

EVALUATION OF THE URBAN INITIATIVES ANTI-CRIME PROGRAM

HAMPTON, VA, CASE STUDY

HUD-0004081

ORIGINAL

HUD-0004081

Contract HC-5231

EVALUATION OF THE URBAN INITIATIVES  
ANTI-CRIME PROGRAM

HAMPTON, VA, CASE STUDY

1984

Prepared for:

U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development  
Office of Policy Development and Research

Prepared by:

Police Foundation  
John F. Kennedy School of Government

The views and conclusions  
presented in this report are those  
of the author and not necessarily  
those of the Department of Housing  
and Urban Development or of the  
United States Government

This report is one in a series that comprises a comprehensive evaluation of the Public Housing Urban Initiatives Anti-Crime Demonstration. The Final Report provides an integrated analysis of the design, implementation and impact of the entire demonstration, and each of the 15 site-specific case studies analyzes the implementation and impact of the programs at individual participating local housing authorities. The complete set of reports includes:

Evaluation of the Urban Initiatives Anti-Crime Program: Final Report

Evaluation of the Urban Initiatives Anti-Crime Program:

- Baltimore, MD, Case Study
- Charlotte, NC, Case Study
- Chicago, IL, Case Study
- Cleveland, OH, Case Study
- Dade County, FL, Case Study
- Hampton, VA, Case Study
- Hartford, CT, Case Study
- Jackson, MN, Case Study
- Jersey City, NJ, Case Study
- Louisville, KY, Case Study
- Oxnard County, CA, Case Study
- San Antonio, TX, Case Study
- Seattle, WA, Case Study
- Tampa, FL, Case Study
- Toledo, OH, Case Study

Each of the above reports is available from HUD USER for a handling charge. For information contact:

HUD USER  
Post Office Box 280  
Germantown, MD 20874  
(301) 251-5154

## PREFACE

The Urban Initiatives Anti-Crime Demonstration was created by the Public Housing Security Demonstration Act of 1978. The program was formally announced in May 1979 and awards were made by the following September. By early 1981, programs in all 39 selected sites were underway; and by mid-1982, all were essentially completed.

As the report notes, the design and implementation of the program were flawed. The demonstration was conceived and developed according to principles which the current Administration has sought to reverse--that influxes of Federal money and direct Federal involvement can provide solutions to local problems.

HUD is currently implementing a series of demonstrations designed to improve the quality of life of public housing residents. These demonstrations stress local autonomy in design and implementation, with communities free to tailor their programs to meet their own unique needs. The demonstrations emphasize the coordination of existing Federal, State, and local resources, rather than the duplication of existing efforts or the funding of new programs. They use existing HUD resources to leverage other public and private funds. And, they require the commitment of all sectors of the local community, with a special emphasis on public/ private partnerships.

The Department believes that the emphasis on local authority which characterizes current Administration policy and provides the basis for operating and planned demonstrations holds much more promise for improving the lives of low-income families than programs that are rigidly structured by the Federal government.

## I. PROGRAM SETTING

### A. The City

Founded in 1610, Hampton, Virginia lays claim to the title of the "oldest continuous English-speaking settlement in America." Located at the mouth of the Chesapeake Bay, the city, along with Norfolk, Newport News and Portsmouth, is an integral part of the area known as Hampton Roads, the greatest natural seaport between New York and Rio de Janeiro, containing over one million people, more than a fifth of the population of the state. Second only to the Port of New York as a container port on the Atlantic Coast, Hampton Roads leads all Atlantic and Gulf Coast ports in total export tonnage. Closely linked to the seaport activities is an enormous complex of related manufacturing plants, dominated by the Newport News Shipbuilding and Dry Dock Company, the world's largest privately owned shipyard.

Because of these capacities, all branches of the Armed Forces maintain facilities in the area. The headquarters of the Navy's Atlantic Fleet and 22 other Navy commands are located in the area--the largest concentration of naval installations in the world. As a result of this concentration, the Department of Defense has spent approximately \$1.2 billion dollars per year in the area in the last several years. So dominant is this Federal influence that the largest employer in Hampton Roads not engaged primarily in government work is a Ford Motors plant with fewer than 1,900 employees.

Hampton, a city of approximately 131,000 residents, has not avoided the strong influence of Federal, especially military, installations. Langley Air Force Base, for example, is situated at the northern edge of the city. In addition, the Langley Research Center of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration (NASA) has had local annual expenditures of over \$125 million. The city has long made efforts to make the military and their dependents feel a

part of the community. As one manifestation of these efforts, in the late 1960s the city constructed the Hampton Roads Coliseum, at a cost of \$8.5 million, because, in the words of one local official, "We wanted to give the military the kind of entertainment they expect in view of their worldwide experience."<sup>1</sup>

B. Demonstration Site and Surrounding Area

Immediately adjacent to the Coliseum is Pine Chapel Village, the project selected by the Hampton Redevelopment and Housing Authority (HRHA) to participate in the Urban Initiatives Anti-Crime Program (UIACP). The 54 acre complex of 450 apartments, situated in single-story, multi-family buildings, was constructed in 1950; for the next two decades it housed military personnel, and their dependents as well as civilians. In 1969, it was purchased by the HRHA and, after extensive rehabilitation, opened as a public housing facility in 1971. At the time the UIACP application was submitted, there were 1,259 residents (95 percent of whom were black, four percent white and the remainder Spanish speaking or other), occupying 423 units; four units were used to house services of other agencies; 23 units were vacant. The vast majority of the households (82 percent) were headed by females; 76 percent received Aid to Families with Dependent Children; only 28 percent of the heads of households were employed.

Unlike many public housing developments, Pine Chapel is not isolated from the rest of the community. In some respects, this has advantages. Privately owned residences are so closely intertwined with the project buildings that the two form a visually unified community. The location also provides residents with easy access to two shopping centers, entertainment facilities, banks, public transportation and other services. Such, indeed, are conditions which would be envied by residents of many projects elsewhere.

Despite these advantages, the location of Pine Chapel creates many problems as well. Since the entrances to the project are uncontrolled, they are

frequently used by nonresidents as short cuts to the Coliseum, one of the shopping malls or to one of the main thoroughfares nearby. Once inside the project, there are no real or symbolic barriers delineating public and private space. The combination of this frequent passage of strangers with the lack of territoriality has led to a situation in which almost all exterior space in the project is treated as public; as a result, groups of people loiter in these areas with little or no challenge.

The location of Pine Chapel poses particular problems on those evenings when public events are held at the immediately adjacent Coliseum. Persons attending those events frequently park in the project, in order to avoid paying a fee. As a result of this competition for limited parking space, both residents and outsiders park in the yards and off-street parking lots, providing enhanced opportunities, if not justification, for vandalism.

Another undesirable feature of the project was the fact that residents there, unlike in the other two Hampton projects, had to pay their own utility bills. By 1979, it was not uncommon for a household to be paying \$35 per month for rent but \$185 for utilities.

In addition to these undesirable features, Pine Chapel had acquired a reputation as being plagued by crime. The city of Hampton had generally low, albeit rising, per capita rates of both personal and property crimes as recorded by the police. The recorded personal crime rate within the project was about three times the city-wide rate; the property crime rate was slightly higher in Pine Chapel than in the rest of the city.

Due to all of these negative features, prospective residents frequently declined the offer to live in Pine Chapel when it was extended to them. As a result, about 25 units were unoccupied at all times, leaving them vulnerable to vandalism and vagrancy.

## II. PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT

HUD's announcement, in May 1979, of a competition to participate in the UIACP came at a time when the HRHA was seeking to develop a program for Pine Chapel similar to the \$300,000 Federally-funded Target Project Program (TPP) administered in the Lincoln Park project from September 1975 through August 1977. That program, which comprehensively addressed the needs for improved physical environment, employment, training, social services and police-community relations, had been judged by the HRHA to be so successful among the 300 units at Lincoln Park that they believed it should be tried at the larger Pine Chapel project. By mid-May, the HRHA submitted a preliminary application briefly describing the demonstration project and the program proposed for it. A few days later, HUD notified the HRHA that they should submit a full application.

The HRHA's Housing Counseling Supervisor, a six-year HRHA employee, had been given the assignment of developing plans for a TPP-like program. As soon as the Executive Director learned of the possibility of receiving UIACP funds, she reassigned that Supervisor to the task of writing the proposal for that program. The Supervisor, a former Deputy Director of the Hampton Community Action Agency, who had begun her work with the HRHA as the Director of Community Organization, provided a copy of the announcement to the President of the Pine Chapel Residents Council and met with her to discuss her opinions concerning possible program elements. As a result of that discussion, flyers were distributed to all residents inviting them to a general meeting to allow them to make recommendations. At that meeting the approximately ten residents in attendance were asked what they considered to be the most serious problems in the project and what solutions they could suggest for those problems.

