with an equivalent bike and pedestrian trail along the river. The public can access Cincinnati or Newport via foot or bike. This type of transportation choice makes for a more livable city which attracts a creative class of people. Younger generations are attracted to alternative modes of transportation such as walking and biking, especially with the increased awareness of global warming, high gas prices, and the obesity pandemic.

More jobs in downtown
Establishing Newport as a player in the regional market for entertainment is a first step. However, the next step is to create a wide range of jobs suitable to varied skill sets. Recruiting employers to downtown Newport will allow Newport to address unemployment and expand its tax base. By creating a vibrant business community in downtown, Newport can move beyond the regional market and find the national-level tenants that can make large developments, such as Ovation, a success or a failure.

Deconcentrating Public Housing
The HOPE VI project has initiated the elimination of concentrated public housing and replaced the HAN North-Site housing with dispersed public housing units which are integrated into the community culture. The South Site is still standing as an energy-inefficient and aesthetically unpleasing point of interest.

The majority of residents are low income and in similar life circumstance. Housing projects such as the south-site perpetuate dependency on the public assistance and nurture a community culture of poverty. By eliminating this type of concentrated public housing, the city can build more sustainable,
cost-efficient structures, and dually help individuals and families become less dependent on government assistance. Programs like CSS offered through Brighton Center could be incorporated into the enrollment and agreement process of participation between the city and the residents. This serves the City of Newport in the long-term by saving dollars which would otherwise be used for maintaining dilapidated buildings and enabling those families that could otherwise be self-sufficient.

**New Rules in Public Housing**

After surveying residents and HOPE VI participants, the disposition of certain residents, such as their unwillingness to actively participate and capitalize on the opportunities available to them, through CSS, became apparent. Selection criteria for participants may be a good way to sort out those individuals who will not benefit from public assistance and self-sufficiency services. Mandatory participation is suggested for those who are selected to participate in public assistance. The individuals and families must commit to accepting services, mandating that children stay in school and graduate, and looking for work; these criteria will be set on a timeline which a case-worker would regularly follow-up with the client. The program reform would bring more stringent participation guidelines and consequences. Assistance should be denied to those who don’t want to better themselves and their children. There is a long waiting list for these services and they should go to those who will try to improve their life chances. The vast majority of people on public assistance can’t participate in the digital economy because they are either without a high school diploma or just earned one. Increasingly, poverty will be those with 12 or less years of education. People with a college education have only a 1 percent chance of ending on public assistance.

**University-Community Partnerships**

The partnership between Newport and the University of Louisville illustrates the positive outcomes of such a partnership. The University of Louisville plays the role of giving an unbiased view of how HOPE VI will eventually create $1 billion dollars in new investments, higher property values, an improved quality of life, greater business opportunities, and lower crime rates. In these tough economic times this is good news. In the words of sociologist Max Weber, the role of the university is to “tell what is rather than what ought to be.” The university is helpful in providing mid-course corrections, advice, and information so the project stays on track instead of falling to the curb. The University of Louisville Center for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods (SUN) has a 15-year history of working with distressed neighborhoods and people to improve their lives (Gilderbloom and Mullins, 2005, Brazley, 2002).

Other HOPE VI projects would have been a lot better if they had university partners who understood the gestalt of the reinvention, revitalization and renewal of urban neighborhoods. The neighboring University of Cincinnati did not buy into higher education-community partnerships and the resulting decline in their downtown has been partly caused by this failure of stewardship to attack urban problems. With a new president, efforts are being made to catch up with other great urban universities. Pennsylvania, Harvard, Yale, Louisville, Illinois, and Loyola are stellar examples of universities working in their communities. Some university partners are not just passive in this process but don’t seem to have a clue of how 21st Century capitalist cities operate. UofL SUN knows how modern neighborhoods are evolving and making them more sustainable in the shadow of a national economic recession which might lead to a depression in certain parts of country. Great universities address urban problems instead of ignoring them. Great universities also make great cities.


Rocky Mountain Institute. (2005) “Building Community Prosperity through Natural...


Subcommittee on Housing and transportation, Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, U.S. Senate (2002). Public Housing: HOPE VI Leveraging Has Increased, but HUD has not Met Annual Reporting Requirement (GAO Publication No. GAO-03-91). Washington, DC: General Accounting Office.
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John I. Gilderbloom is a professor of urban and public affairs in the Graduate Program in Urban and Public Affairs at the University of Louisville, where he also directs the Center for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods (http://www.louisville.edu/sun). Dr. Gilderbloom’s has won two “best teacher” awards at two different universities. Since 1992 his competitive federally funded grants have been over $3.5 million dollars. He has brought in from non-federal sources over a million dollars from private foundations, churches and local government.

