

The Community Capacity Building Impacts of the



An Overview of the Community Development Capacity of the Five Operating Baltimore Empowerment Zone Village Centers

*Prepared By:
Richard P. Clinch
Director of Economic Research*

The Jacob
france
Institute

June 2004

Executive Summary

The Empower Baltimore Management Corporation retained the Jacob France Institute to analyze the impact of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone on building community capacity through an interview and records review based case study analysis of the five currently operating Village Centers. France Institute personnel worked with EBMC representatives and local decision-makers knowledgeable about community development to develop a case study interview guide. France Institute personnel then conducted interviews with key Village Center leaders, EBMC staff and board members, and other key community and City leaders in order to collect qualitative and, where possible, quantitative, information on the local community development capacity created through the operations of EBMC.

The creation of community development capacity is vitally important in the context of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone because as EBMC sunsets, its goal is for the five remaining Village Centers to continue to operate and implement core Empowerment Zone created programs. This report was undertaken before and differs from the NOMAGIC assessments of the sustainability issues facing each village center in that it was a broad, high-level analysis of the issue of sustainability across the empowerment zone, rather than a detailed assessment of the sustainability issues facing each Village Center.

The general finding of this analysis is that the Baltimore Empowerment Zone program was successful to varying degrees in building development capacity in the Village Centers. Each of the five remaining Village Centers overcame various internal and external challenges to become a functioning organization. Each has been able to engage the community in the design and implementation of Empowerment Zone programs. However, there has been substantial variation in the level of success achieved by each of the Village Centers in both community engagement and program implementation. There is also substantial variation among the Village Center's in their readiness for the end of the Empowerment Zone program in Baltimore.

Two Village Centers – East *Harbor Village Center* and *Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council* – have been very successful in diversifying their operational and administrative funding sources and reducing their reliance on EBMC funding. Both of these Village Centers have leveraged the Empowerment Zone program to attract new sources of funding and programs. Both have strong staff and/or boards, clear missions and goals, and a strong probability of success in terms of long-term sustainability. One Village Center – *The Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition* (HEBCAC) – has a history of successful program implementation and lower level of reliance on EBMC funding than other Village Centers, partly because this organization pre-dated the Empowerment Zone and has a strong institutional partner. However, this organization has suffered from turnover of key personnel, difficulties in community engagement, and competition from a new City-created agency to promote east side redevelopment. HEBCAC can play a vital role in supporting east side redevelopment, especially through the delivery of social services, but must address key management issues, hire an executive director, and develop a new strategic plan. The two remaining Village Centers, the *Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center* (HP/LS-VC) and the *Poppleton Village Center* (VCP), have both successfully implemented EBMC programs but both remain dependent on EBMC funding. The Poppleton Village Center is further along in sustainability planning than HP/LS-VC, has created a CDC, and can play an important role in supporting the University of Maryland, Baltimore Research Park now being developed in the community. The Village Center has an opportunity to form a strong, ongoing institutional

support relationship with University of Maryland, Baltimore to facilitate the development of the University of Maryland, Baltimore Research Park. This relationship with the University of Maryland, Baltimore, along with the potential development opportunities created by the UMB research park could, if managed appropriately, support long-term sustainability. However, in order to achieve this, the community could benefit from a more organized strategic and sustainability planning initiative. The Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center has achieved a level of success in both community outreach and implementing the Empowerment Zone's workforce development program. However, HP/LS-VC is nearly entirely dependent on Empowerment Zone funding, with substantial negative implications for long-term sustainability. Furthermore, the HP/LS-VC serves a small area that is also served by several other existing community organizations. The interviews and sustainability planning materials reviewed correctly identify partnership with one of these organizations as the most viable strategy for long-term sustainability of the EBMC programs in this area.

The goal of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone effort was to build *Sustainable Community Development* through the creation of *Community Based Partnerships* or Village Centers. Overall, the community capacity building efforts of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone have been successful in terms of building community capacity - defined as functioning community organizations that have engaged the community to design and implement key strategic goals through a core set of programs. All of the five currently operating Village Centers have accomplished this basic level of capacity. However, the issue of sustainability of these efforts is less clear, with two Village Centers – EHVC and WV/PNPC – well on their way to sustainability, one – HEBCAC – redefining its mission in the context of political and programmatic changes, and two – HP/LS-VC and VCP – remaining heavily reliant on EBMC funding.

The Empower Baltimore Management Corporation went about developing community development capacity in the right way. It established a clear set of goals. It required that communities form representative organizations that underwent a strategic planning process to guide their operations. It provided technical assistance and sufficient funding to support leadership development, board development and community outreach. It tracked both program inputs and outcomes and recognized when it was unsuccessful – as with Self-Motivated. The lesson of the EBMC capacity building effort is the important role that community organizing and community organizations can play in the design and implementation of economic and workforce development projects.

1.0 Introduction

The Empower Baltimore Management Corporation (EBMC) retained the Jacob France Institute to analyze the impact of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone on building community development capacity through an interview and records review based case study analysis of the five currently operating Village Centers. France Institute personnel worked with EBMC representatives and local decision-makers knowledgeable about community development to develop a case study interview guide. France Institute personnel then conducted interviews with key Village Center leaders, EBMC staff and board members, and other key community and City leaders in order to collect qualitative and, where possible, quantitative, information on the local community development capacity created through the operations of EBMC. This report summarizes the results of the interviews conducted and the records analyzed. This report begins with an overview of community development capacity, describes the results of the analysis conducted for the five Village Centers, and ends with a summary and conclusion.

This report is a macro-level analysis of the impact of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone on creating sustainable community development capacity, not an in-depth assessment of the sustainability issues confronting each Village Center. Detailed analyses of the sustainability issues for each Village Center are in the process of being prepared for EBMC by Nonprofit Organization Management And Governance Interventions Corporation (NOMAGIC).

2.0 Community Development Capacity and The Empowerment Zone

Community organizations have historically played an important role in the implementation of urban policies and programs. This is true of the federal empowerment zone program, especially in its implementation in Baltimore, where community organizations – Village Centers – play a central role in program implementation. However, community-based strategies presume that the local organizations have the capacity to manage and implement programs. This is a difficult presumption, especially, as in the case of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone, where the community implementing organizations needed to be created. The creation of long-term sustainable community development capacity is vitally important in the context of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone because as EBMC sunsets, its goal is for the five remaining Village Centers to continue to operate and implement core Empowerment Zone created programs. This section of the report presents a definition of community development capacity, discusses the issue of community development capacity in the context of the Empowerment Zone effort, and presents the results of interviews with three members of the EBMC Board of Directors and two staff members involved in capacity building issues.

2.1 Defining Community Development Capacity

A great body of literature exists on the role of community organizations in urban policy and program implementation. Many articles, books, and guides have been written about, and foundation programs created to support capacity building in community organizations. Despite the existence of this substantial community capacity building literature, there is no generally accepted definition of what community development capacity is. One key problem in defining community development capacity is the broad application of the term. Community capacity has been analyzed in the context of addressing nearly every urban problem, including crime reduction, housing, health, workforce development, economic development and general community development. Another problem is the difficulty in defining what comprises a community. An additional problem is the fact that any attempt to analyze community

development capacity must take into account a wide range of both internal and external factors that impact the community being studied. Few efforts have addressed all of these issues.

A good working definition of community capacity developed by Robert Chaskin is as follows: “Community capacity is the interaction of human capital, organizational resources, and social capital existing within a given community that can be leveraged to solve collective problems and improve or maintain the well-being of that community. It may operate through informal social processes and/or organized effort.”¹ His framework for measuring a community’s capacity can be operationalized through three basic dimensions of community capacity:

- Community Characteristics – consisting of four elements: sense of community; resident commitment; ability to solve problems; and access to resources;
- Levels of Social Agency –the individuals, organizations, or networks that are engaged in promoting neighborhood change; and
- Functions –the actions undertaken to community effect change.

In the model, three additional dimensions shape the three basic dimensions:

- The Strategies implemented to promote community capacity;
- Conditioning Influences -- mediating circumstances that inhibit or promote the development community capacity; and finally
- Outcomes –the policy, social, or economic impacts that result from community capacity building efforts.

2.2 The Importance of Community Development Capacity in the Federal and Baltimore Empowerment Zone Program

The development of community capacity has been a central element of national urban policy. Developing community capacity to effect change in a specific area has traditionally been a central component of place-based strategies. Place-based strategies are comprehensive policy interventions targeted on addressing socio-economic development issues in a defined area. A core goal of place-based strategies is to involve community members in the design and implementation of the policy intervention so as to increase participation, enhance efficiency, and promote localized benefits. Place-based strategies can be compared to people-based strategies, such as welfare support or job training, where policy interventions are targeted on individuals. Place-based strategies have their roots in the progressive era and have come in and out of favor in federal urban policy. The federal empowerment zone program was a return to emphasizing place-based strategies after many years of being out of favor. Indeed, two of the “four fundamental principles” guiding the empowerment zone effort – *sustainable community development characterized by a comprehensive coordinated approach* and *community-based partnerships that engage representatives from all parts of the community* returned place-based strategies to the forefront of federal urban policy.

The place-based strategy of developing community capacity to implement programs and effect neighborhood change was central to the federal Empowerment Zone effort. More importantly, it was a core element of Baltimore’s Empowerment Zone application and strategy.

¹ Chaskin, R. Building Community Capacity: A Definitional Framework And Case Studies From A Comprehensive Community Initiative. *Urban Affairs Review* 36 (3) 291-323

Baltimore's vision for the Empowerment Zone was guided by three principles, two of which directly referenced or related to the creation of community development capacity. The principle of *Sustainable Community Development* called for "rebuild[ing] all basic social and neighborhood systems simultaneously through comprehensive 'whole problem' approaches and to build on the critical mass of innovation already working in community-driven efforts." The principle of *Community Based Partnerships* called for the Empowerment Zone "to solve problems and advance Empowerment Zone initiatives through a highly mobilized resident-citizen force on a block-by-block basis and grassroots-driven 'village partnerships' controlled and directed by residents at the neighborhood level."²

Of the six original federal empowerment zones, Baltimore, along with Atlanta, chose to approach the federal empowerment zone program goal of creating sustainable community development mechanisms by focusing on creating or strengthening local community development institutions. Furthermore, only Baltimore was still evaluated as maintaining this strategy as of the November 2001 *Interim Assessment of the Empowerment Zone and Enterprise Communities (EZ/EC): A Progress Report*. According to the interim assessment, "Baltimore has sought to enhance community capacity in zone neighborhoods by strengthening community development organizations where they existed and seeding new ones where they did not."³ The *Interim Assessment Report* found that, "in Baltimore, building strong Village Centers was central to the EZ's strategy. EBMC has invested considerable time and effort in capacity building by offering technical assistance to the Village Centers, including some help with facilitation, diversity training, and organizational issues, as well as project assistance. The time and effort required for building the capacity of the Village Centers has been significant."⁴ Yet, despite this effort the Village Centers "continue to vary considerably in capacity."⁵ Strengthening the capacity of the Village Centers is of vital importance, because these organizations are expected to continue to sustain community development activities after EBMC sunsets. This report is part of EBMC's efforts to evaluate, strengthen and sustain this capacity.