The Supervisor then arranged to attend the next regularly scheduled meeting of the Hampton Human Resources Council (HHRC), a group comprised of representatives from all city agencies and the United Way so that she could elicit their ideas concerning possible program elements. Also attending the meeting was a Juvenile Justice expert from the Virginia Department of



Corrections. The recommendations made at this meeting were fundamentally the same as those made by the residents: improved security hardware, employment opportunities, drug and alcohol abuse education, additional playground space and a larger recreation center. The only significant difference was that the residents wanted police officers assigned to the project whereas the HHRC members recommended increasing the level of patrol but did not specifically suggest having officers specially assigned to Pine Chapel.

With this advice, the Supervisor met next with representatives of the Hampton Police Department. In these discussions, the police agreed that the HRHA could contract with the department for two officers to patrol Pine Chapel during evening hours and on weekends. In addition, they recommended the use of surveillance or sensor equipment to try to detect acts of vandalism in progress.

Based on the suggestions provided by residents, members of the Human Resources Council and the police, the Supervisor prepared a draft of the proposal to receive UIACP funds. She provided a copy of this draft to all three groups and met with them to obtain their comments. After final revisions were made and endorsements received from these groups as well as other local agencies, the full application was submitted to HUD on June 29, 1979.

Although sparse in words, the proposal outlined a plan to address the problems of crime and fear in Pine Chapel, on a wide variety of fronts, by means of an elaborate network of closely interacting program elements funded by a number of different sources. To house many of these elements, \$50,000 in Modernization funds were sought to rehabilitate nine units to serve as an Anti-Crime Resource Center. Integrated with this was a request for \$26,000 in DOL funds to hire youths to assist in the rehabilitation and maintenance of this Center, as well as for a secretary and a janitor for it. To provide office equipment, \$10,000 in additional Modernization funds were requested.

The Resource Center would provide an office for the Housing Counseling Supervisor, who was selected to become the Anti-Crime Coordinator, the person responsible for overseeing and integrating the broad range of proposed programs. She was supposed to report to the Deputy Executive Director of the HRHA, the same person who had served as the TPP Administrator at Lincoln Park. The HRHA proposed to provide \$30,000 for the Coordinator's salary, benefits, vehicle and other expenses.

Also located in the Center, and reporting to the Coordinator, was to be a Project Safety Specialist, a police officer whose primary responsibilities would be the initiation of anti-crime activities, intervention in (and settlement of) disputes, maintenance of good relations with residents, acting as liaison with the police and provision of training to residents and staff to identify and remedy potential crime problems. To pay for this position, the HRHA sought \$17,000 in Community Development Block Grant funds (CDBG).

Four Community Security/Service Officers, reporting to the Project Safety Specialist, were to be paid with \$40,000 in CDBG funds. These persons were to serve as outreach workers, identifying problems among the residents, referring them to sources of assistance informing them about Anti-Crime activities, working with the neighborhood groups in establishing Block Watch organizations and conducting an assessment of the educational and training needs perceived by the residents. It was anticipated that as many of these outreach workers as possible would be residents, providing more employment opportunities to Pine Chapel.

Also reporting to the Anti-Crime Coordinator would be a Manpower Officer, paid with \$12,500 in local funds, to assist residents in training and job placement; supervising the educational and training assessment; establishing and monitoring on-site education programs; and referring residents to such programs elsewhere in the community. To facilitate this effort, \$25,000 in CDBG funds

were sought to pay for the training and education of residents seeking or able to obtain employment.

Related to this effort among adults would be the development, in conjunction with the local school system, of an On The Job Training Program in which project youths would be hired by local businesses, paid by \$32,000 in DOL funds, given training in the skills necessary to retain employment, and granted credit for the experience.

To provide more recreational facilities, \$75,000 in Modernization funds were requested to expand the Community Center and \$35,000 from the same source to construct tot-lots for young children, intermediate playgrounds for older children and basketball courts for teenagers. Modernization funds amounting to \$5,000 were sought to provide equipment for the expanded Community Center. To complement these recreation facilities, \$32,300 were sought from DOL to hire youths as Recreation Aides to supervise activities using them.

Following the advice of the police, the HRHA requested \$40,000 from Modernization funds to purchase portable television cameras and monitors, panic buttons to be installed in one bedroom units and portable sensor mats for vacant apartments. Youths, to be paid with \$12,900 in DOL funds were to be used to monitor this surveillance equipment.

Modernization funds were also sought to improve doors and window locks (\$12,500), install new lighting (\$50,000) and to improve landscaping and fencing to improve physical design and traffic patterns as well as to create "defensible space" (\$25,000). Project youths, to be paid with \$24,000 in DOL funds, were to be hired to assist in making these improvements.

The final major component of the proposed program to be paid from Federal funds was the hiring of two police officers, paid by \$27,500 in CDBG funds, to patrol the project at night and on weekends.

Finally, local funds were to be provided for a Tenant Imprest Fund; training; improvement of tenant selection, placement and eviction policies; referrals to existing community services; the provision of on-site services; increasing police patrol coverage and training; and several other activities. A Community Alliance, composed of city agencies, businesses, residents and PHA staff was also proposed to plan, coordinate and implement anti-crime programs. Prospective co-targeting of funds from LEAA, HEW, ADAMHA, the Administration on Aging, the Department of the Interior and other sources was also mentioned.

Altogether a total of \$500,000 in Federal funds were requested: \$302,500 from Modernization funds, \$128,000 from the Department of Labor (DOL), and \$69,500 from Community Development Block Grant Discretionary Funds. A local match of \$91,400 was also proposed.

After the proposal had been submitted, the HRHA received a letter from the Chief of Police recommending certain changes be made in the approach to surveillance that had previously been suggested. Instead of installing sensor mats and portable television cameras, the Chief now proposed that the HRHA and the HPD work together to develop Block Watch organizations throughout the project. Since this idea was completely in accordance with the existing proposal--indeed was an enhancement of it--this suggestion was accepted, although it was received too late to be included in the original proposal.

In mid July, 1979, the HRHA was notified that their proposal had been selected to be among those that were to be Semi-Finalists and were invited to a meeting in Washington, D.C. to discuss possible revisions. On August 24, 1979, at that meeting, UIACP representatives requested that certain changes and additions be made to the proposal. As were all the other applicants, the HRHA was required to undertake a Vulnerability Analysis, explain how the timing of the different components would be coordinated and provide more detailed demographic data concerning the residents of the demonstration. In addition,

the HRHA was requested to expand their discussion of tenant selection and eviction, to give tenants a "stronger, more active" role and to more clearly specify a Tenant Imprest Fund. They were also advised to bring in more professionals in the fields of: youth, drugs, alcohol, problems of the elderly, crisis intervention and other areas. These professionals would work in project facilities. HUD also requested that neighborhood organizations, businesses, other community sources and other Federal programs be involved to improve conditions in the surrounding neighborhoods.

HUD also asked that the HRHA try to provide sensitivity training to city police officers to work out of a substation which could be established within the project. These officers, HUD suggested, could then engage in team policing with project youths hired with DOL funds.

Reflecting the concerns raised earlier by the Hampton Police Chief, HUD asked the HRHA to better justify, reduce or eliminate panic buttons, sensor mats and television surveillance equipment. Furthermore, the Authority was asked to better explain how and why the other proposed physical security improvements could be expected to work. Any cost savings that resulted from changes in this area were to be reallocated to other Modernization improvements.

With respect to the proposed CDBG funds, the HRHA was informed that they could expect to receive a maximum of \$50,000, considerably less than the \$69,500 requested. The Hampton representatives also learned that they should apply for these funds through the Innovative Grants program. With these funds, they were instructed to pay for the Anti-Crime Coordinator, the Tenant Imprest Fund, education and training for residents, the Project Safety Specialist, the Security/Service Officers and social service professionals. If this suggestion were followed, it would mean that the HRHA could no longer use CDBG funds to pay for a contract with the police department. Furthermore, it would require them

-10-

to pay for more services with CDBG funds than they had originally proposed--but with almost \$20,000 less money.

Revisions were also requested concerning the proposed DOL program. In addition to creating security patrol assignments for the youths, the HRHA was also asked to hire youths in positions which would address the needs associated with tenant involvement, social services and PHA security management.

Although the HRHA had proposed to commit over \$90,000 to the program (18.3 percent of the total Federal funds requested), they were asked to make certain that the local match was at least ten percent. They were also told that their local matches were "very vague and noncommittal" and were requested to "firm up and specify by dollar amount for each local source involved."