Since he earned his Ph.D, Gilderbloom's real estate research has appeared in thirty peer reviewed journals, twenty chapters in edited books, eleven monographs and twenty-five opinion pieces in newspapers and magazines. He has written or edited five books. His book Rethinking Rental Housing, was declared, "the most significant piece on housing policy written in the last 30 years" by the Journal of the American Planning Association. A survey of college housing courses by the National Housing Institute found it to be the most widely chosen book. In July 2005, SUNY Press released: Promise and Betrayal: University and the Creation of Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods which includes an introduction by former HUD Secretary Henry Cisneros and in the appendix letters of support from President Bill Clinton and, Harvard President Derek Bok.

His latest book, Invisible City: Poverty, Housing and New Urbanism, has earned advance praise from leading urban policy thinkers Andres Duany, William Domhoff, Donovan Rypkema, and Neal Pierce. He has published opinioned pieces in the Wall Street Journal, Washington Post, Los Angeles Times and USA Today Magazine. In the Clinton administration he worked as a consultant on several items including State of the Union Speech, Section 108 programs, Hope VI, and Community Outreach Partnership Programs. His work has won recognition and honors from U.S. Senate, House of Representatives, President Clinton, Sierra Club, American Planning Association Chapter Award, Mayor of Houston. Sierra Club, National Republican Party, Harvard Innovations in Government semi-finalist, and American Institute for Architects. In 2007, Gilderbloom along with an astronaut and movie star, were declared outstanding Alumnus for Mills High School. He has been featured in the Sunday New York Times, Planning, Atlanta Journal Constitution and various other international newspapers.

In 2005 Planetizen called, Encyclopedia of 20th-Century Architecture one of the 10 best planning and architecture books--Gilderbloom’s contribution was a chapter on modern Cuban architecture Dr. Gilderbloom also founded a real estate consulting business in 1999 where he advises real estate professionals on real estate investment opportunities in older neighborhoods. Dr. Gilderbloom was a key consultant in helping Telesis invest $35 million dollars on the 550 unit City View apartments in West Louisville and more recently completed a five year consultancy in Newport, Kentucky which has resulted in a planned one billion dollar real estate investment. Dr. Gilderbloom also owns a company that restores historic homes using green principals.. (http://www.gilderbloom.org). Gilderbloom’s has worked as consultant to organize historic walking tours in Cuba Netherlands, and San Francisco for Leadership Kentucky, Chicago Architectural Foundation, National Trust for Historic Preservation, Urban Land Institute Delaware Historic Society, Williams College and University of California. In 2007, he will release his DVD which includes his slide show talk on restoring older neighborhoods along with various film clips produced by television including his halftime recognition at a UofL basketball game. Gilderbloom also notes that he once wrote for Rolling Stone Magazine, worked with Cesar Chavez in California grape boycott, backed up Allen Ginsberg on flute, studied with poet Kenneth Rexroth, surfed Hawaii and up and down the California coast, once played Elvis in a Nevada nightclub, skis black diamond slopes of Vail & Aspen, is proud that his Godfather, Dave Lewis, wrote the movie script. “Klute,” which won an Academy award. Dr. Gilderbloom’s proudest achievement is raising his son, Max, who graduated at the top of his class in the Honors program at Atherton and is currently a freshman on scholarship at Indiana University.
Matthew J. Hanka is a Ph.D. candidate (ABD) in the Urban and Public Affairs program at the University of Louisville with a focus on urban policy and administration and urban affairs. As an undergraduate, Hanka was one of the youngest persons ever elected to the District of Columbia’s Advisory Neighborhood Commission (ANC), representing single member district 5C12 in ANC 5C for one term. Hanka also has extensive experience in the government and non-profit sector, working as an AmeriCorps volunteer for Heads Up: A University Neighborhood Initiative in Washington, DC and serving as the Director of Community Outreach for Brookland Pride, Inc., a non-profit community development organization also in Washington, DC.

Hanka earned a B.A. in history and world politics from The Catholic University of America in Washington, DC in 2002, and earned a M.A. in Political Science from the University of Louisville in 2004. His research interests include housing, urban politics and policy, community development, comparative urban development, historic preservation, and economic development. Hanka's report will focus on the impact of the HOPE VI program on the economic revitalization of Newport, Kentucky and is expected to be completed in May of 2008.

