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ABSTRACT

Through in-depth analysis of two specific case studies, I have explored how two resident associations participating in the Demonstration Disposition program, a Federal initiative designed to rehabilitate HUD-owned properties, have successfully engaged in both housing and community development activities.

The thesis includes: review of the literature; history of the Demonstration Disposition program; case studies of the Camfield Gardens Tenants' Association and the Franklin Park Developments' Tenant Association; analysis of how these two resident associations have successfully combined the roles of housing and community development; and some concluding observations.
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CHAPTER I: INTRODUCTION

I first became familiar with the Demonstration Disposition program, a Federal initiative to rehabilitate and dispose of HUD-owned properties, in the Fall of 1993. The Deputy Director of the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency (MHFA), Eleanor G. White, was invited to my Housing and Community Economic Development class to speak about the program and how she envisioned MHFA would participate in it. White discussed how residents would be involved in the process from beginning to end and how MHFA's "beyond bricks and mortar" approach would empower residents. I, as were many of my classmates, was impressed with her presentation.

In January 1994 I submitted my resume to the MHFA and in a letter expressed my desire to work on the Demonstration program. White immediately contacted me for an interview at which time we discussed the capacity in which I wanted to be involved in the program. Recognizing my desire to work with residents, White put me in touch with Leslie Giddings, an Officer in the Asset Management department. Giddings directs the Management team that provides oversight and monitoring of the Demonstration properties. Giddings' team is in regular contact with both resident representatives and management agents.

Since May of 1994, I have worked as an Intern with this team. This thesis will examine the housing and community
development process and determine the factors that enable residents to engage in both activities. The findings and conclusions in this thesis, are drawn primarily from my experiences working with this team, conducting over thirty interviews, and the examination of internal MHFA correspondence. Chapter II describes the debate concerning resident engagement in housing and community development activities. In addition, a review of the literature in this genre is presented in this chapter. Chapter III provides an overview of the history of the Demonstration program and MHFA's role in its implementation, and a description of how the program has been administered in Massachusetts.

Chapters IV and V are case studies of two of the resident associations, Camfield Gardens and Franklin Park, that are participants in the program. These cases serve as examples of how residents at different housing developments came to form resident associations that successfully engaged in housing and community development efforts. Furthermore, the cases illustrate the synergistic relationship that exists between these activities. Chapter VI analyzes how housing policy advocates should proceed in attempting to emulate the success achieved by the Camfield Gardens and Franklin Park resident associations.
CHAPTER II: THE DEBATE

...It is not possible to do housing development and community organization at the same time. In fact, we don't know any place where they have gone on side by side.¹

In the 1970s it was argued that housing development overshadows and subdues community development efforts in projects where they are attempted simultaneously. Proponents of this school of thought offered two major reasons as to why combining the roles of housing development and community development could not work.² First, the two activities have different objectives. Housing development involves the construction or rehabilitation of housing and the ability to implement complex real estate and business transactions.


²Community development refers to the deliberate attempt by community people to work together to guide the future of their community, and the development of a corresponding set of techniques for assisting community people in such a process. Community organizing refers to the mobilization of community people to address community issues. Hence, the terms community organizing and community development can be used interchangeable. Housing development is being used exclusively in reference to initiatives in government-assisted and/or low-income housing.
Moreover, the main objective of housing development is product oriented, whereas the goal of community development is for people to build by and for themselves a process and organization through which they can collectively solve problems for their community.³

Second, the conflict between empowerment, which community development elicits, and product generation, which housing development demands, is further exaggerated by the fact that these two activities have different definitions of what constitutes success. In evaluating success in housing development one must look at factors such as the number of units brought on-line, the per-unit cost, and the number of people being served by the project. In community development, success is measured by such factors as sustained resident leadership, broad community participation in the decision-making process, and the development of skills and expertise of people in the community.

The fact that these activities have differing goals and measures of success logically tells one to separate these functions. The separation of these functions allows each group to focus on what it does best -- the development entity performs the housing finance, loan packaging, rehabilitation and management tasks, while the resident group addresses

community quality of life issues.

Antithetically, housing advocates maintained that housing development was the vehicle by which local community development efforts could be fostered. The provision of housing alone, it is argued, may alleviate one immediate problem of a fixed number of families, but it fails to revitalize an entire community. In this view, the true benefit in housing improvement is its ability to serve as a tool from which community organizing can develop. When low-income individuals organize around housing issues, they are engaging in development activities and enhancing their development capabilities and resources. These skills can then be used in efforts to advance other aspects of their existence, leading to improvement in their way of life as a whole. Therefore, communities who engage in housing development should be obtaining the capacity to organize around other pressing issues that will facilitate advancement on a larger scale.

This debate has deep historic roots in the history of community development and in its literature. In 1973, Urban Planning Aid (UPA) produced a pamphlet that articulated its concern for the impact of housing production on community development activities. The experiences of the South End Tenants Council (SETC), one of the strongest and most vital

housing development organizations in Boston in the 1970s, were discussed as evidence of how the exigency of housing development undermines community development efforts. In attempting to do both, UPA claimed, SETC organizers were torn in different directions. Community development activities required organizers to spend a great deal of time educating and informing people about what was happening in their community and what their options for action were. Conversely, negotiating a housing rehabilitation package required financial skills, the task of overseeing the rehabilitation of the property from the planning to the construction stage, and knowledge of the various ownership models. The following quotation illustrates the conflict: "Even though SETC attempted to do both kinds of work, the demands made by the [housing] development process became the most important priority." Ultimately, SETC found that it could no longer engage in intensive community development activities, and in UPA's view the "trap" of housing development was to blame.

UPA then tendered the experiences of the Roxse Homes Tenant Council to further substantiate its argument. In 1970 the Roxse Tenant Council agreed to work with a non-profit developer, the Development Corporation of America (DCA), on the rehabilitation of the Roxse Homes multi-family housing

---

development. Once the rehabilitation was under way, DCA realized that the available funding package was inadequate. DCA's response to this issue was to lessen the quality of materials used. However, these cutbacks required approval from residents. For example, this project required that requests for modifications in the original construction plan (called change orders) be approved by the Roxse board. The board, which lacked the technical expertise to address construction issues, had no way of independently determining whether the changes would substantially affect the quality of their housing. Concerned that the project would not be completed if they withheld their approval, the board approved every change order request. Less than one year after the rehabilitation the residents began to experience severe problems; including everything from inoperable plumbing and backed-up sewage to inadequate electric current. UPA used Roxse Homes' experiences to exemplify what they saw as the inevitably ruinous outcomes residents face when they become involved in the housing process. At the same time, UPA implicitly recognized the need for technical assistance for resident associations.

While this debate raged, a dominant paradigm had taken hold in the community development realm, the technical

---

production paradigm. This paradigm was influential in three aspects: 1) shaping public policy, 2) determining the allocation of resources in the field, and 3) establishing the principal model of local activity in major cities across the nation. Bill Traynor, former Director of Community Development for the Community Training and Assistance Center (CTAC), described the technical production paradigm as a model that replicates the paternalistic service delivery-client relationship that is all too familiar to poor inner-city residents. In this model, project strategies are specified by project funders and lenders and not by community residents. This is a paradigm which:

- views residents as passive recipients of products and services financed by those engaged in charitable work and/or philanthropic or enlightened private and public agencies and delivered by "professional deal makers";
- measures success only by the number and cost of units produced; and
- perceives project selection and implementation as an issue of feasibility and opportunity, as opposed to the project's need or importance to the community.

Thus, in this model, projects were selected and implemented because they conformed to a narrow housing development formula. The question of what could be done superseded and
preceded the question of what should be done.\textsuperscript{7}

More than bricks and mortar must go into a renovation effort to ensure its success and community building has got to be a participatory, from-the-ground-up activity.\textsuperscript{8}

Mary Padula  
Cabinet Secretary, EOCD

By 1988, Jeff Nugent, former Director of National Internship, entered the debate. In an article published in \textit{Neighborhood Funding}, Nugent maintained that the era of debating the merits of different approaches designed to better the lives of the poor, specifically, "Organizing versus [housing] development, which is more effective?" had ended. This polemic has often been reduced to the simplistic level of claiming that organizing leads to empowerment while housing development leads to production.\textsuperscript{9} "In reality, however, housing development often produces leadership and organizing also produces tangible results."\textsuperscript{10} More directly, Nugent felt housing development and community organizing were not inherently in conflict. Consequently, to achieve the goal of improving the lives of people in low-income communities, it

\textsuperscript{7}Traynor, Bill, "Community Development or Community Organizing", \textit{Shelterforce}, March/April 1993, p.6.

\textsuperscript{8}"Massachusetts to be Selected for National Housing Demonstration Program Which will Spur $100 million Investment in Inner-City Neighborhoods", \textit{Dorchester Argus-Citizen}, Dorchester, MA, September 23, 1993.

\textsuperscript{9}Nugent, Jeff, "Is the Question Really Organizing vs Development", \textit{Neighborhood Funding}, 1988.

\textsuperscript{10}Ibid.
was imperative to get the two to act in concert.

From this debate emerged a new synthesis: community participation as a basic ingredient for successful housing development. In the April 1993 issue of Shelterforce, Traynor presented a model that views community participation as key to successful housing efforts.¹¹ This new model responded to the needs of the community and applied the technical expertise that is imperative to housing development, but at the same time emphasized a much more progressive view of the role of residents in selecting and implementing change. In this paradigm, professionals no longer view residents as clients, who are dependents simply utilizing the services of a social service agency, but as consumers of the professionals' output. Furthermore, the community residents are looked upon as potential leaders in the developmental process of their own neighborhoods.