On September 7, the required revisions were submitted to HUD. In that document, in addition to providing the requested demographic information, the HRHA explained that residents, selected through Neighborhood Councils, would be trained to assist in tenant selection and eviction. This training would consist of learning investigative and screening techniques, interpersonal relations skills and presentational techniques which could be used in screening public housing applicants and persons under consideration for eviction. The tenants' advice would be provided to the Tenant Selector and the Housing Manager, who would assume final responsibility for selection and eviction, respectively.

In response to HUD's request to give residents a more active role, the HRHA proposed establishing a \$20,000 Tenant Imprest Fund, paid with CDBG funds, to be used by the Resident Council for education and training programs designed to reduce unemployment and underemployment among residents, establishing Block Watch and other anti-crime efforts. The HRHA continued to propose that the additional \$30,000 in CDBG funds be used to pay for a contract with police department to provide addition evening patrols, rejecting HUD's advice to use these funds to hire the Anti-Crime Coordinator, the Project Safety Specialist

and the outreach workers, instead, the HRHA proposed to hire these persons with local matching funds.

In response to HUD's request that they co-target additional Federal funds, the HRHA indicated that they planned to use LEAA funds to support a Victim/Witness program. In addition, plans were indicated for substance abuse education, crisis intervention and elderly programs.

The Authority agreed to HUD's request that a police substation be established within Pine Chapel. In response to the request that they assign DOL youths to patrol the projects with police officers, the HRHA offered, as a compromise, to train youths to assist the Project Safety Specialist on those evenings when events were held at the Hampton Roads Coliseum. Assurance was also provided that police officers assigned to the project would receive training in family crisis intervention and referral to local community agencies. In addition, HUD was informed that the Community/Security Service Outreach workers, who would be hired from within the project with local CETA funds, would also be provided training in human relations, community services and referrals.

HUD was also reassured that the HRHA was committed to creating a Community Alliance, composed of representatives from the City Manager's office, city agencies, business, neighborhood organizations and PHA staff to mobilize all possible resources that could impact crime and fear. One of the first tasks of this group was to be the conducting of the Vulnerability Analysis. Further, the Authority proposed to apply for LEAA/Action Planning funds to support this effort. A restitution program, created in conjunction with Court Services and Juvenile Probation, was proposed.

The HRHA readily acceded to HUD's requests to eliminate panic buttons, sensor mats and surveillance equipment and, in keeping with the suggestions made by the Chief of Police, proposed to put more emphasis on Neighborhood Watch and increased reporting of crimes to the police. The Authority proposed to spend

\$20,000 of the Modernization funds saved to purchase two patrol cars with detachable radios, for use by the police assigned to the new project substation.

The total amount proposed to be provided from local sources was increased to \$127,800, almost 27 percent of the amount requested from Federal sources. Of this amount the HRHA was to contribute \$41,500 in salaries, services and other expenses. The Hampton Police Department was committed to spend \$27,000 for in-kind service and for a Community Relations officer. The Manpower Services Project was to contribute \$52,500 for four Outreach workers and a Manpower officer. Finally, the local Probation Department and the Peninsula Mental Health Center agreed to provide a total of \$6,800 in services to the program.

The total requested from Federal sources had been reduced from \$500,000 to \$481,000, largely due to the reduction in funds sought from CDBG. The amounts sought from Modernization and DOL funds were unchanged, although the purposes for which they would be spent were changed to reflect elimination of surveillance equipment and the new proposals to purchase two police cars and have youths monitor the project during events at the Coliseum.

On September 27, 1979, the HRHA was informed that they had been selected to participate in the UIACP. As proposed, a total of \$481,000 in Federal funds had been committed to their program. Before they would be authorized to begin spending any of that money, however, final revisions would have to be made in the proposal. The Authority was told that a program staff member would contact them soon regarding the exact revisions that would be required. Even before those revisions were begun, the HRHA was to immediately begin preparation of the necessary paperwork associated with the processing of Modernization and CDBG funds. The usual procedures for receiving Modernization funds entailed dealing only with the Area Office. In the case of the UIACP, the process was much more complicated. A final Application had to be submitted to both the Area Office



and the Director of the UIACP. The Area Office, in principle, would review the Application to ensure that it complied with all technical and statutory requirements. The Central Office Anti-Crime staff would then review the Application to be certain that it fit within the general framework of the Program. Final approval to expend their funds could not be received until a Central Office staff member had made a site visit to examine all locations and the plans to modify them. On October 25, the revised Final Application for Modernization funds was submitted to both the Area Office and the Director of the UIACP Director.

On November 5, the HRHA learned what revisions HUD sought in their application. Although HUD and LEAA had already decided not to fund a Victim/Witness program in Hampton, the Authority was asked to explain how such a program would be integrated with other program elements. HUD again asked that more specific commitments be made concerning the proposed Community Alliance and suggested that the HRHA apply for the Urban Parks Program. Information was requested about the identities and levels of commitment to be "human service officers, as well as law enforcers" concerning the police officers who would work in the project. Finally, more details were required concerning the nature and extent of commitment to the program on the part of the Police Department.

Because final approval to spend UIACP Modernization funds might not be received for some time, the HRHA decided to begin construction of the Resource Center using its own funds. In October, nine apartments were rehabilitated to create the Center; in November, the Anti-Crime Coordinator moved into an office there, as did the Housing Counseling Supervisor, who assumed her previous position.

In December, the Authority sent to HUD a list of the members of the Anti-Crime Oversight Team and a Vulnerability Analysis, which had been conducted

in November by representatives of the HRHA, the Police Department, the Fire Department and a student from the Department of Architecture of nearby Hampton Institute. This Analysis provided a thorough examination of the physical and social problems at Pine Chapel and a rationale for the proposed methods to address them. On December 3, the Manager of the Richmond Area Office indicated to the HUD Central Office that her staff had reviewed Hampton's Final Modernization Application and recommended its approval.

On December 26, 1979, the Anti-Crime Coordinator was informed that a "mini-competition" for funds from OJJDP and ADAMHA would be held among the 39 recipients of UIACP awards. In response, the Coordinator herself began to write a proposal for a Youth Initiatives Program, funded by OJJDP, which would create a Youth Council which, working in collaboration with the Resident Council, would allow project youths to work together to address their common problems. She also contacted the Community Services Board to request that they write a proposal for ADAMHA funds to address the problems of family disputes, mental health, alcoholism, and drug abuse as well as the needs of victims of and witnesses to crimes, both by increasing knowledge concerning existing services and by creating local self-help groups.

On January 31, 1980 the HRHA submitted their responses to HUD's request for further revisions to their proposal. As requested, further information about the proposed Victim/Witness Program and the ways in which it would be integrated with other aspects of the UIACP were provided. HUD was also informed that the HRHA, in conjunction with the Mayor of Hampton, was in the process of organizing the Community Alliance, but that this process was not yet advanced enough to allow firm commitments to be made. The Authority also informed HUD regarding a personnel shortage in the Hampton Parks Department, they would be unable to apply for funds from the Urban Parks Program.

The HRHA also explained that, although the specific identities of the officers who would work in Pine Chapel had not yet been determined, all such officers would be volunteers with a desire to be "human service officers" who would receive the usual classroom and on-the-job training as received by other city police officers. It was explained that the Community Relations Program, begun under TPP and expanded with LEAA funds, would be maintained, accompanied by the creation of a police substation and an increase in the level of police patrol.

Finally, in response to questions raised by DOL, the HRHA explained that they intended to hire the equivalent of 19 youths, three as Maintenance/ Rehabilitation Aides, three as Security Hardware Installation Aides, five as Recreation Aides and eight as Safety/Security Aides. In addition, there would be nine youths participating in the On-the-Job-Training (OJT) Program, in which high school seniors would receive jobs in the private sector.

During the month of February, the Modernization Final Application was reviewed at the HUD Central Office. Questions were raised about the specific nature and costs of the proposed lighting, about the need and costs of two patrol cars as well as about the types and costs of equipment and furniture that were proposed. After consultation with the Anti-Crime Coordinator, it was decided that only one patrol car would be purchased; the funds for the second vehicle would be used to purchase a van to serve youth-related activities. All other proposed Modernization costs were approved as proposed. On March 28, HUD informed the HRHA that they were authorized to continue developing plans. As soon as possible, the HRHA was told, a site visit would be made by a member of the UIACP staff to determine if revisions needed to be made in any proposed work items. Based upon the conclusions reached as a result of this site visit, "complete plans, drawings and the related documents" would be submitted to the

UIACP Director and to the Field Office. Once agreement had been reached between Headquarters and the Field Office, the HRHA was informed, the Field Office would be directed by Headquarters to proceed with final processing and approval of the Modernization proposal.