2.3 EBMC Board Member and Staff Interviews

Three board members and two staff members involved in the community capacity and sustainability activities of EBMC were interviewed on their perceptions of the sustainability issues relating to EBMC and the Village Centers. There was a strong level of agreement in the interviews conducted on the EBMC's goals for the Village Centers, the organizational strength and capacity of each of the five operating Village Centers, and the key steps necessary to support the Village Centers. There were some interesting differences in how each of the Board and staff members interviewed would measure community capacity.

When asked about the long-term goal of EBMC for the Village Centers, there was a strong consensus that the Village Centers should continue to operate. However, there was also agreement that if the Village Centers are unable to overcome key organizational issues, as occurred with the Self Motivated Village Center, or attract new funding to replace EBMC support that there "is no guarantee" that they will continue. There was also a general consensus that if the Village Centers perform an important function, they should be able to attract funding

² Baltimore Empowerment. (1994). The Empowerment Zone application.

³ Hebert, S., A. Vidal, G. Mills, F. James, and D. Gruenstein, 2001. Washington D.C.: U.S. Department of Housing and Community Development. Pp. 7-16.

⁴ *IBID.* p. 6-34.

⁵ *IBID.* p. 7-16.

to sustain operations. Even with this belief, funding was universally seen as the key barrier to sustainability and there was some level of uncertainty that even where Village Centers can demonstrate programmatic success, they will attract the funding required to sustain operations. There was a feeling that the organizational capacity of the Village Centers – or any community organization – depends on sufficient resources to support core administrative functions and community outreach efforts. Yet, the targeted nature of the federal, state, City and foundation community development funding available often limits the amount of overhead and management support available to support administrative needs or conduct outreach and organizing.

When asked about the general factors that influence the organizational strength and capacity of the Village Centers, there was a general consensus on what the key factors were, but different views on the relative priority or ranking of these factors. Board members with a business background emphasized the importance of financial and managerial factors, while board members with a community development background emphasized organizational cohesion and stability, “connections to networks” and the level of local board and community involvement with and investment in the organization. These members also recognized financial and managerial issues, but as secondary to community influences. An interesting and unexpected finding in the interviews was the importance placed on two factors outside of the Village Center’s control in terms of gauging the organizational strength and capacity of the Village Centers. These were “community momentum” – or the overall socio-economic improvement occurring in the neighborhood, and the presence of a key institutional partner. Community momentum was seen as important because it has the combined effect of stimulating and reinforcing community involvement as positive change is noticed and also generating additional resources to support the Village Centers. The presence of a key institutional partner, such as Johns Hopkins University for HEBCAC, was seen as adding to capacity in terms of providing both funding and support and access to the political and other resources of the institutional partner.

Each of the staff and board members interviewed was asked to describe the organizational strength and capacity of each of the five operating Village Centers. Their responses were as follows:

East Harbor Village Center

There was agreement among all three board members interviewed that the East Harbor Village Center was doing very well. It was seen as having a strong management team, as being fiscally responsible and as having a good vision for the community. The strengths of the Village Center was positively effected by low (none for key staff) staff turnover. East Harbor was seen as the most community driven of the Village Centers and as being “99.9% community driven.” This community outreach emphasis was considered especially important to the residents of Flag House Court and Perkins Homes – “who rely on the Village Center as one of their only means of support.” East Harbor was considered to be especially successful in the area of economic development, but as substantially benefiting from the natural expansion of downtown redevelopment into their area. East Harbor was considered to be one of the areas where the organizational strength of the Village Center was positively impacted by “community momentum” – in this case externally driven investment and improvement in the community. The success of East Harbor Village Center was at some level, unexpected to some of those interviewed. Because of the substantial diversity of the neighborhood, one board member reported that they “never thought East Harbor would work.” The efforts of the Village Center

director was seen as important in building consensus within this diverse community. However, the strength of this leader raised the concern that one potential weakness that may impact East Harbor Village Center's long-term sustainability is that the organization is highly tied to one dynamic leader. A key positive factor for long-term sustainability is that "the Village Center has sought to be a partner in the development process" by creating a community development corporation (CDC) and "focusing on economic development opportunities by linking the Village Center to development opportunities through the CDC."

Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center

The EBMC Board and staff members interviewed viewed the Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center as having some organizational strength and capacity limitations. The Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center area was seen as having too small a service area and as having lost too much of its population to develop an efficient scale of operation. The Village Center was also seen as facing competition from other community organizations and also facing "tremendous issues" in terms of resolving conflict at the Board-level. On the positive side, the Village Center board and staff were seen as well organized and hard working. The Village Center owns property and has an opportunity to work with Bank of America, which will contribute to the sustainability of the organization. However, some of the Board members identified partnership or merger of the Village Center with another community organization as the most likely means of continuing core EBMC programs. A key problem facing the Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center is "the lack of an economic driver" – such as a commercial or other employment area and the "dilapidated condition" of a "beautiful housing stock" with "real potential" for development.

Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition (HEBCAC)

HEBCAC was the second Village Center created by the Baltimore Empowerment Zone. HEBCAC was seen by board members interviewed as having a successful history of implementing and managing programs and the benefit of a strong and committed institutional sponsor in Johns Hopkins University and Hospital. HEBCAC was seen as facing a "huge problem" in addressing the "long standing animosity between the community and Johns Hopkins." Some interviewees viewed HEBCAC as more hierarchical, less community driven, and lacking the engagement of the community. Still, HEBCAC was seen as a fundamentally strong organization that has had to confront several internal and externally driven problems. Internally, the organization has suffered from employee turnover. Externally, the main problem was that the organization could not get ahead of the vacancy rate and general deterioration in the community. The Village Center also had to face a high degree of conflict with the political power structure in the City and that "big plans could not be implemented because of political conflict." HEBCAC was currently seen as having to face the fundamental challenge of redefining its mission in the face of planned East Baltimore redevelopment efforts and the creation of a new organization, the East Baltimore Development Inc., which is taking over key tasks once performed by HEBCAC.

The Village Center of Poppleton

The EBMC staff and Board members interviewed did not express strong positive or negative opinions about the organizational strength and capacity of the Poppleton Village Center. The Village Center was seen as having successfully overcome a series of challenges – including "internal strife" and "difficulty in connecting with parts of the community." The Village Center

was seen as having strong leadership and finances. The Village Center was also seen as have good opportunities for development based on both housing development and the proposed University of Maryland, Baltimore Research Park. The Village Center has completed a master land use plan and developed institutional relationships with Bob Secours, UMB and UMMS. However, the Village Center was seen as needing to develop a strong plan in order to capitalize on the development opportunities [This is being done]. The presence of a strong committed leader was seen as a core strength of the Village Center.

Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council

Washington Village/Pigtown was considered to be a successful organization by all of the staff and board members interviewed. The Village Center's chief accomplishment was considered to be its success "in bringing together a disparate community to form a shared purpose" through effective community organizing. One interviewee said "the lesson of Washington Village is the role of community organizing in success. Bad community organizing gives the entire effort a bad name." The Village Center was seen as having a good Board and benefiting from the experience of a good staff. Washington Village was also seen has have a "clear and consistent community voice and vision", "a strong sense of what they want" and a good strategic plan. The Village Center was also seen as benefiting from external factors, such as the presence of a business park, a strong main street, and a good "middle class" housing stock. A key future issue will be dealing with neighborhood change and "how to deal with gentrification." The ability to deal with racial conflict was considered to be a current and future threat to the organization as was employee turnover and the need to hire an executive director.

The EBMC board members were asked which Village Centers were most likely to continue operations after the sunset of EBMC, both East Harbor and Washington Village were named. These two Village Centers were seen benefiting from "community momentum" as development moves into their neighborhoods. They were also seen as having good management, strong finances and a high degree of community support. HEBCAC was considered to have a strong probability of continuing, based on the continued support of Johns Hopkins, but only if it is able to define a new mission in the face of competition from new and existing community organizations. Harlem Park was seen as the Village Center under most threat – with merger with competing community organizations as a likely means of continuing programs. The main threat to Harlem Park was the small size of the service area and competition with other neighborhood organizations. Poppleton was considered likely to continue to operation, but as having to link to the UMB Research Park effort so as to gain an institutional sponsor.

The EBMC board members were asked to identify the role various organizations can play in terms of supporting the ongoing operation of the Village Centers. The role of EBMC was seen as providing planning and grant-writing support to the Village Centers to facilitate opportunities to partner with federal, State, or City agencies and non-profits. The role of the City was to continue to "pay attention" and work through the Village Centers to implement programs in the Empowerment Zone communities. In fact, the City was seen as contributing to the organizational sustainability problems facing HEBCAC because it did not include the organization in East Side redevelopment plans with one person saying "why the City did not include HEBCAC in the East Side Plan is beyond me." City operational funding was considered an important potential, but unlikely, means of supporting the continued operation of the Village Centers. It was considered important that both EBMC and the City play a supportive role in linking the Village Centers to foundations, businesses, and other institutions (hospitals and

universities) with a stake in these neighborhoods. Foundations were seen as a critical potential source of operating and community organizing support.

When asked to rate the EBMC strategy of promoting the formation of community capacity as a central means of implementing the program, the reported strengths of this strategy were as follows:

- “the whole scheme, even though it was forced, absolutely guaranteed community investment and participation. It was a bottom up approach.”
- It “got a lot of people involved in the process” so it “likely improved program participation.”
- It allowed outreach and programs to be tailored to local conditions – “Each Village Center reflected local conditions, priorities and challenges” and “it was not a cookie cutter approach.”
- As a community-driven “distributed strategy” program implementation “was less political” and “both Mayors stayed out of the process” and “put no political pressure on the Board.”
- It demonstrated the importance of community organizing – “I approached this effort with skepticism about community organizing, but without it – it [urban redevelopment] does not work.”

When asked to identify the weaknesses of the EBMC strategy of promoting the formation of community capacity as a central means of implementing the program, the key issues were:

- The time, effort and money required to support the capacity building effort.
- “Communications failure” -- EBMC did not publicize the benefits from the program.
- “Expectations were too high” and “problems so vast” to really change the neighborhoods.

When asked to comment on the overall capacity building effort one person reported – “we started six Village Centers, if four are successful we’re batting over .600 and I’ll take that.”

3.0 East Harbor Village Center

The East Harbor Village Center (EHVC) serves an area that is both racially and economically diverse. The East Harbor Village Center was the third of the Empowerment Zone's six Village Centers to become operational. East Harbor Village Center has overcome initial organizational conflict and difficulties to become a highly successful Village Center.

3.1 Neighborhood Change

East Harbor, with a population of 7,526 in 1990, was the second smallest of the Village Centers formed by EBMC. The Village Center area is racially and economically diverse and includes both some of the most attractive development properties in the City and some pockets of poverty. With a median household income of \$25,445 (in 1999 dollars), East Harbor had the highest median income level of all of the Village Center areas. The East Harbor area has benefited from both the operations of the Empowerment Zone and substantial redevelopment based on the area's real estate assets. Consequently, the East Harbor Village Center reported some of the best programmatic outcomes and improvements in core socio-economic indicators.

A selected list of East Harbor Village Center and Empowerment Zone outcomes is presented in Table 1. As presented in Table 1, Empowerment Zone training programs served a total of 309 individuals or 9% of all residents that participate in the labor force (as of the 2000 Census). A total of 60 Housing Venture Fund investments were made in the East Harbor area, accounting for 6% of total owner occupied housing units (as of the 2000 Census). The level of crimes committed in the Village Center declined by 13%, lagging the City, the zone and other Village Centers.