He currently is the graduate research assistant for Dr. John Gilderbloom and research associate for the Center for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods (SUN) at UofL, where he has edited and co-authored many of Gilderbloom's books, articles, reports and newspaper pieces. Hanka recently co-authored a chapter with Dr. Stephen A. Roosa for his upcoming book The Sustainable Development Handbook, published by Fairmont Press and scheduled to be released in December 2007. He is also a co-author on an evaluation of Newport, Kentucky's HOPE VI housing program. He is a co-author of two recently accepted refereed scholarly articles: an article examining urban policy in the Netherlands and a study of President Clinton's economic empowerment programs in U.S. cities.

In Kentucky, Hanka is active in local civic and international public affairs organizations in Louisville. He is president of the Louisville Chapter of the United Nations Association (UNA) of the USA and Membership Chair for the Kentucky Division of UNA-USA, past president of the University of Louisville Metro Rotaract Club, and serves on the board of directors for Interfaith Paths to Peace. In 2004 and 2005, he led international and community development projects with the University of Louisville International Service Learning Program and Rotary International in Belize and Ghana. Hanka also helped organize a course on social policy and planning in Amsterdam.

Hanka currently lives in an old Victorian mansion in the Old Louisville neighborhood and is engaged to be married on September 5, 2008.

Carrie Beth Lasley has earned a masters in urban planning at the University of Louisville. She is working at the Center for Hazards Assessment, Research and Technology (CHART) at the University of New Orleans, and plans to complete her doctorate in urban studies there.

She earned a bachelors in news-editorial journalism from the University of Missouri-Columbia in 2000, and took a job as a sports copy editor and designer at The Journal News in suburban New York City. While there, she completed a bachelors of arts in geography with geographic information systems certification at the City University of New York-Lehman College in The Bronx in 2002.

The Louisville native has been a research assistant at the Center for Hazards Research and Policy Development at the University of Louisville since 2006, where she focuses on flooding. She has also worked at the Center for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods, and tutors in geosciences, sociology and Spanish at U of L’s REACH tutoring center. She speaks Spanish and is learning Dutch.

A co-authored article on Netherlands planning and policy will be published in Local Environment, and an article on parks and environmental justice will be published in Projections in 2008. Her research interests are in land use decisions and flooding, park development, GIS and public money in the land market. She plans to complete her education and hopefully return to Kentucky to become a professor.

She lives in New Orleans with her fiancé and three ferrets. In her free time, Ms. Lasley stays active by playing rugby, hiking and kayaking.
Erin E. House is currently finishing her thesis in completion of a Master’s Degree in Historic Preservation from the University of Kentucky. She is writing her thesis on a late 19th century Louisville architect, William J. Dodd, focusing on the Old Louisville neighborhood where she grew up. Her interests include neighborhood revitalization, sustainability, and non-profit organizations.

In graduate school, Erin was awarded a research assistantship at the Center for Historic Architecture and Preservation, where she has served as a grant writer for the last two years. In 2005, she worked directly with the Friends of the Farnsley-Kaufman House in Louisville, where she wrote educational and interpretation grants for the historic property. Over the past year, she worked with the University of Kentucky campus architect, composing campus beautification grants for the historic University of Kentucky campus. Before returning to graduate school, she worked at the Kentucky Psychological Association (KPA), a statewide membership organization of over 900 members. At KPA, she coordinated an annual convention and monthly continuing education workshops, performed a wide range of data analysis including demographic and geographic analysis, workshop evaluation statistics, membership retention analysis, and financial reports, and maintained website content and management of the online membership database.

Erin received a Bachelor’s of Music in violin performance from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 2000. While attending UNC, Erin was recognized as a skilled and accomplished violinist. She was awarded the prestigious Volmer scholarship of music, conferred assistant concertmistress of the symphony orchestra all four years, participated in several chamber music ensembles, performed three individual solo recitals, and was awarded honorable mention in two competitions from the Department of Music. Erin attended high school at DuPont Manual and the Youth Performing Arts School in Louisville, receiving her high school diploma in 1996. She participated in the Kentucky All-State orchestra from 1993-1996, receiving the assistant concertmistress chair in 1996.

Erin currently resides in Lexington with her husband Brandt and enjoys traveling, antique shopping, and spending time with her family.

