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1.0 Introduction

The District of Columbia has embarked upon a beautification program that hopefully in the years to come will envelop the entire city. With a city as large as Washington, D. C., and the very limited funds available, it will be many years before the city can fully achieve what can truly be termed a "city beautiful".

The official beautification program of the District of Columbia stretches back as far as the Johnson administration. Concern for environmental quality was expressed in the following words of President Johnson: "Association with beauty can enlarge man's imagination and revive his spirit. Ugliness can demean the people who live among it. What a citizen sees every day is his America. If it is attractive it adds to the quality of his life. If it is ugly it can degrade his existence."¹

The President also remarked that "beauty is not an easy thing to measure".

The investigation reported here is an attempt to develop a system or method utilizing a citizen survey and a ground survey or inspection to assess visual quality in three selected areas² of Washington, D. C.

¹President Johnson's "Message on Natural Beauty..."
²See Chapter 4 for further explanation of selected areas.
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2.0 **Evolution of the Problem**

City officials have long recognized the ever increasing gap in communications between the open space planner and the user or observer of the environment. The attitudes and mental images\(^1\) of the daily user of the environment often differ not only from that of the planner but also from neighborhood to neighborhood.

In 1973, the Department of Environmental Services prepared several memoranda proposing that research be conducted on the visual quality of the District of Columbia and such aspects as general appearance, citizen beautification efforts and overall citizen satisfaction with city beautification services and programs.

The Office of Community Beautification accepted the challenge to conduct the investigation. This thesis is the initial work product of that investigation.

The original challenge was a natural outgrowth of the city's earlier implementation of "Operation Clean Sweep".\(^2\)

2.1 **History of the D. C. Beautification Programs**

Historically, the Office of Community Beautification, originally under the jurisdiction of the Department of Highways and Traffic, was instituted to provide staff assistance to the

---

\(^1\)Lynch, Kevin, *The Image of the City*, The M.I.T. Press, 1960

\(^2\)In the fall of 1971, an intensive effort was made to improve upon the cleanliness of the entire city of Washington. This effort was conducted by the Department of Environmental Services Solid Waste Management Administration. D. C. Beautification and Street Scenes were seen as the natural follow through on a clean city.
Commissioners' Inter-Agency Committee on Beautification Programs, which was established December 7, 1965 by Commissioners' Order No. 65-1676. The purpose of the committee, as stated in the commissioners' order is to:

...act in an advisory capacity to the Board of Commissioners regarding government and community action to beautify public space in the District of Columbia.

The Office of Community Beautification was transferred organizationally on July 27, 1971 from the Department of Highways and Traffic to the newly established Department of Environmental Services by Commissioners' Order No. 71-255.

The Office receives no appropriated funds; it has been funded by grants from the Urban Beautification and Improvement Program of the U. S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD). In 1972, HUD changed their program to "Legacy of Parks". Washington receives approximately $500,000 annually from HUD based on up to 50 percent matching funds for city expenditures on beautification.

The present staff is comprised of three professionals, one para-professional, one administrative assistant, and one clerk-typist.

Comprehensive Beautification Planning: The agency directly responsible for comprehensive beautification planning is the Inter-Agency Committee on Beautification Programs. The committee is responsible for advising the D.C. Mayor Commissioner.

1 For further details of the committee see Comprehensive Beautification Planning.
on all aspects of beautification and developing detailed plans for beautification of District-owned or supported properties. The committee has established an advisory subcommittee for particular phases of activities. Three main points emphasized are: (1) active citizen support for beautification activity (2) utilization of local knowledge for identifying present and future beautification needs; and (3) encouragement of new and different methods of beautifying the national capital.

A staff has been assigned to the chairman of this committee to:

- Advise and assist the Inter-Agency Committee on Beautification Programs and District agencies in formulating projects making up the D. C. Beautification Program.

- Serve as a single point for interdepartmental cooperation and coordination of the D. C. program with federal and private beautification programs within the District.

- Collect and consolidate the financial progress and other needed program information on the D. C. program, with particular stress given to reporting requirements of the Department of Housing and Urban Development.

- Control and report on federal grant funds received for the D. C. program.

Services of all District of Columbia government agencies are available to provide such specialized services as appropriate to make the beautification program as efficient and successful
as possible. In addition, agencies actually participating in projects provide the beautification staff of the Department of Environmental Services with the necessary information to be reported to HUD for review and determination of the grant amount.

2.2 Description of Existing Programs

Functionally, the office develops and administers a comprehensive beautification program for District-owned and supported properties through landscaping, planting, development of neighborhood greens and commons, and decorative and ornamental treatment. Advises the Director on the use of funds available to the District in support of the beautification projects. Provides technical advice, assistance, and plant materials to citizen's block clubs and neighborhood organizations for the rehabilitation of problem areas on public spaces. Provides educational assistance in landscaping and other means of beautifying the city to individuals, organizations, and schools in the District. Assists in coordination of all city beautification efforts.

Goals: To actively work on improvements in the District for the elimination of visual blight and creation of open space by:

(a) The development of a comprehensive city-wide plan for the development and maintenance of open space.

(b) The continued implementation of the plan for the development and maintenance of open space (Street Scenes).

(c) The improvement of the appearance of structures and
landscape surrounding open space.

Program Element: The long-range objectives of the office are to improve the quality of the environment within the boundaries of the District of Columbia; to increase the availability, preservation, development, utilization and improvement of open-space and other public lands; and to increase the acquisition, improvement and restoration of areas, sites and structures of historic or architectural value.

The continuing programs to meet the long-range objectives are as follows:

(a) To expand and further implement the "Street Scene" concept throughout the District of Columbia.

(b) To develop and implement programs, regulations and/or laws aimed at reducing visual blight in the District of Columbia.

(c) To develop cooperative agreements with other agencies on landscaping of public buildings, beautification, and maintenance of exteriors.

(d) To provide consultive services to the departments of the District of Columbia government, businesses and residents who are interested in improving the environment.

(e) To arouse and compliment citizens on behalf of beautification. Handle inquiries concerning methods of improving the attractiveness of public spaces; thus promoting the kind of neighborhood and community pride that is the best defense against blight and decay.

(f) To encourage and assist communities, individuals, and
groups to create a better environment in which to live, work, play, and raise a family and to promote a healthier, more beautiful community.

(g) To provide citizen assistance programs for grass seed, sludge, top soil, and plant materials.

(h) To coordinate the District of Columbia's Arbor Day observance activities, and preparation of educational material, posters and booklets.

(i) To prepare the campaign for the Mayor's Annual Beautification Awards Program.

(j) To continue assistance and programs of environmental education. To assist both the administrative staff as well as the teaching staff in the development and use of plant materials.

(k) To assist vocational education as a major consideration providing for the future of the environment.

(l) To assist local colleges and universities by providing meaningful work experiences for students. Technical assistance is provided by students under various work study and internship programs.