The East Harbor Village Center has reported significant progress in the areas of community outreach, economic development, and sustainability planning over the past several years. In the area of community outreach, EHVC reported: continuing working relationships with numerous organizations in a variety of areas, such as the redevelopment of Flag House Courts, HOPE VI projects, area conflict resolution and strategic planning. The Village Center recruited 3 more Board members and 10 volunteers for its Public Safety Committee. Community organizing is more by participation of community organizations in Village Center activities, and EHVC only produced two versions of a planned quarterly newsletter. EHVC has been ahead of many other Village Centers in planning for sustainability. The Village Center has formed a successful community development corporation that is in the process of finalizing several deals that will generate income to support Village Center operations. Most importantly, the Village Center and CDC are developing the Firehouse property and seven homes in the Flag House Hope VI redevelopment Project. The Village Center has submitted numerous grants and has received \$564,000 in funding to support programs and the Firehouse development project.

The combination of Empowerment Zone programs and market-driven redevelopment has supported some impressive improvement in key Census-based measures of the community's socio-economic status. Median household income increased by 20% (in real terms) the percentage of persons living below the poverty level fell by 7% (compared to a decline of 6% for the entire Empowerment Zone and an increase of 1% for the City), labor force participation increased and the unemployment rate fell by nearly half. The share of owner occupied dwellings decreased slightly, and vacant housing units increased by 2% - well below the 9% increase in the zone and 5% increase for the City. The Village Center lost population, but at a lower rate than the zone or City.

Table 1
Selected Empowerment Zone Programmatic Outcomes
and Reported Village Center Outcomes
for The East Harbor Village Center

| Item | Village Center | Empowerment Zone | Baltimore City |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Cumulative Empowerment Zone Program Outcomes¹ | | | |
| Total Workforce Development Placements (unduplicated) | 309 | 4,725 | n.m. |
| Housing Venture Fund Closings | 60 | 872 | n.m. |
| Change in Crime Rate | -13% | -46% | -39% |

Reported Village Center 2002-2003 Outcomes²

| Goal | Outcome |
|---|--|
| Facilitate Information Sharing And Volunteer Efforts | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Lead Agency Working With Flag House Tennant Council On Their Hope VI Planning Effort • Member Of The Steering Committee To Implement The Broadway Homes Hope VI Initiative • Working With City To Develop A Neighborhood Strategy For South East Baltimore • Maintained Website And Produced Two Newsletters • Recruited 3 Additional Board Members And 10 Volunteer Members For Public Safety Committee |
| Identify And Use In-Kind And Financial Resources To Implement The Village Center's Strategic Plan | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Received \$350,000 HHS Grant For Renovation Of The Firehouse • Received \$100,000 From Annie E. Casey Foundation For Asset Development Center • Received \$49,000 In Funding From HHS To Establish Ida And Economic Literacy Program • Formed Limited Liability Corporation With Noah Group As Part Of Flag House Courts Hope Vi Program • Received \$15,000 Aim Awarded From The Weinberg Foundation For Home Ownership Venture • Awarded 50 Computers And \$50,000 From Hewlett Packard And Baltimore Digital Village For Renovation Of The Firehouse • Will Develop 7 Units Of Affordable Housing In Partnership With Homes For America For Flag House Hope Vi Project. |
| Resolve Area Conflicts And Differences | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Worked With/Continuing To Work With Washington Hill Community Concerning The Proposed "Land Swap" Between Johns Hopkins And The Housing Authority • Worked With/Continuing To Work With Residents, Business Owners And Other Stakeholders On Flag House Development Project |

1 From EBMC Presidents Report September 2003

2 From Village Center Administrative Funding Reports

Source: EBMC Documentation

Table 2
East Harbor Village Center Neighborhood Dynamics

| Item | East Harbor | Total EZ | Baltimore City |
|---|-------------|----------|----------------|
| <u>Total Population</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 7,885 | 72,100 | 736,014 |
| 2000 | 7,003 | 54,012 | 651,154 |
| Change | -882 | -18,088 | -84,860 |
| % Change | -11% | -25% | -12% |
| <u>Percentage of Owner Occupied Dwellings</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 24% | 25% | 44% |
| 2000 | 23% | 26% | 43% |
| Change | -1% | 1% | -1% |
| <u>Percentage of Dwellings that are Vacant</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 24% | 17% | 9% |
| 2000 | 26% | 26% | 14% |
| Change | 2% | 9% | 5% |
| <u>Median Household Income (1999\$)</u> | | | |
| 1990 | \$25,445 | \$18,499 | \$32,316 |
| 2000 | \$30,568 | \$20,750 | \$30,078 |
| Change | 5,123 | 2,251 | -2,238 |
| % Change | 20% | 12% | -7% |
| <u>Percentage of Residents Living Below the Poverty Level</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 39% | 41% | 21% |
| 2000 | 32% | 34% | 22% |
| Change | -7% | -6% | 1% |
| <u>Resident Labor Force Participation</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 45% | 37% | 47% |
| 2000 | 49% | 37% | 44% |
| Change | 4% | 0% | -3% |
| <u>Unemployment Rate</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 15% | 15% | 9% |
| 2000 | 8% | 17% | 11% |
| Change | -7% | 2% | 2% |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, EBMC

3.2 Review of Previous EBMC Materials

The East Harbor Village Center was analyzed as part of the *An Ethnographic Assessment of EBMC Village Centers* prepared by White and Associates in October of 1998. This report found that the East Harbor Village Center has had “success in bringing the diverse voices of the community together.” The major accomplishments of the Village Center were listed as the completion of a land use plan, the formation of a community development corporation, and the formation of a career center. The major challenges were listed as improving the operation of the Village Center Board of Directors, increasing staff understanding of economic development, community organizing, and working with private developers. Recommendations for future action included:

- Obtaining Board Development and Leadership Training;
- Expanding community outreach to reach more residents;
- Developing an economic development agenda; and
- Developing a five-year plan.

The interviews conducted and materials reviewed indicated that EHVC did improve the functioning of its board, expand outreach to the community, and implement a successful economic development plan.

3.3 Interview Results

Interviews were conducted with Ms. Clara Butler, Executive Director of The East Harbor Village Center and Mr. Talib Horne, the Executive Director of the East Harbor Community Development Corporation. The East Harbor Village Center has clearly put economic development at the forefront of the Village Center’s mission. The goal of the organization is to improve resident quality of life, with a real focus on residents of Flag House Courts and Perkins Homes. The key short-term goal for the Village Center is community organizing – “to make sure the community is up to date, to keep them involved in the process, and to keep them informed.” The Village Center is clearly run by the staff with the board playing a planning and evaluation role “the Board meets when needed – the President makes key decisions.” Board members are chosen from community groups and elections are held for the Board.”

Key staff members – the Executive Director, the Assistant Director – Head of the CDC, and the Workforce Development Director have all been with the Village Center since it started. The Village Center has received significant funding from external sources, most importantly \$1.5 million in funding from Hope VI programs related to the Flag House Redevelopment. The Village Center formed its own community development corporation – the East Harbor Community Development Corporation (EHCDC) and owns its building. As a result of the non-EBMC funding received, the Village Center has enough funding to last at least two more years. The EHCDC is developing the Technology Firehouse Project and will develop 7 units in the Flag House Redevelopment.

Because the Village Center immediately diversified its sources of funding and has developed its own CDC, sustainability is less of an issue for EHVC. The organization has saved resources, has two more years of EBMC funding left, and EHCDC has at least two projects underway and success in implementing an Individual Development Account and energy project.

EHCDC has formed strong external linkages, drawing board members from a major development company, a bank, other CDCs and a state business-financing program.

3.4 Review of Reports, Budget and Planning Documents

Available budget, strategic planning, and reporting documents (Administrative Funding Reports) were reviewed. East Harbor Village Center reported some impressive outcomes in a variety of areas.

EHVC has established a strong track record in engaging the community in its efforts, most importantly residents of Flag House Court and Perkins Homes. The Village Center reported success in meeting all of its community outreach goals set out in its administrative funding agreement. EHVC emphasized its success in bringing the different communities together and assisting residents in Flag House and the Perkins housing developments. EHVC also worked with the citizens of Washington Hill, Johns Hopkins, Broadway Resident Council, Landex Development, and the City for the land swap that occurred as part of the Broadway Homes Hope VI project and took the lead in organizing the community process for an Urban Renewal Plan for Central Avenue South. The Village Center completed a Land Use Plan in 1998, which still serves as the primary strategic plan for the organization.

EHVC has also reported success in diversifying its funding base to include substantial non-EBMC sources and according to the November 7th, 2002 EBMC Quality of Life/Community Capacity Building Committee minutes, “The Village Center has been able to leverage other funding to administer its program services and operating costs. This has resulted in a reserve of administrative funding that will allow East Harbor Village Center to operate with Title XX administrative funding for a 6th year.” In the area of non-EBMC funding, EHVC manages the community services portion of the Flag House Hope VI redevelopment project, which has been allocated \$1.5 million over 5 years. The Village Center has also attracted funding to support an Individual Development Account Program, has completed a Department of Energy grant, received Youth Opportunities funding, operates a substance abuse program and other program specific funding. The Village Center also formed a community development corporation, the East Harbor Community Development Corporation (EHCDC), that is currently developing the Technology Firehouse Project, that will include a technology training center and 2 local technology businesses. In total, the EHVC and EHCDC have raised an additional \$2.5 million in non-EBMC funds.

3.5 Analysis of Sustainability Plans

Because EHVC is just ending its fifth year of operations and has reserves to support a sixth year of operation, it has not yet submitted formal sustainability plans or funding requests to EBMC. EHVC made presentations to the April 24th, 2002 and June 26th, 2002 meetings of the EBMC Sustainability Committee and a real estate sustainability request to the November 7, 2002 Quality of Life/Community Capacity Building Committee meeting. EHVC has not yet presented a request to the combined Community Capacity/Sustainability Committee in 2003. The NOMAGIC study of East Harbor is not yet complete.

EHVC has already diversified its funding to include a substantial base of non-EBMC grant and program revenues. The Village Center has a proven track record in implementing programs related to Hope VI investments in the area, training, and youth development programs. The creation of EHCDC is central to long-term sustainability planning. “One of the goals of the East

Harbor Village Center was to develop a vehicle for sustainability of the Village Center and to continue its efforts in neighborhood revitalization and stabilization for the residents of the East Harbor community. The creation of the East Harbor Community Development Corporation (EHCDC) in 1999, to serve as that vehicle for growth will concentrate its efforts on commercial and residential revitalization.” EHCDC is developing the Technology Firehouse project and will develop 7 homes in the Flag House project. The Village Center has also identified key foundations to target for future sustainability efforts.