In the empowerment/consumer planning paradigm, the comprehensive neighborhood agenda is created as a result of a resident-driven process. This agenda is then advocated by a broad-based community group. In this new model, residents:

- participate in training programs and workshops that enable them to identify the needs of and strategize for addressing the issues of their community;
- utilize professionals and professional organizations when

technical expertise is needed, i.e., hiring architects, organizers, accountants, lawyers, planners, and financial consultants;

- advocate for the resources required to support an active and effective community organization; and

- exercise their unified political power to remove the barriers that prevent them from achieving their collective vision.

Traynor maintained that there were key steps that needed to be taken in order to bring his empowerment/consumer planning paradigm into the mainstream of the community development movement and for the paradigm to be effective. Funders and supporters of inner-city revitalization efforts need to provide adequate, minimally restrictive funding and technical assistance to neighborhood residents. Multi-year funding is imperative because it fosters the creation of stable resident organizations. Resident leaders must receive relevant and valuable technical assistance and training to provide the tools necessary to lead the new efforts in their communities. The emphasis must be put on the importance of community education, leadership, and support, and the building of sustainable local organizations.

Peter Dreier, Professor of Politics at Occidental College in Los Angeles, supported Traynor's charge that the time had come for an empowerment/consumer planning paradigm, but he augmented the model by examining factors that hinder community
organizations engaging in development activities. In his essay *Community Empowerment Strategies: The Experience of Community Based Problem-Solving In America's Urban Neighborhoods*, Dreier identified what he believed to be the factors that hinder community organizations, as well as the factors required for successful community organizing efforts. He stressed that, "Although there are important exceptions, most of these local community organizations have very limited success." The three major reasons for this weakness are: 1) not many community organizations have access to ongoing training in leadership development and capacity building; 2) few community organizations have adequate or stable funding to sustain an effective organization, i.e., for staff, office equipment, expertise, and other essentials; and 3) although community problem-solving requires local groups to form alliances with their counterparts in other neighborhoods, cities, and regions of the country, few community organizations have ties to outside allies and resources.

Further building on Traynor's paradigm, Dreier provided the following list of factors required for successful community organizing:

- strong, skilled, indigenous leadership;
- a stable organization in terms of membership and funding;

---

a clear sense of mission, which includes having a long-term stake in the community; and
an overall strategy that allows building on victories as well as defeats.\textsuperscript{13}

Dreier warned that some community organizations combine community development with housing development, but the root of the new community empowerment lies in grassroots organizing. That is not to say that if a community organization begins with grassroots organizing and from there goes on to do housing development, that these components are without their tensions. In addition, Pablo Eisenberg, former President of the Center for Community Change in Washington, D.C., responded to the issue as follows:

Enough experience has now accumulated to belie the most dire predictions of the community organizers and activists who felt that development would inevitably divert citizen organizations from their main function....But there is also evidence to show that moving from organizing into development is neither without pitfalls and dangers, nor a simple process.\textsuperscript{14}

This leads to the new question: if community development is a requirement for housing development, what components are necessary for making these efforts work synergistically? There has been relatively little analysis of the factors that


account for making these activities work in a manner in which they reinforce each other. The empirical answer to this question became the subject of this thesis and is explored in the following chapters.
CHAPTER III: THE DEMONSTRATION DISPOSITION PROGRAM

I will present two examples that demonstrate that when residents become involved with the technical aspects of housing rehabilitation it is possible to incorporate community development activities into their agenda. The cases involve two resident associations that are participants in the Massachusetts Demonstration Disposition program (hereinafter the Demonstration program), a Federal program designed to empower low- and moderate-income families residing in multifamily United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) foreclosed properties by preparing residents for cooperative ownership and/or participation in management.15

The Demonstration program is the result of years of struggle. The beginning of this chapter summarizes this struggle and documents the history of the program. This history is followed by a discussion of the Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency's (MHFA's) role in this process as well as the procedure employed by the MHFA to ensure that it would

---

15The United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) is the principal Federal agency responsible for Federal housing programs, enforcing fair housing, and improving and developing communities across the Nation. HUD was established in 1965 by the Housing and Urban Development Act. Since its creation, nearly 12.5 million households have lived in privately owned, Federally assisted multi-family rental housing developments. (HUD, 1995)
become a participant in the Federal program. Finally, a profile of the Massachusetts Demonstration program is given.

The Demonstration Program

In the mid-1980s HUD had a growing number of troubled properties in its portfolio. Consequently, in 1987, Congress directed HUD to dispose of the overwhelming number of units from HUD's subsidized, privately owned, multi-family inventory. The outcome of this legislation was the Demonstration Disposition program, which permitted HUD and state housing finance agencies (SHFAs) to enter into a cooperative agreement regarding the sale of HUD-owned multi-family properties. It was Congress' hope that the Demonstration would uncover innovative and cost-effective strategies for financing, selling, and managing the growing inventory of HUD-owned properties. In addition, Congress sought to determine whether HUD should use SHFAs in its multi-family property disposition program on a permanent basis.

16 The Massachusetts Housing Finance Agency (MHFA) is a HUD-approved lender which currently monitors approximately 50,000 units of housing in over 439 projects in its permanent loan portfolio. As of June 30, 1994, the Agency had provided $4.75 billion cumulatively to finance the development and preservation of approximately 70,000 apartments and provided homeownership and home improvement opportunities to 30,000 Massachusetts households. In 1994, the Agency marked its 25th anniversary by expanding its mission to address quality of life issues for residents of its properties, particularly in the inner-city. (MHFA, 1994)
In the early 1980s the Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership (MBHP) directed the MHFA-financed renovation of 1,200 units of HUD-foreclosed housing in Boston known as the Granite Properties. The Demonstration Disposition program was modeled on the rehabilitation of the Granites because it served as an example of an SHFA successfully rehabilitating and disposing of HUD-foreclosed housing. The key elements of the Granite revitalization were the $80 million rehabilitation package and the successful transfer of ownership from HUD to community development corporations (CDCs) in Roxbury.

Resident participation was crucial to the continuing success of the Granite properties. In 1986, at the urging of Granite property tenants who despaired of drug-driven crime and violence in their neighborhood, the MHFA established the Boston Inner City Task Force (ICTF) to provide a vehicle for tenants, owners, managers, and various state and local public agencies to address these urban issues. Subsequently, in

---

17Boston Housing Partnership (BHP) the former name of the Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership (MBHP), was convened in the Spring of 1983 by government, business, and community leaders seeking a new way to create much-needed affordable housing in Boston's neighborhoods. Acknowledging the essential role played by residents in endeavors to revitalize buildings and neighborhoods, the Partnership sponsored a resident organizing initiative to help develop effective resident leadership. By the end of the 1980s, the Boston model had motivated the creation of other housing partnerships across the country. (Dreier 1993)

18MHFA, proposal to HUD for participation in the Demonstration program, 1991.
1989 the ICTF established the Granites' Security Program. Through this security program, the MHFA contracted with local, minority-owned security firms to provide regular vehicle and foot patrols at Agency-financed housing in Boston's urban areas. This security program, by controlling crime and securing the property and its residents, has been a major factor in the continued success of the Granite properties.

Influenced by the successful rehabilitation of the Granite properties, the Demonstration program was specifically authorized by Section 184 of the Housing and Community Development Act of 1987. It instructed HUD to enter into cooperative agreements with participating agencies within three months of its enactment, i.e., by May 5, 1988. HUD requested proposals from all 57 SHFAs in May 1988, but only nine responded, and none of the responses led to a final agreement. When HUD failed to meet the stated requirement, under provisions of the 1989 HUD Reform Act it was directed by Congress to submit a report describing the steps to be taken to implement the Demonstration program. In July, 1990, Jack Kemp, former HUD Secretary, submitted a report that affirmed HUD's commitment to implementing the program.

In February 1991, HUD re-announced the Demonstration program and again sought proposals from all 57 SHFAs on how they could assist HUD in meeting two timely objectives - empowering low- and moderate-income residents and creating homeownership opportunities in subsidized housing. Proposals
were to be submitted by May 31, 1991. Soon thereafter, HUD was ready to announce that SHFAs in Massachusetts, Illinois, New York, and Washington, D.C. had been selected to participate in the Demonstration program. However, this announcement was never made because HUD discovered it had made two crucial commitments in its invitation for proposals that it later learned it could not honor.

First, HUD's invitation for proposals indicated that the agency would provide full mortgage insurance under Section 221(d) of the National Housing Act. Just when HUD became prepared to notify the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) that it was ready to implement the program using full mortgage insurance, a revised opinion from legal counsel advised that the legislation authorized a coinsurance demonstration program only. Second, since only formerly subsidized projects were eligible for the demonstration, HUD promised to provide project-based Section 8 with a 15-year contract for 100% of the units. During the course of fiscal year 1992, it became evident that HUD's commitment to provide project-based subsidies would prevent it from activating the program.

"There was a clear imbalance during the fiscal year between available and needed Section 8 funds for property disposition purposes. Accordingly, we could not in good faith, commit to providing such funding for projects identified by SHFAs for
MHFA's Role in the Demonstration Program

From the beginning, the MHFA, under Marvin Siflinger and Eleanor G. White, has played a major role in the Demonstration program. Shortly after the enactment of the 1988 legislation, the MHFA implored HUD to issue a request for proposals (RFPs). Once HUD issued RFPs, in 1988 and 1991, the MHFA continually lobbied for HUD to implement the program by approving one or more of the submitted proposals. But during the Kemp administration HUD did not approve any of the submitted proposals. The MHFA, Massachusetts Governor Weld, and other Massachusetts groups aggressively campaigned for the re-acceptance of proposals. However, it was not until 1994, under the Clinton administration, that the Demonstration program was implemented. On April 11, 1994, the MHFA and HUD signed a preliminary agreement. Under this agreement, HUD and the MHFA authorized the Demonstration program. The final agreement was signed in August, 1994.