New programs for FY 1974 to further enhance the main objectives are:

(a) To develop model programs for utilization by neighborhoods for increasing the aesthetic and utility of green and open space.

(b) To develop Kingman Lake as an in-town swimming beach.

(c) To review the District of Columbia regulations that
pertain to public space quality control and make recommendations, improvements and enforcements.

(d) To accelerate the "Street Tree Program".
(e) To measure the effects of landscape materials on the quality of the environment.

**Relationship of the Beautification Program to Comprehensive Planning:** Under the existing administrative processes of the District of Columbia, the National Capital Planning Commission serves as the central planning agency for the Federal and District Government. This agency is responsible for planning the appropriate and orderly development and redevelopment of the National Capital and the conservation of the important natural and historical features of the District of Columbia.

The beautification program is conducted within the framework of the comprehensive plan for the National Capital. The National Capital Planning Commission reviews the beautification programs developed by the participating agencies and makes recommendations to the Inter-Agency Committee on Beautification Programs. The Planning Commission, together with the Commission of Fine Arts, also assists in the further development of the specific phases of the beautification program.

The National Capital Planning Commission is furnished background materials used in the preparation of grant applications. Their concurrence is sought on proposed beautification programs. The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission also serves as a member of the Inter-Agency Committee on Beautification.
Programs.

Coordinated planning, development, and administration of the District of Columbia Beautification Programs are conducted through the following organizational components:

- National Capital Planning Commission
- Commission of Fine Arts
- Inter-Agency Committee on Beautification Programs
- Beautification Staff, D. C. Department of Environmental Services
- National Capital Housing Authority
- National Park Service, National Capital Region
- Other D. C. Agencies

The major activities of the Office of Community Beautification for FY 1973 can be found in Appendix A.

Of the several beautification programs and activities previously mentioned four have been utilized in the selection of the three neighborhoods used to test the surveys.

The four programs used were selected because of their likely ability to draw upon relatively large amounts of citizen participation and interaction with the government.

The following is a listing of the programs selected and charted in figures 1 through 6 on the succeeding pages.

I. The Annual Beautification Awards Program - This program is designed to encourage individuals, groups, and local business to create a better living environment for themselves and to promote a healthier, more
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beautiful community. The Office of Community
Beautification coordinates all phases of this pro-
gram which is co-sponsored by the Society for a More
Beautiful National Capital, Inc.

(sub-program areas) Grass seed, top soil, sludge
and other plant materials distributed free to the
public. Also included are technical information
services.

a. This program has attempted to tackle the problem
of urban blight by the direct involvement of citizen
energy.

b. It has been an ongoing program of recognizing
and documenting the efforts of school groups, neigh-
borhood groups. and block clubs, business, and private
individuals to improve the appearance of their neigh-
borhoods.

c. The program has received area wide as well as
good national publicity and therefore should be widely
known or familiar to the general public.

d. Attempts have been made by the government to
provide encouragement to citizens by supplying tech-
nical assistance and plant materials when possible.
Citizens continue to make use of the grass seed and
top soil program which is made available to them
during the spring and fall planting seasons.
e. The program involves citizens not only on the productive end of neighborhood beautification but there is also joint citizen/government participation in the administration, financing, and planning of the annual awards program.

II. The Street Scene Program - This program involves the utilization of public spaces for community recreation and activities. Selected streets may be used as settings for the projects. The major emphasis is to increase the amount of usable open space in the city through the use of small underutilized areas of land, including streets, alleys, courtyards, and unused or underutilized fragments of land owned by the government.

a. Streets are often used as an extension of the living room and as a place for entertainment. Street Scenes provide for the revitalization of depressed areas utilizing technical expertise to improve the social, cultural and physical features of the neighborhood. The guiding theme is re-creation. The open space has always been there, but in a form dominated by a function that is incompatible with creative use by local residents. Street Scene projects provide an opportunity to re-create the existing space into useable and satisfying environmental spaces for people.
b. The projects involved citizen input in the initial planning stages and also in the final administration of the activity programming and facility upkeep.

c. There exists the possibility of expanding the Street Scene program into a major program effort of the Bicentennial Celebration.

III. D.E.S./R.L.A.¹ Summer Beautification Program - This program provides an accelerated program of cleaning and beautifying neighborhoods with special emphasis in the urban renewal² areas of the city.

a. The program utilizes neighborhood youth labor in making a conscious effort to reduce blight in selected urban renewal areas.

b. It involves the cooperation of two separate agencies in providing the financing and administration of the program. In many instances local residents are involved in the actual implementation of the program.

Investigations were made into the above mentioned programs. Areas of the city which were recipients of the programs efforts were then documented and charted on the maps which appear in figures 1 through 6.

Research was also conducted into the demographic and

¹Department of Environmental Services/Redevelopment Land Agency
²See Appendix A for details
social characteristics of the various service areas of the city.\textsuperscript{1} The combined information was assessed and used in the selection of the three areas of the city used for the surveys.\textsuperscript{2}

\textsuperscript{1}For more information see Chapter 4
\textsuperscript{2}See figure 6
Fig. 1  1971 Grass seed, top soil, sludge and technical assistance program.
Fig. 2  1972 Grass seed, top soil, sludge and technical assistance program.
Fig. 3 • 1973 Grass seed, top soil, sludge and technical assistance program.
Fig. 4  DES/RLA Summer Beautification Program

Street Scene Sites
Fig. 5  1973 Beautification Award Winners
Fig. 6 + Test Areas for citizen and ground surveys
3.1 Visual Quality

There exists a gap in communications between the open space planner and the user or perceiver of the environment. In recent years research and studies have been conducted which are assisting in closing the gap. This work has been influenced by the earlier research of Lynch, Appleyard, and Lintell.¹ Their studies of the environmental concerns of the observer and of the value of mental images has served as the basis or framework from which this research has grown.

In attempting to view the nature of visual quality, specific variables come into play. The subjective nature of the quality of the visual environment must be considered when deriving parameters. What is pleasing or acceptable to one person may not be so to another. The reasons are varied. Attitudes and visual images must be looked at in relation to the physical surroundings and experiences of the observer.

The quality of the visual environment must therefore rest on the interrelationships of these two variables; the perceiver or observer and that which is perceived or the environmental elements.

This study attempts to devise a method of understanding

¹Lynch, Kevin, The Image of the City, M.I.T. Press, 1960
Lynch, Kevin, Site Planning, 1962
Appleyard, Donald and Lintell, Mark, Environmental Quality of City Streets, December 1970
the relationship of the perceiver, his attitudes, concerns and environmental images to certain services and actual elements of the physical environment.

3.2 The Citizen Survey

The quality of the environment is measured by the reactions of the human observers. Quality is a relationship between individual or group and a section of the environment which can be perceived, comprehended, and reacted to\(^1\).