3.6 Summary and Conclusion

Of the Village Centers that were created by EBMC, the East Harbor Village Center, along with the Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council, experienced the most substantial success in generating new streams of funding to support operations. While sustainability is less of a pressing current issue for EHVC because the Village Center has established a reserve that will allow for administrative funding for a sixth year, and some sustainability support thereafter, it has still reported tremendous success in developing new programmatic funding streams. The Village Center established a successful community development corporation that will be able to generate income in coming years. The Village Center has established a track record of success in implementing programs. This track record will put the organization in a strong position to attract program support in the future. Furthermore, the Village Center has proven to be effecting in organizing the community in response to the redevelopment that is occurring in the community. EHVC has overcome a significant level of local racial and organizational conflict to become an internally and externally respected advocate for the community and its needs. As development continues to move into this community, East Harbor Village Center can continue to play an important role in representing the community in development efforts, as is evident in the City’s request that the Village Center play role in strategic planning for Southeast Baltimore. While the Executive Director clearly has a vision and a plan for the community, EHVC could benefit from revisiting its strategic plan. The goals and vision set out in EHVC’s Land Use Plan still guide operations, however, local conditions have changed dramatically in the five years since that plan was prepared. A more organized sustainability and planning initiative along the lines of WPNPC’s successful effort may be beneficial and provide a vehicle to engage elements of the community not activity working with the Village Center.

4.0 Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center

The Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center (HP/LS-VC) was the fifth of the Empowerment Zone's six Village Centers to become operational. HP/LS-VC serves the smallest population of the six Village Centers.

4.1 Neighborhood Change and Empowerment Zone Outcomes

When it began operations the HP/LS-VC was the Baltimore Empowerment Zone's smallest Village Center, serving an area with 6,415 residents in 1990 – and probably far fewer in 1997 when the Village Center became operational. The Harlem Park/Lafayette Square community has received substantial benefits from the Baltimore City Empowerment Zone (see Table 3 for a list of selected EBMC and Village Center outcomes). A total of 494 Village Center residents received workforce development placements. While this number placed the Village Center 5th in terms of the number of residents receiving workforce development assistance, it accounts for an impressive 35% of residents in the labor force (as of the 2000 Census), ranking this Village Center 1st in terms of the percentage of resident workforce receiving services. A total of 31 Housing Venture Fund investments were made in HP/LS-VC, accounting for 9% of total owner occupied housing units (as of the 2000 Census). The level of crimes committed in the Village Center declined by 69%, the largest decline in any of the Village Centers.

The core Village Center activities listed in the Administrative Funding Report focused on community outreach and core service activities. HP/LS-VC generally met its goals for board members, meetings, meeting attendance and recruitment, signifying success in key outreach activities. However, the Village Center has had to overcome significant levels of local and board conflict over creation and operation of the Village Center, and EBMC reports have generally called for improving both board attendance and operations. The HP/LS-VC conducted programs in core community clean up, substance abuse, and public safety areas that were generally well attended and met or came close to goals.

Despite the efforts of the Village Center and the Empowerment Zone, Harlem Park/Lafayette Square continues to lag Baltimore City in some key measures of socio-economic performance (see Table 4). Harlem Park/Lafayette Square experienced the fourth largest total decline in population, despite having the lowest population level and no demolition of public housing. Harlem Park/Lafayette Square was one of only two Village Center areas (along with WPNPC) to experience a decline in the home ownership rate and experienced the largest increase in the percentage of vacant dwelling units. Resident labor market participation fell and the percentage of local workers unemployed increased. On the positive side, median household incomes increased by 20% (in constant dollar terms), compared to 12% for the entire Empowerment Zone and a decline of 7% for the City as a whole and the percentage of the Village Center population living in poverty fell by 4%.

Table 3
Selected Empowerment Zone Programmatic Outcomes
and Reported Village Center Outcomes
for the Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center

| Item | Village Center | Empowerment Zone | Baltimore City |
|---|-----------------------------------|--|----------------|
| Cumulative Empowerment Zone Program Outcomes¹ | | | |
| Total Workforce Development Placements (unduplicated) | 494 | 4,725 | n.m. |
| Housing Venture Fund Closings | 31 | 872 | n.m. |
| Change in Crime Rate | -69% | -46% | -39% |
| Reported Village Center 2002-2003 Outcomes² | | | |
| | Goal | Outcome | |
| Hold Monthly Board Meetings | | | |
| Number of Meetings | 12 | 14 + 2 Area Wide Meetings | |
| Attendees | 180 | 241 | |
| Hold Quarterly General Body Meetings | | | |
| Number of Meetings | 4 | 5 | |
| Attendees | 160 | 271 | |
| Recruit New HPLSVC Members | 150 | 146 | |
| Bi-Monthly Bulletin - copies distributed | 3,600 | 5,400 | |
| Quality of Life | | | |
| Referrals to HPRC for Counseling | 70 | 82 | |
| Referrals to Baltimore City Revitalization Institute for Exterior Repair Program | 70 | 108 | |
| Improve Public Safety | | | |
| HOTSPOT Team Meetings | 50 | 46 | |
| HOTSPOT Team Meeting Attendance | 250 | 260 | |
| Neighborhood Safety Team Meetings | 12 | 12 Meetings - 141 Attendees | |
| Facilitate Information Sharing and Volunteer Efforts | Maintain Working Relationships | Maintained Relationship with 4 Businesses 5 Churches and 5 Neighborhood Groups | |

1 From EBMC Presidents Report September 2003

2 From Village Center Administrative Funding Reports

Source: EBMC Documentation

Table 4
Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center
Neighborhood Dynamics

| Item | Harlem Park/ Lafayette Square | Total EZ | Baltimore City |
|---|----------------------------------|----------|----------------|
| <u>Total Population</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 6,415 | 72,100 | 736,014 |
| 2000 | 4,283 | 54,012 | 651,154 |
| Change | -2,133 | -18,088 | -84,860 |
| % Change | -33% | -25% | -12% |
| <u>Percentage of Owner Occupied Dwellings</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 13% | 25% | 44% |
| 2000 | 11% | 26% | 43% |
| Change | -2% | 1% | -1% |
| <u>Percentage of Dwellings that are Vacant</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 23% | 17% | 9% |
| 2000 | 40% | 26% | 14% |
| Change | 17% | 9% | 5% |
| <u>Median Household Income (1999\$)</u> | | | |
| 1990 | \$16,088 | \$18,499 | \$32,316 |
| 2000 | \$19,375 | \$20,750 | \$30,078 |
| Change | 3,287 | 2,251 | -2,238 |
| % Change | 20% | 12% | -7% |
| <u>Percentage of Residents Living Below the Poverty Level</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 42% | 41% | 21% |
| 2000 | 37% | 34% | 22% |
| Change | -4% | -6% | 1% |
| <u>Resident Labor Force Participation</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 38% | 37% | 47% |
| 2000 | 33% | 37% | 44% |
| Change | -4% | 0% | -3% |
| <u>Unemployment Rate</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 14% | 15% | 9% |
| 2000 | 17% | 17% | 11% |
| Change | 4% | 2% | 2% |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, EBMC

4.2 Review of Previous EBMC Materials

HP/LS-VS was not included in the *Ethnographic Assessment of EBMC Village Centers* report because a separate consultant was preparing a report. No copies of this report were available for review.

4.3 Interview Results

Interviews were conducted with Dr. Howard Hill, the Executive Director and Ms. Carmena Watson, the Chairperson of the HP/LS-VC Board. Both agreed that the key long-term issue that HP/LS-VC is focusing on right now is the long-term sustainability of the organization. Creating a partnership with a neighborhood CDC was considered to be a likely means of promoting sustainability. According to the Executive Director, HP/LS-VC is in a better position than some other Village Centers in terms of near term sustainability because it started later and has two years of funding left. The core programmatic strategic goals for the Village Center are to work on were listed as:

- Improving workforce development – most importantly expanded outreach to employers and a focus on basic skills upgrades for residents;
- Substance abuse; and
- Public safety – most importantly a Safe Neighborhoods Initiative and Block-by-Block Program.

The key short-term issues involve improving basic organizational and management functions at the Village Center. The Village Center is working on assessing staffing relationships, “strengthening day-to-day supervision”, and reorganizing the bylaws and structure of the organization. The Village Center has had to overcome significant levels of local and board conflict and EBMC has identified improving board operations as a core goal.

The HP/LS-VC Director and Chairperson were asked about overall Board-Village Center and Village Center-Community relations. The Board Chair reported that the organization has been successful in resolving initial conflicts over the formation and operation of the Village Center. There was agreement that the Village Center Board is mostly involved in setting plans and not managing day-to-day operations. The Board Chairperson’s opinion was “I don’t believe in micro management” and “if you hire a director, have them do it.” The Board is responsible for setting the agenda and reviewing operations, but the Board needs for the “executive director and staff to create and set goals.” The community was involved in the operations of the Village Center indirectly through eight existing neighborhood organizations and a larger number of block clubs. A newsletter and public meetings are used to inform and engage the community.

The HP/LS-VC Director and Chair were asked about key operational issues at the Village Center. Most of the Village Center staff has been with the organization for several years. The Executive Director and all other staff have come from the community and employee turnover has been low. The workforce development program was seen as the chief organizational strength of the Village Center. The need to address board functioning and oversight and organizational management issues were identified as the chief organizational weakness of the Village Center. Vacant housing and the lack of a viable commercial center are also long term challenges for both the community and the Village Center.

4.4 Review of Reports, Budget and Planning Documents

Available budget, strategic planning, and reporting documents (Administrative Funding Reports) were reviewed. HP/LS-VC relies on EBMC programs for the overwhelming majority of the organization's funding. In fact, the funding for the two major programs of the Village Center – Village Center operations (AFA) and Career Center/Family Support are commingled, with half of the Executive Director, Office Manager and Receptionist positions funded by each funding source. HOTSPOT, Substance Abuse and Block-by-Block are the only other sources of funding identified and two of these three sources are linked to EBMC. The Village Center reported a \$10,000 grant from the Baltimore Community Foundation and \$350 grant from HOTSPOTS for a Community Greening Program and the donation of a car for the COP Program. While HP/LS-VC is nearly entirely dependent of EBMC for funding, it is in its fourth year of funding and has one year of administrative funding left. The Village Center is in the process of sustainability planning now. Per its *Career Center Program Achievement and Goals Report* "HPLSVC, Inc. recognizes that sustainability is a critical issue for the Family Support initiative, indeed for the Village Center concept itself. With that in mind, the strategic planning for HPLSVC, Inc. emphasizes the identification of potential revenue streams aside from Title XX (EZ) funds."

The Village Center reports success in both community outreach and workforce development. The Village Center has generally met its goal for board meetings, community meetings and information dissemination. Outreach has been especially successful in terms of working with the community's important religious institutions. Workforce development programs are operating close to or above strategic goals and the Village Center reports the highest retention rates, lowest cost per placement, and second highest earned wage per placement of all the Village Centers. The programs (crime, substance abuse, workforce development) seem to address the stated concerns of the community. In the area of housing the Village Center worked with and referred residents to an existing community organization, the Harlem Park Revitalization Corporation and met stated goals in 2002-2003, after failing to meet housing goals in 2001-02

4.5 Analysis of Sustainability Plans

The August 19th 2002 memo to the EBMC Sustainability Committee and draft *Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center Sustainability Assessment* were reviewed. The Sustainability Assessment highlighted the Village Center's success in its Career Center/Family Support, Substance Abuse and community organizing goals. The Village Center's success is credited to its strong ties to the community, however, improved community outreach and communications efforts are needed because the view of the Village Center is not always positive within the community. The Village Center's staff, made up of individuals from and with strong ties to the community, is also seen as a core asset. Improving the operation of the HP/LS-VC Board of Directors was identified as both a key organizational capacity and sustainability issue – with the Village Center having a "fragmented vision at the Board level" and the Board appears to be impacted by a shortage of members and ongoing problems with attendance and the resulting inability to achieve a quorum. It is important to note that the Board bylaws are now in the process of being revised. Overall, the Sustainability Assessment reported "HP/LS-VC has established a solid reputation among its clients and is meeting a need despite there being gaps in service. It has managed and provided a number of successful programs and services." The Sustainability Assessment is positive on the need to maintain the core functions of the Village

Center. However, in “today’s climate of limited funding” “the future of HP/FS-VC lies in their ability to build a strategic partnership with a complementary partner” possibly the Harlem Park Revitalization Corporation.