19 Letter to Marvin Siflinger from Philip J. Salamone, former Deputy Assistant Secretary for Multifamily Housing, date unknown.

20 Marvin Siflinger served as Executive Director and Eleanor G. White served as Deputy Director until their resignations in January, 1995.

21 The delay in the signing of the final agreement was caused by HUD's settlement with the NAACP, Boston chapter. The NAACP's 13-year housing discrimination suit ended in a consent decree giving it veto power over the manner in which HUD disposes of property.
To meet strongly encouraged but poorly defined resident empowerment goals implicit in the legislation, MHFA sought help from various experts on how to approach this issue in its proposal. The Agency held a series of meetings with representatives from the Metropolitan Boston Housing Partnership (MBHP), the Boston-HUD Tenant Alliance (BHTA), the Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation (CEDAC), and the Boston Public Facilities department (PFD) (the city agency responsible for low-income housing development), as well as various other community groups to solicit their input as to how the Agency should structure its proposal for participation in the Demonstration Disposition program.\(^{22}\)

MHFA's success in getting its proposal accepted was directly related to the network of institutions that were involved in different aspects of the process, in which the prime emphasis was on tenant involvement.

These groups assisted the MHFA in developing its strategy for engaging resident associations in the development process. A major decision made by those present at MHFA proposal discussions was that the Agency should furnish start-up loans to establish an effective and representative tenant

\(^{22}\)The Boston HUD Tenant Alliance (BHTA) since 1983, has built a national reputation as an experienced, tenant-led organization committed to resident ownership and empowerment. The BHTA has worked with the MHFA in a number of capacities over the years, including the innovative Inner City Task Force.
association in projects that were not currently organized and/or paying initial costs for a development consultant to provide technical assistance to existing tenant groups in planning the disposition and rehabilitation process.

The Demonstration Program in Massachusetts

HUD selected Massachusetts as the first state to participate in its national demonstration. The Demonstration properties consist of approximately nineteen hundred units of scattered site housing, which are located in the Roxbury, Dorchester, and South End neighborhoods of Boston. The MHFA successfully negotiated with HUD to become interim asset managers of the properties until the properties were sold. This transfer allowed the MHFA to oversee management and to arrange for emergency repairs necessary to address health and safety issues, i.e., lead paint abatement. Interim management under the MHFA regulation is a principal component of the Demonstration because without this authority the MHFA would have been constrained by Federal guidelines, which, because of their intricacy, would have delayed rather than facilitated rehabilitation.

The Massachusetts Demonstration program is expected to yield significant business opportunities for the local economy. It is estimated that the Demonstration program will generate $100 million in development expenditures. "The MHFA, in an effort to maximize this potential for the neighborhoods,
has set a goal of directing 80 percent of [aggregate] controllable expenditures (expenditures for items such as utilities, taxes, and loan interest, etc. will be excluded) to minority business enterprises, many of which are neighborhood based. These expenditures will be closely monitored by the Agency's Equal Opportunity department. This unparalleled goal is expected to have profound repercussions for the communities in which the Demonstration properties are located.

The Demonstration is unique in that it will be a resident-driven process from beginning to end.

Marvin Siflinger
former MHFA Executive Director

The orchestration among the various institutions in putting together MHFA's proposal will be crucial to carrying out the Demonstration. Agencies such as MBHP and the Boston-HUD Tenant Alliance (BHTA) have been working closely with residents to provide assistance in the development of resident leadership and the formation of resident associations. In addition, the Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation (CEDAC) has worked to enhance the tenant associations' ability to find dollars. CEDAC's work entails

---


24 Community Economic Development Assistance Corporation (CEDAC) is a statewide quasi-public corporation that was created by the Massachusetts legislature in 1978. Since 1982 it has provided development technical assistance services to non-profit organizations in Massachusetts pursuing the preservation of federally-assisted multi-family housing.
building local capacity to use the dollars wisely and to raise the level of technical expertise of resident groups. *Figure 1* is a diagram of the network. The Demonstration program is the exogenous factor that facilitates the interaction between each of the organizations for the benefit of the residents.

![Diagram of the network]

**Figure 1: The Demonstration Disposition Network**

CEDAC's staff of development professionals works with assisted organizations to build their capacity to manage the development procedure. Through this work, CEDAC has successfully addressed the large inventory of HUD distressed properties. (CEDAC, 1992)
Resident Resources

The MHFA has created a range of resident resources that will be available in conjunction with the Demonstration program. The MHFA, in partnership with the City of Boston's Public Facilities Department (PFD), established a $5,000,000 loan pool to provide tenant and non-profit organizations short-term, low interest (5% annually) predevelopment loans, known as Tenant Organization Technical Assistance Loans (TOTAL funds). TOTAL funds are administered by CEDAC, a non-profit development agency with extensive experience in two crucial areas of the resident ownership process: tenant organizing and providing technical assistance during the development process. Through the TOTAL program, borrowers may apply for up to $50,000 per development. Loans in excess of $50,000 will be considered, but require board approval. 25

MHFA's philosophy of reaching beyond bricks and mortar is exemplified by the unique community development programs that it sponsors. Created under the auspices of MHFA's Inner City Task Force (ICTF), MHFA's Tenant Assistance Program (TAP) and Youth RAP program have both been made available to the Demonstration properties. The following text describes these programs.

The Agency instituted the Tenant Assistance Program

25 The MHFA and PFD procured the services of CEDAC to provide technical assistance to various tenant associations.
(TAP) to inform property managers of the specific skills required to counter substance abuse and its impact on families living at MHFA-financed properties. The program has since been expanded to cover an array of topics, such as parenting, nutrition, AIDS awareness, all customized to meet the specific needs of the various communities. "Contrary to conventional approaches to affordable housing, TAP focuses on the human element in housing..."²⁶ In fiscal year 1994, more than 70 training sessions in intervention and communication skills were held for property managers, and over 100 requests were answered by TAP staff.

Youth RAP, which was initiated by the Inner City Task Force, is a two-year-old residential-based program which provides year-round educational and recreational activities to youth living at MHFA-financed developments throughout the state. The program derives from a partnership established between the MHFA, the Boston Private Industry Council, and property management companies which allocate funding for the Youth RAP program. At present, approximately 3,000 young persons between the ages of six and 20 participate in 42 different Youth RAP programs.

Resident Participation in the Program

At the crux of this housing rehabilitation effort is resident empowerment via resident participation. The MHFA, in collaboration with various institutions, established twelve major steps that, when followed, allow for meaningful, democratic participation by the resident associations. These steps, which relate to the technical aspects of housing, provide a framework for understanding the case studies presented in this thesis. The process is as follows:

1) Hold democratic elections - widely publicized, open election of resident association leaders;
2) Become incorporated;
3) Apply for TOTAL funds from CEDAC;
4) Obtain office supplies required for daily operations;
5) Develop RFPs for the development team - development consultant, attorney, architect, accountant, etc.;
6) Interview and hire development team;
7) Work with resident architect, board, and residents to design residents' vision;
8) Negotiate with MHFA on the residents' vision;
9) Determine form of ownership;
10) Select management agent;
11) Select co-owner; and
12) Submit financing plan and resident disposition plan to MHFA.

The MHFA has established a monitoring system that allows it to
regularly assess where resident associations are in this process.

The twelve-step process is designed to lead residents to the point where they are able to submit ownership proposals. To increase resident control over their physical environment, three preferred resident-centered development models have been proposed to HUD by the Agency. The following models were selected based on MHFA's experience doing affordable homeownership:

- Negotiate sale to residents who prefer to transfer immediately to a 100% resident cooperative or other models of resident-controlled ownership of rental housing.
- Negotiate sale to residents and a developer (either non-profit or limited dividend) in a joint venture in which residents have greater than 50% interest in the partnership.
- Sell to a limited dividend or non-profit developer selected by a resident association and ratified by MHFA following an open, competitive process. In this model, the developer would commit to train and support residents to move toward full resident control as quickly as possible.\(^{27}\)

The participating resident associations are listed in Table 1:

These associations will determine the long-term ownership structure of their development utilizing one of three stated approaches. See Figure 2 for geographic locations of the properties. The planning that MHFA conducted implicitly applied Traynor's theory concerning resident empowerment. In Traynor's empowerment model, successful participation by the resident associations required them to be able to engage in the technical housing development activities without losing sight of the definite need for community development efforts. In order to examine the implications of this model, case studies of the Camfield Gardens Tenant Association (CTA) and
the Franklin Park Developments' Tenant Association (FPDTA) are presented in the following chapters.
Figure 2: Demonstration Disposition Sites
Chapter IV: Camfield Gardens Case Study

Man's history is dotted by countless efforts to improve communal life. When conditions in an area reach a point of crisis, some leaders might attempt to bring about local action to address the issue at hand. Thus the concept of community organizing does not describe a new untried human experience, but gives particular shape, suited to modern times, to the long-standing human urge to act collectively to improve the group's lot.28

Irwin L. Sanders

I will never forget my first interview with Paulette Ford, President of the Camfield Tenants' Association. She was just home from work, making dinner for her children, and on her way to class at Cambridge College; scheduled between all of this was our interview. It is said that at the heart of any great organization is a dynamic leader. Well nothing could be more true of the Camfield Tenants' Association. Ford is described by her peers as unrelenting in her pursuit of better housing, knowledgeable on Demonstration program details, as well as on policies that relate to the program, and giving in her time, abilities, and heart. When asked to respond to why she makes so many sacrifices to serve the CTA she said, "Everyone has one excuse or another for why they can't do something. The conditions at Camfield gave me an excuse to do something."29 Such charismatic leadership has proven

invaluable to Camfield's Tenant Association.