This survey\(^2\) was designed to gain insight into the environment-observer relationship. The survey method utilized the procedure of individual citizen interview. The questions were designed to gain varied responses on the likes and dislikes of those being interviewed. Questions draw upon the respondents awareness of desirable as well as undesirable images of the visual environment. Also included are questions which draw responses relating to attitudes, values, and social concerns.

The citizen survey is broken down into three response areas; one dealing with images, meaning, value and attitudes; one concerning general demographic data; and finally the visual response or photographic rating of environmental conditions and appearances.

Verbal responses were noted by the interviewer as nearly verbatim as possible. Tape recording was utilized whenever possible. No time limit was placed on the responses and the

---

\(^1\)By Garret Eckbo, "Urban Landscape Design"

\(^2\)See page for the citizen survey
respondents were encouraged to enlarge on their answers.

The photographic rating section of the survey was saved until last so as to serve as a refreshing conclusion to the interview.

The photos utilized in the citizen survey and in the ground survey\(^1\) were selected for inclusion only after several preliminary rankings by groups which included not only professional designers and planners but also university students, government workers, administrators and random city residents.

The subjects participating in the final test survey were initially randomly selected from city directories\(^2\). Of the subjects interviewed, the sample included both whites and blacks, with the majority being black. No specific measures of socio-economic levels were utilized although the interviewers were asked to note their personal impressions of the respondents status. The neighborhood selected for the test were representative of differing economic levels.\(^3\)

See Appendix B for the letter of introduction and explanation which was used in conjunction with the citizen survey.

The survey follows:

---

\(^{1}\) See Chapter 3.3

\(^{2}\) Directories used were "The Haine's Address-A-Key" directory and the "City Directory" of the Credit Union.

\(^{3}\) See Chapters 4.1, 4.3, and 4.5 for further details
Name (respondent) Sex: M F Date ________________
Telephone __________________________ Time at start ______
Address ___________________________ Time at end ______
S. A. C. # __________________________ Interviewer _______

IF UNSATISFACTORY RESPONSE, WHY:
_____ No response, no one at home. ____Person refused to be
_____ Vacant residence. ____Person visited could not
_____ Person no longer at this be interviewed at this
_____ address. ____ time, come back later.

* My name is _____, I represent the Office of Community
Beautification. Your household has been randomly selected to
participate in a study to gather citizen views and impressions of
the visual characteristics or appearance of neighborhoods in the
city.

The answers to the questions asked will be kept in strictest
confidence. The answers given will be analyzed without your name
and your individual answers will not be shown to any agency or
individual not associated with this project.

Will you allow me to interview you as part of this study?
(approximate length of interview: 1/2 hour to thirty-five min.)
YES ____ NO ____ OTHER ______

*May I tape this interview? YES ____ NO ____

1-How would you define neighborhood visual quality or beauty?

2-Is there one thing about your block which you consider beauti-
ful or visually pleasing?

3-What are the three most important aspects of a neighborhoods
appearance that you look for or consider when selecting a place
to make your home? Give them in order of importance please.

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________

4-What four things come to mind when you think of the appearance
of your block?

1. ________________________________
2. ________________________________
3. ________________________________
4. ________________________________

5-Is there anything special or unique about your block?
YES ____ NO ____ Comments: ____________________________
6-What are some things you like about the block you live on and what are some things you don’t like about it?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likes</th>
<th>Dislikes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7-Do you participate in gardening of any kind? Please explain.

YES ___ NO ___ Comments: ____________________________

8-How would you rate the condition of the tree spaces (the area between the curb and walk) on your block? Explain.

Poor ____ Explanation or comments: __________________
Fair ____ ________________________________________
Good ____ ________________________________________
Very Good ____

9-How would you rate the overall appearance of the front and rear yards on your block? Please explain the reasons for your rating.

Front Yards Rear Yards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Very Good</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (front yards) ____________________________
(rear yards) ____________________________

10-What do you think of the overall condition or appearance of your street (curb to curb) and alley (property line to property line)? Please give reasons for your answers?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Street</th>
<th>Alley</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Good</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comments (Street) ____________________________
(Alley) ____________________________

11-Do you sweep or clean the sidewalk in front of your home?

YES ___ NO ___ OTHER ___ (please explain)
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12-What additions, efforts or activities do you feel would have a positive effect on the appearance of your block?

__________________________________________________________________________

13-How often or when do you notice neighbors working in the yards or performing routine maintenance of their property?

   Hardly ever _____
   Occasionally, during warm weather _____
   Frequently ______
   Other __________________________ (specify)

14-Are the yards and sidewalk areas well kept up or maintained?

   YES ____  NO ____  OTHER __________________________ (specify)

15-Would or do you participate in neighborhood clean up or beautification projects? Please explain your answer.

   YES ____  NO ____  Comments: __________________________

16-Is there anything that bothers you or causes you nuisance on and around this block? Please comment.

   YES ____  NO ____  Comments: __________________________

17-Is there a feeling of community or citizen cooperation and public interest on this block? Please comment.

   YES ____  NO ____  Comments: __________________________

18-How many people on this block do you know by sight?

   All ______
   1/2 ______
   3/4 ______
   less than 1/4 ______
   1/4 ______
   None ________________

19-Do you belong to any social organization or any form of local civic group, P.T.A., or block club?

   YES ____  NO ____  Comments: __________________________
20-Do you feel any responsibility for the way the block looks or for what happens on it?

YES _____ NO _____

21-If an outsider criticized your block, would you defend it?

YES _____ NO _____ Comments: ________________________________

22-Have you devoted much time and/or money to improving, beautifying or decorating your home? Please specify where (interior, exterior, rear or front yard, etc.).

YES _____ NO _____ Comments: ________________________________

23-Where do you think that your home extends to; in other words what do you see as your personal area, turf or territory?

_________________________________________________________________

24-Are you aware of any of the following D.C. Government Beautification Programs? If yes, how or in what way are you aware of it?

YES or NO | Program | Comments
---|---|---
| | The Annual Beautification Awards Program | 
| | The Grass Seed and Top Soil Program | 
| | The Plant Material, Speakers & Technical Assistance Program on Beautification | 
| | The Street Scenes Program | 
| | The D.E.S./R.L.A. Summer Youth Program (Dept. of Environmental Services/Redevelopment Land Agency) | 
| | The D. C. Arbor Day Program | 
| | The Beautification Congress | 

25-How long have you lived at this location? _______________________

26-Do you own or rent the place where you live?

Own or buying _____
Rent _____
Other (specify) _____
27-Altogether, how many persons live here, including yourself and what are the general age groupings of each?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of people</th>
<th>respondent's age (estimate if not given)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age Groupings</strong></td>
<td><strong>Interviewer's Tally</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a) Less than 6 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b) 6-12 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c) 13-19 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d) 20-35 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e) 36-65 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f) over 65 years old</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28-What is your marital status, are you single, married, divorced, separated or widowed?

Single ________ Married ________ Separated ________ Divorced ________ Widowed ________ Other ________ (specify)

29-What is your occupation (and that of your spouse)?