On February 14, 1980, the HRHA submitted proposals for \$14,365 from OJJDP and \$45,458 from ADAMHA. While waiting to hear whether these funds would be awarded, the Anti-Crime Coordinator was informed by DOL that the proposed On-the-Job Training Program could not be paid for with YCCIP funds. While appealing this decision, she also learned that HUD had now decided that CDBG funds would be awarded under the auspices of the Technical Assistance Program, not the Innovative Program as originally planned. This change meant not only that a new proposal would have to be written but also that CDBG funds could no longer be used to pay for a contract with the police, necessitating a major revision in funding arrangements. As a result, the Authority agreed to commit, from their own funds, \$20,000 for the Tenant Imprest Fund and \$30,000 for the police contract. The CDBG funds were then to be used to pay for the salary of the Anti-Crime Coordinator, for the portion of their time spent by other HRHA employees on the Anti-Crime program and other costs.

In May, the HRHA was informed that they had received the funds requested from ADAMHA but that their proposal for OJJDP funds had not been accepted. In June, one year after the original proposal was submitted, a Cooperative Agreement was signed awarding DOL and CDBG funds. In July, this Agreement was amended to include the ADAMHA funds. Although final approval of the Modernization Work Plan had not yet been received, the Anti-Crime Program could, at last, officially begin.

### III. PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION

#### A. Improved Management of Public Safety by the PHA

The HRHA proposed to appoint an Anti-Crime Coordinator and a Project Safety Specialist as well as to create an Anti-Crime Oversight Team (ACOT) and involve residents in the screening of applicants and the eviction of problem families. The Coordinator was appointed in October of 1979, well before Federal funds became available, and immediately moved into the Resource Center in Pine Chapel. She assumed responsibility for supervising all aspects of the Anti-Crime Program except the Modernization work, for which the Authority's existing Modernization Coordinator assumed responsibility. An experienced employee of the HRHA, with an extensive background in working with residents, the Anti-Crime Coordinator had the advantage of thorough familiarity with the operations of Authority. Although she officially reported to the Deputy Executive Director, she had the support of, and, when necessary, direct access to the Executive Director. Faced with the dual responsibilities of complying with HUD's demand for multiple quarterly reports and directing an extensive complex of programs, she found it necessary to delegate the management of programs to other members of her staff. As a result of the amount of paperwork required by HUD, she also was unable to spend as much time with residents or staff members as she had been accustomed to in her previous HRHA assignments; this partial isolation led to some disenchantment on the part of the Coordinator and some difficulties in the operation of the program.

The ACOT, a 14-member panel consisting of five HRHA employees, a representative from the HUD Area Office, the President of the Resident Council, two police representatives and representatives from several other local agencies, first met in February of 1980 and has, with few exceptions, met monthly since that time. The function of the group has basically been to serve

as an advisory body, providing overall direction to the Anti-Crime Program and facilitating access to community resources.

The Project Safety Specialist position was assigned to the police officer who had already been working in Pine Chapel as a member of the Community Relations Bureau since December 1979, as part of an extension of the TPP Community Relations Project begun in another project. He assumed primary responsibility for organizing Block Watch organizations and supervising the Youth Security Aides. Unfortunately, because he retained some of his other responsibilities within the Community Relations Bureau, he was unable to work full time in Pine Chapel as had originally been expected.

Although not mentioned in the UIACP proposal, a critical actor in the operation of the Anti-Crime Program turned out to be the new project manager at Pine Chapel, who received the assignment in January of 1980. The manager, who had acquired familiarity with Pine Chapel during an assignment as assistant manager there two years before, had previously established a successful working relationship with the Coordinator when both were employed at the Hampton Community Action Agency. As manager, she played a key role in organizing Block Watch groups by attending meetings of residents to convince them of the utility of such organizations. She also instituted her own version of an anti-crime program by strictly enforcing lease provisions which prohibit persons from residing in the project unless they are registered. Convinced that many of these unregistered tenants, usually male friends of unmarried female heads of households, were perpetrators of crimes in and around Pine Chapel, she conducted more extensive inquiries about the persons living in each unit and tried to convince residents to report to her incidences of such lease violations. In conjunction with this effort, she began to issue many more warrants for possession of apartments, based on late payment of rent.

Other programs, independent of the UIACP, which could have been expected to have had an effect on the crime problem in Pine Chapel were instituted by the HRHA in the summer of 1980. In May, residents no longer had to pay for their own utilities. As a result, the cost of living in the project was significantly reduced, making it a much more desirable place to live and, as a result, the number of apartments which were left vacant began to decline. One month later, in June of 1980, a program was instituted in which residents of Pine Chapel were provided with decals to identify themselves as legitimate claimants to parking spaces in the project. Especially during events at the nearby Coliseum, those vehicles parked in the off-street parking lots within the perimeter of the project which did not have such decals would be given tickets indicating violations of local traffic ordinances.

For several reasons, the involvement of residents in screening and eviction procedures has not yet occurred. The plan from the beginning was that residents selected from the neighborhoods organized into Block Watch groups would receive 12 sessions of training provided by the Community Services Board (CSB) in interviewing, problem identification and counseling techniques. Because such limited training could not be expected to allow residents to handle the sensitive task of reviewing and counseling without assistance from an experienced professional, the CSB stipulated that a counselor must be available at Pine Chapel to assist the residents. Because the organizing of Block Watch groups required several months, selection and training of residents could not begin until the summer of 1981. By that time, the CSB staff person who was going to conduct the training had left that agency. It was then decided to have the ADAMHA program director conduct the training assisted by others at the CSB; this director, however, was heavily involved in his program and was unable to conduct the training at that time. By the Autumn of 1981, budget cuts had caused such sizable reductions in the size of the CSB staff that even assistant

In December 1981 ADAMHA program funding came to an end and, although the CSB agreed to extend the program for one month with local funds, the director was unable to institute the necessary training and counseling. Since that time, although the CSB has maintained its commitment to train residents, they have not had sufficient staff to be able to do so.

B. Rehabilitation to House Anti-Crime Activities and Improvement of Physical Design to Make Buildings and Spaces Harder Targets

The work ultimately proposed under this program area consisted of:

1. Rehabilitating dwelling units to create an Anti-Crime Resource Center;
2. Expansion of the Community Center;
3. Installing new exterior lighting;
4. Constructing "tot-lots," intermediate playgrounds, and basketball courts;
5. Installing stronger locks on doors;
6. Constructing fencing and creating landscaping to effect changes in physical design, traffic patterns, and "defensible space;" and
7. Purchasing a vehicle for use by police officers and a van for use by the DOL program.

The basic rehabilitation to create the Resource Center was completed by HRHA employees in November of 1979. Since release of Modernization funds had not yet been received, this work was paid for with local funds in anticipation that such a release would ultimately occur. The entire staff of the Anti-Crime Program was moved into this space over the next few weeks. Originally called the Anti-Crime Unit, the name was changed to Human Services Resource Center, a term which avoided the stigma associated with being confused as a police station and, furthermore, more accurately reflected the broad scope of services available.



Unlike the usual procedure for approving Modernization expenditures, which merely required the Area Office and the Housing Authority to reach agreement, the special system instituted for UIACP required that several additional steps be taken. First, the Area Office had to review the proposal to ensure that it fit within basic HUD guidelines. Second, the proposal would be reviewed by the UIACP staff to determine if it conformed to the program's goals. After preliminary approval from both the Area Office and the Central Office was received, the Central Office would then authorize the Authority to begin spending funds which would allow for the preparation of cost estimates, specifications and blueprints. Once these details were prepared, a Central Office representative would make a site visit to inspect and approve them. When approval from the Central Office was received, the Housing Authority would then have to request bids to perform the work required. Once a tentative contractor was selected, the Area Office would inspect the bid and the contractor to ensure that all legal requirements had been met.

For the HRHA, this rather cumbersome procedure proved to be quite problematic. Initial Area Office approval was given in December of 1979; in March of 1980, Central Office notified the HRHA Executive Director that approval had been given for them to begin expending money for the development of specifications but that all other expenditures must await a site visit and approval by the Central Office. The Executive Director relayed this approval to the Authority's Modernization Coordinator, responsible for all such work, but not to the Anti-Crime Coordinator. In May, the Central Office UIACP Modernization Coordinator called the Hampton ACC to make arrangements for a site visit. The ACC, after indicating she had not been informed that the initial Central Office approval had been received, expressed her concern that Hampton would not be ready for a site visit for some time, thus delaying the entire approval process and thereby threatening the integrity of the program. She

appealed to the Coordinator for assistance in facilitating approval of certain Modernization items even before a site visit could be made. Recognizing the seriousness of the problem, the HUD official agreed to allow funds to be spent for the two vehicles and for equipment for the Resource Center and the Community Center even before he could make a visit. In July, the UIACP Coordinator wrote to the Area Office Manager indicating his approval of these particular items. Such a letter directly from a Central Office staff member to the Area Office, was contrary to HUD protocol, however, and no official action was taken by the Area Office.