History of Camfield Gardens

Camfield Gardens is primarily composed of working-class families. The mean household income for Camfield residents is $19,200. Based on HUD data, of the 101 families currently residing at Camfield Gardens 64% are Black/African-American, 35% Latino, and 1% other. Twenty-four percent of the families are female headed and approximately 9% of the families are presently underhoused.\(^3\)

Camfield Gardens is a 138 unit (134 residential) duplex townhouse development located in the South End/Lower Roxbury area. Built in 1970 by the Development Corporation of America (DCA), Camfield has since been owned by three different parties. The development's last owner, People's Baptist Church, was foreclosed upon in 1983, at which time HUD became the mortgagee in possession. In this new role, HUD collected the rent payments as they became due. However, as the mortgagee in possession HUD did not possess the rights of a legal owner.

In May 1991, residents returned to their homes at Camfield Gardens to find notices of foreclosure on their


\(^{30}\)Underhoused is when the number of bedrooms required is less than the number of bedrooms currently servicing a family.
doors. Threatened by foreclosure, a few residents called an emergency meeting, to which approximately eighty to ninety residents attended, to discuss how best to address this issue. Later that year, rumors surfaced that Camfield Gardens would be sold by HUD. Camfield residents decided to fight back. They formed a steering committee that began to work with the Boston HUD Tenant Alliance (BHTA) to organize around housing conditions and gentrification. These efforts resulted in HUD stopping the possibility of sale to an "outside" owner by becoming the highest bidder. The BHTA was instrumental in HUD's taking ownership in 1991.

Although organized because of a crisis in 1991, the seven member steering committee at Camfield Gardens was able to make the transition to a formal tenant organization. Following the residents' victory in getting HUD to become the highest bidder they were ready to move to the next level of community organizing, but felt that they were unable to do so with BHTA. "Most of the residents here, when push comes to shove, prefer to do it themselves." Camfield was interested in a self-help model of organizing which requires self-reliance at every level. BHTA operates to empower residents, but under the professional model in which professional organizers assist residents in the developmental process. In the end, it was a basic difference in organizing styles between Camfield's

---

steering committee and the BHTA that caused the separation.

The next step on their agenda was to seek funding and secure an office. With this in mind, and aware of HUD's Resident Initiative requirement, which obliges management companies to assist tenant organizations in the developmental process, the residents negotiated with the Reserve National Management Corporation (hereinafter Reserve) to obtain office space, a telephone line, and a computer. Reserve volunteered to assist Camfield in the incorporation process. Shortly thereafter the steering committee sought the assistance of CEDAC and U.S. Senator John F. Kerry's office. The residents, who heard from BHTA about the money they were eligible for from the HOPE2 (Multifamily Homeownership) planning grant, were offered assistance with the HOPE application from CEDAC.

CEDAC's first step was to contact Boston's Public Facilities Department, which at the time had money targeted to tenants in distressed communities, to obtain seed money to get the

---

32HUD's Resident Initiative supports the formation of resident organizations. HUD's management agents are encouraged to assist residents in pursuit of forming resident associations. The Resident Initiative budget, not to exceed $5. per occupied unit, per month to democratically elected resident associations, is disbursed by management agents.

33HOPE2 (Multifamily Homeownership), which was authorized by title IV of the Cranston-Gonzalez National Affordable Housing Act of 1990, empowered low-income families to become homeowners by providing planning and implementation grants to organizations that assisted individuals in government-insured or -owned, or FHA distressed, multifamily buildings, for purchasing and maintaining their homes and properties. (HUD, 1995)
grant application process for HOPE2 started.

The City made $10,550 available for seed money. Camfield was then in a position to hire an organizer to help conduct the survey that the grant application required. The residents used their seed money to hire Barbara Raines as their organizer. In addition, the steering committee conducted surveys to obtain information from residents who were unavailable during regular business hours. In a matter of months, Camfield was awarded a $93,000 grant to fund the eighteen-month workplan that was described in their application. This was the first attempt to research the feasibility and desirability of tenant ownership at Camfield Gardens.

The $93,000 grant served three purposes. First, it enabled Camfield to hire its own development team, which included the following positions: architect, development consultant, attorney, accountant, executive director of CTA, resident resource specialist, consultant staff, and an organizational trainer; the latter position is unique in that it entails providing basic training in such matters as fiduciary and corporate responsibilities and setting agendas for tenant meetings. Second, it empowered the residents of Camfield by demonstrating to them that they could win a grant based on the merits of their work. Finally, it showed the residents that HUD was willing to help them. The steering committee, with the assistance of CEDAC, worked to develop an
official tenant association. In January 1992, a general meeting was held. Nominations were taken from the floor, followed by a majority oral vote. A more formal election was held in March 1993 after having been announced in the Camfield Tenants' Association (CTA) newsletter. At the election meeting nominations were taken from the floor, followed by a write-in ballot process. One board member from each cluster (there are eight clusters) and five at-large members were elected to the board.\textsuperscript{34} The thirteen board members were then left to elect their board of officers. It was at this time that Paulette Ford was elected President of the CTA. (See Appendix 1 for a description of the complete process a steering committee undergoes in order to become a formally recognized tenant association.)

Camfield Gardens was built in the 1970s under the technical production paradigm. In 1991, when the residents at Camfield became organized they shifted the paradigm to the empowerment/consumer planning model. When that shift occurred, residents discovered three areas where they had to become active. In understanding the shift in paradigm, it is important to understand these areas.

**Procedural Norms**

Procedural norms relate to the institutional mechanism of

\textsuperscript{34}A cluster is made up of eight buildings.
the CTA, such as how the board functions on a daily basis, and individual members meeting their fiduciary responsibilities.

Because procedural norms relate to the organizational capacity of the CTA, this component is a prerequisite for community and housing development operations. In this study, housing development issues were the vehicle through which Camfield residents became organized. Accordingly, the housing aspect was complemented by procedural operations, which provided the springboard from which housing efforts could be developed.

Figure 3: Synergistic Relationships

The community development category includes all quality of life activities carried out by the CTA. Figure 3 illustrates the synergistic relationship that exists between
housing and community development. Housing development was the vehicle that allowed the residents of Camfield Gardens to become a formally recognized organization eligible to receive funding, and created a common issue around which to organize - better housing. Likewise, community development efforts reinforced housing ventures by assuring the long-term viability of the property.

Dan Violi of CEDAC described four examples of Camfield's procedural success. He stated first that members of Camfield's board have established effective communication skills. For example, they are very comfortable telephoning senior MHFA and HUD staff members, which is much more effective than having consultants perform the task for two reasons. First, it indicates that residents are well informed and able to act on their own behalf. Second, it facilitates the development of the residents' communication skills. Furthermore, Camfield has mastered the skill of letter writing including everything from memos to the MHFA to letters to national political figures concerning housing public policy issues. Next, Violi complimented CTA's efficiency in imparting information to all tenants. The media used by Camfield are a tenant newsletter, general meetings, and cluster meetings. Lastly, he discussed how Camfield has defined the goals of the residents and used these goals to productively manage their

---

35 Violi, Dan, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, March 10, 1995.
development team.

Housing Development

As early as 1991, Camfield had been actively engaged in organizing activities. Camfield went from protest organizing in 1991, to acquiring HOPE2 funds to develop as an organization and then to researching the feasibility of ownership. It was not until 1993 that the CTA learned about the Demonstration program. Following notice of the Demonstration program, Paulette Ford and Edna Smallwood, President of the Grant Manor Tenant Association, wrote a letter to Eleanor G. White at the MHFA. In this letter they detailed their concerns about the new program and how it would affect the work that they had accomplished under the HOPE2 program. A meeting was arranged between the three parties to discuss the matter and it was then that Ford and Smallwood learned that their work under HOPE2 would not hinder, but would instead facilitate their participation in the Demonstration program. Under the HOPE program, Camfield Gardens had completed many of the MHFA's initial resident association requirements, such as conducting democratic elections, becoming incorporated, writing by-laws, and hiring

36 There are only two other Demonstration Disposition properties that had active tenant associations prior to the introduction of the Demo Dispo program: Roxse Homes and Grant Manor.
a development team. Camfield entered the Demonstration program having already completed half of MHFA's requirements.

One important MHFA requirement that Camfield had not completed was the selection of a management company. The MHFA issued RFPs to management agents who might have been interested in managing one or more of the Demonstration properties. Camfield Gardens received nine proposals ranging in length from 100-200 pages. It was then up to the tenant association to set up a system and committee for reviewing proposals, interviewing agents, and visiting the various properties currently managed by agents submitting proposals. Paulette Ford, very aware of those who expressed an interest as well as the capability to carry out this task, put together a committee, consisting of two residents and one board member. Once the committee was in place, Ford sought the expertise of someone in her community familiar with this process. She hired Minnie Clark, a property manager to teach the residents how to go about selecting a property manager. This group of four met once a week for approximately three

---

37See Chapter III for complete list.

38CTA requires one board member to sit on each committee.