IF MARRIED

__________________ (respondent) _______________ (spouse)

30-What is the highest grade of level of school you (and your spouse, if married) ever attended?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent</th>
<th>Spouse</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>College Grad.</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part College</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Part High School</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8th Grade or less</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No schooling</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

31-Please look at the cards I will hand you and tell me how you would rate the photos using a rating of either:

Poor
Fair
Good or
Excellent
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you very much. That completes the questions I have to ask, but let me check back to be sure I didn't overlook anything.

INTERVIEWER: TO BE FILLED OUT LATER

General comments by interviewer about the family seen. (Any unusual factor that you wish to identify or stress on your reception, suspicions, insights, etc.)

---

Socio-Economic Level

Upper
Upper Middle
Lower Middle
Lower

Interviewee's reaction to interviewer:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>At beginning</th>
<th>At end of</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of interview</td>
<td>interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enthusiastic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warm</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cool</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reluctant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hostile</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Would you consider the respondent to be White, Black, or other?

White  __
Black   ____
Other   (specify)
Photos from random areas in Washington, D. C.
RATING
Poor _____
Fair _____
Good _____
Excellent _____

Photo #1. Slope appearance & treatment #____

RATING
Poor _____
Fair _____
Good _____
Excellent _____

Photo #2. Front yard appearance or treatment #____
Photo #3. Front yard & tree space appearance

Photo #4. Median Strip appearance
Photo #5. Public Space appearance

Photo #6. Median Strip appearance
RATING

Poor
Fair
Good
Excellent

Photo #7. Median Strip appearance

RATING

Poor
Fair
Good
Excellent

Photo #8. Yard appearance
Photo #9. Median Strip appearance

RATING
Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #10. General Block Appearance

RATING
Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____
Photos from the Upper Northwest Area.
Photo #11. General Block Appearance

Photo #12. Slope Appearance
Photo #13. Alley Appearance

Photo #14. Alley Appearance
Photos from the Southeast Barry Farms Area.
Photo #15. Rear Yard Appearance

RATING

Poor
Fair
Good
Excellent

Photo #16. Front Yard & Slope Treatment

RATING

Poor
Fair
Good
Excellent
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Photo #17. Exterior Home Appearance

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #18. Exterior Home Appearance

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____
Photo #21. General Block Appearance

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #22. General Block & Tree Space Appearance

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____
RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #23. Front yard & Slope appearance  

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #24. Yard Appearance
Photos from the Northeast Urban Renewal Area.
Photo #25. General block appearance

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #26. Vacant Lot Appearance

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____
Photo #27. General Block Appearance

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #28. General Block Appearance

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____
Photo #29. General Block Appearance

Photo #30. Tree Space appearance
RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #31. Front Yard Appearance __________________ #___

RATING

Poor ____
Fair ____
Good ____
Excellent ____

Photo #32. General Block Appearance __________________ #___
RATING

Poor _____
Fair _____
Good _____
Excellent ____

Photo #33, Front Yard Appearance _______ #___
3.3 The Ground Survey

The utilization of the ground survey\(^1\) is an attempt to develop a method by which to relate the environmental assessment of the trained observer to that of the citizen observer.

The ground surveyor inspects preselected streets in the three test areas using a seven point visual quality rating system\(^2\) expressed in a set of photographs. The photos are used as a reference for the various ratings. By utilizing a standard set of photographs, follow-up inspections can be conducted, all with the same point of reference, thus allowing for appearance and treatment comparisons over a number of years.

In addition to the photographic rating section of the ground survey, there are provisions for noting specific observations concerning the appearance, treatment and general condition of the area. This allows for specific documentation of findings and for later coordination with the appropriate office or agency for necessary action to correct or make improvements where possible.

**Ratings for the Visual Appearance of an Area** - The rating for the visual appearance of an area is based on a seven point rating system. The overall rating for an area is determined by totaling the ratings of each condition present or observed in an area and dividing by the number of conditions rated.

---

\(^1\)See page 55

\(^2\)Further explanation is found in succeeding sections of this Chapter.
The seven points used in this rating system can be further categorized into the terms utilized in the citizen survey photographic rating section and in the general question area. Thus allowing for a check of the ground survey against the citizen's views on area appearance and quality.

The seven points are allocated or broken down into the system of classification.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RATING POINTS</th>
<th>CLASSIFICATION</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
EQUIVALENTS IN THE POINT FORM OF RATING

1 - Terribly Bad
    | Poor    | Negative
2 - Pretty Bad
    | Not So Bad | Fair       | Neutral
3 - Not So Bad
    | All Right | Good
4 - All Right
    | OK       | Positive
5 - OK
    | Very Good | Excellent
6 - Very Good

7 Point  →  6 Point  ←  4 Point  ←  3 Point

The following ground survey was conducted in the three test areas of Washington, D. C.¹

¹See Chapter 4 for further explanation of test areas
### GROUND SURVEY
**DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL SERVICES**  
**OFFICE OF COMMUNITY BEAUTIFICATION**

Street ___________________________  S.A.C.# ___________  Inspection Date: ________

D. C. Square # ___________________________  Time at start: ______  Time at end: ________

Location Information: ___________________________  Inspector: ___________

Weather Conditions: ___________________________  Average Condition or Appearance: ___________

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment or Appearance</th>
<th>Even No. Side</th>
<th>Odd No. Side</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excel</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard (lawn &amp; shrub)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slopes &amp; inclines</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley from block face</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public trash containers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk items in public way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulk items (private way)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned autos (public way)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abandoned autos (private way)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment or Appearance</td>
<td>Even No. Side</td>
<td>Odd No. Side</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant lots (public)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant lots (private)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter level (public way)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Litter level (private way)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Miscellaneous Observations</th>
<th>Even No. Side</th>
<th>Odd No. Side</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of Code violations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street furniture condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian use of space (public)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pedestrian use of space (private)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evictions or set outs (public way)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of dead animals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evidence of wild life (birds, squirrels, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clogged catch basins</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Visual Appearance Using Photo Rating System

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Screening appearance and treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope and incline treatment and appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Play area appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of vacant stores and shops</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street planter appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot treatment and appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service station appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree space appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of public space and triangles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant lot appearance and treatment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Front yard or area appearance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of median strips</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Location:**

**Survey #**

**Surveyor:**

**Date:**

---
Screening appearance & treatment

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Slope & incline treatment & appearance

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Play area appearance

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Appearance of vacant stores & shops

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Street Planter appearance

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Write (7) if better than (6)

Parking lot treatment & appearance

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Tree space appearance

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Appearance of public space & triangles

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Vacant lot appearance or treatment

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Front yard or area appearance

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
Appearance of Median Strips

Write (7) if better than (6)

Write (5) if worse than (6) but better than (4)

Write (3) if worse than (4) but better than (2)

Write (1) if worse than (2)
4.0 The Application of the Survey Guidelines to Selected Areas of the City

The surveys which were developed were tested in three of the District's nine service areas. The three service areas utilized were selected for their diversified characteristics and for the frequency with which the beautification programs have been utilized in or near the areas.