As the fall of 1980 passed, the UIACP Modernization Coordinator, believing his letter to the Area Office had made it possible for Hampton to begin spending funds, did not schedule a site visit. Unexpectedly, on September 30, at the end of the fiscal year, the UIACP lost all of its special travel funds. This development put the entire special approval process for UIACP Modernization funding, requiring a Central Office site visit, in serious jeopardy. Nevertheless, the UIACP Director held out hope that alternate sources for travel funds could be found. In the meantime, in an attempt to expedite Hampton's program, the HUD Modernization Coordinator got the Deputy Assistant Secretary to write to the HRHA Executive Director, informing her that she only had to deal with the Field Office in order to receive approval for the vehicles and equipment. As before, however, approval for all other items would require a site visit and approval by the UIACP Modernization Coordinator.

After the presidential election, the UIACP staff began to give up hope of obtaining additional travel funds. As a result, the special Modernization approval procedure had to be eliminated. In December of 1980, the Deputy Assistant Secretary again wrote to the HRHA Executive Director explaining that she no longer needed to receive Central Office approval for any Modernization work items. Instead, the Authority had only to deal with the Field Office, as

was the case in all other Modernization programs. This letter was also a violation of HUD protocol, since the letter was not sent directly to the Area Office Manager; instead, the Manager only received a copy of the letter. Since the Area Office staff had been told directly to relinquish primary responsibility in the program, they contended they needed to be told directly to once again assume that responsibility.

After several revisions, a letter was sent in April 1981 from the Deputy Assistant Secretary to the Area Office Manager, officially informing her that Central Office approval for the UIACP Modernization expenditures would no longer be required. A year and a half after the special UIACP Modernization approval process was created, this process was dismantled. As a result of the delays caused by this new procedure, Hampton still had not received permission to spend Modernization funds.

Even after the Area Office Manager had been officially notified that all further approval for Modernization work would come only from her staff, the delaying effects of bureaucracy continued. First, the notification had to be transmitted to the Area Office Anti-Crime Coordinator, the staff person officially responsible for dealing with the HRHA UIACP; in addition, the unofficial contact person, the staff member most familiar with the HRHA, also had to be notified of the change. Although reviews of the HRHA specifications continued, the approval process did not receive top priority attention because official responsibility for the Hampton project had not yet been transferred. Frustrated by the continuing delays, the Executive Director contacted the HUD central office to expedite the process. In October of 1981, the responsibility for handling the HRHA was officially transferred to the person who had been dealing with it informally. The Executive Director personally visited the Area Office and brought back approved site plans. Finally, Hampton had final approval to proceed with the Modernization program for which they had received an award 26 months earlier. Experienced employees of both the HUD central

office and the Area Office agree that such approval could have been provided at least one year earlier had the usual process been utilized from the beginning.

With approval to proceed, the HRHA moved swiftly to implement their program. By January of 1982, a contract was signed to perform all the work required. By March, bollards had been installed between buildings. By May, trees and shrubbery had been planted at various places throughout the project. Because installing such plants between units to delineate "defensible space" would interfere with the ability of the Maintenance Department to mow the lawns, it was decided instead to place them so as not to hinder such operations.

By the summer of 1982 exterior lighting had been installed, improved locks put on doors, playgrounds built, the Community Center expanded and final work completed on the Resource Center. It was decided to forego the installation of gates to control access of vehicles to the areas behind the project buildings. This decision was based largely on the objection by the Fire Department that such gates would hinder their maneuverability in the event of fires. To compensate somewhat for this deletion, the new playground equipment was situated so as to partially block access to the rear of buildings.

#### C. More Tenant Anti-Crime Participation

Besides the proposed involvement of residents in the screening and eviction processes, discussed above, and the hiring of residents, discussed below, residents were to participate in the UIACP through membership in Block Watch organizations, the creation of a \$20,000 Tenant Imprest Fund for the Residents Council to establish education and training programs and the creation of a Neighborhood Conflict and Dispute Settlement Team. Unknown to the PHA or the Public Safety Specialist, certain members of the Hampton Police Department began organizing Pine Chapel as a Neighborhood Watch site in May of 1980. When this was discovered, the Police Chief was contacted and urged to have his

officers coordinate their activities with the Anti-Crime Program. The Chief then ordered the organizing discontinued until the PHA desired it to begin. These early efforts led to some confusion and duplication of meetings, officers and paperwork. The development of Block Watch groups by the PHA began with the identification of 22 clusters of 13-20 families each which would serve as the base for the groups. Organization began in the late summer of 1980, after the first four Community Security/ Service Officers (CS/SOs) were hired under a six month CETA program. As one of their many responsibilities, these CS/SOs went door-to-door explaining the advantages of creating Block Watch organizations and informing the residents that such groups would begin to be formed in the near future. Informational flyers would then be distributed announcing the initial organization meeting, either in the Resource Center or the Community Center. At that meeting, the Project Manager would further explain the advantages of creating such groups and the CS/SOs would attempt to identify participants willing to serve as Co-Captains of the Block Watch group for that particular cluster. These Co-Captains would then be responsible for enlisting the support of their neighbors. Once 75 percent of the residents of an area had joined such a group, they would be eligible for official recognition by the Hampton Police Department. Once official recognition was granted, signs indicating that status could be installed and the Co-Captains would be provided copies of recorded crime reports from the area. Members of recognized organizations could then report crimes by providing the police their Block Watch number--but without having to reveal their names.

Initial organizing efforts were hampered by both the concern among residents that they might be "snitching" and the confusion of this effort with the Manager's attempt to remove unregistered residents. By the end of November of 1980, eight Block Watch groups had at least held their initial meetings. As these efforts progressed, staff problems were discerned which were judged to be

serious enough to justify a concerted training effort. For the next few months, attention was diverted to training sessions in an effort to develop a coordinated staff capacity; this diversion had a delaying effect on the organization of Block Watch groups. Further delays resulted when, at the end of January 1981, the six-month CETA appointments of the CS/SOs expired. Fortunately, two of these persons could be reappointed as 18-month employees, but the reduction in staff necessarily led to a reduction in effectiveness.

In May of 1981, after further organizing had continued, the Police Department indicated that none of the groups could be recognized since the 75 percent enrollment requirement had not been met. Furthermore, since so many groups were being planned, the department wanted all of the groups formed so that representatives from all 22 could attend one orientation meeting. As a result of this change in approach, the efforts to organize Block Watch groups were intensified. A general resident meeting was held to increase interest; by the end of the month, six groups had reached the required level, two were close and six clusters were scheduled to have organizational meetings during the month of June. At the end of May the CS/SO supervisor position was terminated. The responsibilities were assumed by a full-time HRHA employee. This staff change produced yet more delays, due to the need for familiarization to be achieved by the newly assigned staff member. Despite these multiple delays, by mid-August all clusters had held at least their initial organizing meetings. By November of 1981 all 22 clusters had been officially recognized by the Police Department. Activity among the groups, although variable across clusters, reached moderate levels in several groups but began to decline by the late summer of 1982. Since that time the Authority has taken steps to revitalize these groups.

The Tenant Imprest Fund was established with \$20,000 in HRHA funds. To determine how the residents wanted these funds expended, the CS/SOs conducted

an Educational Needs Survey from December 1980 through March of 1981. The results indicated that the priorities were GED, clerical and nursing aide training. Requests for bids for these types of training courses were solicited in August. When the bids were received, in October, it was discussed that the proposed costs were too high to allow the bid preferred by the Residents Council to be afforded. As a consequence, negotiations between the potential contractor, and the residents produced a compromise in which one pre-GED, two GED classes and two clerical training programs would be conducted within the Pine Chapel project. The clerical training would be included as part of the college curriculum. The classes have been conducted since March 1982. The first GED class began in January of 1982 and lasted for 12 weeks. Fourteen of the 17 participants eventually received their certificate of successful completion. A second class began in April. The first clinical class began in March 1982; the second class began in September 1982.

D. Increased Full and Part-Time Employment of Residents

The original HRHA proposal contained a wide variety of programs aimed at training and employing adult and teenage Pine Chapel residents. Adult residents were to be assisted by the programs instituted by the Residents Council and by the work of a Manpower Specialist responsible for developing employment opportunities. In addition, a limited number of adult residents were to be hired as Community Security/Service Officers (CS/SOs). Nineteen job positions were to be provided within Pine Chapel for project youths under the auspices of the DOL/YCCIP program. Nine other positions were to be funded by this program in the private sector; DOL, however, refused to fund such positions

under the YCCIP and the money set aside by the HRHA for this effort was redirected toward creating jobs within the project.