Elizabeth A. McConnell is a graduate student in the Master of Public Administration program at the University of Louisville in Kentucky. She has recently accepted an internship at the Foundation for a Healthy Kentucky, and will continue her intern position at a local non-profit organization, Bicycling for Louisville. She hopes to set a direction for her future career this academic year and will graduate in May 2008.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program / Activity</th>
<th>Participation Goal</th>
<th>Participation to Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Jobs Center / One Stop Job Training Development</td>
<td>25 Persons</td>
<td>58 Persons goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assist families with entering post-secondary degree program / training</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>25 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll residents in a certificate or degree program @ NK Vo-Tech or NKU</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents will enroll in the bureau of vocational rehabilitation program</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Career training through CET</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents completing CET will obtain full-time employment</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents completing CET will obtain full-time employment for 9 months</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents completing CET will be offered health insurance</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents will complete CET</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals use of the YMCA computer lab</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>17 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Individuals will attend Newport Adult or Community Learning Center,</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>44 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents will obtain GED or increase TABE by 4 grade levels</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>Increase TABE: 27 Received GED: 13 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth will participate in the YLD/Summer Youth program</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>18 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth participation in YMCA activities</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>55 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Form a girl scout troop</td>
<td>10 Girls</td>
<td>21 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth participation in boys &amp; girl club activities</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation in W/A youth programs</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8 goal completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants awareness of childcare availability and funding</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>56 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Point will provide services to families on a sliding scale fee</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>97 goal exceeded</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participation to Date</td>
<td>Participation Goal</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families will purchase a new residence</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>First time moms will receive home visits from every child succeeds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families will receive health insurance for kids through K-chip</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moms and babies will visit the healthy moms and babies van</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newport school based health center will provide families with monthly care</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North key will provide mental health and substance abuse serious to families</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHA maintenance department will provide basic home maintenance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants will go through the NKU entrepreneurship center for small business</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants will receive HUD mortgage counseling through BC</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participants will complete HUD mortgage counseling through BC</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families will receive budget counseling through the CSS worker</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families have credit reports pulled</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families will resolve credit issues</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families will receive transportation assistance</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Families will be given information about TANK routes, and increase usage of public transportation</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Abbreviations Used in Table
BC: Brighton Center
CET: Center for Employment Training
CSS: Community Social Services
GED: Graduate Equivalency Degree
HUD: Housing and Urban Development
NHA: Newport Housing Authority
NK: Northern Kentucky
NKU: Northern Kentucky University
TABE: Test of Adult Basic Education
TANK: Transit Authority of Northern Kentucky
YLD: Youth Leadership Program
Dear HOPE VI Residents:

This is one of our final surveys to gather information on your overall satisfaction of your neighborhood, community, and the services you received from Brighton Center’s Community and Supportive Services (CSS) and the Housing Authority of Newport (HAN) as it relates to the HOPE VI program. We want to hear from you to determine if you and your family have a better quality of life because of the HOPE VI program collectively. The information you provide will be useful in evaluating HOPE VI. Please take a few minutes to complete this survey. If you need help with filling out this survey, please contact us. Your answers will remain anonymous. Your opinions are important to our research and will remain confidential. Thank you for your time and participation.

Sincerely,

John I. Gilderbloom, Professor
& Matt Hanka, Research Associate
University of Louisville, Center for Sustainable Urban Neighborhoods
502-852-8557
I. Neighborhood Satisfaction

Here are some statements about how residents may feel about their living situation in the HOPE VI program. Tell us to what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements. Please place a check mark in the box that corresponds to your answer. Select only one response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SA - Strongly Agree</th>
<th>D - Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A - Agree</td>
<td>SD - Strongly Disagree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N - Neutral (Neither Agree nor Disagree)</td>
<td>NA - No Answer</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

|  | SA | A | N | D | SD | NA |
|----------------------------|
| I like living in my neighborhood | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| I know my neighbors | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| I can walk or ride a bike to work easily and safely in my neighborhood | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| I can walk or ride a bike to the grocery store easily and safely in my neighborhood | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| My (child) children can walk to school easily and safely in my neighborhood | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| My family and I would benefit from bicycle safety education | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| Compared to my neighborhood seven years ago (2000), there are more recreation activities available near my home for my children | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| Compared to my neighborhood seven years ago (2000), there are recreation activities available near my home for adults | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
| I have more choices for entertainment within walking distance of my neighborhood than my neighborhood seven years ago (2000) | [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] |
I have more choices for employment in my neighborhood than I did seven years ago (2000)

Housing Authority of Newport has made my situation worse

Brighton Center’s CSS program has made my situation worse

I have better job opportunities because of Brighton Center’s CSS program

I have better job opportunities because of Housing Authority of Newport

I have choices for transportation (ex. bus, biking, car pooling) in my neighborhood

My family and I use bicycles or walk to and from school or work

My neighborhood is accessible to people who are elderly or disabled

I have better educational opportunities now because of the Housing Authority of Newport

I have better educational opportunities now because of Brighton Center’s CSS

Brighton Center’s CSS is doing a good job

Housing Authority of Newport (HAN) is doing a good job

My life is better because of Brighton Center CSS.