The following tables include many of the characteristics of the above mentioned service areas.¹

¹For a more detailed background see "Demographic, Social and Health Characteristics of the Residents of the District of Columbia" prepared by the D. C. Department of Human Resources
### Service Area I

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ENTIRE DC</th>
<th>SERVICE AREA 1</th>
<th>SUB-AREA A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Population</td>
<td>756,510</td>
<td>79,142</td>
<td>29,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent Black</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>82.8</td>
<td>69.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Median Age</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>31.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of cases</td>
<td>31,315</td>
<td>1,840</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of Recipients</td>
<td>80,873</td>
<td>3,749</td>
<td>649</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Density - Pop./sq. mi.</td>
<td>12,058</td>
<td>12,138</td>
<td>9,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. % units overcrowded</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Median House value</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$22,000</td>
<td>$25,400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Median Rent paid</td>
<td>$ 112</td>
<td>$ 116</td>
<td>$ 124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Median family income</td>
<td>$ 9,583</td>
<td>$11,444</td>
<td>$13,083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Median Education of persons 25 yrs. &amp; over</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. % of families at or below poverty level</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Photographic Description of selected Upper Northwest Area - S. A. C. #1

According to the Washington Star-News, Sheperd Park, along with Crestwood, further south is where Washington's wealthiest blacks live - its doctors, government officials, academicians. Sheperd Park is about half white, too - many of the whites Jewish because of a concentration of synagogues there. The neighborhood school is among the top two or three in the city in reading and mathematics scores. The neighborhood, almost entirely brick or stone single homes, ranges from Georgia Avenue west across 16th Street into Rock Creek Park, between Walter Reed Hospital and the Maryland line.¹

¹For more information see "Area Living" by Lee Flor, Star-News Staff Writer, Sunday April 7, 1974
### Service Area IV

#### Service Area 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ENTIRE DC</th>
<th>SERVICE AREA 4</th>
<th>SUB-AREA C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Population</td>
<td>756,510</td>
<td>126,237</td>
<td>34,622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent Black</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>86.0</td>
<td>89.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Median Age</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of cases</td>
<td>31,315</td>
<td>5,015</td>
<td>1,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of Recipients</td>
<td>80,873</td>
<td>16,231</td>
<td>5,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Density - Pop./sq. mi.</td>
<td>12,058</td>
<td>12,713</td>
<td>12,919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. % units overcrowded</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Median House value</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$18,200</td>
<td>$17,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Median Rent paid</td>
<td>$ 112</td>
<td>$ 110</td>
<td>$ 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Median Family income</td>
<td>$ 9,583</td>
<td>$ 8,566</td>
<td>$ 8,001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Median Education of persons 25 yrs. &amp; over</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. % of families at or below poverty level</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>16.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Photographic Description of Selected Southeast Barry Farms Area - S. A. C. #IV

The Barry Farms area is located just east of the Anacostia - Bolling urban renewal area in Southeast Washington. The neighborhood is composed largely of public housing which is managed by the National Capital Housing Authority. On the fringes of the public housing, a few single homes and several three story apartments are located.
### SERVICE AREA VI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>ENTIRE DC</th>
<th>SERVICE AREA 1</th>
<th>SUB-AREA A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Total Population</td>
<td>756,510</td>
<td>79,157</td>
<td>13,646</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Percent Black</td>
<td>72.3</td>
<td>91.2</td>
<td>92.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Median Age</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Welfare</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Number of cases</td>
<td>31,315</td>
<td>6,962</td>
<td>1,168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Number of recipients</td>
<td>80,873</td>
<td>15,735</td>
<td>2,940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Density - Pop./sq. mi.</td>
<td>12,058</td>
<td>24,207</td>
<td>31,014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Housing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. % units overcrowded</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Median House value</td>
<td>$21,300</td>
<td>$16,000</td>
<td>$16,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Median Rent paid</td>
<td>$112</td>
<td>$87</td>
<td>$92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Median family income</td>
<td>$9,583</td>
<td>$6,612</td>
<td>$7,379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Median Education of persons 25 yrs. &amp; over</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. % of families at or below poverty level</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>22.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Photographic Description of Selected Northeast Area Near the H Street Urban Renewal Corridor

S. A. C. #VI

The H Street, N. E. urban renewal area is located just east of Union Station. H Street was the most active commercial street of the three business corridors damaged during the disturbances of 1968. More than 18,000 people live in the renewal area.
5.0  General Results of the Survey

The questions which made up the survey fall into one of three criteria groupings. These groupings are referred to as: I. Physical - Aesthetic, II. Cultural and III. Value Images. Under the first heading, Physical - Aesthetic, are the characteristics which fall into the sub-categories of natural forms or features, spatial features or patterns, and a general category which includes maintenance and care items. The second grouping, Cultural, contains the sub-categories of social, political and economic factors. Under this classification responses dealing with services, uses, circulation, population, and institutions are found. The final category, Value Images, includes responses directed at attitudes, meanings, preferences and responsibilities.

The three major criteria groupings of survey questions and responses are intended to allow for greater insight into the relationships which create or assist in making visually pleasing or satisfying environments to the observer or viewer.

The final citizen survey involved sixteen (16) respondents scattered throughout the three test areas of the city. These test areas were also visited and rated in a ground survey conducted by a trained observer.

The following data was derived from the various surveys. The results reported here are divided into two parts. One being a response ranking according to the entire test group and the other being responses according to individual groupings.
Results of Citizen Survey: (All test areas)

- 87% of respondents participate in gardening.
- 13% of respondents do not participate in gardening.
- 94% of respondents sweep or clean the sidewalk in front of their home.
- 6% of respondents rarely sweep or clean the sidewalk in front of their home.
- 0% of respondents replied no, they do not sweep or clean the sidewalk in front of their home.

- When do you notice neighbors working in the yards or performing routine maintenance of their property?
  0% - Hardly ever
  37% - occasionally, during warm weather
  63% - Frequently

- Are the yards and sidewalk areas well kept up or maintained?
  81% - Yes
  6% - No
  13% - Other

- Would or do you participate in neighborhood clean up or beautification projects?
  68% - yes
  6% - No
  26% - other

- Is there anything that bothers you or causes you nuisance on and around this block?
  63% - Yes
  37% - No

- Is there a feeling of community or citizen cooperation and public interest on this block?
  88% - Yes
  6% - No
  6% - Don't Know

- How many people on this block do you know by sight?
  81% - All
  13% - 3/4
  0% - 1/2
  6% - 1/4
  0% - Less than 1/4
  0% - None
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-Do you belong to any social organization or any form of local civic group or block club?

75% - Yes
25% - No

-Do you feel any responsibility for the way the block looks or for what happens on it?

94% - Yes
6% - No

-If an outsider criticized your block would you defend it?