As discussed above, the Residents Council had contracted for the provision of pre-GED, GED and clerical training to be provided to residents. The idea of a Manpower Specialist to assist adults in locating employment, however, had to be eliminated when the CETA funds which were to afford this position were drastically cut. The job description for the CS/SOs was written by the Anti-Crime Coordinator requesting that applicants have a "high school education" or the equivalent, combining education and experience;" this was done so that residents, many of whom did not have a high school diploma, would be more likely to qualify than if only educational background were considered. This job description then had to be submitted to the local CETA office, however, whose staff used it to identify a pool of qualified applicants; these names in turn, were referred to the HRHA for final selections to be made. Unfortunately, although several residents applied for these positions, only one was determined by CETA to be eligible. This person was selected by the HRHA, along with three nonresidents, to be hired on a six month appointment in August 1980. In January 1981, this resident was one of two CS/SOs hired on an 18 month appointment.

The Assistant Director of the YCCIP program was hired in August 1980. Once a Director was hired, the Assistant was to concentrate on the development of jobs in the local private sector. In the meantime, however, the Assistant developed the means for announcing the development of announcements about the forthcoming availability of jobs for youths. These announcements were made to all households by means of a flyer, a local newsletter and the CS/SOs in October and November. As a result of this publicity, twelve qualified youths applied for employment. After being screened for eligibility by the local CETA agency, all twelve were hired (one full-time and the rest part-time) on December 15th. The next week, a YCCIP Director was hired.



The first set of YCCIP youths were assigned to work either as Recreation Aides or as Police Security Aides. All were given a general orientation course concerning what would be expected of them during their employment; the importance of promptness, neatness and obedience were stressed. The Recreation Aides received another week of training consisting mainly of instruction in the rules of various games. After this training, the Recreation Aides were given the responsibility of supervising the play activities of younger children at the Recreation Center. Although the youths assigned to this position were responsible to two supervisors, they soon found the temptation to engage in games themselves, rather than supervise them, too strong to resist. As a result, further training sessions were provided to stress the importance of involving the younger children in the recreation activities. These sessions improved the work habits of the youths to some extent but the tendency to slip from work to play remained a problem.

The youths assigned as Police Security Aides (PSA) found themselves in a difficult position. Their responsibilities were to include assisting in the formation of Block Watch organizations, implementing Operation I.D. programs, patrolling off-street parking lots to indicate unauthorized vehicles which should be towed and assisting the police on the evenings when events were held at the adjacent coliseum. As discussed earlier, the organizing of Block Watch groups was delayed by several obstacles. Since the Operation I.D. program was closely linked with this activity, the PSAs did not become actively involved in either of these efforts for the first few months of their employment. Neither could they patrol off-street parking areas, since no lot was available to which illegally parked cars could be towed. Furthermore, the police decided it was advisable to have youths working in the potentially volatile circumstances which exist during crowded coliseum events. As a result of all this, the PSAs were assigned to rake and clean up yards for the initial months of the program.

Efforts by the Assistant Director to develop job opportunities in the public sector were unsuccessful. Depressed business and economic conditions combined to create high unemployment and an almost nonexistent job market. As of November 1981, only two of the youths who had completed their term of employment with the program had managed to find work. No impressive strides were made in securing meaningful employment for young tenants of Pine Chapel beyond the short-term opportunities provided by DOL funds because jobs in the private sector were simply not available.

E. More and Improved Services to Combat Crime or Assist Victim/Witness

Hampton proposed programs of varying scope and intensity to improve services to combat crime or assist victims/witnesses. To increase sensitivity to resident needs, the HRHA staff would be trained in crisis intervention and human relations behavior. In keeping with the HA's concern that tenants be given a voice in activities directly affecting their lives, tenant input was sought--and heeded. This solicitation resulted in the inclusion into the program of three tenant requested services: (1) programs for the prevention and treatment of alcohol and drug abuse, (2) a crisis intervention program, and (3) an arbitration center.

Building on the tenants' request, Hampton proposed to increase the use of existing community services, primarily through referrals. Specifically targeted were mental health, substance abuse, juvenile probation services, and employment education. Extending their commitment to increase the use of existing community services and to reduce unemployment and underemployment among residents, the HRHA committed itself to an effort to insure that residents would benefit fully from local, state, and federal employment programs. This service was designed as complimentary and additional to those provided by the Manpower Officer. Concerned with the large number of unemployable youth residing in the project, the HRHA proposed to initiate youth tutoring programs in order to improve reading and math skills essential for their entrance into mainstream employment.

Eighty-two percent of the families in Pine Chapel Village at the time of the UIACP were single parent, female headed households receiving AFDC or minimal incomes, families for whom child care and youth supervision was generally unaffordable. With that in mind, supporting child care and youth recreation facilities were also proposed.

The HRHS also proposed to apply to then-HEW for ESSA funds to finance the youth tutoring program. Funds were not secured during the UIACP but the tutoring service began in February 1981 under different auspices as an outgrowth of this proposal.

Tenant meetings initiated by the HRHA's Counseling Supervisor elicited primary concerns to which the HA responded, producing three of the proposed programs--dealing with substance abuse, crisis intervention, and conflict resolution. In spite of this demonstrated concern by the HRHA for the needs and wishes of project residents, a HUD review of the proposal recommended that additional changes include a "stronger, more active (tenant) role." This suggestion appears to have been made without regard to the actual proposal. Additionally, HUD's recommendation to bring in more professionals (in the area of youth, drug/alcohol, elderly and crisis intervention) to work from PHA supplied project facilities appears to have been made, not only with disregard for the actual proposal, but also for the capacity of the relatively small housing authority to provide such services and the size of the project itself. The HRHA had proposed to seek ADAMHA funds for a substance abuse program (including the increased use of existing services) to address what was commonly acknowledged as the principle social problem within the project--drug and alcohol abuse. "Where applicable and feasible," they proposed to house professionals on-site at the recently renovated project offices.

In response to HUD's recommendation, the HA reiterated its plans to provide substance abuse programs for both adult and youth. They added a Victim/Witness program that would include a needs assessment of victims and the provision of

services such as transportation, home care, medical aide, replacement of lost documents, food and clothing, temporary shelter, and legal aid should they be needed--and included again, crisis intervention counseling. A formal follow-up procedure would attend to any further problems resulting from the crime and assure that services for which referrals were made had been received. Additionally, weekly group sessions for women and rap sessions for youth were proposed. The authority planned to target LEAA funds for this program.

The HRHA responded that they were exploring a cooperative substance abuse and crisis intervention program with representatives from the Chapter 10 Board (Hampton-Newport News Community services Boards--CSB). As the agency responsible for area wide substance abuse and mental health programs, the CSB was in a position to facilitate Pine Chapel residents' access to the existing network of services.

Responding to an approach by the HA in September 1979, the CSB drafted an application for ADAMHA funds. Primarily authored by two CSB officials, the resulting proposal was presented as a joint effort by the housing authority and CSB. The CSB would contractually assume responsibility for all facets of the program.

In addressing the pertinent issues of substance abuse, crisis intervention, conflict management, and delinquency prevention, the proposal outlined a tightly woven package of cooperation between CSB on-site and service staff, existing local service agencies, HRHA staff, and tenants. Contrary to HUD's recommendation, CSB officials took the position that specialized services and assignment of professionals to Pine Chapel was not feasible. They proposed instead an education and intervention approach which would provide expanded services on-site, and "afford smooth access of Pine Chapel residents to (the existing service system." If successful, it would serve as a model for other neighborhood-based approaches.

Primary to the success of the Education and Intervention Project was the establishment of two on-site positions, that of Family Services Supervisor (FSS) and Peer Facilitator/Pursuit Coordinator (PFPC). Office schedules for the FSS and PFPC were arranged to facilitate maximum access by residents--noon to 9:00 p.m. daily, including weekends.

The first revision of Hampton's AC proposal, including both the Victim/Witness program and CSB human services proposal, was submitted in February 1980. Still not satisfied, HUD asked Hampton to "describe how the victim/witness program can be used as a means of crime prevention--e.g., by creating more cohesion among tenants." Hampton responded by stating that the victim/witness program would increase "social interaction among residents, which should result in creating more cohesion among them" which in turn would result in a "unified anti-crime effort among all residents." HUD was now satisfied. Interestingly, the Victim/Witness program was not funded by LEAA, reportedly because services proposed under that program duplicated services outlined in the separate request for ADAMHA funds. The CSB proposal was approved as submitted.