4.6 Summary and Conclusion

The Harlem Park/Lafayette Square Village Center seems to have achieved a level of success in both community outreach (in terms of both involving the community in operations and implementing the programs desired by the community) and implementing the Empowerment Zone’s workforce development program. The Village Center has provided a forum for redevelopment efforts and served the community. However, the Village Center is nearly entirely dependent on Empowerment Zone funding, with substantial negative implications for long-term sustainability. The Village Center does have additional near-term operating and sustainability funding support available from EBMC, but will need to (and is currently working on) developing a long-term sustainability plan. Harlem Park/Lafayette Square is a small area served by several existing community organizations and the Village Center. The interviews and sustainability planning materials reviewed correctly identify partnership with one of these organizations as the most viable strategy for long-term sustainability of the EBMC programs in this area.

5.0 The Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition Village Center

The Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition (HEBCAC) was the second Village Center approved by EBMC, but was the only Village Center formed as part of a pre-existing organization. HEBCAC was originally formed in December of 1994 as the result of a nearly two year long process of meetings between neighborhood organizations, Johns Hopkins Medicine, Kennedy Krieger Institute, local businesses, churches, and community leaders. The purpose of HEBCAC is to unite businesses, community groups, community organizations, government, institutions, and schools to define and solve problems in the community.

5.1 Neighborhood Change

HEBCAC implemented a number of programs in the seven core areas identified in the organization's 1999 *HEBCAC Strategic Plan 1999-2004* report. These development areas were: Education; Economic; Employment; Family; Community; Physical; and Administration. From 1994 through 1999 the organization reported the following successes: the award of the Historic East Baltimore Family Network Grant – including the Men's Center, the Domestic Violence Prevention Program, and the Family Network; the creation of the GATE (the employment training and readiness program); the Bridges-to-Work transportation program; the completion of a development master plan; and the acquisition of three buildings for development. A selected list of HEBCAC and Empowerment Zone outcomes is presented in Table 5. As presented in Table 5, Empowerment Zone training programs (the services are provided by the GATE) served a total of 2,027 individuals, accounting for 43% of all persons served by all EBMC workforce programs. Workforce development programs served an impressive 32% of all residents that participate in the labor force (as of the 2000 Census). A total of 122 Housing Venture Fund investments were made, accounting for 5% of total owner occupied housing units (as of the 2000 Census). The level of crimes committed in the Village Center declined by 60%, the second largest decline in any of the Village Centers.

The core Village Center Administrative outcomes listed in the FY2003 Scope of Services report, focused on outreach, community building and sustainability issues. HEBCAC reported success in engaging the community through a variety of activities including block captain training, coordinating volunteer activities, assisting community organizations in their activities, and a large-scale community clean-up effort that involved more than 300 volunteers. HEBCAC has assisted EBDI in conducting community meetings on the East Side redevelopment effort and provided assistance in design issues and in developing relocation policies. The Land Use Committee had numerous meetings on the East Side redevelopment and other development issues. HEBCAC maintained programs in domestic violence prevention, substance abuse counseling, youth opportunities, and education. The Village Center reported steps towards sustainability by becoming re-certified for a 5-year federal Weed and Seed program, resolving outstanding financial issues, pursuing development of the owned properties, and applying for numerous grants.

Despite the Village Center and Empowerment Zone programs, the HEBCAC area reported little socio-economic improvement in core Census-based socio-economic variables. HEBCAC continued to loose population, leading the Empowerment Zone in both the number and percentage decline in population, housing vacancy increased more rapidly than in the Empowerment Zone or City, income and labor force participation fell and unemployment increased. Only the percentage of owner-occupied dwellings showed improvement.

Table 5
Selected Empowerment Zone Programmatic Outcomes
and Reported Village Center Outcomes
for HEBCAC

| Item | Village Center | Empowerment Zone | Baltimore City |
|---|----------------|------------------|----------------|
| Cumulative Empowerment Zone Program Outcomes¹ | | | |
| Total Workforce Development Placements (unduplicated) | 2,027 | 4,725 | n.m. |
| Housing Venture Fund Closings | 122 | 872 | n.m. |
| Change in Crime Rate | -60% | -46% | -39% |

Selected Reported Village Center FY2002 Outcomes²

| Objective | Outcome |
|---|---|
| Mobilize Broad-Based Participation by Community Residents and Organizations | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Organized community meeting on East Side Redevelopment • Trained Block Captains • Coordinated Community Clean-up with 300+ volunteers |
| Support East Baltimore Redevelopment Effort | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provided assistance on relocation policies and design issues |
| Provide Community Forum for Redevelopment | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land-use Committee held numerous meetings on development projects |
| Implement Programs/Create Partnerships to Provide Services to Community Residents | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Domestic prevention training • Substance abuse counseling to 220 individuals and advocated for new drug treatment center • Enrolled 169 youth in Youth Opportunities Program and place 71 in un-subsidized training • Collaborated with Casey Foundation to develop the East Baltimore Education Collaborative |
| Enrich Collective Life of the Community | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Boarded, cleaned and/or secured 654 vacant houses • Organized 100+ volunteers' activities • Re-certification for 5 year federal weed and seed grant |
| Seek operational and programmatic resources | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Resolved receivables/reduced debt by \$1.2 million • Development of Diamond Press Building • Over \$1 million in grant applications |

1 From EBMC Presidents Report September 2003

2 From HEBCAC Village Center FY2003 Scope of Services Report – this was the most recent report available.

Source: EBMC Documentation

Table 6
HEBCAC Village Center Neighborhood Dynamics

| Item | HEBCAC | Total EZ | Baltimore City |
|---|----------|----------|----------------|
| <u>Total Population</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 27,920 | 72,100 | 736,014 |
| 2000 | 18,351 | 54,012 | 651,154 |
| Change | -9,569 | -18,088 | -84,860 |
| % Change | -34% | -25% | -12% |
| <u>Percentage of Owner Occupied Dwellings</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 25% | 25% | 44% |
| 2000 | 26% | 26% | 43% |
| Change | 1% | 1% | -1% |
| <u>Percentage of Dwellings that are Vacant</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 14% | 17% | 9% |
| 2000 | 30% | 26% | 14% |
| Change | 16% | 9% | 5% |
| <u>Median Household Income (1999\$)</u> | | | |
| 1990 | \$20,911 | \$18,499 | \$32,316 |
| 2000 | \$20,000 | \$20,750 | \$30,078 |
| Change | -911 | 2,251 | -2,238 |
| % Change | -4% | 12% | -7% |
| <u>Percentage of Residents Living Below the Poverty Level</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 39% | 41% | 21% |
| 2000 | 39% | 34% | 22% |
| Change | 0% | -6% | 1% |
| <u>Resident Labor Force Participation</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 37% | 37% | 47% |
| 2000 | 35% | 37% | 44% |
| Change | -2% | 0% | -3% |
| <u>Unemployment Rate</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 15% | 15% | 9% |
| 2000 | 24% | 17% | 11% |
| Change | 9% | 2% | 2% |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, EBMC

5.2 Review of Previous EBMC Materials

HEBCAC was analyzed as part of the *An Ethnographic Assessment of EBMC Village Centers* prepared by White and Associates in October of 1998. This report found that because the Empowerment Zone programs were being implemented through an existing organization, the start-up time to begin operations was reduced. The White and Associates report reported that the key informants reported that conditions in the community have improved since the formation of HEBCAC. HEBCAC was successful in the areas of workforce development and supporting the activities of local community organizations through fundraising, networking or other assistance. Key barriers reported included: a closed board structure, expanding resident and community organization involvement, and overcoming resident concerns over the relationship between the community and Johns Hopkins Hospital. Key recommendations included:

- Improved communications strategies;
- Expanding the number of slots available for drug treatment; and
- Finalizing plans for the 108 Loan Program for housing rehabilitation.

5.3 Interview Results

Interviews were conducted with Delegate Hattie Harrison the Chairperson of the Village Center Board, Mr. Ephraim Potts, the Chairman of the Village Center Board's Economic Development Sub-Committee and Mr. Jeff Thompson, the Acting Executive Co-Director. All of the HEBCAC representatives interviewed reported that the organization is in the process of redefining its core long and short-term goals. There is consensus that the new strategic direction for the organization will need to be set by the Board, especially since the Executive Director position was vacant. The working relationship between the board and staff was considered strong. All agree that as a result of the planned East Side redevelopment effort headed by EBDI, HEBCAC needs to change its mission. Most importantly, HEBCAC will have a much-diminished role in housing rehabilitation and development. One interviewee reported that "the City took us out of the physical development businesses" and another "that we could only do single houses at a time, but rehab wouldn't work. The area needed a block by block approach and the City went past us." There was a strong general consensus that the key elements of HEBCAC's future strategic direction will include working with the City on the East Side redevelopment effort in the area of community organizing, moving assistance, and human services provision. Comments included:

"The thing that HEBCAC does that nobody else can do is bring all of the stakeholders together. Because of its structure, it brings all of the community representatives together, so it has an important role in brokering on behalf of the community and businesses."

"Somebody has to get prepared to work with the families that need to be relocated. We can do this"

However, some difficulty is expected in terms of defining the role that HEBCAC can play – "the problem is we can't get a decision from the City on the role of HEBCAC in East Side redevelopment relative to EBDI." Other key issues that need to be addressed are:

- Reconnecting with the community;
- Improving communications efforts; and
- "Tightening" program management to improve efficiency.

There was strong agreement that the organizational strength and capacity of HEBCAC was severely degraded by employee turnover. “HEBCAC was created by a dynamic leader. He and 4 other key managers all left within 6 months.” The conflict with the City over the housing program also impacted operations – “because of the ongoing collections problem, HEBCAC leadership has been diverted from strategizing about the future. This has been further complicated City administration ‘flip flops’ and changes in the role of HEBCAC.”

The most important organizational strength of HEBCAC was seen as its success in building common ground for stakeholders. “HEBCAC was created in response to the ongoing battles between the community and Johns Hopkins Hospital. People wanted to change the dynamic.” The key weakness was continued, “lack of belief among the community that [the city] will work with them.” The chief threats to the Village Center are “the lack of a clear understanding between HEBCAC and the City on the role of the organization” and a genuine fear that “if we are not vigilant, other people will take over, and our ‘folk’ will wake up to find they have been pushed out.” Despite the uncertainty caused by the East Side redevelopment project, there is general belief that it will promote positive change – most importantly job opportunities – in the neighborhood. There is further belief that HEBCAC can and should play a positive role in the redevelopment by addressing the human services needs of the community and providing the programs needed to assist the people impacted by the redevelopment. The core functions of HEBCAC that need to be maintained, as long as they are effecting and meet community needs are the workforce development, substance abuse programs, and community organizing. These are both consistent with and needed to support East Side redevelopment.