100% - Yes
0% - No

-Have you devoted much time and/or money to improving, beautifying or decorating your home?

94% - Yes
6% - No

-Awareness of the following beautification programs:

56% - Yes The Annual Beautification Awards Program
44% - No

50% - Yes The Grass Seed & Top Soil Program
50% - No

37% - Yes The Plant Material, speakers & Technical assistance program on beautification
63% - No

37% - Yes The Street Scenes Program
63% - No

63% - Yes The D.E.S./R.L.A. Summer youth program
37% - No

63% - Yes The D. C. Arbor Day Program
37% - No

13% - Yes The Beautification Congress
87% - No

-Do you own or rent the place where you live?

56% - Own or buying
44% - Rent
Findings by test area: UPPER NORTHWEST AREA

- Participants
  - 25% - Male
  - 75% - Female
  - 100% - College Grad.

- Participation in gardening:
  - Yes - 87%
  - No - 13%

- Tree space rating:
  - Poor - 0%
  - Fair - 13%
  - Good - 62%
  - Very Good - 25%

- Front yard rating:
  - Poor - 0%
  - Fair - 0%
  - Good - 38%
  - Very Good - 62%

- Rear yard rating:
  - Poor - 0%
  - Fair - 0%
  - Good - 38%
  - Very Good - 62%

- Street appearance:
  - Poor - 0%
  - Fair - 0%
  - Good - 25%
  - Very Good - 75%
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- Alley appearance:
  
  Poor - 13%
  Fair - 0%
  Good - 50%
  Very Good - 37%

-Sweeping and cleaning of front walk:

  Yes - 87%
  No - 13%

- Observations of neighbors working in yards:

  Hardly ever - 0%
  Occasionally, during warm weather - 38%
  Frequently - 62%

- Yards and sidewalk areas are well kept up and maintained:

  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Participation in clean-up or beautification projects:

  Yes - 62%
  No - 38%

- Reports of nuisance:

  Yes - 25%
  No - 75%

- Feeling of community or citizen cooperation:

  Yes - 87%
  No - 13%

- Membership in civic groups:

  Yes - 87%
  No - 13%

- Feeling of responsibility for the appearance of the block:

  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Devoted time and/or money to improving and beautifying:

  Yes - 87%
  No - 13%
The following data was taken from the response groupings. The most frequently referred to or repeated replys are recorded here.

- **Visual Quality:**
  
  Condition, cleanliness, maintenance
  Handsome, attractive, inviting, pleasing, comfortable, pleasant
  Beautiful, colorful, plantings, trees, shrubs

- **Beautiful or visually pleasing thing:**
  
  Flowers, trees, and shrubbery

- **Important aspects of a neighborhoods appearance that one looks for when selecting a place to live:**
  
  Condition of houses
  Convenience
  General air of care on the part of the neighbors as evidenced by the beauty, cleanliness and maintenance level of the area.
  Shrubs and trees

- **What things come to mind about the block:**
  
  The tidy appearance and quality of upkeep of the houses and grounds
  The chain link fence (negative)
  Colorful trees
  No sameness, the little personal touches of each property owner

- **Special or uniqueness:**
  
  The interesting people, their variety of backgrounds

- **Likes:**
  
  Heavy landscaping
  The respect for others property
  People mixture
  Convenience

- **Dislikes:**
  
  Chain link fence
  Fewer dogs
  4:00 - 5:00 traffic
  Level of city services
- Additions, efforts or activities that would have a positive
effect on the appearance of the block:

Removal of the chain link fence
Improvement of city services
People taking better care of their dogs

- Personal turf or territory:

To the property line and the grass strip beyond the walk
As far as the eye can see
NORTHEAST AREA:

- Participants
  33% - Male
  67% - Female
  33% - College Grad.
  33% - Part College
  34% - High School
  33% - Single
  33% - Married
  34% - Widowed
  100% - Low middle econ. status
  100% - Black

- Participation in gardening:
  Yes - 33%
  No - 67%

- Tree space rating:
  Poor - 33%
  Fair - 34%
  Good - 33%
  Very Good - 0%

- Front yard rating:
  Poor - 33%
  Fair - 67%
  Good - 0%
  Very Good - 0%

- Rear yard rating:
  Poor - 0%
  Fair - 67%
  Good - 33%
  Very Good - 0%

- Street appearance:
  Poor - 33%
  Fair - 33%
  Good - 34%
  Very Good - 0%
- Alley appearance:
  Poor - 33%
  Fair - 34%
  Good - 0%
  Very Good - 33%

- Sweeping and cleaning of front walk:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Observations of neighbors working in yards:
  Hardly ever - 0%
  Occassionally - 0%
  Frequently - 100%

- Yards and sidewalk areas are well kept up and maintained:
  Yes - 33%
  No - 67%

- Participation in clean-up or beautification projects:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Reports of nuisance:
  Yes - 67%
  No - 33%

- Feeling of community or citizen cooperation:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Membership in civic groups:
  Yes - 67%
  No - 33%

- Feeling of responsibility for the appearance of the block:
  Yes - 67%
  No - 33%

- Devoted time and/or money to improving and beautifying:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%
The following data was taken from the response groupings of the Northeast area. The most frequently referred to or repeated replies are recorded here.

- **Visual Quality:**
  Neat, trim, clean
  Togetherness, supervision, block clubs
  Grass, trees, paint

- **Beautiful or visually pleasing thing:**
  Quietness
  Neighbors working to keep area clean

- **Important aspects of a neighborhood's appearance that one looks for when selecting a place to live:**
  Cleanliness
  Convenience
  Neighbors attitudes

- **What things come to mind about the block:**
  Children playing in streets
  Many residents are not property owners
  Not noisy
  Could be cleaner

- **Special or uniqueness:**
  There are some pretty good properties on the block

- **Likes:**
  Quietness
  Attitude of neighbors

- **Dislikes:**
  Others throwing trash and bottles on street
  Parking problems
  Unsupervised children and their vandalism

- **Additions, efforts or activities that would have a positive effect on the appearance of the block:**
  More recreational facilities
  Improved trash collection and cleanliness level
- Personal turf or territory:

  Inside that door
  The whole community
SOUTHEAST AREA:

- Participants
  100% - Female
  0% - Male

  80% - High School
  20% - 8th grade or less

  20% - Single
  20% - Married
  40% - Widowed
  20% - Divorced

  100% - low econ. status

  100% - Black

- Participation in gardening:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Tree space rating:
  Poor - 20%
  Fair - 40%
  Good - 40%
  Very Good - 0%

- Front yard rating:
  Poor - 20%
  Fair - 40%
  Good - 40%
  Very Good - 0%

- Rear yard rating:
  Poor - 0%
  Fair - 80%
  Good - 20%
  Very Good - 0%

- Street appearance:
  Poor - 20%
  Fair - 0%
  Good - 80%
  Very Good - 0%
- Alley appearance:
  Poor - 20%
  Fair - 20%
  Good - 40%
  Very Good - 20%

- Sweeping and cleaning of front walk:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Observations of neighbors working in yards:
  Hardly ever - 0%
  Occasionally, during warm weather - 40%
  Frequently - 60%

- Yards and sidewalk areas are well kept up and maintained:
  Yes - 80%
  No - 20%

- Participation in clean-up or beautification projects:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Reports of nuisance:
  Yes - 80%
  No - 20%

- Feeling of community or citizen cooperation:
  Yes - 80%
  No - 20%

- Membership in civic groups:
  Yes - 60%
  No - 40%

- Feeling of responsibility for the appearance of the block:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%

- Devoted time and/or money to improving and beautifying:
  Yes - 100%
  No - 0%
The following data was taken from the response groupings of the Southeast area. The most frequently referred to or repeated replys are recorded here.