During the months of September and October 1980, the FSS informally canvassed residents of Pine Chapel to determine their preferences for education and training programs. Solicitation was not without its own bias--the problems of alcohol abuse. The FSS invited a counselor from Peninsula Alcoholism Services to give lectures to Pine Chapel management and social services staff, as well as residents, on alcoholism and various options for treatment. Not surprisingly, a consensus developed on the need for an alcoholism program. Two resident leaders assisted with development of a support group which began meeting in April 1981. The FSS's operating philosophy, exemplified in the alcoholism program, was to identify natural resident leaders and to develop their organizational and group counseling skills. The alcoholism support group

met, and continues to meet, weekly; when professional direction is not available a member fills the role of group leader.

In the area of mental health, the FSS worked to identify residents' needs and then either made referrals to outside agencies, made the assistance of professional counselors from area agencies available on-site, or personally organized education and training sessions. Individual tenant participation required involvement beyond that of service recipient to one of facilitator and co-partner in the development and maintenance of programs. Ideally, residents would learn to take responsibility for program activities, perpetuating the programs beyond the expiration of the AC Program.

Education activities sponsored by the FSS included the lecture series on alcoholism, a parenting seminar, an African American cultural heritage festival, a consumer/tenants' rights lecture, a parental workshop on nutrition, and women's seminar. Training for HRHA staff was also furnished by the FSS in conjunction with personnel from local service agencies. Training sessions held in late 1980 and the first half of 1981 included interviewing techniques, case reporting, crisis intervention counseling and referral, interpersonal communications, leadership, and problem identification and referral, in addition to other relevant topics.

Funding for the CSB Education and Intervention Project expired on December 31, 1981. The CSB authorized \$2,000 for a one-month extension while it sought additional funds. A mild furor arose and vehement articles in support of this popular Pine Chapel program appeared in the local press. All to no avail; further funding sources were not obtained and the program terminated.

As of March 1982, the HRHA was still assisting residents to realize two projects: an attempt was being made to procure the support of local churches to develop a network of shelters for battered women, and residents were seeking Title XX funding to open a day-care center at the project.

F. Increased Use of Better Trained City Police Officers

The HRHA originally proposed to enhance police service through a contractual agreement with the Hampton Police Department which would increase the frequency of daytime patrols and provide two police officers to patrol the project on nights and weekends. Increased patrolling would complement the police department's on-going Youth Housing Program which sponsored educational, recreational and cultural activities designed to reduce juvenile delinquency in Pine Chapel. Encouraged by HUD to do so, the HRHA proposed in the first revision to establish a "mini-precinct" for officers working in the housing project and nearby neighborhoods.

The police departments administration, community relations officers and patrol officers contributed to the program from inception through completion. Some police influence was perceived on most program activities: the management position of Project Safety Specialist was reserved for a police officer; the police were consulted regarding appropriate Modernization hardware choices; the Hampton Police Department played a critical role in organizing block watches; the DOL youth security aides who conducted Operation ID and other anti-crime activities were assigned to police supervision; police department representatives assisted the housing authority to undertake the vulnerability analysis; and police officials served in an advisory capacity on the Anti-Crime Oversight Team.

The police department/HRHA program was designed to address the tenants' fear of crime and to improve the interaction between law-abiding project residents vulnerable to crime and police officers sensitized to those residents' needs.

Daytime patrols were increased by a directive from the Chief of Police instructing all officers for District 103 that they were to pass routinely through Pine Chapel when going on and off duty. A more systematically executed effort to curb public disorder was made through the sporadic establishment of road blocks in Pine Chapel. Set up twice per month for six months then one per month, the road blocks were designed to stem the flow of stolen merchandise into the project, detect wanted felons, and curb vehicular violations.

It was proposed, again at HUD's request, that police officers assigned to the project be trained in family crisis-intervention techniques and human services. No distinct UIACP-funded training was provided in these areas since, according to a representative of the Hampton Police Department, local police officers already receive such training as part of the standard police academy curriculum. The Public Safety Coordinator, Project Safety Specialist, Recreation Supervisor, an officer of the Hampton Police Department, and three residents did, however, attend a crime-prevention seminar at Southwest Texas University.

The project-based mini-precinct was never established because of prohibitive costs, instead, one apartment in Pine Chapel was set aside for the use of officers patrolling the project. The police did not make use of that unit, however, because it was not furnished with a telephone, preferring instead to use the nearby Resource Center because of the availability of a telephone there.

The position of Project Safety Specialist was assumed by a detective from the Hampton Police Department. One administrative officer served on the AC Oversight Team while another officer accompanied him to meetings. The DOL-funded youth security aides who conducted Operation ID and reported abandoned automobiles were supervised by the Project Safety Specialist. As previously stated, Modernization funds were allocated for purchase of a police patrol car.



The Anti-Crime Program was conceived as a crime-prevention program in which city police officers would play a critical role in focusing residents' attention on crime-control and self-defense measures which would extend beyond the AC program.

The TPP-funded Police Community Relations Program conducted at Lincoln Park from September 1975 through August 1977 served as a prototype for the Hampton UIACP. The Lincoln Park final report indicated that the program had been responsible for reducing crime by twenty-seven percent and fostering positive relations between thirty to fifty percent of project residents and the police. Most strikingly, a high burglary rate of eight incidents per month plummeted to .5 incidents per month. Some crime-control strategies which had proved successful at Lincoln Park were incorporated into the proposal for Pine Chapel.

The contract between HRHA and the Hampton Police Department executed on August 31, 1980, purchased increased patrol services for one year. The first team was assigned in September 1980, patrolling four days per week, in ten hour shifts, from 4:00 p.m. until 2:00 a.m. Originally proposed as a CDBG expenditure, the \$30,000 cost of this activity was actually assumed by the HRHA as in-kind funding. This change was necessitated by Hampton's receipt of a CDBG Technical Assistance award in lieu of an Innovative Grant. A police car was purchased with Modernization funds and leased to the police department for the sum of \$1.00 per year. Police teams continued to patrol Pine Chapel beyond the expiration of the contract on August 31, 1981. Ongoing and concurrent with the AC program was the Youth Housing Program. Funded by an LEAA grant to the Hampton Police Department and directed by the UIACP's Project Safety Specialist, that program was designed to expose young residents to cultural opportunities and to partially subsidize field trips in an effort to discourage delinquent conduct by youths.

One final AC program activity in which the police department was involved was the Block Watch Program. The Planning and Analysis Division of the Hampton Police Department reports that a portion of Pine Chapel had been organized as a Neighborhood Watch site prior to the start of the UIACP but that residents were skeptical of that project. Subsequently, a joint effort to fully organize the housing project was made by Urban Initiative outreach workers and by police officers. A number of Block Watches were successfully created in June 1981, attaining seventy-five percent resident participation.

G. Stronger Linkages with Programs from Local Government and Other Sources

Hampton's proposal to increase linkages with other community agencies centered on two existing programs and two proposed programs whose creation was primarily out of the hands of the HRHA. The two existing programs, the Police Department's Youth Housing Program discussed previously and the Hampton Recreation Department's on-site recreation program would continue.

The ongoing Hampton Recreation Department's program at Pine Chapel was successfully integrated with the DOL/YCCIP program. Hampton is proud of its well-developed city recreation program consisting of a centralized facility complemented by outreach programs at satellite facilities. Pine Chapel's outreach program was headed by a Recreation Manager who was a full-time employee. Assisted by a Recreation Specialist, the Recreation Manager promoted age-segregated use of equipment through daily scheduling, coordinated excursions, led a Boy Scout troop, instructed youths in money management, and counseled youths on alcohol and drug abuse. He continued to work full-time throughout the UIACP, providing training in program planning and counseling to the DOL Recreation Supervisors, and working with the DOL youth recreation aides.

The HRHA proposal included creation of a "Community Alliance composed of city agencies, representatives of surrounding businesses, tenants, and PHA staff to plan, coordinate, and implement programs and strategies that will enhance anti-crime activities;" a Restitution Program in cooperation with the Juvenile Probation Department and Court Services; and nonspecific references to increased targeting of state agencies.

HUD, finding the language noncommittal, called the section "inadequate" and requested a more specific proposal. Responding that details of the Restitution Program had not been finalized, although several discussions had been held, and formation of the Community Alliance program was still tentative, the HRHA provided little further information other than to reiterate what had previously been stated. The HRHA saw the Community Alliance as the vehicle through which comprehensive community planning of anti-crime programs would reduce criminal opportunity and, therefore, crime.

HUD considered the revisions, and the section, still inadequate and pressed for specific commitments. The HRHA responded in generally the same manner, again stating that although cooperation of other agencies had been pledged no plans had yet been finalized. Since all semi-finalists were also to become finalists, the issue of specific commitments in this area was never resolved and this portion of the Hampton proposal was accepted without further alteration.