39Minnie Clark is a resident at Marksdale Gardens. In the early 1980s residents of several large projects - Marksdale Gardens being one of them - persuaded HUD to sell their developments to the residents. Marksdale Gardens has been cited as one of the best-run developments in the city.
months. Lanette Williams, Camfield's consultant, also attended Management Selection meetings whenever time permitted.

In addition to meeting once a week, each committee member was given a copy of each of the proposals to review. They were required to visit at least one site managed by each agent that submitted a proposal. At this point they eliminated those in whom they no longer had interest. They then made their recommendations to the board. The board then interviewed the remaining agents and made the final selection.

In the fall of 1994 the CTA held weekly cluster meetings to begin discussions on future design issues and emergency repairs. Each of the eight clusters met with the board at the CTA office. By mid-October the design committee was formed. This committee is made up of six people; four are residents and two are board members (Ford is one of the two board members who sits on this committee). The main goal of this group is to design the repair plan according to the residents' vision. This group meets weekly with their architect. Their primary issues are: redesigning entranceways for the individual units, adding additional three bedroom units, selecting a heating system (whether gas or electric), and deciding whether windows need to be replaced. In addition to meeting with their architect, from February 1995 to the present, they have to meet with MHFA's Design and Technical (D&T) and Development Departments on a weekly basis.
Camfield's development committee works with their development consultant to determine how fair market rents (FMRs) will be structured, make comparisons with comparable developments in the South End, analyze how varying levels of Section 8 will work, and explore ownership options. This committee met once a week from September 1994 to February 1995. Their meetings will resume after the Design committee's repair plan has been accepted.

In the course of meeting MHFA deadlines around technical housing issues, the CTA was able to accomplish much more for its community. These accomplishments relate to the housing development aspect, in that they are mechanisms that respond to the problems that plague the residents of Camfield Gardens. Community development activities undertaken by the CTA complement the rehabilitation process through preventative property damage measures and quality of life programs.

Violent crime affects everyone in the community. The person who sells drugs might not live in my development, but if he attempts to sell drugs to my child, then it's my problem. The only way to address these issues is by working together across neighborhood lines.

Paulette Ford

Community Development

One of the CTA's principle philosophies is to reach from the development to the broader community whenever possible. With this in mind, the Camfield Gardens, Roxse Homes, and Grant Manor Tenant Associations, which are located in the
South End/Lower Roxbury area, formed an alliance around the issue of security. Through their communication with the Police Commissioner's Office, they were able to establish a pilot program. Prior to the program, the security officers that HUD hired for the Demonstration properties in December 1993 had the same rights as an ordinary citizen in that they had a license to carry a gun. Under the pilot program, which began in August 1994, the security officers became special police officers. A special police officer has the same rights as a local police officer, except that his/her jurisdiction is limited to the property that is listed on his/her license. At Camfield they were able to make arrests, establish probable cause, etc. Thaddeus Miles, a security officer at the MHFA, describes the impact that the pilot program has had as substantial. "The day the officers put on their square badges, which denote a special police officer, they made three to four arrests and shortly thereafter we began to observe a drop in crime." While security and crime issues are important, Ford felt

---

40 The licenses are awarded by the Boston Police Department after Wackenhut officers complete a 160-hour MHFA special officer training program. Officers are trained in subjects such as civil liability, community policing, criminal law, as well as diversity and cultural awareness.

41 Thaddeus Miles is a former Captain at Wackenhut Security. He joined the MHFA in January 1995.

42 Miles, Thaddeus, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, February 23, 1995.
the tenant association needed to balance those efforts with something constructive for the community. Ford recognized the need for a program to keep their youth positively active. After some thought, she arrived at the conclusion that a summer youth employment program should be offered. The summer youth employment program provided an opportunity for Camfield's young residents to earn money while helping to improve their community. The program, which was jointly funded by the MHFA and Boston's Parks and Recreation Department, helped youth to develop positive work habits, cooperative task completion skills, self discipline, and self-esteem. The participants' duties included: painting development common areas, maintaining the grounds, landscaping, and assisting with the summer activities program. The summer employment program served three purposes. First, it allowed community youth to take part in the beautification of their area. Second, the youth beautification process also served as a deterrent to property damage, i.e., the youth will not be as likely to walk on a flower bed that they planted or to deface a common area wall that they painted. Third, it served to increase the standard of living for Camfield residents by providing the youth with jobs at above minimum wage.

Camfield's after-school program is a follow-up to the summer employment program. The CTA recognized a need for academic support for their youth and accordingly established
an after-school tutoring program at Northeastern University. Children of ages five to ten participate on Mondays and Wednesdays, while teenagers of ages ten through fourteen attend on Tuesdays and Thursdays. Both age groups are tutored from 3:30 p.m. to 6:30 p.m. The program consists of one hour of relaxation and snack time, one hour of one-on-one tutoring, and one hour of recreational activities. The Wackenhut security officers provide transportation to and from the program.

Although the program was originally designed for Camfield residents, it has been extended to the broader community. Ford believes that this will facilitate positive relationships across neighborhood and development lines. To accommodate a larger number of students, the CTA has been working diligently to create partnerships with other Boston universities. To date, programs have been established at the Berkeley School of Music and Boston University.

In addressing the needs of its younger residents the CTA developed a summer drop-in program. The focus of this program was to provide pre-vocational education and academic remediation as well as arts and crafts for children between the ages of five to thirteen. When the program began there was a dollar a day fee to contribute towards lunch and snack costs. However, many of the parents had difficulty in making their payments. Ford recognized this issue and responded by removing the fee. The summer drop-in program was jointly
funded by the MHFA and HUD.

Although Camfield's Annual Christmas party is a one-day activity, it richly affects the lives of children at Camfield Gardens. The annual Christmas party was introduced in 1993. Ford felt that some of the low- and moderate-income families might have difficulty providing for their families during the holidays. With this in mind, Larry Ellis wrote to Toys For Tots, which is directed by the United States Marines, requesting that they provide toys for children of Camfield Gardens. After many follow-up telephone calls, their request was granted. The Marines made a commitment to provide at least one toy for each child in the Camfield Gardens development. I participated in Camfield's 1994 Christmas Party. The Captain of Wackenhut Security was decked out in a Santa costume, there was an abundance of toys and food, but most important, there was a level of happiness among the children that words fail to describe.

It is undoubtedly clear that the CTA's quality of life and preventative property damage measures serve to ensure the long-term viability of the property, as well as its residents. The CTA was able to implement a number of programs and activities that enriched and improved the lives of its residents. Such programs also serve to sustain the rehabilitation or construction efforts from the housing development process.

Ford sees a tenant purchase as far more than a real
estate transaction. "It is a process that relies on a very important transformation among residents." For the purchase to be successful, residents must begin to think differently about themselves, their neighbors, their development, and their community. Camfield's board went into this process knowing that they could not become exclusively entwined in details such as unit reconfiguration without remembering that they had the responsibility to give equal consideration to making investments in the people who live in the development.

While the Camfield Tenant Association has succeeded in combining housing and community development efforts, this is a case where the tenant association was at an advantage. For example, Camfield's organizing efforts began over one year before the introduction of the Demonstration program. In addition, Camfield's relatively high income level, single-site, and desirable location made it more likely to be successful. Franklin Park, on the other hand, entered the Demonstration program without previously organizing and at a lower socio-economic level (as compared to Camfield Gardens), but, nonetheless, was also able to successfully participate in the program.

---

CHAPTER V: FRANKLIN PARK CASE STUDY

In 1917 Marcus Garvey stated that the greatest problem in the Black community was disorganization. 44

Cornell West

One Saturday morning when the board members of Franklin Park Tenants' Association were out distributing flyers, they were called to a particular apartment by a resident. When they arrived at the apartment they saw that the bathroom ceiling had fallen down. Emma Terry, the resident association's president, directed the resident to call the emergency maintenance office. When maintenance arrived they responded by cleaning up the large fragments, sweeping the smaller fragments into a corner, placing a large can in the bathtub, and then leaving. When Terry learned how they had left the apartment she immediately called Jackie Davis, Lead Organizer for MBHP. Terry knew that maintenance had plans to simply replace the fallen sheet rock and anticipated a confrontation. She called upon Davis for support and Davis agreed to meet her at the apartment that following Monday morning.

That Monday Terry and her two organizers arrived at the apartment just when maintenance arrived. Terry explained to

them that the boards were rotten and that this structural issue needed to be addressed before they could replace the ceiling. However, maintenance, unaware that one of Terry's organizers was fluent in Spanish, directed the repair-person, in Spanish, to ignore Terry's comments. At that moment Jackie Davis arrived. When she learned of maintenance's inappropriate behavior, she took a broom and tore down the rotten boards. She then turned to them and said, "Now you have to replace them [the boards]."  

Davis' guidance on the issue of management accountability has been invaluable to the board. She has single-handedly taught the resident association how to conduct themselves during management confrontations and instilled in them the confidence required to stand up for their rights. An incident such as this demonstrates how the residents of Franklin Park, a low-income housing development came to engage in housing improvement issues.

History of Franklin Park

Focusing on the demographics of this housing development, Franklin Park is a 395 unit, project-based Section 8 development located on 29 scattered sites in western Dorchester.  

45Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, April 6, 1995.

46Section 8 is a Federally low-income housing program where tenants pay no more than 30% of their adjusted income
Haitian, 10% is Latino, and 50% is African-American. A large number of young, single mothers reside at Franklin Park. Moreover, many of these young mothers, who often have parents living in the same development, are second or third generation welfare recipients. It is not uncommon for one parent with one to two children to live in a one bedroom apartment. In fact, approximately 30% of the population is presently underhoused.