- Visual Quality:
  Nice, clean
  Togetherness, clean-ups, helping
  Children, lit courts
  Flowers, trees, lawns

- Beautiful or visually pleasing thing:
  Nothing
  Yards when clean

- Important aspects of a neighborhood's appearance that one looks for when selecting a place to live:
  Cleanliness
  Quietness
  People's attitudes

- What things come to mind about the block:
  Should be better supervision of children
  Should be better supervision of dogs
  Don't like sharing porches
  Don't like the color of paint the buildings are being painted

- Special or uniqueness:
  Most quiet street in the neighborhood

- Likes:
  Beautiful view of city
  Quietness
  Neighbors

- Dislikes:
  Being in middle
  Inadequate outdoor lighting
  Dogs messing up yards
  Lack of adequate fencing
- Additions, efforts or activities that would have a positive effect on the appearance of the block:

Wooden picket fences for everyone
Improved cleanliness level
Get rid of dogs
More recreational activities for children after school

- Personal turf or territory:

The entire block

The following figures contain some of the survey results in charted form. Comparison can be seen between ratings given by residents of the three sections of the city as well as comparisons with the trained observer.
Fig. 8  Participation in Beautification or Clean-up projects

Resident Responses:
- N.W.
- N.E.
- S.E.
Fig. 9  Reports of Nuisances
Fig. 10 Responsibility for block
Fig. 11 Tree Space Rating
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Resident Rating

Trained Observer Rating
Fig. 12  Front Yards Rating

1. Poor
2. Poor
3. Fair
4. Fair
5. Good
6. Good
7. Very Good

Resident Rating

Trained Observer Rating

N.W.  N.E.  S.E.
5.1 Overall Rating of Photo Section of Citizen Survey
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Photo Number</th>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#10</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#11</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#12</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#13</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#14</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#15</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#16</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#17</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#18</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#19</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Photo Number</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Comments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#20</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#21</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#22</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#23</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#24</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#25</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#26</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#27</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#28</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#29</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#30</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#31</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#32</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>88%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#33</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6.0 Analysis

The previous chapter reported some of the initial survey findings. The degree of agreement between the various observer groups as far as how they view or rank the visual environment has been an unanswered question for the open space planner.

The findings of this study run congruent to those of Lansing and Marans in their study of neighborhood quality.¹

The responses gathered in this study give insight into the extent of observer agreement on visual quality.

The results of the investigation suggests that citizen observers when rating photographs of environmental conditions have a tendency to rate familiar environmental components slightly harsher than the trained observer. The fact that the citizen observer is more critical than the trained observer is evidenced in the following tables.

¹Lansing, John B. and Marans, Robert W., Evaluating Neighborhood Quality, AIP Journal, May 1969
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Environmental Element</th>
<th>Resident's Evaluation</th>
<th>Trained Observer Rating</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N.W. General Block Appear.</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley Appearance</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope Appearance</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Spaces</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Appearance</td>
<td>Excel</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>Excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.E. General Block Appear.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley Appearance</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slope Appearance</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Spaces</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Appearance</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N.E. General Block Appear.</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alley Appearance</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tree Spaces</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vacant Lot Appear.</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Poor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street Appearance</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The responses indicate that agreement tends to be strongest on the evaluation of the very good or highest quality elements and the poor or lowest quality elements of the observed environment. Differences occur upon evaluating the middle ground, what is fair to one may be good to another.

The results were also analyzed to see if socio-economic and educational background was related in any way to the evaluations. The socio-economic background of the observers made very little difference in the overall rankings but a marked attitude difference was noted in the remembered neighborhood images of the respondents.

The resident respondents exhibited strong agreement within groups in verbal descriptive responses to the remembered visual environment. The three groupings tended to describe the environment in similar terms as is evidenced by the frequency within which certain phrases or word description were repeated. 1

The most frequently voiced elements of a neighborhoods character which respondents felt contributed greatly to its quality are (1) physical condition or maintenance level of structures in terms of upkeep and cleanliness, (2) people or neighbors in terms of variety, responsibility and quietness and finally (3) landscape components such as trees, grass and flowers.

---

1 Refers back to Chapter 5.0, pages 86, 87, 90, 91, 94 and 95
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The evaluation or assessment of environmental elements by the trained observer is generally based entirely on appearance rankings and physical relationships. On the other hand, the resident observer's evaluation tends to be influenced by the individuals values, personal experiences and preferences.

This influence on resident responses is evidenced by the repeated referenced to specific likes, dislikes and reports of nuisance.¹

The survey results give an indication of the general awareness on the part of the resident respondents to the city governments beautifications programs.

Of the programs responded to, the four top ranking programs in terms of citizen awareness are (1) the DES/RLA summer youth program, (2) the D.C. Arbor Day program, (3) the annual beautification awards program and (4) the grass seed sludge, and top soil program.

Programs which were introduced to the community through the children seemed to be most well know. Responses on how the respondents gained knowledge of the specific programs was of assistance in making this determination.

The verbal response portion of the survey is subject to the verbal ability of the respondent to describe ones visual images, likes and dislikes. The photographic ratings by resident respondents offers a certain freedom of expression by providing the respondent with specific images and evaluative

¹Refers to Chapter 5
response choices. This technique drew eager responses on the part of the resident respondent and tended to equalize the relative merits of the survey, where the less articulate may not have previously been able to adequately express images, impressions or meanings. The photographic ranking method of investigating respondent preferences allows for the measurement of attitudes toward the content or make up of the visual environment. This method used in conjunction with the general verbal responses of the survey identifies the physical treatment or elements which create a pleasant or satisfying visual environment.

6.1 Implications

This study responds to the particular needs of the District of Columbia Government for information upon which to base decisions concerning beautification services.

The method utilized in this study can be of interest not only to District officials but to cities or metropolitan areas in general.

These guidelines are intended to serve as a starting point for a more extensive investigation of city visual environments. In order that improvement can be achieved in residential areas of the city, a means of determining acceptability of various visual conditions must be available to city planners and officials. Decision making uses of the study method and data are (1) monitoring of the environment, (2) program planning,
design and budgeting, (3) program evaluation and analysis and (4) integration and coordination of both public and private services.