5.4 Review of Reports, Budget and Planning Documents

Available budget, strategic planning, and reporting documents (Administrative Funding Reports) were reviewed. Because of the relationship of HEBCAC with its core institutional sponsor and the success of the organization in attracting other grant funds, HEBCAC is less reliant on EBMC funding than any other Village Center. For example in fiscal 2001 EBMC accounted for just 14% of HEBCAC’s total grant receipts and in FY 2000 EBMC accounted for 21%. Still an important part of HEBCAC’s overall administrative funding comes from EBMC. In FY 2002, EBMC accounted for 30% of HEBCAC’s administrative funding.

HEBCAC created a long-term strategic plan in 1999 and had several strategic planning efforts in 2001 and 2002. After the resignation of the new Executive Director (the position is still vacant), and with the creation of EBDI, the Village Center needs to again reassess its core strategic focus and mission. This was also the recommendation of the EBMC Community Capacity/Sustainability Committee in their September 24, 2003 meeting. The NOMAGIC analysis of HEBCAC was a core element of this strategic planning effort.

HEBCAC has established a strong track record of developing partnerships to deliver services to the East Baltimore community. The Village Center has established funding relationships with federal, State and City agencies, key institutions, and foundations to support and the internal resources or contractual relationships, such as the GATE, to implement programs in the areas of workforce development, domestic violence prevention, substance abuse treatment, crime (Hot Spots and Weed & Seed), youth opportunities, vacant house clean-up and boarding and other facets of community development. In the area of community organizing, HEBCAC reports strong working relationships with both community residents and

organizations. HEBCAC has operated a successful Main Street Program has acquired and is developing several properties.

5.5 Analysis of Sustainability Plans

The presentation and documentation and follow up materials provided to the June 26th and September 25th, 2002 EBMC Sustainability Committee, the Transitional Funding Request presentation and materials presented to the July 2, 2003 EBMC Sustainability/Community Capacity Committee meeting and Draft NOMAGIC *Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition Capacity and Sustainability Assessment* were reviewed.

The organization is facing significant sustainability challenges including:

- Operating with an Acting Director;
- Reorganization of the Board and a redefinition of the role of key organizational sponsors;
- Some current weakness in community outreach;
- Past conflict with the City administration (recently resolved); and
- The need to redefine its mission.

However, HEBCAC offers much organizational strength, including:

- A strong base of current programs;
- Good reputation with key funders/agencies;
- A strong program staff; and
- Strong history of community relations.

While some of HEBCAC's core mission has been taken over by EBDI, the organizational strengths of HEBCAC are still consistent with the community's needs. HEBCAC's strengths in the areas of land-use planning, human service program delivery, and community organizing and outreach are all complimentary to the housing and economic development mission of EBDI. HEBCAC is an intermediary between Johns Hopkins and the community and has a track record in moving past distrust and conflict between some of the community stakeholders and Johns Hopkins to facilitate mutually beneficial activities. This is still needed.

5.6 Summary and Conclusion

HEBCAC relies on EBMC funding for approximately 30% of administrative funding (in FY 2002). It has a diversified base of funding support, having been awarded \$612,700 in program support grants for FY2003 and an additional \$461,960 in outstanding grant applications. HEBCAC has a strong institutional partner and a proven track record in managing programs. HEBCAC is in the process of developing two buildings – Diamond Press and 901 N. Milton – and owns several other properties that will provide a future revenue stream. However, the long-term sustainability Village Center is clearly threatened by the creation of EBDI, which has assumed some of HEBCAC's core functions, and by political issues. Given the strength and reputation of the organization, it is likely to continue after EBMC sunsets. However, as identified in the NOMAGIC report and by EBMC, HEBCAC must address key management issues, hire an executive director, and develop a new strategic plan that complements EBDI. HEBCAC has the capacity to provide community outreach and human services program delivery that will complement the economic and housing development mission of EBDI. In fact, HEBCAC can play a role not only in supporting East Side redevelopment, but also in ensuring that community members benefit from the effort.

6.0 Village Center of Poppleton

The Poppleton Village Center (VCP) was the last of the six Baltimore Empowerment Zone Village Centers formed. VCP serves the second smallest population of the six original Village Centers. VCP submitted its request for administrative funding for its fifth year of operations in July of 2003.

6.1 Neighborhood Change

At the time of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone application, Poppleton had the highest concentration of population living below the poverty level (55% in 1990), the second lowest level of median household income and a high share of vacant housing. Not surprisingly, workforce development and housing were core goals of the Village Center. VCP has received key benefits from the Empowerment Zone programs. A total of 563 Village Center residents received workforce development placements, reaching a total of 25% of residents in the labor force (as of the 2000 Census). A total of 141 Housing Venture Fund investments were made in the Village Center, placing VCP 4th in terms of total numbers of investments. However, when the number of closings is compared to the overall level of owner-occupied housing, these investments represent 28% of owner occupied units (in the 2000 Census), placing VCP, first in terms of the penetration of the program. Crime in the Village Center fell by 44%, better than the City's decline of 39%.

The VCP activities outlined in the Administrative Funding Report focused on community outreach, education and workforce development. VCP met goals in the areas of board and staff meetings, focused on informing/identifying the needs of the community by attending numerous meetings and the distribution of a monthly bulletin. Programs were put in place to address community clean-ups and public safety. VCP is working with Baltimore City Schools to establish a K-8 Math/Science School in the community. On an important note, the University of Maryland, Baltimore has proposed crossing over Martin Luther King Drive to build a research park in the Poppleton area. A key university leader reported that the Village Center has been "incredibly helpful" in supporting both the project and the community outreach necessary to support it. VCP has also began sustainability planning that includes:

- The acquisition of One North Carey Street for a business development opportunity;
- Developing a franchise agreement to occupy space in the UMB Research Park; and
- Establishing a partnership with a housing developer.

The Poppleton area is on the verge of a major redevelopment driven by the UMB Research Park. As presented in Table 8, while the community lost residents between 1990 and 2000, the percentage of owner occupied dwellings increased, housing vacancy increased less rapidly than in the City and Zone, unemployment fell and labor force participation increased. The percentage of Village Center population living below the poverty level fell by 20%, the most rapid decline among all of the Village Centers. Inexplicably, median household incomes fell.

Table 7
Selected Empowerment Zone Programmatic Outcomes
and Reported Village Center Outcomes
for The Village Center of Poppleton

| Item | Village Center | Empowerment Zone | Baltimore City |
|---|--------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Cumulative Empowerment Zone Program Outcomes¹ | | | |
| Total Workforce Development Placements (unduplicated) | 563 | 4,725 | n.m. |
| Housing Venture Fund Closings | 141 | 872 | n.m. |
| Change in Crime Rate | -44% | -46% | -39% |
| Reported Village Center 2002-2003 Outcomes² | | | |
| | Goal | Outcome | |
| Hold Board/Staff Meetings | 12/26 | 12/26 | |
| Attend Community Meetings to react to needs | 12 Board Meeting and TA to Residents | 15 Landuse Meetings, 10 VCP Board Meetings, 4 Money Smart Workshops, 2 Board Retreats, 6 Special Meetings, 2 Public Safety Meetings | |
| Monthly Bulletin - copies distributed | 800 | 800 + Other Materials | |
| Community Clean Ups | 24 | 6 | |
| Public Safety | 6 | 2 Large Meetings | |

1 From EBMC Presidents Report September 2003

2 From Village Center Administrative Funding Reports

Source: EBMC Documentation

Table 8
Poppleton Village Center Neighborhood Dynamics

| Item | Poppleton | Total EZ | Baltimore City |
|---|-----------|----------|----------------|
| <u>Total Population</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 8,849 | 72,100 | 736,014 |
| 2000 | 6,684 | 54,012 | 651,154 |
| Change | -2,165 | -18,088 | -84,860 |
| % Change | -24% | -25% | -12% |
| <u>Percentage of Owner Occupied Dwellings</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 14% | 25% | 44% |
| 2000 | 15% | 26% | 43% |
| Change | 1% | 1% | -1% |
| <u>Percentage of Dwellings that are Vacant</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 18% | 17% | 9% |
| 2000 | 20% | 26% | 14% |
| Change | 2% | 9% | 5% |
| <u>Median Household Income (1999\$)</u> | | | |
| 1990 | \$15,704 | \$18,499 | \$32,316 |
| 2000 | \$12,939 | \$20,750 | \$30,078 |
| Change | -2,765 | 2,251 | -2,238 |
| % Change | -18% | 12% | -7% |
| <u>Percentage of Residents Living Below the Poverty Level</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 55% | 41% | 21% |
| 2000 | 35% | 34% | 22% |
| Change | -20% | -6% | 1% |
| <u>Resident Labor Force Participation</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 32% | 37% | 47% |
| 2000 | 34% | 37% | 44% |
| Change | 3% | 0% | -3% |
| <u>Unemployment Rate</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 17% | 15% | 9% |
| 2000 | 16% | 17% | 11% |
| Change | 0% | 2% | 2% |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, EBMC

6.2 Review of Previous EBMC Materials

The Poppleton Village Center was analyzed as part of the *An Ethnographic Assessment of EBMC Village Centers* prepared by White and Associates in October of 1998. This report found that the Poppleton Village Center was successful in overcoming neighborhood conflicts in order to launch its programs. The Village Center reported early success in the areas of workforce development and promoting economic development. The White and Associates report recommended:

- Receiving technical assistance in addressing racial, cultural, and other differences among the Village Center's diverse population;
- Improve the relationship with the University of Maryland School of Medicine;
- Increase Village Center representation at community association meetings;
- Expand outreach.

Based on the interviews conducted and materials reviewed, VCP seems to have addressed these issues.

6.3 Interview Results

A joint interview was conducted with Dr. Doris Hall, Director of the Poppleton CDC and Jacqueline Lightfoot, the Village Center Administrative Director, as was an individual interview with Mr. Samuel Singletary, the Chair of the VCP Board. The board members interviewed have been active with the Village Center since the Empowerment Zone began operations. The VCP Board is active in the day-to-day operations of the Village Center as well as in setting long-term plans and goals. The long-term goal of VCP is "create a livable community." The key short-term goal for the Village Center is to address long-term sustainability issues. The main vehicle for community involvement in the zone is through the VCP Board, with each of the community's neighborhood organizations having a seat on the Board. The key organizational strength of the Village Center was its ability to "hold all the groups together" to work with the external community – most importantly the University of Maryland, Baltimore and University of Maryland Medical System. The chief organizational weakness of the Village Center was the difficulties involved in getting the community together – "trying to bring the neighborhoods together to act as a united front."

The development of the proposed UMB Research Park and the operations of the Poppleton Community Development Corporation are the most important opportunities for growth in the community and for the long-term sustainability of the Village Center. The key programs that are essential to promote the development of the community are economic development (with the CDC) and the career center. The key steps that were viewed as essential for long-term sustainability were as follows:

- Continued Village Center Board development training;
- Economic development coordination – "the CDC and economic development committee are vigilant for opportunities to effect positive change in the neighborhood"; and
- Maintain revenue streams – "the CDC will play an important role," City and federal funding is needed, University support is critical.