Although Franklin Park is a 395 unit development, approximately 46% of these units are vacant because they do not meet State sanitary code requirements. Franklin Park was rehabilitated during the 1960s under the auspices of the Boston Urban Rehabilitation Program (BURP). Under this program, private developers owned the property, while HUD insured the interest on the mortgage in exchange for low rents. However, the rents that were required to support the development were much higher than what the residents could afford. This problem was further exacerbated by the 1970s oil crisis. In 1979 HUD foreclosed on the developer of Franklin Park, as well as on other developers of HUD insured jobs throughout the Boston area. Shortly thereafter, HUD was mandated by Congress to dispose of these properties. HUD made repairs to Franklin Park at its own expense and then sold it to a locally-based community developer, the Greater Roxbury Development Corporation. In line with the predominant view of

for rent.
By 1987 the condition of the buildings had deteriorated. Issues such as children being scorched by radiators and unheated apartments in the dead of winter began to surface in the media. In 1990 HUD was forced to foreclose a second time and became the owner once again. At the same time Congress had mandated HUD to dispose of the units in its growing inventory, but this time it was through the Demonstration program.

Hegel says somewhere that all great events and personalities in world history reappear in one fashion or another. He forgot to add: the first time as tragedy, the second as a farce.

Karl Marx

Once the Demonstration program was underway, the MHFA management department became responsible for assessing the current status of resident organizing efforts. At Franklin Park it was observed that there had been little resident organizing. As a result, MHFA began discussions with the various organizing entities. In the end there was an understanding between MHFA and MBHP that MBHP would be responsible for overseeing the organizing of the residents at Franklin Park. At this point MBHP was not directly organizing the residents, but contracting out for these services. In 1992, MBHP contracted the Greater Roxbury Neighborhood Association (GRNA) to organize Franklin Park residents for the
period of one year. At the end of that contract MBHP was prepared to negotiate a second one-year contract. It was at that time that MBHP began to receive telephone calls about what GRNA was not doing. "Under GRNA, we were not learning anything related to organizing residents. All that we would know is that we were having a meeting at which the same residents always showed up." MBHP now wanted supervisory rights negotiated into the second year contract, but GRNA did not want them to have it. There was a long period of negotiations which never resulted in a second contract being signed.

MBHP then went to the Freedom House, a community center, to seek their assistance in organizing the residents of Franklin Park. Freedom House agreed to take on this task and hired two organizers, but at the last minute had a change of heart. At this point it was 1994 and MBHP had grown weary of negotiating and was concerned about the Demonstration program's timelines. With this in mind Jackie Davis, Lead Organizer at MBHP, took control of the situation.

Her first task was to go throughout the development knocking on doors and informing residents about the opportunities presented to them under the Demonstration program. Davis called her first meeting in May 1994 at which approximately twenty-five residents were present. Emma Terry,

---

47 Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, March 2, 1995.
active-resident and soon-to-be President of the Franklin Park Tenant Association, had the following to say about Davis' presence at that first meeting, "She stood there and she said, 'I am going to help you organize, but I will not do your work for you.' Jackie was standing there as she pointed her finger with her hands on her hips and she continued with, 'I am going to tell you these people [management] work for you! You pay rent and that's how they get paid!' And everyone just became enthusiastic about getting organized."\(^{48}\)

It was June of 1994 when the residents were introduced to the various players in the Demonstration program. Beth Marcus of CEDAC met with residents to explain CEDAC's role in the program and the TOTAL loan process. MHFA staff from the various departments met with residents to explain the Demonstration program and to give details of the resident association's responsibilities, such as holding elections and hiring a development team.

In July, shortly after Davis had hired two full-time organizers for Franklin Park, the residents held their election. Emma Terry was elected President, and she was ready to move full speed ahead. MBHP provided the lawyer, and within one week of their election Franklin Park was incorporated.\(^{49}\) When asked to explain how they were able to

\(^{48}\)Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, April 6, 1995.

\(^{49}\)Incorporation is the legal step by which an organization becomes a formal organization, or artificial
accomplish so much in such a short period of time, Terry had
the following to say: "It was hard because many people still
had the mentality of 'we have worked before but nothing ever
happened.' We had to constantly remind the residents that we
were never offered before what Demo Dispo is offering -- a
chance to participate and resident ownership."  

Franklin Park's first application for predevelopment
funds was approved in September 1994 for $30,000. Their
development team was hired shortly thereafter. Terry credits
Davis' hard work for helping Franklin Park become a formally
operating organization. "We were eager, but we had no one to
say 'hey, we are going to do it like this.'"  

Housing Development

Thus far I have presented the history of how Franklin
Park became organized in response to the Demonstration
program. Franklin Park's ability to become a formally
functioning resident organization relates only to procedural
norms category. At this point, I turn to examples of Franklin

"person". By incorporating individual members are protected
from personal liabilities of the corporation. MHFA required
that each resident organization be incorporated as a
prerequisite to receiving TOTAL funds.

50Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording,

51Franklin Park received $159,000 through the TOTAL
loan program.

52Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording,
Park's engaging in both housing development and community efforts. These examples demonstrate the Franklin Park Tenants' Association's ability to combine these efforts.

The process of working with the development team on the technical aspects of the housing rehabilitation is very much the same as it is for Camfield Tenants Association, i.e., putting together development, design, and management committees, weekly meetings, etc.\textsuperscript{53} However, Franklin Park was working under a much tighter schedule. Because Franklin Park had not become organized or held elections until July 1994, the RFPs for its development team were not put together and sent out until September 1994. Moreover, it was not until late November/early December that their entire team was on board.

**Community Development**

In spite of their late beginning, Franklin Park's board of officers was excited about participating in the rehabilitation of their homes and willing to work arduously to make the project a success. Although they were enthusiastic about having a say in management and design decisions, they knew intuitively that the housing rehabilitation process had to be complemented with community development efforts. The most tangible example of the need for these coalesced efforts occurred when one of the board's interviews with a prospective tenant revealed...

\textsuperscript{53}See page 44 in the Camfield case study.
management agent was interrupted by a "shoot-out." "I don't mean one or two shots! It was like an old Western shoot-out. One group would shoot and then duck and so on." This incident prompted Terry to write letters to the MHFA and Boston Police Commissioner Paul Evans.

Franklin Park's board then met with the MHFA to address the issue of crime in Franklin Park and the possibility of emulating the South End properties' ability to obtain police powers for their security officers. It was at this meeting that the idea of conducting an area-wide survey on crime surfaced. The MHFA put together the survey and provided the postage-free envelopes, while the board delivered the surveys throughout the development, private homes, as well as to commercial properties. It was decided that the results of the survey would be utilized at subsequent crime and safety meetings with public officials.

The MHFA was instrumental in assisting Terry in obtaining a meeting with Commissioner Evans. Thaddeus Miles of the MHFA had the following to say about this meeting: "We assisted them in setting up the meeting, but it was Terry that stated the case so eloquently that the Commissioner had no choice but to take action." Terry's moving comments backed by the results of the survey were persuasive enough for Franklin Park to

54 Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, April 6, 1995.

55 Miles, Thaddeus, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, April 5, 1995.
obtain approval to participate in the Special Officers Program. By March 1995 Wackenhut officers at Franklin Park had completed their Special Officers Training Program and were ready to serve and protect.\textsuperscript{56}

To augment the strides made in the area of security, the board took it upon themselves to contact the Judge Gregory Phillips of the Massachusetts District Court Roxbury Division. "We invited him to see first-hand what happens to the criminals arrested during drug raids after he releases them." These individuals are often back on the same street corners engaging in illicit activities. Terry felt that if the Judge came to understand the efforts being made by the resident association to rehabilitate the property and how these few individuals were hindering their efforts, he might not be so sympathetic the next time they appeared in his courtroom.

Second to security, Terry sees welfare dependency as her biggest community development challenge. In response to the overwhelming number of welfare recipients in the development, Terry brought in two community activists who run GED and computer training programs. However, only a disappointing 2-3 residents showed up for their highly publicized meetings. When asked why their turnout was so low, Terry had the following to say, "Residents feel as though they don't have

\textsuperscript{56}See page 47 in Camfield case study.
anything so why should they want anything." \(^{57}\)  

After learning from the GED experience, Terry altered her stratagem - low turnout at the programs demonstrated the need for a parental approach. In hindsight Terry would first have offered self-esteem programs. "Jumping right into self-improvement programs was like putting the cart before the horse." The board is working laboriously to put together a teen mother program. The goal of this effort is to teach young women, between the ages of 16 and 20, that there is more out there for them than welfare and having babies. MHFA negotiated into its contract with HUD the salary for a resident resource specialist (RRS). Terry envisions Franklin Park's RRS, when hired, as getting to know these mothers personally and walking them through the steps required to break the cycle of chronic, generational dependency they have become all too accustomed to. 