7.0 **Recommendations and Conclusions**

In order that the full potential of the study guidelines can be developed, it is necessary that the scope of visual inquiry be expanded to include the categories of commercial, institutional and industrial. The main thrust of this study being the resident respondent and selected residential areas can serve as a point for launching an expansion of the photographic rating method and general survey technique. The investigation of each of the District's nine service areas is a possible next logical step of research.

Assuming it is in the public interest to protect and enhance elements of the visual environment which makes neighborhoods an attractive and satisfying place in which to live.

If it is truly the goal of the Office of Community Beautification to work toward this aim, then the method devised in this study for gaining insight into the resident viewpoint of visual quality and of a general assessment of the physical-aesthetic aspects of a city neighborhood is a method which when implemented can be an invaluable planning tool. This tool can be used to identify physical elements and amenities which are necessary or desirable to insure a pleasant and rewarding environment.
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Plans are currently being devised for the expansion of this study and for dissemination of the preceding application results and implications.

This follow-thru will serve as a natural step in the progression of the definition of District of Columbia visual quality.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appendix A</th>
<th>Major Activities During FY 73</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<tr>
<td>Appendix B</td>
<td>Letter of Introduction Used In Conjunction with the Survey</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX A

Major activities during FY 73

July 1972

DES/RLA Summer Beautification Program in progress: This program provided an excellerated program of cleaning and beautifying neighborhoods with special emphasis in the urban renewal areas. The idea was presented to officials in the Redevelopment Land Agency (RLA) and they agreed to fund the program which the Office of Community Beautification developed and administered.

The program involved hiring some 135 inner-city youths and adults to clean and beautify 14th Street, H Street, Shaw and Northwest #1 of RLA's urban renewal areas. The program was considered to be a success by RLA and has prompted them to make commitments to the Office of Community Beautification for other similar programs to be executed in 1973 and 1974 which are to operate on a continuous basis rather than on a one-time temporary project basis.

Arthur Capper Street Scene under construction: This program involves the utilization of public spaces for community recreation and activities. Selected streets may be used for play areas for children, settings for the arts, or even relaxation areas for senior citizens. The major emphasis is to increase the amount of usable open space in the city through the use of small under-utilized areas of land,
including streets, alleys and courtyards. Although the scope of the project is broad, the initial planning is focused exclusively in the use of public streets as public open spaces. Site selection, development and use are determined by the area residents; the Office of Community Beautification (OCB) coordinates the program.

August 1972

Participation in "Environmental Exposition".

National Park Service transferred land at the Barry Farms Street Scene site to the District government.

The Eastgate Street Scene project went out to bid for the first time.

September 1972

A special government/citizen meeting was held concerning the fate of the Model Cities Street Scene project.

DES/RLA Summer Beautification Awards program for summer employees.

Judging of Randolph Street beautification efforts.

Judging of the 1400 block of S Street, N.W.'s beautification efforts.
October 1972

The D. C. Beautification Awards Program: This program is designed to encourage individuals and groups to create a better living environment for themselves and to promote a healthier, more beautiful community. OCB coordinates all phases of this program which is co-sponsored by the Society for a More Beautiful National Capital, Inc., a private organization begun in 1965 by Lady Bird Johnson when she was active in the District's beautification program. The program for 1972 involved the input of some 1500 citizens from many of our public schools and all sections of the city. Elementary school students from many of our public schools were involved in extensive beautification programs to improve the appearance of their school grounds. An awards ceremony was held on October 5th at the National Arboretum at which the Mayor and City Council Chairman, John Nevius, presented awards to the thirty winners. Other city officials attended this ceremony as well as over 300 interested citizens.

November 1972

OCB proposed a Parks Department for the District of Columbia.

December 1972

Official opening ceremony for the Arthur Capper Street Scene project.
Clearance received for participation by the D. C. Public Schools in the poster art competition for the D. C. Beautification Awards Program and the Arbor Day poster.

January 1973

Environmental Corpsmen assigned to make weekly surveillance of Street Scene sites.

February 1973

Office represented at the National Symposium on Park, Recreation and Environmental Design.

Bids received on the Highland Street Scene project.

Garden plot project for senior citizens began at Fort Lincoln New Town.

Visual inventory of all government owned DES properties began.

March 1973

Preparation of the Beautification brochure to be distributed to citizen groups, schools, libraries and individuals.

Investigations began on developing landscape standards for Washington, D. C.
Recommendations submitted to RLA for the 1973 Summer
Beautification Program in urban renewal areas of the city.

April 1973

Top soil and grass seed program underway.

Arbor Day Ceremony: Tree planting ceremonies are held annually and are participated in by city officials, citizen' groups, recreation specialists, and school children. These ceremonies give honor to the many conservers of forestry throughout our country and inspire in us an awareness of the importancy of our natural resources and the need for conserving them. The last Friday in April is officially designated Arbor Day in the District of Columbia. Over 100 trees were provided to area public schools for Arbor Day Ceremonies. The city's official ceremony was held on April 27th at Arthur Capper Street Scene and Recreation Center. Residents took great interest in the ceremony and provided their own informal entertainment. Mayor Washington stated at the ceremony that he would like to see, "... a tree in every tree space in the District."

May 1973

Beautification Congress: An event of displays, projects and programs contributed by various D. C., Federal and private agencies.
June 1973

Preliminary discussion of a Proposed Parks Land Agency for the District of Columbia.

Approval for the Kalorama Park Beautification Project.

D. C. Public Library to finance the construction of prototype satellite library for the Highland Street Scene project. Planning and construction to be coordinated by the Office of Community Beautification.

Highland Street Scene project is under construction.

Barry Farms Street Scene project is under construction.

Arranged for display of award winning art competition posters in the childrens section of the Martin Luther King, Jr. Library

Year round city-wide distribution of beautification-related materials: Through the use of a mailing list of interested individuals, civic and citizen organizations, and public schools, OCB insures the widest distribution of beautification related items. In this way, the citizens of the District are knowledgeable of what can be done and when, through seasonal literature regarding maintenance of lawns,
trees, flowers; also what kind of help is available to them in this area from the District government. The mailing list has been compiled over the past five years and is constantly updated.
TO WHOM IT MAY CONCERN:

This is to certify that _______________ is participating in a confidential study of the appearance of selected neighborhoods in Washington, D. C.

The purpose of this study is to ascertain the views of various households on their impressions of the appearance of their neighborhoods. It is our sincere hope that this study will help develop a better beautification program in this city. The answers to the questions asked will be kept in strictest confidence. Your answers will be analyzed without your name and we will not show your individual answers to any agency or individual outside of this project.

Your cooperation in this project is extremely important. The Office of Community Beautification is grateful for all the cooperation and assistance you may give to the person whose name appears above. Thank you for your help.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Magrue R. Blanchette, Director
Office of Community Beautification
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