My life is better because of the Housing Authority of Newport
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>SA</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>NA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I wish to move out of my neighborhood in the future</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to stay in the neighborhood and purchase my home</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>II. Community Residents and Safety</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are people with different backgrounds, cultures or life experiences in my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I relate well with my neighbors and community members</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in my neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My children have close and safe places to play</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate street lighting at night</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate police presence in the neighborhood</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>III. Community Activity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have attended events, festivals and meetings in my community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am registered to vote</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I voted in the 2004 Presidential election</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of a community organization or group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take pride in the community where I live</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IV. Safe and Affordable Housing

Housing on the south site of the Housing Authority is better now than it was seven years ago (2000)

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

My community is clean

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

The houses and apartment buildings on my street are well maintained

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

Graffiti has gotten worse since 2000

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

There are more drugs in my neighborhood than there was in 2000

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

There is more gun violence in my neighborhood than there was in 2000

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

There is more safe and affordable subsidized housing than there was in 2000

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

There is more available Section 8 housing than there was in 2000

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

There is a shorter Section 8 housing waiting list than there was in 2000

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

There are more market-rate housing opportunities than there was in 2000

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

I am more comfortable allowing my kids to play outside in the neighborhood than I was in 2000

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]

V. Here are some statements about the services provided by Brighton Center, Inc. Tell us to what extent do you agree or disagree with these statements. Please place a check mark in the box that corresponds to your answer. Select only one response

Brighton Center’s CSS has helped improve my job skills

[ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ] [ ]
Brighton Center’s CSS has helped improve my educational skills

Brighton Center’s CSS has helped connect me to new employment opportunities

Brighton Center’s CSS has helped me become more employable by working with my resume and interview skills

I have used Brighton Center’s Bright Days Child development Center

Brighton Center’s CSS has educated me about childcare alternatives

Brighton Center’s CSS has provided programs for my children

Brighton Center’s CSS services have improved my family’s quality of life.

VI. Demographic Information (We want to know a little about you)

What is your age?

What is your race?

What is your gender?
  o Female
  o Male

What is the highest level of education completed?

Number of Persons in Household (include yourself)

What is your employment status?
  o Full Time
  o Part Time
  o Unemployed, looking for work
  o Unemployed, not looking for work
What is your estimated monthly household Income: $_________ per month

Do you own a car?
  o Yes
  o No

Do you own a bicycle?
  o Yes
  o No

What is your marital status?
  o Single
  o Married
  o Separated/Divorced
  o Divorced
  o Widowed
  o No response

Once again, thank you for participating in this survey. We are very grateful for your input. If you have any other information you would like to share with us, please do so in the space provided below
## D. Survey Results