As a child, what my school teacher failed to teach me, I learned from my Sunday school teacher. And what she did not teach me, my Music Instructor did. I grew up in a neighborhood! Today many children grow up in just a 'hood! \(^{58}\)

---

Cornell West

By creating alliances with other community organizations, Franklin Park was able to catalyze citizen participation

---

\(^{57}\) Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, April 6, 1995.

throughout the community to address community needs. Franklin Park joined the Garrison Trotter Neighborhood Federation, this is a federation of 14 different resident associations in the Dorchester community. They work together on issues such as transforming their area into a viable, safe neighborhood for their children and preventing empty lots being used as garbage dumps and abandoned homes being used as drug facilities. Terry is particularly proud of how the federation was able to raise funds to support the Franklin Park Zoo. "When the children in our community grow up we want them to remember the summer day-camp at the Franklin Park zoo and what their favorite animal was, not the resounding explosion of a handgun!"59

Franklin Park has successfully created links with organizations outside its development. It was through meetings with the Federation that Terry came to know that Mayor Thomas Menino's office had assigned a neighborhood coordinator to her community. The community coordinator for that area meets with the Federation about addressing important social issues. "We work together because we realize that many of our neighborhood problems cannot be solved solely within our development. And by doing this we learn about initiatives that are already in place and this prevents us from constantly

59 Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, April 6, 1995.
These examples demonstrate that Franklin Park has indeed been successful in undertaking the roles of both housing and community development. Franklin Park had the toughest combination of factors: scattered site development; low-income residents; and no previous organizing experience. Nonetheless, it was able get these roles to act synergistically. In the next chapter I turn to a fuller discussion of the factors that led to Camfield’s and Franklin Park’s success in combining the two roles.

---

60 Terry, Emma, interview by author, Tape recording, Boston, MA, April 6, 1995.
CHAPTER VI: ANALYSIS AND CONCLUSIONS

One of the arguments presented in Chapter II was that the housing development process, which is complicated, tends to be disempowering to residents, in that residents become so involved in the technical aspect of housing rehabilitation that little consideration is given to community development. The empirical evidence provided in the cases has demonstrated that housing and community development can be done successfully, "side by side." From the cases I have identified six key elements that were present in both and which were instrumental in a successful outcome. Five of the elements relate particularly to housing development efforts: 1) a charismatic, self-motivated leader; 2) an active board; 3) multi-year funding; 4) a network of institutions; and 5) a third party monitoring the process. The sixth element, creating links between the resident association and the surrounding community, relates more directly to community development efforts. Taken together, these elements go a long way in explaining why these cases were successful. I turn first to looking at each of these elements individually; then I will look at how they operate in concert.

Factors that Enable Resident Associations to Pursue Both Development Goals Simultaneously

The need for a charismatic, self motivated leader is crucial to a resident association successfully carrying out
housing and community development activities. The ideal scenario is well demonstrated in the Camfield Gardens case. In this case the role was taken on by an indigenous community member, Paulette Ford. This is the preferred situation because leaders who are also community members have a more vested interest in the outcome of the project. However, in situations where a charismatic, resident leader does not exist, this role could be filled by a charismatic, external organizer. Although this replacement would come from outside of the development, if he/she can effectively craft a board, mold a cohesive resident association, and generally strengthen resident participation in the process, the impact of missing a charismatic, resident leader will be alleviated. This phenomenon is evidenced by Jackie Davis' successful organizing of Franklin Park.

A charismatic leader can lead but in most instances cannot carry out the work of an active board and residents. By delegating certain tasks to others two things are accomplished: 1) people realize they have a stake in the community, and 2) the longevity of the resident association is better protected. Furthermore, resident association board members and residents that become active participants in their resident organizations develop their critical analysis and planning skills and begin to experience a sense of control over their lives. As each board member becomes a more effective leader, the association's strength increases. This
reaches to the heart of community development - collective empowerment, the stage at which relatively weak groups are able to develop leverage and transform their communities into viable neighborhoods.

Pat Mayo, Vice President of the Franklin Park Tenant Association, sees board and resident participation as requisites for successful resident association efforts. In accordance with her belief, she, like many of Franklin Park's board members, has attended the various training sessions and committee meetings with their President, Emma Terry. Constance Terrell has lived at Camfield Gardens since 1972 and grew up in the South End. When asked why she has committed so much of her time to resident association activities she had the following to say: "I want more for this area!" Her voice saddened while reminiscing about what the area around Camfield Gardens was like when she was growing up. "I remember a time when this area was made up of single-family homes, but many of them were torn down and families were displaced." Quite naturally when the opportunity for ownership came up, Constance Terrell, like other board members, was committed to participating to ensure that history did not repeat itself.

Camfield Gardens and Franklin Park's eligibility for and

---


63 Ibid.
receipt of multi-year funding contributed to their ability to address technical housing issues as well as conduct community organizing activities. Camfield received $10,550 in seed money from the Public Facilities Department, $93,000 from a HOPE2 grant, and $147,000 in TOTAL funds from the MHFA, as well as money from the HUD Resident Initiative fund.64 Franklin Park received approximately $159,000 in TOTAL funds with additional funds from the HUD Resident Initiative funds. This funding has enabled these resident associations to put together their development teams, research the feasibility and desirability of resident ownership, and to be prepared to make decisions on the ownership model best suited for them.

Historically, when residents were asked for their input into the rehabilitation of their property they did not have extensive training in construction and they had no specialist to consult. This left them in a compromising position.65 For residents to offer worthwhile input there is a need for them to have a development team. This team, which is selected and paid by the resident associations, is hired to guide the residents through the complicated housing rehabilitation process.

Multi-year funding is also a necessity for these

64 The HUD Property Disposition Handbook specifies in Section 9 that resident organizations can qualify for up to $5 per unit per month for qualified expenses, such as resident training programs, office equipment, etc.

65 Refer to SETC experience in Chapter II.
organizations to obtain effective technical assistance for organizational capacity-building. Organizational capacity-building includes everything from developing RFPs and selecting a team, to residents receiving conflict resolution training. Companies in the private sector spend millions of dollars to enhance their management skills. Residents participating in housing and community development activities need the same level of on-going training and capacity-building, and multi-year funding makes this possible.

Franklin Park developed its organizational capacity-building by attending workshops on setting agendas for meetings, conflict resolution, fiduciary responsibilities of board members, putting together an operating budget, and selecting a management agent. Camfield hired an organizational trainer to come in and teach the board about these issues, and later when they were faced with the task of management selection, they hired someone from the community who had gone through this very process as a resident. Organizational-capacity training was absolutely critical to the resident associations being able to engage in housing and community development activities. So whether a resident association chooses to attend workshops or hire an expert, multi-year funding is needed to support these efforts.

MHFA's monitoring system is a key factor in Camfield Gardens and Franklin Park's success. In the program, MHFA acts as the bank that will ultimately underwrite the loan that
enables the residents to become owners; therefore, the MHFA monitors the entire process. Anthony Carr, Senior Asset Management Officer, refers to the monitoring as a check and balance process. The MHFA is in constant contact with the residents' development team and is able to intercede at any time if their job performance is not acceptable. In addition, all aspects of workmanship are approved by all departments before the MHFA distributes funds.

The MHFA departments that act on the front line with residents and resident development teams are the Asset Management and Design and Technical (D&T) departments. The Agency assigned an Asset Management team of three experienced staff members to work exclusively with HUD Demonstration properties. The team members provide oversight and monitoring of these properties working with management agents and tenant representatives. The Asset Management department coordinates workshops for scoring of management RFPs and management selection. Management works with the residents and D&T to determine if unit reconfiguration is a necessity. Management also works with tenant associations to develop site specific security plans to assist residents in the implementation process.

The residents' architect works with them to design a realistic vision of what they want and to estimate a final

66 The Management department developed RFP for new management companies.
cost. The Design and Technical department issued RFPs for architectural firms to produce the master rehabilitation scope for each property. MHFA's architects work with the residents' architect to ensure that all re-design aspects are considered. In determining the final rehabilitation plan, the residents' architect is required to negotiate the feasibility with the D&T department. This department also oversees the management of the entire rehabilitation construction process. After the construction contractors certify their work as substantially complete, D&T will prepare a punch list of incomplete or unsatisfactory items and a schedule for their completion.

To replicate the success of the cases there needs to be a three-pronged monitoring system in place to support the efforts made by the residents. This system should be similar to the MHFA's three-pronged approach. At the MHFA, the Design and Technical department oversees the rehabilitation plans and during the construction period certifies that the work has been completed in a satisfactory manner. The Management department also conducts property management reviews (PMR's), a process of monitoring the upkeep of the property, from the time the property enters its portfolio until the mortgage is repaid. Lastly, the Development department oversees the final financing package.

67 The Design and Technical department developed the RFP for the Agency's decision to hire architects.
Even the most technically savvy resident associations can benefit from a third party monitoring strategy. This monitoring provides back-up to residents and critical intervention when resident efforts falter. Such rigorous oversight, by an agency with high standards, safeguards the residents from receiving a substandard rehabilitation of their development.

In Boston there is a rich, highly sophisticated network of interconnections among various organizations dedicated to assisting resident associations in their pursuit of better housing and a higher quality of life. Agencies such as MHFA, CEDAC, MBHP, BHTA, PFD, and R to R, play a critical role in supporting resident associations that engage in housing and community development activities. This network makes it possible for resident groups at any level to participate meaningfully in housing and community development efforts.

These institutions been created to fill gaps in the development process, gaps that most resident associations cannot fill by themselves, at least at the outset. For example, at resident association A, which has a charismatic, self-motivated leader or leaders, the network's mission might be to simply embellish on their efforts. Conversely, for resident association B, which has the desire to participate in the stated activities, but lacks the motivation to begin on its own, the network might take on the responsibility of identifying eager participants and guiding them through the
process. For resident association C, which has not demonstrated a desire to participate, the network might take on the responsibility for canvassing the development to identify potential participants, encouraging their participation and then guiding them through the process.

In other words, the network has three major roles 1) organizer, 2) advisor/consultant, and 3) organizational capacity-builder. Applicable to all three roles is the task of integrating the expressed ambitions of the resident association with the externally derived knowledge and insights that the differing institutions possess. It is my belief that institutions in this network have played and will continue to play an important function in helping resident associations develop.