A key organizational issue that may impact the sustainability of VCP is the seemingly strained relationship between the Village Center and EBMC and the City. EBMC was seen as “not forthcoming on budget issues” which may jeopardize the community outreach goals.

6.4 Review of Reports, Budget and Planning Documents

Available budget, strategic planning, and reporting documents (Administrative Funding Reports) were reviewed. Based on the budget materials reviewed, Poppleton is highly dependent on EBMC funding for operations, but the Village Center has raised external funding from: a recycling program, small overhead from the Annual Community Appreciation Day, and VCP has formed a CDC and will receive a revenue stream from rents paid to the Parren J. Mitchell Business Center and Rite Aid.

VCP reported success in terms of holding regular board and staff meetings. Board participation was not identified as a weakness in the materials reviewed or the interviews, although increasing attendance at Board meetings was identified as a goal in VCP’s goals for the 2002-03 funding year. The Village Center’s outreach and community engagement strategy is based on “attend[ing] community meetings to react to community needs and concerns” and VCP participated in numerous community meetings. Community outreach was also achieved by the participation of all Poppleton community organizations on the VCP Board. Board members were used to inform their communities about Village Center operations and to distribute six volumes of the VCP Newsletter. VCP also reported conducting a Poppleton Community Survey. The Village Center has been successful in organizing community meetings to support the UMB Research Park Development and is planning to hold 12 Economic Development meetings in 2003-04.

The Village Center of Poppleton is active in a variety of program areas. The VCP Career Center has placed 494 individuals and has redesigned its efforts. The career center conducts its outreach through member organizations, the VCP Newsletter, canvassing by Youth Volunteer Force, and client referrals. Key workforce services include: immediate barrier and job readiness counseling, substance abuse counseling and referral, transportation assistance, financial counseling and other services to help place the individual. Other selected activities and goals include:

- Working to establish a K-8 Math/Science School;
- Developing a youth mentoring program;
- Recruiting block captains to distribute VCP materials and engage the community;
- Conducting an annual Merchants’ Association Festival;
- An annual Community Appreciation day; and
- Involving the community in ongoing public safety efforts.

The Village Center did not achieve its goals for developing after school programs at two schools “as a result of EBMC not funding the After School Initiative.” The Village Center also did not meet its goals for community clean-ups.

6.5 Analysis of Sustainability Plans

The NOMAGIC Sustainability Assessment was not yet available, so this analysis drew on the presentation materials provided to the April 30 and July 2, 2003 EBMC Community Capacity/Sustainability Committee meetings. Also, because VCP is just beginning its fourth year of administrative funding, it is just in the process of beginning sustainability planning. VCP

has recognized the need for sustainability planning and the Board of Directors, key staff, the Development Director and, Economic Development Committee “are charged with the responsibility to plan and work towards sustainability models for the Village Center of Poppleton, Inc.” VCP has correctly identified property acquisition and management as a means of supporting operations and has proposed to acquire and renovate a commercial building at One North Carey Street. The Poppleton Village Center has already established a CDC (in 1997) and formed a partnership with the Baltimore City Housing Authority and Bank of America to develop and build the Parren J. Mitchell Business Center Complex and has purchased 1022 West Baltimore St. (the VCP offices). The Village Center has requested EBMC funding for a Development Director and Researcher to promote sustainability issues.

6.6 Summary and Conclusion

The Poppleton Village Center appears to have overcome organizational differences in order to become a functioning community organization. The Village Center appears to have achieved success in both informing and engaging community residents in its activities. VCP reports having formed a strong network of organizations within the community by having all major community organizations involved in the Board, however, EBMC reports improving Board attendance and participation as an organizational development issue. The Poppleton Village Center relies on EBMC funding for a majority of administrative and program activities. While it has one full year of funding left, the Village Center must identify methods of diversifying its funding base. A positive step in this direction is the Village Center’s formation of a community development corporation that has acquired assets to provide long-term funding. Poppleton Community Development Corporation is pursuing new projects, One North Carey Street, and building external relationships to expand involvement with other opportunities. Most importantly, the Village Center has an opportunity to form a strong, ongoing institutional support relationship with University of Maryland, Baltimore to facilitate the development of the University of Maryland, Baltimore Research Park. This relationship, along with the potential development opportunities created by the UMB research park could, if managed appropriately, support long-term sustainability. The community could benefit from a more organized sustainability planning initiative along the lines of WPNPC’s successful effort. Such an effort was not raised in the interviews or discussed in the materials reviewed.

7.0 Washington Village/Pigtown Village Center

Despite having to create an entirely new organization, the Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council (WPNPC) was created as the Baltimore Empowerment Zone's first Village Center. In its Strategic Plan, WPNPC reports that the organization was formed based on the planning that occurred to create the Baltimore Empowerment Zone.

7.1 Neighborhood Change

The Washington Village/Pigtown community received substantial programmatic benefits from the Empowerment Zone program, especially in the areas of housing investments and workforce development. A selected list of WPNPC and Empowerment Zone outcomes is presented in Table 9. As presented in Table 9, WPNPC workforce development programs served a total of 583 individuals, accounting for 19% of all residents in the labor force (as of the 2000 Census). A total of 352 Housing Venture Fund investments were made in Washington Village/Pigtown. This accounted for 40% of all investments made in the entire Empowerment Zone and for 20% of total owner occupied housing units (as of the 2000 Census) in the Village Center. The level of crimes committed in the Village Center declined by 40%, comparable with the decline in the City.

The key WPNPC program outcomes reported in the Village Center's Sustainability Funding Report concentrated on continued community outreach activities, new program outcomes and sustainability activities. Successful community outreach activities were reported in the areas of community green space programs, public safety, and community clean-ups. A new program was launched in the area of substance abuse, which exceeded planning goals, and the career services program, which generally met or exceeded stated goals. The Village Center also reported substantial progress in sustainability planning. The Village Center owns two buildings, which generate \$2,300 in monthly income, submitted a grant to fund the Career Services program, and continued to manage a successful Main Streets program. The Village Center hired a consultant to prepare a Development Plan and was successful in attracting new funding sources. The Village Centers goal was to attract 35% of its funding from non-EBMC sources in FY2002-3 and exceeded this goal – raising 47% of funding from non-EBMC sources.

Key Census-based socio-economic changes in the Washington Village/Pigtown area are presented in Table 10. Despite the successful programs and efforts of WPNPC and EBMC, the Washington Village/Pigtown area continued to decline in several core areas, including population, the share of owner-occupied dwellings, and the percentage of dwellings that are vacant. However, Village Center population declined less rapidly than the zone and the City, and vacancy increased less rapidly than in the zone. On the positive side, median household income increased (in real terms) and the percentage of population living below the poverty level fell.

Table 9
Selected Empowerment Zone Programmatic Outcomes
and Reported Village Center Outcomes
for Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council

| Item | Village Center | Empowerment Zone | Baltimore City |
|---|----------------|---------------------|----------------|
| Cumulative Empowerment Zone Program Outcomes¹ | | | |
| Total Workforce Development Placements (unduplicated) | 583 | 4,725 | n.m. |
| Housing Venture Fund Closings | 352 | 872 | n.m. |
| Change in Crime Rate | -40% | -46% | -39% |

Reported Village Center Outcomes²

Selected Reported Village Center 2002-2003 Outcomes²

| Goal | Outcome |
|--|--|
| Purchase Two Commercial Properties | WPNPC Owns 2 Buildings Generating \$2,300 Per Month In Income |
| Manage Main Street Program | Achieved: Completed 33 Façade Improvements; Created Annual Pigtown Festival, Holidays On The Boulevard, Other Events; Attracted 15 New Businesses; Raised \$80,500 Over 3 Year Period. |
| Community Green Space Program | Formed Partnerships With OSI, DNR, U.S. Forest Service, Park And People Foundation, And Forest Conservation. Raised \$50,800. |
| Maintain Career Services With Sustainable Plan | Submitted Grant With EBCC The GATE For \$180,000. Meet Or Came Close On Placement Goals. |
| Establish A Substance Abuse Program, Refer 50 Residents. | Established Program With 144 Clients Receiving Counseling, 78 Referred To Treatment And 43 Placed In Employment |
| Recruit 10 Residents Into Block Watch | 15 Block Watchers, And More Informal Block Watchers |
| Conduct 8 Community Clean-Ups | 11 Community Clean-Ups |
| Sustainability Planning | Fundraising Plan Initiated; 47% Of Funding From Non-EBMC Sources. Created 5-Year Strategic Plan |

1 From EBMC Presidents Report September 2003

2 From Village Center Sustainability Funding Report

Source: EBMC Documentation

Table 10
Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council Village
Center Neighborhood Dynamics

| <u>Item</u> | WPNPC | Total EZ | Baltimore City |
|---|----------|----------|----------------|
| <u>Total Population</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 8,961 | 72,100 | 736,014 |
| 2000 | 8,061 | 54,012 | 651,154 |
| Change | -900 | -18,088 | -84,860 |
| % Change | -10% | -25% | -12% |
| <u>Percentage of Owner Occupied Dwellings</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 50% | 25% | 44% |
| 2000 | 47% | 26% | 43% |
| Change | -3% | 1% | -1% |
| <u>Percentage of Dwellings that are Vacant</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 10% | 17% | 9% |
| 2000 | 17% | 26% | 14% |
| Change | 7% | 9% | 5% |
| <u>Median Household Income (1999\$)</u> | | | |
| 1990 | \$23,332 | \$18,499 | \$32,316 |
| 2000 | \$24,607 | \$20,750 | \$30,078 |
| Change | 1,275 | 2,251 | -2,238 |
| % Change | 5% | 12% | -7% |
| <u>Percentage of Residents Living Below the Poverty Level</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 27% | 41% | 21% |
| 2000 | 23% | 34% | 22% |
| Change | -4% | -6% | 1% |
| <u>Resident Labor Force Participation</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 40% | 37% | 47% |
| 2000 | 39% | 37% | 44% |
| Change | -1% | 0% | -3% |
| <u>Unemployment Rate</u> | | | |
| 1990 | 9% | 15% | 9% |
| 2000 | 9% | 17% | 11% |
| Change | 0% | 2% | 2% |

Source: U.S. Bureau of the Census, EBMC

7.2 Review of Previous EBMC Materials

The Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council Village Center was analyzed as part of the *An Ethnographic Assessment of EBMC Village Centers* prepared by White and Associates in October of 1998. This report found that WPNPC has been successful in four areas: community clean-ups; substance abuse programs; establishing a Family and Career Support Center; and the number of residents placed in jobs. The most important challenge facing the Village Center were controlling conflict within the Village Center Board of Directors, staff turnover, and the need to hire a new executive director. Key strategic needs include improved community outreach to inform the community about and engage residents in Village Center activities and improved business outreach. Key recommendations for future action included:

- Board development;
- Forming partnerships with other organizations;
- Updating and evaluating progress towards community strategic goals;
- Expanded community outreach;
- Hiring community economic development staff; and
- Increasing the number of programs and services.

WVPNC has been largely successful in meeting these goals. It has formed partnerships with a variety of organizations, conducted board retreats and planning, been successful in community outreach, and developed and maintained a strategic planning.