### Neighborhood Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I like living in my neighborhood</td>
<td>31.5% (17)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I know my neighbors</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.41</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can walk or ride a bike to work easily and safely in my neighborhood</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can walk or ride a bike to the grocery store easily and safely in my neighborhood</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My (child) children can walk to school easily and safely in my neighborhood</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>27.8% (15)</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family and I would benefit from bicycle safety education</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>35.2% (19)</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to my neighborhood seven years ago (2000), there are recreation activities available near my home for my children</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>29.6% (16)</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compared to my neighborhood seven years ago (2000), there are recreation activities available near my home for adults</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more choices for entertainment within walking distance of my neighborhood than my neighborhood seven years ago (2000)</td>
<td>15.1% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.4% (5)</td>
<td>15.1% (8)</td>
<td>15.1% (8)</td>
<td>9.4% (5)</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have more choices for employment in my neighborhood than I did seven years ago (2000)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Newport has made my situation worse</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>50.0% (27)</td>
<td>27.8% (15)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS program has made my situation worse</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.5% (6)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>38.5% (20)</td>
<td>38.5% (20)</td>
<td>9.6%</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have better job opportunities because of Brighton Center’s CSS program</td>
<td>15.1% (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.3% (6)</td>
<td>7.5% (4)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>30.2% (16)</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have better job opportunities because of Housing Authority of Newport</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>13.2% (7)</td>
<td>18.9% (10)</td>
<td>7.5% (4)</td>
<td>32.1% (17)</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have choices for transportation (ex. bus, biking, car pooling) in my neighborhood</td>
<td>24.1% (13)</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My family and I use bicycles or walk to and from school or work</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My neighborhood is accessible to people who are elderly or disabled</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statement</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Rating Average</td>
<td>Response Count</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have better educational opportunities now because of the Housing Authority of Newport</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>35.2% (19)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have better educational opportunities now because of Brighton Center’s CSS</td>
<td>25.9% (14)</td>
<td>37.0% (20)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS is doing a good job</td>
<td>51.9% (28)</td>
<td>44.4% (24)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Newport (HAN) is doing a good job</td>
<td>25.9% (14)</td>
<td>48.1% (26)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My life is better because of Brighton Center CSS.</td>
<td>38.9% (21)</td>
<td>42.6% (23)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My life is better because of the Housing Authority of Newport</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>44.4% (24)</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to move out of my neighborhood in the future</td>
<td>33.3% (18)</td>
<td>33.3% (18)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish to stay in the neighborhood and purchase my home</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.98</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Residents and Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are people with different backgrounds, cultures or life experiences in my community</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
<td>59.3% (32)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I relate well with my neighbors and community members</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>55.6% (30)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe in my neighborhood</td>
<td>27.8% (15)</td>
<td>48.1% (26)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.09</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My children have close and safe places to play</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>35.2% (19)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate street lighting at night</td>
<td>24.1% (13)</td>
<td>50.0% (27)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is adequate police presence in the neighborhood</td>
<td>29.6% (16)</td>
<td>59.3% (32)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td></td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Community Activity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I have attended events, festivals and meetings in my community</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>46.3% (25)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am registered to vote</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>33.3% (18)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>24.1% (13)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I voted in the 2004 Presidential election</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>33.3% (18)</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a member of a community organization or group</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>38.9% (21)</td>
<td>29.6% (16)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I take pride in the community where I live</td>
<td>29.6% (16)</td>
<td>46.3% (25)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Safe and Affordable Housing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Housing on the south-site of the Housing Authority is better now than it was seven years ago (2000)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>31.5% (17)</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My community is clean</td>
<td>26.4% (14)</td>
<td>45.3% (24)</td>
<td>13.2% (7)</td>
<td>7.5% (4)</td>
<td>7.5% (4)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The houses and apartment buildings on my street are well maintained</td>
<td>29.6% (16)</td>
<td>51.9% (28)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graffiti has gotten worse since 2000</td>
<td>5.7% (3)</td>
<td>17.0% (9)</td>
<td>13.2% (7)</td>
<td>30.2% (16)</td>
<td>24.5% (13)</td>
<td>9.4% (5)</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are more drugs in my neighborhood than there was in 2000</td>
<td>18.5% (10)</td>
<td>24.1% (13)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more gun violence in my neighborhood than there was in 2000</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>29.6% (16)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more safe and affordable subsidized housing than there was in 2000</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>42.6% (23)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>2.69</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is more available Section 8 housing than there was in 2000</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>50.0% (27)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There is a shorter Section 8 housing waiting list than there was in 2000</td>
<td>5.9% (3)</td>
<td>37.3% (19)</td>
<td>3.9% (2)</td>
<td>19.6% (10)</td>
<td>9.8% (5)</td>
<td>23.5% (12)</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are more market-rate housing opportunities than there was in 2000</td>
<td>13.2% (7)</td>
<td>54.7% (29)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>7.5% (4)</td>
<td>0.0% (0)</td>
<td>20.8% (11)</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am more comfortable allowing my kids to play outside in the neighborhood than I was in 2000

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Rating Average</th>
<th>Response Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS has helped improve my job skills</td>
<td>25.9% (14)</td>
<td>37.0% (20)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS has helped improve my educational skills</td>
<td>24.1% (13)</td>
<td>38.9% (21)</td>
<td>14.8% (8)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS has helped connect me to new employment opportunities</td>
<td>22.2% (12)</td>
<td>35.2% (19)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>25.9% (14)</td>
<td>2.08</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS has helped me become more employable by working with my resume and interview skills</td>
<td>16.7% (9)</td>
<td>40.7% (22)</td>
<td>5.6% (3)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>31.5% (17)</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have used Brighton Center’s Bright Days Child Development Center</td>
<td>13.0% (7)</td>
<td>20.4% (11)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>11.1% (6)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>44.4% (24)</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS has educated me about childcare alternatives</td>
<td>17.0% (9)</td>
<td>26.4% (14)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>5.7% (3)</td>
<td>43.4% (23)</td>
<td>2.20</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS has provided programs for my children</td>
<td>24.5% (13)</td>
<td>30.2% (16)</td>
<td>3.8% (2)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>5.7% (3)</td>
<td>34.0% (18)</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton Center’s CSS services have improved my family’s quality of life.</td>
<td><strong>42.6% (23)</strong></td>
<td>35.2% (19)</td>
<td>9.3% (5)</td>
<td>3.7% (2)</td>
<td>1.9% (1)</td>
<td>7.4% (4)</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Newport, Kentucky contains a wealth of significant historic structures. This city has embraced this significant resource and local preservation efforts have been successful for a variety of reasons. The city has an active historic preservation office that serves the community by offering resources for historic property owners, and administers a design review process for any alterations to historic sites. The success of preservation efforts in Newport can also be attributed to redevelopment efforts on the riverfront, local incentive programs for historic preservation efforts, and state tax credits.