The HRHA had hoped to initiate the Community Alliance in cooperation with the Mayor's office. Whether that cooperation was extended is unknown. What efforts the HRHA made toward gathering community commitments is also unknown. The Oversight Team meeting minutes of March 27th, May 22nd and 25th, and September 1980 briefly mention the Community Alliance but no formal action resulted and there is no evidence of further action. The Community Alliance did not materialize during the UIACP.

Additionally, the HRHA proposed to initiate a Restitution Program in conjunction with the Court Services and Juvenile Probation Department. Youths who committed minor offenses would, under supervision, perform community service work mostly in the form of repairing damage done to victims' property. LEAA money sought for this program was denied, it therefore, did not materialize under the auspices of the UIACP.

#### IV. PROGRAM IMPACT

##### A. Resident Survey Analysis

After examining available data and consulting with HRHA staff, it was concluded that no other housing project in Hampton was sufficiently similar to the demonstration site in terms of physical structure, population characteristics and the nature of the crime problem to justify selection as a comparison site. Interviews were conducted, however, in the surrounding neighborhood. At the time the interviews were conducted, between May 22 and July 24, 1981, the AC offices were well established in the Resource Center and renovation of the community center was underway. The ACC had served for 18 months, the FSS and PFPC for 9 months. Stronger tenant selection procedures initiated by the Project Manager had resulted in a one third reduction of the high pre-UIACP monthly vacancy rate. The Block Watch program was at its peak organizational level during this time, although the one year contract with the Hampton Police Department, which began in September 1980 was nearing completion. DOL/YCCIP activities were also reaching conclusion. Twelve full time and 11 part time youth had been appointed in December 1980; program completion was scheduled for December 1981. Because most program activity was nearing completion, other than some modernization efforts, at the time of the wave one survey, it was the general consensus of HUD and evaluation staff members that no additional information would be gained to justify the expense of an additional Wave 2 survey, therefore none was conducted.

## 1. Program Awareness

Information obtained from Pine Chapel residents shows a consistently high level of awareness of UIACP activities--between 72 percent and 88 percent for all program components. The HRHA, through the individual efforts of the PSC, FSS, and PFPC, as well as HA and CSB staff, successfully completed the first step of program implementation--tenant awareness; a reflection on the HA's commitment to informed tenant participation.

Although Pine Chapel did not have an Anti-Crime Victim/Witness program, 10 percent of the residents acknowledged awareness of one. In addition, 6 percent stated they participated in such a program. This can be accounted for by considering the extensive referral system developed under the auspices of the CSB Education and Intervention program. Increased use of city wide services, and an increase in the number of requests by tenants for such services, was a goal of the CSB program, inclusive of victim/witness assistance. Although there was no program labeled as such, the distinction was not relevant to whether services were provided--and a distinction tenants would not have perceived.

## 2. Program Participation

Twenty-nine percent of the households at Pine Chapel indicate having a member who participated in crime prevention meetings. As reported in the HRHA proposal, the Tenant Council had been "relatively inactive" for the three years of its existence, especially the year and a half prior to the UIACP. This figure then also represents an almost equal increase in tenant participation.

Although the scope of the youth employment program limited participation and, therefore, not all who wished to become involved were able to do so, 25 percent of the households reported having a member who had participated in the youth employment program.

The greatest participation levels were reported for Neighborhood Watch and the affiliated property engraving program. Organization for Neighborhood Watch, although previously experiencing some start and stop activity, was in full swing at the time the survey was conducted. Forty-eight percent of the households reported participating in having property engraved, 52 percent reported participating in an apartment watch and 43 percent reported participation in Neighborhood Watch.

A very small number of tenants, 6 percent, reported participating in the alcohol/drug abuse program. Those who did participate, however, generated an ongoing group of committed members who now jointly participate in other social activities in addition to providing strong peer support for alcohol related problems.

### 3. Fear and Victimization

Residents rated drug involvement (using and selling) and burglary as the greatest crime related problems in Pine Chapel. Teenage related problems, those of teenagers hanging around, vandalism, and insulting verbal behavior were also perceived as problems. Eighty percent of the residents indicated uneasiness when hearing footsteps behind them; 48 percent felt uneasy when hearing an unexpected knock on the door. Although residents were somewhat concerned that they would be harmed or the victim of a theft or burglary, they did not think crime in their project was a big problem. The level of fear in the project was, for the most part, consistent with the level of fear in the surrounding community.

Twenty-one percent of the Pine Chapel residents reported being victimized by burglary while only 11.1 percent of residents in the surrounding neighborhood reported being so victimized. Victimization figures for both property theft and vandalism were also higher in Pine Chapel than in the surrounding neighborhood: property theft (24.2 percent) and vandalism (10.6 percent) in Pine Chapel compared to the corresponding neighborhood figures of 18.3 percent and 6.6 percent respectively. No figures were available for robbery although 2.9 percent of the residents reported being a victim of a violent crime compared with 1.1 percent in the surrounding neighborhood. Predatory crimes, on the other hand, were lower in the project (1.3 percent) than in the neighborhood (2.6 percent).

#### 4. Perceived Change

Residents' feelings about Pine Chapel seem to be ambivalent. They did not believe that it had become either a better or worse place to live since inception of the UIACP, yet, they believed crime had become less of a problem within the year preceding the survey. Forty-three percent of the residents felt Pine Chapel was a real home and only 38 percent felt residents helped each other. For the work they did, both the Project Manager and maintenance personnel received positive evaluations by the tenants. In addition tenants felt they had some say in the HA decisions that affected Pine Chapel and were generous with their approval of the job the police were doing and the kind of treatment received from them. On the other hand, when asked if they would recommend Pine Chapel to their friends, residents were reluctant to do so, reflecting that they would only "maybe" recommend it. These figures reflect that satisfaction with various components does not necessarily translate to satisfaction with the whole, in spite of what could be considered a reasonably successful anti-crime program.

B. Recorded Crime Analysis

The Hampton Police Department was unable to provide crime figures for Pine Chapel independent of those for the city.

V. SUMMARY

The previous TPP-funded program at Lincoln Park gave the HRHA a prototype from which to build the Pine Chapel UIACP. The proposal, and the eventual program itself, reflect a well crafted combination of existing successful programs with new and untested innovations, a combination which eventually resulted in a program that came close to actualizing HUD's RFP.

From the beginning the HRHA showed a commitment to success. The Anti-Crime Coordinator was appointed well before any federal funds were received. The HRHA proceeded at its own pace, which was considerably faster than that of the federal government. Although the delay of federal funds must certainly be considered a hindrance to program implementation, the HA did not allow it to become an excuse for inactivity. The HRHA invested its own money where needed, and when needed, was willing to shift funding sources in order to keep the program moving.

From the start, tenants were informed and their involvement solicited. Tenant concerns were reflected in the proposal and continued to help mold program activities throughout the duration of the UIACP. Constructive use of the informal channels of communication available in the project as well as the



more formal Resident Association meetings, Pine Chapel Newsletter, and personal contact of Outreach Workers kept tenants informed and provided continual feedback to HRHA staff.

Expressing the philosophy that "success" of the UIACP must include sustained activity after cessation of the program, HRHA staff encouraged and developed tenant initiatives. Such sustained participation is evident in the Resident Association and ADAMHA-funded CSB activities, particularly in the Alcohol Support Group. Energetic and well organized tenant leaders have emerged from these activities. In addition to promoting Block Watch organization and substance abuse education, they are also working to develop a network of shelters for battered women and to procure Title XX funds for day-care facilities.

An important element of the Hampton UIACP was the strong network of cooperation between various community agencies which existed prior to inception of the program. Equally important was the commitment of individual members of the UIACP staff who directed energies toward program goals.

That prior linkages, coupled with staff commitment, were able to produce a relatively successful program must be viewed in the context of the crime problem in Pine Chapel and the Pine Chapel neighborhood. Crime, and the control of crime, was well within manageable proportions, as was the physical size of Pine Chapel and its corresponding population density. It is then disappointing that

Given such positive elements tenants reflect such ambivalence toward the quality of life in Pine Chapel. Although the tenant survey reflects a generally positive attitude by tenants toward project management and maintenance, delivery of police services and an overall belief that crime in the project has been reduced, tenants still do not consider Pine Chapel a better place to live. It is evident that crime reduction and tenant safety in Pine Chapel, although important, are not the only factors which determine tenant satisfaction. But, crime reduction not tenants satisfaction, was the primary goal of the UIACP. The HRHA Pine Chapel effort, then, must be viewed as fulfilling most of the proposed anti-crime objectives.