7.3 Interview Results

Interviews were conducted with Mr. Rahim Spence, the EBMC staff member on temporary loan to WPNPC to serve as interim director and Mr. Tony Savage, the Chairman of the WPNPC Board of Directors. There was agreement that the key long-term goals for the Village Center is sustainability planning. The key short-term goal is to address administrative capacity, job vacancies, and governance (strengthening the Board's operations). When the Executive Director position is filled, the Board is not active in day-to-day operations but very "hands on" in terms of setting direction. However, there is a history of the Board "keeping things very close" and some level of conflict between old and new Board members. There was a feeling that the Executive Director vacancy was hurting sustainability planning and the Village Center "needed to land an aggressive Executive Director" to see it through the challenges it is facing. Once the Executive Director is chosen, a key strategic emphasis for the Village Center will be economic development.

The key organizational strengths of the Village Center were the Career Center and Public Safety program – "these are the two programs that are working well." The most important threats to the Village Center are "politics" and the need to overcome "animosity" among some Board members. There is a strong feeling that the overall direction of the Village Center and neighborhood is positive. There is also a consensus that the Village Center will need to become more "business minded" and will have to "mix social service delivery with profitable operations to achieve sustainability."

7.4 Review of Reports, Budget and Planning Documents

Available budget, strategic planning, and reporting documents (Administrative Funding Reports) were reviewed. WVPNC has diversified its sources of funds, with EMBC accounting for 53% of funding in FY2003, and has attracted over \$600,000 grants and contracts since 2000.

The Village Center has experienced success in the areas of developing and implementing programs, most importantly in workforce development and housing – where substantial program penetration has occurred and substance abuse, where performance outcomes have exceeded plans. The Village Center has achieved success in community organizing and reports “people in the community know staff members and seek them out” and have successfully implemented public safety, community clean-up, and community green space efforts. WPNPC has experienced problems in the areas of personnel management and staff turnover – most importantly the executive director position, which is vacant. The Village Center has recognized these issues and has hired an organizational development consultant.

The Village Center has implemented a regular strategic planning process to guide its efforts and has prepared long-term sustainability plans. WPNPC has met or exceeded core performance goals and established a strong track record of program management.

7.5 Analysis of Sustainability Plans

WPNPC made presentations to the EBMC Community Capacity/Sustainability Committee on September 24, 2003 and to the Sustainability Committee on December 14, 2001 and October 30, 2002. WPNPC has made substantial strides towards sustainability as reported by the Community Capacity/Sustainability Committee, which reported that “WPNPC has met all of its stated goals and objectives as projected for year one of transitional funding. The Village Center has met its leveraging requirements and has secured commitments for leveraged funding for its second year Transitional Funding request.” As described above, key sustainability benchmarks include:

- Hiring a development consultant to prepare a development plan, that includes identification of funding prospects;
- Development of a Strategic Plan;
- Establishment of a community development corporation to acquire and develop two properties;
- Attraction of new funding sources/programs;
- The development of a plan to support Career Services; and
- Diversification of funding so that 47% of funding is from non-EBMC sources.

The Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council recognizes the key issues involved with sustainability planning. Its planning documents identify the strength and sustainability of and required external partnerships to support of each of its core programs, as follows:

Public Safety – WPNPC has extensive ties with key players and “will be able to rely on grants;

Youth Development – Will need to partner with Baltimore’s Office of Employment

Development;

Workforce – WPNPC has already partnered with key providers;

Main Streets – “will need to generate resources to stay alive over the long haul” and is seeking business partners;

Substance Abuse – WPNPC is actively involved in a network of over a dozen providers.

As part of its strategic planning, the Village Center recognizes the need to review its strategic relationships with key institutional partners such as Bon Secours and University of Maryland, Baltimore and to “continue to devote energy towards building relationships with the

many community groups in the WPNPC area.” The Village Center also recognizes the need to form a partnership with an organization to promote economic development goals.

The Village Center also recognizes that it is in a good position to achieve sustainability because of the substantial redevelopment occurring in the area. “WPNPC is fortunate in that there is a lot of economic development activity underway in the area to include Montgomery Park, Camden Crossing, and the Carroll Camden Industrial Park. On top of that, property values are escalating at a rapid pace. This area is a goldmine.”

7.6 Summary and Conclusion

The Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council has achieved an impressive track record of success in community outreach and program implementation. The Village Center has successfully used strategic planning to establish a clear and concise mission statement and goals to guide operations and is using consultants to design a sustainability strategy. Furthermore, the Village Center has been successful in attracting external funding, relying on EBMC for 53% of funding. The Village Center appears to benefit from an energized and involved Board, but has suffered from staff turnover and vacancies.

WPNPC has clearly been a successful exercise in creating local capacity to design and implement programs. However, while the organization has been successful in diversifying its funding sources, it still relies on EBMC for more than half of funding. It will need to identify and attract new funding sources. In planning for sustainability, the community is in the enviable position of being in an area benefiting from market-driven redevelopment. This should increase both interest in the community and opportunities for attracting funding. However, the organization will need to address staffing and management issues to do so.

8.0 Overall Community Capacity Building Summary and Conclusion

The goal of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone effort was to build *Sustainable Community Development* through the creation of *Community Based Partnerships* or Village Centers. Overall, the community capacity building efforts of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone have been successful in terms of building community capacity - defined as functioning community organizations that have engaged the community to design and implement key strategic goals through a core set of programs. All of the five currently operating Village Centers have accomplished this basic level of capacity. However, the issue of sustainability of these efforts is less clear. Sustainability requires both a high level of community engagement and access to sufficient resources to fund operations. Two Village Centers – East Harbor and Washington Village – appear to be well on their way towards sustainability. Two other Village Centers – HEBCAC and Poppleton – are in the process of inserting themselves into neighborhood redevelopment efforts as a means of representing the needs of their respective communities. These two Village Centers can become sustainable to the extent they can provide the services needed to support these redevelopment efforts. Both could benefit from a strategic planning effort to define/re-define their missions in the context of ongoing redevelopment efforts. The fifth Village Center, Harlem Park/Lafayette Square, has achieved programmatic success and built a functioning organization. However, the area served by the Village Center is small, lacks an economic driver or institutional partner, and has competing service delivery organizations. The optimal strategy for promoting the continuation of EBMC programs in that area may be merger or partnership with another organization. A summary of the findings by Village Center follows:

East Harbor Village Center has a strong level of community engagement – especially among the lower income residents targeted by the Village Center. It has a clear programmatic mission, a track record of success in program implementation, and strong management team. It is highly viable in terms of near-term stability because it has financial reserves sufficient to support at least two more years of operations, has established a CDC that will provide future funding streams, and has a diversity of funding sources. The Village Center are benefiting from the effects of positive momentum as development moves into the area from downtown. Long-term sustainability will depend on maintaining a positive role in serving as an intermediary between community residents and this development activity.

Harlem Park/Lafayette Square has a moderate to strong level of community engagement. It has a mission statement and plan, but ongoing difficulties in engaging its Board of Directors and competition from existing organizations serving the same community. HP/LS-VC has achieved positive programmatic outcomes but the small size of the Village Center service area, may make achieving a sufficient scale of operations difficult. The Village Center has only one year of operations funding available from EBMC, but remains nearly entirely dependent of EBMC funding. The Harlem Park/Lafayette Square area is also adversely affected by the lack of a real economic driver to promote redevelopment in the area, and the Village Center lacks a strong institutional partner. Given the lack of an economic driver, the lack of a potential institutional partner, and the nearly complete reliance on EBMC for funding support, the long-term sustainability of the organization is questionable.

Historic East Baltimore Community Action Coalition (HEBCAC) was the only Village Center to be formed as part of an existing organization. HEBCAC benefited from a head start over the other Village Centers and the economic and political benefits of having a strong

institutional partner in Johns Hopkins. The Village Center reported substantial early success in attracting programmatic funding from non-EBMC sources and has traditionally been the least dependent on EBMC funding. However, the Village Center's efforts have clearly been negatively impacted by the loss of a dynamic leader, employee turnover, and political conflict with the City. Despite, the clear community momentum building around the East Side redevelopment efforts, the Village Center has not reaped the organizational benefits that other Village Centers – most importantly East Harbor and Washington Village/Pigtown – have received from redevelopment because of the creation of a City-sponsored competitor organization – EBDI – that has assumed some of HEBCAC's core functions, most importantly in the area of housing development. None-the-less, HEBCAC has a strong record of success in program management implementation and the economic and political benefits of having a strong institutional sponsor. However, in order for the organization to continue, it must redefine its mission as it relates to EBDI and the East Side redevelopment. In redefining its mission, the Village Center recognizes that the social service program delivery, community organizing, and land-use planning areas where HEBCAC is successful are not only still needed by the community, they are fully compatible with and supportive of the goals for East Side redevelopment. If HEBCAC can redefine its mission to focus on the services needed to support East Side redevelopment, and the City recognizes the need for these services, HEBCAC can and will be a sustainable organization.

The Village Center of Poppleton has achieved a moderate and, after overcoming “internal strife” increasing level of community engagement and a moderate level of programmatic success. The Village Center has formed a CDC, which has completed development projects and is planning new projects. However, the Village Center remains highly dependent of EBMC for core funding. The Village Center has sought out and achieved a high level of success in working with the University of Maryland, Baltimore (UMB) on supporting the development of the UMB Research Park. The Village Center can achieve sustainability if it can link its efforts to this development project and play a supportive role in promoting redevelopment.

Washington Village/Pigtown Neighborhood Planning Council has achieved a high level of success in community outreach. The Village Center has also been successful in implementing programs for workforce development, public safety, community clean-ups and substance abuse. The Village Center has formed strong vertical linkages with community organizations and horizontal linkages with City agencies and service delivery organizations. The Village Center operates a successful Main Street program. The Village Center is in its seventh year of operations and has diversified its sources of funding, but still relies on EBMC for more than half of operational funding. The Village Center has several factors that will contribute to long-term stability, including a well defined strategic plan, good real estate, “community momentum” and an energized board. However, employee turnover a job vacancies are a constraint. The successful record of the organization in both service delivery and community outreach bodes well for the organization in terms of attracting new funding sources and maintaining stability.

The six dimensions of community capacity listed in Section 2.1 provides a framework to analyze the overall impact of the Baltimore Empowerment Zone on building “sustainable community development capacity” in the five remaining Village Centers. The Baltimore City Empowerment Zone focused on the creation or strengthening of one level of social agency - Organizations – in this case Village Centers -- (Dimension 2) as means of engaging poor and relatively underserved population (Dimension 1) to implement a common set of policies – or

Functions (Dimension 3). EBMC provided funding and technical assistance to implement core Strategies (Dimension 4) and also tracked Outcomes (Dimension 6). Core Conditioning Influences (Dimension 5) were identified through the interviews and materials.

The Empower Baltimore Management Corporation went about developing community development capacity in the right way. It established a clear set of goals. It required that communities form representative organizations that underwent a strategic planning process to guide their operations. It provided technical assistance and sufficient funding to support leadership development, board development and community outreach. It tracked both program inputs and outcomes and recognized when it was unsuccessful – as with Self-Motivated. The lesson of the EBMC capacity building effort is the important role that community organizing and community organizations can play in the design and implementation of economic and workforce development projects.