This river city was founded in 1795, and named after Christopher Newport, the commander of the first English ship to settle Jamestown. Newport expanded rapidly in the 1800s and became a center for trade, industry, and culture, assisted by the advent of steam-powered riverboats. The Victorian era was Newport’s most prosperous period, as evidenced by the large number of historic Victorian homes in the city today. Newport is home to a mix of historic and contemporary attractions, with a population of 17,048. The city’s riverfront and northern business district are undergoing dramatic redevelopment. One of the most recent projects is the Newport on the Levee, a shopping and entertainment complex on the riverfront that has brought new jobs and attracted tourists from all over the Commonwealth. This project was made possible through a state law that allows developers of tourism-related projects to recover a share of sales tax generated by the developments over 10 years, thus recouping up to 25 percent of their project costs. Newport on the Levee covers 500,000 square feet of shopping, dining, and entertainment venues, and is unique from conventional shopping malls because its location and design encourage longer trips.

In June 2003, the city opened the Louisville & Nashville Pedestrian Bridge, now more commonly known as the ‘Purple People’ bridge due to its new bright purple paint job. This bridge was built in 1875 and the $4.1 million restoration has enabled an important connection between popular Newport and Cincinnati attractions on either side of the river. There is also more traffic congestion in Newport from a new bridge for Route 8. People now use Sixth Street as a major thoroughfare, and the increase of traffic has benefited local businesses through increased exposure.

54 percent of Newport’s housing stock was built before 1939, and 78 percent was built before 1959 (U.S. Census data, 2000). There are five historic districts listed on the National Register of Historic Places in Newport, the largest of which is the East Row historic district. The East Row district is significant for its quality and quantity of late 19th century/ early 20th century residences, encompassing approximately 1150 acres and 984 buildings. It is the second largest historic district in Kentucky, second only to the Old Louisville neighborhood. This neighborhood is currently undergoing considerable revitalization efforts, where twenty years ago it was in a state of severe decline. This district is roughly bounded by the 11th to the south, 6th Street to the north, Oak Street to the east, and Saratoga Street to the west. The city of Newport regularly hosts public walking tours in the East Row Historic District.

Newport has a number of local incentive projects that benefit historic preservation, including sales tax exemptions for building materials, a property assessment moratorium, and local paint partnership programs. Businesses and properties located in the historic core are exempt from state sales tax on building materials and supplies used in the rehabilitation of the property. In addition, business owners are able to defer the added value of improvements of structures twenty-five years or older from the taxable assessment of their property for a period of five years. There are two paint stores in Newport that offer discounts on paint used for all properties located within boundaries of the Monmouth Street Redevelopment Area and East Row Historic District. Sherwin-Williams, Co. located on Monmouth Street offers a 35 percent discount on both exterior and interior paints, and
associated products for rehabilitation. Harmeyer's Paint & Supplies on 10th Street has a similar program, providing a 30 percent-40 percent discount on paint supplies.

Properties located within the East Row and Monmouth Street historic districts are subject to design review. The guidelines are available to the public online, and include rules about recommended paint colors, fencing, alternative materials, demolition, and new construction. Properties owners are required to obtain a certificate of appropriateness for any exterior updates or additions to their buildings. Newport has a limited design review process with an overseeing architectural board, but changes to historic properties are not enforced as strictly as in some of the larger cities such as Louisville or Lexington. Changes to buildings that are located in the East Row historic district (a local historic district) and the Main Street corridor are protected primarily by zoning restrictions. The only building with National Landmark status (and therefore increased restrictions) is the Carnegie Library located on Monmouth Street.