The final factor that is key to success is related more to community than to housing development. It is the resident association's ability to move from within the development to the broader community. This factor accounts for the ability of the resident associations to incorporate community development into their agendas. I am speaking of creating links between resident associations and the community because most community development problems cannot be solved within one multi-family housing development. 68 For example, when a resident association eradicates drug solicitation in its

68Community refers to people who live in some spatial relationship to one another.
development, the drug dealers are displaced, not erased. The dealers simply relocate on the periphery of the development. Resident associations must be willing to forge alliances to address the broader social issues, such as drugs and violent crime, for these issues transcend all neighborhood boundaries.

**Trade-offs Among the Six Key Elements**

I have identified six key elements that were present in these two cases from the Demonstration program and I have argued that all six were necessary to a successful outcome. Although these six elements were available for the resident associations participating in these cases, in most situations the accessible resources will vary and all six may not be present. Therefore, it is useful to examine what trade-offs can be made among the stated elements to see whether all six are necessary to success. If the situation should arise where one or more of the six factors to successful housing and community development are not present or readily ascertainable, I believe that under certain scenarios adjustments can be made allowing the process still to succeed.

My conclusion is that community involvement, an active board and residents, and multi-year funding are indispensable to successful development within a housing development. As later discussed, no housing and community development efforts can be productive without these components. However, the
other three factors can be replaced by certain alternatives that would allow the process to continue successfully.

The role of the charismatic leader can be replaced by a good network. The network would take on the role of the charismatic leader, in that it would be responsible for creating a resident board, recruiting committed and hardworking officers, and providing the leadership that the residents often look to in the charismatic leader. This would require a tremendous commitment in both time and energy from the network. Some might take issue with this assertion because these networks are largely made up of people who live outside the community, and who may not be people of color. However, I believe that regardless of where they have established residency or their ethnic background, members of a network that are able to put the needs of the community first and who seek to empower residents, could in fact carry out the role of the charismatic leader.

Where residents are faced with a situation in which they do not have a network to provide certain necessary functions, there are three third parties that might step in and perform the requisite tasks. A reconfigured government agency, a private firm, or an expanded, quasi-state agency could perform the functions that a network would otherwise undertake. Specifically, the third party would have to participate in organizing the residents, providing technical assistance, and obtaining additional funding. If any of the three entities
enumerated above were equipped to serve these functions, the process could continue even in the absence of a network of institutions.

Finally, where no SHFA is present to monitor the development process, another outside entity would have to fill this role. This entity would have to scrutinize the development process with the stringent eye for detail that a SHFA possesses. In the event that a third party could perform the monitoring necessary, an enlarged development team might be utilized in a process of self-monitoring. Although this is a feasible alternative, all efforts should be made to obtain an impartial expert who can determine whether or not development is properly taking place.

While this discussion has focused on factors that are to a certain degree, replaceable, it is now useful to examine those factors which are requisites to a successful development process. Affordable housing is typically located in lower socio-economic communities which are often plagued by high crime, substance abuse, and inferior delivery of municipal services. Unless the residents of a rehabbed housing development are willing to cordon themselves off with gates and guards, all the problems of the surrounding community will filter into the development. For example, the development could have a dumpster that is serviced by a private company, but if the surrounding community is receiving poor trash removal services, then community members will eventually use
the development's dumpster at the expense of residents of the development. And short of having armed guards patrolling the development, it is unlikely that the development will have a lower crime rate than its surrounding community. Therefore, an organized resident association must proactively help the surrounding community address social ills that afflict the broader area that they occupy. There are more tasks for a resident association attempting to engage in housing and community development efforts than any charismatic leader could ever hope to tend to. For example, in just addressing the technical requirements of the housing development process, both Camfield Gardens and Franklin Park had to establish more than five committees. Due to the overwhelming list of duties involved in this process, it is essential that an active board and/or residents assist the resident association leader in the tasks that need to be addressed.

The participants of the Demonstration program were fortunate to have the funds placed at their disposal for use in organizing and housing development efforts. For resident associations participating in community development and housing rehabilitation/construction efforts, multi-year funding is a necessity for obtaining effective technical assistance, equipment and supplies for an office, and organizational-capacity building efforts. For resident associations that are not provided funds in such amounts, the charismatic leader will have to fill the necessary role of
fundraiser. It will be this person's duty to solicit donations and contributions as well as apply for grants that are provided for resident organizing and development activities. Therefore, a lack of direct funding support can be remedied by a charismatic leader adept at obtaining alternate forms of financing. While there are different ways of obtaining funding adequate funding is critical to a resident association successfully engaging in housing and community development activities.

Conclusion

What I have demonstrated in this thesis is that resident associations can simultaneously engage in housing and community development efforts. Moreover, I believe that I have shown that it is desirable to do both. But both are only possible when the key elements are present: 1) a charismatic, self-motivated leader; 2) an active board; 3) multi-year funding; 4) a network of institutions; 5) a third party monitoring the process; and 6) links between the resident association and the surrounding community, Camfield Gardens and Franklin Park were fortunate to have all six. It is my hope that by identifying these factors planners will be able to integrate the range of elements into future projects. Thus, allowing residents to successfully engage in both housing and community development.
APPENDIX A

Tenant Organizing Process

I. PRELIMINARY ORGANIZING

Objective: Establishment of a representative steering committee of residents of the development.

Duties Required:

1. Identify a core group of concerned residents to serve as the steering committee for an unincorporated association of development residents.

2. Devise a process to employ in identifying resident issues and establishing mediums of mass communication.

3. Establish accommodations for linguistic minorities in the development i.e. translated documents.

4. Conduct outreach efforts to city, state, and federal institutions.

II. INCORPORATION AND ELECTION

Objective: Election of a duly-constituted board of director by the membership of the tenant organization, and establishment of basic corporation framework for the tenant organization with appropriate corporation purposes.

Duties Required

1. Ascertain outside legal counsel.

2. Codify resident input into the Articles of Organization and By-Laws for the corporation.

3. Campaign to solicit membership for the tenant association, and their participation in the first annual meeting of the organization to elect an initial board of directors. Develop criteria for board of director candidates, recruit potential members, present potential members to the resident membership.

4. Obtain a commitment from an outside entity to oversee the conduct of the elections.

5. Design and implement new board orientation and training program including descriptions of activities to date, expectation of members, copies of relevant organization...
III. ORGANIZATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

Objective: Establish a functioning internal structure for the organization

Duties Required:

1. The board of directors formalizes the structure of the informational campaign by creating a standard committee of the board. Its charge is to publish periodic newsletters, and distribute flyers and notices for keeping the membership informed of the organization's activities, ongoing or emerging policy issues, and opportunities for members to be involved in the organization's activities.

2. Establish committees as necessary to carry out basic organizational purposes such as finance; external relations; development/buy-out; and relations with management. Develop job descriptions for the committees including purposes and responsibilities.

3. Arrange for a basic board training exercise by an independent entity experienced in providing such training, to cover such topics as setting agendas for meetings; conduct of meetings in accordance with the organization's corporate documents; the fiduciary and corporate responsibilities of board members; compliance and reporting requirements for non-profit corporations; real estate development process; ownership options; community and resident organizing; role of a property management company; and basic financial management principles for a non-profit corporation.

4. Establish financial accounting, and reporting system of quality acceptable to major funders, with at least some minimal system for fund accounting that provides adequate internal controls and facilitates audits according to generally accepted accounting standards (GAAS).

5. Establish written accounting procedures that indicate duties, record maintenance, internal controls, signature authority, oversight and audit process.

6. Establish procurement and/or personnel policies for selecting, engaging, and effectively supervising consultants/contractors or staff.
IV. ORGANIZATION FORMALIZATION

Objective: Meet generally accepted standards of conduct for well developed nonprofits.

Duties Required:

1. The board of directors should develop a process to periodically review goals and objectives, mission statement, governance structure, basic procedures for conducting business, and for communicating the information to new members.

2. The board of directors files appropriate reports with the Secretary of state and is deemed in good standing with said office.

3. File, pay or determine exemption from, applicable federal and state taxes and fees; most importantly, if they have an employee, payroll taxes, unemployment insurance, and workers compensation.

4. The board shall apply for and receive 501 (c) (3) from the IRS.

5. The board and committee minutes should be regularly kept, distributed, and made easily available to membership.

6. The board of directors and treasurer receives financial reports including income and expense, balance sheet, budget/actual comparison on a regular basis.

7. The board of directors must ensure that records verify journals; that ledgers are maintained; and that checking account is current, balanced, and properly posted.

8. The board develops and approves a balanced budget (revenue and expenses)

9. The board of directors develops a resource development plan.

10. The board of directors carries insurance as necessary and appropriate, possibly including employee benefits, liability insurance and property insurance.

11. The board of directors implement office and accounting systems to monitor corporation's compliance with its contract obligations.

This is a variation of the Technical Development Corporation's: Sample Work Program-For Tenant
Organizing/Organizing Development.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


Duffy, Coleen, Internal Memorandum to Marvin Siflinger, January 9, 1992.


Fisher, Robert, "Community Organizing in the Conservative '80s and Beyond", *Social Policy*, Volume 25, No 1, Fall 1994.
Green, Karen, Memorandum to Mary Padula, June 23, 1993.


Salamone, Phillip, J., Letter to Marvin Siflinger, date unknown.


Siflinger, Marvin, "HUD Planning to Expand the Use of State HFA Housing Delivery System", Banker and Tradesman, April 21, 1993.


Traynor, Bill, "Community Development or Community Organizing, Shelterforce, March/April 1993.

United States Department of Housing and Urban Development, A Place to Live is a Place to Start, January 1995.