The Newport Historic Preservation Office also has a preservation reference library available for public use, as does the Newport Public Library. The city of Newport website contains links to various preservation journal articles and other websites. The main street businesses of Newport do not rely too heavily on tourism dollars. Most of them are small businesses that primarily serve local community members. The majority of these businesses have been in operation for extensive periods of time, some of them for almost 100 years. Most sell high quality and unique goods. Unfortunately, nearly all of these local mainstays close around 5 p.m. One of the city’s main objectives relating to the revitalization of Monmouth Street is to bring in more nightlife to the area.

Part of Newport’s success in preservation efforts is due to its willingness to allow adaptive reuse of historic buildings, within appropriate guidelines. In the summer of 2007, Greater’s Ice Cream opened on the corner of Fourth and Monmouth Streets in a historic building. The rehabilitation plan will include reconstructing historic elements, such as revealing the original tin ceiling and original tile floors, while incorporating modern amenities to make the building suitable for a contemporary retail franchise.

Another successful adaptive reuse project was the Hannaford Suites Hotel, located at 803 E. 6th Street. This late 19th century building was originally the old Notre Dame Academy, and has since been converted into condominiums. The architectural firm, Brandstetter Carroll Inc., has recently been involved in two Newport projects, a Third Street traffic study, and a downtown revitalization study of the Monmouth Street Streetscape. Brandstetter Carroll Inc. has already performed a Master Plan and Phase I Construction Documents for streetscape development of eight blocks of the main retail corridor, including improvements to sidewalks, curbs, curb ramps, lighting and related street amenities. City leaders are looking at various ways to respond to increased traffic and revitalization of the main street. One option being reviewed is converting Monmouth Street from a one-way north traffic flow to a two-way street.

State tax credits have also benefited the preservation community of Newport. Since its inception in 2005, over 89 projects have been completed statewide. Eligible historic properties receive 20 percent tax credit for improvements to income-producing properties and 10 percent for residential buildings before 1936 (70 years or older). Newport’s historic preservation officer Emily Jarzen believes that there has not been a dramatic increase in preservation efforts since the state tax credit program was enacted. She states that the $3 million cap is far too little and the problem is that there is no assurance of receiving funds when applying to the program. Funds are not accessible enough and that the cap should be risen sub-
stantially higher in order to make the program available to a wider population.

There is one tax credit project currently in progress in downtown Newport. The Marx-Cromer property is located on the 900 block of Monmouth Street and is being rehabilitated. The developer has stated that the purchase price of the dilapidated building was out of his price range if the historic preservation tax credits were not available for the rehabilitation effort. The first lease in the building is scheduled to be available in September or October 2007. The monthly rate is currently estimated at one dollar per square foot, which would equal an $800 per month rent. According to Ryan Wyrick with the Economic Development Office, The Marx-Cromer and the Dine-Schabell buildings are two former furniture warehouses located on Monmouth. Each is a three-to-four story building being rehabilitated to provide 50 market rate rental units and approximately 20,000 square feet of office and retail space. This is a dual advantage for urban area. The historical properties’ reuse will bring character back into the urban area while preserving the historic landmarks of the city, and the mixed-use with residential and office space will provide convenience in the urban landscape.

There are several historic districts in Newport on the National Register of Historic Places. Monmouth Street is centrally located downtown, and is adjacent to historic districts which serve many types of businesses. There are HOPE VI developments within just a few blocks of this business district. The York Street Historic District is located on the blocks to the west of Monmouth Street, while the East Row Historic District in Eastern Newport is approximately three to four times the size of Monmouth Street shopping District, and encompasses businesses and several HOPE VI developments.

According to Emily Jarzen, Historic Preservation Specialist for the City of Newport, businesses which locate in historic districts provide more social and economic cohesion. Existing historic district businesses help to stabilize property values and create great selling points for prospective historic district business owners. Also, businesses can take advantage of tax credits offered in historic districts. Historic districts also can be an incubator for new business. The Marx/Cromer project of 41 market-rate units on Monmouth Street was an unused warehouse being converted to loft apartments for residents. The ground floor provided locations for small business to set up shop. Businesses and developers have an array of choice in the building stock within historic districts, partly because the majority of the housing stock in the city is historic. These historic districts make urban areas unique and attract diverse businesses such as funeral homes, restaurants, shops, bars and boutiques. Jarzen also emphasized the need to protect more areas of historical significance in the city. One or two additional historic districts are likely to be created in Newport within the next 5-to-10 years. Jarzen admits the difficulty in connecting HOPE VI program progress to historic business developments. However, she says she believes HOPE VI residential developments located in historic districts have the potential to be properly maintained because of the strict codes and enforcement in place for preserving the historic districts of Newport.